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Both columns contain speeches: ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ὅτι in ii 7 is a clear index of direct oration (see my note ad loc.) though it is impossible to say how far this extended.  

ii 15's ὅς φάτο marks the end of a speech (see ad loc.). and the plural imperative and subjunctive at ii 8 taken together with the participle dependent upon them in ii 6 shows that this speech goes back as far as column two can be deciphered. Of the two speeches it is easier to discern the content of that in the latter, more fully attested, column. Its speaker is rejecting the proposal of a previous speaker who must have put forward contrary advice (ii 8: ἔλθετε μηδὲ λόγοις πειθώμεθ' ὅπως...) to the effect that the Wooden Horse should be destroyed (ii 8ff: ὅπως... ἀναγνώ ἄγαλμα... αὐτῇ κατασχύωμεν δειμαλίως). Let us instead, he says, bring it into the acropolis (ii 6). This last detail dates the deliberation over the fate that should be meted out to the Horse to some time before it was allowed into the city. Reasonable enough, it will be said: when the portals of Troy may have to be widened or its walls partly demolished to allow the creature's entrance (so Il.Parv. Allen p.107 (Procl.) τὸν τε δούρειον ἵππον ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἐξεδέχονται, διελόντες

---

1Mr. Barrett's view to the contrary (for which see below p.617) appears to me refuted by the evidence of ii 6 (see my note ad loc.).
μέρος τι τοῦ τείχους c.f.Verg. Aen. 2.234 and R.G. Austin ad loc.(p.110f)) it is only common-sense to moot in advance whether all that effort is going to be justified by the decision to save the Horse. Yet strangely enough, while this utilitarian course is followed here and in Verg. Aen. 2.32ff, the infinitely more wasteful and illogical alternative of a decision as to the horse's fate after it has been admitted in the first place, is presented by Od. 8.504ff: αύτοὶ γὰρ μὲν Τρῳδες ἐς ἀκρόπολιν ἐροῦσαντο· ὥς δὲ μὲν ἔστηκει, τοι δὲ άκριτα πόλλ' ἀγόρευον | ἦμενοι ἀμφ'αύτόν· τρίχα δὲ εὐφεσὶν ἠνθάνε ευηλή κτλ. So too the epic cycle, if Proclus' resumé is to be believed (Il.Parv. ad fin. Il.Pers. ad init. Allen p.107): οἱ δὲ Τρῳδες τῶν κακῶν ὑπολαβόντες ἀπηλλάχθαι τὸν τε δοῦρεον ἵππον εἰς τὴν πόλιν εἰσδέχονται... οἱ Τρῳδες ὑπόπτως ἔχοντες περιστάντες βουλεύονται ὅτι χρὴ ποιεῖν. καὶ τοῖς μὲν δοκεῖ κατακυκλοφορεῖν αὐτόν (only possible if the horse is already on the acropolis)1 : c.f.Apollod. ep.5.16: εἶλκον τὸν ἵππον καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Πριάμου βασιλείοις στήσαντες ἐβουλεύοντο τί χρὴ ποιεῖν.

If the above deductions are correct, it is highly tempting to identify the man who says i 7 with the proponent of opposing views presupposed by ii 8 ff.

---

1Admittedly nothing is said about Trojan deliberations on the Horse's fate in Proclus' summary of Il.Parv. But we know that the end of this has been curtailed to run more smoothly into the epic IliuPersis.
And it may be his wisdom that is being alluded to in ii 19-24.

We do not know who the two speakers are, but as Page (p.50) observes, when Vergil's Trojans are deliberating the fate of the Horse (Aen. 2.32ff) Thymoetes is for bringing it within the citadel, whereas "Capys, et quorum melior sententia menti" urge its destruction. If Vergil did not invent these names, he may be following a tradition which stems ultimately from the epic cycle, or S., or both.

Führer (R p.19) suggests ἡγαθτ τοῦτον ("the bottom of a small circle": Lobel p.35).

For this phrase dependent on πεποιθότες c.f. Il.12.135: καθορεσθε πεποιθότες ἢδε βηστη, Il.12.153: λαοῖς (λάεσσι Zenoët.) καθορέσθε πεποιθότες ἢδε βηστη.

In view of the general sequence of events in this passage as worked out above (p.61) we may wonder with Page whether the context of this phrase may not be: "let us rely on our strength and the spear [rather than the hope that this Wooden Horse betokens the end of the war]." Or Ἰουτι perhaps the end of a third person pl.?

1: ἄλλ' ἄγε δή
A very frequent formula within Homeric speeches (c.f. Schmidt, Parallel-Homer p.10). Not necessarily a proof of synaphea here (see above p.585).

Παλλυοκες suggested Lobel (p.37), comparing Il·2·848 and 10·428 where that epithet is used of this nation. Page (p.50) remarks that ιαλουκες would be another possibility, and against Lobel's supplement notes how odd it would be if this obscure tribe which plays so insignificant a rôle in the Iliad (they are only mentioned in Il·2·848; 10·428; 16·287 and 291; 21·155, 205 and 211) and loses its leader and best man Asteropaeus some time before the sack of Troy (Il·21·207) should be mentioned here. The objection is by no means decisive: who can tell whether Stesichorean κανυνοπίλα gave the Paeonians an unexpectedly important rôle?

But Page is right to stress the impossibility of deciding between the alternatives.

For the metrical consequences which would result if we could choose see above p.582.

Il: ]·c διακταν'

see above p.594.

16: εὑρότοπα

The constant epithet of Zeus in Homer (Schmidt, Parallel-Homer p.89).

But note that though there is space on the papyrus for the supplement Ζευς directly after εὑρότοπα the metrical
scheme demands that we place the god's name at the start of the following line.

18: π]όλ]έμου τε[λευτά
In the context of the Wooden Horse the significance of this phrase (and perhaps 16's τ]έλος) is immediately apparent. For an attempt to be somewhat more specific than this see my note ad 6.

For the phrase c.f. Il. 14.294, H.H. Aphr. 38,243. Other allusions to cunning occur in 24 and perhaps 22.

21: ἰη[ξ]ήσορα
The adjective is restricted to Achilles in Homer and Hesiod (see West on Hes. Theog. 1007 (p.432)). The epic form puzzles: S's usual practice, especially as exemplified by λιπεσάνωρ (223·5 P) and ὀλεσάνωρ (S 15 ii 5), strongly favours the emendation ἰη[ξ]ήσορα here, unless their post-Homeric origin explains the discrepancy.

μένος κα[ὶ θυμό]ν ἐκάστου (Il. 5.470, 6.72, Il. 291, 13.155, 15.500, 514, 16·120, 275).
Page (p.50) suggests ex gratia ήτοι δ]γ α]ς ε]π[ώ]ν ὄτρυνε
Lobel (p. 37) compares Il. 16.596: διήλως τε πλοῦτων τε μετέπρεπε Μυρμηδόνεσσι and Il. 7.288f: μέγεθος τε βλην τε καὶ πτυσθήν. The first passage supplies us with a very likely supplement here.

col. ii

6: πρὸς ναόν

compare Triphiodorus 467f where Helen υψιμέλαθρον ἐς ἱέρον ἦλθεν Ἀθηνῆς, ἔστη παπταλνουσα ψυχὴν εὐθυρὸς ἴππου κτλ. After she has tortured the heroes inside the Horse by imitating the voices of their wives Athena appears to her φίλου δ' ἔξηγαγε νησοῦ (ib.489).

ἐς ἄκρωπολλίῳν

c.f. Od. 8.504: αὐτὸν γάρ μιν (scil. ἴππου) Τρώες ἐς ἄκρωπολλιν ἔφυσαντο, Triph. 301: ἔλεκτ' ἐς ἄκρωπολιν μεγάλην χρυσήνιον ἴππου, 357: ἦγον ἐς ἄκρωπολιν βεβαρημένων ἔνθεσθαι ἴππου. Since these parallel phrases refer to the introduction of the Horse into the city from outside, I find it hard to accept Barrett's intuition that in S. the debate is about where precisely to place a horse that has already entered.

8: ἔλθετε

finally deciphered by Lobel (ap. West (2) 262) in the
wake of Barrett's ἔλκετε.

λόγοις

for the meaning "deceptive arguments" see West on Hes. Theog. 229 (p.231).

δωμεθάνοι[{π}ως

a remarkable instance of scriptio plena.

Τρωὲς πολεῖς τ' ἐπίκουροι

c.f. Τρωὲς κλειτοὶ τ' ἐπίκουροι (II.6.227, 18.229)

9: τονδεκα[......]υ

10f: ἄγονον ἀγαλμα [θε]ᾶς

The same noun is used by those who wish to preserve the Horse in Od. 8.509: ἂν ἔδαι μεγ' ἄγαλμα δεῖν δεικνύον εἶναι c.f. Il. Pers. (Allen p.107 (Procl.)): οἱ δὲ ἵερον αὐτὸν ἔφασαν δεῖν τῇ Ἀθηνᾶί ἄνατεθήκην Eur. Tro. 525: τὸ δ' ἵερον ἀνάγετε εἴδανον Ἰλιάδι διογενεῖ κόραι. These passages and the general context (esp. ii 6 above) exclude the notion (Gentili, Gnomon 48 (1976) p.747 n.14) that a statue of Athena is under discussion.

αὐτεῖ:

in strong antithesis to ii 6's ἔς ἄρρηπολίν: "let us take the Horse into the citadel instead of doing it some harm here, on the spot."

κατα[σχ]όνωμε[ν

on this word's misdivision in the papyrus see above
p.594. The final decipherment is West's (2.262).

12: for a possible supplement see above p.583. It is hard to devise one which will fall in with Führer's metrical synthesis for this line (ep.8).

15: [ὡς] φάττο
for this coincidence of end of speech and triad see the parallels cited by Führer, Formproblem etc. p.67 Table 1 from Bacchylides and Pindar. Compare S 148·6.

16: φύλλοφιτο
the same verb in the same context at Triph. 258 (not 326 as Page p.49): As the Trojans are pondering over the various speeches proposing or deploring the Horse's destruction (φραζόμενοις δ'ἐπὶ τοῖς) up comes Sinon. So Barrett's τὸι δὲ is an attractive continuation in the previous line.

17: ἵππυλον μὲ : for the metrical superiority of μὲν over μέγαν see p.580 above.

18: φυλλοφιτορ-
the Horse is garlanded in Quint. 12·433ff: ὡς οἷς γε
σφίς πῆμα ποτὶ πτόλυν ἔργον ὑπεισοδῇ
μογκοῦντες ἀνείρυν. ἀμφὶ δ' ἄραύτωι
πολλὸν ἀδὴν
ἐκφέων ἐριθηλέα κόσμον ἔδεντο· ἀυτοὶ δ' ἐκτέσσατο
the best interpretation of these lines seems to me to be that of W.S. Barrett (ap. West (1) 139) who takes them to constitute a simile. He reads Ὅ δὲ ἀξίου in 18 and ᾑλαρες in 21 and aptly compares Triph. 248-9: upon seeing the mighty bulk of the horse the Trojans throng about it in wonder ἄτρ ἀγεντες (δόντες | αἰετον ἀληντα περικλάζους κολοι). On the metrical implications of Barrett's ᾑλαρες see above p.581.

Alternatively, West (ib.) supposes the passage contains a portent. He supports this with reference to omens in Quint. 12.503ff and Triph. 326: both occur as the horse enters Troy, but unfortunately neither involves a bird or birds. Calchas sees a hawk chasing a dove in Quint. 12.11ff and catching it by pretending to have gone away. But this belongs to the wrong time since the Wooden Horse has not yet been built (Odysseus gets the idea for it from this very omen).

19: ποικιλα[ί]ς πτερυγες

1 There is at least one certain bird-portent in S's opus: c.f.209 i 1ff.
c.f. Od. 5.53: πωλημά κτέρα (of an unspecified bird).

20: τανυσίπτερον

used of a wide range of birds, not always specified (see LSJ s.v.). Note that the τανυσίπτ. ὁπνίς in Hes. Op. 211 is the ἵππης, a bird often identified with the κύκνος.

21: ἀνακράγων

Lobel (p.37) warns us that ἀνακράζω of animal sounds is late and rare: LSJ only quote Menand. 620.11 (of an owl). But it is impossible to avoid here, and should also be inserted in Theophrast. Char. 16.8 (the δειτεῦσαν) κἂν γλαύκες βασίζοντος αὐτοῦ ἀνακράγοντες. Foss ὁ ταράττεσθαι ...

... see Ussher ad loc. (p.147).
This interesting fragment becomes all the more exciting if, as seems highly likely, it provides the only example yet in S. of a papyrus text which partially coincides with a fragment already known to us in quotation\(^1\). \(\nu\nu\)

\(\delta'\) in line 5 together with the verb which follows it shows that we are in a speech, and since there is no formula of introduction or conclusion in either the preceding or succeeding lines it is safe to conclude that the whole fragment is in oratio recta. Who is speaking?

Apparently a Trojan, since there is a hostile reference in 6ff to the trickery practised by Epeius on Athena's prompting. Since the speaker is so certain that the Wooden Horse is a device of the enemy, the immediate assumption is that the sack of Troy has already begun and the Greeks have streamed forth from their ambush. S 89 could then be placed with confidence after the events of S 88. However, we ought to keep in mind the possibility that the speaker is drawing on some divinely given powers of second sight: a positive reason for this will be proffered below. This hypothesis still allows the sequence S 88 followed by S 89.

Our fragment at any rate contains a clear allusion to

\(^1\)The identification has doubtless occurred to several scholars independently. Führer seems to have thought of it as early as 1968 (R p.16 n.172): but rejected it on Lobel's advice (ib.n.173).
Epeius and Athena. The sole quotation from the poet vouchsafed us by an author of antiquity (200 P) also, as it happens, refers to the relationship between that god and that mortal. And lo and behold, line 14 of the present papyrus consists of a sequence of letters exactly compatible with the middle portion of ὑϊκτείρε γάρ αὐτὸν ὑδῶρ αἰὲι φορέοντα Δίὸς, while the following line could, though with greater difficulty, be read as κοῦρα βασιλεύειν ἄγανοῖς (Barrett) or Ἀφέδα (Führer R p.16) (On the palaeographical plausibility of this identification see my remarks ad loc.) Metre acts as an ally to the evidence of content and the papyrus, for 200 P fits snugly into ep.2 – mid ep.3 whither it had already been apportioned by West (I) p.137 and Haslam p.25. Accidental coincidence as an explanation of the apparent identity of the two couplets cannot be entirely excluded (see my remarks above p.573) but these three last factors make it seem decidedly unlikely.

5:

for δεῦν with personal subject c.f. Od. 10.68: δακάν μ' ἔταροι τε κάκοι πρὸς τοῖς τε ὑπνος.

As I have stressed above (p.579) it is by no means certain that παὶ[ῶ καλλιρόους] δίνα[ς] is an inevitable supplement. But it is hard to arrive at any alternative which does not present the rather puzzling picture of Epeius as operating by the Simoīs: is that just a circumlocution for "at Troy"? If καλλιρόους... δίνας is right, see my note on 184 P =S 7.3 for the significance.
of παρά + Acc. in connection with rivers. For Homeric καλλίρροοος of streams, rivers etc. c.f. Sideras, Aeschylus Homericus p.62.

7: ήλεικ [[[όματι: an adaptation of the Homeric δεδομένον
όματι (II.19.9, Od. 7.214, 11.341, 16.232 etc. c.f. Al. 309 LP).

7f: δαες ...|μέτρα] τε καὶ σωφλαν
L. Lehnus, S.C.O. 21 (1972) 54-5 compares the phraseology used in the distich at the foot of the Tabula Iliaca:

--- θεοὶ δρομοὐ μάθε τάξιν Ὀμήρου | δύσφα δαες πάσης μέτρον ἔχης σωφλαν. The parallel is certainly striking, since the nearest equivalence of language after it is H. H. Herm. 483: τέχνη καὶ σοφίς δεδαμιένοικαι and Hes. fr. 306 MW: παντοτικὰς σοφικὰς δεδαμαίνοσα (c.f. anon. P. Oxy. 1015.20 = Page, G.L.P. 130.20: Μουσάων σοφίς δεδαμιένοικαι ἄνηρ, Manethon Apotelesmata 3 (2) 102: καὶ σοφίς δεδαμαίνοσα). Phrases like Solon 13.52 W: ἰμερτής σοφίς 
μέτρον ιν. 16.1-2: γνωσμόθυντα ... μέτρον, Theogn. 876: μέτρον ἐχων σοφίς, "Pigres" (West, Iambi et Elegi Graeci Vol.2 p.93) πάσης πελατ' ἔχεις σοφίς, Aristot. fr. 524 (Rose), suggest very strongly that our μέτρα τε καὶ σωφλαν are in hendiadys.


1σωφλα in these passages of course has a somewhat different colouring from that in the present fragment.
ceuvCac 'Aθάνας
c.f. S. 102·1. If this phrase is in apposition with θεός and δαίμος goes with μετρ.τ.κ.οφ. (as I should suppose) the interwoven word-order will be unusual for S. 9-10: ἀντὶ μάχας[ὁ καὶ] θυ [λόπ]δος
c.f. Il.13·789: μάχη καὶ φόλος
10: ἀ[pε]τρΘ'ονεκεν West (1) p.141 exempli gratia: but the sense is feeble and the words break the bridge in terminal \[--\ll preserved in the six attested instances. 11: εὔρω]χόρο[ο]υ Τρ.
the same epithet used of this same city by Sappho 44·12 LP: κατὰ πτόλεμον εὐρέχαρον:
for trisyllabic Τροιάς c.f. LSJ s.v. Τροιὰ.

Τροίας ἀλάςιμον ἀμαρ
c.f. Ibyc. 282 P = S 151·14f: Τροίας ἦ' ψυχόλοιο ἀλάςιμον[ἓ]μαρ ἀνφυμον. In connection with the latter \[assas\]: Page once asserted (Aegyptus 31 (1951) 166): "ἀλάςιμος normally means "easy to capture". Later it is used more loosely "appertaining to capture": παίδαν ἀλάςιμος Aesch. S.C.T.635, ἀλάςιμος βάξις Ag.10. ἀμαρ ἀλάςιμον, "day of capture", in a poet a century earlier, remains none the less remarkable." The last part of this analysis now requires revision in the light of our line. 12:άτερ λαῶν Ἑθηκεν West (1) p.141 exempli gratia. 5-12 clearly ran something like "Now we have been brought to ruin by a skilled craftsman and by Athena: through his devices trickery instead of fighting will have fame
because it brought Troy its day of capture." The mention of Epeius in 200 P would follow well on this.

13: as printed in SLG (P.26) this line's lacuna has room only for the shorter version of ep.1's start. But on the papyrus the letter before eccl stands beneath the \( \eta \) of \( \xi\delta\eta\pi\epsilon\nu \), giving room for \( \ldots\ldots\ldots\).  

14-15:  
if these lines do represent 200 P, we must record the following comments:  
(i) the necessary supplements would fit the space available on the left;  
(ii) there is some difficulty about the interpretation of the papyrus' traces in 14: after the clearly identifiable \( \alpha\omega\rho \) there is a largish hole out of whose right edge there emerges to the left of \( \upsilon \) what Lobel tentatively identifies as "perhaps the top of a circle or loop" (p.44). If the whole complex is to be read as \( \omega\upsilon\upsilon \) there are two possible ways of explaining this curve: (a) as the top of the right-hand stroke of the \( \upsilon \) all but swallowed up in the hole. But there is no comparably large extrusion of ink at this point of the letter as exemplified elsewhere on the papyrus: the closest parallel, in the final letter of \( \upsilon\upsilon\upsilon \) in S 88 ii 12 (= fr.1 ii 12) is considerably smaller. (b) as the tip of the left arm of \( \upsilon \). But again there is no just parallel. The difficulty then is not so much the space occupied by \( \upsilon \) (which in this hand is easily wide enough to fill the hole) or by \( \omega\upsilon \) (\( \nu\nu\upsilon\upsilon \) in the previous line gives a
parallel for the widest space that could be occupied here) but the anomalous curve to the right whose shape is so hard to explain.

200 P has been with us for a long time, P. Oxy.2619 for nearly ten years, but only now has Lobel's dictum "the details reported from the Iliupersis (Stes.frr.196-205) are nowhere apparent" (p.34) been challenged. It is important to ask why this should be so. Studying 200P in isolation one would naturally assume that it occurred in the actual narrative of the poem. The present case affords a salutary warning about apparently "natural" assumptions of this kind, and should make us even more reluctant to speculate about the context of such tiny and isolated quotations. For the remarkable indifference of ancient writers as to whether the lines they cite are from narrative or direct speech, see my note on 182 P = S 85. A more valid justification for our tardiness in detecting the presence of 200 P amid S 89 can be devised: under what conceivable circumstances could a Trojan be expected to know about Epeius' rôle as water-carrier to the Atreidae, let alone Athena's pity for him? It is indeed noteworthy that at the start of S 89 a Trojan speaker should be able to identify Epeius as the maker of the horse and Athena his patronness; but if his reputation as a τεχνών was known to the Trojans, then it was a matter of easy inference to credit him with the construction of the monstrous engine and to name the
patron goddess of handicrafts\textsuperscript{1} as his inspirer. Not so
with knowledge of how and why Athena came to pity Epeius.
That would seem to lie beyond mortal ken, in the territory
of a \textit{μάντις} gifted with second sight. And such characters
are not lacking in the saga of Troy: Helenus and
Cassandra spring immediately to mind. Now if such a
figure is the speaker of the present lines, the fragment
need not be fixed to some time after the appearance of the
Greeks has revealed the true nature of the Horse. A
\textit{μάντις} can be expected to know such a thing in advance,
and in fact tradition casts Cassandra in the rôle of
frenzied but unheeded prophetess of woe to the Trojans
after the Horse has been brought within the citadel but
before the Greeks have sallied forth: c.f. Quint. 12.525
ff, Triph. 368ff.

\textsuperscript{1}And persistent enemy of the city of Troy.
14:...] αντες ας


16:...] ουμ[

[ω]ουμ[- Φührer loc. cit.
West p.137 and Page p.53 interpret this fragment as ant.7 - ep.5 and Führer (R p.13 n.128) has pointed out the advantages of this over the theoretical alternative str. 7 - ant.5:

(i) 94·5 (i) ant.3 ιαγερθΗ[ ~ ~ ~ ]
    (ii) ep.3 ιαγερθΗ [ ]

(ii) 94·7 (i) ant.5 ~ ~ ~ ~ ατας[~ ~ ~ ]
    (ii) ep.5 αν] ατας[ ] so West p.139 c.f. S 148· i 5 αντας[ ]

In each case (ii) is the likelier interpretation.\(^1\)

As for the subject-matter here, West (1) p.139 suggests an assembly, drawing our attention to 1's ιαγορα[ ], 5's ιαγερθΗ[, 6's λόγον, 7's αντας[ ] (the two latter thus articulated or supplemented by West).

4: \[εντεςο [ ] \[εντεςομας Führer R p.19 comparing S 88 i 4: ἔτε. ὁμως \]

and P. Lille 76·204: οτε γάρ αλέν ὁμως .

\(^1\) Führer also detects "word-corresponson" between 94·6 and 88 ii 8 and 94·1 and 88 ii 21 on the assumption that each pair represents ep.4 and str.7
West p.137 says this is str./ant. 7ff; Page p.53 ant.7 - ep.6. The latter, more precise, formulation is obviously right, since 1.4's -τϊμυν [ is incompatible with ant.2 (easily compatible with ep.2:----------] - [----------) while the short line needed on either interpretation between 2 and 7 can only be 1.5 = ep.3 (----------] ρειαν [ || ).
ἐγὼ in line 3 indicates we are by then inside a speech, probably delivered by the swearer of line 1's oath. On the basis of his supplementation of 1 (ὁ ἔμωμος θεοῦ κέκους) and the certain but elliptical readings in 8 (φῶς ἀξιόλογον) and 10 (ἐξατ' αἰζον) West (1) p.139 suggests that Sinon is the speaker, comparing Verg. Aen. 2.154ff: "vos aeterni ignes et non violabile vestrum testor numen" ait, "vos arae ensesque nefandi quos fugi, vittaeque deum, quas hostia gessi: fas mihi Graiorum sacrata resolvere iura, fas odisse viros atque omnia ferre sub auras"... Barrett's alternative supplement for 1, Παλλαὶ ἔμωμος κέκους, need not be fatal to this hypothesis, but we possess far too little in the way of continuous text to be able to verify it.

1: in favour of Barrett's supplement c.f. S 89-7: κέκους Ἄθάνατος.

5: εἰμεῖν

an athematic infinitive, replacing the usual Doric -μέν with long ε (μεν or -ην). -μην is found only in Cretan inscriptions (c.f. R.F. Willetts, The Law Code of Gortyn (Berlin 1967) Index s.v. έμεν ἐπὶ τινι, G.C.I.4998 i 2 etc.) -μεν in inscriptions from Rhodes (I.G. 12 (1) 155-100 etc.) which numbered colonists from Acragas and Gela among its founders. Note that Epicharmus of Syracuse (who shares the form
πέποσχα with S.: see 261P) has the following infinitives:

εἰμεν (170·9, 171·3 and 6, 173·4 Kaibel)¹, εἰμεν (99·2, 182 Kaibel), ἔμπαγημεν (42·6), προδισομειν (—we codd.: 100·4), κατεμειν (—we codd.: 71·3), ποτεμειν (with—we and—μιν as v.v. 1·1.: 170·8 and 10). Since Epicharmus is a relatively late writer it may be suggested that the form εἰμεν was not restricted to Sicilian colonies like Rhodes, but originated on the island itself. εἰμεν or ἢμεν in Alcman, εἰμεν in Bacchylides. It is interesting to know that S. disposed of a spondaic infinitive of the verb "to be" alternative to the Homeric εἰμαι/ἐμειν and consonant-closed: one presumes it was elsewhere more use to him than in its present place at period-end.

7: ] ... ἐκαυν

see p.596 above.

10: καὶ τ' αἰσαν

a very common Homeric phrase (11.3·59 etc.) copied by lyric poets indebted to epic. See P. Lille 76·273, Ibycus S 166·8.

¹E.G. Turner (W.S. 10 (1976) 52) publishes a fragment of Epicharmus (or a close imitator) which at 1.19 contains the letters εἰμεν (interpreted as infinitive εἰμεν by Turner p.57).
Metre: West (1) p.137 originally conceived this as ant.5-
ep.7. Führer (1) p.12f preferred to take it as ep.5 -
str.5, and alternative interpretations are not wanting.
But Führer (R p.15) has now marshalled the important
negative evidence in favour of his reading. Since
5 ≠ str.1, 6 ≠ str.1, 8 ≠ ep.4, 4 must be ep.8, and the
whole fragment represents ep.5ff. This has important
repercussions for our knowledge of the contents of ep.9
and 10. Also for str.3 (see p.580).

5: ἔλανθα δ’ Ἐλένα

c.f. Sappho fr.23.5 LP: ἔλανθα δ’ Ἐλέναι, Ibyc. 282.5P:
ἔλανθα κ’ Ἐλένακ 1.

Epithets adjoined to Helen often refer to her hair: c.f.
Od. 15.58: Ἐλένης πόρα καλλικόμοιο, Hes. Op. 165: Ἐλένης
ένεκ’ ἄνενθεμοι, Pind. Ol.3.1: καλλιπλοκάμωι θ’ Ἐλέναι.

5ff: Προϊάμω .... ἐπίστημος ἀδιάφοι ... 

ἀδιάφοις of Helen ("King Priam's much-sung [daughter-in
law]"-so West (1) p.140) is attractive, especially when
we think of Helen's words to Paris at Il.6.357-8: οἶχιν
ἐπὶ Ζεῦς ὅθεν ποιοῦν μόρον, ὡς καὶ ὅπλεος ἀνθρώποις
πελάμεθ’ ἀδιάφοις ἐσσομένοις ... (c.f. Od. 8.580).

1And perhaps Alcm. 1.51ff: ἀ δὲ χαίτα | τάς ἐμάς ἀνεψιάς
Ἄγγεις ἄνδρας ἐπανεῖ | χρυσός ἄνδροας. See p.412 n.1
supr.But (pace A. Griffiths, QUCC 14 (1972) p.27 n.60) in
Theocr. 1δ. 18.28 ἀ χρυσά Ἐλένα is not an
allusion to gold-coloured hair: see Gow ad loc. (2.355).
8: διαίων πυρὶ κατομέγυν

very probably an allusion to the fate of Troy: c.f.

11.2.414f: πρόν μὲ κατὰ προνής βαλέειν Πριάμου μέλαδρον

αιθαλέας, προκατ δὲ πυρὸς δηοῦο θύρετρα 11.11.666f: εἶς

δὲ δὴ νῆς τοσά ἄγχνι θαλάσσης ἴ.Ἀργείων ἀκεπτὶ πυρὸς

δηοῦο θέρωνται.

9ff: metrically important: the West - Führer scheme seems
to demand here the sequence παράδεξαν [—] [—] προκαντάται.

A sequence of four uninterrupted longa would be very
unwelcome in Σ, yet other evidence points away from
period end at str.2. Page's modification which adds
anceps at the start of str.3 is at its most compelling
here (~ before πο perfectly legitimate).
λέγω in 8 and 19, ποιέω in 11 all point to a speech: so perhaps do 21's γένοιται and 20's προλαμβάνω (if that is the right reading). As for the speaker's identity, the closely connected words Ἐρμιόνη ... ποιέω in 10-11 strongly suggest Helen, given that the poem's subject-matter is Troy's capture. Page (p. 56) brings several objections against this hypothesis, not all of them of equal cogency. ύφαρπάγιμον\(^1\) in line 13 ("snatched away") does not correspond with anything we know of the mythological career of Helen's daughter, but it is an adjective that might well be applied to Helen by Helen speaking self-pityingly (and with tendentious inaccuracy) of her own experience at the hands of Paris. κνακάι (14), κιόρωφαίσεινάπαίσι (16) and παλὸς φίλον (18) are indeed hard to accommodate within this reconstruction but that is largely due to their chronic lack of context: they would be hard to accommodate within any reconstruction, including the alternative which Page tentively develops out of a suggestion by Lobel (p. 46). Quoting Hesychius s.v. Ἐρμιόνη (2.196 Latte) καὶ ἡ Δημήτηρ καὶ ἡ κόρη ἐν Συρακοῦσαῖς he suggests that our Sicilian poet may here be presenting a lament by Demeter for her lost daughter Persephone. He is honest enough to add that the three obstacles listed above retain their full force in the context of this theory (with the possible

\(^{1}\) or ύφ'ἁρπάγιμον
exception of line 14's κνᾶκαί: see my note ad loc.).
And the alternative view brings none of the advantages
which we would require to make us forget the sheer
implausibility of such disparate subject-matter in the
midst of fragments which without a shadow of doubt
describe the fall of Troy. In fact it is rendered
unattractive to the highest possible degree by Page's
own supplement (or something very like it) at line 10.
The undeniable difficulties here are largely due to the
accidental conflict between S's detailed treatment
overall and the brevity of this fragment.

5: πρω(ι)τε[ι
The only possibility for a word starting with the papyrus'
πρωτε[ι] is πρωπέρυς(υ), a spelling prescribed for Attic
by Apollonius Dyscolus (π. ἑπιρρ. 166·25) and Phrynichus
(Praep. Soph. 105) and metrically guaranteed by
Pherecrates fr.182K (though c.f. Kaibel, Sophokles
Elektra p.186 n.1). The sense of this is so profoundly
unpromising that we readily grasp at Lobel's suggestion
πρω(ι)- (p.46).

6: Κυπρογενής α[ι
the metre shows that we have room for no more than a
longum in this verse. In spite of Lobel, there is the
chance of Α[ωροδίτα here¹, since κυπρογ. is attested as

¹For this principle of word-division see my note on
S 15 i 12.
an adjective as well as a noun (which Lobel (p.46) denies, but see H.H. 10.1: Κυμπογενῆ Κυθήρειαν, Theogn. 1386: Κυμπογενῆς Κυθήρεια) and the word beginning with alpha is unlikely to be a monosyllable (see p.585).

7: ἀλιπόρφυρον

used in epic of woollen garments (Od. 6.53 = 306, Od. 13.108). Used of a sentient creature, the ἀριστολοχ, in the famous fragment by Alcman (26.4 P). The reputation of the Argolid city Ἑρμᾶν or Ἑρμῶν as a producer of purple cloth (mentioned by Lobel sup. cit. quoting Plut. Alexandr. 36.2, Alciph. ep.3.10.4) is likely to be irrelevant in this context (see the following note). The most pertinent fact is perhaps the adjective's close proximity to a probable 'Αφροδίτα. Note that the late orator Himerius applies it (Or. 62.2 p.224 Colonna) to the Νηρηϊές, that is to the very nymphs who are invoked at Sappho fr.5.1 LP in the company of Κόπωρις the goddess of the sea (on whom see Page ad loc. (S & A p.46)). For another probable instance of early lyric colouring in Himerius see my note on 193.11 P. Alternatively, the word may be describing an attribute of Aphrodite (c.f. πορφυρόζωνος of Hera in Bacch. 11.49 and note the events of 11.14-16lff.)

ἀγωγόν or ἀγωγόν (c.f. West p.141, Führer R p.11). ἀγγ. follows ἀλιπ. here just as ἱαυδὸς follows the same word in Alcm. 26.4 P mentioned above (the respective metrical positions of the two phrases are practically the same). ἀγωγόν
either we must accept West's ηγή (p.141: a totally unparallelled epic corruption) or we must allow here for str.1 the license attested for the Lille papyrus poem.

9f

ἀθανάτοι·τι πανετυέλλον Ἐρμιόναν (Page p.56) would make excellent sense but is impossible to reconcile with the metrical demands of 10 (str.3). ἀθανάτοι·τιν εἶκελλον, printed in the app. crit. in S.L.G. (p.31) presupposes that beginning which is demanded less imperatively elsewhere (see p.580). It also presupposes synapheia between str.2/3.

It will be allowed that the phrase "like to the gods" would be a grotesque and bizarre epithet for the divine Persephone (and inconceivable, one need hardly add, for the city Hermione).

If Ἐρμιόναν... ποδέω does come from the lips of Helen, compare Athena's words to that heroine in Triph.493f: οὕτω δ’οἰκτερείς πρότερον πόσιν οὐδὲ θυγατρα Ἐρμιόνην ποθεῖς;

11: νόκτες-
νόκτες·τι τε καὶ ἄματ(α) Führer (2) p.253 or τε καὶ ἄμαρ.

With the former c.f. 11.18.340, 24.745 with the latter (far more common) c.f. 11.5.490, 22.432, 24.73, Od. 2.345, 10.28, 80, 15.476, 24.63.
12: λοιπόν

on the metrical superiority of ἀεικλαμησία over Diggle's αἰγοκενόσαν (proposed in C.R. 20 (1970)5) see p.590 supr. It is true that the only other instance of ἀεικλαμησία occurs in Opp. Cyneg. 1·413 (of a hare) but c.f. ἀεικλάνιος used in Homer of Iris (Il. 8.409 = 24.77 = 159), in H.H. Aphr. 217 of ἵπποι, which creatures are the regular recipients of the epithet thereafter (Simonides 515 P, Pind. Nem. 1·6, c.f. Eur. Hel. 1314 (and Kannicht ad loc.) Pind. fr.221 Sn. etc.)

κνακαί

as Page notes (p.56) this looks like a feminine form of the adjective κνακός ("tawny") which is very rare in poetry (Soph. Ichn. 358 perhaps: πίθυς ὀφεῖς ὀξύλου ὄς τράγος κνηκὼς (κνηκώι Wilam.) χιλιδαῖς) Thespis fr.4 Sn., Theocr. 7·16, Babrius 113·2, Agathias A.P. 6·32·14, Epigr. Gr. Kaibel 1034·3 see Gow on Theocr. 3·5 (2·65f)) and hardly more common in prose. Page's σχοινέαν κνακαίς Πολυδέγμυνος ἵππων would certainly work in the myth of Pesephone nicely, but is not the only possibility.
16: κυρυφαίς ναπαίς
since this is capable of several interpretations\(^1\)
(κυρυφαίς ναπαίς or ναπαίς- (Lobel, Oxy. Pap. 37 (1970)
p. 7) or -αιτι νάπαις or -αιτι νάμαις(-) the apparent
relevance of ναπαίς to Demeter's fate is unimpressive.
In favour of the two latter articulations see Ar. Av.
740: νάπαις(-εις και) κυρυφαίς.
κυρυφηκτής is a common Homeric word: ll.3.10, 8.51, 11.183
etc.

18: ἴδη
Page's ἴδη is perhaps marginally preferable to ἴδη
here as a supplement large enough to contain a word that
will make sense of the first two letters of extant text.

\(^1\)Against κυρυφαίς\[\] ναπαίς see above p. 579.
Independently of each other, West and Führer have proposed the combination of P. Oxy. 2619 fr.18 with P. Oxy. 2803 fr.11: c.f. Z.P.E. 7 (1971) 262-6. They were impressed by the following passages' coherence of context, which in one place bursts out into identity:

(S 143) P. Oxy. 2803 fr.11 (S 105A) P. Oxy. 2619 fr.18

Δαναοὶ μεῖν ὅτε ἐκδορον. ὅτε ἐκδορον. ὅτε ἐκδορον. ὅτε ἐκδορον.
‘Εγνωςίδας γαϊδοχος ἄγνος εἰ
Ἀπὸ Ἀπόλλων 10 ὁν
Ἰορᾶν ὦδ. ἄρταμις ὦδ᾿ Ἀφροδίτα
... ὡν πι
... λύν Ζεῦς

Admittedly, the overlapping of ὦν in S 1435 = S 105A is not in itself an extensive enough correspondence to convince. Taken in isolation it might be dismissed as a coincidence: we think of S 116 (ant.6) Ἰβικας πὸλις ὁν and S 137·6 Ἰβικας πὸλις (str.6) where the context shows that we do not have the same passage reproduced by two different manuscripts. In the present case however the various phenomena possess a powerful cumulative force: γαϊδοχος follows so snugly on the heels of Ἐγνωςίδας (see p.649) and ὦδ᾿ ἄρταμις ὦδ᾿ Ἀφροδίτα produces so

1 The similarity of phrasing was noticed by Lobel (Oxy. Pap. 37 (1971) p.7). Compare the coincidence at 105B 4 and 133A6 noted above. p.573.
coherent a phrase; the gap between μεμι and ]c, π[and] λιν is so easily plugged, the over-all sentiment is as lucid as can be expected from so fragmentary a passage.

I have already explained (above pp.586ff) why I am unconvinced by the objections against this combination levelled by Page in PCPS 18 (1973) 47ff. The corruption of μεμάτες to -τας and the accidental omission of a line do not strike me as insuperable obstacles. I also disagree with Page over the difficulties he finds in reading π[δ]λιν in line 14 and π[π]πον in 9.

Against Haslam's attempt at increasing the content of our fragment by adding S 133A; see my remarks p.572f. τ' ἐπικουροτζ- either ἐπικουροτζ followed by a vowel to provide epic correction (c.f. 88 ii 7: Τρῆς πολές τ' ἐπικουροτζ a phrase metrically impossible here) or ἐπὶ κοφί (West(2) p.263) scenting an allusion to Cassandra).

2: 6αρ: probably a misdivision of Δαρδαν (i-): see above p.595f.

3: λιποίσιa

West (2) p.263 suggests that this refers to the departure of Cassandra1 from the scene after her failure to persuade the rejoicing Trojans of the threat posed by the Horse: c.f. Quint. 12.580-5: ἡ δ', ἀτε πόρδαλις ...| ... ὥς ἡ γ' εύρες ἵππου ἀπέκεκτο τειρομένη περ | Τρῶν ἀμφι φόνωι. But it could as easily be Helen retreating

1-ματακα[-[- in the next line is not of course a reference to this heroine: see p.573 supr.
after her failure to lure out the hiding Greeks, or a pro-Trojan goddess abandoning the city. In other words, the guess is not worth making.

4: ἤματακατι

see above p. 573.

8: πιτνη

the scribe has corrected this to πιτνα, but if πιτνα in II.21.7 is a contracted imperfect of πιτνῶ or an Aeolicism (c.f. Chantraine, Gramm. Hom. 1.301) the Doric form will end in -η.

9f: Δαμναοὶ μεμαδὸς ἑκάθορον ἵππου ... Ἐλλυνοσίδας γαλάδοχος

c.f. Quint. 13.58: ὦς οἳ γ' ἔξ ἔπεοι μεμαδός ἑξεχέοντο.

But what is the significance of the closely-following mention of Poseidon? West (2) p.263 suggests he made the earth tremble as an omen: c.f. Triph. 568f: ἐπὶ δ’ ἐβραξε γαῖα βρεῖα ἑ παλλομένη τριόδοντι Ποσεῖδῶν ἔδωκεν ἀκωκῆι (there however the Greeks have been out of the Horse some thirty lines). This explanation overlooks an important fact rightly emphasised by W.S. Barrett ap. Page p.65 n.1. The emergence of the Greeks from the belly of the Horse must have been a crucial turning-point in the poem and it is all but inconceivable that S. should have dismissed in a single line the egress of his hundred heroes. Barrett himself supposes we may have on our hands an unreal negative construction: supplying οὔδε ποκ’ἄν Δαμναοὶ at the start of 9 we might translate:
"the Greeks would never have leaped out [if Poseidon had not done something or other.]" Page's objection to this reconstruction is strangely inept: "μεμαύτες is then plainly out of context; you would only describe them as μεμαύτες, without qualification, when they did emerge; μεμαύτες ἐκθέτον is phrasing that would suit emergence not non-emergence" (ib). But emergence is precisely what this interpretation does presuppose: "the Greeks would never have leaped out (as in fact they actually did) had not Poseidon done x y or z (which he really did do)." And since they did leap out they may be said to have leaped out eagerly.

But I find it harder to follow Mr. Barrett's idea that in this fragment the Wooden Horse is actually being brought into Troy, and that Poseidon here removes some obstacle to its entrance. "The Greeks would never have leaped out" seems to me an unnatural way of conveying the sentiment: "The Greeks would never have been given the opportunity of later leaping out had they not in the first place been helped into Troy." And 11.113-130 are too early, surely, for the Horse's introduction into Troy. Mr. Barrett agrees on this point and supposes that 105 B1 is line 113 of a second book, whence the unexpected title on the back of P. Oxy. 2803 fr.1 (S 133 B). Against this idea see below p.660f.

---

1He does much the same thing in Triph.338ff.
Evvocł6ac: hitherto only in Pindar (Pyth. 4·33,173; Paean 4·11, fr.60 A·6 Sn.), a Doric form of 'Evvocíγαυος.

ἀγνὸς: rare of male deities, but Aesch. Suppl. uses it of Zeus (653) who is called γαῖδοχος in the same play (876).

11-12

a trio of pro-Trojan deities. What are they doing (or, rather, failing to do)? Führer ZPE 7 (1971) p.266 n.13 ingeniously suggests we are being told that Apollo and his fellow-immortals were no longer able to help the Trojans. He compares: 11·5·53: ἀλλ'οδ οἱ τότε γε χραίμι"Ἀρτέμις ὕκειαρα 21·130f: οὐδ' ὑμῖν ποταμὸς περ ἐβροος ἀργυροδίνης ἄρμεσει. H.H. Ap. 367f: οὐδὲ τι τοι τανατὸν γε δυσηλεγ' οὔτε Τυφεύς ἄρμεσει οὔτε χλιμαρα δυσφνυμος Od. 16·260f: καὶ φράσαι ἤμεν νῦν Ἄδηνη σὺν Δίη πατρὶ ἄρμεσει Scut. 357f: οὐ μὲν γὰρ τοι "Ἀρης θανάτοιο τελεύην ἄρμεσει Phoronis (P. Oxy. 2260 i·5-7) οὐδὲ τι κομητῇ ἄρμεσει ἐγρεμάξῃ [δό]λιχαρος ἄγρομει. But this does not exhaust all the possibilities.

12: "Ἀὶρταμις

the usual West Greek form: c.f. Page, Alcman, Parth. p.140. πὶδί λίν

Page continues to insist that the last three letters should be read as νη (which is how Lobel (p.47) originally interpreted them). The cross-bar of the last letter is certainly higher than that of most of this scribe's nus (compare ἐκθόρου and ἀγνὸς in the lines above) but the final letter of 11's -ων and even more so the last letter.
of ἱππακτὸν (88 i 13) seem comparable. So too τοῦ in 88 ii 5. On the other hand it would be hard to find an eta whose cross-bar slanted down anything like as much as this letter's. For the shape created by the supposed fusion of λ and ι c.f. 104·7's ἀλυθοφυρόν.
West (1) p.137 identified this as ep.4 - str.1, Führer (1) p.13 as ep.5 - str.2. Page (p.57) rightly noting that alternative patterns can be drawn up for ll.3 - 5, dismissed "the evidence of this fragment" as "practically worthless." But this is too extreme. Führer, after excluding all other interpretations on negative grounds (R p.15 n.159) returns to the two proposals made by himself and West. Line 4's initial "" is only compatible with ep.3 (or ep.7, assuming misdivision with ep.6 of the type in 588 ii 10 (ll)). The former then is already preferable, and becomes even more so when we observe that in our poem ' - ' only functions as a link-element between D lengths (see p. ).

Barrett (ap West (1) p.141) conjectured and supplemented a woman's speech between 2's ὦδὲ ἐξ ἐν ὑποταύρον and 7's ὦδὲ ὑποταύρον τὰν ἐς' and read ὡς in 3. West preferred a greater specificity: the speech is Helen's to Menelaus. But that heroine is merely the most notorious, not the only, female deserving of the self-applied δοξάσωμαι during the sack of Troy. Nor, in fact, do we know that it is self-applied.

2: ὦδὲ ἐξ ἐν ὑπ’ ὡς

while accepting Barrett's overall interpretation, Führer p.253f rightly prefers ὑποταύρον here as the verb of speech

- 649 -
(c.f. S 11.3) since everywhere else in this poem there is word-end after the D element.

7 there seems to be room enough for Barrett's ὅς ὃδιτο ταυτ. Compare 88 ii 15's ὅς ὃδιτο in the same metrical position.
As Führer observes (R p.13 n.131) the interpretation of these few lines as ep. 2 - 6 (West p.137, Page p.53) depends on Lobel's supplement of 3. Were we to prefer a gen. or acc. in this place we would have str. 7 - ant. 3 on our hands.

3: ἡπεδὰ Μυρμιδόνεκες
Lobel's supplement (p.48) based on the Homeric phrase μετὰ Μυρμιδόνεκες found at the line-end of II.16.15, 240, 19.299, 23.60, Od. 11.495.
Ironic that the only surviving fragment to contain a paragraphos is so metrically ambiguous. 111.2, as last line of a stanza, could be str. ant. or ép. and the ambivalence of the first five letters of the succeeding verse (κάλλα, κάλλα or κάλλα) leaves open the choice between str./ant.1 (so West (1) p.137) and ép.1 (Führer p.13 on inadequate grounds as he now (R p.16 n.169) accepts).
S 115

ep. 1 - 5

4: Σημαμάνδριον δι
δινθέμέντα suppl. Führer R p.19 comparing Il.2.467: ἐν
λειμώνι Σημαμάνδριον δινθέμέντα.

S 116

ant.6 - ep.2

1: Ἰώσαν·πόλιτιν ἢ
αἰστώσαν suppl. Führer ex.gr. (R p.19 n.192). This
must be the first or second line of its column, otherwise
the end of the lengthy ant.4 would be visible in the
actually unoccupied space above πο.
ίημωι βιαί
πολλέωι βιαί τε Φührer Ρ p.19 comparing S 88 i 6 βιαί
tε καλ αἰχμάι
Tentatively identified by West (1) p.137 as ep.5 - 9. Führer (R p.15) re-enforces this hypothesis by equating 4's ἐκατωτυν with ep.8's ———— | ————. For the absence of bridge after double long compare S 104.5 (again ep.8: ———— | ————) and S 105A 13 (ep.617: ———— ———— | ————). The end of the line as Page (p.58 n.1) observes. His printing of the verse in SLG p.36 obscures this fact.

1 Ἰκαν. [1

This line's position viz-a-viz 1 disproves Führer's original notion (1) p.13 n.16) that we should read this as a line beginning —— ἐκατωτι (criticised by Page p.58 n.1, withdrawn by Führer R p.15 and n.153).
1 ἵευτι
-ε'υτ- is a possible articulation of these letters since, as Page observes (p. 63) a mark of elision on the papyrus would not now be visible.

6 Ἰατὰ(κ) κακ
on the metrical implications of Barrett's Kac 〈κανδρα(-) see above p. 581. On the principle of word-division involved see my note on S 15 i 12. For the spelling of the name see Fraenkel on Aesch. Ag. 1035 (2.467f).
In the words of the ed.pr. (pp 3-4) "on the back of this first column are the first letters of a two-lined entry running in the same direction as the text, which must when complete have extended still further towards the beginning of the roll. There can be no question that it was intended to indicate the contents." For other such instances of a title on the back of a papyrus roll c.f. E.G. Turner, Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World (Oxford 1971) pp.16 and 125. Given the subject-matter of our poem, it is hard to avoid the supplement Στη[σιχόρου|]τπισος δουράτεος, διοφρετος, Τρωικὸς vel. sim.2 If any of these suggestions is right, our title joins the numerous company of Stesichorean discoveries which are neither at all expected nor particularly welcome. It is not that the appearance of a hitherto unknown title of a poem by S. need give us pause (there are absolutely no grounds for supposing we have the names of every work he composed). But there is already one Stesichorean composition which must have embraced much the same sequence of events as a work called the "Wooden Horse". This of course is the Iliupersis. Furthermore, if the combination of P. Oxy. 2619 fr.18 (=S 105A) and

1 To be more precise, the entry stands at the level of lines 37-9 of the text on the other side.

2 ήπιπού εἰςαγωγὴ might fit Barrett's interpretation of 105', against which see p.646 supr.
P. Oxy. 2803 fr.11 (S 143) to form S 105B is correct, the Iliupersis is exactly the same work as "the Wooden Horse". There are three possible explanations of the problem which S 133B has posed us: we can reject the above-mentioned identification and suppose that the two different titles entail two separate poems. Or we can take up one of the two alternatives briskly adumbrated by West (2) p.264 and conclude that ἔμπετ "may be an alternative to Iliupersis, or an informal designation of part of it." Let us examine each option a little more closely.

(1) Page, not surprisingly in view of his attitude to the West-Führer metrical scheme (above pp.586ff) believes we have two discrete manuscripts of two discrete poems. He presents the following scenario: "S. composed a "Wooden Horse" concentrating on that particular episode in the story of the tale of Troy; and later took a broader canvas, recounting the events of the Sack of Troy in full... including the episode of the Wooden Horse in a more comprehensive narrative" (p.64). This makes the best possible case for what is in fact a highly incongruous and implausible proposition. For the epic plenitude and detailed scope of S's narrative render near to impossible the notion that any subject which had fallen within his range could ever be given a more detailed treatment. It would be beyond the wit of man, for instance, to devise a fuller account of Telemachus' leave-taking in Sparta.
than is presented in 209 i p. There is nothing in what
we can discern of the Iliupersis' papyrus fragments to
suggest that S. was a whit less copious here: both
columns of S 88 imply a predictably ample narrative
concerning the finding of the Horse (see too my note on
S 89). We know from other sources that S. placed a
hundred heroes within the beast (199 P): he may even
have given a list of their names. And yet we are asked
to believe that he composed an entire poem of the usual
vast length which somehow achieved the feat of giving
even greater prominence than this to the episode of the
Horse. Here, as elsewhere, the notion of two Stesichorean
poems on practically the same subject remains profoundly
implausible.

(2) An alternative designation of part of the Iliupersis?
This notion takes two forms:

(i) The poem about Troy's sack may have fallen into
several books one of which was subtitled "the Wooden
Horse". So Barrett ap. Page p.64 and Führer (2) p.253
n.3, the latter comparing the σιλλυβος containing the
title of Bacch. 15: its inscription runs Βαυχυλίδου
Διδύμαυ τον Ἀντινορίδοι Ἐλένης ἀπαίτησις and the title
of the first dithyramb was clearly written by a first
hand in mistake for the title of the whole book: see the
Snell-Maehler edition p.IX. There are several instances
of titles of this sort for books within an entire poem,¹

¹The books within the Iliad and Odyssey spring instantly
to mind.
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but for S. a different system was used and 213 P shows us what it was: ΣΤΗΣΙΧΟΡΟΣ δὲ ἐν δεύτερω Ὀρεστείας. So too probably 189 P: ἐν πρῶτῳ ΣΤΗΣΙΧΟΡΟΥ Ἑλένης.

(ii) Haslam (p.35) has a slightly different solution to offer: "2803 must be an extract from the whole work, an extract which at some stage or other had achieved the status of an independent poem (with its own title...)... and more suitable for a single performance." "Must" is not a word that should occur often in Stesichorean studies, least of all in the present case, where we are blandly offered an unsupported guess. The only reason we are given for accepting this hypothesis is that otherwise Haslam's addition of S 133A to S 105A will be ruled out, since it has the Greeks jumping out of the Horse after the poem has only been running for two and a half triads - an impossibly early stage of the narrative. Thi-, of course, is merely a further obstacle to the combination proposed by Haslam, not a positive argument in favour of a fresh theory. If one had to place the events of S 105B at a disturbingly early stage of the narrative, it would be preferable to adopt Barrett's notion of a second book, which explains the same phenomena more neatly. But Haslam's reasons for this placing are invalid (so above p.73) and I find Barrett's motives no more compelling.
(3) \(Στην\) ἐπικ\(τ\) represents an alternative and less well-known title for the Iliupersis. This still strikes me as the likeliest answer. Page (sup. cit.) scoffs at the notion that "eccentrically (and for no imaginable reason)" P. Oxy. 2803 should present the Iliupersis "under a title other than that by which it was commonly known". But there can be few more familiar phenomena in every genre of classical literature than the alternative title,¹ and though we have no example of it in S. there are no counter-examples either such as rule out 2 (i). Furthermore the two lines are exactly where analogies (vid. supr. p.657) lead us to expect the title of a whole work rather than some part of a bigger whole (which is what 2 i and ii envisage) and this explanation neatly side-steps the improbabilities inherent in postulating two large-scale works by the same poet on the same topic.

¹ For instances from drama see E. Nachmanson, Der griechische Buchtitel (Göteborg 1941, repr. Darmstadt 1967) 2ff and 6ff, Pearson, The Fragments of Sophocles 1 pp.xviiiff. Non-dramatic examples in Zilliacus, Eranos 36 (1938) 38ff. A reasonably close analogy to the present case is afforded by Pind. fr.70 B Sn. Κηρηκοτείνεις Αντιπορίδατι Ελένης ἄμαρτης cited above.
West (2) p. 264 took this as ep. 2 - str. 5 but 7's τότεξε[ will not fit ep. 8 (so Führer p. 251 and Page p. 63). Führer's alternative (ep. 5 - str. 7) is not free from difficulties as its author freely admits (R p. 20 n. 205). It entails papyrus misdivision at 8 (str. 2: see p. 595). Also the omission of a line representing ep. 9/10 at 6 (see p. 597). Those who cannot stomach such corruptions should consult the statistics assembled above at pp. 599ff.

Synapheia in 3 (between ep. 6 and 7) and in 5 (between ep. 8 and 9) is tolerable. So too the monosyllable required at the end of 12 (str. 6: see below ad loc.).

12

A monosyllable at the end is not impossible to supply: ναδωτ suggests Führer (R p. 20 n. 205) comparing λακτι at the end of S 114:1.

1 In spite of Führer (R p. 20 n. 205) the relative lengths of 5 and 18 match those required for ep. 9 and str. 2 when this misdivision has been taken into account.
"Ep.1-9" says West (2) p.264 followed initially by Führer p.266. But this involves inconsistent supplementation for lines 4-7 (see p.592) Barrett's alternative hypothesis ep.3 - str.1 removes these difficulties and merely entails for ep.6 the same license attested for str.3 (-~-~-~-~-~-~). Führer (R p.20 n.20l) complains that this explanation reverses the normal relationship of lengths between ep.5 and ep.9 (the former regularly shorter than the latter, as in S 88 I 10/14, 88 ii 9/13, 102 2/6, 104 2/6, 123 1/5). But given that the verses are of practically the same duration (ep.9 only lengthier by one longum) an occasional exception to this rule would not surprise.
West (2) p. 264 says this is "str. 5 - ant. 4" though in fact the "tenth line" which would supply ant. 4 seems rather to be the lower edge of the column (there is no trace of writing on it). Even without this snag, West's interpretation requires the maximum number of letters for the lacunae in 4, 7, 9 but the minimum for 5 (see p. 593).

Hence Barrett's preference for ant. 6 - ep. 4 as an identification of these lines. Again there are difficulties (we must assume that ep. 1 has been omitted (see p. 597) and that 139·9 (ep. 4) is in synaphea with 10 and has been wrongly split one syllable too soon (see p. 596)). And again these difficulties must be evaluated in the light of the statistics gathered on pp. 599ff above.

5 ὅτο

In view of the interlinear scholium, το|ξο seems a reasonable interpretation, which explains Page's remark in the Index Verborum to S.L.G. s.v. ὅ, ἡ, τό: "artic... ut vid." But the definite article in this sense is so very rare in S. and the present context so deficient that we may reasonably doubt Page's conclusion.

7: ἴππακκυτεροι

note that this word recurs in lyric only at Bacch. (?)
fr. 60·30 Sn.

9: ἴατ ʰ θε ὲ χάριν

on the metrical difficulties here see p. 596 above.
The usage referred to here is quite common (LSJ s.v. II (1) "put down by force, destroy") from Homer (Od. 2·100: μονομονόκαθάληνικανηλεγένοςθανάτονο = 3·238 = 19·145) onwards. For my taste, LSJ distinguish it too clearly from the cases listed s.v. II 2 ("put down, reduce"). The rendering "overthrow" would cover most examples under both headings. On the Demosthenic instance (quoted from a law) and for other Sophoclean cases see Pearson ad loc. (1·145). To his list of the latter add now perhaps P. Oxy. 2452 = Sophoc. 5 fr. 3·10f Carden (Theseus?): καὶ πρόσθε ὑπὸγόνοςοικοςπολλῶν ὃβρινικαθεῖλοναδιος. If that supplement is right c.f. Hdt. 9·27·2: τὴνΕὐφυκεσθονὶβριννοκαθὲλομεν which LSJ wrongly distinguishes from the use exemplified by Sophocles' passages.
This lady is mentioned, together with Theseus' mother, as a maidservant of Helen in Iliad 3.143f:

οὐκ οἶνα, ἀμα τῇ γε καὶ ἀμφίπολοι δύ’ ἔπνυοι,

Ἀθηνᾶ, Πετρὸς θυγάτηρ, κλυμένη τε βοῶπις.

Of course the authenticity of the second of these two lines has been disputed since the time of Aristonicus: see my note on 191 P (p. 291).

On her (perfectly reasonable) absence from the Tabula Iliaca see above p. 551.
The usual tradition is that Hecuba was transformed into a bitch just as the Greeks were about to stone her. (So Eur. Hec. 1259ff and the other passages assembled by Robert, Heldensage pp.1279f). S. seems to be the only poet to have her carried to Lycia, and it is very tempting to follow the majority of scholars in explaining this divergence by reference to 224 P (a fragment of uncertain provenance): Στησίχωρος δὲ καὶ Εὔφορίων (fr.56 Powell) τὸν Ἐκτορᾶ φασὶν εἶναι υἱὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. It would indeed be remarkable if Apollo allowed his former bed-mate to end her days in canine form. For a list of similar divine rescues of mortals from death or suffering see Heinze, Virgil's Epische Technik p.58f n.2. S may have been inspired by the passage in Il.16.666ff where, at Zeus' behest, Apollo removes the corpse of Sarpedon son of the gods' king from the Trojan battle-field:

πέμπε δὲ μὴν πομποῖς ἀμα κραίνοντι φέρεσθαι,
Ὑπνω καὶ θανάτωι διδυμάσσιν, οἷς μὴν ὥς καὶ
κάτεσαν ἐν Δυσίλει Εὐρήης πλοῦν δήμωι. (681-3)

We do not know at exactly what point in the sack of Troy Hecuba was rescued, but if the Tabula Iliaca can be trusted it was not until Polyxena had been dragged off to her brutal death, since the old queen is there depicted bidding that daughter a tearful farewell on the
steps of Hector's tomb (see above pp.539ff).

Indeed she might even have been saved from stoning, though S. already uses this motif once in the poem.(201 P). Hecuba is strongly connected with Artemis (Ἐκάστη is a short form of the latter's epithet Ἐχνηδόλος (see p.313 n.1) and the Trojan queen's numerous offspring remind us of the goddesses' rôle as a fertility divinity). Artemis is often identified with Hecate (see my note on 215 P).

There may, then, be an equivalence between all three figures, and this equivalence reveals unexpected analogies between the two versions of Hecuba's fate which we have been considering: the queen either turns into a hound - which is the sacred animal of Hecate (c.f. Farnell, Cults of the Greek States 2.507f) - or is transported to Lycia where Hecate was especially honoured (c.f. Robert, Heldensage p.323 n.3).
The number of the heroes enclosed within the horse is in fact variously given. Homer Od. 8.512 says that πάντες ἄριστοι were included (compare Proclus' summary of Lesches' Ilias Parva: ἐπείτα εἰς τὸν δοῦρειον ἵππον τῶν ἄριστων ἐμβιβάζαντες κτλ. (Allen p.107)) but elsewhere (Od. 4.265ff, 11.523ff) names only five: Odysseus, Menelaus, Diomedes, Neoptolemus and Anticlus. Apollod. ep.5.14 says there were fifty and cites the Ilias Parva (fr.22 Allen (p.136)) for an incredible 3,000. Quint. Smyrn. 12.314ff names 30 out of many, Triphiodorus (152ff) 22, Tzetz. Posthom. 642 says there were 23. In other words, despite Eustathius, we can find no parallel for S's hundred, and no instance at all of a tradition of twelve. Even S. who "redundat atque effunditur" might have baulked at giving a name to every one of his heroes, but he doubtless provided one of his epic catalogues, as he does elsewhere in this work (197 P) and in other poems beside (e.g. Suotherae 222 P).

On the composition that lies behind the corrupt name c.f. Bethe, Homer Dichtung und Sage Vol.2. Part 2 (Kyklos) p.225f. Incidentally, the conjecture Σεκάδα τοῦ 'Αργείου which appears on p.213 of Bergk's P.L.G. as if it were the paradosis does not belong to Bergk himself, as Lloyd-Jones (C.R.14 (1964)19) assumes. It appears in Schweighäusser's edition of Athenaeus (1801-7) Vol.5.
p.210, and is usually attributed to Casaubon, both by those who do not accept it (e.g. D.L. Page in Greek Poetry and Life (Oxford 1936) p.228 n.1) and those who do (e.g. Jacoby, F.Gr.Hist. Vol.3B (Notes) p.10).
There is no need for me to expatiate upon Epeius' career in myth. That has already been done in a sympathetic prosopographical note by R.G. Austin (on Aen. 2.264 (pp. 124 - 126)). I can therefore concentrate on this one particular episode: its two components (Epeius' water-carrying and the goddesses' pity) crop up again in the Towneleian scholion on Il.23.665: Ἐπειόν, δὲ ὡδροφορεῖ τοῖς Ἀχαῖοις ἐλεήμων δὲ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ ... and, more obscurely, in one of Simias' Technopaegnia (Σίμιαν Πέλεκυς: A.P. 15.22 = Powell, Collectanea Alexandrina fr.25 (p.117) = Gow, Bucolici Graeci p.174 = Fränkel, de Sim. Rhod. (Diss. Götting. 1915) fr.19 (pp.65ff)) οὐκ ἐνάρξθμοι γεγαδέ ἐν προμάχοις Ἀχαϊῶν, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ κρανᾶν ἑαρὰν νάμα κόμις εὐκλῆς | νὸν δ' ἐς Ὀμήρειον ἔβα κέλευσθοι | σάν χάριν, ἀγνὰ πολύβουλος Παλλᾶς. See Wilamowitz, Jhb. des Kais. Deutsch. Arch. Inst. 14 (1899) 54ff = Kl.Schr. 51.507ff.

The same tradition is preserved in a Simonidean epigram - if we can trust Chamaeleon. For Athenaeus, in the passage immediately preceding his citation of 200 P, reminds us of an interesting anecdote: Athen. 10.456Ε = Chamaeleon fr.34 Wehrli: πεποίηκε δὲ καὶ έτερον ὁ Σιμονίδης ἐπιγραμμα, ὁ παρέχει τοῖς ἀπείροις τῆς ἱστορίας ἀπορίαν (Simon. 173Β = 70D): φησίν τὸν οὐκ ἔθελοντα φέρειν τέττιγος δειλόν τῷ Πανοπτιάδη, δώσειν μέγα δεξιόν Ἐπειόν.
Chamaeleon's explanation is not totally impossible (for defences of it c.f. Bowra GLP¹ p.320f. and Wehrli ad loc. (p.84)) but most people, I imagine, would prefer the ingenious interpretation of R. Reitzenstein, Epigramm und Skolion (1893) p.116, which assumes we have to do with a literary competition in which the prize (δείπνον = δρίκτον ὧν ἵριστον) is a cup (τέττιγος δείλων: τέττιγ = ἄμφος and Acrisius offered cups as prizes in a now lost Sophoclean tragedy (T.G.F.4 378 (Radt))). It is certainly most odd that Epeius should be portrayed in so menial a task, and we would much appreciate some sort of explanation. Paulcke (p.79) suggested that S. was in fact the first author to depict Epeius as a man of lower rank (compare Plautus' presentation of him as an army cook: Varro de L.L. 7.38 = Plaut. fr. incert.1 (Leo) c.f. Fraenkel, Plautinisches im Plautus 97ff = Elementi Plautini in Plauto 91ff). Wilamowitz(Kl.Schr.5. p.507 n.4. c.f. Homerisch.Untersuch.(1884)p.353, Hermes 40 (1905)175 = Kl.Schr.4.222: he is followed by Fraenkel,
Plautinisches im Plautus p.97f = Elementi Plautini
in Plauto p.91f) preferred to attribute this tradition
to early epic (he found the figure in Il.23 "Halbkomische")
comparing the ethnic 'Επείος with such slave names as
Γέτης and Δαιός (see now Sandbach's Menander commentary
pp.290 and 387). Likewise Vörtheim objects (p.38) that
this deprecatory tradition is already implied in Homer's
Iliad where Epeius is absent from the Catalogue and the battle-scenes and is laughed at by the Greek army at
Patroclus' funeral games (Il.23·839ff). But I doubt
whether the first two negative considerations are
important, and Epeius' characterisation in Il.23 is more
ambiguous than is usually recognised (c.f. Howland, PCPS
It is more significant that, judging from what little we
know, S. represented Epeius' servile occupation as a foil
to the favour he received from Athene. The sequel to the
present fragment was presumably that Athene expressed her
sympathy actively by somehow suggesting to Epeius the
building of the Wooden Horse (c.f. Il.15·70f: εἴς δὲ κὴ
'Αχαϊοι | "Ιλιον αἵπτυ ἔλοιεν Ἀθηναίης διὰ βουλᾶς Οδ.
8·492f: Ἰπποῦ ... ὑπουραγεῖν, τὸν 'Επείος ἐποίησεν σὺν
'Ἀθηνῆι Ilias Parva (Procl. Allen p.107) καὶ 'Επείος
κατ' 'Ἀθηνᾶς προαίρεσιν τὸν δούρειον Ἰπποῦ κατακευάζειν
Apollod. ep.5·14 ἐπινοεῖ (scil. Ὄδυσσεος) δουρείου
Ἰπποῦ κατακευὴν καὶ ὑποτίθεται 'Επείοι, δὲ ἢν ἄρχιτέκτων
Polyaen. Strat. 1·9: τὸν Ἰπποῦ δὲ τὸν δουρείου, τὸν
'Επείος ἐποίησεν σὺν Ἀθηνῆι, καὶ τούτῳ στρατήγημα
'Οδυσσέως ἢν Philostr. Her. 11: τὸν Ἰπποῦ τὸν κοιλοῦ,
Triphiodorus refers to θεοίς ὑποεργός 'Επειδός (57) and Quint. Smyrn. 12.25ff relates that after Odysseus had devised the plan, Athena appeared to Epeius in a dream and commanded him to build the horse with her help which he did in three days.

Since Welcker (Kl. Schr. 1.185), scholars have been aware that a poet of Magna Graecia might take a particular interest in Epeius, who was honoured as κτίστης by Lagaria near Thurii (Σ Lycophr. 930, Strabo 263), by Metapontum ([Aristot.] περὶ Δαυμ. ἀκ. 108, Justin. 20.2.1) and by Pisa (Serv. ad. Aen. 10.179). If the "menial tradition" existed before S's time, then it would make some sort of sense to suppose that our poet tried to minimise this stain on a local hero's reputation by linking the ostensible disgrace to Athena's act of favour. But the gap between a convenient and a true explanation is no smaller here than elsewhere.¹

Διὸς κόρα: confirmed as Athena by the corresponding passages in Σ II.23 and Simias. κόρα is in fact a very

¹Paulcke supposes that Athena pitied Epeius because of his cowardice (for this tradition see R.G. Austin sup. cit. p.125). But the present fragment provides sufficient motive for pity - the hero's water-carrying - and there is no proof that Epeius as menial and Epeius as coward ever existed together as two parts of the denegratory tradition, although that would make coherent sense: Epeius was too craven to fight, so he was given the task of fetching water.
common epithet of this goddess, with or without Διός:
see Bruchmann, Epitheta Decrum p.9f. For the phrase
compare the epic formula Διός κούρη (μεγάλοιο) (11·6·312,
9·536, 10·296; Od. 6·151, 24·521 c.f. 11·6·304, 9·502;
Od. 6·323) in exactly the same metrical position.
For the context to which this fragment probably belongs
see my note on S 89·14·15.
The verse of Euripides in question runs ἄρ’ ἐς τὸ κάλλος ἐκκεκόμηται ξίφη; and we are also informed by a scholion ad loc. that Aristophanes of Byzantium read ἐκκεκόμηται and gave as his reason διὰ ἐς τὸ κάλλος Ἐλένης ἀποβλέψαντες ἀνεπάειδητοι ἔμειναν καὶ ἔλασαν τὰ ξίφη (1.214 Schwartz). Wilamowitz (Einleitung in d. gr. Trag. p.152 = Herakl. ¹ 1 p.151 n.58) adduced that Aristophanes must be the source for our information about S. here and in the other fragments provided by the scholia on Euripides' Orestes (216, 217 and 223 P).

Initial ἄρα, as in the Euripidean line here paraphrased, always begins a question, a point not taken by Schwartz or Page (contrast Bergk p.213). The usual tradition about the fate of Helen when Menelaus finally got his hands on her again can be recovered from the following passages (sensibly reassessed by Carl Robert, B u. L 75ff, and more recently P.A. Clement, Hesperia 27 (1958) 47 - 52). Aristophanes Lysistrata 155f reads ὃ γὼν Μενέλαος τὰς Ἐλένας τὰ μᾶλλ’ παρ’υμνὰς παραμελῶν ἐξέβαλ’οὖν τὸ ξίφος on which Σ ad loc. comments ἡ ἱστορία παρ’ Ἰβύκων (296 P) τὰ δ’ αὐτὰ καὶ Ἀέχης ὃ Πυρραῖος ἐν τῇ μικρᾷ Ἰλιάδι (fr.17 Allen (p.134)) καὶ Εὔριπίδης (Androm. 628). The same poet, in Wasps 714, makes a character say καὶ τὸ ξίφος οὐ δύναμαι κατέχειν and the Σ ad loc. alludes to the same tradition, though the Parva Ilias is omitted from the list of sources: ὡσπερ ὃ Μενέλαος'
Finally Eur. Andr. 627ff has Peleus revile Menelaus in the following terms: ἐλὼν δὲ Τροίαν ... σῶν ἐκτανεῖς γυναικα κεφαλαν λαβόν, ἂλλ', ὡς ἐκεῖδες μαστόν, ἐκβαλὼν ἘιΦος | φίλημ' ἔδέξω, προδότην αἰκάλλων κόνα, ἥςσων πεφυκὼς Κύπριδος, ὃ κάκιστε εὖ. The Σ ad 630 enlightens us with the following comment (2.293 Schwartz) in which, it will be noted, only the lyric poet is now named: προδότην αἰκάλλων κόνα· ἠττήθεις τοῖς ἀφροδίσιοις. ἀμείνων ὁμισομήται τοῖς περὶ Ἰβυκον· εἰς γὰρ Ἀφροδίτης ναὸν καταφεύγει ὡς Ἐλένη κἀκεῖθεν διαλέγεται τῷ Μενελάῳ, ὅ ὁ' ἔρωτος ἀφίησε τὸ ἘιΦος. τὰ παραπλήσια οτούτως καὶ Ἰβυκος ὁ suppl. Schwartz\footnote{On this supplement and the last sentence as a whole see the cautious remarks of Clement sup. cit. p.48. Radtke proposed ἡ καὶ Κλεομένης ὁ} (De Lysimacho Alexandrinio (Diss. Strasburg 1893) p.57). On this Cleomenes see Wilamowitz, Gr. Versk. p.395.

Of course this scene was very popular on works of art (c.f. Brommer, Vasenlisten\footnote{Denkmälerlisten 3·147, L.B. Ghali-Kahil, Les enlevements et le retour d'Hélène pp.71ff, Clement sup. cit. pp.54ff). The same is not true, for reasons already explained (pp.552ff above), of S's version of what happened on this occasion. The scholion which preserves the Stesichorean fragment in question is commenting upon Eur. Or. 1287: ἄρ' ἐς τὸ κάλλος ἐκκεκακηκηται ΕἰΦη; where Electra is speculating on the reactions of Orestes and Pylades after they have
entered the palace to destroy Helen.

This casts no light on the exact identity of the subjects of the plurals τῶν ... μελλόντων and αὐτῶν in our citation, but these must refer to either the Greeks or the Trojans. Both had ample cause for wishing to make Helen "don the tunic of stone" with which Hector threatens Paris in Il.3.57, but in a poem describing the sack of Troy only the former can have had the requisite leisure to put their wishes into practice. And Eur. Tr. 1039 in which Menelaus brusquely bids his newly-recaptured wife βαΐνε λευτήρων πέλας may even be a faint echo of S's handling of the event.

Still, it will be allowed that we know absolutely nothing of the circumstances in which S's attempted stoning took place. Where did it occur? Was it with Menelaus' connivance? Consider the following possibilities (the list is by no means exhaustive and there is no way of choosing between the various suggestions).¹(1) Menelaus regained Helen and, too feeble to punish her, was about to take her off to the ships. This galled the Achaean army beyond endurance: they snatched the guilty woman from her husband's arms and prepared to stone her. (2) Menelaus recovered Helen and in a spirit of grim

¹But attempts to combine S's version with the more familiar treatments of Ibycus and others (so e.g. Robert Bild und Lied pp.76ff) motivated as they are by the assumption that the Tabula Iliaca's depiction of this scene provides an unadulterated reflection of S's poem, need not be considered very seriously: see above pp.552ff.
determination willingly handed her over to the troops so that each man might avenge the ten wasted years of his life. (3) The attempt to stone Helen was an impromptu affair which took place in Troy itself shortly after the sack. (4) It was carefully planned so that everyone might take part and was held in the Greek camp several days after the city had been reduced to rubble.

When we know so little of the fragment's setting, generalisations about the intended effect of the fragment itself are doubly dangerous. And yet there does seem to be a deliberate connection between S's version and the more traditional account: in both, weapons are dropped by men overawed by female beauty; but Menelaus' renewed passion for his wife is an intimate experience: S. introduces a wider, more public, background. If we concentrate on the numbers involved we may conclude that our poet is stressing the hateful side of Helen: not only her husband but the Greek soldiery besides detested her strongly enough to will her death. Those who take this view often conclude that this passage affords us powerful grounds for supposing the Iliupersis to be the work which later required the Palinodes. But it is equally possible that S. is telling us something about the magical intensity of his heroine's beauty, which can entrance not only Menelaus but an entire army too.
Other mythical characters threatened with the punishment of stoning include Paris (II.3.57) and Hecuba (see p.668 supr.; S. may have had the opportunity to describe the event in this self-same poem) and Ajax (Iliupersis (Procl. Allen p.108))

The possibility that Helen, returned to Greece, may be stoned by resentful parents whose sons have died at Troy, is raised in Eur. Or. 56ff. A piquant contrast to the Stesichorean fragment is provided by the fate of the famous courtesan Laïs (Plut. Am. 21 p.768A) whose beauty did not prevent her from being stoned to death (in the temple of Aphrodite appropriately enough). On the contrary, the people throwing the stones were women inspired by jealousy of her personal seductiveness.
In lines 8ff of Euripides' Andromache, the titular heroine recalls her fate, ἄκος πόσιν μὲν ἔκτω ἔξω Ἀχιλλέως, δι' ἑδά δ᾿ ὑπὲρ τὸν τίκτω πόσει ἰδιόντα πύργων Ἀκτυάνακτ’ ἀπ’ ὅρθιων, ἐπεὶ τὸ Τροῖας ἐξόλον Ἑλληνές πέδου. Since nothing is said to the contrary, ἰδιόντα clearly entails that Astyanax was thrown alive from the walls of Troy. The scholion ad loc. commences by reproducing an inept cavil over Euripides' treatment, and proceeds to report the remarks of others about the version of Xanthus of Lydia (F. Gr. Hist. 765 F 21). The sentence in which this is done is lacunose, but we can see that it contains an accusative and infinitive

---

1For the sake of convenience I reproduce most of the scholion here: Λυκανάς κατηγορεῖ Εὐριπίδου, κακοὶ λέγων αὐτόν ἐξειληφθεῖ το παρ᾽ Ὀμήρου λεξιθέν (II 24: 734 f) "ἡ τε Ἀχιλλὸς δίψει χειρὸς ἔλθον ἀπὸ πύργου" οὐχ ὅτι πτώτως ἕνθαμμον ἀλλ᾽ ἐκαζόμενον δὲ κέ ζελεία κατακαυκήθηκε τοῦ παῖδα ἢ τοῖς ἄλλοις. Εάνθου δὲ τοῦ τὰ λυδιακὰ γράφαντα (F. Gr. Hist. 765 F 21) "οἱ φαίνει δὲ οἱ Εὐριπίδης Εάνθου προσέχειν περὶ τῶν Τροικών μόθουν, τοῖς δὲ χρησιμωτέροις καὶ ἀξιοπιστοτέροις" [There follows the passage cited above: Ἐπίτιδε.] εἰς ἔν ἔν μὲν οἷς φαίνει αὐτὸν καὶ πόλεις ὅπως καὶ βασιλεύσαι ὅν τὰς δόξας Λυκίμαχος ἐν τοῖς δευτέρω τῶν Ἁρκτῶν ἀνέγραψεν (F. Gr. Hist. 382 F 9).

Wilamowitz was the first to recognise the presence of a lacuna and following him Seeliger p.1 f supplemented the lacuna from Strabo 14.680 = Xanthus F. Gr. Hist. 765 F 14 (ὁ μὲν γὰρ Εάνθος ὁ Ὀδυσσεῖ τὰ τρωικά ψηλὰν ἐλεύθερον τοὺς ἄρσιμας ἐκ τῆς Ἐφρώπης καὶ τῶν ἄριστερῶν τοῦ Πόντου, ἄγαγείν ὁ αὐτὸς Ἑκαμανδρόου ἐκ Βερεκυώνῳ καὶ Ἀσκανίας). As follows: Εάνθου δὲ τῶν τὰ λυδιακὰ γράφαντα * * φαίνει δὲ πρῶτον εἰρημένον τά τοιαύτα περὶ Ἀκτυάνακτος πρὸς δὲ λεκτόν ὅτι Εὐριπίδης Εάνθου προσέχειν περὶ τῶν Τρωικῶν ἀπίσθανον τοῖς δὲ χρησιμωτέροις πείθεσθαι καὶ πιστοτέροις.
construction governed by οἰκίαν, and this construction marches on into the next sentence, which is why Στηρίγμα ... ποιήτην, and Εὐριπίδην are in that particular oblique case, why ἱστορεῖν and ἡμιολογούμεναι are in their particular verb-forms and why τεθνηκόν and διωθείνη are optatives. But what is the meaning of these two verbs in this passage? The latter must mean that Astyanax was thrown alive from the wall, since, as we have just seen, that was Euripides' version and he is here said to have followed the Iliupersis over this detail. It will not make much sense, then, to suppose that S. and the epic poet are being contrasted either by the assertion that "S. said that Astyanax died and the cyclic poet said that in fact he was thrown while still living from the wall" or by the remark "S. said that Astyanax died and the cyclic poet said that he was also thrown when alive from the wall." Both interpretations are incoherent and fail to produce the comparison between the two accounts which the μὲν after S's name leads us to expect. The only rendering which will satisfy that simple requirement is the following: "S. said that Astyanax had already died and the cyclic poet said that in fact he was thrown while still alive from the wall." We do not know whom S. named as the perpetrator of the deed. The Parva said it was Neoptolemus (fr. 19 Allen (p. 135)) the epic Iliu Persis Odysseus (Allen p. 108 (Procl.)). So too Tzetz. Posthom. 735, Triphiod. 649ff. Greeks in general are guilty in Quint. Sm. 13. 251ff,
Apollod. ep.5·23. Sen. Tro. 524ff, 1063ff talk of suicide. When we possess so little information, generalisations about the effect intended by the contrast outlined above (e.g. Bowra GLP\textsuperscript{2} p.104: "[S.] seems ... to have tempered some of the more barbarous episodes in the epic") are to be avoided.
Not a very illuminating reference to our poem. Its Homeric characteristics could have been inferred anyway on several grounds (see now P. Oxy. 2619). Still, it is better to accept this than to argue that S's Iliupersis is implied to be worthy of Homer; Homer did not criticise Helen; therefore the Iliupersis cannot be the Ἀκανθοῦρα Ἐλένης which called forth the Palinodes. This is a veritable paradigm of the method not to adopt when confronted with unhelpful fragments like the present. Such portentous information cannot conceivably be squeezed out of this handful of words. The highly Homeric character of S's poem can now be judged from the recent papyrus finds: see my commentary on S 88 - 147.

On Pausanias' description of Polygnotus' Ἰλίου Πέρσης see above p.514.
Medusa is named as a daughter of Priam by Apollod. 3.12.5 and Hyginus fab. 90. There is no trace of her in earlier poetry, but since we possess so little of the epic cycle, Robert is wise to discourage automatic assumption that S. was the source for Polygnotus' picture and the mythographers (Die Iliupersis des Polygnot p.65: contrast Bowra GLP² p.104). For attempts to identify Medusa on the Tabula Iliaca see above p.535 n.1.
Homer refers once to the κόνα κτυπερόο 'Αβέιο (11.8.368) that Heracles had to bring up from Erebos as one of the labours imposed by Eurystheus (c.f. ib. 363). But as usual he declines to give the brute a physical description or even to name him. For both types of detail we must go to Hesiod's Theogony (311ff and 769ff and see West's notes ad locc.) Oddly enough we are not told in that poem that Cerberus, like several other descendents of Ceto and Phorcys was "the subject of a Heraclean feat" (West p.253) but Hesiod presumably knew the story and it is hard to see what else could have formed the subject-matter of a Stesichorean lyric narrative with the title Κέρβερος.\(^1\) In other words this work, like the Cycnus and Geryoneis, dealt with an exploit of Heracles.

This hero's descent to Hades was a popular theme in several poems of antiquity (Bacchylides 5.56ff, Pindar fr.3^6 (Sn) c.f. fr.249\(^A\)) and Professor Lloyd-Jones has recently cast a penetrating light on them by reviving Norden's theory of an early epic χατάβαςικ 'Ηρακλέους which will be the source - direct or indirect - for the two lyric works just mentioned, and for Apollodorus 2.5.12 and Aristophanes Frogs passim, as well as Vergil's descent of Aeneas in Book Six of his epic. (See Norden's edition of Aen. 6

\(^1\)Compare the title of Pindar's Dithyramb 2: εξατάβαςικ 'Ηρακλέους Κέρβερος, on which c.f. Lloyd-Jones sup. cit. pp.216ff: it is possible, though by no means certain, that frr.249\(^A\) and 346 (Sn.) come from this poem.
p.5 and n.2 and Lloyd-Jones, Maia 19 (1967) 206ff.

For the latest discussion of this topic we must consult F. Graf, Eleusis und die Orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit (1974) pp.142ff with the up-to-date bibliography on p.144 n.17 to which add J. Boardman, J.H.S. 95 (1975) pp.1ff. Among the numerous benefits brought to pass by this hypothesis is one very important negative conclusion: there is no conceivable likelihood that S's Cerberus was a possible source for the relevant poems of Pindar and Baccylides, or that Bacchylides and later Vergil copied Pindar. These extant poems, especially the Pindaric fragment, presuppose a lost epic πατάβαςις whose author was interested in Athens and the Eleusinian mysteries. His depiction of purification doctrines and the link wherewith he connects Heracles and Theseus, the national hero of Attica, lead us to look for a poem composed at a time (c.550) and a place which both exclude its influence upon S. or indeed the reverse process (Lloyd-Jones p.226). We are thus relieved from the uncongenial duty of rummaging through the two poems of Baccylides and Pindar in the forlorn hope of stumbling across faint echoes of S's treatment. And we must stoically accept that all we know of S's handling of his theme is his use of the word φόρητα in the sense of "wallet".  

1 For an exact description of this article c.f. Σ Ar. Eq. 1094A (p.239 Jones-Wilson): πλεκτόν τι βαλλάντινον ἐστιν ὁ φόρητα, διπέρ ἐξελέσθη καὶ ἀνοίγεται, παρά τό ἄρθεν καὶ βάλλειν, Pollux 7.166 (καὶ τά τῶν βαλλαντίων ἀγγελτα φόρητα) and Athenaeus 11.783f: φόρητα ποτηρίων κατώθεν εὐρύτερον, ἀνώ δὲ συνηγμένον,
ta mou o o dounontai nhipsw kobmoy xeroin ... Vurtheim (pp.22-3) concocted a fantastic expansion of the lexicographers' undeniably unenlightening piece of information. An hypothesis which begins by asserting that S's poem "hatte zweifelsohne denselben Inhalt als Sophokles' Satyricon 'Hracticc epo Tantdrow" and ends by assuring us "wie wenig also auch aus S's Kerberos liberliefert worden sei, mit Bestimmtheit dürfen wir feststellen dass das Gedicht eine Parodie war" is unlikely to have anything good in its middle. Nor does it: from the minute wallet is pulled something large and unappealing. We are invited to observe (and even to admire) the spectacle of S. as a precursor of Aristophanes in his presentation of Heracles the hero with immense appetites who needs to stuff his wallet full of journey-money in order to pay for the pleasures which he enjoyed, as the comic poet's Dionysus reminds him, HniK'Hadec epo tov Kerbervon ... porvest, anaapalas, ektrapas, kpanac, dokyc, polecs, dialas, pandoxetrika, dopou koreic olvysto (Frogs 111 ff; c.f. ib. 561ff). Now a poet famed for his "graves Camenae" and a poem entitled Kerbervoc are unsuitable candidates for bestowing or receiving such jocose contd..

1) Wc ta sumpacta balantia, & vni aytta dia thn doplogeta doudballous tines kaloctov. That is, the wallet received its name from the similarly-shaped wine-bowl (for which see the illustrations of Aryballoi in Richter-Milne, The Shapes and Names of Athenian Vases (1935) p.16 (Tables 103-8)). Vurtheim's hypothesis seems ultimately to stem from Kleine's unfortunate remark (p.70): "eiusmodi lagenam in itinere fortasse Hercules, ut poculum amator, adhibuit."
ornamentation. A poet called Aristophanes however, and his comedy "the Frogs" are; and that comic playwright would be furthermore a most appropriate inventor of this humorous device, especially if he adapted to comic ends a detail that had been totally innocent before. If this is not an adequate prophylactic against Vürtheim's fantasy, we may consider Sir Maurice Bowra's gentle reminder (GLP² p.94) that even in the Cerberus, a wallet need not contain money, and need not belong to Heracles.
KYKNOS

For once, our earliest account of the myth is also the fullest: it is contained in that remarkable work "the Shield of Heracles" (‘Αχνίς). That hero and his nephew and squire Iolaus, while travelling to Trachis, encounter Cycnus in the τέμπεως of Apollo, where he and his father Ares are mounted on a chariot. Cycnus hopes to kill Heracles, but Apollo, far from hearing his prayers to that effect, actually (αὑτός 69) urges on the son of Zeus to attack him. There follow various heroic speeches, an arming scene which develops into an ἐκφρασάς of Heracles' shield, and finally the combat itself as Heracles and Cycnus leap from their chariots and fight their way through the encrusting similes with Homeric shield and spear. Cycnus is soon despatched and Heracles then turns upon Ares who in turn is shortly to be seen being born off wounded by his attendants Deimos and Phobos. Heracles and Iolaus strip the spoil from the dead Cycnus and then continue on their way. The neighbouring king Ceyx and his people bury the corpse, but Apollo uses the river

---

1 I cannot accept the views of Wilamowitz (ad Eur. Her. 110 (2 II p.31) and in Glaub. Hell. 1·p.217 n.4 and p.322 n.4) on the place of Cycnus in Greek mythology. He discerns two separate traditions: the first Aeolian (from South Thessaly) whereby Cycnus is a bad king in the Trojan cycle whom Achilles kills; the second and later Dorian, with the Dorian hero Heracles the slayer. But the son of Poseidon and the son of Ares are totally different heroes (c.f. Σ Αρ. Ran. 963) and the metamorphosis of the first is irrelevant to the second. There are probably more than two Cycni: see below pp.695ff. For some interesting comments on the myth of Cycnus and his analogies with other legendary harrowers of Delphi and general enemies of mankind see J. Fontenrose, Python (1959) pp 28ff.
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Anaurus to obliterate his place of burial, thus assuring a resentment that was first kindled by Cycnus' habit of robbing those who came bearing holy hecatombs to Pytho. As experience with Homer teaches us, it is never safe to presume that the first literary occurrence of a myth invariably preserves that myth's original form. In the Iliad all sorts of distorting pressures are at work and the same is true of the Shield. The synopsis given above comes nowhere near conveying the way in which the use of speeches, similes and ἐκπομπή c w r e n ch e s the shape of the narrative into an idiosyncratic assymetry. As Russo points out in his excellent commentary on the poem (second edition (1965) pp.29ff), it is not only the Shield of Achilles (Il.18.478ff) which has influenced the arrangement of the Scutum's contents. The Iliadic Διομήδους ἀριστεία is clearly the model for Heracles' duels with Cycnus and then Ares (see Russo p.30 and pp.158-9 and Scut. 325ff). Unfortunately it is difficult to assess just how freely the author of the Shield has manipulated the material at his disposal, because there is no infallible means of proving which, if any, of the details found in the jejune accounts of the myth which post-date our miniature epic are actually earlier than that poem. Russo goes so far as to argue that two details in particular that we find in later authors are patently old and original but have been dropped from the poem thanks to the influence of Diomedes' ἀριστεία and are replaced by the "flaccid duel": (1) Heracles' initial flight (reinstated by S.); (2) Zeus'
intervention with the thunderbolt to ensure this very ὑποξώρηςις, (also, Russo argues, restored by S: vid inf. p.697f).

On the same principle one might explain almost all of S's divergences from the Shield as reversions to the original form of the legend. After all, the temple of skulls sounds very primitive, and the Stesichorean picture of Ares' directly helping his son looks more "organic" than the rather feeble counterpart in the older poem where Ares' mysterious failure to act until Cycnus' death, and his wounding in a separate encounter, are clear imitations of the end of Il·5. This is a complex problem to which we must return later. But first let us consider those few novelties of detail which spring up spasmodically in post-Stesichorean literature. Here our good fortune in possessing the whole of the Aspis intact will prove most useful: if a late motif is not anticipated in the Shield we must seriously ask whether it ultimately derives from S.¹

Pindar's passing allusion (01·10·15f: τράπε ε Ῥόκνεια

¹Il·23·345f mentions Arion "the swift horse of Adrastus" and Σ ad loc. comments τοῦτω διαγωνισάμενος Ἡρακλῆς πρὸς Κύκνου τὸν "Ἀρεῶς ὑδὸν καθ' ἑπιθρόμιαν ἐνκυκλεῖν ἐν τῷ τοῦ Παγασαίου Ἀπόλλωνος ἔργῳ... This information concerning the name of Heracles' horse is taken from Scut. 120 and Vürtheim (p.25) is right to remind us that the phrase καθ' ἑπιθρόμιαν is a more general and vague allusion to the Homeric method of combat recognised by that poem, not a unique reference to some lost tradition whereby Cycnus challenged Heracles to a chariot-race.
μάχα καὶ ὑπέρβιον Ἴς ᾿Ηρακλῆς) is too brief to be of use here and it raises problems of its own - concerning the relevance of the myth to its context - which are too tangled even to mention. I dismiss the passage, after expressing my agreement with Bowra's suggestion that this briefest of mentions in an ἐπιγνωκόν for a Locrian boy-victor is almost certainly a reference to the tale's treatment by the poet who is so often linked with Locri in our sources and was Magna Graecia's most famous bard (GLP² p. 80).

A slightly more substantial description of the Κυκνομαχία is to be found during the splendid catalogue of Heracles' labours that forms the first stasimon in the Euripidean play about that hero. Lines 389ff read: ἄν τε Πηλιάδ' ἀκταν ᾿Αναύρου παρὰ πηγάς Κύκνον ἐξενοδαῖταν τόξοις ὄλεσεν, Ἀμφαναῖοι ὀλυκτορ' ἄμεικτον ... No such arrows occur in the Shield's Homeric conflict of spear against shield and Wilamowitz ad loc. (2. p. 93) guessed that the detail was an ad hoc invention inspired by the striking ἄγων between Lycus and Heracles' father which concentrates (160ff, 188ff) on the merits and demerits of the bow as weapon. And yet the bow was an attribute of Heracles as early as Homer (c.f. II.5.395ff: τλη δ’ ᾿Αἵδης ... ὄλυν διίτον, εἴτε μιν ... νῦς Δίδας αἵματος, ἐν Πῦλω ἐν νεκρέσσι βαλὼν δοῦνης ἐδωκεν Od. 8.224f: οὐθ᾽ Ὠρακλῆς ὅτ’ ἔφεξεν Ὀλυμπίη, οὐ δ’ ὡς καὶ ᾿Αὶανάτοις ἔριξεν περὶ τόξων Od. 11.606f: Ὑ δ’ (scil. Ὠρακλῆς)... γυμνὸν τόξων
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the poet of the Shield seems to have been aware of Heracles' reputation in this area when he writes, revealing his "gusto per il macabro", κόλλην δὲ περὶ ετήθεςσι φαρέτριν κάθυσεν Ξένπιδεν' πολλοὶ δ' ἔντοσεν διότοι διγηλοὶ, θανάτου λαθυσθόγγυο ὁπτήρες.

It is true that these gruesome instruments are not actually employed in the duel itself, but the length at which they are described suggests they were once in the original myth, before the composer of the Shield overlaid it with motifs from the Διομήδους ὀνειτεία. And several vase paintings of the subject show our hero carrying bow and arrows (see especially pp.699ff below). We have long known that S. equipped Heracles with club, lion skin and arrows (229 P) and we now realise that he had the hero despatch Geryon with the third of those implements (S.15.10ff). In other words, when Euripides says βέλεσι τ' ἀμφέβαλ' (τὸν Wecklein, Wilamowitz), ἤτον τρισώματον οἰκίν ἐκ τα βοτήρ' ἔρυθελας he is accurately epitomising part of the Geryoneis (Her. 422ff). Have we any reason to suppose he is not doing the same for the Cycnus in the earlier part of the stasimon? It may be alleged that Geryon was a special case whose three bodies needed to be assailed from a distance rather more than arm's-length.
different enemies of mankind in two separate poems by
exactly the same means would be to court monotony.
Nevertheless, I think we can no longer rule out the
possibility that Euripides here preserves a detail from
the older poet.

Fresh details in two late mythographers have been inter-
preted as holding wide-ranging implications for S's
handling of the myth, although English scholars, with
Vürtheim, have ignored this hornet's nest of controversy.
We know everything about the Aspis (1), and a little
about S's Cycnus (2). Let us now hear first the words of

(3) Apollodorus 2.5.11:

πορευόμενος οὖν (scil. Ἡρακλῆς) ἐπὶ ποταμὸν Ἐξέδωρον
ήκε. Κύκνος δὲ "Ἀρεός καὶ Πυρήνης εἰς μονωμάχιαν αὐτὸν
προεκάλειτο. "Ἀρεός δὲ τούτον ἐκδικοῦντοκαι συμποίησαν

\[\text{Schmidt, Observ. arch. in carm. Hes.(Diss. p.hil. T-al. 12}
(1894))\text{p.162 is probably right to claim that ἐκδικοῦντο implies}
\text{that Heracles has killed Cycnus (as in Hyginus' account)
before Ares' intervention. (Indeed, at least one scholar has
gone further: as Wagner (Mythographi Graeci 1 p.85) reports
"post προεκαλεῖτο lacunam brevi certaminis enarratione explendam
statuit W. Gemoll, Fleckeis ann. 1882 p.465."). But this conclusion}
totally annihilates his argument. For we must then
suppose that S's original, reflected by the two mytho-
graphers, had the following sequence of events: (1)
Heracles fights Cycnus and Ares and is forced to flee;
(2) Heracles attacks Cycnus when he is alone and kills
him; (3) an angry Ares confronts Heracles and their
conflict is only interrupted by Zeus' thunderbolt. But
how can the two prose authors and S. all be telling the
same tale, when the former pair say nothing of (1) and we
have no evidence that S. related either of (3)'s
components? In my account above, I omit Schmidt's inter-
pretation of ἐκδικοῦντο, as do most of his followers.
Even then his overall interpretation very soon collapses.
μονομαχλαν, βληθείς κεφαλών μέσος διμοιτέρων διαλύει τὴν μάχην.

Next (4) Hyginus fab.31:

Cygnum, Martis filium, armis superatum occidit (scil. Heracles). quo cum Mars venisset, et armis propter filium contendere vellet cum eo, Iovis inter eos fulmen misit.¹

Since Apollodorus goes on to describe Heracles' killing in single combat of another son of Ares called Cycnus (2.7.7: παριόντα δὲ (scil. Ἡρακλ.) Ἰτωνον εἰς μονομαχινάν προεκαλέσατο αὐτὸν Κύννος Ἀρεος καὶ Πελοπίας· εὐστάς δὲ καὶ τοῦτον ἀπέκτεινεν) it seems reasonable to suppose with Frazer ad loc. (Vol.1.p.221 n.3) that the Cycnus saved by the thunderbolt is a completely different character from the villain of "Hesiodic" and Stesichorean fame and the second Apollodoran passage.² Hyginus, true to form, will then have confused the two combats. Still, let us, for the sake of the argument, presume that this is not the case, but that rather Apollodorus has accidentally treated as separate incidents two different versions of the same event. We then have two ways of explaining the

¹ The scholars who quote this passage for this purpose add the phrase "atque ita eos distraxit", which is present in earlier texts of Hyginus but is not in Rose's.

² Apollodorus gives each Cycnus a different mother (Pyrene, Pelopia) and sets the battle with Heracles in different places. Amongst the additions which Wagner made to his second edition of Mythographi Graeci 1 (1925) we read (p.265) "Cycni et Herculis certamen hoc loco... interpolatum esse statuit Zipperer, Bl(ätter) f(ür das) bayr- (lsche) Gymn(asialische) 16·19," a reference I have been unable to verify. I cannot agree with Fontenrose (Python (1959))pp 28ff)that the identicality of Apollodorus' two Cycni has been proved by O. Höfer (in Roscher s.v. Pyrene(3.3341-54ff)). In that entry the German scholar brings to light a
discrepancies between the tales told by Apollodorus and Hyginus: (i) the Greek mythographer preserves a rare variant of the myth but gives it in a curtailed form, whereas Hyginus supplies the full version; (ii) the story found in Apollodorus is complete but very different from the one to which we are accustomed since the duel is permanently broken off without fatality. Hyginus clumsily contaminates this recherché form with the bloody ending which belongs to the famous encounter.

Now the respective reputations of the normally reliable Apollodorus and Rose's "miserable sciolist" would surely decide us in favour of the second alternative. A number of German scholars have blithely adopted the first however (so principally Hub. Schmidt, Observ. arch. in carm. Hes. (Diss. Phil. Hal. 12 (1894)) pp.160ff and F.G. Stegmann, de Scut. Herc. Hesiodei poetae (Diss. Rostoch (1904)) pp.8ff). What is more they then proceed to argue that Zeus' hurling of the thunderbolt to achieve a cessation of hostilities (miscalled by them the version of Apollodorus and Hyginus) ultimately derives from S's Cycnus. In the original poem as reconstructed by their labours, Heracles attacked Cycnus but was forced to retreat, not only because of Ares' participation but because his father deterred him with a thunderbolt. Perhaps this detail was an integral part of the original myth, and though forced out by the influence of Homer's Δωμήδος διοίκησις is palely reflected in the Shield's statement that (383f.)

2 (contd..) μέγα δ’ ἔκτυπε μητίετα Ζεὺς,
passage in the obscure Etymologicum Florentinum s.v. Πυρήνη (ap. E. Miller, Mélanges de littérat.grecque 258) which has a certain Lycaon, son of Ares and Pyrene (like Apollodorus'
The omen is meant to encourage Zeus' own son, so perhaps (the argument runs) it was S. himself who invented the idea of thunder used with hostile intent, and reversed the tenor of the earlier passage. (Compare Il. 8.133ff where the same god's bolt, landing in front of Diomedes' chariot checks his advance; or 75ff of the same book, where the god's thunder and lightning from Mount Ida create terror among the Achaeans). We are warned not to be surprised that this vivid feature is completely absent from the Pindaric scholion's résumé of the work: when a lengthy poem is summed up in about six lines, even the king of the gods may have to suffer exclusion. So far the hypothesis can hardly be said to be drooping under the burden of corroborative evidence. But several vase paintings and other plastic depictions definitely prove the antiquity of the thunderbolt version. To these we must now turn.

(first Cycnus) killed by Heracles at Pyrene. Why this should imply a tradition that any son of Ares and Pyrene died on the Echedorus I cannot see. Fontenrose's alternative suggestion (p.31 n.3) that in S. Heracles first met Cycnus (and Ares) at the Echedorus and later encountered Cycnus alone at Itonus involves too many difficulties, as he himself admits.
THE STORY IN ART

Robert, Heldensage 509 has some useful remarks, but the most recent, as well as the fullest, treatment of this topic is contained in the article by F. Vian, R.E.A. 47 (1945) 5ff to be supplemented by the same scholar's La guerre des géants (Paris 1952) pp. 52ff. S. Karouzou touches briefly on the general problem (B.C.H. 79 (1955) 171 - 181 and 186 - 191) in connection with the Athens Stathatos (ABV 289 - 26 = Vasenlisten3 105 - 16). Artefacts other than vases listed in Denkmülerlisten 1 - 98ff.

The encounter between Heracles and Cycnus was one of the more popular subjects treated by Greek vase-painters, as a few seconds' perusal of the relevant pages of Brommer's Vasenlisten3 (pp. 102ff) will show. Attic black-figure vases are particularly fond of it: their earliest depictions fall before 550. But every possible form of variant seems to be found on one representation or another, and these show several divergences from our literary sources. The bare minimum for visual illustration is, of course, the two enemies shown locked in combat. This, apparently, is what Pausanias saw on the Amyclean throne: επείρασαν ... Ἡρακλέους μονομαχία πρὸς Κόκνον (3 - 18 - 10) and one of the ἀγάλματα at Athens that struck his eye was Κόκνος Ἡρακλέως μαχόμενος (1 - 27 - 6). Numerous vases likewise restrict themselves to these two figures, but others

---

1 But as Karouzou points out (p. 191) though 6th century Attic art favours the myth, only one Corinthian vase (see p. 703) has been found to show it.
add one or more ancillary characters. Rising upwards in complexity we may find Athena aiding Heracles against Ares and Cycnus, or interposing herself between her protégé and a Cycnus who is sometimes aided by the war-god, sometimes not. Or we may find Zeus himself intervening to separate various combinations of the four heroes or deities above mentioned. He may be brandishing his thunderbolt, or alternatively he may be absent physically but represented by that symbol of his power. Often a whole host of subsidiary characters intrude with decreasing relevance: Iolaus, Eris and Phobos for instance, or less frequently but more mysteriously, Amazons or Erinyes. Still more difficult to explain are the two women who urge on the main fighters on several vases. But the most vivid impression of this tendency to expansion will be given simply by quoting the figures who occur on the well-known oenochoe in Berlin (1732: ABV 110.37 = Vasenlisten³ 106.10).

There we find (reading from left to right) Athena, Heracles, Ares, Cycnus, Zeus, Iolaus, Phobos, Poseidon, Apollo, Dionysus, and that genial but out of place personage the Old Man of the Sea.

We ask ourselves the usual question: do such innovations in detail stem from the imagination and wish for variety of the different vase-painters, or are at least some of them derived from literary sources, especially S's Cycnus? And the answer seems easier than usual. Few will be prepared, I suppose, to argue that the Amazons and
Poseidon, or - to give two final further examples from vases - mounted horsemen or Hermes, ever occurred in any such poem: they are too obviously figures who have been added for formal reasons of balance, symmetry and variety. Amazons and Erinyes are vaguely appropriate decorations for a scene of strife. Most of the others whom I have listed lack even that flimsy justification.

Of course even here the ground beneath us can prove treacherous. The two main combatants' chariots often figure on vases and we may be inclined to dismiss them as the mere inventions of vase-painters eager to fill out the edges of their scenes until we recall (see Karouzou p.189) that they already played a part in the Shield (61 ff). But this instance also introduces a further element of uncertainty. Since the chariots appear in the miniature epic we would be unable to tell even if S's version were reflected here. Likewise with Athena: suppose we could be sure that her presence on vases was not simply due to her almost invariable connection with Heracles in plastic art (see my note on the Geryoneis in art p. 99), or the painter's search for variety or a symmetrical balance to Ares. Even then it would be dangerous to think of S. and to compare the help afforded to Heracles by this goddess in the Geryoneis (S14-3ff).

For Athena too appears in the Shield (325ff), as Bowra

---

1His presence may well be due to contamination between Cycnus the son of Ares slain by Heracles, and Cycnus the son of Poseidon slain by Achilles. The two are carefully distinguished by Σ Ar. Ran. 963.
(GLP\(^2\) p.122) seems to forget. Exactly the same applies to Iolaus, Deimos, Phobos, and even to Eris, whose depiction on vases may well have been inspired by \(11.148\text{ff}\) of the Scutum. And since the little we actually know of S's Cycnus implies a poem vastly different from Hesiod's, it would be eccentric to maintain that many or indeed any of these figures on vases represent a Stesichorean adaptation of their Hesiodic originals.

If there is to be even the slightest chance of our recognising that a detail on a vase derives from the Cycnus, it must be incompatible with or extraneous to the Shield. And it should not be the type of detail a painter adds on his own initiative. It would be even better if it corresponded with one of the few pieces of information we possess about the poem. These austere rules drastically reduce the number of relevant vases. Still, more than one of the survivors seems to show distinct promise. Our ears prick up when Vian remarks (p.10) that one solitary vase shows Cycnus' mother trying to restrain her son (Athens Statatu: ABV 289.26 = Vase1.3 105.15). We remember the moving intervention of the mother of another doomed enemy of Heracles in the Geryoneis (S 13.2ff). Did S. use the motif in more than one poem? Unfortunately I can see no good reason for dignifying the female on this vase with the specific title of Cycnus' mother. I would sooner rank her with the pair of women, impossible to identify, who similarly seek to hold back the combatants on several other vases (Vian pp.19ff). Professor
Robertson has observed (C.Q. 19 (1969) pp.217 - 18) that grieving mothers are a common motif on Greek vases, and this seems the likeliest explanation for the female on ABV 289·26 and on the Perugian bronze relief discussed below (p.705f). The pair of women who appear on several vases may well have been "transferred" by the vase-painters from the combat of Memnon and Achilles which in plastic art often shows the mothers of each hero respectively mourning and triumphing (see Robertson l.c. p.217 n.6).

A late Corinthian amphora (Payne NC 131·330 No.1472 A fig. 15 = Vasenlisten 1. 107·C1) has been interpreted as matching the Pindaric scholion in at least one detail: in the background to the fight it shows some sort of building, possibly a temple, and Bowra hastens to identify it with the Stesichorean temple of skulls (GLP 2 p.122). I find this rather unlikely. If the painter was trying to represent this macabre piece of architecture he has failed badly: it looks just like any other normal temple and Payne (N.C. p.131f) and Vian (p.7) with far more plausibility suppose that the artist is amplifying the Hesiodic mention of a τέμενος to Apollo (Sc. 58) by adding an explicit (and totally unexceptionable) temple to that divinity.

We come now to the lynch-pin of that argument which attributes a Stesichorean origin to those vases-some as early as the first part of the sixth century-which portray the intervention of Zeus armed with a thunderbolt. As
we know, S. unlike Hesiod, had Heracles at first assailed by the combined rather than consecutive attacks of Ares and his son. Numerous vases show the two latter ranked side by side against the former and also Zeus interrupting the affray. If one motif comes from S., does not the other? The deduction is by no means inevitable. I observe at once that the recorded line of reasoning ignores the possibility that vase-painters themselves are quite capable of combining and "contaminating" two different versions or stages of one story into a congruous whole. And yet this very phenomenon stares us in the face with respect to the self-same group of vases. For many of them show Zeus separating the combatants over the dead body of Cycnus. By no contrivance can that be reconciled with S's version: such artefacts are not literally "illustrations" of his poem. And if we credit these painters with enough autonomy to alter S's sequence of events and to bring forward Cycnus' death to the time of his first encounter with Heracles, how can we be so arbitrary as to deny that they may have indeed expanded S's account by adding a quite alien motif - that of Zeus' intervention - or that the whole idea of combining Ares and Cycnus' attack may be the painter's rather than S's improvement on Hesiod?¹

There is a further argument to consider. The most

¹Since vase-painters most certainly do combine antagonists clad in the Shield's Homeric armour with Zeus' intervention (eg. the oenochoe mentioned on p.700 such a mixture of motifs is in no way hypothetical.
striking feature of S's treatment was Heracles' unwonted flight. It is asserted that Ares alone could never produce so startling a change in nature: the vases' thunderbolt would be needed. But why then do we never see Heracles turning to flight as a result of his father's divine show of strength? I must stress that we are not demanding anything which an artist would have found difficult to depict. On the contrary the unusual sight of the hero thrown into confusion by his own father's bolt would surely have provided a most striking and exciting composition. Strange that not one single vase contains it and with it the only respectable proof for the theory we are considering.

But it has been maintained that one - and only one - work of art does in fact show the lion-hearted hero beginning to flee at the thunderbolt. We can therefore test the theory at its strongest point. The work of art is a Perugian bronze relief (Denkmälerlisten 1 99·3) and S's influence upon it has been detected by E. Petersen, Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts (Römische Abteilung) 28 (1894) pp.274ff and Zingerle in Oesterr. Jahresb. 21 - 22 (1922-4) pp.237ff: c.f. Friedländer, Herakles 92f. The most detailed reproduction of the piece is still that in Petersen opposite p.275. It has Athena and Ares supporting the two main combatants: Heracles, bearing a bow in his right hand and a club in his left appears to be leaping at Cycnus - at least, one foot is on the ground while the other is raised bent in
The air. Ares is protecting Cycnus with his shield and a woman is advancing behind the god, interpreted by Petersen (p.283) as Aphrodite trying to hold back Ares, more probably (vid. supr. p.702) Cycnus' mother. Two arrows are fixed in the ground between Ares and Cycnus and seven diagonal lines extend between the left and right feet of both battling heroes as far as the top of Heracles' club. Behind Ares and the female figure stands the war-god's four-horse chariot whose steeds have winged feet: at its other side emerge two snakes (Δειονος and Φόβος?) apparently fleeing the fray. Athena too has a chariot whose horses are trampling a feminine form - conceivably an Amazon - beneath their hooves.

Now three assertions of prime importance are made concerning this fascinating work of art: (1) the collaboration of Ares and Cycnus implies S. as source; (2) the two arrows and the seven diagonal lines between the mortal opponents are meant to represent thunderbolts; (3) Heracles is depicted as on the point of flight. The fallacy which vitiates (1) has already been exposed in connection with the vase-paintings (above p.704) and the claim has no more validity here; (2) is highly problematical, but let us accept the inference so that we may arrive all the more quickly at (3) which is the nub of the case. It is well known that gestures on several ancient works of art are ambiguous and susceptible to various interpretations. Nevertheless, I defy anyone to look at Petersen's reproduction and then to say that he and Zingerle are
right to allege that Heracles is about to run away. Relativity of judgement is one thing, but not even Protagoras would have defended the person who tried to claim that Heracles was doing anything but leaping with full and unabated force at his enemy. The so-called movement of retreat detected by the super-subtle in one of Heracles' feet is really nothing of the sort. It can be paralleled for instance from the Leningrad hydra (3145: Beazley EVP 161 = Vasenlisten³ 107·c5: a good illustration in J.H.S. 43 (1923) plate 6) where the idea of a gesture of retreat is out of the question because the scene shows a strict ἅμα ὄλημα with no intervening god or thunderbolt to prompt the hero's flight. It really is absurd to suppose that no early artist was capable of depicting open and unambiguous retreat by such simple expedients as showing Heracles with back turned proceeding quickly in the opposite direction to where Cycnus stands. If, for some quite unfathomable reason, he must be shown on the point of flight rather than in the very act, surely the device of forcing him down onto one knee as an elementary hint at what would follow would not have escaped the artist? When Petersen confesses (p.283) that the "Stesichorean" detail of retreat in the face of Zeus' thunderbolt is not made very plain on our relief, where indeed Heracles' attack looks unstoppable, he lays bare the fatal flaw within his whole argument with a charming
Finally, it must be admitted that most of the art-works discussed above equip Heracles with the lion-skin club and arrows whose first literary appearance is alleged to be in the works of S. (see p.694 above). But even if we could believe this allegation (and we have no reason to: see p.1070) these attributes were so quickly and widely diffused that they became the standard tools of Heracles' trade at a fairly early date; and it would take a rash man to argue that their occurrence here can be traced directly back to one specific poem - S's Cynus. We may then finally conclude that neither literary nor plastic evidence afford any grounds for supposing that Zeus and his thunderbolt ever played the decisive rôle in S's poem which has been attributed to them by some rash souls. Almost all that we can know of this work is contained within the scholion on Pind. 01.10.19; but slightly more information can be coaxed from this unpromising source than has been generally realised.

Vian (p.29f) has anticipated me in pointing out the obvious here.
For Pindar's mention of Cycnus see above p. 693.

Κ. utbc obv ToO "Ap.: whether S. gave a name to Cycnus' mother we do not know. She is not mentioned in the Shield, but it would be like S. to dignify such a secondary character with a name (c.f. 208 P). However, I do not believe that the evidence of vases gives us an adequate reason to suppose Cycnus' mother featured in the poem (see above p. 702f). Pelopia is the name given her in Nicolaus of Damascus F. Gr. Hist. 90 F 54 and Apollod. 2.7.7.

The Shield seems to have located it in the precinct near the ἄλσος καὶ βωμὸς Ἀπόλλωνος Παγασαλίου (Sc. 70: c.f. Σ 11.23.346: ἐν τῷ τοῦ Παγασαλίου Ἀπόλλωνος ἔρωτι and Eur. Her. 389 - 90 also has ἐν τῇ τοῦ Παγασαλίου Ἀπόλλωνος ἔρωτι) and Eur. Her. 389 - 90 also has it ἐν τῇ τοῦ Πηλιδίας ἀκτᾷν ἀναιρέων παρὰ πηγάς (c.f. Sc. 477: τοῦ ἐς τάφον καὶ εἶμι αἰὲς ποίησεν "Ἀναφόρος: the river is near the Pegasae grove). But ἐν Ἰτώνω τῆς Ἀχαΐας is the place mentioned by Nic. Damasc. F. Gr. Hist. 90 F 54, Diod. 4.37.4 and Apollod. 2.7.7. ΣΑ 11.23.346 says πρὸς Τροῖζην (Τραχίνι Heinrich) and Paus. 1.27.6 talks of the encounter as by the river Peneus. We do not know why S's Heracles found himself in Thessaly: was he going to King Ceyx as in Sc. 353? Or was he sent by Apollo to kill Cycnus (Schmidt p.162)?

It is the temple of human skulls which has caused most anguish to students of this fragment, not so much in itself
as because of the god in whose honour the MSS. claim it was built. Apollo, the god of youth and light, seems a mirthfully inappropriate recipient for this ghoulish monstrosity. But we pass beyond a joke if we are also required to suppose, as most scholars have done, that the same Stesichorean character (1) built the aforementioned edifice to Apollo and (2) addressed serious prayers to that deity. Dawe has rightly pointed out (P.C.P.S. 18 (1972) 28ff) that the Shield provides no parallel for this absurdity: its Cycnus prays to Apollo (68), and has been in the habit of depriving him of hecatombs (479–430), but the four hundred line interval that separates these two pieces of information takes the sting out of the paradox. He might have added that a further mitigating factor is furnished by the ellipse in ll. 65ff:


εξάρτητο δὲ Κύκνος ἀμύων

ἐλπίδευσος Διὸς ὑλὸν Ἀρήνου Ἑνόχον τε

χαλκῷ δηιώκειν καὶ ἀπὸ κλυτὰ τεύχεα δύσειν.

ἀλλὰ οἱ εὐχωλέων οὐκ ἔκλυε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων.

The poet does not specifically say that Cycnus prayed to Apollo alone: the possibility is left open that he prayed to several gods but that we are told only the most relevant reaction from the deity who had every reason to respond negatively. I agree indeed that Cycnus' location ἐν τειμένει ἐκατηδόλου Ἀπόλλωνος would supply an implicit reason why he might address a prayer reserved for Apollo's ears.

Now that statements (1) and (2) above have been unmasked
as forming an incoherent whole which cannot cover its nakedness by appeals to the precedent of the Shield, we can see the attraction of emending the name of the deity in (1). But (2) is even more suspect. We saw above that Cycnus has different geographical localities in the epic and in S. The lyric poet places him ἐν τῇ παρόδῳ τῆς θεοκαλίας, not in Apollo's precinct and he thus loses the justification for praying to Apollo which the earlier poem gave him. Almost every detail we know of S's treatment differs from the Shield's: why should we assume that both works shared the motif of prayers to Apollo? If we eliminate (2), the greater contradiction disappears with it. The lesser contradiction, outlined on the previous page, remains, and we must seek to explain it or remove it. Two attempts at the former have been made, by Vürtheim (p.25) and Bowra (GLP<sup>2</sup> p.81). The former - who was always a little too ready to credit S. with a fully developed sense of humour (see p.688) - saw in the temple of skulls "eine komische Antwort" to the self-posed question "what did Cycnus promise Apollo, in return for Heracles' death, when he prayed to him at Scut. 65ff?" Bowra's solution is more dignified: "S. must have been aware of the connexion between Cycnus and Apollo and decided to make more of it. It was not sufficiently dramatic that Cycnus should kill pilgrims; he must do something more blood-curdling, and what better than make a shrine of their skulls? The detail emphasises that, though Cycnus appeals to Apollo, he likes to insult and
deride him and show his independence of him." It will be observed at once that this explanation disqualifies itself by its unwarranted assumption that prayers to Apollo still featured in S's Thessalian setting, so that the question of the validity of its psychological insight into Cycnus' behaviour need not detain us.

Hence we must turn to emendation of the scholion's text. Heyne and Boeckh proposed "Ἀρεί for Ἀπόλλωνι which substitutes a far more suitable recipient for the temple and brings the text into agreement with the testimony of Σ Pind. Ο1·2·137. But it has one fatal drawback observed by Dawe: when the name Ares has occurred twice in the immediate vicinity and is shortly to be mentioned again, corruption in the direction it supposes is rather improbable. Dawe's own brilliant suggestion, presupposing the sequence Φόβων, Φοίβων Ἀπόλλωνι, is easily the best solution so far, especially when we remember that "the language of scholiasts is full of synonymous substitutions". If we accept this emendation there are two ways of making sense of it. Firstly we can suppose that Phobos is to be distinguished from Ares, as usual in Greek mythology,¹ and that Thomas' scholion ad 01.2 is mistaken. We have seen that Phobos played a minor rôle in the Shield as one of the War god's minions, who helped him back to Olympus;

¹As early as Il·4·439f: ὃρεσ δέ τοὺς μὲν Ἀρης, τοὺς δὲ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθηνῆ | Δείμως τ' ἦδε Φόβος καὶ Ἐρις ἀμοτον μεμαθία.
we have seen that he is elevated to the status of Ares' charioteer on a vase which could conceivably reflect S's treatment.

Such a kindred spirit, another son of Ares, would obviously be delighted at the temple. Dawe well compares Scut. 144ff, where on Heracles' shield is set the figure of Φόβος and on his forehead δεινη Ἔρις, of whom we hear

δετέα δὲ εὑρίσκειν ἄλωτον σαμπέλης

Σειρίου διδάσκον μελανην πόθεται αἰτή.

There is no very long journey from these loathsome lines to the gaping skulls of S's temple. Still, we have no definite proof that Phobos featured as a separate entity in the Cycnus, and the evidence of vases, though very interesting, has been shown to be highly ambiguous (see above p.700f). And there is a second hypothesis, which I find more convincing. Let us suppose that Thomas' scholion is right and S. made Cycnus dedicate his temple of death with double appropriateness to his father the war-god Phobos - Ares. We have no right to be indignant at such an identification,¹ for several factors speak in its favour: the common tendency towards the syncretisation of gods; the lack of any clear barrier between a minor deity like Phobos or Enyalios and Ares; S's reputation as a practitioner of ἔλνυντομα. Add to these the weightiest testimony yet, a fifth century inscription from Apollo's temple at Selinus, near S's home town (I.G.14(Kaibel).268²). An

¹The possibility was already considered by Robert, Heldensage p.509 n.7.
²Dawe's article shows no awareness that this important piece of evidence has been re-edited by W.M. Calder III ("The Inscriptions from Temple G at Selinus":G.R.B.S.4(1963)) who adds a useful commentary (the section on metre may safely be ignored).
eccentric pantheon is unfolded in the catalogue of the
divine powers that be to whom the victor gives thanks.
Bringing up the rear are the names Μαλοφόρον and
Πασιφάτειαν, beneath whose unfamiliar exteriors we are
invited to see lurking Demeter and Persephone.¹ Phobos
is accorded spectacular prominence and placed second in
the list with only Zeus himself preceding; but Ares is
equally conspicuous by absence, and one sympathises with
the popular intuition that Phobos and Ares are one and
the same divinity.¹ This piece of evidence is not far
removed in time or place from our poet, and one would
readily believe that S's Sicilian background has influenced
the form he gives to the myth. Besides, as Dawe points
out, the tale works on an allegorical level if Cycnus' ally
is Phobos: Heracles is vanquished by Cycnus with the
backing of Fear: in the absence of Fear he prevails.

Did S. invent the idea of the temple itself?² In theory
this could be one of the original features of the myth
deliberately omitted by the Shield, but when we recall
that poem's "gusto per il macabro" it becomes hard to
believe that its author would have passed by this
opportunity for displaying his peculiar talents. Dawe

¹For helpful doxographies and discussions of these identifi­
cations see Calder's commentary (cited above p.713 n.2)
p.27f and 31f.
²Robert, Heldensage 511 compares Oenomaus' habit of nailing
the skulls of unsuccessful suitors of his daughter to his
house; c.f. Evenus' identical activity as reported by Σ
significantly, Pind. Is. 4.52 ff attributes a temple of
skulls to Antaeus, another victim of Heracles: that
temple was dedicated to Antaeus' father Poseidon.
p.29 n.1 observes that a temple to Fear would not have been out of place in Sparta and quotes Plut. Cleom. 9: ἐστὶ δὲ λακεδαιμονίοις οὐ φόβου μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ θανάτου καὶ γέλωτος καὶ τοιούτων ἄλλων παρηγμάτων ἑστρα. It is worth while asking – with no great expectations of ever receiving a certain answer – whether we have not here another indication of S's residence in Sparta and the influence of that land's religious beliefs.

Finally, how explain the detail of Heracles' flight? Is this too a Stesichorean innovation? Most scholars have assumed so, including Vürtheim (p.24) and Bowra (GLP² p. 80) who both assay an aesthetic interpretation: S. wanted to increase the tension of the story. Zingerle (p.239), bearing in mind S's associations with Magna Graecia, suggested that Ares' importance in Italy as a land god had influenced the myth's new form. But the idea of temporary flight looks primitive: Vian (sup. cit. p.6) traces the motif of a hero's initial set-back against his enemy in Babylonian myth (Marduk against Tiamat), Greek myth (Zeus against Typhon: but this version may be no earlier than the Hellenistic period; c.f. West ad Hes. Theog. 853 (p. 392)) and Roman tradition (the Horatii and Curati). The allegorical significance noted above (p.714) likewise seems early. I therefore agree with Russo (p.29 n.24) who thinks S. is here merely restoring a detail¹ which the

¹A more complex motive for this restoration has been detected by P. Guillon, Études béotienes: le bouclier d'Héraclès et l'histoire de la Grèce centrale dans la période de la première guerre sacrée (Aix-en-Provence
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Shield's author knew but omitted in order to achieve a
tnicer parallel with the Διομήδους ἄριστεια.

(continuation)

1963) p.48 and n.62. He argues that S. was trying to
"effacer le souvenir du Bouclier" and reinstate the local
tradition of Delphi and Pagasae by rejecting the immediate
and total victory which the Shield gave to the Theban
hero. This is connected with Guillon's belief that the
Hesiodic poem's picture of a Theban's defence of (1) free
access to Delphi and (2) the cult of Apollo near Pagasae
cunningly reflects Theban expansion in N. Boeotia c. 600
B.C. and a Theban desire to control the above-named places
and Apollo's sanctuary. The evidence seems to me too
tenuous to support Guillon's claims. See further below
ad 269 P.
NOSTOI

καὶ τότε δὴ Ζεὺς λυγρὸν ἐνὶ φρεῖ ὁδὴτο νός τον
'Ἀργείοις, ἔπει οὗ τὶ νομονές οὗδὲ δίκαιοι
πάντες ἔσαν' τῶ σφεων πολέες κακὸν ὁίτον ἐπέσπον...
So Nestor embarks on his description of the sufferings endured by the Achaeans after the sack of Troy (Od. 3.132ff), in response to Telemachus' request for news of his absent father. The poet of the Iliad seems to have been aware that the misfortunes of his heroes were not to be cut short by the death of Hector or even the fall of Troy: Il.1.29ff may hint at the reception Agamemnon received when he arrived home with Cassandra and Il.5.412ff may contain a similar allusion to a now lost version of Diomedes' punishment in the course of his νός τος for wounding Aphrodite (see Willcock's commentary on both passages: Vol.1 p.8 and p.170). More important is the presentation of Locrian Ajax in Il.23, where his unexpectedly bad-tempered and arrogant outburst against Idomeneus (448ff) and his peevish hostility towards Athene for helping Odysseus in the foot-race (782f) seem to look forward to his action at the sack of Troy and his ultimate drowning during his voyage home. (For the complex relationship between the Games for Patroclus and the later epic cycle c.f. Willcock, B.I.C.S. 20 (1973) pp.5ff).

Still, given its subject matter, the Iliad could not make many such forward references. Not so the Odyssey: one of the most striking features of Books 3 and 4 of that
poem is the sheer amount of space they devote to accounts, set in the mouths of Menelaus and Nestor, of the Achaeans' homeward voyages. In this the poet "probably makes use of much existing material on the N dóctoi, or Returns of the Achaean heroes from Troy ... was probably expanding well-known epic themes" (Kirk "The Songs of Homer" pp.355 and 358). Unfortunately we have no more concrete information on these pre-Homeric poems than we possess for the antecedents of Iliad 9's Meleager narrative (see pp.1008ff). But it would be pleasant to know why these stories loom so large in the Telemachy. The paradigmatic value of Agamemnon's arrival home for Odysseus has long been acknowledged: see below pp.795 ff. The poet may also have been at pains to reveal the ultimate fates of the heroes who were so important in the Iliad, "even though the audience of the Odyssey may be presumed to have known many of them from short poems like those that seem to have been used as source by the monumental composer" (Kirk ib. p.359). It is interesting to observe that Ἀχαιῶν νόςτος is twice mentioned in the Odyssey as a suitable subject for song. In Od. 1.326f Phemius is entertaining the suitors:

δ' Ἀχαιῶν νόςτον ἀξιόν  
λυγρόν, ὦ ἐν Τροῖς ἐπετειλάτο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη  
while Aeolus constantly importunes his guest Odysseus concerning

"Ἰλιὸν Ἀργείων τε νέας καὶ νόςτον Ἀχαιῶν (Od. 10.15)."
What does Nestor have to tell us of the miserable end of many of his former companions? Athene stirred up a quarrel between the two sons of Atreus which proved to be no less fatal than that which Apollo used to set in motion the events of the Iliad. As a result of this division, Menelaus and half of the expedition — including Nestor, Diomedes and Odysseus — sailed off without trying to appease Athene by sacrifice. The gods in general did indeed receive their due of sacrifice from these heroes when their ships reached Tenedos, by which time it was too late. Further strife arose and Odysseus turned back to Troy and Agamemnon. But Nestor and Diomedes pressed on, and were followed by Menelaus, who overtook them at Lesbos. Here they prayed to Zeus for a sign to direct them along the best route, and were told to make their way to Euboea through open sea. This they did, by nightfall they put in at Geraestus, and there they sacrificed gratefully to Poseidon. On the fourth day thereafter Diomedes reached Argos while Nestor, for whom the wind continued to blow favourably, sailed on to Pylos.

Because of this good fortune, Nestor heard no tidings en route about the fates of the other Achaeans. But news brought to him later at Pylos enables him to inform Telemachus that Neoptolemus, Philoctetes, and Idomeneus all reached home safely with no losses at sea. A less

1 A detail exploited by Aeschylus in Ag. 841-2.
pleasant fate awaited Agamemnon, and even Menelaus, who parted company from Nestor at Cape Sunium, reached Cape Malea only to be blown off course. Most of his ships were smashed to pieces off the Cretan shore, though his men survived. Menelaus himself, with five ships, was borne by winds to Egypt, whence he returned, eight years later, to arrive at Mycenae on the very day Orestes was celebrating his murder of Aegisthus.

Thus, on the divergent fortunes of the two brothers, Nestor ends his narrative. We will later (pp. 789ff) consider his account of Agamemnon's reception in discussing S's Oresteia. But we are no strangers to much of what Menelaus has to say to Telemachus: his account of his own sojourn in Egypt proved very relevant to S's Helen and his two Palinodes (Od. 4.351ff: see above p.452) while his repetition of Proteus' description of Agamemnon's death (Od. 4.512ff), must again be considered in relation to other versions (see pp. 789ff). Proteus' first information however, concerns not Menelaus' brother but Locrian Ajax (Od. 4.498ff). He was shipwrecked on the rocks called Pupal but was saved from the sea and would have escaped death vàl ἕθοδεινός περ 'ΑΘηνή, had he not been imprudent enough to boast that he had escaped in spite of the gods: Poseidon's trident cleft the rock to which he was clinging, and he plummeted to a watery grave.

It should be clear by now that the Odyssey's accounts of the Achaeans' vóctoi are too detailed for us to suppose
that the poem was meant to accompany the epic known as the Νόετοι. Conversely, the almost total absence of Odysseus from Proclus' summary of that work (Allen pp.108-9) would seem to suggest that it was composed later than the celebration of Odysseus' deeds contained in the Odyssey. The epic poem on the returns of the heroes from Troy is generally attributed to Homer, or to Hagias (Agias?) of Troezen (c.f. Allen p.108 (Procl.) and Nostoi fr.7 (p.141)). or, once, to Eumelus (Σ Pind. Ολ. 13·31(Dr. 1·364));τοῦτο δὲ διὰ τῶν Ἑυμηλοῦν (Γυράλδος, Σαλμασίους: Ἑυμηλόπον codd.) δύναται ἀρκετῶν καὶ γράμματα νόστων τῶν Ἐλλήνων.)

Proclus' bald resume of the contents of five books bears out, at least as regards Agamemnon, Menelaus, Diomedes and Nestor, the remark which occurs in the Suda s.v. Νόετος (3·479·500 Adl.): καὶ οἱ ποιηταὶ δὲ οἱ τοὺς Νόετους ὑμνήσαντες ἔνσαν τῶν Ὀμήρου ἐς ὅσον εἰς ἔπος ἰσαν. The only new detail that comes our way here concerns Agamemnon's delayed departure from Troy: τῶν δὲ περὶ τῶν Ἀχαιόνων ἀποπλεόντων Ἀχιλλέως ἐνδώλον ἐπιφανέν πειράται δι’ αἰτίας εἰς προλέγον τὰ συμβηκόμενα. 

Bethe (Homer: Dichtung und Saga 2·279) tried to make the correspondence between Odyssey and Nostoi even greater by discounting Proclus' statement that Ajax's death by...
drowning occurred in the Nostoi near the Capherian Rocks. He wanted the later epic to locate this event where the Odyssey had put it, on the Gyraean Rocks, and portrayed Proclus as a culpably careless epitomiser attributing to the Nostoi a version which only came into being when Nauplius' mischievous doings at Caphaereus found a place in the saga. The new Cologne fragment of Alcaeus (S.L.G. 262) with its mention of Aegae, a place in Euboea, the land whose southern promontory is Caphaereus, may be regarded as confirming Proclus' reliability in this one matter (c.f. Lloyd-Jones, G.R.B.S. 9 (1968) 138-9).

For the Nostoi of heroes other than the five above named, Proclus adds the occasional colourful detail: the men accompanying Calchas Leonteus and Polypoetes march overland to Colophon and there bury the dead seer Tiresias. And Neoptolemus, following the advice of his grandmother Thetis, travels home by land, meets Odysseus at Maroneia—a passage suggested by Od. 9.39, 197ff where Odysseus is said to have been in this part of Thrace—completes the rest of his journey home and buries Phoenix. He then travels to the Molossi and is recognised by his grandfather Peleus.

Hardly an exciting list of contents: not sufficient in itself to arouse longing for the last work. And inadequate even as a competent summary; since Pausanias 10.28.7 (= Allen fr.3 p.140: c.f. too fr.11 p.142) assures us that the poem contained a υέκνυα, for which we will search in vain through Proclus' tedious abstract.
This Nékula offers an hospitable home for fragments referring to Medea and Tantalus (Allen frs. 6 and 10); also for mentions of the genealogies of Clymene and Maera (Allen frs. 4 and 5) and of Salmoneus' daughter (fr. 12) which would otherwise be quite obscure. Otherwise these whisps of information would be even more peripheral and hard to place than the rest of the flotsam to be found drifting on pp. 140-142 of Allen's collection. There we must take profit, if we can, from the news that Nauplius' wife and offspring were named (fr. 1) and that the slave girl on whom Menelaus begot Megapenthes is by the same means given stronger reality (fr. 2) than she has in Od. 4.10ff. These pallid and starvling fragments may gain substance and an infusion of colour by a judicious handling of some later prose accounts of the journeying of individual heroes. Herodotus on the wanderings of the seer Amphilochus (Hdt. 3.91, 7.91: c.f. too Strabo 14.642 = Phercydes F. Gr. Hist. 3 F 142), Phercydes on the lamentable death of Calchas (F 142 again), Apollodorus on Nauplius at the Capherian Rocks and the course of Neoptolemus' travels (Apollod. ep. 6.11 and 12) may all stem from the Nóstot. But this is dangerous terrain.

How much more dangerous the attempt to flesh out our knowledge of S's treatment when we have only one explicit reference to it (208 P)! His is the earliest known lyric treatment of the subject and apparently the only lyric handling to have merited the same title as the
epic: this should tell us something of its scale and scope. But other lyric poets had occasion to touch on this theme. As we have already seen, Alcaeus described the tempest which wrecked part of the Achaean fleet off Euboea because of Locrian Ajax's rape of Cassandra, motifs derived from the Ilíu Persis as well as the Nostoi. These two epics were also probably the sources of those 'problematic narratives in Pindar's Sixth Paean and Seventh Nemean (Pae. 6.104ff, Nem. 7.33ff). The visit by Neoptolemus to Molossia, touched on in the paean (115) and stressed in the epinician (39f), with the statement that the hero was king there for a time, possibly emanates from the Nostoi's account.

Sappho (fr.17 L-P) relates an event in the course of the vóctoc of Agamemnon and Menelaus but in a version that is strikingly different from the epic tradition given above: in her account the sons of Atreus are together at Lesbos with their previous quarrel mended, if it ever occurred, and they seem to be held there by bad weather. A release from their predicament is besought of the Lesbian trinity Zeus, Hera and Dionysus: a local variant is clearly being relayed here. (For a fuller discussion of this poem and its unique version of the myth c.f. Page S&A pp.58ff).

Mimnermus is credited by Σ and Lycophr. Alex. 61Off (2.206 Scheer) with a description of the unfortunate homecoming of Diomedes whose adulterous wife plotted against him and forced him to flee to Italy (fr.22 W). Whether this story featured in the epic Nostoi and whether it was in fact related by Mimnermus are unresolved questions: see West ad loc.(IEG Vol.2 p.89).
In all of these poems the legends probably served a purely subsidiary purpose, to point a moral or provide a parallel. S, as usual, will have told the stories at greater length and for their own sake. Pausanias 10.26.1 (208 P) is our only definite evidence that this poem went under the name of Nόctoi in antiquity¹ (but c.f. Tzetz. Posthom. 750, p.173 Jacobs:Στηπάνορος δ’ ἔρημιν τοῦτο ἤπειρον νόκτον and 193.19-20 P discussed pp.774ff) and the passage provides us with a frustratingly peripheral piece of information about a totally minor character: S. made Aristomache the daughter of Priam and wife of Critolaus. This example of ψαλαμοῦτα on a small scale leaves us a whole ocean of incidents to guess at, but those who would play this game should be reminded that before 1956 no-one had come anywhere near to anticipating the contents of the only other possible fragment of the poem: P. Oxy. 2360 col.i - ii = 209 P. The strong echoes here of Od. 15 recall the estimates of pseudo-Longinus π.Ọψ. 13·3 and Quintilian 10·1·62 and increase the dilemma of would-be restorers of the Nostoi's subject matter. Against the ψαλαμοῦτα of fr.208 we must set the sedulously traditional and Homeric contents of 209 P. Which of these polar extremes was more typical of the poem as a whole? We cannot say, and it follows that all attempts to divine which of the details listed above from the Odyssey and the epic Nόctoi were adopted

¹ Which plural, as Kleine (p.53 n.4) realised, implies considerable length.
to S's lyric would have to be abandoned, if there were no external criteria to lend extra aid. However, it has been customary to fill out our meagre store of knowledge by reference to two external pieces of information. The first is Tzetzes' Posthomerica 750ff. After the mention of S. quoted above (p.725) we are given the contents of S's poem:

νόστον Στηρίξωρος δ’ἐρέηςιν ἐοὶς ἐπέειςιν’
ἡ μὲν ὄσοι πελάγει φθάρειν, ἡδ’όσοι ἠλυδον ἄλληι,
ἡδ’όσοι εἰςαφίκοντο φίλην παρὰ πατρίδα γαῖαν.
κεῖνος ταὐτ’ἐρεήςιν ἄνηρ...

Those who needed the Byzantine polymath to tell them that such were the overall contents of a poem called Νόστοι\(^1\) will be duly grateful and impressed by the scope of his reading. Those of us who, like Vürtheim (p.45), could have guessed as much anyway, will remain sceptical on the second count, at least as far as S. is concerned.

The other passage once cited by editors\(^2\) is Phalaris' letter (92) to S. (Hercher, Epist. Graec. (1873) p.435):

οἵ τοὺς μὲν τῶν Ἀχαίων νόστους πυνθάνομαι σε συγγράφειν, καὶ τις τῶν ἥρων ἔκεινων ἀθυλίαν ἐπιτιμάν Ικανός. διόπως δ’αὐτὸς ἀπονοστήσεις ἀπαθῆς ἐξ Ἀλαίσης εἰς Ἰμέραν οὐδὲν χρονίζεις. ἄλλ’εύ ἔσθι ὅτι μένουσί σε ἱκανοὶς πέτραι καὶ Πλαγκταὶ καὶ Ἰχαρῶδες καὶ ὁ ναυπλιος στόλος καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐκφύγοις δὲς τὰς ἡμετέρας κεῖρας, οὐδ’ἄν εἰ θεῶν σε

\(^1\)It was perverse of Blomfield and Heyne (on Apollod.2. 14 (2.360)) to take Tzetzes to be referring to the Iliu Persis.

\(^2\)For instance Bergk p.219, Vürtheim p.45.
Not by Phalaris himself of course, but the very status of the epistles as forgeries is a potent incentive for supposing that the passage genuinely reflects the contents of S's poem. The real tyrant would presumably have been too busy "commanding a million of subjects" to bother his head about S's works, even if he had lived at the right time. Quite differently the "dreaming pedant with his elbow on his desk" who will eagerly have rifled the poems of S. to provide contexts and contents for his fabricated correspondence between poet and ruler. The supposed Phalaris' supposed knowledge of S's works would be a clever corroborating device on the forger's part. "Tibi persuadeas ipsum poeticum ordinem ipsaque poetae verba ab epistolae scriptore esse servata" wrote Kleine (p.83) long ago, and many scholars have followed him. But did the real author of the letter live at a time when such detailed knowledge of S's work was feasible?

\[2\] Including Robert (Heldensage p.1299 n.3: "Dass die Rache der Nauplios auch von S. in seinem Nosten erzählt war, obgleich es nur durch die pseudo-Phalarideischen Briefe bezeugt ist, durchaus glaubhaft") and Gruppe, Gr. Myth. und Religiongesch. 1 p.700 n.3.
The relevance of this particular pseudepigraph has been vehemently argued in recent times by O. Bruno (Helikon 7 (1967) 323ff: "l'epistola della pseudo-Palaride e i Nostoi di S."). He observes, after an exhaustive survey of that literature which embraces the Achaean's return home, that no other ancient author touches on both the Planctae and Charybdis and the Capherian Rocks in the way presupposed by the letter. The Odyssey mentions the first two in connection with its hero's wanderings, but as we have seen (p.722) it does not know of the Capherian rocks as the location of the Greek fleet's wreck. The Nostoi mentioned the region, but since the return of Odysseus found no place in its narrative, the Wandering Rocks and Charybdis cannot have fallen within its scope. Apollodorus' Epitome mentions all three elements but separates them, mentioning the Capherian Rocks apropos of the Greek wreck (ep.6.7), and placing the other two dangers in their Odyssean context (ep.7.20-21). Only S's Nostoi among ancient works can reasonably be supposed to have joined the Odyssey's Charybdis and Planctae to the Nostoi's rocks at Cape Caphereus, especially since we now have good reason to suppose that Odysseus' return featured in S's poem (209 P, but see below pp.736ff). It would be difficult to imagine a more strenuously urged argument, but even so it cannot truthfully be said that Bruno has proved his case. Indeed it is not capable of proof. Too many doubts remain, especially concerning the date of these forged epistles. Bruno
would like to have a stratified corpus of letters composed at different dates, and the present letter a product of the late 2nd or early 3rd century A.D., when S's works were still available to Pausanias, Aelian, Aristides and Athenaeus. Other scholars have dated the whole body to the 4th century A.D. when the works of S. had probably been lost and were not available to our forger. Wilanowitz argued for such a date on the basis of the accented rhythm of the clausulae (Textg. d.gr.lyr. p.35 n.2: "die Zeit ergiebt sich aus dem beginnenden accentuirten Satzschlusse"), Freeman because of possible echoes of Iamblichus' Life of Pythagoras, (Hist. of Sic. Vol.2 pp.468ff and p.476 especially).

Dates apart, can we be sure that the forger would have been scrupulous enough to check the contents of the Nostoi - supposing the work was available to him - before dashing off the letter under discussion? Is it not more likely that he consulted some now lost mythographer who happened to hit on this particular sequence of events, or even cobbled together the connection out of his own head? To argue thus is not to deny the likeliness of the guess that all the events implied by the epistle did occur in S's poem: no Nostoi would be complete without them it might be thought. I am merely trying to re-enforce the conclusion's status as a guess rather than a legitimate deduction from the pseudo-Phalaris.
A sober lesson on the inadvisability of guessing at the Nostoi's contents might seem to be traceable in the publication of P. Oxy. 2360 = 209 P. It is true that before 1956 Vürtheim had confidently predicted (p. 45) "Odysseus' Rückreise kann in unsern Nosten nicht gefehlt haben". But who would have supposed that Telemachus' sojourn in Sparta could ever have formed a part of that return? I argue below that the sheer fullness of narrative in fr. 209 makes it almost impossible to suppose that the Nōctoi embraced this topic. Our extract is almost as long and detailed as its Odyssean original, and this fact, allied to S's usual style of continuous narrative, would imply that the relation between 209 P and the hypothetical "return of Odysseus" within the Nostoi closely resembled the relation between Od. 15.43 ff and the Odyssey as a whole. But who would believe that for a moment? We would have on our hands a lyric "Nostos of Odysseus" almost as long as the epic itself: and that would be a mere part of the entire poem. If we added only two or three "returns" on the same scale, that would result in a lyric poem more than twice the length of the Odyssey! The idea is fantastic. (See further pp. 736ff inf.)

Can we still save our fragment for the Nostoi, while rejecting Lobel's reasons for this attribution? It would make better sense to suppose that S. has taken over from Homer not the entire tale of Odysseus' adventures, but merely the structural device of
Telemachus' visits to Nestor and Menelaus, which Homer himself uses so brilliantly as a framework to give unity to several stories about the Achaeans' returns.

Telemachus, concerned about his father's vóctoc, visits Odysseus' former companions, and hears from their lips varying accounts of the homeward voyages made by the Greek leaders. S. could have expanded these inner tales to a considerably greater length - a length nearer Odysseus' own tales in Od. 9 - 12 - because the enclosing poem would be correspondingly more brief and restricted in scope. The poem would then end with the return home of a Telemachus rendered more hopeful by the omen described in 209 P.

There is absolutely no evidence for this hypothesis, but it fits the few facts we have without postulating an impossibly long lyric poem, or a lyric treatment of the whole Odyssey for which we have no other proof. If it were true it would show that S. had departed from the epic Nostoi's structure. Still, we know depressingly little of that, especially after our trust in Proclus' power to convey the poem's architectonic structure has been shaken by his failure to mention the Ἐκνυτα.
While describing Polygnotus' painting of the aftermath of Troy's sack in the public arcade at Delphi,¹ Pausanias lets fall this morsel of information, which happens to be our only explicit testimony to the poem's title.² About Hicetaon we already knew, thanks to the Iliad, which makes him the son of Laomedon brother of Priam (Il.20.237-8 (238 = Il.3.147): Λαομέδων δ' ἄδω Τιθώνον τεκέτο Πριάμον τε | Ἀδμπον τε κλυτίον ὁ Ἰκατάσκα τ' ἔλην "Ἀριστος c.f. Apollod. 3.12.3) and father of Melanippus (Il.15.546f: πρῶτον δ' Ἰκέταον ἑνένυπεν (scil. Ἔκτωρ) | ἑφίμον Ἐκλανίππου ... 576: Ἰκέταονος ὑλόν, ὑπέρθυμον Ἐκλανίππου c.f. Strabo 13.586). His status as Critolaus' father is only mentioned here, but Vergil gave him a further offspring Thymoetes (Aen. 10.123: Ἰκέταονικός Ἐκεθαρίου). From a Greek source? Aristomache is likewise unknown elsewhere, except for the painting so meticulously preserved in prose by Pausanias, where she appeared as one of the captive women. Her name might be thought etymologically appropriate for the wife of a bold defender of Troy (on the analogy of

¹On which see above p.514.
²Heyne's emendation was made in his Excursus ad Verg. 2 p.280. Kleine was the first to print our fragment as Stesichorean.
Hector's 'Ἀνδρόμαχη' though it would be even more suitable for a woman who was herself a brave fighter, like the Amazon on the Cumean vase which is the only other work of art to show the name. Unless Pausanias has overlooked a passage in the epic Nostoi, S. has invented the figures of Critolaus and his wife. Such fleshing-out of minor characters is typical of the post-Homeric tradition. We might compare the way in which the epic Nostoi supplies the anonymous slave-girl of the Odyssey, who bore Megapenthes to Menelaus, with a name of her own (fr. 2 Allen (p. 140)) or S's own naming of Orestes' nurse (218 P).

S's Iliu Persis might seem a more natural home for the mention of a daughter of Priam. But it is probable, especially if we bear in mind Polygnotus' painting, that one of the Achaean heroes led her on to his ship after her husband had been killed, and set off home with her, just

---

1 It is because of this etymology that Andromache is often depicted on Greek vases as fighting against Greek warriors in the sack of Troy. Compare the pestle she wields on the versions by the Cleophrades and Brygos painters (Naples Mus. Naz. 2422: ARV2 183·74 = Brommer Vasenlisten3 333 B 3; Louvre G 152: ARV 2 396·1 = Brommer Vasenlisten 333 B 6). Robert (Bild und Lied p. 79) actually suggested S. as the source of artistic representations of Andromache's combat with Menelaus, by the following deductive chain: this scene is often found coupled with the confrontation between Helen and Menelaus outside the temple of Aphrodite. That encounter occurs on the Tabula Iliaca; the Tabula Iliaca claims S's Iliupersis as its source. The thread of argument here is obviously far too frail to support Robert's thesis.

2 A squat lecythos of the third quarter of the fifth century or a little later (Naples RC 239: ARV2 1174·6 = Vasenlisten3 B·11).
as Neoptolemus took home Hector's widow to be his concubine (II. Parv. fr.19.6ff Allen (p.135)).
Lobel (p.15) assigned this fragment to S. on grounds of dialect ("a conventional Doric"), metre, and style. 
("The epithet Ὄμηρωγωτατος .... would be not inappropriate to the composer of these verses.") This evidence remains as strong as ever. The ascription to the Νόετοι is more problematical, and this fact will be stressed here, since the question mark which Mr. Lobel placed after his attribution has been rubbed away, as it were, with the passage of time. Peek goes so far as to call the ascription "nicht zweifelhaft" (p.169).
S., says Lobel, "is the only lyric poet who we are told wrote Νόετοι ... and though there is no proof that this piece is part of a 'return of Odysseus' the analogy with Homer makes it a probable hypothesis."¹ The trouble

¹Mr. Lobel does not mention the possibility that the poem which inspired S. here was a pre-Odyssean Telemachy which enjoyed the status of a separate work at the time. I think he is right to omit this possibility but vid. inf. p.744f.
here is, in a word, length. The correspondences with
the leisurely narrative of the Odyssey are numerous, and
although Menelaus and Pisistratus may have been omitted
in col. i, Helen's speech there seems to have a greater
span than its epic counterpart (ten lines in the lyric
poem against seven in the Odyssey). Our scant remains
of col. ii indicate no acceleration of tempo. Everything
we know about S's narrative habits suggests that the
present episode is no Pindaric vignette soon to be
succeeded by a story-line that speeds on its way in
asymmetrical leaps and bounds. Rather, the rest of the
poem will have proceeded at the same stately pace that is
exemplified here. But the travels of Telemachus make up
a very peripheral part of the Odyssey when compared to the
wanderings of his father, and they will not be included in
any but the fullest recasting of the epic's contents.
The conclusion is inevitable: the lyric "return of
Odysseus" by itself will have been scarcely shorter than
the Odyssey, and if this return was only one of several
nóstou, the whole work, though only one poem, will have
exceeded the 26 Books mentioned by the Suda as the sum
total of S's efforts. Apart from this weighty
consideration, it seems unlikely anyway that S. would have
ignored the wise precedent set by the epic Nostoi. This,
as we have seen, sedulously avoided cramming the multi-
farious adventures of Odysseus into a framework already
strained by the returns of the Achaeans. To add not
merely the wanderings of the father but also the quite
peripheral activities of the son would destroy all unity.\(^1\)

There is a real problem here, a problem not to be avoided by Lloyd-Jones' alternative attribution of the fragment to the Oresteia (p.17). Telemachus' visit to Menelaus would be totally irrelevant to the supposed subject-matter of that poem, especially when related at such length.\(^2\)

Besides there are metrical obstacles (as realised by Haslam p.45 n.86). We can now reconstitute the strophe and antistrophe of 209 P and we find that their metre is quite different from anything in the Oresteian fragments. Unless all these fragments belong to the epcde - an implausible hypothesis - or unless the two or more Alexandrian books of that poem were in different metres - a prospect no whit more pleasing - the identification must fall.\(^3\)

More likelihood resides in West's remark (Z.P.E. 4 (1969) p.143 n.6): "The amplitude of the narrative may suggest a

---

\(^1\) It is well-known that S's poems were long enough to contain remarkably digressive incidents. The Geryoneis, for instance, dealt with Heracles' visit to Pholus (181 P = S 19). But the difference here is instructive. The episode with Pholus is incidental to the abduction of Geryon's cattle which is the work's main theme. Telemachus' visit to Menelaus, on the other hand, is peripheral to Odysseus' homecoming which in its turn is only one of several vótct. And that seems too much even for S.

\(^2\) The parallels drawn between Telemachus and Orestes in the Odyssey (see p.795 inf.) are irrelevant here.

\(^3\) The same metrical objection tells against attribution to the Helen, which might conceivably have embraced this subject matter, though the Odyssean original which S.so closely follows here presents a sympathetic Helen, which is just what we do not want in S's κακηγορία.
separate Odyssey. This sets up the problem admirably. A lyric Telemachy is another possibility. If we are tempted to find it strange that so remarkable a piece of literature as a detailed adaptation of the Odyssey (or a part thereof) should have passed unmarked by any literary critic of antiquity, we should remind ourselves how many of the notable compositions most recently brought to light (including the poem on the Lille Papyrus) went totally unmentioned by ancient authors.

We should not feel obliged to assign 209 P to any known work by S. for reasons fully stated elsewhere (above p.507). But I believe I see a way of preserving our fragment for the Nostoi. Telemachus' visits to Nestor and Menelaus in the Odyssey served as a frame for a collection of νότιοι, tales of the returns of the Achaeans compared or contrasted with Odysseus' own and set in the mouths of two former comrades. So it is worth considering whether S. did not adopt this framing device (and little more) from the Odyssey so as to give the collection of various heroes' homecomings a much needed unity. The νότιοι related by Menelaus and Nestor would of course be considerably longer in S's version, and Odysseus' νότιοc would not be retold. This hypothesis would explain the

---

1 It is interesting to note that Welcker (KL. Schr. 1·173), stressing the possibility of now lost Stesichorean works unmentioned by writers of antiquity suggested an Odyssey exempli gratia as one such poem.
phenomena adequately and reserve the fragment for the Nostoi. However, I am more concerned to cast the light of day upon a problem that scholars have largely overlooked than to lay claim to the only possible solution. Many may prefer one of the alternatives outlined above. But the idea of a lyric Nostoi within which appeared an entire return of Odysseus - let alone a full-scale Telemachy - is a notion that grows less credible the more one stares at it.

It may well be thought that this fragment shows S. quite literally at his most Homeric. The remarks of pseudo-Longinus (π. Ὑψ. 13·3) and Quintilian (10·1·62) and the phraseology of the few lines preserved by Athenaeus and the like did not prepare scholars for this. "Wer hätte geahnt, dass die Abhängigkeit auch im stofflichen so weit gehen könnte?" asked Peek (p.173). Homeric subject-matter naturally entails Homeric style and the coincidence of the two is striking. But as I have argued above, there is no firm proof for, and several impressive obstacles against, the supposition that this total coincidence was maintained for the greater part of a very long poem.

In fact it is possible to exaggerate the closeness to Homer. Parallels of phrase will be noted ad locc. An examination of the episode's structure reveals further similarities but also considerable divergences. The model is of course Od. 15·43 - 181 "where Telemachus
takes elaborate farewells of Menelaus and Helen" (Bowra p.78) and where the omen of an eagle flying overhead with a goose in its talons is interpreted by Helen as a sign that Odysseus will return to Ithaca and take vengeance on the suitors. We have already analysed the charm and significance of the Odyssean original in connection with the myth of Helen (p.240). We must now consider the bald sequence of events in Homer and compare it with S. The main point of similarity lies in Helen's interpretation of the omen: in both poets it is taken to mean that if Telemachus returns home safely he will find his father there. But S. seems to have changed the sequence of events.

Look for a moment at the Odyssean narrative: at the beginning of Book 15 Athene wishes to hasten Telemachus' departure from Sparta and therefore appears to him in a dream. Telemachus wakes Pisistratus and at dawn the two young men go to Menelaus and apprise him of their wish to leave. A reluctant Menelaus will not let them be gone before they have been showered with gifts to which Helen adds her part. These are set in the chariot, an Homeric meal is duly taken and digested, the young men mount their chariot and drive to the gateway. Here, with Menelaus and Helen standing by, the omen occurs. In theory all these events might have been faithfully related by S. preliminary to the present fragment. All, that is, except one. For col.ii of our papyrus fragment exhibits the sad remains of a once proud and goodly list
of gifts which seems to have included some object or objects of silver and gold. A bowl made of the same substances was given to Telemachus by Menelaus at Od. 15.155ff., but that was before the portent which S. refers to in col.1.

The Odyssey allows no ceremony or pause after its τέρας. Telemachus merely prays that Helen's interpretation may prove correct, and then he and Pisistratus turn their horses in the direction of home - rather an anticlimax it may be thought. S. seems to have transferred his account of Menelaus' generosity to a position after the omen, perhaps to achieve a better balance between the narratives before and after the all-important event, which was thus thrust into a position of central prominence. But the changes made in the gift-catalogue are not limited to its placing. Whereas the Homeric bowl is a gift from the king of the Sidonians, S's object seems to have originated, in one way or another, from Priam's palace (see p.772 inf.).

The reaction of the characters to the τέρας has also been revised. In Homer, Pisistratus is the first to speak after the omen, and he addresses Menelaus (Od. 15.167f):

\[ \phi\acute{\rho}\acute{\alpha}\zeta \omicron \delta\acute{\eta}, \, \mu\acute{\epsilon}ν\acute{\epsilon}λ\acute{\alpha}ς \, \delta\iota\omicron\tau\omicron\epsilon\varphi\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma, \, \delta\omicron\chi\alpha\mu\epsilon \, \lambda\acute{\alpha}\omicron, \]

\[ \omicron \, \nu\omega\omicron \, \tau\omicron\delta\acute{\epsilon}\varphi\eta\omicron \, \theta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma \, \tau\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma \, \omicron \xi \, \varsigma \, \alpha\omicron\omicron\omicron \omicront; \]

Menelaus, of course, is silent, and it is left to Helen to interpret the event, in a speech aimed at the ears of
the three other people present as its opening apostrophe shows (Od. 15·172):

κλότε μευ'....

There is no positive proof of the presence either of Menelaus or of Telemachus' young companion at this stage of S's version. Indeed quite the opposite: Helen's explication - which lacks an apostrophe comparable with that in Od. 15·172 - is addressed solely to Telemachus (1.2) and the ἄμην of the following line may just as well refer to herself and Telemachus. Menelaus' hypothetical absence might explain why it is Helen herself who at 1.10 reassures Telemachus οὔδ' ἔγω σ' ἐρώσω whereas the corresponding verse of the Odyssey (Od. 15·68) was put in her husband's mouth at an earlier stage of events. It would also explain why the second part of Pisistratus' question at Od. 15·168 is omitted by S. and the first part echoed at 1.1 of S. in the narrative. Menelaus' presence is not required until col.ii's gift-catalogue, if then, and there are certainly no grounds for assuming that before col.i.1 we have lost some version of Pisistratus' penetrating question or Menelaus' embarrassed ἀμορία. S's omission (temporary or permanent) of these two subordinate characters, and his concentration on the two most important figures, the two most involved with the omen, is a very natural way of developing, if not improving upon, Homer's original.

It is also probable that S. had in his mind Od. 15's
other scene of omen-interpretation, the encounter between Theoclymenus the seer and Telemachus (see ad Τηλέμαχος and ἡγεμόν). In theory, of course, there are two possibilities. S. knew of the Odyssey in pretty much the same form as we have it and made various changes, easily explicable on aesthetic grounds, when he retold one of its episodes. Or his epic source was rather different from our Odyssey and he followed it very closely. It is not possible to disprove either of these alternatives, just as there would be no way of refuting someone who believed that S. was only acquainted with a separate Τηλέμαχεια that had not yet been joined to a "Return of Odysseus" and other components to form the present-day Odyssey. Such a scholar could not claim our fragment for S's Nostoi, but apart from that minor inconvenience he might pass on his way rejoicing. But to accept the second of our alternatives would be, I feel, simplistic and unimaginative. For surely the striking feature of 209 P is its faithfulness to Homer, not its deviations.\footnote{This fact is rightly stressed by Fränkel p.320f=p.281. The question of dependence on Homer raises a nice point on the text of the Odyssey. Menelaus' description of the ἔρατον at Od.15.113-119 is omitted from several MSS and suspected by several critics (e.g. Page, The Homeric Odyssey p.80 n.14(7)) because it is identical with Od.4.613ff. Now we see that S. linked this description with the omen, as do most MSS of the Odyssey; the two facts are unlikely to be coincidental. It is one thing for S. to make a minor displacement of the epic's description of the bowl (for structural reasons considered elsewhere; see p.741), quite another to suppose he linked Od.4.613ff with the omen occurring over ten books later. Of course our fragment tells us nothing either way about Kirchoff's theory (Die Homerische Odyssee (Berlin 1879)190ff) that Od.4.620 and 15.113ff originally formed a continuous narrative.}
the most Homeric fragment of lyric poetry we have. To expect a closer adherence to the epic model is to display a total insensitivity to what Homer meant for early Greek poets, and to the required balance between tradition and originality in literature of this date.

In that case our fragment would provide one of the earliest as well as the most reliable literary references to Homer. Taken as a whole it is a far more impressive testimony to knowledge of the Odyssey than the echoes of that poem which Merkelbach detects in Archilochus or Alcman (see Untersuchungen zur Odyssee² (1969) 231: the relevant fragments are Arch. 25.2 (W) and 134 (W) and Alcm. 81 and 84 P: see too 70C, 80, 92, 85D, 86). More impressive too, because more extensive, than the supposed allusions to the Iliad contained in "Semonides'" famous ἐν δὲ τῷ μᾶλλον Χιος εὐτυχεῖν ἀνήρ (= Simonides 8W) and Alcaeus L-P 44 (Thetis' intercession with Zeus). (On the former c.f. (with caution) J.A. Davison, ἐρανος 53 (1955) 125ff = "From Archilochus to Pindar": "Quotations in Early Gk. Lit." pp.70ff and West S.G.E.1. pp.179 - 180; on the latter Page S&A 281ff).

Of course even the continuous and consecutive correspondences provided by 209 P are of limited value because they do not stretch beyond a single episode.

Thus, as we have seen, we could not prove that S. was here using the whole Odyssey rather than e.g. a "pre-Odyssean" and independent Telemachy. But such restrictions are endemic to Homeric allusions in early
Greek Literature, not merely because most lyric poetry of this period is so dismally lacunose, but for the reason that lengthy quotations from an adequately wide "spread" of Iliad or Odyssey, or even reworkings (of the type S. employs here) from several Homeric episodes would be unthinkably unoriginal. As it is, even our fragment cannot pass definitive death-sentence on the theory that the Homeric poems were only brought to Sicily c. 504 by Cynaethus, (so H.T. Wade-Gery, Greek Poetry and Life pp.56 ff = Studies in Greek History pp.31ff), implausible though it is, since S. might conceivably have encountered the Iliad and Odyssey while he was visiting mainland Greece.
First of all let us see what we have (adding letters to mark Merkelbach's identification of the strophe lines):

**col. i**

| 1 | b   | ----------- |
|   | c   | ----------- |
| 3 | d   | ----------- |
|   | e   | ----------- |
| 5 | f   | ----------- |
|   | g   | ----------- |
| 7 | h   | ----------- |
|   | i   | ----------- |

**col. ii**

| 1 | c   | ----------- |
|   | d   | ----------- |
|   | e   | ----------- |
|   | f   | ----------- |
| 5 | g   | ----------- |
|   | h   | ----------- |
| 7 | i   | ----------- |

(See p. 760 below)
The metre of 1 is not repeated until 10, of which only the last six elements survive. But the responsion of these lines is confirmed by the responsion between 2 and the largely intact 11. The well-preserved state of the first three lines of the poem allows us to recover completely the metre of 1\(\dagger\)10, 2\(\dagger\)11, 3\(\dagger\)12. And the shortness of 8 makes it a likely candidate for the last line of the strophe.\(^1\)

After 12 we shall have the sequence 4\(\dagger\)13, 5\(\dagger\)14 etc. But nothing is left of 14 and only one or two letters remain from the rest of the column thereafter. If we are to fill out the rest of the metrical scheme we have two possible aids: (i) we may use common sense about a fairly simple and repetitive metre (compare p. 576) and check these guesses against the space available in the papyrus' left-side lacunae. This will work for 16 (str. 7) and 19 (str. 1), but at 14 (str. 5) 15 (str. 6) 17 (str. 8) and 18 (str. 9) the lacunae on the left are rather too long for this process to be entirely satisfactory. Therefore (ii) Merkelbach made the assumption that col. ii may be used as evidence for the strophe and made the following identifications: ii 1 = str. 3, ii 2 = str. 4 etc., as far

---

\(^1\)Since the lines in col. i whose starts are preserved show no trace of paragraphos. Short lines conclude str./ant. in the Iliupersis and Suotherae (counter-examples in the Geryoneis and the Lille Papyrus' poem).
as \( ii \ 7 = \text{str.9} \). West has questioned the wisdom of this proceeding and Haslam has now reassessed the advantages and disadvantages of Merkelbach's principle. col.\( ii \) has the beginnings of its first seven lines preserved, and no paragraphos is to be seen, which suggests they all belong to a single stanza. col.\( i \) has remains of its first 21 lines preserved: presuming that the poem was triadic we shall have arrived by col.\( i \cdot 21 \) at the epode's fourth line \((= 21 - 8 + 9)\). At this point a whole clutch of imponderables takes over. We would dearly like an answer to two important questions: (1) How many lines did col.\( i \) contain? (2) How many lines were in the epode?

There is a distressingly wide range of possible answers. For instance, the column might have had as few as 21 lines and the epode 11 lines; or the column might have had as many as 45 lines so that col.\( i = \text{str.2 - 9, ant., ep.} \) (e.g. 9 lines) str. ant. and perhaps one or two further lines of ep.\(^1\). A middle position between these extremes (28 lines \((= \text{str.2 - 9, ant. ep. str.1 - 2})\) or 37 lines would be convenient for Merkelbach's reconstruction and Haslam's modification of the same: it would also be not incompatible with the column lengths reconstructed for other MSS of S's poems.\(^1\) But the element of uncertainty remaining is still higher than I for one can accept.

\(^1\)These are the alternatives posed by Haslam, but they do not exclude all other possibilities. Observe the number of lines in the columns of other Stesichorean papyri: 30 for the Geryoneis, 34 in the Lille Papyrus, 27 for one of the MSS of the Iliu Persis (but a very high c.60 for P. Oxy. 2803).
While agreeing with Haslam that (i) we are not justified in using col.ii for reconstruction of the strophe, (ii) the likelihood of its being the strophe is high enough to sow suspicions about reconstructions that do not match it, I prefer to follow West in printing an incomplete scheme of the str. A list of possible supplements to the scheme is appended.
Period-end at str. 2 is proved by hiatus between il and 2. There is word-end before the anceps in all the lines consisting of \((x)DxD(x)\) except 4, where there is word-end after it. Haslam (p. 46) takes this last phenomenon to indicate that 4-5 should be divided into 2 unequal periods \((Dx \parallel DxDx (-)\|)\) even though the anceps is short in this case. Linking of units within periods and at their junctions is the rule. Note the nearness of the first line of the stanza to an hexameter: this is totally appropriate to the very epic nature of the subject matter:¹ what surprises is the very different rhythm of the second line (the "Stesichorean": see p. 1176 inf) which is at odds with the succeeding lines as well. Of the whole, Haslam well remarks (p. 45) "It is the first purely and unmistakeably dactylo-epitrite composition extant, and surely belongs to an early stage in the independent history of the metre".

¹See now the first line of the Lille Papyrus' stroph.
Haslam suggests ~~|| or ~~~| with the first introducing a blunt period-end (for another — supplemented — example, see str.7 (i 6)) and the second, what is possibly our only example of X=" X.

Beginning of str.6 (i 5)
Haslam assails Merkelbach's [~~~] as too long for the available space, but if anything it is too short. In front of φοινά^, there is about as much space as before line 1's δοῖκα or line 4's κατέπατο. In both these cases we know there is metrical room for ~~~ and ~~~~~- respectively. There seems to be slightly more room than there is in front of 2's φοινά (where ~~~- fills the space).

End of str.6 (i 5)
Merkelbach reads ~~~[-[-(-)] but the certain word-end after κεύλαγ^] φοῖκ tells against this. As Haslam suggests the line may have ended with that word. Whatever the exact truth there, we should prefer the reading . ζ φοιν- to . ζ φοιν- since a short before ]-e-[ would be metrically unwelcome.

str. 8 (i 7)
Merkelbach's (ρ)~-----x----- again seems too long

---

We need not then consider Haslam's ~~~ which contradicts his own warning against reconstructions that do not match the openings of col.ii (see above p.749).
after a perusal of the papyrus: the previous line extends c. 11 letters beyond i 7 and yet Merkelbach wants the same metrical length for both lines. There is no real method of choosing between other various possibilities.

Beginning of 9 (i 8)

--- Merkelbach, x---] or ---] Haslam, who prefers the former for length and its echoing of 6's rising opening.\(^1\) In either case the stanza will end in a very Pindaric and Bacchylidean manner with (x)E-.

\(^1\)See now the end of the Lille Papyrus' strophe.
As Lobel observes (p. 17), if 3>6e 6e, together with a verb of saying, originally stood in 1.2, the principal verb of the preceding clause must have been lost before line 1. This verb may well have meant something like "marvelled" or "rejoiced", if S. transferred to Helen the shared emotions of Od. 15·164ff (= Il·24·320ff): oï ðë Łóñtëc. ζήθηκαν, καὶ πάσιν ἐνὶ φωεὶ θυμὸς ἠδύνη.

1: θείον τέρας
there is no closer Homeric parallel to this phrase than Od. 15·168: η νοοὶν τόδ' ἔφηνε θεὸς τέρας, Il 4·398 = 6·183: θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήκας, Il·5·742 = Il·209 = Od. 16·320: Διὸς τέρας αἰγιόχοιο.

τέρας: the last syllable is lengthened before Ψύοιςα. Contrast i 11 where Lloyd-Jones' c<ε> Ψύοιςα (p. 17) is now seen to be metrically implausible.

νύμφα

c.f. Il·3·130: νύμφα φίλη (of Helen!)

2: the exertions of scholars have bequeathed us two apparent alternatives for the restoration of this line, depending on the interpretation of φωνὴ.

(i) φωνὴ is a noun used adverbially

c.f. Il·3·161: Πριάμος δ' Ελένην ἐκαλέσσατο φωνῇ Od. 24·530: (scil. Ἀθηναίη) ἦσσεν φωνῇ Η.Η. Dem. 20: \{δ' ἥρ'\}
i b. 432:
(ii) ἀφνᾷ is a verb
c.f. Pind. Ol. 13.67: φῶναι ὁ', Nem. 10.75: ἔφηθον φῶναι
and we must supplement ὡς ἐξῆνεθ (Lloyd-Jones), since two verbs of speaking in the one line would be ungrammatically otiose.

In fact the second alternative is out of the question, since ἀφνᾷ would be an historic present, and such forms do not exist in early Greek lyric. See my note on 223.4 P. (above p.323f).

We must, then, accept the first interpretation, even although the above-cited instances of ἀφνῃ with this meaning have an awkward "connotatation of loudness" (Lobel p.17) which is certainly not wanted here. And if ἐξῆνεθ is to be supplemented, we should remember that the Homeric verb προεύπην occurs in tmesis only in the formula πρὸς μὸδον ἐπεν (examples in Schmidt's Parallel-Homer p.191).

ποτί: Homeric and Stesichorean.

---

1As has been realised by Peek (p.171), Führer (p.94) and Nöthiger (p.80 n.1).
παίδ' ἸΩNiου προσέφη, Καπανήίου οίον
(an especially close parallel in view of the verb).
Σδένελον, Καπανήίος οίος (in the nominative) also at
11.4.367 = 5.241. Od. 3.264: πόλλ' Ἀγαμεμνονέην ἄλοχον
θέλεσκεν ἐπεῖθεν also fairly close. See too 11.2.20:
Νηληίων οίο, 10.18: Νέκτορ' ... Νηληίων, 11.597: Νηληίωι·
ἵπποι, ib. 682: πόλον Νηληίων, 23.349: Νέκτωρ Νηληίως,
514: Ἀντίλοχος Νηληίως.
As these parallels show, this form of description in
Homer does not need to be accompanied by the name of the
person qualified (see too later examples: Pind. Pyth.
8.19f: Σενάρχειον ... οίον, Aesch. P.V. 592: κορής τῆς
"Ιναχείας). But the immediately following vocative
Τηλέμαχε (see ad loc.) may be a bow in the direction of
the more usual Homeric practice of adding the proper name.
3 Τηλέμαχος
Löbel was right (p.17) to prefer a vocative to an
accusative here, and the invaluable work done since by
Führer on the form of speeches in early lyric backs up
this preference to the hilt. An accusative would mean
that Helen's address began in mid-line, and such an
occurrence would be virtually unique in early Greek
poetry: see my note on S 148 ii 3. Our preference for
the vocative form of Telemachus' name at the start of 1.3
receives further support from the same phenomenon at the
same place in two separate lines from Od. 15. S. seems
to have had these in mind even though they do not occur
in the actual episode which the present fragment reworking:

Od. 15.68: Τηλέμαχ' οδ้ τίς' ἐγὼ γε πολύν χρόνον ἐνθάδε' ἔρυξω...

Od. 15.531: Τηλέμαχ' οδό τοι ἀνευ θεοῦ ἐπιτατο δεξιῶς δρυνικ...

The first line is spoken by Menelaus upon learning of his guest's wish to depart; the second by the seer Theoclymenus after he has witnessed an omen remarkably similar to that which occurred earlier in the Book, a hawk holding a dove in its talons and plucking it, so that its feathers fall to the ground.

Supplementation of the rest of 1.3's lacuna depends on what we make of the τίς that emerges from its right-hand side. Lobel was hostile towards an interpretation of it as interrogative, and indeed there is little to be said in favour of such an hypothesis. There is no corresponding question anywhere in the Odyssean original: Πίσιστρατος' enquiry at 167.8 concerns the interested party to, not the actual significance of, the omen. Besides, after Ἐκτὼν τέρας in 1.1 the audience would find Helen's unanswered question about the meaning of the omen rather otiose (though prosaic logic will insist that Helen has not heard S's description of the τέρας as Ἐκτὼν.)

If τίς is not interrogative it becomes easier to fill the gap. Page's Ἐκτίς or Lloyd-Jones' Ἐκτίς spring readily to mind. Lobel's objection to the latter (ap. Lloyd-Jones p. 17) "that the space is too small" for the
supplement, is difficult to check from the photograph in Ox. Pap. (Plate 2) because of surface-displacement on the papyrus, but the transcript would suggest there is room. Führer (p.118) dislikes ὅρις on stylistic grounds because it deprives the "Legitimation" (see p.769 f. inf.) of its syntactical independence. His full comparison of all other such "Prophezeiungen" in early Greek poetry leads him to expect that the formal section extending from Ἄρις (3) to βῶ δὲ (4) will have an independent meaning of its own, whereas Page's ὅρις allows the sentence to wander on into 1.5 before its construction is completed. For the same reason Führer is reluctant to construe ὅδε with ἄγγελος ("this messenger") as Page's supplement would demand. Instead he would accept Lloyd-Jones' ἦ, understand ἀετίος or some such bird with ὅδε, and take ἄγγελος as predicative: "to be sure this bird has flown down from heaven as a messenger for ἦς."

On the interpretation of ὅδε both scholars could summon supporting evidence to their aid. Page is backed up by a parallel omen in Il.12.200ff: ὅρις γὰρ σφίν ἐπῆλθε says the poet, and a little later (218) Τρωκλὺν ὅδε ὅρις ἠλὰς says Polydamas, hopefully. Calchas' reference to another omen in Il.2.324 (ἤμιν μὲν τὸ ἐξήνευ τέρας μέγα μητίετα Ζεύς) probably re-enforces Page's case too. On the other hand Od. 20.114, the words of the women at the mill in reaction to Zeus' thunder, is good news for Führer as well as for Odysseus: τέρας νῦ τεῳ τὸ ὅδε φαίνεται.
This is clearly predicative use of ὁδε in connection with an omen. And Führer is not at a loss for parallels to the construction "ὁδε (scil. αἰετὸς)". He can produce one from the very passage which S. is here remodelling (Od. 15'161: αἰετὸς ... χήνα φέρων ὄνυχεςι 174: ὦτ ὁδε χήν' ἥρπαξ') as well as from the more remote Il.2·
(308: ἔνθ᾽ ἐφάνη μέγα σῆμα δράκων κτλ. 326: ὦτ οὖτος κατὰ τέκνα φάγε στροθοῖο καὶ αὐτὴν). In both cases the interpreter of the omen uses the demonstrative pronoun of an animal whose identity had previously been made clear in the narrative: this would be exactly the situation supposed for our fragment. Finally, Führer can cite the following uses of ἥ to exemplify the nuance in Lloyd-Jones' supplement: Od. 17'157: ὦτ ἡ τοι ὅδε σέες ἡδὲ ἐν πατρίδι γαίη Od. 20'232: ἡ σέθεν ἐνθάδε ἐόντος ἐλεύσεται οἷς ὁδε ὅδε Bacch. 13'54ff: ἡ ποτε φαμί | [ταξίδε] περὶ στεφάνοις | [παγκρατίου πόνον Ἐλ [ἐλάνεςι] ψν ἠρέσει] ἐσσεθαί. It will be seen that they all occur in the sort of prophetic utterance presupposed here. It cannot be maintained that controversy over the relative merits of [ὁδ] and [ἥ] as supplements, and the exact meaning of ὁδε, possesses the absolute importance of the "furious contests which the difference of a single diphthong excited between the Homoousians and the Homoioousians."¹ But once we command comprehensive statistics for formal divisions within speeches in Greek

¹Gibbon, The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Ch.2.
lyrics, it would be wasteful not to use them, as we use metrical or prosodical statistics, to choose between supplements and conjectures.

δδ'. ἄγγελος: on this type of separation c.f. Wackernagel, I.P.1 (1892) 367ff = K1. Schr. 1·35ff.

ἄγγελος is used of a bird that appears as omen in Od.

15·525f: δ' άρα οι εἰπόντι ἐπέπτατο δεξιός ὄρνις, ἑλκυός, ἀπόλλωνος ταχύς ἄγγελος. The whole scene is very similar (see above p.741f). The bird in the episode which S. is copying is of course an eagle, but this too is called a messenger in Il·24·292ff: οἱ ὁνόμα ταχύν ἄγγελον(sci1.Διός)... ἔδω ἄγγελον (296) ... ταχύν ἄγγελον (310) ... αἰετών (315). The constellation known as "the eagle" is called Ζηνός .. μέγας ἄγγελος at Arat. Phaen. 523.

ἀμην: for an explanation of the dative compare several omen scenes in Homer: Il·2·324: ἱμῖν μὲν τὸ δέ' ἔφηνε τέρας...

Ζεὸς Od. 15·168: ἦ νῷταν τὸ δέ' ἔφηνε θεός τέρας ή κοι αὐτῷ Od. 15·211: οὐ τοι ἀνευ θεοῦ ἐπτατο δεξιός ὄρνις Il·12·216: ἦταν ἄγγελος ἐπήλθε.

4: δ' αἰθέρος άτρυγέτας

compare the line-end formula δ' αἰθέρος άτρυγέτας in Il·17·425, H.H. Dem. 67, 457 (ἀπ'), Hes. fr.150·35 MW (διὰ τ'), P. Oxy. 2509 i·i (Hesiodic Catalogue? see p.1089 n.1). άτρυγέτας

in Homer, this is an epithet with two endings, used of the sea and the sky. See W. Kastner, "Die gr. Adj. zweier Endungen auf -oc" (Heidelberg 1967) pp.42ff.

Apart from this passage the feminine is not found before
I.G.3.900-9, χόδνος ... ἀτρυγήτης or S 414(b) (lyr. adesp.) ἀτρυγήτας ἀλός, whichever is the earlier. Note however that (i) αἴθρο though later masc. (in lyric, Attic prose etc.) is fem. in Homer; (ii) similar formations in compound adjs. take the fem. from Homer onwards (e.g. ἄργυρωτη Od. 6.108; ἄσανατητικτ Il.3.158). The word's meaning is uncertain: for speculation see Frisk G.E.W. Chantraine Dict. Etym. s.v., D.M. Jones, Trans. Phil. Soc. 1953 51.

4 κατέπατο

Despite the seductive parallels offered by Il.19.351 (οὗρανοῦ ἐν κατέπαλτῳ δι’αἰθρός) and Nonnus Dion. 48.614 (οὗρανόθεν κατέπαλτῳ) it seems that κατέπαλτο cannot be read in the papyrus, and attempts to introduce it by emendation are objectionable on more than one count (c.f. Führer p.117 n.7, Haslam p.46 and n.88).

i) metre

κατέπαλτο would produce a dactylic run out of keeping with the poem's metrical scheme; out of keeping too, probably, with S's metrical practice as a whole, since it takes off from an anceps, a phenomenon unparalleled in the surviving remains of S.

ii) meaning

κατέπαλτο would produce somewhat less satisfactory sense, for in the Odyssean original the eagle does not jump down from the sky and land on the ground but snatches up a goose while still flying.
Likewise the idea that these three letters imply βαδίζειν (Lobel) or βαδίζεμεναι (Peek) should be stoutly resisted for the following reasons:

1) βαδίζειν does not occur before S. and is in general a prose word" (Lobel). Exactly the same may be said of the verb's middle form (which rules out Snell's βαδίζομένοις). The middle is in any case only found in the future and imperative.

2) Attempts to supplement βαδίζειν or the like inevitably introduce an interpretation of the missing portion which is quite impossible. The most obvious instance is Snell's βαδίζομένοις meant to be construed with 1.3's δίμι. But that dative can be explained perfectly well (p.759) without the attempt to handcuff it to a word that stands six words and a whole line apart. Lobel's βαδίζειν οἶκαδε κε μελεῖτι and Peek's βαδίζεμεναι κοί ἐπέφραδεν οἶκαδε are no better, for βαδίζειν is used of travelling by foot and on land, whereas the journey that lies before Telemachus in the Odyssey is partly by chariot, partly by ship. Nor is it part of the omen's aim in the Odyssey to encourage Telemachus' return home. That would be a redundant object since Telemachus is already in his chariot sped by the vision of Athene. I do not

---

It does occur twice in H.H. Herm: 210 (ἐμετροφοδόθην δ' ἐβαδίζειν) and 320 (ἐκσφεῖρας δὲ ἐπέβαλλα διὰ ψαμάθοι βαδίζει). But "there is every reason to believe, with the consensus of scholars, that the poem is later than the rest of the longer hymns" and "its language is in places prosaic" (Sikes and Allen pp.133-134).
argue that it was beyond S's power to alter either of these details in his original, merely that there is no proof he has done so, and that in default of such evidence we should refrain from introducing these changes on his behalf. The same objection applies to Page's εοικαδ'άνωγ (P.M.G. p.113).

κατέπτατο βη δ' ει (ε)

For Homeric βη δε in a context of flying Führer compares Il.15.79ff (scil. Ἠρη): βη δ' έξ 'Ιδαίων δρέων ἐς μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον, ὥς δ' ὅτ' κτλ ... ὃς κραίνως μεμαυία διέπτατο πότνια Ἠρη. In the Odyssean original of the portent scene here adapted, an eagle snatches up a goose and bears it away in its talons (Od. 15.161: αἰετός .. κίνων φέρων ὄνυχεσσι). Presumably S. depicted a like event in the vicinity of our present fragment, and with βη δε in this hypothetical context of snatching up and carrying off Führer (less convincingly) compares H.H. Dem. 414ff: ὥς δὲ μ' ἀναρπάξας ... ὧς επεταφόντα φέρον ὑπὸ κεύθα γαίης ... (431f) βη δὲ φέρων ὑπὸ γαίαν ἐν ἄρματι χρυσελοισί | πόλλ' ἀεκαζμένην, ἑβόησα δ' ἄρ' ὀδρια φωνη. This last echo with 1.2 of our fragment just about saves the parallel.
Lobel (p. 16) read ω φοίναι, Führer R p. 2 ω φοίν-, since a short before 1-e- would be difficult metrically speaking (see above p. 751).

Lobel (p. 17) limits this word's meaning to "reddened (with blood)", and then finds its collocation with κεκλαγ [γ] ως "strange". Il. 16.159 (μάτιν δὲ παρηγον άιματι φοίνόν) the only Homeric example of the adjective certainly bears out Lobel's translation. But in H.H. Apoll. 362 the rendering "murderous" would be far more appropriate (λειπε δὲ θυμόν | φοίνον ἀπονυεύοντος) and this is the word's meaning in Nicander (Th. 146, 675; Al. 187) and probably A.P. 6.57.2. Even if we follow Lobel's translation here, we need not find the juxtaposition with κεκλαγ [γ] ως odd, provided we adopt Bowra's suggestion (pp. 77-8 n. 3) that the lost noun qualified by φοίνός meant throat or beak. But it is hard to supply such a word, and I would prefer to have the second meaning here and supplement e.g. Peek's ομί ("with deadly screech" rather than "with bloody beak"). Il. 12.202 (= 220) cited by Führer (p. 120) is probably irrelevant, since it says nothing of a bird's cry: φοίνηεντα δράκοντα φέρων (scil. αετός) δνύχεσσι πέλουρον. S's vivid detail of the bird's shriek does not occur in Homer, but its presumably

1 Compare δαφούς(ε)δός, which in Il. 2.308 and 18.538 means "blood-red" but in Hes. Scut. 250 possibly, and in Il. 11.474 and H.H. Apoll. 304 pretty definitely, signifies "murderous".
symbolic significance (c.f. Theocr. Id. 17.71 inf. cit.)
would suit the content of the prophecy made in the
Odyssey.
κεκλαγ[γ]ώς
Since Homer has κεκληγώς sing. (II.5.591 etc.) and -ηγώτες
-ήγοντες pl. (II.16.430 etc.) and no example of a perfect
with -αγγ- for -ηγ- is to be found before Ar. Vesp. 929.
(and there with present sense: see McDowell p.254) it
seems reasonable to follow Page (S.L.G. p.157) in
deleting a γ from the papyrus' reading, to achieve the
κεκλάγως everyone expects from S. Compare 1.10 where
the papyrus fails to produce the ἔγων which S's dialect
requires.

κλάζω according to Pollux 5.89 (I p.286 Bethe) is proper
to eagles and cranes (ἐπίσοις δ' ἁν κλάζειν μὲν ἀετοῦς,
κλάζειν δὲ γεράνους, ἐπ' ἁμφότερον δὲ κλαγγὴν) and the
predatory bird in Homer's original is, of course, an
eagle. But the verb can apply to other birds as well as
to animals, men, and even inanimate objects. In pre-
Stesichorean literature the birds we find it used of are
vultures (II.16.429, Hes. Scut. 406), the heron (II.10.276),
the crane (Hes. Op. 448f), and jackdaws and
starlings (II.17.756f). It is used of an eagle in
II.12.207, and note too the favourable omen described in
Theocr. Id.17.71f: ὁ δ' ὅφθεν ἐκλαγε φωνάζει... μέγας
ἀετός, ἀεικος δρονικ.
As Lobel observes (p.18): έα as the first letter of the phrase "seems likely but cannot be verified", and ομέτερους δόμους in an address to a single person is paralleled by Il.23.84 (Patroclus' ghost speaking to Achilles) ώς ἐτράφημεν ἐν ομετέροις δόμοις and Od. 18.247f (Eurymachus to Penelope) πλέονές κε μνηστήρες ἐν ομετέροις δόμοις | ἡδέν δαίμον'',

προφανή is a probable interpretation of the traces "in spite of the anomalous appearance of the ν" (Lobel) and then might follow that scholar's προφανεῖς or προφανεῖτ' 'Οδοὺς εἶλος, a rather appropriate verb, since it is used of the wily hero's unexpected appearance at Od. 24.160: οὔδε τις ημεῖων δόνατο γνῶναι τον ἐόντα | ἐξαπίνης προφανέντι'. Also of Achilles' chariot and horses in Il.17.487. Clearly the general meaning here corresponds to Helen's deduction in the Odyssean model (15.174ff): ὡς δέεν χήν' ἡμοπαξε ἔτι ὡς ἕοδος εἶλος ἄν συντήσει καὶ τείσεται, ἥν καὶ ἡδῆ ὁδινο. A satisfactory sense would be achieved by taking Peek's ἡλθεν ἕκα ὃ.δ. προφανεῖς or his καὶ γὰρ ἕκα with either of Lobel's suggestions.

7. αὐ.υς ἄνηρ ("Before the first α what now resembles the right-hand side of υ". Lobel p.17).

Lobel's reading seems a more accurate representation of the traces than Peek's μαντίς. But the latter is a most attractive idea. It would be S's equivalent of Od. 15.172f: αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ μαντεύομαι ὡς ἐνὶ θυμῷ | ἄθανατοι
βάλλουσι καὶ ὡς τελέσθαι οἷς and the very phrase is to be found in Od. 9.508 (ἔσκε τις ἐνόδει μάντις ἀνήρ ἢς τε μέγας τε) as well as in Heracles' prophecy to Telamon at Pind. 1.6.50ff: ἄδεια ὃ ἐνδοῦν μὲν ἐκνίξεν χάρις, ἑβίπεν τε φωνῆςαι ἄτε μάντις ἀνήρ'| ἢσσιαι τοι παῖς κτλ.

8 βοιουλαίς Ἄθάνας
Odysseus himself tells his son at Od. 16.233 νῦν αὖ δεῦρ' ἵκμην ὑποθημοσύνης ποὺ Ἄθηνας. Athene's name is not mentioned in the Odyssean version of Helen's prophecy, but her constant patronage of her favourite hero was established as early as the Iliad: Locrian Ajax could guess, though no-one had told him, which of the gods had made him lose the foot-race: ὅτα ... ὦ τὸ πάρος περί μὴν δὲ ὡς Ὀμυκτη παρίσταται ἢ ἐπαρήγετ (Il.23.782-3).

9 αὐτα λακέρυζα κορώνα
Lobel (p.18) preferred to interpret the four letters before λ.κ. as αὖτα rather than αὖτα but then confessed himself baffled at the unexpected and unwelcome appearance of a gibbering crow at the end of the line. The prophetic bird in the Odyssey scene is of course an eagle,¹ and the same bird has been suggested by 1.3's ἄγγελος and φοίνικες κεκλαγώς (1.5) of the present fragment (see notes ad locc.). If we take it as probable that 11.9ff of Helen's speech are no longer part of a prophecy - for what could she add to what she seems to have said in 11.6-8? - we can approach the puzzle from a different

¹ Though crows too had a reputation for prophecy: see Lloyd-Jones and Rea, H.S.C.P.72 (1967) p.143 and n.4.
angle. Crows had more than one significance in ancient Greece. See D'Arcy Thompson, A Glossary of Greek Birds\(^2\) pp.168ff. They were bringers of bad luck (c.f. Hes. Op. 746-7: μηδὲ ὁμοῦν ποιῶν ἄνεπίξεστον καταλείπειν | μὴ τοι ἐφεξομένη κρῶξὶν λακέρυζα κορώνη and West ad loc. (p.340) and harbingers of stormy weather (c.f. Arat. Phaenom. 949f: ἵππος καὶ λακέρυζα παρ᾽ ἡδόνι προδοχόση | χαίματος ἐρχόμενον χέρωι ὑπέτυφα κορώνη) as well as bywords for longevity (c.f. Hes. fr.304.1: ἐννέα τοι Γάτι γενεὰς λακέρυζα κορώνη | ἄνδρῶν ἡβδόμων Arist. Av. 609; Arat. Phaen. 1022; Callim. fr.260 Pf. 42-3 etc.) None of the above characteristics seems appropriate to the present passage, but the purpose of such full quotation of sources is to ram home a different corvine quality which is relevant. For the lines cited in toto above share with our Stesichorean passage that epithet which conveys the bird's garrulity. This was a feature of the crow which was exploited several times by Alexandrian poets: one of Callimachus' Iambi was largely taken up with a learned conversation between two crows (Callim. fr.194 Pf. 64 - 87, especially 64 κοτῖλον τὸ ζεῦγος and 82 λαϊδρῆ κορώνη | κόσ τὸ χεῖλος οὐκ ἀλγεῖς;) and a long stretch of the Hecale was devoted to a crow's narrative (fr.260 Pf. 17 - 61). In Apollonius, when Hera wishes to speak to one of the Argonauts, we will no longer be surprised to learn that she chooses to speak through a representative of what the poet calls (3.929) λακέρυζα... κορώναι.
The loquacity of the crow seems most relevant to our present fragment and to what we can reconstruct of 1.9's context. Helen has just prophesied the impending return of Odysseus, an event for which Telemachus will wish to hurry home. Sure enough in ll.10ff Helen assures Telemachus that she will not detain him: soon Penelope will behold her dear son again. What more natural than that in 1.8 Helen should promise her young guest that she does not intend to imitate the proclivities of the crow and thus waste valuable time? Peek's supplement μη φῇηας· 'ςετα λ.κ. would make this clear, but the important thing is that it be realised Helen is reassuring Telemachus that she will prove to be no chattering crow. Helen is not saying that she has not been talking nonsense: that idea would not fit the crow's reputation in antiquity, and as we have seen, by ll.10ff Helen has moved away from the subject of the omen.

10: ο’δε'γόть c’ερήξω

c.f. Od. 15.68: οδ τι c’έγω γε πολύ ν χρόνον ένθάδε’έρέξω
(with the same absence of digamma before ἔρω). On the wider implications of the imitation see above p.742.

11: Πανέλοπα

a very uncertain reading strongly implied by the sense. It will then be the earliest known example of the name's short form, as opposed to the epic Πηνελόπεια.

Fränkel (p.321 = p.282) makes far too much of an isolated and incomplete sentence when he argues that Helen's
sympathy for Penelope here "goes beyond anything possible in epic" and marks a significant advance in human sensibility. If sympathy at the reunion of mother and son is being expressed, it does not seem very different from Agamemnon’s attitude to the future reunion of Odysseus and Telemachus in Od. 11.450f.

φιλου πατρός
c.f. Il.19.422: νόσω φίλου πατρός, πατρός φίλου in Il.6.468; Od. 1.94, 2.360.

12. If τέλος εὐθλόν is right, there is no closer Homeric parallel than the verse-end formula κλέος εὐθλόν (c.f. 11.5.3, 18.121; Od. 13.422).
On the analogy of Od. 15.180 (οὕτω νῦν Ζεὺς θείη: Telemachus’ reply to Helen’s prophecy) we might well expect Zeus to be the subject of the sentence ending ἄλος εὐθλόν and an optative verb to stand between subject and object. Peek’s Ζεὺς ὑψιμετὰς δὲ τὸν φόροι τ.ε. is as good a guess as any.

For an analysis of 11. 2-12 in terms of the divisions usual in epic and early lyric speeches of prophecy c.f.

1 Likewise, I think the same scholar errs by reading excessive significance into our fragment’s treatment of "a tender scene of almost ceremonious friendship" rather than "an epic narrative of heroic deeds" (p.321 = p.281). The caprice of fortune has rescued for us this particular extract. Who can doubt that the rest of the poem had its fair share of "epici carminis onera"?
Führer p.117, who distinguishes 4 sections here:-

(1) Address

Τηλέμαχος

(2) Identity of omen

τις ... θα δις

(3) Reference to omen

φοινικίς κεκληγή[γ]ός

(4) Actual prophecy

ἐκ ὅ.δ... ἰδεῖνος.

The value of this type of formal analysis has already been proved (p.757 supr.).

209 p

col.i 14ff.

Clearly nothing can be done with these relics.

Peek (p.175 n.1) very ingeniously suggested γφοινίκα at 19 comparing Od. 15.126 ἐκ γάμου ὀρνη (of Helen's robe, the gift for Telemachus' future bride) and at 20 δοῦνω of the two hosts or their presents; but this is mere conjuring.

col.ii

1ff: these words are reminiscent of one of Menelaus' parting gifts to Telemachus, a silver wine bowl with a golden brim. (Od. 15.115ff = Od. 4.613ff - see above p.741) δῶσω τοι κρητῆρα τετυγμένου... ἄργυρος δέ | ἔστιν ἄπαχ, κρυοῦι δ' ἐπὶ χείλεα κεκαρανται |.... πόρεν δέ ἐ δι αἰθρίμοις ἔρωτι ν ἡλιου βασιλεὺς). It seems likely, after what we have seen in col.i, that the echo is deliberate. But as in col.i, there seem to be calculated
divergences.

1) The gift in S., as in Homer, seems to be made of silver, and χρυσῷ ὁπερθε may be taken as equivalent to the Odyssean χρυσῷ δ' ἐπὶ χείλεα κειράνται, and as referring to a layer of gold "at its edge". But the feminine adjective shows that S. is not talking about a κρατήρ. What he is talking about is harder to say, especially since the three letters which follow ἄργυρεαν in 1.1 are hopelessly ambiguous: τε η or τ' η? Perhaps more likely than either would be τ' ην which Peek supplements ex. gr. τ' ην ἐπὶ κέρατι τ' ἑτει. In other words our fragment gives no help towards deciding the problem. One might scour the Odyssey for objects in Menelaus' palace that are both silver and feminine. Od. 4·128 mentions ἄργυρεαν ἀκαμνάσοι which the Egyptian Polybus had given to Helen's husband, but I doubt that S's Telemachus is being given the dubious treat of hauling a bath-tub back to Ithaca. More likely is Helen's basket which ran on castors (Od. 4·131f):

τάλαρόν θ' ὑπόκυκλον ... ἄργυρεον, χρυσῷ δ' ἐπὶ χείλεα κειράντο

though it would have to be meant as a gift for Telemachus' future wife, like Helen's robe mentioned above. Perhaps a rarer word for a drinking-vessel is the likeliest prospect after all.
2) Menelaus in the Odyssey claimed, as we have seen, that his κρατήρ came from the King of the Sidonians. S's ἐκ Δαρδανίδοι strongly implies something different. Δαρδανίδος in the Iliad is regularly used of Priam (except in II.11.166, 372 where it refers to Ἰλός) but we need not rush to restore the genitive case of Πρίαμου despite the first line of Ibycus 282 P= S151 (Δαρδανίδα Πρίαμου). Nor should it automatically be assumed that the object was taken forcibly from Priam's palace during the sack of Troy. It could conceivably have been given to Menelaus on the occasion of his embassy to Troy (described II.3.205 - 215) in which case the motif might have been inspired by Priam's gift to Achilles of a χρύσεος δέμας (II.24.234ff).

3) From what we can see of the list of gifts in S., we will decide that it was fairly extensive. It is unlikely to be a mere resume of an earlier catalogue occupying the same place in the narrative as the Odyssean equivalent. Hence S. has altered the position of a fairly major feature of Homer's version.

4 Πλείστευνίδας: see my note on 219.2 P. Since the epithet is applied to both Menelaus and his brother by poets, either could be meant here. The former is prima facie more likely because of the parallels with the

1δώμων (Peek) is just one of several possibilities besides Πρίαμου. Or Δαρδανίδων might be right.
Homer's episode where he dispenses parting gifts. Still, it would not be impossible to work Agamemnon in (the silver object might be loot from Troy after all, reserved for the commander-in-chief and presented by him to Menelaus) and the letter following the adjective more closely resembles an A than an M.

5 καὶ τὰ μὲν εὐσ

Peek once again showed great ingenuity in speculatively supplementing καὶ τὰ μὲν εὖς ἔστων κατέθηκέν τι διόρωσιν on the basis of Od. 15.131: καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐκ πειραὶς τῇ ἑπιτείμησιν. This certainly seems a more relevant comparison than West's citation (ap. Merkelbach p.166) of Ibycus 282 P =S 151 ff; καὶ τὰ μὲν ἔν αὐτῷ Ἡμέρας ἐτείμηκεν ἐφ᾽ Ἑλληνικῆς ἐπιτείμησιν ἀλλὰ ὧτι which cuts short the poet's epic narrative. Though in dealing with verses as fragmentary as these we must at all costs avoid complacency about what may seem at first sight "obvious" supplements, I doubt if S. would have broken off his narrative in mid-stream in the same way as Ibycus (see p.1188). And χρυσί at 1.7 would more naturally apply to further gifts than to (e.g.) golden-winged Muses (c.f. 193.11 P: χρυσόπτερε παρθένες).
193 P.16ff
After the mention of Chamaeleon's views on S's two
Palinodes and Helen's stay with Proteus in Egypt, occurs
the passage cited above. There is no means of telling
whether the information it contains likewise emanates
from the peripatetic. The motifs of the εἰςωλον and
Helen's residence in Egypt were extreme examples of
καινοτομα, and it is implied by the phrasing that the
following instance provided no less startling an
illustration of this tendency (οὕτως καὶ καινοτομε ... ὤστε). Hence it is beside the point to criticise
Θοσκαλοῦ (or any other proposed supplement for 1.20)
because, for instance, there is no evidence for any link
between the Calydonian Thesiads and the Attic Theseids.
(So L. Lehnus, S.C.O. 21 (1972) 53). The very lack of
parallels is a positive commendation.
This particular piece of καινοτομα concerns Demophon:
is it possible to tell what poem contained the striking
innovation here alluded to? Demophon's νόςτος is
mentioned, and this at once suggests the Ἄντιοι. That
poem has won the support of M. Doria (P.P. 18 (1963) pp.
83-4 n.11) and L. Ferrari (in Congetture Stesicoree).
Nevertheless the idea may be right. The νόςτος must
surely be the homeward journey of Demophon from the
Trojan War.¹ The tradition that he and his brother
Acamas fought at Troy first appears in the epic cycle
(I1. Parv. Allen p.108 (Procl.) and fr.18 (p.134);

¹This is automatically assumed by e.g. Barret, Euripides' Hippolytus p.437: "S. had Demophon fighting at Troy".
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II. Pers. fr.3 (p.139)) and is probably an Attic innovation of the sixth century: see Barrett's Hippolytus p.2 n.1 and Page, History and the Homeric Iliad p.172 n.78. It is true that Lehnus (sup. cit. 53ff) toys about with Demophon's journey to the Thracian Bisaltians' land and to Cyprus (c.f. Plut. Sol. 26, Apollod. ep.6.16, Tz. ad Lyc. 494, Serv. ad ecl. 5.10, Hygin. Fab. 59) and then finally supplements θεὺς[πια]δόγυ in 1.20 to produce a hitherto unknown variant of the myth related by Diod. Sic. 4.29.2, and Paus. 7.2.2, 9.23.1, 10.17.5. I doubt, however, whether Demophon's participation in the Thespiads' Sardinian colony is the ψαλωνομία meant here, for all that Pausanias tells us the Athenians contributed a band of men to the enterprise, and for all that Diodorus assures us that θεὺς[πια]δόγυ is ν’ ἀνήρ τὸ γένος ἐπιφανῆς ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν, ὅπερ Ἐρεχθέως. The usual story is that Demophon's maternal uncle Iolaus led the expedition, and there seems no room in the myth either for Demophon's own presence or for his later return, via Egypt, to Attica. Besides, the phrasing of the papyrus strongly suggests that Demophon's νόστος is the traditional core, which has been embroidered by variations concerning his company on that occasion and an Egyptian interlude. ὁ νόστος μετὰ τῶν θεὺς[πια]δόγυ would be a remarkably cool and off-hand way of referring to two absolutely unparalleled innovations - the notion that Demophon actually went to Sardinia at all, and the idea of a stay
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in Egypt on his way back. Nor is it easy to name a Stesichorean poem which could offer comfortable lodgings to such events or, for that matter, to the hero's expedition to Thrace and Cyprus.

I therefore prefer to connect the νοῦτος in question with a legend for which we have positive evidence, Demophon's role in the sack of Troy (which S. possibly included in his Iliu Persis [see p. 536]). The Nostoi would obviously be an appropriate context for Demophon's νοῦτος from Troy. But not the only possible context, as the two Italian scholars named above seem to think. The author of the passage has just been mentioning the Palinodes and Helen's presence in Egypt during the war: Menelaus must have landed there to regain her. Perhaps S. used the opportunity to make Theseus' son put in at much the same time for reasons we can no longer know. Demophon hardly seems relevant to the Palinodes' subject-matter but those who argue that there is not enough in the way of events to fill out two separate recantations on Helen, must readily allow the possibility of diversionary incidents to make up the narrative. The Νοῦτοι still seems the likeliest resting-place for Demophon's return, but we must avoid complacency on this point. And the

1 Similarly, it would be an odd mode of alluding to the fact that S. had made Thestor beget a brother for Calchas, as Lloyd-Jones' excessively long supplement θευτόροπος (C.R. 14 (1964) 19) would demand: there is no other evidence of any such brother's existence.
papyrus' apparent failure to name the source of the
details it describes would be explained if they were to
be found in one of the Palinodes that have just been
under discussion.

We cannot tell if the following account of Demophon's
genealogy comes from the same poem as depicted his
arrival in Egypt. The parallel provided by 208 P should
remind us that the Nostoi gave generous provision for the
family-tree of a most marginal and secondary personage.
But the Palinodes or the Iliu Persis are obvious
possibilities too. The mention of Helen (28) and
Agamemnon (29) in isolated scraps after the genealogy does
nothing to facilitate choice. Amphilochus (31) could be
placed without difficulty in a post-Homeric Nostoi (see
p. above) but as Kleine observed (p.125) in connection
with 228 P - a single line set in this hero's mouth - an
isolated Stesichorean reference to Amphilochus may as
well derive from the Eriphyle as from the Iliu Persis or
Nostoi. And by 1.31 of the papyrus the author may well
have moved on to a completely different poem.

On Theseus' wives and children see in general Hans Herter,
RE Suppltd.13 (1973) 166f; and more particularly
Barrett's Hippolytus pp.1-10 and (Addendis Addenda) pp.
437-8 and n.1 on p.438. I would merely disagree with
this scholar's statement in the last-named place that "The
writer describes the list of mothers and children as an
'innovation", but this need imply no more than his
own ignorance of a precursor." The other examples of Stesichorean κανονοτά mentioned by the writer seem well enough attested: Demophon's trip to Egypt for instance, or many of the details later exploited by the Attic tragedians (217 P). But see further below p.779f. There is indeed a tradition of Iope as one of Theseus' wives which may antedate S. See definitely Plut. Thes. 29·1: (καὶ γὰρ ... λέγεται) γῆμαι ὅτι καὶ Περίβοιαν τὴν Ἀλαντος μητέρα καὶ Φερέβοιαν αὐθικ καὶ Ἰόπην τὴν Ἰφικλέους ... and perhaps Hesiod (Eoeae) fr. 147 (M - W) = Athen. 557A: (scil. Ἰετρος φησιν) νομίμως δ' αὐτὸν γῆμαι Μελίβοιαν τὴν Ἀλαντος μητέρα. Ἡσίοδος δ' φησιν καὶ Ἰόπην (codd.: Ἰόπην Barrett) καὶ Ἀγιλην. If Barrett's emendation of the second passage is correct, S's innovation will have developed a detail already present in the Boeotian school of poetry: compare Helen's εὐδοκοῦν.

Phaedra is usually the mother of Demophon as well as of Acamas, "but this is a function in which she might well have supplanted another." So Barrett (pp.8 - 9), arguing for "an earlier form of Attic legend with neither Hippolytus nor Phaedra" and with an Amazon originally called Antiope (Barrett p.8 n.3) as Theseus' lawful wife not concubine. Such a version seems to be implied by Pindar fr.176 (Sn.) = Plut. Thes. 28·2 for which Barrett detects an Attic source: τῆς δ' Ἀντιόπης ἀποδοχούσης ἔγημε (scil. Θησεύς) Φαίδραν, ἔχων υἱὸν Ἰππόλυτον Ἐξ.
The same scholar shrewdly divined that the idea of a fourth separate tradition representing Ariadne rather than Phaedra Iope or Antiope as Demophon's mother (mentioned by Page ed. pr. p. 37) was a mere ghost. Its source was Od. 11.321. Here is the Odyssean line:

Φαίδρην τε Πρόκριν τε ἑδον καλῆν τ' Ἀριάδνην.

And here is the comment on it: 'Ἀριάδνη' Μινώος θυγάτηρ, γυνὴ Θησέως, ἔξ ἢς Δημοφῶν καὶ Ἀκάμας. Is it not clear that this note has accidentally been transferred from Phaedra, its rightful owner, to Ariadne? (Barrett p. 438 n.1).

If we accept both Page's and Lobel's supplements at 11.24ff it becomes conceivable that S. has included Phaedra without Hippolytus: 'Αἰ κάμαν[τα δὲ | ἐν] Φαἴδρας[λ] ἐκ δὲ τῆς Ἀμαζόνος Ἰππολύτη[σ] ... λῆ[σ]. The illegible name of the son seems not to be Ἰππολύτος. If so, Barrett would regard this variant "not as inherited but as a quirk of S's own" (p.438). But given the general aura of καλυπούσα, "a less conventional name" (Page p.37) than Phaedra's may have been lost.

On S's treatment of Theseus' family as a whole Barrett comments: "The legend is evidently still fluid. We may suppose that elements which agree with later Athenian tradition were already current at Athens; we need not necessarily suppose that other elements were not"
Acceptance of the second statement depends on our estimate of the writer before us: is he the sort of man who would attribute the invention of traditions to S. for no better reason than his own ignorance of previous treatments? Since the writer's name is unknown, and his only work Oxy. Pap. 2506, it is difficult to decide. The papyrus itself seems reliable elsewhere: the tale of Demophon and ὁ ἀναγνώρισμὸς διὰ τοῦ βοστρύχου (217. 11 - 12 P) sound as if they have rightly been credited to the fertile brain of S., and the silence about the Cypria's anticipation of Iphigenia's pretended marriage is easily explained (see ad loc.). Even the failure to mention Hesiod's earlier use of the εἴδωλος motif need not imply ignorance (see p.390f). It is true that when other writers credit S. with the invention of Heracles' traditional costume (229 P), or Typhoeus' birth from Hera alone (239 P) they are merely revealing the extent of their own unawareness of earlier treatments. But such mistakes are inevitable when a poet acquires a reputation for καινοτομία, and they need not make us sceptical of every mention of Stesichorean innovation, especially when no evidence to the contrary exists.
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There can have been few more popular subjects for fifth-century Attic tragedy than the various woes of the house of Atreus.¹ Let us at once confine ourselves to the misfortunes that clustered about the family consequent to Agamemnon's Expedition against Troy: that would still embrace a goodly proportion of tragedies extant and lost, and within the former category we very soon think of those plays concerning the two most famous daughters of Agamemnon: Electra and Iphigenia. Now let us cast our eyes back to the Iliad and the Odyssey: in neither poem do these two names so much as appear. In the first poem things fare little better for other prominent members of the family: Clytemnestra² is named once (1.113), Orestes twice (9.142 = 284). Mother and son are given more generous treatment in the Odyssey, and we must remember, of course, that neither epic is directly or primarily concerned with the fate of Atreus' descendents. But despite these reservations, anyone who is at all familiar with the important rôle of Electra in the avenging of her father as presented by the Athenian dramatists, or the significance of Iphigenia's sacrifice as an incentive to the murder of Agamemnon, will be little short of astounded

¹Plastic art tells the same tale: artefacts depicting this saga have been found over a widely-spread area, which proves just how widely-known the myth was.

²On the orthography of this name see Fraenkel on Aesch. Ag. 84 (2.52 – 3). The proper Greek form is of course Κλυταιμήςτρα.
at the total silence about both daughters which Homer maintains.

Now Iphigenia and Electra are absent from Iliad and Odyssey alike; but they loom large in Attic tragedy where Orestes' matricide likewise has a far larger rôle than in Homer. And between the two epochs S. composed his Oresteia. Can this fact be totally irrelevant for the increased significance which the sisters - and their brother - bear in the fifth century? Until fairly recently it would have been quite plausible to argue that it was S. who gave the pair their important rôles in the tradition; and several other features of the saga as it appears in Aeschylus and later authors might have been, and indeed, were, attributed to S. This makes the story of Orestes a most suitable subject for detailed investigation: here if anywhere we may test the thesis that S. represents the crucial stage in the development of myth from epic to tragedy. And we shall soon see that the truth is somewhat more complex than this formulation would suggest.

Let us return for a moment to the Iliad. Are we really to believe that the composer of this poem was unaware that Clytemnestra later killed her husband simply because he does not mention the fact? Or that because he does not mention the names of the two sisters he was ignorant of their existence? Lesky has drawn attention to the dangers inherent in this type of argumentum ex silentio.
Reinhardt exposed its inadequacies in dealing with the Judgement of Paris in the Iliad (Das Pariserurteil (1938) = Tradition und Geist 16f). And we shall see elsewhere the reasons for not equating ignorance with silence à propos of the "magic-brand" version of the Meleager myth. One can resist the application of such an argument to the present case in several ways. When Düring says (p.94) that to the author of the Iliad "Clytemnestra does not seem to have been more than just a name", and that the solitary reference to her in Il.1.113 (καὶ γὰρ ὁ Κλυταιμνήστερος προβέβουλα (scil. Χρυσήλειδα) κοιωνίδης ἀλόχου, ἐπὶ οὗ ἐδὲν ἐστὶ χερεῖλυν, οὐ δὲμας οὔτε φυὴν, οὔτ' ἄρο φρένας οὔτε τι ἔργα) is "quite in accordance with the perception of what was befitting that the king ἀλλοιωτικεῖτε should also bring home a fair woman" (p.91), his statement stands condemned by its own naivité. It is surely far likelier that we are meant to remember what happened when Agamemnon took Cassandra home as e.g. Willcock observes on Il.1.31 (pp.7f).

But there is a very strong argument indeed for supposing that the author of the Iliad certainly knew about Iphigenia and her grim fate at Aulis. It was best stated over half-a-century ago by Zielinski, Tragodumenon Libri Tres (Cracow 1925) p.243, who regarded it as obvious and not particularly novel\(^1\) (p.242: "nihil hic novi dicturus sum") but it

\[^1\]Likewise Welcker, who attacked the view in 1849 (Ep. Cycl. 2 p.144 n.79) regarded it as common. It is
has been ignored or rejected by most scholars since.\(^1\)

And yet Agamemnon's angry reaction to Calchas' suggestion that Chryseïs be restored to her father is scarcely explicable in any other way (Il.1.106ff):

"μάντι κακών, οὐ πώ ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήνυον εἶπας"

αἰὲ τοι τὰ κάν' ἔστι φίλα φρέσι μαντεύεσθαι,

ἐκθλόν ὤφτε τί πω εἶπας ἐποκ σοὶ ἔκτελεσσας ...

What infelix verbum of Calchas can Agamemnon be recalling here if not the seer's earlier proposal that Iphigenia be sacrificed so that the fleet may sail from Aulis? And why does Homer never mention this event specifically?

Zielinski's reply is so decisive that it can stand being quoted in full (p.243):

"Cur, inquam, Iphigeniam a patre mactatam esse tacet?"

(repeated (with no acknowledgement to Zielinski) by Von der Mühll, Kritisches Hypomnema zur II. (1952) pp.19 n.20 and 165 n.15, and W. Kullmann, Die Quellen der II. (Troischer Sagenkreis) Hermes Einzelschr. 14 (1960) pp.198-9 and 267-70 (who adds fresh arguments, none of which I find convincing enough to repeat here). It is also sympathetically considered by P. Clement, "New evidence for the origin of the Iphigenia Legend", L'Antiquité Classique 3 (1934) p.394 n.2. When Kullmann says this particular incident from the Cypria was known to Homer, I agree, provided we are not being asked to envisage an already fixed text of that poem known to a single fixed Homer (c.f. Page, C.R. 11 (1961) 205ff). I would prefer to say that Homer was aware of an incident which we know at one point to have been treated in a poem called the Cypria.\(^1\)

\(^1\)For instance, Denniston dismisses it in a terse footnote p.ix f n.3), and Page(C.R. 11 (1961) 208) calls it "most special pleading". It might be asserted (with Σ II.1.106 (1.40 Erbse)) that Agamemnon is thinking of Calchas' declaration that Troy would only be won after ten years of war, but that pronouncement in itself is not sufficiently dispiriting to account for Agamemnon's outburst and ἀτεί suggests a plurality of grim haruspications. Eustathius on II.1.106 (59 (1.94 van der Valk)) finds both motives relevant.
Eadem ab causam, ob quam Agamemnon ab uxore, Clytaemnestre a filio occisam non commemorat. Haec tria nefaria Atridarum domus scelera artissime inter se cohaerent: filiae enim ultrix mater, patris ultor filius extitit. Omnia vero eadem crudelitatis nota insignita erant, quae a concilianti Homericae poesos animo, prorsus erat aliena; conferatur e.g. pacis et pietatis plena Pelopidarum B 100 seqq. historia, quae cui tandem lectori, nisi aliunde instructo, de cruentis eorum et gestis et fatis vel minimam iniiceret suspicione?"

I find this altogether convincing. The strangely sedate description of the genealogy of Agamemnon's сαμπτον (II· 2·101-8), which is bequeathed by Atreus to Thyestes without the slightest whisper of fraternal strife, deliberately suppresses the details of family hatred and murder which Homer also shuns in his telling of the myth of Meleager (ll·9· 589ff: see p·1103 below). And yet who can deny that the tales of cannibalism, incest, and the reversal of the sun's course are totally primitive and not at all, as Düring alleged (p·127), "comparatively recent ... pure literary

---

1Zielinski uses a second, slightly less impressive argument based on II·1·7lf: καὶ νήσσαι 'Ηγήςατ' (scil. Κάλχας) Ἀχαϊῶν Ἡλιον εἰςω ἐν διὰ μαντοκύνην. How, asks Zielinski, has Calchas brought the ships to Troy except by interpreting to the Greeks at Aulis Artemis' desire for the sacrifice of Iphigenia? This is correct so long as Aristarchus (ap· Σ ad loc· (1·31 Erbse) ) was right to suppose that Homer did not know of Telephus and the second muster at Aulis, and provided that Apollod. ep·3·20 (θεραπευθῆς οὖν ἐδειξε τὸν πλοῦν (scil. Τήλεφος), τὸ τῆς δεῖξεως ἄφθαλος πιστουμένου τοῦ Κάλχαντος διὰ τῆς θαυμοῦ μαντικῆς) is a late conflation of the two divergent traditions, not a reflection of an original version.
fiction"? The same antipathy on Homer's part to legends of internecine strife will explain his silence about the roles of Clytemnestra and Electra. Likewise the idea of Agamemnon's sacrifice of his own daughter is shunned as too beastly.¹

Thus it already seems simplistic to talk of a "growth" in Clytemnestra's status as a literary figure from Homer onwards,² or of the "invention" of Electra and Iphigenia as important characters.³ If S. had any part to play in such a process, it will have consisted in the re-establishment of the traits eliminated in the Iliad. But this re-establishment had already begun with the Odyssey, at least as regards Clytemnestra, who is mentioned far more frequently than in the earlier poem. For, in Murray's words, "The Odyssey ... being less expurgated, is more

¹ For this omission of human sacrifices (especially when they involve young virgins) see Murray, The Rise of the Greek Epic⁴ pp.130-6 (p.131 n.4 concludes, by a rather different argument to Zielinski's, that Homer knew of Iphigenia but did not want to mention her). See also Lloyd-Jones, The Justice of Zeus p.77 and p.183 n.128. The apparent antiquity of the local traditions as to how Orestes was cured of his madness (below p.905f) likewise presupposes an early origin for his matricide.

² The argumentum ab silentio has recently been taken to its logical conclusion by R. Böhme, (Pelopiden und Poeten: zur Interdependenz von Mythos, Dichtung, Historie, Tragödie im klass. Athen (1972)) who argues that the Thyestian feast was invented by Sophocles in his second Thyestes as late as c. 408. The whole principle is naïve enough, but when it starts to impose silence on our ancient authors, by e.g. ripping out large sections from Aeschylus' Agamemnon, it is surely time to protest.

³ For vase-paintings and other artistic evidence for the antiquity of these figures see below pp.712 ff.
explicit" (The Rise of the Greek Epic p.130). But even here "expurgation" of a sort is at work. If Homer finds a myth ἀπερετέλεσε he will either eliminate it or recast it completely in new epic-heroic terms which allow it to fit in with the rest of his narrative: we will see him do this with the Meleager myth (below p.1001) and a similar process is to be observed in the Odyssey. We know there were two versions of the Meleager story, one involving a magic brand and family curses and slayings, the other being an epic tale of war and a brooding hero. It is not hard to tell which is the original primitive version, which the heroic recasting. Similarly there were two versions of the murder of Agamemnon in antiquity, though the exact details of either are hard to grasp. But I think it will be uncontroversial to state that one depicted Agamemnon as returning to his home and being struck down in his bath-tub by Clytemnestra after she had rendered him helpless by flinging a robe about him: for details, see Fraenkel's commentary on the Agamemnon (3.648).

The other told how, on landing, Agamemnon was invited to a feast by Aegisthus; but an ambush had been laid, and

---

1 The variant preserved in Hygin. fab.117, whereby Aegisthus and Clytemnestra kill Agamemnon and Cassandra with an axe during Agamemnon's home-coming sacrifice, I do not regard as important. It is probably derived from a mistranslation of Od. 4.534f = Od. 11.411f: τὸν δ' ὄσον εἰδότ' διεσθον ἀνήγαγε (scil. Ἀγιγίςτος) καὶ κατέπεφε | δειπνίσεας, ὥς τίς τε κατέκαυε βοῦν ἐπὶ φάτνηι. There is certainly no justification for the hypothesis advanced by Juliette Davreux (p.21, following a suggestion of van Leeuwen: see below p.896f) that this is a tradition derived from S's Oresteia and illustrated by the Marlay Painter's Ferrara Cup (7624 (inv.2482): ARV 1280-64 =
the king and his soldiers were beset by Aegislus and his men. After a long struggle, Agamemnon was killed by Aegisthus. Set these two versions side by side: can it be doubted that the second version represents an heroified recasting of the first? The features of both variants point to this conclusion. Death in a bath-tub is scarcely an heroic or epic end for the king of kings. But it is not so much the meanness of his death as its frightening aspects which strike one as typical of the tales Homeric epic shunned. Emily Vermeule explained (p.10) that this version of the death of Agamemnon was notably avoided by pre-Aeschylean vase-painters "both for literary reasons and for its unsettling implications - even the scene as the Dokimasia Painter handles it is frightening as a narrative". The idea of the king struck down in his own bath by his own wife indeed provides a hair-raising symbol of helplessness. And the background to it is totally Homeric. Eduard Fraenkel has clearly shown how "the whole conception of Agamemnon's murder in the Oresteia rests on premises that are characteristically 'Homeric'" (Ag. 3.648). And his brother-in-law has pointed out that the symbol of a warrior's vóctoc was the bath performed by his wife in his house: Clytemnestra's

(contd..)

Brommer V^3 384.B11 = Vermeule 19 § 36) see too Ferrari p. 26f. Hyginus says that Oeax spread a false tale of Agamemnon's adultery with Cassandra: S's poem mentioned Palamedes. Is that a legitimate reason for supposing the former derives from the latter?

So Od. 4.537, where I do not accept Crosby's emendation δωματ' ἔχ Αἰγίςου approved by Lesky p.13 n.23.
dreadful act is thus the perversion of this friendly reception: Hermann Fränkel, "Das Bad des Einwanderers" in Wege und Formen des frühgr. Denkens² (1960) pp.97ff esp. p.98 n.2.¹

In the face of this evidence, it is hard to deny that the epic tradition knew of Agamemnon's death in a bath² but deliberately chose to ignore it. It would be implausible, for instance, to argue that this Homeric colouring was introduced at a late stage by Aeschylus, or even S. The Odyssean tale is patently an heroic version of this sinister and fearful myth. Instead of the picture of a once great monarch reduced to naked helplessness, we have a retelling which (as S ad loc observes) rebounds to the glory of Agamemnon and his men who, despite being ambushed, fight back with near success against their assailants (see especially Od. 4.536f). This version combines two common epic motifs: the feast in a palace and the ambush from which only one survives (c.f. Il.4.397 for the latter).

More specifically, the Odyssey seems to have transferred to

¹This is a reworking in German of an original article "The Immigrant's Bath", Univ. Calif. Publ. in Class. Phil. 12 (1944) 293ff, which lacks the relevant note on Agamemnon's bath.

²Several scholars have seen the origin of this tradition in the bath-shaped sarcophagi at Mycenae containing corpses wrapped in rich embroideries: see Murray, Aeschylus: the creator of Tragedy, pp.234-5, E. Vermeule, A.J.A. 70 (1966) 11. One might compare the myth of Glaucus and Polyidus, which seems to have been inspired by the huge vases specimens of which have been found at Nossus; or the bones of prehistoric creatures which are surmised to have been the starting-point of legends concerning the transference of a hero's ὄτέα.
the tale of Agamemnon the situation which prevails near
its own end, that is the heroic slaughter of the suitors
as they feast in Odysseus' palace. It may also be
relevant that "In all the Homeric descriptions the bath is
followed by a meal" (Fraenkel, sup. cit.).

There are other signs that our earliest account of Aga-
memnon's decease does not in fact reflect the earliest
version of the myth. Agamemnon's murder, in the halls of
Aegisthus¹ whither he has come by invitation is far less
integral and "organic" than the tradition whereby he simply
comes home to be killed. Once an ambush has replaced bath
and garment as the mode of death, the scene of the murder
must be transferred, albeit uneconomically, to Aegisthus' 
home,¹ since it would be rather hard to sneak twenty
soldiers with hostile intent into Agamemnon's own palace.
And this transposition of the murder has the additional
virtue of casting the spotlight for most of the time
(though not in Book Eleven; upon Aegisthus rather than
Clytemnestra. "The crimes of the great wicked heroines,
Clytemnestra, Epicaste, Eriphyle, Procre, Althaea, Scylla,
and the like, are kept carefully away from the Iliad, and
allowed only a scanty mention in the Odyssey ..." (Murray,

¹It is of course to Aegisthus' and not his own residence
that Agamemnon is invited, not only in Od. 11.388ff
(where there is a specific reference to δικτων ἐν
Αγίτεςαλ Σδνος) but in Od. 4.520ff as is realised e.g. by
the commentary of Ameis-Hentze-Cauer ad loc. (l.129).
Any other interpretation would be too absurd for words.
But exactly how scanty are the Odyssey's references to Clytemnestra's crime? Rather than discuss the discrepancies between the two versions of Agamemnon's death outlined above, most scholars have elected to dwell on the apparent discrepancies within the Odyssey itself as to the plot against Agamemnon's life. The Analysts' viewpoint can be summed up as concisely and extremely as possible thus: the Odyssey contains two imperfectly combined and quite distinct traditions on Clytemnestra's rôle in her husband's murder. The Telemachy (especially Od. 3.263ff and 4.514ff) represents Aegisthus as the real culprit (Od. 1.28ff, 3.194, 275, 4.525, 529 = 1.42) and Clytemnestra as a passive victim of originally good character (Od. 3.266: οφεσι γὰρ ἥχρητ' ἄγαθείς) who is seduced by Aegisthus only when Agamemnon's protective δοιδός has been removed (Od. 3.272) and the will of the gods forces her (ib. 269). There is no hint that she plays a significant part in her husband's death and consequently no reason to suppose that she is killed by Orestes: rather, she commits suicide in shame (Od. 3.269). In the Nekyia on the

---

It is interesting to observe the absence of the Odyssean picture of mass-slaughter from early specimens of plastic art: it appears only on late examples, for instance Etruscan sarcophagi and Megarian bowls which can be shown to owe a good deal to Etruscan and Hellenistic taste (c.f. Davreux, pp.216ff figs. 117 - 119; Brunn, Rilievi Delle Urne Etrusche (1870) 1.92, pls. 74.1-2, 75.3, 80.4, D. Levi, Gortina 276. (I owe all these references to Dr. Prag).
contrary, we are faced with a far more active character
who is responsible for the plot against her husband's life
(Od. 11.429, 439) who slays Cassandra (Od. 11.421ff) and
Agamemnon (Od. 11.430 = 24.200) and who is killed in
revenge by her son. For, in the words of the most famous
exponent of this view, who saw in it a proof of the status
of Book Eleven as a late addition, "wenn Klytaimnestra
... gemordet hat, muss sie auch gemordet werden. damit ist die
spätere, eben auch stesichorisch-pindarische Orestfabel da.
die Telemachie kennt sie nicht; die Nekyia muss sie
gekannt haben." (Wilamowitz, Homerische Untersuchungen
p.156). 1

Against all of which a Unitarian might protest what even
the most rabid dissecters must admit: "certo non si potra
negare che i due racconti abbiano elementi in comune
(Ferrari p.3). Indeed, the main facts are surely the same
in both Nekyia and Telemachy: Clytemnestra was a willing
wanton (Od. 3.272 = 422: τὴν δ᾿ ἑδέλων ἑδέλουσαν ἀνήγαγεν
δνδε δνμνδε), Agamemnon was murdered at a feast (Od. 4.
535, 11.419), like an ox at a stall (Od. 4.535, 11.411), in
Aegisthus' palace to which he had been invited (Od. 4.532,
11.410); Clytemnestra was there (Od. 3.235, 4.92, 11.422,
24.97); and the entire followings of Agamemnon and Aegisthus
wiped each other out (Od. 4.536f, 2 11.412, 24.21). 3

1 For more recent attempts (on totally different grounds) to
prove the Nekyia a later addition, see Page, The Homeric
Odyssey (1955) ch.2.

2 See above p.792 n.l.

3 To say with Ferrari of some of these correspondences "sono
Nevertheless, there is clearly a difference of emphasis between Telemachy and Nekyia. Bethe's explanation (Homer, Dichtung und Saga 2.2 (Kyklos) 272ff; R-E 21.891), that the differences were due to the narrators of each version, is inadequate, but its feet are set on the right tracks. Nowadays there is a general recognition of the paradigmatic function of the Odyssey's frequent references to the multifarious activities of the House of Atreus: Agamemnon is paradigm and foil to Odysseus, Clytemnestra to Penelope, Orestes to Telemachus, Aegisthus to the suitors. Here, then, is a third reason why Homeric myths often differ from the more familiar versions: in addition to the revision or total omission of the frightening and unheroic, we find a remoulding of their substance to form παραδείγματα. Indeed, the notion of the paradigm would seem to be replacing the Analytic method as the modern way of explaining mythical inconsistencies. It certainly achieves this end in the case of the Orestes myth in the Odyssey. But to illustrate this fully one would need more

(contd..)

3da riferirsi a tradizioni inferiori" (p.2) is to beg any number of questions.

1See, for instance Düring p.95 and more recently U. Hölscher, "Die Atrideusage in der Odysee", Festschr. R. Alewyn (Könln - Granz 1967) 1-16. E.F. D'Arms and K.K. Hulley, "The Oresteia-story in the Odyssey", T.A.P.A. 77 (1946) 211-213, suggest that these paradigmatic references are meant to transfer the lustre belonging to the famous mythical family of Atreus to the comparatively obscure house of Odysseus.

2All three motives have affected the myth of Orestes here and that of Meleager in 11.9.

space to expatiate on the context of each allusion as has been done by During (pp.95ff), Lesky (pp.13ff).

Here I can only list the relevant loci: Od. 1-32ff, 298ff, 3-193ff, 232ff, 254ff, 301ff, 4-90ff, 514ff, 11-405ff, 421ff, 444ff, 24-97ff. As at least partial compensation for my inability to discuss these passages here, I may be allowed to quote the eloquent and sensitive remarks of Miss Lorimer (Homer and the Monuments (1950) p.519) which express my own views almost exactly. In Menelaus' account of his brother's homecoming "there is no mention of Clytemnestra or Cassandra, and for this reason the tale has sometimes been said to be inconsistent with that in the Nekyia ... but the criticism is unjust. In the previous mentions of Agamemnon's end curiosity has been aroused and suspense created; now the narrative hitherto withheld is unfolded just so far as is necessary to prepare us for the scene in Hades, for which the climax of horror, the direct participation of his wife, must be reserved to be told by the murdered man himself. With his fate that of Cassandra is bound up. There is no discrepancy here, but a masterly economy of disclosure" (my italics).

The paradeigmatic technique explains the prominence of Aegisthus in the Telemachy, where he is often brought forward as a parallel to the suitors for Telemachus' enlightenment, and also Clytemnestra's apparently disproportionate importance in Book Eleven, where - this time for Odysseus' benefit - she is Penelope's foil. We
need not follow the Analysts in supposing that the Nekyia has been grafted on to a tradition which saw Aegisthus as the main actor. Our paradeigma theory would more naturally presuppose a tradition wherein the unfaithful wife and her lover were at least equal partners in crime, and we could then proceed to argue that for ad hoc reasons the latter's rôle had been inflated in the Telemachy, the former's in the Nekyia. Others would go further. Lesky suggested (p.15) and M.I. Davies has accepted (pp.238f) the idea that Homer knew a tradition in which Clytemnestra was the more active accomplice: this has been altered paradigmatis causa in the early part of the poem to bring Aegisthus' guilt to the fore. An interesting theory which presents a reverse-image of the old Analyst argument. But it seems to be supported by the evidence of art. A bronze shieldband conclusively dateable to 575-550 B.C. (E. Kunze, Olympische Forschungen 2 (Archaische Schildbänder 1C (Berlin 1950)) 167-8, 242-3, pis. 1', 18, 73 = Vermeule p.13 [4] plate 7, fig.20A = Denkmälerlisten 3·7·3) shows a woman grabbing and stabbing a man from behind with a sword, while a second man on the right holds the helpless victim by the neck in a hammerlock: the trio almost certainly represents Clytemnestra, Agamemnon, and Aegisthus.2

1 He argues from the absence of Aegisthus in Od. 11·421-5, 430, and 24·194-200, which I do not regard as decisive, for reasons rehearsed above.

2 Aegisthus and Clytemnestra are both active participants in the earliest plastic representation of Agamemnon's
A version with the wife taking the lead in murder is exactly the kind of tale which Homer would want to revise anyway, regardless of paradigmatic considerations, because of his aversion to killings within the family. It may also seem more primitive and compact in comparison with the idea of an equal collusion in crime. If we accept its existence, we will find that the questions we must ask about S's rôle in the evolution of the Orestes saga are already more complex than we originally suspected. A linear development of Clytemnæstra's part in the murder, for instance, is no longer to be envisaged. We are not to ask whether S. was the first poet to depict her as sole murderer; rather was he the first to restore her to her rightful status in the tradition from which Homer expelled her. Likewise with Electra, Iphigenia, and the Erinyes: not who "invented" them or their role in the saga, but who was the first to express their place in the tradition through the medium of literature.

Sometimes Hesiod and the cyclic epic will carry on Homer's "expurgation" of a myth (as in the case of the Meleager legend: see my Introduction to S's Συμοδήματα) sometimes they (contd...)

murder (the terracotta plaque from Gortyn: see below p. 985f) which can plausibly be interpreted as showing a Clytemnæstra who actually wields the murder weapon while Aegisthus merely holds down the victim as on the shieldband mentioned above. Clytemnæstra is also an active participant on the seventh century Argive strap which depicts the death of Cassandra (see below p. 977) and the joint responsibility of both Aegisthus and Clytemnæstra is implied by the Ram Jug Painter's crater (see below p. 966) dateable to c. 670 - 650.
will revert to the more savage and primitive version. The Nostoi may have done both, if Carl Robert was right in his interpretation of the letters on the Megarian bowl he published in Jahrb. d. deutsch. Arch. Inst. 34 (1919) pp 72ff and pl.6 (Berlin inv. 4996; see further A. Severyns, Le Cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque (Liège/Paris, 1928) 402ff, and J. Davreux 216ff, figs. 117 - 119).¹

This shows, from left to right, Clytemnestra pouncing upon Cassandra, lifting her sword high all the while and grasping her enemy by the hair with her left hand. Priam's daughter has sunk to her knees and is raising her right hand in self-defence against Clytemnestra, her left in a pitiful gesture to heaven. At Clytemnestra's feet we see Agamemnon reposing at table, a wreath of flowers in his hair, a goblet in his left hand. His right hand is stretched out in defence against Aegisthus, who is assaulting him with a sword. In between the two men Cassandra appears again, tearing her locks in despair. Behind Agamemnon can be seen three of his comrades, sans weapons, being attacked by some of Aegisthus' men. The names of all the characters are inscribed, even those of Agamemnon's and Aegisthus' men, and there are further letters to tell us the scene represents an event en tòv [Νό]ς [των Ἀ]χ[αί]ῶν Ἐδανατος Ἀγαμέμνονος and [κατὰ τῶν ποιητῶν] Ἀ[γ]αμ. If the single vowel can truly conjure up the

¹These scholars date the work to the fourth or third century B.C., but Professor Robertson informs me that the third or second centuries "would be more in accord with modern ideas."
other letters of this last phrase we might suppose we possessed valuable evidence that Hagias' poem described Agamemnon's death in a way very similar to Homer: no mention yet of the bath and robe, but the same heroic feast and epic plenitude of detail, extending even to the naming of the unimportant personages in the ἔρωτα of Agamemnon and Aegisthus. But the bowl's contamination of the Nostoi’s account with the Odyssey's (see the above mentioned scholars) renders such a conclusion hazardous. Otherwise we must turn to Proclus for our knowledge of the epic cycle's treatment of this particular myth. And he suggests that several details, formerly banned, were now being granted literary treatment. Iphigenia's sacrifice— and rescue— were mentioned in the Cypria (for further consideration of this point see my commentary on 215 P). And here is his frustratingly terse summary of the final part of the Nostoi: ἔπειτα Ἀγαμήμονον ὑπὸ Αἴγισθος καὶ Κλειταμῆς ἔρωτα ἀναπολοῦσα ὑπὸ Ὀρέστου καὶ Πυλίδου τιμωρία, καὶ Μενελᾶος ἐλε τὴν οἰκείαν ἀνακομιδή (Allen p.109).¹ Scholars have not been slow to detect the correlation here between what seems to be a quite unambiguous statement that Clytemnestra actively helped kill her husband, the vengeance apparently exacted upon her as well as Aegisthus, and the literary début of Pylades. No-one should put too

¹Robert (Bild und Lied pp.161f) argued that Proclus' survey could be a summary of Od. 3·304-312, and supposed that Hagias' version was very similar to the first of the two traditions about Agamemnon's death (that outside the Nekyia) which he believed the Odyssey to contain.
much faith in the first two details taken in isolation, since they could quite easily be the offspring of over-compression and muddle on Proclus' part. However, the appearance of Pylades for the first time in literature seems to confirm their worth: does not later tradition consistently portray him as the son of Strophius king of Phocis, the land of Apollo's oracle,¹ and is not Apollo the deity who promotes the matricide - hence his omission from the scene in Od. 3? Ferrari's suggestion that when Orestes killed his mother in the Nostoi he was merely punishing her for adultery has nothing to commend it. It is the anachronistic argument of a fanatical Analyst who believes that part of the Odyssey knows nothing of a Clytemnestra active in crime, and can envisage with equanimity the epic cycle's literary influence upon Homer. Hesiod, like the Cypria, touched on Iphigenia's sacrifice (see my commentary on 215P (pp.908ff). More significantly, his Eoeae included a survey of the eventful careers, as well as the offspring, of Leda's daughters. Clytemnestra is there, of course, with her daughters and her son Orestes:

¹Little need be said here of Wilamowitz's pet theory of a "Delphic epos" which played an important part in the evolution of an evil Clytemnestra. The idea has won small approval outside the admittedly vast circle of its "onlie begetter"'s writings, where it is stoutly maintained: see Aischylos Orestie ... Das Opfer am Grabe (1896) 246ff; the Introduction to his translation of the Choephoroi (Gr. Trag. 2 (1900) 135); Aisch. Interp. (1914) 192; Pindaros (1922) 261; Glaube d. Hell. 2 (1932) 39. Adequate refutation by Lesky, Hermes 66 (1931) 194 = Ges. Schr. (1966) 95, R-E 18 (1939) 978, and W.S. 1 (1967) 9. Not that we need discount the possibility of Delphic influence (as opposed to a fully-fledged poem) on the development of the tradition, as Lesky observes.
At last a clear and irrefutable piece of evidence: Hesiod explicitly stated that Orestes killed his own mother: this should surely imply that she in turn had killed his father. Even before the publication of P. Oxy. 2481 in 1962 scholars (in particular Ferrari and Kunst) had suggested that a lost recension of the Eoeae on Clytemnestra was the source for the more active murderess of the Nekyia and the Nostoi - unlikely, for a variety of reasons - and for S's similar picture. Hes. fr.176.5-6 MW (δε δε Κλυταιμήστρη ἄγαμμον δίον Ἀγαμῆμονα δίον Ἀγάμημον Παρέλειπο καὶ εἴλτο χεῖρον’ ἀκοίτην) were too tame to bear out the second half of this theory, but the new fragment is a different matter. Homer keeps quiet about the matricide and is ambiguous about the full rôle played by Clytemnestra in her husband's death. Hesiod freely admits the first, and there is no reason to suppose he was any less candid about the second.

We are now on very treacherous ground: firstly we must be careful not to exaggerate the importance of Hesiod as did

---

1For the most likely supplement of this word, see my note on S 15 ii 5.
2Not least the anachronistic concept of "sources": see p.785f n.1 above.
3As is pointed out by e.g. Lesky p.10.
Ferrari and others, eager to diminish S's reputation here as a mythical innovator. Hesiod cannot conceivably have been the source for every feature in S. On the one hand we now know that Hesiod named Electra (23A·16), mentioned Iphigenia's sacrifice (23A·17ff), inserted Pleisthenes into the Pelopid family-tree (194), and stated that Orestes killed his mother (23A·27ff above). None of these features, then, was introduced to poetry by S. On the other hand, the Spartan elements of the Oresteia, - the Lacedaemonian setting (216 P), the murderess' snake-dream (219), perhaps the name of the nurse (218),- are unlikely to have been invented by the Boeotian poet or his school.¹ Likewise the details mentioned in 217 P, - the recognition signs and the bow of Apollo - are definitely non-Homeric. But since the commentator who is our source is discussing S's influence upon tragedy, not epic's influence upon S., we must leave open the remote possibility that he has passed over earlier occurrences of these themes just as he fails to tell us that S. was anticipated by the Cypria in the ruse whereby Iphigenia was brought to Aulis.² There still remain a number of features which in theory might have received their first literary treatment at the hands of either poet. These include the motivation of Clytemnestra's actions by Iphigenia's sacrifice, the queen's

¹Though if an Hesiodic εἰς Ὑλοῦν of Helen indicates Boeotian awareness of a very Spartan tradition, we cannot exclude the theoretical possibility that other Lacedaemonian elements found their way into Hesiodic Catalogue-poetry.

²On the reasons for this omission see my note ad loc. (p.944 n.1).
major part in the murder, the axe as her chosen instrument, Orestes' pursuit by the Furies. Certainty about any of these is impossible, but it is my view that as soon as Iphigenia's sacrifice was mentioned it must have become at once a provocation to murder, and that as soon as Orestes was depicted as a matricide, the Erinyes will have been baying at his heels. I would guess then - and it is no more than a guess - that since Hesiod had the first and third of these, he will also have had the second and fourth, even though they are attested only for S. The axe and Clytemnestra's rôle as murderer-in-chief are more problematic still. I can devise no means of deciding priority here, except to stress that there is no proof at all of their appearance in Hesiod, ample evidence for their importance in S. Hence it would be extravagant to adopt the principle that they must be Hesiodic unless proved otherwise, and only moderately rash to suppose the same for S. But even without the aid of these ambiguous motifs, S's standing as a mythical innovator would be the exact opposite of contemptible, since he has to his credit the Spartan colouring mentioned above¹ and probably the first two details listed in 217 P.

We know of three other lyricblings of the myth² which

¹See further below pp. 869ff.
²I say nothing of Corinna's ΟΡΕΣΤΑΣ (690-8-12 P) of which we do not even know the date: see most recently M.L. West, C.Q. 20 (1970) 277ff.
together throw very little light on S's poem. Of Xanthus' and Simonides' poems (699 - 700 P and 549 P) we know next to nothing. I treat the former in an appendix (below pp. 955) and for the latter I would refer to E. Vermeule, A.J.A. 70 (1966) 12 for unintentional proof that we can say nothing of value about his Oresteia, even if it be enriched by P. Oxy. 2434 fr.1A (608 P). Pindar Pyth. 11.16ff has survived of course, and some have hoped for traces of S's influence upon it: τὸν δὴ φονευμένου πατρὸς Ἀρείνα Κλαταμῆστρας | χειρὸν ὑπὸ κρατερῶν ἐκ δόλου τραφὸς ἀνελε ὑπεπνέθεσοι, ὁποτέ Δαρδανίδα κόραν Πρίαμου | Κακκάνδραν πολιώτερα καλκώτερα κῦν Ἀγαμεμνόνιαι | ψυχαῖ πόρευ | Ἀχέροντος ἀκτῶν παρ' ἐδκλινον | νηλῆς γυνᾶ, πότερον νῦν ἄρ' Ἰφιγένει' ἐπ' Εὐρ[…] | σωφρονέται τῆλε πάτρας | ἐκνιζεν βαρυπάλαιμον δρασι χόλων; | ἡ ἐτέρω λέχει δαμαζομένων | ἐννυχοι πάραγον κοσταὶ; τὸ δὲ νεαις ἀλόχοις | ἐχθιστον ἀμπλάκιον καλύψαι τ' ἀμάχανον | ἀλλοτρίαις γλώσσαις | κακωλύγοι δὲ πολίται | ἐκεί το γὰρ δόξος οὐ μείνα φθόνον' | δὴ καμπάδα πνεῶν ἀφαντὸν βρέμει | δὰνεν μὲν αὐτὸς ἥρως Ἀτρείδας | ἱκών χρώνω κλειτάις ἐν 'Αμφικλαίς | μάλιν τ' δλεςε κόραν, ἐπεὶ ἅμω | Ἐλέναια πυρωθέντων | Τραύνων ἐλυσε δόμους ἅβροτος. δ' ζήρα γέροντα ἕγεν Στρόφιον | ἐξηκετο, νέα κεφαλά, | Παρνασσῶν πόδα ναιοῦν' ἀλλὰ χρονιῶι κῦν | Ἄρει | πέφυκεν τε ματέρα θηκὲ τ' Ἄγισθον ἐν φοναίς. Of course if Pindar were drawing upon S's handling of the myth here, we would have a valuable supplement to the

---

1On the accentuation of this name see below p. 818 n. 2.
meagre store of facts about the Oresteia listed above. ¹ But Ingemar Düring argued as strongly as the case will allow that Pindar was influenced by Aeschylus' vivid enactment of the theme, and this, if true, would muddy Pindar's clear reflection of his Sicilian predecessor. External evidence for the date of Pythian 11 is divided, and of the two possible datings for this epinician one would place it before, the other after Aeschylus' Oresteia.² Luckily, this is one morass into which we need not sink, since we may be pretty sure that Pindar was not affected by the Attic tragedian, either because the trilogy was not yet composed, or through sheer ignorance or indifference. Despite the allure of apparent verbal similarities,³ no man in his right mind could overlook the serious discrepancies between lyric and dramatic poet's respective treatments. If Pindar had been intent on copying his contemporary, would he really have set the scene in Amyclae rather than Argo, and called Orestes' nurse by the heroic name of Arsinoe rather than by the slave name of Cilissa which the Athenian gave her?⁴ And are we to suppose he never read past the middle of the

¹Ferrari (p.14) suggested that Pindar learnt of S.'s Western Greek version of the Orestes myth while at Sicily in 476; but S. was always popular in mainland Greece (see my note on 210 P (p.884f)) and possibly composed his Oresteia there.

²The best single discussion of the choice between 474 and 454 is that by P. von der Mühll, Mus. Helv. 15 (1958) 141ff = Kl. Schr. 174ff.

³On which see especially Düring 109ff, Bowra C.Q. 30 (1936) 140-1.

⁴So e.g. Lesky pp.6-7.
Choephori or forgot about Aeschylus' memorable depiction of the Erinyes? For he never mentions them. But if these differences are enough to rule out Pindar's dependence on Aeschylus, do not they - at least the last two - also rule out his dependence on S.? For S's nurse is called Laodamia not Arsinoe, and S. has the Erinyes whom Pindar omits. If we thought there was any substance in the scholia's claim\(^1\) that Pindar's πολιώτι καμωτι refers to a sword (2.257.18 Dr.) we would have a third discrepancy on our hands, since S. made Clytemnestra use an axe as her murder weapon.

Against these two obstinate points of conflict we can set agreement on the nurse's act and the Spartan setting. I argue elsewhere (p.934f) that there is no real contrast between Pindar's placing of Agamemnon in the town Amyclae and S's supposedly more general setting in Lacedaemon. Apart from this, all we can say is that there is no proof that S. did not precede Pindar in mentioning Cassandra or Strophius. The first of these characters was probably an accepted part of the tradition by the time of the Iliad (see above p.785) and is killed at Agamemnon's side in the Odyssey.

And Düring was surely right to infer from the undecided form of Pindar's double-question on Clytemnestra's motivation that the first alternative is not Pindar's invention.

---

\(^1\) Accepted by Fraenkel (Ag. 2.809) and Schefold, Frühgr. Sagenbilder (Munich 1964) p.88 = Myth and Legend in early Greek Art (London 1966) p.94. See below 979.
One does not casually introduce grief for Iphigenia as a new element in the queen's crime by doubting whether it is true, or by linking it with an already familiar motive. And yet this is the earliest occasion upon which we encounter the idea in extant literature: the epic tradition, as far as we know, provided Clytemnestra with only two reasons for killing her husband: her adultery with Aegisthus and her jealousy of Cassandra. Someone has devised Iphigenia's sacrifice as a third piece of over-motivation. We know that the Cypria, Hesiod, and S., all mentioned Iphigenia's sacrifice at Aulis. But the epic poem is perhaps the least likely to have made this a cause of Agamemnon's death, since that sad event did not fall within the limits of the Cypria.

Wilamowitz (Pindaros p.261) saw in ll. 9-10 of this epinician an allusion to Apollo's authorisation of the matricide (Θέμνη λεον Πυθώνα τε καὶ ὀρθοδίκα νιγᾶς ὠμφαλὸν), and others have seen in Pindar's failure to comment on the act an indication that S. too did not treat it as a crime, as if Pindar's silence were not obtained by his omission of S.'s Erinyes! It is high time to assert that Pythian 11 is no reliable mirror for S's earlier poem. Pindar seems to be treating his myth as idiosyncratically here as he does the tale of Pelops in Olympian 1 for instance (where Myrtilus' curse is deliberately excluded). Given Pindar's predilection for things Dorian, his adoption of a Spartan setting need not bemuse: who can say whether he
actually used his predecessor as a literary source to be followed with considerable modifications, or rather independently adapted the same local tradition which S. had plundered? And likewise with the nurse's rôle. So far we have tried to determine the originality of S's Oresteia by reconstructing the tradition before his time. Post-Stesichorean treatments might be indebted for details to the Sicilian poet, but the case of Pindar has warned us not to be too sanguine about the use of other poems for rebuilding the lyric Oresteia. Attic tragedy indeed presents us with a peculiar problem: it is rich in incidents concerning the House of Atreus, any number of which might in theory derive from S. But it is impossible to tell, without the aid of ancient evidence such as 217 P provides. Of course guesses have been made independently of such help, especially in the presence of anomalies. To restrict ourselves to Aeschylus (who is nearest in time to S. and thus most likely to have been influenced), even before 1962 scholars had suspected that the Choephori's recognition tokens owed their existence to S.¹ More recently A. Lebeck has speculated that the robe which figures so prominently in the Agamemnon "is a traditional "given" rather than an invention of Aeschylus" (The Oresteia: a study in Language and Structure (1971) p.63). For a particularly interesting case we must return to the Choephori. In 554ff of that play, Orestes outlines his

plans for killing Aegisthus: several scholars\(^1\) have been impressed by the discrepancy they find between this plan for vengeance and the actual course of events: the chorus is told to keep quiet, but instead it tells the Nurse; Orestes envisages that the palace door will be shut in his face until the threat of a bad reputation forces Aegisthus to open: in fact Orestes enters with ease; a Phocian accent for both Orestes and Pylades is promised but does not materialise; finally Orestes does not find Aegisthus on the throne of Agamemnon, but Aegisthus comes across him. These disappointed expectations have an independent life of their own, some have thought. Were they perhaps borrowed from S?

Only someone so unfamiliar with the conventions of Attic tragedy that he genuinely expects a character therein to start spouting Phocian would be unduly upset by most of these "inconsistencies". In particular the tragic device of leading the audience to expect one thing and then presenting them with another is so much the antithesis of rare that one might think S's influence a superfluous hypothesis. But the picture of Aegisthus paying for his crimes on the very throne he has usurped is striking (Cho. 571f):

\[ \varepsilon \delta'\hat{o}\nu \dot{\alpha}m\epsilon i\acute{\iota}v \betaal\acute{o}n \dot{\epsilon}rkei\acute{\iota}v \piul\acute{o}n \]
\[ \kappa\acute{a}kei\acute{\iota}v \in \dot{\alpha}r\delta\nu\hat{\iota}c\acute{i}v \dot{\varepsilon}u\rho\acute{\eta}c\acute{\iota} \nu\acute{a}tr\acute{o}c \kappa\acute{t}l. \]

In 1881, Carl Robert suggested (Bild und Lied p.179 n.28) that this picture came from S. His reason for this was not concern over dramatic inconsistency but his awareness that Aegisthus' death ἐν Ὀρόνοις Ἀγμέμνονος was a common scene in vase paintings. Left to recover S's Oresteia from purely literary sources of a post-Stesichorean date we are bound to flounder. Let us see whether the evidence of art can help us.
THE EVIDENCE OF ART

Carl Robert was the earliest scholar to suggest how the evidence of Greek vases might be used to supplement our literary testimonia on the contents of S's Oresteia. This he did in the fifth brilliant chapter of Bild und Lied (Der Tod des Aigisthos pp. 149ff), a masterly piece of detective work which is still exciting to read in spite of the weaknesses brought to light by the passage of time. Robert took as the starting point of his chapter six red-figure Attic vases depicting the death of Aegisthus. I list them here, adding to the usual references their paragraph and plate and figure numbers in Emily Vermeule's useful survey of artistic representations of the Oresteia myth (A.J.A. 10 (1966) pp. 13 - 19 and plates 1 - 8).

The initial identifying letters I take over from Robert for convenience's sake.

A Red-figure pelike by the young Berlin Painter (510-500)
Vienna 3725: ARV\(^2\) 204 (109) 1633 = Paralipom. 342-109

---

1 I have been helped more than I can say in bringing Robert's survey up to date, by A. Prag's unpublished thesis (mentioned above p. 781 on the Oresteia in art.

2 The results are lucidly summarised by Jebb (Electra pp. xv-xxii). They were never accepted by Wilamowitz who continued to rail against them in Aisch. Orestie ... Das Opfer am Grabe (1896) 246; Gr. Tr. 2-135ff Aisch. Interp. (1914) 192; Pindaros (1922) 261. Opposition also from Brunn, Kl. Schr. 3-151, Mancuso 213ff, Vürtheim p. 51: and see further below pp. 824ff.
B Brommer Vasenlisten$^3$ 448·B1 = Vermeule p.14$^6$ 9 pl. 6 fig. 12

B Stamnos by the Copenhagen Painter (475-470)
Berlin 2184: ARV$^2$ 257·6 = Brommer Vasenlisten$^3$ 321·B5 = Vermeule p.15$^6$ 13 pl.6 fig.13

C Fragmentary cup signed by Kachrylion as potter (510-500)
Roman Market : ARV$^2$ 108·29 = Brommer Vasenlisten$^3$ 448·B2 = Vermeule p.15$^6$ 10
Beazley, Campana fragments in Florence p.10 (on pl.4 B 19 and 42) pl.Y 13

D Baseggio Amphora (Etruscan "overpainter" amphora by Jahn Painter) (475 - 465)
Philadelphia 48 - 30 - 2: Beazley, Etruscan Vase Painting 195·4 = Brommer Vasenlisten$^3$ 321·D1 = Vermeule p.17$^6$ 25 pl.7 fig.16

E Column krater
Bologna 230: ARV$^2$ 504·8 = Brommer Vasenlisten$^3$ 449·B9 = Vermeule p.16$^6$ 15 pl.6 fig.14

F Column krater
Vienna 1103: ARV$^2$ 277 = Brommer Vasenlisten$^3$ 448·B4 = Vermeule p.17$^6$ 21

G Red-figure cup by Brygos Painter (480 - 70)
Once Berlin F 2301 now lost: ARV$^2$ 378·129 = Brommer Vasenlisten$^3$ 449·3

Most of the relevant bibliography on these vases will be found ad locc. in Beazley and Vermeule. It must be noted
that Robert's investigations were based on a far smaller range of vases than is now available to us. The present picture is much more complex thanks to vase-finds over the past century. To Robert's list of vases depicting the murder of Aegisthus a large number of additions can now be made: see below pp. 824ff.

Robert began with B (pp. 150ff) a stamnos showing four figures, each conveniently labelled: Orestes in full armour¹ (Attic helmet, greaves, cuirass, scabbard and baldric) and chitoniscus, has delivered a mortal wound with the sword held in his right hand to the right breast of the enthroned Aegisthus. He is grasping the back of Aegisthus' head with his left hand, while the usurper clutches at Orestes' sword-arm with his right. Orestes is looking straight at his victim - just the thing not to do, since Clytemnestra, brandishing a small double-axe, comes up from the left (clad in peplos and chiton but without an himation; that is, wearing indoor clothes) and is standing so close behind him that it is hard to see just how he can escape death at his mother's hands. This despite the anguished warning gesture of Electra, who comes up from the right behind the dying Aegisthus - he is staggering back under the impact of Orestes' blow - and points an outstretched right hand at Clytemnestra while

¹ Robert p. 179 n. 27, observing that Orestes appears in armour on a vast number of the relevant vases concluded that in one literary version (probably S.'s) that hero posed as a warrior who had slain Orestes in battle. This motif features in Hygin. fab. 119, but the armour is as likely to be a purely pictorial device.
raising her left to clutch at her hair-ribbon as if to pull it off. A disturbing and puzzling scene, which is to be explained by comparison with other vase-paintings. D for instance (Robert pp 152f), which belongs to a later date and shows Aegisthus sunk on one knee and supporting himself with his sceptre. Orestes, clad in short chiton and chlamys, is ready to deal the fatal blow. Behind him stands a similarly dressed man, identified by Robert as Agamemnon's herald Talthybius. Behind Aegisthus, Clytemnestra is again swinging her axe, and there are also four female figures.

But it is vase A which provides "die definitive Entscheidung der Frage" (Robert pp 153ff). Of earlier date than B and D, it presents us with Orestes on the one side wearing cuirass and baldric but no helmet or greaves, and plunging his sword into Aegisthus' profusely bleeding chest which bears the marks of a further wound besides. Aegisthus is falling from his throne, but Orestes, more circumspect than his counterpart on B, has turned his face away from his victim to glance to the left at Clytemnestra. She, clad in house clothes, is striding from left to right.

1Welcker (in Annali dell'Instituto di Correspondenza Archeologica 15 (1853) 274ff) had suggested he was Pylades. See contra Robert pp.50ff.

2Welcker (sup. cit. in previous note) thought these represented the ghost of Clytemnestra and three Erinyes. For refutation see Robert p.152 who interprets them as four onlooking servant maids. Alternatively, Prag proposes that one of them be identified (because of her apparent gestures of agitation) with Chrysothemis.

3As in B, the Foce del Sele scene, and elsewhere.
on the other side of the vase, coming to Aegisthus' rescue with a double axe in her now familiar motherly way. But an old bearded man, wearing a conical herald's hat, is frustrating her intent by gripping her right arm with his left hand, the axe with his right. Between Talthybius - for it is he - and Clytemnestra stands Chrysothemis (we are back now on the first side of the vase) raising her hands to express horror. As on B each character is securely identified with a label. The five figures appear together here for the first time. "Kein Zweifel", as Robert remarks (p.155) "dass wir hier die ursprüngliche Komposition vor uns haben, kein Zweifel, dass auch der Zeichner von B dieselbe Sagenversion und sogar ziemlich genau denselben Moment darstellen wollte, dass er demselben Typus folgt, wie der Zeichner von A." But B has omitted, from considerations of symmetry or convenience, the crucial figure of Talthybius, who saves Orestes from Clytemnestra's motherly attentions. On the other hand, B's Electra is closer to the original archetype than A's Chrysothemis. It is clear that the "type" which underlies this group of vases as interpreted by Robert contained the following events: Orestes in full armour pierces Aegisthus' breast with a sword; Aegisthus falls from his throne; Clytemnestra

1Contrast the Sicilian metope's Nurse (below pp&ff).

2No-one will wish to be dogmatic about the precise nature of this "type", but several scholars have felt that it was not the actual Oresteia of S.; rather, a wall-painting of Aegisthus' death based on that poem, formed an intermediate stage.
rushes up behind Orestes with an axe; Electra, standing at the back of Aegisthus, cries out in horror to her brother, but Talthybius has already thwarted Clytemnestra's intent. It is equally clear that such a version of "der Tod des Aigisthos" is unparalleled by any extant literary treatment of that happy event. Of the Attic tragedians neither Sophocles nor Euripides can be responsible: the latter has the usurper killed far from the palace, the former sets it within the palace certainly, but after the death of Clytemnestra. Aeschylus' Choephoroi comes closest to the required pattern: in the palace and before the queen's departure from life. More important, when Clytemnestra hears that "the dead are killing the living," she cries to a slave (889f):

δοιή τις ἄνδροκμήτα πέλεκουν, δε τάχος' εἴδομεν εἰ νιπώμεν, ἢ νικώμεθα.

But vase A is to be dated earlier than Aeschylus' trilogy on grounds of style. And it is most unlikely that a vase painter would pluck from the whole fabric of the play this single line's unfulfilled suggestion and convert it into a reality given vivid form by the lively participation of Electra and Talthybius - a participation invented de novo by the plastic artist without the slightest prompting from Aeschylus. Far more plausible, surely, to suppose that the Choephoroi passage echoes an earlier literary treatment wherein Clytemnestra did get hold of an axe, the same poem which our vases reflect more directly than Aeschylus. This sends us back further in time in our search for the
source-poem. Robert (pp.162f) rightly excludes the Odyssey as too ambivalent about Clytemnestra's fate and too silent about Electra and Talthybius to have inspired the vases.

Robert next considered the significance of Talthybius' role on the vases (pp.164ff). His decisive intervention to save Orestes presupposes a prior arrangement with him according to Robert.¹ And Nicolaus of Damascus would seem to offer us valuable evidence:

Exc. de Inscript. p.8·29 = Nic. Damasc. F. Gr. Hist. 90 F 25:

δι ποιεσίαν Ἀγαμέμνονα κτείνας τὸν βασιλέα συμβολῆς τῆς γυναικὸς κλυταιμήστρας καὶ τὸν Ὄρεστην τοῦ τοῦ "Ἀγαμέμνονος υἱὸν ἐμελλέν ἀνελεῖν. τοῦτον δὲ ἐρρύσατο Ταλθύβιος ἔξαρπάσας καὶ ἐκθέμενος εἰς τὴν Φωκίδα παρὰ Στροφίον.² διεκάτω δ’ ἔτει ἐκ Φωκέων ἐλθὼν μετὰ Πυλάδου τοῦ Στροφίου Αἴγισθον καὶ τὴν μητέρα κτείνας τῶν Μυκηνῶν ἔβασιλευεν. Εὐλευμένος εἰς ὑπὸ τῶν Αἴγισθον φίλων ³(κατὰ εἰς τὸν πλείστον λόγον ὑπὸ Ἐρινών) ὡς ἐναγῆς, θεοῦ κελεύομας εἰς Ἀθήνας ἀφίκετο καὶ ἐν Ἀρείων πάγωι κρίθες ἀπέφυγεν. αὕτη ἡ δίκη φόνου τετάρτη ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐκρίθη.⁴

If this were part of the same tradition as that represented by the vases, we would have reconstructed a sequence

¹Against this assumption see below pp.832ff.
²On the accentuation of this name (which Jacoby gets wrong) see Fraenkel on Ag. 881 (2·396).
³For an explanation of this phrase see below pp.902ff.
⁴Robert also cites Dictys Cretensis 6·2: Talthybius Oresten Agamemnonis filium manibus Aegisthi ereptum Idomeneo, qui apud Corinthum agebat, tradidit.
whereby Agamemnon's faithful herald saved Orestes from death as a child by carrying him away to Phocis and later returned with him to help his re-enstatement as the rightful heir. And then Talthybius would be the original of the Sophoclean παιδαγωγός and the Euripidean πρέσβυς in the Attic tragedies called Electra. The parallel with Sophocles' drama is particularly close (c.f. El. 11-14, 1351-6, and 1327-38) since there the old guardian is said to have brought Orestes safe to Phocis and acts as watchkeeper during the recognition-scene. Euripides' senile retainer may be further from the model, but it is still he who saved Orestes (El. 556) and participates in the plan of revenge (650ff). The prominence of the ναυαγος in Aeschylus' Agamemnon may also be partly explicable on the assumption that Talthybius lies behind him.¹

A further point: since the vase tradition portrays brother and sister acting together in collusion, we must presuppose some meeting between the young man returning from exile and his palace-bound sister. For Electra to participate in such a meeting, she must have had some such excuse for leaving the palace as obtains at the beginning of the Choephori: Clytemnestra's dream. This deduction from the evidence of art has been strikingly confirmed by the papyrus find (217.11ff P) which tells us that Aeschylus derived τὸν ἄναγγελον διὰ τοῦ βοστρόχου from S. And

¹The earliest evidence for Talthybius' status as rescuer of Orestes is perhaps Hellanicus (c.f. Nicolaus Damasc. F. Gr. Hist. 90 F 25 which may be derived from Hellanicus: see Robert p.165, Jacoby ad loc 2C p.242)).
the terracotta reliefs from Melos in the developed archaic style found at the Piraeus and now in the Louvre (MNB: 906. Denkmalerlisten 3.326.3) may provide us with additional clues for valid conclusions. Robert discussed them pp. 167ff, and for further remarks with bibliography etc. see p. Jacobsthal, Die Melischen Reliefs (Berlin 1931) 11 no.1 13-16 pl.1 and passim. In the earlier conception of the scene,1 Electra sits plunged in grief on the topmost of three steps that represent the plinth of Agamemnon's stele. (Her name is clearly marked, but unfortunately this inscription, like the labelling of the monument with the name of Agamemnon, is a modern addition: see Jacobsthal sup. cit. pp.181-2). This grief is expressed by the way in which her left hand supports her head which is bowed forward in an attitude of mourning: her elbow rests on her left thigh; her himation is spread over her head.2 Three

1 Jacobsthal dates this "etwa von Ausgang der siebziger bis in die sechziger Jahre hinein" (pp.125-8, 147-153, 174); there are numerous other "Melian Reliefs" based on this original: they are dateable by such considerations as the style of the architectural settings they portray to 470-460 and later. Some of the more recent specimens reveal the influence of Aeschylus' Orestean trilogy, and there are complicating factors like retouching, and even downright forgery. We need not consider these here: full treatments in Jacobsthal sup. cit. The vase-paintings which depict the meeting of Agamemnon's offspring at his grave are for the most part late enough to have been influenced by Aeschylus' Choephori. For a possible exception see below p. 955 n.1.

2 There is no sign of the famous lock of hair on this relief, and since we now know that S. employed it as a token of recognition (217 P) it might be thought that its absence ruled out Stesichorean influence here. Not so: works of art dependent on Aeschylus' Choephori often omit the lock, important thought it is in that play: see L. Séchan, Études sur la Tragédie Grecque (1926) 91.
newly-arrived travellers (together with a horse) stand before her. The first is a male with herald's hat and staff; the second a young man of noble appearance standing beside the horse, with his left hand resting on his sword-hilt, his right raised to his chin. The third another youth clad in himation and with a pilos on his head. Near Electra and given considerable prominence stands the oivoxon holding the libation for Agamemnon. Behind Electra we see a female servant in profile. These figures all converge about the stele which stands off centre to the right.

Robert wished to identify the female servant with the Nurse; the first man, who speaks to Electra, as Talthybius rather than Pylades, since the former alone can be expected to recognise the girl from whose arms he had received the infant Orestes so long ago, and the object in his left hand can as well be a πηρόκειον as a spear. The second man will be Orestes. Robert was reluctant to identify the third with Pylades, who wins no place in his reconstruction: he would be too dangerous a threat to Talthybius' supremacy.

Most of these identifications have been plausibly disputed, and since Robert's reconstruction here begins to be in danger of falling apart, it will be convenient to remind the readers of its convincing aspects before proceeding to expose its shortcomings. Having eliminated epic and

1Wilamowitz, Aisch. Orestie ... Das Opfer am Grabe (1896) p.252, also identifies the figure with Talthybius.
tragedy as the sources of the tradition reflected in the vases and the Melos relief, Robert was, not unnaturally, attracted to that poem which we know to have portrayed the guilty queen as being disturbed by a nightmare concerning her husband: S's Oresteia (219 P: see Robert pp.172ff).

It now seems likelier than ever that there, as in Aeschylus' Choephori and the Relief, Electra came to be making the offering at her father's tomb because of her mother's dream. The closing of this final gap seemed in 1881 to open up vast portions of that poem previously inaccessible through literary evidence alone. What more impressive vindication of the use of archaeological illustrations to throw light on myth and literature? Thanks to their aid, Robert supposed, it was possible to draw up the following table of contents for S's Oresteia (pp.178ff):

Clytemnestra kills Agamemnon with an axe (Aeschylus,\(^1\) Sophocles, Vase G): the Nurse Laodamia entrusts the young Orestes to the faithful Taithybius (218 P, Nic. Damasc. F 25 Dict. Cret., Sophocles, Pindar) who removes him from harm's reach (to Phocis? see Apollo's rôle in 217 P). After 10 years, Clytemnestra dreams of the serpent with bloody head (219 P: compare Aeschylus, Sophocles etc.). Not daring to go in person herself, she sends Electra to Agamemnon's grave with an offering to the dead (Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Melos Relief). As she sits forlorn at the grave she is approached by Orestes and Taithybius

\(^1\)See below pp.975ff.
The Nurse Laodamia and Talthybius the herald facilitate a recognition scene (Sophocles and, more freely, Euripides, the Melos Relief, 217 P). Orestes draws his sword and vows revenge at his father's grave (the same sources). Orestes enters the palace guided by Electra (Vases A-C, E-F by implication) while Talthybius keeps watch (Sophocles). Orestes slays Aegisthus on the throne of Agamemnon (Vases: c.f. Aesch. Cho. 57 ff). Clytemnestra, hearing Aegisthus' cries, guesses the truth and rushes to his aid with the same axe she had used against Agamemnon: Electra's cry alerts her brother, but Talthybius has already pinioned the arms of the relentless queen (Vases: c.f. Aesch. Cho. 889 ff.) Her murder follows.

What is so impressive about this richly detailed list, is the wealth of supporting evidence. Clytemnestra's axe appears time and again on vases (as wielded both against Orestes and his father). It is even alluded to by Aeschylus and implied by one of the few actual Stesichorean fragments of the poem (219 P). Hardly less impressive is the frequency of Talthybius' appearance on vases and the regularity of his rôle: it is always he, not another, who restrains Clytemnestra, and yet on literary evidence alone we would never have suspected his appearance at all in S's Oresteia. Similarly with the frequency with which Aegisthus is killed inside the palace on Agamemnon's throne

\footnote{For discrepant views see below p.860f.}
- again backed up by an implication in the Choephori. No wonder Jebb was impressed by the theory (El. p.xxii).

For our faith in this reconstruction of S's Oresteia to be shaken we would have to encounter entirely new evidence: old works of art would have to be re-interpreted or new ones discovered. We would have to learn, for instance, that Robert was wrong to identify all the men who restrain Clytemnestra on his vases with Talthybius. Or we would have to hear of the discovery of a plastic representation of this scene with an entirely different character performing this task. Only then would the solidarity of the evidence for an underlying poem in which Talthybius twice saved Orestes be disturbed. And again, only if artefacts had come to light after Robert's essay which placed Aegisthus' death in a different locale from Agamemnon's palace and throne would we feel ready to reject the hypothesis that this is where S. had put them.

Unfortunately this is precisely what has happened. Re-evaluation and fresh finds have fatally weakened the base of Robert's grandiose structure. We now have at our disposal an infinitely wider range of artefacts which together conspire to present a very much more complex picture. First, a list of vases depicting the Aegisthophonia, which were unknown to Robert or not fully considered by him:

(1) The Boston Krater (A Calyx Krater by the Dokimasia Painter) Boston 63.1246: ARV² 1652 = Vasenlisten³
fully explored by Vermeule sup. cit. pp.1-10, pls. 1-4: see pp.851ff inf.

(2) A fragmentary stamnos by the Copenhagen Painter
Louvre C 11139: ARV$^2$ 257.7 = Brommer Vasenlisten$^3$
448.B6 = Vermeule p.16 § 14
first published by M.I. Davies, Op. Rom. 9 (1973) 117ff. It shows Clytemnestra with a double-axe reaching out to pull Orestes from his attack upon a seated and corseted Aegisthus. The outstretched right arm and foot of a figure who may be Electra are also included and the hem of this figure's chiton is clearly visible. Inscriptions on this vase include the beginning of Clytemnestra's name (Κλυ-) and above Orestes' arm the end of a name ... δης. Davies, following Bothmer, suggests Εὐχαρίςδης, but, as Professor Robertson points out to me, this is an odd place for a ψάλος name and the other vase praising Eucharides which is offered as a parallel is 15 to 20 years earlier (c.f. ARV$^2$ 229.35; 365.61 (incomplete): 1580.163; 1637.43 (bis)). In view of its position the name ought to refer to Orestes, and Robertson suggests Αγαμεμνονίςδης. There is no vase parallel, but the epithet is applied to Orestes in Od. 1.30 in direct connection with the killing of Aegisthus and so too in Soph. El. 182. A third figure to the right beyond Aegisthus may represent Electra.

(3) Red-figure lecythos (near 500 B.C.)
Brommer Vasenlisten\textsuperscript{3} 449: otherwise unpublished, but mentioned by D.C. Kurtz in Athenian White Lecythoi (1976) p.124 n.7.

Clytemnestra, dressed in house-clothes, comes running in from the right swinging a great double-axe behind her, only to be checked by a near-naked young man inscribed, tantalisingly enough, Telamedes.\textsuperscript{1}

Crossing in front of him and moving to the right is Orestes, who grasps Aegisthus by the back of his neck and plunges a small sword into it. Aegisthus falls from a high backless throne, stretching his right hand under Orestes' sword arm in order to beg for mercy, but sinking down helplessly the while. All four figures are inscribed.

(4) Red-figure stamnos by the Triptolemus Painter

Basle, Cahn 42: ARV\textsuperscript{2} 1648·6 = Paralipom. 364 = Brommer Vasenlisten\textsuperscript{3} 449·B12 = Vermeule p.15§12 pl.5 fig.11.

On the far left a figure of uncertain sex (clad in himation draped over a plain chiton) whose pose suggests he is Pylades, stands wearing a large-crested helmet and an ornate corselet. In front of him, holding two spears, Orestes advances from the left, and his sinistral hand grasps Aegisthus by the top

\textsuperscript{1}Possibly this is the tip of an otherwise totally submerged iceberg, a hitherto unknown tradition. But a conflation of Talthybius and Pylades seems to me a likelier solution of this puzzle (so too Kurtz sup. cit: "the painter's error?").
of his head: his right hand thrusts a sword into his enemy's throat. Aegisthus himself, the cord of whose lyre plectrum is just visible between his wrist and his chair's back, has been thrown off balance by this thrust. His eyes are half-closed and his right hand is stretched out in supplicatory gesture beneath Orestes' sword. Electra runs up from the right and with that hand makes a gesture towards her brother. All of the three latter figures are labelled, and a palm tree indicates the scene is out of doors.

(5) Red-figure stamnos by Tyszkiewicz Painter (480-475 B.C.)
Zurich: ARV² 291.19 = Paralipom. 356 = Brommer Vasenlisten³ 448.87 = Vermeule p.16 § 16 pl.7 fig.15
Clytemnestra (?) strides in from the left but her head, shoulders, and arms, together with any weapon she may have been holding, are now lost. Orestes, in front of her and clad in greaves, a plain corselet over a chitoniscus and equipped with a scabbard, pierces Aegisthus' throat with his sword, as that worthy begins to topple from his throne. Yet again his right hand reaches for his assailant's chin in a futile gesture of supplication.

(6) Red-figure stamnos by the Tyskiewicz Painter (480-475)

¹The first appearance of this gesture combining welcome and support in plastic art.
Naples, Astarita 530: ARV\(^2\) 291-20 = Brommer Vasen-
listen\(^3\) 448-B8 = Vermeule p.16 § 17.

Orestes, with a corselet over his chitoniscus, equipped also with scabbard and baldric, threatens Aegisthus with a sword. The work is exceedingly fragmentary however. For instance all that can be seen of Aegisthus is the lower part of his right leg; nevertheless, that is enough to suggest that here as elsewhere he was originally seated on a throne, and was cast off balance by Orestes' onset. It may also be inferred that as usual Orestes is preparing for a second attack.

(7) Early mannerist red-figure Hydria (48O-470) first published in the Burlington House Catalogue 1903 (pl.95): ARV\(^2\) 587-64 = Paralipom. 393 = Brommer Vasenlisten\(^3\) 449-B10 = Vermeule p.15 § 11 pl.6 fig.10. This vase is now lost and can be observed only on a poor photograph. On the extreme left (Invisible on the photograph just mentioned) a seated male figure leans on a club.\(^1\) In front of him a warrior (Pylades) stands leaning on a spear (or spears?) and facing right. An Orestes fully armed (in Attic helmet, cuirass, baldric and greaves) holds a short

\(^{1}\)For a similar pose and position see Robert's D above. Vermeule p.15 suggests the figure is the Paedagogus but he does not appear again in plastic art. Talthybius is another identification that springs readily to mind, but it would be decidedly odd for a herald to sit, and Talthybius and Pylades never occur together in the pictorial tradition.
sword in his right hand. This is drawn back to deliver a second thrust at Aegisthus, whom he grasps below the right elbow with his other, outstretched, hand. The seated Aegisthus sinks back bleeding from a wound in his right breast and steadies himself with the sceptre held in his left hand; his right hand he holds out in a gesture of horror. Behind these figures Clytemnestra runs from the right, brandishing an axe over her head with both hands. She is followed by a running girl (Chrysothemis or Electra) who is holding her hands in a gesture that may express anguish or entreaty.

(8) Red-figure column-krater probably by the Harrow Painter (480-478)
Vienna 1103: \textsuperscript{2} \textsuperscript{2} ARV\textsuperscript{2} 277 = Brommer Vasenlisten\textsuperscript{3} 848. B4 = Vermeule p.17\S 21
Talthybius strides to the left and restrains Clytemnestra who moves to the right in front of him. He is depicted as bearded, middle-aged and barefoot: he wears chlamys and chitoniscus, on his head a flat-brimmed hat. He grasps Clytemnestra's right wrist with his right hand and probably holds her left shoulder with his left hand. She is swinging her axe out behind her with her right hand.\textsuperscript{1}

(9) Attic red-figure stamnos by the Berlin Painter

\textsuperscript{1}Robert (Bild und Lied p.158) thought the youth on the reverse to be a servant or travelling companion of Orestes. He is, rather, a naked reveller, and the two scenes are unconnected.
(470-465)

Boston 91.227\textsuperscript{A} and 226\textsuperscript{B}: ARV\textsuperscript{2} 208.151 and 1652 = Brommer Vasenlisten\textsuperscript{3} 448.B3 = Vermeule p.16\textsuperscript{\S} 19 pl.8 fig.17.

This is a shattered and fragmentary artefact. On its extreme left a figure that probably represents Pylades\textsuperscript{1} prepares to restrain Clytemnestra from behind by grasping with both hands the axe she swings behind her. Or so we deduce: in fact there remain of this scene only parts of legs and a cloak, the brim of a hat, and hands. Clytemnestra is moving to the right against Orestes who, wearing an Attic helmet but no other armour, swings back his sword for a second blow. His target is Aegisthus, seated to the left and stretching out his right hand towards Orestes; his left hand holds a lyre.\textsuperscript{2} He is wounded in the right breast. Electra runs up with her right hand held out in agitation again, while she pulls at her hair with the left.

(10) White-ground cup by the Pistoexenus Painter (465-460)
Acrnona 19515: ARV\textsuperscript{2} 860.4 = Brommer Vasenlisten\textsuperscript{3} 449. B11 = Vermeule p.17\textsuperscript{\S} 22.

A fragmentary Clytemnestra in house-clothes moves to the right and swings her double-headed axe in both hands. She is confronted by an older man with a

\textsuperscript{1}Unlikely to be Talthybius because there is no room for a herald's staff, and the hat-brim dangling behind the figure belongs more probably to a petasos than a pilos.

\textsuperscript{2}Compare, of course, the Boston Krater (below pp.851ff).
heavy beard (Talthybius) who wears a felt pilos on his head.\footnote{He post-dates the appearance of the similarly clad Pylades in the tradition.} He grasps her right wrist in his right hand.

(11)

Siena: Beazley, Etrusc. Vase Paintings 198 = Brommer Vasenlisten\footnote{This and the cloak identify Orestes as a traveller, which well fits the usual story. The pilos, though absent from sixth and fifth century vase-paintings of Orestes, appears on the Melos relief.} 449·D3 = Vermeule p.17 §26. An unwounded Aegisthus sinks to the ground while towards the left strides Orestes, ready to lunge with his sword at Aegisthus' head. The son of Agamemnon is naked save for a short cloak worn round his left arm. His pilos\footnote{Not Pylades as Vermeule p.17 would have it, because a right breast can be seen on the figure. And not Clytemnestra because too few signs of agitation are apparent.} has fallen from his head but has been caught and held by the strap tangled in his hair. He is facing left as is Electra\footnote{Not Pylades as Vermeule p.17 would have it, because a right breast can be seen on the figure. And not Clytemnestra because too few signs of agitation are apparent.} who stands beside him and raises her palm towards the two men. It is hard to tell whether the scene is represented as occurring inside or outside the palace.
(1) The rôle of Talthybius

As early as 1885, Seeliger (p.23) raised his voice against this, the most novel feature of Robert's reconstruction. The evidence of Nicolaus of Damascus was of no value, for it derived from Hellanicus (see above p.819 n.1) and besides it also named Pylades who, according to Robert, did not feature in S. The supposed tradition of the faithful herald of Agamemnon allegedly reflected in Sophocles' παίδαγωγός and Euripides' πρέσβυς was undermined by the presentation of the actual Talthybius in the Euripidean Orestes, where the messenger's speech portrays him as the archetypal time-server (887ff, esp.895-6: τὸ γὰρ γένος τοιοῦτον ἐπὶ τὸν εὐτυχῆ πηδῶς· ἀδὲ κήρυκες).¹

More important are the objections against the conclusions deduced from vases. Robert's A definitely suggests that Chrysothemis belongs to the same tradition as Talthybius, and we must accept either that Chrysothemis too had an important rôle in S., or that the vase painter has more or less arbitrarily added Homeric names to those two figures. Most crushing of all is the news that D and E portray Pylades, not Talthybius, as saving Orestes from his mother's axe.

"Often Orestes' confederate, the old nurse or Pylades or

¹This objection in itself is of very little weight, since Euripides will often reverse the whole course of previous tradition in his depiction of a character. His new versions of Heracles and the brothers Eteocles and Polyniceus are cases in point.
Talthybius according to the painter's whim, grasps [the axe] from behind and pulls the queen off." Vermeule's summary (p.4) of artistic representations of Aegisthus' death shows how Talthybius' monolithic ascendancy has been challenged since Robert wrote. In general it would seem that after c.480 Talthybius fades from the pictoral tradition to be replaced by Pylades. The influence of Aeschylus' Choephoroi obviously played a crucial part in this process from 458 onwards.

The full-bearded man standing behind Orestes in D is now generally agreed to be Pylades: indeed there are no cogent grounds at all, no herald's attributes, no conical cap, for instance, for identifying this youthful figure leaning on his spear with his left hand and placing his right hand on his hip, with the aged servant of Agamemnon. He is certainly making no attempt to restrain Clytemnestra's axe. E presents us with what is at first sight a curious amalgam: the youthful looks of a Pylades - no Talthybius is ever presented thus beardless - and the conical cap associated with Talthybius on vase A. But this latter feature is also connected with Pylades on Robert's B and my list's (3), and most scholars now favour him as the likeliest candidate.

---

1 Prag associates this beard - which misled Robert as to its wearer's age and identity - with similar vase-depictions of the Athenian Tyrannicides where one assassin is regularly bearded. But since Harmodius and Aristogeiton were lovers, the distinction between beard and smooth chin is meaningful in depictions of their activity.

2 Full bibliography in Prag p.199 n.220.
C is a special case: it was very fragmentary in the time of Robert whose interpretation of it (based only on an earlier unillustrated description (p.149, p.158 n.5)) was soon disputed by Seeliger, and others. As described by Vermeule (p.15) the shattered contents do present an implausible depiction of the death of Aegisthus: "Athena is definitely out of place." But in fact that goddess is only present by courtesy of the restorer: after Beazley's reconstitution it can be recognised that the female running in from the right with outstretched right arm is a young woman with short curly hair who is dressed in chiton and himation. The later inapposite addition of a helmet has veiled the identity of a Chrysothemis or Electra. To her left a fallen Aegisthus is assailed by a naked Orestes who grips him by the back of his hair and draws back his sword-arm: he is checked by Clytemnestra - for once without an axe - and there is also a young woman on the far right (Electra or Chrysothemis again). What matters for the present purpose is the figure at the extreme left of the artefact. Since it wears an himation over a chiton it is unlikely to be a male, which will exclude both Pylades and Talthybius (the latter unlikely

---

1 A most unusual feature: the figure has none of the armour or even the travelling gear usually associated with Orestes in the pictorial tradition.

2 The protagonists are so similar to those of other related vases that the scene must be the same.

3 The usual (though not inevitable) prerogative of women on vases. As Professor Robertson reminds me, the combination is quite often worn by elderly or distinguished men.
already since the figure is making no effort to restrain the queen). The club which some scholars have detected is probably no more than the disarrangement of the garment-folds of the woman - be she a daughter of Agamemnon, the old Nurse, or an anonymous serving-maid. The case for Talthybius on A is of course unshakeable, for he is labelled so: the figure on F may be the herald too. But the reinterpretations of C-E have decisively broken Talthybius' monopoly over the tradition. Other vases, not treated by Robert, further complicate the picture and reduce the likelihood of a single tradition involving Talthybius and stemming from S. For fuller details see the list above pp. 824ff. Here note that they show us: (1) Two fresh examples of Talthybius ((8) and (10) in the list). (2) Two new examples of Pylades ((7) and (9)). (3) The disconcerting début of Telamedes ((3): see p. 822n.1 supr.). (4) Several vases omit both Pylades and Talthybius, who fail to appear either as restrainers or spectators (so e.g. (1) and (5)). Their absence must be due to formal and stylistic considerations: compare the occasional absence of Clytemnestra herself (on (11) for instance).

Further work on the Melos Relief has likewise undermined

1 See Jacobsthal [sup. cit. p.82d.]
Robert's suppositions. Of the first figure bending forward with his right foot on the second step, his right elbow on his knee, with pilos and himation, sword-hilt and scabbard, and a short stick in his left hand, three interpretations are possible, and each can be rendered fatal to Robert's thesis. (1) He may be Talthybius, but one of the other two characters may be Pylades, so that once again Talthybius' monopoly is broken: if both he and Pylades are represented (as in Nicolaus of Damascus), then (2) He is not Talthybius at all but Pylades, and the other two figures are Orestes and a servant.\(^1\) (3) He is not Talthybius at all but Orestes, and the other figures are Pylades and a servant.\(^2\) Whichever option we choose we will be propelled towards the same conclusion to which 217.1ff P leads us. For the literary text tells us that the recognition of Orestes by his sister was facilitated by the tokens which Aeschylus also uses. Talthybius' task of pointing out Electra to her brother is thus superfluous.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\)So Jacobsthal himself, comparing the staff held by an indubitable Pylades on the Sicilian Dirce Painter's Calyx-Krater (Syrac. Mus. Naz. 36334: Brommer Vasenlisten\(^3\) 451. D4).

\(^2\)Orestes first suggested by A. Conze, Oreste ed Elettra, Annali dell'Institute di corrispondenza archeologica 33 (1861) 344.

\(^3\)It might be argued that this consideration does not absolutely exclude his presence (Sophocles' παιδαγωγός is still important, though he does not take part in the recognition). But it is high time for Talthybius to relinquish his pride of place in the reconstruction.
After the above considerations, a case could be made for Seeliger's thesis (pp.22ff) that it was Pylades who restrained the axe-brandishing queen in S's poem. He is, after all, the inevitable companion and trusty helper of Orestes in all literary treatments from Aeschylus' Choephori onwards. But at this point a further complicating factor intrudes itself, in the form of a work of art earlier than any so far considered. One of the metopes from the first and older Heraion at Foce del Sele in Southern Italy, found in the south wall of the Stoa and now in the Paestum Museum (see P. Zancani Montuoro and V. Zanotti-Bianco, Heraion alla Foce del Sele = Text 2· (1954) ch.24 (pp.269ff) and Tables 2· sketch XLIV plate LXXXVI = Vermeule p.14 §6 = Denkmälerlisten 3·321·1)).

The place is right for a Stesichorean influence, so too perhaps the date (570/540?) and several other metopes here have been thought to owe their subject-matter to the Sicilian poet. This particular metope (repaired and reconstituted from about forty fragments, and unfinished) shows a woman with a double-axe striving towards the right. The right side of her head is missing, but no-one at this stage of the enquiry will be surprised to hear that scholars have seen in this sculpture Clytemnestra trying to attack her son. If they are right we will have here the earliest appearance of the fearful axe and likewise the first appearance of a restraining figure. For the female figure is being restrained by a second female figure in a long chiton extending to her feet, whose
right hand seems to be laid flat on "Clytemnestra's" right elbow and whose left hand seems to grasp the handle of the axe. The poses of the two women may well be intended to convey their respective ages: the restrainer looks in her outlines solid and stiff, while the other figure lifts her skirts as she hurries along and wears only her "house-clothes" (peplos without himation) as if suddenly called forth by an emergency. Who is the older woman? She seems too placid and unexcited to be the anguished Electra known to us from vases. Rôle and gesture alike suggest the aged Nurse of Orestes.

Yet another candidate for the rôle of Clytemnestra's obstructor. And, though this is her solitary appearance in art, some would claim that the Nurse enters the competition with considerable advantages. In the first place we know that she featured in the Oresteia (218 P), which is more than can be said for her male competitors. Then, since she had saved the baby from the mother long ago, there would be an obvious appropriateness in her repeating this action for the returned youth. And a final and potentially more significant factor: it has been thought that the evidence of the Heraion metopes should receive more respect than that of other works of art because they derive more definitely from the poet of their country. But we cannot decide on that crucial problem until we have examined the other two metopes which have been seen as preserving lost details of S's Oresteia. Especially the second which follows directly upon the
first and completes it: Clytemnestra's determined stride seems to direct our eyes rightwards to the Aegisthophonia which supplies the two main protagonists who alone can make complete sense of the struggle on their left.

(2) The locale of Aegisthus' murder.

Here too the discovery of fresh artistic evidence has blurred the simple outlines of Robert's thesis, and we can no longer accept the notion of a single tradition, with S. as its fount, which had Aegisthus murdered inside Agamemnon's palace, on Agamemnon's throne. This time let us start with the Foce del Sele metopes. Next in order to the scene of the two women struggling over the axe comes the prospect of two men fighting (Zancani-Zanotti-Bianco sup. cit. Text 2. ch.25 (pp.275ff) and Tables 2. sketch XLV plates LXXXVII - LXXXVIII = Denkmälerlisten 3*321.1)). Or rather one man, beardless and nacked, tries to flee up the steps of a colonnaded building - temple or megaron -, clings to a fluted Doric column, and touches the chin of his assailant in a futile gesture of supplication. Too late: the other, bearded as a token of his virility and heroism, and clad in a chitoniscus, grasps him by the neck with his left hand, and with his right pierces his kidneys with a large sword. Zancani and Zanotti-Bianco have little difficulty in rejecting a possible interpretation of the scene as
Neoptolemus' assassination at Delphi (p.280), and argue strongly for an Aegisthophonia to be taken closely with the preceding metope. Again the contrast between the two figures - one domineering and armed, the other naked and helpless - supports their argument in the most powerful way imaginable.

Emily Vermeule, who accepts this estimation of the scene and the Italians' further hypothesis of Stesichorean influence, plausibly comments (p.14): "This is the first illustration to introduce definite architectural details; we are outdoors in the palace courtyard, unlike the Olympia reliefs with their Homeric indoor setting. The Homeric tradition wins; from now on Aegisthus will be consistently enthroned in his hall." There seems to be a definite tradition of an out of doors death for Aegisthus. Was this the version used by S.? It is certainly old. But the death indoors or near a throne can boast an even more venerable antiquity. Our first unambiguous representation of the death of Aegisthus sets him on a lofty and well-wrought chair within a megaron. This is the bronze relief from a shield strap found at Olympia and dating from 600-575 (E. Kunze, Olympische Forschungen (2 Archaische Schildbänder) 168 I c pl.6 and 169 n.1 = Vermeule p.13 § 5 pl.7 fig.20c = Denkmälerlisten 3·323·3 c.f.

---

1 An interpretation of the scene as a murder of Agamemnon would be no more convincing, and leaves several details unexplained.

2 But for an example of a later out-door depiction of this scene see above p.827 item (4) in the list.
Montuoro-Bianco sup. cit. p.285 n.3). Little do his throne and footstool avail Aegisthus, or his sword, half-drawn from its scabbard:\footnote{This boldly resisting Aegisthus (together with the spear used to kill him) is a unique feature in the pictorial tradition. Elsewhere (as in the metope under consideration) the tyrant is portrayed as helpless and unresisting.} Orestes rushes in from the right to end his rule by grabbing him by the forelock and running him through with his spear. A replica of this scene appears on a shield-strap from the Isthmian sanctuary: c.f. Vermeule p.13§ 5A and n.39.

Now these reliefs are dated to the first quarter of the sixth century by Kunze. Mrs. Vermeule (p.14) "would like to refer the vigour of these representations to S." I would follow her in this, but I should not (as she does) include the bronze relief from Olympia showing our earliest illustrated death of Agamemnon (Kunze sup. cit. 2·167; 4d, pl.18 = Denkmälerlisten 3·7·2: see p.797supr.), since this has Clytemnestra stabbing her husband with a sword, whereas S. made her use an axe (see my commentary on 219 P(p.954)). There is, after all, no need to suppose that all bronze reliefs from shield-straps found at Olympia reflect one and the same literary prototype: the sword is a detail characteristic of epic (see pp.976ff inf.).

On the other hand it would be very attractive to see the reliefs of Aegisthus murdered on his throne as derived from S. We should then have a harmony rare indeed between their testimony, the evidence of almost all vases,
and the possibility raised but not fulfilled in Aesch. Cho. 571 ff:

εἰ δ’ οὖν ἀμελώς βαλὼν ἐρκείων πυλῶν

μάκεινον ἐν ἄρόνοις εὐρής πατρὸς...

Mrs. Vermeule was inhibited from connecting this testimony with S. by her belief that the Heraion metope's out-door Aegisthophonia had a Stesichorean basis. Thus it is high time for us to decide once and for all whether these three metopes are representative of S.'s handling of the Oresteia. By a singular piece of good fortune, the sculpture which it remains to consider can provide the most definite answer to this vexed question.

(3) Orestes and the snake
This is quite crucial, the key to deciding whether these three Sicilian metopes really do reflect S.'s treatment of the Orestes myth. After the scenes apparently depicting Clytemnestra and the Nurse, Orestes and Aegisthus, comes a third, unfinished, slab. It was found - again in the vicinity of the first Heraion - split into several fragments, and its lack of detail (except for some modelling of the anatomy, especially in the lower portions) bears witness to its incompleteness: several parts of the surface are, indeed, unworked. Even so, the simple and striking nature of the composition is easily distinguished: a bare-headed male figure, clad in a long travelling
chiton who, with face and legs in profile and chest in full frontal prospect, is running vigorously while turning his head back to the left. He is raising a sword in his right hand, and his left is clasped around the immediate cause of all this bustle and haste: an enormous serpent which is winding itself round his left thigh in ever-increasing coils to form a reverse and extended "S" shape. It is rearing up its head (this was probably in full frontal prospect originally) to threaten its victim, and he is slashing at it with his sword, which is held parallel to the ground and passes behind his head. The whole grisly illustration was described with the usual exemplary detail, first by Paolo Zancani Montuoro alone (Rend. Acc. Arch. Neap. 26 (1951) 1ff) and then in collaboration with U. Zanotti-Bianco (Heraion alla Foce del Sele etc. Text 2. ch.26 (pp.275ff) and Tables 2. sketch XLVI plate LXXXIX = Vermeule p.14 8 = Denkmälerlisten 3.325.1). But what of their identification? No tale of heroic enterprise against a deadly brute of a monster here, no Cadmus or Jason fighting their respective serpent-adversaries.

1 Not visible in detail but inferred by the absence of male genitalia such as Aegisthus is endowed with on the preceding metope.

2 There seem to be traces of a beard on this head: c.f. Bock, Hermes 71 (1936) 234; J. Boardman, Greek Gems and Finger Rings (1970) pl.509.

3 Cadmus and the snake were at first suggested by Bianco (c.f. H. Furmann, AA (1941) 645) and rejected after fuller reflection. A more recent hypothesis, that our metope represents the recherché story of Ixion fleeing the fury of his avenging brother (E. Simon, "Ixion und die Schlangen", O. Jh. 42 (1957) 25f) is no more plausible, in view of the slab's context.
No Apollo against Pytho either: the snake is all too clearly on the offensive and the unfortunate man, not clad in the armour any rational hero would don as a protection, is obviously trying to escape. So far, few will disagree with the Italian scholars.

Now for their positive suggestion: Orestes the matricide warding off the persecuting Furies of his mother. There survive traces of an original conception of the Erinys as snake-shaped: "l'anima stessa del morto che in forma di serpe perseguita l'uccisore" (p.293) ..." in cui si è trafuso il Ὁυμός, il vigore vitale dell'uomo destinato a sopravivergli" (p.6): compare the numerous depictions of snakes on Attic grave vases. These serpent-formed beings were later transormed, partly through the operations of anthropomorphism, partly for obvious reasons of practicality governing their appearance in Aeschylus' Eumenides, into the Erinyes more familiar to us, with snakes entwined in their hair or hands. Paus. 1.28.6 says Aeschylus was the first to depict them thus, though for traces of the older tradition see Aesch. Cho. 247ff,

1 It will be as well to recall here that there was a version of the Orestes story which told of that hero's encounter with a perfectly genuine snake: the results were unfortunate to say the least. See Asclepiades of Tragilus F. Gr. Hist. 12 F 25: ὦ δὲ Ἀσκληπιάδης ἐν Ἀρκάδιαί θησι τὸν Ὀρέστην ὑπὸ ὀψιών ἀναλεύθηνει ἐβδομῆ- κοντα ἐτών. There is nothing wrong in principle with the idea of an Arcadian legend used by S. (compare 215 P) in his Orestes and adapted thence by a Sicilian sculptor. It is just that the man fleeing from the snake on our metope looks too sprightly to be a septagenarian.
523ff, Eum. 128, 181, 730; Eur. 1·7·286, Or. 256. Vases showing the Erinyes with snakes in hair and hands include (all dating c.440) (1) a Red-figure column-krater by the Duomo Painter (Louvre K 343: ARV² 1117·7 = Brommer Vasenlisten³ 453·Bl.) (2) Red-figure Later Mannerist Hydria (Berlin F 2380: ARV² 1121·16 = Brommer Vasenlisten³ 455·Bl.) (3) Red-figure column-krater by Naples Painter (ARV² 1097·21 (bis) = Paralipom. 450 = Brommer Vasenlisten³ 455·B5.) The influence of Aeschylus doubtless explains the change on vases to humanoid from primitive serpentine form — for the evidence on which see Rohde, Rh. Mus. 50 (1896) 6ff = Kl. Schr. 2·229ff (c.f. his Psyche 270ff (English version)) Küster, "Die Schlange in d. gr. Kunst" (1913) pp.71ff, and especially Bock's Hermes article (71 (1936) 230ff) "Die Schlange im Traum der Klytaiestra", in whose footnotes there is a rich vein of material to be tapped.

Several works of art offer parallels to our metope's snake-Erinys. Zancani Montuoro and Zanotti-Bianco cite the Berlin Vase (Inv. 4841: ABV 97·22 = Brommer Vasenlisten³ 487 Al: c.f. Heraion etc. 2· p.295 n.9) which shows snakes threatening the matricide Alcmeon — whose tale, of course, is a doublet of the Orestes myth (see my remarks on p.474f) and the Campanian guttus in the British Museum (G 48: illustrated by Zancani Montuoro and Zanotti-Bianco on p. 296) which shows an Orestes fled to Delphi and grasping the omphalos in his left hand, while with the right he
wields a sword against a nearby serpent. Here, it would seem, acute shortage of space has driven the artist to a resumption of that archaic concept of an Erinys which would normally have belonged to an earlier date but which could still, even in the Hellenistic period, be easily understood. Compare likewise a black-figure lecythos by the Caetus Painter which is now apparently lost (Athenian Black-Figure Lecythoi 62.198 n.5) and portrayed two enormous snakes emerging from a mound-shaped tomb to pursue a youth at the right. He is looking back over his shoulder and seems to be unarmed. One of the monsters presents a bearded head in profile. The scene may even portray Orestes and the Erinyes. Also another vase with black figures by the same painter and with similar contents. (Athens Nat. Mus. C 2821: ABV 505 = Paralipom. 212).

Considerations of art, chronology, and geography create a likely background for Stesichorean influence here. As we have seen, the metopes at Foce del Sele are probably to be dated to the second quarter of the sixth century. Their sculptures decorate a temple - or more probably a θησαυρός - built for a "stato italiota" and they consequently represent "una creazione originale, che non presuppone necessariamente un archetipo figurato, ma può essere stata ispirata dall'opera letteraria, cui risaliva la versione del mito" (p.10). Furthermore, "aspetti del mito, ai quali la vena d'un poeta ha dato la popolarità, suscitano
la fantasia dello scultore" (ib.).

The date of the sculptures will allow only an epic or a lyric source, but the former is ruled out by the representation of Clytemnestra as a woman in the grip of malevolence - witness the axe - which is not at all the picture given in epic. Who better a source than the lyric poet associated with Sicily who seems to have influenced the two preceding metopes and indeed several other of the sculptures? Their date (650-580) chimes well with a time when "i canti di S. dovettero essere piu in voga, in un santuario della Magna Grecia, che sappiamo frequentato da italioti di tutte le regioni meridionali"...

So much for the Italians' general arguments. Their more specific claims, I fear, are less satisfactory. It is alleged that what little we know of S's Oresteia informs us that he presented Clytemnestra as startled by the dream vision of a snake symbolising her husband's implacable spirit. (219 P). Also we are aware that S. described Orestes' hounding by the Furies (217·14ff P). Neither claim is very impressive. The dead Agamemnon as snake does not have to imply the dead Clytemnestra as the same beast and we have no independent proof of the shape S. gave his Erinyes (see p.941 n.1 below).

But far more objectionable is a flaw which the authors themselves consider, but only once and briefly, on p.299 of their magnum opus. They are painfully aware that we know very little directly of S's Oresteia. And yet one
such direct piece of evidence (217.15ff P) tells us that Apollo gave Orestes a bow to ward off the Erinyes. Here is Orestes in a sculpture allegedly influenced by S. and the weapon he is defending himself with is - a sword. Three possible answers were contrived to this absolutely basic obstacle: we do not know the worth of the evidence for a bow; we do not know the exact stage at which Orestes was given the bow; the bow might merely be "un' allusione simbolica alla protezione del dio." Only the middle claim can be taken at all seriously nowadays. The first and last may have had somewhat greater respectability when they were first made (in 1954) as the only evidence for a bow in S. at that time was E Eur. Or. 268. But since the publication of P. Oxy. 29 in 1962 quoting an explicit reference to the bow from the poem, their strength has simply drained away.

Remains the second line of defence. In theory this is still possible: if we know that Apollo gave Orestes a bow to protect himself against the Erinyes, our reconstruction of the course of events envisaged can fall into two broad categories: (1) Apollo can hand over the weapon before the onset of the Erinyes. Conceivably the gift could even occur before the matricide. More probably - since the vase painters seem to have neglected the interesting possibility of portraying Orestes as killing his mother with this bow slung over his shoulder - it will have taken place in the interval between the matricide and the Erinyes' approach. (2) Apollo declines to use his
ιπόνων in this way. Instead, it is only when Orestes is actually beset by these spirits of vengeance, and prays for help to the god who urged him to the deed, that Apollo manifests himself and presents the bow. Some may find this second version more exciting and dramatic. But it is not difficult to devise a mode of stating the problem which will facilitate choice between option (1) and the verdict that the sculpture is not based on S., and option (2) and the likelihood that it is. For the papyrus tells us that Euripides derived the idea of a bow given by Apollo from S. And we know of other post-Stesichorean works (e.g. Aeschylus' Eumenides) which did not use the motif. An artist is alleged to be copying S., not other poets. And yet he unaccountably omits to depict one motif (the bow) which would have made his debt to S. crystal-clear, and instead equips the son of Agamemnon with a weapon which could quite easily have occurred in the work of another poet but which was not at all the distinctive feature of the Sicilian poet's treatment.

In the face of such a consideration, I fail to see how anyone can continue to assert that the snake metope is indebted to S.¹ And if this is so, then the claim that

¹I do not believe this is too extreme a statement. No attempts to explain the arrant discrepancy between 217 P and the present metope have convinced me. Besides those mentioned above, it has been mooted that the absence of the bow explicitly mentioned by S. is due to a wish to avoid confusion with the otherwise indistinguishable
the other two metopes stem from S's Oresteia is correspondingly weakened. It could still be maintained that the sculptor involved was an eclectic individual who flitted to a different source with every new metope. But one would naturally expect that these three extracts from the Orestes-saga had a common source in literature. The Italians admitted that the scene of the nurse and Clytemnestra might not accurately reflect the poem which inspired it: the identity of the restrainer might have been altered by the plastic artist for his own reasons: the nurse would be "piu decorative e piu facilmente riconoscibile del vecchio araldo." And the fact that she had saved Orestes' life once in the past would readily suggest this faithful retainer as a substitute for the herald in a similar situation. Likewise the architectural background for the killing of Aegisthus might have been provoked by the very building which the metopes decorate.

To sum up: a plausible case can be made for interpreting these three metopes as extracts from the saga of Orestes. But the last one is decidedly not indebted to S's particular treatment of this myth, and it is to be doubted (contd...)
whether the first two are either. What poem they are copying,\(^1\) given their time and place, is a question I am not able to answer. It would be irresponsible of me to raise the spectre of the lyric Xanthus, who is said to have been older than S., who "may have been a West Greek", and who is credited with an Oresteia. (See Appendix 2 infra pp.987ff). What is important is not that we solve that riddle, or that we run back to Robert's idea of an Aegisthūs slain upon a throne and a Clytemnestra restrained by Talthybius. Rather, we must accept that these metopes, like other recent art finds, are like so many stones thrown into the once clear surface of Robert's reconstruction.\(^2\) The works of art discovered since 1881 have complicated our task and have presented no easy answers. The most important exception to this rule is the Boston Krater.

Red-figure calyx-krater by the Dokimasia Painter


Mrs. Vermeule's description of the vase's contents leaves

---

\(^1\)They are certainly interesting in their own right as showing us the first examples of an actively evil Clytemnestra (she seems more passive on the Ram Jug, for which see p. inf.) an axe, and a snake-fury. The archaic simplicity and allusiveness of the metopes' contents would seem to render them recognisable only by someone already acquainted with the legend from a literary source, especially since the tale as a whole is not one commonly illustrated at this time and place.

\(^2\)Attempts to identify other metopes from our site as relating to the Orestes saga (e.g. A.W. van Buren, A.J.A. 46 (1942) 438) have not been happy: see Heraion etc. Text 2.260ff.
nothing to be desired, and her plates of this fascinating work of art are likewise superlative. The obverse shows the death of Agamemnon which the bordering columns and triglyphs indicate to be set inside the palace. The great king is enveloped in a sleeveless filmy mantle: the "dilute strands" of his hair would seem to indicate that he has just emerged from the bath.\(^1\) His right hand tries to extend in a suppliant gesture towards Aegisthus, who has already stabbed him once with his sword and is holding him by the head to steady him for a second blow. Clytemnestra\(^2\) strides confidently behind him in support, holding the now familiar great double-axe in her right-hand. On the extreme left Chrysothemis (?) runs out of the room in terror, behind Agamemnon's figure Electra (?) runs towards the murder gesturing to Aegisthus for mercy. A sixth and smaller female figure escaping on the left may be the doomed Cassandra.

On the reverse we see the death of Aegisthus - again indoors as the architectural setting reveals. Orestes in full armour (corselet, chitoniscus, scabbard and baldric) and plumed Attic helmet is preparing to give Aegisthus - already bleeding from a wound in the right breast - a

\(^1\)This important point has been disputed, and it has been alleged, for instance, that the device is merely meant to indicate the thinness of an old man's hair: c.f. Davies p.251 n.3. But I am unconvinced by this scepticism.

\(^2\)For the divided responsibility of the queen and Aegisthus in the murder of Agamemnon as represented by Sophocles and Euripides see Denniston on Eur. El. 10 (p.56). On the Aeschylean treatment see p.855 and Appendix 1 below (pp. f).
second jab in the chest with his long sword, and is holding him by the head with his left hand in pretty much the same way as Agamemnon was held on the obverse. From his throne (which here resembles a κάθεμις) Aegisthus likewise makes the same futile gesture of suppliancy to his assailant as Agamemnon had made to him eight years (and one vase side) ago. In the manner we now recognise as familiar, Clytemnestra is hurrying up from behind (from left to right) with raised axe to help her lover. She is not dressed in house-clothes and the axe she wields is noticeably smaller than its counterpart on the other side. Here as elsewhere there is no-one to restrain her, and while Electra shrieks, and gestures warning with her right hand, Orestes does not yet look round. It cannot be alleged that the restrainer has been omitted for reasons of space (as is the case with other vases) when the vase-painter has enough room to include the inessential

1C.W. Clairmont's absurd idea (Ant. K. 9 (1966) 125ff) that this woman is Electra acting as her brother's accomplice, and the female figure on the right represents Clytemnestra, is easily demolished by M.I. Davies, Op. Rom. 9 (1973) 123f. Apart from the decisive parallels with other vases considered above pp.812ff (especially B and the Louvre Vase ((2) in the list on p.825) which both label their axe-brandishing woman Clytemnestra) there is the total absence of any literary tradition making Electra so active a partner in Aegisthus' death. The nearest we approach to such a conception is Electra's agonised cry of guilt in Euripides' play of that name: 'Εγώ δ' ἔπεγενέλευσα σοι ἔφυγος ἰ' ἐφηδώμαν ἀμα (c.f. Or. 1235 and di Benedetto ad loc). But it is one thing for Electra to tell her brother that she encouraged him to kill his mother and even guided the sword; quite different is the picture of Electra running zestfully at Aegisthus and raising a murderous great axe in her hands.

2See above p.814.
"Cassandra" figure. Rather, the function of the impeding confederate "seems partly assumed by Cassandra's hand reaching from the left" (Vermule p.4). Less easily explained is the lyre Aegisthus grasps in his left hand - fertile source of many ingenious theories.¹

The gratitude we owe to Mrs. Vermeule for the benefits mentioned at the top of the previous page should not blind us to one damaging deficiency in her treatment of the vase's sources. While admitting that "the current stylistic chronology of Attic red-figure painting ... would place the krater in the 470's or earlier 460's" (p.7), though "as far as shape and ornament are guides ... the Dokimasia Painter's Oresteia could have been painted at any time between about 475 and 450 B.C." (p.10), she proceeds to argue as passionately as possible in favour of a date in 458 or the following year, on the grounds that the painter has been in influenced by Aeschylus' Oresteia. The proofs for this are wafer-thin, especially when confronted with the main cause of dissent. For if "the Dokimasia Painter was sitting in the audience in the spring of 458 B.C. before he painted this krater" (p.6) one can only conclude that he was asleep, or too busy worrying about the export trade to pay attention to the play. Or did he really believe that his conception, with Aegisthus taking the lead in stabbing Agamemnon with a

¹See below p.857f.
sword, and Clytemnestra playing a secondary (though vigorous) rôle, had the remotest point of contact with the drama in which the queen asserts (Ag. 1384ff) παίω ἕς᾽ν ἔτι διὰ τρίτην ἐπενδόθωμι and (1552ff) πρὸς ἡμῶν ἀπεπεπεικε καταδείκνυε, καὶ καταδέσωμεν and the chorus upbraid Aegisthus by asking (1643ff) τι δὴ τὸν ἄνδρα τόν ὑπὸ πυχῆς κακῆς ὀμὸ αὐτὸς ἰναρίζεσ, ἀλλὰ κὺν γυνη... ἔκτενν... ?

With Aeschylus dismissed we can look about for a different source of inspiration. Mrs. Vermeule considers the possibility that the robe on the vase may precede the robe in tragedy, and draws the inference that if this were so "one must conceive of Aeschylus borrowing heavily from a lost model already popular in Athens at the time of the Persian Wars, a model perhaps of the period of Simonides " (p.7). Note the tendentious suppression of the name of S. And yet he was exceedingly popular with the Athenians of Aristophanes' time (210-212 P: see pp.884ff inf.) and one presumes he must have been equally if not more so earlier in the century. And we know that Aeschylus borrowed several details in his trilogy from S. (217·7ff P).

Mrs. Vermeule's frequent assertions that S. cannot have included the death of Agamemnon in his narrative (see p.862ff. inf.) are based on nothing more substantial than a wish to elevate Aeschylus by excluding

1For a more detailed refutation of Vermeule on these lines see the article by M.I. Davies (pp.258ff).
possible rivals. And her statement that "if the most intimate symbols of [Aeschylus'] Oresteia were simply routine motifs of tradition it casts a new light on Aeschylus" (p.7: compare p.22) is based on a misconception. Nobody would deny that Aeschylus makes bold and brilliant use of the images of the robe or the net as recurrent symbols or leit-motifs (on which see most recently A. Lebeck, The Oresteia: a study in language and structure (1971) 63ff) but this need not exclude the possibility that an earlier poet or poets mentioned the robe without giving it the repeated significance which it first acquired in the hands of Aeschylus who used it to produce the structural unity which a dramatic trilogy badly needs.¹

Mrs. Vermeule says of the Boston Vase's illustrator that he alone of such artists insists "on the linked halves of the tragedy, to understand that the death of Aegisthus is meaningless without the death of Agamemnon, to co-ordinate the phases of action and reaction visually as Aeschylus co-ordinated them dramatically" (p.6). But one would not be surprised to learn that S. had earlier co-ordinated them in his narrative. I argue elsewhere that the Stesichorean Clytemnestra's use of the axe (proved by the gory-headed snake of 219 P) very probably implies her use of the robe and bath as well (Appendix 1 pp. 915 ff). These details would then be accurately reflected on the vase. On the

¹Compare the words of Lesky cited on p. 974 below.
other hand it must be allowed that the Dokimasia Painter
does depict Clytemnestra as an accomplice, energetic but
definitely second in command to Aegisthus. And yet 219
P has suggested to many that S's Clytemnestra was as
independent a criminal as Aeschylus' queen. Is this
really so? Is it not possible that a bloody-headed
snake could still haunt Clytemnestra even if she was not
the sole agent of the crime and even if Aegisthus had also
stabbed Agamemnon's body with his sword? In other words,
is not the snake reproaching Clytemnestra ("You were my
wife, and yet you killed me") without any implications for
Aegisthus' rôle? Only if the answer to these questions
is "no" must we abandon the concept of a Stesichorean
inspiration for this krater, attractive though it may be
for other reasons.

A detail on the other side of the vase has given rise to
an hypothesis which must be isolated and destroyed before
it spreads. As we have seen, the enthroned Aegisthus is
holding a lyre as he is murdered. On the basis of an
obscure anecdote preserved in Machon 11.104-114 (Gow),
about the Athenian harper Stratonicus who claims that his
host (a ψάλτης) has killed him ὡς βοῶν ἐπὶ φάτνηι
δειπνίσας, M.I. Davies has composed a wondrous fiction
about an early version of the Orestes myth, possibly

\footnote{Just so in Od. 11 Agamemnon concentrates largely on
Clytemnestra's responsibility (429ff: ὁ θυείδω τεῦξασα πόσει φώνων κτλ.
453: πάρος δὲ με πέσσε καὶ αὐτὸν) though he has earlier
referred to Aegisthus, who τεῦξασ τάνατόν τε μόρον τε ἐκτα σὺν οὐλομένηι ἀλόχωι, οἰκόνθε καλέσσας (409f).}
Stesichorean, in which Aegisthus featured as a player of the τραγάνα. Machon is not the most obvious hiding place for an otherwise unknown tradition concerning Aegisthus, and Davies is obviously dissatisfied with the information he finds there, since he uses it as the merest springboard for the glorious flights of fancy which occur on pp. 246ff on his article. An isolated detail like this, occurring on only two vases, is surely likely to be a free invention of the individual vase painter. If it owned a literary origin it would be more widely disseminated. The exact significance of the lyre has occasioned much lively speculation, with Mrs. Vermeule suggesting a mixture of iconographic motifs from the deaths of Linus and Orpheus, and J.G. Griffith (A.J.A. 71 (1967) 176f) wondering whether it is being implied that Clytemnestra, like her more famous sister (c.f. Il.3.54f) was seduced from her husband by a "carpet-knight". A more simple solution may be advanced: when Achilles leaps up in amazement at Il.9.193ff

\[ \text{αὖτῇ σὺν φόρμωγγι, λειψὼν ἐδοξ ἓνθα θάκεειν} \]

no doubt is being cast upon his manly virtue. He has merely been taken unawares by the arrival of the embassy. So on the Boston Krater the lyre may be the Dokimasia Painter's way of stressing that Aegisthus has been caught unawares, though with more fatal results than ensued for Achilles.¹ At any rate, the phantom of Αἴγυςδος

¹See now J. McIntosh Snyder, A.J.A. 80 (1976) 189f, who has reached the same conclusions as I have on different
should be barred from S's or any one else's, poem. The difference between this unique detail,¹ and the amply attested tradition of Clytemnestra's use of the double-axe against Orestes, is most revealing as an indication of how to detect borrowing from literature.

Conclusions

Of Robert's original reconstruction, the double-headed axe still shines undimmed, or rather with increased lustre gained from the appearance of further vases unknown to Robert which provide further evidence of Clytemnestra's skill with this weapon.

A large number of vases, the unfulfilled command of the queen at Cho. 889f, and S's own testimony that Agamemnon was killed with an axe (219 P) all point for once in the same direction: S's narrative told how, as Orestes was slaying his father's enemy, his mother rushed upon him with the same double-headed axe she had brought crashing down on his father's head. This picture of a superhumanly vile creature, prepared to sacrifice her own son if she can save her lover, chimes well with the little we can glean of S's treatment of Clytemnestra from 219 P. After this we must bid farewell to such relative certainty and the harmonious voice of different witnesses. If Clytemnestra raised an axe against her son, someone must...

¹ grounds (Aegisthus' appearance with the βάρβατος rather than the λόρα).

¹ The cord of a lyre-plectrum is barely visible in (4) on p.827 above.
have checked her, but we cannot say who, so divided is the evidence. Art offers us Laodamia, Talthybius, Pylades, in that chronological sequence. Or the Stesichorean saver of Orestes' life might have been Electra, even though no scene from plastic art gives her this role. At least she and the Nurse were definitely characters in the poem, which is more than can be said of the other two.

Meanwhile Aegisthus is being slain: outside, begging for mercy, or inside surprised on the throne he has usurped? Most of the evidence suggests the second alternative: vases, the unfulfilled expectation raised in Cho. 558f; also the bronze shield straps from Olympia (see p.797 supr.). Now that the Heraion metope, suggesting an outside assassination, seems unlikely to be Stesichorean, these latter are strong evidence, given their date. Which of his sisters, Electra or Chrysothemis, shrieked the warning to Orestes we do not know. Quite possibly neither of them, and the female figure with agitated gesture is an invention of the vase-painters, the product of a desire for symmetry and the wish to balance the aggressive body of Clytemnestra.

The recognition-scene at Agamemnon's tomb, implied by Clytemnestra's nightmare and depicted on the Melos relief, is all but guaranteed for S's poem by the information conveyed in 217 P. Electra will have been there, and the

---

1See above pp.832ff.
Nurse is a plausible companion: recognition by the familiar tokens would render Talthybius otiose, and Pylades is the likeliest identification, perhaps, for Orestes' companion on the relief: he already features in the epic Nostoi and his appearance in S. would not surprise us, especially if we bear in mind the importance to the Oresteia of the god whose oracle stood within the bounds of his father's kingdom (see above p.801). We must also observe the strikingly superfluous presence of Pylades as κωφόν πρόων in later Attic tragedy (the Electras of Sophocles and Euripides). He is best explained as a rudimentary survival, a figure impossible to dispense with entirely because of his importance in S's earlier poem.
Individual details of the poem have been excogitated from the evidence of art, or will be revealed from fragments. A few words on general contents and the beginning and end of the work are in order.

One would most naturally expect a narrative poem called the Oresteia to have very much the same contents as Aeschylus' trilogy with the identical name. Against this reasonable guess only one voice has been raised in recent years: Mrs. Vermeule (p.6) believes that "S's poem probably concentrated on the death of Aegisthus, with the death of Agamemnon used as a controlling event in the past but not actually described." And again (p.12) "nothing suggests that S. really concentrated in narrative time on the death of Agamemnon; the emphasis seems to be as it is in the Choephori or the Electras, the first act far in the past, the second act brought to the front plane as in art." It is rather odd practice to calculate the events of an Oresteia by referring only to the middle play of Aeschylus' extant trilogy. But Mrs. Vermeule is driven to stranger stratagems still by the same consideration that guides her attitude here, namely her passionate advocacy of Aeschylus' work as the source for the Boston Krater (see p.854). S. must be disqualified as candidate for that honour, therefore let him be robbed of the description of Agamemnon's murder.

There is a slightly more convincing argument in favour of Mrs. Vermeule's idea. S. wrote a poem called the Nostoi which concerned itself with the homecomings of the heroes
who sailed against Troy. If the homecoming of the leader of those heroes fell within that poem's scope, and if it was narrated, as expected, with the plenitude revealed in 209 P, it is unlikely that Agamemnon's murder had a second description in the Oresteia.\textsuperscript{1} The answer is that we have no proof that Agamemnon's return home did feature in the Nostoi. And if it did, it could easily have been cut short at the moment the kingly foot touched native soil. This would allow the Nostoi the possibility of a description of the adventures at sea which beset Agamemnon after his quarrel with Menelaus (compare the epic Nostoi Allen p.108 (Procl.)) including the storm described in Od. 3. This agreed, we might provisionally suppose for the first book of the Oresteia roughly the same events as are enacted in Aeschylus' Agamemnon. The only obstacle to this very attractive hypothesis consists of the two fragments which show that Iphigenia's sacrifice at Aulis was important to our poem. Did the narrative then open with the Greek muster there? More probable is an explanation which supposes these events to have been referred to at a later stage as the cause of Agamemnon's fate either by a character in the poem (Clytemnestra for instance) or by the poet himself.

\textsuperscript{1}It is this epic plenitude which rules out facile comparisons with the two Pindaric descriptions of the infant Heracles' strangling of the snakes (Nem. 1.35ff, Paean 20.8ff) in narratives which contain striking verbal parallels.
We have no evidence as to how the Oresteia continued after Apollo's gift of the bow, nor do we know how it ended. It seems reasonable to infer that even Apollo's bow could not ward off the Erinyes indefinitely, and that the poem did not end with this detail. And I hold it for certain that the ἀπόλυτος which is most familiar to us, Orestes' trial before the Areopagus at Athens, had no place in S. Jacoby (p.25) is surely right to insist that this version (which was to win "Alleinherrschaft in der poetischen und künstlerischen Phantasie" as Robert (p.181) remarks) can only be the invention of an Athenian poet, presumably Aeschylus.¹ But the tradition of an Athenian sojourn for Orestes during Aegisthus' rule seems to have been known to the Odyssey (see my commentary on 216 P) and if Orestes came from Athens to get vengeance, it would be the natural place for him to return to for purification. S. could conceivably have had a hand in elaborating the epic tradition along those lines.

Wherever Orestes went, after he had killed his mother and her paramour, it must have been away from his native Sparta in S. Thence he must have been driven by the Erinyes (perhaps too by Oeax and his followers). And if S. depicted Orestes' purification - an eventuality not to be excluded on grounds of principle (see p.943) - then the young prince, as a murderer, would have had to seek this

¹Pherecydes, who lived somewhat earlier than Aeschylus and was an Athenian, seems to know nothing of the Areopagus trial: see the fragment quoted below, p.865.
process in a foreign land (c.f. Latte, R-E s.v. Mord 16\(^1\) (1938)).

Let us turn from this general consideration of possibilities to a more specific scrutiny. One might distinguish four schools of opinion as to Orestes' eventual fate which are geographically linked to the regions of Arcadia, Troezen, Delphi, and Athens:\(^1\) see Radermacher, Das Jenseits im Mythos der Hellenen (1903) pp.136ff, Robert, Heldensage 3.2 pp.1318ff. For other combinations and contaminations independent of this division see Jacoby pp.23ff. We have seen that Arcadia contributed at least one detail to S's poem (215 P; see pp.913 ff) and Robert boldly assumed that this country ("wo [Orestes] gewiss ursprünglich zu Hause ist") likewise supplied the poet with Orestes' place of refuge. For a local legend told how the son of Agamemnon found shelter at the Arcadian town of Orestheion in Parrhasia (see Robert pp.181f). On this see first and foremost Pherecydes F. Gr. Hist. 3 F 135\(^8\): τὸ Παρράσιον οἶ μὲν πόλιν οἶ δὲ χώραν εἶναι φασίν ἀπὸ Παρρασίου τοῦ υἱὸν τοῦ (Π)ελασγῶν ὄνομασθεῖσαν' ἔστι μέντοι τῆς Ἀρκαδίας· τὸ μέντοι Ἀρέστειον τῆς Παρρασίας μεκρισταί, καὶ αὕτη ἡ πόλις κληθεῖσα ἀπὸ 'Ορέστου ὀδὸν τῆς Ἀρκαδίας, ὡς Φερεκόδης' ὑπὶ γάρ ἐπὶ τὸν Ὀρέστην αἰ 'Ερινύες διώκουσιν.

\(^{1}\) No-one seems to have taken much notice of the empty speculation advanced by G. Vallet, Rhégion et Zancle (Paris 1958) p.265 n.6 on the basis of Probus, Proem. in Verg. Bucol. (3.325f Thilo). That passage, which quotes as its sources Varro and Cato's Origines Book 3, relates how Orestes purified himself of matricide in a river near Rhegium and Taurium, and Vallet attributes this Sicilian variant to S.
Robert backed up his conjecture (p. 181 n. 30) by comparing Eur. Or. 1643ff, and Seeliger (p. 28) added the same poet's El. 1273ff. In the latter, Orestes is told by the Dioscuri that after winning acquittal at Athens he must go to Arcadia's river Alpheus and settle there, near the precinct of Lycean Zeus in a city which shall be called after him. In the former, the different concept of an ἐξεισωτικός for murder is introduced: again the trial before the Areopagus court is mentioned, but first Orestes must pass a year's exile at Parrhasium and give his name to the city Ὀπέστειον. How, asked Robert, could Euripides, writing at a time of war, set a Peloponnesian tradition before an Attic audience steeped in Aeschylus' treatment, unless that tradition was equally familiar to Athenians from S.'s Oresteia? It might be added that both Euripidean passages rub shoulders with lines almost certainly indebted to S.'s Palinodes: the Electra goes on to talk of the Stesichorean εἴδωλον (1280ff), while the Orestes passage is preceded by an allusion to the καταστερισμὸς of Helen (1635ff). On the other hand it must be said that Robert rather mis-states the problem. The Euripidean plays surely illustrate that, even at an interval of 50 years from the Eumenides, it was impossible to present a version of Orestes' fate which was not only totally different from, but quite incompatible with, the most familiar Athenian treatment. For they make sure that the Arcadian local variant is combined, albeit
awkwardly, with the Aeschylean version.¹

Let that pass for a moment. Robert and Seeliger suppose that S. made Orestes stay in Arcadia and give his name to Ὠρήστης. Their case would fall if it could be shown that this eponomy originated later than S. Unfortunately, this is precisely what can be shown. The argument rests on the difference between a $\delta$ and a $\tau$. Thuc. 5·64 mentions Ὠρήστης τῆς Μαυλαίας in connection with Arcadia. (See Andrewes' note ad loc. (An Historical Commentary on Thucydides 4·92f)). This town is almost certainly to be identified with the centre of the Oresthis referred to in Thuc. 4·134·1 (ἐν Δαοδωλίῳ τῆς Ὠρήστης), the Orestheion of Hdt. 9·11·2, the Oresthasion of Paus. 8·44·2 (where there is a temple of Artemis Ἱέρεια), and the Orestia alluded to by Steph. Byz. s.v. Μεγάλη πόλις. Also the Arcadian Oresteion which crops up in Euripides (El. 1273f, Or. 1643ff). Although Pausanias uses the name Oresthasion throughout, and derives it from Oresthes son of Lycaon (Paus. 8·3·1-2), he says that its name was changed to Oresteion, ἀπὸ Ὠρήστης κληθείσα. This change can now be dated later than 472, since Tellon, who won the boys' boxing game at Olympia in that year, is described as Ὠρήστης in Paus. 6·10·9 and, more importantly, on his monument [Olympia 5, Die Inschriften (Dittenberger and Purgold 1896) 147-8]. This evidence, and the two Euripidean passages, suggest that the change of name began

¹ Even in the I.T. Euripides goes out of his way to mention the Areopagus trial (945ff).
in the second half of the fifth century. A date after 472 is just about compatible with Pherecydes F 135B.

Now clearly, if an Olympic victor in 472 was still referring to his native town as Orestheion, the link with Orestes cannot yet have been made, or at least cannot yet have gained any wide acceptance. It is inconceivable then that about a hundred years before, S. should have advertised this link in a poem which tried to win credibility for the "Spartanisation" of the Orestes myth.¹

Robert seemed to accept the possibility that the Oresteia ended with another Arcadian tale, the death of the septagenarian Orestes because of a serpent (Asclepiades of Tragilus, F. Gr. Hist. 12 F 25 quoted above p.344 n.1). Seeliger (p.28f) preferred a more inspiring finale: the marriage of Orestes to Menelaus' daughter Hermione as forecast at the end of Eur. Or. (1653ff). This would fit in better with the Spartan colouring elsewhere detected, but there is not an ounce of proof that this hypothesis is preferable to a dozen other conceivable endings. We are deceiving ourselves if we suppose we can ever recover the version S. used to conclude his poem without fresh evidence.

¹As well, I think, it can be shown that Oresteion was not mentioned in S's Oresteia. Paus. 8·3·2 (= 182 P) has cause to touch upon Pallantium and tells us that it found a place in the Geryonii. The very next town he names is Oresthasion, and he does not forget to add that it changed its name to Oresteion after Agamemnon's son. How natural to subjoin the detail that this town too, like Pallantium, was immortalised in Stesichorean verse! How inconceivable that this fact should have been omitted unless, after all, the place was not included in a poem of S!
SPARTAN INFLUENCE UPON THE ORESTEIA

As with the Palinodes so for the Oresteia: it was Wilamowitz who first seriously suggested that the poem had been composed for and in Sparta¹ "Gr. Heidens.," S.B. Berl. 1925 p.46 n.1 = Kl. Schr. 5² p.61 n.1, Glaub. d. Hell. 2 (1932)p.113). But Vürtheim too was aware of the Spartan bias evinced by at least one fragment (p.50). Bowra elaborated the whole idea of "S. in the Peloponnese" (C.Q. 28 (1934) 116 - 118 = GLP² 112 - 115) and it has become the modern orthodoxy. The arguments in its favour are (in ascending order of weight): (1) the name of Orestes' nurse in 218 P; (2) the Spartan parallels for the snake which symbolises Agamemnon's dead spirit in 219 P (a very strong piece of evidence which Bowra ignored, ironically enough, in favour of a far flimsier "proof" of his own devising (see p. 969 inf.)). (3) the setting of Agamemnon's palace ἐν Δακεσαμονὶ (216 P).

I scrutinise the value of these arguments and the objections brought against them in my commentary on the individual fragments, and I have no wish to present the same material twice. But I must say that I have found no reason to doubt the correctness of "the Spartan hypothesis". Here I restrict myself to summarising the historical background which the theory presupposes and considering the few alternative explanations of the phenomena presented by our fragments.

For a lucid exposition of Spartan foreign policy in the

¹He connected this idea with his theory of a Locrian S., but of course we need not follow him in this.
early sixth century and her formation of the Peloponnesian League, see W.G. Forrest, A History of Sparta 950 - 192 B.C. pp.73-6 and 79-83 and the Bibliography on "the Orestes policy" cited on his p.78. See also G.E.M. de Ste. Croix, The Origins of the Peloponnesian War pp.96-8. Unable to repeat elsewhere the conquest and annexation she had used upon Messenia, Sparta turned to subtler devices and began to extend her control over the Peloponnese by means of a system of military alliances with herself at the head. Hdt. 1.65-8 in describing how Sparta had emerged as mistress of most of the Peloponnese κατὰ τὸν κατὰ Κροίκον χρόνον casts much-needed light on the first step in the formation of Sparta's League: Tegea was won over not in war but by alliance, and the Delphic Oracle advised Sparta to bring the bones of Orestes from Tegea to Lacedaemon.¹ The bones of Orestes' son Tisamenus were brought from Achaean Helike to Sparta according to Paus. 7.1.8, and this probably occurred at much the same time: c.f. D.M. Leahy, Historia 4 (1955) 26ff. καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ χρόνου, διὸς πειρώλατο ἄλληλων, πολλοὶ κατυπέρτεροι τῷ πολέμῳ ἐγίνοντο οἱ Λακεδαίμονιοι. ἦδη δὲ εὑ καὶ ἡ πολλὴ τῆς Πελοποννήσου ἡν κατεστραμμένη. So

¹What were Orestes' bones doing in Tegea of all places? According to Paus. 8.5.4 καὶ Ὁρέστης ὁ Ἀγαμέμνονος κατὰ μαντεῖαν τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς Ἀπόλλωνος μετάωκηςεν ἐκ Ἀρκα-δίαν ἐν Μυκηνῶν "but this is probably a late invention" (How and Wells Vol.1 p.90). How and Wells (ib.) and Forrest (p.74) suggest that Orestes had been identified with the minor Arcadian hero Oresthes, eponym of Oresthasion, a theory denounced by de Ste. Croix (p.96 n.14) as "a red herring which should not be dragged in."
Herodotus concludes his fascinating account. The translation of a hero's bones is a familiar phenomenon (c.f. the removal of Theseus' bones to Athens in c. 470 reported by Plut. Cim. 8, and also the burial of Alexander the Great at Alexandria (see P.M. Fraser, Ptolemaic Alexandria 1.16) or the arrival of St. Mark's bones at Venice in the ninth century A.D.) and the remains of a hero adopted as local ensured the land's security (c.f. Soph. O.C. 1522ff). But in the present case thesieze of Orestes' bones marks Sparta's transition from the status of a purely Dorian power to that of heir to the Achaean hegemony of Agamemnon, which embraced Arcadia and the relics of Pheidon's Argive kingdom. Did not Cleomenes in the 5th century protest punningly to the contumacious priestess of Athene at Athens: ὃ γόναι, ἄλλ' οὖ ΛἈφὶς εἶμι ἄλλ’ Ἀχαῖος (Hdt. 5.72·3: c.f. Forrest pp. 82-3)? Did not the Spartan envoy to Gelon of Syracuse burst out indignantly: ἕξε μέγιστοβέμενε ὁ Πελοπίδης 'Ἀγαμέμνων πυθόμενος Σπαρτιώτας την ἡγεμονίν ἀπαραίτηται ὑπὸ Γέλωνός τε καὶ Ευρηκοσίων (Hdt. 7.159)? Was not Agamemnon's very grave located now at Amyclae, a little south of Sparta (Paus. 3.19·6)?

We do not know the exact date of Sparta's acquisition of Agamemnon and Orestes, with its concomitant patronage of the pre-Dorians.

1See for further instances Wilamowitz, Glaube d. Hell. 2· p.11 n.2.
The affair of Orestes' bones should precede c. 550 if Herodotus' dating of Sparta's new hegemony to ἡ αἰγαμόμενον ἡμέραν Κροϊκοῦ is anything more than a cunning structural device. Forrest's attempts to reach a more precise result (p.76) run aground on the unreliability of 553 as the year of S's decease.

Does any other explanation clarify the inescapable Spartan elements in S's fragments so well as Bowra's? I think not. In fact alternative explanations are hard to come by, even from the most virulent opponents of orthodoxy. Podlecki chips vigorously away at various features of this but has nothing coherent to offer in its place. The cult of Zeus Agamemnon in Sparta and of Cassandra in Amyclae mentioned by Düring (p.117) has few points of contact with the remains of S's poetry and is hardly distinguishable from Bowra's theory anyway: Sparta's growing political influence is a presupposition in both.

The two strongest rival theories are both fairly old and present-day silence on them would suggest that they are commonly regarded as superseded - rightly in my opinion, but I include them for the sake of completeness. Several scholars (see pp.802ff above), have seen the Hesiodic Eoeae as an important source for S's Oresteia - I am for them, without supposing it a substitute for a Spartan sojourn. Ferrari alone has tried to argue this. No sane person would dream of denying that the Hesiodic presentation of Clytemnestra (fr. 23A.27ff), Iphigenia
(fr. 23\textsuperscript{A}:17ff), perhaps even Pleisthenes (fr. 194), were important for the development of the tradition.\textsuperscript{1} But we have not disproved Bowra's thesis merely by showing that S's epithet \textit{Πλείκεςαν} has no connection with Sparta (see pp.969 f inf.).

Rate Hesiod's influence as highly as we can, we will not have the slightest shred of evidence for believing that he invented the snake-vision of Clytemnestra (as opposed to her guilt) with its significant parallels to Spartan beliefs about the form taken by dead spirits. (see p. 969 f inf.) And there is no proof that Hesiod put Agamemnon in Sparta.\textsuperscript{2} Nor need this surprise us. Why should a Boeotian poet or poets inject Spartan colouring into their poetry so thoroughly? Ferrari's attempt to circumvent this obstacle is rather pathetic: he has to borrow from the advocate of the theory he is attacking, the further theory that Corinna's 'Ορεστακ shows the Boeotians were interested in tales of the family of Agamemnon (see p. 889 inf.). Now the spring setting of S's Oresteia and Corinna's 'Ορεστακ is one common element: Corinna is Boeotian: may not the spring element derive from the Boeotian Eoeae? And we know S. transferred Agamemnon to Sparta: if he shares one element with Corinna may he not share two? May not Corinna have placed Agamemnon in Sparta? And may not this hypothetical detail

\textsuperscript{1}But I see no evidence for Ferrari's idea that S. derived Apollo's bow and intervention from the Eoeae.

\textsuperscript{2}As Wilamowitz (SS p.241) suggests.
derive from another hypothetical passage in the Eoeae (p.33)? In other words build a mausoleum out of conjectures; and from it cast the problem of Spartan traits back one stage in time behind S; and then wash one's hands of it.

Perhaps the least unattractive alternative to Bowra's thesis is Robert's idea (Bild und Lied pp.187 - 189 and n.35) that the development of this myth reflects a Dorian desire to heap guilt upon the family of Pelops. The Dorian invaders of the Peloponnese were envious of the glory which their Achaeian predecessors, the ancient rulers of Mycenae and Sparta, were given in local tales and especially in that crown of Ionian epic the Iliad. Therefore they turned their hands to blackening the family history of the Pelopidae by inventing those stories of curses, strife, and murder, of which the Iliad was innocent. Such an hypothesis might well explain the presence in 219 P of the Spartan snake-spirit, though why the discrediting process should seek to place one of its main targets of attack so emphatically in Sparta is harder to divine. However the whole concept is insecurely based. I have argued earlier that Il·2's silence about the power-struggles in the house of Atreus is the fruit of suppression not ignorance, and that the Iliad definitely knew of Iphigenia (p.785f supra). And is it not strange, if denigration of the Pelopidae received its impetus from the Dorians, that Pindar, the exponent par excellence of
Dorian ideals, should go out of his way to omit the curse of Myrtilus and its causes from the myth of Olympian 1 and do likewise with the Erinyes in Pythian 11? Or that the Spartan envoy to Gelon should bolster his city's claim to Greek hegemony by an appeal to Agamemnon's authority? (see p.871supr.). As I have argued above, the Spartans attempted not to discredit Agamemnon, but to annex him to themselves.
"In the Oresteia", as Haslam says (p.41), we find "all the characteristic features of dactylo-epitrite composition: anceps link-element, single-short units (though only as period clausula), "dactylo-lengths." But along with these was at least one dactylo-anapaestic run, taking off from the double-short, not from the longum or anceps."

Snell, Gr. Metr.\(^3\) 19 persists in interpreting the latter long anceps (210's ᾄνδρον, 212's ἐξετορτάκ) as biceps, in spite of the protest made by A.M. Dale in her review of the first edition (Gnomon 28 (1956) 195). On the reading schematised above, the Oresteia will have been composed in the dactylo-epitrite type of metre rather than Snell's dactylic χωρί μέτρον. For the present fragments' dactylo-epitrite c.f. Il. Pers. str. 7-8: \[\text{-------} | \text{--------} | \text{--------} \]

This, our smallest quotation from the Oresteia, is also the most eccentric metrically speaking and the two facts may be connected. Snell (Gr. Metr.\(^3\) p.19 n.2) reduces it
to ... --- || --- --- --- || which he interprets as the
dactylic κατά μέτρον denounced above. It is better to
follow Haslam (p.41) in supplying ⟨---⟩ before the quote
begins: the fragment then falls in fairly neatly with the
poem's probably dactylo-epitrite scheme: (...) D^x ---
--- ( || ?)\(^1\). But it is always hazardous to draw metrical
conclusions from quotation fragments, and especially so
here, where Aristophanes may be adapting his original.

217 P
1: (...) --- --- ---
2: seven anapaests ...

Haslam (pp.17 and 42) rightly places period-end in the
above position, on analogy with the Geryoneis' pendant
--- before period-end. S's dactylo-anapaestic lines do
not have the last biceps contracted, so that period-end
after the seven anapaests can be ruled out.

219 P
1: --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- | x D^o
2: --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- D | D

The initial dactylo-anapaestic sequence is probably to be
taken as part of the same period as the following "dactylo"
phrase: such, at least, is what the close continuation of

\(^1\)Haslam's comparison with the closing period of the
Eriphyle triad (-----) is invalid: see p.488.
sense between the two phrases would suggest. Here and in the Eriphyle the anceps element is used where the dactylic components are not exclusively "D" lengths. The following pair of hemiepe with their unlinked juxtaposition of dactylo-epitrite units or longa\textsuperscript{1} are quite unique in S. Valckenaeer in the nineteenth century emended the first line into an hexameter to produce an elegiac distich. It is easy now to sneer at this clumsy approach, but the metrical affinities between our fragment and that couplet are obvious, and it is interesting to find Haslam (p.42) invoking the influence of the elegiac distich to explain the absence of linking element in line 2. Word end after first hemiepes as partial compensation for this lack was presumably constant.

\textsuperscript{1}Remarked upon by Wilamowitz, G.V. pp.397 and 432.
"Haud dubie ipsum hoc exordium Orestiae, sive prima stropha": so Bergk (3-220) and Page was persuaded. Bergk's reasons must have included those produced by Bowra: "Since the song [in Aristophanes' Peace] contains two quotations [211 and 212 P] from S's Oresteia, these words [210 P] must surely be either a quotation or adaptation from the poem" (GLP² p.116). In fact the logic here is not of the strongest: only 212 P is explicitly stated by an ancient source to be from the Oresteia: the ascription of 210 - 211 P is purely a matter of conjecture, and it might be argued that if the first two fragments really were from the Oresteia the scholia would have mentioned the fact, as they do at Ar. Pax 797ff [212 P].

A far stronger support for 210 P's ascription to the poem is provided by its metrical response with the two and a half lines that comprise the definitely Oresteian 212 P. Some have found 210's sedate lines almost grotesquely inappropriate to the bloody yarns linked with the House of Atreus, and Schneidewin (1) p.336 and Schmid (GGL1 p.473 and n.4) go so far as to attribute them to the Helen² which did tell of ὅτι τε γάμους ἀνδρῶν τε διήλθε, or at least Helen's wedding. But pretty much the same objection could be levelled against 212 P.

τοῦ φίλου χόρευον was correctly diagnosed as an

¹Compare the reasons advanced by J. Geel for attributing 223 P to the Oresteia (see p.299f supr.)
²As (quite independently but for the same reason) does Podlecki (p.325).
Aristophanic insertion by Hartung

Not only the sense but the metre too points to this: the ithyphallicus is a characteristic of Attic tragedy and comedy, not of S.

Some scholars have wanted to complete the fragment's third line by continuing with the words that follow in Aristophanes' text: so Kleine, Schneidewin, and (apparently) Bowra (l.c.):

καὶ Θαλίας μακάρων· σοὶ γὰρ τάδ' ἔξ ἄροις μέλει.

On the other hand Bergk, who suggested the attribution to the Oresteia, insisted on omitting the words πολέμους ἄμωσεμεν, while Platnauer (Aristophanes' Peace p.135) would exclude πολέμους ... χόρσους. All in all it seems churlish to reject the exact responson of the two fragments as they are printed in Page: "We may notice the exactness of the two citations, each ending one syllable short of the end of the sixth line in both ode and antode" (Platnauer l.c.). It is impossible to match the excisions mentioned above in 212 P, nor can we continue that fragment's third line.

Marginal X: its meaning explained and further instances given by E.G. Turner, Greek Papyri (Oxford 1968) 115ff.

Bergk was the first\(^1\) to suggest that instead of πλοών here and in the scholion cited in 211 P we read παραπλοών,

\(^1\) P.L.G. 3·220. Page (L.G.S. p.42 and S.L.G. p.157) attributes it to Lobel (c.f. Oxy. Pap. 35 (1968) p.42 n.2) and both fail to introduce it into the scholion at 211 P.
a technical term used for "the insertion of portions of one text in another" (Lobel, Oxy. Pap. 35 (1968) p.43). Compare Hermogenes περὶ ἵδεον 2 (336.15 Rabe): τὰς παραπλοκὰς τῶν ποιημάτων (the only instance cited by LSJ s.v.) ib. 337.8ff: ὃ δὲ Πλάτων καὶ Ἀρκελέστερον ἐν τῷ Συμποσίῳ καταχορεύοντος τῷ τοῦ Ἀγάθωνος προσώπῳ ὡς ποιητοῦ τῆς παραπλοκής ταύτης ἔχρησατο' οὖ γὰρ ἂν ἀπὸ ἄλλους ποιημάτων τυνά, ἀλλ'αὐτὸς ποιήσας παρέπλεξεν. ib. 338.2 and 17. These all refer to the interweaving of poetry and prose. For usages closer to our own passage see ΣV Ar. Ar. 1376: ἐκ δὲ τῶν αὐτοῦ Κινησίου παραπλοκὴν ἔχει, Alcman S2 = Arist. fr. 56.25 C.G.F. (Austin). Bergk also assumed that καὶ ἔλαθεν was corrupt, in view of the fame of S. which this very fragment and its two successors attest: but the two words merely refer to the failure of others to detect the quotation.

For the adjective γλαυφυρός as a literary term, see Rhys Roberts, Dionysius of Halicarnassus On Literary Composition (1910) p.293. Dionysius περὶ συνθ. συνου. (2.121.16 Usener-Radermacher) lists S. among those who combine γλαφυρόν and αὐτηρόν to form what is εὐκρατον.

Moica the frequency of S's appeals to the Muse at the start of a poem is illustrated in my note on 193.10 P.

cù μέν:
for the antithesis which the poet may have proceeded to draw to this initial μέν, see my note on παρ' ἐμοῦ below.
obviously the verb is metaphorical, not literal as in 11.16.25lf: νηὸν μὲν οἱ ἄπευσασθαι πόλεμόν τε μάχην τε ὅως. Bowra (l.c.) takes the wars which the Muse is to reject as relevant to the occasion of the poem's performance: "The note of joy is stressed because the occasion is one of respite from war, and though we do not know what war this is, we can imagine that it was one in which Sparta had been recently engaged or was still engaged." But the Oresteia seems an odd song to sing at a time of "respite from war", since its subject matter, though free from martial events, is equally if not more grim than any narrative of battle and slaughter. One sympathises with Bergk's desire to expunge the phrase, but that remedy is unlikely (see above p.880). I would prefer to take the two words as a request to the Muse to set aside the tales of war which had formed the matter of previous poems (e.g. epics like the Iliad or the Thebais, works of such early elegiac poets as Callinus and Tyrtaeus, perhaps S's own Iliupersis) and turn to a new topic. For the verb in much this sense c.f. Pind. Pae. 4.46ff: ἐπειτα πλούτου πειρῶν μακάρων τ' ἐπιχόριον | τεθμὸν π[ά]μπαν ἔρημον ἄπωσάμενον | μέγαν ἀλλοθι λ'λόρον ἔχω; Bacch. 5.189: φθόνον ἄμφοτέρας ξερείν ἄπωσάμενον. For a rejection of warlike themes as the subject of song see Anacreon fr. eleg. 2 W, Xen. 1.21ff W, Theogn. 763f.

This makes far better sense if taken ἄπο χοινοῦ with
κλειοίκα and ἀπωσαμένα. A glance at the list of opening invocations to the Muse assembled by West on Hes. Theog. 1 (p.151) will remind us how (a) a Muse can sing on the poet's behalf (II.1, Od. 1 etc.), or (b) the poet himself may claim to do the singing (II. Parv. fr.1 Allen p.129: Ἰλιον Ἀείω etc.). The present picture of the Muse singing with S. occupies an intermediate position: see further on such invocations W. Kranz, Rh. Mus. 104 (1961) 3ff, = Studien zur Antiken Literatur und ihrem Nachwirken 27ff especially 29f = 46 where it is suggested that S. went on to make a more personal intervention of type (b) as contrast to the initial μεν.

2ff

If we accept that the fragment belongs to the Oresteia, it is hard to avoid also accepting Bowra's conclusion: "What follows seems to have no very definite relevance to the story of Orestes, but it is simply a statement of the kinds of topics about which poets sing" (italics mine)" and may convey the note of exhilaration which belongs to some feast of the gods at which the poem is performed. The Oresteia of S. clearly began in a mood of high exhilaration before moving on to its more disturbing and more sinister elements." A similar view is expressed by Ferrari p.32, and is presupposed by M. Treu, Rh. Mus. 100 (1957) p.184 n.32 when he argues that our mention of Ὑξεὺν ... γάμως alludes to the subject-matter of the Hesiodic Κατάλογος Γυναικῶν for which the Stesichorean fragment therefore supplies a useful terminus.
ante quem.

κλείοινα ὁμον τε γάμους ἄνδρῶν τε δαίτας καὶ θαλίας

it is an established topos that men and gods form the two main subjects of poetry: see Hes. Theog. 100f and West's note ad loc. (p.188). The first phrase well epitomises the Eoeae, the second would cover the heroic feasts which loom so large in Iliad and Odyssey, the last may be meant to remind us of the Iliadic banquets on Olympus.

It is interesting to note that Aristophanes' audience was expected to pick up these subtle echoes (here and in the following two fragments) of the work of a foreign poet. Doubtless the Oresteia belongs to a special category and was particularly familiar to Athenians, as 217 P suggests.

But Würtheim is probably right to deduce that generally speaking "zu Aristophanes Zeit die Poesie des S. in Athen sehr bekannt war, wahrscheinlich in den Schulen gelesen und gesungen wurde" (p.47). S. was not the only lyric poet of a different period and place to win popularity in 5th century Athens. Aristophanes is once more our source for Athenian interest in Alcman (S 1 and 2 = Aristophanes 56 C.G.F. (Austin), Lysistr. 1297f) Ibycus (Thesm. 161) and Alcaeus and Anacreon (fr. 223 K). See too the allusion to Simonides in Nub. 1356 (c.f. 507 P) and the exploitation

1 Even if the phrase ὁμον ... γάμους is precise enough to allow this conclusion, to date anyone or anything by S. is obscurum ex obscuriore.

2 Wilamowitz Aisch. Orestie... Das Opfer am Grabe p.247: "Seine Orestie hat in der tat zu der schullecture der athenischen knaben gehört."
of one of Pindar's prosodia (fr. 89\textsuperscript{A} Sn.) in Eq. 1264ff, the adaptation of Anacreon 426 P = Timocreon 733 P in Vesp. 1063-5, and the relationship between Ar. Nub. 595 and Terpander 697 P. See Wilamowitz, Textg. d. gr. Lyr. 12, SS p.108 n.1; Reitzenstein, Epigr. und Skol. 32f; Fraenkel, Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes pp.204 - 208 = Aristophanes und die Alte Komödie (Wege der Forschung 265) 43 - 47; Th. Gelzer, Alte Komödie und hohe Lyrik, Mus. Helv. 29 (1972) 141ff, esp. 144-5.
Wilamowitz, perhaps persuaded by his pupil Holsten's treatment of the subject (de Stesichori et Ibyci dialecto etc. Diss. Greifsw. (1884) p.30f) regarded the MSS. 'οταν as "sicher" (Textg. d. gr. lyr. p.45). It is anything but. 'οταν

for the phrase c.f. Il·6·148: έαρος ... ώρα, Ar. Nub.

For the common connection between the swallow and spring c.f. Simonides 597 P: ἀγγελε κλυτά | έαρος ἀδυμόου | κυανέα κελιδοί; Pop. Carm. 848·1·2 P: ήλθ᾽ ἠλθε κελιδῶν | καλὰς ώρας ἄγουσα, Ar. E.N. 1·7 (1098A) = Cratinus fr. 33K: μία κελιδῶν έαρ οὗ ποιεῖ, Ar. Eq. 419: ώρα νέα, κελιδῶν, Ἀν. 714, Thesm. 1, Chionides fr.8 K, Philemon 215 ἥ μεν κελιδῶν τὸ θέρος, ὥ γίναι, λαλεῖ, Αελιαν Ν.Α 1·52: κελιδῶν δὲ ἄρα τῆς ώρας τῆς ἀρίστης ὑποσημαινεῖ τήν ἐπιδημίαν.

See too the inscriptions on a red-figure pelice formerly attributed to Euphronius (Leningrad 615: ARV² 1594·58: c.f. P. Kretschmer, Die Griechischen Vaseninschriften 66 (p.91)).

A young man is depicted crying ίδοι χελιδῶν which elicits the response νὴ τὸν Ἰπρακλέα from a man and αὐτή: έαρ ἦδη.

By Hellenistic times the τόπος has become a cliche: see Leonidas A.P. 10·1 = 2490 G-P, Antipater of Sidon A.P.
10·2 = 440 G-P, Argentarius A.P. 10·4 = 1451 G-P, Thyillus A.P. 10·5 Satyrus ib. 10·6, Agathias ib. 10·14 Paulus Sil. ib. 10·15 Theaetetus ib. 10·16 Hor. epist. 1·7·13, Od. 4·12·6, Ov. Fast. 2·835, Columella 10·80, Pliny N.H. 2·47. Other references in D'Arcy Thompson, A Glossary of Greek Birds² p.319f and p.324f.

κελαδῆι χελιδών

the verb and its noun were originally used (in Homer and Hesiod) of loud sounds made by rivers, winds and the like, and this usage persists. But its employment for the chirping and twittering of birds is also well established: see Gow on Theocr. Id. 18·57 (2·361). The present passage is the first attested instance of this: whether S. was influenced by the prospect of a play on words (so Diehl p.52) we cannot say.
τοιάδε
τοιόκος used in similar contexts of a suitable subject for song in Alcman S 2 (where τοιόνδε belongs to the lemma), Bacch. 20.3 (τοιόνδε μέλος), Pind. Is. 4.27 (τοιάδε ... φύλλα ἄοιδαν) fr. 122.14 Sn. (με ... τοιάνδε ... ἀρχὰν εὑρόμενον σκολίου).

Χαρίτων
Escher RE 3 2161, and J. Kroll, "Theognis interp."
Philologus Suppl. 29 (1936) p.18 n.53, supposed the Graces to feature here as goddesses of spring (see below p. 349 f.) but in the present context their close connection with the Muses (see above 341) is likely to be more relevant.

δαμώματα
ἀπ. λέγ. rightly explained by Ε ad loc. and the Suda s.v. (2.5 Adler) as τα δημόσια αιδόμενα (the misprint τα δημόσια αιδόμενα has survived several reprintings of P.M.G.) and translated by L. Delatte (L'Antiquité Classique 7 (1938) p.26 n.1) as "chants destinés à être exécutés en public" (not, that is, "popular songs" in the modern sense). So too Van Leeuwen's commentary on Aristophanes' Peace ad loc. ("carmina publica cantata" p.126) deriving the noun from δαμοῦσα ("publice celebrare, carmen populo in medio proferre") c.f. Simon. 564.4: οὕτω γαρ "Ομηρος ἦς Ετασίχωρος ἄεις λαὸς·. This verb occurs in Pind. Is. 8.8: γλυκύ τι δαμωσόμεθα (rightly glossed as εἰς τὸν δῆμον ἀγάλωμεν by Ε ad loc. (3.270 Dr.)) and Plato Theaet. 161E:
ταῦτα πῶς μὴ φῶςεν δημούμενον λέγειν τὸν Πρωταγόραν; See further the reference to δήμων δοιδοί in Heraclit. 22 B 104 DK, and Σ Od. 8.44's explanation of the name of Demodocus (οίκεῖον τὸ ἱόνα διὰ τὴν παρὰ τῶν δήμων ὑποδοξίαν). Note that Hesychius' definitions of δαμάματα, δαμώμενον, and δημώματα (1-403 and 427 Latte) are quite irrelevant for the word's usage in the three literary passages above cited.

καλλικόμων

used in Homer only of mortal women (as in Pind. Pyth. 9.106, Nem. 10.10. Of a νύμφη in Hes. fr. 141.10 MW):

II.9.449 (of a παιδακικός) and Od. 15.58 (of Helen). For its use of Muses, Graces, and the like c.f. Hes. Theog. 915 (Mnemosyne), Op. 75: (χάριτες τε καὶ) ὣραι καλλίκομωι. Later we find the adj. used by Sappho 128 LP and Simonides 577a.1p of the Muses, by Ibycus 288.2 P of the Graces or the Horae (see Page's app. crit. ad loc.), by Anacreon epigr. 15 (74) Page of the Graces, and (390 P) of κοῦραι Διός, and by Epimenides 3B 19 DK = F. Gr. Hist. 457 F 7 of Aphrodite.

Why is the season of spring mentioned so strikingly at the beginning of this Oresteia? Bowra (l.c.) suggests that the poem was performed in the spring, comparing Corinna's 'Ορέστακ (690 P) and Pindar, Pyth. 11. For the common points of these two poems see Page's Corinna (1957) p.28. Page concludes that "we must at least keep our minds open to the possibility that a festival at the Ismenion - where, as Pindar shows, the Delphic legends
were familiar themes - was the occasion of Corinna's Orestes." There is nothing to connect S's Oresteia with Boeotia and nothing to suggest Pythian 11 was sung at spring-time. But Corinna certainly does refer to that season (690-11 P: Φέρως ἐν άνδρες) and Apollo, whom we know to have played an important part in S's Oresteia (217-21ff P) was pre-eminently a god of spring, since it was then that he returned from his winter sojourn among the Hyperboreans. (For Apollo as "Gott des Frühlings" c.f. Roscher Myth. Lex. 1-426 and the ancient authors there cited on the winter ἀποθημιζει and spring ἐπισημεῖαι of this divinity. Especially relevant is Theogn. 776ff: ἦν οὖν (scil. Ἀπόλλωνι) λαοὶ ἐν εὐφροσύνη ἡρος ἐπερχομένου κλειτάς πέμποντο ἐκάτομβας | τερπόμενοι καθάρι | καὶ ἐφατί θαλης | παιάνων τε χοροῖς (αὐτίκει τε σὸν περὶ βωμῶν). We would welcome some such explanation of the vernal tone of these opening lines.

Delatte (L'Antiquité Classique 7 (1938) 23ff) goes even further, in arguing that our poem and other such δαμώματα were actual examples of Paeans sung at spring festivals in the West and involving the purification of the participants. (He was partly anticipated by Schmid G.G.L.11-473f). The evidence for such activities is sketchy indeed: Anecd. Paris. 1 p.172 Cramer = Aristoxenus of Tarentum fr. 26 Wehrli = DK 1.468-19 (Pythag. Schule 58 D): ὅτι οἱ Πυθαγορικοὶ, ὡς ἔφη 'Ἀριστόξευος, καθάρεσεν ἐξ οὗ ἦν εἰμι οὐκοτος διὰ τῆς ιατρικῆς, τῆς δὲ ψυχῆς διὰ τῆς
These are witnesses so deficient in credibility that even if they spoke in unison we should think twice about accepting their testimony. As it is they fall a-quarrelling as to whether a single singer (scholion) or several (Aristoxenus) are involved in these dubious rites; and we must stoop to special pleading of a strange kind to bring the scholion into line with its recalcitrant bed-fellow by arguing that the former has confused two ideas in which a paean is (1) a cathartic song and (2) a θηναίος, and by postulating a lacuna after the scholion's θηναίος which supposedly contained at least a mention of the paean.

We may be impressed by the coincidence of elements between these testimonia and 212 P - spring, public performance of songs, the gentle nature of these compositions (with...
212·2's ἄφων ὑμνεῖν corresponding to the scholion's ἄρεμαλοις ἄρμονιασι. We may be prepared to overlook the fact that it is the Pythagoreans who are linked with the public singing of paeans, not the poet of Himera who lived far earlier: after all, the whole population of Western Greece, not just the Pythagoreans, celebrated spring by the performance of paeans if we can believe Apollonius Mirab. 40 = Aristox. fr. 117 Wehrli: μαντευομένους δὲ τοῖς Δομορίς καὶ Ἠριγήνοις περὶ τῆς ἀπαλλαγῆς τοῦ πάθους εἰπέντε τὸν θεὸν παίανας ἀδελφον ἐαρινοῦς [δωδεκάτης] ἡμέρας ἐξ' ὀθέν πολλοὺς γενέσθαι παιανογράφους ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ.

But there is no way of escaping the ultimate objection which now raises its ugly head: what reason have we for equating S's Oresteia with a paean? The former was a long narrative poem which it would be hard to identify with any of the functions associated with the latter.

True, Apollo played an important and creditable part in a portion of the Oresteia's action (see below p. 941f) but this hardly makes the poem a hymn in his honour. True again, S. is credited with the composition of paeans (276b P) but no-one would normally dream of ranking the Oresteia with these. And once this very simple truth is appreciated, we shall realise that the appearance of the Graces here, in Pindar Paean 6·3, and Ariphon's Paean (813·9 P) is nothing more than an uninteresting coincidence. The oddly lyric tone of the poem's beginning

1Del. Müller.
(noted above p. 879) needs some explanation, but Delatte's approach is simply not supported by the evidence.

φρύγιον μέλος

C.f. Alcman 126 P: φρύγιον αύληςε μέλος τὸ κερβήσιον,
Telastes 806·1P: ἂ φρύγα καλλιπνών αύλων ἵερων βασιλῆα
κτλ. id. 810ff P: πρώτοι παρὰ κρατήρας Ἐλλάνων ἐν αὔλοις

| συνοπάδοι Πέλοπος Ματρός ὕρεις | φρύγιον ἄειςαν νόμου.

The most famous example of a φρύγιον μέλος in literature is the Phrygian's lament at Eur. Or. 1369ff which styles itself (1384) an ἄρματεινον μέλος. We are inevitably reminded of Glaucus of Rhegium's statement (ap. ps-Plut. de Musica 7) that S. employed the ἄρματεινον νόμος. Furthermore, as West has observed (C.Q. 21 (1971) 310) § ad Eur. Or. 1384 (1·220 Schwartz) equate the ἄρματεινον μέλος with the νόμος Ἀθηνᾶς, which, ps-Plut. de Mus. 33B tells us, was (a) in the Phrygian mode; and (b) a nome of Olympus. Pollux 4·77 concurs with the second piece of information, and we are again reminded of Glaucus' remark that S's ἄρματεινον νόμος was invented by Olympus ὀ αὐλῆτής. In case we feel that our phrase is acquiring too auletic a connotation we may finally note (with West sup. cit) how Pollux 4·66 states that the νόμος Ἀθηνᾶς also existed in citharistic form.

† ἔξυρόντα

at first sight it may seem absurdly timorous and indecisive of me not to choose between one of the neat emendations listed in the app. crit. which avoid the hiatus offered us by the MSS. But I wish to register a warning against the drawing of any conclusions as to the poem's
mode of performance from the appearance of singular or plural participle in this fragment's text. West (C.Q. 21 (1971) 309) for instance, apparently accepting Kleine's correction, infers from this line that "composer and singer are identified." Even if εξευρόντας were a certain emendation, it would be rash to deduce from this passage alone that ἡμὰς as an instance of plural for singular must be supplied as subject. πεδ'εμεῦ in 210 P is a far safer guide (though see ad loc.).

For the notion of "finding" a song c.f. Pind. Pyth. 1.60: εξεύρωμεν οἷνον, fr.122-14 Sn. sup. cit. on 1's τοιάδε, Alcman 39 P: Ρέπη τάδε καὶ μέλος Ἀλκμάν | εὖρε (See too Pind. Pae. 7B 19ff: δικτίς ἀνευθ' ἐλικωνιάδον|βαθίαν ε.. [..].ον ἔρευναί σωφίας δόδον); B. Snell, Dichtung und Gesellschaft (Hamburg 1965) p.127f.

άβρος for a good note on the various nuances of this word c.f. W.J. Verdenius, Mnemosyne 15 (1963) 392-3, who takes the present passage to refer to the poet's "luxuriating" in singing, just as Anacreon luxuriates in playing at 373.2f P: ἄβρος ... φάλλω πηκτίδα. It certainly seems better to take ἄβρος with ὄμνειν rather than ἐπερχομένου as Bowra (GLP2 p.115): "when the spring comes delicately on" - a notion not to be found in any of the parallels phrases about the coming of spring cited in the note on ἤρος ἐπερχομένου. Compare Sappho 128 LP: δεῦτε υἱν ἄβρατον Χάριτες καλλίκομοι τε Μοῖσι. The word does not appear in Homer, but c.f. Hes. fr. 339 MW: ἄβρατον παρθένος.
compare Theogn. 777: ἥρος ἐπερχομένου, Alcaeus 367.1 LP


R. Führer, Z.P.E. 28 (1978) p.182 n.20 has casually observed a close verbal similarity between \( S \)'s:

\[
πάρο πυρὶ χρή τοιαῦτα λέγειν χειμῶνος ἐν ὀρῇ.
\]

ἐν κλίνῃ μαλακῆ κατακείμενον, ἐμπλεον δυνα κτλ.

Note especially τοιαῦτα χρή ... ὑμνεῖν ὧ χρή τοιαῦτα λέγειν, ἥρος ἐπερχομένου (c.f. 211 P ἥρος ὄραμ) ὧ χειμῶνος ἐν ὀρῇ and the rare short vowel before χρή in both passages.

These correspondences are more important for Xenophanes than \( S \), since the philosopher's fragment comes from a work entitled Παρωδίαι. Scholars (e.g. Untersteinter in his commentary on Xenophanes) have so far failed to explain why the fragment should belong to a work bearing this title: "obwohl es homerische Formeln benutzt, hat es jedoch nichts 'Parodisches" (von Fritz in RE s.v. Xen. (gA2 (1967) 1544). Führer's footnote now quietly tells them why by disproving this last statement. Xenophanes and \( S \) were both Sicilians of course. It will be as well to observe here that after the three Stesichorean echoes of 210 - 212 P the Peace's parabasis
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continues (801ff) διαν ... κελαδής, χορὸν δὲ μὴ χην
Μόρσιμος | μηδὲ Μελάνθιος, οὐ δὲ | πικροτάτην ὑπα γηροῦ |
cαντος ἣκους’ ... On this last phrase Van Leeuwen commented "poeticam dictionem quivis agnoscit" and supposed that the poem colouring Aristophanes' language here was yet again S's Oresteia. One immediately thinks of the description of Cassandra's death in Od. 11.421f: οἰκτροτάτην δ' ἢκουσα ὑπα Πριάμου ὑγατρός, τὴν κατακολύτης κυλομήτης κτλ. That would be a suitable ingredient for S's poem and it has been argued (c.f. Juliette Davreux, La légende de la prophétesse Cassandre d'après les textes et les monuments (1942) pp.20-1) that S. therefore had Cassandra killed in the Homeric manner. A rash reference surely, even if we could be sure the phrase was Stesichorean. We cannot be so sure (why do the scholia, so knowledgeable about S's Oresteia, fail to tell us that these words too derive from the poem) and the line may instead be relevant to the literary output of Melanthius and Morsimus.
First of all we learn the important news that the Oresteia was long enough to be divided into at least two books.\(^1\) Wilamowitz's notion (Aisch. Orestie ... Das Opfer am Grabe (1896) p.249) that the phrase έν δεκάτωι Ορεστείας could imply there were two separate poems each called the Oresteia proved a mercifully short-lived delusion: it was forgotten in favour of the obvious interpretation by 1913 (SS p.239 n.1). See above p.271.

Then we learn that S. credited Palamedes with the invention of the alphabet. The idea of a πρώτος εἰσαγωγή was of course very common in ancient thought: see the literature cited by Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. Od. 1.3.12 (p.50) especially A. Kleingünther, Philol. Suppl. 26 Heft 1 (1933). Whether S. was the first to give Palamedes this rôle we do not know: he was followed by Gorgias Pal. 30, Alcidamas Od. 22, Σ Eur. Or. 432 (1.148 Schwartz), Dio Chrys. 12.21, Philostr. Her. 10.1, Tzetzes. Antehom. 320.

This invention was elsewhere claimed for Prometheus (Aesch. P.V. 460f in a list of general benefits) Cadmus (Hdt. 5.57-9, Ephorus F. Gr. Hist. 70 F 105 (c.f. G.P. and R.B. Edwards, C.R. 24 (1974) 181f) etc.) Orpheus (Diod. 3.67.1-5, Alcid. Od. 24), Linus (Diod. 3.67-8, Zenob. s.v. Κασμέλα γράμματα). A full list of other contenders in

\(^{1}\text{This seems the safest formulation: there might have been a third book (or more), and to this extent Page's heading for 215 - 219 P (OPESTEIAS A vel B) is rash.}\)
Hecataeus F. Gr. Hist. 1 F 20 = Ephorus 70 F 105 =
Anaximander 9 F 3 = Anticlides 140 F 11 = Apollodorus 244
F 165 = Dosiadas 458 F 6 = Dionysius 687 F 1. For a list
of lesser-known candidates see Hyginus fab. 227 and Rose
ad loc. (pp.170-1). For later attempts to modify and
reduce Palamedes' achievement to the additions of letters
to the alphabet and improvements thereto see RE 18² (1942)
2506·7ff, Jacoby's commentary on Ephorus 70 F 105C (pp
62-3). On Palamedes in general see E.D. Phillips, "A
Suggestion about Palamedes", A.J.P. 78 (1957) 267ff. A
more comprehensive invention of weights and measures, games,
and all the concomitants of civilised life is attributed
to Palamedes by Soph. fr. 479 P and Euripides Suppl. 201-
432 (1·148 Schwartz). But it was the alphabet which
proved most useful, since with its aid his brother Oeax
sent news to his father of Palamedes' death: c.f. Eur. frr.
578 and 582 N² and Σ Ar. Thesm. 771.
That this versatile inventor should have been mentioned in
the second and possibly final book of S's Oresteia is
problematical. For the most obvious link between
Palamedes and the house of Atreus lies in the action taken
by Palamedes' father Nauplius upon failing to exact
satisfaction from the Greeks for his son's death. (For
a good but by no means exhaustive discussion of different
versions of this tale see Pearson, The Fragments of
Sophocles 2·55.80-83 and 131-133). As early as the
Cypria, Odysseus was not the sole Machiavellian instrument
of this unhappy event. There Diomedes is in collusion with the Ithacan as in the Doloneia (II.10.242ff) or the expedition after the Palladium (II. Parv. fr.9 (Allen p. 131)) and the pair drown the man on a fishing trip (Paus. 10.31.2 = Cypr. fr.21 (Allen p.124). This variant does not appear again, but in the story told by Ε Eur. Or. 432 Agamemnon is added to Diomedes to form a trio of accomplices who falsely incriminate Palamedes by means of one of his slaves and a Phrygian captive and have him stoned to death for treason. Apollod. ep. 6.8-9 names only Odysseus and Agamemnon as the guilty partners. Such a version as Ε Eur. Or. tells (rather than the more familiar treatment in Hyg. fab. 105 which gives Odysseus a monopoly over the mischief-making) would best explain the generous scope of Nauplius' revenge. For he did not confine himself to bringing ruin on Odysseus (by throwing Penelope into the sea: see my note on Stesichorus fr. 225 P) and causing Anticleia to hang herself in grief by his false report of her son's death (Ε Od. 11.197 and 202)). He also arranged for the wives of the absent Greek leaders to play their husbands false: Apollodorus' list of the erring women (ep.6.9-10) mentions Clytemnestra and Aegialea, the wives of Agamemnon and Diomedes, as well as Medea the wife of Idomeneus. Hyginus fab. 117 contains a little-marked and apparently unique variant whereby it is Palamedes' brother Oeax who drives Clytemnestra to adultery: Clytaemestra Tyndarei filia Agamemnonis uxor cum audisset ab Oeace Palamedis fratre Cassandram sibi paelicem adduci,
quod ementitus est ut fratris iniurias exsequeretur, tunc
Clytaemestra cum Aegistho filio Thyestis cepit consilium
ut Agamemnonem et Cassandram interficeret, quem
sacrificantem securi cum Cassandra interfecerunt. This
version is eccentric (see Rose's note ad loc. (p.84)) since
"ementitus" implies that Cassandra was not Agamemnon's
concubine. And Agamemnon's death at a sacrifice\textsuperscript{1} is only
heard of again in Serv. ad Aen. 11.267 and Sen. Ag. 218-19,
897 - 900. Does it, I wonder, stem from a misunderstand­
ing of the Homeric phrase ὃς τίς τε κατέχανε βοῦν ἐπί
ὡς τηνι?

At any rate, Nauplius' incitement of Clytemnestra to
adultery (with or without Oeax's help) would seem at first
sight an excellent context for the mention of Palamedes.
One could imagine its being introduced as a piece of
supplementary causation, additional to Iphigenia's
sacrifice, to motivate Agamemnon's death. In such a case
one would not need to refer to Nauplius' false fires for
the returning Greeks off the Capherian Rocks, perhaps
mentioned in the Nostoi of Eumelus and S. (see above p.722).

\textsuperscript{1}Juliette Davreux, (Cassandre p.68 and 216 no.193) thought
this might originate from S., together with Hyginus'
earlier detail about Oeax and Palamedes (see above p.789)
and supposed it to be reflected in the Morlag painter's
versions wherein Clytemnestra axes Cassandra by an altar
and sends a tripod flying (a red-figure vase from Ferrara
(435 - 425) T 264: Vermeule 19 no.36 = ARV\textsuperscript{2} 1280.64 =
Brommer Vasenlisten\textsuperscript{3} 384.B11. Her alternative
(and more plausible) hypothesis is that Hyginus' variant
itself derives from a pictorial tradition. And this
tradition might have evolved out of Aeschylus' Agamemnon.
These would have far less relevance to Agamemnon than the
other form of revenge practised by Nauplius. But if
Palamedes really were introduced in connection with
Clytemnestra's infidelity, we might expect this to have
occurred near the start of the whole poem, that is in
Book One. Yet our fragment explicitly names the second
book.¹

Clearly, too many imponderables are involved here. In
particular, we have no idea how the events described in
the Oresteia were spread over its two or more books. But
it is worth while reporting the influential and ingenious
(though highly speculative) solution which Carl Robert
advanced in Bild und Lied p.184, quoting the stichomythia
in Eur. Or. 431ff between Menelaus and Orestes:

Me. τίνες πολιτῶν ἔξαμιλλόνται σε γῆς;
Or. Οἶαξ, τὸ Τροίας μῆκος ἀναφέρων πατρὶ.

Me. συνήκα μιαμηδός σε τιμωρεῖ φόνου.
Or. οδ γ'οό μετήν μοί. διὰ τριῶν δ'ἀπόλλυμαι.

Me. τίς δ'ἄλλος; ή που τῶν ἀν'அγίκεθοι φίλων;
Or. οθτοι μ'ὕβριζουσ' δὲν πόλις τὰ νῦν κλύει.

The Euripidean passage² by itself suggests a very plausible

---

¹Of course we know absolutely nothing about the actual
point at which the first book ended: that Book Two
roughly coincided with the events of Aeschylus' Choephori
(c.f. Schmid GLL ll.477) is a plausible guess, no more.

²There is no space here to consider Robert's grounds for
supposing these lines to be interpolated (an argument
advanced in Excurs 5 to Bild und Lied (pp.240-1) and
maintained in Heldensage 3.2 p.1317 n.6). The apparently
illogical thought-sequences therein which seem to
context for our fragment in the natural course of Book
Two's narrative: after the murder of Aegisthus and
Clytemnestra, Oeax sees an excellent opportunity to
avenge his dead brother, the inventor of the alphabet.
He stirs up trouble against the matricide and has him
driven from the country. But as Robert pointed out (p.
182), there are traces in later poetry and art of a
tradition whereby the two sons of Nauplius, Oeax and
Nausimedon, were opponents of Orestes and allies of
Clytemnestra and Aegisthus in a closer way than is
suggested by Euripides.

One thinks especially of the Πυνακοθήκη at the Athenian
Propylaea described by Pausanias (1.22.6). Among the
scenes Ὄρεστης ... Ἀιγίςθον φονεύων καὶ Πυλᾶδας τοὺς
παῖδας τοὺς Ναυπλίου βοηθοῦς ἐλθόντας Ἀιγίςθωι. This
would cast light on a phrase in the fragment of Nicolaus
of Damascus (F. Gr. Hist. 90 F 25) which I quoted on p.818:
ἐλαυνόμενος δὲ (scil. Ὅρεστης) ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀιγίςθου φίλων.
The plurals in their turn may be explained by Apollod.
2.23 = Nostoi fr.1 Allen (p.140): ἔγημε δὲ (scil. Ὅ
Ναῦπλιος) ὡς μὲν οἱ τραγικοὶ λέγουσιν (Nauck TGF. p.502)
κλυμένην τὴν Κατρέως, ὡς δὲ ὁ τοὺς Νάπτους γράψας, Φιλόραν,
ὡς δὲ Κέρκωψ (Hes. fr. 297 MW) Ἡσιόνην, καὶ ἐγέννησε
Παλαιμηῆν, Ὀλακα, Ναυσιμέδουτα.

(contd..)
Thus, although the minimal context necessary for 213 P on this hypothesis would be the activity of Oeax after the murders, as outlined on the previous page, we should at least consider adding Nausimedon, who was known to early epic, to be his brother's helper and explain the tradition of several opponents of Orestes. All this would be comfortably at home in Book Two of an Oresteia, and Oeax's rôle there might have been prepared for in Book One along the lines suggested by Hygin. fab. 117: instead of, or in collaboration with, Nauplius, he poisons Clytemnestra's mind against Agamemnon and provides causation ancillary to Iphigenia's sacrifice for her crime.

But this may be the merest fantasy. It would be grossly irresponsible to conclude without reasserting the highly speculative nature of Robert's theory. Most of the details mentioned above might derive from Attic tragedies on the subject of Erigone.

And it requires no great ingenuity to devise explanations of our fragment that are but marginally less plausible than Robert's.¹

¹Bearing in mind the possibility that the information conveyed in 213 P might emanate from a speech we could compose a scene wherein the desperate (and disarmed) Clytemnestra made a final attempt to excuse her actions before her son's weapon dealt its final blow. It was all Nauplius' doing, she might have alleged, and he persuaded me in order to avenge his son Palamedes. That would fit what events we might devise for Book Two admirably. I know at least one scholar who ingeniously supposes S's primary concern was with writing and his mention of Palamedes' invention of this boon purely secondary: Soph. El. 167ff (c.f. 319, 1155, Eur. Or. 616-17, Wilamowitz, Hermes 59 (1924) 258 = Kl. Schr. 4·352 and Denniston p. xxvii ) refers to ἀγγελίαι and φήμαι sent by the
exiled Orestes to his sister. Were these written messages in S? Were they the cause of an incidental excursus on Palamedes? I will continue to suppose that S. on the contrary referred to Palamedes for his own sake (as well he might) and alluded to his discovery of the alphabet only in passing.
Habron was a grammarian, and pupil of Tryphon of Alexandria (see RE sv. Habron (4)). Previously the word ἀθαυτός was only known as an element in a list of words terminating in -αυτός drawn up by Arcadius p.517 = Herodian Gr. 1.150. The present fragment of Herodian may be found in H. Hunger, "Palimpsest-Fragmente aus Herodians Καθολικὴ Προεωτία, Buch 5-7", Jb. d. Oest. Byz. Gesellsch. 16 (1967) p.5 (c.f. p.20).

Vürtheim failed to discuss this fragment in his commentary, and at first sight one finds it hard to blame him. However, this dereliction of duty earned him the rough edge of Ferrari's tongue (p.27 n.2). For, as the Italian scholar rightly points out, stone objects are important for the later stages of the Orestes myth in several versions. For instance, in Paus. 8.34.2 we are told of a Δαιτόλου μνήμα in Arcadia. On the way out from Μεγαλοπολις to Messene, to the left of the road, is a temple to the Eumenides, and the goddesses themselves and the region around the temple are called Μαυία. Pausanias then proceeds to give the local Arcadian legend of what happened to Orestes: he was driven mad by his act of matricide and thus gave the name of Μαυία to the place where he lost his senses. At no great distance from here he bit off a finger on one of his hands, and this explains why the small mound of earth surmounted by a finger of stone is called "the tomb of the finger". Nearby a
place called "Ἀχν and another temple to the Eumenides mark
the spot where Orestes was cured of his madness. The
Arcadian legend told how the Furies appeared to Orestes
in black when they intended to drive him mad, but when
he had bitten off his finger they appeared in white, thus
causing him to regain his wits and make a sin-offering to
the black goddesses to avert their anger and to the white
goddesses a thanks-offering.\(^1\)

Pausanias regales us with several other local traditions
about Orestes in which a stone plays a significant part.
Paus. 3•22•1 describes the unwrought stone in Laconia near
Gythium which Orestes set up on recovering from his
insanity: διὰ τοῦτο ὁ λίθος ὀψιομάκη Ζεὺς Καμπώτας κατὰ
γλωσσαν τὴν Δωρίδα. After which we hear with no very
great sensations of surprise that in front of a temple at
Corinth (Paus. 2•31•4) there is a sacred stone on which
nine men of Troizen once cleansed Orestes of matricide,
and nearby a house called "the Booth of Orestes" where
he lodged until he was cleansed. Even the Attic
traditions on Orestes\(^2\) are not exempt: near the Areopagus
there is an altar to Athena Areia which Orestes dedicated

\(^1\)See Wilamowitz, Glaube d Hell. l. p.406 n.2.
\(^2\)The self-same Attic traditions (especially in the form
that Aeschylus gave them) seem to be the sources for
those specimens of plastic art which include the stones.
Instances are the red-figure column krater by the Orestes
Painter (British Museum 1923•10•16 10: ARV\(^2\) 1112•5
(Paralip. 452) = Brommer Vasenlisten\(^3\) 455•B2), the red-
figure column krater by the Duomo Painter (Louvre K 345:
ARV\(^2\) 1117•7 = Brommer Vasenlisten\(^3\) 453•B1) or the late
gem illustrated in Daremberg and Saglio, Dictionnaire des
Antiquités Grecques et Romaines 1•388 fig. 491.
on being acquitted (Paus. 1.28.5): τούς δὲ ἀργοὺς λίθους, ἐφ' ὧν ἐστάσειν δοκὶ δύνας ὑπέχουσι καὶ οἱ διώκοντες, τὸν μὲν "Ὑβρεὺς τὸν δὲ Ἀναίδειας αὐτῶν ὀνομάζουσιν. Compare the two βάθρα of Eur. I.T. 961-3.

Of all these potential contexts the last is the least likely to have occurred in S's poem. Orestes' trial before the Areopagus would most naturally be the invention of the Athenian dramatist Aeschylus (see p.864 supr.). One might think that Sparta's local tradition had the best claim to a place in a poem which we know to have been influenced by that city's political expansion. But that very process involved the usurpation of several Arcadian rights and prerogatives (such as Orestes' bones at Tegea: see p.87f.) The version of Iphigenia's rescue from sacrifice which S. follows is said by Paus. 1.43.1 to be Arcadian.¹ Therefore it would be as well to bear in mind the possibility that Sparta took over at least one detail from the local Arcadian tradition on Orestes and was followed, in this as in other respects, by S. It would also do no harm to remember that the powers of coincidence can overturn the most plausible guesses: the stone object may have been something completely different.

¹Against this notion see Wilamowitz p.198 n.1.
(1) I preface my comments on what this passage tells us about S. and Iphigenia with some remarks on the actual fragment of Philodemus, for which I am totally indebted to the kindness of A. Henrichs. His text, which I reproduce above, is based on the original disegni.

The plate reproduced in the Collectio Altera p.52, which was Gomperz's source, is nothing but a secondary and worthless copy (see Henrichs' article in G.R.B.S. 13 (1972) 70 for the relationship of the extant copies). Like its neighbours N 248 V and VI, the present fragment deals with the burials of Greek gods, and Henrichs is undoubtedly right in claiming that Philodemus' ultimate source for the correlation of Iphigenia and Hecate is, once more, Apollodorus' περὶ δεσδῶν. That Apollodorus interested himself in the identifications of divinities we know from other evidence (see Henrichs, Cronache Ercolanesi 5 (1975) 15ff) and he certainly had cause to mention the equation of Artemis with Hecate (F. Gr. Hist. 244 F 109 - 111).
The main textual crisis comes after [ὀνομάζω] ομένην.
Before, all is plain sailing, and even at the end of the fragment, the general sense may be guessed (see below).
But upon the grave intermediate crux, scholars have shattered several lances: 

\[ \pi\varepsilon\rho\iota \mid \delta'' \omega \kappa \sigma \alpha \delta \iota \alpha \nu \]

\[ \theta\varepsilon\rho\alpha[\pi]\varepsilon\sigma\varepsilon[c\sigma\alpha] \] (on the Arcadian connections of Artemis in Hesiod see below p. 912) was the solution advanced by Schober (in his unpublished dissertation of 1923: see GRBS sup. cit. p. 69); 

\[ \pi\varepsilon\rho\iota \mid \tau\eta \nu \] \( \Lambda \tau \alpha \nu \) (= Colchis, c.f. Soph. fr. 914 Pears. with Pearson's commentary ad loc. (3·93)) Philippson (Hermes 55 (1920) 272), comparing Eur. Med. 397: 'Ευδήνα των, μυχοῖς ναίουκαν ἐστιάς ἐμής.

I owe my knowledge of these suggestions to Professor Henrichs, who himself issues the warning: "where extant, the actual papyrus fragments of De Pietate have taught us that scholars who changed whole series of letters in the disegni were never right. It therefore seems advisable not to tamper too much with the transmitted letters", and proposes 

\[ \pi\varepsilon\rho\iota \mid [\ldots] \alpha\iota\nu \delta\eta\tau\alpha[\nu] \nu\epsilon[\mu\epsilon\iota\nu] \],

suspecting an actual quotation from S. because of the apparent Doric ending in -τα [.]. But the run of four consecutive longa provided by \( \alpha\iota\nu \delta\eta\tau\alpha \) is almost certainly illicit for S. (see p. 85).

Though we have not yet discovered the truth there, it seems clear that the quotation explained how Iphigeneia alias Hecate was still alive, whatever her exact location.
For the concluding section, there are the following

(2) It will be most convenient if I open with a summary of earlier poets' treatment of Iphigenia. I argued at the start (pp.735ff) that Homer knows of Iphigenia's existence but edits it out of his heroic world. In II.9.141 (= 287) he lists the three daughters of Agamemnon, all available for marriage to Achilles,¹ and a very eccentric list it is in comparison with later treatments:

Χρυσόδεμις καὶ Αιαδίκη καὶ Ἱφιάνακα

It is patently obvious that Homer has invented these girls¹ as an ad hoc inducement to Achilles, and he has endowed them with equally fabricated, though melodious, names, which as Σ ad loc observes (2.428 Erbse) are etymologically appropriate for the daughters of a king "to whom Zeus has given the sceptre and the themistes, that he may take counsel for his people."² See V. Ehrenberg,

¹W. Kullmann, Die Quellen der Ilias (Troischer Sagenkreis) Hermes Einzelschr. 14 (1960) 199 suggests that the idea of a genuine offer of marriage to a daughter of Agamemnon derives from the feigned offer of marriage to Iphigenia which Agamemnon makes to Achilles in the Cypria and elsewhere.

²Lloyd-Jones, The Justice of Zeus p.7 (c.f. p.166 n.23).
Die Rechtsidee im frühen Griechentum 1921 (reprinted 1966) pp.1, 54, 81, 127f. On such Homeric invented names in general see H.H. Roer, "De nominibus propriis quae in Iliade inveniuntur ab ethnicis derivatis" (Diss. Münster 1914) passim, and M.M. Willcock, C.Q. 14 (1964) 144-5. Less elevated examples are Copreus in 11.15.639 and the murderous-sounding names in 11.4.394ff. Like most of Homer's ad hoc inventions these names did not long survive the immediate purpose which called them into being. Laodice (see Appendix 2 below pp.987ff) and Iphianassa soon disappear from sight except as names, and the same fate would have befallen Chrysothemis had not Sophocles given her a more concrete embodiment as a duplicate of Ismene, and made of her the familiar Sophoclean "all too human" foil for his central heroic character.¹

Although Iphigenia and Iphianassa have superficially similar names they are most definitely not the same person: Iphianassa has not been sacrificed by her father, but is still alive back in Greece in the ninth year of the war. This fact was appreciated by the composer of the Cypria and Sophocles: both felt able to mention the

¹ She does not exist in Eur. El. 14f (οὐξεῖν δόμοις ἔλιφ' δτ'ἐς Τροίαν ἔπλει, ἀρενά τ' ὀρέστην θηλό τ' ἡλεκτρας δάλος) or Ι.Τ. 562 (λέοιπεν (scil. Ἀγαμέμνων) ἡλεκτραν γε πορθένον μ' ανω) but unexpectedly appears in Or. 23 (πορθένοι .. τρεὶς .. χρυσόθεμις, Ἰφιγενεία τ' ἡλεκτρα τ' ἕγω) and Ι.Α. 1164 (τικὼ δ' ἐπι τρεὶς πορθένοις παιδα) which led Mayer p.35 n.43 and A.S. Owen (Greek Poetry and Life (1936) 145f) to suppose that Sophocles' Electra was produced after the first two and before the second two Euripidean plays just mentioned.
unfortunate Iphigenia, and both simply added her to the daughters mentioned in the Iliad (Σ Laur. in Soph. El. 157 = Allen fr. 15 (p. 123): ἡ Ὄμηρων ἄκολουθετ (scil. Σοφοκλῆς) εἰρηκότι τὰς τρεῖς δυνατέρας τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος, ἡ δὲ τὰ Κύπρια δ’ ὁικίν, Ἰφιγένειαν καὶ Ἰφιάνασσαν.1 Soph. El. 157: οὖν Χρυσόθεμις ζωὴ καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα, ib. 530ff: ἔπει παθήρ οὕτος κόσμεν ἃρηνεῖς ἀεὶ, τὴν σιν δαιμονίαν μοῦν Ἑλλήνων ἔτη | θύσαι θεοίσιν (but Iphigenia is not named in the play). Commentators usually assume that Lucretius was misled by homoeonomy when he called (1.85) the daughter sacrificed at Aulis Iphianassa. But this detail might derive from a Greek author, as is suggested by Hesychius s.v. Ἰφιάνασσα (2.382 Latte): οἱ νεότεροι ταῦτα Ἰφιγένειαν λέγουσιν. Eur. Or. 22f (οἱ παρθένοι μὲν τρεῖς ἐφυμεν ἐκ μιᾶς Χρυσόθεμις Ἰφιγένειά τ’ Ἡλέκτρα τ’ ἑγὼ) may simply be omitting the obscure Iphianassa rather than equating her with Iphigenia as Σ ad loc (1.99 Schwartz) and ΣD Il.9.145 assume.

The Cypria, less reticent than the Homeric poems, mentioned the sacrifice and miraculous escape of Iphigenia.2 Allen

---

1 This scholium must be the result of a conflation of two incompatible notes, since the same man cannot simultaneously remember and forget the existence of Iphigenia. A.D. Pitton-Brown, P.C.P.S. 12 (1966) p. 28f diagnoses the problem correctly but applies the wrong remedy.

2 It is hard to tell whether Homer knew of this rescue, since immortalisation is a concept as rigorously excluded from the Iliad and Odyssey as human sacrifice (see above). The Dioscuri in Il.3.236ff lie beneath the earth and have not yet won that alternating immortality which is theirs in the Catalogue poetry of Od. 11.302-3, and the Cypria (Allen p. 103 (Procl.)). Achilles in Od. 11.467ff is distinctly dead and does not enjoy that posthumous life.
p.104 (Procl.) : καὶ τὸ δεύτερον ἥπερος ἡμέρας τοῦ στόλου ἐν Ἀδίδη Ἀγαμέμνονον ἐπὶ τῆς βαλλόν ἐλαφον ὑπερβάλλειν ἐφήσει καὶ τῆν Ἀρτεμιν. μνήμεσα δὲ ἡ θεός ἐπέσχεν αὐτούς τοῦ πλοῦτος χειρόνας ἐπιπέμπουσα. Κάλχαντος δὲ εἰπόντος τὴν τῆς θεός μὴν καὶ Ἰφιγένειαν κελεύσαντος θύειν τῇ Ἀρτεμιδί, ὡς ἐπὶ γάμον αὐτήν Ἀχιλλεὺς μεταπεμφάνενοι θύειν ἐπι- χειροῖς. Ἀρτεμίς δὲ αὐτὴν ἔξαρπάσασα εἰς Ταύρους μετακομίζει καὶ ἀθάνατον ποιεῖ, ἔλαφον δὲ ἀντὶ τῆς κόρης παράστησι τῶν βασιλέων. ¹

Hesiod too embraced the topic, though until recently we have had only Pausanias' word for it (Paus. i.43.1 = Hes. fr.23B MW): λέγουσι δὲ εἶναι καὶ Ἰφιγένειας ἀρωτών ἀποθανεῖν γὰρ καὶ ταυτὴν ἐν μεγάροις. ἐγὼ δὲ ἀκουσά μὲν καὶ ἄλλον εἰς Ἰφιγένειαν λόγον ὑπὸ Ἀρκάδων λεγόμενον, ² οἴδα δὲ Ἡσίοδος ποιήσαντα ἐν Καταλόγῳ Γυναικῶν Ἰφιγέ- νειαν οὐκ ἀποθανεῖν, γνώμηι δὲ Ἀρτέμιδος Ἐκάτην εἶναι.

(contd..)

² on Leuce which his mother gives him in the Aethiopis (Allen p.106 (Procl.)). In II.16-433ff Zeus considers saving his son Sarpedon from death but is easily dissuaded, though in the Aethiopis the minor deities Eos as easily wins from him immortality for her son (Allen ib.). Most striking of all, in Homer not even Zeus' favourite son Heracles can escape death (II.18.117ff): contrast his singular good fortune in the late Od. 11.602-3. From this evidence it emerges that the Homeric epic's stern recognition of the omnipotence of death gave way to an acceptance in the Cyclic epic of the folk-lore idea of easily-won immortality of which Iphigenia is an instance. The nadir of this process is reached with the frivolous flood of sempiternity which was used to give the Telegony a happy ending (Allen p.109 (Procl.)). περιττὰ ταύτα καὶ κενὴ μοχθηρίᾳ as Eustathius (1796-35) says.

¹ For similar accounts see Schol. Ambr. in Callim. Hym. 2 (2.57-26ff Pf) with Pfeiffer's note ad loc.

But since 1962 we have had the very good fortune to possess the ipsissima verba of the Eoeae there referred to (fr. 23A 17-25 MW):

*Ipiu^o?!, µέν ηφικας εὐκνή[µιδες] Ἀχαιοι_

βωμότι ἐπ' Ἀρτέμιδος χρυσηλακίδτου κελαδεινής,

ηµατι τώι οτε νηπελὺν ἀνέπλησον Ἰλιον εἰςω

ποινήν τειρδενοι καλλιερφόρου Ἀργειώνης,

εἰδωλον' αὐτήν δ' ἔλαφηβόλοος λοχέαιρα

δεία µάλε ἐξεκάσε, και ἄµβροσι[ην] ἑρµατε [ηνὴν

εστάξε κατὰ κρη[θεν], ἢν οἱ χρῶς [ἐ]µπε[δ]ο[ς] εἰςη,

θῆκεν δ' ἀθάνατον και ἄγιο[αα]ν ἡμα[τα] πάντα.

τὴν δὴ νῦν καλέο[µµιν] ἐπὶ χθονὶ φῶλ' ἄντρωπων

Ἀρτεµιν εἰνοδί[ην], πρόπολον κλυτοῦ [[ο]χεδαιρ[ης].

So here at last we have the very passage which, according to Philodemus, S. took as his source¹ in the Oresteia.

It is interesting to learn that Hesiod called the daughter summoned to Aulis by the name of Iphimeede, a name that was only previously held (in the form Iphimedea) by the wife of Aloeus and mother of Otus and Ephialtes (c.f. Od. 11.305). But Pausanias in paraphrasing the Hesiodic lines talks of Iphigenia: so it is possible that Philodemus and Proclus likewise substitute the more familiar name for that used in the Cypria and by S., and that 'Iφιµεδη, far from being an eccentric innovation by Hesiod, was the heroic name used by all early poets, and 'Ιφιγένεια

¹With the phrase Στ... κατακολουθήσας Henrichs compares Ν 248 VII: Ἅλειοδ[ος δὲ κατα[κολουθήςας (scil. Ὀµήρωι).
a later form introduced e.g. by Aeschylus.

J. Geffcken argued (in Hermes 26 (1891) 57ff) that Philodemus was wrong to make S. call Iphigenia Agamemnon's daughter. But this thesis rests on a misconception. There is no need to be upset by the contradiction with 191 P, as I have pointed out in my commentary on that fragment (p. 284f). True, Iphigenia is there represented as the offspring of Theseus and Helen. But few people will be surprised if the same poet uses different versions of a myth in different poems: "Auch Pindar bleibt in mythologischen Angetegenheiten nicht immer derselben Meinung und variiert den Leuten zuliebe, deren Landesruhm er singt. Was aber dem Pindar recht ist, kann dem S. billig sein!" (Vürtheim p. 49). S. changed his tune about Helen when he came to Sparta and the same change is probably reflected in the Oresteia, which bears similar marks of a stay in Lacedaemon (see above pp. 869 ff.). But there would be an even weightier reason for making Iphigenia Clytemnestra's real daughter than Spartan veneration for a chaste Helen: it is hard to conceive of any treatment of the Orestes saga which simultaneously made Iphigenia a significant personage and Helen's daughter. For, as Wilamowitz pungently asked (Hermes 18 (1883) 252 = Kl. Schr. 6-198) "Soll sie" that is, Clytemnestra" etwa ihren Gatten aus Rache für ihre Nichte erschlagen haben?" And if it is Agamemnon who does the sacrificing, Iphigeneia must be his daughter. I reserve discussion of the pretext of the marriage with
Achilles for my commentary on 217.25-7 P (pp. ff below). Let us now consider what grounds S. and Hesiod before him, gave for the sacrifice of Iphigenia. On the various αἰτία given for this c.f. Zielinski p.244 n.1, Seeliger pp.15-17, Ferrari pp.12ff, Wilamowitz, pp.195ff, Fraenkel Ag. 1.97-8. As we have seen, the Cypria contained the motif of the mortal who boasts against the gods and thus brings ruin on himself and his family, a motif which recurs in the tales of Actaeon, Cassiope, Eurytus, Niobe, Orion, Thamyris, and the Proetiades. The same causation is to be found in several later authors:
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own initiative and mistakenly, the sort of aposiopesis we find in Apollod. ep.3.21 (ep. Vat.): βαλὼν ἔλαφον ἐπεν' "οὖδὲ ἢ "Ἀρτέμις."

Soph. El. 566ff borrows the Cypria's motif but adds the crime of sacrilege incurred by junting in Artemis' grove: πατήρ ποθ'οὐμός, ὡς ἐγὼ κλώω, θεὰς | παίζων κατ' ἀλκός 
εξεκλίνησεν ποδότιν | στικτόν κεράττν ἐλαφον, οὗ κατὰ 
σφαγὰς | ἐκκομπάς έπος τι τυγχάνει βαλὼν. Zielinski p.245 (followed by Fraenkel, Ag. 2 p.98 n.2) is probably right to argue that the original tale enshrined in the epic narrative, though omitted from Proclus' summary, was this legend of sacrilege. We then have a close nexus between crime and punishment: "pro cerva-virgo", which is maintained in the Cypria's account of Iphigenia's rescue: "pro virgine-cerva". The boasting motif was a secondary detail, derived from the similar tales of Cassiope, Thamyris or the like listed above, and grafted on to the original sacrilege theme.

Apart from this tale of sacrilege, there is an entirely different and more primitive-seeming tradition. (I exclude here the mysterious eagle-omen of Ag. 114ff which Aeschylus has invented for his own dramatic purposes).

We find this intriguing versions in Eur. I.T. 18ff: 'Αγάμεμνον, οὔ μὴ ναός ἄφορμης χθονός, | πρὸν ἀν κόρην 
ἐν Ἰφιγένειαν Ἀρτέμις | λάβη τι σφαγεῖσαν διὶ γὰρ 
ἐνιαυτὸς τέκνοι | καλλιστον, ἕξεν φωσφόρως θόκειν θεᾶι. 
C.f. ib. 209ff: ἄν πρωτόγονον θάλος ἐν θαλάμωις | Δήδας ἀ 
τλάμων κούρα | σφαγίου πατρῴαι λώβαι|...|έτεκεν. It
recurs in Cic. de off. 3.95 (Agamemnon cum devovisset Dianae quod in suo regno pulcherrimum natum esset illo anno immolavit Iphigeniam, qua nihil erat eo quidem anno natum pulchrior) and is probably hinted at darkly in Apollod. ep.3.21: Κάλχας δὲ ἡ ἐξ ὡς ὁδὸν ἄλλας δύνασθαι πλεῖν αὐτοῦς, εἰ μὴ τῶν Ἄγαμέμνονος θυγατέρων ἡ κρατιστεύουσα μᾶλλον σφάγιον Ἀρτέμιδο παραστήτι, although the summary then goes on to give the more familiar αἰτίων of the sacrifice mentioned above (p.917) adding the failure of Atreus to sacrifice the golden lamb to Artemis.

Is it possible to determine which of these three versions, - boast, sacrilege, or the year's finest fruit -, was used by S. and by Hesiod too if S. followed him in this particular as well as in the metamorphosis of Iphigenia into Hecate? The idea of the sacrifice of the year's best produce certainly seems primitive and may well represent the oldest version of the myth. But this tells us nothing about its literary history since it does not appear to have featured in the Cypria, and primitive-looking variants often make their débuts in Alexandrian and late poets. On the other hand, Hesiod regularly introduces a primeval feature missing in earlier epic (compare, for instance, the castration of Uranus (Theog. 178ff) omitted from the Iliad). Wilamowitz (followed by Mayer pp.27ff) thought he had discovered a more accurate means of proving that S. had used this variant. Its primitive tone would correspond to the primitive nature of the identification Iphigenia-Hecate-Artemis which we know
S. (as well as Hesiod) to have made. More strikingly, he claimed that S. was the source of Lycophr. 326-9:

\[ \text{ν εἰς βαθείαν λαμίςας ποιμανδρίαν} \\
\text{ετερηφόρουν βοῦν δεινός ἄρταμος ὀράκλων} \\
\text{βαίσει τριπάτρων φασγάνωι Κανδάνωος,} \\
\text{λύκοις τὸ πρωτόσωπον ὀρχιον σχάσας.} \]

For is not Agamemnon symbolised by a snake here as in 219 P? And does not the last line's mention of the first oath-sacrifice refer back to Euripides' πρωτόγονον Θάλος and beyond? "An Euripides wird man nicht denken, S. ist so gut wie direkt zitiert. S. lag auch für Euripides nahe genug. Auf ihn also scheint des Gelübde zurück zu führen, und wenn es die brauronische Legende in einer uns nicht mehr zugänglichen Form gleichfalls gehabt haben sollte, so würde das nur dadurch zu erklären sein, dass S. einer Tempellegende folgte." (p.202).

Now it is true that Euripides often seems to pluck individual details from S. when one would least expect it.

But in stating that fact we are really propping up a crumbling building. Even if we accept that Lycophron's convoluted lines refer to Iphigenia's sacrifice rather than Polyxena's\(^1\) and even if we identify τὸ πρωτόσωπον ὀρχιον with the first-fruit legend, we must in all truth

---

\(^{1}\)S. is thought to have originated this folk-lore motif by Robert, Bild und Lied p.170f, Mayer p.27, and O. Krausse, de Euripide Aeschyli Instauratore (Jena 1905) pp.113 - 114 as well as Wilamowitz sup. cit.

\(^{2}\)For an explanation of this passage c.f. Lloyd-Jones, Gnomon 35 (1963) 450.

\(^{3}\)See Lloyd-Jones [sup. cit. in previous note].
confess that there is very little substance in the claim that l. 327's δράκων necessarily originates from S. As Seeliger (p. 16) pointed out (followed by Ferrari p. 13), δράκων is a very common metaphor in Lycophron: he uses it of Neoptolemus (185), Achilles (309), Polysperchon (801), and Leucus (1223), and for good measure he uses δράκαινα of Circe (674) and Clytemnestra (1174). So farewell to Wilamowitz's thesis of a Stesichorean source for Lycophron's lines with its concomitant liabilities of a temple-legend and links with Brauron.

The likeliest solution to our problem has been provided by the discovery of the papyrus fragment quoted earlier (p. 914). Hesiod related how Artemis saved Iphigenia by the substitution of a deer on the altar and then made her immortal. If S. followed Hesiod in the latter, as Philodemus alleges, there is a strong probability that he followed him in the former too. And the close ἔλαφος - virgo nexus upon which we have already commented (p. 917) would lead us to suppose that both poets motivated the sacrifice by that combination of impious boasting and sacrilege in Artemis' grove which we find in Sophocles' Electra and which probably occurred in the Cypria. For the killing of her ἔλαφος Artemis demanded the life of a virgin, but she later saved the virgin and substituted for her an ἔλαφος.  

1 Contrast the later animal substitutes mentioned by Alexandrian poets: a bear (Euphorion fr. 90 (Powell) and Phanodemus (F. Gr. Hist. 325 F 14) or a bull (Nicander fr. 58 Schneider), or an old woman (Tzetz. ad Lycophr. 183 (2·91 Scheer).
This consideration, and the recent discovery that S. definitely brought Iphigenia to Aulis (217.25ff P), fully reveal the absurdity of Düring's claim (p.10) that we lack evidence for supposing S. mentioned Iphigenia's sacrifice as opposed to her transformation into Hecate. In all known versions of the myth, metamorphosis (of whatever nature) inevitably implies a prior attempt to cut the girl's neck. But did S. also make Agamemnon's sacrifice of his daughter the original cause of Clytemnestra's murderous hatred towards her husband? Wilamowitz assumed so (Aisch. Orestie ... Das Opfer am Grabe (1896) p.249) and even if we did not know that Iphigenia's death had been introduced as a motive before Pindar's time (see above Βούγιος) we should surely guess that a poem which acknowledged Iphigenia's presence at Aulis (as Homeric epic did not) could hardly avoid establishing a causal connection between the two events. S's Oresteia fits this description; so too perhaps the Hesiodic Εκεας.

Attic tragedy certainly makes Iphigenia's fate a potent element in Clytemnestra's revenge. It is probably imitating the influential S. in this. For the motivation to work, of course, the queen must be kept ignorant of her daughter's rescue by Artemis. Therefore this detail is

---

1J. Geffcken, Hermes 26 (1891) 571ff is surely wrong to allege that the Athenian dramatists make Clytemnestra use Iphigenia as an excuse for the act to which her innate promiscuity impelled her. Not that this would imply anything about S's treatment even if it were true.
suppressed by Aeschylus and Sophocles (Ag. 247 does not hint at it: see Fraenkel ad loc. (2 p.141 and n.3) and by Euripides in his Electra. S. clearly mentioned it and must therefore have ensured that no-one told Clytemnestra about it.

On Iphigenia as a goddess see the discussions by Wilamowitz pp.195ff, Seeliger pp.14-15, and especially P. Clement, "New evidence for the origin of the Iphigenia Legend", L'Antiquité Classique 3 (1934) 393ff. Paus. 1.43.1 says Hesiod told how Iphigenia became γνώμην 'Αρτέμιδος 'Εκάτη and Philodemus confirms that S. followed Hesiod in transforming her into Ἡ 'Εκάτη νῦν δυναμεῖν. But now that we have Hesiod's actual words (or most of them) before us, we see that he called the immortal version of Iphigenia "Ἀρτέμις εἶναίνη, an attendant (Lloyd-Jones' highly plausible supplement) of Artemis. But there is no contradiction here, for Artemis and Hecate were identified early and often. For a list of relevant authors see R-E 7.2770 where it is claimed that the earliest examples of the equation are Aesch. Suppl. 676: (scil. εὐχόμεθα) "Ἀρτέμιν δʼ ἔκάταν γυναικῶν λόχους ἐφορεύειν and Eur. Phoen. 109f: ἦς πότνια παῖ| Λατοῦς 'Εκάτη. It seems that this identification led to the mixing of the goddesses' qualities and to the obscuring of

1"A being distinct from Artemis, as is Ἀπόλλων νόμιος (Aristaeus) from Apollo his father" (West, Gnomon 35 (1963) p.753).
Hecate's traits: Artemis was certainly known as τριοδίτις on Thera (c.f. Hiller v. Gaertringen, Klio 2 (1901) 224) with which compare Charicles 394.1 (Kock): δέσποιν’ Ἐκάτη τριοδίτι). See further Apollodorus P. Gr. Hist. 244 F 109 - 111 with Jacoby ad loc c. (2 D p. 768).

As to why Artemis, Hecate, and Iphigenia should be identified with each other, note that (1) Farnell, Greek Hero Cults (1921) 56ff (c.f. Clement sup. cit. p. 396f) gives instances of a priestess' assuming the name of the deity she serves (e.g. Hyperborean maidens who served Apollo and Artemis at Delos were called Opis, Hecaerge and Loxo) or of a heroised priestess' receiving the dedications appropriate to the goddess she served. Hence the Hesiodic "Ἀρτεμίν εἶνοδίνην πρόπολον κλυτοῦ λοχεαίρης."

(2) For the very common identification of Iphigenia and Artemis there is plentiful evidence and discussion: see e.g. Farnell sup. cit., P. Clement sup. cit. 395ff, and most recently W. Sale, "The Temple-Legends of the Arkteia", Rh. Mus. 118 (1975) 265ff, especially 278ff. Hence the Stesichorean transformation of Iphigenia into Hecate. Farnell and Clement argue plausibly that Iphigenia was originally a goddess and only later came to be regarded as a heroine: the reverse process (elevation from mortal to divine status as a divinity with two names who received

---

1The equation of Iphigenia with Artemis concerns the latter's rôle as a fertility goddess. Note especially the etymology of the former's name (from ἴφι and γήνωμαι) which signifies "she who causes the birth of strong offspring" (compare Καλλιγένεια).
the sacrifices due to Artemis goddess of childbirth) would be quite unique.

Our second problem concerns the location of the immortalised Iphigenia in S. Proclus does not make it clear whether she was called Hecate-Artemis in the Cypria, but he does give her a new place of residence: "Ἀρτέμις δὲ αὐτὴν ἔξαρπάσασα εἰς Ταύρους μετακομιζει καὶ ἄθανατον ποιεῖ. Did the Tauri feature in the Hesiodic and Stesichorean handlings of this theme? Not according to Wilamowitz (p.197) and Seeliger (p.17). The former believes that Herodotus' tale of the Tauric maiden-goddess (Hdt. 4.103) must considerably post-date the discovery and recognition of that inhospitable deity by Greek travellers. The latter remarks: "Eine Eintrückung der Iphigeneia - Hekate nach Tauri kann natürlich bei ihnen [S. and Hesiod that is] nicht angenommen werden; auch für die Kyprien erscheint mir die betreffende Stelle des Proklosexcerptes verdächtig. Erst geraume Zeit, nachdem die Iphigeniasage zu den Taurern gebracht worden war, konnte im Mutterlande die Legende entstehen, dass das Bild der Göttin von dorthier gekommen sei; wenn sie aber das Bild durch Iphigeneia zurückbringen liess, so setzte sie vorous, dass diese keine Göttin, sondern die Priesterin der Artemis sei." But how can we tell when the Greeks first got to know of the Tauric deity? And Iphigenia already features as "die Priesterin der Artemis" by the time of Hes. fr. 23A.26 if Lloyd-Jones' almost inevitable προτομολογία is to
be accepted: a minor goddess sometimes identified with a major one (see above p.923) might also be called her πρόπολος: see H.H. Dem. 440 with Richardson ad loc. (p. 294f). West, Gnomon 35 (1963) 755 compares Phaethon's relationship to Aphrodite in Hes. Th. 991, and notes that Iphigenia herself is Artemis' priestess in Eur. I.T. 34. See generally A. Baschmahoff, "Origine Tauridienne du mythe d'Iphigénie", B.A.G.B. 64 (1939) 9ff.

The mention of a τάφος at first seems incompatible with the deification which Philodemus has mentioned and Vürtheim's comparison (p.49) with the grave of Cretan Zeus does not convince. Nor is Euripides' reference to the destined grave of his very mortal Iphigenia relevant (I.T. 1464ff: οὔ (scil. ἐν Βραυρῶν) καὶ τεθάψη ταυτανοῦσα κτλ.). But several authors mention a cenotaph, which is compatible with Iphigenia's immortality, and this is presumably what Philodemus means: c.f. Euphorion fr.91 (Powell) - copied by Nonnus 13·186 - ἄγχιάλον Βραυρῶν, κενηρίων Ἰφιγένειας, quoted by Σ Ar. Lysistr. 645 as typical of those of ... τὰ περὶ Ἰφιγένειαν ἐν Βραυρῶνι φασίν, οἷς ἐν Αὐλίδι. But Nonnus sup. cit. describes Iphigeneia's sacrifice as occurring at Aulis. This is interpreted by Wilamowitz (p.205) as "an elegant Alexandrian polemic" against Euphorion's cenotaph at Brauron. S. certainly did not use the tradition of
Iphigenia's sacrifice at Brauron (see my note on 191 P). Where he placed the cenotaph we cannot tell, (see above p.909).
This fragment is conventionally taken to be the strongest indication of Spartan influence upon S's Oresteia. The Iliad certainly knows nothing of a Lacedaemonian locale for Agamemnon's palace which it places at Mycenae according to our scholion, though anyone who has read and enjoyed Professor Page's "History and the Homeric Iliad" will know the heartaches and complexities which underlie that ostensibly simple testimony. The Iliad says that Agamemnon lives in Argos (I.1.30, 2.108, 4.171, 9.141 = 283) but Argos there must mean the Argolid region not the city¹ (see Page sup. cit. p.164 n.33) because elsewhere in the same poem the king's city is said to be Mycenae (I.2.569, 4.376, 8.180, 9.44). On the historical reality which may lurk behind these passages, and on the cloud of problems raised by the Catalogue, which takes "Argos" away from Agamemnon and gives it to Diomedes c.f. Page sup. cit. 127 ff and 164 ff. We can bypass these difficulties and reach the Odyssey, where at first sight the same situation prevails: Agamemnon's general territory is Argos (Od. 3.263) and his actual city is Mycenae (Od. 3.304). If this admirably simple picture were accurate all would be lucid and obvious: S. departs from Homer's picture because of Spartan pressure. He is followed in

¹And not the whole of the Peloponnese or even Greece, as Leaf-Bayfield ad I1. 1.30 would have it.
this detail by Simonides (549 p.: see p. 50 f) and Pindar Pyth. 11.15f: ἐν ὀφνεαίς ἀρούραις Πυλάδα | νικῶν εἴνου Δάκωνος Ὀρέστα ... ib. 31f: τάνεν μὲν αὐτὸς ἦσσα
Ajax| ἱκὼν χρόνωι κλείταις ἐν Ἀμύκλαις Nem. 8.12:
 Ajax| οἱ τὰ ανάστατον Πελοπηδῶν Νεμ 11.34: Ἀμύκλαιδεν γὰρ
 Ajax| ἔβα σὺν Ὀρέσται. For the Spartan tradition of Aga-
 Ajax| memnon's burial at Amyclae see Paus. 3.19.6. Amyclae,
 Ajax| the old capital of Laconia, was in legend the last place
 Ajax| in that region to be conquered by the Dorians, and in
 Ajax| Pausanias' day Agamemnon's tomb was shown there together
 Ajax| with a statue of Clytemnestra and a shrine of Alexandra
 Ajax| (identified as Cassandra). Their date is quite uncertain,
 Ajax| but it seems likely that the cult of Agamemnon will have
 Ajax| started here at the time when the Spartans were developing
 Ajax| their claim to the Pelopid dynasty.
 Ajax| The Attic tragedians on the other hand follow Aeschylus
 Ajax| (Ag. 24, 503, 810) in placing Agamemnon's palace at Argos.
 Ajax| Aeschylus will have been influenced by two contemporary
 Ajax| considerations: the alliance between his city and Argos,
 Ajax| and the desolation of Mycenae after Argos had sacked it in
 Ajax| 468/7 (Diod. Sic. 11.65.2ff). It was thanks to this
 Ajax| second factor that these two cities were continually
 Ajax| equated in Attic tragedy: see Strabo 86.19 p.377: διὰ δὲ
 Ajax| τὴν ἐγγύτητα τὰς δύο πόλεις ὡς μίαν οἱ τραγικὸι συνωνόμως
 Ajax| προσαγωγεῖσθαι. See further Σ Eur. Or. 46 (1.102
 Ajax| Schwartz), Wilamowitz, Aisch. Interp. p.190 and n.1, C.P.
 Ajax| Bill, "The Location of the Palaces of the Atreidae in
 Ajax| Greek Tragedy", T.A.P.A. 61 (1930) 111ff, and Denniston's
note on Eur. El. 1 (pp.55-6); Tarrant on Seneca Ag. 1 (pp.160f). Later tragedians may then have seen themselves as returning to the Homeric tradition in situating Agamemnon at Argos.¹

But what if Homer too knows of a Spartan localisation for Agamemnon? Would not this be S's immediate source and render otiose the notion of Spartan influence? Such is the claim of Ferrari (pp.5ff) and Podlecki (p.315) those persistent opponents of Bowra's thesis. They claim to derive strength from that enigmatic passage in Od. 4·514ff where Menelaus describes his brother's homeward journey:

```
αλλ’δε τῇ τάχ’ἐμελλε Μαλειάων δρος αἶπ’ ξέεδαι, τότε δὴ μὴν ἄναρπάξασα θάμνα πόντον ἐπ’ ἅλκυδεντα φέρεν βαρέα στενάκοντα, ἀγροῦ ἐπ’ ἐσχατήν, ὡθὶ δῷματα ναὶ ἄθετης τὸ πρὶν, ἀτὰρ τότ’ ἑναι θετιλάδις Αἰγιθεσ. αλλ’δε τῇ καὶ κεῖθεν ἐξαινετο νόστος ἀπήμων, ἄψ ὡς δῇ οἴρον στρέψαν, καὶ οἶκαι ἰκονιοτο,
```

¹J.M. Cook, "The Cult of Agamemnon at Mycenae", Geras A. Keramopoulos (1953) 113ff, argues that such remarkable fluctuations in the whereabouts of Agamemnon's palace were only possible because no firm tradition about Agamemnon's tomb actually existed. Therefore the shrines discovered at Amyclae and on the banks of the Chaus stream at Mycenae must be mere Ἱδωτα, shrines - independent of any tomb - where the hero-cult was practised down to Hellenistic times. The tradition of the tombs of Agamemnon, Clytemnestra, and Aegisthus in the grave-circles at Mycenae (Paus. 2·16·6-7) must have grown up later. Cook cites parallel evidence in the growth of hero-cults around Mycenaean tombs from the late Geometric Period onwards and suggests they result from the stimulus caused by the spread of epic poems through mainland Greece. See contra S. Marinatos, Das Altertum 1 (1955) 158ff.
That these lines imply a different home for Agamemnon from that accepted in the set of Homer seems first to have been realised by Friedrich von Duhn, de Menelai itinere Aegyptio etc. (Diss. Bonn. 1874).

Eduard Schwartz in a slightly more familiar work (Die Odyssee, (Munich 1924) 76) summarised the facts concisely when he said "Wenn Agamemnon das Kap Malea umfahren wollte, war die Argolis sein Ziel nicht." No indeed. And if Agamemnon is rounding Cape Malea on his way home he must be heading for Sparta not Mycenae (compare Menelaus' own route in Od. 3·287). I have read many would-be explanations of this discrepancy and have found none of them convincing. Nor can I devise a satisfactory solution myself. I doubt whether we will ever have enough information to understand the passage properly. Fortunately, this does not prevent us from observing that Ferrari and Podlecki vastly exaggerate the difficulties it poses for the theory of Spartan influence on S. Here, for instance,

---

1 On these lines in general see Wilamowitz, Die Heimkehr d. Od. (1927) 120, Pfeiffer, Ausgew. Schr. 18.

2 It is far too complex to be tackled here: most of the general surveys mentioned in the bibliography above (p.751 f.) devote some space to this knotty problem; and further preliminary bearings may be taken from the bibliography in Nilsson, The Mycenaean Origins of Greek Mythology (1932) 70ff, to which add Momigliano, Stud. It. 8 (1930) 317ff = Quarto Contributo alla storia degli Studi Classici (1969) 503ff, since others have clearly found its thesis that the motif of Cape Malea as a place where storms blow a hero off course (Od. 3·287, 9·89, 19·187) has been misapplied to Agamemnon here less arbitrary than I do.
is the former on this subject: "L'argomento non esiste, perché S. non ha innovato nulla, egli ha semplicemente seguito una versione diversa da quella predominante nell'epos omerico e a lui di non poco anteriore se un riflesso ne compare nella Telemachia" (p.8. n.1). Podlecki likewise talks blithely of this pre-Stesichorean tradition of Agamemnon in Sparta (p.315), as if we knew enough about the Odyssean lines (or S.) to dogmatise about their dates! Still, let us suppose, as is reasonable, that the passage did exist by S's time: in what way would that explode the theory of Spartan influence? The Odyssey here adopts a Spartan tradition about Agamemnon's kingdom, just as at Od. 3.306f it seems to adopt an Athenian tradition as to Orestes' whereabouts during Aegisthus' usurpation (see p. 864). In the former case however, the Spartan tradition is at odds with everything else Homer has to tell us about Agamemnon's homeland. Why should any non-Spartan poet, with the Iliad and Odyssey before him, adopt the version enshrined in this single passage - a version so inconspicuous that its significance lay hidden until 1874 - and close his ears to all the other lines which roar "Argos" or "Mycenae", unless Sparta were exerting some sort of pressure? I except the possibility that S. knew a version of the Homeric poems very different from ours, with far more references to Agamemnon's Lacedaemonian homeland. But how such a very different version could arise, unless by Spartan influence, I cannot imagine. After all, the situation envisaged for the Oresteia
is very similar to that which we hypothesised for the 
Palinodes: there is a Spartan version of a given legend 
which "leaks out" and is adopted in non-Spartan epic 
(Ionian or Boeotian) where it plays a relatively subserv­
ient part (Agamemnon in Sparta; Helen in Egypt and her 
ειςωλον at Troy). Then S. visits Sparta and is 
persuaded to give the local version far more prominence 
than it ever received in Homer or Hesiod. If we are 
being pedantic, S. did not "invent" this version, but it 
seems fair to refer to his "deliberate innovation" (Bowra 
GLP² p.113) in literature. To pretend that it would be 
equally possible to describe Homer as putting Agamemnon in 
Sparta is absurd. Any objective reader of Homer would 
summarise the poet's views on Agamemnon's homeland in 
exactly the same way as Σ Eur. Or.

One final point, also involving the scholion's phrase­
ology: Bowra (sup. cit.) believes in "the growth of a 
legend" about Agamemnon in Sparta, whereby S., eager to 
divorce Agamemnon from Argos, only mentions the general 
locality (Λακεδαιμων) while Pindar expands the tradition 
to name the town (Ἄμυχλαι). I think this is rather a 
rash inference to draw from the phrase ἐν Λακεδαιμονι in 
contrast to ἐν Ἀγρει and ἐν Μυκήναις. The scholion may 
not be straining for such precision. And besides, if S. 
derived his version from Sparta, it seems probable that
the tradition of Agamemnon's life and death as implied by Paus. 3.19.6 would be deep-seated enough to have been available to S.
The editio princeps is by D.L. Page, Oxy. Pap. 29 (1963) fr.26 col.ii pp.11 (text) and 37 (comments): Plate IV (e). On the precise nature of the work to which this fragment belongs, see my note on 193 P (p.431 n.1).

1-7

1-3: as Page points out there are two possible approaches to the interpretation of these lines:

(i) "the majority of other poets used S."

presupposing some such supplements as τῶν τε ἀλλῶν ποιήτων οἱ πλείονες τὰίς ἀφορμαίς ταῖς τούτων (scil. ἔχοντας). But since τῶν τε ἀλλῶν naturally suggests a phrase like δὲ τῇ ἡμίχρωσι as preceding, the meaning "S. used the narratives of x, and so did most other poets." would thus be produced. Slightly superior, given the sequel, will be Page's preferred alternative:

(ii) "S. used the narrative of (e.g. Homer), and most other poets used his (i.e. S's)."

For this meaning μὲν ... δὲ would have been more natural particles than τε ... τε, but the context as a whole is far better suited by this rendering. Holwerda's attempt to justify τε ... τε (Mnemos. 18 (1965) 74) by supplementing καὶ νοοῦτα γῆματων in 1, ὤμοιμαῖς in 4 and τούτου μέ[σμονται] in 5 (referring to Aeschylus) does not seem to me to produce a coherent thought-sequence or idiomatic phrasing.

ἀφορμαίς: for the word in this technical sense see Wilamowitz on Eur. Her. 236 (22, p.60) - a good history of
its development -LSJ s.v. II 5. To the examples there given we might add¹ Menand. Rhet. 336·12, 347·20, 403·21, 409·15 etc. (page numbers of Spengel Rhet. Graeci 3).

Also Dion. Hal. de Lys. 15 (25·19) 18 (30·2) and comp. verb. 4 (23·4) (page numbers of Usener-Radermacher).


AESCHYLUS

8-9: "τριλόγ[ιαν seems obvious, although the trace does not suggest γ. It is hard to think of anything to insert between '_AG. and Xo., but if there was nothing v.9 was a very short line" (Page ib.).

"It must be borne in mind that in all probability the tokens formed a part of the traditional story before Aeschylus. One would dearly like to know whether they figured in the Oresteia of S; if so, their occurrence in Aeschylus would hardly be surprising. Not that one has any right to think Aeschylus incapable of inventing them."

So Professor Lloyd-Jones in 1961 (C.Q 11 p.180 n.1) considering Fraenkel's objections to Choeph. 205ff. The

¹I owe these examples to D.A. Russell.
following year brought a partial fulfilment of the wish expressed in his second sentence. We now know that S. did indeed mention the first of the three tokens, the lock of hair. Whether he also prefigured the remaining Aeschylean recognition-signs, the notorious foot-prints and the piece of cloth woven by Electra, the papyrus does not say. I do not think we should be in a hurry to draw conclusions from our fragment's silence on this point, as Lesky (p.8) rather surprisingly seems to do. There is absolutely no reason to suppose that this work, whatever its exact nature, is here trying to give a totally exhaustive list of every single passage in Greek Tragedy that was influenced by S. Rather, there are signs to the contrary. For it omits the Choephoroi's τροφός, who was derived, whatever changes Aeschylus introduced, from S's Laodameia (see 219 p). Hence no argumentum ab silentio should deter us from speculating as to whether other Aeschylean details in general and these two tokens in particular derive from S's Oresteia. Unfortunately, in the case of the tokens, speculate is all we can do. Some might think that since Aeschylus adopted the first of them from S., it is highly likely that the other two are from the same source. Others could argue that Aeschylus found only one token in S. and then manufactured two more in order to produce that dramatic increase in tension and movement towards a climax which are appropriate to Aeschylus' play but not to S's more static lyric narrative. Could this be the reason for the rather feeble nature of
the foot-print passage? Of course those who are persuaded that this whole region of the play is interpolated will not accept that S. contained so much as a whisper of the footprints.¹

It is rather unnerving to discover that Carl Robert in 1881 categorically denied that any of Aeschylus' tokens could be derived from S. (Bild und Lied p.172 n.20). For Euripides pokes fun at each of them, and what would be the point of this if S. had invented them? "Aus der scharfen Kritik, welche Euripides an der Art, wie in den Choephoren die Erkennung durch Fusstapfen, Haarfarbe und ein altes Gewand herbeigeführt wird, ausübt, darf und muss man doch wohl folgern, dass dies alles von Aischylos selbst erfunden ist. Gegen S. gerichtet wäre die Polemik doch wirklich zu kindisch." Robert of course could not be expected to give a friendly reception to the idea that S's Orestes was recognised by his sister with the aid of tokens. He wanted Talthybius to play the rôle which we now find to have been filled by the lock of hair. Nevertheless, although it was influenced by ulterior motives, I believe his conclusion to be unassailable. Only, now that we know that S. mentioned at least the lock of hair, we must turn it round and say that if Eur. El. 520-84 are genuine, then Euripides is doing nothing so vulgar as ridiculing his predecessor. Instead, he is turning these traditional tokens to new use. But this is not

¹See in favour of interpolation Fraenkel, Ag. 3·815ff (Appendix D), against, Lloyd-Jones, C.Q.11 (1961) 172ff.
the place to try negotiating that particular quagmire.¹

More important, we now have proof positive that Electra featured in S's Oresteia. For if S. mentioned a token of recognition he must also have described a recognition-scene: and between whom else but Orestes and his sister? This new fact chimes well with previous deductions from works of art which assumed that Orestes encountered and recognised Electra at their father's tomb (see p.819f supr.). Wilamowitz too had already guessed (Hermes 18 (1883) p.214 n.1 = Kl. Schr. 6 p.161 n.1) on no very good grounds² that S's Orestes came to Agamemnon's tomb on Apollo's advice to sacrifice there. If S. did locate the recognition there, it seems highly likely that he explained Electra's simultaneous presence by having Clytemnestra send her to her father's tomb as a result of the nightmare described in 219 P.

Our new fragment likewise disproves Robert's hypothesis that it was Talthybius who facilitated Oreste's recognition by his sister.

On the recognition scenes in the three Greek tragedians

¹On Euripides' supposed parody of Aeschylus see most recently G.W. Bond, Hermathena 118 (1974) [H.W. Parke Festschrift] lff. On pp.2-3 of that article he attacks the sort of explanations which I would prefer to employ and claims, I am sad to say, that they "reek of the psychological drama of the present century." Another likely approach is that suggested by Denniston in his commentary on Eur. El. (p.114 ad fin.) [See now D. Bain, B.I.C.S. 24 (1977) 104ff.]

²Viz. that the sacrifice in Sophocles' Electra has no real effect on the course of the drama. He was followed by Mayer p.39.
and the significant differences between them see F. Solmsen, "Electra and Orestes: three recognitions in Greek Tragedy" (Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde Nieuwe Reeks Deel 30 No.2 (1967)): a German version in Wege der Forschung 87 (1974) Wege zu Aischylos 2. 275ff. Also the article by Bond referred to in p. 938 n. 1.

20: our MSS. of Eur. Or. 268-9 give us μ' before εἶπε, not before ἐξαμύνεσθαι as here.

21-2: Page suggests τὸ[ξα δ'ἔγω,] τὸ[ξα δὲ κοι], which we may accept when we have changed the latter, in the light of our new-found knowledge of S’s dialect, to τὸ[ξα δὲ τιν].

23: Page notes the difficulty of having κεκαθαμένους +DAT. in its normal early sense of "excelling in" (LSJ. s.v. καὶνωμ I, to which section (rather than to II "furnished with" (tragedy etc.)) belongs Pind. Ol. 1.27: ἐλέφαντι διὸν κεκαθαμένου) govern the infinitive, as it must here with παλαμαίς: instrumental or local: "by the power of/in my hands excellent at striking mightily". Lloyd-Jones' κεκαθαυκνόνα (C.R. 15 (1965) 71) produces a metrically implausible sequence for S. (------) and we must concentrate on the two passages adduced by Page and Lobel: (i) for καὶνωμ + INF. c.f. Od. 3.282: ἐκαῖνυτο φῦλ' ἄνθρωπων]νῆα κυβερνήσαι. (ii) verbally similar: [Hes.] Scut. 320f: ἀρσάμενος παλαμῆςι ...|πάλλεν ἐπικρατέως (scil. σάκος); (compare the Homeric ἀρμανον ἐν παλαμῆςιν (Il.18.600; Od. 5.234)). This second passage suggested to Lloyd-Jones the
emendation πάλλειν for βάλλειν (C.R. 14 (1964) 19) which is quite likely given this scribe’s carelessness (see above p.431).

ταλάματίσιν ἐµαῖτι: c.f. 11.19.263: ἐνὶ κλείτης
ἐµήσιν ib. 220: μύθοισιν ἐµωίσιν. ἐπικρατέως in 11.16. 67 etc.

We already knew that in S's Oresteia Apollo gave Orestes his bow to ward off the Furies: Σ Eur. Or. 268 (1.126 Schwartz) had told us Σησιχόρων ἐπόμενος (scil. Εὐριπίδης) τῷ δα ψηλίν αὐτόν (scil. Ὀρέστην) εἰληφέναι παρὰ Ἀπόλλωνος. But in Euripides' realistic, not to say sordid, treatment, bow and Furies alike are the products of Orestes' wild hallucinations, not the solid figures of Aeschylus and S. Aeschylus, though nearer in time to the lyric poet, does not imitate this particular feature as closely as Euripides, but he does have Apollo threaten the Furies directly himself with his bow (Eum. 180ff):

ἀπαλλάσσεσθε μαντικῶν μυχῶν,
μὴ καὶ λαβοῦσα πτηνὸν ἄργυστήν δην,
χρυσηλάτου θύμιγγος ἔξωρικωμένον,
ἄνηκε ὑπ' ἀλγόυς μελαν’ ἀπ’ ἀνθρώπων ἀφρὸν κτλ.

and he assures both them (232ff) and Orestes (64ff) of his continued protection of the latter. For representations in plastic art see above p.842ff.

S. is the earliest author credited with mentioning the Furies: did he invent their rôle here? In the first
place I think "invention" the wrong word for what may have been a reinstatement of details suppressed by Homer. Secondly, since the Nostoi seems to have mentioned Orestes' act of matricide (above p.800) I find it hard to believe that this advance on Homer in explicitness did not bring with it a mention of the prime instruments of punishment for that act. The same poem mentioned Pylades, son of the king of Phocis; Apollo's oracle at Delphi lay within Phocian territory. Hence Apollo's support may well have featured in epic before S's time. But there is no way of telling what form S's Erinyes had.¹ Jacoby in his excellent discussion of the variant versions as to Orestes' fate after his acts of vengeance (in his commentary on the Atthidographers: 2·24-6) makes two assertions: the first, that it is uncertain whether Apollo ordered Orestes to kill his mother as well as Aegisthus, is surely wrong as applied to S. Jacoby himself is well aware that the avenging Erinyes are hounding the slayer of Clytemnestra, not of Aegisthus. But, if Apollo helps Orestes to thwart these same spirits, it surely follows that he ordered the original act which they are now striving to punish (so Robert, Bild und Lied p.175). The second assertion, that the gift of the bow

¹ Eur. Or. 275 (1·126 Schwartz) mentions the introduction of winged Erinyes (πτερωτάς καὶ οὖσα τάς 'Ερινύας ὀμέδετρα) but there is no indication that these are being credited to S.: c.f. R.R. Dyer, "The Iconography of the Oresteia after Aeschylus", A.J.A. 71 (1967) p.175 n.7. The notion that S's Erinyes were snake-shaped is advanced by Zancani Montuoro in R.A.A.N. 26 (1951) 273-4. Heraion etc. 2·294 on no very good grounds: see below p.970 n.1.
excludes the idea of purification as well as of ethical conflict, is more ambiguous. That the latter element, together with the judicial action at Athens, were inventions of Aeschylus is an almost inescapable conclusion.\(^1\) It is hard to make sense of the tradition as a whole without this supposition, as Jacoby has shown.\(^2\) The same scholar follows the orthodox idea that purification was an important stage in Greek thought, perhaps encouraged by Delphi.\(^3\) Hence it was "more probably introduced" into the Orestes-saga "to give a solution more acceptable to sixth century thinking" than the gift of Apollo's bow (p.26). But in fact the importance of purification is acknowledged in several pre-Stesichorean passages of literature, and was even known to Homer, though he, in the manner now familiar to us, chose to exclude it for the most part from his epic world. (So first Karl Otfried Müller in 1833: see especially Lloyd-Jones, The Justice of Zeus pp.71-6 and 182-4). It would, then, be unwise to dismiss the possibility of a Stesichorean purification of Orestes solely on grounds of Geistegeschichte. Nor does it necessarily ensue from

\(^1\) Contra c.f. E.G. Pemberton, A.J.A. 70 (1966) 377: "S. seems to have initiated a new interpretation of the myth, stressing not the righteousness of Orestes' act... but the moral conflict of Muttermord". This scholar seems to have initiated a new misconception: the presence of the Erinyes in S. does not by itself entail any ethical conflict of the sort implied by "Ἀρεία Ἑμμηαλεττ, Αἶκα Αἶκα (Cho. 461) and stressed in the Eumenides' trial scene.


\(^3\) Jacoby's view is shared by L. Radermacher, Das Jenseits im Mythos der Hellenen (1903) p.132, Lesky sup. cit. (in n.2) 977.
Orestes' temporary ability to ward off the Furies with a bow that he would not wish to win permanent respite through purification. Indeed, Aeschylus' list of places where Orestes had been purified (Eum. 276ff) presupposes some unspecified pre-Aeschylean tradition of purification for the son of Agamemnon. But whether this tradition is S's we do not know: for the brute fact is that an impenetrable mist descends on the Oresteia immediately after the event recorded in this fragment, and we have no reliable means of deciding how the poem ended or what happened to Orestes.

25-7: despite the gaps, the underlying sense is clear: Euripides adopted from S. the idea of Iphigenia's journey to Aulis under the pretext of marriage to Achilles. (The reference is presumably to the I.A., although Euripides also alludes to the story in El. 1020ff). This is news to us, but the motif was not invented by S. since it occurs first in the Cypria: ὃς ἐπὶ γάμον αὐτῆς (scil. Ἰφιγένειαν) Ἀχιλλεὶ μεταπεμψάμενοι θύειν ἐπιχειροῦσιν (Allen p.104 (Procl.)). Of this wretchedly starved summary Zielinski (p.247) rightly remarks that there are three possible interpretations: (1) both Achilles and

Our writer's failure to draw attention to this important fact should not be taken as a reason for doubting his reliability. In the present section he seems to be discussing S's relationship to Attic tragedians: epics such as the Cypria do not enter into the question. Compare the silence about such important sources as the poem on P. Lille 767ε'ν Ἐπτα ἐπὶ θῆβας πλὴν τῆς Ἰώδατας in "Aristophanes'" Hypothesis to the Phoenissae. Such Hypotheses likewise only refer to indebtedness to Attic tragedians.
Iphigenia are deceived by the pretext; (2) Achilles was a party to the deception; (3) Achilles was unaware that his name was used in the sordid pretence. The same scholar pointed out that even if we could decide which of the combinations the Cypria employed, several other important details would remain obscure. Whom did Agamemnon send to fetch Iphigenia? Did her mother accompany her to Aulis? The same difficulties confront us in our attempt to recover S's treatment of the story. The only possible difference is that since we now know Euripides to have taken over the whole idea of the marriage-ruse from S, he might possibly have taken over some of its individual details from the same source. So it would be as well to bear in mind that Euripides represents Clytemnestra as bringing her daughter to Aulis, and Achilles and Iphigenia as joining her to form a trio of dupes of Agamemnon's trick. But it would be foolhardy to ransack the whole i.A. for possible Stesichorean echoes.

For a possible answer to the first question see Apollod. ep.3-22: πέσας Ἄγαμέμνον πρὸς Κλυταμήτταν Ὀδύσσεα καὶ Ταλάδωβον Ἰφιγένεται. Οδυσσέας appears as solitary go-between in Soph.T.G.F.4F 305 (Radt): c.f. Eur. I.A. 107; Diomedes accompanies him in Hygin. fab. 98. The tradition was probably the inspiration behind the late idea that Iphigenia and Achilles really did marry or at least produced a child—Neoptolemus. See, for instance, Lycophr. 183 and 323 (with Tz. ad locc. (2·90 and 129 Scheer) and Duris F. Gr. Hist. 76 F 88. The whole tale is in arrant contradiction with the early epic version which knew Neoptolemus as the son of Achilles and Deidameia (Cypr: Alien p.104 (Procl.) and fr.14 (Allen pp. 122f) ; Parv. II. (Alien p.106 (Procl.)). Connected with this late development is the picture of Achilles and Iphigenia united on Leuce which we find in Lycophr. 201 and Nicander fr.58 (Gow-Scholfield) and Et. Mag. p.464.
when in so much of this play we hear the very individual voice of the playwright speaking, whether for that scene he be Euripides or another. One thinks of the amusing encounter between Achilles and Clytemnestra (819ff),¹ or the decision of Iphigenia to sacrifice her life for the sake of the Trojan expedition (1375ff), a typical Euripidean device (c.f. Macaria in Hclld. 500ff, Menoecus in Phoen. 991ff etc.).

Apart from the Cypria and Euripides, the story of Iphigenia's pretended marriage to Achilles also occurs in Sophocles' Iphigenia (T.G.F.4 F 305 (Radt): see Pearson, The Fragments of Sophocles, l.218ff).

cατ [.].ρ.[

In view of the particular context and the probable nature of the whole work from which the present passage is taken,² this seems likeliest to be a reference to Euripides' biographer rather than to a satyr play.

¹821 (c.f. El. 1062) is implausibly traced back to S. by Mayer p.33.
²For "the interweaving of biographical material ... with the interpretation of selected passages" characteristic of the monograph περὶ τοῦ δείκτα see the passage by Pfeiffer quoted on 193 P(p.431 n.1).
Aesch. Cho. 732: ποί δή πατέης, Κήλεσσα, δώματων πόλας;
Pind. Pyth. 11.17ff: τὸν δή φονευομένου πατρὸς Ἀρεινόα
κλυταίμήστρας | χειρῶν ὦπο κραταρὰν ἐκ δόλου τροφὸς ἄνελε
δυσπενθέος ... No author before S. seems to have mentioned
Orestes' τροφός, and it seems reasonable to suppose S.
invented her, perhaps under the influence of the Odyssey's
Eurycleia. The two lyric poets give her an heroic, the
Attic tragedian gives her a slave name ("the Cilissian").
S. and Pindar probably envisaged the nurse as a noble-
born woman who had been sold into slavery after being
stolen by pirates or when her native land had been ravaged
by enemies. Such an one was the nurse of Eumaeus in the
Odyssey, whose life was ruined by sea-robbers (Od. 15.425
ff):

"ἐκ μὲν Σιδώνως πολυχάλκου εὔχομαι εἶναι,
κοζρή δ’ εἰς Ἀρουθαντος ἔγω διὸν ἀφενείοτοι·
ἄλλα μ’ ἀνθρωπαῖν τάφοι ληφτόρες ἄνδρες
ἀγρόθεν ἐρχομένην, πέρασαν δὲ μὲ δευρ’ ἀγαγόντες
τοῦδ’ ἀνδρὸς πρὸς δώμαθ’ ὁ δ’ ἀείλου ὄνον ἐδώκε·"

And in the same category falls her charge (Od. 15.450)
Eumaeus himself, who was son of a king (ib. 413f) and was
carried off by Phoenician traders thanks to his nurse and
was bought by Laertes of Ithaca and became his swineherd.
Or perhaps the lyrics' nurse became a slave through war,
like Tecmessa, Ajax's concubine (Soph. Aj. 487ff):

ἐγώ δ’ ἐλευθέρου μὲν ἔξεψαν πατρός,
Aeschylus on the other hand gave her a servile name, the sort nurses of his own time might bear. Slaves were often called by the name of their original country (countless instances in New Comedy, Plautus and Terence; see besides [Dem.] 59·35 etc.). The name Laodamia is given to Orestes' nurse by Pherecydes as well as S. Pherec. F. Gr. Hist. 3 F 134 = Σ Pind. Pyth. 11·25B (2·257 Dr.): λέος δὲ φησιν ὁ Πίνδαρος Ἀοσινόθην εἶναι τὴν Ὀρέστου τροφῆν, Φερεκύδης δὲ Λαοδάμειαν λέγων αὐτὴν τὸν ταύτης παιδό φησιν ἀνηρήθαι ὑπὸ Αἰγίσθου¹ νομίζομενον Ὀρέστην εἶναι. τὸν δὲ Ὀρέστην ἐκκαλαπέντα εἶναι τριῶν ἐτῶν, ὡς ὁ Ἡράκλειος ἐν Πελοπείαι (F. Gr. Hist. 31 F 1).

"Die versuchte ermordung kennt nur Ph." says Jacoby in his commentary ad loc. (p.424). That seems a bit steep. In fact I cannot discern the reasoning behind this statement. Since S. mentioned Laodamia in his poem, he must have given the poor woman something to do: it seems unlikely that she was the subject of a single line which conveyed the useless piece of information that Orestes had a nurse called Laodamia. And what could such a nurse do but save the life of her infant charge? Pindar's narrative implies that the reason why the child was taken from Clytemnestra

¹It seems to me altogether illegitimate to conclude from this phrase that Clytemnestra is regarded as the passive partner in the conspiracy against Agamemnon, which is not even referred to in this passage.
was that either she or Aegisthus were likely to do it harm. If the metope discovered at Foce del Sele does reflect a Stesichorean scene, with the nurse restraining Clytemnestra from hurling herself at the returned Orestes with a double-axe, the likelihood of the earlier attempted murder would be increased. On two occasions the faithful nurse would have saved the life of her charge. And the axe should remind us that it was not only Aegisthus who posed a threat to the baby's life. But Pherecydes implies that Aegisthus took the initiative. Are we to suppose that this feature, and the nurse's unique personal sacrifice, derive from S. as Kleine (p.83) suggested? I see no reason to exclude the hypothesis. That Pherecydes should have been indebted to a poet so popular at Athens (see p. 884 ff) is at least as likely as Jacoby's suggestion involving complex contamination of traditions (ib.: "die Verwechslung dabei aus der Aedongeschichte (F 124), von wo sie (durch Euripides? Robert, Heldensage 48f) auch in die Phryxosgeschichte übertragen ist"). Aeschylus' nurse plays no such rôle in saving Orestes' life of course, because the playwright has Clytemnestra send her young son to Strophius the Phocian (Ag. 877ff, Cho. 914). But he

---

1 Though there is no reason to follow Vürtheim (p.51) in reading "S." for "Pherecydes".

2 See further on the different versions Robert, Heldensage pp.1305f. The rescue of the infant Orestes is conspicuous by its absence from vase-paintings. Beazley could only cite a cup by the Telephus Painter (Hermitage 658: ARV² 817.3 = Brommer V³ 334 B 10) which Prag gives good reasons for interpreting as a scene from the Iliupersis.
certainly derived the idea of the nurse from S. His two successors omit her completely. Sophocles ("con arte piú delicata" as Ferrari (p.23) says) makes Electra herself rescue her young brother and entrust him to the παιδαγωγός (El. 296ff, 1348ff). Euripides deprives his heroine of that deed and allows the old manservant to Agamemnon to save Orestes and deposit him with Strophius (El. 16ff, 556ff). For the theory that πρέσβυς and παιδαγωγός are descendants of a Stesichorean Talthybius who received the child from Laodamia's arms and conducted him to safety, see above pp.812ff and 815ff. But only in Hellanicus F. Gr. Hist. 90 F 25, the contemporary of Sophocles, does Talthybius feature as the sole rescuer.¹

Is there any other explanation for the differing names of the three poets' nurses? Bowra (in C.Q. 28 (1934) 117f repeated with little change in GLP² 114) suggested that S. took over for his poem the name of the mother of Triphylus and the daughter of Amyclas king of Lacedaemon as mentioned by Paus. 10.9.5: τούτων δὲ ἦν οὖν ἑβατὸ τῶι Τριφύλωι μήτηρ, ἀλλὰ Λαοδάμεια ἦ ἀμύκλα τοῦ ἐν Λακεδαίμονι βασιλεύσαντος. The aim of this particular fictitious genealogy was to provide Triphylus the Arcadian hero and eponymous ancestor of the Triphylians with a Spartan grandfather via Laodamia, and thereby allow the Spartans

¹Robert's hypothesis that the Nurse (together with Talthybius) assisted in the recognition scene of Orestes and Electra seems unlikely now that we know S. used the lock of hair (see above p.936).
to claim Triphylia (which they annexed in the seventh century) on grounds of racial kinship. "It looks", writes Bowra, "as if [Laodamia] appealed to S. as a suitably national figure to save the child Orestes from death". Pindar and Aeschylus, writing for non-Spartan audiences to whom all this would be meaningless, changed the nurse's name at will, but Pherecydes followed S., perhaps because of his interest in genealogies. This hypothesis has been attacked by Podlecki (p.314): "It seems a dubious compliment to the Spartan royal line to adopt from one of its members the name of Orestes' nurse, when we remember the lowly, indeed buffoonish rôle she plays in the Choephori". To which we will reply that Podlecki has misunderstood the dramatic function of the nurse in that play,¹ and that even if he had not, S. could hardly be held responsible for the alterations made to this character by a different poet writing in a different place more than a century later. The heroic name of S's nurse and the considerations adduced on p.947 above make it unlikely that the Spartan royal house would have been offended. This is not one of Bowra's more impressive proofs of Spartan influence, but I have yet to encounter any valid argument against it.

¹On which see R.F. Goheen, A.J.P. 76 (1955) 132ff.
Vice, Plutarch informs us, is active and strong until its crime is performed, but then falls a prey to terrors and superstition. So S. modelled Clytemnestra's dream on reality.

A wonderfully concise and lucid explanation of these two lines (together with a resumé of previous interpretations) is given by Lesky in RE s.v. Orestes (181 (1939) 976-35ff). This fragment surely deserves some sort of prize as the most ambiguous of S's remains: without the aid of the lacunae or uncertain letters which infest the papyrus finds, simply by means of that common curse of quotations, lack of context, 219 P achieves effortless obscurity.

Certainty here is a luxury even less attainable than in S's other fragments, so let us give ourselves a treat by beginning with an interpretation of these two lines which is certainly wrong and which Lesky accurately terms "kein glücklicher Gedanke". Wilamowitz, in Aisch. Orestie ... Das Opfer am Grabe (1896) pp.248-9 n.3, asserted that our fifteen words were even more impenetrable than had been realised: we cannot tell whom the snake represents, or even whose blood it bears on its head, for only the first line describes Clytemnestra's dream; the second line deals with the immediate realisation of the actuality corresponding to the dream - hence the different tenses of ἐδωκήσε and
\( \varepsilon \phi \alpha \nu \) and the nuance behind \( \delta \rho \alpha \). This reading was repeated in Aischylos: Interpretationen (1914) p.191 bolstered by that type of bullying dogmatism with which Wilamowicz invariably reinforces a weak case: "Wer nicht weiss, was \( \varepsilon \kappa \ \tau \omicron \ \upsilon \ \delta \rho \alpha \ \varepsilon \varphi \alpha \nu \nu \omicron \iota \) im Gegensatze zu \( \delta \omicron \kappa \eta \varsigma \omicron \) bedeutet, soll es lernen, ehe er mitzureden wagt."

In this later treatment the great man actually insists that the title of the fragment's poem is unknown. Literally true, but it is hard to see what Stesichorean poem apart from the Oresteia would be likely to mention a dream of Clytemnestra. Nor are the other arguments advanced any more satisfactory. The significance of \( \varepsilon \kappa \ \tau \omicron \omicron \ \delta \rho \alpha \) is ambiguous to say the least (see below) and the \( \delta \omicron \kappa \eta \varsigma \omicron \varphi \alpha \nu \varepsilon \varsigma \delta \omicron \omicron \) contrast is unimportant as regards both meaning and tense. The whole notion that the two lines connote dream-fantasy and corresponding reality in that sequence seems to be based on a misapprehension about the meaning of Plutarch's introductory phrase \( \pi \omicron \delta \omicron \tau \ \gamma \lambda \gamma \nu \omicron \omicron \epsilon \omicron \nu \) καί \( \pi \omicron \delta \omicron \ \tau \omicron \nu \ \delta \lambda \lambda \delta \varepsilon \omicron \omicron \).

Wilamowicz was aware of the fact, so fatal to his interpretation, that Plutarch regarded his quotation as furnishing an instance of a dream-vision: why then does he add the second line if it merely refers to a reality reflecting the dream? Rarely can so potent an objection

---

1. Wilamowicz evidently saw the particle as an example of the meaning listed under heading (2) by Denniston GP p.36. See contra p.959 inf.

2. See too Aristot. und Ath. 2 (1893) 183 n.32. The fantasy seems to have been tacitly abandoned by 1922 (see Pindaros p.510).
have called forth so feeble a retort: "Den Erfolg des vorbedeutenden Traumes brauchte er nicht mitzuteilen; aber ob er es wollte, war seine Sache, und er hat es getan" (Interp. p.191). As if uneasy over this anaemic response, Wilamowitz turns to maul in a foot-note the perfectly natural conclusion that line one's snake represents Agamemnon and that the wounds on his head were those made by Clytemnestra's axe. If the snake were Agamemnon, "mit dem Schwerte wurde sie ihn in die Brust gestossen haben, und dann die Schlange ihre Wunde dort tragen." We must in fact ask ourselves what is the obvious weapon with which to strike an enemy on the head as opposed to stabbing him on the body. "An axe" has seemed the likeliest answer to a large number of scholars, and I can see no argument to refute them.¹

Wilamowitz is prepared to entertain the possibility that the second line of our fragment alludes to Orestes' accession to his father's throne, but again his eccentric reading of the two lines as a whole hangs like an albatross round his neck: S. has described Clytemnestra's dream so

¹These scholars include Robert, Wecklein, Denniston p.69, and Lesky (RE 18 (1939) 976-7 and W.S. 1 (1967) 20). Fraenkel's rejection of their view as "arbitrary" (Aesch. Ag. 3. p.809 n.1) is part of a wider view on the history of the axe as murder-weapon which I find profoundly unsatisfactory: see Appendix 1 below. Since I have heard it seriously maintained that, as the most natural way to kill a snake is by a blow to the head, S's line need not imply Clytemnestra's use of the axe, I may observe that our fragment's snake is not an ordinary snake but a symbolic specimen, and S. clearly meant to make a point by drawing our attention to the whereabouts of its wounds.
briefly (in one line!) as to leave it uncertain whom the serpent represents. Therefore he cannot have devoted a full narrative to the "Traumgeschichte" but must have referred to it obliquely as part of a prooemium, just as Aeschylus' Choephori probably referred to Clytemnestra's dream in the lost portion of its proem, before the encounter at the grave! I do not blame Wilamowitz for here failing to appreciate the implausibility of so drastically curtailed a dream in a poet we now know to have produced narratives of an Homeric scope. But one must protest at the piling of unprovable hypothesis upon unprovable hypothesis with the aim of preserving an unreal distinction between the two lines of the fragment and maintaining an unreal openness (or rather vacancy) of mind over the significance of the snake. Can any sane person doubt, if he is told that Clytemnestra, who is cited as an instance of the workings of a guilty conscience, dreamt of a blood-stained snake, that the vision relates to her dead husband? What else could it conceivably refer to? Commonsense is here valuably supplemented by scholarly research, which has reminded us that the spirits of the dead often assume snake-like shape in Greek belief. Perhaps the idea arose from the fact that serpents often do frequent tombs and seem to disappear into the ground.¹

¹Compare the scene on a black-figure lecythos by the Sappho painter (Naples Mus. Naz. 111609: ABV 226.18 = Brommer Vasenlisten³ 450·Al) which shows a large mound in the centre, surmounted by a stele: the mound has a snake on it, the tomb is possibly that of Agamemnon himself, visited by Electra, Orestes and Pylades.
(See especially E. Kuster, Die Schlange in Griechischer Kunst und Religion (Religionsg. Vers. v. Vorab. 13 (1913) pp.71ff and the other works listed in the very full bibliography given by Montuoro and Zanotti-Bianco, Heraion alla foce del Sele 2 (1954) pp.293-5, to which add now J. Fontenrose, Python (1959)passim). Given that Clytemnestra dreams she is approached by a dead spirit, what other deceased character would be as relevant to the queen as Agamemnon? The evidence of the following line (ambiguous, but it must refer to Orestes or his father) merely confirms the obvious.

So far then, we can interpret the first line securely: ταῖ δὲ refer to Clytemnestra, the snake symbolises the dead Agamemnon, and the blood-stained crest represents the blows dealt to Agamemnon's head by Clytemnestra's axe. The notion that dead spirits still bear the wounds inflicted upon them in their life is rare but very effective: compare Deiphobus in Verg. Aen. 6.445, and add that and the present passage to the list of instances offered by Dodds on Plato's Gorgias 524A (p.379).

With ταὶ δὲ ὀράκων compare Il.22.93: ὡς δὲ ὀράκων (both the beginnings of their lines). And for βεβροτωμένος c.f. Od. 11.41: βεβροτωμένα τεῦχεα.

In the second line we must exchange such certainties for

1 Greek writers on dreams acknowledged that a snake could symbolise a king: c.f. Artemidorus Oneirocrit. 13.2: ὀράκων Ἀκέλεα ἑμαυτέα διὰ τοῦ δυνατοῦ; Αἰχμέα p.228.9 Drexl: δ ὀράκων εἰς πρόσωπον Ἀκέλεας κρίνεται.
probabilities. I would not dare to be dogmatic on either of the problems here, although I think a sequence of likeliness can be established for both. First, the lesser problem.

2: ἐκ δ' ἄρα τοῦ

"Did the Pleisthenid king grow out of the snake, or does ἐκ ... τοῦ mean "after that"?" (Lloyd-Jones CR 19 (1969) 23). The latter interpretation of the phrase as temporal (and thus equivalent to ἐκτότε: for ἐκ meaning "after" vid. LSJ s.v. II) has been adopted by Wilamowitz in the works cited above (952f) and Lloyd-Jones himself in his translation of the Choephori (Prentice-Hall (1970) p.2): "and then appeared the king, the son of Pleisthenes." So long as we do not follow Wilamowitz in torturing this temporal interpretation into a reference to some suppositious "reality" outside the dream, this is a perfectly feasible rendering. For the sense of ἐξωφαίνομαι which it requires c.f. Il.19.46: οὗν Χίλλας ἔξεφόμη.

Most scholars, however, have taken it in the alternative way as does e.g. Bowra GLP p.117: "and from it a king, son of Pleisthenes, appeared". For this meaning of ἐξωφαίνομαι c.f. Od. 12.441: Χαροῦδεος ἔξεφάνη though the tense is different. Irritatingly enough, this translation itself is capable of bearing two meanings: "it" may be the snake - ἐκ τοῦ (scil. ὅραμαντος) as almost everyone seems to have assumed; or it may be the head - ἐκ τοῦ

1The same scholar points out (C.R. 14 (1963) 247) that the same phrase contains the same ambiguity in Aesch. fr. 478 Metle.
(scil. κόρατος) as G. Devereux (Dreams in Greek Tragedy: an Ethno-Psycho-Analytical Study (1976) pp.171ff) has recently insisted with great vigour. There is absolutely no means of deciding between these last two alternatives on grammatical grounds - I attach no importance to the fact that κόρατος would be a more immediate antecedent - and there are no other grounds for us to use. Those who are acquainted with Devereux's previous writings will not be surprised to find that in the second line of our fragment as interpreted by him "the father's skull-phallos ejaculates a homunculus" (p.175) or that "The phallic symbolism of the snake and the nexus between the emission of blood = venom = semen and the male cephalic birth of Orestes add an erotic element to the anxiety caused by the appearance of the snake" (p.176). Nor will they be astounded - though they may not yet be inured - at the total lack of evidence to support this lurid reconstruction. Devereux talks so much about the female viper's decapitation of the male viper during coitus (pp.177ff) that one supposes he must really believe his own statement that "The similarity with the Stesichorus text is manifest", though the only similarity I can detect is with his own generously supplemented recreation of our two lines. Theories like this are not so superabundantly cogent that they can dispense with some sort of support from the actual words of the fragment. The prudent reader will note that the ambiguities of ἐκ τοῦ are too numerous to make Devereux's interpretation of the phrase anything
more than an interesting possibility. If he is generous he will draw the same conclusion about Ἀριστείδης Ἑιδεύς. If he is frank, he will decide that the weight of evidence tells against Orestes. To be as kind as possible, Devereux's theory is not sufficiently attractive to carry it past these preliminary obstacles.

One cannot decide between the three renderings of ἐν τοῖς by ruminating on the nuances contained in the particle ἄρα. As we have seen (p.953) Wilamowitz seems to have ranked this occurrence with the instances gathered under heading (2) on p.36 of Denniston Gr² whereby "The reality of a past event is presented as apprehended either during its occurrence ... or at the moment of speaking or writing: or at some intermediate moment ("as it subsequently transpired")." Denniston himself rightly lists it under (1) "Primary use, expressing a lively feeling of interest" (Gr² p.34). It is indeed an instance of the collocation δ'άρα so common in epic narrative: other examples of δ'άρα in lyric narrative are assembled by M.L. West, C.Q. 15 (1965) 201. To these add now two instances from the Geryoneis: S 15 ii 12 and 14.
2: βασιλεύς Πλεισθένιδας

The meaning of this phrase is slightly more important, though no easier to reach through the wasteland of dispute. In the first place, "Who was Pleisthenes, and what did he do?" should certainly have ousted "what song the Sirens sang" or "what name Achilles assumed when he hid himself among the women" as one of SirThomas Browne's "puzzling questions". Compared with it, the two latter are mere teasers for tyros. On the whole problem of his identity see Fraenkel ad Ag. 1569 (2.740) with the literature there cited. A judicious survey of the evidence from Lesky, RE s.v. Pleisthenes (1) 21\textsuperscript{1} (1951) 199·12ff). One thing we do know is that Pleisthenes gets no mention from Homer, who consistently makes Agamemnon and Menelaus the sons of Atreus. But he features in Hesiod (fr. 194 MW) as a rival to Atreus for the paternity of those two heroes. The information conveyed by the various testimonia which comprise this Hesiodic fragment can best be expressed in the form of two comparative family-trees\textsuperscript{1}:

\[\text{Hes. fr. 195·4ff MW may mention Pleisthenes but it is problematical: Lobel (Oxyr. Pap. Vol.28 (1962) p.43) claims that the easier supplement has Hesiod making Atreus the father of Agamemnon, Menelaus and Anaxibia. See contra Merkelbach and West ad loc. and see now the full discussion by J. Th. Kakridis, Z.P.E. 30 (1978) 1ff.}\]
Tzetzes adds by way of explanation the following note:

This tradition of a Pleisthenes who dies early leaving his sons to their grandfather for protection is very common. It is a patent excuse, allowing the intrusion of this shadowy figure into the Pelopid family and is repeated by Σ Ven. A ad 11.2.249 (1.95 Dindorf): οὗτοι ήσαν κατὰ μὲν τὸ σύνηθες Ἀετρόπης καὶ Ἀτρέως παῖδες τοῦ Πέλοπος, τῇ δ’ ἄλλησθαι Πλεισθένους, δὲ φασίν ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ καὶ Πορφύριος ἐν τοῖς ζητήμασιν, ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ Πλεισθένης νέος τελευτᾷ μηδὲν καταλείπως μνήμης ἄξιον, νέοι ἀνατραφέντες ὑπὸ Ἀτρέως αὐτοῦ παῖδες ἐκλήθησαν. The antepenultimate clause is exquisite. The same family tree as Hesiod's and the same premature death is given by Σ Eur. Or. 4 (1.96 Schwartz) but this goes further in explaining this.
sad loss (Πλησιοδένη τό κόμα άδενη) and also idiosyncratically names his wife and the mother of Agamemnon Menelaus and Anaxibia as Eriphyle: its source is unknown. A different wife again crops up in yet another tradition, this time the woman whom both Homer and Hesiod made wife of Atreus. Apollod. ep.10 follows the Homeric tradition of Agamemnon as the real son of Atreus. But Apollod. 3.15 has the Hesiodic picture of Pleisthenes son of Atreus and father of Agamemnon fleshed out with some new details as to how Pleisthenes acquired his wife Aerope. She was the granddaughter of Minos, daughter of Catreus king of Crete, who gave her and her sister to Nauplius to sell abroad because of a prophecy that he would die at the hands of an offspring. Pleisthenes married her, Nauplius married her sister. Apollod. 2.23 cursorily repeats this latter fact and adds that it is ὡς ... οἱ τραγικοὶ λέγουσι, and the story of Pleisthenes' bride was treated in Euripides' Κρήσσα according to Ε Soph. Aj. 1257. According to the plot of that drama, however, Aerope was entrusted to Nauplius in order that she be drowned as punishment for a liaison with a slave. That unsavoury tale is cast in Agamemnon's teeth in Soph. Aj. 1295-7, but the hero who makes an honest woman out of Aerope there is Atreus her regular husband, since Sophocles is following the usual Homeric tradition (1293) which makes Agamemnon

1 Lucian gives a more precise explanation with comic effect: ἐκ τῶν Πελοπίδων ποδαγρός ἦν ὁ Πλ. (Tragodopod. 257).
the son not grandson of Atreus. ¹ Ε Eur. Or. 812 says Sophocles somewhere had Atreus (not Catreus) drown Aerope for adultery and theft of the golden lamb: see the commentators on Soph. Aj. 1295ff.

A quite different line of approach makes Pleisthenes son of Pelops and brother of Atreus (so Σ Pind. Ol. 1·144 (Dr. p.48)). Hyginus fab.86 seems to make him a son of Atreus whom his father accidentally kills under the illusion that he is Thyestes' son. But the name here may be a late insertion as Rose ad loc. suggests. It is moreover obvious that the Pleisthenes mentioned as son of Menelaus and Helen in Σ Eur. Andr. 898 = Lysimachus F. Gr. Hist. 382 F 12 = 758 F 6 = Cypria fr.9 (Allen p.121)² and the namesake who features on the Thyestean menu at Sen. Thyest. 726 and Hyg. fab.88 are ciphers who have nothing to do with our nonentity.

The inevitable conclusion from the above pieces of information was drawn by Wilamowitz in his ἑπιτραπεζιον on this great hero (Pindaros p.510): "einen festen Platz im Stemma hat Pl. nicht erhalten, und von seinen Taten wissen wir nichts." So much for the identity of Pleisthenes: who (or what) is a Pleisthenid?

¹Hence there is no justification for Wilamowitz's notion that Sophocles is referring to the Κρῆσσαι (performed 438 according to the Hypothesis to Alcestis) and that therefore the Ajax postdates 438 and Antigone (441): c.f. Anal. Eur. 255; Kl. Schr. 6· p.180 n.1; Berl. Klassikertexte 52 p.71 n.1; Reinhardt, Sophokles³ pp.243ff.
²See Wilamowitz, Homerische Untersuchungen p.181 n.27.
Most scholars are divided between Agamemnon and Orestes, so that a line of approach which bysteps this dichotomy seems at first sight very attractive, and we turn with interest to Vürtheim (p.53), who found the phrase inappropriate for father and son alike. His positive argument is that β. Πλ. "is a vague phrase meant to inspire a sense of majesty and awe and refers to a scion of the royal line who will take the place of the dead Agamemnon" (Bowra GLP² p.117). In other words Aegisthus and Clytemnestra after their seizure of power naturally hope that an offspring of their own will succeed to the royal power. The epithet Πλ. spells out a stern "No" to that ambition: no son of Aegisthus, but rather a representative of the former lineage will restore power to the family of Agamemnon. No objections so far, but why should this interpretation not be combined with an identification of β. Πλ. with Orestes, as is assayed by Bowra sup. cit. and Campbell G.L.P. 259? Vürtheim doubts if the term βασιλεύς can properly be applied to the young prince in exile: however, Orestes would presumably be past the tiny tot stage by the time of Clytemnestra's nocturnal vision, so age is no barrier. And the word βασιλεύς in epic denotes social status rather than office (c.f. especially Od. 1.394 (... βασιλῆς Ἀχαίων ἐίς ἄπαντοις ἀλλων ἐν ... Ἰθάκης) 8.41 and 390. In all these cases the word is practically equivalent to "prince" or "king's son"). Its use of an exile then need not surprise us.
Vürtheim's objection to Agamemnon's eligibility for the title ΠΛ. makes one rub one's eyes in amazement - or despair. "War Klytaimestra", he asks, "so dumm, dass ihr der Sinn des Traumbildes entging? Muszte die Schlange durch eine Verwandlung in Agamemnon zu ihr sagen: sieh, ich bin euer Gatte?" As if in ancient times any more than in the present, a dreamer was so totally in command of his or her sleep visions as to be able to halt them as soon as their import was grasped!

The guilt-ridden woman has been badly disturbed by the apparition of the snake: what more natural than that symbol should now give way to reality and a climax of horror be reached with the appearance of husband or son to confound her?

It is thus neither possible nor desirable to avoid the choice between father and son. Let us re-consider these alternatives.

(1) Orestes
This identification has been accepted by (among others) Blomfield, Valckenaer, Wilamowitz, Seeliger (p.19) and Schmid G.G.L. 1.1.477. Its recent revival by Bowra and Campbell (see above p.964) has made it the most popular interpretation at the moment (at least in the English-speaking world) and it is symptomatic that, for instance, J.P. Barron should automatically assume its validity (in B.I.C.S. 16 (1969) p.145 n.33) without any
indication of the uncertainties involved. And yet positive arguments in its favour, as opposed to empty assertions, are wonderfully hard to come by. I cannot imagine why Bowra should find this alternative "on the whole ... more convincing". There may be at work an unspoken assumption\(^1\) that because at least two of the Attic tragedians make Clytemnestra dream of Orestes, S. must have done so too. If this be the case, the assumption should be vigorously rejected, for as Seeliger stresses, the dramatists may have taken over the idea of the dream while subjecting its contents to considerable changes, just as Aeschylus adopted the idea of Orestes' nurse, but gave her a different name character and rôle (see pp. 947 ff). Now in the Choephori, Clytemnestra dreams that she gives suck to a snake only to find it has drawn blood. Orestes sees the snake as representing himself (549-50): \(\varepsilon\kappa\delta\rho\alpha\kappa\omega\upsilon\delta\varepsilon\iota\varsigma \delta'\xi\gamma\omega | \kappa\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\omega \nu\nu\nu, \delta\varsigma \tau\omicron\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\upsilon \varepsilon\nu\nu\nu\epsilon\iota \tau\omicron\delta\epsilon\varsigma.\)\(^2\) Prima facie this dream seems quite different from the Stesichorean version (though for an attempt to reconcile the two see below pp. ff). Sophocles' dream seems even more incompatible. In Electra 417ff Clytemnestra dreams she sees her dead husband on the hearth, and from his sceptre a branch grows

\(^1\)And in the case of Devereux (sup. cit.p.171) an all too explicitly admitted assumption: "S. influenced both Aeschylus and Sophocles. Their versions \textit{therefore} permit one to settle ... the exact meaning of S's \textit{crystal-clear} text." (my italics.)

\(^2\)For the significance of the snake in Aeschylus' dream c.f. Bowra's Sophoclean Tragedy 223-4.
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which overshadows the land, portending the return of Orestes. The contamination with Herodotus' account of Astyages' dream (Hdt. 1.108: c.f.7.19) wherein a vine springing from his daughter symbolises the future reign of her son Cyrus in Astyages' stead, makes comparison with S. totally futile. Euripides (Or. 618) speaks only vaguely of the queen's dreams about Agamemnon (δείκνυσιν' ἄγγελλουσα τάγματι μνημονικὸν) which if anything is an argument against any allusion to Orestes in 1.2 and in favour of the other alternative. At 1.479 Tyndareus admittedly calls Orestes δ μητροφόντης δέε πρὸ δώματων δράκων and at 1424 the Phrygian calls him δ μητροφόντας δράκων, but there is no dream context.

Unable to produce any positive reasons for equating β. Πλ. with Orestes, proponents of this first interpretation turn to rebutting those who claim the phrase cannot allude to the queen's son. In this, it must be said, they are tolerably successful. Robert had objected (Bild und Lied p.171) that Orestes could hardly be called "king", and would more naturally be termed Πελοπίδας, after the propagator of the whole family, than Πλευσσενίδας after his obscure grandfather. But the first assertion is valueless (see above p.964) and the adjective Πλ. indicates the race in general as in Aesch. Ag. 1569 and 1602. Wilamowitz (Pindaros p.510) compares the use of Αιακίδης for Achilles and see too the epithet Πελοπίδης used of Agamemnon in Hdt. 7.159.

Fraenkel follows this explanation for Aeschylus' use of
the term in the passages cited above (Agam. 2.470).

2) Agamemnon

This view may be less popular today, but it is superior in the number and authority of the scholars who support it: for a full list of these see the excellent bibliography up to the Second World War given by Lesky s.v. Orestes in RE 181 (1939) 976-7 (to which add Jebb p.xix). Since then it has won favour with, e.g. Ed. Fraenkel (on Ag. 1569 (3.740)). It also has the advantage of support from several formal parallels: Ibycus 282.21 P uses the phrase Πλείσθενίς βασιλεύς of Agamemnon, though that monarch is also described a line later as Ἀτρέως ... παῖς.1 Bacch. 15.48 calls his brother Πλείσθενίς Μενέλαος and yet earlier in the same poem (1.6) he likewise talks of Μενέλαος ἀ' Ἀτρέαδα βασιλεύς. S. in 209 col.ii 4 P applies the epithet Πλείσθενίς to one of the brothers, more probably Menelaus. Working from this evidence we must conclude that there is nothing inconsistent in the same hero's being known as Πλείσθενίς and "a son of Atreus". The explanation will be found either in the tradition that Pleisthenes was their real father but died young (see above p.961) or in the attractive but

1See J.P. Barron's commentary ad loc. (B.I.C.S. 16 (1969) 128) and E.W. Handley's suggestion there recorded that the phrase παῖς ᾲγιονος may be a poetic synonym for γόνων υἱός, an expression later used to distinguish a true from an adopted son (c.f. Men. Samia 346f, Lysias 13.91). If this is right, Ibycus will then be affirming that Agamemnon was not an adopted son of Atreus but his genuine offspring.
totally unverifiable suggestion of J.O. Dalzell (Herma-
thena 110 (1970) 79-80) that at some stage πλεισθευιδής
was etymologised as meaning πλειστοθένης (by apocope)
and regarded as an inheritable family title.

C.M. Bowra saw in S's use of the name πλεισθευιδάς further
evidence of the Oresteia's Spartan background (C.Q. (1934)
116 = GLP$^2$ 115). Atreus was persona non grata at Sparta
because of his lack of standing there, his grave at
Mycenae (Paus. 2.16.6), his disreputable career, and his
Argive connections. "If Spartan interests demanded a
glorification of Agamemnon, some other father than Atreus
had to be found, and Pleisthenes supplied the need" (GLP$^2$
115). Podlecki objects that this is "far-fetched or at
least unfounded" (p.314) and it is certainly the weakest
of Bowra's proofs of a Spartan link. We simply do not
have enough of S's Oresteia to tell whether Atreus
actually was displaced: Ibyc. 282.21 P discussed above
suggests he need not have been. What we can say is that
if any such attempt to break the link with Argos was ever
made it was short-lived or of little influence. An
Argive homeland is strongly implied by Ibyc. 282.28 P and
when the Spartans are asserting their claim to hegemony
in front of Gelon (Hdt. 7.159) they claim that the monarch
who will groan in his grave if they lose command is οἱ
Πελοπίδες Ἀγαμέμνων (not οἱ πλεισθευιδής 'Αγ.). In fact
our fragment supplies a far mightier indication of Spartan
influence, albeit one unmentioned by Bowra or Podlecki
This was first observed by M. Bock in a short but crucial article ("Die Schlanke im Traum der Klytaimestra", Hermes 71 (1936) 230-236) too little known in this country. After re-emphasising that correspondence between snake and χνός of the dead which we have already had cause to note - a mammoth bibliography on pp.23fnn. 1 and 2 of his article - he drew attention to a point which others had ignored and some still do: the "Drakontomorphismus des Toten - und Heroenglaubens" was particularly connected with Sparta. His article provides irrefutable documentation for the conclusion that either the snake detail derives from a Spartan version of the Oresteia, or S. himself has invented it by analogy with "eine religiöse Denkform, die nirgend so scharf ausgeprägt ist wie in Sparta und seiner Landschaft" (p.236). Strange that one of the strongest arguments for the Oresteia's Spartan background has been as sedulously ignored by the most persistent promoter of that thesis as by its most obstinate attackers.¹

Do these two lines represent the full extent of the queen's dream, or did it continue and can we guess the sequel? Homeric analogies render a two-line dream no more plausible than Wilamowitz's single-line apparition: on their basis one might guess that the dream continued for several lines, and that Agamemnon (if he it was) proceeded to upbraid his guilty wife. Robert (p.171) held out hope of more than idle speculation about this sequel. He had

¹This idea should be distinguished from P. Zancani Montuoro's theory (advanced in R.A.N. 26 (1951) 273-4 and Heraion alla foce del Sele 2 (1954)) that the fragment's serpent is a fury in the form of a snake. I can see nothing to commend this.
noted that in the Aeschylean dream (p. Q6- supr.) a snake symbolising Orestes sucked the queen's breast and drew blood. Now if this preserves faithfully the end of the Stesichorean dream, we can bridge the interval between that and the beginning quoted by Plutarch, in the following way: Agamemnon appears from the snake, approaches his former wife and copulates with her; the offspring of this union is the snake which draws milk and blood from his mother's breast. Ferrari followed Robert thus far and then went further: on the basis of this reconstructed "Stesichorean source" he argued that ωυλία in the Sophoclean dream means "copulatio" (p.19, and at length with parallel passages in pp.34-7's "Appendice su Sofocle El. 417 sgg."). This same interpretation has been advanced independently by J.H. Kells in his recent commentary on this play ((1973) ad loc. pp.112-113), with no mention either of the supposed Stesichorean original or of the corroborating loci. See too Jebb p.xix n.1 § 3.

Now that this latter development gets no support from S. or Aeschylus, I am sure. Sophocles' dream, though it perhaps derives its inspiration very remotely from S., is totally dissimilar in conception. It has been hopelessly contaminated with the Herodotean dream of Astyages (see above p. 966f), and it says nothing of snakes or even of Orestes, though he is symbolised by the fruitful bough which springs from his father's sceptre. Hence it is absurd for Ferrari to argue that the meaning of "copulatio"
for δυνάμει had already been popularised by S. The merits or demerits of that interpretation depend on the conviction carried by the would-be parallel passages (precious little in my eyes). But there is small reason to accept Robert's original thesis either, ingenious though it is. Why suppose that Aeschylus is closely following S's dream at this point? Rather than postulate an accurate copy of a lost part of S's dream, why not say that the tragedian is departing fairly widely from the version preserved in Plutarch? The dramatist has taken the motif of the snake, but has freely applied it to the son rather than the father. There are certainly no grounds whatsoever for imagining that a possible outcome of the situation described in 219 P could be the birth of a serpent son. "Diese (Klytaimestra) gebiert von dem Drachen einem Drachen" pleads Robert (l.c.), but even within the short compass of 219 P, S. states most emphatically that Πλεῖωςε-

vίδακ changes from serpentine to human form. If in the sequel the king was foolish enough to deviate from the principle "once bitten, twice shy" and lie with the queen in human shape, why in the name of reason should the son he begets turn out to be a snake?

What we can now say is that in the Oresteia S. had Electra recognise her brother by means of the lock of hair (217. 11 f P: see pp.935ff above). If Aeschylus followed his predecessor in this and in the general idea of the dream, it is highly likely that he was also indebted to him for
the economic device which connects the two events. Clytemnestra's terrified sending of Electra with offerings to Agamemnon's tomb. This, probably, was the ultimate sequel to the queen's dream, and it seems as likely as not that S. introduced the whole sequence of events into literature. F. Dornseiff (Arch. Myth. p.58) suggests that Penelope's dream in Od. 19·536-50 was the inspiration for Clytemnestra's unsettling experience. This might more justly be called a nightmare, and the Homeric poems, although aware of such frights (11·22·199-202) edit them out of their world and do not allow their heroes to be disturbed by them. Instead, Homeric characters experience objective and rationalised visits by a "dream-figure" which never allows them to forget they are asleep in bed (c.f. Dodds, The Greeks and the Irrational (pp.104ff and 122ff)) a concept which persists until far later (e.g. Pind. Ol. 13·67, Aesch. Eum. 94). But even in the Odyssey we have symbolism, "condensation" and "displacement" in the dream of Penelope referred to above, "the only dream in Homer which is interpreted symbolically" (Dodds p.106). In that dream, without the aid of a dream-figure, Penelope imagines she sees a great eagle kill her flock of twenty geese and then reassure her by speaking with a human voice and revealing himself as Odysseus. This is a case of

---

1 On the presentation of dreams in ancient literature see further Leo, Gesch. d. röm. lit. 1 p.179 n.2 (though I cannot follow him when, perhaps relying too much on Robert's expansion of the Stesichorean lines, he finds nothing dreamlike in them).
wish-fulfilment (though see G. Devereux, Dreams in Greek Tragedy, p.xxiv n.11) which stands at the opposite pole to Clytemnestra's grim vision; but the idea of animal symbolism from which the human element emerges may have occurred to S. under the Odyssey's influence, especially since that epic so often correlates the characters and fates of Odysseus and Agamemnon, Penelope and Clytemnestra. But for the extra, Spartan, dimension of S's δράκων see above p.97).

One final point: our fragment is generally taken as proof that as early as S. Clytemnestra had that monopoly over her husband's murder which she so trimphantly claims in Aeschylus' Agamemnon. But our evidence is not extensive enough for us to tell whether her undeniable guilt here is that of actively abetting wife or single-handed murderess (see further pp.794ff supr.). Even if the latter interpretation is right we must surely agree with one of its proponents when he adds the prudent after-thought: "Soll man es eigens sagen, dass dadurch die Grösse der Gestaltung durch Aischylos nicht um eines Haares Schatten gemindert wird?" (Lesky p.20).
APPENDIX 1

On the weapon with which Clytemnestra kills Agamemnon

I have argued above (pp.787ff) that we must envisage two distinct traditions concerning the death of Agamemnon: the version involving axe, bath, and robe, which is the original form although it appears first in literature at a relatively late time; and the epic recasting of this with feast and sword, which is the earliest version we meet in literary texts. Those who disagree with my conclusions on the relationship of these two traditions will at least agree that they are separate and divergent. The point of dispute arises over when the death by axe made its first appearance: it has been suggested that this was not until the time of Sophocles and Euripides. I do not know whether there is a causal link between the instrument of murder and its setting; whether, that is, a sword is obviously more efficient than an axe when a banquet is the scene of carnage, and whether (more plausibly) an axe will produce the better performance against a man enswathed in a sleeveless robe. But the connection of sword with feast and axe with robe and bath is in most cases beyond dispute. If we could extend this correlation to all cases, we would have achieved

1For the axe as a weapon against a victim in a bath, Professor Kassel refers me to Schiller, Wilhelm Tell, Act I, Sc. I lines 90 and 97: "Ich hatte Holz gefällt im Walde ... Und mit der Axt hab ich ihn's Bad gesegnet."
something more than a gratifyingly symmetrical consistency. We would have learned something important about S.'s handling of the myth and his place in its development. For if he used the axe, he will also have used the robe and bath.

The sword which, it is generally assumed, Clytemnestra wields in the Nekyia, is not without its difficulties. See Od. 11.421-6:

οικτροτάτην δ’ ἠκουσα δπα Πριάμου θυγατρός, 
Κασσάνδρης, τὴν κτείνε κλυταμήστρη δολόμητις
ἀμφ’ ἐμοί· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ ποτὶ γαῖῃ χεῖρας ἀνθῶν
βάλλον ἀποδνήσκων περὶ φασγάνωι’ ἡ δὲ κυνόπις
νοσφίσατ’, οὐδὲ μοι ἔτην ἓντι περ’ εἰς Ἀἴδαο
χερσὶ κατ’ ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐλέειν σὺν τε στῶ’ ἔρεισαι.

The purpose of Agamemnon's gesture at 423-4 is quite obscure (see the commentators ad loc. and Lesky p.16f) and we cannot be sure whether the king is beating the earth

---

1 The state of Agamemnon's hair on the obverse of the Boston Krater (above p.851 and n.1) probably implies that he has just emerged from the bath, and this vase has been thought to reflect the events of S's Oresteia (see pp. ff). A pre-Aeschylean (c.490) artistic depiction of the robe would be at hand if we could interpret the cup by the Brygos Painter (New York Metrop. Mus. L 69 1135: Paralipom. 367·1 (bis) c.f. Webster, Lustrum 15 (1970) 20, M.I. Davies, Ant. Kunst. 16 (1973) 60ff) as a death of Agamemnon. It shows a woman standing over a corpse through whose chest sticks a sword from behind. The woman is holding a spangled cloth. That this is not Clytemnestra with the net (but rather Tecmessa and the dead Ajax) has been demonstrated by Davies in the article mentioned above. See too B. Shefton, Rev. Arch. (1973) 203ff.
with his raised hands as he dies "about" the sword which
his wife has implanted in him, or is raising his hands to
set them about his own sword (presumably to draw it in
self-defence) as he dies. The scholia are aware of both
interpretations. The former seems to be supported by
several works of art but the Hagias vase (above p.799) does
not help us here.

The bronze relief on a shieldband found at Olympia (see
above p.797) may also derive from the epic tradition: it
discards the Odyssey's reticence about Clytemnestra's
exact rôle as a plastic representation inevitably must.
So too the bronze strip from the Argive Heraeum dating
from c.660-650 (unnumbered in the Athens National Museum:
Vermeule p.1e 3 G 1 = Denkmälerlisten 3·198·4) seems to
show a repellently long-nosed Clytemnestra aiming a short
sword at Cassandra's waist. And the Gortyn terracotta
(below p. 935) is best interpreted as a depiction of
Clytemnestra stabbing Agamemnon in the back with a hidden

1E.G. Pemberton (A.J.A. 70 (1966) 377-8 revives (unwitting-
ly) an ingenious idea that is at least as old as Kleine
(p.86 n.2: see too Wilamowitz, Gr. Tr. 2· p.40 n.1) when
he supposes the phrase ὥς τίς τε κατέκτανε βοῦν ἐπὶ
φινυη (Od. 4·535 = I1·411) to imply the axe version of
Agamemnon's death. It is indeed true that one would
naturally slaughter an ox with a hatchet rather than a
sword (c.f. P. Stengel, Opferbräuche der Griechen (1910)
113ff) and it would certainly fit my theory to see here
an inadvertent allusion to the tradition which Homer has
elsewhere suppressed. But I get the impression that the
point of comparison is with the helplessness of a noble
beast, not with the mode of its death.

2 Representations of the murder of Cassandra are otherwise
very rare in early Greek art.
sword (there is no room for an axe).  

There is no unambiguous tradition of the use of a sword outside epic. It is hard to see the justification for the scholia's claim that πολιώ̣ν χαλιώ̣ν in Pindar's Eleventh Pythian means a sword (see p.807). Their testimony is welcomed by Fraenkel (inf. cit. P.QO°) who is eager to accept such witnesses when they bolster up his theory. The Aeschylean scholia which suggest that Agamemnon was killed by an axe (Tricl. Ag. 483\(\text{A}(1\cdot139\ O.L.\ Smith),\) Schol.Vet.Ag.1149(1\cdot13 O.L. Smith) meet with less kind treatment and are dismissed as "arbitrary" (p.806 n.1). It is of course well known that the two later Athenian playwrights have Agamemnon killed by an axe (Soph. El. 99; Eur. Hec. 1279 and Tro. 361f (both by way of prophecy) and El. 160 and 279).  

These passages say nothing of bath and robe, but Euripides elsewhere alludes to both in passing as if they were incidental facts in the story that everyone would know about: El. 154. Or. 26, 367. Such casual introductions of these three important motifs are best explained by supposing that Aeschylus had already adequately popularised the connection of axe with bath and robe on the Attic stage so that the first automatically suggested the others. The strongest opposition to the notion that S. and

---

1 The steatite disk seal from central Crete (N.Y. 42·11·1) c. 710-650 is too ambiguous to be of any help here: see M.I. Davies pp.224ff with figs. 6\(\text{A} - 10.

2 The axe passed thence into popular currency: for later authors see Tarrant on Sen. Ag. 897 (p.341).
Aeschylus both make Clytemnestra use an axe\textsuperscript{1} comes from an intimidating source: Eduard Fraenkel in Appendix B to his edition of the Agamemnon (3.806ff: "On the Weapon with which, according to the Oresteia, Agamemnon was murdered.") I would not for a moment dream of assailing the central truth established by Fraenkel, that Aeschylus is deliberately inexplicit about Clytemnestra's murder weapon, in order to focus attention upon the entangling robe, a symbol which runs like a leitmotif through the whole trilogy. (See most recently A. Lebeck, The Oresteia: a study in language and structure (1971) pp.66ff and 81ff). It is just that I disagree with him over the way in which the dramatist is being vague.

And indeed there must be few who can be found to agree with Fraenkel's attempt to escape the inevitable interpretation of 219 P. I have explained in my commentary ad loc. (p.\textsuperscript{954}) why it is likely that the snake's bleeding head entails an axe as the murder weapon. When Fraenkel concludes (p.809 n.1) that "It is arbitrary to conclude from the well-known fragment of S. ... that he represented Agamemnon as having been slain by the axe, as is maintained by Robert, Wecklein, and others", the word "arbitrary" is incomprehensible, unless we gloss it as "awkward for my theory as a whole, and therefore to be suppressed in a footnote."

\textsuperscript{1}That the axe pre-dated Aeschylus should be clear by now. Apart from the scholars mentioned in p.954 n.1 see Wilamowitz Gr. Trag. 2.40, Aisch. Interp. p.173 n.1, Blass on Aesch. Cho. 886ff etc. for acceptance of this thesis.
Awkward it most certainly is. Once we have accepted that S. used the axe as murder weapon we will find it prima facie unlikely that Aeschylus, who borrowed other details from him (217 P etc.) failed to do so here, but rather skipped back to the Homeric concept of a sword; especially since the sword belongs to the idea of death at a feast, which finds no place in Aeschylus' treatment. Still, we must be prepared to modify our initial impressions in the face of the evidence provided by the text of the Aeschylean Oresteia. And this is where complications arise. While stressing, quite rightly, that Aeschylus is purposefully vague throughout the trilogy, Fraenkel finds three passages of "unambiguous explicitness" (p.808).1 The first of these is Cho. 1010ff: εδρασεν η ουκ εδρασε; μαρτυρει δε μοιφαρος τοδ'ως εβάψεν Αιγίδου ξιφος. φόνου δε ηκις ευν χρόνωι ευμβάλλεται.

It constantly amazes me that proponents of the sword quote and stress the above lines as their strongest proof...

1 For a bibliography of earlier attempts to decide between axe and sword see Fraenkel p.806. Latte's note in Hermes 66 (1931) p.132 n.2 there referred to has been reprinted as his Kl. Schr. p.270 n.34 quoted below p.932, and Lesky's remarks on p.193 of the same volume of that journal now form pp.94f of his Ges. Schr. (but are generally superseded by his later treatment in WS 1 (1967) 1ff). Also Schadewaldt, Hermes 71 (1936) p.64 n.1 = Hellas und Hesperien (1960) p.348 n.120.

Fraenkel's magisterial treatment seems to have inhibited further discussion (let alone disagreement) over this subject (though see the Denniston-Page commentary on the Agamemnon which refers (p.171) to Clytemnestra's "deadly instrument, her sword or axe.

Most of his points were already anticipated in the very brief treatment by Tierney C.Q. 30 (1936) 103f whose reference to three "unequivocal passages" seems to be echoed by Fraenkel in the phrase quoted above in the text.
when it is in fact their weakest. For, when presented with a reference to a robe dyed by Aegisthus' sword, who but someone with a grudge against simplicity (or a case to prove) would translate not "Aegisthus' sword drawn and used by Aegisthus", but "Aegisthus' sword borrowed and used (on this occasion only) by Clytemnestra"? We know that Clytemnestra alone took a hand in murdering her husband (see p. 354 f above). And so when we hear of Aegisthus' sword dyeing Agamemnon's robe, what else do we suppose but that Aegisthus has approached the corpse of his dead enemy and stabbed it, as the Achaeans did Hector's (II. 22. 371 24. 420f, Aesch. fr. 264 N2 (c.f. Dover, C.R. 14 (1964) 12))? Such an action would be totally consistent with the character of the undignified weakling who appears at the end of the Agamemnon and exults over a deed not his own. The reason why Aegisthus' responsibility rather than Clytemnestra's should be stressed at this point of the play is perfectly well explained by Fraenkel himself, but how much more effective is Orestes' speech if we take him to be referring not to Aegisthus' supposed loan of his sword - not elsewhere mentioned and a feeble point in itself - but to his repeated stabbing

1 So Lloyd-Jones (Aeschylus' The Libation Bearers (Prentice-Hall (1970)) p. 68). We know from 1. 439 of the play that Clytemnestra had mutilated the corpse, and Wilamowitz in his note on 1011 (Aisch. Orestie ... Das Opfer am Grabe (1896) p. 244) rightly assumes that Aegisthus took part in this. See too his Hom. Unters. 103.
of the corpse!

Fraenkel's first passage, then, fails. His other two are in fact more impressive, but before we consider them it will be more convenient to turn to examine those passages in the trilogy which have suggested to scholars Clytemnestra's use of the axe. Pre-eminent among these is Ag. 1125ff: ἀπεχὲ τῆς βοῶς τὸν ταῦρον ἐν πέπλοις μελαγκέρωι λαβότας ἡχανήματι τῷπετε.¹ Fraenkel himself tells us in a different context that "the fact that the prophetess has a clear vision of her coming doom gives especial value to her statement", and yet he seems curiously reluctant to detect the metaphorical reference to the two-edged axe which Clytemnestra swings against her husband in the phrase μελαγκέρωι ... ἡχανήματι. Latte (Kl. Schr. p.270 n.34) quotes a parallel Icelandic kenning: "Die Frage, welche Waffe bei Aischylos anzunehmen ist, wird wohl durch eine Beobachtung von Frl. Vera Lachmann, die mir Von der Mühll mitteilt, im Sinne von Wilamowitz gegen Blass entschieden: Das Beiwort μελαγκέρως (Ag. 1127) kehrt im Isländischen für die Axt wie der in Kenningar wie snaghyrnda χσ scharf (?) gehörnte Axt, χσχarhyrna Axthorn. So wird auch das "schwarzgehörnte werkzeug" bei Aischylos als Axt zu verstehen sein." Fraenkel lists this note in his bibliography and even quotes a different part of the article (on p.807) but, not surprisingly, he cannot bring himself to raise, let alone

¹For the latest discussion of the more general problems raised by these lines see T.C.". Stinton, P.C.P.S. 21 (1975) 82ff.
refute, so strong an argument against his own conclusions.¹

When at Cho. 889 the queen demands a man-slaying axe, she obviously envisages using the same weapon against her son as she had earlier swung, to devastating effect, against his father.² Fraenkel (p.807) tries to explain away this further obstacle to his theory by borrowing the suggestions of Blass and Latte that an axe (as opposed to sword and spear) "is always ready to hand in the inner rooms of the house."³ But he has to admit that "this distinction cannot be maintained in all cases without exception", and works of art further weaken his case. The double-axe swung by Clytemnestra on several vases (see my discussion above, pp.81ff) in a vain attempt to rescue Aegisthus from Orestes also presupposes her earlier use of this weapon against her husband. Predictably, Fraenkel disagrees (p.809 n.2), but his statement that such representations "do not, of course, prove anything with regard to the way in which Agamemnon's murder was represented at that time" is — to use a favourite word of this scholar — quite arbitrary. The discovery of at least one vase painting

¹Stinton too (sup. cit. [p.88 n.3]) is mysteriously blind to the fact that a cow's horns are infinitely more likely to symbolise an axe than a sword.

²The epithet ἀνδρωπομετά clearly implies Clytemnestra's own former ἀνήρ (see Blass ad loc. (p.179)).

³The explanation is still popular (see e.g. A. Sideras, Aeschylus Homericus (Hypomnemata 31 (1971) p.22 n.19). Alternatively, Tierney [sup. cit. p. 980 n.1] suggested that Clytemnestra's cry preserves an isolated allusion to the axe as murder weapon which older tradition Aeschylus elsewhere replaces with the sword.
has radically changed the scene since he wrote. For Fraenkel claimed (p.809) that we have no "reliable monuments of decorative art of sufficient antiquity" to indicate whether the axe murder was any early tradition for predating Sophocles and Euripides. But unless "reliable" is to be granted that elasticity of meaning which Fraenkel normally reserves for the word "arbitrary", this statement is no longer true. The appearance of the Boston Krater has given firm proof that axe, robe, and bath were all integral parts of the tradition before Aeschylus.

So too, one of the Heraicn metopes, whatever its literary inspiration, is firm evidence of the axe's antiquity.

So far in our investigation of the evidence we have found everything consistent with Clytemnestra's use of the axe. Vague references (in Ag. 1496 and 1520) to a two-edged weapon tell nothing either way. But Fraenkel's two other passages (pp.807-8) give us pause: Ag. 1262f: ἐπεύχεται θήγουσα φωτὶ φάσγανον ἐμῆς ἀγωγῆς ἀντιτείλεσθαι φόνον and Ag. 1528: ἔξεια οἰδέας, ἔξεια πάσχων μηδὲν ἐν Ἀιδοῦ μεγαλαυχέτω, ἔιδοθήτων ἑανάτων τείσαι ἀπέρ ἔξεν. It would be hard to deny that these words state that Agamemnon was murdered with a sword, and do so more clearly than any of the allusions to the axe.

---

1 On the first of these two passages see most recently A. Sideras, Aeschylus Homericus (Hypomnemata 31 (1971))pp.21f.
2 Expertus dico: I formerly tried to explain away the prior passage as purely metaphorical - which it could be, were it not for Ag. 1528ff.
considered above. But are the former so decisive that they totally obliterate the latter implications as Fraenkel would have us believe? I prefer to suppose that Aeschylus thrusts the thematically significant robe into even greater emphasis by leaving his audience confused as to which of the two weapons was employed. Usually the axe is implied; twice there is a studied ambiguity of reference; and twice the sword is said to be the murder weapon.¹ Such dramatic inconsistency would not surprise us in Sophocles: it seems to me the most economic explanation of the facts here. And we may then accept the conclusion strongly suggested by the Boston Krater, that S's narrative made robe and bath concomitants of the axe. Aeschylus followed his great predecessor closely in this matter, deviating only slightly over the weapon used, in order to enhance that great motif-pattern which is his main contribution to the dramatisation of the Orestes myth.

The antiquity of the robe could be more accurately fixed if we could accept M.I. Davies' interpretation of two early works of art, the terracotta pinax from Gortyn Crete c. 630-610 (Heraklion 11512: Davies pp. 228ff and figs. 9 and 10 = Denkmälerlisten 3.7.3) which was omitted by Mrs. Vermeule from her otherwise full list

¹Fraenkel has explained the reason for the ad hoc stress on the sword (pp.807f): Agamemnon killed Iphigenia with that weapon (c.f. Eur. I.T. 27 and 785) and the lex talionis demands that he die in a like manner.
of representations; and a proto-Attic Krater by the Ram
Jug Painter (Berlin A 32: C.V.A. 1 pls. 18-21 = Vermeule
p.13 § 1 c.f. Davies pp.252ff and figs. 14-15: = Vasen-
listen³ 448 A.1). The scene on the first shows Agamemnon
seated on an armless stool while Aegisthus holds the king's
spear with his left hand: his awkwardly held right hand,
Davies suggests, may be casting the notorious net over his
head. (A popular interpretation: see e.g. T.B.L. Webster,
Lustrum 11 (1965) 15 and Davies p.230 esp. n.3). A
figure with a sword on the second seems to be throwing
an object of delicate material over the head of the man
before him: can this, asks Davies, be Aegisthus with the
fatal robe? But in fact the identification of both these
scenes is highly uncertain and Dr. Prag has convinced me
that both interpretations outlined above are wrong. In
the Gortyn terracotta, for instance, Aegisthus' right hand
may merely be grasping his victim's hair to hold him down.
And over the second artefact - which would, on Davies' inter-
pretation, be the only plastic representation of
Aegisthus as the sole murderer to include the famous net
- orthodoxy appears to have the better of the
argument: everyone else interprets the vase as a depiction
of Orestes marching Aegisthus and Clytemnestra to their
deaths. It would obviously be irresponsible to base
arguments about the date of the robe's appearance on
evidence such as this.
APPENDIX 2

Xanthus and Stesichorus

699 P
Athen. 12.512F-513A

τούτον οὖν (scil. τὸν Ἡρακλέα), φησίν (scil. ὁ Μεγακλέειδης), οἱ νέοι ποιηταὶ κατασκευάζουσιν ἐν λῃστοῦ σχῆματι μόνον περιπορευόμενον, ξύλου ἐχοντα καὶ λεωντῆν καὶ τόξα. καὶ ταῦτα πλάσαι πρῶτον Στησίχορον τὸν Ἰμεραῖον. καὶ Σάνδος ὁ μελόποιος, πρεσβύτερος ὁ Στησίχορος, ὡς καὶ αὖτος ὁ Στησίχορος μαρτυρεῖ ὡς φησίν ὁ Μεγακλέειδης, οὐ ταῦτην αὐτῶι περιτίθει τὴν στολὴν ἀλλὰ τὴν Ὄμηροικην. πολλὰ δὲ τῶν Σάνδου παραποιήκειν ὁ Στησίχορος, δὲπερ καὶ τὴν Ὅρεστείαν καλουμένην.

700 P
Aelian V.H. 4.26 (2.71 Hercher)

Σάνδος ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν μελῶν, ἐγένετο δὲ οὗτος πρεσβύτερος Στησίχορος τοῦ Ἰμεραίου, λέγει τὴν Ἡλέκτραν οὐ τοῦτο ἐχειν τοῖσον πρῶτον ἀλλὰ Δασδίκην. ἐπεὶ δὲ Ἀγαμέμνων ἄνηρέθη, τὴν δὲ Κλυταιμήστραν ὁ Αἴγισθος ἔγνει καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν, ἐλεκτρον οὖσαν καὶ καταγγέλσαν παρθένον Ἄργειοι Ἡλέκτραν ἐκάλεσαν διὰ τὸ ἀμορεῖν ἄνδρος καὶ μὴ πεπειράσθαι λέκτρου.

To those who fret over the limitations on our knowledge of S., consolation inevitably comes upon reflecting on the
remains of Xanthus. The sum total of our knowledge of this poet is contained within the two citations given above. That is, it hangs upon a razor's edge. And this edge is even thinner if, as Robert suggested (Bild und Lied p.174), Megaclides is the source of Aelian too, and thus our sole authority for Xanthus' existence. The similarity between two sets of phrases (ἐς ὁ μελοποιός ὁ δὴ ποιητὴς τῶν μελῶν and πρεσβύτερος ὁν Στησίχόρου ἐγένετο δὲ οὗτος πρεσβύτερος Στησίχόρου τοῦ 'Ἰμεραίου) in the different authors' texts was Robert's warrant for this suggestion. If he is right we are in a sad state, for to learn about Xanthus through Megaclides is obscurum per obscurius. "Probably a Peripatetic" was Robert's conclusion on the latter (p.173) and most scholars have followed him. Several Homeric scholia credit him with a treatise περὶ 'Ὀμήρου: see Bux in R-E 15¹ (1931) 124f who places him in the fourth century B.C.

A major assault upon Xanthus' very existence was launched by Robert (pp.174f) who denounced him as "a peripatetic invention".¹ That remedy would conveniently rid us of an awkward figure and remove some anomalies. For it is certainly odd that, if Xanthus was so important a source for S., he should have quite disappeared from our ken except for the two sparse testimonia cited above. And the picture of S. as a plagiarist on a large scale is also

¹Followed by Düring p.106 n.3 and others. Contra, Seeliger p.17f.
unattractive. On the other hand, Athenaeus' testimony is difficult to circumvent entirely, especially since it implies that S. mentioned Xanthus by name, as he probably referred to Hesiod and Homer. One might possibly argue that Megaclides is reported as mentioning S.'s reference to Xanthus in connection with Heracles, and that we have no explicit statement that S. mentioned his predecessor in the Oresteia: his debt in that poem might be a matter of inference, accurate or otherwise. Or, as Robert maintained, S. might have mentioned Xanthus, but not as the source which Megaclides claims him to be: S.'s Xanthus may not have been the lyric poet that our peripatetic makes him. But all this is special pleading of a very rarified kind. And what conceivable motive Megaclides could have had for the sort of imposture with which Robert burdens him we are not told. Bearing in mind the dangers inherent in the argumentum ex silentio (see p. 507) I conclude that we should not grudge Xanthus the modest position in Greek literature offered him by the two passages above.

But let us make sure that we know exactly what these sources tell us of Xanthus' importance for S., restricting ourselves to his putative Oresteia.1 Xanthus was a lyric poet from whom S. πολλά παραπεποίηκεν. The meaning of this verb here is presumably something like "adopted". Compare the Hypothesis to Aeschylus' Persae: Γλαυκὸς ἐν

1On Xanthus' treatment of Heracles see my note on 229 P.
There is no need to follow Schweighäuser (on Ath. 12.513A [11.346]) in injecting the derogatory implication "spoiled in copying" ("dum mutuatus est, mutavit et corrupit" c.f. his Index Auctorum [14.199], and Wilamowitz SS p.240 ("er... gehässig ausbeutet")). Apart from his treatment of Heracles and Electra (on the latter see below p.990f) this is all we have received about Xanthus from antiquity's hands, and it is brief enough. Attempts to expand it by speculation have been mercifully few, and this is just as well, since they would hardly be distinguishable from essays at eking out by fantasy details which are themselves possibly fictional. The only guess intelligent enough to be worth recording is the suggestion that Xanthus, like S., came from West Greece.¹

That Xanthus is alleged to have mentioned Electra and given an etymology for her name is fascinating news, but it almost revives previous doubts as to his existence, so otiose is the rôle given to him here. The statement that Electra was previously called Laodice is a clear attempt to reconcile the three invented daughters of Il.9.145

(= 287) with the more famous tradition of Electra. C.f.
Hesych. s.v. Λαοδίκη (2.571 Latte): Λαοδίκην δὲ οἱ νεώτεροι Ἡλέκτραν λέγουσιν, Σε D Il.9.149. Compare the similar compromise involving Iphianassa and Iphigenia (see above p.912). Whether Electra had a previous existence in tradition, whether she had been embodied in literature before Xanthus, does not appear from Aelian's account. Until recently indeed it was commonly (and reasonably) supposed that Xanthus was the first poet to allude to Electra. ¹ But we now know, and have done since 1962, that the Hesiodic Eoeae named Electra as one of Agamemnon's daughters (fr. 23A.16 MW). This is a name Hesiod also gives to one of Ocean's and also one of Atlas' daughters: see the Index Nominum to the Oxford Text's Hesiod (pp. 236f) and for other holders of the name see West or Hes. Theog. 349 (p.265). It strikes me as highly unlikely that the lyric poet Xanthus lived before Hesiod and the Hesiodic school, and less likely still that these Boeotian poets copies this paradigm of obscurity (West Greek or not) over the name of Agamemnon's daughter.
This is not to deny that Xanthus may have felt the need to do some tidying-up of the tradition by reconciling the Homeric and Hesiodic accounts of the names of Agamemnon's daughters. And he may equally well have equipped Electra with a false etymology to explain the equation with Laodice.

¹This was still maintained in 1970 by Lloyd-Jones in the work mentioned at the end of the foot-note on p.990.
Robert (p.173) thought that this etymology presupposed a Dorian source with the form 'A-λέκτρα. Likelier by far that the name first appeared as 'Ηλέκτρη in Boeotian catalogue poetry, (Robert p.173 n.21 rightly compares the form 'Ηλέκτρων) and that if any such pseudo-etymologising as Aelian mentions ever took place, it occurred after the event. Whether S. is supposed to have taken over the etymology and the change of name from Xanthus as one of the πολλά which he παραποίημε, Aelian does not tell us. S. certainly included Electra in his narrative (see p. 93 supra.). And there is a further consideration: the striking etymology which so catches our imagination seems to have been largely ignored by later poets. Of the Attic tragedians only Euripides alludes to it (Or. 72):

παροδένε μακρὸν δὴ μῆκος 'Ηλέκτρα χρόνου

It may be that this dramatist elsewhere in this play makes reference to S's Oresteia. (see above pp.901 ff). Is he doing so again here, or is he obliquely and uniquely hinting at the handling of the story by the obscure and largely unknown Xanthus, for whose popularity at Athens there is not the slightest shred of evidence?

1 Followed by Jebb in his commentary on Sophocles' Electra p.xx.

2 For similar word-play in Attic tragedy, especially Euripides, see Wilamowitz, Ana. Eur. p.190, Mayer p.36.
For a general consideration of Scylla c.f. Robert, Helden-
sage 1367 ff, J. Fontenrose, Python (1959) pp.97ff. Her
parentage varies wildly from author to author, with
several mythical personages vying for the dubious
distinction of being her mother or father. (For a very
full survey of all the relevant passages c.f. O. Waser,
Skylle und Charybdis (Zurich1894) pp.22ff and the same
scholar's summary s.v. Skylla (l) in Roscher's Lexicon
1030 - 31). S. is the only source to introduce Lamia,
and whom he believed her husband to be we are not told.
Homer (Od. 12:124 ff) says nothing of Scylla's father, but
calls her mother Crataeis, in which he is followed by Ov.
Met. 13:749, Apollod. ep. 7:20, and Σ Plato Rep. 9:588C,
to name but a few. The best-supported candidate for
paternity is probably Phorcus / Phorcys (for the alternative
form see West ad Hes. Theog. 237 (p.235), who can claim
among his canvassers Acusilaus F. Gr. Hist. 2, F 42,
men of the sea" seem to be peculiarly appropriate begetters
of monsters (see the passages quoted by West Theog. p.244)
which is presumably why Phorcys also appears in Hes. Theog.
270-336 as father by the aptly-named Ceto of a whole
brood of them (not, however, including Scylla) and why, as
Eustathius remarks before he gives the reference to S.
quoted above, εἰςὶ δὲ οἱ Τριτωνία φαςὶν εἶναι πατέρα τῇ
Hesiod (in ταῖς μεγάλαις Ἡσῖαῖς) made Phorbas the father of Scylla (Hes. fr.262 M-W). Tyrrhenus is an alternative name preserved by Σ Plato Rep. sup. cit. Hyginus fab.125, 151 and praef. 39 has Typhon, and modern scholars have amused themselves by resurrecting the debate and considering whether the Τριώνου mentioned as a variant for Phorcus in Apollod. ep.7-20 should be allowed to stand in glorious isolation or be replaced by a more familiar Τυρρηνοῦ or else Τυφῶνος, Τριώνος or even Τριάνος (the first and third suggestions are Bücheler's, the second Wagner's).

Agreement is only a little easier to find on Scylla's mother. Hesiod fr.262 MW, Acusilaus F. Gr. Hist. 2 F 242, and Dionysius ὁ κυκλοφόρος F. Gr. Hist. 15 F 12 do concur on the name Ἑκάτη, and Ap. Rhod. 4·828f follows them, but his νυκτιπόλος Ἑκάτη ητ ην τε κλείουσι Κράταιν is a patent attempt to reconcile this strand of tradition with the Homeric version. Hyginus talks of Echidna (fab.125, 151; praef.39).

On Lamia in general see Fontenrose, Python pp.100ff. Why did S. alone pick on her? Bowra (GLP2 p.95) suggests that as an ogress who stole and killed children (c.f. McDowell on Ar. Vesp.1035 (p.266)) she was "well-suited to be the mother of Scylla, who stole sailors from ships and killed them". The two actions seem to me dissimilar, and the comparison therefore fanciful. Waser (sup. cit. p.25) and Mancuso (p.235 n.1) toy with the idea that Lamia was particularly at home in Sicily, but a late
inscription from Acrae twice mentioning a place called Λαμίας μακάδοι (I.G. 14·217·41 and 47) is no adequate reason for supposing that her association with that land pre-dated S. Not that I can produce any convincing alternative, except for S's addiction to ξανονόμα. As usual, we simply do not know enough.

We do know however, from the agreement of our three sources, that Lamia was S's choice for Scylla's mother, and we must bear this in mind while trying to make sense of the meaningless phrase εἰδόντι τινως that disfigures Σ Ap. Rhod. We still then be able to dispense at once with emendations such as Bergk's Είδοος τινως or Vürtheim's Είδοος τινως (this last to be interpreted as an intrusive gloss originally naming an alternative mother to Lamia). There is no proof that Eido (i.e. Eidothea: for the hypocoristic form c.f. Kannicht on Eur. Hel. 11 (Vol.2 p.20) and Richardson on H.H. Dem. 47 (p.167)) was ever considered for this role by antiquity, and indeed she seems totally unsuited to it. Keil's εἰδοος τινως is too obscure on its own, and becomes even more so when Waser tries to make εἰδοος mean εἰδόλου and εἰδοξολου mean "monster", with a forward glance to Lamia's late reputation as a bogey like Mormo (Skylla und Charybdis p.26 n.1; Roscher 1031·36ff). Wendel's suggestion that τῆς

1"Dasz dieselben Leute, die der Skylla einen Meergott zum Vater gaben, ihr auch eine Meergöttin als Mutter zurechteilen" says Vürtheim (p.26). But none of the authors who make Phorcys Scylla's father bears out the second half of Vürtheim's dogmatic statement.
Ποσειδώνος may be the cure (c.f. Plut. de Pyth. Or. 9 (398c): ἔνιοι δὲ φασίν ἐκ Μαλείων ἁρμικάδαι (scil. Sib. Delph.) Λαμίας οὖςαν θυγατέρα τῆς Ποσειδώνος, Paus. 10.12.1: ἢν (scil. Sib. Delph.) θυγατέρα Ἑλληνος Διός καὶ Λαμίας τῆς Ποσειδώνος φασίν εἶναι: c.f. Clem. Alex. Stromat. 1.15 (2.45.3 Stahlin), ps-Dio Chrys. Or. 37.13 p. 296 Dindorf is the best of the conjectures which seek to retain as much as possible of the ductus litterarum—though again there is no evidence that this Lamia was ever linked with Scylla. If we are not afraid to depart some way from the outline of the ten letters that so vex us, we might consider Lloyd-Jones' Λιβυκτίδος (C.R. 14 (1964) 19) supposing that the initial Λι- was swallowed up by the last syllable of the preceding Σκύλλη, and -τίδος then suffered ditto- 
ography (c.f. e.g. Eur. fr. 922 N² = Diod. Sic. 20.41.6: δὴ δὲ κατὰ τὴν Λιβόνη γέγονεν αὕτη (scil. Λάμια) καὶ τὸν Εὐριπίδην δείξαι τις ἄν μαρτυροῦντα λέγει γὰρ τίς τοῦ ἄυμον δονομα τοῦπονειδίστον βροτοῦς ὅποι οὗδε λαμίας τῆς Λιβυκτικῆς γένος; Hesych. s.v. Λάμια (Latte 2.569): ὅτι οὖν, καὶ γυνὴ τις ἄρχαία οὕτως καλουμένη Λίβυσσα).
Scylla is about the only monster in the whole of Homer to enjoy (Od. 12·85ff) a description of her physical features explicitly and at length: contrast the reticence over the appearance of the Cyclops in Od. 9 or the Centaurs in either epic. The Σ ad loc (= Dionysius ὁ μυκηναῖος F. Gr. Hist. 15 F 12) gives an even more lurid account of her, and it is worth while quoting this in full, not only to remind ourselves of the monstrous statistics but also because the last line or so of the passage raises an important point of principle: Σκῆλλα θυγάτηρ μὲν ἦν φόρκυνος καὶ Ἐκιτής· τὸ μὲν μέγεθος θαυμαστὴ, εἶχε δὲ πόδας μὲν δώδεκα, κεφαλὰς δὲ ἔξι, ἐν ἑκάστῳ δὲ τὸν στομάτων τρεῖς στίχοις ὁδόντων, ὀφθαλμοὺς δὲ πυροείδες. καὶ τὸ μὲν ἄλλο σῶμα ἐκρύπτετο αὐτῆς ἐν τινὶ επιλαλοῖ κατὰ βυθὸν βεβλημένον, σωμφόνης ὀσκα τῇ πέτρᾳ· τὰς δὲ κεφαλὰς αὐτῆς εἶχεν ἔξι, περιμίχεις ὡς δύνασθαι ἀπὸ τῆς πέτρας εἰς τὴν ναῦν φθάνειν. ταύτην λέγεται τὸν Ἡρακλέα, ὅποτε τὰς Γηροῦνοις βοῶς ἔγει·, ὡς εἶδον ἀπληστευομένην ἀνελεῖν, τὸν δὲ πατέρα διὰ πυρὸς ἀναγκάσατο πάλιν αὐτὴν ἀναθῆκαι. ἢ δὲ ἱστορία παρὰ Διονυσίωι. (For a very similar description of Scylla see now P.S.I. 10·1173 = Pack² 1209 148ff.) The same tradition of Scylla's poaching of Heracles' stolen cattle, that hero's retaliation, and the consequent need to resurrect the monster, may be found, enshrouded by the usual fog of obscurity, in Lycophr. Al.44ff, and (more lucidly narrated) in Σ ad Lyc. 46 (2·35 Scheer).
Vürtheim suggested (p.27),\(^1\) without an atom of proof, that these events formed the substance of S's poem, which thus provided a sort of appendix to the Geryoneís. Bowra (GLP\(^2\) p.94) meekly followed suit. Neither scholar seems to have noticed the discrepancy their hypothesis leaves in its wake. For if this particular incident was ever handled by S. it must surely have occurred in the Geryoneís. In the first place, this piece of myth by itself would hardly supply adequate substance for a poem of Stesichorean length and plenitude of detail. And secondly we know that the specific composition to which Geryon gave his name covered a very wide range indeed: Heracles' visit to the centaur Pholus fell within its spacious and generous scope (181 P = S 19). Are we seriously being asked to believe that the poet had space enough and time to dilate on the totally irrelevant topic of Ἡρακλῆς παρὰ Φόλωι, but none to include the far more germane incidents which befell our hero as he returned from Erythea with the cattle of Geryon? The idea becomes positively preposterous if the entertainment by Pholus succeeded rather than preceded the actual theft of the cattle, for then S. must be supposed to have unaccountably overlooked the highly relevant subject of what later happened to these cattle and instead hauled in from outside the inorganic story of Heracles and the centaurs.

\(^1\)In fact the idea first occurs in the works of K.O. Müller (Gr. Lit. 1. p.335 (361)) and O. Waser (sup. cit. p.68), works which Vürtheim mentions (p.27) without making clear the exact nature of his debt to them.
If we believe that an entire Stesichorean poem devoted to Scylla is not feasible, we must conclude that Σ Ap. Rhod. is corrupt and this monster only featured in part of a work by the poet. Quite possibly, by an assimilative error of a very common type, a scribe at same stage may have written "in the Scylla, it is Lamia whose daughter Scylla is", instead of "in the x, it is Lamia whose daughter Scylla is". We must observe that in the parallel passages from Eustathius and Σ Od 12, no poem called Scylla is attributed to S. If this suggestion were correct, we could identify the unknown poem x with the Geryoneis and accept Scylla's attack on the herd of cattle as part of its contents. Or (to keep the question open) we might suppose that 209 P implied a Stesichorean Odyssey and could place S's remarks on Scylla's parentage in that. But this particular fragment is so terse and uninformative that I would not like to see it used as the basis for any ambitious theorising.

Professor West has produced a different solution (in C.Q. 20 (1970) 206). He would attribute the Scylla to the second S. (mentioned by the Parian Marble) who apparently performed the dithyramb known as the Cyclops before Philip Macedon (c.f. 840 - 841 P). Philoxenus and Timotheus also performed their dithyrambs on the same occasion, and

---

1 For this sort of mental error by anticipation c.f. West, Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique (1973) p.24.
2 So too Schmid, G.G.L. 1 479, but without even the gesture towards justification which West makes.
by a bizarre concatenation of fortune, they bore exactly the same title. Now Philoxenus' Cyclops introduced to literature that combination of the pathetic and the grotesque which is the love-smitten Polyphemus (for its influence on Theocr. ldd.6 and 11 c.f. Gow's Theocritus Vol.2 p.118). And his co-eval Timotheus composed a Scylla (793 P) which included a ὅψις from Odysseus. This makes West think that the final member of this trio of contemporaries, who may resemble Philoxenus in having composed a work that was to influence Theocritus (the controversial "Daphnis" (273 P); see pp.120 ff below) may also be like Timotheus in having written a Scylla. I must say the evidence for all this is far too tenuous to make me think along these lines. West is quite right of course to be unimpressed by the concord of Alexandrian scholarship revealed by those three testimonia which implicitly attribute the Scylla to S. the first. And it was typically shrewd of him to observe that the metrical writer's remark on the catalectic octameter ("quo usus est Stesichorus in Sicilia") in 275 (ii) P "is neither a relevant nor a characteristic addition". But West's conjecture "in Scylla" is no less uncharacteristic, and when the very existence of a Stesichorean poem with that title is so debatable, I would much prefer not to use it to alter a phrase that in itself makes sense.

The title appears only in Athenaeus 3.95D (c.f. 221 P). Athenaeus himself does not name the hunters or mention Meleager, but it is hard to see who these cuoðικαι can be if not those in pursuit of the Calydonian boar, the most famous hunters in Greek myth, (see Welcker, Fl. Schr. 1.180 for the early scholars who took this view). We know of several individual heroes who went a'boar-hunting on their own (Heracles in pursuit of the Erymanthian boar is an obvious example) but the adventures of a single hero in search of a boar would be too limited and unvarying to afford the full-scale and leisurely treatment which we now expect from S. The appearance of 222 P confirms this assumption. The only other passage known to me where the noun cuoðικαι occurs is Philostr. Imag. 2.17.
It is now generally recognised that our earliest treatment of the tale, Homer II.9.529-599, with its epic picture of a war between two cities and a hero nursing his χόλος, is very different from the more familiar story of the magic brand, which makes its first known literary appearance in Phrynichus’ Pleuroniae(TGF 3 F6 Sn.) and Bacchylides 5.94ff. Between these two poets and Homer lived S., the very man who is suspected of having wrought so many changes in other myths on their journey from Homer to later authors. And Paus. 10.31.4 when quoting the Phrynichus fragment mentioned above, strongly implies that the brand version was already familiar by the time the dramatist mentioned it. (τοῦτον τὸν λόγον Φρύνιχος ὁ Πολυφράδμωνος πρῶτος ἐν δράματι ἔδειξε Πλευρωνίας ... οὐ μὴν φαίνεται γε ὁ Φρύνιχος προαγαγὼν τὸν λόγον ἐς πλέον ὡς εὐθύμα ἀν τις οἶκετον, προσαφάμενος δὲ υἱότῳ μόνον ἄτε ἐς ἄπαν ἡξῆ διαβεβαιμένου τὸ Ἐλληνικὸν).

It was thus inevitable that sooner or later some scholar should pick on S. as the "inventor" of the now famous detail of the fire brand, which is so conspicuous by its absence in Homer. That scholar was M. Croiset (Mélanges Henri Weil (Paris 1898) "Les origines du Méléagre de Baccylide" pp 77ff = Calder & Stern, Pindaros und Bakchylides, Wege der Forschung, 134 (1970) 405ff). His hypothesis (inadequately assailed by O. Gruppe in Bursian
137 (1908) 150) is totally implausible, since clearly "the story is too primitive to have been merely literary invention." (Pearson p.65: for folk-tale parallels which bear out this assertion see Kakridis' Appendix 1 (p 127ff)).

We must ever be on our guard against the bland assumption that whenever Homer fails to mention some version of a myth (or indeed a cultural phenomenon) it is because he does not know of it. In creating his own individual picture of an heroic world, Homer often omits and suppresses features (such as the cult of the dead) which would not fit: see my remarks on the remoulding of the Oresteia legend in Homeric epic. This must be one of the explanations for the peculiar form of the Meleager myth in Homer, where the folk-tale motif of the Three Fates' sinister and magical stick is totally excluded, the grisly tale of murder within the family is reduced to a single obscure phrase (Il.9.567) and the legend is retold in

---

1 Apart from S.'s position in time somewhere between the composition of the Eoeae and Bacchylides and Phrynichus, Croiset can only produce the following approximation to a supporting argument (p.411): other Stesichorean heroines murder (or at least mistreat) their nearest and dearest: Scylla ensures her father's death, Eriphyle is responsible for her husband's decease, Helen abandons Menelaus, and Clytemnestra actively kills Agamemnon. Therefore S.'s Althaeas must have destroyed her son by burning the brand. Magnanimously leaving aside the initial blunder over the identity of S.'s Scylla, we can accept the parallels without the conclusion that is alleged to follow from them. How can we decide from such precedents (especially that of Eriphyle) that S.'s Althaeas brought about her son's death with the brand rather than by the more indirect device of her curse, as in Homer? Croiset's picture of the two traditions - the "primitive" epic version and the more ingenious (and therefore later) brand version - seems to me the exact reverse of the truth.
heroic terms. Another explanation of course is the need to refashion Meleager into a paradeigma for Achilles.

We can then confidently accept Kakridis' arguments on the primitive nature of the original brand version, which is based on the ancient but unhomeric concept of an "external soul" dependent on the safety of an external object. It is thus almost certain that S. did not "invent" the brand. He may or may not have been the first poet to give it a literary form (compare, perhaps, the axe in the Oresteia) and combine it with the epic version which involves the war of the Calydonians and the Curetes, and Meleager's death on the battlefield. For a long time the only poet known to have made this combination was Nicander of Colophon in his Ετροικήματα, and harsh words were used of his incompetence in combining the incompatible. Now we can see that he was preceded in this conflation by Bacchylides 5.94ff. Did Bacchylides in turn have S. as his model for the combination, as Croiset suggested? Without fresh evidence, we shall never be able to tell. But the small increase to our store of knowledge that has accrued since Croiset wrote, does not encourage us to think further along these lines. For it shows us that S. gave Meleager's uncles different names from those they bear in Bacch. 5.

Now we have seen that the eccentric version of the myth which we find in 11.9 is to be explained partly as an avoidance of scarifying or supernatural elements, partly by the desire to make Meleager's position as similar as
possible to that of Achilles. The usual brand version would have Meleager killed almost instantly, thus giving him no time to withdraw from the war: this last detail is essential for the parallel with Achilles' situation, and is only made possible by Homer's slow-working curse (see especially Willcock pp 148ff). One would expect all other poets who tell the story, freed from the particular factors which shaped its features in 11.9, to revert to the brand, but this was not the case. Paus. 10.31.3 after showing that he took 11.9.598 (τῷ δ’ οὖν κει δόρ’ ἔτελεσθαι) as an allusive reference to the final effect of his mother's curse on Meleager, proceeds to mention as different from Homer's narrative the treatment of the myth in the Eoeae and the Minyad, where it is Apollo, helping the Curetes against the Calydonians, who kills Meleager: ἐς δὲ τοῦ Μελεάγρου τὴν τελευτὴν Ὄμηροι μὲν ἔστιν εἰρημένα ὡς ἢ Ἑρινὺς καταρθὸν ἀκούσα τῶν Ἀλδαλας καὶ ἀποθάνονι κατὰ ταύτην Μελεάγρου τὴν αἰτιὰν. αἱ εἰ Ἰοῖαὶ τε καλοῦμεναι καὶ ἡ Μινυάς ὁμολογήμασιν ἀλλήλαις' Ἀπόλλωνα γὰρ δὴ αὐτάλ φασιν αἱ ποιήσεις ἀμηνὶς Κοῦρηςιν ἐπὶ τοὺς Αἰτωλοὺς, καὶ ἀποθανέτων Μελεάγρου ὑπὸ Ἀπόλλωνος. We now have a fragment from the Eoeae which contains the passage referred to by Pausanias (Hes. fr.25.9ff M-W): ὁδὲ τὸς ἐν πολέμῳ φιλοχνὸν ὑπομενόντι ἐκλαυστὶ ἐκάντα ἐκάντα μεῖν μετὰ δικηραθῆσαι Μελεάγρου ἀνδρῶν ἥρων, ὅπως ἔστι τὸν ὦν οὐτα μαχέσθαι ἀλλ’ ὅπως Ἀπόλλωνος χερεῖς ἔκει μαρνάμενος Κουρήςι περὶ Πλευρωνίᾳ μακεδονηί.
(On this passage see Willcock pp.153ff). It would be attractive to suppose that Pausanias is talking about the same "epic version" that Homer used in 11.9, which would then be found to have rationalised the older brand version by having Meleager die at the hands of Apollo who is helping the enemy (for this epic motif compare the similar deaths of Patroclus and Achilles at Troy). But against this hypothesis stands the incompatibility of Althaea's curse (Homer) and Apollo as killer (Eoeae and Minyad) - unless Apollo is fulfilling the unusual rôle of an instrument of the Erinys carrying out a mother's curse. Also Pausanias' explicit contrast of Homer with the two later poems (note μεν and δε in the passage cited above). So it seems we must accept the verdict of Kakridis (p.14): Apollo as killer represents a later adaptation of the Iliadic version, and one "of no particular importance". Some poet was inspired by the parallels Homer drew between Meleager and Achilles, to extend the similarity to their deaths, substituting for the maternal curse and the Erinys Apollo's intervention.
S. elsewhere follows the "Hesiodic" version of a myth, and it would be pleasant to know whether he did likewise here or whether he restored the brand. Pleasant, but impossible given our scant information about his poem. The title Συοδηρατι, together with the two fragments, suggests that the boar-hunt was an important feature of the work. It is most unlikely that this boar-hunt figured in the original folk-tale about Meleager before
Homer adapted it to epic ends. The anger of a goddess, her sending of the Calydonian boar as a bane for mortals, the gathering of heroes to kill it - not one of these motifs is integral to the story of the mother and the brand. But they are all very epic in flavour, and look very much like part of the Homeric heroisation of the folk-tale. The explanation of human misfortunes by the anger of a deity can be paralleled by the Achaean plague which Apollo's χόλος causes in Iliad Bk.1. And the boar-hunt as a focus of heroic activity is a clear epic touch. This epic feature has been retained by all later writers (including S.), even those who combine it with the folk-tale's brand and reject most of the other heroic touches introduced by Homer.

One must finally mention the problem of Atalanta. In later literature it is Meleager's love for her which leads to the quarrel with his uncles over the hide and his eventual death. That version of the story was told by Euripides in his "Meleager" (c.f. Page, Greek Literary Papyri pp 154ff for plot and possible fragment) and it has been suggested (c.f. Geffcken, RE 15.453) that it was invented by the playwright. She is not mentioned in II 9 - but then nor are any of the Calydonian boar's hunters except Meleager. The character herself certainly flourished a long time before Euripides, since she already appears in the Hesiodic Catalogue as ποδώμης δι' Ἀταλάντη (fr.73.2 MW) with her famous aversion to marriage and
her father's remedy in the form of a foot-race both well-developed (c.f. frr. 72-76 MW). She is also frequently depicted on Greek vases as participating in the hunt (see below pp.109ff) or wrestling with Peleus at the Funeral Games of Pelias, and it is just conceivable that she featured in S's Ἑασῆς - and very possible that she was in the Ἀδηλα: see 179AP and me ad loc. - but unlikely that she as yet provided any love interest\(^1\): it is still most plausible that this idea was introduced by that master of female psychology and tragic eroticism, Euripides.

It was once customary to believe in a pre-Homeric epic on Meleager (the so-called "Meleagris") which inspired the plot of the Iliad and its similar hero Achilles and was the direct source for Il.9.529-599 (and the far later vase-paintings which illustrate the Calydonian boar-hunt). The pages of Roscher and RE are aswim with mentions of this "Meleagros-Epos", and the whole theory was given an unwelcome boost by the strenuous argumentation of Kakridis in his "Homeric Researches" passim (see the Index s.v. "Meleagris"). His claims for the existence of this poem are ultimately unconvincing: the similarities between Achilles and Meleager are to be explained (with e.g.

\[^1\]She cannot have provided this in the Homeric version, for it would be incompatible with Meleager's affection for his wife Cleopatra: Apollodorus' clumsy attempt to combine the two traditions of Meleager as lover and husband only underlines this fact (Ap. 1.8.2). Of course there is no place for the wife in the basic brand version: she is a further invention of Homer's.
Bethe, Schadewaldt and Willcock) by supposing that Homer has added χόλος, withdrawal, and the supplication by the hero's ἔταξις to the myth of Meleager to facilitate Phoenix's paradeigma: he has transferred the motifs from Achilles to Meleager and not vice versa. Of course epic poems will have been composed before Homer's time, and Meleager may have formed the subject of some of them, but it is absurd to suppose that we have more tangible knowledge of one of them, a specific and concrete "Meleagris", simply because Homer applies common epic motifs to both Achilles and Meleager.

We need not then consider a "Meleagros-Epos" as a possible source for S., or try to reconstruct the poem from II.9. But we can say that S. had before him both epic versions of Meleager's myth (with and without the curse) outlined above as in Homer and "Hesiod", and also the original folk-tale version. We cannot tell which he chose to use. The title Συναγωγή might suggest that S. confined himself to the boar hunt. (If he used the folk-tale version, this would still take him as far as Meleager's death; if he used either of the epic versions he must, on this assumption, have broken off before Meleager's death in battle). But we know how discursive S's narrative could be: if the Geryoneis had time and space to include Heracles' entertainment by Pholus (181 P = S19) why should a poem of his with the title "Boar-Hunters" have restricted itself to the boar-hunt?

But it is impossible to recover from later treatments of
the hunt S.'s scope and style. The only really large-scale literary treatment of this topic is Ovid's (Met. 8.270ff). The mythographers have disappointingly little to tell us, especially Apollodorus (1.8), of whom we might have hoped better in view of the full scale and probably Stesichorean origin of his description of Heracles' expedition against Geryon. (Apollod. 2.5.10: see my Introduction to the Geryoneis above pp.67 ff).

There is no such promising amplitude of detail in the meagre list of events which is Apollodorus' recounting of the Calydonian boar hunt. We merely hear how Pylus\(^1\) and Ancaeus were killed by the boar, how Peleus accidentally killed Eurytion while aiming at the beast, how Atalanta, Amphiaraus and Meleager (in that order) each wound the brute, the last fatally, and how the award of the hide to Atalanta sparks off the disastrous quarrel. This treatment is not even sufficiently detailed to tell us how Apollodorus' source thought the boar was discovered by the hunters (see on 221 P below p. ). Only the epic motif of Oeneus' preliminary feasting of the hunters for nine days (compare Il.6.174f: έννήμαρ Ξέλυνε τε καὶ έννέα Βοῦς Ίέρσους and the Odyssey passim) immediately strikes the eyes, and that may as well derive from a genuine epic as from S.

Bowra (p.97) suggested that some of S. might be preserved in the account of Ovid, who after all shares with the\(^1\)

\(^1\)Πόλος codd.: against the emendation Hyleus c.f. Wilmovitz, Berliner Klassikertexte 5 p.24 n.3.
Greek poet the "duo Thestiadae" (304), "impiger Eurytion" (311) and Caeneus (305). But it would be foolhardy in the extreme to look for clues as to S's original details and style in Ovid's idiosyncratic treatment, which is clearly related in his own highly individual and comic voice. The Alexandrian allusiveness of Ovid's catalogue of hunters (e.g. 316-317: Amphycidesque sagax et adhuc a coniuge tutus | Oeclides nemorisque decus Tegeaea Lycaei) is totally alien to the naïve simplicity of early epic Catalogues and the small fragment of S's list which we now possess. And the most interesting and unparallelled events that we find in Ovid's hunt, Nestor's pole-vault into a tree to escape the boar (365-7), or Telamon's encounter with a tree-root which sends him sprawling flat on his face (378-9), are clearly Ovid's own humorous contributions to tradition, a carefully calculated deflation of the epic style.

Nevertheless, as Hollis points out in his commentary (p. 77), Ovid's description of the hunt is untypically epic: "Very many of the incidents and turns of phrase contain unmistakable echoes of battle scenes in the Iliad. We find not only the stock formulas used to describe the shooting of an arrow (381) - where "imposuit nervo" at the start of the hexameter represents the Homeric δῆκε δ'ἐμι νευρῃ in the same position - "or a warrior's death (399-402)" - where "quaque est via proxima letō" reminds us of the Homeric ἵνα τε ψυχής ὑκτός δέλεθρος - "but also, more generally, some typical Homeric descriptive
patterns" (e.g. 365-6: "forsitan et Pylius citra Troiana perisset tempora, sed" etc. closely paralleled by Il.5.311-12: καὶ νῦ νεν ἐνθ’ ἀπὸλοιτο ἀναξ ἄνδρων Αἴνειας ἐπ’ ἡμὶ ἄρ’ ὡς νόης Ἀδός θυγάτηρ Ἀφοσίτη κτλ.). What Hollis describes in Ovid as "the transference of Homeric motifs from a battle to a hunt" is precisely what we should expect from S's Suothraei if we bear in mind passages such as the Geryoneis' adaptation of Sarpedon's words to Glau- cus (Il.12.322ff) or of Hecuba's plea to Hector (Il.22.82ff) in S11.8ff and S2-13. Whether Ovid is here copying epic directly or copying S's imitation of the epic style, he gives us a very general idea of the treatment S. must have given his subject-matter. Nearer than this to the truth we cannot come, especially since, in contrast to other of his poems, the Suotherae seems to have had remarkably little influence on succeeding ages: witness its failure to impress its own list of participants on vase paintings or other literary treatments.

That descriptions of boar hunts and of boars themselves were popular in literature before S's time we can tell from passages in Homer and Hesiod. See, for instance, the splendid simile in Il.13.471ff:

ἄλλ' ἔμεν', ὡς ὀτε τις εὐς ὠδρείην ἄλκι πεποιθώς, ὡς τε μένει κολοσσυτόν ἑπερχόμενον πολύν ἄνδρών χώριν ἐν οἰσπόλωι, φρίσσει δὲ τε νῶτον ὑπερθεν' ὀφθαλμῶ δ' ἄρα οἱ πυρὶ λάμπετον' αὐτὰρ ὰδήντας θήγει, ἀλέξασθαι μεμαωκناس ἥδη καὶ ἄνδρας.
See too the detailed account of a boar hunt in Od. 19-428ff. The "Hesiodic" Aspis likewise contains an exciting boar simile (386ff):

οἶκος ὃ ἔν βῆκεν ὁρέος καλεπός προϊδέσθαι
κάπρος καυλιόδων φονεῖτι θυμωί μαχέσασθαι
ἀνδράκι θηρευτῆς, ἔλεγε δὲ τε λευκὸν ὅδοντα
δοξῳδῆς, ἀφρός δὲ περὶ στόμα μαστιχώντι
λείβεται, δις δὲ οἱ πυρὶ λαμπετῶντι ἐλκτον,
ὄψις δ᾽ ἐν λωφήτι φοίσσει τρίχας ἀμφι τε δείρην...

It seems safe to presume that the Ἐὐοθῆραι reflected the interest in descriptions of boarhunts as revealed by such passages as these and several Attic black-figure vases datable to the second quarter of the sixth century (see below pp.1061ff) or the metope of the boar on the Sicyonian Treasury at Delphi made at roughly the same time. A passage similar to those on the roused boar quoted above will doubtless have featured in the Ἐὐοθῆραι. But the exiguous nature of our fragments of this poem render all further speculation futile. Vürtheim for once gives a salutary reminder of the danger of over-enthusiastic reconstructions of our poem. Mancuso had written lyrically of the "passionalità nuova, che lasciò tracce su tutta quanta l'arte posteriore" (La Lirica classica greca in Sicilia e nella Magna Grecia p.229). Writing in 1919, Vürtheim (Clodius accusat moechos!) sternly reminded him "Aber schlieszlich kennen wir von den Ἐὑοθῆραι nur fünf Worte!" (p.28). Well, six actually, and now 222 P has given us a few more. But we are still far from knowing...
anything like enough of S.'s treatment of his theme.

METRE


R. Führer, Hermes 97 (1969) 115-116

M.W. Haslam, 12-20

"The metres", Lobel wrote in his ed. pr. (p.11), "...are dactylic and anapaestic cola with no visible strophic structure." The last five words explain his view that col.ii might contain a different poem from col.i, a view originally accepted by Page (P.M.G. p.119) who noted "ii incertum an eiusdem carminis." His mind has now been changed (S.L.G. p.157) as a result of Snell's reconstruction of the poem's metre. This is indeed masterly, and its pioneering work has been valuably supplemented and modified by Führer and Haslam. But there are details in the work of all three which I find it impossible to reconcile with the evidence of the papyrus.¹

Any recovery of the metre must take for its basis the paragraphos under ii 7.² Then we will observe how

¹Mr. Barrett has given me invaluable help here in questioning orthodox opinion.

²This is crucial: compare the difficulty of deciding whether col.ii in 209 P is part of a str./ant. or epode simply because of the lack of a similar thin black line. Μωρόφραστοι are likewise very useful in fixing the metrical scheme of the Geryones.
peculiarly short are i 1, 5, and 8 in comparison with the other lines, and how 2 and 9 of the same column end in the metre \textit{J\ldots\ldots}. All this information can be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>col.i</th>
<th>col.ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (short)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (short)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these facts an attractive hypothesis readily emerges: ii 1-7 form a strophic whole of seven lines, and i contains a similar str./ant. of the same length beginning at 2 and ending at 8. This hypothesis explains much: the responson between i 2 and 9 for instance, and the apparently similar shortness of i 8 and 1 which will both be the ultimate lines of a strophic whole; also the responson between i 1 and ii 7, each, it would seem, of much the same length, each the last line of a str./ant. Note too the verbal as well as metrical equivalence of \textit{ενθεν} \\textit{μέν} (ii 1) to \textit{ενθεν} \textit{δὲ} (ii 8) and the synaphea between the following: i 2/3 \textit{ό} ii 8/9 and i 4/5 \textit{ό} ii 3/4. Putting these data together we can draw up a provisional metrical scheme. But it is most important to fix the
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metre of i 1, since only thus can we calculate that line's length and fix the position of the first column's margin. That will allow us to keep a check on the various supplements — verbal and metrical — which have been suggested for this lost portion of the papyrus. Col.i 1 is a short line, the last line of a strophic whole, and in response with i 8 and ii 7; its remains are easily supplemented as θετηταδων which corresponds to all but the initial two shorts of ii 7 χιξνα νυρωπον. Simultaneously, then, we discover that the latter line is complete, while the former lacks but two short syllables. For reasons shortly to be unfolded (p.1021 f below) it will be safest to assume that these two initial syllables could have been contracted to a single longum. In theory, then, about 2-4 letters stood in our line before θετηταδων. Practical attempts at provisional supplementation produce sequences of letters which differ very little in extent (e.g. δυο θετηταδων (for the phrase c.f. Ov. Metam. 8.304: duo Thestiade) τοις θ.κατ θ.etc.) Absolute certainty about what word stood at the start of this line is of course unattainable and for our present purposes unimportant: what matters is that we are able to gauge fairly closely the position of col.i's margin so as to verify whether the different metrical schemes and supplements that have been put forward will in fact fit the available space.

There is one complicating factor. As Lobel says (p.13) col.ii's "alinement is notably irregular",1 that is, the slope is reproduced in the texts of Lobel and Page.

---

1The slope is reproduced in the texts of Lobel and Page.
beginnings of its lines lean gradually towards the left as they progress towards the foot. This is a common phenomenon at the edge of papyri columns and is known as Maas's Law after the scholar who first drew attention to it: further examples in E.G. Turner, Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World (Oxford 1971) p.6. Führer and Haslam assume (reasonably enough) that a similar slant to the left originally afflicted the margin of col.i, and allow for an increasingly large number of missing letters in 16 downwards. The principle is unobjectionable, but both scholars grossly over-estimate the number of extra letters it would allow, as anyone can see who bothers to trace col.ii's margin onto col.i by anchoring it in front of one of the supplements to Θερμίδης mentioned above. However rough this guide, it suffices to rule out Snell's reconstruction\(^1\) of the first two lines of the poem's strophe as 5 da. apiece: there is not nearly enough room for supplements of this metrical length and we can safely dismiss this interpretation without more ado. Führer's alternative view of the strophe as opening with 2 lines of 4 da provides supplements of the right length and thus needs no further commendation. The same can be said of Snell's reconstruction of the rest of the strophe, except that the appropriate supplements here are not those proposed by Snell himself who continues to supply words

\(^1\) pp.79-80, together with the impossible supplements in p. 80 n.2. This scholar's Gr. Met.\(^3\) p.21 n.2 repeats his interpretation.
that are far too long for the original space, even granted it was swollen by the left-wards slant.

In exaggerating the consequences of this bias Führer and Haslam merely create difficulties for themselves. The former calculates the increasing number of syllables missing at the start of col. i thus:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

Such a tendency would suggest \( \text{--} \cdot \text{--} \cdot \text{--} \) or \( \text{--} \cdot \text{--} \cdot \text{--} \cdot \text{--} \) as the initial syllables of the last line (9). Führer supposes this implies a span of 5 da. for the first line of the strophic system, but his attempt to side-step this obstacle to his metrical reconstruction is unfortunate. Haslam takes the same evidence to indicate the existence of an epode, whose first line (i 9) he reconstructs as

\[ \text{Γιλατιδύαδαφρονος} \ (i \ 9) \ \text{stands directly and vertically below} \ \text{δυτιονοι τε} \ \text{ωάλ αναϊ.-} \ (i \ 2) \ \text{only} \ \text{--} \text{--} \text{--} \text{--} \ \text{need be missing. But this is an elementary blunder as Haslam (p.14 n.11) has seen. Given the leftwards slant the facts to which Führer draws our attention constitute an argument against both lines having the same length, not for it. Still, I think Führer is right about the amount missing from the start of i 9, though for the wrong reasons.} \]

---

1 He claims (p.116 n.1) that since Ειλατίδγαδαφρονος (i 9) stands directly and vertically below δυτιονοι τε ωάλ αναϊ.- (i 2) only \( \text{--} \text{--} \text{--} \text{--} \) need be missing. But this is an elementary blunder as Haslam (p.14 n.11) has seen. Given the leftwards slant the facts to which Führer draws our attention constitute an argument against both lines having the same length, not for it. Still, I think Führer is right about the amount missing from the start of i 9, though for the wrong reasons.
Neither solution is valid. The conclusions of both scholars are based on the false premise that \textendash \textendash \textendash is a feasible supplement in 6 and that even larger supplements are required in the succeeding lines. Whoever thinks this possible should use the criterion for judging the gap mentioned above. He will then see that even in 19, where the leftward tendency will be at its greatest, there is room for no more than about seven letters covering \textendash \textendash .

When Haslam says (pp.14-15) "there seems definitely too much room for just \textendash \textendash , which would be required if the line were the first of the strophe/antistrophe ... The length would suit either \textendash \textendash \textendash or \textendash \textendash \textendash ." I cannot conceive how he reaches his conclusion.\footnote{Of course the left hand margin of col.i may have had a slope of quite different proportions from ii's. But in that case we will never know whether it was greater or lesser, and all calculations are futile. It is irresponsible to take a leftwards slant into account while supposing it more extreme than col.ii's.}

The Suotherae may have been triadic nevertheless. But that conclusion must be reached not by positing an impossibly large number of lost letters at the start of 19, or by noting that the text of 221 P yields a metrical sequence without parallel in our reconstructed str./ant. viz. ... \textendash \textendash \textendash \textendash ... \textendash \textendash \textendash \textendash ... . Stesichorean papyrus finds have reminded us again and again that the indirect tradition is often corrupt and inaccurate, and it would be irresponsible to draw important metrical
conclusions from this one short quotation. Snell’s attempts (p. 81) to fit 221 P into the str./ant. by postulating accidental abbreviation (\(\textasciitilde\textasciitilde\) κρύψε δὲ ὑγχος ἄκρον \(\textasciitilde\textasciitilde\) γάς ὑπένερσε or κρύψε δὲ ὑγχος ἄκρον \(\textasciitilde\textasciitilde\) γάς ὑπένερσε) do not presuppose any impossibly high level of carelessness in citation. And since i 1 \(\cong\) i 8 and ii 8-9 \(\cong\) ii 1-2, there is no room for an epode on our papyrus, unless that epode had exactly the same opening as str./ant., a phenomenon as yet without parallel in Stesichorean metric.

Here then is Führer’s modification of Snell’s reconstruction, for which we should be especially grateful since it removes the possibility that the Suotherae ended and a new poem began in col.i. Everything we have learned about the scope of S’s poem since 1956 reinforces the impression that when Lobel terms the idea that P. Oxy. 2359 represents two poems ‘improbable’ (p. 11) he is indulging in understatement.

str./ant.

1 Verbal response between ἐπέθεν μὲν and ἐπέθεν δ’ strikes me as somewhat likelier between strophe and antistrophe than between either of these and an epode. But the argument is not a very strong one and I do not press it.
Haslam (p.18) argues for taking the first fourteen da. as an exceptionally long single period, split into two parts by diaeresis after the first 8 da. In fact there is only one instance of word-end in this position extant on the papyrus (not two as is claimed by Haslam (p.18 n. 17)). But it does stand out (i 3) in contrast to the clearly attested cases of run-over after the fourth and twelfth da. In all discernible instances (i 2, 4, ii 4, 9), in view of these phenomena it seems sounder to bring ii 2 into line and assume there too run-over after the fourth da. rather than write Ἰάνων with Lobel and nearly all scholars after him and thus create a unique exception (see ad loc.). Note too the extraordinary way in which the "anapaests" of str.5-7 provide an almost exact "metrical mirror-image" (Haslam p.19) of the dactyls in str.2-4 down to the position of the diaeresis. A very similar device is to be found in the Geryoneis (see my remarks pp.38) and indeed there are several points of resemblance between the metre of the two poems, as Führer has shown. We might set out these resemblances as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Συνθέσεως</th>
<th>Γηγεννητής</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>str. 1·2·3</td>
<td>ep. 3·4·7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>str. 3/4</td>
<td>ep. 5/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>str. 5</td>
<td>str. 2·4·6·8·9, ep.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Note too the blunt closing period of the Suotherae: "--". This is so abrupt, especially after the enormous length of the preceding period, that it is probably best to regard it as a daring coda intended to bring the stanza to a quick close. Again, the only remote parallel for this blunt ending comes from the Geryoneis (see p. 86). Granted these affinities, it is highly likely that the absence of consecutive monosyllabic biceps in the present poem points to a ban on the phenomenon such as is operated by the other poem. Nor would it be unreasonable to suppose that the contraction of "" to " was allowed here, as it is there, in all places.

This likelihood enables us to decide on the probability of various supplements proposed (see my commentary on 222 i P).
COMMENTARY

221 P

Meineke originally changed the MSS reading ἐν Συνθήρατος to ἐν Συνθήρατι (presumably in his Teubner edition of Athenaeus (3 vols.: 1858-9) but I have not seen this).

Now that we can be almost sure that the poem contained an extensive catalogue of hunters, this emendation becomes even less desirable than it seemed to its author, who ultimately disowned it (Analecta Crit. ad Ath. Deipnos. (1867)).

A far more plausible emendation involving the ipsissima verba of S. was made by Dindorf (in his 1827 edition of Athenaeus: Vol. 1 p. 219) who conjectured νοώψε for νοώψατ, a change applauded by E. Kapp and Snell (p. 80 n. 3). The paradox is objectionable for two reasons: (1) An infinitive is difficult to explain (though when the entire fragment is so minute this is hardly surprising. But the hypothesis of a lost verb governing νοώψατ (it "tried to hide", it "began to hide", it "wanted to hide") produces ineffably feeble sense). (2) An infinitive would result in anomalous metre, to wit ... —— —— —— ... That isolated breve must have jarred even in Dindorf's time. Now that we can tell from the metre of 222 P (see p. 1020) how totally without parallel it is, the temptation to restore a dactylic sweep is almost irresistible. The corruption will probably have arisen when a thoughtless scribe altered indicative to infinitive under the influence (conscious or unconscious) of ψηνεύω. But it is just
conceivable that Athenaeus is presenting us with a quote in oratio obliqua (compare the possibility that his citation carelessly contains several lacunae: see p.). Still, even then Dindorf's emendation would effortlessly restore oratio recta. (For a similar problem involving the metre of 178 P see my note ad loc. (p. ))

γάς ὑπένεφθεν


Without more information, it is clearly impossible to tell at what point in the poem our fragment occurred, particularly in relation to 222 P. Can we even be sure what is happening in the course of these six words? Bowra (p.97) puts forward two hypotheses: either the boar is preparing for the fight, or else he has been wounded and gives it up. But given either of these possibilities, sticking the snout underground seems an irrelevant gesture for any self-respecting swine. A likelier suggestion is that the boar is uprooting a tree. After all, this is what we find described in Il.9.540-2 (scil čuv):

δ' μακά πόλλ' ἐρθεκεν ἐθων οἶνηος ἀλων'  
πολλὰ δ' ὅγε προσθέλεμνα χαμαί βάλε δένορεα μακρὰ  
aυτήςιν δίζησε καὶ αὐτοὶς ἀνθεκτι μήλων.

But again, is sticking the snout below earth the most efficient way to bring down a tree? G. Huxley, in GRBS 7 (1966) 319-20, argues that a thrust above ground from
the brute's shoulder or flank would be needed to achieve this end. His own interpretation of our passage, that the boar is searching for underground food and unearthing it with its snout, is the likeliest so far. Boars do root for grubs, worms, and acorns beneath the earth, according to season, just like domestic pigs after truffles. Huxley's list of corroborative parallels has been augmented by R. Renehan, Studies in Greek Texts (Hypo-
8.6.595\textsuperscript{A} 17: ριξοφάγον δὲ μάλιστα ἢ ὃς ἔστι τῶν ζῴων διὰ τὸ εὖ πεφυκέναι τὸ βύγχος πρὸς τὴν ἐργαλείαν ταὐτήν. Ar.
Nub. 188: ζητοῦσι οὗτοι τὰ κατὰ γῆς' το βολβοῦς ἄρα ζη-
τοῦσι. Plut. Mor. 670\textsuperscript{A}: τὴν δ' ὑπὸ κρητῆς αἰτίας τιμάσθαι λέγουσιν πρὸς τῷ γάρ σχίσασα τῷ προβοότῳ τοῦ βύγχους, ὡς φασίν, τὴν γῆν ἵνα ἄνοδως ἔθηκεν καὶ τὸ τῆς ὀνεως ψηφήσατ' ἔργον' ὅθεν καὶ τὸν νομομα γενέσθαι τῶι ἐργαλείωι λέγουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς ὄδο ... (B) χρησάμεναι (scil. ὧς τῶν Ἀλυσίων) πάτων καὶ ὄρυξιν ταξύ τὴν γῆν ἔτρεψαν ἐν βάδους καὶ τὸν επόρον ἀπέκρυψαν. Hesych. s.v.
βολβοῦξα (1.1375 Latte)' τὴν οὖν. Λάκωνες. See too
C.G.F. 219.19 (Austin) where ὅνειξαθῶν (v.l. ἔρυσ'—) is probably an epithet for a pig (so Kassel, ZPE 14 (1974)
122f). See further Orth s.v. "Schwein" in RE 2\textsuperscript{Al} 807 19 ff, W. Winter, AJP 72 (1951) 66-7 (on ὃδον).
Huxley's further suggestion that the hunters may have caught (or, I would prefer, discovered) the boar unawares while it was unearthing a root may even be right. It certainly creates a vivid picture, which, however, no other
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account of the hunt preserves. Ovid, the only ancient author whose treatment is large-scale enough to include this sort of detail, has the heroes drive the boar out of his lair (Met. 8.334ff).

222 P

ed. pr. E. Lobel, Oxy. Pap. 23 (1956) P. Oxy. 2359 fr.1 (pp.11-14; Plate IV)


D.L. Page, C.R. 7 (1957) 192 (conjectural supplements now revealed for the most part as metrically impossible).

A.A. Barrett, Cl. Phil. 67 (1972) 117-119.

The fragment may safely be assigned to S. on grounds of dialect, metre, and subject-matter.
A catalogue of the heroes who participated in the Calydonian boar hunt. As Homer says (Il. 9. 544-5) Meleager killed the boar πολλ PriorityQueue ανδρός ἄγερος καὶ κόνις’ οὐ μὲν γάρ κε δάμη παύροις βροτοῖς, and here they are, the Ἐλλάνων ἄριστοι of Bacch. 5. 111. The Catalogue is the most obvious example of that borrowing of epic motifs which we earlier suggested (p. 151) would characterise S.'s Συνσφραί. Wisely wishing to forestall premature complacency about the identity of P. Oxy. 2359, Lloyd-Jones in his review of Lobel's ed. pr. (p. 17) wondered whether the lines might not belong rather to the Ἀθλα έπι Πελίαι than to the Συνσφραί, especially since many of the competitors at the games later participated in the boar hunt as well. The truth of this last statement can be instantly confirmed by a glance at my list of the participants variously reported as present at Pelias' funeral games (see above p. 31). I reinforce this impression by repeating their names here and appending a number to show how many of the three literary sources tabulated below (pp. 151-3) represent them as at the hunt too. A second number, if it occurs, refers to the two vase painters there mentioned, and gives the same information for them.

Acastus (1, 1) Admetus (1) Alastor Amphiaraus (3) Argeius Asterion Atalanta (4, 1) Capaneus Castor (4, 2) Euphemus Eurybotas Heracles
We can see that several heroes attended both events. But Procaeon and Clytius, Eurytion and Caeneus — the only heroes named or implied in 222 P — are not among them. Still they might have attended the games in traditions now lost to us. Certainly at least one vase shows a Clytius, presumably Meleager's uncle, watching a wrestling-bout between Peleus and Atalanta (see p. 30).

Furthermore, metre very slightly favours Lloyd-Jones' alternative attribution: "Αθλα 179 B P = our poem str./ant. 5-6 (222·6-7 P) a straightforward equivalence; whereas it is rather more difficult (though by no means impossible) to fit into our poem's scheme 221 P the only other fragment explicitly assigned by an ancient source to the Συσδηραί.

Nevertheless, Lobel's original attribution is still the likeliest. I say this not because I believe that "The careful mention of the sons of Thesius may perhaps sway the scales in favour of the Συσδηραί" (Bowra p.96 n.1, with the presumable implication that they are mentioned carefully because they are going to be killed later in the poem). The carefulness of the mention may merely be the result of S.'s customary amplitude of style. The
juxtaposition of Eurytion (6) with the Thestiadae however, would have more point in a poem that went on to describe the death of all three of them; and the parental concern for the younger Thestiads which possibly underlies ll. 2ff would be more naturally aroused in the context of a hunt for a deadly boar than if attendance at Funeral Games and nothing else were involved.

1ff: Θεστηδαί... Προκάων Κλυτίς

For very speculative attempts to complete the first line see above p. 1016.

Thestius was King of Pleuron, father of Althaea and her two brothers killed by Meleager. His sons are variously named: the only other source which definitely mentions Procaon and Clytius in a pair is ΣΤ ad 11.9.567 (3.521 Erbse): κακιγνήτου φόνοιον κακιγνήτοιο δε "γυναικά τε θήσατο μαζῶν" (11.24.58) εἰ μήποτε καθ'"Ομηρον εἰς ἔστιν. δόο δὲ ήκαν, Κλυτίος καὶ Προκάων. But the two are almost certainly set next to each other in a further fragment, once attributed to Pindar, now convincingly reassigned to Bacchylides by Lobel. (P. Ashmole inv. 20 = Pindar fr. 343 Sn. = Bacch. 25: on authorship c.f. Lobel, Oxy. Pap. 23 (1956) pp.30 and 38). There we read 25

"Αμφίτριωνιδᾶς

[...]

Ἱππ' ἄπο τεῖχεσιν

Ἰμέν αὐθήρ'
Lobel's restoration of the name of Clytius in 29 is very plausible, but he then states that "the mention of Heracles (25) appears to preclude the Calydonian boar-hunt" (sup. cit. p.13 n.1). Need it? It is indeed true that Heracles is not named in any extant list of heroes who attend the hunt. If we are reluctant to accept that the poet here departs from this tradition, we can still assert that the patronymic in 1.25 could in theory apply also to Heracles' brother Iphicles and Iphicles' son Iolaus, and it is in fact used of the former by Nicander, Theriaca 687 ("Ἀμφιτρωνιάδας ... Ἰψικλέος"). Since each of the two is said by a different author to have been present at the hunt (Iolaus is mentioned by Paus. 8.45.6, Iphicles by Apollod. 1.68) there is every reason to suppose (with Snell p.80 n.2 and ad Bacch. 25.25 (p.76)) that the name of one of them occurred in the lost portion of Bacchylides' poem, qualified by the epithet "Ἀμφιτρωνιάδας. S's list of heroes might then have found at least one echo in later poetry. But it would be an isolated echo: nearly all other literary treatments, including Bacchylides' fifth epinician, depart from S's names for the uncles of Meleager. And this should remind us that poets seem to

---

1 Snell-Maehler put the wrong accent on Κλυτίος: it must be paroxytone (c.f. Fraenkel on Ag. 881 (2.396)), H. Frankel's app. crit. on Ap. Rh. 1.86) as Lobel (sup. cit. p.13 n.1) has seen.

2 According to the Lexicon des Frühgr. Epos. fasc. 4 p.691 col.1.1 the epithet is confined to Heracles in the remains of early epic.
have been so tenaciously idiosyncratic in their lists of the participants that it would be rash to assume Bacch. 25's mention of the presence of Iphicles or Iolaus to be taken, like the names of the Thestiads, from S's Suotherae.

The names Procaon and Clytius for the Thestiads certainly do not belong to the most common tradition. A different scholion on 11.9.567 (deriving from Didymus according to Erbse) has the following note: ἀδελφοὶ ὅτε ὁ Ἀλθαίας Ἰφικλος, Πολυφάντης, Θάνης, Ἐδρύπυλος, Ρήξιππος. Apollod. 1.7.10 gives a slightly varying list: Ἰφικλος, Ἐδρύπυλος, Ρήξιππος, Ἐδρύπυλος. And that of Σ in Ap. Rhod. 1.99 (Wendel p.25) differs again: θεστιάδας Ἰφικλος καὶ λιγνη- τος Τοξέως καὶ Ρήξιπποι καὶ Ἀλθαίας τῆς Μελεάγρου μητρός. Bacch. 5.128-9 names Iphiclus and Aphares as the two uncles slain. Lactantius in Stat. Theb. 1.402 comments on the lines Olenius Tydeus fracerni sanguinis illum conscius horror agit as follows: quia occiderat avunculum suum Thoantem, Althaeae matris fratrem, vel, ut quidam volunt, Aphaerea. Ov. Met. 8.440-1 calls his "duo Thesti- dae" Toxeus and Plexippus: Hyginus fab. 73.2 is corrupt at this point, but he clearly mentioned Plexippus.

When Apollodorus says that the sons of Thestius attended the hunt and later that they were slain by Meleager (1.8.2-3), he presumably does not mean to imply that all four brothers whom he listed earlier came and were killed. Bacchylides and Ovid both mention two slain uncles,
leaving it unstated whether there was an indefinite number of Thestiadae left unslain at home. Likewise, which and how many of the Thestiads mentioned by the various scholia on Homer and Apollonius were killed by Meleager is impossible to say. (The Apollonian scholion includes the names of Toxeus and Plexippus who are the two brothers killed off by Ovid). At least the sheer diversity of the tradition here has been brought home to us, so that we will not waste our time on guessing games over the identity of the Thestiads lurking behind the lacunae at 2ff.

For another possible reference by S. to the Thestiadae (itself highly controversial, highly problematic) see 193. 20 P and my note ad loc.

2ff: δψιγόνοι τε καὶ ἄσπασί [οι ἐν μεγάροις]ιν
I comment first of all upon what we actually have on the papyrus. Then I turn to the supplement at the start of 2. S. here seems to be saying that whereas Procaon and Clytius came to the nunt, the other sons of Théstius were too young and stayed at home. For the phraseology Lobel compares H.H. Dem. 164f: τηλύγετος δέ οἷς ἔνι μεγάρωι εὐπήκτωι δψιγόνοις τρέφεται πολυεύχετος ἀσπάσιος τε,
though as he points out, the context and the apparently disjunctive force of ἄτάρ would suggest μένοιν rather than τράφεῖν as the supplement in 3, to provide a contrast between the younger Thestiads and those named in 4.

(Also -οι μένοιν is a snug fit, -οι τράφεῖν a little too long). Δψιγόνοις in Homer always refers to men "of later ages" as opposed to πρόγονοι. In post-Homeric passages
(such as the present and H.H. Dem. 165 and 219) it means "late-born": see the authors quoted by Richardson on H.H. Dem. 165 (p.200). Now in these lines from the Homeric Hymn and in Greek poetry generally (see especially Pind. Ol.10.86ff) a single child would be especially "welcome" (ἀκτησίος) precisely because ὡς γενόμενοι: late in his father's life his birth suddenly and unexpectedly kept the property within the family and prevented its dispersal among outsiders - always a hateful thought to a Greek (c.f. Il.5.154ff). I would not readily believe this to be the case here, since the plurality of ὡς γενόμενοι in this line ought to reduce inversely their claim to be ἀκτησίοι, were that claim not already destroyed by the existence of the considerably older Procaon and Clytius. Perhaps one could compare τηλόγετος, which is used both of only-children and of infants who are last-born or born to aged parents (see Richardson on H.H. Dem. 164 (p.200)). Or is the idea that they are retrospectively ἀκτησίοι because being so young they cannot go to the hunt and risk their lives there? Parental anxiety for the dangers incurred by sons in war is a common motif in the Iliad (Il. 11.328ff; c.f. Il.5.149ff) and S. might be adapting it here to a slightly less appropriate context: for a similar transference of an original Homeric motif to a somewhat less suitable situation see S 11.5ff (the Geryoneis). Professor Kassel compares the way in which Theseus' father tried to keep him at home away from the Marathonian bull in Callimachus' Hecale (dieg. 10.23ff (1.227
If this explanation were right, we would have further evidence that the fragment belonged to the Συοδήματι rather than the ΑΘΛΑ.

Page's τοι μεν ἔρ and Führer's τοῖς γελά both presuppose that the Θεστίαδαι of the previous line are the children too young to attend the hunt. So either those who failed to turn up are mentioned in the Catalogue before those who actually took part, or Procaon and Clytius were referred to before col.i begins, in a way that is hard to square with their naming in lines 4-5. A trivial point? More difficult is the fact that both supplements mentioned above are not quite long enough to reach the left-hand margin as gauged above (p.1017). To achieve that, we need the broader letters of a word like πέντε (γελά). That is Mr. Barrett's suggestion, and though very hypothetical, it fulfills the requirements of space and sense remarkably well, especially if we could be sure that the word δύο preceded line 1's Θεστίαδαι. For then we would have a sequence far superior to what is offered by other supplements: "Next came two sons of Thestius. For", (explaining why only two), "five other sons had been left behind as too young." Admittedly there is no warrant for the number five in this context, in any ancient author, but we have seen how fluid were the traditions concerning the Thestiads, and the restorations produce excellent sense.
a highly popular Homeric line-end formula: c.f. Il·1·418, 9·461, 14·439 etc; Od. 2·299, 3·401, 4·210 etc.

3-4: πόδας.... τ ἄγαθοι

If Lobel's interpretation of the traces is correct, note that Bacchylides calls his differently-named Thestiadae

Θοούς μάτρως (5·219). Snell's ἀνωρέων at the start of 4 fits the space and helps obviate the difficulty over the phrase πόδας ἄγαθοι expressed by Lobel (p.13). But I find the parallels he cites close enough to remove objections: Il·15·139: βίην καὶ χείραμ ἀμείλων ib. 641f: ἀμείλων παντοῦ τὸ ἄρετά, ἢμέν πόδας ἢδε μαχέσσαν Antim. fr.46 Wyss: πόδας ἄνετά.

6: ἦς δὲ μόλις Ἑὐρυτίων

Eurytion was the son of Actor, King of Phthia, and the hero to whom Peleus fled after killing his half-brother Phocus. Eurytion purified him and gave him his daughter Antigone in marriage together with a third of his land (Pherecydes F. Gr. Hist. 3 F 61B, Apollod. 3·13·1f).

Unfortunately, Peleus was prone to manslaughter, and when the two joined in the Calydonian boar-hunt, Peleus, aiming at the creature, accidentally hit his father-in-law and killed him (Pindar fr.48 Sn., Ov. Met. 8·380ff, Tzetz. ad Lyc. 175 (84·28 Scheer). For the variant tradition whereby Peleus marries Actor's daughter Polymela, and Actor is the father
of Irus and grand-father of Eurytion c.f. Pind. fr. 48
again, ET in Il. 23.89 (5.382 Erbse), Ap. Rhod. 1.72.
On Eurytion see further Wilamowitz, Sitzb. der Preuss.
Akad. der Wiss. 1925 p. 225 n. 1 = Kl. Schr. 5\textsuperscript{2} p. 100 n. 2,
Erbse’s note on ET Il.23 sup. cit.
Given that we are dealing with the Suotherae rather than
the Athla, there may well be point, as Lobel suggests (p.
13), in the close proximity of Eurytion and the two sons
of Theseus in our list, since the hunt they were joining
was to prove fatal to all three of them. It does not
seem that S. made this point explicitly (at least not in
what is preserved of our fragment – he may have made it
before col. i begins) since he proceeds to mention Caeneus,
who survived the hunt. Perhaps he went on to mention
Peleus, who like his unfortunate host and Caeneus, will
have come to the boar-hunt from Thessaly.
Eurytion is mentioned in the Catalogues of Ovid (Met. 8.311) and Apollodorus (1.8.2). In the latter we read
Εὐρυτίων ἄκτορος ἐκ Θῆλακ, which suggested the supplement
Θῆλακ in 6 to Lobel and Page. We can now see that it is
difficult to accommodate this to the required metre and
space. Snell’s ἄπο Θεσσαλίακ is metrically unobjection-
able and, since Phthia is a region of Thessaly, topographi-
cally correct, but is at least two letters in excess of
the space allowed by the criterion mentioned above (p. 1017).
Barrett most ingeniously suggests ἄπο Λαμπρίακ, which
satisfies all three criteria: metrically unimpeachable it
fits the space available, and for its geographical
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propriety c.f. Ap. Rhod. 1.40f: Αδρικαν δ’ ἐπὶ τοῖς λυπῶν Polύψημος ἵκανεν | Εὐλατίδος with the comment of Σ ad loc. (10 Wendel): Αδρικαν τὴν Θεσσαλίας λέγει ... ἢ ἐν τῷ Πελασγωτῷ τῇς Θεσσαλίας

7ff: Ιδ ταυτιτέπιλου| | ᾧκ | [ ]. Εὐλατίδαο δαῖφρονος

The problem of these genitives was lucidly posed by Lobel (p.13) and elegantly resolved by Page (p.192). The former observed the difficulties inherent in supposing that the genitives represent Eurytion's mother and father. That man, as we have seen, was called Actor or Ilus, not Elatus, who has no place in this particular family tree. Elatus was however the father of another hero we find mentioned in lists of the hunters: Caeneus (c.f. I.2.746 and Σ I.1.264 (1.83 Erbse), Ap. Rhod. 1.57). The trouble with this identification is that the genitive Εὐλατίδαο would most naturally imply a descendant or grandson of Elatus, a son of Caeneus for instance (e.g. καὶ ὄνομα Εὐλατίδαο) not Caeneus himself. But none of the catalogues of hunters include any such individual. The only escape from this quandary is to follow Page in supposing that some such epic periphrasis as Καυνέοις βία (agreeing with the patronymic Εὐλατίδαο) has been lost in the lacuna. Only now, knowing, as we do, so much more about

---

1 My adaptation of a supplement by Snell (p.80 n.2: καὶ Καυνέοις γόνοις (Εὐλατίδαο)) which is doubly impossible: it is far too long for the space available, and it yields the wrong sense, for all that Snell seems to think it can mean both "Caeneus" and "son of Elatus".
the metre and size of this lacuna, we can be more precise: one form of periphrasis particularly recommends itself: ἡ δὲ 
κυριευμένη Ἐλλατίδαο.

All that remains after this is to fathom the mysterious feminine name in 8. Lobel suggested (with due caution) that the epithet ταυνατόν might apply to Caeneus himself, harking back to his former existence as a woman. This strange tale certainly seems to pre-date S: Poseidon's intercourse with the maiden Caenis at the price of her request to become a man is related by Phlegon F. Gr. Hist. 257 F 36 who seems to be following (appropriately enough) Hesiod's Γυναῖκῶν Κατάλογος (= Hes. fr.87 MW). Acusilaus of Argos (F. Gr. Hist. 2 F 22 = 9 B 40 A DK) tells how the invulnerable man brought into being by a gratified Poseidon was finally hammered into the earth by the Centaurs on Zeus' instructions. Acusilaus' work is largely based on Hesiod (see my note on 236 P (p.1089) and this particular passage's derivation from the Catalogue is confirmed by Hes. fr.88 MW (= P. Oxy. 2495 fr.3) which despite its lacunose condition seems pretty certainly to describe the violent climax of Caeneus' career at the wrong end of the Centaur's clubs. But although S. may have been acquainted with all this, and his indebtedness to Hesiod would be nothing new, it is well-nigh impossible to fit any such reference to "iam non femina Caeneus" into the space and metre at our disposal. -αυτοί must be the end of the name of Eurytion's mother and
ταυυπέπλου an epithet describing her.\textsuperscript{1} It is not quite true (as Lloyd-Jones p.17 seems to think) that we do not know the name of this good woman: Hyginus fab.14 tells us that the wife of Irus and mother of the Argonauts Eurydamas and Eurytion was called Demoanassa.\textsuperscript{2} That will not fit here but there is no reason why S. should not have given her a different name with the metrical value required. If it were not for Pausanias (to give one instance) we would be equally ignorant of the identity of Critolaus' wife (208 P: see my note ad loc. for S's tendency to equip such secondary personages with names).

7: ταυυπ[έ]πλου

In Homer, an attribute of Thetis, Helen, and other women occurring seven times in all. Also in Hes. fr.291.3 (of Eudora), Scut. 83 (of Henioche), and Bacch. fr.20\textsuperscript{A}15 (Karpossi).

9: Ειλατιδαο

the form Ειλατιδης occurs in Hes. fr.60-4 MW.

δαίφρονος

this word crops up about 40 times in the Iliad, where it may always mean "warlike" (from δαί the dative of the

\textsuperscript{1}Snell's alternative suggestion that ταυυπέπλου and ιακ belong to two different women (p.80 n.2) is again ruled out by the excessive length of the supplement it entails: θετιδος τε πός ιακ ταυυπ[έ]πλου.

\textsuperscript{2}Hyginus is our only source for this name, but Irus' paternity of Eurytion recurs in Ap. Rhod. 1.74 and Ζ Ap. Rhod. 1.71 (13 Wendel).
noun for battle): at least it is always used of brave heroes. In the Odyssey it appears about 20 times, applied to Odysseus, Telemachus, Alcinous, Penelope, a wife (15.356), and a craftsman (8.373). There the meaning "wise" (from διηνοτος) seems most appropriate. In the present list of heroes, despite the lack of immediate context, the warlike connotation fits best, especially since a formal parallel is presented by Il.10.402: Αλκιδαςο διηφρονος.


ii

ἔνθεν ... ἔνθεν suggested to Lobel (p.13) "that we here have an account of the composition of two contending parties", and he must have been primarily influenced in this verdict by awareness of the quarrel over the hide and tusks of the Calydonian boar which in all accounts brings the hunt to a disastrous close. If his mind was swayed by any other consideration, I think he was wrong. The statement that two different groups are positioned in two different places does not in itself imply any
hostility between those two groups. And (in spite of A.A. Barrett's assertion to the contrary) the numerous martial epithets - αἰχματαί, ὑπερθύμμοι, μενεχάμματι - do not necessarily entail that S. is already describing a warlike scene any more than his careful enumeration of the two parties and their positions means that he must by now be depicting a great and important endeavour, rather than mere preliminaries. Both these latter features are typical of S.'s style. The amplitude of the narrative is by now too familiar to require illustration. The parallel with Homer, and a remark such as that by Hermogenes (περὶ ίδεων 2 p.338 Rabe: ὁ Στησίχορος σφόδρα ἡδύς εἴναι δοκεῖ διὰ τὸ πολλοῖς χρῆσθαι τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις) strongly suggest that the adjectives are purely ornamental.

The idea that the strife over the hide is already under way by col.ii has been revealed as most precariously based. If any arguments can be found against it they must be seriously heeded. Such arguments are not slow to raise their heads. In the first place, as Lobel himself observed, the nature of the quarrel may differ from author to author, but, in all versions that are known, the battle over the hide is confined to Meleager and the Curetes, who are both Aetolian. In the present passage however, we read of Locrians Achaeans and Boeotians being positioned in one place, Dryopians and (probably) Aetolians in another. This is clearly incompatible with any distinction that could be drawn between Meleager and the Calydonians who supported him on the one side, and the Curetes on the
other. For such a distinction c.f. Σ 11.9.529 (2.513 Erbse): 

There is an even weightier objection which may not have been so clear to Lobel, writing in 1956. The concrete evidence of the vast scale of S's narrative which papyri have brought us since that date—especially his ponderous use of lengthy speeches in the epic mould—reinforces Quintilian's estimate of him. The Geryoneis contained over 1300 lines (see above p. 225).

An even more relevant parallel is provided by 209 P. No-one has tried to argue that any ambitious sequence of events elapses between the two columns which constitute that fragment. The second column seems to describe a gift which was handed over in the parting-scene of the first. We expect a similar relationship between the two columns of the present poem. And we can, indeed, be a little more precise: the columns of the Geryoneis papyrus contained 30 lines, the two papyri preserving Stesichorean "matter of Troy" have 27 or 53 lines and c. 60 lines respectively, those of the latest discovery 34 or 35.

Now col. ii of the present poem started with a strophe, col. i with the last line of a str./ant., seven lines of a str./ant., and the first line of a str./ant. (if the poem was dyadic) or with the last line of a str./ant., seven lines of a str./ant., and the first line of an epode (if the poem was triadic). Let us adopt the first alternative: col. i = 1 + 7 + 1 + (6) + x, and 14 (7 + 7) or
21 (7 + 7 + 7) is a reasonable equivalence for $x$ on analogy with the other papyri. Now supposing the Suotherae was triadic we can only guess at the length of the epode; but again, other Stesichorean poems provide comparative material: Geryoneis 8 lines, Iliupersis 10 lines; P.Lille 76 has 7 lines. The same process of computation will produce 38, 36 or 42 lines as the probable length of col.i.¹

Whatever the exact extent of col.i, it is inconceivable that the rest of the Catalogue, all the multifarious events of the hunt, and the start of the quarrel over the hide - to say nothing of the speeches and other epic devices with which $S.$ will have adorned his tale - can have been crammed into the interval between the two columns. On the contrary, an interpretation which presupposes as little narrative as possible in the first column will best fit what we know of the scope of $S.$'s handling of heroic myth.

These considerations rule out not only Lobel's view² but also Bowra's modification of it (GLP² p.98) which tries to retain a connection with the strife between Meleager and his uncles. Why then are the Aetolians distinguished

¹It may be noted here that papyri whose lines are generously and regularly spaced - as they are in the present case - are likely to have fewer lines to the column.

²Lobel's alternative hypothesis that one Stesichorean poem has ended and a second begun in the interval between our two columns is, a fortiori, even further removed from probability.
from them? Perhaps "the fight was not yet a full-scale merriment" but only restricted to the parties of Meleager and his uncles: the Aetolians and the others mentioned are sitting apart as onlookers, not yet combatants. When we have so little of the text of 8-9 we must shun dogmatism like the plague: but Bowra's distinction between Aetolians and Aetolians hardly rises automatically from the Greek words we have before us. Besides, his explanation is disqualified not only for the reasons listed above, but also, alas, because of his at first sight innocuous statement that 2's "τζάνοα αυτή can only mean 'sat'." We know even less about that verb than has generally been realised. As Haslam has pointed out (p.18 n.17) there is no proof that word-end after the syllables directly preceding τζάνοα is permissible: run-over occurs in that metrical position in the only two other instances of the line we can check (i 2-3; ii 8-9; see further above p. 1021).

The notion of a now-lost prefix is fully consistent with the rules for word-division on papyri as summarised by E.G. Turner, Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World (Oxford 1971) pp 19-20. A syllable usually divides after its vowel, but there are exceptions, especially "after a single consonant, if that letter is part of a preposition forming a compound word." Some such syllable may be hidden from sight here.

And hidden from sight is how the exact nature of the activity recorded in col.ii must remain. Because it does
not allow for the possibility of the unknown prefix, we must reject A.A. Barrett's hypothesis that this part of the poem shows us "warriors assuming hostile positions not against each other but against the boar" right at the start of the hunt. None of the instances of ἵζων with the semi-technical meaning "assume a hostile position" which A.A. Barrett quotes has a prefix (Hdt. 8·71, 9·26; Il·8·520-2 etc.). As well, they are all middle not active, which does not improve matters. This is very sad, since the beginning of the hunt is quite the furthest point of narrative which the poem could plausibly have reached in the interval between what we have of the two papyrus columns. The verbal prefix does not, I think, render obsolete Lloyd-Jones' suggestion that Meleager might "have addressed the assembled competitors in an assembly before the hunt began." We might indeed expect S. to have exploited the epic devices of a mustering and harangue prior to action, in order to bestow length and weight upon his story.

ii

lff: ἐνθεν μὲν ... ἐνθεν δ'
Interestingly enough, this combination is not to be found in Homer. The closest approach to it is ἐνθεν γάρ ... ἐπερωθι δὲ (Od. 12·235) and ἐνθεν μὲν ... προτὶ δ' (ib.59).

If (as we have no reason to doubt) the Suotherae followed
the Geryon in the avoidance of more than three consecutive longa (see p. 85) then ενθεν μέν must be followed by ΔΑΚΟΙ with a short before kappa + rho and a succeeding vowel to produce epic correction.

2:-ιδάνου: see above p. 1044.

αίχματαί: on this and the martial epithets in ll. 5 and 9 see above p.

3: τέκνα φιλα

amid a list of ethnic nouns this phrase puzzles: we might best suit the context if we hypothesised the loss of some such phrase as "[having left at home their] dear offspring". Or a further ethnic allusion might be lurking here: "dear offspring [of x land]," though such a metaphorical usage of τέκνου is really quite unparallelled.

3-4: ἐρήμος Ἀχαιοί

a very attractive supplement from Lobel, though Homer only uses the epithet of ἐταίροι (and once of ἐταίρος (sing.) in ll. 4-266): c.f. Schmidt Parallel-Homer p. 83.

5: ὑπερθύμοι

This is the accentuation of the papyrus, whose scribe only adds an accent when he might be departing from normal practice: therefore the nom. masc. pl. is intended here (Snell p. 80 n.1) not ὑπερθύμοις(ν). The epithet occurs again at 266 P (ὅπερθυμέστατον ἄνδρῶν) in S. In epic it is used of many heroes individual but also of whole races, particularly the Trojans (seven times). Compare ll. 15-135: αὕτη γὰρ ΤΡΩΣ μὲν ὑπερθύμοις καὶ Ἀχαιοῦς. But
in our line of course, though the 'Ἀχαῖοι' appear in 4, the Trojans are out of the question. As Lobel observes (p. 14) a relative seems to be lost in the lacuna and one expects the line to have ended in ὅκου or ὅ. But if this poem too has a ban on more than three consecutive longa we can exclude both Page's θοῶκης ὅκου (see SLG p.157) and ingenious attempts to introduce Κουρῆτες here.

6-7: the metre shows both lines to be complete.
6: ἱπάν ... χόδα

C.f. P. Lille 76.205 καὶ ἀλαν ἱπάν. But in the present case a specifying geographical adj. is added, to bring it into line with other applications of ἱπρός to particular places: Il.1.366: θῆβην, ἱπάν πόλιν Ἡπείρων, Il.2.535: ἱπρήν Εὐβοίας Bacch. 9.34f: ἱπάν νάζολν Ἀχιλλίαν etc.

On the connotations of ἱπρός in such passages see P. Wülfung -v. Martitz, Glotta 38 (1960) 282ff.

Βοωηίδα


7: πυροφόρον

elsewhere used of γῆ (Solon fr. 24·2 W) ἄρουραι (Il.12.314, 14.123, Sim. 591 P etc.) πεδία (Il.21.602) etc. Od. 3.495

Since Phocis is bounded to E., N.E., and W. by Locrians of various kinds, the appearance of its countrymen here after ii l's Δωροῖ would not surprise. What would surprise is the hyper-Doric form and the run of longa.

- 1047 -
has πεδίον πυρηνόρον.

8-9: Δρόμοις τε καὶ Ἀιτωλοὶ μενεχάμαι
The apparent parallel in Il.9.529 Κουρητές τε μάχοντο καὶ Ἀιτωλοὶ μενεχάμαι and the exigencies of metre (there is room only for """) make the supplement proposed by Lobel inevitable.

μενεχάμαι is used in the Iliad mainly of named individual heroes, so too Hes. fr.5.3 MW; of whole races only in the Iliadic passage just mentioned.
THE EVIDENCE OF ART

We have no means of telling how far S's Catalogue of Heroes extended before and after i 1-9, nor what other individuals it embraced beyond the four explicitly named or implied. (Peleus is the strongest candidate for inclusion: see below p.1051). It is worth while, however, to compare the other extant lists of χορηγοί in literature and on vases, and I have done so on the table over the pages. The literary catalogues I draw on occur in:

(1) Ov.¹ Met. 8.298-328 (c.f. too 360 (and Hollis ad loc. (p.81) for two additional names - reading uncertain - unique to Ovid).
(2) Apollod. 1.8.2
(3) Hyg. fab. 173.
(4) Paus. 8.45.3 (a description of the front pediment of Scopas' temple of Athena Alea at Tegea).

Lengthy lists of hunters also occur on two Greek vases:
(1) A band cup signed by Archiclese and Glaucytes (Munich 2243 J33: ABV 163.2 = Brommer Vasenlisten³ 311.A14 = ABFH 116.1: c.f. J. Hoppin A Handbook of Greek Black-figure Vases p.60): to be dated to the third quarter of the sixth century. (2) A volute crater signed by Cleitias and Ergotimus (Florence 4209: ABV 76.1 = Brommer Vasenlisten³

¹There also exists a Greek elegiac fragment, probably of the early third century B.C., containing part of a catalogue of hunters which agrees with Ovid as far as it goes (whether Ovid used it directly or not is uncertain). For a text see Barns and Lloyd-Jones, SIFC 35 (1963) 205-27; c.f. Hollis' Metam. 8 Appendix 1 p.150. In the table overleaf those heroes common to Ovid and the fragment are marked with an asterisk.
= ABFV 46.1 and 3 c.f. J. Hoppin sup. cit. p.152) the so-called "François Vase" (see briefly ABFV p.33f). On the Calydonian Boar-hunt as depicted on Greek vases, see G. Daltrop, Die Kalydonische Jagd in der Antike (Berlin 1966) and the bibliography by Brommer Vasenlisten³ pp 310-312. The subject seems to be restricted almost entirely to the second quarter of the sixth century¹ and the two vases mentioned above are the only ones to give a really ample tally of participants; but several depict or label one or two figures (e.g. Peleus and Meleager). Others fail to label any of their heroes, though some of them are easily identified, especially Atalanta dressed as an archer and marked out by white paint as female. But even this popular character can be omitted, and several boar hunts with horsemen have no justifiable claim upon the heading "Scenes from the Calydonian boar hunt". (For rightly austere criteria for the identification of the Calydonian boar hunt on vase-paintings c.f. Brommer. Gnomon 34 (1962) 824: "Als gesicherte Darstellungen sind nur die anzusehen bei denen die Namensbeischriften darauf hinweisen, oder bei denen Atalante dargestellt ist"). It is all too clear that such repeated motifs as the dogs which attack the boar, or the trident boar-spear used against it, are inventions of the vase-painters which owe

¹But Professor Robertson reminds me that apart from the earlier vase (1) just mentioned above, some fifth and fourth century vases (as well as later material) have been taken as reflecting an early classical wall-painting of the Calydonian hunt; compare pp. 478 and pp. 816 above.
nothing to literary treatments. The large number of names on our two selected vases - extending to the hunting dogs - might be thought to owe something at least to earlier poetry, though there would be no good reason for identifying this hypothetical source with S.'s Suotherae rather than, for instance, some lost epic. However, we must tackle this problem in the context of all the available catalogues set out on the previous page. What strikes us first from these lists is the extent to which widely differing versions continued to flourish side by side. "No one version of the participants succeeded in obliterating its rivals", as Hollis says (p.73). This fact is most brutally brought home to us when we realise that among the 27 names which appear on the François Vase not one occurs in 222 P. This was apparently one of those cases in which S. did not influence vase-painting.\(^1\)

Can we isolate a hard core of heroes indispensable to any treatment in literature? At first sight it might seem safe to assume that those who occur in all the literary lists and both the vases must also have occurred in S.'s Catalogue. But (excepting Meleager himself of course) only the ubiquitous Dioscuri and Peleus emerge from this process. (Peleus is the strongest candidate for inclusion in the Suotherae: he killed Eurytion and came

\(^1\)Contrast the relation between vase-paintings and S.'s Ζώλα ἐπὶ Πελίκαι. There too, vases differ widely as to the names of the participants, but it is possible to suppose that S.'s poem was a common source from which different artists have made different selections in a choice necessitated by lack of space (see pp.171 ff).
from the same area as he and Caeneus, both of whom S. mentioned in close proximity: see p.10.6). Perhaps we should broaden our scope: can we safely suggest that those heroes who occur in all three literary lists also appeared in S? That would allow us Ancaeus, Atalanta, Idas and Lynceus, Jason, Telamon and Theseus. But I do not know if we have not already seen the ground crumble beneath our feet. Ancaeus is the invariable victim of the boar in mythology and vase-painting (see Ov. Met. 8.379ff, Apollod. 1.8.2, Hygin. fab. 173-4, Paus. 8.45.2, Callim. Hymn 2.215ff; the François Vase's Antaeus is presumably a slip for Ancaeus). But on a black-figure deinos (Aths. Agora 1712 p 334 = ABV 23M = Brommer Vasenlisten 3 310.A2 c.f. R.S. Young, Hesperia 4 (1935) 430-441) we suddenly come across the name Πηγαῖος - unknown to the literary tradition - for the boar's victim. This addition to the list of hunters should reinforce our awareness of the invincible strength of the differences between variant traditions on this topic, and make us resign the task of re-establishing the heroes of S.'s Catalogue as an impossibility.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STESICHORUS</th>
<th>OVID</th>
<th>APOLLODORUS</th>
<th>HYGINUS</th>
<th>CLITIAS</th>
<th>ARCHICLES</th>
<th>PAUSANIAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acastus</td>
<td>Acastus</td>
<td>Admetus</td>
<td>Admetus</td>
<td>Acastus</td>
<td>Admetus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admetus</td>
<td>Admetus</td>
<td>Admetus</td>
<td>Admetus</td>
<td>Admetus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcon</td>
<td>Alcon</td>
<td>Alcon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphiarus</td>
<td>Amphiarus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amphiarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancaeus*</td>
<td>Ancaeus</td>
<td>Ancaeus</td>
<td>Ancaeus</td>
<td>Antander</td>
<td>Antimachus</td>
<td>Ancaeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancaeus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atalanta</td>
<td>Atalanta</td>
<td>Atalanta</td>
<td>Atalanta</td>
<td>Atalanta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Atalanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caeneus</td>
<td>Caeneus</td>
<td>Caeneus</td>
<td>Castor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caeneus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castor*</td>
<td>Castor</td>
<td>Castor</td>
<td>Castor</td>
<td>Castor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Castor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cepheus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cteatus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cometes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Deucalion</td>
<td>Dryas</td>
<td>Echion</td>
<td>Enaesimus</td>
<td>Eurytion</td>
<td>Epochus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eurytion</td>
<td>Euthymachus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APOLLODORUS</td>
<td>Dryas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eurytion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYGINUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eurytion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLITIUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eurytion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHICLES</td>
<td>Cynortes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eurytion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEUSICORUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eurytion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Hippothous</td>
<td>Iphicles</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Laertes</td>
<td>Leex</td>
<td>Leucippus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APOLLODORUS</td>
<td>Hestius</td>
<td>Iolas</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Laertes</td>
<td>Leex</td>
<td>Leucippus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVID</td>
<td>Hestius</td>
<td>Iolas</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Laertes</td>
<td>Leex</td>
<td>Leucippus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLITIAS</td>
<td>Hippothous</td>
<td>Iolas</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Laertes</td>
<td>Leex</td>
<td>Leucippus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYGINUS</td>
<td>Hippothous</td>
<td>Iolas</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Laertes</td>
<td>Leex</td>
<td>Leucippus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUSANIAS</td>
<td>Hippothous</td>
<td>Iolas</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Laertes</td>
<td>Leex</td>
<td>Leucippus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHICLES</td>
<td>Iolas</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Laertes</td>
<td>Leex</td>
<td>Leucippus</td>
<td>Lyncus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Mopsus</td>
<td>Peleus</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Polydeuces</td>
<td>Telamon</td>
<td>Theseus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archilochus</td>
<td>Ormenus</td>
<td>Peleus</td>
<td>Phorax</td>
<td>Polydeuces</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Theseus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clitias</td>
<td>Pausileon</td>
<td>Peleus</td>
<td>Polydeuces</td>
<td>Telamon</td>
<td>Thestiads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyginus</td>
<td>Mopsus</td>
<td>Peleus</td>
<td>Phyleus</td>
<td>Polydeuces</td>
<td>Theseus</td>
<td>Thestiads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid</td>
<td>Nestor</td>
<td>Panopeus</td>
<td>Phyleus</td>
<td>Polydeuces</td>
<td>Telamon</td>
<td>Theseus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pausanias</td>
<td>Peleus</td>
<td>Piritous</td>
<td>Polydeuces</td>
<td>Telamon</td>
<td>Theseus</td>
<td>Thestiads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollodorus</td>
<td>Mopsus</td>
<td>Peleus</td>
<td>Piritous</td>
<td>Polydeuces</td>
<td>Theseus</td>
<td>Thestiads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1056 -
For a detailed commentary on this important fragment see above pp.298ff.

Again, as with fr. 198 P, we do not hear that S. had any predecessors in this departure from orthodoxy. The grief-stricken Priam does maintain at Il.24.258f that he has lost

"Εκτορά θ', δε θεός έκκε μετ’άνθρωποιν, οὐδε εύκεκε
ανθρώπος γε θηντοῦ πάϊς ειμεναι, ἀλλὰ θεοῖ.

but this is easily explained as grief and sorrow's hyperbole. Vürtheim (p.39) adduces the lines wherein Homer makes Hector himself say, in exuberant mood, (Il.

13.825ff)

εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼν οὕτως εϊ γε Αίος πάϊς αἰγυπτοῖο
εἶν ἴματα πάντα, τέκνοι δέ με πότινα Ἡρη,
τιούμην δ'ως τιέτ' Ἀθηναιὴ και Ἀπόλλων,
ὡς λυφήν ἡμέρη ἠδὲ κακὸν φέρει Ἀργείοις.

Also Hesiod fr.235 MW (see my note on 226 P) which describes how Apollo made profitable use of his time off building Troy by getting an anonymous nymph with child—viz Ilieus.

Far more relevant, to my eyes, are (a) those Iliadic passages in which Apollo shows himself an especially fond protector of Hecuba's son by rescuing him from defeat in
the duel with Ajax (Il. 7.27ff), by encouraging him after his temporary worsting in battle (Il. 15.236ff), by giving him speed to flee from Achilles (Il. 22.203ff) whom the god has previously (Il. 21.600ff) led astray, by saving his corpse from corruption (Il. 23.188ff) 24.18ff), and by promoting this corpse's ransom (Il. 24.32ff); (b) the fact that, according to Σ Lykophr. 307 (2.213 Scheer) and Apollod. 3.12.5.7, Hector's brother Troilus was actually the offspring of Apollo.

For other instances where Euphorion and S. are mentioned as joint sources for a mythical detail see 191 and 225 P. In the first of these fragments, as here, Alexander Aetolus is added to make a trio.
The reason which the Zacynthians as reported by Pausanias give for Odysseus' emblem is that, while a baby, Telemachus fell into the sea and was rescued by a friendly dolphin. This story is referred to by Lykophr. 658 in a characteristically allusive fashion when he calls Odysseus δεκαυλνόσημον κλώμα Φοινίκης θεάς. Robert, Heldensage 2·3 p.1398 n.1 supposes the tale to be modelled on the similar fate of Telemachus' mother who was reputed to have been rescued by wild ducks (πηνέλοπες) from the sea into which Nauplius had cast her (c.f. Didymus ap. Eust. 1422·7, Σ Od. 4·797).

Many similar yarns have been spun concerning the rescue of humans by dolphins. They are usefully collected by D'Arcy Thompson, A Glossary of Greek Fishes s.v. δεκαυλίς (pp.54ff).

The agreement of S. with Euphorion over a recondite mythical detail is no isolated phenomenon: see my note on 191 P. "Pertinet fort. ad Ἰλίου πέραυν" wrote Bergk (p.228) and that ascription is marginally the most likely. But no-one can deny that the Nostoi, for instance, or the Helen, would provide almost as suitable a context for this fragment.
The Hesiodic fragment 235 MW is preserved in Etymol. gen. et Gud. (apud Reitzenstein, Gesch. der griech. Etymologica 161·4), Etymol. magn. s.v. 'Ἢλεός.

It runs as follows:

Σελεόκου 'Ἢλεός' ὁ Ἀλαντός πατήρ ἐτυμολογεῖται, ὡς φησὶν Ἡσίοδος οἶον.'

Ἢλεα, τὸν δ᾽ ἐφῆλθεν ἀνάξ Διὸς υἱὸς ὧν ἄπολλων· καὶ οἱ τοῦτον ὀνόμαζον ὄνομα ἔδωκεν, οὐδεμισσι νόμῳν εἰρήμενον ἱλεῶν μὴ θητ ἔκρηξεν φιλότητι ἐματί τοῖς, δότε τεῖχος εὐθῦμητε πόλης ὑψιλὸν ποιήσει Ποσειδᾶν καὶ ἄπολλων.

ταῦτα παρατίθεται ἐν δὲ Σιμωνίδου. ¹


¹"i.e. commentarii in Simonidem" :Merkelbach and West ad loc.
Zenodotus wished to introduce the spelling into various passages of the Iliad (c.f. Σ I I·12·365 (3·370 Erbse), ΣA I I·13·203 (3·438 Erbse), Σ I I·14·442 (3·668 Erbse) etc.) Aristarchus opposed him (Σ I I·2·527 (1·299 Erbse) etc.). Discussions of the variant spelling may be found in the ancient scholia and lexica conveniently listed by Merkelbach and West on fr.235 (p.115), to which add Herodian ii 1 73·14 (Lentz), Choeroboscus o 244·31 etc. Further ancient evidence is adduced, and the whole vexed problem subjected to a most lucid scrutiny, by Nickau, Untersuchungen zur Textkrit. Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos (Berlin 1977) 36ff, whose discussion will be henceforth indispensable. He concludes that Zenodotus endeavoured to interpret such phrases as ΟΙΔΕΥΣ or ΟΙΔΙΑΔΗΣ as indicative of the 'Ιλ - spelling by redividing the letters, with omicron usually (but not invariably) cast as the definite article. Note especially his supplementation (p.40 n.23) of Herodian ἀρ ΣΑ I I·1·264 (1·83 Erbse) ὅσ καὶ 'Οιλεύς μὲν παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ Ἰλεύς δὲ παρὰ Ετησιχόρωι ὄσπερ καὶ παρ' Ἑσιόδωι. In view of such considerations as the sixth century vase cited above, it seems unlikely that the spelling 'Ιλεύς did not occur in some texts of Homer before the activities of Zenodotus, who will have had a degree of textual tradition to back up his intuitions. We cannot then exclude the possibility (for a related problem see my

1 On the question of 'Ιλεύς from an original Φιλεύς see Nickau sup. cit. p.40 n.25.
note on 255 P) that S.'s spelling was based upon some sort of manuscript authority for Homer (not to mention Hesiod). We do not know whether S. was once more indebted to Hesiod in the matter of the etymology of Hesiod's name.

For some reason, most scholars have assigned the fragment to the Iliupersis. This is always possible, especially if Ajax's manhandling of Cassandra on the Tabula Iliaca derives from S. (see p.533f). But the Nostoi is no less likely a resting place, and this Ajax may have been included in the list of Helen's wooers (190 P). Or, for once, all three possibilities (or any combination thereof) may be correct.
For a list of the various versions of Perieres' parentage and descendants, see Frazer on Apollod. 3.10.4 (2. p.20f n.2). Tyndareus, Aphareus, and Leucippus are represented as brothers by Theocr. Id. 22.138 and 170, but we cannot tell whether he was following S. in this, for, as Dover's note on the latter line observes (p.248), Apollodorus "cites S. as his authority for the marriage of Perieres, but it is not clear whether S. also listed the sons." Tzetzes' phrasing would suggest he did, but since this author may merely be drawing a hasty conclusion from Apollodorus' words, his testimony is not decisive. We cannot therefore pretend we have enough evidence to be sure that S. for once departed from the Hesiodic tradition, which made Perieres the son of Aeolus (fr. 10 MW) while representing Tyndareus as the son of Oebalus (fr.199.8 MW). Still less should we follow Mayer (p.24 n.30B) in drawing conclusions from the absence of Hippocoon in the list of brothers about the date and motives behind this figure's introduction into the tale of Tyndareus' expulsion (for which see Page, Alcman: The Partheneion p.26f). If (as is stated by Σ Eur. Or. 457 (1.150 Schwartz): c.f. Σ Il.2.581 (1.308 Erbse)) Hippocoon was a bastard child of Oebalus fathered upon Nicostrate, his absence from a list of the offspring of Perieres and Gorgophone is self-explanatory.
On the exact nature of Eustathius' text here, see Van der Valk's app. crit. ad loc. On Aristophanes' Δέξεις and its various sections see Pfeiffer, History of Classical Scholarship I pp.198ff. Page (P.M.G. p.121) gives the heading of the extract from Aristophanes as "π. τῶν ὑποπτευομένων μὴ εἰρήκωθαί τοῖς παλαιοῖς", but in fact a new heading has appeared on p.428 of Miller (ὄνοματα ἥλικιων) and a further fresh section commences at p.437 line 13, just before our fragment, though its heading (περὶ συγγενικῶν ὄνομάτων) is not separately given: see Pfeiffer p.201 n.2.

Diod. Sic. 4.68.5 neatly expands the genealogy and places it in its context: καὶ Μελάμπους μὲν μάντις ὃν τὰς Ἀργείας γυναῖκας μανεῖσας διὰ τὴν Διονύσου μῆνιν ἔθερπαυεσθεν, ἀντὶ δὲ ταύτης τῆς εὔεργεσίας χάριν ἔλαβε παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Ἀργείων Ἀναξαγόρου τοῦ Μεγαλένθους τά δύο μέρη τῆς βασιλείας κατοικήσας δὲ ἐν Ἀργεία κοινήν ἐποιήσατο τὴν βασιλείαν Βλαντί τῷ ἄδελφῳ. γῆμας δὲ Ἰφιάνειραν τὴν Μεγαλένθους ἑτέκνωσεν Ἀντιφάτθν καὶ Μαντώ, ἔτι δὲ Βλαντί καὶ Προνόην. Ἀντιφάττου δὲ καὶ Ζευξίππης τῆς Ἰπποκόωντος Οἰκλῆς καὶ Ἀμβάλλης ὑπήρξαν, Οἰκλέους δὲ καὶ Ἐπεμήστρας τῆς Θεσπίου Ἰφιάνειρα καὶ Πολύβοια καὶ Ἀμφιάραος ἐγένοντο.

On Amphilochus' rôle in the Eriphyle myth see above p.

It was to S.'s poem on this topic that Bergk wanted to
assign our fragment (p.211), and Vürtheim (p.33) followed him. But as Kleine long ago observed: "ad Thebanas igitur, vides, ut ad Troianas res, ad Nostos adeo verba pertinere possunt" (p.125). Amphilochus indeed fought at Troy (see for instance Qu. Sm. 14·366, \(^1\) a list of heroes in the Wooden Horse) and as a seer he is appropriately present at the sacrifice of Polyxena on the vase mentioned ad 226 P (p.1060) and his departure from Troy in the company of Calchas and their journey to Claros was well known (Strabo 14·1·27 = Hes. fr.278). He was also a suitor of Helen (Hes. fr.197·6ff MW). It is doubtless in connection with one or more of these poems that his name occurs, without context, at 193·31 P (see ad loc.). μάτρως and πάτρως are both fairly common words, the former appearing often enough in Pindar for instance, the latter in Herodotus and elsewhere.

\(^1\)c.f. ib. 12·325 with Vian's app. crit. ad loc.
Megaclides is reported as having attributed to S. the invention of Heracles' club, lion-skin, and bow. This claim is unlikely to be literally true for several reasons. The evidence of literature suggests that Heracles was famous as an archer long before S. began to compose poems about him. The Aspis, to be sure, equips him from head to toe in full Homeric panoply (122ff), and the wound which renders Cycnus lifeless comes from a spear (417ff), but we have already seen (in connection with S's Κόκυνος: see pp.691ff ) the reasons for this idiosyncratic departure from tradition, and even the Shield's composer cannot omit a lengthy description of the arrows of his hero, unused though they will be in the actual fight:

κοίλην δὲ περὶ εὐθείας φαρέτριν
κάθθαλεν ἐξόπιθεν' ποιλωὶ δὲ ἐντοσθὲν δῖκτοι
διγνωτὶ, θανάτως λαθωθόγγυς δοτήρες'
πρὸςθὲν μὲν θάνατον τ'εἰχον καὶ δάκρυσι μῶρον,
μέσσωι δὲ ἔστωλι, περιμήκεις, αὐτὰρ ὀπίσθε
μόρφωνοι φλεγόμενοι καλυπτόμενοι πετρύγεωςιν...

And Heracles the Bowman was no stranger to Homer (II.5-395ff: τῆς δ' Αἰώνας . . . ὦκυν δίκτοιν, εὐετὲ μῖν ... υἱὸς Δίὸς ἀλιγχόξοιο, ἐν Πολυὶ ἐν νεκύεσσι βαλὼν δόλυνοις ἔδωκεν, Od. 8.224ff:οὖθεν Ἡρακλῆς οὐτ' ἐνθριάζῃ Ὀίχαλῆς, ὁ δ' ἐκαὶ διαθάνατος ἐρίζεσκον περὶ τὸξων, Od. 11.606f: 

οὐ δ' (scil. Ἡρακλῆς) . . . γυμνὸν τὸξον ἔχων καὶ ἐπὶ
νευρήφιν διϊςτόν) or to Alcman for that matter (87A P: κό τοξότας Ἡρακλής). The testimony of art has the same tale to tell (See in general P. Zancani Montuoro, "Il tipo di Eracle nell'arte arcaica", Rendiconti Accad. Lincei 8 (1947) 207ff and, with particular reference to the club, B.B. Shefton, Hesperia 31 (1962) 368). The bow is depicted as Heracles' weapon from the eighth century onwards: our earliest reproduction of Heracles' fight with Geryon (a Protocorinthian pyxis of the mid-seventh century: Brommer Vasenlisten 3 63·c4) seems to give our hero a quiver.

Perhaps, then, S. invented only the club and the lion-skin? The evidence of literature here becomes ambiguous and for that reason I set it to one side for a moment. But art's voice continues loud and clear in the matter of the lion-skin: it was certainly known before the time of S. Heracles is to be seen sporting this item of clothing on a Corinthian vase (more precisely an alabastron from Rhodes: Florence 79252: Brommer Vasenlisten 3 88·C2) dating from the middle of the second half of the seventh century: he is aiming an arrow at a centaur. Only the club has anything like an impressive claim to a status as a Stesichorean invention. But Heracles is using it on Athenian vases by c. 580. The bridegroom equipped with lion-skin and quiver on a Melian amphora dating from about the start of the sixth century (Athens Nat. Mus. 354: Brommer Vasenlisten 3 36·c1) must be Heracles, and
may well have had a club. The very similar figure on
the Chiot fragment of about the same time (Athens acro-
polis 450: ARV² 66·134 = Brommer Vasenlisten³ 80·B3)
definitely has a club and lion-skin and probably had a
bow as well. The contemporary Attic lecythos from
Corinth (London B 30: ABV 11·20 = Brommer Vasenlisten³
156·58) shows Heracles attacking Nessus with a club but
no skin or bow is to be seen: and a polychrome plate (c.f.
P. Amandry, Mon. Piot. 40 (1944) 40, 3, pls. 11 and 63
no.45) which like the three vases just mentioned cannot
be later than the 570's, displays our hero with all three
attributes.

Now it is true that the earliest of the above artefacts
are exceptional. Most other seventh century renderings
of Heracles show him naked (or nearly so) and attacking
his various enemies at close quarters with a sword (as
for instance on the late seventh century Corinthian
aryballos where his victim is the Hydra (Payne Necro-
corinthia 481 = Brommer Vasenlisten³ 81·C1). Or he may
be clad in a chiton as he wields his sword (against
Nessus (?) (New York 11·210·1: Brommer Vasenlisten³ 154·
28)).

Club and skin start occurring together in art regularly
from about the second quarter of the sixth century
onwards and soon become standard. But it would not even
be safe to attribute this process to a Stesichorean
influence, for antiquity seems to have known a divergent
tradition whereby the originator of the hide and the club was the epic poet Pisander of Cameirus.\[1\] See Strabo 15.688 (Pisand. fr.1 Kinkel): καθάπερ τὸν Ἰρακλέα καὶ τὸ σκυταληθυρεῖν καὶ ἐπικεκαύθει ποιοί καὶ ἡμιόνοις ῥόπαλον ... καὶ ἂ τοῦ Ἰρακλέους δὲ στολῆ ἢ τοιαύτη πολὺ νεωτέρα τῆς Τρωικῆς μνήμης ἔστι, πλάσμα τῶν τὴν Ἰρακλείαν ποιησάντων, εἶτε Πείσανδρος ἢν εἶτ’ ἄλλος τὸς ὢς. - Erato-sthen. Catasterism. 12: λέγει δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ Πείσανδρος ὁ Ῥόδιος, δίκι καὶ τὴν δορὰν αὐτοῦ (scil. λεόντος) ἔχειν. Σ Αp. Rhod. 1.1195 (p.108 Wendel) = Pisand. F. Gr. Hist. 16 F 4: Πείσανδρος δὲ φησὶ χαλκοῦν εἶναι τὸ ῥόπαλον Ἰρακλέους Suda s.v. Πείσανδρος (4.122 1465 Adler): ἔστι δὲ τὰ Ἰρακλέους ἔργα ἐνδὰ πρῶτος Ἰρακλεῖ ῥόπαλον περιτεθέεικε. The problem of Pisander's floruit and of his chronological relationship to S. is still unsolved: for the most recent discussion (with bibliography) c.f. Jacoby, F. Gr. Hist.\[2\] 1A pp.544ff. The ancients were clearly εἰς uncertain as we εἰς (see p. 113), and it is an easy hypothesis that those who supposed S. lived earlier than Pisander credited him with the invention of Heracles' distinctive weapons, and vice versa for those accepting the reverse chronology. We

\[1\] The small Argive shield reliefs (Kunze, Arch. Schild- bänder (Ol. Forsch. 2 (1950) 106ff) pls.30, 50-2, 63, 65: Denkmälerlisten 1.49·1fff) dating from the seventh or early sixth century, generally depict Heracles sans bow or quiver attacking Geryon with a sword. On some, it is true, he wears a lion-skin, but such reliefs may well represent a later recension: Kunze dates them to the middle of the sixth century.
know just enough about S.'s floruit to decide that his
invention of bow, skin, and club is out of the question.
And (pace Wilamowitz, Herakles² p. 67 n.1) the apparent
irresponsibility of Megaclides' claim as regards the first
of those items is such that it is unnecessary to presume
that he had any grounds at all (let alone any reliable
grounds) for placing S. earlier than Pisander. The
Greek fondness for α πρωτος ευρέτης, coupled with S.'s
reputation for καινοτομία in other myths, would amply
explain the origin of the error enshrined in the present
fragment.

On Megaclides see my commentary on 700 P and on Xanthus
and his likely influence on S's Oresteia see my Appendix 2
to that poem.
The statement that Xanthus dressed Heracles not in the
Stesichorean fashion but in Ἡ Ὄμηρων κτολή is outwardly
ambiguous: does it mean the hero was clad in the hoplite
armour typical of Homeric warriors in general? Or did
he wear the outfit that Homer equips him with? The
former surely, since, as we have seen, Homeric epic
mentions only one item of his armour - the bow. There
need be no contradiction between this and S's treatment:
there most certainly is a contradiction between S's
picture and the Homeric hero's panoply which Heracles
wears in the Aspis.
The most recent discussion of this passage, together with a collection of variant accounts of the "Kindermord", is Matthews' commentary on the fragment of Panyassis (pp. lllff). But Wilamowitz's treatment (Herakles$^2$ l-81ff) is still masterly, and far superior in vigour and power of penetration. The particular phrasing of Θησαυρος δὲ καὶ τάδε ἐπιλέγουσιν makes it clear that Pausanias thinks he is moving on to a totally distinct form of the myth from that preserved by S. and Panyassis, and this would render the second half of our passage useful negative evidence for what the epic and lyric poets did not relate. But the value of this evidence will be considerably reduced if Pausanias had in fact no direct knowledge of the actual texts of these poets.$^1$

If we can trust the distinction he draws, the first deduction to make is that in S. and Panyassis$^2$ Heracles did not kill his father. Pausanias cannot be saying that madness did not feature in their accounts. Although this detail and indeed the whole notion of infanticide is edited out of the Homeric tradition (Od. 11.269f: καὶ Μεγάρην (scil. Ἕδου), Κρείοντος ὑπερθύμοιο ὑγατρὰ, τὴν

$^1$Which is what his practice elsewhere in quoting S. would suggest.

$^2$"Panyassis kannte die geschichte, wahrscheinlicher, dass er sie der vorlage des S., als dass er sie diesem selbst verdankte". (Friedländer, Herakles (Berlin, 1907) p.52).
It re-emerged in the Cypria (Néstw δὲ ἐν παρεμβάσει διηγεῖται αὕτωι (scil. Ἐνελάωι)... τὴν Ἡρακλέους μανίαν (Procl. Allen p.103)) and indeed a version which portrayed Heracles' murder of his children without the impetus of insanity would be unthinkable.

I do not see why Wilamowitz (p.84) followed by Matthews (p.111) should suppose that in the early tradition (including Panyassiss and Stesichorus) Heracles did not kill Megara. (The story of Heracles' divorce of Megara in Paus. 10·29 clearly belongs to a different tradition from the "kindermord".) Nor can I see the grounds for Vürtheim's presumption that merely because S. elsewhere (229 P) decks this hero out with bow and club, he must have had him despatch his children with these weapons (as in Eur. Her. 965ff) rather than hurl them into the fire, as Wilamowitz (p.85) guesses he did regularly as part of the pre-Euripidean tradition.
Heracles does indeed feature in our earliest literary accounts as both Boeotian and Argive. For the latter c.f. Il.19.105: Zeus envisages Heracles as ruling over τῶν ἄνδρων γενεὰς ὦ θ'αἵματος ἕξ ἐμεῖ εἰς. Heracles' mother Alcmene was grand-daughter (via Electryon) of Perseus, son of Zeus, rightful ruler of Argos and actual king of Tiryns. At least six of Heracles' labours (those set in the Peloponnese) likewise link him with Argos: the Nemean lion, the Hydra of Lerna, the boar of Erymanthus, the hind of Ceryneia, the Stymphalian birds, the stables of Augeas.

But Homer also knows of a tradition that ties Heracles to Thebes. Il.19.98 recalls the time ὅτε ἔμελλε βίν Ἡρακλησίην Ἀλκμήνη τέξεσθαι ἐξοικεΐαν ἐν Θῆβαι: c.f. [Hes.] Scut. 1ff. His birth and early adventures (the conquest of Orchomenus and the killing of the lion of Mt. Cithaeron, the bedding of the daughters of Thespius: c.f. Apollod. 2.4.10 - 11) are inextricably tied to that city.

See for greater detail Wilamowitz (Herakles Vol. 1 pp.52ff).

On the Phoenician and Egyptian Heracles see Hdt. 2.42ff with A.B. Lloyd's commentary ad loc. (2.201ff).
Metre

As was first seen by Wilamowitz (Griech. Versk. p.425f), the metre of the text as it stands consists of an encomiologus (D X e -(referred to as the "encomiologicum stesichoreum" by Plotius Sacerdos (6.543.26 Keil = 275 (a) (iv) P)) followed by a run of 4 + dactyls.¹ Haslam (p.43) notes that on the analogy of Iliup. str.3,μολ(μάκ) may be monosyllabic biceps and adds that if the beginning's corruption extends to τοι, the whole fragment will fit Iliup. str.2 - 4. But there is no compelling reason to suppose it does extend so far. Word-end occurs after initial hemiepeis in 11.2 and 3. For the mixture of dactylo-anapaestic¹ runs with regular dactylo-epitrite exemplified by the present fragment compare the Oresteia.

Wilamowitz's conjecture (Hermes 40 (1905) 128 = Kl. Schr. 4.181) assuming parabiepsι after the last two syllables of S.'s name and then assimilation to the following μάλιστα, is far and away the likeliest remedy so far, and completes an appropriate trio of objects for Apollo's affection.

Apollo's passion for dances and song is well attested: see for instances such epithets of his as τεφρίχορος (A.P. 9.525-20), χοροποιός (Orph.h. 34·6) and ὄρχηστης (Pind. fr.148 Sn.), μολπαστής (A.P. 6·155 = Gow - Page H.E. 3507), ἄνδακτωρ μολπῆς (h. mag. 2·2·7 Abel) and ψιλομολπος (Alcman S 1 = Com. gr. fr.56·62 Austin) if this last

¹Miss Dale's tentative interpretation of the last line as dactylo-epitrite (CQ.44 (1950) 147 = Collected Papers 57f) does not convince.
adjective does refer to Apollo: see p.340 supr.

The contrast between Hades and Apollo is enhanced by the latter's reputation as the ἄπασθης θεός. See Aesch. Ag. 1074f: τι ταύτ' ἀνωτότυμα ἀμφι λοξίου; οὐ γὰρ τοιούτος ὃς καὶ ἡμιτο αὐτὸν παραπτατεῖν with Fraenkel's note on the first passage (3.491).

Diehl (p.55) suggests that the lines come from the paean attributed to S. by Pliny and Plutarch (271 P). The guess was not worth making.

παίγμοινας
this ἀμάξ of course means "play, sport", not, as LSJ s.v. inadvertently renders it, "child's play". There are precedents for the ending in numerous Homeric and Hesiodic nouns in -ούνη (see W. Porzig, Die Namen für Satzinhaltene im Gr. und im Indogerm. (1942) pp.220ff), and for the plural compare ἰποσούναι (Ili.16.776 = οἰ. 24.40, 11.23.307), δαιτροσούναι (Od. 16.253), τεκτοσούναι (Od. 5.230), καλλιφοσούναι (Od. 16.310) etc., J.B. Hainsworth, B.I.C.S. 4 (1957) 1ff. See now μαντοσούναι in P. Lille 209. On the form as a whole see Porzig sup. cit.: he lists similar apparent derivations presupposing unattested nouns (δρημοσούνη → *δρήςμων, χρησμοσούνη → *χρήςμων) but omits παίγμοινα - *παίγμων. This is supplied by Chantraine, Formation des Noms en Grec Ancien (1933) 174, who, however, seems to believe that -γμοι or -γμα are equally possible endings of the originating noun (c.f. the
co-existence of κέλευμα, -μος and -μοσύνη). But compare
φιλοπαίγμων in Od. 23.134, Hes. fr.123.3 MW etc. (Attic
form φιλοπαίγμων twice in Plato) and the φιλοπαίγμοσύνη
cited by Pollux 5.161. These forms also tell against
the alternative spellings παιδύ- or παις- suggested by
Wilamowitz and speciously supported by φραδύμοσύνη from
φραώ (φραδύμοσύν- in the Geryoneis (860.3)).
κήδεα δὲ στοναχάς τι:
c.f. ἀλγέα τε στοναχάς τε | in II.2.39, Od. 14.39, κήδεα ...
'Αἰδας ἐλαχε
on the verb see Barrett ad Eur. Hipp. 80 (p.173). The
aorist tense suggests some specific occasion in the
past, such as the more famous triple partition of the
universe recalled in II.15.189ff, when 'Αἰδης δ’ ἐλαχε
ζόφον ἡρόεντα (191).

Incidentally, as regards the context of the fragment, D.A.
Russell reminds me that Plutarch's avoidance of hiatus is
not quite so strict as to necessitate Benseler's deletion
of δ before Στηςίχορος.
The prior passage is extracted from a fragmentary papyrus text first edited by Lobel (Oxyrhynchus Papyri Vol. 20 (1952) pp.109 - 113) and re-edited by Merkelbach (Arch. f. Papyr. Forsch. 16 (1958) 115ff). The first editor described it as "a commentary on a poetic text", but, as Merkelbach saw, it might more accurately be termed a theological work dealing with epithets of Athena (δολι-χόρος in col.i, Πάλλας in col.ii) which are based on etymologies. He tentatively assigned it to Apollodorus' περὶ θεῶν, in which he is followed and confirmed by Pfeiffer, History of Classical Scholarship 1·262f, and A. Henrichs, Cronache Ercolanesi 5 (1975) 20ff. The latter provides the best and latest version of the relevant section of the text which I here reproduce:

col.i 28 - ii 11: οὗτοι μὲν οὐδὲν | καὶ ἐν ἐτέρων
πολλοῖς | τὴν τοιαύτην τοῦ δυναμάτι | τῶν κατὰ φάσιν οὖν
ἀπα | ἔξωθεν | ἐκαθαρίσας | ἅλλα καὶ τῆν | Παλλάδα | προσαγορεύονταν
φασίν οὗτως ἀπὸ | τοῦ πάλμωτος διὰ τὸ καὶ τῇ | τῇ ἡ
γείγενσιν | ἐγὼ ὕψωσαν ἐξουσίαν | αὔτὴν ἐξ ἀλλαχθαί
παλ | λιμένην καὶ ἐπισειλου | σαν τὰ ὄπλα. | ματὰ γὰρ | τὸν
Εὐριπίδην κτλ. (All supplements suggested by Henrichs except i 28 - 30 (Lobel); ii 4 φησίν Lobel, ἀπὸ Lobel, 5 (Merkelbach - Lobel), 7-8 (Lobel), 8-9 (Merkelbach), 9 ἐπισειλου - Merkelbach. For a discussion of the text see Henrichs p.20). This etymology, Homeric usage (c.f. Il. 17.214: τεῦχες λαμπόμενος, 18.510: τεῦχες λαμπόμενοι, 20.46: τεῦχες λαμπόμενοι: compare τεῦχες λαμπομένως in
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Hes. Theog. 186, Scut. 60: see also Nonnus Dion. 1.10: τεῦχεσιν ἀκτράπτουσαν... ἅδην with Vian ad loc. (l.p.46 n.5). and the shape of the last mark before δροῦσι (the upper right-hand arc of a letter compatible with c) all conspire to favour Merkelbach's supplement as against e.g. τεῦχεσι λαμπομένοις κατάδροουσιν. For the "narrative δ’ ἄρα" suggested before τεῦχεσι see my note on the collocation in 219.2 P.

Our fragmentary text cites several passages from literature which exploit this derivation: Ibycus 298 P 3-4: Παλλάλιάτι ἐτὰν γὰρ ἐτίκτε ἅντος, κορυφάς δὲ οἱ ἐξανέπαλτοι. Euripides fr. 1009 (Snell, Suppl. ad Nauck TGF 2 (1964) p.19): ἀκο ALPHA συν καλάδαιν καὶ πήδησε κοῦφα ποδ/[. Callim. fr. 37 Pf.: οἱ τε Τρίτωνος ἐν θάνατιν Ἀκβόσται ἡ Ἡφαίστου λόχυνθον δῆξ[α]μένου πέλεκυν| βρέγμαλτος ἐν δίοιο σύν ἐντε[ε]σθιν ἤλαο πατρὸς. See too Σ ΙΙ.1.200 (1.65 Erbse) [Παλλάς] ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναπάλθην αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ Διὸς. Cramer Anecd. Ox. 1.347: ἀπὸ τοῦ παλθῆναι αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ Διὸς. Et. Mag. 589.53: παρὰ τὸ ἀναπέπαλθαι ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ Διὸς etc. All these quotations imply that Pallas' name derives from a verb meaning to leap: πάλλομαι, ἀναπάλλομαι or ἐξαναπάλλομαι (or ἐξανεφάλλομαι? c.f. Henrichs, p.32 n.145). The verbs δροῦσιν in the Stesichorean lemma and ἀναπηδήσαι in Σ Ap. Rhod. bear this out. But there existed in antiquity an alternative derivation of her name from the verb πάλλη to shake. This is referred to in the passage from Apollodorus' περὶ Θεῶν quoted above and is mentioned by e.g. Σ ΙΙ.1.200 (1.65 Erbse) ἀπὸ τοῦ πάλλειν καὶ κραδαίνειν τὸ δόρυ, Eust. 84.35 (1.34 van der
Valk) óc ἀπὸ τοῦ πάλλω τοῦ δηλοῦντος τὸ κινω, Et. Gud.
450: ἀπὸ τοῦ πᾶλλειν κατὰ τὸν μυστικωδέα λόγον, c.f.
Eur. Her. 1003: Παλλάς κραδαίνους ξυχος, Ion 210:
pάλλουσαν ... Παλλάς'. There is a fuller collection of
all the relevant ancient passages with an excellent
discussion of these (and other) etymologies of Pallas'
name in Henrichs pp.30ff.
With the etymology here we might compare ἀλεκτρον ὁσαν...
'Ηλέκτραν apparently coined by Xanthus (700 P) and very
possibly taken over by S. himself (see above p.992). The
title Παλλάς only occurs in Homer in conjunction with
'ἈΘΗΝΗ/αλη. Its first appearance on its own is in Η.Η.
Dem. 424. Then the present passage and 274 P =
Lamprocles 735 P, Pind. Ol.2.26 etc.
The second passage has long been known. Controversy
has centred over its idea that S. was the earliest
author to describe Athena's peculiar mode of birth. As
with fr.229 F, S.'s claim to primacy is convincingly
disputed by the evidence of art and literature. Whether
we suppose the present reference is to Athena's genesis
as a whole, or to the fact that she was armed when she
sprang from her father's head,1 the notion of S.'s
originality is abysmally hard to maintain. Homer, to be

1The hypothesis that S. is only being credited with the
invention of an Athena born in armour was put forward by
Welcker (Aesch. Tril. (1824) 278 and 476), G.F. Schömann
(Comparatio Theogoniae Hesiodeae cum Homerica(Greifswald
(1848)) = Opusc. Acad. 2.51 and 74), and Dornseiff2(Arch.
Myth. 22). It is blandly repeated by Bowra GLP p.123
without the slightest indication of the difficulties
involved.
sure, keeps a sedulous and characteristic silence over this grotesque detail, but II.5.880 (αὐτὸς ἔγειναι παιδ’) seems to imply it. No less characteristic is Hesiod's frank breaking of the silence. And when he does so in these words

αὐτὸς δ’ ἐκ κεφαλῆς γλαυκώπιδα γείναι᾽ Ἀθηνήν,
δεινὴν ἐγρεκόδομον ἀγέκτρατον ἀτρυτώνην
πῶτνιαν, ὦ κέλαδοι τε ἄδον πόλεμοι τε μάχαι τε.

(Hes. Theog. 924-6)

are we really to suppose that the subject of those formidable epithets was merely wearing baby napkins when she made her first appearance? There is a second "epic" description of the birth of Athene, in the form of the 19 hexameters preserved by Chrysippus (fr.908, Stoic. Vet. Fr. 2.256 v. Arnim = [Hes.] fr.343 MW) ap. Galen. They are independent of the Theogony's account and although probably composed later than it, seem to represent more faithfully the original myth without any of the distortions imposed by the former poem's context: for a full discussion of the two traditions see Sigrid Kauer, Die Geburt der Athena im altgr. Epos (Diss. Köln 1959) passim; also West on Theog. 886 - 900 (pp.401-3). This version quite explicitly envisages an armoured Athene:

τὴν μὲν ἔτιπτε πατῆρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε
πάρ ὕποροφήν.................................

........................... πολεμητὰ τεύχε᾽ ἔχονναν. (fr.343.11ff MW)

So does H.H. Ath. (28) 4ff:
Admittedly we cannot date these passages very precisely. But once again the evidence of art re-enforces the impression that the detail is pre-Stesichorean. Our earliest representation of it is on a relief amphora from Tenos which can be dated to the first half of the seventh century (c.f. K. Schefold, Myth and Legend in Early Greek Art (1966) pl.13; K. Fittschen, Untersuchungen zum Beginn der Sagendarstellungen bei den Griechen (1969) 129 - 131). That at least must antecede S. and it shows an armed Athene. So do several Peloponnesian shieldbands reliefs dating from c.600 (E. Kunze, Archaische Schildbänder (Olympische Forschungen 2 (1950))77f) and numerous Attic vases from the 560's on wards (for these and Athena's birth in art generally c.f. Brommer, Jb. Röm. German. Zentral Museum 8 (1961) 66ff).

By this time of course the question of Stesichorean influence becomes a possibility: but, granted the competition offered by [Hes.] fr.343 and H.H. Ath. 4ff, it must remain just one possibility among many.
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Pind. O1·7·36: κορυφὰν κατ’ἄκραν Eur. Ion. 456-7: κατ’
ἄκροτάτας κορυφὰς Call. fr.37 Pf.:Βρέγματος ἐκ Δίοιο Hymn
5·134-5: ξύλικε θεὰν Διὸς κορυφὰ Apollod. 1·20: ἐκ
κορυφῆς P. Colon. Inv. 5604 Col.ii 1-2 etc. This
version can be combined with the tradition of Athena's
birth by the river (or lake) Triton as Callim. fr.37, Ap.
Rhod. 4·1310, and Apollod. 1·20 attest. For uncertainty
over the meaning of the ancient title Τριτογένετα see
West on Hes. Theog. 895 (p.404). For excellent remarks
about the significance of birth from Zeus' head and its
application to the goddess Athena see the same scholar
on Theog. 886 - 900 (pp.401-3).
Bowra GLP\textsuperscript{2} places especial stress on the Phrynus painter's lip cup (British Museum B 424: ABV 169.3 = ABFV pl.123). I am no more able than Bowra to resist repeating Beazley's highly-quotable description of its contents: on one side \textquotedblright Zeus is seated on his throne: Athena bursts from his head in fighting trim, shield on arm: Zeus brandishes his thunderbolt in his emotion; Hephaestus, axe in hand, turns to leave, quite the surgeon satisfied with an operation.\textquotedblright On the other \textquotedblright The scene is again Heaven, and two of the figures are the same as on the reverse, for Athena is introducing Heracles to her father. The hero, on him all he owns (white shirt, lion-skin, sword, bow, and arrow, and club), is drawn rapidly forward by his guide: Zeus on his throne, with his sceptre, extends a gracious hand.\textquotedblright (Attic Black-Figure: a Sketch p.7). Since Heracles' accoutrement here includes the trio of items which S. is said to have been the first to give him, Bowra finds the case for Stesichorean influence upon the whole vase especially persuasive. But as we have seen (above p.1079 ff) S. has no monopoly over those details either, and his claims to primacy here too are very dubious. Two questionable assumptions do not make a very strong case.
I owe to A. Henrichs (1) the correct citation of the scholion which provides our fragment; (2) the information that its source is the so-called "Mythographus Homericus"; (3) a reference to P. Lünstedt, Untersuchungen zu den mythologischen Abschnitten der D - Scholien (Diss. Hamburg 1961) which provides (on p.154) the following testimonia for the tradition of Dionysus' pursuit by Lycurgus and his rescue by and reward of Thetis: Il.·6·135ff, ΣΔΑ Il.·6·131 (2·153 Erbse) = Eumelus fr.10 K, Agatharch. de mar. Erythr. 8 (E.G.M.I, p.116, 19ff), Quint. Sm. 2·438f, Nonnus Dionys. 20·344ff, Serv. auct. Verg. Aen. 3·14 (ed. Harv. 2·10f), Σ Lycophr. 273 (2·117f Scheer) Od. 24·173ff.

This fragment shows that S. somewhere employed two Homeric motives, the gift handed down from one individual to another (c.f. e.g. Agamemnon's κωφ.τρον, also made by Hephaestus, in Il·2·101ff: this is handed from god to god and then to mortals; also Il·10·266ff (without the divine element)): see my note on 178 P) and the god who takes refuge with Thetis (Dionysus, on the very occasion referred to here, in Il·6·130ff; Hephaestus, interestingly enough, in 11·18·394ff. c.f. Eumelus fr.10K).

Il·23·91-2 run: δε δε και διετέα νωϊν ὅμη σορὸς Δμωβικαλύπτοι | χρύσεος Δμωβιφορεύς, τὸν τοι πόρε πότνια μῆτηρ. On these concluding lines of the speech of Patroclus' εἴδωλον to
the sleeping Achilles, Σ ad loc. comments on l. 92¹ (5.383 Erbse) ἀδέτεται, δὴ εἰ σορὸν δέδωκεν, ἢ ἐν ἄλλοις λάρνακα καλεῖ (Il. 24.795), πρὸς τί καὶ ἀμφιφορὴ; μετενήνευται ὅπ π ἐν τῆς δευτέρας νεκρῆς (Od. 24.74) ... τὸ γὰρ οἰκοδέον ἐπάγεσθαι δυσοιλίωντοι. It is hard to deny the justice of the remark. The first objection can only be overridden by subterfuge (LSJ s.v. σὀρος: "vessel for holding human remains") or re-writing (Aeschines contra Timarchum 149 = Il. 23.83 A-B: ἀλλ' ἵνα πέρ σε καὶ αὐτὸν δομῇ γαῖα κεκεύθη | χρυσῷ ἐν ἀμφιφορῇ τόν τοι πόρο πότνια μήτηρ). The point concerning the absurdly ill-omened gift is unanswerable.

In the Second Nekyia, on the other hand, all is as it should be, and Thetis brings the ἀμφιφορεύς for her son's funeral after his death: δῶκε δὲ μήτηρ | χρύσεον ἀμφιφορὴ | Διονύσοιο δὲ δόρον | φάσκ' ἐμεναῖ, ἔργον δὲ περικλυτοῦ | ἡφαίστεοι. | ἐν τῶι τοι κεῖται λεύκ' ὀστέα, φαϊδίμ' Ἀχιλλεύι, | μύθα δὲ Πατρόκλοιο Μενοιτίδαο Θανύντος (Od. 24.73ff). This might have been what happened in the Stesichorean poem. A scene on the François Vase shows Dionysus bringing the golden amphora to Thetis on the morning after her wedding: see J. Boardman, Antike Kunst 19 (1976) p.12 n.34.

The reason for the choice of Naxos as the region where

¹See Wilamowitz, Ilias und Homer p.110 n.2.
Dionysus entertained Hephaestus (as he entertained Ariadne on another occasion) is obvious. It was the centre of the Dionysiac cult (c.f. Preller-Robert, Griech. Mythol. 1 p.676 and n.2) since that divinity was particularly associated with large Aegean islands (Andros, Chios, Lemnos etc.) favourable to the growth of the vine, and Naxos was pre-eminent in that respect. It was also strongly connected with the cult of Hephaestus (c.f. Wilamowitz, Nachrichten der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Gottingen. Phil. -hist. Klasse 1895 235-7 = Kl. Schr. 5^2 25-6). Doubtless Preller-Robert went too far in speaking of a "friendship" between the two deities here (sup. cit. 1. p.176 n.3, reproved by Wilamowitz sup. cit. p.25 n.2). We only know that one entertained the other as a guest. And yet that in itself is remarkable enough in contrast with the tradition of their rivalry for the possession of Naxos which is preserved (from an unknown source) in Σ Theocr. 1d.7.149 (150^A Wendel): ὁ μέντοι ὁ λνὸς ὁ δούλιος ἐκεῖνος ὁ δοθεὶς ὑπὸ Διονύσου χαριστήριου ἀνθεδ’διν αὐτῶι προσενεμεν ὁ Φόλος κρινομένωι παρ’αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν Ἡφαίστον.
κοιλωνυς here is a δαξ, though Homer has several δυνυς compounds (μωνυς in the line-end formula μωνυματικειαι -εις Иππους/-οι very frequent: see Schmidt, Parallel-Homer pp.146-7; κρατορινυς (of lions and wolves); γαμψωνυς ("with crooked talons": of vultures in Il.16.428, Od.22.320)) all restricted to the nominative or accusative pl.
kοιλος compounds first appear, so far as we know, in later poetry (S. excepted). There is κοιλογιστωρ in Aesch. S.C.T. 496, 1035, and κοιλοπεδον νάμος in Pind. Pyth. 5.38. Furthermore, κοιλος is very frequently used in Homer of such objects as ships, harbours, bays, vales and the like.

A good commentary on the present epithet is provided by Simon περι ἱππικης 5: ὁ ψάφος τῆς ὀσλῆς τῆς ἀγάθης. κυμβαλιζει γάρ ἡ κοιλη (sci. ὀσλη) μᾶλλον ἢ ἡ πληρής καὶ σαρκώδης.

πρότανυν: the first extant instance of this word for "lord" or "ruler," which is often used in the vocative and of gods, especially Zeus, in early lyric. See 0. Szemerényi, J.H.S. 94 (1974) 154.

---

1See R-E s.v. Simon (7) 3 Α 173·38ff. The author was an Athenian writer referred to by Xenophon in his περί ἱππικης 1.1.3, 11.6.
Another passage full of difficulties. First, a general problem: how many of the details given actually come from S? Surely everything from Στησίχορος to λάβει at the very least. When Pausanias stresses the reason for Actaeon's death with the particle δή, he is clearly drawing attention to its recherché nature, not idly tacking on his own explanation in the form of a totally obsolete version. This is in fact the oldest form of the myth.1 The notion of Actaeon as Zeus' rival is common to the two earliest authors we know to have treated the tale. S. shares it with Acusilaus, F. Gr. Hist. 2 F. 33 = Apollod. 3. 4. 4: Αὐτοῦν δὲ καὶ Ἀρισταίον παῖς Ἀκταίων ἐγένετο, δὲ τραφές παρὰ ξείρων κυνηγὸς ἐδιάδχη, καὶ ἔπειτα ὄστερον ἐν τῷ Κυθαιρώνι κατεβρώθη ὑπὸ τῶν δίων κυνών. καὶ τοῦτον ἐτελεύτησε τὸν τρόπον, δὲ μὲν Ἀκουσίλαος λέγει, μηνίσαντος τοῦ Διὸς δτὶ ἐμνηστεύσατο Σεμέλην. L. Malten, Kyrene (Phil. Unt. 20 (1911)) pp.18ff, followed by R. Pfeiffer ad Call. fr.523 (1.379), most ingeniously argued that both passages were inspired by the Hesiodic Γυναικῶν Κατάλογος, a portion of which he believed to be embedded in Apollod. sup. cit., where one of the hexameters contained in the text attributes Actaeon's death Διὸς ἐννεκῆς (vid. inf. pp. 110ff).

---

1 For an exciting attempt to trace the origins of the myth back to pre-historic ritual, see W. Burkert, Homo Necans (1972) pp.127ff.
There is not nearly enough evidence available to prove or disprove the general hypothesis, but it is a very seductive supposition. S. often borrows from Hesiod, and Acusilaus likewise frequently converts stories from the Boeotian Catalogue into prose (e.g. Coronis in F 17 and 18 of Acusilaus (c.f. Hes. frr.59 - 61 MW) and Caeneus in F 22 (c.f. frr.87 - 88 MW)). Less convincingly, Malten drew attention to similarities between the legend of Actaeon and those of Coronis and Cyrene, which we know to have fallen within the scope of the Eoeae (frr.59 - 61 and 215 - 216 MW).¹

This tale was changed at an early stage, presumably when the family tree of Thebes' royal house assumed its now

¹Malten's hypothesis, both in its general outline and in its particular application to the hexameters preserved in Apollodorus' text, would be revealed as patently erroneous if Lobel is right to identify P. Oxy. 2509 as a fragment from the Υγιναϊκῶν Κατάλογος (P. Oxy. Vol.30 (1964) pp.4ff). These hexameters begin with a goddesses' prophecy to Chiron about Dionysus, and then proceed to mention Actaeon and his hounds. Their stress on Semele would be appropriate to Malten's reconstruction of this particular region of the Eoeae, but then their silence about Actaeon as Zeus' rival is odd, and the sequence of events, as interpreted by Lobel, obscure: Dionysus' ascent to heaven seems to precede Actaeon's death! Still, Lobel's tentative identification of the lines is far from unassailable. One of the leading experts on Hesiodeia has characterised them as "An incoherent epic pastiche... The author of the Hesiodic Catalogue would turn in his grave if he knew that it had been attributed to him" (M.L. West, C.R. 16 (1966) 22). A. Casanova, (Riv. Fil. Instr. Class. 97 (1969) 31ff) by extensive rewriting and over-confident supplementation, has satisfied himself that all the events of the papyrus fragment occur after the death of Actaeon, and thus reconciles (1) Malten's hypothesis and the new fragment; (2) this new fragment and the Apollodoran hexameters. The less hysterical among us will perhaps decide that "res manet incerta." See further A.M. Cirio,"Fonti letterarie ed Iconografiche del mito di Atteone", Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei 25(1977) 44ff, and my remarks below pp.110ff.
familiar outline and Semele became Actaeon's aunt. Perhaps the version immediately next in time was that recorded in Diodorus, whereby Actaeon's attentions are simply transferred to Artemis and he is killed by his hounds (Diod. 4.81.4: δὲ κατὰ τὸ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν διὰ τῶν ἀνατιθεμένων ἀμφοδινών ἐκ τῶν κυνηγῶν προσιρεῖτο τῶν γάμων κατεργάσασθαι τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος). The story we first find in Euripides' Bacchae 337ff (the dogs tore him to pieces κρείσσον ἐν κυνηγίαις Ἀρτέμιδος εἶναι κομπάσαντ ἐν όργαις) exploits the primitive motif of the sacrilegious boaster: compare Eurytus in Od. 8.224ff, Agamemnon's taunt against Artemis in the Cypria (Allen p.104 (Procl.)) and the fate of the hunter in Call. fr.96 dieg.37 Pf. The dramatist probably transferred this latter detail to Actaeon in order to make him a closer παράδειγμα for his cousin Pentheus (see Dodds ad loc. (p.113)). The story of Artemis' detected bathing, which we know so well, and which Apollodorus (l.c.) rightly attributes to οἱ πλεῖονες, first appears (to the best of our knowledge) as late as Callimachus' Hymn εἷς λουτρα τῆς Παλλάδος containing the very similar story of Tiresias and Athene (5.107ff).

Now Pausanias calmly juxtaposes this version, apparently the newest, with S.'s which seems to be the earliest. And he makes the Stesichorean Artemis directly responsible for the death of Actaeon. In so doing he has brought a storm of protest splashing down on his head. For what has Artemis' vengeance to do with S.'s poem, where the
anger of Zeus against a mortal rival was the most potent factor? Hence a wide range of explanations, with Pausanias' bungling incompetence as the lowest common denominator. The earliest and latest forms of the myth have been clumsily contaminated by the periegete (so Frazer ad loc. (5.7), Vürtheim p.29, and Wilamowitz, Hell. Dicht. 2·p.23 n.2). Or else he has been careless in excerpting from the different streams of the tradition, and has omitted the name of Zeus, who should be subject of the verb περιβαλεῖν (c.f. Robert, Bild und Lied p.26; E. Schwartz, Ann. dell'Institut. 54 (1882) p.296). It has even been suggested that Pausanias took the name of S. from a mythological handbook and accidentally transferred what it told him of Acusilaus' treatment to S. (Bethe, Genethl. Götting. 74ff).

None of these hypotheses convinces me. I am not even as sure as most scholars seem to be that we should not accept the surface implication of Pausanias' text that Artemis' bathing and Zeus' hatred of a rival both occurred in S.'s poem. Such a double motivation of Actaeon's death would have several parallels including one involving Artemis herself (Aesch. Ag. 134ff; c.f. Lloyd-Jones, The Justice of Zeus p.169 n.47). The goddess would then be unwittingly carrying out Zeus' plan while simultaneously avenging the personal insult to her nakedness.

Still, it is a fact that there is no definite trace of the "bathing Artemis" version before Callimachus: the
variants found in Euripides and Diodorus bear no mark of it. So it may be safest to follow Malten (p.19 n.1) and others in regarding the whole idea as an "Alexandrinisches erotisches Motiv" invented by Callimachus or some other Hellenistic author. Not that we need then proceed to convict Pausanias of error in giving Artemis a significant rôle in S's poem. The short fragment of Acusilaus, though silent about the virgin goddess, confirms that Actaeon was from earliest times thought of as a hunter. (The little we know of Aeschylus' Τὸ ὄνακτον reinforces this impression: see frr.241 and 244 N² of that tragedy).

What more natural than that when Zeus desires to obliterate the hunter, he should choose to work through the hunting goddess, even though at this stage she is merely the agent of Zeus' vengeance, which she as yet accomplishes with an appetite unwhetted by private affront?

But now a further problem looms: by precisely what means did Artemis accomplish Actaeon's death? Until fairly recently, Pausanias' words were taken at their face-value, and Artemis, it was supposed, threw over Actaeon the hide of a deer killed in the hunt. His undiscriminating hounds mistook their strangely attired master for the real thing and gory tragedy ensued. Told like this, the story sounds like a "normalisation" of the more familiar version which has Actaeon supernaturally metamorphosed into an actual deer (c.f. Ov. Met. 3.138ff, Hygin. fab. 181, Nonnus Dionys. 5.287ff etc.). From this
interpretation Carl Robert drew far-reaching conclusions, and credited S. with the reputation of a rationaliser\textsuperscript{1} of the old myths, a reputation which sits uneasily on the shoulders of the poet whose most famous achievement was the salvaging of Helen's reputation by means of a magical \textit{εἰδωλον}.

This uncertain picture is rendered still more hazy by the evidence of art. There is even more of this than usual, but I find its relevance somewhat dubious. Briefly, the truth seems to be that plastic depictions at first show Actaeon normal and naked, or with the animal skin flung round him, very much as the literal interpretation of Pausanias' words would lead us to expect: only later is he represented as actually transformed into a beast.

(Up-to-date lists of vases in Brommer\textsuperscript{3} 473ff and of other artefacts in Denkmalerlisten 3·28ff. P. Jacobsthal, \textit{Aktaions Tod} (Marburger Jahrbuch der Kunstwissenschaft (1929)) provides excellent illustrations and discussions of the relevant artefacts then known. On Actaeon's death in vase-painting there is a useful discussion in Caskey and Beazley's \textit{Attic Vase Paintings in the Museum of}

\textsuperscript{1}Robert's inference (Bild und Lied p.24f) is presumably the source of the even more dangerous generalisation enshrined in Busolt's Gr. Geschichte\textsuperscript{2} (1885) 1·p.275: "er (scil. S.) behandelte die Sagen als Lyriker frei nach seinem persönlichen Gefühl, nicht selten rationalisierend" etc. (In all fairness it should be added that the rash phrase was omitted from the second edition (1893): see its p.423. Robert himself remained contumacious: see Oidipus\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{(1915) p.75n.79}. It is amusing to find scholars drawing diametrically opposed (but equally erroneous) conclusions from fr.195 of S.: see pp.508ff above.
Fine Arts, Boston (Part 2 (1954)) pp.46ff and 83ff with a bibliography on p.46). Some recent additions to our knowledge helpfully encapsulated by J. Boardman, Antike Kunst 19 (1976) 12f.)

For instance, a metope on temple E at Selinus (Denkmälerlisten 3·29·13: see O. Benndorf, Die Metopen von Selinunt etc. (Berlin 1873) p.56f for a full description of the artefact and a reproduction and, more recently, Robertson, A History of Greek Art 1·212ff with the bibliography in 2·p.652 n.102) dating from the second quarter of the fifth century and thus post-dating 3., has the hero with a skin draped over his shoulders. The hounds are leaping up onto it in an alarming manner, while to the left stands the tall and imposing figure of Artemis observing the grim fate of this victim of a divinity's anger. And the Pan Painter's death of Actaeon (Athens Acrop.760: ARV² 552·20 = Vasenlisten³ 474·B4) on a fragmentary volute krater, shows the hero "dressed, as nowhere else, in a deerskin fitting close to his trunk, thighs and arms, with the head (not merely the scalp) forming a sort of cap" (Caskey-Beazley sup.cit. p.48). In fact this device is now paralleled in a vase by the Eucharides Painter dating from the early fifth century (Hamburg 1966·34: Paralip. 347·8 = Vasenlisten³ 474·D6) which hangs the deerskin round Actaeon's neck while its head is worn like a cap. Such are the facts: what are we to make of them? If the animal skin had precisely the same significance in literature and plastic art (as Bowra, GLP² p.125f assumes
they did) the works listed above would constitute a very strong argument in favour of the literal interpretation of Pausanias' words. Two independent occurrences of the same unusual detail in art and in literature would be unthinkable: S.'s version must be reflected on the vases and the Selinus metope, and the latter artefact in particular would suggest the likelihood of a Sicilian version exploited, if not originated, by the poet of Himera. But there is room for considerable doubt as to whether the skin in art means the same as it would in literature. The latter medium can describe the whole process of metamorphosis through its every stage from beginning to end, as does Ovid Met. 3.19ff. A single plastic depiction can only isolate and illustrate one phase, and a primitive but effective way of stressing that a magic transformation of man to deer is under way would be to use the device of the hide. To show either the beginning or the end of the metamorphosis would be to court ambiguity by displaying an apparently normal man or deer. And granted that the fairly sophisticated concept of a partially transformed Actaeon arises at a relatively late stage - early in the fifth century on a white ground mug (Würzberg H 5356) which shows his body covered in hair and on a Bell-krater (Boston 00.346: ARV 1045.7 = Vasenlisten 474.B5) where the hero has "not only... antlers and animal ears, but... forehead, nose and cheeks... covered with fur - rendered by brown stippling" (Caskey-Beazley sup.cit. p.83) - then the Pan Painter's simpler
technique is admirably suited to his purpose. "By giving Actaeon this strange costume [he] is explaining how the hounds come to take their master for a stag" (ib. p.48). The essentially plastic concept of the device is emphasised by the fact that the Pan Painter "had Heracles' lionskin in his mind, but still more Dolon's wolfskin coat": Caskey-Beazley l.c. with references to parallels afforded by other vases.

Seeliger (Überlieferung p.2) in the course of a wholly admirable attempt to rebut Robert's picture of a rationalising S., suggested that the poet's concept of Actaeon enwrapped in a deer-skin arose under the influence of the sort of representation we can now see on the post-Stesichorean metope at Selinus.¹ I cannot accept this. We are asked to believe that S. gauchely misunderstood a simple convention of the plastic medium and reproduced it in literature where it could make no sense; or that he wilfully transplanted the detail into a setting where it was, on its own, inexplicable. Influence of the relevant artefacts by S.² is, in this particular case, no likelier: what a wondrous concidence that the vase-painters should adopt an eccentric motif that was incoherent in S. but made perfect sense in terms of their own medium! It is high-time to point out that, with one notable exception, the stoutest advocates of the hide-version in S. are unable to explain it. The sixth century seems far

²So Benndorf, Die Metopen von Selinunt etc. p.57.
too early a date for rationalisations of myth, and in any case we expect the rational account to succeed, not proceed, the fantastic version. But what other justification is there? When Vürtheim (p.30) alleges that the throwing of the hide emphasises Artemis' intervention, or Bowra says (GLP² p.100) that S. is thus "providing a reason why Actaeon's dogs should devour their master", we must retort that the usual idea of a magical transformation would achieve these ends just as well, if not better.

The only attempt to defend the literal meaning of περιβαλετυ which strikes me as even remotely convincing is Walter Burkert's (Homo Necans (1972) p.128 and n.15). He cites the bizarre passage from Dionysius'Bassarica (Page GLP 134 = Die gr. Dichterfragmente der Rom. Kaiserzeit fr.9 (verso) Heitsch) in which the corpse of an enemy is dressed in the flayed skin of a stag so that he entirely resembles the beast, and derives both this and our fragment from primitive rituals in which men disguised themselves in the hides of wild animals. This might well explain the origin of the myth of Actaeon, but by the time of S.'s poem and the vases which depict a skin, the feature is meaningless. And the very ancient notion that one dons a beast's identity with its hide is no less relevant to the one line of approach we have not yet explored.

An alternative way out was first proposed by E. Hiller in his review of Seeliger's Überlieferung (Bursians Jhb. 54
(1888) 177) but he rejected it almost as soon as he had raised it. Half a century later, H.J. Rose independently conceived pretty much the same explanation (Mnemos. 59 (1931) 431f). His robust common-sense was affronted by the feebleness of the concept of Artemis draping her victim with a deer-skin, and he decided that Pausanias' words must be a metaphorical allusion to the actual transformation of Actaeon. S. had originally used some such phrase as we find in Aeschylus' description of the very real transformation of Philomela into a nightingale:


The metaphorical meaning "clothe" for περιβάλλω is common, though not properly recognised by LSJ: c.f. Od. 5.231, 22.148, Hdt. 1.152, 9.109, Eur. I.T. 1150 etc.

As possible obstacles to this solution I see two closely-linked objections which shrink in importance the more one looks at them. Firstly, as Bowra l.c. observes, ἔσμα does not mean the same as δέμας, and we will be attributing to S. an even more highly-coloured image than Aeschylus employs if we follow Rose. And daring Aeschylean phraseology is precisely what we do not expect from S. whose language, as the recent papyri finds constantly stress, combines simplicity and the conventional in highly concentrated solution.
I doubt if these considerations should be allowed to alienate us from Rose's attractive hypothesis. Although we now have a good deal more S. than formerly, the sum total of his fragments still represents only a tiny proportion of his entire output, and this is an inadequate basis for precipitate generalisations about what words S. can or cannot have used. Besides, even within the constricted limits of the Geryoneis we find "agonies from the manslaying speckle-necked Hydra", a phrase "of almost Pindaric boldness" (Page's translation and description in J.H.S. 93 (1973) 152: see S 15 ii 5-6 with my note ad loc). That seems sufficient warrant for granting S. the occasional vivid phrase or two. Nor must we forget that between us and the original wording of S.'s poem stands the genial but opaque figure of Pausanias the periegete, who may, for instance, have mistaken S's drift and substituted δέρμα for an original δέμακ under the influence of the conventions used in plastic art. This and other such imponderables must prevent us from reaching absolute conclusions from this fascinating passage. Pausanias' personality leaves behind too strong a trace in these lines for us to deduce confidently from the relevant phrase either that S. was a great rationaliser of myths or that he occasionally used a colourful expression. But the second of these alternatives seems considerably likelier, and one might add two further considerations in its favour: Gregory Nagy, H.S.C.P. 77 (1973) 179f has supported Rose's interpretation.
by adducing lexical evidence for the primitive equation of "one's identity with one's hide". And a frequent folk-tale motif bears this out: compare tales of the werewolf who by putting on a wolf's skin becomes that creature.

The examples of men in animal clothing cited by Burkert (sup. cit.) also corroborate this interpretation.

What we can definitely say is that in S.'s version Actaeon was not Semele's nephew, since he vied with Zeus himself for her affections, with disastrous consequences. The story may have been told in the Europeia; but a separate poem utilising the Theban saga is just as likely.

Appendix

Theodor Bergk sanguinely supposed that he could add two further areas of information on the poem by S. which mentioned the death of Actaeon. This happy state of affairs, however, was reached by somewhat questionable means. In the first place he had to restore Philodemus π. εύςεβ. p.60 Gomperz in ambitious fashion: Στηςίχορος 'Ακταίωνι και |υ και καθάσηρ | ἐννονι[...] ετ. That supplement marks the triumph of hope over experience. It would be possible to argue for Ἡκιόδος since so little of the context survives (c.f. Malten sup. cit. p.18) but
I forbear: for an alternative reconstruction see Merkelbach and West's app. crit. to fr.346 of Hesiod (p.173).

Even if we could be absolutely certain that Bergk's supplement were correct, our tiny store of knowledge about S's poem would not be increased by a single grain. The same cannot be said for Bergk's next coup, which is to detect a sizeable chunk of this poem preserved in most of our MSS of Apollodorus 3.4.4. It has long been alleged that these lines of verse have been spliced together out of two separate poems, since Actaeon's name occurs in two different forms (Ἀκταίων and Ἀκτατός). It has even longer been realised that the lines are hexameters. I know that S. was Ὀμηρωκωτάτος but this (pace Vürtheim p.31) is ridiculous. Bergk clearly thought so too, since he rewrote the extract in lyric metre and with many a violent change. The end result is dire, as those unsqueamish enough to visit the victim in the quiet seclusion of PLG Fragmenta Adespota 39 will appreciate. If Bergk had behaved like this a little more often, Page could not have written "nunquam obsolescet hominis ingeniosissimi illustre monumentum" (P.M.G. p.vi). As it is, no-one has taken this isolated aberration seriously, and later scholars have either maintained that S. may have written hexameters - so Vürtheim (l.c.) but this is incredible in view of the silence of antiquity - or that the lines may contain details which derive, even if indirectly, from S's poem (c.f. Bowra GLP1 pp 96-7).

Phrases like καλὸν σῶμα ... Μῦτε Ὑδρος and Δῶς ἐννεάτηςι
have been thought to lend substance to the latter theory, together with Apollodorus' statement that Artemis is said to have τοῖς ἔπουμένοις αὐτῷ πεντήκοντα κυσίν ἐμβαλεῖν λύσσαν - to what end unless Actaeon had not actually been transformed into a stag?

This last point, I feel sure, must be wrong: Apollodorus' own narrative reveals no knowledge of S.'s version, and the λύσσα is introduced to explain not how the hounds were duped by a mere hide but why the dogs went so far as to devour their prey (ὦφ'ῶν κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἔβρωσθ). The same consideration explains the mention of λύσσα in Paus. 9.23 of course. Besides, we have already seen that Pausanias' words need not imply a Stesichorean version in which Actaeon was still human: καλὸν σῶμα and ἡ ὑπερδηρος are not to be used as frail props for the theory that S. lies behind these lines of poetry; and if Διὸς ἐννεθήκετι alludes to Zeus' extirpation of a rival in love it is far likelier, as Malten argued (see above p. ), that these hexameters either come from the Hesiodic κατάλογος or bear its influence.1 So A. Casanova has

---

1 But others believe the passage comes from an "Actaeonis epyllium" of Hellenistic date. They were printed as such by J.U. Powell in his "Collectanea Alexandrina" pp 71-2 with a superfluity of rash emendations but a valuable bibliography of earlier treatments. And recently, A. Grilli (Parola del Passato 26 (1971) 354ff) has added ingenious and largely convincing arguments to support this view. Starting from the new papyrus fragment of a list of Actaeon's hounds (P. Med. Inv. 123: ed. pr. S. Daris, Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology (1970) pp 97-102) he claims as common source for this and Hyginus' list (fab. 181) a Hellenistic hexameter poem which he supposes to be partly represented by the lines we find in Apollodorus. This
recently asserted (see p.1089 n.1).

I (contd..)

epyllion he argues, was copied by Ov. Met. 3.206ff
(surprisingly strong parallels can be found between the
two: see p.363 and c.f. G. Salanitro, Helikon 7 (1967)
428ff)) and Nicander's Ετεροτομέα or his Κυνηγετήκα
are named as a plausible Ovidian source. I am not
totally persuaded by the Hellenistic traits Grilli finds
in the "Apollodoran" hexameters but I agree that an
Alexandrian poet is a far likelier source for Ovid than
the Boeotian Catalogue. Only then Zeus' jealousy of
Actaeon must have survived as a motif later than we
realised - or so Αὐτὸς ἦννεκίησι suggests.
On the mythical detail see Merkelbach and West ad loc. (p.67). 'Ἀραβάκ appears as a v.l. for Ἐρεμβοῦς at Od. 4.84.

For the variant versions of Iason's parentage and a list of the relevant sources see Jacoby's commentary ad loc. (p.418).
The version here attributed to S. is reminiscent of the account given by H.H. Ap. 305 - 55. According to this, Hera was vexed with Zeus for having produced Athena independently of her: her own son Hephaestus had turned out a cripple. Consequently she prays to Earth, Sky, and the Titans for another offspring as mighty as Zeus, and in the fullness of time she gives birth to Typhon whom she delivers to the female serpent of Pytho to bring up. The serpent is shot by Apollo, but what happens to Typhon we are not told. This story makes the birth of Athena from Zeus' head a cause of hatred and envy in Hera, emotions which in their turn bring about the birth of Typhon. Now since S. described the birth of Athena out of her father's head in fr.233, and the present passage has Hera bear Typhon on her own out of resentment for past injuries, it is highly likely that both events occurred in the same poem which contained a narrative on pretty much the same lines as the Homeric Hymn's. (So Sigrid Kauer, Die Geburt der Athena im altgr. Epos (Diss. Koln (1959)) p.54f and several other scholars besides).

As an alternative explanation we may remember that Kleine (p.123) drew attention to Typhon's position as father of Orthus (Hes. Theog. 309) the dog that protected Geryon's cattle. The fragment would then be part of an incidental

---

On the variant forms of this name see West on Hes. Theog. 306 (p.252).
digression in the Geryoneis unconnected with 233 P. For a further possible biographical excursus of this sort see my note on $S_7 = 184$ p.

Why do the lexica mention S. without saying anything about the Hymn's analogous version? It would obviously be rash to draw any conclusions about the relative dates of S. and the Homeric Hymn to Apollo from this omission (as does, for instance, A. Matthiae, Animadversiones (Leipzig 1800) p.33).

The latest scholar to discuss the problem dates this part of the Hymn to c.600 (M.L. West, C.Q. 25 (1975) 161ff). There is no need to suppose that our fragment's sources are singling out S. as the first poet to give Typhon this particular genealogy. And even if they were doing this, there would be no call to believe them right. 233 P offers an apparent parallel for an attribution of a mythical innovation to S. reached only by ignorance of an Homeric Hymn, an ignorance easily explained by the indifference of Alexandrian scholars to compositions they regarded as non-Homeric (c.f. the section entitled "The Homeric Hymns in Antiquity" in the commentary of Allen - Sikes (- Halliday) and Schmid, G.G.L.l·1 p.245). The claim that S. was the first to equip Heracles with club, lion-skin and bow (above pp.106ff) rests on a more comprehensive ignorance.

For Hera's connection with Typhon c.f. Farnell, Cults of the Greek States 1·183ff who rightly points out that it is
part of the epic characterisation of the goddess as a jealous wife: in a similar spirit she nurtures the Lernaean Hydra and the Nemean Lion (Hes. Theog. 314 and 328) out of resentment against her husband's son Heracles. She is not here regarded as a chthonian deity.¹ On the Hesiodic and other poetical treatments of the Typhon myth c.f. West on Hes. Theog. 820 - 80 (pp.379ff with bibliography on p.383).

Scholars go about noting that - for no fathomable reason - Bergk suggested our line was the exordium of the Iliupersis. Since 1969 they have added that given our new knowledge of the poem's metre this arbitrary guess might actually be right. (so e.g. West, ZPE 4 (1969) 137, Haslam p.12 n.7). The truth is in fact slightly more complicated and mysterious than they realise. Bergk did indeed remark (p.223) a propos of this fragment "fortasse exordium 'Ιλίου Πέρσιδος", but his groundless conjecture was anticipated by an equally groundless but more dogmatic statement. Th. Ch. Tychsen, Commentatio de Quinti Smyrnai Paralipomenis Homeri (1783) p.31 n.r, and Quinti Smyrnai Posthomerorum libri XIV (1837) p.LXIX, categorically declares that the words are the beginning of S.'s Iliupersis. He advances no reason and expresses not the least doubt. He has all the air of a man producing a self-evident fact, not a tenuous hypothesis. I have been no more successful in divining the reasoning behind this confident assertion than other scholars were in their attempt to explain Bergk's more cautious remark. There is certainly no justification to be found in the context of Eustathius' quotations. Perhaps Tychsen's statement is a simple mistake. Here I must leave the mystery, but not without remarking that I find it highly unlikely that Bergk's speculation is not somehow connected with his predecessor's bolder formulation.
the word is a common component of appeals to the Muses: see my note on 193 P (p.338).

again a verb commonly found in this type of invocation: c.f. Alcm. 27·1 P: optima Calliope miranda poematibus with my note ad loc., Hor. Od. 3·4·1f: descende caelo et die age tibia | regina longum Calliope melos, Nisbet - Hubbard on Hor. Od. 1·24·3 (pp.282-3). For the form see my note on S.'s Εὔρωπεία (195 P);it recurs in Empedocles B 131·3 D-K, Agathias A.P. 4·3·61.

the epithet is applied to the Muse by Od. 24·62, Alcm. 14·1 P (sup. cit.) and 30 P: ἀ Μῶςα κέκλαγ' ἀ λήγηα Σηρήν, [Stes.] 278·1 P (sup. cit.) and 1045 P: Μῶςα λίγεια (not in Page's Index). See too Boeotica fr.692·2·3 P: λίγγοι where the context suggests the presence of the Muses: see my note on 193 P (p.340f) and Callim. fr.1·42 Pf with Schol. Lond. 49ff (p.7 Pf.).
On the report of Dr. K. Alpers (per. litt.) MS.B has the compendium ἐπ' which signifies ἐπεκ not (pace Miller p.212, Calame p.36) ἐπεκν.

Bergk (p.223) produced two Stesichorean fragments from these testimonia (μέτευμι δ' ἔφ' ἔτερον προοίμιον and μάτας ἐπ'ών) and placed them under the heading ἦς ἀδήλων ἐλθόν. "Fortasse haec duo fragmenta Palinodiae adscribenda, in quo carmine poetam se simul ab aemulorum criminationibus defendisse non est improbabile" he commented, suggesting that Aristides' εἰς μάτην γίγνεσθαι τους λόγους possibly derived from the same poem. However, this was not enough for J.M. Edmonds (Lyra Graeca 244) who with that delicate sensitivity and caution which has won admiration from all - see especially E. Lobel, CR 36 (1922) 120-1 - ran Bergk's two fragments together, changed ἐπ'ων to ἐπον (from Et. Gen B 212's supposed μάτας ἐπεκν) and plonked the result in front of the three lines from the Phaedrus.

Abracadabra, and we have the beginning of S's Palinode: μάτας ἐπον' μέτευμι δ' ἔφ' ἔτερον προοίμιον. The best comment upon this is R. Kassel's, in connection with Menander's Sicyonius (p.III of his edition): "ex instituto suo corruptit et foedavit J.M. Edmonds." Nemesis took slightly longer than usual in descending upon Edmonds' creation, but in time descend it did. His contemporaries might have pointed out that there was no proof that Plato quotes from the beginning of the Palinode (and now we know
he didn't: see 193·8ff P) and likewise no evidence that S. used the iambic trimeter in the Palinode (and now we know he didn't: see p.330f above). The news that Et. Gen. B has μόνας εἰς τερεμ not εἶς τερεμ would be a final nail to the coffin were that not already confined to the earth. Should this débacle inhibit us even from seeing the Aristides passage as a close paraphrase of S? Wilamowitz (Textg. d. gr. Lyr. p.34 n.5) deprecated attempts to form a fragment out of Aristides' words: "Interessant ist, dass Ar., einer der ihn gelesen hat, die Anwendung mehrer Prooemien bemerkte, wie er sich in seiner rhetorischen Technik ausdrückt - woraus die Modernen unglaublicher Weise ein fragment des S. machen." Kannicht (p.28 n.5)\(^1\) goes even further, in noting that the only proof we have that Aristides actually read S. derives from the circular argument that μέτεμι ἕπαι ξετερον προολυμον is a direct quotation rather than e.g. a familiar cant-phrase. It seems to be pushing scepticism too far to deny that 241 P is at the least a loose paraphrase of some words of S. But there is no solid ground for supposing the poem referred to is the Palinode. Admittedly Aristides goes on to use the word σχαμαχεῖν, which might be a reflection of the ξελόλον, and εἰς μοῦν is a phrase which would not be out of place in a recantation. But what proof is there that these words are echoes of precisely the same poem as mentioned ξετερον προολυμον? The citing of those words from poem x by S. could easily have excited a half-conscious recollection of the phantom-motif and the

\(^1\)See p.329.
apology from the same poet's more famous work which seems
to have coloured Aristides' vocabulary here. This
explanation would circumvent the tangles inherent in
Bowra's idea (2 p.91)1 that τέρσον ἰποίομεν comes from
the Second Palinode, because the ἰποίομεν must be τέρσον
relative to something of its own kind, to wit the prelude
of an earlier palinode, not the very different Helen. We
would, on this interpretation, be adding Aristides to the
four testimonia which seem to show awareness of two
Palinodes. That in itself is not impossible, but it will
take more to convince me that Aristides is the only author
apart from Chamaeleon to quote or paraphrase part of the
Second Palinode than this slender phrase.

I think Page was wise to keep the whole passage under
"Incerti Loci". That is also the home he selects for
μάτας εἴπων, confirmed as a Stesichorean phrase by Et. Gen.
A and B. It was once customary to argue that these two
words, which look at first blush like a suitable ingred­
ient for a palinode, are merely a corruption for which we
should read Et. "μάτας" εἴπεν. If this were so we would
be left clasping the single word μάτας, and it would be a
bold man who tried to assign that to either of the Palin­
odes, or any other specific poem by S. The emendation
may still be right, but it no longer has the support of
Et. Gen. B, and for μάτας εἴπειν as a phrase we might
compare Aesch. Cho. 918: μὴ ἄλλ' εἴποιμοιως καὶ πατρὸς τοῦ
coe μάτας. However, even if the two words do belong

1See p.328.
together, I think the unprejudiced mind will concede that they might be uttered by any character in any Stesichorean poem.
"Compounds involving -μαχος are accentuated differently according to whether they derive from verbs or not". It is unfortunate that Athenaeus is so busy telling us how to accentuate compound -μαχος forms that he says nothing at all about the spelling of the first element in this Stesichorean adjective. However Blomfield's correction is supported by Callim. fr.638 Pf: ἵλαθι μοι φαλαρίτιν, πυλαμάξε and the two passages cited by Pfeiffer ad loc., Arist. eq. 1172: ἡ Παλλᾶς ἡ πυλαμάξεος and Lyociph. 356: Παλλάδος ... Πυλαίτιδος. Admittedly in this last instance πυλαίτιδος exists as a v.l. But the remark of Σ ad loc. is instructive (2.139 Scheer): καὶ τοῦτο συμβολικὸν ἐπὶ θέτον Ἀθηνᾶς ἐν ταῖς πύλαις γὰρ αὕτην ἐγραφὼν τῶν πόλεων καὶ οἰκιῶν ὡς ἐν προαστείοις τῶν Ἀρεά κτλ. It is possible that S. used his epithet of Ares, since the Homeric scholion cites it in connection with the epic τειχεσιμπλήνης which is applied to that god. And of course the form that is truly analogous to the compound τειχεσιμπλήνης which is applied to that god.

1Nöthiger (p.150 and n.4) argues that Aristophanes is here directly imitating S. But we know too little about the history of the word to be sure of this, and there is the world of difference between the large-scale echoes of the Oresteia in Aristophanes' Peace (210-212 P: see my note ad 212) and this sort of allusion. He also insists that Aristophanes' punning reference to Pylos proves he took over from S. the form πυλαίτιν, though why (restricting ourselves for a moment to this evidence alone) Aristophanes should not have altered the form himself to facilitate his word-play I cannot see.

2For other examples of such manuscript variations (as between ὡθαγενής and ὡθαγενής) see Lobeck's Phrynichus (Parerga p.648).
πλήτης, with its initial element ending in a locative dative, is πυλαί- μάχος. One might also compare the Homeric proper name Πυλαίμενης (II.2.851, 5.576, 13.643). The meaning I would attach to such an epithet is "fighting at the gate". Compare Pind. Pyth. 8.46f:

(Θαέσσαμε...) 'Αλκμάν ἔπαττόδος | νομῶντα πρῶτον ἐν Κάδμου πύλαις.

One should, then, accept Blomfield's emendation, for all that πυλεμάχος can be bolstered up by appeals to forms like πυλη- δόχος (H.H. Herm. 15: a hymn of late date: see my note on 205 i 4 p (p.761n.1)) and *πυλα -ορος (Homeric πυλαωρός: II.21.530, 24.681).

Verbal -μαχος compounds recur frequently from Homer onwards: ἀγχε- , ἱππο- πυγ- etc.
Metre: dactylo-anapaestic (?): (…) ————→—. (Against the v.l., which would produce a dactylo-epitrite sequence, see below).

A.E. Harvey, C.Q.7 (1957) p.212 n.l well remarks of the adjective here illustrated that "even in the archaic period its vagaries are notable". In Il.23.583 it is used of a whip and in Sappho 115.2 LP of a sapling, and in both cases, as Harvey observes, some such rendering as "pliant" will serve. The meaning is already shifting somewhat in S's fragment, and the same scholion that is our source for this informs us that Ἀνακρέων δὲ ἐπὶ τὰχως ἐταξε τὸ ἀδινὸν (456 P): "Ἅβεκος δὲ (336 P) ἐπὶ τὸν τὸν οὐρανὸν βασταζόντων κιόνων, εὐμεγέθεις λέγων. The translation "slender" would seem to cover most other instances: H.H. Dem. 183, Hes. Th. 195, Sappho 102.2 LP, Anacr. 467 P etc.

ἐπέπεμπον

as Haslam remarks (p.12 n.8), this is surely protected against ἐπέπεμπον by the consideration "utrum in alterum", even though it is the only extant example of the verb with this particular meaning. The closest parallel for our fragment's separation of adj. and corresponding noun by τίξουσ verb has the non-compound form: Hes. Theog. 715f: τριηκοσίας πέτρας εἰς βαρέων ἀπὸ χειρῶν | πέμπον ἐπαναπέμπα. Contrast H.H. Art.6: πέμπουσα στονοέντα βέλη. For πέμπω meaning "discharge (of missiles)" see LSJ s.v. II2 (to
which add the second of my two references). \( \epsilonπιπέμπω \)

with the same signification is not recognised by LSJ s.v.

but the present fragment guarantees it.
Metre

--- identified as dactylo-anapaestic by Fraenkel, Rh. Mus. 72 (1918) 168 = Kl. Beitr. 1.172:
the first line is the archebulean, attested for S. by Caesius Bassus (275 (iv) P)
As usual in dactylo-anapaests, biceps before closing is kept disyllabic:
c.f. Alcm. 56.6 P (with Welcker's ἄριστος ὀνόματος), Ibyc. 298.3, 321 P, Sim. 506.1 P, etc.
For analogies with the metre of the Eriphyle see p.

This and the following Stesichorean fragment, together with Semonides fr.2 W (τοῦ μὲν θανόντος οὐκ ἂν ἔνθαμοι-μεθα. | εὖ τι φρόνονεις, πλεῖον ἡμέρης μής) are quoted by Rohde, "Psyche" (English translation) p.440 n.15 to illustrate the common archaic Greek attitude "don't give the dead another thought after we have buried them." He might have added Archiloch. fr.11. W: οδυτέ τι γὰρ κλαῖνυν ἵππωμαι. See p.412 of the same work for the sort of background presupposed by this outlook, which strangely ignores any notion of a cult of the dead. Of course it is dangerous to suppose that the Greeks of the archaic (or any other) period had one constant and unchanging attitude to so complex a phenomenon as death and the dead, and even more dangerous to suppose we can reconstruct it from one - or two - line fragments such as those mentioned above. These for the most part seem to be echoing the advice given by Odysseus in Il.19.288-9.  ἄλλα χρὴ τὸν μὲν
the manuscripts present us, almost unanimously, with the superlative of the adjective ἀτελής whose only other occurrence in early poetry is at Od. 17.546 (τδι κε καὶ ὅπι ἀτελής δάνατος μηκοτήρως γένοιτο | πάσι μάλ' - death for the suitors would not be "unaccomplished," it would be certain to come upon them). The present context however requires a meaning that is best supplied by the epic epithet ἀτελεστος ("without issue or effect"). Ahrens' emendation is compelling for this reason and because it eliminates the odd superlative, which sits uncomfortably by the following positive.

ἀμάχανα

I adopt for the moment a lexicographically convenient, though unsatisfactory, terminology, when I say that in epic this adjective regularly has a passive meaning ("concerning which nothing can be done"). The only instance of an active sense in Homer is at Od. 19.363 (ἀ μοι ἔγω τέκνου, ἄμηχανος: "unable to achieve anything"). That same meaning must obtain here and at H.H. Ap. 192 where mortals are described as ἀφοβάδες καὶ ἄμηχανοι. Compare the active signification of the epic
epithet for Odysseus, ἀπομήχανος ("contriving many things"). Even in later Greek active ἀπομήχανος is relatively rare: see LSJ s.v. I. But see Barrett on Eur. Hipp. 677ff (p.289f) for the artificiality of such act./pass. distinctions for many Greek compound adjs.

A wide basic meaning ("such that there is no μηχανή") perhaps best fits the facts.

tοῦ Ὀδυσσείου: the only Stesichorean passage where the definite article means "the". To be explained not by the generalised and gnomic context (note the absence of the article before Ὀδυσσείου in the similar passage at 245 Η) but by the wish to turn the participle into a noun. This usage occurs in epic, though rarely: see Il.3.138, 21.262, 23.325, 663, 702 and Chantraine, Gramm. Hom. 2.163.

κλαίειν

when a neuter adj. is used as predicative of an infinitive, that adjective is usually in the singular. It is rare to find it in the pl. as here and in Archiloch. fr.134 Η: οὗ γὰρ ἐσθάλα καθανοῦσι κερτομεῖν ἐπ' ἀνδράςιν. There are metrical reasons for Archilochus' plural: see Page, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique, tome 10 (Archiloch), p.155. In our fragment too the singular would create metrical difficulties.
Metre: apparently dactylo-epitrite up to the corrupt word: x~x'.'w.'x'.

So Haslam (p.50), who seeks to excuse the contravention of Maas' bridge by positing period-end after ἄνθρωπος (unlikely on grounds of the over-run of sense: see p.86). Such contraventions are of as little significance in isolated and corrupt one-line citations as the numerous dialectal solecisms provided by such sources. The most enthusiastic defence of πολιδ comes from Wilamowitz (Textg. p.35 n.3) who takes it as equivalent to γεγοραμενα, μαραθομενη. That would make admirable sense ("when a man dies, the glory he receives from his fellow-beings grows old and fades") but it foists upon πολιδ a quite unparallelled signification, and the word's metaphorical meanings (for which see LSJ s.v., I 3 b) provide inappropriate import for the context in which Stobaeus quotes the line.

Whatever the exact truth about the original verse, ποτ' will be elided Doric ποτι as in Pind. Ol.7.90 (καὶ ποτ' ἀπετέων καὶ ποτι ἐξελονον). Other instances of the elision in LSJ s.v. ποτι. Wilamowitz, of course, saw this; Würtheim (with his reference to ποτε (p.84)) did not. Page's μας ἀπωλείτες ἄνθρωπον χάρις introduces by conjecture a use of the definite article that is elsewhere in S. rare to the point of non-existence.

1Compare Gr. Versk. p.299.
The discerning reader will notice the change that has come over this fragment between the first publication of P.M.G. in 1962 and the corrected reprint of that work in 1967. In the former, Page enclosed the four-word fragment between cruces and referred us to his brief article in C.R.9 (1959) 193 where he had shown that Bergk's citation "Etymol. Vindob. cod. CLVIII: "Διος ουμα παρα Στηςι-χόρω" was incorrect: Phil. Gr. 158 (for that is what Bergk is referring to) has no quotation from S. s.v. Διος, that entry is the same as in the other manuscripts of the Gudianum (c.f. Sturz 23·7, de Stefani 1·58·6). Page then proceeded to point out that a corrupt form of Bergk's fragment lurked within the lexicon of Cyril in Cod. Bodl. Auct. T II (11) f.90 Διος ουμα παρα Στηςιχόρω. This was first published by Kurt Latte in Mnemos. 3 ser. 10 (1942) 84 = Kl. Schr. 669f, though as he himself noted, the entry in the 1940 edition of LSJ s.v. Διος (c.f. its Addenda p.2045) had already detected the reference to S. Latte's own remedy for the corruption was to suppose that the Bodleianus' entry really ended at παρα Στηςιχόρω with the remainder as a correction of the beginning. Thus, presuming ο to be the article and not an abbreviation for δος δ αιων we will have had in the archetype Διος δ παρα Στηςιχόρω where the nonsensical form Δις will itself be a corruption of the word Δις a correct variant for the lemma Διος. The true reading will be: αιως ο
αἰῶν παρὰ Στηξιχόρωι.

Lloyd-Jones, who re-checked the Bodleianus’ reading ap. Page, preferred to interpret it as a conflation of two separate entries: ‘Αἰών’ δ(νωμα) παρὰ Στηξιχόρωι. Αἰών’ δ αἰῶν.¹ This conjecture has been resoundingly confirmed by the identification of Bergk’s source as Cod. Phil. Gr. 158 (fol. 5r) and the discovery of a fresh (Cod. Vind. Phil. Gr. 23 (fol. 7v)) recorded by Page in 1967.² Both read “Αἰών’ δ(νωμα παρὰ Στηξιχόρωι.

Choeroboscus ap. An. Ox. Cramer ii 171.19 explains the word: Αἰών’ εἰμαίνει δὲ τὸν ἀκούοντα ... ἀπὸ τοῦ Αἰῶν, Αἰών. However unlikely we may find this there is no alternative solution. We can dispense then with such wretched attempts at emendation as are listed by Vürtheim ad loc. (p. 93).

¹ Since, in Lloyd-Jones’ emendation no less than Latte’s, the senseless Αἰών can be explained as a corruption of Αἰών, it is misleading of Page (in P.M.G., though not in his article of 1959) to enclose Αἰών in angular brackets as if it had left no trace at all in the Παραδόσις.

ἀξετάλιος, though long known to editors of S. (e.g. Kleine p.132 etc.), was omitted from all editions of LSJ. as Page observed ad loc. (P.M.G. p.127). It is now in the 1968 Supplement (p.6), though little good it does us, since its meaning remains obstinately opaque.
On the halcyon in general see D'Arcy Thompson, A Glossary of Greek Birds\textsuperscript{2} pp.46ff.
&nu;ψαλος is glossed with &delta;λαβής a word whose
basic meaning ("such that there is no βλάβη") is wide
enough to make some of its manifestations appear active,
some passive (see my note on 244 P). It is hard then to
see why LSJ s.v. should automatically render the Stesi-
chorean adjective as passive ("unhurt"). Even more
culpable is Meyer's assumption (p. 53) that the epithet is
active ("doing no harm"), for he ties to this the guess
that the child mentioned is the Iliupersis' Astyanax
described in Eur. Tro. 765: τόνδε παίδα ... οὐδὲν αἴτιον.

Note that Ψαλος does not occur in LSJ.
For S.'s tendency to begin his poems with an appeal to the Muse(s) see my note on the opening lines of the two Pali-nodes (193 P) (a) and (b) and compare 210 P (the Oresteia: Μοῖσα κυ μὲν πολέμους ἀπωκαμένα κτλ.) 240 P (δεύτερες Καλλιόπεια λίγες) 275 P ("optima Calliope miranda poematibus").

As to the form of S.'s epithet, we might expect the first element to be ἀρχέ-, comparing ἀρχέκαιος (Il.5.62f), ἀρχέωροος (Bacch. 9.12), ἀρχεδίκας (Pind. Pyth. 4.110) or ἀρχέπολις (Pind. Pyth. 9.54). Such constructions are common in tragedy (e.g. Eur. Tr. 151 ἀρχέχορος and also in proper names (e.g. the Homeric Ἀρχέλοχος (Il.2.823, 12.100, 14.464) and Ἀρχεπτόλεμος (Il.8.128, 312) Ἀρχέ-μοοος, the posthumous name of Opheltes, or the Ἀρχηγος who features in Schwyzer, Dialectorum Graecorum exempla epigraphica potiora (1923) 723.1). ἀρχεσιμολπος however is to be explained by analogy with such alternative epic formations as ταλα-πενθής / ταλας-φρων, τανύ-πτερυξ / τανυς-πτερος, ἐληκ-χτων / ἐλκες-ππλος.1 Numerous other epic examples in E. Risch, Wortbildung der hom. Sprache2 (1974) p.192. Compare too Alcman's Ἀγησιχόρα (1.53, 57, 77, 79, 90 P) and Bacchylides' epithet for

---

1Metrical considerations play their part here of course, since ἐλκες-ππλος would be a useless form for the epic hexameter.
Urania (6.10): ἀναξίμωλος.

Personal names are far less often formed thus: only Archesilas from 5th century Argos (Bechtel, Die gr. Personnamen ² (1894) p.84 = Die hist. Personnamen des Griechischen (1917) p.84).
On the analogy of the antithesis between δίτερον ("joyless": Homer, Simonides, Aeschylus etc.) and επιτερεύον ("pleasing, joyful": H.H. Ap. 413, Plato etc.) one expects a similar contrast between δεπερπνος and an implied επιτερπνος (whose comparative form is presented by the MSS. at Thgn. 1066: see West's app. crit. for scholars' objections to it) especially since the simplex τερπνός is an amply attested form (only v.l. at Od. 8.45; but c.f. West's Index to Vol.2 of Iambi et Elegi Graeci s.v. τερπνός (p.238)).

The grammarians of antiquity offer a doubly impossible explanation of δεπερπνος. (1) the use of δεπερ as a prefix is without parallel; (2) the notion of syncope of ο under these circumstances is highly implausible: see O Szemérenyi, Syncope in Greek and Indo-European (1964) ch.3 pp.258ff.

This is the first of a series of fragments wherein, in one sense or another, the use of a word is attributed to both S. and Ibycus. Here is a complete list:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>δεπερπνος</th>
<th>Stesichorus 251 P</th>
<th>Ibycus 328 P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἔξοδεν</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>252 &quot; 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λευκιππος</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>256 &quot; 285.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βρυαλκται</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>258 &quot; 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δρείχαλκος</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>260 &quot; 282ή.42-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πηνέλοψ</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>262 &quot; 317ή.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χάρμα</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>267 &quot; 340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D.L. Page, in his famous article on Ibycus' Polycrates ode (Aegyptus 31 (1951) 167) put forward an ingenious explanation of the phenomenon:¹ "Evidently it was found impossible to make a certain distribution between the two West Greek poets of the choral lyrics which survived from the sixth century ...... In most or all cases we suspect that the extant testimonies make the best of two worlds: one part of the tradition had assigned these things to Ibycus, another to S. The later compiler therefore finds records of them in both poets and tells us in the end that they occurred in "S. and Ibycus" not "S. or Ibycus". One grammarian assigned ξυράλκαται to Ibycus; another to S. Both were alluding to the same passage of an old lyric poem. The later compiler reads the grammarians, not the poets; he therefore finds authority for the phenomenon in both poets, not in one only."

This hypothesis may apply to some or many of the above instances, but it would be unwise to use it as a blanket explanation: After all, we do know now for a fact that the word αἰσθεῖσαρισα occurred in the texts of both poets (S 15 ii 5 (the Geryoneis): 317Â 2P) as did the phrase ἑρωλικοὶ ἄμαρ (S89.11 (the Iliupersis): 282·P = S 141 14 - 15). There is nothing in the least incredible in the notion that the two lyric poets of Magna Graecia had several coincidences of vocabulary, nor in the idea that Ibycus borrowed several phrases from his famous

¹Developing remarks made by Wilamowitz, Textg. der. gr. Lyr. p.33 n.2.
predecessor. In the present case, however, the phrase παρὰ 'Ρηγύνοις vel. sim. might seem to tell against S.'s use of δέκοντος as R. Holsten, de dialecto Stesichori et Ibyci et copia verborum (Diss. Greifsw. 1884) p.53 n.25 and Wilamowitz, Textg. p.33 n.2 observe. But some such words as <καὶ παρὰ 'Ιμεραίοις> might easily have dropped out.

252 P

See M. Lejenne, Les adverbs grécoques en -δεν (Bordeaux 1939).
In spite of the ancient lexica's claims, most readers, I imagine, would prefer to derive this otherwise unattested epithet of Heracles from ζφάλλω. (As do most modern lexicographers s.v. So, for instance, LSJ ("overthrowing much"), and Frisk and Chantraine in their etymological dictionaries).

On the meaning of the word see Barrett ad Eur. Hipp. 732-4 (p.300). "Alexander (epic, and thereafter as a borrowing from epic) is in Homer always an epithet of πέτρη, of uncertain meaning and etymology: the borrowers evidently understood it as 'high' or 'sheer'." See further A. Sideras, Aeschylus Homericus (Hypomnemata 31 (1971)) p.139f.

As for the form, it is hard to tell whether the lexica's ἀλίβατος is the usual banalisation which the book-text quotations present (c.f. χολωσαμένη (223.4) or ἀμύχανα (244.1) etc.) or genuine. Compare the uncertainty between μᾶλα and μῆλα in 187.1, κάδεα and κηδεα in 232 P. ἀλίβατος in Pind. 01.6.64 and Theocr. 26.10 is usually dismissed as an artificial Doricism.
Herodian's reference to S. doubtless derives from Aristarchus' annotation of the Homeric passage. I borrow my text of ΣΒΤ 11.21.575 from Nickau, Untersuchungen zur Textkrit. Methode des Zenodotos v. Ephesos (Berlin 1977) p.34 n.2, whose general discussion (p.34f) of the whole problem is fundamental. He happens to be dealing with this topic at all because Zenodotus was one of the τινες who believed in the word κυνυλαγμός, as we learn from Didymus (ap. ΣΤ 11.21.575: τινός φησιν Ἀρίσταρχος γράφειν "κυνυλαγμόν" οἶνον κυνὸν ὄραμόν· οὗτο καὶ Ζηνόδοτος). In fact there have always been good reasons for not believing in it, and Nickau has added to them. Since, as the unemended Homeric line and several other loci attest, the unadorned substantive ὄραμός per se signifies "baying" or "barking", the variant κυνυλαγμός seems strangely otiose. See especially E. Risch, "gr. Determinativkomposita", I.F. 59 (1947) 291, who observes that a new creation of the type envisaged here "geht auf ein oder mehrere schon bestehende Komposita zurück, die ihrerseits gar nicht immer Determinativkomposita zu sein brauchen."

Ancient grammarians were no less wary of the form. Herodian, after quoting the Stesichorean phrase, goes on to give excellent grounds for objecting to its latter part: verbal nouns that end in -γυμός always place the verbal element first as in παλαγμός, ἐμπαλαγμός, κυραγμός,
ɛκκηρυγμός, etc. This adequately explains the formation of ὀλαγμός (which apart from its Iliadic occurrence stays submerged until 4th century Attic prose: contrast ὀλαγμα in Tragedy) as from ὀλάκω (a verb of the Kaiserzeit). And it ruthlessly exposes the total lack of parallel for a -γυμος verbal noun in which the substantive usurps first place. No wonder Nöthiger (who perfectly understood the difficulties just raised) could find no closer formations to compare than such terms of abuse as κυναμύα (II.21.394, 421), κυναλόπηξ (Arist. Lysistr. 957) or κυνόδους (= κυνόδων): Epicharmus fr.21.3 Kaibel).

Two conclusions inevitably follow from these lucubrations. κυνυλαγμός is an impossible formation; but a fortiori it would never have occurred to any ancient Greek had not some supposititious authority for it been found in some text.

This second deduction has independent support in the τινες mentioned in the scholia cited above as supporting Zeno­dotus' bizarre predilection, and in Aristonicus' report that ἐν τις γράφεται κυνυλαγμόν (see ΣΑ II.21.575 (5.256 Erbse)).

---

I give the original Greek of Herodian's remarks for convenience's sake (text Nickau's again): οὖχ δρώμεν δε τι πλέον (πλ. B, πλέον T) ἐκ τῆς συνθέσεως ὁ γαρ ὀλαγμὸς καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ προσκετέθαι τὸ δόμα ἵνα ἐπὶ κυνῶν ἀκούεται, ὡς ὁ κρεμετεριμὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ἵππων. ἄλλως τὸ τὰ εἰς-γυμος δηματικά μετὰ προθέσεως πέφυκε συντέθεθαι, τῆς αὐτῆς τάσεως μενούσης, μετ' ἄλλου δὲ οὔδενός, οἷον (μετ- οίον T, om. B) παγμός ἡμπαγμός, κηρυγμός ἐκκηρυγμός. καὶ τὸ ὀλαγμὸν οὖν παρὰ τὸ ὀλάκω (ὑ. T, ὀλάκειν B) γεγονὸς οὐ συντεθήκεται μετ' ἄλλου μέρους λόγου. συνδέσμοι οὖν ἐπὶ τὸν ὦ τοῦ "ἐπεὶ κεν ὀλαγμὸν ἀκούση" (ἐν -ακ. T, om. B.)
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It is hard to see how S. can have been brought to swallow this enormity without some sort of written evidence. The dispensability of \( \kappa \nu \) following \( \varepsilon \pi \iota \alpha \) (Chantraine, Gramm. Hom. 2·256ff) will have helped. S. is at least less culpable than those who interpreted \( \delta \iota \alpha \varepsilon \kappa \tau \iota \eta \nu \) (\( \varepsilon \rho \iota \varsigma \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon \)) at 11·1·6 as \( \delta \iota \alpha \varepsilon \kappa \tau \iota \eta \nu \) (\( \varepsilon \rho \iota \varsigma \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon \)): see Gow's note on Theocr. Syrinx 14 (2·557).

In Homer, the metrically alternative \( \delta \iota \kappa \iota \epsilon \rho \varepsilon \kappa \iota \omicron \varsigma \omicron \)oc is more common than \( \delta \iota \kappa \iota \epsilon \rho \varepsilon \kappa \iota \omicron \varsigma \omicron \)oc, especially in the line-end formula \( \delta \iota \kappa \iota \epsilon \rho \varepsilon \kappa \iota \omicron \varsigma \omicron \) \( \delta \iota \kappa \iota \epsilon \rho \varepsilon \kappa \iota \omicron \varsigma \omicron \) which appears eleven times in the Iliad (Schmidt, Parallel - Homer p.25). Both forms bear the same meaning as the epic adjective \( \delta \iota \kappa \iota \epsilon \rho \omega \nu \) ("boundless, countless"; see my note on 184 P = S 7·4) and the present connection with an already eccentric \( \kappa \nu \nu \lambda \alpha \gamma \mu \omicron \omicron \)c rings very odd. Perhaps the closest parallel is Od. 11·620ff: \( \delta \iota \zeta \omicron \nu \)...

In isolated quotations like the present, it is always difficult to decide whether such features as the epic -\( \omega \)o endings here are genuine or not. Endings in -\( \omega \)u would produce a smoother dactylic run.

Bergk thought the phrase (which he emended to the dat. sing.) to have emanated from the Geryoneis (p.231). Did he connect it with the behaviour of Geryon's dog and first cousin removed Orthus? Bernage, de Stesichoro Lyrico (Paris Diss. (1880)) attributed it to the Scylla, bearing in mind the Odyssey's description of that monster: \( \Sigma \nu \alpha \lambda \lambda \eta \).
δεινὸν λελακυῖα· | τῆς ἕ τοι φωνῆ μὲν δὲν σκῦλακος νεογυλῆς | γίγνεται (12·85ff). Σ ad loc. glosses δεινὸν λελακυῖα
with ὑλακτοῦσα and the name Scylla was of course associated with σκῦλαξ: see Od. 12·86f: τῆς ἕ τοι φωνῆ μὲν δὲν
σκῦλακος νεογυλῆς | γίγνεται. O. Bruno, Helikon 7 (1967)
323ff accepts the possible parallel but prefers to derive
our two words from the Nostoi. All of which goes to show
how utterly futile is the attempt to provide a decent home
for fragments so totally without context: Cerberus might
have barked thus in the poem named after him, so might
hunting dogs in the Suotherae; and one could go on.
One thinks at first of such Homeric formations as λεύκο-
απίς (II. 22·294), λευκόλευκος (II. 1·55; Od. 6·239
etc.) and also of personal names like Άευκοθή (Od. 5·
334) and Μελάννεπος (II·8·276 etc.) to say nothing of
As usual, it is difficult to say whether proper name or
epithet came first.

Eustathius cites this fragment to prove that, contrary to
the grammatical rule, aspiration within a compound
becomes inoperative not only in personal names but also
in adjectives. In fact there is no such rule: the
aspirate can survive or not, both in the former (e.g.
"Ανθίππος, "Εφιππος, Πλαύκιππος, Κράτιππος: more instances
in Meister, Die homerische Kunstsprache (1921) 215f) and
the latter.

Mayer p. 21 suggests that S. used the epithet of the
Dioscuri, who may have been mentioned in one of the
Palinodes or numerous other poems. See Eur. I.A. 1154:
("Διος .. παιδ'") ἵπποις μαρμαροντ', Hel. 638: κόροι
λεύκιπποι and Kannicht's note on Hel. 204-9 (2·76).
On the dances here described see also Hesychius s.v. 

βρυσαλίχα (1.351 Latte): πρόσωπον γυναικεῖον· παρὰ τὸ γελοῖον καὶ αίσχρον ὁ δρόμος τίθεται ὁ ὅρνηθι τὴν ὀρχήστραν καὶ γυναικεῖα ἱμάτια ἐνεσθέντα. ὃθεν καὶ τὰς ἁμαρταὶς βρυσαλίχας καλοῦσιν ἄθλους, ἵδι. s.v. β(ρ)υσαλίχα (1.353 Latte): χοροῖ τινες ὀρχηστῶν, παρὰ ἄθλους. Pollux s.v. βαρυλλίκα: τὸ μὲν ἐδρημα Βαρυλλίχου (vel. sim.) προσωρχούντο δὲ γυναικεῖς 'Ἀρτέμιδι καὶ Ἀρόλλωνι. That the noun βρυσαλίκας signifies some sort of noise is suggested by two more Hesychian entries: βρυσαλιμύλον· ψόφων, ἥχου καὶ βρυσαλίζων· διαφόρεσσον (both 1.350 Latte: their significance was first seen by C. Sittl, Gebärden der Gr. und Röm. (1890) 230).

The best modern treatment of the phenomenon (and the corrupt lexical entries which are our sources for it) comes from Nilsson, Gr. Feste von relig. Bedeutung (1906) p.186f. See too Latte, "De saltationibus Graecorum", Religionsgesch. Versuche und Vorarbeiten 13 (1913) 8f, and 31. It would indeed be interesting if these bizarre Laconian "war-dances", which somehow involved the dressing of men in women's garb, and the donning of frightening masks, all to the accompaniment of songs and αἰσχρολογία meant somehow to honour Apollo and Artemis, were known to the two West Greek lyric poets. But it is not perfectly plain what these two authors are being credited with. However, ἡπειδούμφοι would read oddly as an additional
gloss on βρυαλίκταί intruded by Hesychius himself, since it does not correspond to what else we know of these dancers from the lexica. It would make better sense as an adjective applied by the two poets in question to people engaged in the dances. Latte's punctuation βρυαλίκταί· πολεμικοί ὀρχηταῖ "μενεδουμοι" would be consonant with this and would achieve the same end as Hermann's (βρυαλίκταί: μενεδουμοι more economically. It also agrees with the common lexicographical idiom whereby an explanatory gloss is inserted between the first and second word of the phrase which is being explained. Compare the Suda's "πηκτον"· τὸ κατακεκυματῶ "ἀροτρον" (4·124 Adl.: c.f. II·10·353 = Od. 13·32). Numerous other instances produced by Nauck in his review of Papageorgiou's edition of the Sophoclean scholia (Mélanges Gr. -Rom. 6 (1892) 39, a reference of which I should still be ignorant were it not for Professor Kassel).

The only other instance of μενεδουμοι which LSJ can cite is Orph. Argon. 539 (θεα μ. Αθηνη). Our closest analogy will be μενεκτυμοι in Bacch. 17·1, and both words will be modelled on such epic formations as μενε-χάμυς, μενε-δητος, μενε-πτόλεμος. The first element is immediately explicable. Note, however, that in these two words alone do δούμοι and κτύμοι forsake their customary signification of noise ("thud", "crash" and the like). Everywhere else that meaning is maintained, be
it in the simplex (Il. 11.364: δοῦμος ἄχοντα, 12.358f: Κτύμος ... γακέων are but two of numerous examples) or in compounds like ἄντι-δουμος, ἄπιδο-δουμος, ἑργ-δουμος etc. Here, uniquely, the two sound words expand to embrace the more general meaning "war", in the fashion of ἄντι and ἑργ. It would be satisfying to know if S. was the first to promote this change.
Choeroboscus, who lived from the sixth to the seventh centuries A.D., lectured on the works of older grammarians such as Theodosius, and we have here the result of notes taken from his remarks on the latter. Since Theodosius himself is extracting from the works of Herodian (a grammarian contemporary to Marcus Aurelius) we face a complex problem of abbreviated sources, on which see Hilgard, Gramm. Graeci IV 1 pp. LXXIV ff.

P.J. Bicknell, Apeiron 2 (1968) 10ff, has explained why this fragment is potentially "of very great importance for the history of Greek astronomy" if we accept its surface implication that S. referred to the planet μεσόνυξ. Since this article is rather inaccessible, I give a summary of its findings here. Seven "planets" were eventually known to the ancients (Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, the Sun, Venus, Mercury and the Moon), and our fragment would seem to prove (A) that one of the three whose orbit lies outside the Earth's (Saturn, Jupiter, or Mars) was distinguished from fixed stars as early as S., as these latter alone can be seen at mid-night. (The inner planets are observable only near sun-set or sun-rise). It also proves (B) that when S. made the present allusion no more than one outer planet was known: it is unlikely that a name with this etymology would long survive the discovery of the other planets visible at mid-night. Mesonux was presumably discovered by the Greeks later than Venus, the most conspicuously bright of all planets (see Hes. Theog. 381ff and West ad loc. (p. 272) who imagines it is "the
only planet mentioned in Greek literature before the fourth century B.C.) whose twin manifestations 'Εωρφόρος and Φωρφόρος may even have provided models for the name Μεσονυξ (a planet that appears περὶ μέσας νόκτας: for the phrase see Xen. Anab. 7.8.12 etc.). Bicknell suggests Mars as the likeliest candidate for identification with Mesonux: it is appropriately brilliant at the perihelic opposition, and circles the zodiac in a mere 780 days, while its rivals among the outer planets, Saturn and Jupiter, take more than 29 years and c. 12 years respectively, the former being not at all bright. The name Πυρόςις is not attested for Mars until Plato Rep. 617A or possibly [Arist.] de mundo 392A 25ff etc. Unfortunately, since we know so little of S.'s dates, the above deductions are rather less useful than Bicknell supposes. Our fragment provides the only instance of the word, which E. Risch, Mus. Helv. 2 (1945) 16 characterises as "höchst künstliche" and "offenbar selbst vom Adjektive μεσονύκτιος retrograd abgeleitet" (on which adjective see Risch 16ff). The first statement must not, of course, be taken as incompatible with a popular etymology. Seeliger (p.37) noted that Troy traditionally fell at midnight (c.f. Il·Parv. fr.12 (Allen p.132f): νυξ μὲν ἑν μεσάτι, λαμπρὴ δ’ἐπέτειλε σελήνη. Eur. Hec. 914: μεσονύκτιος ὄλλῳμαν, Fraenkel on Æsch. Ag. 826 (2.380)) and wondered, in passing, whether our fragment had the same significance and belonged to the Iliupersis. The suggestion is too ingenious to be totally suppressed, far
too speculative to be taken very seriously, especially since we have no reasons to suppose S. used ᾿μήκονυξ as anything other than a noun.
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As to the form of the word, its initial element derives not from the stem of ᾿ὅρος (as e.g. in ᾿ὅρει-ϐιος (Opp. Cyn. 3.345) or ᾿ὅρει-κύλις (Il.1.268, Hes. fr.209.5 MW etc.)) but from the locative dative singular as in ᾿ὅρει-ϐάτης, ᾿ὅρει-δρόμως, ᾿ὅρει-κτιτός, to give but a few of the numerous later examples. Creations from locative dat. pl. are somewhat rarer but c.f. ᾿ὅρει-τρώος in Homer, ᾿ὅρει-φοιτός etc. See further E. Risch, Wortbildung der hom. Sprache² (1974) p.219f.
D'Arcy Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds*\(^2\) pp.248-9 collects much information about this species of wild duck. The fragment of Ibycus referred to is presumably that quoted by Athenaeus 9 388 E: τοῦ μὲν πετάλοις ἐπ’ ἀκροτάτοις ἠζάνοις ποικίλαι αἰολόδειροι | πανέλοπες λαθιπορφυρίδες (τε) καὶ ἄλκυόνες ταυσίπτεροι. c.f. Alc. 345 LP: ὀρνιθες ... πανέλοπες ποικιλόδειροι ταυσίπτεροι.

For the mythological connection between the πανέλοψ and Penelope see my note on 225 P (p.1059 above).
Strabo is illustrating the idiom whereby πόλις can mean "land" or "country". He goes on to give further examples: Soph. T.G.F. 4 F 411 (Paet) (from the Mysians): Ἀκίδα μὲν ἡ κόμπας κατεταί, ἤὲν, πόλις δὲ Μυκῶν Μυκία προσήγορος, and Eur. fr. 658 N²: οἱ γῆν ἠχουὲ Εὐθοίδα πρόσχωρον πόλιν. This does not exhaust the phenomenon by any means: see Eur. fr. 730 N²: Ἑπεκα Πελοπόννησος εὐτυχὲς πόλις. More instances in LSJ s.v. πόλις II ("country, as dependent on and called after its city.") The usage is especially connected with islands, though see Platnauer on Arist. Peace 251 (p. 89f). For the reverse process whereby γῆ, χθὸν or χώρα are used for πόλις see Eur. Tro. 868, Phoen. 636, 1058, I.A. 535, Arist. Thesm. 109 etc.

---

¹It is odd then that he should misremember II·24·544 both here (in the middle reference of the three above) and at 13.8 when the MSS. read ἔδος for πόλιν in both places.
This is the first attested reference in Greek literature to those fascinating but mysterious beings the Telchines. Good general accounts in P. Friedländer's article in Roscher s.v. and Herter's article in RE s.v. Thanks to the publication of Callim. fr.1 (1 and 7) Pf. such definitions as are provided by Eustathius, Hesychius s.v. (βάσκανοι, γόντες, φθονεροί) and Suda s.v. ((4·521 Adler) πονηροὶ δαίμονες Ἦ ἀνθρωποὶ φθονεροὶ καὶ βάσκανοι) can now be fully understood. Unfortunately we are still less clear than we should like as to the exact significance of S.'s mention of the Rhodian Telchines. But since it now seems probable that the Φχρες were originally conceived of as malignant spirits (see especially Malten, RE Suppl.4 s.v. Ker (883·13ff), who compares words like κηραίνειν and ἀκήρατος, Nilsson, G.G.R. 1·206ff, and Jacoby, Sitzb. Berl. Ak. Wiss. 1931 p.101 n.1 = Kl. Schr. 1. p.538 n.24) one instantly sees why S. should have described one set of evil-working beings in terms appropriate to another. Rhodes' share in the founding of numerous Sicilian colonies (Gela, Acragas etc.) may explain how S. came to know of that island's magicians (so C. Blinkenberg, Hermes 50 (1915) p.293f n.1).

σωτόςετείς remains problematical: it is a late prose word (see LSJ s.v.I) and presumably originates here from Eustathius himself who uses it (of metaphorical darkness lifted from the eyes) in his account of the conquest of Thessalonica (p.32 l.10 in Kyriakidis' edition). Wilamowitz (Nachrichten der Kgl. 1147)

1 That is no reason to follow O. Crusius (Roscher 2·1145·24ff) in impugning the validity of the gloss.
Gesellschaft der Wissensch. zu Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1895 p. 242 n. 5 = Kl. Schr. 52 p. 32 n. 5) suggested that some such expression as \text{τελχίνες} δὲ οἱ ὀσς καλυφαν is the basis of Eustathius' remark. He compared Et. Mag. s.v. \text{Τελχίνος} on τελχὴ ἐς \text{Θάνατον καταφορά}, and Blinkenberg, sup. cit. adds Et. Gud. s.v. \text{Τελχίνος}: λέγεται δὲ τελχὴ καὶ ἐς \text{Θάνατον μεταφορά}, Steph. Byz. s.v. \text{Τελχίς}: λέγονται καὶ τελχίνες ἁλυκᾶς αἱ ὑπὸ πληγῆς ἐς \text{Θάνατον καταφορά} and the Suda s.v. \text{Θέλης} (2.689 Adler) ἀγαπᾷ ἂν κακοτ, ἀμαυροτ, σκοτοὶ ἂν ἀπατᾷ. The ancient derivation of \text{Τελχίνες} from \text{Θελγίνες} (see Friedländer sup. cit. 241.56ff, Herter sup. cit. 198.35ff) would explain these latter definitions. See now D. Bremer's remarks in his Licht und Dunkel in der frühgr. Dichtung (Bonn 1976) pp. 41-3 on Greek words for darkness and darkening as synonyms for death and killing. 271 P on the eclipse of the sun seems likely, on this interpretation, to be irrelevant. Wilamowitz's explanation, accepted by Malten, RE Suppl. 4 885-63 and Friedländer, Roscher 5.237.10f, is far and away the most plausible. Earlier attempts to solve the problem are listed by O. Crusius in Roscher s.v. Keren (2.1145.30ff). He is rightly sceptical of them, but his own solution - that the Telchines, like the Keres, possess malicious and magical powers to destroy crops - hardly convinces, and is only obtained by ignoring the word σκοτῶσεις (see p. 1147 n. 1). Even less desirable is Blinkenberg's alternative suggestion (sup. cit.) that \text{Στηνίχωρος} here is a mistake for \text{Στηνίμυρος} (F. Gr. Hist. 107 F 26) whose mention of the Cretan Dactyls in F 12, similar in many ways to the Telchines though they be, does not entitle him to be dragged in here.
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Metre: dactylo-anapaestic (?)

The apparently irregular comparative or superlative of an -o stem adjective is in fact fairly common: c.f. Od. 2.190: ἄνιηρέστερον, Alcm. 2 (iv) 4 P: αἱδολοεστάτοι, 135 P: Φασεμέστατον. It seems particularly Sicilian: c.f. Epicharmus fr.186 Kaibel: Ἄ. δὲ καὶ ἀλλοεστέρον λέγει καὶ ἐπιηρέστερον καὶ ἀναγκαιέστατον καὶ ὀραεστάτον, id. fr.121: εὖωνέστερον. The irregular forms give a metrically convenient alternative to the normal -δερος, -στατος though this makes all the more remarkable ἄπονέστερον for ἄπονωτερον in Pind. Ol.2.62. The phenomenon was discussed by the ancient grammarian Philoxenus (see Theodoridis' edition (Berlin 1976) pp. 248ff).

As Nöthiger (pp.138-9) well observes, on the relatively rare occasions in the Iliad when the word ἄνδρον is attached to a superlative, the effect is not to elevate the hero thus treated from the level of his compeers, but to give an overall emphasis to the superlative.
The usage here attributed to S. and Ibycus, whereby χάρωμα signifies ἐπιδορατίς or the tip of a spear, was also employed by Pindar in Dithyramb 3 (fr.70c Sn.) according to the marginal scholium ad loc. Obviously relevant are two Hesychian entries s.v. ἀγ-χαρμον· ἀνωφερη τήν αἰχμήν (1.33 Latte) and s.v. καγχαρμον· το τήν λόγχην ἀνω ἔξειν [Μακεδόνες] (2.387 Latte).

But how did this meaning come about? P. Petersson, Beitr. zur idgm. Wortforschung (1912) p.222f associates it with a further Hesychian entry χαρία· βουνός ("hill, mound, a rising object") and χώρος ("a rock rising up out of the sea"): c.f. χήρ ("hedgehog") and Indo-germanic gher- (J. Pokorny, Indgm. Etymol. Wörterbuch 1.440 and other literature cited by Frisk G.E.W. s.v. χάρωμα (2) 2.1075).

I prefer the alternative hypothesis offered by Frisk himself (ib.) of a free poetic "expansion" of χάρωμα in its usual sense of "battle-joy", inspired by a word like (1) χαλκο-χάρωμα (interpreted on analogy with e.g. χάλκω-αντίς, χαλκο-χίτων) and (2) μευ-χάρωμα (interpreted on analogy with μευ-αίχμης). Note too that χάρωμα in Homer can mean not only "joy of battle" (LSJ s.v., (A) I) but also battle itself (ib. II), and that δόροι which is frequently used

1del. Latte. For an attempt to defend the word's relevance see Kallérís, Les anciens Macédoniens (1954) p.82f; contra, Latte's app. crit. ad loc.
of a spear or its shaft (LSJ. s.v., II (a)), occasionally bears the metaphorical meaning "war" (ib. 2). The application of the principle "things equal to the same thing are equal to one another" might have aided the process envisaged by Frisk.
The scholion is commenting on line 5's mention of τετρά-μοίραν νυκτός φυλακήν. Homer, in contrast, divided the night into three μοίρας (see, apart from the Odyssean line cited by the scholion, Il.10.252f (from the Δολόνεια): ἀνίκα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε, παροικωμεν δὲ πλέων νυξὶ τῶν δύο μοίρῶν, τριτάτη δ’ ἔτι μοίρα λέεινται). The Rhesus itself elsewhere alludes to a πέμπτην φυλακήν (542). Invention of the watches of the night is attributed to Palamedes by Gorgias Palam. 30 (c.f. Σ Eur. Or.432 (1.148 Schwartz). See above p.897.

Nöthiger (p.153) rightly emphasises that we cannot be sure whether the ἄπαξ πενταφῶλακος is a direct quotation from S. and Simonides as LSJ s.v. assumes. φυλακή with the meaning "watch of the night" first appears about the time of Herodotus (9.51.3: τῆς νυκτὸς ... δευτέρη φ. c.f. ib. 93.2, 44.1, Rhes. 542 sup. cit., LSJ s.v. I 4). πεντα- as the first element of a compound on analogy with ἐπτα- and δεκα- would have precedent in such Homeric forms as πενταετῆς (Od. 3.115: numerous Herodotean examples assembled on p.299 (column two) of Powell's lexicon to that author). πεντε- compounds seem to come later: πεντέ-κύριγγες Arist. Eq. 1049, πεντέλιῳ id. fr.366 K etc.

\[\textit{For the tendency of the Rhesus' scholia to comment on the drama's divergences from Book 10 of the Iliad see Ritchie, The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides (Cambridge 1964) pp.48ff.}\]
"Stesichori nomen a contextu alienum videtur": Page (P.M.G. p.183); "The name is probably corrupt": Paley (Hesiod p.120). These statements are presumably the fruit of doubts arising from the phrasing of the Hypothesis itself, doubts which were succinctly expressed by J. A. Davison (Eranos 53 (1955) pp.137-8 = From Archilochus to Pindar pp.82-3): "the words about S. and Hesiod do not look as if they were part of the original text of the Hypothesis, which balances Aristophanes (presumably of Byzantium), who thought the poem unHesiodic, against .. Megaclides ... and Apollonius of Rhodes, both of whom thought it genuine ... S.... is brought in in a way more suitable to an afterthought." The appearance of the early Greek lyric poet after the three late Alexandrians is surprising, but the collocation ὡς ... ὡς seems unobjectionable: see Denniston G.P.² p.199: "the former particle [denotes] that something is added, the latter that what is added is distinct from what precedes", and especially the list of examples on p.202" introducing the last item of a series."

The idea of a clumsy afterthought need not, then, be entertained. Nor that of corruption. After all, there are worse ways for a believer in the Shield's Hesiodic origin to arrange his material than that adopted here: the secondary evidence of the Alexandrian scholars is placed first, with the solitary voice of dissent allowed
to speak right at the start; then come the more favourable views - Megaclides grudging, Apollonius more enthusiastic; finally, as fitting climax, the news that the poem's authenticity was vouched for by a primary source, a poet of no less antiquity than S.

But must we accept the validity of the argument so effectively expressed? One obstacle to our so doing would seem to be the Hypothesis' failure to quote S's ipsissima verba. Instead we find Apollonius' deductions from internal evidence reproduced apparently faute de mieux. Still, I think it would be rash to assume, with Davison, that this absence of a direct quotation must be explained by a like absence in the works of the Alexandrian scholars who are the sources of the Hypothesis. For their original arguments are clearly being abbreviated here, and the Argument's compiler may well have decided that after he had summarised Apollonius' not altogether ineffective case, a mere reference to S. in the emphatic position explained above, was quite sufficient for his modest prefatory resumé of the facts. On such grounds, he could reasonably have omitted a quotation from S's poem, if he found one in any or all of the scholars on whom he is drawing. Indeed, there is a very strong possibility that at least one of these scholars inspired the reference to S. which we find so problematical. For we know that Megaclides elsewhere alluded to S's treatment of Heracles and, still more significantly, noted (229 P = 699 P) S's mention of the earlier lyric poet Xanthus (so
A final chronological problem. The actual description of Heracles' shield (Scut. 139 - 313) has been dated to the first part of the sixth century (Wilamowitz, SS p.240; R.M. Cook, C.Q. 31 (1937) 204 - 213; J.L. Myres, J.H.S. 61 (1941) 17 - 38). Those who innocently accept the Suda's date for S. (632 - 556) express amazement that S. should have attributed to the far earlier Hesiod a poem composed in the middle of his own lifetime (Davison p.82 followed by Bowra GLP p.80; for Hesiod's floruit c.f. West, Theogony pp.40 - 48). Even if the Suda were right, such amazement would be out of place: S. must have lived at a time when communications were difficult over any distances, and scholarly interest in the chronology and genuineness of Hesiodic works non-existent. Of course to our way of thinking, the later S.'s date the easier his mistake, and no misplaced reverence for the Suda's testimony should prevent us from lowering its limits should we think it necessary to place S.'s allusion at a more suitable date.

---

1 On the date see further Russo pp.29ff. P. Guillon, Le Bouclier d'Héralcles (1963) p.48 and n.62 (see above p. wishes to shift the usually accepted 590-660 to c.600 because he supposes that the Shield's depiction of a Theban hero helped by the Delphic Apollo against a local hero of Pagasae must reflect Theban expansion in N. Boeotia and that city's occupation of Ptoion. We know so little of the history of Greece at that period that such a guess cannot be proved or disproved. And even the date of the occupation of Ptoion is the subject of dispute: J. Ducat (REG 77 (1964) 283 - 92) reviewing Guillon's book casts considerable doubts on c.600 for archaeological reasons. The uncertainty over the exact time of the Shield's composition does not radically affect our own particular problem.
distance in time (say twenty years) from the terminus post quem which Cook fixed for the Shield (so West sup. cit. p.306). Alternatively, S. may have known an earlier version of the poem which lacked the disproportionate ἐκφοραῖς which dates the poem so late. Or did he use the name "Hesiod" in a generic sense, as earlier writers use Homer's?¹

These difficulties are more relevant to a chronological investigation of the relevant poets and need not concern us here. But we have seen that they need by no means rule out the notion that S. mentioned Hesiod in one of his poems. We now have several impressive parallels for this: not only Xanthus but Homer and Hesiod (in the Palinodes: 193 P) are now known to have been cited by name in S.: compare Simonides' direct naming of Homer and S. in 564-4 P, Bacchylides' direct naming of Hesiod in 5.119ff.² What poem of S. is meant by the Hypothesis?

"In Cycno id dictum iuisse vix dubites" says Kleine (p. 71) and no scholar has found a more plausible alternative. Both poems dealt with the same subject-matter, and what could be more natural than for S. to make some sort of reference to his predecessor's treatment? Unfortunately, we lack the detailed information that would allow us to

¹ Davison p.82 suggested that S. may have referred to the opening of the Shield as we possess it, which comes from the Κατάλογος Γυναικῶν (fr. 195-8ff MW). But since the composer of the Hypothesis recognises that 11 1-55 are not integral, it would be inept (or dishonest) for him to see a Stesichorean allusion to these as proof that the Shield is by Hesiod.

² For the possibility that Hesiod was mentioned by name (as Ἀλκευ) in Alcaeus or Sappho see West, Theogony p.87f n.3.
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reconstruct the precise nature of this reference. Carl Robert boldly declared that it was a criticism of Hesiod (Bild und Lied p.189, more explicitly Heldensage p.511) and this statement has been adopted by (1) those who share the belief that S.'s poem originally included the intervention of Zeus in the Kuklopes e.g. Stegemann pp. 10ff, Russo p.30) and think that the composer of the Scutum earned the rough edge of S's tongue by omitting this crucial feature. (2) By Guillon (p.16) who sees S. as retorting to the Theban propaganda implicit in the Shield. I hope I have given adequate reasons for my refusal to believe in the formers' reconstruction of S's poem (see above pp.697ff) and the latter's political interpretation. One can jettison them and still maintain the idea of criticism: S. might have had general objections to the changes Hesiod introduced into the tradition under the powerful influence of the Διομήδους Δριττεῖα. But perhaps the least implausible attempt to devise a motive for specific criticism is Robert's (Heldensage sup. cit.) when he suggests that S. thought it wrong for a mortal hero to wound the divine Ares. It is certainly true that the jejune synopsis which the Pindaric scholion has bequeathed us leaves no room for such a wounding of the god in S's account.¹

¹Indeed, any criticism of his predecessor by S. would have to be restricted to the immortals, since in his treatment of Heracles the lyric poet is far more exposed to blame than the earlier author. In the course of the Palinodes Hesiod was blamed for relating a version of a myth which was discreditable to the heroine Helen
S. mentioned Hesiod in the Cycnus; and we know that his treatment differed in one or two important details from the earlier poem. This tiny nucleus of fact will not allow us to advance very far. Either S. will have made a quite general admission of indebtedness to his predecessor, or he will have drawn attention to those discrepancies of detail of which we know, and perhaps to others of which we are ignorant. Whether the latter process, if it occurred at all, was critical in tone we simply cannot tell.

1 (contd..) (193-5-6 P). And yet in the Cycnus we find the detail of Heracles' initial rout which is not in Hesiod. On what conceivable grounds could S. have blamed that omission, which preserves the good name of Heracles just as his own Palinodes preserve Helen's?
References to Himera in S.'s poetry are presupposed by these three passages and those references are probably the sources of the overwhelmingly powerful tradition which connects S. with Himera.

Note that the passages do not say anything of S's being born at Himera.

In what connection S. came to make so personal a statement as that presupposed here we cannot tell. Kleine's guess (p.109) that it came from some such poem as the Daphnis (compare the mention of Himera in Theocr. 7.75) has nothing to commend it. The Geryoneis may be relevant: see p.71 n.1. For the common phenomenon of the transference of a river's name to its city compare Gelas- Gela, Sybaris etc.

Note that the phrase τὴν Σικελικὴν ... ἔλευθέραν ποιεῖ ... τῶν τυράννων is not to be taken literally (with e.g. Wilamowitz SS p.236 n.1) as referring to an actual act of S. It is merely a characteristically poetic feature of Himerius' high-flown and flowery style. Of the idiom whereby a poet is said to do what he merely describes, the three most famous instances are Vergilian: ecl. 6.46: Pasiphaen nivei solatur amore iuvenci .. 62: tum Phaethontiadas musco circumdat amarae | cortexis, atque solo proceras erigit alnos. 9.19f: quis caneret nymphas? quis humum florentibus herbis | spargeret, aut viridi
Other examples of this device are given by Leo, Hermes 37 (1902) p.25 n.2 = Ausgew. Schr. 2, p.39 n.2 and R. Kassel, Rh. Mus. 109 (1966) 9f. To them we may add the present passage (including the phrase omitted above (490 P)

'Ανακρέων ... κάκειτεν ἀγεὶ τοῦς Ἐρωτας) and Himer. or.

14.10 - 11 (= 48.10 - 11 Colonna) = Alcaeus fr.307c LP:

' ἕν μὲν οὖν θέρος καὶ τοῦ θέρους τὸ μέσον αὐτὸ διε ἔξερσις' Ἀλκαῖος ἀγεὶ τῶν Ἀπόλλωνα and Himer. or.

1.4 (= 9.4 Colonna) = Sappho fr.194 LP: (scil. Σαπφώ) ἔως ἐις ἔλθει μετὰ τούς ἀγῶνας εἰς θάλαμον, πλέκει παρτάδα, τὸ λέξος ετρόμνυσι, ἀγεῖτε παρόντος εἰς νυμφεῖον, ἀγητέ καὶ Ἀφροδίτην ἐφ' ἀρματι καρπίων καὶ χορὸν Ἐρώτων συμπαίστορα μηλ.

The present phrase then means only that S. celebrated Sicily's freedom from tyrants in some work or other, as is grasped by Schmid, G.G.L.1-1 p.470 n.1.

On the various writers exploited by Silius in these lines see J. Nicol, The Historical and Geographical Sources used by Silius Italicus (Cambridge 1936) p.172f.
On the text and content of Plutarch's passage, see now the excellent discussion by H. Görgemanns, Untersuchungen zu Plutarch's Dialog De Facie in Orbe Lunae (Heidelberg 1970) pp.125-6. As he observes, the fact that S. and Pindar are paired in both authors, implies a common source other than the original poetic texts.

Perhaps, as the Plinian passage would suggest, this was an astronomical treatise on eclipses, which contrasted the terror felt by ancient poets with the rational enquiries of scientists.

The phrase μέσω δώματι νόκτα γινομένην has no counterpart in the paean by Pindar, and Bergk (p.229) tentatively assigned it to S. (or Cydias). West follows him in his texts of the relevant fragments of Archilochus and Mimnermus (Iambi et Elegi Graeci Vol.1. p.49; Vol.2 p.89) where he prints "μέσω δώματι νόκτα γινομέναν" as a quotation. But even the citation of Pind. Pae. 9·2·3 by this author is rough paraphrase rather than exact reproduction; and the words that follow are more probably a free amplification of Pindar's original, with μέσω δώματι representing the Pindaric ἐν δῷμαι which Plutarch has omitted before κλεπτόμενον.

The poem in which Pindar mentions his eclipse being a paean, it has been suggested that S.'s mention likewise occurred in the paean(s) attributed to him by Timaeus (276B p). We know too little to be able to reject
or accept this guess.
A very great mystery: Hesychius tells us under the lemma referring to "dwellings sub-let to lodgers = inns" (c.f. LSJ s.v. ναούκαλησσος II) that some people called them "trading stations" and that S. used the phrase έμπορίως οίκως of an inn. The sentence seems perfectly intelligible and free from corruption, but few will be found to disagree with Page's verdict on S. "quem voc. έμ usum esse vix adducor ut credam" (P.M.G. p.134 ad loc.). Both word (which, predictably, recurs only in prose authors) and concept seem below S.'s usual level of dignity: in what context of heroic poetry could an inn have been mentioned? Aristophanes' Heracles can enter such a place in the course of his ναοναδίς and devour twelve cakes of bread there (Ran. 550ff) but so innately comic a detail can have as little contact with S.'s "graves Camenae" as the comedians' tradition of Heracles the uncontrollable glutton with the Κέρβερος (see my note on 206 P).
Wilamowitz's brilliant supplements were proposed during the course of his masterly review (Gottingische Gelehrte Anzeigen 1900 p.42) of Grenfell and Hunt's original publication in their second volume of Oxyrhynchus papyri (1899). He derived them from ΕβΤ (5·136 Erbse) which comments upon Lycaon's pathetic plea to Achilles ἐπιτείνετι τῷ φιλόζωλον δι' ὧν συγγνώμην ἔχοι, παρατείνων τά τῆς δεξήσεως. (For the scholia's tendency to remark upon such pathetic details in Homer, see now J. Griffin, C.Q. 26 (1976) pp.160ff.) The author of the remarks so restored is named by the papyrus as Ammonius: for a discussion of his identity see Grenfell and Hunt pp.53ff. As they conclude, the Homeric scholar of that name seems the likeliest candidate: on him see the remarks of Erbse, Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien (Zetemata 24 (1960)) 295ff, Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem 5 pp 78ff.

That someone in a poem by S. should indulge in μακρολογία will astonish no-one these days, acquainted as we are with the elaborate and lengthy Homeric speeches that adorn the Geryoneis and almost smother the latest find. That someone on the verge of death should make such a speech is no more of a surprise. Homeric antecedents (apart from the Lycaon scene) include the dying addresses of Patroclus (Il·16·844ff) and Hector (Il·22·338ff and 356ff).

For the notion of a delayed death as gain c.f. Aesch. Ag. 1300: δ δ' ὀστατός γέ τοῦ χρόνου πρεβεύσεται with Fraenkel's
note ad loc. (3.605f). Fraenkel quotes the explanation given in Triclinius' Ἐξολ. παλ. ad loc. (1.195 O.L. Smith): τίμιος ἦστι παρ' ἀνθρώποις, ὡς εἰν, ὁ ἄγατος χρόνος· δὴν γὰρ πρὸς τὸ τέλος ἥκοι, καὶ τὸ βραχὺ ζῆςαι κέρδος ἴγονται, and (ad 1301) cites Socrates' words in Plat. Phaed. 117A: οὐδὲν γὰρ οἶμαι κερδανεῖν ὁλύγον ὀστερον πιὸν ἀλλο γε ἡ γέλωτα ὀφλήσειν παρ’ ἐμαυτῶι, γλυκόμενος τοῦ ἅθν καὶ φειδίδμενος οὐδενὸς ἐτι ἐνόντος. One could cite other instances of the idea, negative and positive, besides the Stesichorean fragment: Soph. El. 1485f: τι γὰρ βροτόν ἄν σὺν κακοίς μεμιγμένων· ἐν ἐκεῖνον ὁ μέλλων τοῦ χρόνου κέρδος φέροι; Eur. Or. 789: τοῖ κρόνων δὲ κερδανεῖς (but see di Benedetto ad loc. (p.156)). Apollod. Caryst. fr.10 (3.284 Kock): οἱ γὰρ ἄτυχοντες τὸν χρόνον κερδαίνομεν (διόποσον αὖ ἄγνοω) μὲν ἄτυχηκότες· Ter. Hec. 286f: nam nos omnes quibus est alicunde aliquis obiectus labos, οἷον quod est interea tempū priu' quam id rescitumst lucrost. See οἷον Eur. Her. 143 (Lycus addressing Amphitryon): τίν' ές χρόνον ζητεῖτε μηκῶναι βίον;

Of course we have no idea of the identity of S.'s μακρολόγος (or μακρολόγοι if the papyrus went on to give more than one example). But since we must otherwise close our commentary on this fragment, and we have time and space to spare, there can be no harm (and possibly there may be considerable benefit) in examining a genuine curiosity of

1"B2, κερδανείν BT, unsuccessfully defended by Stallbaum": Fraenkel loc. cit.
scholarship. B. Gentili (in Gnomon 48 (1976) 747 and Il mito greco (Atti del convegno internazionale, Urbino 7 - 12 maggio 1973) p.301) suggests that the μαχρολόγος is Geryon. That is no more than possible. He also thinks that S 11 preserves his μαχρολογία. That is no less than incredible. It is hard to say which is the more preposterous, the picture of the half-dead Geryon engaged in metaphysical speculation as to whether he will perish or become immortal, or the notion that anyone in such a position could address the hero who had just killed him as ὄ φίλας (S 11·6). Gentili seems oblivious of the first absurdity. The second he seeks to defend by an appeal to Achilles' reply to Lycaon (Il·21·106) ἀλλά, φίλος, θάνε καὶ κύ. As if there begins to be the remotest point of contact between the savagely ironical words used by Achilles to his helpless victim and the predicament of the defeated Geryon.¹

¹ Misjudged by several commentators ad loc. (e.g. Leaf (2·393), Ameis-Hentze (7·100f)).

² The probably ironical use of the phrase κυ μεν φίλας in S 148 i 8 (see my note ad loc.) would be considerably more relevant, though it remains a thousand miles removed from the tone which Gentili seeks to impose on S 11·16.
The passages collected together above are essentially those assembled by Page with his customary diligence, economy, and clarity, to form Lamprocles fr. 735. The sigla used in distinguishing the various Aristophanic scholia are those employed by K.J. Dover in his commentary on the Clouds (see pp. cii - ciii and cxxvii - cxxviii). E(stensis) was first published by Holwerda, Mnemos. 4·5 (1952) 228ff, N(ea)p(olitanus) by Koster, ib. (1953) 62f. See now Koster, Schol. in Arist., Pars 1, Fasc. 3¹, schol. vet. in Nubes (1977) pp.iv - vi.


"La questione è, come si vede, ben imbrogliata" (Mancuso, La Lirica &c p.246). "E tanta testimoniorum confusione veritatem extrahere non possumus" (Page, P.M.G. p.379). Nevertheless, past scholars did make some progress towards the probable truth - I think especially of Wilamowitz's brief but trenchant appendix in Textg. d. gr. Lyr. pp. 84-5 - and now, not least because of Page's lucid presentation of all the relevant evidence on one page, we are as near as we shall ever be to a resolution of the enigma. The conclusions I should draw from this evidence are so close to those actually drawn by Dover (in his note on Nub. 967 (p.215)) that I feel no qualms about reproducing the latter virtually intact: $\varepsilon^R$ and $\varepsilon^E(1)$ have suffered in coherence from a series of minor corruptions, but
according to Σ^{E}(2) (3): (1) Eratosthenes said that a poem containing the words Παλλάδα περσέπολιν δεινάν θεόν ἔγρευκόδοιμον was mentioned by Phrynichus (the comic poet, presumably) as the work of Lamprocles ... (We hear of Lamprocles in Ath. 491^C [= 736 P] as a "dithyrambic poet.")

(2) "Some say" that τηλέπορον τι βόσμα λύρας was by Cydidas (sic) of Hermione. (3) Chamaeleon knew an alternative version of the first poem, Παλλάδα περσέπολιν κλειναν πολεμαδόκον ἀγναν παϊδα Διὸς μεγάλου δαμάσκιπον.

Statement (3) is amplified in a critical work of the third century A.D., P. Oxy. 1611, which asserts that Phrynichus used the verse Παλλάδα ... δαμάσκιπον and attributed it to Lamprocles, but reports that Chamaeleon in fact wondered whether it was by Lamprocles or by S. The most probable solution of this tangle... is: (i) Παλλάδα ... δαμάσκιπον [(a) above] is what Phrynichus wrote. (ii) Chamaeleon knew of a poem among the works of S. which contained the words Παλλάδα ... ἔγρευκόδοιμον [(b) above]. (iii) He did not know whether (a) there had existed a different poem by Lamprocles beginning with the same two words, or (b) the poem which he had regarded as S's was actually by Lamprocles. We do not know, either. (iv) Eratosthenes, as reproduced by Σ^{E}, has changed Chamaeleon's argument by condensing it; but he may not be fairly reproduced by Σ^{E}. So far as τηλέπορον τι βόσμα is concerned Σ^{RVE} knows that the next word was λύρας, and tells us that the poem from which the words are taken was found, as a fragment (ἀποκατσωμίου) by Aristophanes.
(sc. of Byzantium) in the (sc. Alexandrian) library. (This depends on a virtually certain emendation; \( \Sigma^{RVE} \) actually says that "[subject unnamed] found it in the library of Aristophanes"). We do not know the grounds of ascription to "Cydidas", whoever he was; presumably \( \text{Ku} \delta i \delta o \) in \( \Sigma^{RVE} \) is a corruption of \( \text{Ku} \delta i \delta o \), i.e. the Cydias mentioned in Pl. Charm. 155\( ^{D} \) and Plut. Mor. 931\( ^{E} \) (c.f. 714, 715 948 P): the name is written against a lyre-player leading a komos on a red-figure psykter (E 767) in the British Museum.

Supposing then, for the moment, that S. composed the line represented by (b) above. A commentary on S. may be expected to make the following observations:

\( \Pi \alpha l \lambda \dot{a} \alpha : \)

the name seems to have been used without the epic adjunct \( \text{\'A} \theta \nu \nu \nu \alpha \) \( \text{\'A} \theta \nu \nu \nu \alpha \) \( \text{\'A} \theta \nu \nu \nu \alpha \): see my note on 233 P.

\( \pi \rho \gamma \epsilon \pi \sigma \omega \lambda \nu : \)

in spite of the formal parallel provided by \( \text{\'A} \theta \nu \nu \nu \alpha \) \( \text{\'A} \theta \nu \nu \nu \alpha \) \( \text{\'A} \theta \nu \nu \nu \alpha \) in Callim. Hymn 5\( ^{4} \)43, the prevailing dactylic rhythm favours this spelling here. At first blush it may seem strange that the deity pre-eminently connected with citadels and cities, who is apostrophised as \( \text{\'E} \nu \zeta \pi \tau o \) \( \text{\'E} \nu \zeta \pi \tau o \) \( \text{\'E} \nu \zeta \pi \tau o \) (v.l. \( \text{\'E} \nu \zeta \pi \tau o \)) in Il\( \cdot \)6\( \cdot \)305, should receive this epithet. But the protectress of citadels is likewise established, from the earliest times, as a goddess of war (compare the Homeric epithet \( \text{\'A} \gamma \lambda \dot{e} \lambda \eta \), the Hesiodic \( \text{\'A} \gamma \dot{e} \zeta \tau \rho \alpha \circ \)). Both aspects are juxtaposed in the opening lines of H.H.11:
This last line reminds us that ἡπερέσπολις has the same force as the epic πτολίπορος which is applied to Ares (Il.20.152, Hes. Th. 936) and Enyo (Il.533: οὕτ' ἄρ') Ἀθηναίη οὕτε πτολίπορος Ἐνυω etc. The reversal of the elements in these two epithets may be compared with the similar switch observable between δακτός-θυμος and θυμο-δακτης. The verb πέρος/πέρσας is confined to cities in Homer (with πόλις as its favourite object, but also ἄστεα or πτολίπορον). For the goddess Athena as its subject c.f. Il.20.191f (Achilles loquitur): οὕτός ἔγω τὴν (scil. Λυσιννησίν) πέρσα μεθορμηθείς σὺν Ἀθηνη καὶ Διὶ πατρὶ. For the reason why this first element takes the form ἡπερε- rather than the expected ἡπερι- see Th. Knecht, Τετσύμβροτος (Zür. Diss. 1946) pp.33 and 43, who points out that the pre-Greek name Περεσέβον was later interpreted as a compound of πέρσας and φόνη with obvious results for similar formations. Περέσπολις is the name of a son of Telemachus in Hes. fr.221-3 MW, just as Πτολιπόρες features as a son of Odysseus in the Thesprotis (Kinkel p.218). In both cases the proper name will have post-dated the epithet.

Εὐληπτολίς (Aesch. Ag. 689) seems to be modelled on our

---

1On the spelling Περεσπολις as preferable to Περεσιπολις when dealing with the ancient capital of Persia, c.f. Wackernagel, Glotta 14 (1925) 36ff = Kl. Schr. 2.844ff.
epithet.

δεινὰν:

used as an epithet of Pallas in H.H. 11.2 sup. cit.,

Hes. Th. 924f: Ἀδηνὴν δεινὴν ἔγρευκόδοιμον κτλ. 11.5·

839, Od. 7.41.

ἔγρευκόδοιμον:

elsewhere only in Hes. Th. 925 sup. cit. (see West ad

loc. (p.413)) and late imitators (Pseudorph. Lit. 586 Ab.

γλαυκῆν δ' ἔγρευκόδοιμον ἀταμβέα Τριτογένειαν, Nonn. Dionys.

36.21ff: κούρη δ' ἔγρευκόδοιμος ... Παλλᾶς ἄμητωρ).
FRAGMENTUM ADDENDUM

Philodem. de piet. N. 1088 III (p.391 Gomperz)

κατ' Ἀπολλω[ν] | δη (T.G.F. I.152 F 3 Snell)) καὶ κατὰ
[Ἡς] | δοῦν καὶ κατὰ Στην | σίχορον ἐν[

[parr [ | φὴν ποι[νάς ὑπ'] | αύτοῦ τα[ροῦ] | τα[ι]]).

omnia suppl. Bücheler, exc. ποι[νάς ὑπ'] et τα[ροῦ] | τα[ι]
(Schober)

ἐν [Ὁρετεῖ] at Bücheler, ἐν [Ὑμουνη] στι Bergk καὶ
παρ' ἄ[c τὸ πρὶν | ἔφην ποι[νάς ὑπ'] | αύτοῦ τα[ροῦ] | τα[ι]]
Henrichs, καὶ παρ' ἄ[πριν ἔφην, τὸν [Κρόνον δι'] | αύτοῦ

"Deest ap. Page" as Snell says of the reference to S.
(T.G.F. 1 p.308) although Gomperz listed it in his index
under "S.", and Bergk knew it (see below). Snell gives
an obsolete text in which the apparent lack of context
seems to justify Page's omission up to the hilt. The
improved text which I print is once again due to Professor
Henrichs.

Snell prints Bücheler's supplement ἐν [ハウス] at and
tentatively interprets κατὰ [Ἡς] | δοῦν as a reference to
fr.23B MW. Philodemus would then be returning to the
subject of Iphigenia's deification at Aulis, hence the
juxtaposition of Hesiod and S., as in 215 P. This is
all very convenient and comforting, but the context of
the fragment as it now appears tells against this, as it
does against Bergk's notion (p.207) that our passage is
concerned with divinities "qui mala et contumelias
perpessi sunt" so that the allusion to S. concealed Heracles' ill-treatment of Helios and Oceanus in the Geryoneis (see p.207). In fact, Philodemus is talking of gods who were once imprisoned (he proceeds to mention Dionysus and Ares, to name only certain supplements).

"Secundum Apollonidem et Hesiodum et Stesichorum praeter eas quas supra attuli punitiones ..." was Schober's paraphrase of the opening of the fragment, and he reconstituted the missing lines before the initial mention of Apollonides as [καὶ ὁ Προμηθέως συνθεῖται κατὰ Ἀἰκσόλον καὶ] κατ' Ἀπ.

κατὰ τ' Ἡσιόδου will then be a reference to Theogony 521f and 616.

But what lies behind the phrase κατὰ Στηρίχορον? I do not believe we should see here a late justification for Vürtheim's attempt to insert Prometheus into the θῆλα ἐπὶ Πελλαί (p.58f above). The Titan's punishment might have been described at length in some work of which we know not even the title; or in passing in almost any poem whose title we possess. The Geryoneis is perhaps the likeliest of the latter group, because of the established link between its events and Prometheus. See especially Dion. Hal. A.R. 1.4.1: πεποιήται γὰρ αὐτῷ ὁ Προμηθέως ὁ Ἡρακλεῖ τά τε ἄλλα πρόλεγων ὡς ἔκαστον [αὐτῷ] τι συμβηκεῖσθαι ἔμελλε κατὰ τὴν ἐπὶ Γηρυόνην στρατεύων καὶ ὃν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἀλητικοῦ πολέμου κτλ. (= Aesch. Prom. Sol. fr.199 N);[1] c.f.

[1] Inaccurately referred to by Lloyd-Jones in The Justice of Zeus p.102: "It was the journey to the west after
Hygin. Poet. Astr. 2·6: Aeschylus autem in fabula quae inscribitur Προμηθεὺς Λυστεινος Herculam ait esse non cum dracone sed cum Liguribus depugnante. dicit enim quo tempore Herculae a Geryone boves abduxerit iter fecisse per Ligurum fines etc. Bergk's [Γηρύουνη]δι, then, may be right, though for the wrong reasons.

contd..

1 the cattle of Geryones that brought Heracles face to face with Prometheus.
As Haslam observes (p.13 n.9), there is an ambiguity about the exact classification of this metrical sequence. Diomedes' description of it as an hexameter bereft of its final syllable suggests dactylo-anapaest, but his Latin example with its spondaic third foot might be dactylo-epitrite or a mixture of the two. (D|X D: c.f. 210.1
212.1 P from the Oresteia, 223.1-2 P, 209.1.12 and 6
(Nostoi str.47)). Only context or responson could remove the uncertainty.

Diomedes' use of the word "tale" does not permit West's assumption (ZPE 4 (1969) p.137 n.4) that the Latin example is "not invented, like many of the Latin metricians' examples, but a translation" of an invocation by S. (and other justification for the idea there is none). Nor does his attempt to reconstruct this original (Καλλιόπεια φιλα νυστώμολπε - - - - ) scan as an angelicum.

(ii)

on West's emendation "Scilla" for "Sicilia" see p.1000.

1Compare Marius Plotius Sacerdos (507.19.22: Keil vi) who describes the verse as a catalectic hexameter but analyses it, in effect, as D x D. His Greek example, and that given by Servius (461.9 Keil iv) who calls the verse an hypercatalectic pentameter, share the metrical ambivalence of Diomedes' Latin phrase.
(iii)
this particular metrical sequence is now attested as
str.2 of the Nostoi.

(iv)
We find the archebulean at 244.1 P.
The encomiologus (D x e - ) is apparently represented by
232.2 P (see my note ad loc.) as well as str.2 of the
Lille Papyrus' poem. Str.3-4 of the Eriphyle represent
a rising version of this.
we find Athenaeus applying similar phrases to Alcman (600 F = 59 P: Ἀλκίμηνα γεγονέναι τῶν ἐρωτικῶν μελῶν ἡγεμόνα καὶ ἐκδοῦναι πρῶτον μέλος ἀκόλαστον δύνα καὶ περὶ τὰς γυναικάς καὶ τὴν τοιαύτην μοῦσαν εἰς τὰς διατριβάς... λέγει δὲ καὶ ὥς τῆς Μεγαλοκτῆτης οὖ μετρίως (Schweighäuser:συμμέτρως codd.) ἐρασθεὶς κτλ. c.f. Suda s.v. Ἀλκίμην (1.117 Adler.) καὶ δὲ ἐρωτικὸς πάνυ εὔρετής γέγονε τῶν ἐρωτικῶν μελῶν) and to Pindar (601 C: καὶ Πίνδαρος οὖ μετρίως δὲν ἐρωτικὸς φησὶ fr.127 Sn.) See too Plut. de Virt. mor. 6 p.445f (on Mimnermus fr.1A): ἀκόλαστων μὲν γὰρ αἰθέ φωναί, Suda s.v. Ἰῆμος (2.607 Adl.): γέγονε δὲ... ἐρωτομανέστατος περὶ μειράκια. Procl. Comm. in Plat. Parmen.317 (p.809 Stallbaum): Ἰῆμος... περὶ τὰ ἐρωτικὰ ἐκποιοῦσας.

Further examples of this type of transference of literary features into the poet's own life are collected and discussed by Welcker, Rh.Mus.2 (1834) 220ff = Kl. Schr. 1 228ff, who was the first scholar to consider the important question of the balance between convention and reality in the sort of poetry presupposed in (a). Of later discussions, P. Von der Mühll, "Persönliche Verliebtheit des Dichters?" Mus. Helv.21 (1964) 168ff esp.170ff = Ausgew. Kl. Schr. 231ff esp.234ff is crucial (F. Lasserre, Serta Turyniana (1974) pp.5ff brings the doxography up to date but hardly advances the issue). One should also consult J.A. Fairweather, "Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers", Ancient Society 5 (1974) pp.234 and 264. Whatever the truth of the matter, the phrases here used of S. imply the existence of
poetry quite different from the heroic narratives elsewhere connected with him. As we shall see there may be an assimilation with the later poet called by the same name. Or has the ubiquitous confusion between S. and Ibycus played its part? (For the latter's erotic poetry see below).

cuvěct郄e: Schweighäuser commented (in the Index Auctorum of his edition of Athenaeus (Vol.14 p.199)) "S. ludicrarum et amatoriarum cantilenarum princeps auctor:... sic enim intelligendum videtur verbum cuvěct郄e. non modo quod hoc genus carminum composuerit, sed quod primus illud invenerit". But as Kleine observed (p.101) this ignores Alcman's reputation as εφρετίκης... τῶν ἐρωτικῶν μελῶν in Athenaeus himself as well as the Suda (see above). Kleine's "composuit" is a more reasonable rendering of the verb.

As regards meaning, παδέων and παιδίων are as interchangeable as ἵππειος and ἱππικός (c.f. Wilamowitz, Gr. Verskunst p.423 n.1). When Bacchylides talks of παιδίων ὑμοί (fr. 4·80 Sn.) or Pindar (Is. 2·3) of παιδίους... ὑμοῦς, they are referring to the same genre, in which they themselves composed several poems (e.g. Bacch. fr.18 Sn., Pind. frr.123-4 Sn.).

---


2 This is not always so with -τικός and -εικός nouns: see, for instance, Dover on Ar. Clouds 204 (p.122).

3 The Bacchylidean poem was classed as an ἐφρετίκος by the Alexandrian editors who also recognised encomia as a classification of his work. Pindar's fragments were treated as encomia by the same scholars, who did not allow him erotica. For the extreme difficulty of classifying many an ancient poem, see A.E. Harvey, C.Q.5 (1955) 157ff. The discussion on pp.160ff of his article is most pertinent to this problem. See more generally L.E. Rossi, "I Generi Letterari e le loro Leggi νων Scritte nelle Lett.Class.", B.I.C.S.18 (1971) 69ff.
Is.2·3 (3·213 Dr.) observes: διε δὲ περὶ παιδικοῦ ἐρωτοῦ ἢ τοῖς λυρικοῖς ή τῶν ποιημάτων σπουδῇ, δημοσίης ὁ λόγος... ταῦτα δὲ τείνει καὶ εἰς τούς περὶ Ἀλκαίων καὶ Ἰβυκοῦ καὶ 'Ἀνακρέοντα καὶ εἰ πνευ̂ς ἄλλων τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ [scil. Πινδάρου] δοκοῦσι περὶ τὰ παιδικά ἡγχολήσθαι, οὕτω γάρ παλαιότεροι Πινδάρου. For Alcaeus see Page, S & A p.294f. The mention of Ibycus will remind us all of the Polycrates Ode (282 P = S 155) and fragments like 284, 286-9, and 309 P. Most of us will think too of S 166. Anacreon hardly needs illustration (see his remark διε οὕτω (scil. παιδικά) ἡμῶν θεοὶ εἰςιν (Σ Pind. Is. 2·1)) Idylls 28 - 30 of Theocritus are labelled παιδικά Αἰολικά in our MSS (the first ineptly so) and Theognis 1231 - 1389 provide further specimens of the genre. In view of the above passages, it is hard to accept Page's remark ad loc. (P.M.G. p.136) "credideris Athenaeum carmina qualia Rhadinam respicere."1 Admittedly, the second line of that poem as quoted by Strabo has the Muse εὐμῶν περὶ παῖδων ἔραται φθέγγομένα λύραι, and that sentiment, taken in isolation, would well fit the proem to a παιδείον or παιδικόν, especially one composed for the court of Polycrates. But as Strabo's sequel at once shows, the παιδεία in question are not beautiful boys but Rhadine, her brother, and her cousin-lover. Unless Strabo has bungled badly Page must be wrong. Those who take S 166 to be a Stesichorean composition are free to suppose that Athenaeus is thinking of that poem.

1 Welcker made much the same assumption (Kl. Schr. 1·204ff) under the mistaken impression that παιδεία could be synonymous with παῖγνια (as in Aelian's phrase νομευτικά παῖγνια (Hist. An. 15·19) referring to Theocritus' Idylls 28 - 30). That was in 1829; he had realised his mistake by the time he came to emend παιδεία to παιδεία (in his review of Schneidewin's Ibycus: Rh. Mus. 2(1834) 237 = Kl. Schr. 1·242).
vel. sim. here. I have given my reasons elsewhere for refusing to accept this as a work of S. (see pp. 1184 ff).

Pederastic poetry was composed both in archaic Greece (examples above) and Hellenistic times, and there is no real way of deciding whether Athenaeus is referring to the younger or the elder poet who bore the name of S., though if the former is the case he is most certainly not referring to such works as we shall shortly see good reason to give him.

(b)
Once we have grasped that S.'s poetry was monodic rather than composed for chorus, we shall not be surprised by the various witnesses who suggest that his works were recited after dinner. Lucan's reference to choruses is presumably an easy deduction from S.'s name.

At first sight, the closest parallel for Timaeus' juxtaposition of a lyric like S. with a tragedian like Phrynichus as poets whose works might be performed at dinner parties is Arist. Nub. 1355ff where Strepsiades asks his son to sing Simonides' song about Crius (507 P) and, this refused, tries to settle for a recitation from Aeschylus (see Dover ad loc. (pp. 251ff, especially p. 254 where we are told that "There are no grounds for thinking that in Ar.'s time recitation from tragedy was normal after dinner."). Here, however, it is said that the
works of the poets in question were paeans.¹
(b) and (c)

For the significance which the ancients attatched to the names Paean and Hymn, see the excellent remarks of A.E. Harvey, in his article "The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry", C.Q. 5 (1955) 164ff and 172ff. These are the only passages which attribute such compositions to S., with what justification we cannot say.² There need not be the same contradiction in tone and content between these works and what we know of S.'s poetry as we find when asked to accept his authorship of παιδίκα or the Rhadine and Calyce.

¹Page might have included among (b)'s testimonia Hesychius s.v. τρία Στησιχόρου ἔδωκεν παρά πότον δίδεσθαι η δά "Ομήρου. Admittedly Wilamowitz deleted the last three words (SS p.239 n.2) as a late gloss which ignorantly inserted the familiar notion of our poet as Όμηρος ψάλταρος into a reference to Stesichorean scolia such as are presupposed by (a). But there is nothing amiss with the notion that appropriate extracts from Homer could be performed παρά πότον.

²According to Wilamowitz (Textg. p.34) the Paeans were not included in the Alexandrian edition of S.'s works.
Σ Ap. Rhod. 1305B (p.118 Wendel) has the following comment on this lemma: ἄδλων γὰρ Πελίαο ἐκ τοῦ ἄμω'αύτοῖς: δὴ Ἡρακλῆς ἀνείλε τούς Βορεάδας διὰ τὸ καλύει τὴν ναὰν ὑποστρέψαι πάλιν εἰς τὴν Ἑυκλαύν, φησίν Ἀπολλώνιος. Ἔτιμος (F. Gr. Hist. 396 F 9) δὲ ψησὶ διὰ τὸ λεισθήναι δρόμωι τὸν Ἡρακλέα ὑπὸ τῶν Βορεάδων, Στηνίσμβροτος (F. Gr. Hist. 107 F 19) δὲ, δὴ διαφορὰν ἔσχον πρὸς τὸν Ἡρακλέα περὶ τῶν δεδομένων ὅρων ὑπὸ Ἰάδονος τοῖς ἀριστεῦσιν. Νικανόρος δὲ ὁ Κολοφώνιος ἐν τῇ ἀ τῶν Οἰταϊκῶν (F. Gr. Hist. 271/2 F 11 = fr.15 Schneider) φησὶ Βορέαν αἰτιόν γεγονέναι τοῦ θανάτου τῶν προειρημένων διὰ τοῦ κειμάτω τῶν Ἡρακλέα εἰς Κῶ ὑποστρέφοντα.

At the start of the sentence naming the second of the three sources, Στηνίσμβροτος was conjectured for Στηνίσμβροτος by Ed. Schwartz, de Dionysio Scytobrachione (Diss. Bonn. 1880) p.11 n.2. Lest anyone should suppose I wish to disguise the force of his argument I reproduce it here verbatim: "quid tamen hoc loco [the fragment cited above] ille auctor Thasius sibi velit, prorsus non intellego, neque haec ad Stesichori de Peliae ludis funeribus carmen referre dubito, praesertim cum eo ipso loco Apollonius illorum mentionem fecerit." Jacoby in his commentary on the relevant fragment of Stesimbrotus (2D p.349) allows that the suggestion is "nicht ohne wahrscheinlichkeit." But, as he goes on to remark, the
reverse corruption would be more natural in this context, and Stesimbr. F 12 ( = Σ Ap. Rhod. 1.1126 (p.101)) is proof positive that this historian was capable of deriving a detail from Apollonius of Rhodes. For another alleged confusion between Stesichorus and Stesimbrotus see above p.1148.
S166 = P. Oxy. 2735 fr.1

It is worth while discussing this fragment here because, although I believe its author to be Ibycus rather than S., at least two distinguished scholars have favoured the contrary view. Lobel in his editio princeps (Oxy. Pap. 35 (1968) pp.9ff) decided very cautiously that the poem was by S., while Martin West (Z.P.E. 4 (1969) 142ff) implicitly assuming the correctness of this verdict, proceeded to sketch in some very important consequences with characteristic assurance and gusto. Strangely enough for a scholar who maintains that our fragment is "one of the most interesting new pieces of Greek poetry to come to light in recent years" (p.142) not to mention that "We learn several exciting things from the new text, besides how S. ended a poem. We learn that he stayed at Sparta and sang before a Spartan prince, and we are granted a new and vivid glimpse of the place in the period between Alcman and Pindar" (p.148), West nowhere makes clear, in the article in which these claims appear, just why he supposes S. to be the composer of these lines.

One can only presume that his grounds for so doing coincide exactly with Lobel's. And so we shall examine these first. In fact Lobel only offers two possible reasons for preferring S. to Ibycus. After briskly excluding Simonides, Bacchylides and Pindar because of the type of Doric accents used on this papyrus(see p.11)1 he continues:

1 S. Fogelmark, Scripta Minora Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Literarum Ludensis 2 (1974/5) 27ff apparently contests this approach, but I only know his article via a reference in Führer R p.25 n.254.
"S. and Ibycus are left of the major poets whose names we know and of this pair I should incline to S., on the general ground that manuscripts of his poems have turned up in Oxyrhynchus many times more than those of Ibycus ... and for the particular reason that there is a chance that [S 176] has a connection with the ἌΘλος ἐπὶ Πελιάου which S. wrote." Let us not forget that Lobel's very next words are: "These are weak arguments ..."; and it is hard to disagree. The first retains some value as reminding us of a significant fact, but clearly we should not attach too much weight to it: if we carried this attitude to its logical extreme we would soon be unable to attribute to Ibycus any Oxyrhynchus papyrus that did not bear some quite incontrovertible proof - such as is mostly lacking for S 152ff - of Ibycean authorship. As for the second claim, the sting has been very neatly removed from its tail by Professor Page (P.C.P.S. 17 (1971) 89ff). He points out - what is obvious anyway - that the cursory list of characters and events which underlies S 176 is very unlike the full and leisurely narrative which we would expect to find in S.'s account of the Funeral Games of Pelias. On the contrary, "The technique recalls Ibyc. fr.282 =[S151], a summary list of numerous matters capable of lengthy exposition" (Page p.90). Note especially the sudden appearance of Geryon at line 18, a grotesquely improbable participant in any contest that might be held in memory of Pelias, but easily explained if we suppose that the poet is leaping from one item in a
list to another, as we have a right to expect of Ibycus.

S176 then, gives us no cause to suppose P. Oxy. 2735 contained one or more poems by S. And Lobel's arguments in favour of a Stesichorean authorship for S166 are exhausted. West, in an attempt to rebut Page's ascription of our fragment to Ibycus, throws up two new defences in the course of his inaugural lecture: ["Ibycus] is not otherwise associated with Sparta, and the close metrical similarity between the fragment and S.'s Iliu Persis seems to me to outweigh Page's arguments." ("Immortal Helen" p.17, n.10). Positive claims in favour of Ibycus we shall consider in a moment, but let us linger awhile amid the apparent signs of S.'s authorship. West's metrical observation looks impressive at first sight. But when we remember that West achieved his metrical scheme for this poem by restorations based on the very supposition that the composer of the lines was S. (pp.143ff) we cannot but detect a certain circularity of argument. Praises of a handsome youth (22-8) followed by an encomium of Sparta (29ff) certainly suggest a visit to the Spartan court, a visit neither directly suggested for Ibycus by any of our testimonia on this poet nor supported by evidence of any other nature. But given the scrappy nature of our sources this is hardly surprising. It would be more remarkable if this important poet had not, like S. before and Pindar, Bacchylides and Simonides after him, seen both the mainland of Greece and Magna Graecia.
Nor can I remain mute about the serious difficulties that we create for ourselves if we attribute the subject-matter of the present fragment to S. Page cites an obvious instance (P.C.P.S. 15 (1969) p.71). "The meagre evidence may rather suggest that love ... and handsome young men ... would seem a little more at home in Ibycus." From S166 he cites 1.7 (οἵδ τ' ἔρωτος) and 11.23ff (especially 25's ἡλικία). It will not do to protest that S. is credited with παιδεία or παιδία by Athen. 13.601A (= 276A P). Who knows what work or works are there referred to, or how reliable the statement is? Better by far to observe that several of Ibycus' extant fragments have to do with pretty boys lauded in erotic court-poetry (e.g. 287-8 P: c.f. 284, 289, 309 P: on the penultimate fr. see Richardson H.H. Dem. 383 (pp 279ff)) matters far removed from the austere heroic narrative revealed to us by the surviving lines of S. Other examples could be given: the moralising in 8-14 or the encomium of Sparta in 29ff would be hard to parallel from S. but are very reminiscent of 11.23ff and 46ff of the Polycrates ode.

But perhaps the grossest anomaly is pointed out by West himself (p.147). At 11.22ff the poet breaks off his narrative, and turns from the tale of war to the praises of his addressee. "We are irresistibly reminded", says West, "of Ibycus' Polycrates-poem", and he quotes 282 P = S151.22-6: καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄνω Μοίσαις κεκοφηγμέναι ἐδώ 'Ελληνοὶ δεδεμέν removes λόγωτερον, ἃνετος δ' ὁμαλὸς καὶ ἀνθρώπον τὰ ἐκατὰ ἐπιτοῖ... Quite so. But why
not adopt the obvious and straightforward explanation of two poems both by Ibycus, rather than suppose (West p.149) that the Ibycean stanza is copying a Stesichorean original? Does Professor West fully appreciate the implausibility of such a break-off formula in a poem by S.? It is one thing to cut short a brief and superficial catalogue of subjects whose praise the poet never really intended to sing: the song is relatively short and the true object of the poem's praises is thereby emphasised. This device could never work in a composition by S. As if, following a copious narrative on the usual vast scale, the poet could abruptly reject the subject-matter on which he had lavished epic detail and suddenly profess greater interest in the fortunes of a pretty face! What is an effective transition in a small Ibycean ode becomes a mere incoherence when tacked on to the close of a work that may have spread itself over two or more books. And of all the Stesichorean compositions to fasten upon, and burden with this unlikely ending, the Helen must surely be the least suitable. I say nothing of the metrical incompatibility of S151 with the Helen's fr.187 P observed by West himself (p.148). But we had already had cause to guess that S. visited Sparta because of the discrepancy between the views of the heroine displayed in the ἡμηνορᾶ Ἐλένης and the two Palinodes (above pp.410ff). In seeking to re-enforce this attractive hypothesis West

1 Though if str.1 is restored [...x...-... 187 P will fit S151's scheme.
in fact reduces it to rubble. If S.'s Recantations were somehow prompted by Spartan influence, how could the original offending poem have been composed for and recited at the court of a prince of Sparta?

The consequences of West's identification of S166 have been numerous and unfortunate. Other scholars have taken it up and have drawn misleading conclusions\(^1\) and West himself (C.Q. 21 (1971) 306 c.f. ZPE 4 (1969) 149) has used the alleged influence of the present fragment upon the Polycrates ode of Ibycus as one of his arguments for re-dating S. to the period 560-540.

It would be sad if this process went much further. I am gratified to find myself in agreement here with Haslam (p.48) who writes "I see nothing that favours S. against Ibycus." Nor I think would any unprejudiced observer, and future generations will be amazed that anyone could ever have decided differently.

I have no intention of producing more detailed remarks upon this poem and thereby lightening the burden of any future commentator on Ibycus. It is however worth remarking that West's observations on our fragment's

\(^1\)The useful lists and statistics in Nöthiger's valuable study of "Die Sprache des S. und des Ibycus" must be modified to take into account their author's acceptance of West's thesis. And Kannicht has renounced his objections (in a letter to Professor Kassel) to the notion of Spartan inspiration behind the Palinodes (see above p.414) solely because of West's identification of our poem's author with S.: unfortunate that he should come to the right conclusion at last for the wrong reasons. West has now allowed his identification to distort his own statistics (ZPE 29 (1978) p.2 and n.3).
metre have been modified by Führer, ZPE 5 (1970) 15ff and Haslam pp.48-9.

This seems the most appropriate place in which to list the other fragments of uncertain authorship that have been assigned to S. by at least one earlier scholar. I inter­
sperserse a few comments of my own, mainly pejorative.

282 P = S151

Authorship of the famous "Polycrates Ode" must rest either with S. or with Ibycus. For the latest discussion of the problem see J.P. Barron, B.I.C.S. 16 (1969) 132f, with the bibliography in p.147 nn. 47-8, to which add H. Fränkel, Frühgr. Dicht und Phil. p.328 n.22 = Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy p.288 n.22, the most extreme advocate of the case for S. Of the arguments he mentions,\(^1\) the cataloguing tendency and the pederastic features are, as he admits, at least as suggestive of Ibycus if not more so: on the latter see above p.1185; for the former compare 315-317\(^{\text{A}}\)P. The same is true of the considerations advanced by other scholars in favour of S's authorship (the poem's Doric dialect, for instance, or

\(^1\)I cannot conceive what Fränkel means by his reference to "the excessive detail" ("Übergrosse Ausführlichkeit") of the poem, which seems to me to display that rapid summar­
ing of subjects capable of lengthier treatment which we encounter in other probably Ibycean works (apart from S166 see S176).
its triadic structure, Homeric qualities, and use of the word ὀπείχαλκω (on which see p.1144). I am persuaded that the poem is by Ibycus, to such an extent indeed that I have automatically assumed (above pp.1186 ff.) that those features of S166 reminiscent of the Polycrates Ode point to Ibycean authorship rather than Stesichorean influence by the latter upon the former.

938EP (fragm. adesp.)

Diehl (p.56) claims that Wilamowitz attributed this line to S. The statement is quite erroneous: see the remarks of Wilamowitz in Hermes 60 (1925) 302 = Kl. Schr. 4.389.

947 P (fragm. adesp.)

= Aristides, or. 28.66 (2.163 Keil)

Wilamowitz thought he possibly detected S's hand here (SSp.150ff n.3) interpreting (a) as a transition to mythical narrative, (b) as part of a lengthy digression. He successfully showed that most other poets can be ruled out¹ and that the likeliest candidate would be a poet elsewhere cited by Aristides (as is S. in or. 33 = 241 P). And Haslam (p.42 n.73) has recently added some strength to this guess by observing how unexceptionably Stesichorean is the metre of the fragment's two portions: (a) _D_Dewriter| D, (b) (in responson?) _Dewriter Dewriter Dewriter | _ ... The hypothesis

¹The strongest rival candidate is Simonides, against whom Wilamowitz (and Page ad loc) cites M. Boas, de epigr. Simonideis (1905) p.95 n.19. Boas' arguments have not convinced everyone: see U. Albin, Parola d. Passato 88 (1963) 456ff reasserting Simonidean authorship.
remains quite unprovable.

For further remarks on (a) see H. Maehler, Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum (Hypomnemata 3 (1963)) p.70, and on both portions U. Albini in the article mentioned in n.1 of the previous page.

1014 P (fragm. adesp.)
= ΣA II. 16·57 (4·173 Erbse)
"Fort. est Stesichori" commented Bergk ad loc. (p.701).
The mental processes behind such deductions are too simple to need recounting here, too simplistic to require refutation.
SPURIA
277, 278, 279 P

CALYCE, DAPHNIS, and RHADINE

Authenticity

I suppose the credit for being the first to call this into question belongs to E. Rizzo, "Questioni Stesicoree (vita e scuola poetica)", Rivista di Storia Antica 1 (1895) pp. 25ff, 2 pp.1ff. After an exceptionally mediocre and unproductive survey of the evidence for the poet's life, wherein there is nothing that is at once novel and free from absurdities, this scholar unexpectedly turned to consider the three poems in question, and produced surprisingly strong reasons for denying them to the famous composer of the Geryoneis. In 1900, Wilamowitz briefly and fairly summarised the grounds for suspecting the authorship of the Calyce and Rhadine (Textg. p.33f). Later Paul Maas more concisely still (and more dogmatically) decided against the authenticity of these works in the course of two articles in Pauly-Wissowa (RE 1^A (1920) 37 l-2 (s.v. Rhadine) and 3^A (1929) 2461 18ff (s.v.

1These two articles have apparently been published together as a separate work with different pagination (Questioni Stesicoree I (Messina, 1895)). I have not seen this version. On p.26 of the second part of his article Rizzo claims to be propounding "una teoria del tutto nuova" and, as far as I can see, this claim is correct.

2He regarded the Daphnis as genuine: see SS p.240.
Stesichoros). Then H.J. Rose (in C.Q. 26 (1932) pp. 88 ff) produced the most complete argument yet in favour of the spuriousness of the Rhadine and the Calyce. His article, together with Rizzo's contribution, is mentioned by Page (P.M.G. p. 137) who consigns all three works to the end of the section occupied by the compositions of S., under the heading "Spuria". Attempts to refute the attitude of these scholars have been sparse, piece-meal, and unconvincing. Some will be mentioned below. The fullest and most recent effort is by L. Lehnus, Studi Classici e Orientali 24 ((1975) pp. 191ff.

The strongest and most convincing single argument against the genuineness of these works is their utter difference in character from anything else we can suppose S. to have written. When, at the end of the Suda's list of compositions by Pindar, we read ὄρῳτα τραγικὰ ή (4·133 Adler = 260 TGF Snell) few of us can refrain from laughing.¹ That Pindar should have written tragedies is in no way more implausible than that the lyric poet elsewhere characterised as "Ὀμηρωκότος", "ἐπίκη τραγικῶν ήρων", "ferox", and the author of "graves Camenae", should have also produced pretty stories of romantic and unhappy love and rustic life that are redolent of folk-tale. As most of the scholars mentioned above have seen, literary compositions of this latter type

¹See further Snell's note on 227 1-4 TGF.
are primarily characteristic of the Alexandrian era. For instance, the contents ascribed to the Rhadine are clearly adapted, at no very great remove, from a local popular tale of Samos or Elis: we might compare the way in which Callimachus in his Aetia professes to have learned the tale of Acontius and Cydippe from Xenomedes' mythological history embracing the local legends of the island of Ceos (fr.75.53ff Pf.). The troubled and tragic passions which formed the subject-matter of all three poems are amply paralleled by many of the love-stories assembled within Parthenius' περὶ ἔρωτικων παθημάτων.1 More specifically, the Rhadine's stock tyrant and persecuted lovers have numerous analogues in the Greek Novel (see Rohde, Gr. Roman4 (1960) pp.28ff). If the Calyce re-wrote the contents of a popular ballad, Phoenix's Κορωνικτή (fr.2 Powell (p.233)) based on the Rhodian beggars' song of that name, and the Adonis song in Theocr. Id. 15.100ff provide matter for comparison. And the interest taken in bucolic life in general and Daphnis in particular by poets like Theocritus, Moschus, and Bion is too obvious to need documentation.

This is not to say that Alexandrian and later interest in such themes might not have been anticipated by an earlier poet.2 It is to say that the rest of S.'s output renders

---

1 On the Alexandrian associations of Parthenius see Wendell Clausen, GRBS 5 (1964) 190.
2 K.J. Dover is probably right to suggest (Theocritus (1971) p.lxxi) that "Hellenistic poetry began not with the great Alexandrians but with the deaths of Euripides and Sophocles." And even before that time a poet like
him a singularly implausible candidate for such a rôle.
The stern epic nature of his other products has no point
of contact whatsoever with the works under discussion,
and the fact that these works have totally perished save
for the summaries preserved in late prose-writers does
not effect this argument one jot. We automatically
reject the notion that Pindar was a part-time tragedian
even though we cannot inspect the tragedies he is alleged
to have written.

We have no direct quotation from either the Daphnis or the
Calyce. We do possess however the first two lines of
the Rhadine (278 P) and these have been thought by some
(Rizzo (2) p.31, Wilamowitz, Textg. d. gr. lyr. p.34 n.1,
Rose p.90) to afford a metrical argument against Stesi-
chorean authorship of this poem. The two lines are
Major Asclepiads: Rose in 1932 was rightly cautious about
using the contrast between this and the overwhelmingly
dactylo-epitrite nature of the rest of S.'s fragments to
(contd..)

Panyassis could anticipate the Hellenistic "relish for
geographic, glossographic and aetiological lore" (Lloyd-
Jones, Gnomon 48 (1976) 504). But this comes nowhere
near to covering S.'s case. Admittedly, Lehnus (p.194f)
quotes our single fragment of Myrtis (716 P), a romantic tale
from Tanagra wherein the maiden Ochna, having failed to
tempt her cousin the chaste Eunostus, falsely accuses
him of seduction. Her brothers kill him while she
casts herself from a precipice. The resemblance to our
three poems is obvious. The objection is not that
Myrtis' status as a contemporary of Pindar is only
probable not certain (c.f. Page, Corinna (1953) p.31
n.1). It is that we know nothing of the rest of her
output. What we really require (but fail to find) is
a parallel for an archaic poet who composes both totally
epic narratives and pretty tales of doomed love.

1 Compare Gr. Versk. p.408 n.2.
prove anything: there were so few of the latter. In our present state of knowledge this contrast is much more striking and significant. On the other hand, a poem with a totally different subject-matter might evoke a totally different metre. It is the first feature that offends, for reasons stated above, and it seems best to subsume the metrical argument under the heading of objections to content.

We may stay with the Calyce a little longer to consider the arguments for its authenticity advanced by Lehnus (p.192f). Siezing upon the remark σωφονικόν δέ πάντα κατεσκεύασεν ὁ ποιητὴς τό τῆς παρθένου ἡθος he claims to detect the same concern for ἡθοποιία as is elsewhere attested for S. by Quintilian (10.1.17-18 ... personis in agendo simul loquendoque debitam dignitatem) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (π. μ. ν. fr.6.2.7: τὰ ἡθη ... ἐνθισμένην). Those passages seem to me to be alluding to a rather different concern but for the moment forget that this is so: the alleged coincidence would only be an argument for authenticity if S. were the one and only Greek poet who took pains over consistent characterisation: quod absurdum est. A similar insensitivity to nuance or probability marks Lehnus' comparison of Calyce (οὐκ ἢ παντὸς τρόπου θελούσῃς συγγενέσθαι τῷ νεανίσκω) with the reformed Helen of the Palinodes. I am more struck, I must confess, by the differences between the heroine famous from epic
and worshipped as divine in Sparta, and the obscure and passive victim of love who ends her life by jumping from the Leucadian Rock.

Arguments in favour of the Rhadine as a poem by the elder S. are feebler still. The similarity between its initial invocation of the Muse and 240 P may have influenced ancient critics but that is no justification for Schmid's statement that "Für S. Spricht der Musenanruf" (G.G.L.I.1 p.481 n.2), still less for Lehnus' supine repetition of the fantasy in passing (p.192 n.7) especially after Rose had definitively exposed its inadequacy.\(^1\)

Defenders of S. the first's authorship of the Daphnis - and thus of his tenure of a position of prime importance in the history of Greek bucolic poetry - have frequently resorted to some sort of "minimisation" from the time of Welcker (Kl. Schr. 1.189) onwards. This they are well advised to do, if only to mitigate the total silence about S. preserved by (among others) the author of the study of bucolic's origins prefixed to the Theocritean scholia. Rizzo was prepared to contemplate the existence of some small Stesichorean reference to Daphnis which later ages interpreted as the germ of the bucolic genre.

H.W. Prescott, H.S.C.P. 10 (1899)

\(^1\)Schmid adds the two lines' Doric dialect as a further index of S.'s hand. Rose comments (p.89) justly: "By parity of reasoning one might prove that S. wrote the lament for Daphnis in Theocr. 1 which is in excellent Doric and invokes the Muses frequently."
122ff, stressing Aelian's use of the phrase τοιοῦτοι μελο- 
ποίημα (as opposed, for instance, to τοιοῦτο τοῦ μελούς), 
suggested that S. was being credited with the invention of 
the romantic element in melic poetry of which Daphnis 
constitutes a good example. Stoll, in his Roscher 
article on Daphnis (1:957) wildly speculated 
that S. inserted the tale of Daphnis into the 
Palinode in connection with his own blindness. And 
recently K.J. Dover has matched this madness with his 
usual sanity in producing the following explanation (Theo-
critus (1971) p.lxv):"S. can have told the story, or part 
of the story, of Daphnis in a lyric poem, but need not 
have represented Daphnis as composing songs, nor need the 
lyric poem have been presented as the utterance of a 
herdsman."1 Eminently reasonable, but the contradiction 
in subject-matter is still as arrant as ever. 
Our doubts about the Daphnis are increased by the failure 
of all other authors than Aelian to mention S.'s important 
rôle as ποιητής εὐρετής of the pastoral genre. No word 
about him, for instance, in the investigation into the 
origins of bucolic poetry which is prefaced to the scholia 
on Theocritus, or in Diod. Sic. 4:84 in his account of 
the myths relating to Daphnis. 
Other arguments against these poems' authenticity have 
little substance. Maas' gloss on Στηνίξιορος ποιηματι 

---

1It will be instantly clear that I am merely selecting a 
small range of representative views out of the vast 
literature of speculation that has arisen around the 
problem of Daphnis and S.
Stesichoros' in his article on Rhadine ("also offenbar nicht verfasst hat") is certainly illicit, as Rose's reference (p.88) to Bonitz's Index to Aristotle shows: the verb merely suggests that the poem was generally believed to be by S. And again Maas' guess that the three works were not included in the Alexandrian edition (his article on S. in R-E, 2461-18ff) is interesting but need not be decisive even if it could be proved. No, the corner-stone of all argument against the Stesichorean nature of these poems must continue to be their total difference from works reliably assigned to him.

The problem of why such arrantly unStesichorean subject-matter should ever come to be attributed to that poet if he did not in fact compose these works will serve as a useful transition-point to the next part of our discussion. For several scholars have taken this paradox to be the strongest general argument in favour of the authenticity of the Daphnis, Calyce and Rhadine.¹ It is a line of approach upon which I could look with favour in other contexts, having asked elsewhere why the scenes depicted on the Tabula Iliaca should be attributed to S. unless he really did include them in his Iliupersis. In the present case however the argument is worthless, since it requires but a moment's thought to devise numerous convincing explanations of the misattribution. Taking

the poems individually, we might suggest that the Rhadine came to be wrongly given to our poet because of the coincidence between its opening appeal to the Muse and that of a genuine Stesichorean fragment (ἀγε Μοῦσα λίγετ' ἐς Ευρ'ἀγε Καλλιόπετα λίγετα). The Daphnis' misplacing may be explained by the close connection between the mythical figure and S.'s town of Himera (see Theocr. Id. 7.75, Timaeus F. Gr. Hist. 566 F 83 etc.). More generally, if the specimen of Locrian love-song discussed by Bowra GLP\textsuperscript{2} p.83f is at all typical, other examples of the same type might come to be attributed to a poet from that region. But most important is the existence of the second Stesichorus of Himera (see p.999) about whom Lehnus, in his recent defence of "i poemetti 'minori!'" preserves so significant a silence. Rose obviously considered the possibility that the two Stesichori had been confused\textsuperscript{1} here, but he rejected it (p.89) on the grounds that the later S., as a member of the same school as Timotheus\textsuperscript{2} "with his pantomime verses and his musical elaborations" was "not likely to have been the author of any very startling innovations in poetry."

When we know next to nothing of the second S. it is unwise to be dogmatic about what he can or cannot have written. Rose's own solution, that S.'s fame "was so mistily great that it might easily have attached to it any poem of unknown date and authorship, provided only it was in a lyric metre" is possible; but it is not entirely immune from the objection outlined above: surely the

\textsuperscript{1}As Maas had already suggested in connection with the name "Tisias".

\textsuperscript{2}See my note on the Scylla (p.999f).
nature of S.'s other works would have discouraged such a mindless attribution. And Rose's further suggestion that the Καλώνη and 'Ραδίνη are the works of an Alexandrian poet "of a good period" (p.90) who adopted S.'s name, once more raises without need that prospect of an unrecorded plurality of Stesichori which I am ever eager to avoid. It would certainly be the most economical hypothesis to suppose that the Daphnis, Rhadine, and Calyce were wrongly attributed to the earlier and more renowned S., when in fact it was his younger name-sake who had composed them (c.f. M.L. West, C.Q. 20 (1970) 206 who limits this explanation to the Daphnis). We will then realise why such inappropriate subjects were laid at the door of the archaic S. We will also have an explanation of their Hellenistic quality: S. the second is the poet who won a contest at Athens in 370/68, whose Cyclops was performed before Philip of Macedon. On that same occasion, the conqueror of Methone sat through a performance of Philoxenus' Cyclops (815-824 P) a work said to be the source of Theocritus' Sixth and Eleventh Idylls (see Gow, Theocritus 2·118). It might be the case that the younger S!'s Daphnis influenced that poet's First Idyll. But whatever the truth about that, time and background alike seem right for the composition of works that anticipate the interests of the Alexandrians and their successors. There is a difficulty involved in applying this explanation to the Calyce. At what time do we suppose the confusion between the two Stesichori to have occurred? Strabo's life spanned the first centuries B.C. and A.D., Aelian's the second and third centuries A.D. We may find
it strange that the Alexandrian editors should have made a muddle between the archaic poet and the namesake whose floruit stood at a distance of at least two centuries. Those who believe that Aristoxenus is the source of Athenaeus' little disquisition on the Calyce (277 P = Aristox. fr.89 Wehrli) will find it next door to impossible to believe that a musical theorist born between 375 and 360 B.C.¹ could have perpetrated so crass a blunder as to confound a near contemporary with the venerable poet of Himera. The mere notion that the pre-Alexandrian Aristoxenus thought of the Calyce as Stesichorean has convinced some scholars of its irrefutable authenticity.² But in fact the connection between Aristoxenus and S's authorship is wafer-thin. In the first place "Für den Zusammenhang bei A. besteht .. umso weniger Gewähr, als Athenaeus im gleichen 'Zuge auch fr.129 gibt" (Wehrli ad loc (p.76)). The reference is to Athen. 14 619⁶ where we read ἐν δὲ τοῖς κατὰ βραχὺ ὑπομνήματι ὡς 'Αριστόξενος Ἔφιλος, φησίν, Ἀρσαλύκην ἑρασθείσαν ὑπερείδειν. ἢ δὲ ἀπέθανεν καὶ γίνεται ἐπ' αὐτῆι παρθένοις ἄγων ὀξέῳ, ἔτεις Ἀρσαλύκη, φησί καλεῖται. This very similar passage reminds us that Aristoxenus may have confined himself to an account of the Calyce sung by αἱ ἀρχαῖαι γυναῖκες and the remark Στησι-χόρου ᾧ ἴν ποίημα with its sequel may be Athenaeus' own addition. The tense of ἴν implies that the work was no longer extant by Athenaeus' time.

¹On Aristoxenus see Wehrli's commentary (second edition 1967) pp. 41ff.
²So Sitzler in his review of Rizzo's Questioni Stesicoree (Bursian 104 (1900) 120f) and Lehnus p.192. Also Bowra (GLP²) p.85.
This fable has several variant forms, most conveniently to be consulted on p. 495 of B.E. Perry's Loeb text of Babrius and Phaedrus (1965). Particularly close is the version there cited in full, the only important difference being that there the snake poisons a draught which is already in the cup: no otiose trip to a spring is involved.

Of course the notion that the early lyric poet called S. included the yarn in any of his compositions is absurd, for all that as good a scholar as H. Maehler (Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum (Hypomnemata 3 (1963)) p. 73 n. 3) can assert that S. composed the same sort of animal fables as Hesiod or Archilochus.1 We might know more about the reasoning behind the attribution if we knew more about Crates of Pergamum's actual mention of S. Κράτης ο Περγαμηνός, also known as K. Μαλλώτις, was the first head of the library at Pergamum, a Stoic grammarian whose most notable writings were on Homer. He was active in the first half of the second century B.C. For further details see Kroll's article in RE 11 (1922) 1634ff s.v. Krates (16); the fragments are assembled and

1 An assertion also made by as bad a scholar as Vürtheim (p. 76) though even he cannot accept 280 P as genuinely Stesichorean (p. 79). Animal fables are conspicuous by their absence in Homeric epic, and it seems unlikely that so Homeric a poet as S. found the inclusion of such popular elements in heroic narratives any whit more appropriate.
discussed in two books by H.J. Mette: Sphairopolie: Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie des Krates von Pergamon (Munich 1936) and Parateresis: Unt. zur Sprachtheorie des K.v. P. (Halle 1952)). Unfortunately, we are totally ignorant about the context of Crates' invocation of S. (F 15 n. in Mette's first volume). The fable of the horse and rider which Aristotle puts in S's mouth is doubtless a relevant factor in trying to guess how the present attribution ever came to be made, but beyond this we cannot go.
The picture of the auspicious nightingale on the lips of the infant poet reminds us of the ubiquitous folk-lore motif whereby ants or bees leave honey upon the lips of a child destined for future greatness (c.f. Stith Thompson, Motif-Index of Folk-Literature² (1955) B. 147·3·1·2). The tale told of the baby Pindar's happy encounter with bees (Paus. 9·23·2 etc.) is usually assumed to derive from Pind. fr.152 Sn. (μελισσοεύκτων κηρίων ἐμὰ γλυκερότερος ὄμφα) and one wonders if there was a like origin for the tradition about S. Two other Greek modes of thought are likely to be relevant: (a) "Nightingale" is often a metaphor for the poet himself or his song (see LSJ sv. ἄηδων I "metaph."). (b) the image of some abstract quality or bird representative of that quality as seated on an individual's lips does recur (c.f. Eupolis fr.94·5 K on Pericles' oratory: πειθῶ τις ἐπεκάθιζε ἐπὶ τοῖς χείλεσιν, and Ar. Ran. 679ff on Cleophon's barbarian origin: Κλεοφῶντος, ἐφ'οδ δὴ | χεῖλεσιν ἀμφιλάλοις δεινὸν ἐπιβρέμεται | ἑρημία χειλεσίων | ἐπὶ βάρβαρον ἐξομένη πέταλον). Note too the tradition that S.'s father was called Εὐφήμος.