2 Stesichorus' Homer

ADRIAN KELLY

Scholarly eyes are returning once more to the oldest of Homeric questions, the origin of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and some of these critics use a very literate and textualised model, according to which the poet was aware of and using not only fixed Greek epics but also a range of ancient Near Eastern texts.[1] Early Greek poetic culture thus begins to resemble its later forms, where written texts interact directly, in a fully developed intertextual manner. There are many reasons to be sceptical of this trend, but one important area remains unexplored in this connection: if Homer was the literate, allusive poet increasingly conceived in modern scholarship, then it would be reasonable to expect some evidence of this quality in the reception of Homeric epic in the lyric and elegiac poets of the archaic period.[2]

This chapter will argue that such evidence is lacking until Stesichorus, sometime in the first half of the sixth century BC. Interaction with the Homeric poems of various kinds may have occurred before him, but in Stesichorus we see something new. For the first time a poet is not merely using Homeric allusions as a repository of striking episodes or expressions, or as a general appeal to Homer's authority and status, but deploying themes and sequences stretching across large swathes of those poems.[3] Ford argues that Herodotus is the first to show such a sustained appreciation of Homer,[4] but I will set out Stesichorus' prior claim.[5]

I would like to thank Bill Allan, Felix Budelmann, Patrick Finglass, Richard Rawles, Henry Spelman, Laura Swift, and audiences in Oxford, Belo Horizonte, and Maynooth for their assistance with this chapter. None of them should be assumed to agree with me.

[1] For examples, see Currie (2006), (2012); for critique, Kelly (2008), (2012).

[2] For an excellent introduction to this subject, see Graziosi and Haubold (2009).

[3] On some possible lyric precursors, see p. 35.

[4] Ford (1997).

[5] Burkert (1987) = (2001–11) I 198–217 = Cairns (2001) 92–116 is an important predecessor in this aim. Stesichorus' date (for which see Finglass (2014a) 1–6) tallies with several kinds of evidence for Homer's emergence into Greek consciousness: Cook (1983) and Snodgrass (1998) have established that pictorial depictions of episodes from other parts of the Trojan War predominate over 'Homeric' images well into the sixth century, while West (1999) 377 = (2011–13) I 429 points out that 'from the last third of the sixth century … Homer springs into life. Author after author names him and comments on his achievements. The epics are no longer treated as free-standing records of the past, but as the artistic creations of an individual, to be praised or criticized.'

Reception methodologies

The study of Homeric reception in archaic literature used to comprise the identification of supposed allusions to his works in the early lyric poets. The realisation that orality had something to say about early Greek poetry, however, long ago undermined the practice of drawing lines between texts in this way, and Davison and Fowler argued influentially against previously accepted quotations of and allusions to Homer.[6] Their scepticism was influenced by doubts over the extent of textualisation, by the abundance of other poems or performances with the same material, by the traditional and formular quality of not only epic but also non-epic poetic forms, by the fact that Homer was originally associated with many more poems than the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and so on.[7]

In essence, they were trying to avoid the error recently given the acronym WYSIATI (What You See Is All There Is), a version of the documentary fallacy still widespread in scholarship on early Greek literature.[8] It is a natural temptation to connect our surviving texts and to neglect the thousands of lines and hundreds of poems which must have existed in the earliest period. But this risks simplifying and misreading an enormously complex process. Take as a first example the well-known 'men as leaves' theme in *Iliad* 6.146–9:

> οἵη περ φύλλων γενεὴ τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν.
> φύλλα τὰ μέν τ' ἄνεμος χαμάδις χέει, ἄλλα δέ θ' ὕλη
> τηλεθόωσα φύει, ἔαρος δ' ἐπιγίγνεται ὥρη·
> ὣς ἀνδρῶν γενεὴ ἣ μὲν φύει ἣ δ' ἀπολήγει.
>
> Just as the generation of leaves so too is that of men.
> The wind pours some leaves on the ground, but others are
> grown in the blooming wood, and the season of spring arrives;
> so one generation of men grows and the other dies.

At the turn of the classical period, Simonides fr. 19 *IEG* quotes *Il.* 6.146 verbatim, ascribing it to the blind man from Chios, before in fr. 20 *IEG* identifying him explicitly as Homer:[9]

[6] Davison (1955) = (1968) 70–85, Fowler (1987) 3–52.

[7] Cf. Griffith (1975) 74–5 (on Mimnermus) or Rosenmeyer (1997) 125 (Sappho), who both acknowledge these problems, but then ignore them; also p. 28 n. 34, and West (1995) 203–4 = (2011–13) I 188–9.

[8] For the concept, originally devised by economists to help explain sub-optimal decision-making, see Kahneman (2011).

[9] I accept the case made by Sider (1996) = Boedeker and Sider (2001) 272–88 (cf. Bowie (2010c) 78) that frr. 19–20 come from the same poem, and appeared in this order; cf. West (1993)

ἓν δὲ τὸ κάλλιστον Χῖος ἔειπεν ἀνήρ· 19.1
"οἵη περ φύλλων γενεή, τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν"·
…
—⏑⏑—] φράζεο δὲ παλα[ιοτέρου λόγον ἀνδρός· 20.13
ἦ λήθην] γλῶσσης ἔκφυγ' Ὅμηρ[ος ⏑— κτλ.

And the single finest thing the Chian man said;
'Just as the generation of leaves so too is that of men.'
…
and consider the story of a man of old;
truly has Homer escaped the forgetfulness of the tongue etc.

This explicit invocation of another poet's specific creation is a solid *terminus ante quem* for the emergence of the Homeric poems, and for their currency among poets and audiences. It shows that both the name 'Homer' (or simply the figure, if West's text of fr. 20.14 is wrong) and his poetry itself were sufficiently well known and authoritative for the elegist to redeploy them, though it is hard to know what further use, if any, Simonides was making of this quotation in the context of his poem – a problem we will encounter repeatedly.

The theme itself, however, is traditional, even as early as Homer.[10] When, therefore, it recurs in Mimnermus fr. 2 *IEG* (especially 1–2 οἷά τε φύλλα φύει πολυάνθεμος ὥρη | ἔαρος), should we push our *terminus* a little further back, into the last third of the seventh century? Mimnermus' words are not a quotation, but have been considered a direct allusion to the Homeric passage.[11] Given, however, the traditional background clearly indicated in the *Iliad*, Fowler, Allen, and Burgess are right to be sceptical that Mimnermus is doing anything more than using a typical theme.[12] In a context where themes exist independently of the few representations of them to have survived, and without the kind of trigger found in Simonides above, we cannot safely conclude that Mimnermus is interacting directly with Homer.

10–11 = (2011–13) II 122–3, who reverses them. There is some doubt about the reading of fr. 20.14, in that Parsons (who originally came up with the text printed in *IEG*) also suggests ἔκφυγ' ὃ μὴ γ[όμιμον, which would remove the explicit reference to Homer. Whatever the reading of that verse (and autopsy proves that both *nu* and *rho* are possible), there is no doubt that the 'blind man of Chios' in fr. 19.1 refers to Homer; as Sider (1996) 272 = Boedeker and Sider (2001) 280 notes, 'what little we can read does suggest that Homer, that is, his poetry, provides the desired contrast with ephemeral human life.'

[10] *Il.* 2.467–8, 2.800–1, 21.462–7, *Od.* 7.105–6, 9.51–2, Burgess (2001) 190–1.

[11] Thus Griffith (1975), Adkins (1985) 99, Sider (1996) 265, 272–6, especially 273 n. 17 = Boedeker and Sider (2001) 274, 280–3, especially 281 n. 17, Bowie (2010c) 60 n. 10.

[12] Fowler (1987) 32–3, Allen (1993) 41, Burgess (2001) 117–26. One might ask, if there is an Homeric interaction, which of the several passages cited in n. 10 above is being recalled?

Let us, nonetheless, momentarily entertain that conclusion. What would the interaction add to Mimnermus' poem? This is an important question to ask, since scholars are often in a hurry to identify allusions in an attempt to say something about the history of Homer, whilst disregarding the new context almost entirely.[13] However, the dynamics of invocation can tell us much more about how well audiences were expected to know their Homer, and what use the poet felt he could make of that knowledge. In this case, the audience does not seem required to do very much, intertextually or interpretatively, with the Homeric passage. Perhaps there is an added heroic nuance to Mimnermus' somewhat pessimistic view of human life, or an agonistic positioning against epic in calling for renewed indulgence in the sadly ephemeral joys of youth,[14] but the elegy does not demand an understanding or interpretation of any particular Homeric passage, or indeed even Homeric as opposed to epic poetry in general,[15] to make those points.

So we have a model for identifying Homeric interactions in archaic poetry: first, ensure that the passage is actually interacting with Homer's *Iliad* or *Odyssey*, rather than a traditional and generically epic background; second, assess what the supposed interaction asks the audience to invoke about the Homeric poems, and how that invocation affects the target poem. We should be wary of assuming that literate culture and dynamics spring forth fully formed in the archaic period, as though these phenomena need only the appearance of written texts in order to flourish immediately in a developed form; such a view requires the further unlikely postulate that no one had to think about them, that no conceptions about poetic composition, performance, or re-performance had to change or develop – they just existed from the start. Evolution seems far more likely, and this is precisely what we find in the lyric poets.

[13] Cf. West (2002) 207 n. 1 = (2011–13) I 392 n. 1: 'I am not here concerned with the interpretation of the Lesbian poets or their use of mythical material, but rather with trying to establish what epic poetry was available to them.' The two tasks need to be more closely connected.

[14] Cf. especially Griffith (1975), who adds more allusions to other parts of the *Iliad*. I am indebted to Laura Swift for discussion of this point, but remain unconvinced by Griffith's arguments.

[15] Cf. Fowler (1987) 33: 'The question is whether in any of these passages we really need to recall the details of the model in order to understand the point of the imitation … [on Tyrtaeus fr. 11 *IEG*] The poet's purpose is to evoke in a general way the heroic atmosphere of Homer in order to inspire his fellow Spartans. That is easy enough, and not quite the same thing as requiring the reader to ponder the original context and to discover which aspects of the model are relevant.'

Lyric poetry before Stesichorus – Alcaeus, Sappho, Alcman

Homeric allusions have been sought, and found, in Greek lyric poetry from the very beginning.[16] The strongest candidate for such an allusion is Alcaeus fr. 44 Voigt:[17]

ἀχ̣[
ἄκ[……].[
θ̣[……].[
ἐ[……..].[.].ρ[..]..[
μ[.]ρ[. . . . .]νι κάκω περρ[
μάτε[ρ . . . . .]άϲδων ἐκάλη να[
νύμφ[αν ἐνν]αλίαν· ἀ δὲ γόνων [ἀψαμένα Δίοϲ
ἰκέτευ[. . . . .]τω τέκεοϲ μᾶνιν [⊗

The occurrence of a 'wrath of/for a child' (τέκεοϲ μᾶνιν 8), with a maternal sea-nymph addressed (6–7), and her supplication at Zeus's knees (7–8) seem to suggest the *Iliad*. However, Achilleus is deeply embedded in the formula systems of Homeric epic,[18] and it is not unthinkable that several stories about his anger management issues (what oralists call a 'wrath pattern') were circulating in the earliest period.[19] Patroclus can speak of his harsh character as a general truth (δεινὸϲ ἀνήρ· τάχα κεν καὶ ἀναίτιον αἰτιόωιτο, *Il.* 11.654), and the Neoanalysts have suggested that a wrath pattern also informed Achilleus' behaviour in the *Aithiopis*,[20] but it is a common and variable sequence even in Homeric poetry, structuring the whole of the *Iliad* and Meleager's tale in Phoenix's speech in Book 9.[21] Alcaeus' wrathful Achilleus need not have been derived from our *Iliad*.

Secondly, Thetis' particular role in her son's fortunes is presupposed in other early epics, notably the *Aithiopis*,[22] and Slatkin has suggested that

[16] Terminology is difficult (lyric? melic? non-epic?), and space necessarily involves some exclusions. The most important are the early elegiac/iambic poets, for which cf. Fowler (1987) 3–52 and Burgess (2001) 114–27 for a sceptical view about the extent to which the elegists were reacting specifically to Homer, against Adkins (1985) and Bowie (2010c) 60–7, 78. I hope to address the relationship between Homer and Ibycus elsewhere.

[17] In support, see Fowler (1987) 37, Meyerhoff (1984) 46–53, West (2002) 209 = (2011–13) I 394–5, Liberman (1999) I 38; *contra* Jensen (1980) 102–3, Burgess (2001) 115 ('possible but debatable').

[18] See Higbie (1995) 43–68.

[19] Cf. Lord (1960) 186–97, Kelly (2007a) 97–8.

[20] Cf. Burgess (1997), though he himself does not adopt an explicitly neoanalytical stance.

[21] For another example, cf. *Il.* 13.458–69 (Aeneas); also Lord (1967) for the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. When Fowler (1987) 37 says, 'few will believe that another full-length *Iliad* (or even a "Wrath-poem") existed alongside Homer's ca 600 BC', I cannot agree with the bracketed part of his sentence.

[22] *Aith.* arg. 11, 21–2 *PEG* = arg. 2, 4 *GEF*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107706989.003 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Homer knows the story that Thetis was to bring forth a child stronger than its father, necessitating her mortal marriage.[23] Thus the origin of Zeus's favour to her in *Iliad* 1 (a divine rebellion) is an Homeric innovation of another earlier favour, in which she had agreed or been forced to marry Peleus.[24] This story could have been found in a genealogical narrative, but past favours are frequently invoked in early Greek epic when recalled in the process of a supplication or request.[25] Thus any earlier version of her relationship with Zeus could have been invoked in the context of a request made of him by Thetis.[26] In fact, Thetis constantly approaches Zeus on her son's behalf, resulting in a stream of information (e.g., *Il.* 11.794–5, 17.408–9), while the parallels between Achilleus and Memnon, whose mother Eôs does obtain a special favour of immortality from Zeus,[27] led Schadewaldt to propose an episode in the *Aithiopis* in which Thetis successfully lobbied Zeus for Achilleus' immortality.[28] Thus, if Thetis is supplicating Zeus in verses 7–8, Alcaeus could be referring to a story very similar to that suggested by Schadewaldt for the *Aithiopis*, and even this detail in fr. 44 need not have come from our *Iliad*.

None of this proves that there was such another story or poem, and there is a good chance that fr. 44 is a reference to the *Iliad*. But, as a matter of argument and evidence, we cannot be sure.[29] This may be excessive or even mischievous scepticism, and perhaps it is one, both, or all of these. Yet, if there is an allusion here, the loss of the beginning of the fragment makes it hard to do more than speculate about what is being done with the Iliadic reference. Certainly, the knowledge of the *Iliad* shown by the poet and demanded of the audience is rather elementary: Achilleus' supplication of his mother, and then hers of Zeus, are two momentous, marquee-episodes near the narrative's beginning, involving the poem's major characters and

[23] Slatkin (1991) = (2011) 19–95.

[24] Cf. Willcock (1964) = De Jong (1999) (ed.) III 385–402 = Cairns (2001) (ed.) 435–55, Braswell (1971) 18–19.

[25] Cf. *Il.* 1.39–41, 8.238–42, Latacz *et al.* (2000) on 1.37–42, 40 for the traditional structure of Homeric prayer (with further bibliography), and Parker (1998) (especially 106–7 with n. 4, 116–18) on the underlying *charis* principle.

[26] Achilleus mentions Briareus when speaking to his mother (*Il.* 1.396–406), but she only refers in general terms to her benefit when she speaks to Zeus (1.503–4).

[27] *Aith.* arg. 14–15 *PEG* = 2.7–9 *GEF*.

[28] Schadewaldt (1952) 16 = (1965) 160.

[29] Cf. Steinrück (1999) 139–40 n. 4, à propos the rather adventurous case made by Rissman (1983) 9–11 for a connection between Sappho fr. 1 and Aphrodite's wounding in *Iliad* 5: 'Dieser Umstand schliesst nicht aus, dass, wie Rissman sagt, Sappho mit ihrerem Lied gerade polemisch auf *Il.* 5 verweist, aber auf der methodischen Ebene, bietet sich diese Interpretation nicht als überzeugende Beziehung zwischen Sappho und der *Ilias* an.'

pretext. This is not to fault Alcaeus for failing to be Callimachus, merely to note differences in what he is asking his audience to do: they may be required to know of the *Iliad* and its basic plot, but they are not required to invoke very much of its details or even its course. If more of the fragment survived, it might become clear that Alcaeus is doing something rather complex; as it is, we cannot see it.

Though the vicissitudes of transmission are especially important in the above case, and potentially misleading in the impression they give us of Homeric interactions, they are not always the most pressing difficulty.[30] A fragment of Alcaeus contains a list of armour which has been held to be a quotation of Homer or 'the Epic':

μαρμαίρει δὲ μέγαc δόμοc
χάλκωι, παῖca δ' Ἄρηι κεκόcμηται cτέγα
λάμπραιcιν κυνίαιcι, κὰτ
τᾶν λεῦκοι κατέπερθεν ἵππιοι λόφοι
νεύοιcιν, κεφάλαιcιν ἄν-
δρων ἀγάλματα·

And the great house gleams
with bronze, and the whole dwelling is arrayed for Ares
with bright helmets, from
which the white horse-hair plumes nod
from above, adornments for
heads of men.

Alcaeus fr. 140.2–7 Voigt[31]

Arming scenes are legion in Homer, and lines 4–5 look very much like a formulaic couplet:[32]

κρατὶ δ' ἐπ' ἰφθιμωι κυνέην εὔτυκτον ἔθηκεν
ἵππουριν· δεινὸν δὲ λόφοc καθύπερθεν ἔνευεν·

And upon his mighty head he set a well-made helmet
with a horse-hair crest; and dreadfully did the plume nod from above;

The language is close indeed, but can we be sure that it is the *Iliad* which is evoked? This is, after all, a formula, located within a typical scene, and so presumably not limited to our *Iliad* in the experience of an archaic audience. If it is an Homeric reminiscence, is Alcaeus asking his audience to

[30] Yet the similarly fragmentary Stesichorus does provide much more, and much clearer, proof of direct Homeric interaction, which may suggest that our surviving evidence is actually representative.

[31] Cf. Page (1955) 209–23, Rösler (1980) 153–4.

[32] *Il.* 3.336–7 (Paris) = 11.41–2 (Agamemnon) = 15.480–1 (Teucer) = 16.137–8 (Patroclus).

https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107706989.003 Published online by Cambridge University Press

think of Paris, Agamemnon, Patroclus, or Teucer? Or is there a generalised connotation of heroic epic endeavour to be applied to the poet's current circumstance?[33] In either case, there seems to be little sustained or active interaction with any particular Homeric passage(s).

Typicality is not the only barrier to identifying a direct Homeric allusion. Take the story of Helen in Alcaeus frr. 42 and 283 Voigt, and Sappho fr. 16, a story told in the *Cypria*.[34] Though the date of this 'cyclic' poem is unknown, its material is at least as old as the two Homeric epics, so its episodes must have been known in some more direct epic form to the Lesbian poets. The same must be said for the 'Cologne Alcaeus' (fr. 298 Voigt), which tells the story of Cassandra's rape, but this time compares Ajax's violence to the behaviour of Pittacus.[35] Scholars have long drawn attention to the importance of post-Homeric epic influence on Lesbian poetry,[36] and it is unclear why we should look always to an interaction with Homer, who only alludes to these stories, as opposed to those poems which narrated them directly.

In this connection, Sappho fr. 44 ('Sappho's most Homeric poem'[37]) is particularly interesting, since the wedding of Hector and Andromache is not known from another epic source, though it is not difficult to imagine it within the narrative scope of the *Cypria*. Scholars have argued that Sappho uses several Iliadic scenes, largely from Books 6, 22, and 24 – marquee-episodes once more – to compose a 'new' story.[38] Yet neither Hector nor Andromache

[33] Cf. especially lines 14–15 τῶν οὐκ ἔστι λάθεσθ' ἐπεὶ | δὴ πρώτιστ' ὑπὰ τῶργον ἔσταμεν τόδε with Rösler (1980) 154; also Spelman (forthcoming 1).

[34] Cf. Meyerhoff (1984) 91–113 (fr. 42 Voigt), 76–86 (fr. 283), 54–75 (Sappho fr. 16); also Rosenmeyer (1997) 142, à propos Sappho fr. 16: 'How can we *not* imagine the consequences, how Homer told the story, how Helen will eventually sail back with the husband she is in the process of abandoning? The very name of Helen functions as an allusion to Homer's epic'; cf. similarly Blondell (2010) 358–9, arguing that the reference to Achilleus' horses in Alcaeus fr. 42.14 (ξάνθαν … [πώλων) must refer to Achilleus' horse Xanthus in *Iliad* 19, and so to their prediction of their master's death in that passage. But (as Blondell notes) 'Achilles' famous horses [are] mentioned several times in the *Iliad*' (359; cf. Schein (2002) 201–2, especially 201 n. 25) and so presumably this immortal team was known before Homer; Blondell (2010) 359 then suggests that ἀμφ' Ἐ[λέναι (fr. 42.15) is 'another Homeric allusion', pointing to ἀμφ' Ἑλένηι (*Il.* 3.70), yet this formulaic expression also recurs at *Il.* 3.91 and *Od.* 22.227 in the same metrical position (and thematic context). The nature of the evidence should give rise to more caution than this.

[35] Cf. Liberman (1999) II 99 for bibliography. Similarly with Achilleus' birth in Alcaeus fr. 42 (*contra* Blondell (2010); see previous note), and Telamonian Ajax in fr. 387; the former example relates to material nowhere contained in the Homeric poems, whilst the second reflects a longstanding tradition about Ajax.

[36] See Meyerhoff (1984), Steinrück (1999); cf. also West (2002) 209–15 = (2011–13) I 395–402 for epic traditions known to the Lesbian poets.

[37] Rissman (1983) 121.

[38] Cf. Rissman (1983) 119–41, Meyerhoff (1984) 118–39, Schrenk (1994), Bowie (2010c) 71–4; *contra* Suárez de la Torre (2008) and especially Spelman (forthcoming 2), who suggests

is an Homeric invention; Hector's traditionality needs no argument, and his wife has a consistent back-story which gives us no compelling reason to think that she is an innovation,[39] while both the Iliadic episodes which give most of the requisite information – the prospective lamentation in Book 6, and the formal lamentation in Book 24 – are typical scenes, in which such reminiscences are also typical.[40] Homer is unlikely to have been the first or last epic poet to sing of their marriage. There is here no trigger of interaction, in the form of a specific reminiscence or expression which could not be a coincidence, the result of shared thematic and mythological context.[41] No one would deny that Sappho is recalling epic language here; but we cannot identify those interactions as specifically Homeric.

A little more promising, at least initially, is the description of the narrowing of Xanthus' waters in a poem of Alcaeus: στενω̣ [̣ ̣] Ξάνθω ῥο̣̣[ος] ἐς θάλασσαν ἴκανε.[42] Unlike the previous example, this does match a particular episode in the *Iliad*, where Xanthus/Scamander is choked with corpses and unable to flow to the sea (21.218–20):

> πλήθει γὰρ δή μοι νεκύων ἐρατεινὰ ῥέεθρα,
> οὐδέ τί πηι δύναμαι προχέειν ῥόον εἰς ἅλα δῖαν
> στεινόμενος νεκύεσσι, σὺ δὲ κτείνεις ἀϊδήλως.
>
> For now my lovely streams are filled with corpses,
> nor can I at all pour forward anywhere my stream to the divine sea
> groaning with corpses, and you kill on, to annihiliation.

Once more, however, battle on the plain – at the edge of which the river is situated – is a repeated feature of Trojan War epic, and Achilleus' rampage before his death, which was later preserved in the *Aithiopis* and is widely assumed to be alluded to in the latter books of the *Iliad*,[43] may be a source

convincingly that fr. 44 refers to the wedding of Helen and Paris. For another widely accepted interaction, between Sappho fr. 1 and several scenes in Homer, cf. the rightly cautious Hutchinson (2001) 149 against Blondell (2010) 373–7.

[39] Cf. Wathelet (1988) I 274–83 (§ 33).

[40] See Kelly (2012) for bibliography and discussion.

[41] For instance, Rissman (1983) 123–4 links κλέος ἄφθιτον (line 4) with *Il.* 9.413, but this is a traditional expression (as she notes, but dismisses because of other Homeric reminiscences in the poem); cf. [Hes.] fr. 70.5 M–W, Sappho fr. 44.4 Voigt, *CEG* I 344.2 (Phocis, 600–550?). Further, Rissman (1983) 126–7 and Bowie (2010c) 72–3 stress the role of Idaios (line 3) as an allusion to his role in the ransom of *Iliad* 24, yet Idaios (an expected name for a Trojan) is also 'prominent' in Books 3 and 7, and a fixed character in the story: cf. Wathelet (1988) I 598–600 (§ 157).

[42] Alcaeus fr. 395 Voigt; cf. Liberman (1999) II 172 n. 349 (who reads ῥ[όο]ς̣]). The source for this fragment, the Ammonius papyrus commentary on 21.219–20 (V 98.6–10 Erbse), connects the passages directly, but this is mere inference.

[43] See in general Burgess (2009) 74–92, especially 75–7, 78–83, 85–90 for the correspondences between the Iliadic battle scenes and those apparently drawn from Achilleus' story.

for the image. Remember too that Xanthus/Scamander has two names and a very developed formular system in the *Iliad* which – as in the case of Achilleus – shows us that pre-Homeric poets had given him a prominent place in epic narrative,[44] as does an hexameter inscription on the early fifth-century Douris 'school cup' (Μοῖσά μοι ἀ⟨μ⟩φὶ Σκάμανδρον ἐύρ⟨ρ⟩οον ἄρχομ' ἀεί{ν}δε⟨ι⟩ν).[45] Aside from recurring frequently in a number of both ancient Near Eastern and Indo-European contexts,[46] the motif is also found in Archilochus' 'Telephus elegy', this time applied to Greek corpses in the Caïcus (especially ἐϋρρείτης δὲ Κ[άϊκος | π]ι̣π̣τ̣όντων νεκύων στείνετο καὶ [πεδίον] | Μ̣ύ̣σ̣ι̣ο̣ν, 8–10).[47] Given this background, we cannot conclude that Alcaeus' use of the theme must be referring to Homer's description of Xanthus.

So there are few very good cases for direct Lesbian interaction with the poetry of Homer.[48] The traditionality of the epic and the loss of other poems detailing Trojan War material militate against most identifications, leaving aside the further and at times crippling drawback of the incomplete preservation of the poetry of Sappho and Alcaeus. But, even if we grant the interactions here, the type of engagement being suggested is limited to some big episodes involving the major characters. There is no abstruse or detailed knowledge of the *Iliad* (still less of the *Odyssey*), or its employment into the target poem; the allusive strategies of later ages have yet to appear. Again, this is not an argument against Lesbian sophistication or quality, since much of the significance critics see in direct Homeric interactions remain even if Sappho and Alcaeus are instead invoking more generalised notions of epic poetry. Nonetheless, the interactions we have seen here should caution us against imposing on the archaic period notions of intertextuality familiar from more literate periods of Greek cultural history.[49]

[44] Richardson (1993) 53–4.

[45] Lyr. Adesp. fr. 938(*e*) *PMG* (I am indebted to one of the Press readers for this reference); cf. Lowenstam (1997) 45–6; also Sider (2010), who at p. 544 n. 4 notes that the inscription was once attributed to Stesichorus. Patrick Finglass draws my attention to the fact that Simoeis is similarly prominent at the beginning of Stesichorus' *Sack of Troy* (fr. 100.9–10 F.): the rivers of Troy were clearly an important part of epic topography.

[46] See West (1997) 392, (2007) 491.

[47] Text according to Obbink (2006); cf. Swift (2012), though I am not persuaded that Archilochus is alluding to Homer.

[48] Cf. Meyerhoff (1984) 13: 'Stoffe der Odyssee spielen bei Sappho und Alkaios keine erkennbare Rolle.' This matches well with the fact that all extant seventh-century Odyssean images in pictorial art concern the blinding of Polyphemus, and artistic coverage of the *Odyssey* remains limited until the middle of the sixth century; see Snodgrass (1998) 129–30.

[49] For a tentative reconstruction of the development of intertextuality over the period see pp. 42–4.

The slightly earlier figure of Alcman presents the same general picture. The first candidate comes from the *Partheneion* (fr. 1.45–9 *PMGF*):

δοκεῖ γὰρ ἦμεν αὔτα
ἐκπρεπὴς τὼς ὥπερ αἴτις
ἐν βοτοῖς στάσειεν ἵππον
παγὸν ἀεθλοφόρον καναχάποδα
τῶν ὑποπετριδίων ὀνείρων·

For she seems herself to be
outstanding, just as if someone
were to set a horse among the herd,
compact, prize-winning, thundering-footed,
a horse of winged dreams.

The description of the horse in verses 47–8 has been linked with Agamemnon's prize-winning horses (δώδεκα δ' ἵππους | πηγοὺς ἀθλοφόρους, οἳ ἀέθλια ποσσὶν ἄροντο, *Il.* 9.123–4 = 265–6).[50] If the allusion is allowed, then Hutchinson may be right that, by reducing Agamemnon's twelve horses to one, Alcman is underlining Hagesichora's exceptionalism.[51] But once more, this is not a sustained interaction with the entire text, or even the wider Iliadic passage (which would defeat the sense of the praise almost entirely). Instead, it is cherry-picked from a prominent episode, perhaps simply because it was unusual and striking, though it does at least indicate an engagement with a textual detail.

But should we assume that Homer was the first or only poet to have used the collocation πηγοὺς ἀθλοφόρους? Note the typical explanatory relative clause οἳ ἀέθλια ποσσὶν ἄροντο (*Il.* 9.124 = 266), though it appears only to gloss ἀθλοφόρους.[52] Homer does explain well-known words in this way,[53] but also uses explanations of this sort much more often for less familiar words, collocations, or ideas.[54] Given that πηγός elsewhere in Homer only describes waves (κύματι πηγῶι, *Od.* 5.388, 23.235) and is otherwise unknown, a false association between πηγός and πηγή seems to have arisen in early epic,[55] as

[50] Cf. the admirable caution of Hutchinson (2001) 87–8. Calame (1977) II 67–8 lays more emphasis on another Iliadic simile, where Agamemnon is compared to a bull among the herd (2.480–3).

[51] Hutchinson (2001) 87–8. [52] So Rank (1951) 82.

[53] Cf. Rank (1951) 82–4. For Homer's familiarity with this compound, cf. *Il.* 11.699–700, 22.22, 22.162–3; it also appears at [Hes.] frr. 23(a).39, 198.8, 199.1 M–W, *Cypria* fr. 15.6 *PEG* = 16.6 *GEF*.

[54] Cf. Rank (1951) 76–82.

[55] 'False' only in the sense that their original derivation from πήγνυμι (cf. *LfgrE* s.v. πηγ(ή) E (R. Führer) was probably independent.

https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107706989.003 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in Hesiod's attempt to explain Pegasus' name (τῶι μὲν ἐπώνυμον ἦν, ὅτ' ἄρ' Ὠκεανοῦ παρὰ πηγὰc | γένθ', *Th.* 282–3). πηγούc thus represents an original sense poorly understood in Homer's time, and so glossed (or at least included in the gloss) in the *Iliad*; the poet seems to have linked πηγούc with πόccιν, in the sense of being 'firmly founded' or 'strong in foundation' (< πήγνυμι).[56] That the term confused all later interpreters as well suggests a history behind the *Iliad*'s deployment which we are now unable to see.[57]

A more tantalising case comes in Alcman's fr. 80:[58]

> καί ποκ' Ὀδυccῆoc ταλαcίφρονoc ὦατ' ἑταίρων
> Κίρκα ἐπαλείψαcα.
>
> And once the ears of enduring-minded Odysseus' companions
> were anointed by Circe.

The source for this hexameter fragment does not seem to think it means that Circe personally did the anointing,[59] an event which could allude to Homer's Circe advising Odysseus to anoint his companions' ears with wax (*Od.* 12.47–9):

> ἀλλὰ παρὲξ ἐλάαν, ἐπὶ δ' οὔατ' ἀλεῖψαι ἑταίρων
> κηρὸν δεψήcαc μελιηδέα, μή τιc ἀκούcηι
> τῶν ἄλλων·
>
> But drive past out of the way, and into the ears of your companions anoint
> honey-sweet wax, having worked it, lest someone of the others
> should hear;

Moreover, earlier in the encounter, she restores their form by anointing them with another drug (*Od.* 10.391–2):

[56] Cf. *LfgrE* s.v. πηγός (W. Beck) for this meaning; differently Calame (1977) II 68 n. 41: 'l'harmonie physique du cheval'. For several items in a previous clause being glossed in this way, cf. *Il.* 16.260–2.

[57] Cf. ΣbT on 9.124a (ii 423.48–52 Erbse) μέλαναc· τούτουc γὰρ ἀρίcτουc φαcὶν οἱ περὶ ἵππων γράψαντεc. ὁμοίωc καὶ "κύματι πηγῶι" (*Od.* 5.388, 23.235), εἴγε ἀλλαχοῦ φηcι "μέλαν τέ ἑ κῦμ' ἐκάλυψεν" (*Il.* 23.693; cf. *Od.* 5.353). τινὲc δὲ μεγάλουc, εὐτραφεῖc, ὑψαύχενας; cf. Porphyry *Quaest. Hom.* on *Il.* 3.196–7, Hesych. π 2151 (p. 105 Hansen) πηγόν· οἱ μὲν λευκόν· οἱ δὲ μέλαν. καὶ εὐτραφῆ, ἢ μέγα, *Su.* π 1491 (IV 123.28 Adler) πηγόc· ὁ εὐτραφήc. Cf. Hinge (2006) 263: 'was Alcman sich vorgestellt hat, wissen wir leider nicht.'

[58] West (1988) 151 n. 4 = (2011–13) I 36 n. 4 suggests that these verses are the work of the third-century Alexander the Aetolian, who wrote a *Kirka* (fr. 2 Magnelli). However, Athenaeus 7.283a expresses doubt about that poem's authenticity (see Magnelli *ad loc.*), the *scholia vetera* frequently quote Alcman, and there is nothing textually amiss in the scholion.

[59] ΣT on *Il.* 16.236 (IV 223.25–30 Erbse) invokes the fragment to explain Achilleus' claim that his earlier prayer to Zeus was his (ἐμόν), despite the fact that it was delivered by Thetis. For the principle 'qui facit per alium facit per se', see Davies and Finglass (2014) on Stes. fr. 96 F.

https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107706989.003 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> οἱ μὲν ἔπειτ' ἔστησαν ἐναντίοι, ἡ δὲ δι' αὐτῶν
> ἐρχομένη προσάλειφεν ἑκάστωι φάρμακον ἄλλο.
>
> They then stood opposite her, and she going through them
> anointed each one of them with another drug.

Several interactive possibilities may be suggested: Alcman may be following the *Odyssey* or its story in assigning her responsibility for the tactic; he may be suggesting that she personally did it, in a clever recombination of these two Odyssean episodes into one; or he may even be misremembering the Homeric event. However we choose to read Alcman's view of her agency, Circe is no newcomer to early Greek epic, and Hesiod already tells us that she bore Agrius and Latinus to Odysseus (*Th.* 1011–16). The authenticity of that passage has been questioned, but Latinus could have entered Greek tradition at any point from the eighth century onwards, when Greek contact and trade with Italy began in earnest,[60] so the story is likely to be early. It would thus be unwise to narrow Alcman's source for such a well-established character only to the *Odyssey*.[61]

The final case from Alcman is fr. 77 *PMGF*, Δύσπαρις, Αἰνόπαρις, κακὸν Ἑλλάδι βωτιανείραι, a striking expression invoked by an Homeric scholiast to illuminate *Il.* 3.39 = 13.769, Δύσπαρι εἶδος ἄριστε γυναιμανὲς ἠπεροπευτά.[62] Like αἰνο-, κακο-, and privative ἀ-, the prefix δυς- is several times appended to words in epic to create a derogatory form,[63] a common type of kenning with many Indo-European parallels.[64] Hence, it is hard to believe that Homer was the first or only Greek epic poet to have a character abuse Paris in this way, especially when we remember his obvious traditional importance to the entire Trojan story. But again, if this is an interaction with Homer, we cannot go very far into Alcman's poem, or speculate about the intertextual dynamics

[60] Cf. West (1966) on Hes. *Th.* 1016, though he argues for a connection in the mid-sixth century (the peaceful connections of earlier periods 'can have caused little stir in the homeland'); more recent discussion in Lane Fox (2008) 132–7, Finglass (2014d) 32, Davies and Finglass (2014) 400–2. For argument in favour of the passage's authenticity, see Kelly (2007b) 389–96.

[61] Cf. *contra* Hinge (2006) 257, though he ignores the context of the fragment's quotation (above, n. 59). On Circe's epic background, cf. Heubeck *ap.* Heubeck and Hoekstra (1989) on *Od.* 10.133–574, Danek (1998) 200–3. Henry Spelman suggests to me that Alcman's introductory expression καί ποκ' suggests an allusion or reference in passing (as at, e.g., Pind. *N.* 3.38), i.e., to a proverbially well-known story.

[62] See the discussion in Fowler (1987) 30, and also Hinge (2006) 257 (though note his caution): 'dass Alkman die homerischen Epen *zumindest teilweise und in irgendeiner Fassung* gekannt hat, wird allgemein angenommen' (my italics); *contra* Calame (1983) 489 on his fr. 97.

[63] Cf. *Od.* 23.97 μῆτερ ἐμή, δύσμητερ, *Il.* 18.54 ὤ μοι δυσαριστοτόκεια, *Od.* 19.260, 19.597, 23.19 Κακοΐλιον, 18.73 Ἶρος Ἄϊρος, Risch (1974) 215, Fehling (1969) 176, 287–9.

[64] See West (2007) 80–1; though in formation a compound, Δύσπαρι is used as a kenning in the *Iliad*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107706989.003 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in the engagement. The word is memorable enough (as perhaps with πάγον in fr. 1.48, above) so that one wonders if there need have been any further interactive aim.

To sum up: as in Lesbos with Alcaeus and Sappho in the first third of the sixth century, so in Sparta with Alcman in the last third of the seventh. The picture is remarkably uniform in what it tells us about direct Homeric interactions. In those few cases which might get over our evidence bar, the level of engagement – where we can speculate – seems to be superficial and limited. Nothing much about the source text is revealed or deployed, and the audience is not asked to import much of that text into their interpretation of the lyric poem.[65] There is no good evidence here for a sustained redeployment of the Homeric texts.

All this tallies suspiciously well with the evidence of artistic representations of Trojan War material in the archaic period.[66] Homeric scenes remain in the minority well into the sixth century BC, and they seem only to impose a small range of 'famous' episodes into the artistic tradition. As Ford has shown, this was Homer's common literary fate in the archaic period as well: to be invoked as a great and authoritative epic poet without that invocation requiring detailed or sustained knowledge of his actual texts.[67] Homeric reception in these poets does not support the increasingly popular scholarly notion that archaic poetic culture thrived on quasi-literate levels of allusion. 'There are no Virgils here.'[68]

Stesichorus and Homer

All this appears to change with Stesichorus. He is an anomaly in other ways, most notably in composing in dactylic rhythms and an epico-Doric dialect the scope and corpus of an epic-style narrative poet.[69] It is no surprise that the extent of his epicism is more obvious, because previous poets (as far as we can tell) were not trying to write self-contained narrative on this scale, and heroic epic material remains in the minority in their corpora; for Stesichorus this type of composition is almost all that we have and know of his work.[70]

[65] Bowie (2010c) 84 observes that 'what we miss so far is a protracted questioning of the heroic ideal or of the way Homer's gods behave such as we find in later fifth-century plays of Euripides'. This may not be unconnected to the lack of 'sophisticated' or sustained interaction under examination.

[66] Cf. p. 21, n. 5; p. 30, n. 48. [67] Ford (1997).

[68] Fowler (1987) 39.

[69] Cf. Maingon (1989), Arrighetti (1994), (2006) 119–40, Russo (1999), Finglass (2014a) 40–6.

[70] Cf. Rutherford, Chapter 6, this volume, for the 'non-epic' works, which are often considered spurious.

There are some shadowy predecessors in this program of 'lyric epic', but it is impossible to know how far, if at all, Stesichorus was indebted to them.[71] For instance, according to Athenaeus, the fourth-century scholar Megaclides believed that Stesichorus named (whatever this might mean) Xanthus as an earlier poet, and also related that Xanthus dressed Heracles – *differently* from Stesichorus – in the Homeric manner.[72] This is hardly a debt, and when Megaclides is further reported to have said that Stesichorus 'took many things over from Xanthus, including the poem entitled *Oresteia*', one can only speculate on what these 'many things' were. Megaclides' authority is in any case questionable, given his wrong contention that Stesichorus was the first to depict Heracles 'in the garb of a robber … with club and lionskin and bow'.[73] Despite these problems, it may be significant that the seventh-century figure Xenocrates, another possible predecessor,[74] is, like Stesichorus, from the Greek west.[75] We have to admit the possibility that much of the programme identified here as Stesichorean may have owed a great deal to these predecessors.

Nonetheless, dealing with what we have, there is still a real difference between Stesichorus and the other extant lyric poets. His approach naturally admits more opportunity for interaction with Homer and other epic poetry.[76] That is, Stesichorus moves beyond the details we observed earlier, which might recall and/or rework Homeric elements involving the major characters at major moments in the poems – Paris being abused by Hector, Hector's farewell to his wife or the lamentations at his funeral, Achilleus fighting with the river, Odysseus and Circe. As we saw with the pictorial artists of the archaic period, these poets' practice might be considered a 'highlights' approach to Homeric interaction. But in Stesichorus, as Burkert argued thirty years ago, we finally get beyond this.[77]

First, in the *Geryoneis*, Heracles shoots an arrow through one of Geryon's three heads, which is then compared to a poppy (fr. 19.44–7 F.):

[71] Cf. West, Chapter 4, this volume.

[72] Athen. 12.512e–513a = Xanthus fr. 699 *PMG* = Stes. frr. 171, 281 F.

[73] Stes. fr. 281 F.; cf. Davies and Finglass (2014) *ad loc*.

[74] He is sometimes called Xenocritus. Cf. [Plut.] *De Mus.* 1134e, Rutherford (2001) 382–7, Finglass (2014a) 21–3. Power (2010) 251 n. 156 sees Stesichorus 'represent[ing] a choral reception of an already developed citharodic tradition of mythic-epic narrative', but the evidence is wanting.

[75] We do not know where Xanthus was from.

[76] On the famous *Palinode*, cf. Kelly (2007c) and Davies and Finglass (2014) *ad loc*. This poem was widely held in antiquity to show an anti-Homeric stance, reflecting an ancient perception that Stesichorus had a particular relationship to the Homeric past; cf. Graziosi and Haubold (2009) 108–9.

[77] Burkert (1987) = (2001–11) I 198–217 = Cairns (2001) 92–116.

ἀπέκλινε δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ αὐχένα Γ̣ᾳρ[υόνας
ἐπικάρcιον, ὡc ὅκα μ[ά]κ̣ω̣[ν
ἅτε καταιcχύνοιc᾽ ἀπ̣ᾳλ̣ὸ̣ν̣ [δέμας
αἶψ᾽ ἀπὸ φύλλα βαλοίc̣α̣ ν̣[υ—⏑⏑

And then Geryon bent his neck
at an angle, as when a poppy
which shaming its gentle [form
immediately casting off its leaves ...

The poppy simile (45–7) is universally compared with Homer's description of the death of Gorgythion (*Il.* 8.302–8):[78]

καὶ τοῦ μέν ῥ᾽ ἀφάμαρθ᾽, ὃ δ᾽ ἀμύμονα Γοργυθίωνα
υἱὸν ἐΰν Πριάμοιο κατὰ cτῆθοc βάλεν ἰῶι,
τόν ῥ᾽ ἐξ Αἰcύμηθεν ὀπυιομένη τέκε μήτηρ
καλὴ Καcτιάνειρα δέμαc ἐϊκυῖα θεῆιcι.
μήκων δ᾽ ὡc ἑτέρωcε κάρη βάλεν, ἥ τ᾽ ἐνὶ κήπωι
καρπῶι βριθομένη νοτίηιcί τε εἰαρινῆιcιν,
ὣc ἑτέρωc᾽ ἤμυcε κάρη πήληκι βαρυνθέν.

And this man he missed, but he struck noble Gorgythion
the strong son of Priam on the chest with an arrow,
the one born to his mother brought to marriage from Aisumna,
fair Castianeira, like the goddesses in her form.
And as a poppy casts its head to one side, the one in the orchard
weighed down with fruit and the spring rains,
so on one side bowed the head, weighed down by its helmet.

Scepticism first: flowers and plants are not uncommonly found in such circumstances in early Greek epic,[79] and the image is different – poppy shedding its leaves, poppy weighed down by fruit and spring water – while the poppy-head (κώδειαν) is deployed elsewhere in an Homeric simile of a decapitated head (*Il.* 14.496–500). In fact, only μήκων is shared between two passages, though one might also point to βαλοῖcα and βάλεν, and (if line 46 is correctly supplemented) to the repetition of δέμαc from the biographical mention of Gorgythion's mother in the *Iliad* (8.304–5), but now applied to Geryon himself. Such deliberate recomposition of epic phraseology in Stesichorus has been extensively documented,[80] so it

[78] Cf. Maingon (1980), Lazzeri (2008) 254–68, Curtis (2011) 146–51, Davies and Finglass (2014) *ad loc.*

[79] Cf. Kelly (2007a) 289–91.

[80] Cf. Maingon (1978), (1980), (1989), Tsitsibakou-Vasalos (1986), (1990), Vagnone (1982), Willi (2008) 58–74, Rocha (2009), Curtis (2011) 48–9, Finglass (2014a) 40–6. For reasons which will become clear, I am sceptical of many of these identifications.

would not be out of place here. But μήκων does not occur again in poetry until Aristophanes, and the chances that the same, highly untypical simile image would be applied in two unconnected passages to a figure struck by an *arrow* – a distinctly uncommon means of victory in Homer – must be small.

Unlike the earlier interactions, furthermore, this is not a prominent episode in the *Iliad*: the victor is Teucer, the victim the otherwise unknown son of Priam, Gorgythion (cf. Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.12.5) – a suggestive name for Geryon[81] – who is himself a minor figure killed by mistake for Hector, and whose death falls during one of the less important sequences in the poem. If we allow this interaction, what does it reveal about Stesichorus' level and type of engagement with the *Iliad*?

One might consider in this connection that the story of Gorgythion's mother Castianeira (her wedding and his childbirth) is mentioned at *Il.* 8.304–5, immediately before the simile that describes the death of her son; this may be recalled in the extended scene between Geryon and his mother in Stesichorus, which itself takes place ahead of the battle with Heracles in which the poppy simile occurs (frr. 16–17 F.). At the very least, as Homer's simile bestows pathos on an unknown warrior killed by mistake, so this simile seeks to use the Homeric source to bestow upon the monstrous Geryon a similar level of feeling.[82] If one were to take a hopeful view of the interactions examined earlier, one might suggest that Stesichorus differs only in taking a minor episode rather than a major one, and deploying it for a determinedly non-Homeric story. Perhaps that is advanced enough on the Iliadic model, but luckily this example can also be read in conjunction with the next case, also from the *Geryoneis*.

This is the famous exhibition of the mother's breast in fr. 17 F. and *Il.* 22.83. First Stesichorus:

ἐ̣γὼ̣ν̣ [μελέ]α καὶ ἀλαc–
τοτόκοc κ]αὶ ἄλ̣[αc]τ̣α̣ π̣α̣θοῖcα
— ⏑̯ Γ]αρυόνα γωναζόμα[ι,
αἴ ποκ᾽ ἐμ]ό̣ν τιν μαζ[ὸν] ἐ̣[πέcχ⏑̯[83]
— ⏑̯ — ∪∪]ω̣μον γ[— ∪∪ —

[81] The link between Γοργυθίων and γοργός 'fearsome' (*EM* 238.48 Gaisford) would make an easy association with Geryon's rather terrifying appearance, since he was after all Medusa's grandson through his father Chrysaor (who may be mentioned in the *Geryoneis*, fr. 15.3–4 F. (*suppl.*)); cf. Hes. *Th.* 270–81, 287–8. von Kamptz (1982) 134, 322 links it instead with the Γέργιθες, inhabitants of the northern Troad.

[82] Cf. Davies and Finglass (2014) *ad loc.*

[83] The verb could be ἐ̣[πέcχον (*suppl.* Barrett, *LGS*) or ἐ̣[πέcχεθον (Page, *ibid.*); see Davies and Finglass (2014) *ad loc.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107706989.003 Published online by Cambridge University Press

⏑⏑——]
—⏕—⏑] φίλαι γανυθ̣[ε⏕
—⏕—]ρ̣οϲύναιϲ

I unhappy and wretched in my
childbearing and suffering wretchedly
I grasp your knees, Geryon,
if ever] my breast to you [I held out
…
…
… dear enjoy[
spirits …

Now the *Iliad* passage (22.82–3), as Hekabe addresses her son:

῞Εκτορ τέκνον ἐμὸν τάδε τ᾿ αἴδεο καί μ᾿ ἐλέηϲον
αὐτήν, εἴ ποτέ τοι λαθικηδέα μαζὸν ἐπέϲχον·

Hector, my child, respect these things and pity me
myself, if ever I held to you the breast that eases care;

The theme becomes popular in the tragic tradition,[84] but is found only in these two settings in extant archaic literature.[85] Of course there is the danger of circularity here, in that the Homeric passage has had an obvious influence on the supplement of the fragment. Even so, there is still the presentation of the mother's breast to her child as part of a supplication not to go out and fight an overwhelmingly dangerous enemy.

Further and more precise Homeric interactions in the scene between Geryon and his mother have been proposed. It has been suggested, for instance, that fr. 17.2–3 F. reflects several expressions denoting Thetis' lamentation for Achilles; if the connection in fr. 17.5 be granted, this must be at least plausible.[86] But the verbal link is not that strong, certainly not as strong as the display of the maternal breast, and both Stesichorus and his audience must have known lamentation scenes in other poems and performances.

[84] See Garvie (1986) on Aesch. *Cho*. 896–8, Curtis (2011) 116–17, and the detailed study provided by Castellaneta (2013).

[85] One might also consider the episode in which Menelaus drops his sword at the sight of Helen's breasts in the *Little Iliad* (fr. 28 *GEF*) as another, somewhat different, example.

[86] Cf. Davies and Finglass (2014) *ad loc*.: 'reminiscent of Hom. *Il*. 1.414 τί νύ ϲ᾿ ἔτρεφον αἰνὰ τεκοῦϲα; (Thetis to Achilles), 18.54 ὤιμοι ἐγὼ δειλή, ὤιμοι δυϲαριϲτοτόκεια (Thetis in reaction to her son's grief and imminent death). The plangent hapax in the latter passage may have inspired Stesichorus' own coinage. If there was an allusion, Stesichorus could be implicitly, and remarkably, equating the grief of the goddess Thetis for her son Achilles with Callirhoe's grief for Geryon.' Maingon (1978) 282 also suggests that πέπλ[ον (fr. 17.10) recalls κόλπον ἀνιεμένη (*Il*. 22.80, Hekabe unveiling her breast).

To place emphasis on those similarities would be merely to use a relatively solid case for Homeric engagement as an excuse to indulge in the WYSIATI fallacy. The method may seem too rigid in this case (and others like it),[87] but any allusion needs to be distinctively Homeric for an ancient audience to link it specifically with Homer rather than with the dozens, if not hundreds, of epic performances and tales in their experience. For instance, typical lamentatory language or speech introduction formulae might generally augment the epic feel of Stesichorus' poem, and in that way help to invoke the clearly Homeric allusions, but that is not the same thing as being allusions in themselves.

Leaving these considerations aside, the interaction here is of a different order from those analysed above. Though Hekabe's plea to Hector is once more a marquee-scene in the *Iliad*, in this case the action, its broader context, and the non-formulaic phraseology are mirrored between the passages. Furthermore, when combined with fr. 19, this passage shows Stesichorus consistently using images from the *Iliad* that are (1) unique to that poem, and (2) applied there to the Trojans, in order to flesh out the characterisation of Geryon and his situation. This is a noticeable increase in the level and sustained nature of the Homeric interaction, and shows Stesichorus using a continuum of representations of the Trojans' plight in Homer's *Iliad*, most likely to evoke sympathy for the usually monstrous Geryon.

As a second example of Stesichorus' fondness for slightly *recherché* episodes in the Homeric poems, we should consider 'arguably the most Homeric fragment of all lyric poetry',[88] fr. 170.1–11 F. (tentatively ascribed to the *Nostoi*):

θε[ῖ]ον ἐ[ξ]αίφνας τέρας ἰδοῖcα νύμφα,
ὦ̣δ̣ε̣ δ̣' ἔ̣[ει]φ' Ἑλένα φωνᾶι ποτ[ὶ] παίδ' Ὀδύcειο[ν·
"Τηλέμαχ', [ἦ] τ̣ις ὅδ' ἁμὶν ἄγγελ[ο]c ὠρανόθεν
δι' αἰθέρο[c ἀτ]ρυγέτας κατέπτ̣α̣το, βᾶ δ[
]. . φοινᾶ̣ι̣ κεκλαγώ̣[c
]. . .c ὑμετέρους δόμους προφα̣[. . . . . .]υc
]. . . .αν.υc ἀνὴρ
βο]υ̣λ̣α̣ῖc Ἀθάνας
].η̣ιc αυτα λακέρυζα κορώνα
—◡—×—◡].μ̣' οὐδ' ἐγώ c' ἐρύ[ξ]ω̣
—◡◡ Παν]ε̣λ̣ό̣π̣α̣ c' ἰδοῖcα φίλου πατ[ρ]ὸc υἱὸ̣ν̣
The maid seeing suddenly the divine omen,
and thus Helen spoke with her voice to Odysseus' son:

[87] Cf. pp. 41–2, on fr. 15 F. [88] Davies and Finglass (2014) *ad loc.*

'Telemachus, surely this is a messenger to us from heaven,
winged down through the unfruitful air, and it has come …
... screaming with bloody ...
... to your house ...
... man
... by the counsels of Athene
... this cawing crow
... nor will I keep you back
... Penelope looking on you, son of a dear father

This has been compared with Telemachus' departure from Sparta in *Odyssey* 15 ('but a minor episode in the subplot of Homer's *Odyssey*').[89] There are, for current purposes, two obvious differences:[90] Helen interrupts Menelaus to give her interpretation in the *Odyssey* (15.171 τὸν δ' Ἑλένη τανύπεπλος ὑποφθαμένη φάτο μῦθον), whereas in Stesichorus she notices the omen and speaks first (1–2); the Homeric omen is an eagle holding a crane which causes joy to all who look at it (15.164–5 οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες | γήθησαν, καὶ πᾶσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμὸς ἰάνθη), and in Stesichorus it is a 'cawing crow' (9, λακέρυζα κορώνα).[91]

Stesichorus gives Helen more authority, as she offers her interpretation without, apparently, any prior consultation of Menelaus; note, too, that Stesichorus focuses on her sighting of the omen alone, unlike the explicit reaction of the crowd in Homer's scene. This may not surprise in a poet so renowned for his relationship with Helen, but the same programme may also be suggested in line 10 (οὐδ' ἐγώ σ' ἐρύ[ξ]ω), which looks very much like Menelaus' similar sentiment a little earlier in the Homeric scene (15.68 Τηλέμαχ', οὔ τί σ' ἐγώ γε πολὺν χρόνον ἐνθάδ' ἐρύξω). Of course hospitality is a typical feature in early Greek epic, but there is no other first person statement to this end in Homer (contrast *Od.* 7.315 ἀέκοντα δέ σ' οὔ τις ἐρύξει).

[89] Reece (1988) 8.

[90] Cf. Davies and Finglass (2014) *ad loc.* for these and other points of contact with a range of episodes in the *Odyssey*.

[91] Peek (1958) 170, 172, followed by Davies and Finglass (2014) *ad loc.*, favours seeing the crow as something to which Helen compares herself, i.e., μή] φῄς "αὔτα λακέρυζα κορώνα", but λακέρυζα κορώνη seems to have been an epic formula, appearing in *Op.* 747 as a bad omen, and in [Hes.] fr. 304.1 M–W once more in an oracular context. Such an association would fit well with line 5 (φοινᾶι κεκλαγώς), and it would be unsurprising if Stesichorus were doing with Hesiod what we have suggested he was doing with Homer, i.e., redeploying major and (as here) minor passages in a thoroughly novel context. Later ages certainly took him to be as agonistic with Hesiod as he was with Homer, even making him the son of Hesiod in one tradition (Arist. fr. 579 Gigon, Philoch. *FGrHist* 328 F 213 = Stes. Ta18, Ta19(a) Ercoles; see Finglass (2014a) 4–5) – which also involves Hesiod's death (see Finglass (2013f) 161–2) – and the story of the *Palinode* involved both of these poets. Yet we should also remember that, if the crow is conventionally a bad omen, it is not its appearance in Hesiod('s remains) that may be influencing Stesichorus.

Together, these details suggest that Stesichorus is explicitly reworking the Homeric passage, not merely by selecting random details from the *Odyssey*, but by reworking the relationship between Helen and Menelaus in Sparta, revealing an interpretation of this theme of Homer's narrative. Stesichorus achieves this by transferring to her authoritative actions towards the end of the hospitality scene, and perhaps also by focusing solely on her reaction to the omen. This is a slightly less radical redeployment than that in the *Geryoneis*, since in fr. 170 the same characters and circumstances are involved as in Homer, but the interaction encourages the audience to think in the same way.

Other cases of specifically Homeric interaction in Stesichorus have been proposed, notably the level and manipulation of his epic diction,[92] for example in the existence of speech introduction formulae. But formulaic diction could be derived from any one of the many epic poems and performances with which Stesichorus and his audience were familiar. More tempting, perhaps, is the thematic parallel between Geryon's reply to his mother's caution and Sarpedon's famous speech on the heroic ethos in *Iliad* Book 12.[93] First of all, Stesichorus (fr. 15.5–12 F.):

5 "μή μοι θά[νατον ≍ — ≍ —
τα δεδίcκ[ε(ο) — ∪∪ — —
μηδέ μελ[— ≍ — ≍ — ∪∪
αἰ μὲν γὰ[ρ ∪∪ ἀθάνατος ≍
μαι καὶ ἀγή[ραος — ≍ — ≍ —
10 ἐν Ὀλύμπ[ωι
κρέccον[(∪) — ≍ — ≍ — ∪ ἐ–
λέγχεα δ[— ∪∪ —

5 'Do not, I ask, death ...
terrify ...
nor ...
for if [immortal ...
and ageless ...
10 on Olympus ...
better … re-
proaches …

Now the Homeric passage (*Il.* 12.322–8):

ὦ πέπον εἰ μὲν γὰρ πόλεμον περὶ τόνδε φυγόντε
αἰεὶ δὴ μέλλοιμεν ἀγήρω τ' ἀθανάτω τε
ἔccεcθ', οὔτέ κεν αὐτὸc ἐνὶ πρώτοιcι μαχοίμην

[92] Cf. n. 80. [93] Cf. Tsitsibakou-Vasalos (1991–2).

οὔτέ κε σὲ στέλλοιμι μάχην ἐς κυδιάνειραν·
νῦν δ᾽ ἔμπης γὰρ κῆρες ἐφεστᾶσιν θανάτοιο
μυρίαι, ἃς οὐκ ἔστι φυγεῖν βροτὸν οὐδ᾽ ὑπαλύξαι,
ἴομεν ἠέ τῳ εὖχος ὀρέξομεν ἠέ τις ἡμῖν.

My friend, if we two escaping this war
were always to be ageless and immortal,
neither would I fight among the first
nor would I send you into battle where men win honour;
but now, since the fates of death stand hard by,
fates innumerable, which a mortal cannot escape nor avoid,
let us go, whether we grant the boast to another or someone to us.

There is, however, no trigger for specific interaction with Sarpedon's speech, since the best case ('immortal and ageless' in lines 8–9) depends on restoration, and the expression is anyway a formulaic expression frequently found in settings stressing the mortal/immortal contrast.[94] Though there is no other extant example of this phrase in which such a comparison is made in precisely this context, formularity pushes this parallel below the evidence bar.[95] If it managed to get over, however, it would provide more evidence for Stesichorus using specifically Trojan (or, in this case more accurately, non-Greek) elements from the *Iliad* so as to encourage sympathy or admiration for Geryon.[96]

Conclusion

Stesichorus was the most consistently epic of all the archaic lyric poets. His work represents an important stage in what we are able to say about the

[94] This does not make it an unlikely or unreasonable restoration in the *Geryoneis*, but the evidence bar in this chapter has been set very high. For the formula, cf. *Il.* 8.539, 12.323 (above), 17.443–4, *Od.* 5.135–6, 5.218, 7.94, 7.256–7, 23.335–6, Hes. *Th.* 277–8, 304–5, 949, 954–5, [Hes.] frr. 23(a).12, 23(a).24, 25.28, 229.8 M–W, *Hom. Hym.* 2.242, 259–61, 3.151–2, 5.214.

[95] Yet its sentiment is close to *Il.* 8.539 (cf. n. 94, and the supplement of Rozokoki (2008) 69 to fr. 15.9 F., ἤματα πάντα μένων), a part of the *Iliad* one can reasonably be sure that Stesichorus was using in the *Geryoneis*; cf. pp. 35–7.

[96] That is, the audience should apply both the message (that one must fight and risk one's life because of one's social prominence) and the sympathetic characterisation of Sarpedon in the *Iliad* to Geryon and his decision to fight Heracles. Davies and Finglass (2014) *ad loc.* further argue that Stesichorus' 'use of the motif would be a fine twist on Sarpedon's speech. There the prospect of immortality on escaping this particular battle is advanced as an unattainable impossibility. Stesichorus turns this into a real option which the monster rejects in favour of going into battle.'

diffusion and deployment of Homer's poems in the Greek world, and about the development of poetic culture and intertextuality in the period. The level of his interaction specifically with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and not just with epic poetry more generally, seems clear in two cases: (1) in the *Geryoneis* Stesichorus takes two unique episodes from the *Iliad* which emphasise the sympathetic value of the Trojans' fate and applies that sympathy to Geryon's fate; and (2) in the *Nostoi* he emphasises the greater determinative power of Helen implied throughout the *Odyssey*, but takes it even further by giving her two unique actions given by Homer to Menelaus. In both of these cases, the audience is asked to connect thematically linked passages in the Homeric source, interpret them, and apply that reading to the Stesichorean poem.

This suggests that Stesichorus had access to more than just a general knowledge of the poems, almost certainly to a written text, but also that the nature of interaction is closer to the developed intertextuality of a later age: rather than merely showing knowledge of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, or invoking Homer as an authority figure, or even alluding to big moments in the poems, Stesichorus seems also to be engaging a larger reading of their themes (Trojans as sympathetic figures, Helen as more impressive than Menelaus) in order to augment the semantic power of his own text. For the first time that we can see, the audience is being encouraged to access large swathes of the poem *and* its details, and actively to apply that knowledge to the current composition.

Partially, this may be a matter simply of the parlous state of our evidence. Sappho fr. 44, for instance, could be claimed as precisely this kind of sustained recomposing interaction, and the thesis of this chapter would not be materially altered: after all, the two are so close in date that it would be surprising if Stesichorus in the culturally thriving west[97] had access to a complete text of Homer whilst Sappho (and Alcaeus) in the equally rich east did not. If we had more of her poem (or poetry), we might find stronger indications of a direct interaction with Homer – that is, indications of the kind we find in Stesichorus.

But it may also reflect increasing textualisation as a cultural phenomenon in the archaic period, in which intertextual dynamics develop along something like the following lines: poets begin with general references to epic tradition and stories before specific versions attain currency, then they invoke well-known episodes from those poems without yet demanding

[97] For the Greek west, cf. Willi (2008), Bowie (2012), and especially Morgan (2012) 35–48, with the corrections of Finglass (2013e); also the essays in Breglia and Moleti (2014), and West, Chapter 4, this volume.

knowledge of textual details, and finally they recombine and recompose those episodes (and then their more abstruse neighbours) so as to depend on such detailed knowledge. Drawing precise boundaries between these stages is difficult, and they are not exclusive, since almost all of them could be evidenced, for example, in Alcaeus. Nonetheless, it may not be coincidental that the earlier stages are well exampled in the material from the lyric poets analysed above, whilst before Stesichorus there are only a few contested cases of the last stage.

Viewed in this way, Stesichorus' differences from Sappho are still noticeable: if her fr. 44 is drawing on Homer, it takes a range of marquee-episodes from the *Iliad* and recombines them into something new, suggesting a reading of several different Homeric episodes into a coherent continuum, but her new narrative has to do with the same characters and events as in Homer, just set at the opposite end of their story. Stesichorus does this too in the *Nostoi*, but he also takes less familiar episodes and expressions, and applies them to an entirely different story in the *Geryoneis*. So perhaps we should think of him reaching a more developed stage in a continuum of interaction, and pushing further and more systematically the potentialities explored by his predecessors and contemporaries. Certainly, if we grant to Sappho this kind of Homeric recomposition, then Stesichorus still stands out in using it to a greater extent and placing it at the centre of his poetic programme.

In any case, the conclusion remains the same: Stesichorus' interaction with the Homeric poems is something new, as far as we can now see, in the literary history of the archaic Greek world. This chapter opened with the observation that we have become recently (re)acquainted with a highly developed *arte allusiva* between Homer and his predecessors, Greek and otherwise. But our examination of the supposed Homeric interactions in lyric poetry before Stesichorus does not support such a picture. Textual interaction in the archaic period is a story of evolution, not revolution, and Stesichorus' efforts mark a pivotal stage in what we can reconstruct of that narrative.