STESICHORUS

THE POEMS

M. DAVIES AND P. J. FINGLASS

CAMBRIDGE CLASSICAL TEXTS AND COMMENTARIES

54

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE CLASSICAL TEXTS
AND COMMENTARIES

EDITORS

54

STESICHORUS: THE POEMS

STESICHORUS

THE POEMS

EDITED WITH INTRODUCTION,
TRANSLATION,
AND COMMENTARY

BY

M. DAVIES

Associate Professor in Classical Languages and Literature,
University of Oxford, and
Fellow of St John's College, Oxford

AND

P. J. FINGLASS

Professor of Greek and Head of the Department of Classics,
University of Nottingham, and
Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107078345

First published 2014

Printed in the United Kingdom by Clays, St Ives plc

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-107-07834-5 Hardback

COLLEGIO DIVI IOANNIS BAPTISTAE

CONTENTS

PREFACE

The genesis of this project goes back to the mid-1970s, when Malcolm Davies began a commentary on the fragments of Stesichorus, the first such work since the rediscovery from the 1950s onwards of significant quantities of this poet on papyrus. In 1979 he successfully submitted the completed work as a DPhil thesis to the University of Oxford; it was subsequently awarded the University's Conington Prize. But the difficulties faced by academic publishers at the time, and the relative unfamiliarity of the idea of a detailed commentary on a fragmentary author, impeded its publication as a book. In 2006, Patrick Finglass approached him to propose a collaborative commentary on Stesichorus taking Davies's thesis as its starting point. At that time Finglass was engaged in an edition of Sophocles' *Ajax*, and Davies in preparing further volumes of his edition of the lyric poets, and so it was not until 2010 that the new project began in earnest. The completed typescript, incorporating an introduction and a new text of the fragments, as well as the commentary, was submitted to Cambridge University Press early in 2013 for consideration by the Editors of the Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries series. The revised typescript was submitted in September 2013, and it has not usually been possible to refer to work published after that date.

The majority of the resulting book is a joint effort by the co-authors. Davies's thesis was sent in Word form to Finglass, who has thus had full access to that work during his writing of the commentary, and has frequently drawn on it, although of course he has engaged with subsequent scholarship too; he has also had the benefit of discussion with Davies throughout, and has been loaned several books and offprints by Davies during the project. However, Finglass is the sole author of those sections of this book which have no corresponding sections in the original thesis: that

is, the Introduction, the Text and Apparatus,[1] the Commentary on frr. 97, 186–268, 293, 321, 325 (i.e. fragments on papyri, including the Lille fragment, not discovered when Davies wrote his thesis), the Bibliography, and the Indexes; he has also verified the references and taken account of the detailed comments from the Series Editors and from colleagues who read all or part of the typescript. Davies himself read the entire typescript in early 2013 and offered detailed comments. As a whole, then, the present work constitutes not a revised or updated version of the original dissertation, but a new book in its own right, a work of genuine collaboration.

* * *

A project that has lasted some four decades has incurred many debts. First thanks are owed to our respective institutions, the University of Nottingham and St John's College, Oxford, for giving us the time to do research. A particularly vital contribution was made by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, which awarded Patrick Finglass a Research Fellowship for the academic year 2012/13, during which this book was brought to completion. This is the second successive book by Patrick Finglass funded by the AHRC, and he would like to express his thanks not only to that organisation for its generosity, but also to its anonymous peer reviewers, whose comments have affected his thinking in ways large and small. The award, by the Leverhulme Trust, of a Philip Leverhulme prize to Patrick Finglass in 2012 has also assisted the gestation of this project.

The whole volume has been read in typescript and significantly improved by James Diggle, Neil Hopkinson, Michael Reeve, Henry Spelman, and Martin West; we have additionally benefited from comments on selected passages by Simon

[1] Readers should note that since the text is wholly the work of Finglass, the newly-numbered fragments should be cited simply as 'Stesichorus fr. 1 Finglass' etc.

Hornblower and Alan Sommerstein. The encouragement of Michael Sharp and the Editors of the Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries series at Cambridge University Press has been essential in bringing the project to a successful conclusion. Muriel Hall's copy-editing greatly improved the accuracy of the volume. Patrick Finglass's visits to Oxford to discuss Stesichorus with his collaborator, to consult papyri, and to use libraries have been facilitated by the continuing kindness of the Warden and Fellows of All Souls College. Some of his ideas have been presented in papers read to audiences in London, Birmingham, Naples, Nottingham, Oxford, Thessaloniki, and Turin. Malcolm Davies's original thesis benefited from comments from Spencer Barrett, Winfried Bühler, Rudolf Kassel, Hugh Lloyd-Jones, and Martin West. Neil Stewart-Rutter converted the original thesis into electronic form during his time as Malcolm Davies's research assistant; Annamaria Peri provided Patrick Finglass with a copy of Marcovigi (1970), a document otherwise unavailable in the UK. David Kovacs gave him sight of Benedict (2005), an excellent MA dissertation submitted to the University of Virginia. Donald Mastronarde kindly sent him his preliminary editions of Euripidean scholia containing fragments of Stesichorus. Robert Fowler generously allowed him to see the second volume of his *Early Greek Mythography* in advance of publication. Finally, we are grateful to the staff of the Hallward Library in Nottingham, the Bodleian, Sackler, and Taylorian Libraries in Oxford, the University Library in Cambridge, and the British and Institute of Classical Studies Libraries in London.

We cherish the memory of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones, the supervisor of Malcolm Davies's doctoral thesis, who provided us both with advice and friendship in the early stages of our respective careers. And we dedicate this book to St John's College, Oxford, which has supplied one of us with employment, the other with education, and both with membership of a flourishing academic community. May the College

continue to foster the study of the ancient world for generations to come.

Scribebamus in urbibus Oxonia et Snotengaham M. D.
Die Festo S. Ioannis Chrysostomi P. J. F. F.
AD MMXIII

Patrick Finglass's work on this book was supported by the award of a Research Fellowship by the Arts and Humanities Research Council.

INTRODUCTION

1 DATE

Stesichorus' mythological narratives eschew the kind of historical references or personal reminiscences that could shed light on when their author lived. The creative interaction of one fragment with a specific passage of the *Odyssey* indicates that Stesichorus knew the latter work, and that enough of his audience knew it to make the imitation worth his while.[1] Translating this relative dating into anything more precise, however, is not easy. According to the lowest Homeric chronology with any serious scholarly support, the *Iliad* was composed shortly after *c.* 680,[2] and the *Odyssey*, which shows the influence of the *Iliad*,[3] well within the second half of the seventh century;[4] this would put Stesichorus' activity no earlier than, say, 610. But many scholars advocate a much earlier dating for the Homeric poems;[5] if they are right, Stesichorus might have been composing decades before 610 and still have had the chance to respond to the *Odyssey*.

More promising, at first sight, is the reference that Stesichorus apparently made to Hesiod as the author of the *Aspis*,[6] which yields a *terminus post quem* coincident with the date of this poem. But that could be any time between the late seventh and mid sixth centuries.[7] The most recent discussion places the work

[1] See fr. 170n.

[2] West (1995) = (2011–13) I 188–208; cf. (2011–13) I 209–11, 231.

[3] See K. Usener (1990).

[4] See West (2005a) 58 = (2011–13) I 303, (2012) 237. According to West, the *Odyssey* was influenced by the lost *Argonautica*, which cannot be earlier than the middle of the seventh century, since it implies exploration of the Black Sea, where there are no Greek finds from before *c.* 640.

[5] See e.g. Lane Fox (2008) 381–4, who argues for an eighth-century date for the *Iliad*, and R. Rutherford (2012), who reviews West's argument.

[6] Fr. 168. See *ad loc.* for the form that this reference might have taken.

[7] See Janko (1986) 43 (referring to parallels with archaic art). Cf. the wide range of possible dates suggested for another poem wrongly attributed to Hesiod, the *Catalogue of Women* (Cingano (2009) 116–17).

between 591 and *c.* 570; after 591 because its closing lines are thought to refer to the fall of Crisa during the First Sacred War, and before 570 because of the interest taken in the subject by vase-painters from *c.* 565, and a possible reference to the poem on the François vase of *c.* 570.[8] But much of the First Sacred War is of doubtful historicity, attested as it is by late, partisan sources who may be fabricating archaic history to suit their own ends;[9] we can hardly treat the fall of Crisa as a reliable chronological datum. The evidence of art is more valuable, but still far from cogent. The circulation of a newly-composed *Aspis* might indeed have encouraged vase-painters to portray this myth on their wares. Equally, both poem and vases could be independent responses to a more general interest in the myth of Heracles, the poem perhaps postdating the earliest vases; or the *Aspis* might have taken some time to achieve popularity, and thus influenced the vase-painters years or decades after its composition.[10] The evidence provided by the François vase is the most intriguing: it portrays a centaur called Melanchaetes, a word used as an epithet in a list of centaurs from the *Aspis*, which may have been misunderstood by Clitias, the vase's inscriber, as a proper name.[11] But even if we accept the link (which may be mere chance), Clitias could have been misremembering a poem that he first encountered many years before. Hence the dating of the *Aspis* cannot be restricted to the early part of the sixth century; and as a result it does not provide as helpful a chronological limit on Stesichorus as we would like. Nevertheless, the *Aspis* is not without value for our investigation. It is most unlikely

[8] Thus Janko (1986) 38–47; cf. Cingano (2009) 111. Janko also uses his presumed dating of Stesichorus' poetic career (570–540) to date the *Aspis*; we omit this consideration to avoid circular reasoning.

[9] See N. Robertson (1978), J. Davies (1994), R. Fowler (1998) 13 n. 30.

[10] After all, the *Iliad* does not make an identifiable impact in art until well after its composition (not until *c.* 580, according to Burkert (2012)).

[11] [Hes.] *Asp.* 186 Ἄρκτον τ' Οὔρειόν τε μελαγχαίτην τε Μίμαντα. The end of the line may have been misremembered as Μίμαν τε, or that might be the true text (as conjectured by West (1961) 140), which would turn μελαγχαίτην into a proper name.

to be earlier than the late seventh century, and as a consequence, Stesichorus' poem will not have been composed before, say, 610.

Pliny and Plutarch refer to a poem of Stesichorus containing an emotional reaction to a solar eclipse.[12] If we assume that this work was prompted by an actual eclipse, that this eclipse was total or near-total, and that it occurred in Sicily, south Italy, or Greece, three possibilities emerge: the eclipses of 608, 585, and 557.[13] Of these, the total eclipse of 557 is the most plausible candidate, since its zone of totality fell squarely across Sicily and Greece.[14] By contrast, the zone of totality in 585 passed somewhat to the north of Sicily and Greece; while during the annular eclipse of 608 the strip most in darkness was to the north of Sicily, and far to the north of Greece. But the initial assumption that Stesichorus' poem was in fact the response to an eclipse is open to doubt. Eclipses had already found their way into Greek poetry,[15] and these literary descriptions could be imitated by later writers with no direct experience of the real thing; eclipses no doubt lived on in folk memory, too. There was nothing to stop Stesichorus from incorporating one into a narrative if he judged it appropriate, whether or not one had recently taken place.[16]

What about external testimonia to Stesichorus' career? The earliest is provided by Simonides, who was active in the late sixth and early fifth centuries.[17] After describing Meleager's victorious spear-cast at the funeral games for Pelias, he adds 'for thus did Homer and Stesichorus sing to the peoples'.[18] In Simonides'

[12] See fr. 300n. [13] For the data see Ercoles (2007).
[14] Thus West (1971a) 306 = (2011–13) II 84–5.
[15] Cf. Archil. fr. 122 *IEG*, Mimn. fr. 20 *IEG*; also Hom. *Od.* 20.356–7.
[16] Thus Ercoles (2007) 74.
[17] He wrote poetry in praise of Eualcidas of Eretria, who died in 498 (T54 Poltera), and in celebration of the Greek victory at Plataea in 479 (frr. 10–17 *IEG*). For further discussion see Molyneux (1992); Molyneux does not provide evidence that Simonides was active before 510 (as Poltera notes, his edition, p. 7 n. 34), but if we can rely on his traditional birth date of 546 it is likely that he was composing by that date.
[18] Simon. fr. 273 Poltera (Tb37 Ercoles; see Stes. fr. 4).

view, Stesichorus was a figure of the past, an established classic worthy of being set alongside the very best composer of epic. Hence our poet was at least a generation older than Simonides, and probably more. He therefore seems unlikely to have been active after, say, 540.

Scholarship on Stesichorus from the late fifth century onwards contributes further relative datings. Glaucus of Rhegium asserts that Stesichorus took the *harmateios nomos* and his dactylic metre from Olympus,[19] a musician perhaps of the late eighth century.[20] According to Megaclides, Stesichorus' *Oresteia* was heavily influenced by the poet Xanthus;[21] unfortunately, we have no independent means of dating the latter. Chamaeleon in his work *On Stesichorus* claims that the works not only of Homer but also of Hesiod, Archilochus, Mimnermus, and Phocylides were set to music.[22] Archilochus' *floruit* was placed in 664/3, Mimnermus' in 632–629;[23] so if Chamaeleon was working with these or similar dates, and if he meant that Stesichorus set the work of these poets to music (not a certain inference), he probably imagined that Stesichorus was composing in the late seventh or sixth century.

A startlingly different chronology is implied by the author of the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Orchomenians* and by Philochorus, who claim that Stesichorus was the son of Hesiod.[24] This

[19] Fr. 2 Lanata (Tb20 Ercoles). For Glaucus' life and work see Huxley (1968).

[20] The *Suda* makes him a contemporary of Midas (king of Phrygia 738–696?). For the sources for Olympus see further Campbell's edition, pp. 272–85, supplemented by West (1992) 331 n. 9.

[21] Stes. fr. 171.

[22] Chamaeleon fr. 27 Giordano (Tb21 Ercoles), on which see Ercoles.

[23] By Apollodorus and the *Suda* respectively, the latter reflecting earlier scholarly tradition. Phocylides is dated shortly after the middle of the sixth century by the *Suda*, which makes him a contemporary of Theognis (see West (1974) 65–6); in fact, he is more likely to have lived in the first half of the sixth century (see West (1978a) = (2011–13) II 68–77). When Chamaeleon put him we cannot tell.

[24] Arist. fr. 579 Gigon (Ta18 Ercoles), Philoch. *FGrHist* 328 F 213 (Ta19(a)). The source of the Aristotelian fragment, Tzetzes, goes on to say that Stesichorus was a contemporary of Phalaris of Acragas (who reigned in the

relationship may have been invented as a response to perceived similarities between their poetry, or have arisen somehow from the poets' shared Locrian connexions: Hesiod is said to have died in Ozolian Locris after seducing the girl who became Stesichorus' mother, while Stesichorus' birth was placed in Metaurus, a settlement associated with Epizephyrian Locri.[25] If this account dates Stesichorus much earlier than we would expect, a different report does the reverse. According to the Parian Marble, a work of chronology inscribed in 264/3, the year 485/4 was when 'Stesichorus the poet arrived in Greece'; the same date saw Aeschylus' first victory and the birth of Euripides.[26] Such a chronology is ruled out by the testimony of Simonides. It may have originated from a desire to synchronise Stesichorus with two tragic poets whose work he influenced; or it might refer to a different poet who took the name Stesichorus and for whom this is our only evidence.[27] Whatever the truth, we may disregard this reference in our search.[28]

With Cicero we return to a more familiar chronology: he puts Stesichorus' death, and Simonides' birth, in 556/5.[29] His dating is probably taken from Apollodorus of Athens,[30] although there is no explicit evidence of this. The *Suda*'s dates for Stesichorus,

second quarter of the sixth century) and Pythagoras (born perhaps in the mid-sixth century). But this information will be based not on actual chronological data, but on Stesichorus' associations with both figures in the later biographical tradition (see West (1971a) 302–4 = (2011–13) II 79–81).

[25] The different views and their supporters are set out by Ercoles (2008) 37 with n. 2; he rightly argues that both may have been responsible for the growth of the myth. For Metaurus see further pp. 13–15.

[26] *FGrHist* 2B 239.50 (Ta36 Ercoles); Στησίχορος ὁ ποιητὴς εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀ[φίκετ]ο. According to the same source, a fourth-century poet took the name 'Stesichorus of Himera the Second', which shows that at least one artist sought celebrity by adopting the name of his archaic predecessor.

[27] For these hypotheses, and their proponents, see Ercoles (2008) 36.

[28] For the possible significance of the reference to Stesichorus 'coming to Greece' see p. 25.

[29] Cic. *Resp.* 2.20 (Ta5(a) Ercoles); supplements are owed to Mommsen (1860) = (1905–13) VII 39–41 and Rohde (1881) 568–9 = (1901) I 106–7.

[30] Apollod. *FGrHist* 244 F 337 (Ta5(a) Ercoles); thus Mommsen (1860) 167 = (1905–13) VII 41, Jacoby (1902) 196–7.

632–556, are probably shared with Cicero's source; so are Eusebius', which give 611/10 for Stesichorus' *floruit* and 560/59 for his death.[31] These figures have no particular authority, however, being 'founded on nothing but the assumption that Stesichorus was younger than Alcman and older than Simonides'.[32] Reports that Stesichorus lived to a great age reflect a general topos concerning poets' lives.[33]

Our search has proved frustrating, but not quite fruitless. If we say that Stesichorus' career covered some of the period betweeen 610 and 540, we shall not be far wrong.

2 LIFE

Stesichorus' poems tell us nothing explicitly about his life.[34] Here we consider the evidence for his homeland and his family. Understanding where he came from will turn out to be important for assessing aspects of his poetic career.

Stesichorus is associated most persistently with Himera, a Greek city on the north coast of Sicily,[35] which was proud enough

[31] *Su* c 1095 (Ta10 Ercoles); Euseb. *Chron.* Ol. 42.2, 55.1 (Ta5(b)). For other sources containing, or consistent with, these dates, and also probably derived from Apollodorus, see Ercoles (2008) 35 n. 1.

[32] West (1971a) 302 = (2011–13) II 78. West (n. 2 in each) points out that the date for Stesichorus' birth is exactly forty years after the *floruit* for Alcman given by the *Suda*, which in its entry for Stesichorus emphasises τοῖς δὲ χρόνοις ἦν νεώτερος Ἀλκμᾶνος. Willi (2008) 52–4 is too credulous of these datings.

[33] See Kivilo (2010) 216–17. These reports may nevertheless be right, purely by chance, since his enormous output suggests a relatively long life; see pp. 18–20.

[34] For this whole subject see Kivilo (2010) 63–86.

[35] Thuc. 6.62.2 refers to Himera, ἥπερ μόνη ἐν τούτωι τῶι μέρει τῆς Σικελίας Ἑλλὰς πόλις ἐστίν. 'Here Ἑλλάς functions as an adjective, as it sometimes can do; but the choice of word, the normal noun for "Greece", may lend a certain emphasis: Himera was an outpost of Greece' (Hornblower (2004) 193; cf. his n. on 6.62.2 and Willi (2008) 51). For Himera see further Allegro (1999) (with useful maps), Fischer-Hansen *et al.* (2004a) 198–201, Domínguez (2006) 292–8, De Angelis (2012) 176–9; for Greek settlement in Sicily more generally see Malkin (2011) 97–118, Tribulato (2012b) 17–23.

of its poet to cast him in bronze.[36] Traditionally Himera's foundation is dated to 648;[37] recently discovered archaeological material is consistent with a date in the mid-seventh century.[38] It was founded, Thucydides tells us, from Zancle, whose own mother city was Chalcis in Euboea.[39] Most of the Himeran colonists[40] were of Chalcidian descent, but they were joined by political exiles from the Dorian city of Syracuse, called the Myletidae. That name might indicate that they first settled at Mylae, another, earlier Zanclean foundation on the eastern tip of Sicily's northern shore, which Strabo calls Himera's mother-city.[41] As a result, the Himeran dialect was mixed, containing Chalcidian and Dorian elements, but the laws and customs (νόμιμα) of the Chalcidians prevailed.[42] Such blending is borne

[36] The statue was made before the Carthaginian sack in 409, and taken to Carthage before being returned to Thermae Himerenses (the nearby successor city to Himera, founded 409) by Scipio Aemilianus after Carthage's destruction in 146 (Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.86 = Ta42 Ercoles). It constitutes the earliest evidence for Stesichorus' connexion with Himera; the next references come in Glaucus of Rhegium (fr. 2 Lanata = Tb20) and Plato (*Phaedr.* 244a = Ta17).

[37] Thus Diod. 13.62.4.

[38] Thus Brugnone and Vassallo (2004) 761 n. 3, Vassallo (2010) 42 with n. 8; earlier reports which deny archaeological evidence for settlement before 625 can be disregarded.

[39] Thuc. 6.4.5–6; cf. Lane Fox (2008) 284. Zancle was founded from Cyme, another Chalcidian settlement, before further settlers arrived from Chalcis and the rest of Euboea. Different types of evidence place its foundation *circa* either 770 or 720 (thus Lane Fox (2008) 285–6; cf. Domínguez (2006) 266). Around 494 the city was captured by Anaxilas of Rhegium, who renamed it Messana (today's Messina) after his homeland of Messenia (cf. Simkin (2012) 184–6).

[40] The term 'colonisation', as applied to Greek overseas settlement in the archaic period, has come in for criticism in recent scholarship, since it may carry associations that could confuse the unwary. Note however the argument of Willi (2012a) 72 n. 51 that it 'may refer quite generally to any process of collective settling in an ethnically (and linguistically) foreign environment, without necessarily implying an "organized, state-sponsored venture"'.

[41] Strab. 6.2.6; thus Bérard (1957) 241, Alessio (1970) 92 n. 384. For Mylae see Nielsen (2002c) 59–60.

[42] Thuc. 6.5.1.

out by dialectal variation in Himeran inscriptions.[43] It may also be reflected in the names of the city's founders, Euclides, Simos, and Sacon:[44] while men called Euclides are found all over the Greek world, Simos and related names feature strongly in Euboea, and Sacon is attested in Dorian Sicily but not in Euboea or other Ionian settlements.[45]

Himera's ties with other Chalcidian settlements are evident from its material culture. Recent house excavations have led to the discovery of 'craft connections between Zankle and Himera right from the latter's foundation'.[46] The similar coinage introduced into Zancle, Naxos, and Himera in the third quarter of the sixth century suggests enduring institutional and economic links.[47] So too does a Himeran law inscribed on bronze from the second half of the sixth century, written in the alphabet of Chalcis, which may have been produced by the same workshop as another such inscription from the unidentified Chalcidian settlement at Monte San Mauro near Caltagirone.[48] A Himeran coin dated between 413 and 408 depicts the head of Kronos,[49] a god whose associations with Zancle were strong, and whose

[43] So *IGDS* I §7 (550–500) Πρ]ατυίδεο is an Ionic genitive of a derivative from Πράτυς, while *IGDS* I §8 (6th c.) κόρēι (with metrically guaranteed short first syllable) shows a typically Ionian, and so Euboean, lack of compensatory lengthening (cf. Dell'Oro (2010) 16 with n. 11); the unusual γλαυκόπι (instead of γλαυκόπιδι) in the same inscription may have been chosen because names in –ις usually have dental stems in west Ionic, and so the form may have sounded more epic to Himeran ears (thus Dell'Oro, pp. 17–18). But *IGDS* I §14b (*c.* 400) Ἡρακλείδα is a Doric genitive, and *IGDS* I §11 (475–450) hιάλē, aorist passive from ἰάλλω 'send', is also found on a Doric inscription from Delos (*ID* 87.2, *c.* 400). See further Mimbrera (2012a) 195–6.

[44] These names are given by Thuc. 6.5.1.

[45] Thus Knoepfler (2007) 95; cf. Bérard (1957) 241–2.

[46] De Angelis (2012) 177.

[47] Thus Kraay (1971) 10 ('these three coinages, minted on a common standard, which was employed, as least for coinage, nowhere else in the West must be treated as a single phenomenon'), (1984) 13–16, 19, Torelli (2003) 676–7.

[48] *IGDS* II §15; see Brugnone (2003) 84. According to Frasca (1997), this town should be identified with the settlement called Euboea mentioned by Herodotus (7.156.3; see Fischer-Hansen (2002) 143–9, Fischer-Hansen *et al.* (2004a) 191–2, Mercuri (2010)).

[49] Serbeti (1992) §1.

characteristic weapon, the sickle, gave its name (in the local Sicilian language) to that town;[50] it thereby hints at shared cultic practices between mother and daughter city.[51] A continuing close association is implied by Herodotus' account of how Himera sheltered the tyrant Scythes of Zancle after he was deposed in 490.[52] It may even lie behind the appearance of the figure Perieres in Stesichorus' poetry.[53] One of Zancle's founders, Thucydides tells us, had that name, which is not attested elsewhere except in mythology.[54] Did its Zanclean flavour appeal to the Himeran poet?[55]

In common with other cities in Sicily and south Italy, Himera may have become more Dorian as time went on.[56] A cult of Pelops, that quintessentially Dorian hero, could have existed from the late sixth century.[57] The city fell under the control of Theron of Acragas and his son Thrasydaeus after the battle of Himera in 480. An attempt by the Himerans four years later to encourage Hieron of Syracuse to intervene on their behalf resulted in a purge by Theron of many leading citizens, and the settlement of Dorians (and any others who wished to come) in their place.[58]

[50] See Thuc. 6.4.5, Call. *Aet.* fr. 43.68–71 Harder, Poccetti (2012) 56, Simkin (2012) 167–70.

[51] Thus Lane Fox (2008) 285.

[52] Hdt. 6.24.1.

[53] Fr. 287.

[54] Thuc. 6.4.5 = *LGPN* IIIa 360; Knoepfler (2007) 102 calls it 'a totally unique name . . . that cannot, and should not, be corrected'.

[55] Caution is in order. The mythological Perieres was king of Messenia, and the renaming of Zancle as Messene in *c.* 494 (see n. 39 above) might have prompted the invention of a founder with that name. The Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* refers to him, and that poem has no Zanclean associations. But it remains possible that Stesichorus was aware of a founder of Zancle called Perieres, and included that name in his poetry out of local sentiment.

[56] See Cassio (1997b) 207. Among the inscriptions discussed above (n. 43), characteristically Dorian forms are found only from *c.* 475; but the sample is too small for this fact to have much value. For the Dorianisation of another Chalcidian town, Rhegium, see Ucciardello (2005) 50–1.

[57] See Torelli (2003) 678–9.

[58] Diod. 11.48.6–8, 49.3–4. As Hornblower (2004) 195–6 notes, these may have included Himera's most famous fifth-century resident, the athlete Ergoteles; see further p. 11.

Himera's site seems to have been chosen because it lay as far to the west as one could travel without going into Phoenician or Elymian territory.[59] It was also a convenient location for trade between Spain, Italy, and North Africa.[60] The oldest remains come from the coast, not the hill inland, suggesting a maritime orientation rather than a defensive posture, and the latest discoveries bear this out.[61] Himeran coinage must have been made up of foreign silver, since the metal is not native to Sicily; it might have come from Tuscany or Spain.[62] In Hornblower's words, the settlement was, 'like Palermo in later centuries, a culturally, ethnically and linguistically heterogeneous place: on the city streets and harbourside of Himera you could no doubt jostle not only with . . . Dorian and Ionian Greeks, but with more exotic folk as well', such as Phoenicians, Carthaginians, Etruscans, Elymians, and indigenous Sicilians.[63] The extensive restructuring of the city plan that took place from *c.* 550 indicates Himera's prosperity, the result of its success as a centre of trade.[64]

For all its wider connexions, the city did not escape local conflict, as a dedication from Samos dating to the first half of the sixth century makes clear. This commemorates the involvement of certain Samians when the Himerans repulsed the Sicanians;[65] the depiction of a shield and ship's prow in relief suggests that

[59] The same may be true for Selinus, which was founded from Megara Hyblaea on the south coast of Sicily at about the same time (thus Domínguez (2006) 294).

[60] Dunbabin (1948) 300–1.

[61] 'Recent finds, such as an important quantity of transport amphorae, . . . show the insertion of Himera within the wide network of commercial interchanges existing in the Tyrrhenian between the later 7th and the first half of the 6th century' (Domínguez (2006) 295).

[62] See Dunbabin (1948) 301 and Kraay (1971) 11. Himera's archaic coinage, which begins in about 550–540, is more abundant than that of Naxos or Zancle (thus Kraay, cited above, n. 47).

[63] Hornblower (2004) 195.

[64] See Vassallo (2009).

[65] This inscription may encourage us to question the claim of Franzen (2009) 72 that 'Himerans are not Greek, they are a new breed, a mixture of the natives and Greeks, [who] looked to Stesichorus for the documentation of their mythical lineage.' For relations between Greeks and Sicels/Sicanians see Tribulato (2012b) 23–7.

their engagement took place by land and sea.[66] Yet even this domestic fracas takes on an international dimension thanks to the participation of these eastern Ionians, presumably mercenaries paid for out of the city's harbour taxes. The Samians' decision to celebrate their involvement in Himera's battles gives us a further glimpse of how that city was, from the earliest times, tightly integrated with the wider Greek world.[67]

This integration is exemplified by the career of the athlete Ergoteles. In the fifth century he was exiled from his home city, Knossos, and settled in Himera; as a Himeran citizen he took part in athletic competitions back in Greece, winning the *dolichos* (a race of *c.* 4,800 metres) twice in each of the great panhellenic contests.[68] He commissioned the Boeotian poet Pindar to celebrate one of his victories,[69] and later dedicated a statue of himself at Olympia. On its base he proclaimed that he had set up 'an immortal memorial for Himera', proudly asserting his city's links with the old country;[70] he also describes himself as 'defeating the Greeks', a phrase that may carry the defiant undertone 'we colonial Himerans are as good as any of you Greeks from the homeland'.[71]

Such was the city that Stesichorus called home. Its diverse linguistic and cultural amalgam – part Ionian, part Dorian – provided an appropriate setting for a poet who would combine Dorian lyric with Ionian epic.[72] And its consistent engagement with the wider Hellenic world was no doubt exemplified by Stesichorus' own career, which most likely took him around

[66] *IG* xii/6 §575 ὁπόθ' ο[ἱ] Ἱμερα[ῖ]ο[ι ἔ]ριδ' ἔπαθον Σικα[ν]ῶν.

[67] Samians had been trading with Spain since at least Colaeus of Samos in *c.* 638 (Hdt. 4.152), and we can imagine that many will have stopped off in Himera, 'a good staging post for the voyage to the far west' (Barron (2004) 263).

[68] Paus. 6.4.11.

[69] Pind. *O.* 12, commemorating success in the *dolichos* in 466; on this poem see Silk (2007).

[70] *CEG* i 393 (from 464 or slightly later) Ἱμέραι ἀθάνατον μ̣ν̣[ᾶμ(α). See Hall (2012) 31 for this function of Sicilian dedications.

[71] Ἕλλανας νικῶν; thus Hornblower (2004) 193.

[72] See section §6 below.

Sicily, Magna Graecia, and Greece; in principle, any place where Greeks were settled could have welcomed him. Unfortunately, we lack specific, reliable sources concerning his links with Himera, such as we have for Ergoteles. According to Aristotle, he warned his fellow-citizens against granting Phalaris a bodyguard, but this looks like an apocryphal story, especially because a similar tale is told in which Gelon, a fifth-century tyrant, takes the place of Phalaris.[73] Two further anecdotes illustrate how Stesichorus acquired a reputation for political wisdom, although neither is connected with Himera: he urges the Locrians against provoking their enemies (a tale also told of 'Dionysius', presumably Dionysius I of Syracuse), and calms an imminent street battle in an unspecified town.[74] Such legends arose in the fifth or fourth century to fill the void that was Stesichorus' biography, possibly prompted by some statement in his poetry expressing disapproval of tyranny: it was common enough in ancient biography for statements made by characters in a literary work to be naïvely applied to their authors.[75]

The Locrians in question are presumably Epizephyrian Locrians. The story may preserve, at whatever remove, some connexion between Stesichorus and their city, especially since another mythical tale links Stesichorus' recovery of his sight with the battle of the Sagra between Croton and Locri;[76] a further trace of a Locrian association may appear in the story that makes Stesichorus the product of an affair of the poet Hesiod and a local girl in Ozolian Locris.[77] Another probably apocryphal story has Stesichorus flee from Pallantium in Arcadia to Catane in Sicily, where he died and was buried near a gate

[73] Arist. *Rhet.* 1393b8–22 (Ta34(a) Ercoles), Conon *FGrHist* 26 F 1.XLII (Ta35).
[74] Arist. *Rhet.* 1394b34–1395a2 (Ta33(i) Ercoles), Diog. Bab. fr. 85 *SVF* (Ta31). The story involving Dionysius is told by Demetr. *Herm.* 99.
[75] Thus Lefkowitz (2012) 39.
[76] Paus. 3.19.11–13 (Ta30(b) Ercoles), Conon *FGrHist* 26 F 1.XVIII (Ta30(a)), Hermias on Pl. *Phaedr.* 243a (Ta30(c)).
[77] See pp. 4–5 above.

which was called 'Stesichorean' after him.[78] This tale may ultimately derive from Stesichorus' *Geryoneis*, in which case it would reflect the career of Evander rather than that of the poet.[79] But the reference to Catane is unexpected: Evander is elsewhere associated with Italy, not Sicily. So perhaps this story too, although unreliable in part, may hint at an association between Stesichorus and Catane, itself a Chalcidian settlement like Himera.

A more reliable tradition associates Stesichorus with Metaurus, a settlement on the toe of Italy, north of Rhegium: today's Gioia Tauro.[80] Metaurus, like Himera, was founded from Zancle;[81] from the mid-sixth century it fell under Locrian influence,[82] but in Stesichorus' youth (at least) it was a Chalcidian settlement.[83] Archaeological material from the first half of the seventh century into the sixth century reveals a well-connected town: the tombs contain 'mixed Greek and indigenous grave goods indicating a mixed population; the Greek wares reveal ties with the Chalkidian cities of Zancle and Rhegion and above all with Mylae, but overall a wide commercial network is revealed by the tomb material.'[84] This suggests extensive cultural interaction between Greeks and non-Greeks,[85] a

[78] Thus *Su* σ 1095 (Ta10 Ercoles). The burial of Stesichorus at Catane is also attested by Ant. Sid. or Thess. *A.P.* 7.75 = 483–6 *GP* (Tb39), Phot. π 168 and *Su* π 225 (both Ta40); Himera is said to be his resting place by Poll. 9.100 (Ta39) and Suet. Περὶ Παιδιῶν 1.22 (Ta38(a)). See further Barbantani (2010) 23–41.

[79] See fr. 21n.

[80] Stephanus of Byzantium (s.v. Μάταυρος = Ta15 Ercoles) calls Stesichorus Ματαυρῖνος γένος; the *Suda* (σ 1095 = Ta10) says καλεῖται γοῦν Ἱμεραῖος, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Ματαυρίας τῆς ἐν Ἰταλίαι.

[81] Thus Solinus 2.11 *a Zanclensibus Metaurum locatum*.

[82] Hence Stephanus calls it a Λοκρῶν κτίσμα; see further Burnett (1988) 136 n. 87, Cordiano (1995) 91–3, Greco (2006) 178. The foundation of Hipponium and Medma by Locri in the vicinity *c.* 600 no doubt assisted this process.

[83] Thus Cassio (1998b).

[84] Fischer-Hansen *et al.* (2004b) 283; cf. Greco (2006) 177–8.

[85] See Skinner (2012) 184–5 with 183 n. 132.

phenomenon attested more generally across Sicily and south Italy.[86] Although Metaurus' association with Stesichorus is not attested before the sixth century AD, it is likely to be true: no-one had a motive for inventing it apart from the Metaurians themselves, and their voice will hardly have been preserved by history.[87] Equally, the Himeran connexion is too persistent and early to be a fiction. Since Stephanus of Byzantium states that Stesichorus was 'a Metaurian by birth', we may guess that he was born there and later settled in Himera.[88]

An Italian origin for Stesichorus' family is supported by testimonia which give him a brother called Mamercus, Mamertius, or Mamertinus.[89] All these names recall the Oscan people called Mamertini, and therefore raise the intriguing possibility that Stesichorus had some Italic, and therefore non-Greek, ancestry; or that his family, while wholly Greek, had some connexion (say, diplomatic or mercantile) with the hinterland which led Stesichorus' father to give one of his sons a conspicuously Oscan name.[90] This would fit the picture revealed by archaeology (see the previous paragraph) of a Greek town with close connexions to non-Greek peoples: such associations were perhaps particularly intimate in the case of Stesichorus' family.[91] The Mamertini may even have lived in the region around Metaurus, at least from the second half of the fourth century, and if that was true of the

[86] For example, in terms of bilingualism and intermarriage: see Hall (2012) 28.

[87] Thus W. Ferrari (1937) 247–8, Cassio (1997b) 205.

[88] Thus Ferrari (1937) 248; cf. Rizzo (1895) 35–6.

[89] Thus Mosino (1997). Mamercus: Procl. in Euclid. *Prolog.* 2 (Ta21(a) Ercoles). Mamertius: Heron *Defin.* 136.1 (Ta21(b)). Mamertinus: *Su* c 1095 (Ta10). The last of these sources credits Stesichorus with a second brother, Helianax the law-giver. The name Mamercus is well attested in southern Italy as early as the fifth century (examples at Clackson (2012) 139).

[90] Cf. Knoepfler (2007) 95. For Euboean interactions with Etruscans in Italy see Lane Fox (2008) 158–61.

[91] Cf. Poccetti (2012) 91: 'the extent of language contacts and culture-blending in the Straits area is best illustrated by the life of the Greek poet Stesichorus.'

archaic period too it would strengthen the onomastic case for an Oscan connexion with Stesichorus' family.

Stesichorus' own original name may have Oscan associations. The *Suda* tells us that he was first called Τισίας,[92] which is virtually the same as the name of a settlement of the Bruttii, an Oscan people from the south of Italy, mentioned by Appian.[93] But Teisias is a common Greek name in all ages and periods, so any hypothetical connexion is far from certain.[94] It may seem odd to take seriously an alternative name for our poet unattested before the tenth century, when the name Stesichorus is found as early as Simonides. But even though Στησι– and –χορος are frequent onomastic elements in Euboean and elsewhere,[95] it seems quite a coincidence that someone who achieved fame as a choral poet was given at birth a name so prophetic of his then unrecognised talent: 'he who sets up the chorus'.[96] The *Suda*'s name might be a fabrication by a scholar offended by this coincidence, but it more probably preserves a genuine tradition, since it seems too unremarkable to be a fiction. Stesichorus, like Homer, almost certainly did not refer to himself by name; many archaic poets did,[97] but such a practice did not prevail in mythological narrative. Any passage in which Stesichorus did refer to himself

[92] *Su* σ 1095 (Tb2 Ercoles).

[93] Τισία, App. *Hann.* 188, from 214/13 BC. Thus Kleine, p. 10; cf. Mosino (1997).

[94] For example, it appears in Camarina and Syracuse during the fifth century (*LGPN* IIIA 422) and in Eretria during the third century (*LGPN* I 430).

[95] Thus Knoepfler (2007) 95. The name 'Stesichorus' is itself attested across the Greek world: Athens (*LGPN* II 405, from 180/179, and perhaps the fourth century and 90–80 too), Thebes (*LGPN* IIIA 384, from 316 and 167–156), Carthaea (*LGPN* I 412, from 341), Teos (*LGPN* V 410, from 330–300), Heraclea Pontica (*LGPN* V 409, from 420–400 and 380–350), Lipara (*LGPN* IIIB 401, Hellenistic), south Italy (*LGPN* IIIB 402, Imperial).

[96] As Bowie (2012a) 85 notes, 'it might be argued from his name that he was born into a family of professional melic poets', but this is not very likely. For the significance of Stesichorus' name for the manner in which his poetry was originally performed see section §4 below.

[97] See West (1999c) 365 = (2011–13) I 410.

would most likely have been preserved as a quotation, given the interest of later generations in extracting biographical data from ancient poetry.[98]

According to Plato, and later sources which probably follow him, Stesichorus' father was named Euphemus,[99] but another tradition, first attested epigraphically, calls him Euclides.[100] Two further names, Euphorbus and (probably) Euetes, appear in the Byzantine period.[101] Some of these names may have Pythagorean associations, especially Euphorbus: Pythagoras, we are told, claimed to be the reincarnation of Euphorbus the Trojan.[102] Euphemus, the earliest attested name, begins with a weak presumption in its favour, but the quite different account which makes Stesichorus the son of Hesiod[103] hardly implies confidence in Plato's account among the Peripatetic scholars where it finds its first attestation. Euphorbus, the name first mentioned by the *Suda*, is attractive on onomastic grounds: it is attested for an Eretrian at the end of the sixth century, and the –φορβος element is common in Euboean names.[104] One

[98] The phrase στησίχορον ὕμνον ἄγοισαι (or στησιχόρων ὕμνων, as Beazley (1948) 338 suggests) found on a papyrus roll depicted in a school scene on an Attic kylix from Naucratis in the style of Duris, from the first half of the fifth century (Hogarth *et al.* (1905) 120 with illustration at pl. VI.5 = Lyr. Adesp. fr. 938(*c*) *PMG*), may come from the beginning of a poem (as is demonstrably the case for other papyrus rolls depicted on vases, cited by Beazley), with ἄγοισαι agreeing with e.g. Μοῖσαι (thus Hogarth *et al.* (1899) 64). If that poem were by Stesichorus, the first word would elegantly allude to the poet's name (cf. Theocr. 18.3 χορὸν ἐστάσαντο, perhaps an allusion by Theocritus to his fellow-Sicilian: thus NH).

[99] Pl. *Phaedr.* 244a (Ta17 Ercoles); so also Steph. Byz. s.v. Μάταυρος (Ta15), an anonymous epigram *ap.* Σ Pind. I 10.12–13 Drachmann (Tb3(c)), and *Su* c 1095 (Ta10).

[100] *IG* XIV 1213 (Ta16 Ercoles), from a herm found at Tibur, probably from Hadrian's villa, and thus dating to the early second century (*IG* XIV p. 304), and *Su* c 1095 (Ta10).

[101] *Su* c 1095 (Ta10 Ercoles). Euetes is an emendation by Wilamowitz (1913) 236 n. 2 for the manuscripts' Hyetes (Εὐέτους for Ὑέτους). The latter name is nowhere attested, whereas the former has many attestations.

[102] Cf. West (1971a) 302–4 = (2011–13) II 79–81.

[103] See pp. 4–5 above.

[104] Hdt. 6.101.2; thus Knoepfler (2007) 95–6 with n. 34.

Euclides was a co-founder of Himera,[105] and it may be no coincidence that some sources give Stesichorus' father that name; not because the poet was in fact the son of Himera's founder,[106] but because the association between Stesichorus and Himera was so strong that some scholar, or even the Himerans themselves, casting around for his paternity, hit on the idea of assigning it to the very *ktistes* of his city.

The name of Stesichorus' father is irrecoverable, and relatively unimportant. His brother's name is more interesting, since it suggests an association between his family and non-Greek Italians. That onomastic hint in turn supports the tradition connecting Stesichorus with Metaurus in south Italy, where he may have been born before later settling in the bustling city of Sicilian Himera. Such origins provide important context for at least three aspects of his poetic career, all of which receive fuller discussion later in this Introduction. First, Stesichorus' associations with mainly Chalcidian towns make his native dialect more probably Ionic than Doric, even if his Ionic was to an extent mixed with Doric thanks to the particular linguistic combination found at Himera.[107] Second, they may have contributed to his evident fascination with the poetry of Homer, since from earliest times the Euboeans had a particular link with epic.[108] Third, Himera's close ties with the wider Greek world make it

[105] He is the first of the three founders mentioned by Thucydides (6.5.1).

[106] As tentatively suggested by Willi (2008) 51 n. 1. Weak support for this position comes from the claim, mentioned above (n. 89), that Stesichorus had a brother who was a law-giver, since that occupation is associated with the foundation of cities.

[107] The same is true of Ibycus, who came from Rhegium, another Chalcidian settlement.

[108] Thus Cassio (1997b) 206 'sapendo quanto l'area euboica ha contribuito in epoca arcaica alla circolazione dell'epica . . . e poi allo studio dell'epica . . . la scelta di Stesicoro di far entrare l'epica nella lirica non può essere considerata casuale'; cf. *id.* (1998a), and Debiasi (2012) 499 on the association of Rhegium, another Chalcidian settlement, with Homer. In the course of its pre-Homeric development the epic tradition may itself have passed through a Euboean phase (cf. West (1988) 165–72 = (2011–13) 1 61–73).

all the more likely that Stesichorus did not restrict performances of his poetry to his homeland.[109]

3 WORKS

Most of the quotations and paraphrases from Stesichorus found in other authors simply attribute their contents to our poet without specifying a particular work. Thanks to a few that name their source precisely, we can recover twelve titles: *Geryoneis*, *Helen*, *Palinode* or *Palinodes*, *Eriphyle*, *Europeia*, *Sack of Troy*,[110] *Cerberus*, *Cycnus*, *Returns*, *Oresteia*, *Scylla*, *Boarhunters*.[111] Two more titles from the secondary tradition, *Rhadine* and *Calyce*, denote poems falsely attributed to Stesichorus.

Fragments of eight ancient books of Stesichorus' poems are preserved on papyrus. Only one (Π5) still has its title: the *Horse*, perhaps the *Wooden Horse* or *Trojan Horse*.[112] Content permits the attribution of four of the remaining seven to poems known from the secondary tradition: *Geryoneis* (Π2), *Eriphyle* (Π4), *Boarhunters* (Π6), and *Sack of Troy* (Π8). An overlap between Π5 and Π8 suggests that *(Wooden/Trojan) Horse* and *Sack of Troy* were alternative titles for the same work. That leaves three. One may be from the *Returns* (Π3), but this attribution could easily be mistaken. In that case it would come from an otherwise unattested work, like the remaining two papyri (Π1, Π7), one of which (Π7) probably contains verses from two or more poems, not all of which are necessarily by Stesichorus.

We thus have evidence for at least fourteen poems by Stesichorus: the twelve known from the secondary tradition (four or five of which are also attested in the papyri), plus two more from the papyri which cannot be attributed to any known

[109] See section §4 below.

[110] This title is also attested on the *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina* (fr. 105).

[111] That number is increased to thirteen if there were two *Palinodes* neither of which was identical with another named work by Stesichorus.

[112] See the Introduction to the *Sack of Troy*, pp. 405–6. For the papyri, see pp. 73–6 below.

title.[113] According to the *Suda*, Stesichorus' works occupied twenty-six books. This figure, if correct,[114] will refer to an edition made at Alexandria in the third or second century BC. At least two of his poems, the *Oresteia* and the *Helen*, took up more than one book in that edition, as we know from other ancient authors who specify that a quotation comes 'from the first book of the *Helen*' or 'from the second book of the *Oresteia*'.[115] Other poems, too, probably merited one or more additional books; we would not expect that every ancient reference to a multi-volume work would be so helpful as to specify that fact. We know, then, of at least sixteen of the twenty-six books which comprised the edition of Stesichorus, and probably more: a remarkable proportion. Indeed, if two-volume works were the norm rather than the exception, or if any poems lasted for three or more books, it is conceivable (if unlikely) that we know of every one of his poems that reached Alexandria.

The edition in twenty-six books marks Stesichorus out as considerably more prolific than his fellow-lyricists.[116] Anacreon's works filled at least three books;[117] Alcman's six,[118] Ibycus' seven,[119] Sappho's perhaps nine,[120] Alcaeus' ten.[121] Even Pindar, whose career lasted more than half a century and who was constantly in demand by patrons across the Greek world,

[113] The number would be greater than fourteen if there were two *Palinodes* neither of which was identical with another work by Stesichorus, if Π3 does not belong to the *Returns*, or if Π7 contains more than one poem by Stesichorus.

[114] Numbers are especially subject to textual corruption. Nevertheless, the figure is consistent with the data revealed by the transmission, as this paragraph should indicate.

[115] Frr. 84, 175, 176.

[116] For Alexandrian editions of the lyric poets in general see Porro (2009).

[117] See Acosta-Hughes (2010) 160–3.

[118] Alcm. TB1 *PMGF*.

[119] Ibyc. TA1 *PMGF*.

[120] See Sappho frr. 226–36 Voigt with Liberman (2007) 42–4; but the edition may have included only seven (cf. Acosta-Hughes (2010) 92–104) or eight (cf. Yatromanolakis (1999)).

[121] See Alcaeus fr. 453 Voigt, Lyne (2005) 543–4 = (2007) 295, Acosta-Hughes (2010) 134–40. There were editions of Alcaeus by both Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus: see Ar. Byz. fr. 383A Slater.

only managed seventeen.[122] The impressive size of Stesichorus' output is reflected in the scale of individual poems. As we have seen, at least two required more than one book, which suggests a length of at least 2,500 lines for each work, and possibly as many as 4,000.[123] A stichometric mark in Π² reveals that the *Geryoneis* lasted at least 1,300 lines. The story in Π¹ breaks off at line 303, when it has barely got going; the complete work must have been far longer. The detailed, unhurried imitation of a minor episode from the *Odyssey* in Π³ implies a work of significant proportions. The name *Returns* (perhaps the same poem as Π³) implies several different narratives and thus a poem of some bulk.[124]

The earliest reference to an actual title is that of the *Palinode*, mentioned in the fourth century by Plato and then by Chamaeleon (who claims that there were two poems so called). This is an unusual name; we would rather expect something from myth. There is no independent evidence for this designation after Chamaeleon, nor indeed for the existence of the poem after that date; so it is possible, albeit unlikely, that this poem did not form part of any Alexandrian edition. The existence of two titles, *(Wooden/Trojan) Horse* and *Sack of Troy*, for the same poem may be a trace of multiple editions at Alexandria. Once an editor had given the work the title '*Sack of Troy*' it is hard to see why he should have called it the *(Wooden/Trojan) Horse* in addition, whereas a different editor might have had his own reasons, such as scholarly rivalry, to prefer the less obvious name. It may be significant that the two titles only ever appear on their own, never as alternatives. On the other hand, editing Stesichorus once would have been a massive undertaking: would demand have been sufficient to lead someone to repeat the exercise?

[122] Ar. Byz. fr. 381 Slater; cf. D'Alessio (1997) 52. The numbers for Bacchylides and Simonides are unknown.

[123] Book 1 of Sappho contained 1,320 lines (cf. Page (1955) 114 n. 2). The shortest book of Pindar's three complete books of epinicia, the *Nemeans*, has 1,261; the longest, the *Pythians*, has 1,983. No book of archaic lyric or Hellenistic poetry for which the length is known exceeds 2,000 lines. See further Irigoin (1994) 47–8, Rutherford (2001) 143 n. 20.

[124] Thus Arrighetti (1994) 9.

The titles of the works attributed to Stesichorus suggest mythological narratives. Some of these were apparently classified by ancient scholars as paeans or hymns.[125] It is probably a mistake, however, to regard these references as testimony to the existence of distinct groupings within his oeuvre. More likely they reflect the difficulties of fitting Stesichorus' poems into any generic category. A narrative which contained an early invocation of Apollo might have been called a paean; the prominence of any divinity could have led to a poem being designated a hymn. This very problem of definition is explicitly attested for Stesichorus' lyric predecessor or contemporary Xenocritus of Locri (see below).

There is no good evidence for small-scale works by Stesichorus. A single reference to his producing paederastic poetry can be found in Athenaeus.[126] As Cingano argues, this is unlikely to be accurate, for two reasons.[127] First, no extant fragment comes from a paederastic work; even the *Rhadine*, *Calyce*, and the poem about Daphnis, which are generally thought to be doubtful or spurious, deal with doomed heterosexual, not homosexual, passion. Second, the passage of Athenaeus in question associates several other archaic lyricists with paederastic poetry, citing for each of them a passage to illustrate that link. In Stesichorus' case alone, however, no citation appears; evidently Athenaeus did not have one to hand. Very probably this assertion was a mere guess or error on his part, or on the part of his source, and so we can set it aside.

There is something of the monumental about Stesichorus. In this respect his poems are more properly grouped with epic than with the shorter compositions of the lyric

[125] Paeans: Timaeus *FGrHist* 566 F 32. Hymns: Conon *FGrHist* 26 F 1.XVIII, Ael. Arist. 20.3, [Phal.] *Epist.* 103.1, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1.16.78.5, and perhaps fr. 321 (n.). See further Cingano (1990) 211–12.

[126] Athen. 13.601a (Tb°7 Ercoles) καὶ Στησίχορος δ' οὐ μετρίως ἐρωτικὸς γενόμενος συνέστησε καὶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον τῶν ἀισμάτων ἃ δὴ καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν ἐκαλεῖτο παίδεια καὶ παιδικά.

[127] Cingano (1990) 204–8.

poets,[128] and we see this reflected in the judgments of antiquity, which continually compare him to epic authors: Homer in particular, but also Hesiod.[129] Yet there are hints of lyric predecessors, too. Xanthus, a poet of unknown origin,[130] is said by Megaclides to have provided Stesichorus (who apparently referred to him by name) with much material, especially in his *Oresteia*.[131] Xenocritus of Locri was involved, together with Sacadas of Argos and other poets, in the reorganisation of the Gymnopaedia at Sparta, which puts him in the archaic period;[132] he apparently lived after Thaletas, who in turn lived after Archilochus.[133] It was disputed whether Xenocritus' output should be classified as paeans or dithyrambs; the latter name was preferred by some because his works consisted of 'heroic themes containing actions'.[134] The Locrian character of his work is celebrated by Pindar, who may have contrasted it with the Ionian mode; a Pindaric commentator tells us that Xenocritus employed the Locrian *harmonia*.[135] Locrian he may have been, but he nevertheless provides a tantalising parallel for Stesichorus: an archaic poet from south Italy, whose

[128] 'The vast scale of his compositions puts him in a category of his own . . . these were epic poems, in subject and style as well as in length' (West (1971a) 302 = (2011–13) II 78). Compare the long narrative elegies analysed by Bowie (1986) (at p. 33 he cites the length of Stesichorus' poems).

[129] Homer: cf. Ant. Sid. or Thess. *A.P.* 7.57 = 483–6 *GP*, [Long.] *Subl.* 13.3, Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.62, Wright (2005) 87 n. 82. Hesiod: see the account of Stesichorus' paternity given above (pp. 4–5), and also frr. 90, 168.

[130] Morgan (2012) 43 n. 33 refers to the 'western precedent' for Stesichorus' poems provided by 'Xanthus of Locri' (so also Vallet (1958) 265 'le locrien Xanthos'), but in fact we know nothing about Xanthus' homeland. West (1971a) 306, 313 = (2011–13) II 85, 96 guesses that he was a westerner.

[131] Fr. 171.

[132] [Plut.] *Mus.* 1134b. For Sacadas see D'Alfonso (1995) 49–54, Bowie (2001) 52–3, (2010a) 152–3, (2014).

[133] Thus perhaps Glaucus of Rhegium fr. 2 Lanata. Xenocritus is called Xenocrates in some sources; see Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 669.

[134] [Plut.] *Mus.* 1134e ἡρωϊκῶν γὰρ ὑποθέσεων πράγματα ἐχουσῶν ποιητὴν γεγονέναι φασὶν αὐτόν; translation owed to Rutherford (2001) 383.

[135] Pind. fr. 140b S–M with Rutherford (2001) 382–7; Σ Pind. *O.* 10.17k (I 315.5–6 Drachmann).

compositions involved heroic narrative and proved difficult for later writers to classify. The spread of Xenocritus' reputation beyond his homeland, presumably via performance, probably provides a further connexion with Stesichorus, as we shall see in the next section.

4 PERFORMANCE

Three questions confront anyone investigating the performance of Stesichorus' poetry: where, why, how? That is, first, were performances of Stesichorus' work restricted to his homeland, or did they take place across the Greek world? Second, what was the occasion for these performances: civic festivals or aristocratic patronage? Third, how did these performances take place? By means of a chorus, a solo singer, or some combination of the two?[136]

First, then, where were Stesichorus' poems performed? The poems themselves apparently offer no clue. Unlike some of the works of, say, Ibycus or Alcman, they contain no specific connexion with any place in the Greek world. Their subject matter ranges from Troy to Tartessus, from Egypt to Greece.[137] Nor is his poetry tied to any particular location through its language.[138]

But this negative result is not without interest. If Stesichorus had been composing for performance mainly or wholly in a single locality, we might expect to see some indication of that in his poetry, via content or dialect. Since we do not, it is reasonable to infer that he envisioned a panhellenic audience.[139] This in turn suggests a travelling poet who performed his works around the Greek world. An early Stesichorean scholar may have got it right

[136] The related issue of reperformances is considered below, section §9.

[137] See pp. 32–3 below. [138] See section §6 below.

[139] Cf. Vallet (1958) 263–4, Burkert (1987) 51–2 = (2001–11) 1 210 = Cairns (2001) 106–7, Arrighetti (1994) 30. Contrast Hutchinson (p. 114): 'we have little ground for saying how far, if at all, [his] career took him beyond Himera or Sicily'.

when he declared that Stesichorus 'was a Himeraean, but then and now enjoys the highest esteem and fame throughout the whole of Greece because of his talent'.[140] Such a career would suit an inhabitant of a city which, as we have seen, remained closely connected with the rest of the Greek world.[141]

A travelling lyric poet would be no surprise in the archaic period.[142] Arion of Methymna, perhaps a contemporary of Stesichorus, was a citharode and dithyrambist who competed successfully in Italy and Sicily, and also performed at the court of Periander in Corinth: 'an apt symbol of personal mobility and of ease of communications'.[143] The elegist Xenophanes migrated in the same direction: on being exiled from Colophon he travelled to Zancle and Catane, and wrote a poem on the foundation of Elea.[144] But wandering poets could pass from west to east, too. Xenocritus of Locri enjoyed prominent Spartan connexions.[145] A citharoedic contest at Delphi featured Eunomus of Locri and Ariston of Rhegium, acting out the rivarlry between their cities at the great panhellenic shrine: 'evidence . . . of the energy with which western poets strove for success in panhellenic venues'.[146] Ibycus of Rhegium performed in Samos, and probably in Sicyon too; his interest in the mythology of that city, a subject neglected elsewhere in literature,

[140] Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.87 *fuit Himerae<us>, sed et est et fuit tota Graecia summo propter ingenium honore et nomine.*

[141] '[Stesichoros'] Wirken . . . zeigt, wie man in der auf Sizilien weit nach Westen vorgeschobenen Kolonie geistig auf der Höhe des Hellenentums lebte und wie von hier auch Wirkungen auf das Mutterland ausgingen' (Meier-Welcker (1980) 16). See section §2 above.

[142] For the phenomenon in general (including elegiac and iambic poets) see Bowie (2009). Cf. Kowalzig (2013) 58: 'Greek mousike was embedded in a culture of mobility: music and musicians travelled the Mediterranean crossing the boundaries of local and social fragmentation, tying the Greeks into a web of social, cultural, and economic exchange.'

[143] Hdt. 1.23–4; Purcell (1990) 29.

[144] Xenoph. 21 A 1 D–K (1 113.15–16, 114.5–6); cf. Bowie (1986) 31–2.

[145] See pp. 22–3 above.

[146] Timaeus *FGrHist* 566 F 43; Morgan (2012) 39. On this story see further Berlinzani (2002).

suggests some kind of personal association.[147] An honorand of his epinician poetry probably came from Sparta, and his mythological choices might suggest patrons (epinician or otherwise) from Leontini and Syracuse too.[148] The best way for a poet to ensure demand for such pieces across the Greek world was to travel; we may imagine that Ibycus attended panhellenic festivals partly in the hope of attracting new commissions.

Accounts of Stesichorus' life, for all the difficulties that they present,[149] support the picture of a travelling poet: his associations with Metaurus, Himera, Catane, and Epizephyrian Locri suggest that he and his poetry were familiar at least throughout his local region. A single testimonium to a lengthier voyage may be present on the Parian marble, which refers to Stesichorus 'coming to Greece'. Although attached to an implausible date, this reference may preserve a genuine tradition that Stesichorus did indeed come to the mainland.[150] Moreover, a poet of Stesichorus' stature would no doubt have exploited the close connexions of his home town Himera with the rest of the Greek world.[151]

Attempts to locate performances in specific locales, however, fail to convince. These are usually based on the hypothesis that certain mythological variants were chosen to please audiences in particular places. Such a hypothesis is often attractive in the case of other poets; I have just applied it in my discussion of Ibycus, arguing that he had a personal connexion with Sicyon on the

[147] Ibyc. frr. S151.36–41 (where Sicyonian troops at Troy fight under their own commander, Zeuxippus, not under Agamemnon, as at Hom. *Il.* 2.572), 308, 322 *PMGF*; thus Barron (1969) 132–3, 137–8, Cingano (1989) 27–36. For Ibycus' wanderings see in general Bowie (2009) 122–7.

[148] Sparta: fr. S166 *PMGF*. Leontini: fr. S220 (see Barron (1984) 20, 22, Wilkinson's edition, p. 3). Syracuse: frr. 321, 323. For Ibycus and epinician see Wilkinson's edition, pp. 23–7, Rawles (2012) 6–12, and Morgan (2012) 46, although some of the claims made by Morgan regarding the geographical spread of his patrons need to be treated with caution. Ibycus may have been associated with Zancle too: see Wilkinson's edition, p. 5, citing the *Suda* and the scholia to Pindar.

[149] See section §2 above.

[150] Thus Morgan (2012) 43.

[151] See pp. 6–12 above.

basis of his interest in specifically Sicyonian mythology. But these Sicyonian tales do not seem to have formed part of the general storehouse of Greek myth; they are virtually unknown outside the fragments of Ibycus, and under such circumstances it is fair to ask why they should have found a place in his poetry. Positing a personal association between Ibycus and Sicyon, quite possibly in the form of a visit or visits there, economically accounts for otherwise problematic data.

Stesichorus, by contrast, does not seem to have used such localised myths in his poetry; among our many fragments, there are no mythical details which demand an audience in any particular part of Greece. So for instance, the myths that he sets in the Greek west (the killing of Geryon, and the flight of Aeneas) would have interested not just Greeks from that region, but also Greeks from the east who were playing such a prominent part in exploring and colonising all parts of the Mediterranean. Stesichorus' interest in Athenian mythology is manifested by his inclusion of Demophon and Acamas in the *Sack of Troy* and probably the *Palinode(s)*,[152] but that need not imply a visit to the city. The sons of Theseus had already entered the broader corpus of Greek myth, featured as they were in the epic *Iliu Persis* and *Little Iliad*,[153] and so audiences throughout Greece were presumably familiar with their exploits. If Stesichorus had composed a poem devoted to the sons of Theseus, the hypothesis that it was intended above all for performance in Athens would hold more weight; but in both the cases mentioned above they occupy minor roles in poems focussed on other subjects. Athens was certainly a poetic focal point in the last quarter of the sixth century, attracting practitioners such as Anacreon and Simonides;[154] it would not be surprising if Stesichorus had performed his poetry there a generation earlier. But to conclude as much from his mythical choices would be a mistake.

[152] See frr. 105, 90.15–30.
[153] *Iliu Persis* arg. 4 and fr. 6 *GEF*; *Little Iliad* fr. 17; see Finglass (2013a) 38.
[154] See West (1999c) 380 = (2011–13) 1 433.

A perennial conjecture associates the *Palinode(s)* and *Oresteia* with Sparta. The former poem, it is argued, must have been performed at, or commissioned by, Sparta, because in it Stesichorus exonerates Helen from the crimes which he had previously attributed to her in the *Helen*; the volte-face was required because Helen was worshipped as a goddess at Sparta, and so an unfavourable portrayal of her would not be tolerated there.[155] But the poet might have had quite different reasons for going back on his previous work: a desire to display his artistic versatility, for example, or the sheer love of paradox. Helen was known throughout the Greek world as the cause of the Trojan War, and any community would have been surprised and gripped by the novel idea that her guilt was merely the result of mistaken identity. We need not suppose that the exoneration of Helen implies an audience who worshipped her as a goddess any more than Hesiod's volte-face in the *Works and Days* regarding the number of Erides (Strifes) in the world demands listeners with a particular devotion to that divinity.

As for the *Oresteia*, Stesichorus' choice of Lacedaemon as the location for Agamemnon's palace has been taken as a sign that he was aiming that work at a Spartan audience.[156] But that inference is problematic, as consideration of Pindar's *Pythian Eleven* will reveal. This poem too places the myth in Laconia, yet it was written for a Theban. If it were lost, and we knew only the Laconian setting of its myth, we might well be tempted to conclude, wrongly, that it honoured a Spartan. Nor is Pindar the only other poet to set Agamemnon's home in Laconia. So does Simonides, and passages in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* suggest that the idea was known to epic too: it is unlikely to have been Stesichorus' invention.[157] By the sixth century, the

[155] Cf. Seeliger (1886) 8–9, von Premerstein (1896) 634, Wilamowitz (1913) 241, Bowra (1934) 115–16 = (1961) 106–7.

[156] Thus Wilamowitz (1931–2) II 113, Bowra (1934) 117 ≈ (1961) 113–14.

[157] Cf. Hutchinson, p. 114 n. 1 'Even if the origin of the idea were political, it would be rash to assume that Stesichorus was its originator . . . , let alone that he was writing for Spartans'; also Bowie (2010c) 79–80.

Spartan location was just one option available for a poet wishing to compose a work on this theme, and Stesichorus happens to have chosen it, perhaps for no particular reason, perhaps as a sign of his independence from Homer; a Laconian audience is not required or implied. Bowra has ventured a further, onomastic, argument in favour of a Spartan commission: Stesichorus named the Nurse Laodamia after the daughter of Amyclas, king of Lacedaemon.[158] But Laodamia was hardly a characteristically Spartan name: it is shared by the daughter of Bellerophon and mother of Sarpedon,[159] and by Protesilaus' wife, the daughter of Acastus (at least in later tradition), among others. A third argument by Bowra relies on identifying the βαcιλεὺc Πλειcθενίδαc (fr. 180.2) with Agamemnon: 'it was . . . in Spartan interests, which demanded a glorification of Agamemnon, to find him a better father than Atreus'.[160] But the βαcιλεύc in question is probably Orestes (see n.); even if it is Agamemnon, the description βαcιλεὺc Πλειcθενίδαc does not imply that Atreus no longer has a place in the genealogy.

The evidence for Spartan performance of either poem is insubstantial. One might make an equally strong (or rather, weak) case out of other parts of Stesichorus' poetry to dissociate him from Sparta,[161] or to connect him with other parts of the Mediterranean world, such as Etruria.[162] We may rather agree with Morgan that 'Stesichorus' *Oresteia* and his *Helen/Palinode* (as well as the poet himself) would have met with an enthusiastic

[158] Fr. 179; thus Bowra (1934) 117–18 ≈ (1961) 114, citing Paus. 10.9.5.
[159] Hom. *Il.* 6.196–205.
[160] Bowra (1934) 118 ≈ (1961) 115.
[161] For example, Stesichorus furnishes Heracles with a lionskin (fr. 281), yet the warrior is never found thus equipped in Laconian art, perhaps because 'for the ancestor of a royal family such a rustic and rugged image may well have been felt inappropriate by artists serving a society that regarded itself too of the genos of Herakles' (Boardman (1992b) 29). Stesichorus' failure to adopt pro-Spartan mythological accounts in the *Boarhunters* is worth noting in this context (see Finglass (2012c) 43–4).
[162] Spivey (2009) 68 tentatively advances this hypothesis on the basis of similarities between Stesichorus' poetry and the François vase, which was found at Chiusi; he does not, however, enumerate these similarities or canvass other possible explanations.

reception in Rhegium, Tarentum, and Sparta, but also in Athens'.[163] The list of towns that would have welcomed Stesichorus could be extended indefinitely, as could the titles of the works that they would have been keen to hear. It is hard to imagine any Greek settlement excluding him, or any of his works, and correspondingly hard to imagine him not exploiting his fame to the full.

The usual performance context for Stesichorus' poetry was presumably the civic festival, perhaps involving competition, sponsored by a city or a rich patron: a common event in Sicily and south Italy as well as in mainland Greece.[164] A lead curse tablet from a grave in south-east Sicily, dating to the earlier fifth century, testifies to a flourishing culture of choral performances, probably in a theatrical context.[165] An anecdote preserved by Pausanias, and probably referring to the fifth century, describes how the people of Messana regularly sent a chorus of thirty-five boys, a trainer and an aulos-player, to a local festival at Rhegium.[166] In a lead tessera from Camarina dating to *c.* 450 one Thrasys the Emmenid claims to be the 'best singer of all the Doristomphoi', an inscription which may imply some sort of communal singing.[167] In his *Oresteia*, Stesichorus refers to his poetry as δαμώματα, a term that 'suggests both choral performance and a notion that the narrative is public property'.[168]

[163] See Morgan (2012) 45–6.

[164] See Burnett (1988) 141–7 (although we do not follow Burnett in associating Stesichorus with particular named festivals) and Morgan (2012) 37–9.

[165] The tablet was republished by Jordan (2007) and analysed by Wilson (2007b) and Eidinow (2007) 156–63.

[166] Paus. 5.25.2–4. After the loss of a particular contingent at sea, the Messenians commissioned a statue of the deceased troupe from Callon of Elis (active late fifth century: see Dörig (1976) 126–8), on which Hippias (presumably the sophist Hippias of Elis, late fifth century) was later asked to compose an elegiac couplet.

[167] Δοριστόνφον ἁπάντον ἐστὶ ὑπέρτατος ἀείδον (reference owed to SH). Thus *SEG* 42 §846 (p. 245); a different text is offered by *SEG* 44 §758. See Hornblower (2004) 191–2, Fisher (2010) 92 n. 55.

[168] Fr. 173.1, Morgan (2012) 43; see further Cingano (1993) 354 with n. 28, D'Alfonso (1994) 105–19.

But attempts to associate this poem with a festival of Apollo[169] or a spring festival,[170] or to make similarly specific claims for other works, go beyond the evidence. According to Murray, writing for a festival context led Stesichorus to adopt his particular approach to myth;[171] there may be something in this, but epic was of course itself performed at festivals and competitions. A less likely locus for performance is the aristocrat's house. Stesichorus, unlike (for example) Ibycus and Simonides, is not associated with individual patrons, whom he would no doubt have had to commemorate by name if he had been paid to perform for them privately.

The third and perhaps most contentious question concerns the manner of performance. The default position should be that Stesichorus' poetry was usually performed by singing and dancing choruses.[172] The very name Stesichorus, 'he who sets up the chorus', which is attested as early as Simonides, implies choral participation. As Furley and Bremer say, 'to "set up a chorus" (χορὸν ἱστάναι) for the performance of ritual songs became the standard term for the inauguration of hymns in performance . . . Names such as Stesichoros, 'Chorus-Trainer' or Hagesichora, 'Chorus-Leader', Terpsichora (one of the Muses), 'Chorus-lover', point to the familiarity of the

[169] Thus Cingano (1993) 357–8.

[170] Thus Delatte (1938) (cf. Rutherford (2001) 54); criticised by Cingano (1993) 356–7.

[171] O. Murray (2008) 169–70: 'despite his closeness to Homeric diction, he seems to be seeking to transform the language and stories of traditional epic for performance in a different setting: the purpose of his poetry seems to be to produce poems shorter, better articulated, and therefore more suited than the epic tradition to performance within a context of festival or citharodic contest, or some other social context which requires performances of shorter length, such as the symposion. He has often seemed to mark a transition or a breaking down of Homeric forms: wherever heroic epic had been previously performed, it was now seeking more varied audiences and roles.'

[172] See Cingano (1993) 347 n. 3 for scholars taking this position, as well as those supporting a purely monodic Stesichorus, perhaps accompanied by a silent, dancing chorus.

concept.'[173] Stesichorus repeatedly refers to his own poetry as μολπή, a term associated in archaic epic and lyric above all with the singing and/or dancing of choruses.[174] One such passage in Stesichorus, if a probable emendation is accepted, explicitly associates μολπή with χορεύματα.[175] Later authors characterised at least some of Stesichorus' output as paeans and hymns; the former were certainly performed by a chorus, while the latter, too, 'as works commissioned for public celebration . . . are more readily imagined as choral'.[176] Choral works by poets from Stesichorus' homeland are securely attested in the cases of Ibycus and Cleomenes, both poets from Rhegium associated with dithyramb.[177]

It remains possible that Stesichorus composed works intended for performance by a soloist,[178] perhaps with choral dancing; or that his choral works were sometimes so handled. The strict division between practitioners of monody and practitioners of choral lyric is a modern invention with no support in ancient sources.[179] Arion is said by Herodotus to have been the first to train choruses for the dithyramb, and yet the same author presents him as a solo citharode performing for his captors.[180] There is no contradiction: different occasions required different modes of performance.[181] It would be foolish to claim that the choral poet Stesichorus never had his own poems sung by a soloist. Certainly, reperformances of his works at the symposium involved that manner of delivery, and we may imagine

[173] Furley and Bremer (2001) 1 9–10; see also Soph. *El.* 280n. for parallels for χορὸν ἱστάναι. For the use of the word adjectivally in lyric see n. 97.

[174] See frr. 90.9, 271.2, 278 with Cingano (1993) 349–53 (whose argument is misunderstood by Lloyd-Jones (1995a) 420 = (2005) 402) and Beck (1993a), (1993b).

[175] See fr. 271n.

[176] Thus Carey (1989) 562 n. 44.

[177] Ibycus: Cingano (1990) 215–19, D'Alessio (2013b) 121 n. 38. Cleomenes (fifth century): fr. 838 *PMG*, Kassel and Austin on Chionides fr. 4 *PCG*.

[178] This view was first put forward by Kleine, p. 53.

[179] See Davies (1988a).

[180] Hdt. 1.23–4.

[181] Thus Bowie (2012a) 85 n. 12.

that Stesichorus himself or his contemporaries anticipated this practice themselves.[182]

An alternative view explicitly denies that Stesichorus was a choral poet, and claims that he was solely a citharode.[183] The chief objection to a choral Stesichorus arose out of the *Geryoneis* papyrus, ΠΠ², which informed us that this poem lasted at least 1,300 lines. According to Barrett, 'choral presentation of a work of this kind and this length would surely be intolerable. It will have been delivered, surely, like the epic on which it is based, by a single performer, accompanying himself doubtless on the lyre.'[184] Barrett was giving his gut feeling in an oral paper read shortly after the publication of ΠΠ², but subsequent repetitions of his case have failed to adduce evidence in its support. There have been no attempts to prove the implied hypothesis that a group of people is unable to coordinate an effective performance of a long sung lyric. Nor is the similarity of Stesichorus' poetry to epic a cogent consideration: similarity of content need not imply similarity of performance. An attempt to cite pseudo-Plutarch *On Music* in support of a citharoedic Stesichorus[185] has met with scepticism: there is no explicit statement in the treatise to this effect, and the inference made seems tenuous.[186] The case as a whole appears insufficient to challenge the choral hypothesis.

5 MYTH

Stesichorus' poems show an impressive mythological range. Most fall naturally into three groups: the Trojan cycle (*Helen*, *Palinode(s)*, *Sack of Troy*, *Returns*, *Oresteia*), the Theban cycle (*Europeia*, *Thebais*?, *Eriphyle*), and poems about Heracles (*Geryoneis*, *Cerberus*, *Cycnus*). That leaves the *Games for Pelias*, which

[182] For the question of Stesichorean reperformance see below, section §9.
[183] Thus Wilamowitz (1913) 239 n. 3. For others supporting this position see Burnett (1988) 129 n. 68.
[184] Barrett (1968) 22–3.
[185] [Plut.] *De Mus.* 1132bc; see West (1971a) 307–11 = (2011–13) II 86–92.
[186] See Burnett (1988) 129–31, Hagel (2010) 403 n. 87, Curtis's edition, pp. 26–7.

covers an event from the saga of Iolcus associated with the Argonauts; *Scylla*, perhaps an episode from the return of Odysseus and thus part of the Trojan cycle; and *Boarhunters*, a work taken from Aetolian myth. At least five different cycles, then, are represented in Stesichorus' output. These cover the major part of the world familiar to the Greeks: Laconia (*Helen*, *Oresteia*), Arcadia (the Pholus episode in the *Geryoneis*), Thebes (*Europeia*, *Thebais*?, *Eriphyle*), Aetolia (*Boarhunters*), Thessaly (*Games for Pelias*, *Cycnus*), perhaps Phoenicia and Crete (*Europeia*), Troy (*Helen*, *Palinode(s)*, *Sack of Troy*, *Returns*, *Oresteia*), Egypt (*Palinode(s)*), Italy or Sicily (Aeneas' probable destination in the *Sack of Troy*), and Spain (*Geryoneis*). This is truly panmediterranean poetry. Of all the regions explored by the Greeks down to Stesichorus' day, perhaps only the Black Sea and Cyrene are omitted; and even they may have featured in any retrospective account of the Argonauts' expedition in the *Games for Pelias*.

Yet despite coming from Magna Graecia, Stesichorus apparently shows a preference for myths from the Greek homeland; only the *Geryoneis* and *Sack of Troy* display interest in mythology with a specifically western connexion.[187] Contemporary parallels for this attitude appear in the poetry of the slightly later western poet Ibycus, whose fragments contain virtually no western references,[188] and in the metopes from the temple of Hera at Foce del Sele, which do not depict any distinctively Italian or Sicilian myths.[189] This preference will reflect the cultural

[187] Müller (1822) 313 suggests that Stesichorus himself, as a poet from the west, encountered Aeneas' voyage to Hesperia in a western source. It is possible that some of the lost poems were concerned with myths of the west, but since we have the names of well over half of Stesichorus' works (see section §3 above), further discoveries are unlikely to change the picture dramatically.

[188] He refers briefly to Geryon (fr. S176.17–18 *PMGF*) and apparently to the founding of a Chalcidian colony, perhaps Rhegium (fr. S227); see Bowie (2012b) 91, 93–4.

[189] The comparison is made by Marconi (2007) 200–4. Cf. how Hall (2012) 31 cites the archaic metopes of Selinus as an example of Sicilian 'oscillation between civic identity and a mainland orientation'.

leanings of the western Greeks, who were still strongly connected to the old country: just as they continued to make dedications at Delphi and Olympia and to participate in panhellenic games, so too they retained their interest in the traditional myths of Greece.[190] But it is also consistent with the view, advanced in the previous section, that Stesichorus performed his poetry not just in his homeland, but across the Greek world. Nor is there evidence to suggest that the engagement with western mythology that we do find in Stesichorus was shaped by the particular ideological concerns of western Greeks. Before the discovery of the papyri, a scholar could write that 'one purpose of the *Geryoneis* was the glorification of the brave Greeks who were winning new lands for Greek settlement'.[191] But this precociously postcolonial reading was not borne out by the publication of ΠΣ, with its surprisingly sympathetic portrayal of Geryon during his conflict with the Greek hero Heracles.

Some western myths known from later sources might go back to Stesichorus: Heracles' visit to Italy and/or Sicily on his return from Spain to Greece,[192] which could have been described in the *Geryoneis*, and Orestes' purification at Rhegium,[193] a hypothetical episode from the *Oresteia*. But associating either story with Stesichorus is merely the result of surmise. Moreover, there are reasons to treat these speculations with caution. The *Geryoneis* already portrayed an episode from Heracles' return, but this was in Arcadia. Stesichorus might have included events in Italy or Sicily as well, and a reference to Pallantium in the poem may provide a trace of such a narrative,[194] but that would have taken up space in a poem already not short of incident. As for Orestes'

[190] Cf. Bowie (2012b) 86: Stesichorus 'chooses some central, traditional Greek myths in order to emphasise the Greekness that the settlers in Sicily and South Italy shared with their metropoleis in mainland Greece and the islands'.
[191] Dunbabin (1948) 330.
[192] Cf. Hecat. 1 F 76 *FGrHist*, Hellan. fr. 111 *EGM*.
[193] Cf. Σ Theocr. prol. Ba (p. 2.13–20 Wendel), Morgan (2012) 38, 44.
[194] See fr. 21n.

visit to Rhegium, our source for this myth relates that he undertook this journey after recovering his sister and the statue of Artemis from Scythia, and that after his purification he crossed over to Tyndaris in Sicily, where the statue was celebrated by the inhabitants. The town of Tyndaris was not founded until 396, so that part of the story, at least, must date from after then.[195] And the inclusion of Orestes' recovery of his sister, as well as the trip to the west, would make even the two-book *Oresteia* strain at the seams.

One clear way in which Stesichorus' mythology looks back to that of old Greece is via its associations with Homer. The connexion between these poets was first mentioned, as we have seen, by Simonides, and by many ancient critics thereafter.[196] But only when the papyri began to be published could we appreciate how close that association went in terms of myth.[197] The first papyrus to appear, perhaps from the *Returns* (Π[3]), surprised scholars with its close reworking of a minor episode from the *Odyssey*: 'who could have suspected', Peek asked, 'that the dependence [sc. of Stesichorus on Homer] could have gone so far in matters of content too?'[198] The *Geryoneis* papyrus (Π[2]) revealed the profound influence exercised by various episodes from the *Iliad* on the portrayal of Geryon and his conflict with Heracles. The same kind of literary background was posited by Burkert for the Lille papyrus (Π[1]): 'Stesichoros . . . is probably less original in content than in elaboration and presentation; [fr. 170] slavishly depends on the *Odyssey*, and [fr. 97] will reproduce a situation from the *Thebais* in a similar way.'[199] Stesichorus is not alone in evoking Homer in his poetry: perhaps the earliest poetic response outside epic to the *Iliad* is found in Alcaeus.[200]

[195] Diod. 14.78.6. [196] See p. 22 above.
[197] Stesichorus' relationship with Homer's language and metre will be discussed in subsequent sections.
[198] Peek (1958) 173 'Wer hätte geahnt, daß die Abhängigkeit auch im stofflichen so weit gehen könnte?'; cf. Fränkel (1962) 320–1 = (1975) 281–2.
[199] Burkert (1981) 35 = (2001–11) I 154–5.
[200] Fr. 44.6–8 Voigt; see West (1988) 151–2 n. 5 = (2011–13) I 36–7 n. 5.

But in no other archaic poet is this response so widespread and sustained.

The comparison with Homer should, however, mark the beginning of our investigation of Stesichorus' mythological choices, not its end. Above all, we should beware of assuming that allusion implies a lack of originality. The imitation of the *Odyssey* in Π3 may be close, but even here subtle differences suggest Stesichorean reshaping. So a bird omen which in Homer is preceded by a list of gifts is placed by Stesichorus in front of that list, perhaps gaining greater prominence. Stesichorus may also have limited the omen's audience to Helen, its interpreter, and Telemachus, whom it concerns, concentrating attention on the pair most involved in the event, instead of assembling a larger group, as in Homer; at the very least, Stesichorus' Helen takes a dominant role in comparison with her Odyssean counterpart. Further differences would no doubt be apparent if we had more of the papyrus; even with the brief text that survives, 'detailed comparison shows that the poet did not slavishly imitate the [Homeric] scene, but rather combined aspects from a variety of portent scenes . . . and employed "formulaic" expression from the epic tradition as a whole.'[201]

Nor is the use of the *Iliad* in the *Geryoneis* an example of poetic dependence. Scenes and motifs which in Homer celebrate the greatness and pathos of human heroism are applied by Stesichorus to the terrifying Geryon, humanising the beast and encouraging the audience to admire his valour and to feel the tragedy of his predicament.[202] Compassion for the foe is, of course, a familiar feature of the *Iliad*.[203] Yet such profound sympathy for a multiple-headed monster goes beyond Homer:[204] we are not

[201] Maingon (1989) 48; see further her discussion, Grossardt (2012) 41, and fr. 170n.

[202] See e.g. frr. 15, 17, 19.44–7n.

[203] Cf. Griffin (1977) 46 = Cairns (2001) 379: Homer's 'treatment of the Trojan enemy [is] in no way monstrous or hateful'.

[204] Homer does generate some sympathy for the Cyclops Polyphemus by portraying him in conversation with his ram (cf. Newton (1983)), but this is neither as sustained nor as moving as in Stesichorus.

encouraged to ponder the inner emotional world of Scylla in the *Odyssey*, for example, as she feasts on Odysseus' crew.[205] At once Homeric and unHomeric, Stesichorus' presentation of Geryon testifies to an extraordinary poetic self-confidence: he takes over key moments of the *Iliad*'s plot, such as Sarpedon's speech to Glaucus, or Hector's to Hecuba outside the walls of Troy, and reapplies them to radically different contexts, creating a distinctive emotional effect. In Homer poetic novelty is celebrated for the first time in western literature;[206] Stesichorus asserts his own originality by his audacious reshaping of Homeric epic.

The breadth of Stesichorus' mythical range ensures that his poetry encompasses subject matter far beyond Homer's. As we have seen, not just the Trojan, but the Theban, Calydonian, and Iolcan cycles are represented in his work; and several of his poems focus on Heracles, a hero prominent in neither the *Iliad* nor the *Odyssey*.[207] All this mythical territory would have been staked out by epic long before Stesichorus; but his response to that poetic tradition shows the same passion for innovation that we can identify in his interactions with Homer. So Stesichorus' *Cycnus* presents a quite different account of a story already treated in the Hesiodic *Aspis*. By making his Heracles retreat in the face of Cycnus and his father Ares, he creates a more complicated narrative with greater scope for characterisation; we may suspect that his poem saw rather more drama than its epic predecessor, and rather less shield.[208] Moreover, Stesichorus' Cycnus fashions a temple of skulls to Apollo out of the remains of his victims; this macabre edifice, absent from the *Aspis*, would have made Cycnus' criminality more tangible and thus raised the stakes for his battle with Zeus's son.

[205] Whether Stesichorus managed a more humane portrayal of this creature in his *Scylla* we cannot tell.

[206] Hom. *Od.* 1.351–2.

[207] For Heracles in the *Iliad* see Kelly (2010) 261 n. 10; in the *Odyssey*, Andersen (2012). See further Bernardini (2010), Fowler, *EGM* II §8.1.

[208] See the introduction to that poem, section §8 below, and Finglass (2015a).

As for Burkert's hypothesis that Stesichorus' *Thebais* simply reproduces an episode from the epic *Thebais*, the evidence suggests that Stesichorus set his work on a quite different track. Oedipus is probably dead at the start of Stesichorus' poem, whereas in the epic he is very much alive and shortly to curse his sons. That fundamental distinction probably led to all kinds of consequential differences, such as the prominence given by Stesichorus to Oedipus' widow: it is unlikely that she could have taken so commanding a role when her husband was still alive. This outcome may have motivated Stesichorus to cast the story as he did: as Tsitsibakou-Vasalos remarks, 'a rich cast of female characters emerges from Stesichorus' mutilated poetry',[209] and strong women may have been a distinctive feature of his oeuvre. Far from being a 'slavish' (Burkert's word) copy of an earlier epic, his poem may rather have placed a decidedly feminist slant on the material that he inherited.

In his treatment of myth Stesichorus often gives prominence to themes and ideas that Homer downplays or avoids altogether. In the *Sack of Troy* the initial focus on Epeius puts the spotlight on a surprisingly lowly character at the start of the poem: a water-carrier becomes the recipient of divine favour, displacing Odysseus, whose role in the construction of the wooden horse is more usually emphasised.[210] The central part played by monsters – Geryon, Cerberus, Scylla, Pholus, and so on – in his work is something quite different from what we find in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, where such figures play a circumscribed role.[211] The magic involved in the presumed translation of Helen to Egypt, and the use of poisoned arrows by Heracles, are unHomeric phenomena.[212] Stesichorus seems comfortable with a broader range of action than that preferred by Homer; this may be

[209] Tsitsibakou-Vasalos (1996) 24; apart from the Queen in the *Thebais*, she refers to Clytemnestra, Eriphyle, Callirhoe, and Althaea.

[210] See Finglass (2013c).

[211] Cf. Griffin (1977) 53 = Cairns (2001) 384.

[212] 'The cycle . . . admits miracles of a sort which Homer does not' (Griffin (1977) 42 = Cairns (2001) 370).

the result of a conscious decision to differentiate himself from Homer as well as to imitate him.

Sometimes we observe Stesichorus differentiating himself from his own previous work in his quest for mythological originality. So he makes Iphigenia daughter of Theseus and Helen in the *Helen*, but of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra in *Oresteia*. In each case, the version of the myth that he chooses suits clear poetic goals.[213] In the *Helen*, Iphigenia is a symbol of Helen's chequered past, and her sacrifice at Aulis ensures that her mother receives a terrible punishment for her adultery. The *Oresteia*, by contrast, makes Iphigenia the daughter of the man who sacrifices her, and of the woman who kills that man, presumably in part because of the sacrifice. Elsewhere, in the *Palinode*, Stesichorus confronts a standard element of the mythological tradition – Helen's voyage to Troy with Paris – and declares it to be false. Here too he offers a different myth from one found in another poem of his, the *Helen*; yet unlike (we presume) the case of Iphigenia in the *Helen* and *Oresteia*, here he highlights the difference by apologising for his previous poem. The act of offering different mythological accounts now becomes something worth highlighting for its own sake: the poet can offer equally engaging, yet diametrically opposed, versions of Helen's life thanks to his artistic versatility. The family that Stesichorus ascribes to Theseus, probably in the *Palinode*, shows considerable innovation, although in this case we can only speculate as to his reasons.[214]

Far from merely repeating existing myths and imitating Homer, Stesichorus took a delight in challenging established stories and adapting them to suit his literary intentions. In this he is the model for all subsequent engagement with Homer. Any later poet who interacts creatively with Homeric epic is following and implicitly paying tribute to the first poet to perfect this technique: Stesichorus.

[213] Sitzler (1907) 185. [214] See Finglass (2013a) 43–6.

6 LANGUAGE

Stesichorus came from a mainly Ionian city, and was probably of Ionian descent himself, although he may have had Italic ancestry as well.[215] His everyday dialect was thus probably Ionic: more specifically, the Ionic spoken by the Chalcidians who settled in Metaurus and Himera. The language of his poetry, however, was quite different: a combination of Doric and epic Ionic, with barely a single distinctively Euboean form. Scholarly descriptions of Stesichorus' language reflect this mixture, but show significant differences of emphasis. According to Russo, 'Stesichorus' language [is] universally agreed to be a Doricized epic literary dialect.'[216] Yet for Colvin, 'Stesichorus, a speaker of West Greek, also uses a fairly thorough West Greek diction, but with epic features which reflect the dactylic quality of his metre and his Homeric flavour.'[217] Silk's verdict is more like Russo's: in his view, Stesichorus' language is 'effectively an epic-based composite with (so to speak) a generalized Doric accent'.[218] In turn, Willi argues for a basically Dorian language with an epic timbre.[219] To discover whether Doric or epic Ionic predominated in Stesichorus' poetry, we must consider its various linguistic features one by one.

The Doric characteristics of Stesichorus' poetry are numerous,[220] although it is sometimes unclear whether a particular irregular formation is the result of textual corruption or variation in Stesichorus' own practice.[221] Inherited ᾱ, which becomes η in Ionic, is retained. ε does not contract before ο, ω,

[215] See section §2 above. [216] Russo (1999) 340.
[217] Colvin (2007) 55. [218] Silk (2010) 426. [219] Willi (2008) 74–6.
[220] For a full discussion, to which our analysis is indebted, see Willi (2008) 58–74, which in turn draws on Nöthiger (1971); Willi, however, had access to more Stesichorus than Nöthiger did, thanks to the publication of Π1 and Π7. For the characteristics of Sicilian Doric see Mimbrera (2012a) 202–15.
[221] For some probable hyperdorisms see frr. 15.1, 97.241, 114.7; also Willi (2012b) 277 n. 26.

or α, and αε contracts to η.[222] 'Weak' Doric vocalism is preferred to 'strong' (contrast Alcman): so ε contracted with ε gives ει (i.e. [e:]), not η, and ο contracted with ο gives ου ([o:]), not ω. There are two places in the papyri where an ο is lengthened to ω rather than ου.[223] The accusative plural of a-stems contains a short alpha, not a long as in most dialects.[224] Individual Doric forms are found, including Ἄρταμις, ἰαρός, ὄνυμα, and πρᾶτος,[225] as are Doric particles, prepositions, pronouns, and conjunctions, such as γα, ποτί (although πρός also appears), πεδά (for μετά), ἐγών, τιν, νιν, ἁμίν, ὑμίν, and ὅκα/πόκα.[226] Thematic infinitives end in –εν and –ειν, and athematic infinitives in –μεν and –μειν, as expected in Doric.[227] Thematic verbs have the expected –οντι ending in the third person plural.[228]

Contracted futures θησε[ῖ and δωσοῦντι are found in the papyri, presumably as Doric forms, although the feature is unattested in inscriptions and not remarked on by the grammarians;[229] Ruijgh suggests that they are due to the Corinthian roots of choral lyric, or to the Doric admixture in the Himeran dialect,[230] but in fact we lack sufficient evidence to determine their origin.[231] These are also found in papyri of Alcman and Ibycus.[232] Unfortunately, no example from archaic

[222] Examples at Willi (2008) 61 n. 36. An exception at fr. 16.7 should be emended (n.).

[223] Frr. 17.4 γωνάζομα[ι, 170.3 ὠρανόθεν; see Willi (2008) 59–60. However, Stesichorus himself will have written what appears as EI or H in our texts simply as E, and OY and Ω simply as O. Hence the inconsistency in the papyri may reflect editorial uncertainty over the correct interpretation of Stesichorus' script; it does not prove that he used both forms. The same textual problem appears in our texts of Theocritus (cf. Willi (2012b) 268–73). Sicilian Doric uses weak forms (cf. Tribulato (2012b) 18, Mimbrera (2012a) 202, 217–18).

[224] See fr. 9.5n. [225] Willi (2008) 61.

[226] *Ibid.* 70 n. 83, 66 n. 59. [227] *Ibid.* 67–8. [228] *Ibid.* 66 n. 61.

[229] Frr. 16.12, 97.278. In the former the papyrus has θησε͂[, with the crucial accent placed, as usual, on the first vowel of the diphthong.

[230] Ruijgh (1986) 459 n. 7. [231] Thus Tribulato (2008) 189.

[232] Alcm. fr. 1.73 *PMGF* φασεῖς (1st c. papyrus), fr. 3 fr. 1.7 σκεδ[α]σεῖ (2nd c. papyrus), Ibyc. fr. S257a fr. 27.6 ὑμησῶ (1st–2nd c. papyrus), fr. S151.47 ἐξεῖς (papyrus from *c.* 130 BC).

lyric is metrically guaranteed. This contrasts with the same feature in Callimachus and Theocritus, where it is attested in places secured by the metre. As a result, it is likely to be a feature recognised as Doric in the third century (and perhaps earlier), which was imported into the texts of the archaic lyricists when metrically possible.[233] The alternative, that it is mere chance that all the futures attested in three lyric poets are distinctively Doric only when a non-Doric form would be metrically equivalent, appears too much of a coincidence. Accordingly, this edition offers uncontracted θήcε[ι and δώcοντι in the passages just mentioned.

This example should give us pause in our search for Doric forms. How do we know whether the others are genuinely Stesichorean, when we have just found good evidence for editorial tampering? Many settlements in Magna Graecia and Sicily became Dorianised from the fifth century onwards.[234] Over time, this part of Greece became characterised as a producer of Doric literary culture, thanks to figures such as Philolaus, Archytas, Epicharmus, Sophron, Theocritus, and Archimedes. This could have had an impact on texts of Stesichorus in two ways. Either Sicilian texts had Doric forms inserted, whether deliberately or not, by Doric-speaking scribes;[235] or Alexandrian editors, on acquiring their texts of Stesichorus, inserted Doric forms on the assumption that Stesichorus was a Doric poet.[236]

Yet it is evident that some Doric features, at least, must go back to Stesichorus himself, since they are guaranteed by the metre: the short-vowel infinitive γαμέν, for example, or the short-vowel accusative plural παγάc.[237] Most Doric forms are

[233] Thus Cassio (1997b) 200–1, Tribulato (2008) 189.
[234] See p. 9 above.
[235] Thus Cassio (1997b) 203.
[236] Thus Wilamowitz (1900a) 44–6. The two possibilities are not mutually exclusive: the presence of some Doric forms inserted by scribes may have led editors to introduce more.
[237] Frr. 93.17, 9.5; in both cases the syllable in question is open and short, and so must contain a short vowel.

metrically equivalent to their Attic-Ionic counterparts, so these few instances where the metre does differ are especially valuable. It would be absurd to suggest that Stesichorus used only these Doric forms and no others; rather, our assumption should be that the Doric forms found in our texts are genuine unless (as with the contracted futures) there is reason to think otherwise.

Accentuation[238] is distinctively Doric in two of the four Stesichorean papyri that contain accents.[239] Our information about Doric accentuation is derived from statements by the grammarians, and from papyri of Doric authors.[240] The mediaeval manuscripts of Pindar contain Doric accents for certain adverbs, and such forms are sometimes advocated in the scholia; at least twice these adverbs are required by the metre.[241] Sometimes different pieces of evidence are in conflict, and we must deduce which counts for more when we decide what to print. So according to Choeroboscus, a penultimate syllable with a long vowel which carries an accent always has an acute accent in Doric.[242] But papyri of Doric poets show many words with a circumflex in this position;[243] we therefore print an acute in this position only for a few words, such as the oblique cases of παῖς and γυνή, which are specifically stated by other grammarians to take a consistent acute accent there.

Stesichorus' language contains forms which are not Doric, many of which can be associated with the version of Ionic found in epic. Compensatory lengthening is usually found after loss of digamma.[244] Digamma is sometimes implied by hiatus, sometimes not: in this regard he stands closer to epic than to Alcman, who observes it consistently.[245] He apparently made use of

[238] For this topic see Nöthiger (1971) 83–6, García Teijeiro (1993) 157–62, Pardini (1993) 125, Hinge (2006) 122–37.

[239] Π^2, Π^6, the others being Π^5, Π^7. The secondary tradition can be disregarded: scribes writing a text of e.g. Athenaeus would not have written Doric accents in quotations.

[240] See Ahrens (1839–43) II 26–35, Probert (2003) 160–2.

[241] Thus Ucciardello (2012) 136–8. [242] Choer. I 386.12–15 Hilgard.

[243] See Nöthiger (1971) 84–5. [244] Willi (2008) 60–1. [245] *Ibid.* 61–2.

Attic-Ionic κλεινός and Aeolic κλεεννός,[246] both of which are found in other choral lyric, but there are no surviving instances of Doric κλεεινός. Among pronouns we find Aeolic ὔμμι and non-Doric cέ.[247] Non-Doric ἄν is employed instead of Doric κα, but that choice is shared with other choral lyricists;[248] Stesichorus also uses words in –θε(ν) rather than Doric –θα.[249] The nu-ephelkystikon on that ending, and on dative plurals and third-person singular verbs, is a non-Doric feature that may show epic influence.[250]

Stesichorus uses the genitive in –οιο, as well as –ου, the expected Doric form; thematic dative plurals in –οισι/–αισι as well as Doric –οις/–αις; and dative plurals to consonantal stems in –εσσι as well as Doric –σι.[251] In each case, the usage is consistent with the hypothesis of epic influence, and there is some evidence that these non-Doric forms are used particularly in names and other words familiar from epic.[252] It is especially noteworthy that –οιο is not attested in Alcman, and so is unlikely to form part of any tradition of choral lyric.[253] Athematic verbs have unDoric –σι endings in both singular and plural.[254] Feminine participles in –οισα show an Aeolic ending, but one shared with Alcman and Pindar.[255] There is one possible instance of an aorist participle in –αις, as well as another place where a participle certainly ends –ας.[256] The former, Aeolic ending is sometimes attested in Pindar, but our evidence is far from sufficient to introduce it throughout the text of Stesichorus.[257] Once we encounter a Euboean form, εἶν (Attic εἶναι).[258]

Faced as we are with so many forms from both Doric and epic-Ionic (not to speak of Aeolic), it seems futile to attempt to decide which element is predominant: both are fundamental to Stesichorus' literary language. Doric was already established as the regular dialect of choice for lyric poetry. We see this

[246] Frr. 9.2, 117.6. [247] Willi (2008) 66. [248] *Ibid.* 70 with n. 84.
[249] *Ibid.* 63. [250] *Ibid.* 63 with n. 47. [251] *Ibid.* 64–5. [252] *Ibid.*
[253] *Ibid.* 64 n. 51. [254] *Ibid.* 66 n. 62. [255] *Ibid.* 68.
[256] Frr. 247.17, 97.257. [257] So rightly Cassio (2005) 25. [258] Fr. 19.7.

not only in the case of Terpander, Alcman, Stesichorus, Ibycus, Simonides, Bacchylides, and Pindar, but also in less well known figures such as Xenodamus of Cythera, Sacadas of Argos, and Eumelus of Corinth.[259] When and how Doric was adopted as the language of lyric is not recoverable: our evidence does not go back far enough. Scholars still disagree over the reasons behind the dialectal mixture of epic poetry, for which our evidence is earlier and more extensive; consensus over the origin of literary Doric is even less likely to emerge. According to Morgan, Stesichorus' choice 'can be interpreted as an expression of a Sicilian cultural *koine*'.[260] But Doric in the early sixth century was hardly the majority Sicilian dialect: as noted above, the Doricisation of Sicily was a gradual process, which did not begin in earnest until the fifth century.[261] And as we have seen, Doric lyric was far from a purely or even mainly Sicilian phenomenon.

The non-Doric features are not all epic; and some which are found in epic may be part of a common poetic inheritance shared by lyric and epic, or even epic borrowings from Doric lyric.[262] But many are likely to have entered lyric from epic; and Stesichorus' particular fondness for such forms (beyond what we find in Alcman, for example) suggests that their inclusion in his poetry results from conscious choice, comparable to his decision to engage closely with epic poetry in his treatment of myth. But just as Stesichorus' engagement with the myths of epic paradoxically allows him to demonstrate his originality,[263] so too his interaction with epic language gives him the opportunity to innovate on a smaller scale.[264] Often we can observe

[259] Thus Tribulato (2010) 395. For these poets see [Plut.] *Mus.* 1134bc. There were exceptions, such as Anacreon and the *Erotika* of Bacchylides (Ionic), and Sappho and Alcaeus (Lesbian).

[260] Morgan (2012) 42.

[261] For the Sicilian Doric *koina* see Mimbrera (2012b).

[262] For influence in this direction see West (1988) 167–8 = (2011–13) 1 64–6.

[263] See section §5 above.

[264] For the subject see Haslam (1978) 52–3, Maingon (1989) 35–45, Benedict (2005) 52–72.

him adopting distinctively unepic vocabulary, such as κυδαλέος instead of the metrically equivalent epic form κυδάλιμος;[265] or building otherwise unattested formulae, such as μέγα χωσάμενος, an original formation created on the basis of epic μέγ᾽ ὀχθήσας;[266] or applying a phrase such as βάλ᾽ Ἄρταμις, used in epic only of the peaceful deaths of women, to another, probably more violent, context in the myth of the Calydonian boar.[267] Traditional epic phraseology is refashioned: expressions which seem familiar turn out to be his own creation, often as the result of a fusion of older formulae to create something new.

The very combination of Doric with epic Ionic may have appealed to a poet from a city where the native dialect was a mixture of Doric and Ionic: Willi well describes Stesichorus' poetry as 'a generic hybrid . . . , one of choral lyric and epic . . . which responds to the colonial need for a new common genre bridging the gap between the Ionian and the Doric traditions meeting in Sicily'.[268] True, the literary amalgam used by Stesichorus would have been different from the particular combination spoken in Himera and other Ionian-speaking Sicilian towns: his poetry contains almost no specifically Euboean forms, for example.[269] Nevertheless, a Himeran audience, when it had the chance to listen to its much-travelled son on home territory, may have perceived in Stesichorus' poetic language something arranged on not entirely dissimilar principles from those underlying the linguistic mix of their own city.

[265] Fr. 112.3. [266] Fr. 120.3. [267] Fr. 208.2.

[268] Willi (2012b) 286; cf. *id.* (2008) 89–90. Willi (2012b) 286–8 goes on to argue that literary hybrids are a particularly Sicilian characteristic, pointing to Epicharmus, Gorgias, and others; there may be some truth in this, although innovation in generic matters is hardly confined to that island.

[269] Thus Hutchinson (p. 115): 'his poetry certainly does not present either a quasi-Himeraean mixture of Ionic and Doric or, despite the occasional Euboean form, a sharply localized identity . . . Place is not, as in the Lesbian poets, proclaimed by his very language.'

7 METRE

Stesichorus' poems for which metrical evidence survives fall into two groups. Some are dactylo-anapaestic[270] (*Games for Pelias*, *Geryoneis*, *Boarhunters*, most or all of Π7, probably fr. 270a, fr. 301): that is, their metre is based on —⏑⏑ or ⏑⏑— repeated in lengthy series. The majority are dactylo-epitrite (*Helen*, *Palinode*, *Eriphyle*, *Thebais?*, *Sack of Troy*, *Returns?*, *Oresteia*, possibly fr. 214, frr. 271, 302): poems which contain metrical structures containing single short syllables as well as double shorts (e.g. —⏑—×—⏑—, —⏑⏑—⏑⏑—). Triadic composition can be identifed in six poems (*Geryoneis*, *Boarhunters*, *Eriphyle*, *Thebais?*, *Sack of Troy*, *Returns?*); the others offer too little material for any such structure to be discerned.[271] The reconstruction of a metrical scheme for each individual poem is attempted in the commentary. Here we offer general observations on the two metrical groups and their relationship.[272]

The metrical pattern of dactylo-anapaestic 'is essentially simple, repetitive and unbroken, but does not totally exclude structural variety'.[273] Stesichorus seems to end periods in different ways, depending on whether stanza- and period-end coincide. Period-end inside a stanza is pendant, with two concluding long syllables: so either —⏑⏑—⏑⏑ . . . —⏑⏑—— or ⏑⏑—⏑⏑— . . . ⏑⏑——. Period-end coincident with the end of a stanza, however, is blunt, with only one long: either —⏑⏑—⏑⏑ . . . —⏑⏑— or ⏑⏑—⏑⏑— . . . ⏑⏑—. According to

[270] For this name see Haslam (1974) 15–16 n. 16; he rejects the alternative term 'lyric (or rising) dactyls' as 'question-begging, insofar as it carries the implication that the basic unit of composition is —⏑⏑ [and not ⏑⏑—]'.

[271] There is no reason to think that Stesichorus was the inventor of epodic composition (so rightly Crusius (1888)). In other early metrical schemes the epode can be analysed as a development of the strophe/antistrophe, but Stesichorus' stanzas are too long and too simple for such development to be apparent (see West (1971a) 312–13 = (2011–13) II 94–5).

[272] Two articles are central to this whole topic, Haslam (1974) and (1978), and this discussion is indebted to them even when it differs on minor details.

[273] Thus Haslam (1974) 16.

Haslam, 'we may fancy that the effect of bringing the period to such a speedy and abrupt halt would not have been felt acceptable anywhere but at a stanza end',[274] but that invites the question why an abrupt halt (if that was how it felt to Stesichorus' original audiences) was felt acceptable at all. The most that we can say with confidence is that the different styles lent a predictable variety to the rhythm.

Of the three stanzas in this metre that are preserved in full, one is wholly anapaestic (*Geryoneis* strophe), another moves from anapaests to dactyls (*Geryoneis* epode), and another from dactyls to anapaests (*Boarhunters* strophe). The shift from one to another, when it does occur in a stanza, occurs only once; nevertheless, it is found in two stanzas out of three, so Haslam may go too far when he says 'there is not much interplay of rising and falling beginnings, and the verse would surely have lost something of its dignity if there were a lot of chopping and changing'.[275]

The length of periods varies from two anapaests (*Boarhunters* strophe) to fourteen dactyls (*Boarhunters* strophe, *Geryoneis* epode) or fourteen anapaests (*Geryoneis* strophe). Each of the three long periods contains an internal break where word-end consistently coincides with the end of a particular metron: this occurs after either four, six, or eight metra in the different verses.[276] In the lines from the *Geryoneis*, for which there is considerably more evidence, we can observe other places where word-end is frequent or consistent, and others where it appears to be avoided. 'A certain shape is preferred, even if it is not reproduced in every instance. We may guess that the pattern was set in the first stanza, and underlined by the melodic accompaniment.'[277]

A further pattern involving word-end is associated with the contraction of two short syllables into one long. This contraction is avoided immediately before word-break: so whereas ⏑⏑—‒‒—⏑⏑— is generally licit, ⏑⏑—‒—|—⏑⏑— is not. It

[274] Haslam (1974) 17–18. [275] Haslam (1974) 17.
[276] See Haslam (1974) 18–21.
[277] Thus Haslam (1974) 21; see *ibid.* p. 20 for data on word-break.

may be that the latter arrangement sounded too much like period-end and was avoided for that reason. Another pattern involves contraction alone: namely, that when two shorts are contracted into a long, the two shorts in the metra immediately before, and immediately after, are not contracted. Such metrical shaping ensures that 'the lines are carried along with clarity and ease of movement; the embargo on a succession of more than three longs averts any heaviness and loss of definition, and the "bridge" [i.e. the avoidance of word-end immediately after contraction] has a propulsive function, sweeping the verse past any suggestion of clausula'.[278]

Other poems by Stesichorus show the dactylo-epitrite metre familiar to us, in a more developed form, from Pindar and Bacchylides. Of the *Returns* Haslam says, perhaps harshly, that 'there can be few duller dactylo-epitrite schemes'.[279] No individual dactylo or epitrite element is surrounded by elements of the other kind; all elements are joined by anceps, which appears as either long or short. The scheme of the *Helen* is similar to this; the *Palinode* scheme, however, shows interlacing of dactylo and epitrite.[280] The *Thebais* is also straightforward dactylo-epitrite, with interlacing, although there the anceps can appear as short, long, or double short.[281] In this fragment the combination of mute plus liquid after a short vowel always produces a long syllable, unlike in the *Geryoneis*, where such a syllable is short as often as it is long; 'this is probably connected with the fact that its metre is wholly dactylic with no admixture of cretic elements, so that there was a greater need of short syllables'.[282]

Other dactylo-epitrite poems (all of which involve interlacing) share features with dactylo-anapaestic. The *Oresteia* includes the length D^2 (followed by a pair of D elements without a linking anceps, fr. 180) and a dactylo-anapaestic run immediately after

[278] Thus Haslam (1974) 15. [279] Haslam (1974) 45.
[280] It is possible that these two poems shared the same metrical scheme.
[281] Gentili (1999) rightly rejects the *a priori* attempt by Pavese (1997) 259–63 to remove all instances of linking biceps in the *Thebais* by emendation.
[282] Thus West (1978b) 2.

a period ending with, or consisting of, *D*— (fr. 181). In the *Sack of Troy* we find D^2 and D^3 (along with double short anceps). The *Eriphyle* contains even longer *D* elements, D^2, D^3, D^4, and D^5. Indeed, the correct description of the scheme of this poem is unclear: we may be dealing with a series of fluid transitions between dactylo-epitrite and dactylo-anapaestic, or an intermediate metrical form. So depending on our interpretation, the first line of the *Eriphyle* scheme contains either an anceps appearing as a double short, or a dactylo-anapaestic run beginning (with ⏑⏑— . . .) immediately after some epitrites, with no intervening anceps. The poem from which fr. 271 is taken seems to have been of this type.

Two stanzas end with a verse ———⏑—— (*Eriphyle* epode, *Thebais* epode), 'a peculiarly dragging line, I dare say devised by Stesichorus himself for its weightiness'.[283] Other stanzas end blunt (*Eriphyle* strophe, *D*) or pendant (*Thebais* strophe, *Sack of Troy* strophe and epode, *e*—).

Of the two metrical forms used by Stesichorus, dactylo-anapaestic is the simpler and older. Dactylo-epitrite shows the integration of dactylo-anapaestic with metrical lengths based on long/single short alternation. The coming of epitrites meant the coming of anceps, and the anceps soon invaded what had been purely dactylo-anapaestic runs. So what had been simply (say) a series of six dactyls could be reinterpretated as *D*×*D*×, where × originally represented a double short that could be contracted, but which in time became an anceps that could appear in some poems as long, double short, or single short, and in others as either long or single short. Over time, this new anceps in dactylo-epitrite became assimilated to anceps elsewhere, and became purely a choice between long and short. The Stesichorean corpus thus allows us a glimpse of the development of the dactylo-epitrite metre.[284]

When did this development begin? We already find integration of dactylo-anapaestic and epitrites in Alcman and

[283] Haslam (1978) 37–8. [284] See Haslam (1978) 56–7.

Archilochus, for example,[285] although not on the same scale as in Stesichorus. If we go further into the past, the 'Cup of Nestor' is inscribed with an iambic trimeter (long/single short) followed by two hexameters (long/double short).[286] But the process of integration must be far earlier even than this, since it antedates the creation of the epic hexameter itself. That metre was formed from the combination of units such as *D* and ×*D*×, or *D*× and *D*×. Proverbial, and therefore probably ancient, epic phrases such as μάλιστα δέ τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοί or δίκη δ' ὑπὲρ ὕβριος ἴσχει are found in this very metrical form; it appears that such rhythms 'enjoyed some degree of independence as distinct semantic and metrical entities that could be manipulated and re-combined in various ways'.[287] The existence of Homeric hexameters in the form *D*⏑*D*— indicates how that metre had its origins in early dactylo-epitrite, where anceps could be realised as a short, a long, or two shorts.[288] As a result, it is likely that 'Stesichorean poetry represents the late survival – with continuing development into a variety of new metrical combinations – of a kind of early and pre-Homeric epic that was based on dactylo-paroemiac runs not tightly constrained by stichic recurrence'.[289]

It is tempting to regard the scheme of, for example, the *Returns* as a primitive and therefore early example of Stesichorus' handling of this metrical form. Stesichorus' works may have shown a gradual trend towards greater complexity across his career, but without firm dates for any of the poems this can only be a hypothesis. Moreover, the development of this metre had been going on for at least two centuries before Stesichorus. He may have experimented with (what seemed to him) archaic versions of metrical forms which had long since developed in different directions.

The overall effect of Stesichorus' metre may not be as dazzling as that of Pindar: he uses no energetic enjambment, for

[285] Cf. Alcm. fr. 3 fr. 3.ii.80–1 *PMGF*, Archil. fr. 168 *IEG* etc.
[286] Pithecusae, *c.* 730; *CEG* 1 454 (cited by Haslam (1974) 52).
[287] Hom. *Od.* 6.185, Hes. *Op.* 217; Russo (1999) 345.
[288] Thus West (1973b) 188 = (2011–13) 1 14.
[289] Russo (1999) 345.

example.[290] This reflects his early position in the metrical tradition; as Haslam puts it, 'further developments – more thoroughgoing epitrite integration, more flexible fusion of metrical parts, more sophisticated rapport of metre and syntax – these are left to Stesichorus' successors, the choral lyric poets and the tragedians'.[291] Yet although this developmental model has some validity, we should resist concluding that, from a metrical point of view, Stesichorus is merely a poor man's Pindar. Our analysis has identified distinct rules governing the composition of Stesichorus' metres; rules which existed not for their own sake, but in order to create the balance between regularity and variation that is the hallmark of ancient Greek metrical patterning. Read aloud, his stanzas, rightly characterised by West as 'more voluminous and flowing than those of Alcman',[292] retain an aesthetic appeal. How their rhythms were integrated with the music is unknowable; but the length of Stesichorus' career, and the continuing popularity of his poetry, suggest that audiences throughout the Greek world found his combination of metre and melody irresistible.

8 STYLE

Perhaps the most difficult aspect of Stesichorus' poetry to assess is his style. With a poet whose work survives in full we can formulate stylistic hypotheses based on a few instances, and test them by examining the corpus as a whole. Such an operation, or at least its second part, is generally not available for students of Stesichorus. Nevertheless, it is worth drawing attention to certain apparently distinctive features of his poetry, however tentative our conclusions. The following discussion of three particular aspects of Stesichorus' style – imagery, redundancy,

[290] Cf. how, according to the data collected by Rossi (1983) 8–9, Stesichorus uses hyperbaton less than Pindar. Note however his effective delay of the name Κύπρις in fr. 85.1–3, perhaps until after the end of a period (n.).

[291] Haslam (1978) 57.

[292] Thus West (1992) 339.

and narrative – is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather to stimulate readers to consider this crucial yet under-researched aspect of his output.

The remnants of Stesichorus' poetry present relatively little *imagery*, but what we have is often intriguing. In an unidentifiable context he refers to δνοφέα στάσις, 'gloomy discord'.[293] This noun, common in poetry and prose from the sixth century onwards, usually attracts metaphors associated with disease. The unique image may be exploiting the metaphorical connexions of darkness with death: in a single phrase Stesichorus deftly implies the massacres that are the inevitable consequence of civic turbulence. Another passage, from the *Games for Pelias*, refers to a χειροβρὼς δεσμός, the 'hand-eating bond' wrapped around a boxer's fists.[294] The wounds caused by this equipment are vividly described by the metaphor: the wearer bites into his opponent's flesh not with his mouth, but with his hands. Simultaneously, the χειρ– element suggests that the wearer's hands are eaten away by the tight straps that dig into them: if the opponent was the only one who suffered, there would be no reason to limit the locus of his suffering. Thus in a couple of words Stesichorus vividly depicts the gnawing pain meted out, and suffered, by the ancient boxer. The linguistic periphrasis elevates the mundane piece of sporting gear; the image reminds us of its brutally destructive capacity. A phrase so densely packed with meaning would make for a suitably gripping start to the poem, which is almost certainly where it appeared.

Stesichorus' imagery sometimes works in a more extended fashion. A developed simile may follow the decision of the Trojans in the *Sack of Troy* to take the fatal horse within the city, a high point in the action; however, the text is highly fragmentary, and a portent is at least as likely.[295] A certain example, or rather pair of examples, occurs at a climactic moment in the

[293] Fr. 222.8. See however the commentary *ad loc.* for the possibility that this fragment is not by Stesichorus.
[294] Fr. 1. [295] Fr. 103.45–8.

Geryoneis: the elimination of the monster's first head by means of an arrow.[296] The image begins with a reference to the arrow's head, usually a dead metaphor. But the picture becomes more interesting when we hear that the head has (probably) 'death' around it: 'arrow heads do not properly have anything around them, much less something as abstract as death'. Now Stesichorus introduces a reference to blood and bile, which makes the reference to death more concrete. The image is completed by the mention of the hydra, after which the arrow can at last pierce Geryon's head. 'The literal bloody death from the heads and necks of the hydra has been applied to the head of the arrow. As that arrow pushes silently into one of the heads of Geryon, it pierces flesh and bone so that Geryon's head and body become blood-smeared just like the head of the arrow which killed him. The Hydra's death pains, blood, and bile have produced more pain, blood, and death.'

The results of the arrow's flight are then described, again via imagery: the fall of Geryon's wounded head to one side resembles a poppy shedding its leaves.[297] A similar image is found in Homer, again to describe the effect of a head wound, but with important differences. Homer's poppy merely leans its head to the side thanks to the weight of seed and rainwater, whereas Stesichorus' is apparently in the process of dismemberment, losing its leaves and 'disfiguring its gentle form'.[298] The picture is more violent than Homer's; its emotional impact is complicated by Geryon's surviving heads, which allow him to fight back despite an injury which in Homer was fatal. The use of two separate images in swift succession marks this whole passage as a high point in the action. Yet this concentration of imagery nevertheless produces an effect of considerable variation: the dead metaphor gradually brought to life is succeeded by a formal simile with Homeric antecedents. If the loss of the first head

[296] Fr. 19.31–43. The progress of the metaphor is well described by Garner (1990) 15, from whom the quotations in this paragraph are taken.
[297] Fr. 19.44–7. [298] See *ad loc.*

was treated in such a heightened manner, we can only guess how Geryon's ultimate end was described.

Another striking feature of Stesichorus' style is its *redundancy*.[299] Lists of all kinds are found throughout his poetry, whether or not all the information that they contain is entirely necessary. So at the beginning of the *Oresteia*, the poet commands the Muse to set aside war and to turn instead to joyful topics: marriages of the gods, feasts of men, and banquets of the blessed ones.[300] It requires considerable ingenuity to take these as the subject matter of Stesichorus' poem,[301] and we should probably understand them not as three rigorously separate categories (indeed, they partly overlap, since presumably all divine marriages involve banquets), but as part of a technique aimed at emphasising the basic idea of joyful themes by means of accumulation. These happy strains must at some point have yielded to the darker themes that the poet at first seemed to be rejecting, and that shift will have been all the more pronounced thanks to what appeared to be redundancy at the opening.

Emphasis through elaboration can be observed elsewhere. One fragment expresses the contrast between Apollo and Hades by enumerating three things enjoyed by the former, two by the latter.[302] The point is not the gods' fondness for these particular five sources of pleasure (which again overlap), but the antithesis between the divinities, highlighted in each case through a list. Accumulation of terms also occurs in narrative. The objects thrown at a married couple during their wedding procession come in four varieties;[303] whereas five different kinds of gifts, listed in a single line, are offered to a maiden.[304] The latter context is obscure; in the former, the abundance of projectiles marks the popular joy at Menelaus' wedding, and the irony that such celebration attends a wedding that will indirectly trigger the most bloody of conflicts. Repetition can be found in emotive

[299] He shares this quality with certain fragments of Ibycus: Wilkinson remarks of fr. 286 *PMGF* that 'almost every noun has an adjective or qualifying phrase, creating depth and intensity'.

[300] Fr. 172. [301] See *ad loc.* [302] Fr. 271. [303] Fr. 88. [304] Fr. 3.