

# STESICHORUS' *GERYONEIS*, *SLG* 15 I-II

The fragments of *P. Oxy.* 2617, first edited by E. Lobel<sup>1</sup>, have shed some light on the poetic profile of Stesichorus, a fountain of inspiration for posterity (*PMG* 217) but still hidden in the shadow of Time. The recently discovered papyrus scraps pose numerous problems, out of which those arising from *SLG* 15. i-ii have been singled out for examination here:

col. i str.	]γ[ ]ναντ[ ]ανδο.ω.[ ] ]τα νόωι διέλε[ν] ]ν. ]πολὺ κέρδιον εἶν ]οντα λάθραι πολεμε[ῖν	5
ant.	]κραταιῶι. ]ξ κατεφράζετ[ό] οἱ πι]κρόν ὀλεθρον. ἐ]χεν ἀσπίδα προσ[ ] ]ετο τοῦ δ' ἀπὸ κρα- τὸς ] ἱπ]πόκομος τρυφάλει. ] ἐπὶ ζαπέδωι.	10  15
	(desunt ep. + str. 1-5)	
col. ii	]ων στυγε[ρ]οῦ θανάτοι]ο..[ ] κ]εφ[αλ]ῆι πέρι[ ] ἔχων, πεφορυ- γ]μένος αἵματ[ι.....]..[.] τε χολᾷ,	

1. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 32, London 1967; D. L. Page, *Lyrica Graeca Selecta*, Oxford 1968. All subsequent references to the *Geryoneis* in this paper derive from the edition of D. L. Page, *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis*, Oxford 1974.

ant.	ὀλεσάνορος αἰολοδε[ίρ]ου ὀδύναιεν Ὑδρα· κυγαῖ δ' ὅ γ' ἐπι- κλοπάδαν [ἐ]νέρεισε μετώπῳ. διὰ δ' ἔσχισε σάρκα [καὶ] ὁ[ετ]έα δαί- μονος αἷται. διὰ δ' ἀντικρὺ χέθεν οἱ[ε]τὸς ἐπ' ἄ- κροτάταν κορυφάν, ἐμίαινε δ' ἄρ' αἵματι πορφ[υρέωι θώρακά τε καὶ βροτόεντ[α μέλεα].	5     10
ep.	ἄπέκλινε δ' ἄρ' αὐχένα Γαρ[υόνα] ἐπικάρσιον, ὥς ὅκα μ[ά]κω[ν] ἄτε κατασχύνουσ' ἀπαλδὼν [δέμας αἰψ' ἀπὸ φύλλα βαλοῖσθαι ν[ ]	15

The above-cited fragments, despite their deplorable state of transmission in certain places, allow us to reconstruct and envision at least in outline the confrontation of the two major figures of the story, Heracles and his teratomorphic opponent Geryon, whom tradition has endowed with three heads (Hes. *Theog.* 287) and Stesichorus with six arms, six legs and, most impressively, wings (*PMG* 186 = *SLG* 87). Coping with such an extraordinary situation is not a simple task; it calls for craft and wile, a quality that the Greek hero possesses in abundance. Heracles has to act δόλῳ or δολίῳς (i.3)<sup>2</sup>. He weighs his alternatives and ponders over the best course of action (νόῳ διέλε[ν], i.5) and seems to him (ἐδοάσσατο (?οἱ, γάρ]), (i.7)<sup>3</sup> to be more profitable or advantageous for him (πολὺ κέρδιον εἶν, i.7) to fight secretly, by stealth<sup>4</sup> presumably ἐπὶ τὸν κατιόντα λάθραι πολεμε[ῖν | τόξῳι ῥοπάλῳι τε] κραταίῳι (i.9-10)<sup>5</sup>. Heracles resolves to fight εὐρ]ᾶξ (suppl. Barrett), side-ways, and devises a bitter destruction, that is, death, for Geryon (i.10-11) by adjusting himself to the demands of this peculiar situation: not only is his opponent

2. O. Musso, Due note papirologiche, *Aegyptus* 49 (1969) 72-74: δόλος, δόλιος; B. Gentili, 1. Poetae Melici Graeci, 2. Lyrica Graeca Selecta, 3. Supplementum Lyricis Graecis, *Gnomon* 48 (1976) 745-47 with n. 13: δόλῳ; F. de Martino, La 'Αριστεία μετὰ ἀπάτης di Eracle [Stesicoro, fr. 15, 3-4 SLG], *Aegyptus* 62 (1982) 59-61: δολίῳς.

3. So J. Diggle, Notes on Greek Lyric Poets, *CR* 20 (1970) 5.

4. λάθραι opposite of ἀμφαδόν: by stealth, clandestinely, secretly, R. J. Cunliffe, *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect*, Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1963; H. Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum*, 2 vols. Leipzig, 1885: «Gegensatz zum offenen Kampf» (Duentz.), *clam, in occulto*.

5. So P. Lerza, Note e Discussioni. Nota a Stesicoro, *Atene e Roma* 24 (1979) 42; id., Osservazioni e Congetture alla *Gerioneide* e alla *Iliou Persis* di Stesicoro, *Maia* 33 (1981) 24; id., *Stesicoro. Tre Studi. Frammenti con traduzione a fronte*, Genova 1982, p. 65; the extant text, however, mentions only the club and arrow.

of unconventional physical structure but is also well-armed like a hoplite with shield and helmet, *χὼ μὲν στέρνων ἔ]χεν ἀσπίδα πρόσ[θ'* (i.12)<sup>6</sup>. In a way (to be discussed below) Heracles deprives Geryon of his plumed helmet, which then falls off his head onto the ground<sup>7</sup>.

There is a substantial lacuna of thirteen verses at this crucial point in the narrative only partially eliminated by Lerza with the insertion of *SLG* 21, which she supplements as follows:

ep. καὶ τὰ]ν μὲν [ δα]ίμονες ὠκυπέτα[ι  
 ῥά γε πικρὸν ὄλεθρον]ν ἐχοίσαι  
 [-υ] ἐπ[λ.]ἄξαν ἐπ[ι] χθόνα·  
 ]απέ. η κεφαλὰ χαρ[  
 ]. σῶα. [.] ε... [

The swift-flying gods who apportion bitter death make the helmet fall onto the ground, thus exposing Geryon's head<sup>8</sup>. There still remains a lacuna of eight verses (ep. 6-8, str. 1-5), and when we return to our text we hear of someone or something that has death about his/its head and is befouled with blood and gall that has been produced or issued from the pain of manslaying and speckle-necked Hydra. Then silently and secretly ὃ γ' thrusts Geryon's forehead and splits his bones and flesh, as has been decreed by the gods. The arrow goes through Geryon's forehead and stops on the very top of his head, staining his chest and gory limbs

6. So D. L. Page, Stesichorus: *The Geryoneis*, *JHS* 93 (1973) 151; Lerza, *Osservazioni*, p. 24, objects to it for metrical reasons, i.e., because of the creation of two initial spondees, a metrical feature unattested elsewhere in the extant anapaests of the *Geryoneis*.

7. Cf. T. B. L. Webster, Stesichorus: *Geryoneis*, *Agon* 1-3 (1967-69) 6: «the [Heracles] (put off) his shield against (a rock?); from his head the horse-crested helmet was put on the ground». There follows a reference to Magacleides (*PMG* 229) and the hypothesis that perhaps in the lost epode he put on the lionskin and took an arrow from his quiver. See M. Robertson, *Geryoneis*: Stesichorus and the Vase-painters, *CQ* 19 (1969) 211; W. S. Barrett (see the following note) leaves open the question of «whether these accoutrements belong to the same body as that struck by the arrow in col. ii, or another», but «is inclined to think it likely that the two columns deal with a single body».

8. Cf. Webster, p. 9 with n. 13; κεφαλαχαρ. Stesichorus used χάσμα for a spear shaft (*PMG* 267). It looks as if κεφαλὰ here (fr. 1.1.4) and in fr. 4.ii.3 was the head of a weapon». W. S. Barrett, Stesichorus and the Story of Geryon, a lecture addressed to a meeting of the Hellenic and Roman societies at Oxford in September 1968, suggests that «Heracles shot an arrow, but the helmet [kept it away] from his head; [and the arrow fell] on the ground». Page, Stesichorus: *The Geryoneis*, p. 151, believes that «the description of a failure sits uncomfortably in this context» and for this reason he supplements col. i.17 ἃ δ' αὐτόθι μίμνεν] ἐπὶ ζαπέδω; cf. also F. de Martino, *Noterelle alla Gerioneide di Stesicoro*, *AFLB* 25-26 (1982-83) 99-101, who translates ἐπ[.]ἄξαν «piombarono(?)» and suggests that it is neither the arrow nor the helmet that reaches the earth, but the *κῆρες* themselves.

with blood. There follows a picturesque simile, whose admirable appropriateness and realism will be examined below.

In the above-outlined highly vivid death scene there are admittedly quite a few obscurities which blur the clarity of the picture and hamper our understanding of the entire episode. Although some of the lacunae can be supplemented with some confidence, there are others, like the one between columns i and ii in particular, that cause great confusion and call for further enquiry, since their significance goes beyond the narrow compass of this specific passage and even of the poem itself and involves broader issues such as the underlying mythological version and ideological substratum as well as the relation of Stesichorus with the literary tradition, both before and after him.

In the first category of lacunae, that can be rather safely supplemented, belong i.13f., in which Stesichorus specifies what λάθραι fighting consists of: Heracles lies in ambush, probably hidden behind a boulder<sup>9</sup>, and evaluates the situation. He resolves to deprive his opponent of his helmet, since, as a rule, it cannot be pierced by an arrow. According to Page, Heracles accomplishes this by throwing a rock, ὁ δὲ πέτρῳ] | χροτάφοιο καθίξετο, thus excluding the alternative of a club, on the grounds that a few verses later Heracles acts as an archer, a detail that presupposes the existence of a great distance between the two combatants<sup>10</sup>.

Lerza entertains momentarily the option of rock throwing<sup>11</sup>, but in general she insists on the use of ῥόπαλον at this early phase in the battle: therewith Heracles breaks the leather strap of Geryon's helmet and knocks the latter down. She reconstructs the episode by positing the occurrence of a scene comparable to that of *Iliad* 16.778-93. Considering δεύτερον (*SLG* 16) an adverb («per la seconda volta») Lerza assumes the successive employment of three weapons: club, arrow, and club again<sup>12</sup>.

The above proposal is based on the alleged difficulty created by the «inconci-liabilità» of fighting λάθραι with the use of the club. However, these two are not

9. See P. Brize, *Die Geryoneis des Stesichoros und die frühe griechische Kunst*, Beiträge zur Archäologie, Würzburg 1980, p. 47f. and 60: this posture is depicted on a lecythos of ca 500 B.C. (Ger. 48 Taf. 5): Heracles kneels behind a boulder (?) and lying in ambush aims at Geryon who is already hit in one of his heads. Brize (p. 60) believes that in this piece of art we may have a reproduction of the Stesichorean scene; cf. *ibid.*, p. 50, in the Etruscan crater in Cerveteri there is a tree which presumably serves as a hiding place for Heracles.

10. Page, Stesichorus: *The Geryoneis*, p. 151. The verb καθιχνέομαι «reach, touch» occurs only in aor. II figuratively ἐπὶ κακοῦ in Homer (*Od.* 1.342, *Il.* 14.104); later of any down-stroke, Soph. *OT.* 809 etc. (see *LSJ*).

11. Lerza, Osservazioni, p. 24.

12. Lerza, Osservazioni, p. 24 with n. 27, 28; id., Note e Discussioni. Su un Frammento della *Gerioneide*, *Atene e Roma* 23 (1978) 85; id., Nota a Stesicoro, p. 42.

necessarily mutually exclusive; the εὐρ]ᾶξ illuminates what λάθραι consists of: Heracles intends to steal the victory emerging out of his ambush «on one side, side ways» (*LSJ*, see *Il.* 11.251, 15.541), presumably when his enemy has slightly passed him. What seems to be incongruous is the set-up required by these two ways of fighting: the use of the club implies a combat at close quarters, in contrast to the arrow-shooting, which presupposes different spatial arrangements. The tidal movement created by the proposed club-arrow-club sequence strains the probability of the narrated scene. Besides, the adverbial meaning of δεύτερον (*SLG* 16) cannot be confirmed in such a mutilated context. It may as well be an adjectival attribute of κάρα, for instance, in a passage dealing with the hitting of the remaining heads of Geryon<sup>13</sup>.

On this issue of what kind of weapon Heracles uses first against Geryon, Homer proves helpful. The diptych: far-near is never violated; in all typical battle scenes in which there is a spear-rock or spear-sword sequence, «a fighter can strike the same opponent first with a spear or rock and then again with a sword (*Il.* 5.580, 4.517, 527, 20.457, 478). The order is never reversed»<sup>14</sup>. The employed weapons suggest a directional move from afar to near. The use of a stone or a spear to wound a victim who is then finished off by sword is, according to Fenik, a common pattern in the *Iliad*.

It now remains to be investigated whether Stesichorus complies with the Homeric conventions or not. In his extant *Geryoneis*, the poet explicitly equips Heracles with bow and arrows, thus preserving the Homeric tradition (*Il.* 5.392ff.), and with the club (*SLG* 16), a new accoutrement which, together with the attire of a ληστής in lion-skin, originates with Stesichorus himself, according to Megacleides (*PMG* 229, Eust. *Il.* 1279.8)<sup>15</sup>. In ancient Greek and Etruscan art depictions of

13. So Barrett and Page, Stesichorus: *The Geryoneis*, p. 153, and Robertson, p. 209, 211, favor the adjectival function of δεύτερον. Robertson remarks that in art «the three bodies had to be dealt with each on its own» (cf. the Chalcidean amphora from Caere, mid-sixth c. B.C.); the same conclusion is reached through Brize's (p. 41-51) detailed art descriptions of Geryon's death, regardless of the kind of weapon employed; cf. Aesch. *Agam.* 870-73: τρισώματος Γηρυῶν ... ἄπαξ ἐκάστωι καθανὼν μορφώματι; F. de Martino, *Noterelle alla Gerioneide di Stesicoro*, p. 93, translates «per la seconda volta», but recognizes the probability of the view advanced by Page.

14. B. Fenik, *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad* [Hermes Einzelschriften, Heft 21], Wiesbaden 1968, p. 23, 61, 64.

15. The question of whether it is Stesichorus or Peisander (fr. 1 Kinkel) who is the πρῶτος εὐρετής of this unhomeric image of Heracles is still unsettled. Suda dates Peisander ca. 645 (i.e., 7th c. B.C.), and so does G. Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelus to Panyassis*, London, 1969, p. 102, n. 2, who categorically discounts the statement of Megacleides as mistaken; see also B. Gentili, *Poesia e pubblico nella Grecia antica da Omero al V secolo*, Roma-Bari 1984, p. 161f. with n. 14; cf., however, U. von Wilamowitz, *Euripides Herakles*, Berlin 1895, p. 66f., 121, who dates Peisander in the 6th c. B.C. and makes him younger than Stesichorus; so also C. M. Bowra,

Geryon's death these two weapons, arrow and club, are absolutely indispensable, whereas the spear is depicted as the main weapon of Geryon. On the evidence of art we may narrow down the spear-stone Homeric alternative with the exclusion of the spear. The hypothesized use of a rock, also a thrown missile, at this preliminary phase in the combat gains ground, consequently, not only because it has a precedent in Homer but also because it accords with the necessary spatial requirements<sup>16</sup>.

It is worth noting that in our extant text there is no mention of Heracles as a gladiator or swordsman. The use of a sword at such an early phase in the combat described in *SLG* 15 would imply a grip at close quarters, a rather inappropriate and implausible hypothesis, since it violates the distance requirements for the use of bow and arrow referred to immediately thereafter (col. ii). However, on the meagre evidence of our *Geryoneis* we are entitled neither to confirm nor exclude the role of the sword at a later stage of the fight against Geryon<sup>17</sup>. We may give it a serious thought nonetheless, since Heracles, well-known as an archer in *Iliad*, appears in art more frequently fighting with a sword<sup>18</sup>. We should not press this issue further because the help given by art is multifarious: convention and originality mingle together producing varying pictorial creations<sup>19</sup>.

On these conditions we may rather safely argue that Heracles hits from the side (ἐὺρ]ᾶξ) and succeeds in knocking down Geryon's helmet by breaking the ὄχεύς that secures the helmet on the head (cf. *Il.* 3.369-72). Our i.13f. may then be supplemented as follows:

---

*Greek Lyric Poetry*, 2nd ed., Oxford 1961, p. 91; G. Philipp, Herakles und die frühgriechische Dichtung, *Gymnasium* 91 (1984) 335f.; and R. Keydell, Peisandros, *RE* 19 (1937) 144; id., Die Dichter mit Namen Peisandros, *Hermes* 70 (1935) 301-311, Brize, p. 25f., 30 with n. 184-195 and 215-218, correctly observes that the new image of Heracles reflects not necessarily the innovations of one poet but the ideas of the entire epoch to be duly appreciated by means of a cultural-historical analysis.

16. For the relation between distance and chosen weapon see also Brize, p. 43, 59f.; Strabo, *Geogr.* 10.I. 12-13 (448), relates the various weapons with the kind of fighting.

17. Cf., however, Philipp, p. 336: the new papyrus findings portray the threefold fight with bow, club and sword.

18. Robertson, p. 213; Brize, p. 41ff.

19. This process of creative freedom is exemplified by the two Chalcidean vases painted by the same artist: although in both the painter draws upon the Stesichorean conception of winged Geryon, the weapons depicted differ: the amphora from Vulci equips Heracles (in lion-skin) exclusively with arrows, whereas the amphora from Caere «shows a different moment —perhaps a different version— of fight» (Robertson, p. 209; see also Brize, p. 42, Taf. 3.1-2): the quiver of Heracles (without lion-skin) is to be seen but there are no loosed arrows. Two heads of Geryon are already afflicted and drooping one forward and one backward, while Heracles grabs the middle one from the helmet-crest and with a sword stabs Geryon's throat. The sword plays a role but in the finale of the death scene.

ὁ δὲ πέτρῳι | κατ' ὀχῆά νιν ἔκ]ετο<sup>20</sup>.

The assumption that the stone plays an instrumental role at this initial stage in the fighting (col. i) is bound up with literary criticism: whereas in Homer a helmet smitten by a stone is only once splintered together with the head<sup>21</sup>, in our *Geryoneis* the helmet falls intact, as it seems, on the ground. This detail reveals the perspective of the lyric poet and the limited implications of λάθραι fighting: Heracles, who elsewhere also waits for the right moment (*PMG* 207, against Cynus), lays the foundation for a potentially successful outcome. A reference to a broken helmet and head as well would probably have a «scattering» effect: it would distract one's attention from the great challenge imposed to Heracles, and the high suspense that derives from the encounter with a monstrous *tricephalic* opponent would be not highlighted. Although Stesichorus speaks of one head and one neck in this passage (cf. Hygin *Fab.* 30.11 *Geryonem ... uno telo interfecit*) the great compass of the poem (at least 1300 verses, N stichometric in *SLG* 27) suggests that the successive succumbing of the three heads was in all probability painstakingly described by Stesichorus as well. The detail of the intact helmet falling on the ground gives us, moreover, an insight into the way Stesichorus takes over conventional elements and moulds them in such a manner as to serve better his own imaginative inspiration. It is noteworthy that this specific picture of the knocked-down helmet has left a permanent mark neither in the extant literary production nor in art, where Geryon's dying heads droop while still wearing their helmets.

In the second category of important «open loops», the presence of which determines the quality and significance of the poetic web, belongs the lacuna of eight verses between the epode of column i and the strophe of column ii. The loss of this part in the narrative raises two interrelated questions: firstly, who is the «owner» of the κεφαλά (ii.3), and secondly, what is the identity of ὁ γ' (ii.6).

In the *editio princeps* Lobel comments: «l. 3 κ]εφ[αλ]ᾱ looks possible but I do not know that it is wanted». The occurrence of an arrow in ii.10, however, makes Lobel «fairly confident that what is referred to here is one of the arrows of Heracles befouled with the blood and ... gall of the ... Hydra». This is a detail known from Apollodorus (*Bibl.* 2.5.2) Pausanias (2.37), Hygin (*Fab.* 30.3), Diodorus (4.11.38). «But», Lobel continues, «it must be admitted that ὁδύναισιν intrudes awkwardly into such an interpretation». He identifies ὁ γε with Heracles and

20. κατὰ *cum* acc. *LSJ*, B.I.: frequent in Homer in describing the place of wound, *Il.* 11.108, 16.465 etc., 5.46, 11.339, 5.537, 615; ἐνέομαι *cum* acc. *LSJ*, 2. «reach, attain to», in neg., *Il.* 11.352, *Od.* 19.451.

21. *Il.* 12.378-85; in *Il.* 16.411ff. and 578f. it is not specified whether the helmet is also smashed or falling down.

translates «Silently he cunningly stuck it in (his enemy's) forehead». But there are oddities here to which, as he himself confesses, he can give no satisfactory account<sup>22</sup>. In Lobel's commentary the participle *πεφορυγμένος* is certainly associated with *οἰστός*, but the syntactical associations of *κεφαλαῖ πέρι* are not specified.

Barrett and Page make a fresh attack on the problems: both recognize a figurative use of the *κεφαλή*: «(the arrow) with doom of hateful death about its head, smeared with blood and with ... gall, agonies of manslaying speckle-necked Hydra». The general sense is clear, according to Page: the arrow «has doom around its head»<sup>23</sup>. However, there is a point of divergence. Barrett and Lobel identify *ὁ γ'* with Heracles, who is considered the subject of *ἐνέρεισε* while *οἰστός* the subject of *ἔσχισε*. By contrast, Page identifies *ὁ γ'* with *οἰστός*, which he takes to be the subject of both *ἐνέρεισε*, intransitive in this case, and *ἔσχισε*<sup>24</sup>.

A. Dale Maingon fully agrees with Page and supplements ii.1: *φέρ[ω]ν στυγε[ρ]οῦ*, on the pattern of *Iliad* 9.411 *διχθαδίας κῆρας φερέμεν θανάτοιο τέλοσδε*<sup>25</sup>. Page's proposals are also approved of by Lerza<sup>26</sup>.

The above survey has shown that, despite disagreements as to who the *ὁ γ'* is, there is a consensus as to whose *κεφαλή* is the one referred to in ii.3: it is not Geryon's head, as it was the one figuring a few verses above (*SLG* 21.4), but it is the apex of the arrow, which thus dominates the picture with its bold imagistic personification. An animated deadly weapon stained with the blood and gall that has issued from Hydra's death pangs, becomes the center of the narrative, exactly like the *μοχλός* that blinds Cyclops in *Odyssey* 9.

The above-outlined interpretation is very imaginative, indeed, and would do justice to a poet of the caliber of Stesichorus. But before endorsing it, we should examine its premises. We have to prove, for instance, that the word *κεφαλή* is used metaphorically at this early period. The argument that *ὁ γε* «implies a continuation, not a change of subject»<sup>27</sup> has also to be explored, as well as the assumption that

22. Lobel, *P. Oxy.*, vol. 32, p. 6.

23. Page, Stesichorus: *The Geryoneis*, p. 152; id., *Lyrice Graeca Selecta*, p. 268: «πεφορυγμένος: scil. οἰστός vel ἰός, itaque fortasse κεφαλαῖ πέρι = 'circum sagittae apicem'».

24. Lobel (p. 7) translates: «it cut through the flesh».

25. A. Dale Maingon, *Stesichorus and the Epic Tradition*, Diss. The University of British Columbia 1978, p. 196-98, 201; id., *Epic Convention in Stesichorus' Geryoneis: SLG S15, Phoenix* 34 (1980) 99-107, esp. 101-102.

26. Lerza, *Osservazioni*, p. 25: in this passage we have a strongly personified arrow, the action of which is characterized by the adverbs *σιγαῖ* and esp. *ἐπικλοπάδαν*, a *hapax* that derives from the Homeric *ἐπικλοπος* which always refers to human beings (*Il.* 22.281, *Od.* 13.291, 21.397). Musso, *Due note papirologiche*, p. 74, associates *πεφορυγμένος* with the arrow. Similarly F. Bornmann, *Note a Stesicoro, SCO* 28 (1978) 149.

27. Page, Stesichorus: *The Geryoneis*, p. 152.



ἐνέρεισεν is intransitive, since our unique precedent for the use of this verbal form is *Odyssey* 9.382, where, again with dative, it is undoubtedly used as transitive. The picture becomes more confused if we take into consideration the existence of a spacious gap of eight verses at this crucial point in the narrative as well as the special demands raised by Geryon's teratomorphy. Since our link is unfortunately lost in these eight verses we may get some help by applying strictly philological criteria and by examining the specific way in which the key words of our text, that is, οἰστός, κεφαλή and πεφορυγμένος, are used in literary tradition.

In Homer the word οἰστός is qualified by the epithets περρόεις, ταχύς, πικρός, ὀξυβελής, στονόεις, and πολύστονος. The synonyms βέλος and ἰδός are accompanied by the same attributes to which we can add ταρφέες (ιοί), ὠκύμορος, χαλκοβαρής, χαλκήρης, ἔχευευκής, ὀξύς. The arrow-tip is qualified by the adjectives χαλκήρης (tipped with bronze), τριγλῶχis (three-barbed), ταυγλῶχis (with long barb), or by the substantive ἀκωκή, the extremity of the spear being an αἰχμή<sup>28</sup>. With some additions or variations the same epithets occur in post-Homeric literature<sup>29</sup>. Later on the arrow-tip is called ἀκίς<sup>30</sup>.

Although arrows and spears are often personified<sup>31</sup>, they are never said to have a κεφαλή. The word κεφαλή in pre-classic literature has a very concrete range of meanings. By contrast to its synonyms κάρηνον and κάρα, which are used metaphorically of mountain peaks and towns, the word κεφαλή is used of animate beings such as common people, deities or animals. Only once is it employed of an inanimate being, in *Iliad* 11.72 ἴσας δ' ὕσμινη κεφαλὰς ἔχεν, to signify that the inimical forces are ἰσοπαλεῖς or ἰσόρροποι<sup>32</sup>. At any rate, the reading of the verse is

28. See G. L. Prendergast, *A Complete Concordance to the Iliad of Homer*, new ed. rev. by B. Marzullo, Hildesheim 1962; H. Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum*; H. Dunbar, *A Complete Concordance to the Odyssey of Homer*, new ed. rev. by B. Marzullo, Hildesheim 1962.

29. τριγλῶχis Sim. *PMG* 636; τραχύς Bacch. 5.82; ἀνάρσιος *PMG* 922 (a) 2; metaphorically of a poem, Pi *Ol.* 9.12, 2.90; δακρυόεντα β. Mimn. 14.8; τυφλὰ β. Bacch. 5.132; ἀδινόϊς β. *SLG* 167.8, κομήτης Soph. *Trach.* 567, χαλκεόκρανος Bacch. 5.74 etc. (see *LSJ*).

30. Plu. *Dem.* 20: οἱ δὲ τῶν Πάρθων βασιλεῖς ἐσεμνύνοντο τὰς ἀκίδας τῶν βελῶν χαράττοντες αὐτοὶ καὶ παραθήγοντες; with respect to Heracles' arrows: Diod. 4.11.6 εἰς τὴν χολὴν ἀπέβαπτε τὰς ἀκίδας, ἵνα τὸ βληθὲν βέλος ἔχη τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἀκίδος πληγὴν ἀνίατον; Paus. 2.37.4 ἀπὸ τῆς χολῆς αὐτοῦ [τοῦ θηρίου] τὰς ἀκίδας φαρμακεῦσαι τῶν οἰστών; without specific reference to the tip: Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.5.2, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τῆς Ὑδρας ἀνασχίσας τῇ χολῇ τοὺς οἰστοὺς ἔβαψεν; Similarly Zenobius *Centuria* 6, Hygin *Fab.* 30 et eius felle sagittas suas tinxit.

31. ἄλτο δ' ὁ. *Il.* 4.125; ἐπέγραψε 4.139; ἔπτατο 5.99, 13.587, 592; δαμάσσατο ὁ. 5.278 cf. 11.478; θρώσκοντας 15.470.

32. Ebeling, κεφαλή: (a) *de capite hominum*, (b) *de Jove, Ate*, (c) *de animalibus*, (d) *de Gorgone, de Scylla, e translate ὕσμινη (Il. 11.72); saepe de toto homine or pro ψυχᾷ or in periphrasis φίλη κεφαλή etc.; de iurantibus per caput, de vita παρθέμενοι κεφαλὰς Od. 2.237 etc.* In the sense of head of a man or animal or periphrastically for a person is the word also used in Lyric Poetry: Archil. (West) 9.10; Praxilla *PMG* 754.2; Alcaeus (Lobel and Page) B 18.1, prob. D

uncertain<sup>33</sup> and it would probably be worth remembering that 'Υσμίνη personified occurs in Hesiod (*Theog.* 228). From the first quarter of the fifth century downwards, the word κεφαλῇ is used figuratively of things to denote «extremity» in botany, anatomy, architecture<sup>34</sup>. Most of the so-characterized objects have a round shape. This would hardly fit a piercing, lacerating weapon, the potency and efficacy of which depends on the sharpness of its tip, unless we keep insisting on the bold personification of a headed arrow, for which there is no precedent. In such cases ancient literature testifies to a preference for using compound epithets in -κάρανος or -κρανος and -κέφαλος.

A large number of epithets in -κρανος, -κάρανος, -κάρηνος<sup>35</sup> characterizes both animate and inanimate beings, such as δίκρανος of mortals (*Parm.* 6.5), ἑκατογκ(ά)ρανος of Typho (*Aes. Pr.* 353, *Pi. P.* 8.16), ἀμφίκρανος = ἀμφικάρηνος (*Eur. HF* 1274) and μυριόκρανος of Hydra (*Eur. HF* 419), who is elsewhere called πολυδειράς (*Q.S.* 6.212) and πολυαύχενος (*Apl.* 4.92)<sup>36</sup>. Inanimate objects are similarly qualified: δορίκρανος of the λόγχη (*Aesch. Pers.* 148), ἀμφίκρανος of Hermes' wand (*Soph. Fr.* 701), ῥαιβόκρανος of κορύνα (*AP* 6.35 [Leon.]), ὀρθόκρανος of the funeral mound (*Soph. Ant.* 1203) and last but not least χαλκικόκρανος of the arrow (*Bacch.* 5.74).

The compound epithets in -κέφαλος<sup>37</sup> not only outnumber those in -κρανος but also have a much richer range of use, a full reference to which would make too long a list. For the present it would suffice to summarize and classify the evidence into categories: the adjectives in -κέφαλος qualify human beings, fabulous creatures, plants (ρίζοκέφαλος, *Theophr. CP* 1.5; μονοκέφαλος of σκόρδον *Dsc.* 2.152),

16.3, *Z* 42, *Z* 20.2, *Z* 23 (a) 4f., *Z* 34.4, *Z* 35.2 etc.; *Theognis* (West) 447, 503, 535, 977f., 1012, 1022 (= *Mimn.* fr. 5.6), 1260; *Tyrtæus* (West) 11.26, 20.14; *Sim. PMG* 567.2, *Pi. P.* 11.35, 203; *P.* 9.31, 80f., *Ol.* 6.60, *Ol.* 7.67, *Isth.* 8.9; *Bacch.* 10.16; 27.35, 5.91; fr. 20 A 12 etc.; *Pi. P.* 12.9, 12.23 κεφαλῶν πολλῶν νόμον, «many-headed tune» (Loeb transl.), because it imitates the hisses of many serpents entwined in the Gorgon's hair; cf. νόμος πολυκέφαλος *Plu.* 2.1133d (*LSJ*).

33. See H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, vol. 3, Berlin 1973, p. 138 on *Il.* 11.72a-c.

34. See *LSJ*, II a-e, III-V.

35. See C. D. Buck and W. Petersen, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives*, Chicago 1945, p. 266; the epithets in -κρανος, first attested in *Aesch. Pers.* 148, derive from κρανίον (*Il.* 8.84 of horses; of men *Pi. Isth.* 4.59, *Eur. Cyc.* 683, *Crat.* 71, *Pl. Euthd.* 299e etc.). See P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Greque*, Paris 1968, s.v. κρανίον; as second compound it is found in technical and mostly medical terms.

36. See also οὔλοκάρηνος of Eurybates (*Od.* 19.246), ταυροκάρηνος of the elephants (*Nonn. Dion.* 26.317), ταυρόκρανος of Ocean (*Eur. Or.* 1378), χρυσοκάρηνος of the golden-horned hind (*Eur. HF* 375), ἐλαφόκρανος of horses (*Str.* 15.1.56), πολύκρανος of serpents (*Eur. Ba.* 1017) and μακασίκρανος of a hoopoe (*Hsch.*).

37. Buck and Petersen, p. 359f.

all kinds of animals, and finally are used metaphorically with λόγος, μῦθος (ἀκέφαλος, Pl. *Phaedr.* 264c, *Laws* 752a, Luc. *Scyth.* 9), of objects (σφῦρα), of verses (προκέφαλος Ps. Plu. *Metr.* 2) or νόμος (πολυκέφαλος, Plu. 2.1133d). Despite the occasional figurative use of the -κέφαλος adjectives attested as early as Plato, the great majority of the occurrences demonstrate a concrete and literal use of mainly animate beings and herewith we confirm our similar observation with regard to the substantive κεφαλῇ: with the exception of ὕσμινη (*Il.* 11.72; cf. Hes. *Theog.* 228), the noun κεφαλῇ is always used of animate beings.

Of the above-mentioned occurrences one, Bacchylides' χαλκεόκρανον ἰὸν (5.74), deserves a closer look, since it refers to Heracles' arrow and may furnish the closest parallel to the alleged Stesichorean conception of a «headed» arrow. In the adjective χαλκεόκρανος, «bronze-tipped», (*LSJ*), or more precisely «bronze-headed», of Bacchylides as well as in the χαλκοκράς of Timotheus (*Persae* 30, bronze-headed, i.e. bronze-tipped, of missiles) the implications of the imaginative human or animate characteristics contained in the second part (κρανίον-κάρα) are narrowed down and specified by the first compound χαλκο-: the head is not that of an animate being but is made of bronze; it is the «head» of an arrow or spear. The first part of the compound epithet helps bridle our imagination. In the case of χαλκεόκρανον, both compounds impart the idea of sturdiness and strength, since the κρανίον is also used of the skull, the hard part of the head. This compound adjective, consequently, aims at emphasizing the relentless, unyielding force of the strong arrows of Heracles, matching thus the endurance and strength of the hero. The arrows thus become the concrete external *insignium* of a hero of whom his son Tlepolemus says, «βίην Ἡρακλείην, ... ἑμὸν πατέρα θρασυμέμονα θυμολέοντα» (*Il.* 5.638-39).

A comparably restrained personification of a piece of armor is achieved with similar compound epithets, such as χαλκο-γλῶχis, «with point or barbs of bronze» (*LSJ*, μελίη *Il.* 22.225), χαλκο-πάρηος, «with cheeks or sides of bronze», epithet of helmets (*Il.* 12.183, 17.294, 20.397, *Od.* 24.523) or of javelins (Pi. *P.* 1.44, *N.* 7.71), and χαλκό-γενυς (ἄγκυρα, Pi. *P.* 4.24). In the above examples the bold personification of inanimate objects is checked with the use of compound adjectival attributes, the first part of which constrains the connotations of the second. In the extant Stesichorean *Geryoneis* restrictive adjectives or genitives that would define the kind or owner of the κεφαλῇ are absent. This fact, taken together with the observation that in early Greek literature the noun κεφαλῇ has a literal meaning, that is, specifies a concrete anatomical part of a living being, with the questionable and unique exception of ὕσμινη, makes it rather difficult to associate κεφαλῇ (ii.3) with οἰστός (ii.10).

This skepticism seems, moreover, to be reinforced by the specific way πεφορυγμένος is used. πεφορυγμένος, the passive perfect participle of φορύσσω,

does not occur in Homer, where we find instead the form *πεφυρμένος* of *φύρω* as well as some other forms<sup>38</sup> without an essential difference in meaning, since both verbs are, according to Eustathius<sup>39</sup>, probably synonymous and etymologically akin. They mean: affect by admixture, moisten, sully, mar, stain, mix up, defile (Cunliffe and *LSJ*). The form *πεφορυγμένος* figures in much later writers such as Nicander, Oppian and Quintus Smyrnaeus<sup>40</sup>.

It should be noted that the above-mentioned verbal forms and especially the participle *πεφορυγμένος* figure in a context in which the presence of moisture is unmistakable; they are used especially of fresh blood and tears, once of a semi-wet substance (*πηλῶ* Nic. *Ther.* 203), and seldom of a dry substance (Eur. *Hec.* 496). The *πεφορυγμένος* has a conspicuous immediacy about it; it is mostly employed of the very moment someone or something is being moistened and befouled with liquid. The wooden bar that blinds Cyclops, for instance, is all dripping with fresh warm blood, not merely contaminated with but *πεφυρμένον αἵματι πολλῶ* (*Od.* 9.397, *ib.* 388, cf. 18.336 *φορύξας αἵματι πολλῶ*).

The idea of immediacy of moisture conveyed by *πεφορυγμένος* can be discerned in the Stesichorean narrative (ii. 3-4); the participle evokes liquid imagery rather inappropriate to an arrow dipped in the bile of Hydra a long time ago. A more realistic allusion to the natural process of blood congelation is attempted by Sophocles (*Trach.* 572ff) when he speaks of the *ἀμφίθρεπτον*, clotted, blood of Nessus which he urges Deianeira to take *«ἤ μελαγχόλους| ἔβαψεν ἰοὺς θρέμμα Λερναίας ὕδρας»*<sup>41</sup>. By contrast, Stesichorus' imagination seems to be

38. *φορύσσω*, only in aor. participle and infinitive; *Od.* 18.336 *φορύξας αἵματι*; cf. Nic. *Ther.* 203 *ἐφορύξατο γυῖα πηλῶ*; Opp. *Hal.* 5.269f. *κῦμα δ' ἅπαν λύθροιο φορύσσεσται ἐκχυμένιοι ὠτειλαῖς ὀλοῇσι*; Hp. *Mul.* 1.74 *ὕδατι φορύξαι*, *id.* *Ster.* 221. *φορύνω*, *Od.* 22.21 *λύθρῳ ἐφορύνετο γαῖα*; cf. Q.S. 2.356 *λύθρῳ δ' ἐφορύνετο γαῖα ὄλλυμένων Δαναῶν*, 3.604 *ἀμφὶ δὲ λαῶν μυρομένων δακρύοισι φορύνετο τεύχεα. φύρω*, *Il.* 24.162 *δάκρυσιν εἵματ' ἔφυρον*; *Od.* 18.21 *μή σε στήθος φύρσω αἵματος; πεφυρμένος -η*, *Od.* 9.397 *πεφυρμένον αἵματι*, 17.103 *δάκρυσιν πεφυρμένη*, 18.173 *δακρύοισι πεφυρμένη*, 19.596 *δάκρυσ' ἐμοῖσι πεφυρμένη*; cf. Eur. *El.* 1173 *δῖμμα δακρύοις πεφυρμένοι*, *ib.*, 1171f. *μητρὸς ἐν αἵμασι πεφυρμένοι*; Xen. *Ages.* 2.14 *γῇ αἵματι πεφυρμένη*; also of dry substances Eur. *Hec.* 496 *κόνει φύρουσα κάρα*.

39. Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, 1849.16 (cf. 1917.42) *τὸ δὲ φορύξας αἵματι ταῦτόν τῳ φύρσας, ὃ προέγραπται. ἴσως δὲ καὶ πρωτότυπον ἐκεῖνου. φορῶ γὰρ φορύω, ἐξ οὗ παράγωγόν τὸ φορύσσω. τὸ δὲ φορύω συγκοπὴν παθὸν καὶ μετατεθὲν φύρω γίνεται*; cf. Apoll. Soph. *Lex. Homericum*, *φορύξας συμφύρας*; Hesychius *Lexicon* ed. M. Schmidt, vol. III-IV, p. 255.95 and 800: all the forms of *φορύνω* and *φορύσσω* are translated *μολύνω* and *συγχέω*. *Suda* 621, *φορύνω* = *μολύνω*.

40. Nic. *Ther.* 301f. *αἶμα διὲκ ῥινῶν τε καὶ αὐχένος ἡδὲ καὶ ὠτων πιδύεται χολόεντι νέον πεφορυγμένον ἰῶ*; cf. schol. on 302d *πεφορυγμένον δὲ ἡγουν μεμολυσμένον, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀναμειγμένον καὶ συγκεκραμένον τῳ χολώδει ἰῶ*; Oppian *Cyn.* 1.381f. *εἴαρι μὲν χολόεντος ἔχεις πεφορυγμένος ἰοῦ ἱκτο λέχος ... ἀλόχοιο*; Q.S. 12.549-51 *ἐπ' εἰλαπίνῃ δ' ἄλεγεινῇ| δαίνυσθ' ὕστατα δόρπα κακῶ πεφορυγμένα λύθρῳ*.

41. «Just where Hydra, Lerna's monstrous breed, has tinged the barbed arrow with her gall»

captured by the sight of gushing, running blood, which is vividly visualized by means of his habitual alliteration. He artistically insinuates the image of flowing liquid, lethal or nourishing, with the repetition of liquid and labial sounds: as in τᾶι δὲ δράκων ἐδόκησε μολεῖν κάρᾳ βεβροτωμένος ἄκρον (*PMG* 219), so in his *Geryoneis* the sounds μ-β, π-φ coupled with the ρ sound and its audio-visual connotations of gushing liquid, namely, blood drawn violently, underline a scene of bloodshed<sup>42</sup> and death: κ]εφ[αλ]ᾶι πέρι [κ]ῆρας] ἔχων, πεφορυγμένος αἵματι [πικροτάτᾳ] τε χολᾶι and ἐμίαινε δ' ἄρ' αἵματι πορφ[υρέωι | θώρακά τε καὶ βροτόεντ]α μέλεα (*SLG* 15. ii.3ff., 12f.). In the same context the repetition of liquid and nasal sounds ολ, ρο, νο in ὀλεσάνορος αἰολοδε[ίρ]ου ὀδύναισιν "Υδρας (ii.5f.) evoke the watery abode of the serpent. Elsewhere in the poem (*PMG* 184 = *SLG* 7) the labial and liquid sounds imitate in diction the sound of the lifegiving running water of the river Tartessus.

The emphasis on liquid imagery in the *Geryoneis* is not accidental. In fact it forms part of Geryon's «biography». He is the son of Chrysaor and Callirhoe, both associated with water. Chrysaor is begotten by the god of the sea, Poseidon, on Medusa, whose lineage is also watery since it goes back to Pontus through Ceto and Phorcys and Nereus and Gaia (Hes. *Theog.* 233-38, 270-94). Chrysaor begets Geryon μυχθεὶς Καλλιρόῃ κούρῃ κλυτοῦ Ὀκεανοῦ (Hes. *Theog.* 288, cf. *ibid.*, 979-83), that is, with an Oceanid of a descriptive name: Callirhoe, Beautiful-flowing. In Geryon's genealogy water and blood are closely related with life and death: Chrysaor and Pegasus are brought to life springing from the severed neck of Medusa. The watery connexions of Geryon are, moreover, confirmed by his association with the hot springs of Himera<sup>43</sup>.

(Loeb transl.). *LSJ*: «in periphrasis, ὕδρας θρέμμα, for ὕδρα *S. Trach.* 574». But since θρέμμα also means «nursling, creature», I take the gall of Hydra to be her nursling. A comparable ambiguity is observed in the use of ὠδίνω, ὠδῖς and ὀδύνῃ, cf. *Od.* 9.415 ὠδίνων ὀδύνῃσι of Cyclops and esp. *Il.* 11.269-72. Unfortunately the ancient Greek pronunciation is lost for us and a possible pun on ὠδίνεσσι-ὀδύναισιν (*SLG* 15. ii. 6) cannot be confirmed apart from metrical considerations. The oxymoron of life created in death is conspicuous also in Soph. *Trach.* 833-34: ἰοῦ, | δν τέκετο θάνατος, ἔτρεφε δ' αἰόλος δράκων. On a mythological level Chrysaor and Pegasus spring from the neck of Medusa upon her death.

42. See Maingon, *Epic Convention in Stesichorus' Geryoneis*, p. 103: the epithet πορφύρεος generally associated with πόντος, introduces «connotations of vastness and the profusion of blood flowing from the wound».

43. See Brize, p. 51, 64f. with n. 358: Geryon is a chthonic daemon associated with Himera's hot springs, whence the suggestion that Stesichorus and the Chalcidean art have taken over the detail of winged Geryon from the local cults of Himera. Bowra, p. 92: «Geryon may once have been a god of death and the underworld». W. Burkert, *Le mythe de Géryon: Perspectives préhistoriques et tradition rituelle, Il mito greco: Atti del Convegno Internazionale*, Urbino 1973 (Roma 1977), p. 273-83, traces the origin of the myth into prehistoric times in a hunting society.

It is concluded, therefore, that the alliteration in Stesichorus has a functional and almost factual role. In a context where the flow of blood is unmistakable, the liquid sounds have an evocative power: they allude to Geryon's watery lineage and Hydra's water associations. In such a context the *πεφορυγμένος* should be associated with a major figure, Geryon, rather than the arrow. This interpretation seems to be supported by the ambiguity of αἵματ[ι πικροτάτῃ] τε χολᾷ. It is not specified whose blood is referred to, especially since there are two traditions: Heracles dipped his arrows in Hydra's blood or in her gall<sup>44</sup>. This blending of vital liquids creates an ambiguity, intentional in my opinion<sup>45</sup>. Blood and bile blend with each other destroying life. Geryon and Hydra have a common fate: they both die in the hands of Zeus' son, who cleans the world from monsters. In this case he turns the one against this other. Dead Hydra kills living Geryon, an image so familiar from the *Oresteia* (PMG 219, cf. Aesch. *Choe.* 886).

Finally, the identity of ὃ γ' enters the picture as long as it has a bearing on the question of whose κεφαλὰ Stesichorus is referring to. "Ὁ γε can certainly suggest a continuation, as Page argues, and thus be the subject of both the preceding and succeeding action, but it can also signal a change of subject, as it does indeed<sup>46</sup> in the narrative of *Iliad* 9.205f. We are not obliged, consequently, to associate ὃ γ' with οἰστός and specify the κεφαλὰ as the arrow-tip. Such an interpretation would inevitably justify Quintilian's *redundat atque effunditur* (*Instit.* 10.1.62). Yet the precedent of *Iliad* 9.205f. may support the proposal of Lobel and Barrett: ὃ γ' can very well be Heracles himself. His action is emphasized with a possible «determinative and intensive» γε which in Homer quite often follows «a pronoun preceded by a particle or particles»<sup>47</sup>. Yet the quasi-connective function of γε here in the place of γοῦν or γάρ is very tempting because it may explain Geryon's being πεφορυγμένος. The particle δὲ seems to be continuative in this case and somehow makes up for the absence of a copulative conjunction τε or καὶ expected between the two adverbs σιγαῖ and ἐπωκλοπάδαν (cf. ii. 4, 8, 13). The Homeric influence on this

---

Its three basic themes (a) journey to «l'au-delà» through the way of sun, (b) combat with a monster, and (c) reward, recur in shamanistic rituals. In the person of Heracles survives the old shaman while Geryon and his cattle are figures of Hades; cf. W. H. Smyth, *Greek Melic Poets*, New York 1963, p. 260: the name (cf. γηγρύων) points to a personification of the giant power of the storm.

44. See Sittig, s.v. Hydra, *RE* 17 (1914) 46.61ff.

45. A comparable ambiguity is observed in PMG 219. The well-known crux of who the Pleisthenidas *basileus* is, suggests the imaginative elusiveness of our poet.

46. Cf. Hes. *Theog.* 621, *Op.* 206; change of subjects also occurs in *Il.* 1.280f., 342, *Od.* 6.120, all three being speeches where a distinction between persons is required.

47. J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed., Oxford 1950, p. 119, 121f (quoting Neil), 144, 155 (ii).

juxtaposition of particles, with the resulting paratactic style of narrative which has a rather marching effect, may strengthen the proposal that Stesichorus does not necessarily brood over the description of a single object, the arrow itself, but moves on to the successive stages of the described battle scene<sup>48</sup>.

These reservations may be reinforced by the observation of the Stesichorean technique as displayed in i. 13 f.: if only two verses are sufficient for the almost epigrammatic description of how Heracles deprives his opponent of his helmet, we may quite legitimately assume that the lacuna of eight verses is equally, if not more, sufficient for the introduction of a fresh attack, with arrow this time. This shooting would be timely, indeed, since the *κεφαλὰ* of Geryon (*SLG* 21 transposed between *SLG* 15 i and ii) has already been exposed, as if waiting for the fatal blow ordained by the gods. Why should our poet follow an anticlimactic course by making Heracles delay, and thus postpone, a death, the premises and causation of which have been so carefully laid out? In fact, it is very likely that in the crucial lacuna of col. i (ep. 6-8, str. 1-5) Stesichorus mentions the fatal attack on one of Geryon's heads: Heracles aims at his opponent and lets his poisoned arrow go. It hits Geryon, who then stands, perhaps with a statement of programmatic value (ii. 1-4):

κίχ]ων<sup>49</sup> στρυγε[ρ]οῦ  
 θανάτοι]ο π[ικρὰς]  
 κ]εφ[αλ]ᾶι πέρι [κ]ήρας] ἔχων, πεφορυ-  
 γ]μένος αἵματ[ι πικροτάτῃ]! τε χολᾷ

According to this interpretative approach it is Geryon who arrives at the end of hated death and who is smeared with blood and the gall of Hydra. For δ γ', namely Heracles, silently and secretly stuck [it = the arrow] in his forehead. The active ἐνέρεισε with local dative, here without the expected object in accusative, has a close parallel in *Od.* 9.382 f., where the object is present: οἱ μὲν μοχλὸν ... ὀφθαλμῷ ἐνέρεισαν. Although the verb «thrust in», sounds strange for a thrown missile<sup>50</sup>, yet this is Stesichorus' choice and a respectable one because of this. The absence of a new subject in this sequence of events suggests that it is not the arrow

48. Gentili, *Poesia e pubblico nella Grecia antica*, p. 163 with n. 19 speaks of a narrative characterized by temporal linearity also witnessed in Bacchylides 5.

49. Cf. *Od.* 17.476 Ἀντίοον πρὸ γάμοιο τέλος θανάτοιο κίχην; *Il.* 11.451 φθῆ σε τέλος θανάτοιο κίχῃμενον; *Il.* 9.416 οὐδὲ κέ μ' ὦκα τέλος θανάτοιο κίχην; cf. *Il.* 3.291, 11.441, 22.303, 17.478, 672, 22.436 etc.; Orph. *Arg.* 103 ὄφρα τέλος θανάτοιο κίχῃ: the participle κίχων in *Od.* 15.157; in this passage the participle ἐφέπων could also very well fit, cf. *Il.* 2.359; 15.495; 20.337, 6.412, 22.39, 7.52, 21.100 (ἐφέπων in the sense of coming upon, encountering, facing); *Od.* 2.250, 4.196, 4.562, 5.308, 12.342, 14.274, 24.31, etc. Vv. 2-3 have been supplemented by Page, *LGS*, p. 268, and v. 4 by Lertz.

50. See Lobel, p. 6.

but Heracles again who cleaved, ἔσχισε, the flesh and bones of Geryon. It is only after the clausula of ii. 9 that the poet explicitly moves on to the arrow.

The above-proposed scheme can possibly give us some hints about the Stesichorean narrative technique. The occasional reduplication of themes and expressions (*SLG* 11.8-10, 16-19, *SLG* 15.i.3 δο[λίως], 8 λάθραι, ii. 6f. ἐπικλοπάδαν) in Stesichorus' adept hands becomes not a *vitium* but a vehicle for throwing in relief the *ethos* of his heroes. In fact the *Geryoneis* presents a wide scope of personalities: next to the highly emotional and disturbed pathos of a female, Callirhoe, stands out the square logic and determination of the two major male personages whose crucial dilemmas and decisions are laid out in an orderly and almost geometrical pattern. To the rational evaluation of Geron's alternatives, introduced by him in direct speech with αἰ μὲν ... αἰ δ' (*SLG* 11.8, 16) respectively, corresponds the narrative part, in which Heracles' dilemma over the choice of the most advantageous course of action is indirectly mediated to us by the poet. Both the argument of Geryon and the scheme of Heracles are clear and neat. To focus on Heracles' actions, they have a remarkable linearity in their completion. The Geryonic dilemma «if, on the one hand», and «if, on the other», is matched by another dilemma in Heracles' conduct: a preparatory and a finishing stage, either one of which reveals a further inner stratification. The first, the preparatory stage, for example, may be broken down into three subdivisions: (a) method of fighting —with stone very probably; (b) result —blow and knocking down of helmet, and (c) ultimate divine causation in a very emphatic manner (*SLG* 21). The second, and finishing, stage is structured on a similar pattern: (a) method of fighting —with an arrow; (b) result: deadly blow on the head, and (c) causation: Heracles in the foreground as the agent of his divine accomplices.

This bipartite structure seems to be formally capped with the catalectic anapaestic clausula of ii. 9 (δαί)|μονος αἶσαι (= str. 5). Herein we may observe the Stesichorean articulating habit in which the end of a syntactic unit coincides with period-end<sup>51</sup>. From this point downward the focus shifts to the deadly weapon and the dying monster, who bends his neck sidewise, «shedding» his head as the delicate poppy sheds its petals bringing shame to its tender body.

In the foregoing section of this survey Homer has been a permanent point of reference as he is bound to be, since he is the fountain-head of all poetry. The

51. For the coincidence of metrical and semantic marking-off see M. Haslam, Stesichorean Metre, *QUCC* 17-18 (1974) 15-24, confirmed in *id.*, The Versification of the Lille Stesichorus (P. Lille 76 abc), *GRBS* 19 (1978) 29-57 esp. 45ff. For the meter see also Lobel, p. 2; Page, *Lyrica Graeca Selecta*, p. 263f., and *id.*, *SLG*, p. 5; R. Führer, Die metrische Struktur von Stesichoros Γηρυονητής, *Hermes* 96 (1968) 675-84; B. Snell, The Oxyrhynchus Papyri Part 32, *Gnomon* 40 (1968) 116-120 esp. 17 with n. 3, scans the poem as «steigende Daktylen».



reliance of our poet on the epic poetry is well known (Quint. *Inst. Or.* 10.1.62) and Stesichorean studies inevitably turn out to be a «Homeric Interpretation»<sup>52</sup>, to a certain degree, of course. The remaining part of this study will focus on this specific issue, namely, the extent of Stesichorus' indebtedness to, or deviation from, the epos and his own influence on later poetry as well with respect to Geryon's story. Every new discovery of Stesichorean fragments is bound to revive the claim, so often heard, about the link position of Stesichorus in our literary tradition. The validity of this contention can now be explored through a comparison of the Odyssean episode of Cyclops' blinding with the *Geryoneis*.

Stesichorus' loans are not merely verbal, that is, restricted to πεφορυγμένος and ἐνέρεισεν. The qualifications of Heracles' scheming —δόλωι (or δολίως), νόωι διέλεν, ἐδοάσσατο (? οί, γάρ)] πολὺ κέρδιον εἶν, λάθραι, κατεφράζετο, σιγαῖ, ἐπικλοπάδαν— echoe both verbally and conceptually Odysseus' superb show of cunning and guile<sup>53</sup>. Exactly because they are like-minded, the two Greek heroes respond to the peculiar needs of the time making the best out of the situation. Odysseus, on the one hand, being imprisoned in the cave of a man-eating monster, is rendered unable to use his martial skills; thence he relies on his craft ὥς τε περὶ ψυχῆς· μέγα γὰρ κακὸν ἐγγύθεν ἦεν (9.422f.). Heracles, on the other, ἤρξατο χειρῶν ἀδίκων, whence his δόλος operates on a different level, and is complementary to the aggressive violence of which his «hands» are an emblem<sup>54</sup>.

The reliance of our lyric poet on the epos and the modelling of his Heracles on Odysseus is suggested by the use of the adverb ἐπικλοπάδαν, a derivative of ἐπικλοπος. The adjective is used by Hector of Achilles (*Il.* 22.281), a tragic irony, indeed, and three times of Odysseus (*Od.* 11.364, 13.291, 21.397). The passage of 13.290-310 is of special value, since the ἐπικλοπος is used in a context where the κέρδος, κερδοσύνη, ἀπάτη and δόλος of both Odysseus and his divine protectress, Athena, are strongly stressed<sup>55</sup>. We should not forget that both Odysseus and Heracles enjoy the championship of Athena (cf. *SLG* 14) and fight descendants of Poseidon.

52. C. Meillier, Stésichore, P.L. 76a (+P.L. 73), Quelques Conjectures possibles, *SCO* 28 (1978) 35. This fundamental and often repeated idea underlies also the study of F. Maltomini, Due Note Stesicoree, *SCO* 34 (1984) 67-70, espec. 69 n. 13: in his *Geryoneis* (*SLG* 11) Stesichorus uses structural elements typical in Homeric monologs and his Geryon is modelled on the epic heroes.

53. *Od.* 9.228 ἦ τ' ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον ἦεν, 282 δολίως (ἐπέεσσι); cf. vv. 316-18, 406 δόλωι ἢ βίηφι, 422 πάντας δόλους καὶ μῆτιν ὕφαινον, 424 etc.

54. See F. de Martino, Le mani di Eracle e l'effimero Gerione (Stes. fr. S11), *Aevum* 56 (1982) 21-24.

55. See *Od.* 13.255 νόον πολυκερδέα νωμῶν; Athena to Odysseus: κερδαλέος κ' εἶη καὶ ἐπικλοπος ὅς σε παρέλθοι | ἐν πάντεσσι δόλοισι (291f), cf. 293-99.

The possession of poisoned arrows by Odysseus and Heracles enhances the concept of δόλος that underlines the personality of both. By contrast to Odysseus, who leaves φάρμακον ἀνδροφόνον διζήμενος, ὅφρα οἱ εἴη | ἰοὺς χρίεσθαι χαλκήρεας (*Od.* 1.260-62) (although it is unknown if he ever used them), Heracles' arrows dipped in the poisonous bile ὀλεσάνορος "Υδρας are an indispensable element in his legend. Whether this detail originates with Stesichorus is hard to tell, but Homer certainly does not say anything about them, and Hesiod (*Scut.* 129-34, cf. *Theog.* 313-18) does not explicitly mention them as such<sup>56</sup>. Heracles complements his δόλος by using the gall of another treacherous creature that even gives rise to the proverb "Υδρης ποικιλώτερος (Herod. 3.89, cf. Diogen. 7.69 ἐπὶ τῶν δολερῶν). But the primitive law of an eye for an eye works in Heracles' case. The primeval monsters which he so diligently endeavors to extinguish take revenge on him. The παῖς Διὸς eventually succumbs to the cunning of a monster that proves more than his match: Nessus brings about Heracles' death with the θρέμμα of Hydra which he deceptively calls κηλητήριον, charm, spell, a philter of death disguised as philter of love and seduction (Soph. *Trach.* 575): charm, treachery, δόλος, are key words to a new conception of Heracles and his adversaries, and introduces us to a new era.

Both Odysseus and Heracles follow a course of action well attested in Greek literature. When Heracles lies in ambush, he behaves no differently from Cronus, εἶσε δέ (sc. Γαῖα) μιν κρύψασα λόχῳ... δόλον δ' ὑπεθήκατο πάντα (Hes. *Theog.* 174f.); or from the Cadmeian leaders who lie in ambush for Tydeus, πυκινὸν λόχον εἶσαν ἄγοντες (*Il.* 4.392); or from the ἄριστοι of the Greeks who enter the Wooden Horse (*Od.* 4.277ff., 8.51 κοῦλον λόχον ἐκπρολιπόντες); or from Menelaus attacking Dolops, στῆ δ' εὐράξ σὺν δουρὶ λαθῶν, βάλε δ' ὦμον ὀπισθεν (*Il.* 15.541) and from Coon attacking Agamemnon, στῆ δ' εὐράξ σὺν δουρὶ λαθῶν 'Αγαμέμνονα δῖον (*Il.* 11.251)<sup>57</sup>; or from Paris, who shoots Diomedes and

56. δάκρυσι μῦρον Hes. *Scut.* 132; cf. *LSJ*: «they trickled with tears, of poisoned arrows». However, Hesiod may have simply characterized the death dealing capability of the arrows (θανάτοιο λαθιφθόγγιοι δοτῆρες) that depends on their tip (πρόσθεν μὲν θάνατον τ' εἶχον). But the late date of the *Scutum* (see J. A. Davison, *Quotations and Allusions in Early Greek Literature, Eranos* 53 (1955) 125-40, esp. 137f.) may not exclude «Hesiod's» knowledge of the poisoned arrows.

57. See Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, vol. 3, p. 171, on *Il.* 11.251: ἡνάγκασται μὲν διὰ τὸ πάθος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ παρακινδυνεύειν, οὐ τολμᾷ δέ, ἀλλὰ κλέπτει τὴν μάχην. λεληθότως οὖν ἀτυχίας, οὐκ ἀνανδρίας ἐγκαλεῖ τῷ 'Αγαμέμνονι ἀριστεύων γοῦν ὑπὸ τινος εὐτελοῦς ἐκ πλαγίου τιτρώσκεται, ἔπειτα τῆς οἰκείας γῆς δυστυχῶς ἐπέβη (cf. δ. 521-35). Μενέλαος δὲ τούναντίον «μαλθακὸς» μὲν «αἰχμητῆς» (P. 588) ἄλλως δὲ μακάριος, διδάσκει οὖν ὁ ποιητῆς ὡς τέλεια τὰ ῥώμης ἅμα καὶ τύχης; Eust. 1030.47: ἔχει δὲ ἀπορίαν, πῶς ὁ ἐκ πλευροῦ στὰς ὦμον βάλλει ἐχθροῦ ὡς καὶ στέρνου διελάσαι τὴν αἰχμὴν. λύσειε δ' ἂν τις τὸ ἀπορον εἰπὼν

then, boasting, ἐκ λόχου ἀμπήδησε (*Il.* 11.379). It seems that this way of fighting in which deception and craft are miraculously combined with *arete* is of almost divine sanction traced as far back as the first order of Gods.

However, scholiasts and modern scholars tend to overrate other models of the heroic world, considering them an unviolable norm. The stout resolution, for instance, of Hector not to fight Ajax λάθρη ὀπιπεύσας ἀλλ' ἀμφοδόν (*Il.* 7.243), καίτοι πάντα τρόπον μάχης εἰδώς· ἡ γὰρ μετὰ ἀπάτης ἀριστεία αἰσχροῖα (Schol. on *Il.* 7.242-3), has been considered the epic norm of fighting and has given cause for Heracles' denigration. Eustathius' verdict that behaving otherwise would constitute a κλοπή of victory<sup>58</sup> sets the modern criticism in motion: Heracles' fighting λάθραι (cf. *Il.* 11.251, 15.541 λαθῶν) is anti-Iliadic and equivalent to a conscious stealing of victory. Heracles is a homicide despite his absolution by Peisander, δικαιοτάτου φονῆος (fr. 10 Kinkel)<sup>59</sup>.

This absolute and categorical condemnation of Heracles fails to take into consideration the acknowledgment of Eustathius himself (1030-45 on *Il.* 15.541-42), ὅτι εὖρηται κάνταῦθα δόλος οὐ ψεκτός οἷα στρατιωτικός<sup>60</sup>. Two other factors are, moreover, neglected. Firstly, the nature of the enemies of Heracles, which does not warrant the transfer of high heroic standards into a different context. By contrast to Hector or Achilles, the exemplary figures of the aristocratic military society of *Iliad*, Heracles and Odysseus encounter creatures of supernatural strength and stature that can only be subdued by a combination of craft and might (cf. *Od.* 9.406 δόλωι ἢ βίῃφιν). Secondly, the special freedom of action enjoyed by archers such as Heracles and the practical needs of their profession. The scenes described in *Iliad* 4.112-25 and 8.266-72 have a paradigmatic value and will help us justify Heracles' lying in ambush, for instance, presumably behind a boulder. Pandarus is covered behind the shields of his comrades while drawing his bow and getting ready for shooting. So is Teucer (*Il.* 8.267f.), who delivers his shoot and then αὖτις ἰὼν πάϊς ὥς ὑπὸ μητέρα δύσκειν | εἰς Αἴανθ'· ὁ δέ μιν σάκεϊ κρύπτασκε φαιινῶ (271f.). Such a stance and characterization in no way entails disgrace, *aischos*, for the archer. Athena, in disguise, arouses Pandarus saying to him, πᾶσι

ὡς πλευρόθεν στὰς ὁ Μενέλαος καὶ ἀφείς τὸν ἐχθρὸν προβῆναι καὶ νῶτα δεῖξαι εἴθ' οὕτως ἔβαλε κατ' ἐκείνου. See also *ib.*, vol. 4, p. 118 on *Il.* 15.541.

58. Eustathius 679.39 on *Il.* 7.242: 'Ἰστέον δὲ καὶ ὅτι τὸ μὴ ἐθέλειν κλέπτειν τὴν νίκην ἐξ Ὁμήρου ὁ Μακεδὼν Ἀλέξανδρος μαθὼν ἐκέρδησε πλάσαντος τὸν Ἑκτορα.

59. So F. de Martino, *La 'Αριστεία μετὰ ἀπάτης*, p. 61; similarly *id.*, *Noterelle alla Gerioneide* di Stesicoro, p. 75, 93; Kinkel, *E.G.F.*, fr. 10 δικαιοτάτου φονῆος ἐπὶ γὰρ καθαρότητα φόνους ἐποίει.

60. See also Eustathii *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem Pertinentes*, ed. M. van der Valk, vol. 2, Leiden 1976, p. XC, note 2: the guile was allowed to the leaders of the army; ἀγαθὸς *et* κακὸς δόλος Eust. 404.24f., 480.29f. δόλος ἐπὶ καλῶ 1002.39f.; cf. also *ib.*, vol. I, p. CXVIII with n. 4.

δέ κε Τρώεσσι χάριν καὶ κῦδος ἄροιο (*Il.* 4.95), while Agamemnon, delighted with Teucer's success, urges him on (*Il.* 8.278-91) to become a «light» for the Danaans and his father Telamon. Agamemnon crowns his praise and encouragement with an admonition of high emotional force, τὸν (sc. Τελαμῶνα) καὶ τηλόθ' ἔόντα εὐκλείης ἐπιβησον (285). This exhortation is finally capped with the promise of additional material τιμὴ (286-90).

To sum up, unless we surmise the application of double standards in the appraisal of heroic deeds, the above examples suggest that there is no moral blemish attached to an archer for his specific way of operating: in the world of *Iliad* it is presupposed and expected<sup>61</sup>. For Stesichorus' world things are not that simple, as we will see below.

However, by contrast to the remarkable congeniality of character between the two Greek heroes (a congeniality which is repeatedly underlined with verbal and conceptual reminiscences), the juxtaposition of *Odyssey* 9 and the *Geryoneis* reveals an unequal treatment of their extraordinary and physically unconventional opponents. The epic poet broods over the monstrosity, the hideous manners and looks of Cyclops who lives a solitary, unsociable and unjust life, ἀπάνευθεν ἐὼν ἀθεμίστια ἤδη (189, cf. 428). His stature is huge, θαῦμα ἐτέτυκτο πελώριον, he looks like ῥίω ὑλήεντι | ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων (190ff., 257) and eats people raw (287ff.) ὥς τε λέων ὀρεσίτροφος (292). His monstrous appearance is a perfect match for his character. A striking feature of Cyclops is his unique eye, which becomes Odysseus' target. It is blinded by one huge ῥόπαλον (319) that resembles the mast of a ship ἥ τ' ἐκπεράα μέγα λαῖτμα (323), thus nicely foreshadowing the successful outcome of the enterprise. When the natural ῥόπαλον is turned into a μοχλὸς by human *technē*, it wreaks vengeance upon Cyclops, blinding his unique eye with brutal violence. The insistence of the poet on the working of the μοχλὸς (375-94) has a psychological motivation: it reveals his inner need to have the emblem of uncultured, brutal life and insolence<sup>62</sup> punished by an object of equal cruelty: justice triumphs at last in violence.

However, in the *Geryoneis* the opponent of Heracles is only externally monstrous. The three-headed and winged creature hides a noble and heroic heart under his deformity. The detail of turning the head side-ways<sup>63</sup> reflects the gulf

61. Cf. Maingon, Epic Convention in Stesichorus' *Geryoneis*, p. 101 with n. 8: «combat with bow and arrow ... appears to have been considered an inferior means of proving one's valour».

62. For the Cyclopes see G. S. Kirk, *Myth. Its Meaning and Functions in ancient and other Cultures* [Sather Classical Lectures, vol. 40], Berkeley and Los Angeles 1970, p. 162-71.

63. ἐπικάρσιος *LSJ*: «cross-wise at an angle», but «in *Od.* 9.70 αἱ μὲν [νῆες] ἔπειτ' ἐφέροντο ἐπικάρσιαι either (ἐπὶ κάρ), *plunging*, cf. Eust. *ad loc.*, or (as Sch.) = πλάγναι, i.e. making leeway, drifting». In Homer turning the head to the side is a typical posture in death scenes: ἐτέρωσσε κάρη βάλεν *Il.* 8.306, cf. *Od.* 22.17; παρηέρθη δὲ κάρη *Il.* 16.341.

separating the two monsters: Cyclops goes to sleep ἀποδοχμώσας παχὺν αὐχένα (372) vomiting human flesh, in contrast to Geryon, who goes to death turning his αὐχένα ... ἐπικάρσιον (SLG 15.ii.14f.) like a delicate field flower. Geryon's preeminent feature that attracts the attention of the lyric poet is revealed through the repetition of the words τοῦ δ' ἀπὸ κρατός, κεφαλὰ (SLG 21 and SLG 15), μετώπῳ, ἐπ' ἀκροτάταν κορυφάν, αὐχένα. It is Geryon's head, then, that Stesichorus focuses on. Although different artists have different predilections and portray Geryon hit in the eye, nose, throat chest or somewhere in the head<sup>64</sup>, Stesichorus carefully specifies: μετώπῳ σθέθεν οἰ[σ]τὸς ἐπ' ἀκροτάταν κορυφάν<sup>65</sup>. One may entertain the idea that Stesichorus proceeds with a well-planned design: he does not localize the wound in the eye in order to avoid evoking the blinding of Cyclops, with whom his Geryon shares nothing but the external deformity and enormity, and to a much greater degree at that.

The specific way Stesichorus moulds the epic material so as to serve his own inspiration and goals is, moreover, suggested by the poppy simile, the prototype of which is to be found in *Iliad* 8.306-308. Teucer, an archer like Heracles, shoots Gorgythion, who «turned his head to the side like a poppy heavy with fruit and spring showers. So his head bent under the weight of the helmet»<sup>66</sup>. Although Gorgythion is smitten in the chest, the epic poet is fascinated by the sight of his head drooping under the pressure of the heavy helmet and this picture triggers the simile. The inclusion of fruit and spring showers conveys the image of abrupt, sudden death of a man in full bloom, right in prime of youth.

With an admirable sense of reality and sensibility Stesichorus adjusts the Homeric simile to Geryon's physical peculiarity and his heroic temper and nobleness: the «shedding» of his head(s) is imaginatively likened to the shedding of the petals of the poppy, a most frail field flower. The poppy represents natural, uncultured but gentle and tender life; in effect it represents one side of Geryon's character.

The participle καταισχύνουσα used in the simile of vv. 15ff. meaningfully concludes Geryon's heroic resistance. The choice of the verb καταισχύνω, first attested in the *Odyssey* (16.293, 19.12, 24.508), mostly with the particular meaning of bringing shame to one's own *genos* (cf. αἰσχύνω in *Il.* 6.209, 22.75, 24.418), has an air of macabre finality about it since it echoes Geryon's fatal resolution to suffer what is *morsimon* immediately rather than committ deeds shameful to his *genos* (SLG 11.20-24).

64. See Brize, p. 41, 44, 46f., 60.

65. See Maingon, *Epic Convention in Stesichorus' Geryoneis*, p. 103; the word κορυφή is employed «in its less common sense in order to magnify the dimensions of the monster».

66. μήκων δ' ὥς ἐτέρωσε κάρη βάλεν, ἥ τ' ἐνὶ κήπῳ, | καρπῷ βριθομένη νοτίησι τε εἰαρινῇσιν, | ὥς ἐτέρωσ' ἤμυσε κάρη πῆληκι βαρυθύν.

20

νῦν μοι πολὺ καὶ λλιόν ἐστι παθῶν  
 ὅτι μόρσιμ[ον]  
 ant. καὶ ὀνειδέ[  
 καὶ παντὶ γέ[νει  
 ὁπίσω Χρυε[άο]ρο[ε υ]ϊόν·

The point of contact between the poppy and Geryon which has triggered the simile is to be found in the participle καταισχύνοισα, and its connotations of insults, αἵσχεα, suffered<sup>67</sup>. The poet seems to envision the poppy trampled shamefully<sup>68</sup> down just as Geryon is on a figurative plane. With remarkable sensibility and sympathy Stesichorus transfers the humiliating and ignominious suffering of αἵσχεα to the delicate poppy, thus saving Geryon from the utmost disgrace. The motivation for this imaginative conceptual *hypallage* (I would dare call it), that is, the transfer of αἵσχεα to another recipient and the resulting skilful *aposiopesis* of a disagreeable outcome, is worth exploring.

It is undeniable that Stesichorus gives Geryon a protagonistic role of tragic dimension. Geryon behaves like a typical Homeric ἀγαθός, when he consciously and firmly rejects the option of fleeing before his opponent. In a well-balanced and well-articulated argument (*SLG* 11) he frustrates the salutary efforts of both his mother (*SLG* 12, 13) and Menoites (*SLG* 10)<sup>69</sup>. This scene reminds us of Hector's stance when confronted with a comparable vital dilemma and the supplication of his parents (*Il.* 22.37-91). Both Geryon and Hector are surrounded by friends and family by contrast to the son of Zeus who travels alone<sup>70</sup>, a solitary figure whose

67. See A. W. H. Adkins, *Merit and Responsibility*, Oxford 1960, p. 40ff., 171 (note 15).

68. Cf. Maingon, *Epic Convention in Stesichorus' Geryoneis*, p. 106: the poppy loses its petals «whether in a storm or at the end of its cycle in late summer». The poppy is a short-lived flower that blooms in spring and disappears around the end of May the latest, at least in the Greek countryside.

69. B. Gentili, *Gnomon* 48 (1976) 747, assumes that Heracles is the interlocutor of Geryon in *SLG* 11.16, but in his *Poesia e pubblico nella Grecia Antica*, p. 163 n. 20, he correctly adopts Barrett's identification of ὦ φίλ[ε] with Menoites. Gentili justifies the length of Geryon's speech using the scholium on Hom. *Il.* 21 = *PMG* 273: Geryon is a *makrológos*, like all those who are about to die. Such a speculation, however, fails to take into consideration, first, the very fact that Geryon does not know whether or not he is mortal; second, the *ethos* of Geryon who, unlike Lycaon, did not ἡῤῥηκεν ... τὴν δέησιν like all the μελλοθάνατοι who act so, ὅπως τοσοῦτον γε χρόνον κερδαίνωσι —on the contrary, he chooses immediate and unashamed death; and third, the fact that Geryon does not speak to his would-be killer, as Lycaon does.

70. The painting by Olto who provides Heracles with the assistance of Iolaus and three warriors is unique; see Robertson, p. 218f. The plural ἀφίκοντο (*SLG* 8) has been considered a key to this issue. Barrett: the plural might represent Heracles and the cattle; Webster, p. 4: Iolaus and Heracles; F. de Martino, *La ἀριστεία μετὰ ἀπάτης*, p. 60, n. 3: Heracles and Athena; cf. id., *Noterelle alla Gerioneide di Stesicoro*, p. 79-80: Heracles did not travel alone but with company; the proposal of Robertson is nonetheless favorably looked upon;

loneliness and furtive way of acting are subtly insinuated by Stesichorus. The sun retrieves his cup and continues his journey to his mother, wedded wife and dear children, while the son of Zeus enters alone a grove shaded with laurels (*SLG* 17 = *PMG* 185). The alliteration of sibilant sounds (vv. 8-9) conveys a complex set of ideas: the silence, the hush that reigns in this natural shelter, Heracles' loneliness (cf. *μόνον περιπορευόμενον* *PMG* 229) and his furtiveness when slyly, like a snake or a whistling arrow, *σιγαῖ δ' ὁ γ' [he] ... διὰ δ' ἔσχισε σάρκα [καὶ] ὁ[στ]ῆα δαίμονος αἶσαι* (*SLG* 15, ii. 6f.).

Stesichorus, who is fond of speeches<sup>71</sup>, in our extant text, at least, handles the doings of the Greek hero in a narrative part. This style gives him the freedom to impart his message and comment on the situation in a more or less allusive and elusive manner. His comments are, indeed, so different from those of Peisander, who absolves Heracles of all guilt and moral responsibility, using for him the superlative of an adjective with judicial overtones: *δικαιοτάτου φονῆος*. The *Geryoneis* even in its present fragmentary state, heralds the dawn of a new era whose representative is Stesichorus among others. The challenge of old values, the critical attitude towards the traditional beliefs can be detected behind the artful strokes with which Stesichorus draws the portrait of his two heroes. Stesichorus seems to pave the way for Pindar's rather ambiguous expression (fr. 81 Maehler):

σὲ δ' ἐγὼ παρὰ νιν<sup>72</sup>  
αἰνέω μέν, Γαρυόνα, τὸ δὲ μὴ Δι  
φίλτερον σιγῶμι πάμπαν.

Pindar praises Geryon but at the same time he decides to pass in silence, i.e., to keep secret, something that displeases Zeus. The cause of Zeus' presumable offence is not specified<sup>73</sup> but, judging from a similar way of handling Bellerophon's fate,

Robertson, p. 215f. and 216, Page, Stesichorus: *The Geryoneis*, p. 148, Brize, p. 33: Eurytion, Geryon's herdsman, and his mother Erytheia. The version followed by Pindar (fr. 169[a]. 44-48 Sn.-M.) also makes Heracles go alone: *Σθενέλο[ι]ό μιν | υἱὸς κέ[λ]ευσε<ν> μόνον | ἄνευ συ[μ]μαχίας ἔμεν | καὶ Ἰόλαος ἐν ἑπταπύλοισι μένω[ν τε Θήβαις* etc.

71. D. Auger, Discours et récit chez Stésichore, *CRIPEL* 4 (1976) 335-37.

72. On νιν cf. Schol. Aristid. ii.409: *παρ' αὐτὸν τὸν Ἡρακλέα*. H. Lloyd-Jones, Pindar Fr. 169, *HSCP* 76 (1972) 56: «I praise you in comparison with him, Geryones». *παρὰ cum* acc. is used, of course, of comparison, see *LSJ*, C.7: «*alongside of, compared with*, usu. implying superiority [...], sometimes inferiority or defect». It may be preferable to translate *alongside of*, i.e., next to him, beside him, in fear that otherwise Pindar may appear to exalt Geryon over Heracles, and this would run counter to the claims about Pindar's piety and silent approval of divine order and his honor of Heracles.

73. W. Theiler, *Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς*, *Mus. Helv.* 22 (1965) 74: the praise to Geryon displeases Zeus. Gentili, *Poesia e pubblico nella Grecia antica*, p. 179, speaks of an ἀρετὴ exemplified in the person of Geryon and Diomedes, which is displeasing to the god. He admits an incoherence in the ethics of Pindar and makes a distinction between *arete* accompanied by divine

διασωπάσομαι οἱ μόνον ἐγὼ (*Ol.* 13.91), we may assume that Pindar hints herein at the treacherous death of Geryon in Heracles' hands *dei auxilio*. He decides not to elaborate on this issue further and breaks off at this point<sup>74</sup>. In his well-known *nomos*-poem<sup>75</sup>, puzzled with the ethical and religious question of how most unjust and violent deeds can be justified, Pindar, obviously dissatisfied with inadequate aphorisms of the type of δικαιοτάτου φονῆος, attempts to give an answer by subordinating all human and divine action to a *nomos*<sup>76</sup> which is the *basileus* of all, both mortal and immortal, and ἄγει δικαίων τὸ βιαιότατον ὑπερτάτα χειρί. Pindar adduces his mythological *exemplum* for this kind of justice<sup>77</sup>, τεκμαίρομαι ἔργοισιν Ἡρακλέος (4f.), picking out two of Heracles' labors because they apparently illustrate best the working of the νόμος postulated by him: the theft of Geryon's cattle and of Diomedes' horses (vv. 6-8):

ἐπεὶ Γηρυόνα βόας  
Κυκλώπειον ἐπὶ πρόθυρον Εὐρυσθέος  
ἀνατεί τε καὶ ἀπριάτας ἔλασεν.

There follows a detailed and shuddering description of Heracles' attack upon Diomedes. The scene strongly reminds us of the Stesichorean *Geryoneis*: Heracles follows the same tactics and enters the house of Diomedes (18f.) by using stealth, κρύβδαν (suppl. Page) or κρυφᾶ (Snell) or λάθρα (Gentili). Not unlike Geryon, Diomedes resists (vv. 15-17):

οὐ κό]ρῳι ἀλλ' ἄρετᾶι·  
κρέσσον γ]άρ ἀρπαζομένων τεθνάναι  
πρὸ χρημ]άτων ἢ κακὸν ἔμμεναι.

succour and *arete* negative, παρὰ καίρον. Lloyd-Jones, p. 56, argues that Heracles acts justly «for in attacking these common enemies of gods and men Heracles was carrying out the will of Zeus [...]. Fr. 81 [...] seems to provide an exact parallel». But if this were so, Pindar must have committed a religious offence by praising the θῦμα —an enemy of gods and men— side by side with the θύτης.

74. See also G. Philipp, p. 338f.; Sophocles will later declare that Zeus punishes Eurystus because he hates death δόλω (*Trach.* 274ff.).

75. *P. Oxy.* 2450 fr. 1, E. Lobel; see also D. L. Page, Pindar: *P. Oxy.* 2450, fr. 1, *Proc. Camb. Philol. Soc.* N.S. 8 (1962) 49-51; fr. 169a Maehler.

76. For the meaning of νόμος see M. Treu, Νόμος Βασιλεύς: alte und neue Probleme, *Rh. Mus.* 106 (1963) 193-214; C. O. Pavese, The New Heracles Poem of Pindar, *HSCP* 72 (1967) 47-88; M. Ostwald, Pindar, Nomos. and Heracles, *HSCP* 69 (1965) 109-38; E. R. Dodds, *Plato, Gorgias*, Oxford, 1959, p. 270f.; B. Gentili, *Poesia e pubblico nella Grecia antica*, p. 181f.; Lloyd-Jones, p. 45-56.

77. The motif of justice figures in Aeschylus, *Heracleidae* fr. 74 Radt; βοτῆρας ἀδίκους; it is worth noticing the correspondence of Ὠκεανὸν περάσας (v. 3) with δι' Ὠκεανοῖο περάσαις (*SLG* 17.3 = *PMG* 185); cf., however, O. Musso, Esiodo e Stesicoro nel fr. 109 M (= 74N<sup>2</sup>) degli 'Eraclidi' di Eschilo, *Aevum* 41 (1967) 507f.: Aeschylus draws upon Hes. *Theog.* 292 διαβάς πόρον Ὠκεανοῖο.



In these three verses (15-17 suppl. Page) Pindar encapsulates a dilemma so similar to that of Geryon in the Stesichorean formulation of the story (SLG 11.11ff.): κρέσσον[ ἐ|λέγχεα δ[ (11f.); νῦν μοι πολλὸν κα[λλιόν ἐστι παθῆν | ὅ τι μόρσιμ[ον (20f.)<sup>78</sup>. Pindar's focusing on the labors of Heracles «from the standpoint of the hero's victims to show a less attractive side of what were normally looked upon as glorious exploits»<sup>79</sup>, is now less peculiar and inexplicable: Stesichorus broke ground on this issue by allowing Geryon to fully unfold his feelings and thoughts.

The above survey has reconfirmed two truths known of old: Stesichorus is familiar with the epic poetry, and he is marked by a distinct innovating spirit (PMG 193) which is mirrored in the way he uses his mythological stock and moulds his characters so as to serve his own inspiration and intellectual needs. With the transformation of a monster into an exemplary type of ἀγαθός he purports to convey the message of a new sense of heroism: the two aspects that heroic excellence consists of, namely, physical beauty and martial prowess, are cleaved. Handsomeness is no longer considered an indispensable requirement for the appropriation of the title of ἀγαθός. The dissociation of the two virtues ushers in a new era in which psychic qualities such as courage, bravery and nobleness are praised independently of physical attractiveness. Stesichorus' poetry becomes a vehicle for insinuating a new ethical code, for hinting at a reality that his Parian fellow poet Archilochus had so poignantly and tersely summarized (fr. 114W.).

οὐ φιλέω μέγαν στρατηγὸν οὐδὲ διαπεπλιγμένον  
οὐδὲ βοστρύχοισι γαῦρον οὐδ' ὑπεξυρμένον,  
ἀλλὰ μοι σμικρὸς τις εἴη καὶ περὶ κνήμας ἰδεῖν  
ροϊκός, ἀσφαλέως βεβηκώς ποσσὶ, καρδίης πλέως.

In contrast to Archilochus' epigrammatic and caustic manner, Stesichorus skilfully weaves into his grand poetry moral issues which suggest his critical, though partly concealed, attitude toward the values of the old heroic world, thus revealing an outlook that may deserve the characterization «break of expectancy», not with respect to the use of the formula this time but to the challenge of traditional heroic values and conventional labelling. The way for the «rationalists» of the sixth century has opened up\*.

University of Thessaloniki

E. TSITSIBAKOU-VASALOS

78. For the similarities between Pindar and Stesichorus see also F. Bornmann, Zur *Geryoneis* des Stesichoros und Pindars Herakles-Dithyrambos, *ZPE* 31 (1978) 33-35.

79. Ostwald, p. 126.

\* I regret being unable to consult the article of M. Davies, Stesichorus' *Geryoneis* and its Folk-tale Origins, *CQ* 38 (1988) 277-90, which appeared after I had submitted my manuscript for publication.