

P. OXY. 3876, Frr. 1-24: THE MELEAGER MYTH

The Egyptian soil has once more rewarded exploration: it has yielded a copious number of papyrus scraps first published by M. W. Haslam¹. These fragments (*P. Oxy.* frr. 1-84) have been attributed to Stesichorus on the basis of their style and metre and it is assumed from their different metrical and contextual features as well as their manuscript appearance that they contain at least three different poems². Fragments 1-24 in particular, because of their homogeneity in script and appearance, have been taken as remnants of one and the same poem. This poem involves the myth of Meleager and the Calydonian boar hunt, as is suggested by textual clues such as the presence of Artemis characterized as Ἄρτα]μις ἰοχέαιρα [ἰ θυγάτηρ Διὸς ἄγρεσ[ι]θήρα (fr. 2. 6f.), the mention of the toponymic Κά[λυδ]ῶν' ἐρατάν (fr. 2. 8+6 [b]. 3), and the reference to a female figure of noble birth εὐπατέρει- | α (fr. 4. 5f.) whose brothers have been killed by someone ἄ]μύμων (fr. 4. 11), whose name is lost to us³.

The objective of the present study is to examine the Stesichorean version of the Meleager myth in the hope of eliciting some features that will enable us to compare it with both the preceding (epic) and succeeding (classical) mythical accounts and thus to ascertain the stage of evolution of the myth figuring in the Stesichorean text. Finally an effort will be made to take a closer look at the text of frr. 2. 6 and 4. 4f.

The state of transmission of our new ἔρμαιον requires that we scrutinise the major fragments of our new poem in search of elements that may shed some light on our topic.

1. *Editio princeps* by M. W. Haslam, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol 57, London 1990, pp. 4-45, plates I-II. See also M. Davies, *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (hereafter *PMGF*), Oxford 1991, Appendix. *Ineditorum Stesichoreorum*, pp. 307-25; D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric III*, Loeb ed., Cambridge, Mass. - London 1991, fr. 222 B, pp. 144-55.

2. So Haslam, p. 1; cf. Davies, *PMGF* 222 (a), p. 213: probably four.

3. For other mythological alternatives see Haslam, p. 34.

Fr. 1

. . . .
 .]ρομε ... [
] ἀλλά νιν α[
] αὐτὸς Ἐνυα[λι
] Τριτογενής [
] ππορόα πτολ[
] μέγα δ' ἐν φρεσ[ι
 ..]βιος ὄρετι τ .[
 ...]πρ[.] . ε .[

In fragment 1 there is a list of names of divinities whose presence in this mythological framework calls for an explanation. The role of Enyalios and Athena in particular, is obscure⁴ and speculation as to their function here can only rest on various cult or other mythopoetic factors.

Ἐνυάλιος (v. 3), «the Warlike» (*LSJ*) occurs in *Iliad* as an epithet of Ares (*Il.* 17. 211, 20 69) or as his proper name (*Il.* 2. 651, 7. 166, 18. 309), while later this epithet is applied to other characters and acquires new shades of meaning (see *LSJ*).

Would Ares or Dionysus (*LSJ*, *PMG* 1027 [b]) be the god referred to as Enyalios in the new fragment and what would his part in this story be? Both gods are functionally conceivable in this saga. Ares not only has close cult associations with Artemis, the principal deity of this myth⁵, but in some variants of the Meleager story has a blood relation with the hero: he is said to have engendered Meleager⁶. Dionysus, on the other hand, in

4. See Haslam, p. 32, «Ares and Athena are found juxtaposed on a variety of occasions ... but none in which the following lines would seem particularly at home».

5. Artemis is the major divinity of Aetolia and Calydon as Λαφρία and Αἰτωλή. See Th. Schreiber, «Artemis», in W. H. Roscher's *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* (hereafter *Myth. Lex.*), 1. 1, Leipzig 1884-86, coll. 563-64, 581-82; O. Hirschfeld, «Aitolia», *RE* 1. 1 (1893) col. 1115; K. Wernicke, «Artemis», *RE* 2. 1 (1895) coll. 1349, 1365; M. P. Nilsson, *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung*, Leipzig 1906, pp. 218-25; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, 2 Bd., 4. Aufl., Darmstadt 1959, 1: 374-80; W. Fauth, «Artemis», *Der Kleine Pauly*, 1 (1964) coll. 622-23.

6. Ares father of Meleager: implicit in Hes. fr. 25. 4 (cf. ib., v. 14) M.-W. See U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Epische und elegische Fragmente*, *Berliner Klassikertexte*, Heft V., Berlin 1907, p. 25 ad Bacch. 5. 117-20; id., *Kleine Schriften* V 2, *Die griechische Heldensage* II (1925), Berlin 1971, p. 87; O. Höfer, *Myth. Lex.*, VI Nachträge, p. 8; so Eur. (*Ps.-Plut. Parall. Gr. et Rom.* 26A, p. 312A = *TGF* p. 525 N); Hygin *Fab.* 14. 16, 171; Apollod. I. 8. 2; Ovid *Met.* 8. 437. Ares is Oeneus' grandfather: *Ant. Lib.* 2, ed. M. Papathomopoulos, *Les Métamorphoses*, Paris 1968, p. 3.

addition to his cult connections with Artemis⁷, is said to have begotten Deianeira by Althaea and it was on his plea to Artemis that Deianeira and Gorge were not transformed into birds⁸. Yet, despite the associations of the god of vegetation and wine with a king aptly called *Oeneus*, both the transfer of the epithet Enyalios to Dionysus and the account of the transformation of the Meleagrides, dated back to Sophocles, seem to constitute later accretions to the Meleager myth, by contrast to the divine descent of our hero from Ares and his death through divine agency which are epic motifs first attested in Hesiod⁹. Although we cannot tell whether or not Stesichorus, here as elsewhere (*PMG* 224, *SLG S* 11, 14), has adopted the motif of the divine descent of a hero, thus motivating Ares' presence, the layout of our fragment suggests that Ares is mentioned here individually and not in metonymy, «war».

Τριτογενής (v. 4), an epithet of Athena, is a collateral form of the most

7. For Artemis and Dionysus see: Wernicke, coll. 1364-65 and Schreiber, coll. 570-71; E. Ciaceri, *Culti e miti nella storia dell' antica Sicilia*, Catania 1911, p. 170 with nn. 2, 3 and 171 with n. 1, and Nilsson, pp. 199-205. For the ecstatic Artemis see *PMG* 778 (b); Hesych. s. v. ἀγγελική, καλαβρία, καλαβοῖδια, κυριτοί, κορυθαλίστρια, βρυδαλίγα; Poll. 4. 103, 104; Athen. 14. 629 E; R. M., Dawkins, *The Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta* [*JHS* Suppl. 5], London 1929, pp. 172-74. For their cult associations see Papathomopoulos, *Ant. Lib.*, p. 76 n. 29; C. Calame, *Les chœurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque*, 2 vols., Rome 1977, 1: 262f.; W. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, trans. by J. Raffan, Oxford and Cambridge, Mass., 1985, pp. 222f.; R. Seaford, «The Eleventh Ode of Bacchylides: Hera, Artemis, and the absence of Dionysos», *JHS* 108 (1988) 124-28; id., *Reciprocity and Ritual*, Oxford 1994, p. 330 with n. 5.

8. Dionysus and Althaea: Apollod. I. 8. 1; Hygin *Fab.* 129; Eur. *Cyc.* 38-40: see R. Seaford, *Euripides Cyclops*, Oxford 1984, p. 105 ad loc.; Serv. Comm. *Aen.* 4. 127, pp. 485f. I Thilo. See C. Robert, *Die griechische Heldensage*, vol. 1, Berlin 1920, pp. 85f., 98 with n. 1. Story of transformation: Soph. ap. Plin. *N. H.* 37. 40 = *TGF* p. 219 N (not in *TrGF* Radt); Apollod. I. 83. 3; Aelian *Nat. An.* 4. 42; *Ant. Lib.* 2, Papathomopoulos, p. 4; Ovid *Met.* 8. 542-46; Hygin *Fab.* 174; R. Holland, «Meleagrides», *Myth. Lex.* 2. 2, Leipzig 1894-97, coll. 2586-91 and J. Andrée, «Meleagrides» in *RE* 15. 1 (1931) coll. 445-46.

9. Classifying our sources thematically, Meleager dies at the hands of Apollo: Hes. fr. 25. 12 and fr. 280. 2 and Paus. 10. 31. 3. According to M. Croiset, «Origines du récit relatif à Méléagre», *Mélanges H. Weil*, Paris 1898, p. 78; R. C. Jebb, «Bacchylidea», ib., p. 233, and Wilamowitz, *Berl. Klassikertexte*, p. 26, this motif was known to Homer and his public; similarly S. C. R. Swain, «A note on *Iliad* 9. 524-99: The Story of Meleager», *CQ* 38 (1988) 272 with n. 10 and 275 with n. 25, and J. Bremer, «La plasticité du mythe: Méléagre dans la poésie homérique», in *Métamorphoses du mythe en Grèce antique*, ed. C. Calame, Genève 1988, p. 43. Cf. Robert, pp. 91f. and E. Bethe, «Ilias und Meleager», *Rh. Mus.* 74 (1925) 7, Apollo and Althaea's curse cannot co-exist in the same version. When this occurs, it is due to a late contamination of the versions. J. Th. Kakridis, *Homeric Researches*, Lund 1949, pp. 13f., regards the Hesiodic version «a later adaptation of the tale in the *Iliad* and of no particular importance»; cf. M. M. Willcock, «Mythological Paradeigma in the *Iliad*», *CQ* 14 (1964) 152 with n. 3, this story looks like an epic rationalization. J. R. March, *The Creative Poet* [*BICS* Suppl. 49], London 1987, 39-43, combines the curse and the Apollo motifs in Homer and considers them the «reason» and the «actual physical cause» of Meleager's death respectively.

commonly used epithet Τριτογένεια¹⁰. Her role in the story is obscure, but a few possibilities will be mentioned below à propos of v. 7.

ἰ]πποσόα (v. 5) can be grammatically a feminine nominative/vocative, or perhaps a masculine nominative/vocative (cf. μητίετα, εὐρύοπα, ἱππότα), although the standard form is ἱπποσόας, -ου, ὁ (LSJ). The *casus* of the preceding noun (Τριτογενής, the case of Ἐνυά[λιος being uncertain) makes the nominative plausible, suggesting that this epithet qualifies Artemis¹¹ whose involvement in this story is notorious.

The traces πτολ[may stand for πτολίεθρον or πτολίπορθος (Haslam), an epithet of Ares (*Il.* 20. 152, Hes. *Theog.* 936) and Ἐνυώ (*Il.* 5. 333) among others. It is unattested for Artemis no matter how aptly it describes her catastrophic work at Calydon. If it is really meant for her, it is worth noting that it was the city saving and protecting aspect of Artemis that was recognized and commemorated in Stesichorus' ambience¹².

ὄλ]βιος ὅστις τ. [(v. 7) seems to introduce an apophthegmatic phrase of familiar ring in lyric and tragic poetry¹³, but of remarkable immediacy in comparison with the rest of the *sententiae* contained in the Stesichorean corpus which we knew about three decades ago. Maxims of Pindaric, let us say, immediacy and pithiness did not sit comfortably in Stesichorus' poetry of *maxima bella* and *clarissimos duces* (Quint. *Inst. Or.* 10.1.62). The available examples of Stesichorus' moralizing were limited (*PMGF* 244, 245). However, the recently discovered papyrus scraps, in addition to epigrammatic comments such as: δαίμονος αἶσαι, κατ' αἶσαν, παρ' αἶσαν, μόρσιμόν ἐστι etc, have treasured gnomic expressions exemplified elsewhere in choral lyric¹⁴.

10. See A. Furtwängler, «Athene», *Myth. Lex.* 1.1, Leipzig 1884-86, col. 676, and F. Dümmler, «Athena», *RE* 2 (1896) coll. 1986-90.

11. See Pi. *Ol.* 3. 26, *Pae.* 9, 7, fr. 80. 2 B. = 89. 2 Mae., *Pyth.* 2. 8 Mae. Haslam, pp. 32f., considers the possibility of a genitive masculine «of Poseidon?» Campbell, p. 145 n. 4: «Artemis (see fr. 2)? Poseidon?» Despite the plausibility of the *pro* Poseidon argument (P. Hippios; see also Stes. *S* 14. 5 and *PMG* 235), the emphatic presence of Artemis in fr. 2 as well as the grammatical form of the masculine seem to speak against it. For the horse in her cult see Strabo 5. 1. 9; Dawkins, pp. 146, 150, 157, 189-92, and Bérard, *La Magna Grecia*, Torino 1963, pp. 358f.

12. Σώττιφα in Syracuse and Acragas, Σωσίπολις in Gela: Schreiber, col. 575; Ciaceri, *Culti*, p. 169. For Artemis' cult in the West see: Nilsson, pp. 205f.; G. Giannelli, *Culti e miti della Magna Grecia*, Firenze 1922, 2nd ed. 1963, pp. 73-75, 129, 168, 220; E. Ciaceri, *Storia della Magna Graecia*, Milan 1928, I: 229f., *Culti*, pp. 165-74; G. Vallet, *Région et Zancle*, Paris 1958, pp. 79, 118, 130f. 266, 307f.; Bérard, pp. 364f.; A. Brelich, «La religione greca in Sicilia», *Kokalos* 10-11 (1964-65) 35-54; F. Cordano, «Il culto di Artemis a Rhegium», *PP* 29 (1974) 86-90, et al.

13. To the examples cited by Haslam (*Hom. h. Dem.* 480, *Hom. h.* 25. 4f. = Hes. *Theog.* 96f.; *Hom. h.* 30. 7; Pi fr. 137. 1, *Ol.* 7. 10; Bacch. 5. 50 Mae.) add: Aleman *PMG* 1. 37-39; Sappho, *P. Oxy.* 1231 fr. 50-54+2166 (a) 5. 12f.; Emp. 132; Soph. *El.* 160-62.

14. *Iliou Persis PMGF* 88. 16f. (cf. Alcm. *PMG* 1. 83f.); *P. Oxy.* 3876 fr. 64 (b). 2-6. Cf. also

Fr. 1. 7 offers only some hopeless traces τ [, which Haslam, after an assessment of other options, supplements: Τρ[ιτογένειαν, and interprets, «Happy he who has Athena on his side»¹⁵. It is presumably Τριτογενής (fr. 1. 4), the collateral form of Τριτογένεια, that has motivated this proposal. Regardless of the viability of this supplement, the presence of Athena Tritogenes in this text is indisputable and this raises the important issue of her role in the Meleager story —so influential a role, indeed, as to merit so emphatic an individual mention. Such a version would be unique, as far as we can tell, since we know of the benevolence of Athena towards two members of this family, Tydeus and Diomedes¹⁶, but nothing that suggests her involvement with Meleager himself¹⁷. Athena's inclusion in this list of interrelated divinities (fr. 1)¹⁸ is surprising because her absence from all the other versions of this myth is conspicuous. There exists, nonetheless, some literary indirect evidence of Athena's connections with this Aetolian family and the boar hunt¹⁹, and some of pictorial nature: in a painting of Parrhasius, Heracles, Perseus and Meleager are depicted together (Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 35. 69). The significance of this escapes us: we cannot confidently extrapolate Athena's feelings towards Meleager from her attitude towards Perseus and Heracles. Although Athena enjoys an

the extended *quasi*-philosophical treatise on the dependence of human life upon the unpredictable and arbitrary divine will in the P. Lille poem (PMGF 222 [b]. 204-28). The absence of γνώμαι is also pointed out by D. A. Campbell, «Stobaeus and Early Greek Poetry», in *Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, Studies in Honor of L. Woodbury, ed. by D. E. Douglas, Chico 1984, p. 57.

15. Haslam, p. 33.

16. For Tydeus see Σ D II. 5. 126 = *Thebais* fr. 5, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (hereafter *EGF*), ed M. Davies, Göttingen 1988. For Diomedes see *Iliad*, esp. book 5. Diomedes enters also the Aetolian cycle: see *Il.* 14. 117 and Sch. *Ar. Ach.* 418a; Hygin *Fab.* 175; Strabo 7. 7. 7, 9. 3. 12, 10. 2. 26, and Ps.-Arist. *De mir. ausc.* 109, 110. For Diomedes in Italy see Giannelli, pp. 53-59, 90f., 116f.

17. All we know of Athena's cult in Aetolia is the name of the Aetolian month Ἀθάναιος. For her cult in the West see Dümmler, col. 1970; Ciaceri, *Culti*, 153-57; Giannelli, *passim*; T. J. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks*, Oxford 1948, pp. 34, 94, 113, 178, 236f., 311, 318, 357, 372; G. Pugliese Carratelli, «Culti e dottrine religiose in Magna Grecia», *PP* 20 (1965) 5-27. Athena is a major cult figure in both cities that are biographically tied with Stesichorus: Himera was consecrated to her (Diod. 5. 4, see Ciaceri, *Culti*, p. 156) and at Locri her «worship was popular»: Dunbabin, p. 69 with n. 1; Giannelli, pp. 206-08, 269f.

18. For Athena and Ares see Dümmler, coll. 1977, 2005. Athena and Artemis also occasionally share epithets (e. g. Λαφρία), priestesses and shrines. See Wernicke, col. 1363. For the relation of Artemis (Παρωνία, Λαφρία) and Athena with fire see Burkert, pp. 61-63.

19. Ovid *Met.* 8 275; Paus 8. 45-46. 1 and Callim. *Dian.* 219f.: Scopas depicted the Calydonian boar hunt on the front gable of the temple of Athena Alea in Tegea. See Robert, pp. 93, 96, this hunt may have involved a Peloponnesian boar; so also M. C. van der Kolf, «Meleagros», *RE* 15. 1 (1931) col. 473.

exalted status in the poetry of Stesichorus²⁰, it cannot be confirmed whether the Tritogenes of his present lyric poem operates as the Athena of Heracles (*Geryoneis*) and Odysseus (*PMG* 209), that is, as the «Goddess of Nearness»²¹ who is always close to her protégés, or, on the contrary, of Geryon (*Ger. S* 14, 15. col. ii. 8f.); whether she is an αἴσα dispenser for Meleager (perhaps, through being Deianeira's or Gorge's brother?), as she is for Geryon and the Homeric Hector, or benevolent to him, as to the two aforementioned male members of his family; whether she functions here as an accessory to Artemis or as her foil.

With the exception of the Meleagrides incident, in *all* versions of this myth it is Artemis who wreaks havoc and causes the death of *men*. A role in the poem for Athena might be suggested by another myth relating her hostile involvement with some *female* members of the Aetolian royal dynasty. The titles of Athena, Γοργοφόνος, (-νη), Γοργῶπις, Γοργώ, Γοργολόφα, direct us toward Gorge, Meleager's sister, who has been considered a hypostasis of Medusa²². It is probably in this context that the title Tritogenes (or Tritogeneia) could find its *raison d'être*²³.

When Diodorus (3. 53) locates the lake Tritonis in the West close to the Ocean²⁴, he implicitly associates Tritonis and by extension Tritogenes, or Tritogeneia, with an area in which tradition locates the garden of the Hesperides and the dwelling of the Gorgons²⁵. Stesichorus follows this

20. *PMG* 200 ~ *S* 89. 6-11, cf. *Od.* 8. 493, *PMG* 230, *Ger. S.* 14, *Iliou Persis S* 89, *PMG* 233, *P. Oxy.* 2260 col. ii. 18ff.; cf. *Sch. Ap. Rh.* 4. 1310, πρῶτος Στησίχορος ἔφη σὺν ὅπλοις ἐκ τῆς Διὸς κεφαλῆς ἀναπηδῆσαι τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν. For the πρῶτος εὐρετής motif see Mancuso, p. 247; Vallet, p. 279; cf. S. Kauer, *Die Geburt der Athena*, Würzburg 1959, p. 55. On the function of this motif see A. Kleingünter, *Πρῶτος Εὐρετής. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung* [*Philologus Suppl.* 26. 1], Leipzig 1933, pp. 1-155.

21. So W. F. Otto, *Die Götter Griechenlands*, Bonn 1929, 4th ed., Frankfurt 1956, p. 54 quoted by Burkert, p. 141.

22. See E. Kuhnert, «Meleagros», *Myth. Lex.* 2. 2, Leipzig 1894-97, coll. 2606-07. Heracles, Meleager and Medusa meet in the underworld in Apollod. 2. 5. 12. Meleager figures in the *Nekyia* of Polygnotus (Paus. 10. 31. 3); as a «hunter» he belongs to the underworld depictions according to van der Kolf, col. 460. For the chthonic liaisons of this family see Kuhnert, coll. 2605-07, and Papatomopoulos, p. 73 n. 6.

23. For Gorge and Athena see Robert, p. 87 with n. 4; B. Niese, «Gorgo», *RE* 7. 2 (1912) coll. 1641-42, 1646-47, and Furtwängler, coll. 675-76. This engagement was popular in Sicilian art: Dunbabin, p. 275 nn. 6 and 7. Worth noting is the description of Meleager in Hes. 25. 6f. M. - W., αὐτὰρ ὃ γ' ἦρως | γοργόνος εἰδ[ος] ἔχων.

24. For Tritogeneia and Tritonis see *LSJ*; H. Frisk, *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3 vols, Heidelberg 1973, 2: 934; E. Fehrle, «Tritogeneia», *Myth. Lex.* 5, Leipzig 1916-24, coll. 1146-50; H. Herter, «Triton», *Der Kleine Pauly* 5 (1975) coll. 967-69; M. le Glay, «Triton», ib., coll. 969-70; F. R. Dreßler, «Triton. Tritonen», *Myth. Lex.* 5, col. 1192.

25. Hes. *Theog.* 274f.; Strabo 7. 3. 6; Apollod. 2. 4. 2; *Sch. Ap. Rh.* 4. 1515, p. 320 W. = Phe-rec. *FGrHist.* 3F11 with Comm. ad loc.; Ovid *Met.* 4. 772-89, *Cypria* fr. 26 = *EGF*, p. 44; Palaeph.

tradition (*Ger. S* 8, *S* 86). In view of the contemporary travelling adventures, the immense interest in navigation and the concomitant redefinitions of the boundaries of the earth²⁶, combined with the above-mentioned connections of Athena with Triton-Tritonis and the Gorgons²⁷, it would not be farfetched to suppose that Stesichorus has assigned Athena a role in this myth and chosen the title Τριτογενής not only for its distinct belligerent connotations²⁸, but also for its ambiguity and its inherent capacity to evoke the mysterious and exotic atmosphere of the western limits of the world, the arena of Athena's engagement with Gorgo-Gorge. If so, our poet would neatly tie up the loose ends of two subtly interrelated mythological cycles and a wide circle of enmity would run its final course²⁹.

If the ῥινηλατεῖν attempted above has a germ of plausibility in it and we are not dealing here simply with a case of a conventional catalogue type narrative (see *Iliou Persis S* 105 [b]), then the Stesichorean Athena has presumably been accorded a prominent role in cooperation with Artemis ἰοχέαιρα: they both strive to destroy some members, male or female, of this royal house.

Unfortunately the state of transmission of our papyrus scraps cannot prove or disprove this claim of coordinated divine hostility. Besides, the nature of the Stesichorean technique displayed already in the *Geryoneis* and the P. Lille poem advises caution: our poet is a master of subtle undercurrents of tragic irony and ambiguity and a renowned myth innovator. In view of this and only if Haslam's approach to v. 7, Τρ[ιτογένεια, could be confirmed, we could even imagine here a divine *agon* (cf. *Ger. S* 14), in

31. Cf. Hdt 4. 91 and Paus. 3. 17. 3. For the eastward movement see Aes. *Pr.* 790-800; for the northward see Pi. *Pyth.* 10. 30-36: cf. the protest of the Sch. Pi. *Pyth.* 10. 72b (p. 248 Dr.). See also Niese, coll. 1633-34.

26. The Stesichorean description of Tartessus, e. g., with the «inexhaustible», «silver-rooted» water (*Ger. S* 7 = *PMG* 187) reflects the reality (Strabo 3. 2. 3; Arist. *De mir. ausc.* 135). The awakening of geographical interest is also suggested by the more precise localization of the island Erytheia in the Tartessus bay. See C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 2nd ed., Oxford 1961, pp. 89f., and Dunbabin, pp. 301, 330.

27. For Triton as the western frontier stream, as the «Grenzestrom», see Furtwängler, col. 676, who refers to W. H. Roscher, *Die Gorgonen und Verwandtes*, Leipzig 1879, pp. 30f., 119 (unavailable to me).

28. For Tritogeneia see Hes. *Theog.* 892-98, 934-26; *PMG* 884, 1037. 1f.; Ar. *Eq.* 1166-89; *Hom. h.* 28, a composition «Stesichoro recentiore» (so O. F. Kleine, *Stesichori Himerensis Fragmenta*, Berlin 1828, p. 127), which imitates the Stesichorean hymn to Athena (so U. Mancuso, *La lirica classica greca in Sicilia e nella Magna Grecia*, Pisa 1912, p. 246).

29. See G. Arrighetti, «Stesicoro e il suo pubblico», *MD* 32 (1994) 19-23, for Stesichorus' predilection for myths connected with the West; see also ib., pp. 27-30, Stesichorus presents great nuclei of mythological material in an organic manner and in causative terms, whence the great length of his poems and the accumulation of details.

which Athena, favourably inclined towards Meleager, would somehow step in and venture to override the vengefulness of Artemis thus promoting the suspense of the story and fostering false expectations³⁰. This interpretation would furnish an example of mythological manipulation, an innovation in line with Stesichorus' reputation in posterity. As Poseidon in the *Geryoneis*, so here Athena would have to yield eventually to the territorial rights and supremacy of the Aetolian Artemis. At any rate, *χώεται Ἰοχέαιρα κακώτερα Τριτογενείης* (Nonn. *Dion.* 5. 343).

It is evident that we fail to explain why Athena's alleged presence brings happiness. On the other hand, the mutilated traces of v. 7, τ[], may have no relation whatsoever with Athena³¹. They may be vestiges of e. g., τρεῖς, as the names of three deities figure in the text and the metre here requires a long syllable, or refer to Artemis herself in a kind of wishful thinking. This interpretation may be suggested by the verbal similarities of our fr. 2. 7, which undoubtedly describes Artemis, with *P. Oxy.* 3876, fr. 40. 3] Διὸς ἄγρ[and 12 (-)δ]όχιμος τρ[ι]παλαιγενὲς ἀπ'ἀ[λαμόν τε (Haslam)³².

At this point we move forward into the context of frr. 2+6 (b) (conjoined after W. Barrett) and 4, in which we encounter those crucial clues that tie our poem to the Meleager myth. Our text reads as follows:

30. Cf. Iocaste's plea to Apollo in the Lille poem, for which see my «Two Homeric Formulae in the P. Lille Poem: *θεοὶ θέσαν* and *ἄναξ ἰκέτης*», *Glotta* 64 (1986) 165-84; for the Stesichorean technique of ambiguity and irony see also L. Carmignani, «Stile e tecnica narrativa in Stesicoro», *Ricerche di Filologia Classica I, Studi ai letteratura Greca*, Pisa 1981, pp. 25-60, and R. Garner, *From Homer to Tragedy. The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry*, London and New York 1990, pp. 14-18. If so, Heracles would provide the pattern for considering Athena the champion and rescuer of Meleager. For Meleager and Heracles see Bacch. 5. 56-175; Apollod. 2. 5. 12 and Pi. fr. 249a Mae. = Sch. D Gen. on *Il.* 21. 194.

31. Athena's presence here is introduced in hypothetical terms after all; see Haslam, p. 33, «At the end, e. g., Τρ[ιτογένειαν could be one line of approach ("Happy he who has Athena on his side")»; Davies, *PMGF*, p. 307, «Τρ[ιτογένειαν ex. gr. possis».

32. See Campbell, ad loc., p. 151, fr. 40 speaks of «Artemis, daughter of Zeus, animal-huntress», although it is uncertain if v. 12 is «addressed to a man or a woman». The respect paid to this deity is discerned in both the *τριπαλαιγενὲς* and the (-)δ]όχιμος, perhaps εὐδ]όχιμος [?], «in good repute, honoured, glorious» (*LSJ*). Cf. Davies, *PMGF*, p. 317, [-δ]όχιμος. For the metre consult Haslam, p. 40, «if - - - -] is supplied at the beginning of line 12, we may have a hexameter».

Fr. 2	Fr. 4
.
] . [] . [c. 5] ἄθαν μ[
] ις ἀπέδωκε[c. 6] λετομ[
] . ία δ' ἄρ' ὁπῶς [c. 6] ψάμε[] ος [
] εν ἀγγελία[c. 6] ποτέ[ει] πε θ[
] πεμφε δέ νιν [c. 5] . εὐπατέρει-
Ἄρτα] μιν ἰοχέαιρα [] . λυμ[α, τ] ἄχ' ἀγγελίας ἀμεγάρτου
θυγάτ] ηρ Διδος ἀγρεσ[ι] θήρα εγ[πε] ὕσσαι ἐμ μεγάροις· τεθνᾶσι τ[ο]ι
'] πωσκα[] νεραταν[ἄμα] τι τῶιδε παρ' αἰ-
] αι μέ[] μαπῆρικλ[καν] ἀδελφ[εοί·] ἔχτανε δ' αὐτοῦς
.	c. 6] φ[]
	c. 5] . c. 7 ἄ] μύμων
	c. 16] φρένα[

In a third person narrative someone «gave back» (ἀπέδωκε, fr. 2. 2) something unspecified but likely to be extracted from v. 4, where another person is probably presented as receiving a message, ἔκλυ] εν ἀγγελιά[ων (fr. 2. 4)³³. This second person may be identical with the female figure characterized later on in terms of nobility as εὐπατέρει-ια (fr. 4. 5f.), and her identity may be sought in the traces] . ία (fr. 2. 3.). The name of Ἀλθαία is a possibility³⁴.

Important for the understanding of the passage and the appreciation of the Stesichorean compositional technique is the addressee of νιν in the phrase προέ] πεμφε δέ νιν[(fr. 2. 5). This personal pronoun with the distinct Doric flavour can refer either to the Calydonian boar or the speaker of fr. 4. 5ff.³⁵. I would prefer the former, assuming a kind of flash back narrative: (Althaea?) heard the news brought by the messenger about the boar. In the paratactic style of our homerizing poet, Artemis sent the boar (νιν) in order to ravage Calydon. That this is the arena of the deadly engagement has been revealed by the conjoining of frs. 2. 8+6 (b). 2.

The effects of the conjoining emerge at frs. 2. 6f.+6 (b). 1f.: the for-

33. Or ἀγγελία[ς: see *LSJ* κλύω cum acc. rei and gen. rei. Haslam's view that «other cases, incl. nom. sing., are of course possible», (p. 33) is rather obscure syntactically, if we are to read here a transitive verb, ἔκλυ] εν.

34. So Haslam, p. 33, «Ἀλθ]αία not excluded for line 3, but not commended»; Davies, *PMGF*, p. 307, «Ἀλθ]αία possis, sed confirmari nequit»; Campbell, p. 144, «Ἀλθ]αία?»

35. Haslam, p. 33, considers both options but prefers the latter. The suggestion of Campbell, p. 145, «and Artemis ... sent him / her¹ (from Olympus?)» taken together with n. 1: «The messenger to Althaea (see fr. 4)?» will be discussed below à propos of fr. 4. 3f.

mulaic phrase Ἄρτα]μις ἰοχέαιρα³⁶, originally considered a self-sufficient verse³⁷, is amplified with the addition of ... λυμ. Haslam explores the supplements ἀπ' Ὀλύμπου, or ἀπολυμ-³⁸ assuming a lacuna of three letters at the suture point and a metre of probably four and a half dactyls (5daΛ)³⁹.

It is beyond our capacity to confirm the measure of 5daΛ for fr. 2. 6. Yet, the supplement ἀπ' Ὀλύμπου, which seems to yield a 4da unit, has a syntactical and metrical integrity nicely rounding off the verse and the metre. Such a unit has a precedent both in this poem (fr. 4. 7)⁴⁰ and elsewhere (*Ger. ep.* 3, 4). This supplement would be felicitous if νιν were identified with Iris, or even with the boar, in case the place of its origin were specified at least in one of the two major accounts of the myth (*Il.* 9. 538f.; *Bacch.* 5. 104-06)⁴¹. The ἀπολυμ- alternatives after ἐπεμψεν, on the other hand, can range between a future infinitive or participle of e. g. ἀπολυμαίνομαι (i. e. ἀπολυμανεῖσθαι, ἀπολυμανούμενον) to denote the purpose, or a predicate of νιν (on the pattern of *Soph. OT* 1518 etc., see *LSJ*). The first two options are prosodically (˘ ˘ ˘ . . .) incompatible with the assumed dactylic sequence. For metrical reasons the alternative ἀπολυμαντῆρα (. . . ˘) is rather unwelcome, while ἀπολυμαντήν, in the sense of λυμαντήν (*Soph. Tr.* 793), λυμεῶνα or λύμην (*vitae exitialem pestem*, *TGL*) would be a perfect match both metrically and conceptually, were it only attested. Yet, such a coining would not be unthinkable for a poet who has presently enriched our linguistic treasure with «a sprinkling of new words,

36. Commonly located at the end of the hexameter (5X in *Il.*, 2X in *Od.*); less often at the beginning (*Il.* 20. 71, *Hom. h. Ap.* 199). The frequency of this formula in other cases is not counted here.

37. So Haslam, p. 33 ad 6-7, «in which case 6 has verse end». This would yield a D - colon at verse end, rather unusual in the dactylo-anapaestic compositions of Stesichorus.

38. Haslam, p. 34, «along with (? ἀ[π]) Ὀλυμ[π- e. g. ἀπολυμ- could be considered, but λυμ is itself far from being assured»; id., p. 35 ad fr. 6 (b). 1, «Ὀλύμ[π- looks likely». Davies, p. 308 ad 6 (b). 1, Ὀλυμ[π- *veri sim.*; Campbell, p. 144, «-αιρ' ἀ[π] Ὀλύμ[π-?» presumably in an effort to eliminate the hiatus (cf., however, *Hom. h. Ap.* 199) and most of all the metrical inconvenience of having three consecutive short syllables.

39. For the uncertainty of the metre see Haslam, pp. 1, 33 and 34, «it is not clear just where this fragment stands in relation to the line beginnings and endings» ... «The metre of line 6 is still uncertain (perhaps four and a half dactyls; in that case one might have expected the line division to be made one syllable earlier, but cf. *Ger. ep.* 5-6 [6daΛ, divided after the fifth longum], and mistaken or inconsistent colometrization is always possible)».

40. See also Haslam, p. 34, «lines 8 and 9 [fr. 2] may have consisted of four dactyls apiece».

41. We cannot prove that δῖον γένος (*Il.* 9. 538) qualifies the boar. See *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, 7 vols., ed. H. Erbse, Berlin 1969-88, 2 (1971): 514, ad loc., πρὸς Ἀχιλλεῖα ... ὃ δὲ Νικάνωρ ἐπὶ Ἀρτέμιδος. Cf. *Il.* 6. 180, θεῖον γένος, of Chimaera.

mostly compound adjectives»⁴².

The last conjecture could probably find support in the context. The lavish use of attributes for Artemis, ἰοχέαιρα, θυγάτηρ Διός, ἀγρεσιθήρα, apart from their epic ring, aim at forcefully conveying her inimical image. Likewise, in *Iliad* 9 she is χρυσόθρονος, Διὸς κούρη μέγαλοιο, δῖον γένος ἰοχέαιρα (533, 536, 538). These epithets bring to the foreground the aggressive aspect of a goddess who can bless and curse animal and vegetative life alike; who is a protectress as well as a death-inducing agent. Artemis ἀγροτέρα also in Bacchylides (5. 122f.) discharges the boar (5. 104, cf. Stes. P. Oxy. 3876, fr. 5. 4). It is Artemis ἰοχέαιρα⁴³, ἀγρεσιθήρα⁴⁴, or ἀγροτέρα⁴⁵, consequently, the author of the heroic massacre at Calydon. Against this background the uncertain traces λυμ[(fr. 2. 6) may reveal not the place of origin of the boar necessarily, but the purpose of Artemis to λυμαίνεσθαι by sending an appropriate agent, the boar, as ἀπολυμαντήν⁴⁶. At any rate, the pursuit of certainty at this point is rather utopian in view of the constraints posed by the physical appearance of our fragments.

Fr. 3 seems to describe the battle raging in front of the city, πρόσ]θεν πόλ[ιος (v. 2) and some of the participants, Κ]άστωρ (vel ἄ]λάστωρ, v. 3), βρισμ[αχ- (v. 4). The reading Κ]άστωρ would evoke the Stesichorean Ἰθλα ἐπὶ Πελῖαι (PMG 178)⁴⁷, in which Castor's famous horses are mentioned. The long narratives are a recognizable component of Stesichorus' poetry and this description recalls the detailed catalogue of the heroes

42. Haslam, p. 2.

43. Artemis ἰοχέαιρα is often associated with death: *Il.* 6. 427f., 24. 605f.; *Od.* 11. 172f., 15. 478; *Certamen* 117f.

44. For our poem see A. Pardini, «Per una nuova edizione dei lirici», *QUCC* N. S. 43 (1993) 111, n. 2: the traces εγ[in v. 7 apparently coming from a scholiast seem to suggest a variant ἐγ[ρεσιθήρα.

45. For the etymology of Ἀγροτέρα (and Apollo Ἀγρίτης) see: *LSJ*⁹ and *Suppl.*; *Lfgre* and P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris 1968, s.v. ἄγρα. A. Ἀγροτέρα is offered sacrifices as a war goddess. See Wernicke, col. 1349 and Schreiber, coll. 563-64 and 581-82, who identifies Artemis of *Il.* 9 with A. Αἰτωλή and Λαφρία; similarly Burkert, pp. 62f., A. Laphria from Calydon. Artemis seems to have incorporated in herself contrasting functions; the boundaries between a goddess, who promotes life and destroys it, are not clearly distinguished: see Wernicke, col. 1348 and Fauth, coll. 622-23. For the death associations of Artemis Orthia see Dawkins, pp. 112, 206, 240, 242, 266. For the association of Artemis and Dionysus with female death and metamorphosis in relation to the female rite of passage into womanhood see Seaford, above n. 7.

46. In this context it is worth recalling the significant *hapax* characterization of Althaea παιδολυμᾶς by Aes. *Choe.* 604: Althaea, a mother of a tragically ironic name, eventually capped the disaster initiated by Artemis.

47. *Et. Magn.* 544. 54, *Suda* s. v. Κύλλαρος, *Et. Gud.* 353. 22 s. v. Κυλλαρίς; see Th. Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, 3 vols, Leipzig 1886-1915, Pars III *Poetae Melici*, pp. 205f.; J. Vürtheim, *Stesichorus' Fragmente und Biographie*, pp. 1-5, and PMGF 178 with testimonia.

gathered in his *Syotherae* (PMG 222).

The deplorable state of transmission of fr. 4. 1-4 makes it impossible for us to decipher with certainty the vestiges]φάμενος [(fr. 4. 3) which can be rendered as αἰ]φα μέν, or as a masculine participle⁴⁸, or even αἰ]φα μένος. An additional complication involves the identity of the person who delivers the speech introduced with the formula ποτέ[ει]πε θ[(fr. 4. 4). It has been ascribed either to Iris or an unknown male person⁴⁹. Although the speculation that Iris is the messenger sent by Artemis to Althaea is tempting, we should be sceptical for the following reasons: Iris usually delivers an inter-divine mail, that is, she communicates the injunctions of the major gods to the lesser ones⁵⁰, or is dispatched to mortals⁵¹ to impart information and counsel the immediate undertaking of certain actions. It is worth observing that, with few exceptions (*Il.* 15. 143-67, 18. 165-86), in which Hera sends Iris, or in which the sender remains unspecified (*Il.* 3. 121-38), in all other instances it is emphatically Zeus, the father of gods and men, who sends Iris to mortals.

It is exactly this hierarchical ordering of the divine world that should caution us against assigning to the Artemis of our lyric poem an authority and status consistently reserved for Zeus and only exceptionally for his wife in the epos. Besides, the validity of this «unconstitutional» authorization on Artemis' part is contingent upon the allegedly feminine gender of νιν and the reading ἀπ' Ὀλύμπου. But these two problems cannot be attacked in a cogent and confident manner, as has been pointed out above.

Under these circumstances we may consider the option of having here a masculine subject, a messenger, delivering the speech. Now if we take into consideration all the parameters involved, that is, the possibility that v. 4 began anapaestic; the trace θ[and the end of v. 4; the computation of circa five missing letters from the beginning of v. 5 (~ ~ ~ ?); a possible sigma right thereafter⁵² as well as the probability that v. 5 began

48. So Haslam, p. 35, «-φάμενος is the obvious guess ... though αἰ]φα μέν is a possible articulation»; see also Campbell, p. 145, on fr. 4. 3 «(he?)¹» with n. 1, «Text uncertain; the speaker need not be male».

49. So Haslam, p. 35, «θ[: nom. or acc.? E. g. θ[εἰς Θαυμαντιάς (Ἴρις), if something other than -φάμενος in 3, or e. g. θ[ύγατρα». The indifference about the prosody of the final syllable and the difference in size of these supplements presumably rest on Haslam's assumption that «Longer lines could be postulated if desired» (p. 34). See also Campbell, p. 145 on fr. 2+6 (b). 5, «him / her» reflecting on fr. 4. 4, «(he?) addressed (her)».

50. *Il.* 8. 397-425, 15. 55, 144-217, 23. 198-212, 24. 77-95; cf. *Hom. h. Ap.* 102-114, *Hom. h. Dem.* 314-24.

51. *Il.* 2. 786-807, 3. 121-138, 11. 185-211, 18. 165-202, 24. 117, 143-188; twice in disguise, *Il.* 2. 790, 3. 124; cf. Pap. I col. ii ad *Il.* 2. 791-95 in *Sch. Hom. Il.*, Erbse, 1 (1969): 169.

52. Haslam, p. 5; see ib., «trace on edge suggesting overhang of c». Cf. id., p. 35, «The pre-

dactylic⁵³, then fr. 4. 4-5 could be supplemented *exempli gratia* as follows:

(ca. 5) ~ ~ ~] ποτέ[ε]πε θ[οὸς δὲ χιῶν
ἄγγελος]

This supplement yields an anapaestic dimeter in v. 4⁵⁴, if we assume a missing ~ ~ ~] from the verse beginning, and rests first on the emphatic and repeated use of words signifying celerity in descriptions of angelic tasks⁵⁵, and second on the connection of ἄγγελλω with χίω⁵⁶.

We cannot hope to answer the question of whether fr. 3 and 4. 1-4 are entirely or partially sections of a third person narrative or a speech. The verb ποτέ[ε]πε in fr. 4. 4 circumscribes our options: it marks the beginning of a speech, extensive in all probability, since the Stesichorean characters have a propensity to long speeches and the pursuit of the climax effect⁵⁷. It is important to note how the latter is accomplished on a broader plane: the description moves gradually from the «far» and «out» to the «inside» and «now», and the chronemics and proxemics blend to establish the setting, that is, the *hic et nunc* of the mythological background in which this lyric poem is placed (πρὸς]θεν πόλ[ις vs. ἐμ μεγάροις, τάχα, ἄμα]τι τῶιδε). With this technique of internalizing the external the poet moves from the level of merely physical and factual into the psychic and

ceding trace is very slight; if in fact sigma, Θεσιά]c would fit»; since «a patronymic might not sit well with εὐπατέρεια», the supportive evidence is drawn from the Hellenistic epic.

53. Haslam, p. 34.

54. Cf. fr. 4. 4 (suppl): anap. dim. ~ to Ger. str. 2, 4, 6, 8. The metrical structure of this fragment bears some similarities with that of the *Geryoneis*: cf. fr. 4. 6, 9: anap. dim. ~ Ger. str. 1, 3, ep. 2; fr. 4. 7: 4da ~ Ger. ep. 3, 4. Cf. however, fr. 4. 8 (and probably fr. 4. 5): 3da ~.

55. This has even led to the coining of a proper «speaking» name: *Il.* 12. 342f. with Erbse 3: 368 ad 12. 342 a. ¹ ὅτι οἰκείον ὄνομα κήρυκος, ἀπὸ τοῦ ταχύνειν, καὶ ὅτι ὀνοματοθετικὸς ὁ ποιητής A. 12. 343 a. ὅτι παρετυμολογεῖ τὸν Θωῶτην ἀπὸ τοῦ θέειν A. *sim.* b. T. See also Hes. fr. 271. 1 M. - W.; *Hom. h.* 19. 29. For the pertinent characterization of an ἄγγελος see *LfgreE* s. v., coll. 52-54.

56. See *Od.* 18. 6f. Ἴπρον δὲ νέοι κίχλησxon ἅπαντες | οὔνεα' ἀπαγγέλλεσxe χιῶν, where we encounter another significant name (<Ἴρις). Unlike all other cases which almost always occupy the verse-end position, the nominative χιῶν always coincides with the heptemimeral caesura. This restriction should not necessarily apply here due to the metre difference.

57. See *Ger. S* 11: the arrangement of arguments depends on the moral priorities of Geryon. The alternative of immortality, which is actually inconsequential for his decision, precedes the highly emotive alternative of his mortality. The tragic tension culminates in his resolution to confront Heracles either way, but especially if he is mortal. *Ger. S* 12 and 13 reveal Callirhoe's progression from the controlled realm of πειθῶ to the uncontrolled of passion. Similarly the lingering description of Geryon's killing in *S* 15 culminates in v. 13 only to be followed by the poppy simile (vv. 14-17), which serves as a pivotal point at which the climax produced by the visualization of the gory killing reverses into an emotional and thus cathartic serenity: sympathy for the monster settles in. The P. Lille poem (*PMGF* 222 [b]) manifests a comparable stratification of ideas with a mild climax effect on an intra-stanzaic level (οὔτε γὰρ ... οὔδ' ἔγ' αὖ μάν, 205-08, 211-13) and a stronger one on an inter-stanzaic level (the epode-end coincides with statements of critical importance, 209-10, 228-31).

emotional: the climax is presumably accomplished with the delivery of the heart-rending tidings that are so crucial for the evolution of the story.

With the above-analysed fragments as a guideline, we may now attempt to reconstruct the Meleager myth of Stesichorus with the ultimate goal of drawing the line that connects him with his predecessors and successors. We will concentrate on two thematic peculiarities: the number of Althaea's brothers and the use of the curse or the firebrand motif.

The former emerges with great clarity from the mutilated extant text. The Homeric singular number κασιγνήτοιο φόνοιο (*Il.* 9. 567), which the scholiast apparently attempted to align with the later literary and mythographic tradition by transposing the accent and producing an adjective κασιγνητοῖο⁵⁸, has been definitely replaced by the plural in Stesichorus, τεθνᾶσι τ[ο]ι[αῖ]μα[ι] τι τῶιδε παρ' αἰ- | σαν] ἀδελφ[εοί:] ἔχτανε δ' αὐτούς (fr. 4. 7-9). This piece of information enables us to establish the *post quem* of this detail.

Regarding the latter we are completely in the dark: the new Stesichorean text cannot itself help us establish whether or not Stesichorus had used the firebrand motif⁵⁹. Whereas the curse motif occurs explicitly already in Homer (*Il.* 9. 565-72), the firebrand motif is first attested in Phrynichus' *Pleuroniae* (*TrGF* fr. 6 Sn. = Paus. 10. 31. 4), <---vv---vv---> .-> κρυερὸν γὰρ οὐκ | ἄλυξεν μόρον, ὥχεϊα δέ νιν φλῶξ κατεδαίσσατο | δαλοῦ περθομένου ματρὸς ὑπ' αἰνᾶς καχομηχάνου. It recurs in Aeschylus (*Choe.* 604-11)⁶⁰ and through Bacchylides (5. 136-54) it makes its way to the mythographers either in isolation or in combination with the curse motif⁶¹.

58. *Sch. Hom. Il.*, Erbse, 2: 521 ad loc., a. κασιγνήτοιο {φόνοιο}: τινὲς δὲ προπερισπῶσιν ... ἵνα γένηται κασιγνητικοῦ· ἡ γὰρ Ἀλθαΐα, φασίν, οὐκ ἕνα εἶχεν ἀδελφόν A. c¹. οὕτω Ἀρίσταρχος, τοῦ ἀδελφικοῦ A^{int}. *sim.* c² / d². bT. d¹. δύναται δὲ καὶ ἐνὸς καὶ πλειόνων ἀδελφῶν A^{im}. *Sch.* ad v. 567b. δύο δὲ ἦσαν, Κλυτίος καὶ Προχάων, agrees with Stes. *PMG* 222 col. ii. 4f. ~ Pi. fr. 343 Mae. = Bacch. *Dith.* fr. 25. 29 Sn. by contrast to Bacch. 5. 128f. Wilamowitz, *Kleine Schriften*, V 2, p. 85; Robert, p. 86 with n. 6, and March, pp. 35f., 39, 43, disapprove of the scholiastic accentuation: in Homer Meleager kills one uncle.

59. See Bowra, pp. 98f., «there is no evidence that he used the theme of the log whose existence is coterminous with that of Meleager».

60. For the curious verbal similarities of Aeschylus and Bacchylides in the treatment of this story see A. F. Garvie, *Aeschylus Choephoroi*, Oxford 1986, p. 211 ad loc.

61. Firebrand: Diod. 4. 34. 6f.; Paus. 10. 31. 4; Dio Chr. *Or.* 67; Ovid *Met.* 8. 445-525; Hygin *Fab.* 171, 174, et al. Juxtaposition of both versions: Apollod. 1. 8. 2 (brand) and 1. 8. 3 (curse) and combination of both in *Ant. Lib.* 2. The situation in Soph. *Μελέαγ.* (*TrGF* fr. 401-06 Radt) is doubtful: he follows Homer once (*Sch. A Il.* 9. 575 a¹.), but nothing guarantees his overall conformity with the epic version and the exclusion or not of the firebrand motif. Euripides' choices (*Μελέαγ.* *TGF* fr. 515-39 N) are not immediately obvious, despite the efforts of Robert, p. 99 with n. 6, and van der Kolf, coll. 453-54, 477-78, to integrate the firebrand motif in the Euripidean exposition of the myth.

The concomitant question is naturally whether this cause of Meleager's death is Phrynichus' innovation, and if not, what his sources may have been. Pausanias, who was the first to cite this fragment, is categorical: Phrynichus touched upon the firebrand theme not as one would one's own invention, but ἅτε ἐς ἅπαν ἤδη διαβεβημένου τὸ Ἑλληνικόν. It is worth noting that both Phrynichus and Aeschylus deal with the firebrand motif in a choral part of their tragedies. In Phrynichus it must have been a more or less indispensable constituent of a story titled *Pleuroniae*, whereas in Aeschylus (*Choe.* 595-636) it constitutes one of the three mythological paradigms of outrageous female audacity and cruelty, the *tertium comparationis* in their comparison with Clytaemnestra. Could this observation give us some clues about the nature of the source(s) of our tragedians?

At the end of the last century Croiset, with an impressive insight into the philosophical and tragic dimensions of Stesichorean poetry, pointed to Stesichorus as the ultimate source of inspiration not only of Phrynichus and Aeschylus but of Bacchylides as well⁶² with respect to the use of the firebrand motif⁶³. Croiset assumed a development of the two motifs in chronological order and in linear fashion: the combined epic *aetion*, the curse and Apollo, is later replaced by the firebrand motif, an ingenious invention of Stesichorus himself.

Croiset's theory, parts of which have been more or less mildly criticized⁶⁴, or rejected for lack of evidence⁶⁵, rests essentially on an overvaluation of the fact that Stesichorus has exercised a great influence on posterity and especially on the Attic tragedians⁶⁶. Most pertinently, his 'A-

62. Cf. Robert, p. 92, Bacchylides draws upon Phrynichus.

63. Croiset, pp. 77-80; on his steps follow Mancuso, pp. 228f., and March, p. 44. See R. C. Jebb, *Bacchylides: the Poems and Fragments*, London 1905, pp. 469f., the «brand was a tragic, but not a glorious, death. Such a doom was fitted, by its pathos, for lyric treatment».

64. See Kuhnert, coll. 2595, 2597, 2605-07, 2611, 2614, the firebrand may have been introduced accidentally or upon the influence of Stesichorus, who has upgraded Atalante's role in his poem; similarly Mancuso, p. 229, the protagonists have acquired «un contenuto di passionalità nuova» that has left its traces in art; cf. van der Kolf, coll. 450, 461, 474, 477-78, the pre-eminence of Atalante in art may suggest the influence of a Meleager epos or a lyric poem as that of Stesichorus, but the firebrand motif is very old, a «Märchenmotiv» of «verborgenen Leben» that has survived in folk narratives. It was replaced by Apollo or the curse in epos, but it never vanished; Stesichorus cannot have been the inventor of the firebrand motif: it was already there.

65. Vürtheim, pp. 27f.

66. Stesichorean motifs have found their way into tragedy: cf. *PMG* 219 with Aes. *Choe.* 523-33, 549f. and Eur. *Or.* 618; *Palinode(s)* *PMG* 192, 193 with Eur. *Hel.*; the dilemma of the race vs. the city and the lot drawing in *PMGF* 222 (b) with Aes. *Sept.* passim and the prolonged life of Iocaste (Stes. ib.) with Eur. *Phoen.*; *PMG* 217. 14-24 with Aes. *Choe.* and *Eum.*, Eur. *Or.* 269f.; *PMG* 217. 15-27 with Eur. *IA* 98-103.

θλα ἐπὶ Πελῖαι (PMG 179 [b]) was famous and of great authority⁶⁷. Stesichorus mentions the Calydonian boar elsewhere (PMG 221), while in a catalogue type narrative he names the heroes who gathered at Calydon (PMG 222 col. i) and describes their martial deployment on either side of the boar (col. ii)⁶⁸. Our new fragments (P. Oxy. 3876) reconfirm Stesichorus' interest in this popular story: he has sung of Meleager in more than one poem⁶⁹. Yet, our evidence is meagre; we can prove neither the use of the curse nor the invention or even the mere employment of the firebrand motif by him. Besides, the arguments of classicists, historians and cultural anthropologists against the alleged linear developmental process and cultural or ideological stratification in strictly chronological terms are convincing: the firebrand motif not only seems to have been of great antiquity, whether or not originally connected with the Meleager cycle, but even older than the curse. The hypothesis of its invention by Stesichorus is bound to remain, consequently, in suspense⁷⁰. All we can hope for is to mine out some clues as to which motif he is likely to have favoured, first by exploring his ties not so much with Aeschylus (whose reliance on Stesichorus has been amply documented), but with Phrynichus, the earliest known exponent of the firebrand motif, and second by taking a closer look at his technique and thematic choices.

67. Sim. PMG 564, οὕτω γὰρ Ὀμηρος ἢ δὲ Στασίχορος ἄεισε λαοῖς. See U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyriker*, Berlin - Göttingen 1900, p. 43 with n. 2; for a discussion of the confusion between Stesichorus and Ibycus and the authorship of the *Athla* see E. Cingano, «L'opera di Ibyco e di Stesicoro nella classificazione degli antichi e dei moderni», *A.I.O.N.* 12 (1990) 189-224, esp. 191-96.

68. Παις. 8. 45. 6-7, the boar was κατὰ μέσον μάλιστα. See H. Lloyd - Jones, «Oxyrhynchus Papyri», *CR* 8 (1958) 17, col. i belongs to the *Syotherae*, «but col. ii is perplexing»: it may belong either to the *Syotherae* or the *Ἀθλα ἐπὶ Πελῖαι*; cf. the scepticism of E. Lobel, *Papyri Oxyrhynchus*, vol. 23, London 1956, p. 11, and D. L. Page, PMG 222, app. crit. «*incertum an eiusdem carminis*»; see, however, A. A. Barrett, «P. Oxy. 2359 and Stesichorus' Συνοθῆραι», *CPh* 67 (1972) 17-19. Bowra, pp. 97f., and G. Huxley, «A Boar in Stesichorus», *GRBS* 7 (1966) 319f., reconstruct the scene differently. March, p. 46, sees here a post-hunt war between the Kouretes and the boar hunters.

69. According to Davies, PMGF 222 (a), p. 213, the new papyrus should not be conjoined with the *Syotherae* because of their different metrical structure.

70. See Kuhnert, coll. 2593-94; Robert, pp. 88 with n. 5, 92; Bethe, p. 7; Kakridis, «Μελέαγρος», *Philologus* 90 (1935) 1-25, esp. 1-4; id., *Homeric Researches*, pp. 14-42, and Ἀρά, Ἀθήνα 1929, pp. 105-15. The log belongs to the pre-Iliadic version and «it is a reflex of a sacrifice through destruction by fire» according to Burkert, *Greek Religion*, p. 63, while for Bremer, «La plasticité du mythe», pp. 45-57, the brand is a post-Homeric element incorporated into the Meleager myth in the 6th c. B.C. under the influence of the Calydonian fire-festivals. For a detailed bibliography see H. Bannert, «Phoinix' Jugend und der Zorn des Meleagros», *WS* 15 (1981) 69 n. 1, and B. Hainsworth, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, 6 vols., ed. G. S. Kirk, Cambridge 1985-1993, 3 (1993): 130-40.

The names of Stesichorus and Phrynichus figure together twice. First in a rather problematic passage of Athenaeus⁷¹ in which it is uncertain if what the ambassadors of Dionysius and the sailors sang were paeans or merely «selections» of Phrynichus and Stesichorus⁷². The former option is plausible, since the Epizephyrii Locri (with which Stesichorus is biographically connected), Rhegium and Italy in general were famous for their pae-anography, as is suggested by the aetiological account of Aristoxenus⁷³. The fluidity in terminology and classification (e.g., ὕμνος προσοδίου, ἐγκωμίου, παῖανος)⁷⁴ defies our modern filing system. As for Phrynichus, we are much less equipped to pass any judgment on whether his repertory comprised paeans. He was famous in antiquity for the sweetness of his μέλη and the variety of his dances⁷⁵, while the predominance of the lyric parts in his tragedies can possibly explain why he is numbered in this passage of Athenaeus together with lyric poets of the caliber of Stesichorus and Pindar and elsewhere with Ibycus, Anacreon and Alcaeus (Ar. *Thesm.* 164). A suspected biographical note that makes Phrynichus die in Sicily⁷⁶

71. Athen. 6. 250 B = PMG 276 (b); cf. Timaeus *FGHist.* 566 F 32. 15. See also ib., Komm., vol. 3. b, p. 556; *TrGF* 1: T 11 Sn.

72. So Campbell, ad loc., p. 191, on the grounds that «the paeans of the first two poets are not attested elsewhere». This difficulty has been pointed out already by Vürtheim, p. 81, who accommodates this piece of information by assuming the existence of a Stesichorean paean relating the sun eclipse (PMG 271). See Pi. *Pae.* 9. 2-5. L. Delatte, «Note sur un fragment de Stésichore», *AC* 7 (1938) 23-29, considers Stes. PMG 212 part of a paean sung at spring time with cathartic purposes.

73. In Telestos' *Vita*, fr. 36, *FHG* 2: 282 = fr. 117 Wehrli. Xenocritus of Locri was presumably active in the ambience of pae-anographers: see Ps. - Plut. *De Mus.* 1134 C, 1134 E. See Pickard - Cambridge, *Dithyramb Tragedy and Comedy*, 2nd ed. rev. by T. B. L. Webster, Oxford 1962, pp. 10f., and A. E. Harvey, «The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry», *CQ* 49 (1955) 157-75, esp. 172f.

74. See Färber, *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike*, München 1936, I. 28-32, II. 26-33; Harvey, pp. 166, 172f.; Kleine, pp. 89f. For the Stesichorean hymns see PMGF TB 23 (c); Conon 26 F 1, 18 *FGHist.* His poem on Athena (PMGF 233, 274 i, ii) is a hymn according to Bergk, *Poetae Melici*, pp. 222, 555; Mancuso, p. 246, et al. On the genre issue see L. E. Rossi, «I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle lettere classiche», *BICS* 18 (1971) 69-94; C. Calame, «Reflexions sur les genres littéraires en Grèce archaïque», *QUCC* 17 (1974) 113-28; W. Luppe, «Dithyrambos oder Paian - zu Bakchylides Carm. 23 Sn-M.», *ZPE* 69 (1987) 9-12; L. Käppel and R. Kannicht, «Noch einmal zur Frage "Dithyrambos oder Paian?" im Bakchylides-kommentar P. Oxy. 23. 2368», *ZPE* 73 (1988) 19-24; I. Rutherford, «Paeans by Simonides», *HSPH* 93 (1990) 169-209; id., «A New Papyrus of Pindar's paeans ...», *ZPE* 86 (1991) 5-8, esp. 7f. with nn. 14, 15.

75. Aristot. *Probl.* 19. 31 (920a 11); Sch. ad Ar. *Ran.* 909f.; Ar. *Ran.* 1298-1300, cf. Sch. *RV* 1298; *Vesp.* 219f.; Sch. *RV* ad Ar. *Av.* 750 = *TrGF* 1: T 10 (a-d, g) 13, 15, 16.

76. Anonymous *Περὶ χωμ.* (*Proleg. de com.* III) 9, p. 7 Kost, Φρύνιχος Φράδμονος ἔθανεν ἐν Σικελίᾳ: *TrGF* 1: T 6 Sn. (*exciderunt omnia de Phrynicho comico dicta*). Πολυφράδμων is one of the names attributed to the father of the tragic poet Phrynichus according to *Suda* (4. 762, p. 766 Adler). A von Blumenthal, «Phrynichos», 4) *RE* 20. 1 (1941) col. 911, considers this infor-

may render comprehensible not only the familiarity of the ambassadors of Dionysius with Phrynichian poetry but also the inclusion of Phrynichus in the company of Stesichorus.

One element of potentially rare value in the present exploration of the possible ties between Phrynichus and Stesichorus could be the use of the epithets *χρυσερὸν* and *χρυσέντα* to qualify not *φόβος*, *γόος* or *Ἰωκή* as in Homer, but *μόρον* and *θάνατον*, figuring in Phrynichus (*TrGF* fr. 6 Sn.) and Stesichorus (*Ger. S* 11. 5f.) respectively. This would be the earliest occurrence of this noun-epithet combination⁷⁷, presumably suggestive of the indebtedness of the former poet to the latter, on the level of diction at least. However, this reliance and its corollary, the thematic influence, is rather frail, since it is contingent upon a supplement, *μή μοι θά[νατον προφέρων χρυσέντα-| τα δεδίσχ[ε] ἄγάνορα θυμόν (χρυσέντα, W. Barrett)*.

The technical report of *Suda* that Phrynichus *πρῶτος γυναικεῖον πρόσωπον εἰσήγαγεν ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ*, could be seen as an allusion to the role of women in his tragedies⁷⁸. Female choruses are linked with the name of Phrynichus. Such a recognition and exploitation of female passion for the creation of a tragic climate, in combination with Phrynichus' possible sojourn in Sicily, could take us even closer to Stesichorus whose preoccupation with female ethnography is conspicuous.

This aspect of our poet, so perceptively pointed out by Croiset, has been confirmed by the new papyrus discoveries. A rich cast of female characters emerges from Stesichorus' mutilated poetry: passionate and dangerous wives and mothers, such as Clytaemnestra (*PMG* 219) and Eriphyle (*S* 148), feature in his poetry and stand in contrast to the newly discovered mothers, such as Iocaste (*PMGF* 222[b]) and Callirhoe (*S* 12, 13), who, driven by anxious love, desperately endeavour to save their children and their home or / and city. This image has been nicely transferred to the person of Helen (*Nostoi*, *PMG* 209 col. i and *S* 104), whose unconditional absolution is witnessed in the *Palinode(s)* (*PMG* 192, 193). The predilection of our poet for domineering female figures is unmistakable. This is no proof, of course, that he has sung of an Althaea employing the firebrand.

mation «eine nicht kontrollierbare Nachricht».

77. Hes. *Op.* 153, *χρυσεῖν Ἀΐδαο* and *Orph.* fr. 222, *Τάρταρος χρυσεῖς* involve the personified Death and the nether world.

78. See A. Lesky, *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen*, 3 aufl., Göttingen 1972, p. 62, Phrynichus has «die weiblichen Masken und den Tetrameter eingeführt. Jenes wäre möglich, da für Phrynichos zuerst weibliche Titel belegt sind; vielleicht ist aber gerade das die Erklärung der Notiz»; cf. Pickard - Cambridge, p. 64, «he first introduced a female character - a statement which we cannot check».

Our assumptions would gain force, however, if we singled out one significant component: the element of *action*. The Stesichorean heroines undeniably play protagonistic roles marked by the exhibition of a pronounced *action*, whether utterly malignant or benevolent⁷⁹. They always *do* something drastic, either to destroy or rectify and amend. They always come forward with ruinous or salutary plans and actions. This pattern would be broken in the case of a *cursing* Althaea: the immediate reciprocity between a person who does and a person who is done to is violated with the introduction of the divine intermediary and the personal tragic dilemmas and decisions are attenuated. The curse entails a figure of limited options who is aware of her limitations; a figure who has lost control of the situation and has only one outlet: to look in despair for divine allies and delegate the action to them. This would be odd in the Stesichorus we know, even as imperfectly as we do: the curse obviously constitutes an «Abschwächung», as Bethe has correctly remarked⁸⁰. A passive and helpless Althaea who divests herself of authority and curses her son much like the Homeric Epicaste (*Od.* 11. 279f.), but unlike the Stesichorean Iocaste of the P. Lille poem (cf. *PMGF* 222 [b]. 222, φίλου ... [πατρός] who even assumes the prophetic authority in order to add weight and force to her salutary proposals (v. 219, προφαίνω), would stand out awkwardly in the parade of Stesichorean energetic female figures. This observation may not constitute a proof, but if coupled with the evidence of the overwhelming importance of fire in the cult of Artemis Laphria of Aetolia/Calydon⁸¹, it may be a strong suggestion in favour of the firebrand motif, since this would not only incorporate in itself the Aetolian religious situation, but it would also align Althaea with the rest of the Stesichorean heroines. A story of tragic tensions and traumatic dilemmas and decisions would thus unfold in front of us, justifying the popularity of Stesichorus among the Attic tragedians.

If the above-ventured reconstruction of the treatment of the Meleager

79. An «inbetween» situation is exemplified in the person of Helen who constitutes in herself a hybrid case in that the intended rehabilitation of her requires that certain things be *done* to her or for her by the gods who are overtly in charge of the situation. Their supremacy and manipulation of human affairs is reflected in the εἶδωλον motif. Inactivity and passivity is forced upon the once δῖγamos, τρίγamos and λιπεσάνωρ Helen (Stes. *PMG* 223) before she reaches the stage of ultimate bliss: deification.

80. Bethe, p. 7.

81. See Burkert, *Greek Religion*, pp. 61-63 and F. Graf, *Nordionische Kulte*, Roma 1985, pp. 410-17 quoted by Bremer, «La plasticité du mythe», p. 46 n. 26. Before the discovery of our poem Bremer also brought up the name of Stesichorus as a plausible candidate for the use of the firebrand motif (ib., pp. 46f.).

myth rests on fairly solid ground, we are now better placed to appreciate the Stesichorean professionalism and poetics. Stesichorus' poetry should be evaluated in its historical context, that is, in the light of contemporary Sicilian and Italian socio-religious reality, as I have argued elsewhere⁸², and in view of its function. The poetry reveals that its creator was as well-versed in the Homeric pan-Hellenic mythological tradition as in the local, epichoric folk stories or mythological variants⁸³. His command of this wide range of sources allows us to draw certain inferences about his clientele and work practices, although there is no trace whatsoever in his poetry of the sort of the Pindaric φιλοκερδής and ἐργάτις Μοῦσα (*Isth.* 2. 6). The rich gamut of mythological versions contained in his professional φαρέτρα, apart from reflecting his own poetic identity, seems to have been tailored to meet the traditions and sensibilities of the people he composes his δαμώματα for (*PMG* 212), whether these are the colonial Greeks of Sicily and Magna Graecia or those of the mainland⁸⁴. The very choice of his mythological material intimates his keenness and professional virtues. This professional versatility would seem to be that of a travelling poet commissioned by various cities or communities to compose poems meant to be performed on public religious or other occasions⁸⁵, given that the motivation of the choral lyric is to be found «in the rhythm of human life (initiation, marriage, death), and in the religious calendar of a given community»⁸⁶.

University of Thessaloniki

E. TSITSIBAKOU-VASALOS

82. *Stesichorus and his Poetry*, Diss. University of Chicago 1985, pp. 60-71, 258-66.

83. See Arrighetti, pp. 9-30, esp. 16, 26, 30: the Stesichorean poetry was connected with the culture and traditions of Magna Graecia and Sicily but also had a pan-Hellenic value. His «destinatario» was not only local but pan-Hellenic as well, since the poet strove for an audience as wide as possible. See also Vallet, pp. 263f.: «le fond de l'oeuvre de Stésichore est donc pan-hellénique».

84. Cf. W. Burkert, «The Making of Homer in the Sixth Century B.C.: Rhapsodes versus Stesichoros», in *Papers on the Amasis Painter and his World*, Malibu, California 1987, pp. 51f.: the absence of «overt reference to a specific place, person, or audience», suggests that «these compositions could be performed everywhere in the Greek world without change ... It is a Pan-hellenic fantasy world of heroic myth» propagated by travelling professionals and by choruses of professionals. On the professionalism of the choruses see the objections of G. Nagy, «Transformations of Choral Lyric Traditions in the Context of Athenian State Theater», *Arion* 3rd Series 3. 1 (1994-95) 46f.

85. See Vallet, pp. 305-08; Delatte, *supra* n. 72; L. E. Rossi, «Feste religiose e letteratura: Stesicoro o dell' epica alternativa», *Orpheus* 4 (1983) 5-31; A. Burnett-Pippin, «Iocasta in the West: the Lille Stesichorus», *ClAnt* 7 (1988) 23-29.

86. J. M. Bremer, «Pindar's Paradoxical ἐγώ and a recent Controversy about the Performance of his Epinicia», in *The Poet's «I» in Archaic Lyric*, ed. by S. Slings, Amsterdam 1990, p. 42.