STESICHORUS

THE POEMS

EDITED WITH INTRODUCTION,
TRANSLATION,
AND COMMENTARY

BY

M. DAVIES

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

AND

P. J. FINGLASS

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

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

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

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

First published 2014

Printed in the United Kingdom by Clays, St Ives plc

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

ISBN 978-1-107-07834-5 Hardback

ἄνδρε.[⏑—⏑⏑—
πο̣μπ.[—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—].δ' ἵκοντο Ἰσθμὸν
ποντιο.[—⏑⏑—
κραι..[⏑—⏑—⏑].υχαις

αὐτὰ̣[ρ ⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏓] ἄστεα καλὰ Κορίνθου 15th ant.
ῥίμφα δ' [ἐϋκτιμένας] Κλεωνὰς ἤνθον

ΙΛΙΟΥ ΠΕΡΣΙΣ

98 (203) Dio Chrys. *Or.* 2.33 (1 29.12–15 de Budé)

Στησιχόρου δὲ καὶ Πινδάρου ἐπεμνήσθη, τοῦ μὲν ὅτι μιμητὴς Ὁμήρου γενέσθαι δοκεῖ καὶ τὴν ἄλωσιν οὐκ ἀναξίως ἐποίησε τῆς Τροίας.

99 (S133(*b*)) P.Oxy. 2803 fr. 1 in tergo

Στη[σιχόρου
Ἴππ[οc

100 (S89 + S90 + 200) P.Oxy. 2619 frr. 15(*b*) + 30 + 31 (coniunxit Barrett) + fr. 15(*a*) (Pardini) + Athen. 10.457a (Führer)

⊗ —⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑— str. 1–ep. 5
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—
x—⏓—⏑⏑—x—⏑—x
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—
]δ̣ρ[
θε̣ά, τὺ [⏑]δο[⏑⏑—x—⏑—
παρθέν[ε] χρυc[⏑⏑—x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑] ἰ–
μείρει [δ'] ἀ̣είδ̣ε̣[ιν.
<————————>
νῦν δ' ἄγ̣ε̣ μ̣οι λ̣<έγ>ε πῶc παρ[ὰ καλλιρόου(c) ant.

298 c̣[Parsons 300 πόντιο̣ν [ἀμφίαλον Parsons: ποντίο̣υ [Ἐννοcίδα West 302 West 303 Barrett, West
99 1 Lobel 2 West, post quod Τρωϊκός Haslam
100 7 Kazansky 8 Führer ἀ̣είδ̣ε̣[ν West 9 ἄγ̣ε̣ Kazansky post West λ̣<έγ>ε Führer παρ[ὰ West καλλιρόου(c) Barrett

δ̣ίνα̣[ϲ] Σιμόεν̣τοϲ ἀνὴρ
θ]εᾶϲ ἰ̣[ό]τατι δαεὶϲ ϲεμν[ᾶϲ Ἀθάναϲ
μ̣έ̣τ[ρα] τε καὶ ϲοφίαν του[—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—
×—⏑]οϲ ἀντὶ μ̣ά̣χα[ϲ
καὶ] φυ[λόπ]ιδοϲ κλέο̣ϲ̣.[×—⏑—
εὐρυ]χόρ[ο]υ Τροΐαϲ ἁλώϲι[μον ἆμαρ ⏑—
×—]ν ἔθηκεν
<————————>
(×)—⏑⏑].εϲϲι πό̣.(.)ο̣.[×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—× ep.
ὤικτιρε γὰ]ρ αὐτὸ⌊ν⌋ ὕ⌊δωρ ἀεὶ φορέοντα Διὸϲ
κούρα βαϲιλ]ε̣⌊ῦϲι⌋ν̣ α[⏑—×
].ων[
]. χθον[

Athen. 10.456f–457a (II 493.2–8 Kaibel)

ἀνακομίζοντοϲ δ' αὐτοῖϲ [*sc.* τοῖϲ χοροῖϲ τοῦ Σιμωνίδου] τὸ ὕδωρ ὄνου, ὃν ἐκάλουν Ἐπειὸν διὰ τὸ μυθολογεῖϲθαι τοῦτο δρᾶν ἐκεῖνον καὶ ἀναγεγράφθαι ἐν τῶι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνοϲ ἱερῶι τὸν Τρωικὸν μῦθον, ἐν ὧι ὁ Ἐπειὸϲ ὑδροφορεῖ τοῖϲ Ἀτρείδαιϲ, ὡϲ καὶ Στηϲίχορόϲ φηϲιν [sequuntur versus xviii–xix supra].

101 (S133(*a*)) P.Oxy. 2803 fr. 1 coll. i–ii

]ε̣υ̣ι̣
]
]
]
]α
]ατα[ ]καϲ
]
]
]
]

10 West: –[ι Barrett 11–15 Barrett 15 Τροΐαϲ Page post West: τρωαϲ Π[8] 17 πό̣ν̣ο̣ι̣ vel πο̣λ̣ι̣ο̣ι̣ Lobel 18 ὤικτιρε Page: ὤικτειρε cod. Athenaei 19 ἀ[γαυοῖϲ Barrett

101 3 Σ Θ]έ(ων) π 4 Σ] καὶ Θέ(ων) π̣ροϲώιχετο Ἀρ(ιϲτο)νί(κοϲ) 6–7 Καϲ|[ϲάνδρα Barrett

]
]
]

desunt versus aliquot

[
'15' [
[
[
[
[
'20' [
[
[
[
.[
'25' ε[
[
]..[

102a (199) Athen. 13.610c (III 346.14–19 Kaibel)

καὶ ἐὰν μέν τίς σου πύθηται τίνες ἦσαν οἱ εἰς τὸν δούρειον ἵππον ἐγκατακλεισθέντες, ἑνὸς καὶ δευτέρου ἴσως ἐρεῖς ὄνομα· καὶ οὐδὲ ταῦτ' ἐκ τῶν Στησιχόρου, σχολῇ γάρ, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς Σακάδα τοῦ Ἀργείου Ἰλίου Πέρσιδος· οὗτος γὰρ παμπόλλους τινὰς κατέλεξεν.

102b (199) Eust. *Od.* 1698.2 (I 432.41–2 Stallbaum)

φασὶ δὲ τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν (*sc.* τὸν δούρειον ἵππον) καταβάντας τινὲς μέν, ὧν καὶ Στησίχορος, ἑκατὸν εἶναι, ἕτεροι δὲ δώδεκα.

103 (S88) P.Oxy. 2619 frr. 1(*a*) + 1(*b*) + 47 (coniunxerunt Lobel et Barrett)

]̣γ̣α̣λ̣α̣ς̣α̣γα̣.[ ] ant. 4–str. 8
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]

22 $\overline{\text{A}}$ 25, 26 antisigmata
102a Σακάδα τοῦ Casaubon: σακατου codd.: Ἀγία τοῦ Hermann

x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x—]ακον
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x—⏑⏑—]τε.ομως
x—⏑—— —]
<———————>
(x)—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x—]ντι βίαι τε καὶ αἰχμᾶι ep.
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—] πεποιθότες· ἀλλ᾽ ἄγε δὴ
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x]
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x—]ο̣νες ἀγκυλοτόξοι
—⏒—⏑⏑—x]
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x—].c διάσταν
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]
x—⏑—x—⏑—x—]ρ̣απαcιν
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]η̣cων
x—⏑⏑—⏑] Ἀχαιῶν
<==========>
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—] τ̣έλος εὐρύο̣[πα str.
x—⏑⏑—⏑]υναις
x—⏒—⏑⏑— π(τ)]ολέμου [τε]λ̣ευτά̣[ ]
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x—]ε̣ν πυκιν̣[άς] τ̣ε̣ φρ̣[έ]ν̣α̣ς
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—] ῥηξάνορα̣
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑— ὥτρ]υνε μέγαν φρ[α]cὶν̣ ἐν
x—⏑—— —]
<———————>
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]π̣ρεπε καὶ π̣ι̣ν̣[υ]τᾶι ant.
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]
x—⏒—⏑⏑—x—⏑]ε̣ργον
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x—⏑⏑].οπτολ̣[⏑—
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x—⏑—]
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑]νο
x—⏑—— —].[

103 4 δ̣ Page 16–17 εὐρύο̣[πα | Ζεὺc Page 18 Lobel 19 Lobel 21 ῥηξάνορα̣ Lobel: ῥηξή– Π^8 22 ὥτρ]υνε Page: φρ[α]cὶν̣ Barrett post Lobel 24 Lobel: μετέ]πρεπε idem 27 N]ε̣οπτόλ̣[εμ– Finglass

<———————>

ṭονδ[..].δα̣.υν λ.[·].μ.ε.[ep.
πρὸς ναὸν ἐ̣ς ἀκρ[όπο]λ̣[ι]ν̣ ς̣πεύδοντες̣ [⏑—⏑⏑—
Τρῶες πολέες̣ τ᾽ ἐπίκ̣[ου]ρ̣οι
ἔ̣λ̣θ̣ετε μη̣[δ]ὲ λόγο[ιc π]ε̣ι̣θώμεθ᾽ ὅπως π̣[⏑⏑—x
τονδεκα.[...]ο̣νι.[ ]..
ἀ̣γ̣ν̣ὸν ἄ[γαλ]μα [⏑—].. αὐτεῖ καταὶ–
cχ]ύ̣νωμε̣[ν ἀ]ε̣ι̣κ[ελί]ω̣c
x]νιν δὲ̣ [—x—⏑]. ἀ̣ζώμεc̣θ᾽ ἀ̣ν̣ά̣ς̣[cac
x].η̣coν̣[⏑—⏑⏑—≏—]ρ
.].[.]..[ ]..α̣[ ].

<═══════>

ὣc] φ̣ά̣[τ]ο· τοὶ [δ(ὲ) ⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—].[str.
φ[ρ]ά̣ζ̣ο̣ντο .[⏑—⏑⏑—
ἴ̣π̣[π]ο̣ν με.[⏑—⏑⏑—x—⏑—x].[
ω̣.[.].. φ̣υ̣λλο̣φ[ορ—x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—
πυκινα̣[ῖ]ς̣ πτερ[ύγεccι ⏑—
κίρκον τανυcίπ[τερον —x—⏑—
—].ec ἀνεκράγο̣ν̣ [—x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—
].τε.[

<———————>

104 (S102) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 13

—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—].δ̣᾽ ἐπώμο̣ce ς̣εμ[ν⏑⏑—x ep. 4–str. 4
—≏—⏑⏑—x]
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x]ε̣ς̣θ̣᾽, ἐγὼν δ᾽ αυ
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]
x—⏑—x—⏑—x—]γο̣ν̣ εἶμειν
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—≏—]..
x—⏑⏑—]...εcαγυ

<═══════>

33 West: [ἐπεccυμένως Barrett 34 Lobel 35 West ὅπως West: οππως Π^8 36 δεκατ[ήϊ]ο̣ν West ἴ̣π̣[π]ο̣ν̣ Barrett 37 Barrett θε]ᾶ̣ς̣ West 38 cχ] West, cett. Barrett 39 Barrett: μᾶ]νιν West 42–4 Barrett 44 μεν̣[Führer 45–7 Lobel
104 1 Παλλ]ά̣δ᾽ . . . ς̣εμν[ὰν Barrett 7 μεcαγύ West

—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—] φάος ἀελίου [str.
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]
x—≚—⏑⏑—x]ᾳ. [κ]ατ᾽ αἶϛαν [
].[ ]...εψ[

105 (205) *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina* (Rome, Capitoline Museum, Sala delle Colombe inv. 316)

106 (201) Σ Eur. *Or.* 1287 (I 214.6–9 Schwartz)

ἆρα εἰϲ τὸ τῆϲ Ἑλένηϲ κάλλοϲ βλέψαντεϲ οὐκ ἐχρήϲαντο τοῖϲ ξίφεϲιν; οἷόν τι καὶ Στηϲίχοροϲ ὑπογράφει περὶ τῶν καταλεύειν αὐτὴν μελλόντων. φηϲὶ γὰρ ἅμα τῶι τὴν ὄψιν αὐτῆϲ ἰδεῖν αὐτοὺϲ ἀφεῖναι τοὺϲ λίθουϲ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

107 (202) Σ Eur. *Andr.* 10 (II 249.7–11 Schwartz)

<οἱ δέ> φαϲιν ὅτι <οὐκ ἔμελλεν> ὁ Εὐριπίδηϲ Ξάνθωι προϲέχειν περὶ τῶν Τρωϊκῶν μύθων (*FGrHist* 765 F 21), τοῖϲ δὲ χρηϲιμωτέροιϲ καὶ ἀξιοπιϲτοτέροιϲ· Στηϲίχορον μὲν γὰρ ἱϲτορεῖν ὅτι τεθνήκοι (*sc.* ὁ Ἀϲτυάναξ) καὶ τὸν τὴν Πέρϲιδα ϲυντεταχότα κυκλικὸν ποιητὴν ὅτι καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχουϲ ῥιφθείη (fr. 3 *GEF*)· ὧι ἠκολουθηκέναι Εὐριπίδην.

108a (224) Σ Lyc. *Alex.* 265a (p. 54.3–5 Leone)

Στηϲίχοροϲ δὲ καὶ Εὐφορίων (fr. 80 Lightfoot) τὸν Ἕκτορά φαϲιν εἶναι υἱὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνοϲ καὶ Ἀλέξανδροϲ ὁ Αἰτωλῶν ποιητήϲ (fr. 12 Magnelli).

108b (224) Σ^{T} Hom. *Il.* 24.258–9b (V 568.95–2 Erbse)

Στηϲίχοροϲ Ἀπόλλωνοϲ αὐτόν (*sc.* Ἕκτορα) φηϲιν, οὐ νοήϲαϲ τὴν ὑπερβολήν.

109 (198) Paus. 10.27.2 (III 153.18–19 Rocha-Pereira)

ἐϲ δὲ Ἑκάβην Στηϲίχοροϲ ἐν Ἰλίου Πέρϲιδι ἐποίηϲεν ἐϲ Λυκίαν ὑπὸ Ἀπόλλωνοϲ αὐτὴν κομιϲθῆναι.

10 Lobel ρ[Lobel, unde γ]ᾴῤ West
107 suppl. West

110 (197) Paus. 10.26.1 (III 150.9–20 Rocha-Pereira)

τῶν δὲ γυναικῶν τῶν μεταξὺ τῆς τε Αἴθρας καὶ Νέστορός εἰσιν ἄνωθεν τούτων αἰχμάλωτοι καὶ αὗται Κλυμένη τε καὶ Κρέουσα καὶ Ἀριστομάχη καὶ Ξενοδίκη. Κλυμένην μὲν οὖν Στησίχορος ἐν Ἰλίου Πέρσιδι κατηρίθμηκεν ἐν ταῖς αἰχμαλώτοις· ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ Ἀριστομάχην ἐποίησεν ἐν Νόστοις (fr. 169) θυγατέρα μὲν Πριάμου, Κριτολάου δὲ γυναῖκα εἶναι τοῦ Ἱκετάονος· Ξενοδίκης δὲ μνημονεύσαντα οὐκ οἶδα οὔτε ποιητὴν οὔτε ὅσοι λόγων συνθέται. ἐπὶ δὲ τῇι Κρεούσηι λέγουσιν ὡς ἡ θεῶν μήτηρ καὶ Ἀφροδίτη δουλείας ἀπὸ Ἑλλήνων αὐτὴν ἐρρύσαντο· εἶναι γὰρ δὴ καὶ Αἰνείου τὴν Κρέουσαν γυναῖκα· Λέσχεως (fr. 19 *GEF*) δὲ καὶ ἔπη τὰ Κύπρια (fr. 28 *GEF*) διδόασιν Εὐρυδίκην γυναῖκα Αἰνείαι.

111 (204) Paus. 10.26.9 (III 152.22–7 Rocha-Pereira)

ἐφεξῆς δὲ τῇι Λαοδίκηι ὑποστάτης τε λίθου καὶ λουτήριόν ἐστιν ἐπὶ τῶι ὑποστάτηι χαλκοῦν· Μέδουσα δὲ κατέχουσα ταῖς χερσὶν ἀμφοτέραις τὸ ὑποστάτην ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐδάφους κάθηται· ἐν δὲ ταῖς Πριάμου θυγατράσιν ἀριθμήσαι τις ἂν καὶ ταύτην κατὰ τοῦ Ἱμεραίου τὴν ὠιδήν.

112 (S103) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 14

—⏑⏑]οντ̣αραις̣[× ep. 5–str. 5
—⏑]ι̣ τον̣ε̣ λόχο̣.[×—⏑—×
—].ενα κυδα̣λ̣έο[
×]υν τ' ἔχοντ̣..[×—⏑—×—⏑—×
ξ]α̣νθὰ δ' Ἑλένα̣ Π̣ρ[ιάμοιο νυὸς
βα]σιλῆος ἀοιδιμ̣...[⏑——
<═══════>
.]α̣ι̣ δ' ἐκελεύσετ....[⏑——⏑⏑—⏑⏑— str.
δ]α̣ΐ̈ωι πυρὶ καιομ̣ε̣ν̣[—
×—]πρήσαντας̣ ε̣[—×—⏑—×
]...αμεν̣[—⏑⏑—×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—
×—].απο.[—⏑⏑—

112 1 τα̣ Page: τι̣ Lobel 2 να̣ Lobel: νδ̣ Page 5 ξ] et [ιάμ– Lobel –οιο Führer νυὸς Schade 6 Lobel ἀοίδιμος̣ West 8 Lobel ϊω 9 ἐμ]πρ– West

113 (S104) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 16

—⏑⏑—⏑⏑] αἶψα [—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x ep. 4–ant. 7
—≏—⏑ ἐ]ναργές
—⏑⏑—]. ἐτύμως αιθ.[—⏑—x
—⏑⏑ ἁ]μιόνους
x—⏑]υραν πρωπε̣[—x—⏑—x
x—⏑⏑ κ]υπρογενὴς α[(⏑)—
x—] ἁλιπόρφυρον ἁγν[—
<═══════>
—⏑⏑]αιμεν ἐγὼν λέγω [—⏑⏑— str.
x—⏑].ι ἀθανάτοι
x—⏑]λον Ἑρμιόναν τ.[—⏑—x
—⏑⏑].ων ποθέω νύκτ̣[—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—
x—⏑⏑—].λοπόδαν
x—⏑]ν ὑφαρπάγιμον [—x—⏑—
—⏑⏑—].ρομέναν κνακα[⏑⏑—⏑⏑—
x—⏑—]τα
<———————>
—⏑⏑— κ]ορυφαῖσι νάπαις[(ι) τε ant.
x—⏑⏑]ων στυγερὸν
x—⏑]δα παίδα φίλον .[x—⏑—x
—⏑⏑—].ọ λέγω μηδ[—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—
x—⏑⏑]ω̣..ρο..πω[[ι]][
x—⏑⏑]οντο γένοιτ̣'.[x—⏑—
].[

114 (S105 + S143) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 18 + P.Oxy. 2803 fr. 11 (coniunxerunt West et Führer)

<———————>
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]τ' ἐπικουρ[⏑⏑— ant. 1–ep. 10
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑].δαρ

113 2 Lobel 4 West post Lobel 5 πρωπέ[ρυσιν vel πρὼ<ι>πε[Lobel 6 Lobel 11 ἐ]γὼν Page νύκτ̣[ας τε καὶ ἄματ(α) Führer 12 ἀ]ε̣λ<λ>οπόδαν Page: αἴ]γλοπόδαν Diggle 16 κ] Lobel ἀκροτάταις] Diggle [(ι) τε Daly 20 προλ̣ίπω Page
114 1 ἐπίκουρ[οι Lobel 2–3 Δαρ|[δαν(ι)– Lobel

x—⏑⏑—∪∪—x—]λ̣ιποῖca[
—∪∪—∪∪—x—⏑∪∪—]ματακα[
x—∪∪—∪∪—]
x—∪∪—∪∪— γαι]ᾳ̣όχου
—∪∪—∪∪—]πίτνη πυ.̣[∪—∪∪—
x—∪—·—]
<———————>
(x)—∪∪— Δα]ναοὶ μεμ[αότ]ᾳ̣c ἐκθόρον ἴ[π]τ̣̣[ου ep.
x—∪∪ Ἐ]γ̣νοcίδας γαιάοχος ἄγνός ε[—
x—∪∪—]αρ Ἀπόλλων
—∪∪—∪]αραν οὐδ' Ἄρταμις οὐδ' Ἀφροδίτα [
—⏑⏑—∪∪—x]
—∪∪—∪∪—] Τ̣ρ̣ῳ̣ῶν π[ό]λιν Ζεὺc
—∪∪—∪]ατων
x—∪—]ου Τρῶας .̣[x—∪—].̣μουc
x—∪∪—]ιν.̣μερ.̣[⏑—
x—∪∪—]τοca.̣[——
<═══════>

115 (S107) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 19

ἱμερτὸν πρ[∪∪—x ep. 5–str. 2
ὧδε δέ νιν .̣[∪∪—x—∪—x
.̣ωc ἀγαπαζ̣[∪∪—
δ]υcώνυμοc̣ [x—∪—x—∪—x
x]ᾳ̣δε τεκ[—∪∪—⏑—
x].̣χοιc.̣[∪∪—∪∪——
<═══════>
ὣc φά]τ̣ο· τὰν [δ(ὲ) ∪—∪∪—∪∪— str.
]..[

6 West 9 Δα]ναοὶ Lobel: μεμ[αότ]ᾳ̣c West et Führer: ἴ[π]τ̣̣[ου West 10 Lobel 11 οὐδ'] ἄρ' West: γ]ὰρ Barrett 12 ἰ]αρὰν West 14 [ό] West 17 ἄ̣μερc̣[Barrett
115 2 τ̣[οτέφα Führer 3 τ̣ωc Barrett 4 Lobel 5 τίc] ὧδε Finglass 7 Barrett

116 (S115 + S116) P.Oxy. 2619 frr. 27 + 28 (coniunxit Barrett)

x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]ώcαc πόλ[ι]ν ant. 6–ep. 5
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x— τ]έκος Αἰακιδαν
x—⏑——]
<————————>
]..[ ] περὶ ἄcτυ ..[⏑—x cp.
].αι.[.]c κατὰ φυ[
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑]εντα[ ]
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑— Σκ]αμάνδριον α[⏑⏑—x
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x]

117 (S118) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 32

x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—].εφω[⏑— str. 6–ant. 7
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x ο]ὐδὲ ῥέᾳ [⏑⏑—
x—⏑——]
<————————>
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑]μωι βαρέα .[ant.
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑— Τ]ροΐας κλεεννὸ[ν
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑ (ἐκ)πέ]ρcαντες ἐϋκτιμέ[ν—
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑ ἀ]νθρώπους κλέο[c
]να.[

118 (S135 + S136) P.Oxy. 2803 frr. 3 + 4 (coniunxit Lobel)

x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x—⏑⏑]῾.λκυ[⏑— ep. 2–str. 5
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x]
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x—] θαλέας παρ[⏑—x
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x]
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x]ραν πολυξε[

116 1 Lobel ἀϊcτ]ώcαc Führer 2 Lobel: –ίδαν vel –ιδᾶν idem 6 Σιμό]εντα Diggle 7 Lobel ἀ[νθεμοέντα Führer: ἀ[κτάν Diggle
117 2 Finglass 6 West –οῖ– Page: –ωι– Π^8 7 Lobel 9 Lobel ἐπ᾽] vel κατ᾽] Finglass
118 3 ἄc 5 ᾶν Πολυξέ[ν– Lobel: πολυξε[ν|ώτατ– Finglass

—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]
×—⏑—×—⏑—]̣τοτεχ̣ε̣[⏑—×
×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑̲⏑̲]̣νᾶρ
×—⏑⏑—⏑ δ]ρακοῖca
<═══════>
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑́]χεν α[ῖ]c ἀλόχ[οιc str.
×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]
×—⏑̲⏑̲—⏑⏑—]κ[..]οιcι ν[—×
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×] αἵcι̣.[⏑—⏑⏑—
×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]
desunt versus aliquot
'15'] [
] [
] [
] .[
] [

119 (S137) P.Oxy. 2803 fr. 5

].[str. 1–ant. 4
] [
×—⏑̲⏑̲—⏑⏑— ἥ]ρ̣ωc Ἀχι̣λ̣λ̣ε̣υ̣[
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×—]δ' ἄφελεστε[⏑—
×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]
×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]ώcαc πόλιν
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×—]ε δὲ τείχεοc [—
×—⏑—⏑—]
<————————>
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑]ν̣αc θραcυν[— ant.
×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]
×—⏑̲⏑̲—⏑⏑—×]̣. θαυμα[—×
]ναν̣.[
] [] [ant. 5?

8 ἄρ ἀρ|[ξε Lobel 9 Lobel οἴcᾰ 10 Lobel α[.]cᾰλόχ 12 οιcι,ν 13 αἵcι '16' Σ Θέ(ων) π['19' Σ] καὶ Θέ(ων)
119 3 Lobel 4 ἄφ 6 ᾱc ἀϊcτ]ώcαc nos 7 τέι 8 Σ μελαθ[ρ– 12 νᾰ̃ν

120 (S91) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 2

]α..[str. 7–ep. 6
x—∪——]
<————————>
—∪∪—∪∪—] μέγα χωcαμ[εν— ant.
x—∪∪—∪∪]ᾳι
x—⏑—∪∪—]μᾳ τουτ[∪—x
]εν̣.[
x—∪∪—∪∪—]
]μοιμε.[
—∪∪—∪∪—]ν μεγαλ[—∪∪—∪∪—
x—∪——]
<————————>
] Πριᾳμ[ep.
]ε.π̣ε.[.].[
]κα [
]..αντες α[
—⏑—∪∪—x]
]θιμ[

121 (S113) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 25

x—⏑—∪∪—x—∪—]χᾳc̣ [str./ant. 3–8
—∪∪—∪∪—x—∪∪ πον]τ̣οπόρου̣[
x—∪∪—∪∪—]
x—∪∪—∪∪—x—∪—]
—∪∪—∪∪—x—∪∪] κ̣ῦ̣μα πολυ̣[
x—∪——]

122 (S138) P.Oxy. 2803 fr. 6

]κα[ep. 3– str. 1
]c.[].[
—⏑—∪∪].ς.ν τριc

120 3 Lobel 14]ῳc̣αντες ἄ[cτυ Führer 16 ἰφ]θιμ[– Führer
121 2 Lobel 5 πολυ̣[φλοίcβου θαλάccαc Barrett

—⏑⏑—⏑⏑]ῳ̣ς ἔβαν ὁπλ̣[—×
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]·
]̣.ν ἀριςτ̣[
]..δα [
]̣.[ ]...[
<═══════>
]̣.[str.

123 (S101) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 12

×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×—⏑—]c str. 6–ant. 7
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×—⏑]̣.α̣.(.)θ̣ειναι
×—⏑——]
<———————>
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]αθεcαι ant.
×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]
×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×—⏑]ηραι
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×—⏑⏑—⏑]̣.λεται
×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]
×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×—⏑—]
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑]αι

124 (S97) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 8

]ῥ̣ωγ̣[str. 6–ant. 6
]̣.αν̣.[
×—⏑——]
<———————>
]̣.με[ant.
×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]
]γ̣ι̣αιcιγ̣[
]κ̣α̣.[ ]φ̣.[
×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]
]̣.[

122 4 ἔβᾰν 5 Σ inter lineas]̣.οιc̣.ec (ἐcτιν) ωγ̣ |̣.ππ̣[ ]..c̣.[8 Σ?
123 4 κ]αθέcαι Barrett

125 (S100) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 11

]με.[ant. 7–ep. 6
x—⏑——]
<————————>
].εφ.[ep.
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—]c μίμν̣.[—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—
x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑]ρειαν[
]ν̣κελες[
—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x].
]...[

126 (S111) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 23

λ̣α[ ]...[str. 7–ant. 4 vel ant. 7–ep. 4
πέρcαντες η[
————————
καλλαδαπα[
αὐτοὶ καταᾳ̣[
..]ᾳ̣ωναγε.[
].[]εδ̣[

127 (S94) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 5

] ᾳ̣γορᾳ̣[str. 7–ant. 5 vel ep. 6–str. 2
]ων [
]μενο[
]εντες̣ ο.[
]αγερθη[
]ᾳ̣ λόγον [
]αcταc̣[

128 (S109) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 21

] ᾳ̣θανᾳ̣[ep. 2–6 vel str. 7–ant. 3
] [

126 3 κάλλα Lobel: κᾰ̈λλα Page
127 4 supra εν, Σ α· ὁμ[ῶc Führer 7 ἀν]αcτὰc̣ West

] τ̣εδὰ Μυρμιδ[όν–
] [·
]..α [

129 (S92) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 3

]...δ̣α̣[
ἀ]ργαλεα[
κ]ο̣ύφως[
]μαδ[
].περ.[
]..υς[

130 (S114) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 26

]αυ̣ς [
] [ ] [
].μενος θεα. [
βλο]cυροῖς ὑ̣π̣[
] [

131 (S123) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 37

]καν· [
]ας ἄλλοις[
]οκριτο̣υ̣[
] ἑκάστωι νυ̣[
].ς̣[.].αι..[

132 (S139) P.Oxy. 2803 fr. 7

]...[ ]
]ώμενος

128 3 Lobel
129 2–3 Lobel
130 4 Lobel
131 5 πέ]ρ̣ς̣[ε]τ̣αι Barrett
132 1 Σ οτε 2 ώμ

]ọυδέ. ̓ότο
]
] ἐπαccύτεροι
]
]ạị δ[ ]ẹ χάρ̣ιν
]

133 (S99) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 10

]. κ̣α. [
]..ανωι φ[
]   [
]ν Ἀχαιοị [
]   [
] [

134 (S106) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 17

] [
]πολεμ[
]τεμ[
]τεπο. [
]. αμε. [
]. ρον[
]. ιπ[

135 (S108) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 20

] κ̣λυτạ[
]. δαμε[
θέ]μ̣εθλα[
] ἄ̣νδρε[c
]. ναβ[
]ακ[

3 δέ ότο 3–4 το|ξοτ– Lobel 4 Σ inter lineas ͻοβριμ[| ͻτοξοτ. [ ]..
5 επᾰ 7 χά
133 4 –οι̇ vel –οῑ| [cι(ν) Page
135 3 Lobel 4 Finglass: nol. Lobel

136 (S112) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 24

]..[].[
]ηθηθα.[
]ρ̣οc πολυ[
]ε̣cca[
].[

137 (196) Harpocr. *Lex.* I 165.18–166.2 Dindorf

καθελών· Δημοcθένηc ἐν τῶι κατ' Ἀριcτοκράτουc (23.53) φηcὶν "ἢ ἐν ὁδῶι καθελών" ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνελὼν ἢ ἀποκτείναc. ἐχρήcαντο δὲ οὕτω τῶι ὀνόματι καὶ ἄλλοι, ὡc καὶ Στηcίχοροc ἐν Ἰλίου Περcίδι καὶ Σοφοκλῆc ἐν Εὐμήλωι (fr. 205 *TrGF*).

138 (S98) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 9

].εμ[
]..   [
[abrasum]
]ω̣[
]ν [
]ω̣c μ.[
].ω̣ιc̣ γε..[
[abrasum]
]τυχὼν α.[
].αδα.[
].ν [

139 (S146) P.Oxy. 2803 fr. 14

]..[
].c ὁ[
]αc.[
].ρά.[
].[

137 Ἰλίου Περcίδι West post Dindorf et Bekker: ἡλίου περcίδι codd.
139 2 ὁ   4 ρά̓

140 (S125) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 39

]χ̣[
]ηκα.[
]αρης[
].ọσιφ[
].[

141 (S121) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 35

]ν..[
]εσθ[
]οι̣ [
]..[

142 (S131) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 45

]ωι[
] [
].ι [
]ρχομ̣[

143 (S119) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 33

]..α[ ].[
]ναας.[
]κερου[

144 (S127) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 41

] [ ] [
] [
] ευτροχ[
] [
].ου [
] [
].[

145 (S134) P.Oxy. 2803 fr. 2

].ọ...[
] [

] [
] [
5 ´]δ̣αν· ἅ .[
].[

146 (S126) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 40

]λυcα[
] [
] [
] [
5]..c[

147 (S110) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 22

]ι̣c. [
]ματα[
] [
]..[

148 (S145) P.Oxy. 2803 fr. 13

].[
].α[
]η[
] [

149 (S93) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 4

]θ̣α.α[
]επερ...[
] [

150 (S95) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 6

]..[].[
]ocε̣.[
].c.[

145 5 ´]δ̣ᾶν·ἅ Lobel
148 4 Σ δ̣ω

151 (S117) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 29

]̣.[
]̣.μων..[
]̣.απε[ ]....[

152 (S120) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 34

]ε̣μωι βια[
] [
]̣. νόστο̣.[

153 (S124) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 38

]χ̣οις ολ[
] [
]..ομ[

154 (S132) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 46

]ν̣δρ[
] [
]α̣πο[

155 (S141) P.Oxy. 2803 fr. 9

]δα[
] [
]τρ̣[

156 (S144) P.Oxy. 2803 fr. 12

]̣.νε[
] [
]ιυ[

157 (S147) P.Oxy. 2803 fr. 15

] [

152 1 πολ]έ̣μωι βία[ι τε Führer
153 1 ὀι

]ος[
]επ[

158 (S122) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 36

]πατ[
]αλ̣ε̣[

159 (S128) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 42

] [
]ροις ἐς δ[
]..[] [

160 (S129) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 43

]..[
]. [
]εγαν[

161 (S130) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 44

]....[
]πατ[
]..[

162 (S140) P.Oxy. 2803 fr. 8

] [
].αν· γ..[
].[

163 (S96) P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 7

].οπη[
] [

164 (S142) P.Oxy. 2803 fr. 10

] [
].. [
] [

] [
]..ν [
] [

ΚΕΡΒΕΡΟΣ

165a (206) Pollux 10.152 (II 236.1–2 Bethe)

ἀρύβαλλος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ cυcπάcτου βαλαντίου ἐν Ἀντιφάνους Αὐτοῦ ἐρῶντι (fr. 52 *PCG*) καὶ ἐν Στηcιχόρου Κερβέρωι.

165b (206) *Synag.*^{B} 2123 (p. 666 Cunningham), *Su* α 3870 (I 350.14–16 Adler)

ἀρύβαλλος· οὐ μόνον παρὰ Στηcιχόρωι καὶ ἄλλοις Δωριεῦcιν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν Ἱππεῦcιν Ἀριcτοφάνους (1094)· "εἶτα κατacπένδειν κατὰ τῆc κεφαλῆc ἀρυβάλλωι."

ΚΥΚΝΟΣ

166a (207) Σ^{BCDEQ} Pind. *O.* 10.19b (I 316.3–12 Drachmann); eadem fere sine nomine Stesichori Σ^{A} Pind. *O.* 10.21a (I 316.20–7 Drachmann)

ἐτράπη δὲ καὶ ὑπεχώρηcεν ἐν τῆι πρὸc τὸν Κύκνον μαχῆι ὁ μέγιcτοc Ἡρακλῆc, παρορμήcαντοc Ἄρεοc τὸν Κύκνον. ἐμαχέcατο δὲ Ἡρακλῆc ὅτι κακόξενοc ἦν Κύκνοc καὶ ἐν παρόδωι τῆc Θεccαλίαc οἰκῶν ἀπεκαρατόμει τοὺc παριόντας ναὸν τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι βουλόμενοc ἐκ τῶν κεφαλῶν οἰκοδομῆcαι, καὶ αὐτῶι παριόντι ἐπεβουλεῦcαι ἠθέληcε. cυcτάcηc οὖν αὐτοῖc μάχηc ἐφυγάδευcεν Ἡρακλῆc, cυμβαλλομένου Ἄρεοc τῶι παιδὶ Κύκνωι. ἀλλ' ὕcτερον Ἡρακλῆc καὶ τοῦτον ἀπέκτεινε. Στηcίχοροc ἐν τῶι ἐπιγραφομένωι Κύκνωι ἱcτορεῖ.

166b (207) Σ^{A} Pind. *O.* 10.19a (I 315.22–4 Drachmann)

Κυκνέα μάχη· ὅτι τὸν Ἄρεοc Κύκνον Ἡρακλῆc φυγὼν αὖτιc ἀνεῖλε, Στηcίχοροc ἐν τῶι ἐπιγραφομένωι Κύκνωι φηcίν.

164 4 Σ Θέ(ων). 6 Σ]ρ̣αυτικ̣[ ]̣.ε̣c̣c̣α̣.[
166a Ἀπόλλωνι] Φόβωι Dawe: Ἄρει Heyne Στηcίχοροc . . . ἱcτορεῖ] ἱcτορεῖται ταῦτα ἐν τῆι Ἡcιόδου Ἀcπίδι καὶ Στηcιχόρου τῶι ἐπιγραφομένωι Κύκνωι C

SACK OF TROY

THE TRADITION[1]

The sack of Troy is among the earliest identifiable scenes from mythology in Greek art. A fragmentary late eighth-century bronze Boeotian fibula shows the legs of a horse, with wheels attached;[2] a similar image appears on a fragmentary relief pithos from Tenos from the second quarter of the seventh century.[3] For a complete image of the horse we turn to another relief pithos, this time from Mykonos, dated to about 675.[4] The horse, depicted on the neck of the vessel, is equipped with numerous windows, through which warriors can be spied. Some of these are handing out pieces of armour through the windows, as if preparing to leave the animal; fighting is already under way outside. The rest of the pithos displays the violent scenes of that bloody night. One panel shows a man gripping a woman by the wrist and holding a drawn sword above her, another panel a man swinging a child by the foot as a woman watches.[5] The former could be Menelaus confronting Helen, the latter the death of Astyanax; neither identification is certain. From the earliest stages of the tradition, the sack is presented both as a great feat achieved by the matchless cunning employed in the horse, and as an atrocity featuring indiscriminate violence against the powerless and innocent.[6]

[1] For this topic in art and poetry see Finglass (2015b); for the artistic evidence see further Pipili (1997), Anderson (1997) 179–265, Hedreen (2001), Giuliani (2003) 77–95. Throughout this section, and indeed this book, we use *Sack of Troy* to denote Stesichorus' work, *Iliu Persis* to denote the homonymous poem from the Epic Cycle.

[2] Sadurska (1986) §22 (henceforth in this section, '§XXX' means '§XXX in Sadurska (1986)').

[3] §24.

[4] §23; see Ervin (1963), Ervin Caskey (1976) 36–7, Anderson (1997) 182–91.

[5] Numbers 7 and 17 respectively; numeration from Ervin (1963).

[6] For this dual characterisation see Zeitlin (2009) 681.

The next images of the sack appear on vases from the mid-sixth century until the mid-fifth century. Some scenes are particularly common: these include the recovery of Helen,[7] the death of Priam (usually accompanied by the killing of Astyanax),[8] Ajax's rape of Cassandra,[9] the sacrifice of Polyxena,[10] and Aethra's rescue by her grandchildren.[11] The horse is occasionally found too. An early sixth-century kotylos displays the horse with warriors inside.[12] Two vases from the mid-sixth century show an image similar to that on the Mykonos pithos.[13] One from the early fifth century portrays the construction of the horse;[14] another shows Athena apparently caressing it, marking it out as her creation.[15] In the mid-fifth century, the sack of Troy was the subject of paintings by Polygnotus in the Stoa Poikile at Athens and the Cnidian Lesche at Delphi, and of the metopes on the north side of the Athenian Parthenon.[16]

The sack was also the subject of poetry. The author of the *Iliad* conspicuously avoids depicting it, in order to make Achilles' encounter with Priam, not the destruction of Troy, the climax of the work; the poem does however anticipate the sack, which Zeus says will take place 'thanks to the counsels of Athena' (Ἀθηναίης διὰ βουλάς).[17] The *Odyssey* refers three times to the wooden horse: when Menelaus is talking to Helen and Telemachus,

[7] Anderson (1997) 202–6, Hedreen (2001) 32–63; see further fr. 106n.

[8] Miller (1995) 452–3, Anderson (1997) 192–9, Hedreen (2001) 64–8; see further fr. 107n.

[9] Anderson (1997) 199–202, Hedreen (2001) 22–32.

[10] See Bremmer (2007a) 59–65 (supplementing *LIMC* at 59 n. 26).

[11] Kron (1981) §§59–72.

[12] Corinthian kotylos from Gela, *c.* 580–570, in Ingoglia (2000).

[13] Corinthian aryballos from Caere, *c.* 560 (§17); Attic black-figure vase from Orbetello, 560–550 (§18).

[14] Red-figure cup from Vulci, *c.* 490, showing Epeius making the horse (which looks like a normal animal) as Athena watches (§1).

[15] Red-figure cup from Chiusi, 470–460 (§2). For Athena helping to build the horse cf. Hom. *Od.* 8.493, Eur. *Tro.* 560–1, Horsfall on Virg. *Aen.* 2.15.

[16] Paus. 1.15.2, 10.25–7. For these see G. Ferrari (2000); for the date of the Lesche (*c.* 475–460) see Scott (2010) 325.

[17] Hom. *Il.* 15.70–1.

when Odysseus asks the Phaeacian bard Demodocus to sing of that subject, and when in the Underworld Odysseus relates to Achilles the bravery of his son Neoptolemus within the horse.[18] Made by Epeius with the help of Athena, it contained the leaders of the Greeks, including Menelaus, Odysseus, Diomedes, and Anticlus. The Trojans dragged it to the agora on their acropolis after they saw that the Greeks had departed. Then, sitting around it, they 'voice much disordered talk' (ἄκριτα πόλλ' ἀγόρευον, 8.505), which crystallises into three opinions: to force open the horse with their weapons, to cast it down from a high point, or to welcome the 'great image' (μέγ' ἄγαλμα) as 'a means of charming the gods' (θεῶν θελκτήριον, 8.509). The last view prevails. At some point before they dispersed, Helen called out to the horse in the voices of the Greek leaders' wives; only Odysseus' resolute action prevented individual Greeks from responding to her enticements. Odyssseus' role in the enterprise was key, responsible as he was for the manning of the horse and the timing of the ambush.[19] Athena herself tells Odysseus, on another occasion, that 'Priam's city of the wide ways was captured thanks to your plan'.[20] The poem says very little about the sack itself; the only event of the grim night that it recounts is the visit of Menelaus and Odysseus to Deiphobus, presumably to kill him and recover Helen.

The Homeric poems avoided a full-scale treatment of the sack; other early epic poets showed no such reticence. The *Little Iliad* concluded with the destruction of Troy, effected by means of the horse, made by Epeius according to Athena's plan; the Trojans took down part of their wall to bring it into the city, presumably aiding the subsequent Greek assault.[21] Among the many episodes of that night and its aftermath recorded

[18] Hom. *Od.* 4.266–89, 8.492–520, 11.523–37. [19] *Ibid.* 8.494–5, 11.524–5.

[20] *Ibid.* 22.230 εἴη δ' ἥλω βουλῇι Πριάμου πόλις εὐρυάγυια.

[21] *Little Iliad* arg. 4–5 *GEF*, on which see West (2013) 205–6. Proclus' summary ends with the Trojans breaching their walls to take the horse inside, probably because he wanted a smooth transition to his next plot summary, that of the

in the poem were the killing of Priam, the rescue of Helen, and the throwing of Astyanax from the battlements.[22] The epic *Iliu Persis*, as its name suggests, focussed on the sack, and perhaps began with the construction of the horse. The Trojans debate what to do with the mysterious object, eventually deciding to bring it within the city. Laocoon, who presumably has attempted to dissuade them from this course, is consumed by a pair of serpents along with one of his two sons. This portent leads Aeneas and his family to depart from Troy for Ida. At night the Greeks sail in, guided by firebrands held up by Sinon, and attack the city, aided by the men in the horse. Priam is killed by Neoptolemus at the altar of Zeus Herkeios; Menelaus kills Deiphobus and rescues Helen; Ajax drags Cassandra away from Athena's statue, incurring the goddess's enmity, and is nearly stoned by the Greeks as a result; Odysseus kills Astyanax; Polyxena is sacrificed at Achilles' tomb. The whole poem is not completely dominated by bloodshed: Demophon and Acamas, the sons of Theseus, rescue their grandmother Aethra.

Both poems feature a Greek called Sinon, who assists the deception in different ways. In the *Little Iliad*, as we learn from the *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina* (cf. West (2013) 204–5), Sinon accompanies the horse into Troy, hands bound behind his back; this suggests the story familiar from Virgil, in which he is left behind by the Greeks to persuade the Trojans to accept the horse. The *Iliu Persis* as summarised by Proclus refers merely to his holding up of firebrands to guide the Greek fleet towards the city, having entered the city under a false pretext (arg. 2 *GEF*); this implies that he did not perform the same function as in the *Little Iliad*.

Stesichorus was not the only lyric poet to treat the subject. His approximate contemporary Sacadas of Argos also did so,

Iliu Persis (see West (2013) 15–16). Fragments cited by other authors make it clear that the work did include the sack.

[22] *Ibid.* frr. 25, 28, 29.

if we introduce his name, by a likely emendation, in a passage of Athenaeus.[23] That testimonium (if that is what it is) tells us only that Sacadas named many of the Greek warriors inside the horse. Alcaeus described Ajax's rape of Cassandra in a poem of which a substantial fragment is preserved.[24] But for a fully preserved account of the sack we must wait until Virgil's *Aeneid*, half a millennium after Stesichorus.

The sack of Troy saw the destruction of the city, but not the ending of the race. Already in the *Iliad* Poseidon prophesies that Aeneas and his descendants will rule over the Trojans.[25] In her *Homeric Hymn* Aphrodite makes the same prediction to Anchises concerning their son.[26] Aeneas and his family slip away from Troy in the *Iliu Persis* after seeing the Trojan priest Laocoon and his son devoured by serpents. The survival of Laocoon's remaining son, who is eaten alongside his brother in other accounts, may symbolise the preservation of one branch of the Trojan royal family, especially as the attack is followed by Aeneas' departure.[27] The escape of the Trojan prince is also found on black- and red-figure Attic vases.[28]

From the late sixth century we encounter Trojans escaping the sack to found cities in the west. According to Hecataeus, Capua was established by the Trojan Capys, while Thucydides relates how Trojan refugees founded Eryx and Segesta.[29] The

[23] Athen. 13.610c (= Stes. fr. 102), where transmitted σακατου has prompted the conjectures Σακάδα τοῦ (Casaubon (1600) 559.10–14) and Ἁγία τοῦ (C. F. Hermann), of which the former is more convincing (see Dihle (1970) 13–14 n. 9). The same name causes problems at Pollux 4.78 (1 224.9–10 Bethe), where Σακάδα νόμος is corrupted in two manuscripts into σακαδονόμος.

[24] Alcaeus fr. 298 Voigt; cf. fr. 306Ah. [25] Hom. *Il.* 20.300–8.

[26] *Hom. Hym.* 5.196–7, with Faulkner's edition, pp. 3–18, and Fowler, *EGM* II §18.6.

[27] Thus Robert (1881) 192–3.

[28] See Canciani (1981) §§59–87, 88–91 (dated 540–490 and 500–450 respectively).

[29] Hecat. *FGrHist* 1 F 62 (see further Bernstein (2008) 240 n. 111); Thuc. 6.2.3. Hecataeus shows some familiarity with western Italy (FF 59–63; emphasised by Wiseman (2004) 68).

same period sees the first association of Aeneas and Rome, in Hellanicus and his pupil Damastes of Sigeum.[30] In their account, Aeneas comes from the land of the Molossians to Italy and founds Rome with Odysseus.[31] He names the city after a Trojan woman called Rome, who encouraged her companions to burn their ships after they arrived.

Another work by Hellanicus related a quite different tale: on escaping from Troy, Aeneas merely crosses the Hellespont and settles in Pallene.[32] Hellanicus states that Aeneas took the sacred objects of Troy with him on this journey, but we cannot extrapolate to claim a similar cargo for his Roman voyage. A late sixth- or early fifth-century Etruscan scarab shows Aeneas leaving Troy and carrying Anchises, who carries a chest which presumably contains the sacred objects.[33] Isolated though this find may be, it provides vital proof that this idea was attested in Italy at an early period. The earliest literary reference to Trojan sacred objects at Rome is in Timaeus, in the late fourth or early third century.[34] By the late fourth century Aeneas had acquired a personal association with Romulus, when Alcimus makes him Romulus' father; Romulus in turn fathered Alba, who was the mother of Rhomus, founder of Rome.[35]

An even earlier association between Aeneas and Italy may have left a trace. At the end of our manuscripts of Hesiod's *Theogony*, in a section often thought to derive from the *Catalogue of Women* rather than from Hesiod himself, Aeneas' birth

[30] Hellan. *Priestesses of Hera at Argos* fr. 84 *EGM*; Damastes fr. 3 *EGM*. See further Horsfall (1979b) 376–83 (excessively sceptical), Solmsen (1986). Contrast Arist. fr. 702.1 Gigon, according to whom Rome was founded by Greeks blown off course when returning from Troy.

[31] The mention of both Aeneas and Odysseus here 'looks like a combination of two separate traditions existing already' (Wiseman (2004) 68). See also Fowler, *EGM* II §18.6.

[32] Hellan. *Troica* fr. 31 *EGM*.

[33] See Canciani (1981) §95 (500–475), Texier (1939) 16, Galinsky (1969) 60 with n. 115 (late sixth).

[34] Timaeus *FGrHist* 566 F 59.

[35] Alcim. *FGrHist* 560 F 4. For the development of the Aeneas myth see further Casali (2010) 44–5.

is immediately followed by that of Latinus.[36] This 'may be a mere coincidence; it may on the other hand be an association suggested by the legend of Aeneas in Italy'.[37] The section on Latinus describes how he and Agrius were the sons of Odysseus and Circe, and ruled over the Tyrrhenians 'in an undisturbed part of the holy islands'.[38] Compare how, according to Eratosthenes, Hesiod (presumably in the *Catalogue* or some other sixth-century poem ascribed to him) placed Odysseus' travels around Sicily and Italy.[39] This again may suggest an awareness of Italy in early sixth-century poetry and a willingness to incorporate it into established poetic narratives.

Nothing in the archaeological record conflicts with such a connexion at the time of the composition of the *Catalogue* in the late seventh or early sixth century. Etruscan finds in Greece are attested from the early eighth century; so too are Greek finds in Etruria and Latium.[40] The earliest attestation of the name Latinus in Italy occurs in an Etruscan inscription from *c.* 600.[41] It first appears in Greek on a stone stele from Sicily, perhaps Selinus, *c.* 550–500, which marks the tomb of a man from Rhegium.[42] The name Τυρσανός appears on a lecythos fragment from the Athenian agora, *c.* 500–480.[43] Both the Greek examples may result from a Greek naming his son after the people with whom he had a *xenia*-relationship, and thus are

[36] Hes. *Th.* [1008–16]; cf. Solmsen (1986) 97 n. 14.

[37] West on Hes. *Th.* 1008.

[38] *Ibid.* 1011–16; μυχῶι νήσων ἱεράων (1015).

[39] Erat. *ap.* Strab. 1.2.14; translated as fr. 6 Roller. This information is apparently not included in recent editions of Hesiod's fragments; other information derived from Eratosthenes via the same passage of Strabo is mentioned in the apparatus to [Hes.] fr. 150.25–6 M–W. See further Debiasi (2008) 77–9.

[40] Ridgway (1996) (the earliest Greek letters so far discovered, found on a local pot at Gabii in Latium, *c.* 775), Jameson and Malkin (1998) 482 with n. 23, Nikou (2008), Wiseman (2004) 67–8.

[41] Amphora from a tomb at Veii, *CIE* II/1/5 §6671 *mi Tites Latines.*

[42] Λατίνο {η}ἐμί | τõ Ῥεγίνο ἐμί; *IGDS* II §24, Jameson and Malkin (1998), Poccetti (2012) 86.

[43] *LGPN* II 436.

indicative of particularly strong and long-lasting ties.[44] And the name Λεύκιος on a Samian inscription from *c.* 575–560 might have a Latin or Etruscan origin.[45]

STESICHORUS' VERSION

Stesichorus' poem begins with an address to the Muse. He asks her to sing of how Epeius was inspired by Athena to build the wooden horse. The goddess pitied him, the poet tells us, as he performed the menial service of a water-carrier for the Greek kings (fr. 100). A hundred warriors sat inside the horse, although most of them were not named (fr. 102). The Trojans debated what to do with the mysterious object. One speaker urged its destruction, another that it should be taken into the city. The latter view prevailed, perhaps aided by Zeus taking away the Trojans' wits, thanks to their misintepretation of a bird omen immediately after the second speech (fr. 103), and (more doubtfully still) by the intervention of the deceiver Sinon (fr. 104).

The night of the sack was full of incident. The following events are attested, though not necessarily in this order; sources other than fr. 105 (the *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina*) are specifically indicated. Ajax rapes Cassandra, Neoptolemus kills Priam, Demophon and Acamas rescue their grandmother Aethra. The Greeks attempt to stone Helen, but the rocks fall out of their hands when they see her beauty (fr. 106). Helen may well encounter Menelaus and deliver a self-critical speech in his presence (fr. 115); another speech, in which she expresses her longing for her daughter Hermione (fr. 113), might also come from such a meeting.[46] The women of Troy are captured, including Hecuba,

[44] Thus Jameson and Malkin (1998) 482.

[45] *IG* XII/6 §586; thus Barron (2004) 261–5.

[46] According to Wachter (2001) 317–18, another episode involving Helen may have occurred in Stesichorus' poem. He suggests that the near-killing of Helen by Aeneas at Virg. *Aen.* 2.[567–87] was taken from Stesichorus, and points to a Corinthian column crater from Etruria, *c.* 570–550, which shows

Andromache, Cassandra, Polyxena, Clymene (fr. 110), and probably Medusa (fr. 111).

Talthybius takes Astyanax from Andromache to be thrown from the battlements; he may already be dead by the time that he is thrown (fr. 107), possibly by Neoptolemus (fr. 116, a risky inference); Polyxena is taken from her mother by Odysseus, who brings her to Neoptolemus to be sacrificed at Achilles' tomb, perhaps prompted by a prophecy from Calchas (in addition to fr. 105, cf. frr. 119.3 and possibly 118.5). Hecuba is taken by Apollo to Lycia (fr. 109). After receiving the sacred objects of Troy, Aeneas escapes from the city carrying his father and accompanied by his son Ascanius and perhaps by his wife. He leads a band of Trojans, including Misenus, into exile in the west.

* * *

Stesichorus' account is roughly coterminous with the narratives found on the Mykonos vase and in the *Odyssey* and *Iliu Persis*: it begins with the horse and ends with the sack. All these versions are so brief or fragmentary that it is difficult to identify how original Stesichorus' poem may have been. Moreover, other epic accounts of the sack were probably in circulation, and have left no trace. Nevertheless, some possibilities are worth mentioning.

(1) Epeius' role in the construction of the horse is mentioned in the *Odyssey*, the *Little Iliad*, and in art. The prominence given him by Stesichorus is remarkable, however, and the emphasis on his lowly status and Athena's pity may well be the poet's invention (fr. 100n.). Such emphasis might have had broader thematic importance: the pity shown by Athena to Epeius could have contrasted with the pitiless behaviour of the Greeks, particularly Neoptolemus, at the sack, while Epeius' ascent from

Aeneas moving towards Helen (Kahil (1988) §192) as evidence that this story was known in the archaic period. The latter inference is uncertain, the former highly speculative.

menial service to the glory of building the horse might have made an effective contrast with the reversal of fortunes experienced by the Trojan prisoners. But in the absence of the whole, such considerations can only be speculative. See further Finglass (2013c).

(2) Stesichorus places outside the city the debate about what to do with the horse, rejecting the version found in the *Odyssey* and, probably, in the *Iliu Persis*, according to which the Trojans first dragged the horse inside and then made their decision (fr. 103n.). Stesichorus' version is more realistic; he may have invented it, dissatisfied with the logic of the epics, or taken it from another poem now lost.[47]

(3) Stesichorus' poem contains a detailed account of the Trojans' debate, which includes a possible intervention from Zeus and an omen (fr. 103n.). Only a comparison with the relevant scenes from the *Little Iliad* and *Iliu Persis* would allow us to say how original this is.

(4) In Stesichorus Sinon may have helped to persuade the Trojans to accept the horse; thus probably the *Little Iliad*, but not the *Odyssey* or the *Iliu Persis* (fr. 104n.).

(5) Many of the events of the sack in Stesichorus are attested in both the *Little Iliad* and the *Iliu Persis* (the rescue of Aethra by her grandchildren, the capture of the women of Troy, the killing of Astyanax), or in only the *Little Iliad* (Priam's death at the hands of Neoptolemus) or the *Iliu Persis* (Ajax's rape of Cassandra, Polyxena's sacrifice at Achilles' tomb). Some, however, are not found in what we have of these epics, or in other early accounts. These are Hecuba's translation by Apollo (who may have been Hector's father) to Lycia (fr. 109n.); Helen's near-stoning by the

[47] Virgil's *Aeneid* follows the sequence of events found in Stesichorus. He names the chief participants in the debate: Thymoetes argues that the horse should be taken into the city and located on the citadel, Capys that it should be cast into the sea or set on fire, or opened up (2.32–9). This does not mean that Virgil was inspired by Stesichorus; they may have shared an epic source. Virgil's names (if they are not his invention) may stem from the Epic Cycle, or Stesichorus, or both (cf. Page (1973b) 50).

Greek army (fr. 106n.); and Aeneas' escape from the city during the sack, and his voyage to the west with the sacred objects of Troy (fr. 105n.).

Two of these involve travel to far-off lands. Perhaps Stesichorus wanted to moderate the poem's relentless foregrounding of the city of Troy by opening up these vistas. His bringing of Aeneas to the west, perhaps Sicily or Italy, can be seen alongside his localisation of the Geryon myth in the vicinity of Tartessus in southern Spain. If Zeus intervened during the debate over the horse to bring disaster to the Trojans, Apollo's rescue of Hecuba would show that they had not been completely abandoned by the gods; Aeneas too may well have enjoyed divine support. Such reversals, or rather mitigations, of cruel fortune wold have provided a more satisfying ending than the series of atrocities committed during and after the sack.

Although these three events indicate Stesichorus' originality, all are influenced by earlier epic tradition. Hecuba's removal to Lycia recalls that of Sarpedon in the *Iliad*; Helen's near stoning might have been suggested by Hector's threat to Paris, her paramour; and Aeneas' escape is presupposed by Poseidon in the *Iliad* and by Aphrodite in her *Homeric Hymn*. As usual, Stesichorus does not create something out of nothing, but fashions new material out of pre-existing traditions and motifs. Just enough survives of this poem to suggest that it was an original variation on what was presumably already a familiar, perhaps hackneyed theme.

THE FRAGMENTS

The poem is preserved in two papyri (Π^5, Π^8), nine book fragments (only one a direct quotation), and one illustration. One piece of Π^5 overlaps with one of Π^8 (fr. 114), and one book fragment coincides with Π^8 (fr. 100.18–19). The name *Sack of Troy* is attested by the illustration (fr. 105), Harpocration (fr. 137), and Pausanias (frr. 109–10). Π^5 has the title *Horse* (perhaps *Wooden* or *Trojan Horse*: the relevant line is incomplete), which provides

evidence for an alternative name.[48] The horse was sufficiently important in the poem, which most likely begins with its construction (fr. 100n.), to justify its employment as a second title. The title *Horse* is attested for Hellenistic poems on the sack of Troy.[49] There are also parallels in early lyric for works with two titles.[50]

One fragment of Π[8] contains parts of two adjacent columns (fr. 103), which allow us to reconstruct a column length of 26 lines. But because the scribe's hand is not consistent in size, we cannot use this figure in conjunction with the metrical scheme (discussed below) to work out which line in the metrical scheme stood at the top of each column of the papyrus. The papyrus contains a number of small errors,[51] but overall its text appears accurate. A fragment of Π[5] contains parts of two adjacent columns (fr. 101), but not enough is preserved to work out how many lines each column contains, or to assess how accurately its text is preserved.

METRICAL ANALYSIS

The fragments of the *Sack of Troy* are fewer and worse preserved than those of the *Geryoneis*. Its metrical scheme is correspondingly

[48] Thus West (1971b) 264. Page (1973b) 64 suggests that Stesichorus first wrote a work called *Horse*, and then one called *Sack of Troy*. But a putative poem on the Trojan horse would presumably have included a detailed account of the sack; Page's hypothesis thus requires us to suppose two poems by Stesichorus on exactly the same subject.

[49] Dioscor. *A.P.* 5.138.1 = 1471 *HE*, anonymous dithyramb from Teos, late third/early second century (*SEG* 57 §1137.4; see Ma (2007) 232–44), and cf. Alcaeus *A.Pl.*(B) 7.3–4 = 56–7 *HE* Ἵππου | ἔργματα (perhaps *The Exploits of the Horse*; thus Gow and Page).

[50] Pind. fr. 70b S–M Κατάβασις Ἡρακλέους ἢ Κέρβερος Θηβαίοις, Bacchyl. 15 Ἀντηνορίδαι ἢ Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις, 17 Ἠίθεοι ἢ Θησεύς; see further Nachmanson (1941) 6, Pearson's edition of the fragments of Sophocles, pp. xviii–xx, Zilliacus (1938) 38–9. West (1982b) suggests two other texts which may have been called either the *Sack of Troy* or the *Horse*, but in each case the textual problems are too severe for them to be of much value (thus Pardini (1995) 69–70 n. 29).

[51] See frr. 100.9, 100.15, 100.18, 103.35, 112.1, 112.2, 117.6.

harder to establish and more open to doubt. Nevertheless, we can make progress towards reconstructing a scheme, as follows.

The seven lines of frr. 100.9–15 and 103.42–8 respond. The immediately preceding line (frr. 100.8, 103.41) does not respond: it is short in the former, long in the latter. Hence one of frr. 100.9 and 103.42 marks the opening of a strophe, the other of an antistrophe. We can tell from fr. 103.42–3 that the first line of the strophic pair was long, the second line was short, and the third may have been long (the relevant ink is faint); fr. 100.15 shows that line 7 of the strophic pair was long.

The line which follows these seven-line sections is short at fr. 100.16, and of indeterminate length at fr. 103.49. This represents either line 8 of the strophic pair in both fragments, or line 1 of the epode in one fragment and line 1 of the antistrophe in the other. Let us assume the latter. As a consequence, fr. 100.16 is line 1 either of the epode or of the antistrophe. But it cannot be line 1 of the antistrophe, since that is a long line. If it is line 1 of the epode, then the preceding line (fr. 100.15) is the seventh and last line of the antistrophe, and so should correspond with fr. 100.8, which would be the last line of the strophe. But the former is long, the latter short. Hence fr. 100.16 cannot be line 1 either of the epode or of the antistrophe, and so the initial assumption is wrong. Hence frr. 100.16 and 103.49 is the eighth line of the strophic pair.

A further instance of responsion occurs between frr. 100.18–19 and 103.33–4. Since these two passages cannot be accommodated in the strophic pair, they come from the epode, which thus extends in fr. 103 from (at least) 33 until 41. Hence fr. 100.17 is either the first line of the epode, or the last of the antistrophe. The triad as a whole is eighteen lines long: the strophe and antistrophe last for eight or nine lines, the epode for ten or nine.

More responsion is apparent between frr. 103.33–41 and 114.9–17. Line ends show that fr. 103.32–41 (either the epode, or the last line of the antistrophe followed by the epode) correspond to fr. 103.6–15. It follows that fr. 103.16–23 makes up

the first eight lines of the strophe, and the line ends fit that pattern: long-short-long in the first three lines, long-short in lines 7 and 8. The following line, fr. 103.24, is either the first line of the antistrophe or the last line of the strophe. If it is the latter, then fr. 103.25 is the first line of the antistrophe. But that is not possible, since fr. 103.25 is short, whereas the first line of the antistrophe is long. Hence fr. 103.24 is not the last line of the strophe, and so must be the first line of the antistrophe, which lasts until fr. 103.31, the meagre fragments being consistent with the established pattern of line endings. We now know that the strophe and antistrophe last for eight lines, the epode for ten; and frr. 100.17, 103.32, and 114.9 can be identified as the start of the epode.

Having established the extent of the triad and its constituents, we can now turn to establishing the metre of the individual papyrus lines, and the placing of period ends. Below we set out a metrical scheme based on consideration of the larger papyrus fragments, and then justify the decisions which establish it.

Strophe/Antistrophe

(1)[52] —⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—	D^3
(2)[53] ——⏑⏑—⏑⏑—	$—D$
(3)[54] ×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑—‖	$×D⏑⏑e—$
(4)[55] —⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—	$D×D$
(5)[56] ⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—	$⏑⏑D$
(6)[57] ×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑———⏑—	$×D—e$
(7)[58] —⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—	$D⏑D$
(8)[59] ——⏑——‖	$—e—$

[52] Frr. 100.9, 103.16, 103.24, 103.42, 114.1.
[53] Frr. 100.10, 103.17, 103.25, 103.43, 114.2.
[54] Frr. 100.11, 103.18, 103.26, 103.44, 114.3.
[55] Frr. 100.12, 103.1, 103.19, 103.27, 103.45, 114.4.
[56] Frr. 100.5, 110.13, 103.2, 103.20, 103.28, 103.46, 114.5.
[57] Frr. 100.6, 110.14, 103.3, 103.21, 103.29, 103.47, 114.6.
[58] Frr. 100.7, 110.15, 103.4, 103.22, 103.30, 103.48, 114.7.
[59] Frr. 100.8, 110.16, 103.5, 103.23, 103.31, 103.49, 114.8.

Epode

(1)[60]	(—)—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑— —	(—)*D*⏑*D*—
(2)[61]	— —⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—	—*D*×*D*
(3)[62]	— —⏑⏑—⏑⏑— —	—*D*—
(4)[63]	—⏑⏑—⏑⏑— — —⏑⏑—⏑⏑— —	*D*—*D*—
(5)[64]	—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—(—)	*D*(—)
(6)[65]	—⏑⏑—⏑⏑— — —⏑— —	*D*—*e*—
(7)[66]	—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—	*D*
(8)[67]	]— — —⏑— —	. . . —*e*—
(9)[68]	— —⏑⏑—⏑⏑—(⏑⏑)—(—)	—*D*[(2)]—(—)
(10)[69]	]⏑— —‖	. . . —

Str./Ant. 1 begins —]⏑⏑— (fr. 103.42) and ends ⏑⏑—⏑⏑— (frr. 103.24, probably 103.16). The fullest version of the line, fr. 100.9, runs —⏑⏑—<⏑>⏑—⏑[, with an unavoidable supplement. Taken together, this makes —⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑— very probable.

Str./Ant. 2 begins — —⏑⏑—⏑⏑— (fr. 100.10) and — —⏑ (fr. 103.43), ends ⏑— after a gap of about —⏑⏑—⏑⏑— (fr. 103.17), and does not appear after a similarly sized gap (fr. 103.25). Most probably fr. 100.10 represents a complete version of this line.

Str./Ant. 3 appears in fr. 100.11 after plausible supplements as (⏑)—⏑[⏑]—⏑⏑— —[—⏑— —. It starts — —× in fr. 103.44; and ends ⏑⏑—⏑— — after a gap of about —⏑⏑—⏑⏑— in fr. 103.18, and — — after a gap of about —⏑⏑—⏑⏑— in fr. 103.26. These are all consistent with the metre suggested by fr. 100.11, with or without initial anceps. The difference of length of frr. 103.18 and 103.26 is notable, but within the bounds of acceptable variation. We adopt initial anceps, since nowhere else in the scheme is *D* followed by *D* without one.

[60] Frr. 100.17, 103.6, 103.32, 114.9. [61] Frr. 100.18, 103.7, 103.33, 114.10.
[62] Frr. 100.19, 103.8, 103.34, 114.11. [63] Frr. 100.20, 103.9, 103.35, 114.12.
[64] Frr. 100.21, 103.10, 103.36, 114.13. [65] Frr. 103.11, 103.37, 114.14.
[66] Frr. 103.12, 103.38, 114.15. [67] Frr. 103.13, 103.39, 114.16.
[68] Frr. 103.14, 103.40, 114.17. [69] Frr. 103.15, 103.41, 114.18.

Str./Ant. 4 begins —[⏑]⏑—⏑⏑—— (fr. 100.12), ends —⏑⏑[—]⏑[⏑]— (fr. 103.19) after a gap of about —⏑⏑—⏑⏑—. The line is made up of —⏑⏑—⏑⏑— twice. We cannot be sure that there was an anceps between them, but since anceps is found between all other repetitions of this pattern in this poem, we may assume that one occurs here too.

Str./Ant. 5, a short line (frr. 103.2, 103.20, 103.28, 114.5), begins ⏑⏑—⏑[⏑—× (fr. 103.46), and contains ⏑—⏑⏑— after an opening the size of ——⏑ (fr. 100.13). This looks like an anceps (appearing in fr. 103.46 as ⏑⏑) followed by —⏑⏑—⏑⏑—.

Str./Ant. 6 begins (⏑)—⏑ (fr. 100.6), —]—[⏑]⏑—⏑× (fr. 100.14), and ——⏑⏑—[⏑⏑ (fr. 103.47), ends ⏑× after a gap the size of ——⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑— (fr. 103.3), and ——⏑× after a gap the size of —⏑⏑—⏑⏑— (fr. 103.21). This suggests ×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑————⏑—.

Str./Ant. 7 probably reads —⏑]⏑—⏑⏑—⏑—⏑[⏑—× at fr. 100.15. This is consistent with beginnings —⏑⏑— (fr. 100.7) and]⏑⏑—⏑×[(fr. 103.48); the endings —]—⏑⏑—⏑⏑× (fr. 103.22) and ⏑⏑— (fr. 103.4) indicate that the line as a whole read —⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—.

Str./Ant. 8, a short line (frr. 103.5, 103.23, 114.8), reads ————⏑—— in fr. 100.8 (which is either the end, or close to the end), and ends ⏑—— in fr. 100.16 after a gap of about —⏑; that gap does not seem big enough for ————, which is what would have to stand there if the lineation of fr. 100.8 is correct. Moreover, ————⏑—— results in two adjacent ancipites at the start of a line, when elsewhere on the papyrus such a pair is always split between papyrus lines (ep. 1–2, 8–9). So this line probably reads ——⏑——.

Ep. 1 begins — in fr. 103.32. It ends —⏑⏑—⏑⏑—— in fr. 103.6 after a gap of about ——⏑⏑—⏑⏑; it contains —⏑⏑— in fr. 100.17 after a gap of about ——⏑⏑. In fr. 114.9 it contains ⏑—⏑ after a gap of about ——⏑⏑—, and then ⏑—⏑⏑—[— after a further gap of about two syllables. The line seems to be composed of two —⏑⏑—⏑⏑— phrases, concluded by an anceps, and perhaps preceded and/or connected by others. A likely restoration in fr. 114.9 requires a connecting anceps.

Ep. 2 is firmly established by fr. 100.18; the other instances are consistent with this.

Ep. 3 is firmly established by fr. 103.34; the other instances are consistent with this.

Ep. 4 begins —˘˘—˘˘———˘˘— (fr. 103.35) and ends ˘˘—˘˘—— (fr. 103.9). Fr. 114.12 reads ˘]˘———˘˘—˘˘——[. The start of the line is cut off at the same point as in fr. 114.10–11; in those two lines there is enough space for ——˘˘—.

Ep. 5 is as long as ——˘˘—˘˘ (fr. 100.21; cf. the preceding line but one) and —˘˘—˘˘— (fr. 103.36; cf. the preceding line), but shorter than —˘˘—˘˘———˘ (fr. 103.10; cf. the preceding line). It begins —˘˘ (fr. 103.36); —˘˘—˘˘—(—) is a reasonable guess.

Ep. 6 runs —˘˘—˘(˘—)——˘— in fr. 103.37. But its ending appears as —˘——in fr. 103.11 and ——˘——in fr. 114.14. One misdivision is easier to assume than two; misdivision at fr. 103.37 would be especially easy, since the break occurs in the middle of a five-syllable word.

Ep. 7 appears as ——˘˘—˘˘— at fr. 103.38, but this should be —˘˘—˘˘— (cf. on ep. 6). The ending ˘— recurs at fr. 114.15.

Ep. 8: This ends ˘—— (fr. 103.13), after an opening roughly the same length as —˘˘—˘˘——— (cf. the relationship between fr. 103.13 and the surrounding lines). In fr. 103.39 the line contains ———˘—[—, after a gap roughly commensurate with —˘˘—˘˘— (cf. the relationship between frr. 103.39 and 103.35). Since that makes fr. 103.39 slightly longer than fr. 103.13, it is likely that fr. 103.39 does not extend further than ———˘—[—. In fr. 114.16 we find ——× after a gap commensurate with —˘˘—˘ (cf. the relationship between frr. 114.15 and 114.16). So ep. 8 ends ———˘——, but we cannot tell how it began. The two likeliest alternatives for the complete line are ×—˘—×—˘—×—˘—× (Führer (1970) 14) and (—)—˘˘—˘˘—×—˘—× (WSB).

Ep. 9: In fr. 103.14 this ends —— after a gap of between ˘—˘—×—˘—×— and ×—˘˘—˘˘——— (the length of the missing parts of the two adjacent lines). Another instance, fr. 103.40, begins ×]—×, and is about as long as —˘˘—˘˘———

or x—⏑—x—⏑—x— (cf. fr. 103.37, 39). This points towards ——⏑⏑—⏑⏑—(⏑⏑)—(—).

Ep. 10: This ends ⏑—— in fr. 103.15 after a gap commensurate with ——⏑⏑—⏑⏑, and contains ⏑x after a gap of about ——⏑⏑—⏑⏑ in fr. 114.18.

Period-end appears after str./ant. 3 (fr. 114.3). Synapheia exists between str./ant. 7–8 (frr. 103.22–3, 103.30–1) and ep. 6–7 (fr. 103.37–8).

With the above scheme established, it becomes possible to fit other, shorter fragments within it. The placings listed below are justified in the relevant notes in the commentary.

fr. 104: ep. 4–str. 4
fr. 112: ep. 5–str. 5
fr. 113: ep. 4–ant. 7
fr. 115: ep. 5–str. 2
fr. 116: ant. 6–ep. 5
fr. 117: str. 6–ant. 7
fr. 118: ep. 2–str. 5
fr. 119: str. 1–ant. 4
fr. 120: str. 7–ep. 6
fr. 121: str./ant. 3–8
fr. 122: ep. 3–str. 1
fr. 123: str. 6–ant. 7
fr. 124: str. 6–ant. 6
fr. 125: ant. 7–ep. 6

Once placed, these fragments allow the following further inferences.

The first double short of str./ant. 3 can be contracted, as we learn from fr. 112.9.

Str./ant. 7 has a long anceps in fr. 113.14.

Ep. 4 has a short anceps at fr. 116.7.

Ep. 5 ends —— (fr. 113.2); its first double short can be contracted (fr. 115.1).

Ep. 8 begins x]—⏑— (fr. 112.4), ⏑—⏑x (fr. 115.4), has]———x[after a gap consistent with x—⏑ (fr. 113.5),]⏑⏑x after a gap roughly commensurate with ——⏑⏑—⏑⏑— (fr. 118.7), and]⏑— after a gap roughly commensurate with ——⏑⏑—⏑⏑— (fr. 122.6). This is consistent with the line x—⏑—x—⏑—x—⏑—x suggested by Führer, and rules out the alternative (—)—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x—⏑—x put forward by Barrett.

If ep. 9 ends with anceps, then it is followed by period-end, since ep. 10 begins with anceps (see below). That would result in three successive short periods, which does not seem in Stesichorus' manner. Hence we should prefer ——⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑— over ——⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑——— or ——⏑⏑—⏑⏑———. This facilitates attractive (but not necessary) supplements in frr. 112.5 and 113.6.

Ep. 10 begins ⏑]⏑—⏑⏑—⏑ (fr. 112.6, securely supplemented); it has]⏑⏑—⏑⏑— after a gap consistent with ⏑⏑— (fr. 113.7). Taken alongside the earlier data, this suggests a line ⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑———.

It appears that an anceps can be realised as ⏑, —, or ⏑⏑; in the scheme below we mark all ancipites as x, however they are actually attested. The first biceps of *D* is twice contracted, but we do not generalise this across the scheme, since it is not clear whether all bicipites could be so contracted. We avoid signalling period-end and synapheia except where they are certain; the scheme set out by Haslam (1974) 24 may nevertheless very well be right. We thus end up with the following:

	Strophe/Antistrophe	
(1)	—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—	D^3
(2)	x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—	x*D*
(3)	x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x—⏑—x‖	x*D*x*e*x
(4)	—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—	*D*x*D*
(5)	x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—	x*D*
(6)	x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x—⏑—	x*D*x*e*
(7)	—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—x—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—	*D*x*D*
(8)	x—⏑——‖	x*e*—

Epode

(1)	(×)—◡◡—◡◡—×—◡◡—◡◡—×‖	(×)*D*×*D*×
(2)	×—◡◡—◡◡—×—◡◡—◡◡—	×*D*×*D*
(3)	×—◡◡—◡◡—×	×*D*×
(4)	—◡◡—◡◡—×—◡◡—◡◡—×	*D*×*D*×
(5)	—⏑—◡◡—×	*D*×
(6)	—◡◡—◡◡—×—◡—×	*D*×*e*×
(7)	—◡◡—◡◡—	*D*
(8)	×—◡—×—◡—×—◡—×‖	×*e*×*e*×*e*×
(9)	×—◡◡—◡◡—⏑—	×*D*²
(10)	×—◡◡—◡◡——‖	×*D*—

COMMENTARY

98

The fragments allow us to glimpse why Dio regarded this poem as 'not unworthy of Homer'.

99

This text on the back of a piece of papyrus which contains (among others) the hundredth line of its poem (fr. 101) is presumably the title of the work. For titles on the reverse of the papyrus, κατὰ τὸν κρόταφον, see Luppe (1977), Turner (1987) 13–14 with n. 72, Caroli (2007) 23–8, Schironi (2010) 70 n. 169. It should be supplemented Στη[σιχόρου] ἵππ[ος (thus respectively Lobel (1971) 4 and West (1971b) 262–3), perhaps with Τρωϊκός (Haslam (1974) 35) in addition. For the significance of this title, see pp. 405–6.

100

This fragment, discussed in detail by Finglass (2013c), consists of four pieces of papyrus and one quotation. The first three (P.Oxy. 2619 frr. 15(*b*), 30, and 31) were joined by Barrett *ap.* West (1969) 140 and printed in *SLG* as fr. S89. To these is added a quotation preserved by Athenaeus 10.456g, which matches the metre and context of lines 18–19, and all but one of the traces; we must assume a scribal error for the one recalcitrant trace. This connexion was made independently by Führer (1977) 16 nn. 172–3 (who remarks that the idea occurred to him in

1968, but Lobel persuaded him to abandon it), Barrett *teste* Kazansky (1997) 90, and Kazansky (1976). The final piece, P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 15(*a*), was placed by A. Pardini *ap.* Schade, pp. 121–4, 151. With the aid of R. Coles, Schade noted matching pieces of ink on the back of frr. 15(*a*) and (*b*) (p. 123), which confirm the join. Lobel (1967c) 44 had previously associated frr. 15(*a*) and (*b*), and unsuccessful attempts to unite them had been made by Barrett *ap.* West (1969) 140 and Kazansky (1976). It is possible that fr. 277 is the first line of the poem (thus Tychsen (1783) 31 n. r), but this remains a guess. Although it fits the metre, and is evidently the first line of some poem, the metre in question is not so distinctive that we could discount its appearance at the start of another work by Stesichorus.

The invocation takes up the second part of a strophe (6–8), and presumably the first, unpreserved part as well (1–5). The poet then asks the Muse how it was that a man was inspired by the gods to put an end to the war (9–16); the answer comes that Athena gave him the idea of the wooden horse, since she pitied his never-ending menial service for Greek kings (17–19).

This fragment almost certainly comes from the opening of the poem (thus Kazansky (1976)). Stesichorus is fond of beginning poems with an address to a Muse, in contrast to later lyric poets such as Pindar and Bacchylides (fr. 90.8–10n.). Moreover, the content suits a beginning. The making of the wooden horse fits neatly at the beginning of a poem called the *Sack of Troy*. In the *Odyssey*, when Odysseus asks Demodocus for the story of the sack, he tells him to 'sing of the wooden horse that Epeius made with the help of Athena' (8.492–3). The *Iliu Persis* probably began with this event. Virgil begins *Aeneid* 2 with the construction of the horse. The poem's alternative title *The* —— *Horse* (perhaps *Wooden* or *Trojan*) would suit a poem beginning with its construction.

The fragment puts great emphasis on Epeius. For a discussion of this figure and his importance in Stesichorus see Finglass (2013c) 7–13, Zachos (2013); also Davies (2011).

6 θεά, τὺ [⏑]δο[: 'Goddess, you . . . '. For θεά addressed to the Muse see fr. 90.8–9n. For τύ (σύ) in addresses to the Muse cf. fr. 172.1, Hom. *Il.* 2.761, Sappho fr. 124 Voigt, Pind. *O.* 10.3, Pigres 1–2 *IEG*.

7 παρθέν[ε] χρυσ[: 'golden . . . maiden' (*suppl.* Kazansky (1976)). For the association of maidenhood and gold with the Muse see fr. 90.10n. The second word may be χρυσ[ολύρα (Führer) or χρυσ[οκόμα.

7–8 ἱμείρει [δ'] ἀείδ̣[ιν. 'and desires to sing' (*suppl.* Führer *ap.* Schade, p. 151). The subject cannot be the Muse or the narrator; it could

be the narrator's θυμός or similar, as in Alcaeus fr. 308.1–2 Voigt σὲ γάρ μοι | θῦμος ὕμνην. The verb ἱμείρει takes the Muses' song as its object; the latter is often associated with ἵμερος (Alcm. fr. 27 *PMGF*), or characterised as ἱμερτός (Sol. fr. 13.52 *IEG*), ἱμερόεις (Bacchyl. fr. 20C.3–5 S–M, Simon. fr. eleg. 22.17 *IEG*). ἀείδω is *vox propria* for the Muses' occupation: cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.598, Hes. *Op.* 1, *Hom. Hym.* 3.518–19, Theogn. 15–16, Pind. *I.* 2.6–8, *N.* 4.2–3, Kranz (1961) 6–7 with n. 5 = (1967) 29–30 with n. 5. Homeric hymns often placed this verb at the end of the first line, a practice imitated by Callimachus (see Harder on *Aet.* 1.1, II 16), and perhaps made use of here by Stesichorus at the conclusion of this first stanza.

9 νῦν δ' ἄγε̣ μο̣ι λ̣<ἐγ>ε πῶς 'Come now, tell me how . . . ' (αγε̣ *suppl.* West (1969) 141, interpreted as ἄγε by Kazansky (1976), μο̣ι Lobel (1967c) 44, λ̣<ἐγ>ε Führer *ap.* Schade, p. 151, πῶς thus interpreted by Kazansky). Of the dotted letters ε̣, μ̣, and λ̣ are reasonably secure; the others fit the traces, and no alternatives make sense or fit the metre. This reconstruction supposes an error on the part of the scribe, who wrote ΛΕ for ΛΕΓΕ; for other small omissions in a lyric papyrus of this period see Bacchyl. 15.55, 16.12, 17.74, 17.93, 18.39, 18.48, 19.5. The scribe's eye will have jumped from the first epsilon to the second.

νῦν in requests to the Muses marks a progression, and emphasises the immediacy of the song: cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.484 etc., Hes. *Th.* 965–6, [Hes.] fr. 1.1–2 M–W, *Epigoni* fr. 1 *GEF*, Bacchyl. 12.1–4. Pind. *O.* 9.5, fr. 52f.54–8 S–M, Crat. fr. 237.1 *PCG*, Virg. *Aen.* 7.37. The Iliadic examples are accompanied by μοι, which also appears at Hom. *Od.* 1.1, Hes. *Th.* 114, Sol. fr. 13.2 *IEG*, Hippon. fr. 128.1, Simon. fr. elcg. 92, Pind. *P.* 1.58–9, Lyr. Adesp. frr. 935.3, 938(*e*) *PMG*. For ἄγε in addresses to the Muse cf. fr. 277, Alcm. frr. 14(*a*).1, 27.1 *PMGF*, Pind. *P.* 1.58–60, *N.* 6.28, Pl. *Phaedr.* 237a (a highly poetic passage: see Norden (1898) I 110), *Cert. Hom. et Hes.* 8, Ap. Rh. 3.1 εἰ δ' ἄγε νῦν, Ἐρατώ, perhaps Call. *Aet.* fr. 76b Harder, [Stes.] fr. 327.1, Virg. *Aen.* 7.37, Hor. *C.* 1.32.3, 3.4.1–2; cf. Sappho fr. 118.1 Voigt, Hor. *C.* 1.32.3, 2.11.22. λέγω is not elsewhere applied to the Muse, but cf. Pind. fr. 520.32–4 S–M Μοῖσα . . . ὀαρίζε[ι] | λόγον τερπνῶν ἐπέων; also Hom. *Od.* 1.10 εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμίν, Hes. *Th.* 24–5 μῦθον ἔειπον | Μοῦσαι, Soph. *Tr.* 499/500 καὶ ὅπως Κρονίδαν ἀπάτασεν οὐ λέγω, Hor. *C.* 3.4.1–2. As Renehan (1975) 130 says, 'λέγειν = ᾄδειν is adequately attested for the classical period', citing Anacr. fr. 402(*c*).2 *PMG* χαρίεντα μὲν γὰρ ἄιδω, χαρίεντα δ' οἶδα λέξαι; cf. also West (1981) 114 = (2011–13) I 129–30. As in the Anacreon passage, here the preceding ἀείδειν may help to 'colour' λέγε so that it too refers to song.

Stesichorus asks his Muse 'how?', as at Hom. *Il.* 16.112–13 ἔσπετε . . . | ὅππως δὴ πρῶτον πῦρ ἔμπεσε νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν, Hippon. fr. 128.1–3 *IEG* Μοῦσα . . . ἔννεφ' ὅπως, Lyr. Adesp. fr. 935.1–8 *PMG*, Virg. *Aen.* 1.8 *Musa, mihi causas memora*, and the alternative proem to the *Iliad* cited by Aristoxenus (fr. 91.I Wehrli) ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι . . . | ὅππως δὴ μῆνίς τε χόλος θ' ἕλε Πηλεΐωνα. Usually the Muses are asked 'who?' (Hom. *Il.* 2.761–2, 2.484–7, 11.218–20, 14.508–10, *Od.* 1.1–2, Bacchyl. 15.47), but 'what?' (Hes. *Th.* 114, Pind. fr. 52i.65–7 S–M) and 'from where?' (Pind. fr. 52f.50–61) are found.

9–10 παρ[ὰ καλλιρόου(c)] | δίνα̣[c] Σιμόεντος 'by the eddies of the fair-flowing Simoeis' (or 'the fair-flowing eddies . . . '; π. and δ. *suppl.* West (1969) 140, κ. *suppl.* Barrett, *ibid.* p. 141; δίνα[ι *suppl.* Barrett *ap.* Page (1973b) 51, though as Page notes, the plural gives a better fit). In post-Homeric poetry the river Simoeis could refer to Troy in general (cf. Willink on Eur. *Or.* 809, deleting his Homeric parallels, which denote a specific location in the Troad). But it is especially relevant to Epeius, whose daily occupation will have made him all too familiar with the rivers of Troy (18–19). Cf. Eur. *Or.* 5–10, where Helen causes destruction and lamentation παρὰ ποταμὸν . . . ἀμφὶ τὰς Σκαμάνδρου δίνας.

For παρά with the accusative specifying location by a river see fr. 9.5n. καλλίροος (no other adjective seems suitable) is applied to rivers and their water in epic (cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.752, *Od.* 5.441, Hes. *Op.* 737), lyric (Anacr. fr. 381(*b*) *PMG*, Pind. *O.* 6.83, Bacchyl. 11.26), and elegy (Theogn. 1088). The Simoeis, one of the two great rivers of Troy, is elsewhere given δῖναι only at [Eur.] *IA* 751–2 (cf. [Eur.] *Rhes.* 826 οὐ τὰς Σιμοεντιάδας παγάς), but they are often associated with rivers in epic, lyric, and elsewhere (as are the related forms δινήεις, βαθυδίνης, ἀργοροδίνης).

10–12 ἀνὴρ | [θ]εᾶς i̯[ó]τατι δαεὶς σεμν[ᾶς Ἀθάνας] | μέ̣τ[ρα] τε καὶ σοφίαν 'a man, by the will of the goddess, revered Athena, having learned the measures of wisdom' (*suppl.* Barrett *ap.* West (1969) 140–1). The juxtaposition of ἀνήρ and θεᾶς expresses the contrast between mortal and immortal, and the dependence of one on the other. Bare ἀνήρ introduces Epeius just as ἄνδρα does Odysseus at the start of the *Odyssey*, whom Epeius is in a sense displacing (see Finglass (2013c) 7–10); the translation 'the man' might therefore be appropriate. θ]ε̣ᾶς i̯[ó]τατι adapts θεῶν ἰότητι, found at Hom. *Il.* 19.9, *Od.* 7.214, etc., *Hom. Hym.* 5.166, Alcaeus fr. 309 Voigt, and used with reference to a singular goddess at *Il.* 15.41, 18.396. For δαείς cf. *Hom. Hym.* 5.483 τέχνηι καὶ σοφίηι δεδαημένος, 4.509–11, [Hes.] fr. 306 M–W παντοίης σοφίης

δεδαηκότα, Pind. *O.* 7.53 δαέντι δὲ καὶ σοφία μείζων ἄδολος τελέθει, *Laudes Theonis gymnasiarchi* §16.20 Heitsch ταῦτα δὲ Μουσάων σοφίης δεδαημένος ἀνήρ; also Hom. *Od.* 6.233–4 = 23.160–1 (a craftsman) ὃν Ἥφαιστος δέδαεν καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη | τέχνην παντοίην, χαρίεντα δὲ ἔργα τελείει, 20.72, 17.518–19 ὅς τε θεῶν ἔξ | ἀείδηι δεδαὼς ἔπε' ἱμερόεντα βροτοῖσι. It might have been prompted here by Epeius' use of the word δαήμονα at Hom. *Il.* 23.671 (cited above in the introduction to this fragment).

For σεμνή predicated of Athena cf. perhaps fr. 104.1, Bacchyl. 13.195, Soph. *OC* 1090, Eur. *IT* 1492–3. 'μέτρα is loosely used of the rules and formulae known to the expert' (West on Hes. *Op.* 648); cf. Sol. frr. 13.52 *IEG* ἱμερτῆς σοφίης μέτρον ἐπιστάμενος, 16.1–2, Theogn. 876 μέτρον ἔχων σοφίης (same phrase at Arist. fr. 578 Gigon), which suggest that μέτ[ρα] τε καὶ σοφίαν represent hendiadys. σοφία in early poetry denotes technical skill (cf. West on Hes. *Op.* 649), here the skill of a carpenter (cf. Hom. *Il.* 15.410–12, where also the worker enjoys the guidance of Athena, patroness of craftsmen). The expression as a whole is similar to the distich on the *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina* (fr. 105n.).

13–14 **ἀντὶ μάχα[ς | καὶ] φυ[λόπ]ιδος κλέος** '<winning> glory <from menial labour/craftsmanship> instead of battle and strife' (*suppl.* Barrett *ap.* West (1969) 140–1). For the association of μάχη and φύλοπις see fr. 24.4n.

15–16 **εὐρυ]χόρ[ο]υ Τροΐας ἁλώσι̣[μον ἄμαρ ⏑—×—]ν ἔθηκεν** 'brought about the day of the capture of spacious Troy' (*suppl.* Barrett *ap.* West (1969) 140–1). εὐρύχορος (fr. 32.4n.) is applied to Troy by Sappho fr. 44.12 Voigt, and used of a city in Homer at *Od.* 24.468; Homer calls Troy εὐρυάγυια (*Il.* 2.12 etc.). The papyrus's τρωας is written Τροΐας by Page, *SLG*, after West (1969) 140–1 had advocated Τρωΐας; the metre would suit disyllabic Τροία, but we may as well assume that the poet avoided contraction when it was so easy to do so. For confusion between these forms see Soph. *Aj.* 421–6n. Absent from epic, ἁλώσιμος 'pertaining to capture' recurs at Ibyc. fr. S151.14–15 *PMGF* Τρο]ίας θ' ὑψιπύλοιο ἁλώσι̣[μο]ν̣ | [ἄμ]αρ ἀνώνυμον, Aesch. *Sept.* 635 ἁλώσιμον παιῶνα, *Ag.* 10 ἁλώσιμον . . . βάξιν. In 16 West (1969) 141 suggests e.g. ἄτερ λαῶ]ν, 'without the use of armies'; cf. Pind. *N.* 3.34 (Peleus) ὃς καὶ Ἰωλκὸν εἷλε μόνος ἄνευ στρατίας.

17 **πό̣.(.)ο̣.:** either πόνοι or πολιοί is possible (both owed to Lobel (1967c) 44).

18–19 **ὤικτιρε γά]ρ αὐτό[ν] ὕ[δωρ ἀεὶ φορέοντα Διὸς | κούρα βασιλ]ε̣ί̣[ῦσι]ν̣ α[⏑—×** 'For the daughter of Zeus pitied him as he

continuously carried water for the kings'. The placing of the quotation from Athenaeus fits metre (West (1969) 137 identified it as ep. 2–3, or str./ant. 4–6, before it was joined with the papyrus) and context (having described how a man effected Troy's destruction after learning his craft from Athena, it is reasonable for the narrator to explain why the goddess selected this individual for her ends; γάρ often introduces a narrative, as illustrated at Soph. *Tr.* 9n., Braswell on Pind. *P.* 4.70(a), Finglass (2005a); in 17, πόνοι (if correct) is at home in the context of Epeius' laborious service). As for the traces, the supplements at the start of each line suit the space available. In 19 the ink is consistent with ε but does not demand it; of the next dotted letter Lobel (1967c) 44 remarks 'before α an upright, perhaps the right-hand upright of ν'. In 18, after the gap containing [ν], there is some ink which Lobel calls 'perhaps the top of a circle or loop'; the papyrus had two letters between omicron and upsilon, when the text requires only one. But it is easier to suppose that the scribe has made an error (e.g. by writing αὐτούς instead of αὐτόν) than that the papyrus has nothing to do with Athenaeus' quotation, even though the other traces, the metre, and the context all fit the latter. The final word could be ἀ[γαυοῖς (*suppl.* Barrett *ap.* Davies, *PMGF*), Ἀ[τρείδαις, Ἀ[θάνα (Führer (1977) 16 n. 171), or Ἀ[χαιῶν (Kazansky (1976)). ὤικτιρε is owed to Page, *PMG* for Athenaeus' ὤικτειρε (see West's edition of the *Iliad*, 1 xxxiii).

Eust. *Il.* 1323.56–8 (IV 812.12–16 Van der Valk) refers to part of this quotation: τὸν δὲ εἰρημένον Ἐπειὸν ὑδροφορεῖν τοῖς Ἀτρείδαις ἱστορεῖ Στησίχορος ἐν τῶι "ὤικτειρε δ' αὐτὸν ὕδωρ ἀεὶ φορέοντα Διὸς κούροις βασιλεῦσιν". ἔνθα ὅρα τὸ "Διὸς κούροις", καθ' ὃ καὶ Διὸς κούρη ἡ Ἀφροδίτη ἐν παραθέσει, ὥστε κατ' ἐξοχήν τινα Διόσκουροι συνθέτως οἱ τῆς Λήδας καὶ τοῦ Διός. The textual error κούροις instead of κούρα indicates that Eustathius had access only to Athenaeus; if he had had a complete text of Stesichorus, he would have realised that Athena, not the Dioscuri, featured here. Hence Eustathius does not provide independent testimony for Stesichorus' text.

101

We cannot tell how many lines intervene between the two columns that make up this fragment.

3–4 The scholia cite at least two scholars. In line 4 Theon and Aristonicus can be identified; the former's name is preceded by καί, as at fr. 118.19, and so another scholar was probably named in what preceded. (Thus McNamee (2007) 373–4; her alternative, that on both

occasions Theon was advocating the reading καί, seems too much of a coincidence.) In line 3 Theon's name almost certainly featured: although only an epsilon is extant, that epsilon is raised, as in the other abbreviations of his name. The epsilon is followed by a pi, as at fr. 118.16 (although there the pi is at the edge of the papyrus and so we cannot tell whether anything followed it). That letter might stand for Ptolemy, but the single-letter abbreviation would be remarkable (on Π^7 he is designated $\Pi\tau o^\lambda$). This is the only reference to Aristonicus; he is apparently credited with advocating a variant reading, προσώιχετο (a poetic word attested elsewhere only at Pind. *P.* 6.4); hence perhaps Stesichorus' text had ποτώιχετο (thus MLW)? For all these scholars see further p. 69.

6]κας: perhaps Κας|κάνδρα (thus Barrett); for the spelling of the name see Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1035.

22 The stichometric numeral A here marks the hundredth line; for such numerals in general see fr. 25n.

102

Stesichorus, according to Eustathius, placed a hundred warriors in the Trojan horse, but according to Athenaeus, names few or none of them. In the *Odyssey*, the horse contained πάντες ἄριστοι (4.272, 8.512; cf. 11.524 Ἀργείων οἱ ἄριστοι), but the poet names only five (Odysseus, Menelaus, Diomedes, Neoptolemus, and Anticlus; 4.265–89, 11.523–32). Proclus' summary of the *Little Iliad* presents a similar version, in which the Greeks temporarily withdraw, εἰς τὸν δούρειον ἵππον τοὺς ἀρίστους ἐμβιβάσαντες (arg. 5 *GEF*). According to the manuscripts of Apollodorus (*Epit.* 5.14 = fr. 12 *GEF*), in this poem fully three thousand men were packed inside. But numerals are especially prone to corruption, and the correct figure may be thirteen; thus Severyns (1926) 312–22, especially 320, arguing that ΦΗΣΙΙΙΓ′ (13) became ΦΗΣΙΙΓ′ (3) and then ΦΗΣΙ,Γ (3000). Apollodorus himself prefers a horse containing fifty warriors; other figures include twenty-two (Triph. 152–83) and twenty-three (Tzetz. *Posthom.* 642), while Quint. Smyrn. 12.314–35 names thirty out of many; see further Hainsworth on Hom. *Od.* 8.492–3, West (2013) 203–4. Sacadas, according to Athenaeus, named 'very many' of the warriors in the horse (on this poet see pp. 22, 398–9). Eustathius states that 'others' put twelve in the ambush, and names them: Menelaus, Diomedes, Philoctetes, Meriones, Neoptolemus, Eurypylus, Eurydamas, Phidippus, Leonteus, Meges, Odysseus, Eumelus. The diverse traditions may reflect different ideas as to

whether the Greeks inside the horse were a mere advance force intended to let in the rest, or an army capable of sacking Troy by itself (thus Timpanaro (1978) 438–42, an expanded version of (1957) 161–3).

Despite Eustathius, we have no parallel for Stesichorus' hundred, and no instance of a tradition of twelve. Athenaeus is very likely correct that Stesichorus did not give a name to each of the hundred warriors inside his horse (thus Severyns (1926) 316 with n. 2), but he may have included some in an epic-style catalogue (fr. 110n.).

103

This fragment consists of three pieces of papyrus, spread over two adjacent columns (lines 1–28, 29–49). The first and by far the biggest piece was joined to the second, which contains parts of lines 31–8, by Lobel (1967c) 35. The third, containing parts of lines 30–42, was added by Barrett *ap.* West (1969) 135.

The text contains two speeches. One is ongoing at line 7, another at 33–5; the former is certainly over by 22, and possibly by 11, and 42 marks the conclusion of the latter. In that second, more fully attested, oration, the speaker rejects a previous proposal to destroy the horse (35–8). Let us instead, he says, bring it to a temple on the acropolis (33); this implies that the debate is taking place outside the city, where the Greeks left the device. We may guess that the view which the speaker is rejecting was put forward by the character speaking at line 7. In the transition from one speech to the next, Zeus may have confused the wits of either the Trojans or the second speaker (16–24n.).

For a comparison of Stesichorus' treatment of this episode and those found in other early sources, and in Virgil, see p. 404.

1].γ̣α̣λ̣αc̣α̣γα.[: perhaps μ]ε̣γάλαc (*suppl.* HLS) ἀ̣γαθ̣[-- (Führer (1977) 19).

4]τε.ομωc: the dotted letter is probably triangular (cf. Lobel (1967c) 35–6) and, if so, will probably be delta (thus Page (1973b) 48), giving]τε δ̣' ὁμωc.

6–7]ντι βίαι τε καὶ αἰχμᾶι | [×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—] πεποιθότεc· 'trusting in strength and the spear'. Perhaps 'rely on your strength and your spear, [not on hopes that the Wooden Horse is a token that the war is over]' (Page (1973b) 50).]ντι may be the end of a third person plural. For βίαι

τε καὶ αἰχμᾶι cf. *Il.* 3.431 βίηι καὶ χερσὶ καὶ ἔγχεϊ, 18.341 βίηφί τε δουρί τε, and, for this phrase being dependent on πεποιθότες, 12.135 χείρεσσι πεποιθότες ἠδὲ βίηφιν, 12.153 λαοῖσιν καθύπερθε πεποιθότες ἠδὲ βίηφι.

7 ἀλλ' ἄγε δή 'Come now', marking a change from the description of a problem to the proposal of a solution (cf. n. on fr. 97.218 ἀλλ' ἄγε). Very frequent in Homeric speeches, this phrase is attested in lyric (Anacr. fr. 356b.1 *PMG*), elegy (Theogn. 829), and prose (Pl. *Phaedo* 116d, Xen. *Symp.* 4.34); further examples in FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 625. The mark in the papyrus after δή is probably stray ink; a stop would make no sense here (cf. Lobel (1967c) 36).

9]ọνες ἀγκυλοτόξοι 'with crooked bows', probably referring to the composite bow. Supplements include Παί]ọνες (Lobel (1967c) 37, comparing Hom. *Il.* 2.848 and 10.428, where this epithet is used of this nation), μαχήμ]ọνες (Page (1973b) 50), and δαήμ]ọνες.

11 διάσταν 'they were divided', presumably referring to the debate over the horse; the speech is thus likely to be over. Cf. Hom. *Od.* 8.506 τρίχα δέ σφιειν ἤνδανε βουλή, *Iliu Persis* arg. 1 *GEF* τὰ περὶ τὸν ἵππον οἱ Τρῶες ὑπόπτως ἔχοντες περιστάντες βουλεύονται ὅ τι χρὴ ποιεῖν, and especially Virg. *Aen.* 2.39 *scinditur incertum studia in contraria vulgus.* The verb is used of quarrels as early as Hom. *Il.* 1.6, but is not limited to epic, or poetry (LSJ⁹ s.v. διΐστημι II 2).

13]ραπασιν: either –ρ' ἅπασιν or –ρα πᾶσιν.

16–24 Perhaps Zeus (16–17) intervenes to ensure an end to the war (18) by inciting someone (22) to give bad advice; this individual may have had a particular reputation for wisdom (24), which may suggest that Zeus first confused his wits (19) or the wits of the Trojans as a whole. Divine manipulation of mortal minds is found in epic: cf. Hom. *Il.* 6.234 Κρονίδης φρένας ἐξέλετο Ζεύς.

16] τ̣έλος εὐρύο̣[πα: the epithet (*suppl.* Page (1973b) 48) frequently qualifies Zeus in epic (and in lyric at Pind. frr. 52f.134, 52iA.14–15 S–M), and so his name may have occurred in the next line (thus Page). τ̣έλος could be adverbial ('finally') or an object ('Zeus brought things to their conclusion'). Thanks to the beginning of the poem, the audience knows that the gods are indeed bringing the war to its end, but not in the way that the Trojans are hoping for.

18 π(τ)]ολέμου [τε]λ̣ευτά̣['end of the war' (*suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 37). The phrase occurs in Thucydides (1.13.3 etc); Homer has πολέμου τέλος, τέλος πολέμου (*Il.* 20.101, 16.630). Its occurrence so soon after τέλος conveys a strong sense of finality, which is ironic in the context.

19]ἐν πυκιν̣[άς] τ̣ε̣ φρ̣[έ]ν̣α̣ς 'and his/their cunning mind(s)' (*suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 37). The phrase occurs in the context of deception at Hom. *Il.* 14.294 πυκινὰς φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψεν and *Hom. Hym.* 5.38, where it 'aptly stresses the intelligence that is overcome' (Janko on the former; for further parallels see Faulkner on the latter). Other allusions to intelligence occur in 24 and perhaps 22. At the start of the line,]ἐν may represent a verb.

21] ῥηξάνορα 'breaker of men'. The adjective is restricted to Achilles in Homer and Hesiod (see West on Hcs. *Th.* 1007). Lobel (1967c) 37 restores lyric vocalism (cf. frr. 19.35, 85.5, the latter corrupted in some witnesses) for the papyrus's ῥηξή–, which shows the introduction of the form familiar from epic. The word might have featured at fr. 100.13 (*suppl.*).

22 ὦτρ]υνε μέγαν φρ[α]σὶν ἐν 'he urged on the great... in his/their mind' (ὦτρ] *suppl.* Page (1973b) 48, [α] Barrett, *ibid.*). Cf. the Homeric ὣς εἰπὼν ὤτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἑκάστου (*Il.* 5.470 etc.), always at the end of a speech. Stesichorus' phrase need not have occurred in a similar location, as long as we avoid restoring ὣς earlier in the line. Page (1973b) 50 supplements the remainder ὤτρ]υνε μέγαν φρ[α]σὶν ἐν | [σφετέραισι θυμόν, comparing Hom. *Il.* 12.266 μένος ὀτρύνοντες, 21.395 μέγας θυμός, 9.462 ἐν φρεσὶ θυμός. We write φρασίν rather than φρεσίν because Stesichorus, like Pindar, probably used the older form (see Braswell on Pind. *P.* 4.219(a)).

24]π̣ρεπε καὶ π̣ι̣ν̣[υ]τᾶι 'was pre-eminent also for wisdom' (*suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 37, together with μετέ]πρεπε: cf. Hom. *Il.* 16.596 ὄλβωι τε πλούτωι τε μετέπρεπε Μυρμιδόνεσσιν, 7.288–9 μέγεθός τε βίην τε | καὶ πινυτήν). Page (1973b) 48 suggests πινυταῖ|σ(ι), but synapheia is unattested here.

27].οπτολ̣[: two possibilities are Ν]ε̣οπτόλ[εμ– (*suppl.* Finglass) and φι]λ̣οπτόλ[εμ– (Schade, p. 180). If the former is right, the narrator's perspective may shift to consider the Greeks inside the horse (HLS), where Neoptolemus, according to Odysseus' account in the *Odyssey* to Achilles, showed particular courage (11.523–32). A brief reference to the Greeks would increase the tension at this fateful moment.

32 τ̣ονδ[..].δα̣.υν λ̣[: the dotted letter before the delta could be epsilon or sigma. The dotted alpha could just as well be lambda, but next to the delta only alpha is suitable. West (1969) 138 suggests κ̣ for the letter before upsilon, but as he notes, the letter 'would be anomalous'. After upsilon editors since Lobel have printed undotted

kappa, but the letter seems rather to be a nu; the join between the first and second strokes seems too high for a kappa in this hand. Since –*νλ*– is an unusual combination, word-break is likely after nu. But this still leaves us frustratingly far from a plausible interpretation.

33 πρὸϲ ναὸν ἐ̣ϲ̣ ἀκρ[όπο]λ̣[ι]ν̣ ϲ̣πεύδοντεϲ̣ 'rushing to the temple on the acropolis' (*suppl.* West (1969) 138; Barrett (*ibid.*) suggests ἐπεϲϲυμένωϲ for the last word in the line). Contrast Hom. *Od.* 8.504 αὐτοὶ γάρ μιν (*sc.* ἵππον) Τρῶεϲ ἐϲ ἀκρόπολιν ἐρύϲαντο, where the placing of the horse on the acropolis precedes the debate, as also probably in the *Iliu Persis* (thus Tsagalis *ap.* Finglass (2015b)); cf. Apollod. *Ep.* 5.16 εἷλκον τὸν ἵππον καὶ παρὰ τοῖϲ Πριάμου βαϲιλείοιϲ ϲτήϲαντεϲ ἐβουλεύοντο τί χρὴ ποιεῖν. In Virgil the horse is set up on the *arx* of the city (*Aen.* 2.32–3, 245); on the *Tabula* it is found towards the top of the city, outside a temple. The temple in Stesichorus is presumably Athena's (cf. 37–9). In the *Iliu Persis* (arg. 1 *GEF*) the Trojans decide to dedicate the horse to Athena, presumably in (or near) her temple, which is its location in Triphiodorus (467–8, 489); cf. Eur. *Tro.* 525–6 τόδ' ἱερὸν ἀνάγετε ξόανον | Ἰλιάδι Διογενεῖ κόραι. In one tradition the horse bore an explicit dedication to that goddess (cf. Apollod. *Ep.* 5.15, Robert (1921–6) II/1 1230 n. 1).

34 Τρῶεϲ πολέεϲ̣ τ' ἐπίκ̣[ου]ρ̣οι 'Trojans and their numerous allies' (*suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 37); cf. Hom. *Il.* 6.227, 18.229 Τρῶεϲ κλειτοί τ' ἐπίκουροι, 6.111, 9.233, 11.564.

35–8 ἔ̣λ̣θ̣ετε μη̣[δ]ὲ λόγο[ιϲ π]ε̣ι̣θώμεθ' ὅπωϲ π̣[⏑⏑—×] | τονδεκα.[...]ο̣νι.[ ].. | ἁ̣γ̣ν̣ὸν ἄ[γαλ]μ̣α [⏑—].. αὐτεῖ καται̣[ϲχ]ύ̣νωμε̣[ν ἀ]ε̣ι̣κ[ελί]ω̣ϲ 'come, and do not obey the arguments to destroy shamefully herc this . . . , a holy imagc [offered to the goddess]'. 35 begins ἔ̣λ̣θ̣ετε (Lobel *ap.* West (1971b) 262), not ἕ̣λ̣κ̣ετε (Barrett *ap.* West (1969) 138); then [δ], [ιϲ π] *suppl.* West (1969) 138, ὅπωϲ for papyrus οππωϲ *coni.* West, *ibid.*, [γαλ] *suppl.* Barrett, *ibid.*, [ϲχ] West (1971b) 262, ἀ]ε̣ι̣κ[ελί]ω̣ϲ Barrett. The above translation incorporates the plausible supplement θε]ᾶ̣ϲ before αὐτεῖ owed to West (1969) 138; the sense of the genitive would be 'not a statue owned by the god, but a special offering made to a god' (thus Day (2010) 126 n. 193; cf. his n. and *CEG* I 302.1 Φοῖ]βο μέν εἰμ' ἄγαλ[μα Λ]ατ̣[οί]δα καλ[ό]ν, from the Ptoion sanctuary in Boeotia, *c.* 540).

At the end of 35 we might have an adjective qualifying the horse, such as π̣[εριμήκε]||τον (if synapheia is allowed) or π̣[ερίμετρον (though word order might then be problematic, depending on the word that follows). If there is word-break at the start of 36, then τόνδε is preferable to τόν; the article is rare in Stesichorus, and 'the famous' horse would be

inappropriate in this context. At the end of 36 ἵπ̣[π]ο̣ν̣ Barrett *ap.* West (1969) 138 is very likely, although the traces are evanescent. Metrically sound restorations of the intervening gap include κατ̣[αίcι]ο̣ν (Barrett) and καθ̣[άρcι]ο̣ν (West), but both are too big for the space (so rightly Page (1973b) 48). An alternative, δεκατ̣[ήϊ]ο̣ν (West, a *hapax*), gives unusual sense ('the tithe horse') which may neverthless suit the context (the speaker thereby emphasises that the horse is an offering to the gods). (Page's claim that the fragmentary letter before nu contains the upper half of an upright, and so cannot be omicron, involves an impermissible deduction, since the right side of omicron in this hand in isolation would often look like the upper part of an upright stroke; the only other possibility that fits metre and context would be iota, but a word ending –ιν does not seem likely here.) *Exempli gratia* we might therefore restore περιμήκε]τον δεκα[τήι]ο̣ν ἵπ̣[π]ο̣ν̣, 'the great tithe horse'.

λόγο[ιc may imply deceptive arguments (see West on Hes. *Th.* 229, adding Soph. *Phil.* 55, Eur. frr. 661.8 and perhaps 650 *TrGF*). In the *Odyssey* the Trojans who wish to preserve the horse call it a μέγ' ἄγαλμα and θεῶν θελκτήριον (8.509); such language implies that damaging it would be sacrilege. αὐτεῖ is opposed to ἐ̣c̣ ἀκρ[όπο]λ̣[ι]ν̣ (33); cf. Triph. 296–9 (Sinon) εἰ μὲν γάρ μιν ἐᾶτε μένειν αὐτοῦ ἐνὶ χώρηι, | Τροίην θέcφατόν ἐcτιν ἑλεῖν πόλιν ἔγχοc Ἀχαιῶν· | εἰ δέ μιν ἁγνὸν ἄγαλμα λάβηι νηοῖcιν Ἀθήνη, | φεύξονται προφυγόντεc ἀνηνύcτοιc ἐπ' ἀέθλοιc. The adverb ἀεικελίωc probably means 'shamefully, disgracefully for the recipient of the treatment', as in Hom. *Il.* 22.395 ἀεικέα . . . ἔργα (see Griffin (1977) 45 n. 36 = Cairns (2001) 377 n. 43); καταιcχύνω has a similar sense (see Griffin (1980) 85 n. 9).

39 ×]νιν δ̣ὲ̣ [—×—⏑]. ἁ̣ζώμεc̣θ̣' ἀ̣ν̣ά̣c̣[cαc 'let us respect . . . of the Lady' (*suppl.* Barrett *ap.* Page, *SLG*). At the start West (1969) 138 suggests μᾶ]νιν (for this used of divine anger see Soph. *Aj.* 654–6n.), which we might expand to give *exempli gratia* μᾶ]νιν δέ [τοι βαρεῖα]ν̣ 'let us respect the grim anger of the Lady' (other particles, such as νῦν or μάν, might be possible; βαρεῖα]ν̣ *iam* West); for βαρύc in this context see Soph. *Aj.* 41n. The reference to the goddess's anger may provide an ominous close to the speech.

42 ὣc] φ̣ά̣[τ]ο 'thus he spoke' (*suppl.* Barrett *ap.* West (1969) 138–9). For the coincidence of end of speech and triad see fr. 15.5–6n.

42–3 το̣ὶ̣ [δ(ἐ̣) ⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—].[| φ[ρ]ά̣ζ̣οντο 'But they took counsel' (*suppl.* Barrett *ap.* West (1969) 138–9). φράζομαι appears in the same context at Triph. 258, referring to the Trojans' ongoing debate, at which point Sinon appears. Barrett prefers 'they . . . considered

<how to bring> the great horse <into the city>', but we might first have expected a statement expressing the victory of the second speaker.

44 ἴ̣π̣[π]ο̣ν με̣.[ː μέ̣ν (*suppl.* Führer (1970) 12) fits the traces (see the description given by Lobel (1967c) 36) better than μέγα̣[ν (Barrett *ap.* West (1969) 138–9).

45–8 ω̣.[.].. φυ̣λλοφ[ορ—×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—] | πυκινα̣[ῖ]ς̣ πτερ[ύγεσσι ⏑—] | κίρκον τανυσίπ[τερον —×—⏑— | —].ες ἀνεκράγο̣ν̣ ['leaf-bearing . . . with thick-feathered wings . . . a long-winged hawk . . . they cried out' (*suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 37). The sense is unclear; two possibilities are as follows. (i) West (1969) 139 identifies a portent, such as those that occur when the horse enters Troy at Quint. Smyrn. 12.512–13 (screeching birds) and Triph. 326–7 (Zeus's trumpet prophesying conflict). He points also to Quint. 12.11–20, where (as reported by Calchas) a hawk catches a dove by hiding in a bush and pretending to have departed. Supplementing Τρ]ῳ̃ες in 48, West suggests that the Trojans see a hawk darting out of a bush and cry out. If the hawk went on to attack another bird, the omen would apply still more closely to the Trojans' situation. The portent suits this moment in the story: when the Trojans have to decide which course to follow, they observe an omen which they proceed to ignore or misinterpret. Virgil chooses this point for the intervention of the serpents, themselves a misinterpreted portent. (ii) Barrett *ap.* West identifies a simile, reading ᾧ̣ δ̣[ἀ]π̣ό in 45 and ψᾶ]ρες ('starlings') in 48, and comparing Triph. 247–9 οἱ δ' ὅτε τεχνήεντος ἴδον δέμας αἰόλον ἵππου, | θαύμαςαν ἀμφιχυθέντες, ἅτ' ἠχήεντες ἰδόντες | αἰετὸν ἁλκήεντα περικλάζουσι κολοιοί. But such a comparison, emphasising the massive size of the single horse in comparison to the numerous Trojans, would more naturally occur at the discovery of the horse, which is where Triphiodorus places it. Stesichorus would be referring simply to the noise of the Trojans as they debate what course to take, which is perhaps not significant enough a detail to dignify with a simile. Moreover, Barrett's supplement at the start of 45 is unsafe. The final dotted letter, as Lobel (1967c) 36 observes, 'looks most like θ or ρ, though anomalous for either'; omicron can probably be ruled out. If the letter is rho, ὡ̣ς̣ [γ]ά̣ρ̣ is just possible.

If φυ̣λλοφ[ορ– does not refer to a bush, it may denote garlands placed by the Trojans on the horse (cf. Quint. Smyrn. 12.433–6, Triph. 316–17). πυκινὰ πτερά recurs at Hom. *Od.* 5.53. τανυσίπτερος is used of a variety of birds, including the ἴρηξ at Hes. *Op.* 212, a bird often associated with the κίρκος. Elsewhere ἀνακράζω is not used of animal

noise until later Greek, but κράζω denotes human and animal noise from at least the fifth century (Soph. *Aj.* 1236–7n.), and so it would be unsafe to presume that this word must have had a human subject.

104

The pattern of long and short lines fits only ep. 4–str. 4 (thus West (1969) 137).

ἐγών in line 3 indicates a speech, perhaps delivered by the swearer of the false oath in line 1. Pointing to lines 1, 8, and 10, West (1969) 139 tentatively suggests that Sinon is the speaker, comparing Virg. *Aen.* 2.154–8 *'vos, aeterni ignes, et non violabile vestrum | testor numen', ait, 'vos arae ensesque nefandi, | quos fugi, vittaeque deum, quas hostia gessi: | fas mihi Graiorum sacrata resolvere iura, | fas odisse viros atque omnia ferre sub auras'*. If West is right, Sinon plays a part similar to that probably found in the *Little Iliad* and in Virgil (the deceiver who persuades the Trojans to accept the horse), and different from that found in the *Iliu Persis* (the man who signals to the Greek fleet that the horse is inside and they can attack); see further pp. 398, 404. It is possible that the whole fragment comes from a speech by somebody who has realised Sinon's treachery too late.

1]̣δ̣' ἐπώμοσε ϲεμ[ν 'swore a false oath by . . . ' Barrett *ap.* Page, *SLG* suggests Παλλ]ά̣δ̣' . . . ϲεμν[άν (for this combination see fr. 100.10–12n.). The dotted alpha is consistent with the plate and with the description of the traces offered by Lobel (1967c) 42; the relevant part of the papyrus is now lost.

3]ε̣ϲθ̣', ἐγὼν δ' αυ 'you . . . , but I . . . '

5 εἶμειν 'to be'. This infinitive and others in –μειν are attested in Epicharmus and the pseudepicharmeia (see Kassel and Austin on fr. 97.8 *PCG*) and in Dorian inscriptions from Rhodes (*IG* XII/1 155.100–1, second c. BC and 923.9, third c. AD or earlier) and Gela (*SEG* §45 1359.3, early fifth c.; cf. Willi (2008) 47 n. 82). Their appearance in Epicharmus may show the influence either of the thematic infinitive in –ειν (Willi, pp. 136–7) or of the Rhodian dialect (since Gelon had transferred part of the Rhodian colony at Gela to Syracuse, according to Hdt. 7.156.2; the Rhodian form will itself have been influenced by thematic –ειν).

7 ×—◡◡—]...ϲcαγυ: the end of the epode must coincide with word-end, so presumably μϲcαγύ; thus West (1969) 139, although he doubts the mu. According to Page (1973b) 53–4, mu is inconsistent with the

traces; if so, we must assume corruption or some unknown word ending in –εσαγυ.

8 φάος ἀελίου 'the light of the sun'; cf. epic and elegiac φάος ἠελίοιο (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 1.605, Theogn. 569, Faulkner on *Hom. Hym.* 5.105).

10]ᾳ. [κ]ατ' αἶσαν 'in due measure' (*suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 42), a phrase found in Homer (*Il.* 3.59 etc.) and lyric (perhaps fr. 97.273, Ibyc. fr. S166.8 *PMGF*, Pind. *P.* 4.107, Bacchyl. 10.32; cf. fr. 191.8–9 παρ' αἶ[σαν). The dotted letter may be rho, in which case γ]άῤ (*suppl.* West (1969) 139) is likely.

105

The *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina* is a calcite tablet 25 centimetres high, 30 wide, and 1.5 thick. It was discovered about ten miles south-east of Rome, in a villa not far from Bovillae (cf. Horsfall (1979a) 32), and first published in Fabretti (1683) 315–84. Its iconography suggests a date from the last quarter of the first century BC (thus Sadurska (1964) 37), so possibly after the publication of the *Aeneid* in 19 BC (Horsfall (1979a) 32, 38–40). About three-quarters of the original piece remain. Squire (2010) 68, (2011) 12–13 (and plates I–IV) provides images, and Horsfall (1979a) 36 a schematic diagram that clarifies the layout. But the best photographs can now be found online; and since an internet search for *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina* will reveal several high-quality pictures, we do not include one here. Squire (2011) 132–3 reproduces a line drawing by Fedor Ivanovich, first published in Tischbein (1821) as a plate between pages 12 and 13. This rendering has led more than one scholar astray, and should be used with extreme caution. A better one by L. Schulz can be found in Jahn and Michaelis (1873), table I* and in Squire (2011) 36–7.

The centre of the tablet portrays events from the sack of Troy: warriors emerging from the horse near the top, a figure being slain at an altar in the middle, a group of Trojans led by Aeneas emerging from the central gate, and underneath that, outside the city, a group of mourning Trojan women, a row of Greek ships, and Aeneas and his men embarking on a ship. Just below the main gate is the inscription Ἰλίου Πέρσις κατὰ Στησίχορον, and then, in bigger letters, Τρωϊκός (perhaps *sc.* κύκλος, or πίναξ: see Squire (2011) 253). The text is then interrupted by the row of ships; under them we read Ἰλιὰς κατὰ Ὅμηρον, then Αἰθιοπὶς κατὰ Ἀρκτῖνον τὸν Μιλήσιον, followed by Ἰλιὰς Μικρὰ λεγομένη κατὰ Λέσχην Πυρραῖον.

Illustrations of all these texts appear around the central section depicting the sack; brief inscriptions identify characters and occasionally give other details. At the bottom of the tablet are two horizontal strips, the uppermost depicting the *Aethiopis*, the one underneath the *Little Iliad*. To the viewer's right is an inscribed column which summarises the content of books 7 to 24 of the *Iliad* (although books 13 to 15 have been omitted). Further to the right are twelve panels on which appear the events of the last twelve books; book thirteen is at the bottom, book twenty-four at the top. The strip above the depiction of the sack is taken up with the first book, which is thus given special prominence. Above the strip depicting the *Aethiopis*, and below the text naming the inspiration for the images, an elegiac couplet identifies the author of the tablet: τέχνην τὴν Θεοδ]ώρηον μάθε τάξιν Ὁμήρου | ὄφρα δαεὶς πάσης μέτρον ἔχηις σοφίας (*suppl.* Mancuso (1911) 730). The language of this couplet, while traditional, appears to allude to an expression found at the start of Stesichorus' poem (fr. 100.11–12; thus Lehnus (1972) 54–5, Horsfall, on p. 589 of his commentary on *Aeneid* 2, Squire (2011) 106–8). It would be a remarkable coincidence if both Stesichorus and Theodorus used the same expression, and both in such a prominent fashion.

The tablet thus purports to illustrate the events of Homer's *Iliad*, Arctinus' *Aethiopis*, Lesches' *Little Iliad*, and Stesichorus' *Sack of Troy*. Its depiction of the first three works corresponds closely with what we have of them. In the case of the *Iliad*, only the most trivial divergences can be observed. The most notable occurs in the illustration of *Iliad* 18, where Hephaestus has three assistants (Cyclopes?) to aid him as he forges Achilles' shield, whereas in the poem he labours alone. Other differences include the portrayal of Agamemnon with drawn sword during his quarrel with Achilles (cf. Valenzuela Montenegro (2004) 38), whereas in the *Iliad* he never even reaches for his weapon. Such deviations are slight, and in accordance with well-established iconographical formulae, which arise out of the particular demands of plastic art (see Brüning (1894) 145–64; also Touchefeu-Meynier (1992) §§32–41, Simon and Bauchhenss (1997) §§56–64, and Valenzuela Montenegro (2004) 66–9, 386 on Hephaestus with the Cyclopes). The illustrations of the Epic Cycle are similarly accurate, corresponding exactly to what is known of these poems from the extensive plot summaries provided by Proclus and from the other fragments, right down to the order of events. Getting the *Iliad* right was not hard; accurately illustrating the Epic Cycle required specialised knowledge of much more recherché poems.

There are thus three reasons to begin with a presumption that the tablet accurately illustrates the events of Stesichorus' poem: first, the mere fact that the inscriber claims that it does; second, the allusion in the couplet on the tablet to the text of the opening of Stesichorus' poem; and third, the accuracy of the portrayals of the other poems which the tablet is meant to illustrate. A fourth, speculative reason is advanced by Mancuso (1912) 185–6: namely, that the sculptor chose to illustrate Stesichorus' poem instead of the epic *Iliu Persis* (the latter option being the expected one, since all the other poems depicted on the *Tabula* are epic, not lyric) precisely because he offered the first trace of the association between Aeneas and Italy. We should therefore disbelieve the tablet only if the events that it portrays are manifestly incompatible with the written sources of Stesichorus' poem, or if we can say with confidence that they are unlikely to have been included in the poem on some other ground. Before we can do this, we must describe the tablet's portrayal of the sack. In what follows we record every named figure that appears in the picture, and every probable portrayal of significant events from that night and its aftermath. We do not attempt to list every instance of a Greek slaying a Trojan, or indeed to convey the careful artistry that the piece displays.

The picture of the sack is divided into two parts, inside and outside the city walls. Within those walls, three main sections can be identified. The uppermost contains the wooden horse (labelled), its flank open and a ladder propped against it. Near by is a temple; its front columns are grasped by an individual who in turn is grasped by a warrior, labelled Αἴα[c. This represents Ajax's rape of Cassandra, and the temple will be Athena's; this would be an especially suitable location for the horse.

The middle section shows the death of Priam. On the central altar sits the king with a full beard, long garment, and Phrygian cap. Neoptolemus leaps upon him from the left, holding a sword in his right hand, and placing his right foot on Priam's thigh. His left hand, which bears his shield, is grasping at the old man's head to drag him from the altar. To Neoptolemus' left a dying warrior lies on the ground. On Priam's right a woman, apparently clothed, sits clinging to him with both hands; this must be Hecuba. To her right is a warrior endeavouring to pull her from the altar by her head.

To the viewer's right is a temple of Aphrodite (labelled), on the left of which stands a warrior. His right hand holds a sword, his left a shield and the hair of a woman who seems to be trying to escape, and may even be attempting to ward him off with her left hand. The garment she is wearing seems to have slipped down in the course of

the struggle and so covers only her legs, and those only partially. Her back is turned towards us. It is difficult to say who this pair can be if not Menelaus and Helen. Balancing this on the left of the central section is another temple, with an altar outside; a woman is kneeling here with arms outstretched, as a warrior stands above her, holding her hair and poising his sword for the death stab. No identification for this scene springs to mind. It may reflect an episode in Stesichorus otherwise unfamiliar to us (thus Jahn and Michaelis (1873) 35), or it could simply be a general image of violence chosen to balance the encounter of Menelaus and Helen on the opposite side.

The lowermost section is right up against the walls and gate of the city. On the right stands a woman labelled]ρα, with two warriors one on either side, one identified as Δη[. The trio must be Aethra, Demophon, and Acamas. Aethra's head sinks as if in exhaustion, and her arms rest on her grandchildren. On the left, Aeneas (labelled) takes a casket with both hands from a man clad in a long robe and cap (similar to Priam's), who is fleeing from a warrior behind him. The casket doubtless contains the sacred objects of Troy, and the man giving it to Aeneas could be the priest in charge of their cult. One possibility is Panthus (cf. Paulcke (1897) 70), who brings them to Aeneas in Virgil (*Aen.* 2.318–35, with Horsfall on 320). Paulcke claims to see the letters]ων next to this figure (on the basis of which he suggests Ucalegon or Pammon), but such an inscription cannot be read today, if it ever could.

Between these two sections stands the central gate of Troy. Here Aeneas is led forth by Hermes (both labelled), bearing upon his left shoulder his father Anchises (labelled), who in turn carries the casket in his left arm. With his right hand, Aeneas leads the tiny Ascanius (labelled), who is apparently naked. Behind him is a barely discernible figure generally reckoned to be Aeneas' wife.

The area outside the city can be divided into four sections. At the top left a rectangular structure with adjoining steps all round is labelled Ἕκτορος τάφος; on the far left is a further label, Ταλθύβιος καὶ Τρωιάδες. Next to this stands the Greek herald; then, at the front of the structure, sit Andromache, Cassandra, and Helenus (all labelled). Andromache is probably holding Astyanax in her lap; Cassandra is gripping her head in her hands. The perpendicular side of the building, facing towards the right, portrays Hecuba, Polyxena (a small woman, held by Hecuba), Andromache (without Astyanax this time), and Helenus, in conversation with Odysseus, who is standing near by (all labelled). Perhaps Talthybius has come to take Astyanax away to be killed (hence the reaction of Cassandra), as in Euripides' *Troades*. Then

Odysseus arrives afterwards (hence Andromache's presence, without her son) to fetch Polyxena for sacrifice. But why Helenus should feature in both scenes is a mystery. The finished stone structure of Hector's tomb diverges from the Iliadic account, where the Trojans merely heap great stones over the trench that receives his ashes (24.788–801).

The tomb is balanced on the right by a square column with a stepped base labelled Ἀχιλλέως σῆμα. Before this Polyxena kneels, naked to the waist, hands bound; Neoptolemus holds her head back to stab her in the throat. On the other side of the pillar sits Odysseus, his head propped in his right hand in what might be a pensive pose; next to him stands Calchas. All these characters are labelled.

At the bottom left, reaching over into the middle, is a line of twelve ships labelled ναύσταθμον Ἀχαιῶν. In the middle at the bottom is a square pillar labelled Σειγαῖον. The picture at the bottom right has the remarkable superscription Αἰνείας σὺν τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀπαίρων εἰς τὴν Ἑσπερίαν. A ship stands ready to depart, with oars in position and sails raised. The shields ranked in order at its side suggest that the ship has its full complement of sailors. Next to the vessel we read ἀπόπλους Αἰνήου. On the plank that stretches from land to the vessel stands Aeneas; in his right hand is his son Ascanius, and in his left his father, who, as he steps on board, hands his casket to a man standing inside the vessel; the figures are labelled Ἀγχίσης καὶ τὰ ἱερά. Behind them is a figure holding a trumpet in his left hand and his head in his right; he is labelled Μίσηνος.

While we accept the tablet's authority as a source for the reconstruction of Stesichorus' poem (so also Debiasi (2004) 161–77, Scafoglio (2005), Finglass (2014b)), the artist's primary duty was to produce an effective work of art, not to reproduce faithfully the details of the poem. When considering any individual scene on the tablet, we must consider the possibility that it has been altered to suit artistic rather than literary aims. To give one example, we cannot say that in Stesichorus Cassandra was clinging to the columns outside Athena's temple, as she is on the tablet, rather than to the statue of Athena, as in the *Iliou Persis*. The picture on the tablet could easily be the artist's invention, a replacement of the interior scene found in Stesichorus, which would have been harder to portray. Nevertheless, overall there is a basic similarity between poem and artefact: 'the *Iliupersis* of Stesichorus, however garbled and contaminated, gave reason for its use as a caption for the carved relief' (Gruen (1992) 14).

Some scholars argue that the tablet cannot illustrate Stesichorus' poem, for the following reasons:

(1) Menelaus' encounter with Helen presupposes the account known from the *Little Iliad* and Ibycus, in which her nakedness prevents him from killing her. In Stesichorus, by contrast (fr. 106), the impact of her beauty was felt by the whole army, who as a consequence held back from stoning her (cf. Schmidt (1917) 66–7).

(2) Hecuba is sitting alongside the other captives, when in Stesichorus (fr. 109) she is transported to Lycia by Apollo (cf. Schmidt (1917) 68–9).

(3) Aeneas' escape from Troy to the west is dubious, for several reasons (cf. Schmidt (1917) 86–91). (i) The general prominence given to Aeneas' departure 'must reflect the importance of the Aeneas-legend as dynastic propaganda at the time the *Tabula* was produced' (Horsfall (1979b) 375). (ii) Stesichorus would not have used the term Ἑσπερία to denote Italy or the west (thus Fabretti (1683) 381). (iii) The inclusion of the sacred objects of Troy (the *penates*) is an anachronism unique in Greek art (Horsfall (1979b) 376). (iv) Misenus and his trumpet are out of place here (thus Schmidt (1917) 73–4): 'this is the Misenus of the Roman antiquarian tradition' (Horsfall (1979b) 376, referring to Virg. *Aen.* 6.164–5; thus Fabretti (1683) 381). (v) Dionysius of Halicarnassus cites many sources for the Aeneas legend (Hellanicus, Sophocles, Menecrates of Xanthus, Cephalon of Gergis, Hegesippus, Ariaethus, Agathyllus of Arcadia, Homer; 1.48–64), but fails to mention Stesichorus, despite his familiarity with that poet (he 'knew his Stesichorus well, as the rhetorical works bear witness', according to Horsfall (1979b) 376), and his interest in establishing as early a date as possible for Aeneas' travels (thus Horsfall (1979a) 43 with n. 128).

We respond to these points as follows:

(1) This is the most serious charge against the tablet – that it directly contradicts Stesichorus' account. We cannot escape the contradiction by supposing (as Welcker (1829b) 236 ≈ (1849–64) II 193 does) that Stesichorus included both near-lynchings, by Menelaus and by the army, in his poem. The Euripidean scholium which quotes our fragment explicitly differentiates Stesichorus' treatment from those of the *Little Iliad* and Ibycus, and thereby implies that Stesichorus did not describe Menelaus' encounter with Helen. Nevertheless, we cannot deduce from the discrepancy that the tablet has no significant relationship to Stesichorus' work. The poet's version could not have been represented easily on the tablet without taking up a disproportionate amount of space (cf. Welcker (1829b) 236 ≈ (1849–64) II 193), and yet the climactic encounter could hardly have been omitted from a depiction of the sack of Troy. Working in a medium with such limitations, the artist substituted the story known to him from the *Little Iliad*

for Stesichorus' account. In this case, the particular demands of plastic art trumped the desire to provide a faithful presentation of the poem. The same process occurred in the sculptor's treatment of scenes from the *Iliad*, as shown above; we do not conclude on that basis that the sculptor had no knowledge of the *Iliad*, and so it would be illicit to make the same deduction in the case of Stesichorus (so rightly Valenzuela Montenegro (2004) 383).

(2) Hecuba's presence on the tablet does not contradict Stesichorus' poem, since the relevant fragment does not tell us at what stage Apollo translated Hecuba to Lycia. Her removal after the death of her daughter Polyxena would have the poetic benefit of allowing her to sink to her lowest point before her rescue by the god.

(3) (i) If we accept that the tablet reflects the contents of Stesichorus' poem, we may nevertheless believe that the prominence given to Aeneas is the result of contemporary concerns (thus Mancuso (1911) 721). That said, the beginning of Aeneas' voyage would have been a most effective conclusion, and Stesichorus could have highlighted it to achieve variety amid the misery of the sack. It may be that Stesichorus' poem (and not the epic *Iliu Persis*) was chosen to illustrate the *Tabula* precisely because he included Aeneas' journey to the west (thus Jahn and Michaelis (1873) 37–8 with n. 247).

(ii) Other instances of the noun Ἑσπερία are indeed post-Hellenistic; *Hesperia* is first attested in Latin at Enn. *Ann.* 20 Skutsch, perhaps (as Sk. suggested) taken from Naevius. But the designation 'people of the west' is as old as Homer: at *Od.* 8.28–9 Alcinous declares that Odysseus has arrived ἠὲ πρὸς ἠοίων ἢ ἑσπερίων ἀνθρώπων. The adjective Ἑσπέριος accompanies χθών at Ap. Rh. 3.311 and Agathyllus fr. 15.3 *SH*. A further possible instance is at [Hcs.] fr. 150.6 M–W Ἑ̣σ̣πε[ρί]ην (in a context where many places are named, but this is by no means a certain supplement). See further Malkin (1998) 192–3. Stesichorus might not have used the noun, though even this is not certain; but he could easily have used the corresponding adjective as part of an expression simplified by the sculptor of the tablet into 'Hesperia'.

The 'west' in question might be Sicily or Italy (thus Niebuhr (1811–12) I 129), but could even be as specific as Latium. After all, Aeneas' associations with Italy and Rome are attested by a scarab as early as the late sixth or early fifth century. They may be earlier than that, if the juxtaposition of his birth with that of Latinus in a probable fragment of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* is meaningful. Moreover, Stesichorus may well have referred to Evander's migration from Arcadia to Latium in the *Geryoneis* (fr. 21n.). On the other hand, if Stesichorus had specified Italy or Latium, we might have expected the caption to mention it;

'this vagueness supports its authenticity; a forger would have had free rein' (Malkin (1998) 192). If Stesichorus simply mentioned 'Hesperia', the question arises what he meant by this word. We might not be able to solve this problem even if we had the whole poem.

(iii) Aeneas' rescuing of the sacred objects is attested on a late sixth- or early fifth-century Etruscan scarab (see p. 400 with n. 33 above), which suggests that an Italian connexion was felt even then. Hellanicus too refers to his retrieving them, although in the context of his settling at Pallene, not Rome. These early attestations of the myth in different media and environments suggest that the story was an established part of some variants by the sixth century.

(iv) The *Tabula*'s portrayal of the sack contains many differences from Virgil (thus Valenzuela Montenegro (2004) 387–91); so, for example, the *Tabula* presents Hermes/Mercury guiding Aeneas and his family, when in Virgil the god makes no such appearance. (Hermes assists Aeneas in Marcellus of Side's Epitaph for Regilla, lines 23–7: see Davies and Pomeroy (2012) for an edition.) And if the *Tabula* was mainly influenced by Virgil, we may ask (with Heurgon (1969) 25–6) why it specifies Hesperia (an obscure name for Aeneas' destination) rather than Rome or Italy. There is no reason to assume that the *Tabula*'s depiction of Misenus is owed to Virgil, or indeed to the Roman antiquarian tradition, in which he featured as either helmsman or a trumpeter; the latter version was used by 'Caesar' in the first book of the *Libri Pontificales* (thus [Aurel. Vict.] *Origo gentis Romanae* 9.6; the Caesar in question may be the L. Caesar who at 15.4 is said to have narrated Ascanius' actions in Latium 'in his first book'). If Misenus was associated with the Punto di Miseno in the archaic period, Stesichorus the westerner may well have been familiar with that landmark (thus Sadurska (1964) 33, Heurgon (1969) 26). Misenus was also said to have been a companion of Odysseus (Strab. 1.2.18), whose legend was so intertwined with that of Aeneas that they were made co-founders of Rome (Hellan. *Priestesses of Hera at Argos* fr. 84 *EGM*, Damastes fr. 3 *EGM*; cf. Solmsen (1986), Debiasi (2008) 70 with n. 209). Strabo's testimony suggests that Misenus was involved in voyages from Troy in the Greek tradition well before Virgil, and so there is no reason why Stesichorus should not have featured him as a character.

(v) The argument from silence can be countered in two ways. First, Dionysius is erratic in his citations of Hellanicus (for which see above, pp. 399–400). He begins his investigation of the Aeneas legend by citing at length Hellanicus' *Troika*, in which Aeneas' travels involve merely a short trip across the Hellespont. Only much later (1.72.2) does he cite Hellanicus' other work, *On the Priestesses of Argos*, in which

Hellanicus describes how Aeneas journeys to Italy and founds Rome. Earlier on, he argues against the view that Aeneas never came to Italy (1.53.4); Hellanicus' evidence would have been useful here, yet Dionysius fails to adduce it. This odd way of handling what to us seems a key testimonium suggests that Dionysius cannot be relied on to treat literary evidence in the most logical manner. We are therefore reluctant to conclude that he could not have known a passage in Stesichorus stating that Aeneas travelled to the west. If he did know such a passage, he might have ignored it on the ground that Stesichorus did not bring Aeneas to Italy, let alone to Latium (thus Gruen (1992) 14), although it can only be a guess that Stesichorus did not mention either of those places.

Dionysius refers to Stesichorus only three times. He associates him with Pindar in the use of grand periods (*Comp. Verb.* 19), with Alcaeus as the best lyric poets at blending different sorts of vocabulary (*ibid.* 24), and praises the grandeur of his plots and the portrayal of his characters (*De imit.* epit. 2.7 Aujac). He never quotes his work, however (with the exception of fr. 91a.1, cited in his *First Letter to Amaeus* 3.1, which he probably knew from its Platonic citation) or refers to it in a way that suggests detailed knowledge (so rightly Valenzuela Montenegro (2004) 392). It does not follow that he had not read Stesichorus, but he might not have been particularly familiar with his poetry.

106

According to the scholia to Euripides' *Orestes*, Stesichorus described how the people about to stone Helen were diverted from that purpose by the sight of her beauty. The scholia on the same line refer to an emendation of the line of Euripides by Aristophanes of Byzantium (fr. 389 Slater); his note on the line might have been the source for the knowledge of Stesichorus shown in the scholium (thus Wilamowitz, in his first edition of Euripides' *Heracles*, 1 p. 151 with n. 58). The fragment is not attributed to the *Sack of Troy*, and the people engaging in the stoning are not said to be the Greek army at Troy; but both hypotheses are very probable. According to Wachter (2001) 316, 'the scholiast is explaining a scene from the *Oresteia*, when the characters in question were long since back home in Greece, and he mentions neither Menelaos nor Troy'; but it is hard to imagine Menelaus being powerless to defend his spouse on his return home. The attempt on Helen's life back in Greece in Euripides' *Orestes* seems like an innovation by that poet, not an echo of a Stesichorean version. According

to Heurgon (1969) 25, the fragment came from the *Palinode*, but that would imply quite a lengthy description of the sack of Troy in a work that we may imagine was mainly set in Egypt.

The *Odyssey* does not describe the moment when Menelaus recovers Helen at the sack. Proclus' summary of the cyclic *Iliu Persis* says only Μενέλαος δὲ ἀνευρὼν Ἑλένην ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς κατάγει, Δηΐφοβον φονεύσας (arg. 2 *GEF*). In the *Little Iliad* (fr. 28 *GEF*) Menelaus was about to put Helen to the sword when a glimpse of her breasts diverted his ardour. This account occurs in Ibycus (fr. 296 *PMGF*), Euripides (*Andr.* 627–31; cf. *Or.* 1287), and Aristophanes (*Lys.* 155–6). In art the first probable appearance of the scene is found on the Mykonos pithos which also features the earliest depiction of the Trojan horse; Menelaus draws his sword as he approaches Helen (Kahil (1988) §225). The same image is found on a Spartan relief from *c.* 580 (§230), the Chest of Cypselus (§226), a temple metope from Selinus from *c.* 520 (§231), and Attic black-figure vases from *c.* 560–510 (§§210–24); Helen removes her head covering or veil as if to assuage Menelaus' anger with beauty; the more explicit disrobing found in literary texts is missing. Other vases show Menelaus in pursuit of Helen (*c.* 550–450; §§235–51) or seizing her by her garment or elbow (*c.* 550–480; §§291–313). See further Hedreen (1996), Dipla (1997).

Stesichorus' version is not explicitly attested elsewhere. There may be an echo in Euripides' *Troades*, where Menelaus brusquely tells Helen βαῖνε λευστήρων πέλας | πόνους τ' Ἀχαιῶν ἀπόδος ἐν σμικρῶι μακρούς | θανοῦσ', ἵν' εἰδῆις μὴ καταισχύνειν ἐμέ (1039–41), a fate which the audience knows she will somehow escape. In *Orestes* Electra describes how Helen returns to Greece at night, in case she is stoned by the parents of warriors killed at Troy (56–60).

Presumably the version in the *Little Iliad* was more popular because it is more piquant for Helen's own husband to come close to killing her. If that account focusses on the intimate passion of a husband for his wife overcoming even a justified desire for revenge, Stesichorus sets the event against a wider, more public background. Helen is hated not (merely) by her husband, but by the entire army, who have suffered on her behalf, and who are thus keen to stone her (paradoxically, since they have fought so long to secure her recovery); equally, her beauty affects not a single man, but a mass of troops. The picture of a lone woman at the mercy of a whole army would be powerfully exploited in Attic tragedy (Iphigenia at Aesch. *Ag.* 192–247, Polyxena at Eur. *Hec.* 518–82). Other stonings, real or threatened, associated with the Trojan War include those of Paris (threatened by Hector at

Hom. *Il.* 3.56–7) and the lesser Ajax (*Iliu Persis* arg. 3 *GEF*, Alcaeus fr. 298.1–4 Voigt); Stesichorus has as it were transferred this motif to the recovery of Helen. Plutarch's account of the courtesan Lais provides a melancholy contrast with Stesichorus' poem: her beauty did not prevent her from being stoned to death (in the temple of Aphrodite, appropriately enough), but rather inspired her killers with jealousy (*Am.* 768a). For stoning in antiquity more generally see Soph. *Aj.* 253/4–256n.

107

In the *Iliad*, during her lament over Hector's body, Andromache imagines the likely fate of her son Astyanax: either he will follow her into slavery, or one of the Greeks will throw him over the walls of Troy, in anger for a relative killed by Hector (24.732–8, a passage which, as Burgess (2010) argues, probably indicates that Homer and his audience knew the story of the boy's fate). Andromache's fears become reality in the *Little Iliad*, where Neoptolemus throws him from the wall (fr. 29 *GEF*; cf. fr. 18 with West (2013) 216), and in the *Iliu Persis*, in which he meets the same fate (fr. 3) at the hands of Odysseus (arg. 4). The killer goes unnamed in Eur. *Andr.* 8–11. The earliest possible appearance of Astyanax's death in art occurs on a relief pithos from Mykonos, dated to 675–650; Astyanax (if it is he) is being thrown from the battlements (Touchefeu (1984) §27). His death features on Attic black- and red-figure pottery from *c.* 560 until 450 (§§7–24), always in connexion with the death of Priam. A warrior, usually unidentified (though named Neoptolemus on §18), is about to throw a child, who may be alive or already dead, towards Priam as the latter is killed. This type is quite distinct from the version known from literary accounts; the difference will reflect the particular challenges of depicting this scene in visual art, not the influence of an unknown literary version. For Astyanax in epic, tragedy, and art see further Kern (1918); for near-eastern parallels for his killing, S. Morris (1995).

The scholium which contains this fragment is not clearly expressed, and the phrase τοῖς δὲ χρηςιμωτέροις καὶ ἀξιοπιστοτέροις implies a preceding negative; the supplements at the start of the citation are owed to West, *GEF*. Euripides is said to have followed the version in the *Iliu Persis*, in which Astyanax is thrown from the wall. In Stesichorus, whom Euripides by implication did not follow, Astyanax is simply said to have died; yet Astyanax's death features, at least by implication, in the version shared by Euripides and the Cycle. Perhaps Stesichorus just mentioned that Astyanax died, without giving details (so MLW).

Or Astyanax might already be dead in Stesichorus when he is tossed from the battlements. The *Tabula* shows Talthybius taking the child from Andromache, although it is not clear whether the baby is still alive at this point.

108

The scholia to Lycophron and to the *Iliad* state that Stesichorus makes Hector the son of Apollo. In the *Sack of Troy* Apollo takes Hecuba to Lycia; this suits an account in which Hector is the fruit of their union (fr. 109n.), and so our fragment probably comes from this poem (thus Kleine p. 80).

In the *Iliad* Apollo frequently shows himself an especially fond guardian of Hector, and this may have prompted Stesichorus, or an earlier poet, to make him Hector's father. Alternatively, that very tradition influenced Homer. Apollo rescues Hector from defeat in the duel with Ajax (7.271–2), encourages him after his temporary worsting in battle (15.236–62), leads Achilles astray to protect him (21.599–22.20), gives him speed to flee from Achilles (22.202–4), preserves his corpse from corruption (23.188–91, 24.18–21), and promotes its ransom (24.31–54). A later tradition makes Apollo the father of Hector's brother Troilus (Σ Lyc. *Alex.* 307a = p. 61.7–9 Leone, Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.12.5). Apollo also fathered Ileus on a local nymph during his building of the walls of Troy for Laomedon ([Hes.] fr. 235 M–W). More generally, Priam in his grief refers hyperbolically to Ἕκτορά θ', ὃς θεὸς ἔκτε μετ' ἀνδράσιν, οὐδὲ ἐώικει | ἀνδρός γε θνητοῦ παῖς ἔμμεναι, ἀλλὰ θεοῖο (24.258–9); and Hector himself, in a moment of exuberant triumph, exclaims αἴ γὰρ ἐγὼν οὕτω γε Διὸς πάϊς αἰγιόχοιο | εἴην ἤματα πάντα, τέκοι δέ με πότνια Ἥρη, | τιοίμην δ' ὡς τίετ' Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἀπόλλων, | ὡς νῦν ἡμέρη ἥδε κακὸν φέρει Ἀργείοισι (13.825–8).

The scholia to Lycophron add that Hector is said to be Apollo's son in Euphorion (fr. 80 Lightfoot) and Alexander Aetolus (fr. 12 Magnelli); Lycophron too follows this account (*Alex.* 265). A further Homeric scholium attributes the story (on the authority of Porphyry) to these three Hellenistic poets, and also to Ibycus (fr. 295 *PMGF*), with no mention of Stesichorus. This may well result from confusion over the authorship of the *Sack of Troy*; Porphyry, or his source, would have attributed it to Ibycus, and thus named him instead of Stesichorus alongside the Hellenistic writers (thus Cingano (1990) 199–200).

For other instances where Euphorion and Stesichorus are mentioned as joint sources for a mythical detail see fr. 86n.

109

Pausanias states that Stesichorus had Hecuba translated to Lycia by Apollo in his *Sack of Troy*. According to the regular account, Hecuba is transformed into a bitch after the sack of her city (cf. Eur. *Hec.* 1259–74, Robert (1921–6) II/1 1279–80, Forbes Irving (1990) 207–10, Buxton (2009) 57–9). Stesichorus' unique version was probably inspired by Hom. *Il.* 16.666–83, where Apollo, at Zeus's command, removes the corpse of Zeus's son from the battlefield, washes, anoints, and dresses him, and has him placed by Sleep and Death 'in the rich people of broad Lycia' (ἐν Λυκίης εὐρείης πίονι δήμῳι, 16.673 = 683) for burial by his family. Sarpedon had a prior connexion to Lycia, his homeland. Whether Stesichorus invented an association between Hecuba and Lycia to explain her conveyance, we cannot say.

The fragment may be connected with fr. 108, which states that Stesichorus made Hector the son of Apollo (thus Schmidt (1917) 69). Such a detail would motivate the god's involvement: he did not want his former bedmate to end her days as a dog. For similar divine rescues of mortals from death or suffering see Heinze (1915) 58–9 n. 2 = (1993) 62–3 n. 95 (citing the cases of Laodice from later accounts).

110

Pausanias states that one of the prisoners of war in Stesichorus' *Sack of Troy* was called Clymene. According to our manuscripts of the *Iliad*, 'ox-eyed Clymene' and Aethra daughter of Pittheus were maidservants to Helen (*Il.* 3.143–4), but the line containing their names is most likely an early Attic interpolation (see Krieter-Spiro's n., and cf. Hom. *Il.* 1.[265], West (1999a) 186–7). Stesichorus may have known the line (and perhaps included Clymene alongside Aethra, whose presence is confirmed by fr. 105; thus Seeliger (1886) 38, Grossardt (2012) 35–6), but that is not a necessary deduction from his mention of Clymene here (so rightly Dihle (1970) 32–3 n. 42). He may have shared another epic source with the Athenians, who needed another female name to set alongside that of Aethra.

κατηρίθμηκεν suggests a catalogue of prisoners of war; for other catalogues in Stesichorus cf. frr. 102, 183.

111

According to Pausanias, Stesichorus names Medusa as one of Priam's daughters; such a detail is probably from the *Sack of Troy*, perhaps in

a list of prisoners of war. Medusa appears in Polygnotus' depiction of the sack of Troy painted in the Cnidian Lesche at Delphi between 458 and 447, and in Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.12.5 and Hyg. *Fab.* 90.6. There is no trace of her in earlier poetry outside Stesichorus, but our evidence is too scanty to allow the conclusion that these later accounts used Stesichorus as a source (so rightly Robert (1893) 65).

112

No line beginnings or ends are preserved, but small, very probable supplements at the start of lines 5, 6, and 8 give parallel word-beginnings, and thus most likely the left edge of a column of text. Line 5 could be str./ant. 2, 3, 5, 6, ep. 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, or 10. Line 6 could be str./ant. 2, 3, 5, 6, ep. 1, 2, 3, 9, or 10. This narrows the possibilities for lines 5–6 down to str./ant. 2–3, 5–6, ep. 1 -2, 2–3, 9–10. We can eliminate str./ant. 2–3 (because line 4 will not fit str./ant. 1), str./ant. 5–6 and ep. 2–3 (because line 8 will not fit str./ant. 8 or ep. 5), and ep. 1–2 (because line 7 will not fit ep. 3). This leaves ep. 9–10; therefore the fragment as a whole covers ep. 5 str. 5.

τονδε (2, if correctly restored) may suggest speech, but if so, it is not clear where the speech ends. .]αι δ' ἐκέλευσε τ[(7) suggests narrative; and if 5–6 were part of the speech, there would be no room for a phrase meaning 'thus s/he spoke'.

1 —⏑]οντ.αραις[×: perhaps ἰαραῖς(ιν), attested for Stesichorus at fr. 8.4, but the dotted letter is more likely alpha (Page (1973b) 54) than iota (Lobel (1967c) 43). If it is alpha, either the letter itself is a mistake, or γ' or τ' (e.g.) has dropped out.

2 τον.ε λόχο.[: 'ambush/stratagem'. In the *Odyssey* the horse is referred to as a κοῖλον λόχον (4.277, 8.515) and πυκινὸν λόχον (11.525). The dotted letter after τον is more probably alpha (Lobel) than delta (Page (1973b) 54). If it is alpha, the passage is corrupt. If it is a miswritten delta, τόνδε λόχον (thus Barrett *ap.* Page (1973b) 54) suggests direct speech, which is unwelcome (see introduction above); whereas τὸν δὲ λόχον (Page) would introduce a rare definite article.

3 κυδαλέο['noble', a *hapax* derived from κῦδος (cf. θάρσος, θαρσαλέος) and presumably equivalent to κυδάλιμος (epic, Alcaeus fr. 129.6 Voigt); adjectives in –άλιμος result from contamination of others in –αλέος and –ιμος (Risch (1974) 105). The words are metrically equivalent too: Stesichorus freely discards the epic form.

4 ×]υν τ' ἔχοντ..[: perhaps βαρ]ύν (MLW). The end of the line is restored ὠν[by Barrett *ap.* West (1969) 139, ε..[by Lobel (1967c) 43.

5–6 ξ]ανθὰ δ' Ἑλένᾳ Πρ[ιάμοιο νυὸς βα]σιλῆος ἀοιδιμ...[⏑— — 'golden-haired Helen, daughter-in-law of Priam the king' (ξ–, –ιάμ–, βα– *suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 43, –οιο Führer (1970) 12 n. 11, νυός Schade, p. 197). Helen is ξανθά at Sappho fr. 23.5 Voigt, Ibyc. fr. S151.5 *PMGF* ('an epithet that suggests heroic beauty': Wilkinson). At the end of line 5 we need a word describing the relationship of Helen to Priam; only νυός (attested in epic, and used of Helen herself at Hom. *Il.* 3.49; see further Faulkner on *Hom. Hym.* 5.136) will do, which leads us to prefer Πρ[ιάμοιο to Πρ[ιάμω (the latter *suppl.* West (1969) 140). In 6 ἀοίδιμος ('much-sung'; West) may well be right; cf. Hom. *Il.* 6.357–8 (Helen to Paris) οἷσιν ἔπι Ζεὺς θῆκε κακὸν μόρον, ὡς καὶ ὀπίσσω | ἀνθρώποισι πελώμεθ' ἀοίδιμοι ἐσσομένοισιν. A verb will have stood at the end of 6; this is most unlikely to have been εἶπεν, since 7 does not look like the start of a speech.

8–9 δα]ΐῳι πυρὶ καιομεν[— | ×—]πρήσαντας 'burning with destructive blaze . . . setting on fire' (*suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 43). In epic the common phrase δήιον πῦρ (*Il.* 9.347 etc.) occurs with (ἐνι)πίμπρημι at Hom. *Il.* 2.414–15 and 8.181–2; πῦρ alone features with (ἐνι/ἐμ)πίμπρημι at 7.429, 432, 9.242, Soph. *Ant.* 200–1, Eur. *Her.* 1151, Ar. *Lys.* 269, with καίομαι at *Il.* 8.521, 21.361, 375–6 and commonly in poetry and prose. The final syllable of πρήσαντας is short because of the following epsilon; it therefore fits in the metrical line ×— ⏑⏑ —⏑⏑— ⏑⏑ —⏑— — after a gap representing ×—. That gap might have been filled by ἐνι]–, which is small enough to fit while nevertheless providing the requisite two syllables (ἐμ]– *iam* West (1969) 140). ἐνιπρ– always has a long second syllable in epic.

113

The line pattern of longs and shorts fits only ep. 4–ant. 7.

λέγω (8, 19) and ποθέω (11) point to a speech (thus West (1969) 141); so perhaps do γένοιτ' (21) and προλιπω (20, if correctly restored). Ἑρμιόναν . . . ποθέω (10–11) suggests Helen as the speaker (cf. Hom. *Od.* 4.261–4, where Helen laments the ἄτη with which Aphrodite afflicted her, ὅτε μ' ἤγαγε κεῖσε φίλης ἀπὸ πατρίδος αἴης, | παῖδά τ' ἐμὴν νοσφισσαμένην θάλαμόν τε πόσιν τε, and Triph. 493–4, where Athena asks her οὐδὲ θύγατρα | Ἑρμιόνην ποθέεις;). The passage may even be from Helen's climactic encounter with Menelaus. Perhaps ὑφαρπάγιμον (13) was applied (self-pityingly and tendentiously) by Helen to

herself. Page (1973b) 56 mentions but rejects this idea, preferring to develop a suggestion by Lobel (1967c) 46: namely, that this passage should be connected with Hesych. ε 5957 (II 196 Latte) Ἑρμιόνη· καὶ ἡ Δημήτηρ καὶ ἡ κόρη ἐν Συρακούσαις, and that it depicts Demeter lamenting her lost daughter Persephone. But such a story would be unexpected in this mythical context.

1–3 The dramatic language ('immediately . . . clear(ly) (*suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 46) . . . truly') suggests a highly wrought moment: perhaps some revelation or realisation is taking place?

4 ἀ]μιόνους 'mules' is owed to MLW; Lobel (1967c) 46 had written ἡ]μιόνους. The dotted letter is 'the top of an upright' (*ibid.* 45) and, while consistent with mu, does not demand it; but no other plausible restoration is at hand.

5 πρωπε̣[: either πρωπέ̣[ρυσιν ('two years ago'; this and not προ– happens to be the correct Attic form, as is metrically guaranteed at Pherecr. fr. 196 *PCG*, and prescribed by Apoll. Dysc. *De Adverbiis* 1/1 166.24–6 Schneider and Uhlig, but what form was preferred by Stesichorus we cannot tell) or πρὼ<ι> πε[; both are put forward by Lobel (1967c) 46.

6 κ]υπρογενὴς α[: *suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 46. This title of Aphrodite, attested from Hesiod onwards (see Braswell on Pind. *P.* 4.216(b)), could be an adjective as well as a noun (cf. Theogn. 1386, *Hom. Hym.* 10.1), and so the following word could be Ἀ[φροδίτα (despite Lobel).

7 ἁλιπόρφυρον 'of sea-purple'; used of woollen garments in Homer (*Od.* 6.53 = 306, 13.108), of a bird in Alcman (fr. 26.4 *PMGF*). The adjective is the wrong case to describe Aphrodite (line 6), but might qualify one of her attributes. She is said to be πορφυρέη at Anacr. fr. 357.3 *PMG*; cf. Bion 1.3–4, Anon. *A.P.* 12.112.2 = 3711 *HE*, Dürbeck (1977) 135–7. Himerius (*Or.* 62.2) uses the adjective to qualify the Nereids, whom Sappho (fr. 5.1 Voigt, a safe supplement) invokes in the company of Aphrodite. A different approach notes the connexion of the town of Hermione (line 10) in the Argolid with purple cloth; but its proposer acknowledges that line 10 more probably denotes the daughter of Helen (Lobel (1967c) 46).

ἁγν[: either ἁγνόν or ἁγνάν 'holy' (as West (1969) 141 implies). The word follows ἁλιπόρφυρον just as ἱαρός follows the same word in Alcm. fr. 26.4 *PMGF*.

9–11 ἀθανάτοι[×—⏑]λον Ἑρμιόναν τ̣.[—⏑—×—⏑⏑].ων ποθέω: perhaps ἀθανάτοι[σιν εἴκε]λον (*suppl.* Page, *SLG*; cf. *id.* (1973b) 56),

maybe with ἑ]γών (*ibid.* p. 55) giving 'I long for . . . Hermione, who resembled the immortals'

11 νύκτ[: perhaps νύκτ[ας τε καὶ ἄματα (*suppl.* Führer (1971b) 253; cf. Hom. *Il.* 18.340, 24.745) or ἄμαρ (Page (1973b) 55; cf. 5.490, *Od.* 2.345, Leumann (1950) 100), emphasising the perpetual nature of the emotion (cf. Soph. *El.* 86–93).

12]λοπόδαν: there are two possibilities. (i) ἀ]ελ<λ>οπόδαν 'with wind-swift foot' (*suppl.* Page (1973b) 55), for which cf. Ibyc. fr. S223(*a*).21 *PMGF*, Hell. Adesp. fr. 953.3 *SH*, Opp. *Cyn.* 1.413, 3.184, Quint. Smyrn. 10.189; also ἀελλόπος, predicated of Iris in Homer, and of horses elsewhere (see Faulkner on *Hom. Hym.* 5.217). (ii) αἰ]γλοπόδαν 'with radiant foot' (Diggle (1970) 5, comparing Pind. *O.* 13.36 αἴγλα ποδῶν).

13 ὑφαρπάγιμον: this adjective (*hapax*) is derived from ὑφαρπάζω 'snatch secretly' (attested in Aristophanes); the simplex ἁρπάγιμος is found in Callimachus. The secret snatching is presumably connected with Helen.

14 κνακα[: probably feminine of κνακός 'tawny' (thus Page (1973b) 56), attested at Thespis *TrGF* 1 F 4.2, Soph. fr. 314.367 *TrGF*; cf. Hesych. κ 3083 (II 492 Latte) κνακός· ψαρὸς ἵππος.

16 —◡◡— κ]ορυφαῖσι νάπαις[(ι) τε 'in the peaks and glens' (κ] *suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 46, *cett.* Daly (1969) 238); cf. Ar. *Av.* 739–40 νάπαισί τε καὶ κορυφαῖς, Lyr. Adesp. fr. 935.6 *PMG* κατ' ὄρεα καὶ νάπας. The gap at the start of the line might contain ἀκροτάταις 'highest' (JD). Less natural is the articulation κ]ορυφαῖσιν (Lobel (1967c) 46) after which we would have ἄπαις or ἀπαις[–; the former would presumably refer, by hyperbole, to Helen missing her daughter Hermione, but the sense is strained.

18]δα παίδα φίλον: if the adjective goes with the noun, then the phrase is not referring to Hermione; impersonal φίλον (e.g. 'may it be dear to the gods that', as at fr. 15.25) would allow παίδα to refer to Hermione (thus Lerza (1981) 27–8), but it is more likely that the word qualifies the adjacent noun.

20]ῳ..ρο..πω[ι][: προλίπω (*suppl.* Page (1973b) 55) is consistent with the traces.

21 γένοιτ' .[: the dotted letter seems incompatible with omicron (cf. Lobel (1967c) 46), and so the verb must be elided.

114

This fragment is made up of two pieces from different papyri: P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 18 (which contains parts of lines 1–15) and P.Oxy. 2803 fr. 11 (lines 4–18). The connexion was made by Führer (1971a) and West (1971b) 263–4. P.Oxy. 2619 fr. 18 comes from the top of a column. Its first line was either ant. 1 (the topmost text, which we print as line 1 of the fragment) or str. 8 (which is too short to reach the preserved part of the papyrus).

The fragment refers to the Greeks leaving the horse (9). However, this is most unlikely to have been the moment in the poem when the ambush began; Stesichorus will hardly have dismissed such a crucial turning-point in a single line (so rightly Barrett *ap.* Page (1973b) 65 n. 1). Perhaps the fragment refers back to a description of that event ('When the Greeks . . . '); it would then presumably have come from a speech delivered by a Trojan.

1]τ' ἐπικουρ[: either ἐπίκουρ[οι (*suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 47) or ἐπὶ κούρ[(West (1971b) 263, with reference to Cassandra). In the preceding gap, perhaps πολέες] (*suppl.* Führer *ap.* Schade, p. 155; cf. Lobel); Δαρδανίδαι would fit at the start of the line, but is perhaps unlikely given the likely content of the following lines.

2].δαρ: word-break is most unlikely after these letters; the only possibility (attested in epic, but not lyric) would be εἶδαρ, but the preceding trace does not seem compatible with iota. Words containing δαρ anywhere are not common; Δαρ|[δαν(ι)– (*suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 47) would be highly appropriate, but would require synapheia at a place where other lines have word end. It seems likely that the papyrus has misdivided the words (thus Barrett *ap.* Page (1973c) 57, Haslam (1974) 26 n. 31, Führer (1977) 14 n. 143); hence we do not take this passage as evidence for synapheia in str./ant. 2–3.

3]λιποῖσα[: a female is leaving, possibly more than one; she could be Cassandra, after her failure to persuade the Trojans of the threat posed by the horse (cf. Quint. Smyrn. 12.580–5; thus West (1971b) 263), Helen, after her failure to lure out the hiding Greeks, or a pro-Trojan goddess abandoning the city (cf. perhaps 11–12 and Aesch. *Sept.* 217–18 θεοὺς | τοὺς τῆς ἁλούσης πόλεος ἐκλείπειν λόγος).

4]ματακα[: perhaps a neuter plural noun followed by καί, or by Κα[ς|άνδρ– (the latter Führer (1971b) 253).

6 γαι]ᾱόχου['who carries the earth' (*suppl.* West (1971b) 263; <**wek*^{h}– 'convey'); that is, Poseidon (cf. 10, Hom. *Il.* 13.83, *Od.* 3.55, Pind. *O.*

1.25–6, Aesch. *Sept.* 310, Soph. *OC* 1072–3, Mylonopoulos (2003) 379). Elsewhere the epithet is applied to Zeus (Aesch. *Suppl.* 816) and Artemis (Soph. *OR* 160–1) in the sense of πολιοῦχος (see FJ/W on the former passage, Beck (1982)).

7 πίτνη 'he/she/it was falling'. The scribe writes πίτνα *supra lineam*, perhaps influenced by πίτνα at Hom. *Il.* 21.7, or as a hyperdorism (cf. Willi (2008) 59); if we assume that the former is a contracted imperfect of πιτνάω or an Aeolicism (cf. Chantraine (1942–53) I 301), the corresponding Doric form will end in eta. The dotted letter in πυ.[is a vertical stroke; πῦρ 'fire' (thus West (1971b) 263) is possible, as would be πυμ[ατ– 'furthest', 'utmost'.

9 Δα]ναοὶ μεμ[αότ]ες ἐκθόρον ἵ[π]π̣[ου 'the Danaans eagerly leapt from the horse'. Δα] is owed to Lobel (1971) 10. In μεμ[αότ]ες (*suppl.* West (1971b) 263, Führer (1971a) 266 n. 12) the papyrus traces are perhaps more suggestive of alpha than epsilon, but they are too faint to be sure; an alpha would have to be emended. In ἵ[π]π̣[ου (thus West, *ibid.*) part of the iota is visible, but almost none of the pi; the context makes this word very probable.

10 Ἐ]ννοσίδας γαιάοχος ἁγνὸς ε['the holy, earth-shaking, earth-holding...' (*suppl.* Lobel (1971) 10). Poseidon is given many epithets, in contrast to the divinities at 11–12, who apparently have none. His title Ἐννοσίδας is elsewhere found only in Pindar; the usual form is Ἐννοσίγαιος (see Braswell on Pind. *P.* 4.33(e)), which accompanies γαιάοχος (6n.) at Hom. *Il.* 9.183 etc., *Od.* 11.241, [Hes.] fr. 253.2 M–W. ἁγνός is applied to male deities at Pind. *O.* 7.60 (Helios), *P.* 9.64 (Apollo), Aesch. *Suppl.* 653 (Zeus).

11–12]αρ Ἀπόλλων | [—⏑⏑—⏑]αραν οὐδ' Ἄρταμις οὐδ' Ἀφροδίτα ['[nor] Apollo... nor Artemis, nor Aphrodite... holy...' (Ἄρταμις is the West Greek form: cf. Page's edition of Alcman's *Partheneion*, p. 140). These deities are all supporters of the Trojans; perhaps the poet remarked that they were unable to assist their protégés (thus Führer (1971a) 266 with n. 13, citing e.g. Hom. *Il.* 5.53 ἀλλ' οὔ οἱ τότε γε χραῖσμ' Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα), or that they did not stay in the city now that its capture is at hand (3n.). This may have evoked sympathy for the defeated Trojans (HLS). In 11 we might supplement οὐδ'] ἄρ' (West (1971b) 263) or γ]άρ Barrett (*ap.* Page (1973b) 59); if the latter is right, some action by Poseidon is apparently cited as the cause for another (negative) action by the other three divinities. Then in 12 ἵ]αράν qualifying e.g. πόλιν or Ἴλιον (thus West (1971b) 264) is very

plausible, but not the only possibility (e.g. λιπ]αράν could also have qualified Troy).

14] Τ̣ρ̣ῳ̣ῶν **π[ό]λιν Ζεύς** 'Zeus . . . the city of the Trojans' (*suppl.* West (1971b) 264). The missing verb might mean 'destroyed'. Before Ζεύς the papyrus reads λιν (West, p. 263), not νη (Lobel (1967c) 47). The right stroke of the lambda intersects with the bottom of the iota, as at fr. 113.7, the only other place on this papyrus where these two letters adjoin clearly; similar intersections are found when alpha is followed by iota. The slight curve in the right stroke is reminiscent of part of lambda rather than the cross-stroke of nu. The third letter, nu, has a cross-stroke which ends higher than usual, as in frr. 103.3, 130.3. If it were an eta, however, such a slanting cross-bar would be unparalleled.

16]**ου Τρῶας** .[×—⏑—]**.μους:** West (1971b) 263 identifies the dotted letters as iota and epsilon, but the evidence is tenuous. The word ending –μους may have been an adjective accompanying Τρῶας.

17]**ιν.μερ.[:** possibilities include πόλ]ιν ἰμερό̣[εσσαν 'lovely city' (*suppl.* West (1971b) 263; cf. Tyrt. fr. 4.4 *IEG*, *Hom. Hym.* 3.180, [Hes.] fr. 43a.62 M–W) and ἄ̣μερς̣[(Barrett *ap.* Page, *SLG*; the verb ἀμέρδω 'deprive, bereave' is attested in epic and lyric).

115

Line 1 does not fit str./ant. 8, and, if the sequence ×—⏑⏑— could not be realised as ————, would not fit str./ant. 2, 3, 5, 6, ep. 2, 3, 9, or 10. Lines 2 and 3 do not fit str./ant. 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, ep. 2, 3, 8, 9, or 10; line 4 does not fit str./ant. 1, 4, 7, 8, ep. 4, 5, 6, or 7. As a consequence, the only place where line 1 could fit is ep. 5.

A speech begins in 2. It probably ends in 6; if so, it is certainly spoken by a woman (Barrett *ap.* West (1969) 141; cf. 7n.). The speaker may be Helen, the addressee Menelaus (West, *ibid.*; cf. 1n., 3–4n.). The shortness of the speech may suggest urgency and/or a dialogue between two characters in which several such speeches were exchanged.

1 ἰμερτόν 'desired, lovely' would suit, but does not demand, a reference to Helen (though of course it would not qualify her directly, on grounds of gender); she is the object of ἵμερος at Hom. *Il.* 3.446, [Hes.] fr. 199.2 M–W. (Cf. however the possible supplement at fr. 114.17, in which Troy itself is ἰμερόεσσα.) The intensely subjective adjective provides an emotional end to a speech.

2 The dotted letter will be gamma or pi with a retouched cross-stroke (thus Lobel (1967c) 48). If it was the latter, π̣[οτέφα (*suppl.* Führer (1971b)

253–4) is superior to π̣[οτέειπ– (Barrett *ap.* West (1969) 141), because it provides word-end after —⏑⏑—⏑⏑—, as in all preserved instances from this poem.

3–4 .ωc ἀγαπαζ[⏑⏑— | δ]υcώνυμοc̣ ['love . . . of ill repute' (*suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 48). π̣ῶc (*suppl.* Barrett *ap.* Page, *SLG*) is likely, and not too small for the space (cf. the large line-initial π at fr. 100.7). Slings (1994) 105 suggests e.g. π̣ῶc ἀγαπάζ[εαι, ἃ | δ]υcώνυμοc̣ [πάντεccιν ἀνθρώποιcίν εἰμι: ('How can you love me, I who am of ill repute among all people?').

5 ×]ῳδε τεκ[: word end might fall before or after omega (giving e.g. τίc] ὥδε τεκ[or ἄμφ]ω δὲ τεκ[), and is likely after epsilon (] ὧδε τε κ[puts τε in third place). If π̣ῶc is right in 3, τίc] ὥδε would be the second of two questions, as at Aesch. *Ag.* 478–82, Soph. *Phil.* 1160, and Eur. *Phoen.* 594; if Slings's supplement for 3–4 is correct, a further question would suit the emotionally heightened tone. τεκ[might indicate a reference to Helen's daughter Hermione (τέκ[ος); the overall sense, 'Who could have abandoned her child in the way that I did?', would continue the self-loathing.

6 ×].χοιc.[: it is hard to make anything of the dotted letter, if indeed anything has survived before the chi. ἀλ]ό̣χοιc (*suppl.* Kazansky (1997) 100) seems too short (thus MLW).

7 ὣc φά]τ̣ο· τὰν [δ(έ) 'Thus she spoke; and [someone answered] her[, saying]' (*suppl.* WSB; cf. fr. 103.42).

116

This fragment is made up of two pieces of papyrus (P.Oxy. 2619 frr. 27 and 28), joined by WSB. The latter contains lines 1–3 and parts of 4–5, the former lines 6–8 and parts of 4–5. The end of line 1 will fit only str./ant. 6; the line pattern of longs and shorts found on the fragment as a whole will fit only ant. 6–ep. 4. The topmost piece of text on the papyrus (line 1 of our text) is the first or second line of its column, since otherwise the end of the lengthy ant. 4 would be visible above πο. Hence the space under line 8 is the result of the short line ep. 5, not the bottom of a column.

It is just possible that this fragment comes from Neoptolemus' killing of Astyanax, though the identification is far from certain (2n., 4n., 6–7n.).

1]ώcαc πόλ[ι]ν: *suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 51, (1971) 7. Perhaps ἀϊcτ]ώcαc 'having destroyed' (*suppl.* Führer (1977) 19 n. 192); cf. fr. 119.6.

2 τ]έκος Αἰακιδαν [: *suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 51; the reference will be to Neoptolemus or (less probably) Achilles. If Neoptolemus is meant, the form of the designation could draw attention to his status as the inheritor of Achilles' prowess. The latter word (as Lobel notes) could be Αἰακίδαν (acc. sing.) or Αἰακιδᾶν (gen. plur.). The former in epic always denotes Achilles or Peleus; the latter case is attested in lyric but not in epic.

4 περὶ ἄστυ 'around the city'. In epic this phrase usually denotes fighting around the city of Troy (Hom. *Il.* 6.256, *Od.* 3.107). The exiguous traces are not consistent with Ἀστυάν̣[ακτ– (so rightly Page, *SLG*).

5 κατὰ φυ[: perhaps φῦ[λα (*suppl.* HLS, comparing Hom. *Il.* 2.362, *Od.* 15.409).

6–7 x—◡◡—◡◡]**εντα[ ] | [**—◡◡—◡◡— **Σκ]αμάνδριον α[**◡◡—x**:** *suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 50. Diggle (1990) supplements Σιμό]εντα (citing Hom. *Il.* 5.774, 12.21–2, where the two rivers are mentioned together) and ἀ[κτάν (citing Eur. *Tro.* 374, *Hel.* 609–10). Führer (1977) 19 prefers ἀ[νθεμόεντα, comparing Hom. *Il.* 2.467 ἐν Λειμῶνι Σκαμανδρίωι ἀνθεμόεντι. Scamandrius is said to be Astyanax's real name in the *Iliad* (6.399–403). We might supply Ἀ[στυάνακτα, which would make Σκ]αμάνδριον an epithet for him based on the Homeric passage.

117

The only section of the metrical scheme which fits the line lengths is str. 6–ant. 7. The first line of text has space above it; this represents either the top of a column or the short line str. 5.

The fragment may come from a speech, in which someone declares that it was not easy to sack Troy (2), and that the soldiers who sacked Troy (6–7) have won immortal glory among men (9); or this might be a prediction, saying the same thing in the future tense.

2 ο]ὐδὲ ῥέᾳ 'nor easily' (*suppl.* Finglass); cf. Hom. *Il.* 12.58 οὔ κεν ῥέα, 12.381 οὐδέ κέ μιν ῥέα, 20.101 οὔ κε μάλα ῥέα. Of other possible supplements, the adverb coheres less well with στεῦδε or εὖδε; metre excludes τὺ δέ.

4 βαρέ̣α .[: the neuter plural seems inevitable, as the feminine stem would require βαρεῖα. In Homer βαρέα occurs only in the combination βαρέα στενάχ– (eight times), but ς[cannot be verified (thus Lobel (1967c) 52); if it were correct, str./ant. 1–2 would be in synaphcia.

6–7 Τ]ροΐας κλεεννό[ν | —⏑⏑—⏑⏑ (ἐκ)πέ]ρσαντες ἐϋκτιμε[ν— 'sacking the famous, well founded... of Troy', or perhaps '... of well founded Troy' (6 is supplemented by West (1969) 141, with Page, *SLG* writing Τ]ρο– for the papyrus's Τ]ρω–; 7 by Lobel (1967c) 52). Cf. Hom. *Il.* 21.433 Ἴλιου ἐκπέρσαντες ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον, [Hes.] fr. 212(b).7 M–W Ἰ]αωλκ[ὸν ἐϋκ]τιμένην ἀλάπαξεν, Bacchyl. 11.122 πέρσαν πόλιν εὐκτιμέναν. The gap at the start of 7 presumably contained a noun governing Τ]ροΐας and qualified by κλεεννόν (perhaps by ἐϋκτίμε[νον too, as Lobel suggests, although ἐϋκτιμέ[νης is possible). Possible nouns include πέδον (cf. Eur. *Andr.* 11, 58, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 432–3), βάθρον (Eur. *IA* [1263]), δάπεδον (*ibid.* [755–6]), ἕδος (Bacchyl. 9.46); one might restore *exempli gratia* Τ]ροΐας κλεεννό[ν | παμπήδην δάπεδον πέ]ρσαντες ἐϋκτιμέ[νης 'having completely sacked the famous plain of well founded Troy'. Of other nouns, πτολίεθρον (often qualified by ἐϋκτίμενον in epic) and χθόνα (Eur. *Tro.* 816) are less likely on metrical gounds.

Aeolic κλεεννός occurs first at Alcm. fr. 10(*b*).12 *PMGF*, and then in other lyric, but not in epic or Lesbian poetry (see Braswell on Pind. *P.* 4.280(b)).

9 ἀ]νθρώπους κλέο[ς 'glory [among] men' (*suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 52). There may be a link with fr. 100.14, where Epeius is said to have won glory by bringing about the sack through his craftsmanship (thus HLS): here, it appears, the glory is more widely shared (cf. Simon. fr. eleg. 11.13–15 *IEG*). Before the noun we probably need to supply a preposition, probably ἐπ' (cf. Hom. *Od.* 24.94 πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους κλέος ἔσσεται ἐσθλόν, 1.299, 14.403, 19.334, *Il.* [10.212–13], 24.202), though we cannot rule out κατ' (cf. Theogn. 23 πάντας δὲ κατ' ἀνθρώπους ὀνομαστός).

118

This fragment consists of two pieces of papyrus, one containing lines 1–14, the other lines '15'–'19', joined by Lobel (1971) 6 on the basis of shared horizontal fibres. Line 9 is a long line ending ⏑——, and so could be str./ant. 3, ep. 1, 4, 6, 8, or 10. It is followed by a long line with —⏑⏑—⏑⏑— at or towards its end; this leaves str./ant. 3, ep. 1, 8, and 10. The next three lines are short-long-long; this leaves str./ant. 3 and ep. 10. Only the latter fits the preceding pattern of longs and shorts; hence the fragment covers ep. 2–str. 4 (thus West (1971b) 264; or str. 5, if the space at the bottom represents a short line rather than the end of a column). Führer (1971b) 251 objects that line 7 does not fit

ep. 8, and that the resulting synapheia between ep. 9 and 10 (lines 8–9) is undesirable; but the double short could have occurred in the anceps before the final epitrite, and we do not know enough about synapheia in this poem to rule it out for that reason.

1]̣λκυ[: the traces appear to rule out ή and ε]ἰ (Lobel (1971) 6), but ἑ would fit; hence e.g. ἕλκυ[σον.

3] θαλέας παρ̣[: there is a gap on the papyrus between the epsilon and alpha (big enough to contain another letter), which must have been empty; the only conceivable letter that could have filled the gap is rho, but θαλε[ρ]άς or –ᾶς would produce a long second alpha, contrary to the short mark above the letter. For a –θαλής compound with the short alpha demanded by the mark over that letter cf. Pind. fr. 52f.181 S–M εὐ]θαλέος, Bacchyl. 13.69 πανθαλέων (thus Lobel (1971) 6; scansion with long alpha is possible in the Bacchylides passage). After πα the traces are consistent with eta or rho (cf. Lobel (1971) 6); only the latter yields possible words.

5 πολυξε[: either πολυξε[νώτατος, suggesting a context of feasting and hospitality, or Πολυξέ[να (*suppl.* Lobel (1971) 6), whose sacrifice could motivate the reference to ἥρως Ἀχιλλεύς (fr. 119.3; thus West (1971b) 264).

8].νᾶρ: 'ἄρ|ξε or the like implied' (Lobel (1971) 6).

9 δ]ρακοῖσα (*suppl.* Lobel (1971) 6) implies a female looking at something.

10 α[ἳ]ς ἀλόχ[οις could be a reference to Priam's wives (thus Lobel (1971) 6).

12]κ[..]οισι ν[: the comma after the second iota presumably indicates word-break at a point where serious ambiguity was possible.

16, 19: for the scholia Θέ(ων) π[and καὶ Θέ(ων) see fr. 101.3–4n.

119

Line three contains ——⏑——, probably towards its end. This fits str./ant. 3, 8, ep. 6, and 8, but of these, only str. 3 fits the pattern of long and short lines. The resulting scheme, str. 1–ant. 4 (thus West (1971b) 264), fits the text of each line, with the possible exception of line 9. There, θρασυν is followed by a small extent of blank papyrus. If this marks the end of a line, the final syllable has been erroneously written at the start of line 10; but it may be that the gap between letters was

larger than usual, or that the ink has been dislodged. The space under line 12 could be ant. 5 (a short line), or the bottom of a column.

3 ἥ]ρως Ἀχι̣λ̣λ̣ε̣υ̣[: *suppl.* Lobel (1971) 7. The phrase will be a nominative (as Lobel suggests) or vocative. For ἥρως accompanying a proper name see fr. 93.3n. It is not found with Achilles elsewhere; see fr. 118.5n. for a possible explanation of its appearance.

4 ἄφελεστε[: either ἄφελε imperative, ἄφελε for ἀφεῖλε, or ἄφελες for ἀφεῖλες (thus Lobel (1971) 7); the first two might be followed by στε[φαν– (JD, citing Eur. *Tro.* 784 πύργων . . . στεφάνας, *Hec.* 910 στεφάναν . . . πύργων). The papyrus's accent rules out ἀφελές and ἀφελέστε[ρ–.

6]ώσας πόλιν: perhaps ἀΐστ]ωσας (cf. Lobel (1971) 7, who suspected that a verb of destroying stood here; fr. 116.1n.). The participle is singular; if Achilles is still the referent, his achievements are hyperbolically described as causing the destruction of Troy (cf. Hom. *Il.* 22.410–11).

7]ε δὲ τείχεος 'of the wall'; might some part of the barrier be damaged or broken through, as at Hom. *Il.* 12.291 τείχεος ἐρρήξαντο πύλας καὶ μακρὸν ὀχῆα? 'From the wall' would require a preposition in the vicinity, which seems impossible.

9]ν̣ας θρασυν[: possibly another singular participle, possibly from a verb meaning 'kill' (thus Lobel (1971) 7). There is a slight gap between the nu and the edge of the papyrus; if this is the last letter of the line, we have a case of incorrect word-division, since one more (long) syllable is required. θρασυν could be θρασύν, θρασὺ ν–, or the future stem of θρασύνω (which has a short upsilon in the future, long in the present).

11]. θαυμα[—× will be either θαῦμα, θαύμα[τ–, or θαυμά[σα–; metre excludes θαυμα[ζ–, the traces ἐθαυμα[σ–.

120

The pattern of long and short lines fits the metrical scheme only at str. 7–ep. 6.

3] μέγα χωσαμ[εν— 'greatly angry'; *suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 38, noting that while χωσάμενος is attested in epic, it is not qualified by μέγα; epic does frequently contain the phrase μέγ' ὀχθήσας, however.

5 —]μ̣α̣ τ̣ουτ[∪—×: no other division appears possible; the second word is probably τοῦτ[ο.

12]ε.̣πε.̣[: the first dotted letter will be iota or sigma, although the dots are too faint to verify this (so Lobel (1967c) 38).

14]..αντεc α[: perhaps ἀϊcτ]ώcαντεc (Führer (1977) 19, comparing fr. 116.1, where see n.; cf. Lobel (1967c) 38 ']ῳ might be acceptable').

16]θιμ[: ἰφ]θιμ[– Führer, *ibid.*

121

The pattern of long and short lines fits only str./ant. 3–8. πον]τοπόρου[and]κῦμα πολυ[suggest a reference to sea travel. This could be the Greeks' return from Tenedos, Aeneas' intended voyage to the west, the original voyage to Troy of the Greeks, or of Paris and Helen, or something quite different.

2 πον]τοπόρου['sea-going' (*suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 50).

5–6] κῦμα πολυ[×—◡—— 'wave . . . much'. Barrett (*ap.* Page, *SLG*) suggests πολυ[|φλοίcβου θαλάccας, a variant on the epic/elegiac κῦμα πολυφλοίcβοιο θαλάccης (cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.209, *Cypria* fr. 10.8 *GEF*, *Hom. Hym.* 6.4, Archil. fr. 13.3 *IEG*). πολυ[φλοίcβοιο πόντου would be another possibility. An adjective πολύ describing κῦμα seems less likely.

122

Line 3 ends with two long syllables, and is followed by a longer line, then a much shorter one; this fits str./ant. 3, ep. 1, 3, 5, and 10. Line 7 is shorter than line 8; this leaves only ep. 1, 3, and 5 as possibilities. If line 3 is ep. 1, then lines 5, 7, and 9 are ep. 3, 5, and 7, and ep. 3 is shorter than lines 7 and 9, which is unlikely. If line 3 is ep. 3 (thus West (1971b) 264), then lines 5 and 7 are ep. 5 and 7; line 5 must then contain —◡◡—◡◡—× before the line appears on the papyrus, whereas line 7 will have only —◡◡—◡. It is better to take line 3 as ep. 5, and thus the fragment as ep. 3–str. 1 (thus Barrett *ap.* Page (1973b) 63). Führer objects that this leads to ep. 5 being longer than ep. 9, but as the difference between them may be no more than one syllable (less if a contracted biceps is involved), this on its own is not surprising.

123

The line pattern of longs and shorts fits only str. 6–ant. 7. The blank space above line 1 could be str. 5 (a short line) or the top of a column.

2 α̣(.)θ̣εσιναι: between alpha and theta we probably have λη or *ν* (thus Lobel (1967c) 41), and hence ἀλη̣θέσι(ν) or ἄνθεσι(ν) followed by (ν)αι– in synapheia. But the papyrus fragment is lost, and neither reading can be confirmed from the plate provided by Lobel.

4]αθεσαι: perhaps κ]αθέσαι (*suppl.* Barrett *ap.* Page, *SLG*), though]αθες αι– (Führer (1971b) 251 n. 3) would be possible if synapheia was possible here.

7]̣λεται: the preceding letter is probably epsilon or upsilon (thus Lobel (1967c) 41), which suggests one of κ]έ̣λεται, π]έ̣λεται, and μ]ε̣λετᾶι (cf. Schade, p. 193).

124

The pattern of longs and shorts fits only str. 6–ant. 6.

125

The line pattern long-short-long-long-long-long-(slightly shorter)long-long fits only ant. 7–ep. 6 (as proposed by Page (1973b) 53).

126

From the *paragraphos* after line 2 we deduce that the fragment represents str. 7–ant. 4, ant. 7–ep. 4, or ep. 9–str. 4. Line 2 does not fit the metre of ep. 10, and so we can rule out the last option. The other two remain equally plausible.

3 καλλαδαπα[: possibilities include κάλλα (Lobel (1967c) 49, citing Alcm. fr. 35 *PMGF*) and κάλλα (Page (1973b) 58).

127

Line 2 is surrounded by longer lines; it could be str./ant. 2, 5, 8, ep. 3, 5, 7, and 9. Of these, str./ant. 2, 5, ep. 9 are ruled out by the metre and position of line 5; ep. 3, 5 by the length of line 4. The following possibilities remain: str./ant. 8 and ep. 7. We can eliminate ant. 8 because it places line 5 in ep. 3, where it would require a preceding gap of ×—◡◡—◡, when line 2 would need a gap of only ×—◡—. Hence the fragment could fall in two places in the metrical scheme: str. 7–ant. 5 (as noted by Steinrück (2006) 552) and ep. 6–str. 2. Whichever

is right, the blank space beneath line 7 indicates column-end, not a further, short line.

The fragment might come from an assembly; thus West (1969) 139, noting lines 1 ('meeting-place'), 5 ('gathered'), 6 ('word/speech'), and 7 (n.). This could be the Trojan assembly convened to decide about the horse, or a Greek assembly after the sack to discuss, among other things, the fate of Ajax.

4]εντεςο.[:]εντες ὁμ[ῶς *suppl.* Führer (1977) 19, comparing frr. 97.204, 103.4.

7]αστας[: West (1969) 139 supplements ἀν]αστάς 'having stood up' (perhaps of a speaker in an assembly), but e.g. στάς[ις is also possible.

128

Depending on what we supplement in line 3, this could be ep. 2–6 (West (1969) 137) or str. 7–ant. 3 (Führer (1977) 13 n. 131).

1] ἀθανα[: either 'Athena' or (supplementing [τ–) 'immortal'.

3] πεδὰ Μυρμιδ[όν–: this could be supplemented –όνεσσι ('amid the Myrmidons', *suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 48; cf. μετὰ Μυρμιδόνεσσιν at Hom. *Il.* 16.15 etc., *Od.* 11.495), –όνων (*suppl.* Führer *ap.* Schade, p. 210), or –όνας (Führer, *ibid.*).

129

2–3 ἀ]ργαλεα[. . . | κ]ούφως[: 'woeful . . . lightly' (*suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 38).

5].περ.[: perhaps περθ[(Lobel (1967c) 38). The previous dotted letter might have been sigma, but was not epsilon.

130

4 βλο]συροῖς ὑπ['under hairy/fierce' (*suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 50); attested in epic, in lyric at Aesch. *Eum.* 168, but not exclusively poetic (Plato uses it). The letter after upsilon could be pi or gamma (thus Lobel); ὑπό seems very likely, especially given Hom. *Il.* 15.608 βλοσυρῆισιν ὑπ' ὀφρύσιν. That passage comes from a description of Hector's battle rage, and in particular of his fiery eyes; a similar picture is possible here.

131

3]οκριτου̣[: Bacchyl. 7.17 has νεοκρίτου; no other word, apart from names, seems to be attested with the letters –οκριτο–. Word-break before kappa is possible.

5].ς̣[.].αι..[: πέ]ρ̣ς̣[ε]ῖται 'he/she/it will sack' (*suppl.* Barrett *ap.* Page, *SLG*).

132

Line 5, a long line ending ⏑—⏑⏑—, could come from str./ant. 1, 4, 7, or ep. 2. Since two lines later we need a line ending ⏑—, probably ⏑⏑—, we can rule out str./ant. 1 and ep. 2. But the two remaining possibilities, str./ant. 4 and 7, both have the wrong pattern of line lengths in lines 3–4 (long-short, where the metrical scheme has short-long). The fragment therefore does not fit the metrical scheme. We may presume a transcription error, such as the loss of a line.

On the right hand of the fragment opposite line five are some marks which apparently begin two lines in the next column of the papyrus.

3 ὁτο: perhaps ὁ (thus Page, *SLG* p. 169, s.v. ὁ, ἡ, τό) followed by το|[ξοτ– (*suppl.* Lobel (1971) 8; cf. Σ τοξοτ.[), with ὁ meaning 'the famous, well known', and thus referring to the famous archer Apollo, who may be mentioned together with Athena (cf. Σ ὀβριμ[οπάτρη, used of Athena by Homer, Hesiod, and Solon).

5 ἐπαςςύτεροι 'one after another'; found in Homer and Hesiod, the adjective appears elsewhere in lyric only at Bacchyl. fr. dub. 60.30 S–M.

133

The line pattern long-long-short-long could be accommodated if the fragment started with str./ant. 3, 6, ep. 1, 10. The pattern of line 4, ⏑———, will not fit if the fragment starts with str./ant. 3 or str. 6. Hence the possibilities are ant. 6–ep. 1, ep. 1–4, ep. 10–str. 3. If the blank space after line 4 represents a short line rather than the end of a column, only the first two are possible.

2]..ανωι φ[: word division before phi is inevitable; Lobel (1967c) 41 suggests nu for the dotted letter before alpha.

4 Ἀχαιοι̣[: either Ἀχαιοί or Ἀχαιοῖ|ςι(ν) (thus Page, *SLG*), depending on whether synapheia is possible.

135

3 θέ]μεθλα['foundations' (*suppl.* Lobel (1967c) 48). The word is found in epic (Hom. *Il.* 14.493, 17.47, Hes. *Th.* 816), lyric (Pind. *P.* 4.16, 4.180, Bacchyl. fr. 20B.27 S–M), and elegy (Sol. fr. 4.14 *IEG*). In Homer it describes parts of the body (the 'foundations' of the eye, or the stomach), as it might here too if]. δαμε[in 2 were a part of δαμείς. Equally, it could refer to the foundations of Troy itself (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 2.624–5 *visum*... |... *ex imo verti Neptunia Troia*).

4] ἄνδρε[c 'men'; despite Lobel (1967c) 48, this restoration seems safe.

137

Harpocration says that Stesichorus used καθαιρέω to mean 'kill'; abbreviated statements to the same effect, probably taken from our fragment, appear in Phot. *Lex.* κ 27 (II 345 Theodoridis) and *Su* κ 48 (III 6.23–4 Adler). This usage is common enough in poetry and prose (cf. LSJ[9] s.v. II 1 and 2, two categories which could be merged, and Pearson on Soph. fr. 205).

'Ιλίου Πέρσιδι is owed to MLW, after Dindorf's 'Ιλιοπέρσιδι (I 166.1) and Bekker's 'Ιλιοπερσίδι (p. 104.17); the manuscripts have ἡλίου περσίδι. West's option is preferable because no form such as 'Ιλιόπερσις is known to exist.

143

3]κερου[: perhaps κερου[λκ– 'horn', describing a bow, but other words are possible (e.g. γλυκεροῦ).

144

3]ευτροχ[: perhaps εὔτροχος 'well wheeled', which is used to describe a chariot nine times in epic and once in lyric; less likely is εὐτρόχαλος 'well rolled', attested at Hes. *Op.* 599 and 806, of a threshing-floor.

152

1]ε̣μωι βια[: πόλ]εμωι βία[ι τε 'by war and by force' *suppl.* Führer (1977) 19, comparing fr. 103.6.

153

1]χ̣οιc ολ[: this division seems more probable than]χ̣οι cολ[.

156

3]ιυ[: no word ends –ιυ, so the small gap between the upsilon and the papyrus edge must represent an unusually large space between one letter and the next.