

**Zeitschrift:** Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica

**Herausgeber:** Schweizerische Vereinigung für Altertumswissenschaft

**Band:** 64 (2007)

**Heft:** 1

  

**Artikel:** Stesikhoros and Helen

**Autor:** Kelly, Adrian

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-49497>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

**Download PDF:** 14.03.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

# Stesikhoros and Helen

By Adrian Kelly, Oxford

*Abstract:* The famous story of Stesikhoros' encounter with Helen can be explained as a biographical derivation from the structure itself of a single 'hymnodic' poem composed in honour of that figure. Known in antiquity as either the *Helen* or the *Palinode*, this poem employed a *persona* narrative (probably) in its first section, and it did so principally in order to establish Stesikhoros' authority against the background of Homeric and Hesiodic treatments. This episode then gave rise to stories both about the author (his blindness) and his text (two compositions, and then even two *Palinodes*). After considering the evidence for such encounters in Archaic and Classical Greek poetry and how they might be reconciled with the fragments and testimonia, the article discusses the problems with those sources which multiply the *Helen / Palinode*, and closes with a brief reconstruction of the poem according to the current hypothesis.

This article attempts to support the argument that Stesikhoros wrote only one poem devoted to Helen, advancing the hypothesis that his composition consisted of two 'hymnodic' segments, one of them containing a narrative in which the poet himself encountered Helen's divinity. Accordingly, the famous story of Stesikhoros' blinding and recantation is not (i) evidence for multiple poems, nor (ii) a later biographical rationalisation of that fact, nor (iii) hysterical blindness, nor (iv) even the metaphorical shortcomings of the singer identifying his errors in the face of local opposition or criticism;<sup>1</sup> but the traces of an episode *inside*

\* I should like to thank Bill Allan, Michael Fleming, Sophie Gibson, Gregory Hutchinson, Dirk Obbink and Anna Taborska for their help on this article. They are not responsible for the argument and its shortcomings.

1 None of these positions is entirely exclusive of the others. For (i), cf. D. L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford 1962) and M. Davies, *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Oxford 1991); F. Sisti, "Le due Palinodie di Stesicoro", *Studi Urbinati* 1 (1965) 301–13; M. Doria, "Le due Palinodie di Stesicoro", *Parola del Passato* 18 (1963) 81–93; P. Leone, "La Palinodia di Stesicoro", *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Napoli* 11 (1964–8) 5–28, esp. 7–11; J. A. Davison, *From Archilochus to Pindar* (New York 1968) 223; F. De Martino "Un proemio secondo e le due Palinodie di Stesicoro", *Belfagor* 35 (1980) 72–6; E. Cingano, "Quante testimonianze sulle palinodie di Stesicoro?", *QUCC* 10 (1982) 21–33; A. Smotricz, "Papyrus z Oksyrynchos nr 2506: I Palinodia Stezychora", *Meander* 20 (1965) 445–50; B. Gentili, *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece* (tr. by T. Cole) (Baltimore 1988) 274–5 n. 27; K. Bassi, "Helen and the Discourse of Denial in Stesichorus' Palinode", *Arethusa* 26 (1993) 51–75; G. O. Hutchinson, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford 2001) 116–17; (ii) L. Woodbury, "Helen and the Palinode", *Phoenix* 21 (1967) 157–76 (reprinted in: *Collected Writings* [Atlanta 1991] 168–87), at 173–5; Leone (op. cit.) 25; M. Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (London 1981) 33–4; G. Arrighetti, *Poeti, eruditi e biografì* (Pisa 1987) 58–9; L. Pratt, *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar* (Ann Arbor 1993) 132–6; also H. Fraenkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (2nd ed.) (Munich 1962) 322 n. 7; (iii) A. Farina, *Studi Stesicorei: parte prima: il*

*the poem* in which Stesikhoros used epic and hymnodic conventions in order to construct an authoritative *persona*.<sup>2</sup> I shall begin by illustrating these elements and relating them to the *Palinode*'s various reports and fragments; move on to a discussion of the most important extant witnesses, particularly those which seem to contradict my hypothesis; and conclude with a brief reconstruction of the poem according to the preceding argument.

### 1. Meeting Helen

The proposition of an embedded narrative in which the poet appears as a character immediately raises the question of the melic 'I'. The narrator inside the melic or epic poem is, I would argue, a construction of that text, and the features associated with this figure are to be interpreted for what they add to the poem itself, as Griffith has said *a propos* of Hesiod:<sup>3</sup>

“. . . the techniques of self-reference in Hesiod belong to traditions much older than Homer himself and shared by other early Greek poets . . . Hesiod's personal and autobiographical remarks always serve a specific and necessary function within the contexts in which they occur, and should be viewed in these terms rather than as gratuitous self-revelation and reminiscence.”

For practical purposes, Hesiod's apparently 'biographical' statements in the *Works and Days* all combine to cast him as an authoritative figure to deliver his

*mito di Helena* (Naples 1968) 12; G. Devereux, "Stesichorus' Palinodes: two further testimonia and some comments", *RhM* 116 (1973) 206–9; (iv) C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (2nd ed.) (Oxford 1961) 125; Davison (op. cit.); (with variation) A. Beecroft, "'This is not a true story': Stesichorus' *Palinode* and the Revenge of the Epichoric", *TAPA* 136 (2006) 47–70. M. Wright, *Euripides' Escape Tragedies* (Oxford 2005) 82–112 has very little trust in the evidence for the *Palinode*, but he overemphasises minor inconsistencies in the sources. For bibliography, cf. esp. Doria (op. cit.) 82–3 n. 8; D. Sider, "The blinding of Stesichorus", *Hermes* 117 (1989) 423–31 423 n. 1; D. Giordano, *Chamaeleontis Heracleotae Fragmenta (editio altera)* (Bologna 1990) 158–9 n. 245; cf. also M. Davies, "Derivative and Proverbial Testimonia Concerning Stesichorus' 'Palinode'", *QUCC* 10 (1982) 7–16. In this article, Stesikhoros' *testimonia* and fragments are cited according to *PMGF*, and printed in bold type.

- 2 Prefigured in the work of many others, the current hypothesis has not to my knowledge been made in this form. Those close to my position (in several respects) include C. Blomfield, "Stesichorus", in: T. Gaisford (ed.), *Poetae minores Graeci* (Leipzig 1823) 3.336–48; R. Kannicht, *Euripides Helena* (2 vols.) (Göttingen 1969) 26–41; Sider (above, n. 1); E. Bowie, "Lies, Fiction and Slander in Early Greek Poetry", in: C. Gill/T. P. Wiseman (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Exeter 1993) 1–37; N. Austin, *Helen of Troy and her shameless phantom* (Ithaca 1994) ch. 4; B. Graziosi, *Inventing Homer: the early reception of epic* (Cambridge 2002) 147–50.
- 3 M. Griffith, "Personality in Hesiod", *CA* 2 (1983) 37–65, at 37. For other explorations and an introduction to this issue, cf. S. R. Slings, "The I in personal archaic lyric: an introduction", in: id. (ed.), *The Poet's I in Archaic Greek Lyric: proceedings of a symposium held at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam* (Amsterdam 1990) 1–30.

poem, augmenting his status and importance as a source of poetic wisdom.<sup>4</sup> For example, the detail that he competed at funeral games (*Op.* 650–9) equates him with epic characters who typically compete in such contests (aside from *Il.* 23, cf. 5.802–8, 23.629–43, 23.678–80; *Od.* 8.94–256, 24.85–92; *Cypria* arg. 22–4), and Hesiod is therefore an ‘epically’ successful figure in a competition concerned with poetic excellence. This self-advertisement functions in much the same way as the Muses’ gift of a staff (*Theog.* 30–1) is not – as some have taken it – a tacit admission that Hesiod could not sing, but another claim of authority analogous to that assumed by the epic hero when he gets up to speak in an *agore*.<sup>5</sup>

Hence, my contention of an epiphanic meeting between Stesikhoros and Helen implies only that, within the poem itself, this narrative would serve to enhance the poet’s authority to sing such a song. Certainly, an epicising strategy of this sort would have appealed to Stesikhoros, recognised in antiquity as one of the most ‘epic’ of melic poets,<sup>6</sup> and given to the frequent recasting of Homeric episodes in his own compositions.<sup>7</sup> But, in fact, encounters between poet and deity are found throughout early Greek poetry, which is perhaps unsurprising given the prominence in this body of verse of hymnodic narrative and its kletic conventions. One of the most obvious of these is invocation, its purpose being

4 cf. Griffith (above, n. 3); W. Thalmann, *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Poetry* (Baltimore 1984) 152–3; E. Stein, *Autorbewußtsein in der frühen griechischen Literatur* (Tübingen 1990) 8–12; K. Stoddard, *The Narrative Voice in the Theogony of Hesiod* (Leiden 2004).

5 cf. M. L. West, *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford 1966) ad loc., 163–4; e.g., *Il.* 1.234–7, 1.245–6, 2.100–9, 2.185–6, 18.505–6, 23.566–9; *Od.* 2.37–8, 2.80–1.

6 cf. **TB 5–20** (for the citation conventions in this article, cf. above, n. 1); also M. L. West, “Stesichorus”, *CQ* 21 (1971) 302–14, at 302; De Martino (above, n. 1) 73 and n. 2. Stesikhoros was described as Hesiod’s son in several early sources (**TA 2–6**; cf. **TA 7**), a phenomenon analogous to the way in which textual affiliations in early heroic epic were expressed in terms of a genealogical link to Homer; cf. Graziosi (above, n. 2).

7 cf. **S 15** and *Il.* 8.307–8 with A. Maingon, “Epic Convention in Stesichorus’ *Geryoneis*: *SLG* 315”, *Phoenix* 34 (1980) 99–107; **209** and *Od.* 15.164–8; **S 11** and *Il.* 12.322ff.; **S 13** and *Il.* 22.83. There are several *caveats* to this statement, including the extent to which Stesikhoros associated the idea of ‘Homer’ with our *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and whether similarities between melic and epic texts are to be explained as allusions or the inheritance of a common poetic culture; cf. J. A. Davison, “Quotations and Allusions in Early Greek Literature”, *Eranos* 53 (1955) 123–40; R. L. Fowler, *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric* (Toronto 1987); J. Burgess, *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* (Baltimore 2001) 114–31. Though doubtful about allusion in the seventh century, I think it begins to occur with some frequency in the sixth. For example, on the way in which Ibykos’ Polykrates ode (*S* 151 *PMGF*) explicitly recalls the *Nautilia* from Hesiod’s *Works and Days*, cf. esp. J. Barron, “Ibycus: to Polykrates”, *BICS* 16 (1969) 119–49 134–5, esp. 135: “[t]he purpose of the passage in Hesiod is to provide the poet with an opportunity of alluding to his own skill: Hesiod only crossed the sea once, to compete at the funeral games of the Chalcidian Amphidamas, and there he won first prize for his ὕμνος. By recalling these lines, Ibycus sets his own reputation as a poet more tactfully before his audience. He too is a champion”; cf. also now D. Steiner, “Nautical matters: Hesiod’s *Nautilia* and Ibycus Fragment 282 *PMG*”, *CP* 100 (2005) 347–55.

either to summon the deity to the place of the performance and/or guarantee their assistance for the poet (*Il.* 2.484–93, *Od.* 1.1 & 10; Hesiod *Theog.* 104–15; *Op.* 1–2; *Hom. Hymns* 1.17–21, 2.490–5, 3.545 etc.),<sup>8</sup> though the most famous meeting is Hesiod’s encounter with the Muses on Mt. Helikon as he tends his sheep (*Theog.* 22–34), where they not only speak to him but also provide him with his staff of authority. A similar encounter is related in the Mnesiepes inscription about Arkhilokhos, though the absence of any specific quotation covering the event has led some to doubt whether this was in fact found in his poetry.<sup>9</sup>

Such meetings are not confined to the *Dichterweihe*. For example, in Sappho F 1 LP the narrator’s previous encounter with Aphrodite (5–24) is invoked within a *da ut dedisti* prayer framework as a paradigm for the current request. The connection between Aphrodite’s proven favour and the authority or success of a love poet is as obvious as the Muses’ favour for a successful epic poet.<sup>10</sup> Similarly, Pindar’s eighth *Pythian* contains a meeting between the poet and the hero-seer Alkman, son of Amphiaraios, who benefited Pindar with a display of his mantic powers, probably to be interpreted as a reference to the future victories of the *laudandus* (56–60).<sup>11</sup> The episode helps to establish the relationship between hero (and the heroic more generally), poet and *laudandus* which is so central to epinician poetry. Finally, though a much later case, one may compare the link with Apollo and Asklepios in Isyllos’ *Paian* to those deities, where a previous encounter between the narrator-poet and Asklepios (62–84 F Powell) – in which the god gave him instructions subsequently passed on, with good effect, to the Spartans – serves as the previous instance of a divine favour at whose repetition the poet is aiming in the performative present.<sup>12</sup>

Furthermore, consider the positioning of these *persona* narratives. Hesiod places his *sphragis* passage in the *Theogony* inside the first section of that poem, during the opening proem-hymn to the Muses; the poet of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* refers to himself and his presence at the festival being attended by Apollo at the end of the shorter, Delian section of his poem; Isyllos tells his story in the

8 cf. W. D. Furley & J. M. Bremer, *Greek Hymns; Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period Volume I: The Texts in Translation* (Tübingen 2001) 52–5; D. Fröhder, *Die dichterische Form der homerischen Hymnen* (Zürich 1994) 17–35; W. Race, “How Greek poems begin”, *YCS* 29 (1992) 13–38.

9 cf., e.g., D. Campbell, *The Golden Lyre: the themes of the Greek Lyric Poets* (London 1983) 254; also Bowie (above, n. 2) 8 for other meetings in Arkhilokhos’ poetry.

10 For other meetings of this sort in Sappho’s poetry, cf. D. L. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford 1955) 41–2; also Stein (above, n. 4) 124–6.

11 cf. R. Burton, *Pindar’s Pythian Odes* (Oxford 1962) 182–3; also P. van ’t Wout, “Amphiaraios as Alkman: Compositional Strategy and Mythological Innovation in Pindar’s *Pythian* 8.39–60”, *Mnemosyne* 59 (2006) 1–18, at 9–14, esp. 11 and n. 18.

12 For other such meetings in general, cf. O. Falter, *Der Dichter und sein Gott bei den Griechen und Römern* (Berlin 1934) 79–88. They need not end up positively, as shown by the story of Thamyris (*Il.* 2.594–600) or indeed the qualified nature of the Muses’ gifts to Demodokos (*Od.* 8.62–4); cf. below, n. 25.

final portion of his hymn; Sappho calls upon and relates a past conversation with Aphrodite, and Pindar a meeting and continuing relationship with the mantic figure of Alkman. In other words, each composition is driven by an encounter in which the poet-narrator appears as a character referring to a (generally) past episode, but one contained *entirely* within the current poem.

It is of course one thing to point out that epic and melic poets from the Archaic through Classical periods and beyond could do this kind of thing, and another to suggest that Stesikhoros did so in his *Palinode*. Yet, apart from the demonstrable interactions with Homeric poetry in his more substantial fragments, several sources hint that this composition specifically had an hymnodic quality. The mythographer Konon (1st c. BC/AD) uses the term ‘hymn’ for the *Palinode* (**TA 41** = *FGrH* 26 F 1 Στησίχορος δ’ αὐτίκα ὕμνους Ἑλένης συντάττει),<sup>13</sup> and Isokrates mentions ‘some blasphemy’ at the ‘beginning of the song’ (**192** = *Helen* 64 ἀρχόμενος τῆς ᾠδῆς ἐβλάσφημησέ τι) in a manner intimative of this type of context.<sup>14</sup> *Hymnos* can refer to a wide range of compositions, and hymnodic conventions are widespread, but one does not need to define the hymn in a monolithic way to accept that its conventions may appear in, or even be characteristic of, Stesikhoros’ poem. Certainly the marriage story told in the extant fragments of the *Helen* (**187, 188, 189, 190 & 223**<sup>15</sup>) would well concord with the typical themes addressed in the *partes epicae* of, e.g., the *Homeric Hymns* dealing with the major female deities, where the settlement of the goddess’ sexual status with regard to the hegemony of Zeus is the subject of the τιμή narrative.<sup>16</sup> Moreover, the second-person address to Helen herself

13 I shall return to this testimonium and the expression ὕμνους συντάττει below, pp. 15–16. Though it is unlikely that they had independent access to the *Palinode*, Irenaios and Hippolytos also refer to τὰς παλινωιδίας ἐν αἷς ὕμνησεν αὐτήν; cf. Davies (above, n. 1) ad 193, 180; also below, n. 55.

14 I refer specifically to the use of the verb ἀρχω within, and to denote, *prooimia*; cf., e.g., *Od.* 8.499; *Hom. Hymns* 1.17–18, 5.293, 9.9, 18.11, 21.4; *Theog.* 34, 48; *Il.* 9.97; Alkman 29 *PMGF*; *Theognis* 1–3 W; Pindar *Nemean* 2.1–3; cf. Davison (above, n. 1) 218; W. Race, “Aspects of Rhetoric and Form in Greek Hymns”, *GRBS* 23 (1982) 5–14.

15 Though not connected with the *Helen* or *Palinode* by Page or Davies, this last fragment (= Σ Eur. *Orestes* 249) treats Aphrodite’s hostility towards Tyndareus as the explanation for the sexual incontinence of his daughters, and is often taken (e.g. by J. A. Davison, “Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 2506”, in: *Atti del’ XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia* [Milan 1965] 96–117, at 101) to come from the *Helen*. It would be particularly appropriate to an hymnodic narrative about that character; cf. M. L. West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford 1985) 133–5; also below, nn. 16–17.

16 The equivalent sections of the hymns devoted to the male deities is their claiming of power, and acceptance by Zeus. For typical elements in the *Homeric Hymns*, cf. R. Janko, “The structure of the Homeric Hymns”, *Hermes* 109 (1981) 9–24; C. Sowa, *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns* (Chicago 1984); Fröhder (above, n. 8); also below, n. 17. That Zeus’ sexual control is an important issue in these (and other early) works is argued convincingly by J. S. Clay, *The Politics of Olympus* (Princeton 1989); cf. also *Hom. Hymns* 2.3–4, 5.45–52.

(192) would be far from inappropriate in a *χαίρει* transition of the sort commonly found, again, in the *Homeric Hymns*.<sup>17</sup>

But a more powerful suggestion of the poem's hymnodic character may be provided by Aelius Aristides 33.2 μέτειμι δὲ ἐφ' ἕτερον προοίμιον κατὰ Στησίχορον (241), linked (originally by Bergk) with *Et. Gen. A Στησίχορος μάτας εἰπών* (and *Et. Gen. B Στησίχορος μάτας εἶπες* 257) to form a possible verse from the *Palinode* (i.e. μάτας εἰπών · μέτειμι δ' ἐφ' ἕτερον προοίμιον).<sup>18</sup> Whether the reconstruction or even the association is correct is immaterial; what is important is, firstly, that Stesikhoros could refer to his own compositions as *prooimia*, for this was the generic term applied e.g. by Thucydides to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (3.104).<sup>19</sup> Secondly, and perhaps more significantly, the idea of progressing ἐφ' ἕτερον προοίμιον would fit very well with a single poem of two hymnodic segments, each with its own beginning.<sup>20</sup> Two such invocations to the Muse associ-

17 For this convention, cf. *Hom. Hymns* 1.20–1, 2.490–5, 3.545–6 (also 165–8), 4.579–80, 5.292–3, 6.19–21, 7.58–9, 9.7–9, 10.4–6, 11.5 etc.; also B. A. van Groningen, *La Composition littéraire archaïque grecque* (Amsterdam 1958) 73–4; Janko (above, n. 16); Fröhder (above, n. 8) 57–60; Furley & Bremer (above, n. 8) 61–2; Davison (above, n. 1) 207–8; Race (above, n. 8); also below, p. 7 with n. 22.

18 cf. Woodbury (above, n. 1) 175; Davison (above, n. 1) 218 n. 1 describes the metre of the resulting line as “iambic tetrameter acatalectic which has lost its first two syllables”, adducing Scaliger's emended version of 245 (θανόντος ἀνδρὸς πᾶσ' ἀπόλλυται ποτ' ἀνθρώπων χάρις) as a complete example (for other reconstructions, cf. Davies (above, n. 1) 224). For μάτ– in a similar context (i.e. change of subject matter or direction), cf. Ensemble d 7 M-P of the new Empedokles fragment (νῦν δ]ὲ μάτη[ν ἐν] τῶιδε νότ[οι κατέδ]ευσσα παρειάς), while d 10 (ἐπιβ[ήσομ]ε'ν' αὐθις) provides a suggestive parallel for μέτειμι; cf. below, n. 52. μάτας itself would be an excellent term for Stesikhoros' story about Helen's lewd behaviour (and/or that story), given this rather rare word's application to sexual transgressions in Aesch. *Supp.* 820 (despite Σ ad loc.), *Cho.* 918 and (perhaps) Soph. F 798 (Radt); cf. Zonaras 1338 (s. 257); Page (above, n. 1) 130.

19 cf. Fröhder (above, n. 8) 8 and n. 1; also J. S. Clay, “The Homeric Hymns”, in: I. Morris & B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden 1997) 489–507, at 494–8. For other kitharoidic *prooimia* (conventionally ascribed to Terpan-dros), cf. West (above, n. 6) 307 and n. 2. This need not have been Stesikhoros' term, but it is at least evidence that his work could be viewed in this way, and perhaps even characteristically so.

20 De Martino (above, n. 1) 74–5 argues that the structure of the poem was essentially triadic (i.e. 1st proem = *strophe*; 2nd proem = *antistrophe*; *Palinode* = *epode*) because “il proemio non è un canto o un inno qualunque, ma il primo di una serie di canti ovvero di inni, così come il prologo non è che il *logos* preliminare.” However, Thucydides uses the term of one of the larger *Homeric Hymns* in its entirety (as De Martino [above, n. 1] 74 n. 6 goes on to remark), and his conception of triadic structure assumes narrative correspondence with (rather large) strophic and epodic units, which is not found e.g. in the *Geryoneis* or the Lille papyrus (222b); cf. also West (above, n. 6) 312–13, who (314) infers from Aelius that Stesikhoros prefaced his large compositions with smaller *prooimia* to the gods (“after the prooimion, the main song.”). If so, the expression would then be even stronger evidence of a two-fold structure in Stesikhoros' poem, for an audience would expect after the *prooimion* a ‘main’ song and instead be faced with another proemic narrative. This must of course be possible, though the tradition that Terpan-dros wrote kitharoidic *prooimia* (above, n. 19) makes it at least as likely that they were free-standing compositions like the larger *Homeric Hymns*.

ated with the *Palinode* have in fact been preserved by P.Oxy. 2506 (193.9–11 = Khamaileon F 29 Giordano),<sup>21</sup> and the phenomenon can be directly paralleled in the clearly hymnodic contexts of the *Theogony* (1–4; 104–15), the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (1–2 [cf. also 19–20]; 179–81) and Simonides' Plataia elegy (F 11.19–21 W). In all these cases, the reinvocation is preceded by a χαῖρε transition (*Theog.* 104; *Hom. Hymn Ap.* 165–6; Simon. F 11.19 W) and serves to mark the progression from one narrative to another, slightly different in focus or tone; in Simonides' case to the story of the battle, in the *Theogony* to the catalogue proper and in the *Homeric Hymn* to the 'Pythian' τιμή narrative.<sup>22</sup> Thus a transition of this sort in Stesikhoros's poem could move from his 'offensive' narrative about Helen into the apparently exculpatory one which placed her in Egypt. Given all this, I propose that the *Palinode* took the form of a doubled hymn, concerned with the stories and powers of Helen and containing elements elsewhere associated with hymnodic narrative.<sup>23</sup>

This generic context would provide a ready explanation for the encounter story as a *persona* narrative like those examined above, which in turn would help to illumine the substance of the punishment itself, for poetic blindness quickly associates Stesikhoros' *persona* with Homer's, particularly the way in which Demodokos seems to have been interpreted "as an autobiographical character"<sup>24</sup> at least as early as the poet of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, who advertises himself in his own *sphragis* as the τυφλὸς ἀνὴρ from Khios.<sup>25</sup> Indeed, Plato's account

21 I shall return to this *testimonium* and its contention that there were two *Palinodes* below, pp. 15–18. For now, I merely note the existence of two invocations linked with this (type of) composition.

22 D. Obbink, "The Genre of *Plataea*", in: D. Boedeker/D. Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides* (Oxford 1993) 65–85, at 69 n. 12 also points to the transitional function of the Muses' reinvocation before the Catalogue of Ships in the *Iliad*, to which I would add that such reinvocations occur several times in that poem before pivotal events in the narrative (11.218–20; 16.112–13). For other reinvocations in a variety of sources, including Aristophanes' *Birds* 676–736 and Empedokles B 4 DK, cf. Obbink (op. cit.) 70–1; also G. B. Conte, "Proems in the middle", *YCS* 29 (1992) 147–60 for Alexandrian and Roman examples. I. Rutherford, "The New Simonides: Toward a Commentary", in: Boedeker/Sider (op. cit.) 33–54, at 45–6 and 50 suggests that the Plataia elegy contained a *sphragis*, which would render it an even more compelling parallel for the current hypothesis. Of course, only Hesiod is demonstrably earlier than Stesikhoros (for the date of the hymn, cf. below, n. 76, and W. Burkert, "Kynaithos, Polykrates, and the Homeric Hymn to Apollo", in: G. Bowersock/W. Burkert/M. Putnam [eds.], *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies presented to Bernard M. W. Knox on the occasion of his 65th birthday* [Berlin 1979] 53–62), but we are searching for generic *comparanda*, not sources (I am grateful to Dirk Obbink for drawing my attention to this material).

23 For a more detailed reconstruction of the poem, cf. below, pp. 19–21.

24 Graziosi (above, n. 2) 138 (138–63 for the entire issue); at 147–50 she accepts that Stesikhoros' story of blindness was directed specifically at the story of Homer's affliction (cf. also Woodbury [above, n. 1] 173 & nn. 33–4). While Bassi (above, n. 1) 54–5 n. 6 grants that the theme may be significant in these terms, she believes that "there is no evidence that the *Palinode* itself refers to the poet's blindness"; cf. Sider (above, n. 1) 424–5.

25 172 οἴκει δὲ Χίωι ἐνὶ παρπαλοέσση; cf. also Simonides F 19 W Χίος . . . ἀνὴρ. Consider the punishment inflicted on Thamyris by the Muses for his hubristic competitiveness; cf. S. Grandolini,



of Stesikhoros' affliction contrasts him on this very point with Homer, who did not recognise the source of the trouble and so remained blind.<sup>26</sup> A narrative in which Stesikhoros admits that he was afflicted in this way, and then realised the reason for it, would place him above the Homeric poet, in terms both of his σοφία and his connection with the divine Helen, and in this way would grant him the poetic authority to offer his own treatment of a character already described by his authoritative competitor(s).<sup>27</sup>

An allusive antagonism of this sort could also explain the testimony of the melic commentator in P.Oxy. 2506 (193.2–7) that Stesikhoros μέμφεται both Homer and Hesiod in his poem(s). It has been argued from this *testimonium* that he must have referred to them both by name,<sup>28</sup> though the presence of these two figures may reflect no more than the fact (misunderstood by the commentator or his source) that they were considered the authoritative sources of more or less all the stories told about Helen – *ergo* a new version must by definition be critical of them.<sup>29</sup> Of course direct mention of either epic poet need not have been out of place in Stesikhoros (despite some limited evidence that Hesiod used the εἶδωλον),<sup>30</sup> but the hypothesis that the blindness story was part of a *persona* narrative would permit the more economical conclusion that this papyrus reflects someone's understanding

*Canti e aedi nei poemi omerici* (Pisa 1996) 48–50; also R. Buxton, “Blindness and its limits: Sophokles and the logic of myth”, *JHS* 100 (1980) 22–37, at 30–2, esp. 32: “the essentials of the infringement-and-punishment sequence in the Stesikhoros-Helen myth show strong similarities to the structures already familiar to us.”

- 26 *Phdr.* 243a οὐκ ἠγνόησεν ὡσπερ Ὅμηρος; cf. also **TA 42** (= Hermias ad *Phdr.* 243a). The sixth Homeric *Vita* contains a very similar story (51–7 Allen): ἄλλοι δέ φασι τοῦτο αὐτὸν πεπονθέναι διὰ μῆνιν Ἑλένης ὀργισθείσης αὐτῷ διότι εἶπεν αὐτὴν καταλελοιπέναι μὲν τὸν πρότερον ἄνδρα, ἠκολουθηκέναι δ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ· οὕτως γοῦν – ὅτι καὶ παρέστη αὐτῷ, φησί, νυκτὸς ἢ ψυχῆ τῆς ἡρώϊνης παραινοῦσα καῦσαι τὰς ποιήσεις αὐτοῦ . . . τὸν δὲ μὴ ἀνασχέσθαι ποιῆσαι τοῦτο.
- 27 cf., in general, W. Burkert, “The Making of Homer in the Sixth Century BC: Rhapsodes versus Stesichorus”, in: *Papers on the Amasis Painter and his World* (Malibu 1987) 43–62. The range of interpretations of Stesikhoros' blindness is great, as Sider (above, n. 1) 424–5 notes, but the fact itself is usually considered to be somewhat remote from the poetry.
- 28 cf., e.g., Bowie (above, n. 2) 24–5. He further contends from the papyrus' reference to ἐν τε τῇ ἐτέρῃ (6) that Homer was mentioned in one segment, Hesiod the other; cf. also Smotricz (above, n. 1). It is of course possible that the contrast with Homer was more marked at the end of the first hymnic segment, whilst in the second Stesikhoros may (e.g.) have disagreed in some way with Hesiod's story of the εἶδωλον (F 358 MW) or even retold the tale of Helen's marriage (187) (cf. below, pp. 19–21 for my reconstruction). Nonetheless, Kannicht (above, n. 2) 39 plausibly argues that Khamailon was the first to bring out the names explicitly, that Stesikhoros himself only dealt with the μαχλοσύνη theme from Hesiod F 176 MW (and in the 'schmähender Teil' of the *Helen*), and so it is an attractive conclusion that the schematism represents a scholarly misunderstanding of Stesikhoros' poem similar to those proposed in the next section (below, pp. 11–19, esp. 15f. for discussion of the papyrus).
- 29 cf. West (above, n. 15) 133–4. Indeed, the same commentator, in the very next column of the papyrus (P.Oxy. 2506 F 26 col. ii. = 217.1–7), explicitly acknowledges Stesikhoros as of primary importance after Homer and Hesiod for later mythographers.
- 30 Hesiod F 358 MW; also F 23(a) with J. March, “Clytemnestra and the *Oresteia* Legend”, in: *The Creative Poet* (BICS Supplement 49) (London 1987) 79–118, at 88–9.

of Stesikhoros' allusion to the Homeric and Hesiodic *personae* – the former in the story of the blindness, the latter in the meeting with the divinity.<sup>31</sup>

The details of the encounter itself are of course difficult to recapture. One scholar focuses on the verb ἀνέστη in Isokrates' account describing Stesikhoros getting up to find himself blind, and suggests that this refers to the way in which the blind Demodokos is presented as a seated figure when he performs his first and third songs (*Od.* 8.65–6, 472–3).<sup>32</sup> This is indeed plausible, though the *Suda* (TA 19) suggests that Stesikhoros was informed of Helen's displeasure in a dream (ἐξ ὀνείρου), and so ἀνέστη could refer to the poet waking to find himself blind, after being told in the dream both the deity's intention to inflict the punishment on him and the reason for it.<sup>33</sup>

Dreams are widespread in Homeric epic (*Il.* 2.6–35, 23.65–101, 24.679–89; also 10.496–7, 22.199–201; *Od.* 4.795–841, 6.15–49, 15.9–45, 19.535–53, 20.30–55; also 14.495) and a typical *locus* for a meeting between gods and mortals (e.g., *Il.* 2.6–35, 24.679–89; *Od.* 6.15–49, 15.9–45).<sup>34</sup> It may therefore be significant not only that the *Odyssey* poet has an εἶδωλον formed and sent by Athene to Penelope to have a lengthy conversation with her in a dream-episode (4.795–841), but also that Penelope narrates one of her past dreams to the disguised Odysseus and invites his interpretation of it (19.535–58).<sup>35</sup> A typically Stesichorean reconfiguration of, and allusion to, these two Homeric passages would have been of considerable significance for his tale through the association of Penelope and Helen; while the *Odyssey* uses their relationship primarily for contrast, Stesikhoros' story would cast them both as complementary illustrations of fidelity.<sup>36</sup> I suggest that these two scenes were in fact one of the major reasons behind Stesikhoros' choice of the εἶδωλον device (for the other, cf. below).

31 cf. above, n. 7, for the analogous way in which Ibykos specifically appropriates elements of the Hesiodic *persona* in his ode to Polykrates (S 151 *PMGF*). A later parallel for an agonistic *persona* discourse may be observed in Pindar *Paian* 7(b).18–20 (C2 Rutherford) τυφλαὶ γὰρ ἀνδρῶν φρένες, ἴ ὅστις ἀνευθ' Ἑλικωνιάδων ἰ βαθειᾶν . . . ἐρευνᾶι σοφίας ὁδόν. This statement serves to point out the insufficiency of the Homeric poet, whose 'well-worn path' Pindar has just explicitly deprecated at v. 11, and it does so by implying that Homer failed to have the support of the Helikonian, i.e. Hesiodic, Muses. Pindar thus claims support from one great poetic authority in order to compete with another, an obvious *desideratum* in a song covering a topic famously (cf. Thucydides 3.104) treated in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*; cf. Kannicht (above, n. 2) 29; I. Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeans* (Oxford 2001) 247–9, esp. 247 n. 7, though he does not use verses 18–20 in support of his argument for an allusion to the *Homeric Hymn*.

32 Sider (above, n. 1); Davison (above, n. 1) 206.

33 cf. Bowie (above, n. 2) 27. For other epiphanic narratives linked with dreams, cf. Falter (above, n. 12) esp. 81.

34 cf. C. Walde, *Die Traumdarstellungen in der griechisch-römischen Dichtung* (Leipzig 2001) 19–72.

35 cf. Sappho F 134 LP ζᾶ . . . ἐλεξάμαν ὄναρ Κυπρογένηα with Stein (above, n. 4) 125, esp. n. 159.

36 cf. *Od.* 23.218–24 for Penelope's own attempt to exonerate or mitigate Helen's offence; also Austin (above, n. 2) ch. 4, esp. 114–15.

There are therefore several indications, from several sources, that the story about Stesikhoros' blindness and recantation was a narrative inside the *Palinode* itself, and its purpose was to bolster its author's claim on his audience and their attention. The resulting *persona* is constructed from recognisably Homeric and Hesiodic elements, their conventions appropriated to authenticate a competitor's song. This is not just a younger poet's playful irony, but an essential strategy for challenging one's predecessors: if the new is to be believable, it must still be clothed in familiar dress.<sup>37</sup>

But Stesikhoros' relationship with these poets may go even further, and concern the most famously Stesichorean element of the *Palinode* – the 'correction' itself. Correction arises naturally from the competitive culture of archaic poetry,<sup>38</sup> and an author could of course refer to an external composition of his own in this way, as Hesiod seems to do with his admission that there are two *Erides* (*Op.* 11–12),<sup>39</sup> or perhaps Pindar in his seventh *Nemean* (102–4 τὸ δ' ἐμὸν οὐ ποτε φάσει κέαρ | ἀτρόποισι Νεοπτόλεμον ἐλκύσαι | ἔπρεσι) with regard to his depiction of Neoptolemos in the sixth *Paian*.<sup>40</sup> But corrections are not confined to external references; in Stesikhoros' own lifetime, for example, Ibykos (S 166 *PMGF*) uses an *Abbruchsformel* to change direction from a Trojan war narrative to turn towards "praises of a handsome addressee" and then "a general encomium of Sparta" in terms which naturally suggest the current impropriety of the previous subject matter (22 καὶ τὸ] μὲν οὐ φάτον ἐστίν).<sup>41</sup> In the next century, Pindar's first *Olympian* also breaks off after embarking on what would have proven an inappropriate path (52 ἐμοὶ δ' ἄπορα γαστρίμαργον μακάρων τιν' εἰπεῖν· ἀφίσταμαι), as again does the ninth *Olympian* (35–40 ἀπό μοι λόγον | τοῦτον, στόμα, ῥῖψον· | ἐπεὶ τό γε λοιδορήσαι θεοῦς | ἐχθρὰ σοφία, καὶ τὸ καυχᾶσθαι παρὰ καιρὸν | μανίαισιν ὑποκρέκει· | μὴ νῦν λαλάγει τὰ τοιαῦτ(α)).<sup>42</sup>

37 Consider the way in which Pindar's new myth of the Pelops story in *Olympian* 1 sticks closely to the original story; cf. also A. Kelly, "Neoanalysis and the *Nestorbedrängnis*: a test case", *Hermes* 134 (2006) 1–25, esp. 19–22, on the relationship between *Pythian* 6, *Iliad* 8 and the *Aithiopsis*.

38 cf. M. Griffith, "Contest and Contradiction in early Greek poetry", in id./D. Mastrorarde (eds.), *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmayer* (Atlanta 1990) 185–208.

39 M. L. West, *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford 1978) ad loc., 143. However, R. Scodel, "Self-Correction, Spontaneity, and Orality in Archaic Poetry", in: I. Worthington (ed.), *Voice into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece* (Leiden 1996) 59–80, at 74–6 well points out that Hesiod could be referring not to the *Theogony* but to the passage in the *Works and Days* itself (656–9) in which his *persona* narrative, specifically his victory at the funeral games of Amphidamas, exemplifies the existence and operation of the good Eris.

40 cf. G. Most, *The Measures of Praise* (Göttingen 1985) 207–10; Arrighetti (above, n. 1) 85–6; B. Currie, *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford 2005) 321–40.

41 M. L. West, "Stesichorus Redivivus", *ZPE* 4 (1969) 135–49, at 147 (his supplements), though he ascribes this fragment to Stesikhoros.

42 cf. H. Pelliccia, "Pindarus Homericus: *Pythian* 3.1–80", *HSCP* 91 (1987) 39–63, at 46–8, esp. 47 n. 20.

Yet, much earlier than any of these examples, and of potentially fundamental significance for the *Palinode*, both Homer and Hesiod employed an εἶδωλον *in precisely this way*, the former with regard to the story of Herakles in the underworld (*Od.* 11.601–8) and the latter in the sacrifice of Iphigeneia (F 23(a).13–26 MW).<sup>43</sup> On each occasion the character is located firmly in an action or circumstance which is then applied instead to his/her εἶδωλον.<sup>44</sup> So the phenomenon in general provides good precedent for self-correction within a poem, but the two epic examples of Herakles and Iphigeneia also contain even the very substance of Stesikhoros' correction.<sup>45</sup> It would seem that his famous Helen-phantom was simply the deliberate application of existing epic material and convention to a new circumstance.

To conclude this section: the evidence hitherto considered is either suggestive of, or not inconsistent with, the hypothesis that Stesikhoros' meeting with Helen was a *persona* narrative within the *Palinode*. Not only was such an episode a well-known poetic convention, and highly suitable for the type of composition proposed here, but it would have granted Stesikhoros the authority in his audience's eyes to compete with his Homeric and Hesiodic predecessors, even as he appropriated their stories to do so.

## 2. One *Palinode* or two?

Many of the sources for the *Palinode* have already been explored, but along the way several references seemed to suggest there might be more than one such composition.<sup>46</sup> In this section I will propose that these statements are not in fact inconsistent with my hypothesis; some of the sources usually cited as evidence for these multiple poems do not in fact say this, while those which do may be explained as a biographical interpretation of the doubled poem proposed above. Let us begin with the two earliest – and emphatic – references to one composition, Plato *Phaedrus* 243a and Isokrates *Helen* 64 (192), set out here in that order:

43 cf. Griffith (above, n. 38) 197. The *Catalogue of Women* is of unknown date, but its composition is usually placed in the middle third of the sixth century; cf. West (above, n. 15) 130–7. Whether Hesiod was the author of this poem or not is immaterial, for it was commonly ascribed to him in antiquity; cf. West (op. cit.) 127.

44 For other examples of self-correction, cf. Scodel (above, n. 39). For other εἶδωλα in Homeric poetry, cf., e.g., *Il.* 5.449–53; compare also 21.597–601; Kannicht (above, n. 2) 33–8. West (above, n. 15) 134–5 unconvincingly argues for Stesikhoros' priority over the passage from *Il.* 5, which he deems an interpolation (similar arguments against the authenticity of the *nekuia* passage are also unpersuasive; cf. A. Heubeck, in: id./A. Hoekstra, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey; Volume II: Books IX–XVI* [Oxford 1989] ad loc., 114).

45 For other examples of Stesikhoros' allusive recasting of Homeric passages, cf. above, n. 7. Perhaps this combination of Homeric and Hesiodic precedent lies behind the statement of P.Oxy. 2506 (above, p. 7 and nn. 28–30).

46 cf. above, n. 1, esp. position (i).

ἔστιν δὲ τοῖς ἀμαρτάνουσι περὶ μυθολογίαν καθαρμὸς ἀρχαῖος, ὃν Ὅμηρος μὲν οὐκ ἤισθετο, Στησίχορος δέ. τῶν γὰρ ὀμμάτων στερηθεὶς διὰ τὴν Ἑλένης κακηγορίαν οὐκ ἠγνόησεν ὡσπερ Ὅμηρος, ἀλλ' ἄτε μουσικὸς ὢν ἔγνω τὴν αἰτίαν, καὶ ποιεῖ εὐθύς –

οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος,  
οὐδ' ἔβας ἐν νηυσὶν εὐσέλμοις,  
οὐδ' ἴκεο Πέργαμα Τροίας·

καὶ ποιήσας δὴ πᾶσαν τὴν καλουμένην Παλινωιδίαν παραχρῆμα ἀνέβλεψεν.

ἐνεδείξατο δὲ καὶ Στησιχόρῳ τῶν ποιητῆι τὴν ἑαυτῆς δύναμιν· ὅτε γὰρ ἀρχόμενος τῆς ὠιδῆς ἐβλασφήμησέ τι περὶ αὐτῆς ἀνέστη τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐστερημένος, ἐπειδὴ δὲ γνοὺς τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς συμφορᾶς τὴν καλουμένην παλινωιδίαν ἐποίησε, πάλιν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν φύσιν κατέστησεν.

Both authors refer to τὴν καλουμένην Παλινωιδίαν, which is not a mere reflection of uncertainty over the poem's title.<sup>47</sup> Note, firstly, Plato's phrasing: καὶ ποιήσας δὴ πᾶσαν τὴν καλουμένην Παλινωιδίαν παραχρῆμα ἀνέβλεψεν. The qualification πᾶσαν is most unusual, for it implies that the story of the blinding, or at least the advertisement of the previous story's falsity, was part of an incomplete or larger work (i.e. 'and when he had composed the whole so-called *Palinode* immediately he regained his sight').<sup>48</sup> Thus the participle καλουμένην reflects the fact that, at least from Plato's perspective (and probably Isokrates' as well), Παλινωιδίαν does not describe the poem's contents in an entirely accurate manner.<sup>49</sup> Such an intimation would certainly fit a two-segment hypothesis, for only the second could with justice be called a Παλινωιδία.

47 I assume that 'Palinode' was indeed a title for the poem (below, n. 49), though this is not essential to the following argument. For the issue in general, cf. below, nn. 52–3.

48 cf. Leone (above, n. 1) 6–7; Kannicht (above, n. 2) 30–1; Sider (above, n. 1) 426 n. 14; *contra* Doria (above, n. 1) 87 n. 25; Sisti (above, n. 1) 303. I do not believe that Plato simply meant 'when he had finished the so-called *Palinode*', for that would render πᾶσαν superfluous; the adjective here has almost the force of 'the rest of'. One could argue that πᾶσαν need only refer to the rest of the song as opposed to the three verses just quoted; yet it is known that the poem(s) (and/or each of its sections) began with an invocation (193.9–11). Plato cannot, therefore, be quoting the beginning of the poem, and so something else *before* those verses must be considered within the ambit of πᾶσαν. It is unlikely that this comprised the re-invocation, for Plato's emphasis on the fact that Stesikhoros generated the τρία ἔπη immediately upon his realisation (ἔγνω τὴν αἰτίαν καὶ ποιεῖ εὐθύς) would intimate that the story of the blindness and his decision to recant were a part of the first section; the substance of that recantation was then the subject of the second.

49 Sider (above, n. 1) 426 n. 14 points out that Plato never uses this participle with other titles. However, he certainly does use it (1) with notions generally defined or apprehended (e.g., *Phd.* 112e7 ὁ καλούμενος Ὀκεανός; *Soph.* 228d7 τὸ μὲν πονηρία καλούμενον ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν; *Resp.* 544c4 καλουμένη δ' ὀλιγαρχία), and (2) where those terms or conceptions are incor-

An immediate counterargument is that, given independent evidence about the existence of a poem called the *Helen*, it is more natural to interpret the *Palinode* as a separate poem subsequent to the original one.<sup>50</sup> Yet it is noticeable that neither of the two later sources who refer to the *Helen* by name (Athenaios and the author of the *argumentum* to Theokritos 18) ever cite the *Palinode*, and the same is true *mutatis mutandis* of the very much larger group of authors who cite the *Palinode* but not the *Helen*. This may admittedly only prove that each author in the two groups never had occasion to refer to the other poem, and one should never push an argument from silence too far. Nonetheless, even with that caveat, it is surely remarkable that Athenaios only refers to the *Helen*, though he makes extensive use elsewhere of the Peripatetic Khamaileon,<sup>51</sup> who did explicitly cite the *Palinode*.

This exclusivity would be well explained by the simple hypothesis of two titles for the same work, a hypothesis certainly not inconsistent with the τὴν καλουμένην Παλινωιδίαν of Plato and Isokrates, and hardly without general precedent.<sup>52</sup> The choice between *Helen* and *Palinode* in any given case, at least

rect or inaccurate; cf., e.g., *Phd.* 64d3 τὰς ἡδονὰς καλουμένας τὰς τοιάσδε (cf. *Resp.* 442a8); 73b5 ἡ καλουμένη μάθησις (cf. *Meno* 81e4); 86d3 ἐν τῷ καλουμένῳ θανάτῳ (also 95d4); *Soph.* 242d6 ὡς ἐνὸς ὄντος τῶν πάντων καλουμένων (from the perspective of the Eleatics); *Prm.* 135d5 καλουμένης ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν ἀδολεσχίας; *Grg.* 448d9 τὴν καλουμένην ῥητορικὴν; *Resp.* 511c6 ὑπὸ τῶν τεχνῶν καλουμένων; 518d9 αἱ μὲν τοίνυν ἄλλαι ἀρεταὶ καλούμεναι ψυχῆς; 550a3 τοὺς μὲν τὰ αὐτῶν πράττοντας ἐν τῇ πόλει ἡλιθίους τε καλουμένους καὶ ἐν μικρῷ λόγῳ ὄντας. Isokrates too has several instances of both the former (cf. *Paneg.* 84.5 τοῖς ἐκ τῶν θεῶν γεγονόσιν καὶ καλουμένοις ἡμίθεοις; 179.5 καὶ τῆς μὲν Ἀσίας, τῆς δ' Εὐρώπης καλουμένης; *Areop.* 64.4 τοὺς μὲν δημοτικὸς καλουμένους; *Phil.* 112.9 τὰς στήλας τὰς Ἡρακλέους καλουμένας) and latter usages (*C. soph.* 19.5 τὰς καλουμένας τέχνας; *De pace* 94.6 τὴν καλουμένην μὲν ἀρχήν, οὖσαν δὲ συμφορὰν; 270.6 τὴν καλουμένην ὑπὸ τινῶν φιλοσοφίαν οὐκ εἶναί φημι; 313.2 τοὺς μὲν καλουμένους σοφιστάς). Given these two frequently related senses, the participle would be appropriate for a title which was both generally accepted as well as not entirely apposite.

- 50 Davies (above, n. 1) lists **187–191** under the *EAENH*, though neither **190** nor **191** mention any title.
- 51 Athenaios even cites Khamaileon's περὶ Στησιχόρου (Khamaileon F 27 Giordano); for his general familiarity with the Peripatetic, cf. F 3, 4, 7–12, 23–5, 27, 30, 31, 33–6, 39–44. This very fragmentary author never mentions the *Helen*; cf. below, pp. 15–18.
- 52 cf. E. Nachmanson, *Der griechische Buchtitel* (Göteborg 1941) esp. 1–10, 49–52; also Kannicht (above, n. 2) 29 n. 7. The same conclusion has been suggested with regard to Stesikhoros' *Wooden Horse and Sack of Troy*, separated by Page (S 133–47 *SLG*) but not by Davies; cf. D. L. Page, "Stesichorus: the 'Sack of Troy' and 'The Wooden Horse'", *PCPS* 19 (1973) 47–65 at 64–5; M. L. West, "Stesichorus' Horse", *ZPE* 48 (1982) 86; E. Robbins, "Stesichorus", in: D. Gerber (ed.), *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* (Leiden 1997) 232–42, at 238–9. Indeed, the new Empedokles fragment (P Stras. 1665–6) provides a good parallel for the current argument for, until its publication in A. Martin/O. Primavesi, *L'Empédocle de Strasbourg* (P. Strasb. gr. Inv. 1665–6): *Introduction, édition et commentaire* (Berlin 1999), scholars commonly assumed that Empedokles' *Physics* and *Purifications* were two separate poems. The new fragment adds powerfully to the argument that there was just one poem with two titles (perhaps one for each part), since Ensemble d 7–11 M-P links the 'demonological' aspect of Strife with its 'physical' aspect, material hitherto often adjudged mutually exclusive and so appropriate only to one or the other work: [νὺν δ]ὲ μάτη[ν ἐν] τῷδε νότ[ωι κατέδ] εῦσα παρειάς | [ἐξικ]νούμε[θα γὰ]ρ πολυβενθ[έα Δῖνον?], οἴω, | [μυρία? τε] οὐκ ἐθέλουσι παρέσσει[ται ἄλγ]εα θυμῷ | [ἀνθρώποις? ἡ]μεῖς δὲ

in the early period, would depend on what type of story the author was trying to adduce: the wedding or betrayal of Menelaos would suggest the former title, while stories of Stesikhoros' recantation, the εἶδωλον or Helen's detention in Egypt would more readily attract the latter. At a later stage, this plurality would naturally encourage scholarly biographism by conveniently providing names for these now separate poems.<sup>53</sup>

Yet, another objection to the single poem theory is that the expression ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου Στησιχόρου Ἑλένης (**189** = *arg.* Theokritos 18) implies not only that the *Helen* existed, but that it had been divided into two poems, as Davies tentatively proposes in his apparatus ("= Ἑλένης α' ?"). Leaving aside alternative explanations,<sup>54</sup> this *testimonium* cannot be earlier than the Alexandrian period, when the work of previous ages was being gathered, sifted and divided; one only needs to consider the Homeric book-divisions to realise that such a process might have little to do with an original construction or intention. Moreover, whether this note reflects direct knowledge of the poem or not, the type of composition suggested in the last section could easily be read in the light of influential passages like those in Plato and Isokrates. Their emphasis on the temporal sequence could readily be interpreted as a series of discrete events occurring over a period of time, dovetailing nicely with the apparently separable structure of the poem itself.<sup>55</sup> In short, neither of the sources who name the *Helen* need be inconsistent with the argument for an originally unified or single poem known by two titles.

λόγων (σ') ἐπιβ[ήσομ]ε'ν' αὖθις | [κείνων· ὀππότ]ε δὴ συνετύγχανε φ[λογ]μὸς ἀτειρής κτλ.; cf. S. Trépanier, *Empedocles: an Interpretation* (New York 2004) esp. ch. 1 (I am indebted to Gregory Hutchinson for drawing my attention to this parallel).

- 53 Kannicht (above, n. 2) 29 argues that the work's title was in fact *Helen*, and that *παλινωιδία* was "nicht ein genuiner Titel, sondern, wie καλουμένη zeigt, nur die Bezeichnung"; cf. above, nn. 47 & 49. For parallels in the citation of Hesiod's *Works and Days*, cf. West (above, n. 39) 136; for Empedokles, cf. Trépanier (above, n. 52) 29.
- 54 e.g., Wright (above, n. 1) 89–90 n. 90: "the start of Stesikhoros' poem of Helen." I wonder whether it might reflect the internal division proposed here, sc. something like ὕμνου or ποιήματος.
- 55 Later authors almost universally reflect this progression or division; Dio Chrysostom 11.41 speaks of the recantation coming ἐν τῇ ὕστερον ᾠδῇ, while Maximus of Tyre 21.1 refers to τὴν ἔμπροσθεν ᾠδὴν, and Philostratos *Vita Apoll.* 6.11 to τῷ προτέρῳ λόγῳ (all under **192**; cf. also **TA 40–2**). These phrases "do not necessarily refer to a *distinct* earlier poem" (Wright (above, n. 1) 91) and the chance that any of them are independent witnesses is, according to Kannicht (above, n. 2) 27–9, very small. For Stesikhoros' reputation and availability in the 5th century, cf. Eupolis F 148 KA with Aristophanes *Frogs* 1355–8 (though cf. *Peace* 775–80, 796–801); also I. Storey, *Eupolis, Poet of Old Comedy* (Oxford 2003) 373. The Oxyrhynchos papyri show that his work survived into the Roman period and beyond, but it is remarkable that almost no ancient author quotes from this most famous of Stesikhoros' poems, all those later than Plato and Isokrates confining themselves either to the blindness story and/or the details of the recantation (possibly not uninfluenced by elements from Herodotos and Euripides). One may doubt whether the separatist case was always based on a direct and independent reading of the poem; Austin (above, n. 2) 96 goes so far as to say that "the Palinode was more talked of than read, if indeed it was read at all after the time of Plato." One quotation is, however, found in P.Oxy. 2506 (1st / 2nd c. AD; cf. below, p. 15f.), but that commentator cites *Khamaileon* for the quoted verses (11–12 ὡς | ἀνέγραψε Χαμαιλ[έω]ν), though in the next column of the same papyrus frag-

However, some of the other sources for Stesikhoros' *Palinode* explicitly say that there were two such poems. The most important of these is preserved on P.Oxy. 2506, a 1st/2nd cent. AD text of a melic commentary drawing on a range of sources and works.<sup>56</sup> During his discussion, the anonymous author delivers himself of the following information (193.2–12 = P.Oxy. 2506 F 26 col. i = Kha-maileon F 29 Giordano):

[μέμ-

φεται τὸν Ὅμηρο[ν ὅτι Ἐ-  
λέ]νην ἐποίησεν ἐν Τ[ροίαι  
καὶ οὐ τὸ εἶδωλον αὐτῆ[ς, ἐν  
τε τ[ῆι] ἐτέραι τὸν Ησίοδ[ον  
μέμ[φεται]· διτταὶ γάρ εἰσι πα-  
λινωιδ(ίαι δια)λλάττουσαι, καὶ ἔ-  
στιν <τ>ῆ<ς> μὲν <ῆ> ἀρχή· **δεῦρ' αὐ-**  
**τε θεὰ φιλόμολπε,** τῆς δέ·  
**χρυσόπτερε παρθένε** ὡς  
ἀνέγραψε Χαμαιλ[έω]ν. αὐ-  
τὸ[ς δ]έ φησ[ιν ὅ] Στησίχορο[ς  
τὸ μὲν εἶδωλο]ν ἐλθεῖ[ν ἐς  
Τροίαν τὴν δ' Ἐλένην παρὰ  
τῷ Πρωτεῖ καταμεῖν[αι etc.

This has, not unreasonably, caused a great stir, for it seems to state that Kha-maileon knew of two poems he called *Palinodes*, the opening phrases from which he was able to quote. Those convinced by this statement point to corroborating references to plural songs, specifically the 1st cent. BC/AD mythographer Konon (TA 41) and the Christian authors Hippolytos (*Adv. Haer.* 6.19.3) and Irenaios (*Adv. Haer.* I F 12).<sup>57</sup>

However, the first of these supplementary sources does not actually refer to two *Palinodes*. Konon's story of Stesikhoros' blinding occurs within a wider tale concerning a war between the Locrians and Crotoniates, in which a wounded soldier travelled to an island with an oracle of Akhilleus to seek treatment. Whilst there, he apparently met and had a chat with Helen herself, *κάκειθεν*

ment (F 26 col. ii = 217) he quotes directly *παρὰ Στησιχ[όρω]τι* (21). However widely available was the *Palinode* itself, it is obvious that the biographical tradition has become tremendously influential. Once the story had been analysed in those terms, the nature and structure of the poem proposed in the first section would have aided anyone so inclined to separate them into two compositions; cf. below, pp. 17–18, for examples.

56 cf. D. L. Page, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri Part XXIX* (London 1963); Davison (above, n. 15). Text as Giordano (above, n. 1), set out as Davies (above, n. 1) 193; for Lobel's <τ>ῆ<ς> (line 9), cf. below, n. 82 (I am particularly grateful to Dirk Obbink for showing me this papyrus and discussing its readings).

57 cf. Davies (n 1) ad 193, 180.



ἐξιόντα ἀπαγγέλλειν αὐτὸν Στησιχόρωι Ἑλένη κελεύει τὴν εἰς αὐτὴν ἄιδειν, εἰ φιλεῖ τὰς ὄψεις, παλινωιδίαν. Στησίχορος δ' αὐτίκα ὕμνους Ἑλένης συντάττει καὶ τὴν ὄψιν ἀνακομίζεται. Here Konon equates Stesikhoros' poetic activity (ὕμνους συντάττει) with the instruction to sing 'the *Palinode*' (τὴν παλινωιδίαν), and without feeling any contradiction between these two sentences. The verb συντάσσω can of course refer to composition in a literary context (cf. LSJ s.v.)<sup>58</sup> and so one might argue that Stesikhoros sang two *Palinodes* in response to Helen's injunction, thus confirming the multiple-poem hypothesis. Yet this does not explain the definite article in the previous sentence, and thus an internal difficulty remains.

Perhaps the answer is to be sought in the interpretation of συντάττει, for this verb can also mean 'compile', i.e. work with existing compositions, as in the hypothesis to the scholia on Pindar's *Olympian* odes (Drachmann p. 7, 14–15) προτέτακται ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀριστοφάνους τοῦ συντάξαντος τὰ Πινδαρικά and, with slightly more room for addition or fresh composition, in Plut. *Brut.* 4.4 αὐτὸς ἄχρι τῆς ἐσπέρας ἔγραφε συντάττων ἐπιτομὴν Πολυβίου. In these terms, Konon's ὕμνους συντάττει could indeed describe a single but two-fold *Palinode*, reflecting both the priority of the first segment and its *persona* narrative, and the nature of the composition as a whole. This would combine the two 'literary' meanings of συντάσσω above, in that Stesikhoros composed *and then* added τὴν παλινωιδίαν to the earlier song so as to make his poem, the *Helen*, which could with justice be described as ὕμνοι συνταχθέντες.<sup>59</sup>

If, then, it is not certain that Konon believed in two *Palinodes*, did Khamaileon? In fact, one should first ask if that opinion was even held by the commentator – or the scribe – of P.Oxy. 2506. Though it has been universally assumed that the papyrus states a belief in two poems, the case is not quite so clear-cut. Firstly, its crucial portion in line 8 is actually missing, and in line 6 it speaks of 'the other' ἔν τε τῆι ἑτέραι, presumably matching 'one' in the lost section preceding the quotation. What noun is referred to? Scholars have assumed that it must be a singular form of the subsequent nominative plural παλινωιδία reconstructed by Lobel in line 8. This supplement would indeed supply a plural subject for διτταί εἰσι, but Euripides *Hippolytos* 385–6 αἰδώς τε· δισσαὶ δ' εἰσίν, ἢ μὲν οὐ κακὴ, | ἢ δ' ἄχθος οἴκων makes it clear that διττός in the plural can refer to a singular substantive from a previous sentence.<sup>60</sup> I would, consequently,

58 A *TLG* search revealed only one parallel for the current collocation before the Christian period, Josephus *Ant.* 7.305 ὕμνους συνετάξατο (of David).

59 It is noticeable that Cingano (above, n. 1) 31 n. 41, who argues for two *Palinodes*, actually leaves this possibility open. There is of course another explanation – that Konon did believe in two *Palinodes* but was wrong to do so, and misled by the kind of scholarly activity evident in the work of Khamaileon and the author of the anonymous commentary. In any event, this passage is not good evidence for two *Palinodes*.

60 For plural διττός referring to a plural noun in a preceding sentence, cf. Hippoc. *Morb.* 2.4.1.22; also *De Oss. Nat.* 10.22.

suggest that the referent noun in the earlier missing portion was *ᾠδὴ* (the term used for the offending [part of the] composition by Isokrates),<sup>61</sup> and that either a genitive *παλινωιδίας* or a (palaeographically better) dative *παλινωιδίαι* should be restored in the papyrus at line 8. The sentence would then read ‘for twofold were the different<sup>62</sup> [songs] of the *Palinode*, and of the first the beginning was . . . and of the second’ etc.

Of course, the papyrus may in fact mean to say that there were two *Palinodes*. In that case, it must be remembered that a doubled hymnody could lend itself to separation,<sup>63</sup> while it is even possible that the commentator may not have had direct access to a text of the *Palinode* on this point, for he cites Khamaileon for the two invocations.<sup>64</sup> Furthermore, Konon antedates the papyrus, making it conceivable that the author of the latter has misunderstood Konon’s language in the light of Khamaileon’s observations, not to mention those of Plato and Isokrates, and so come up with the two-poem hypothesis. That is, the commentator was faced with an apparent report of two compositions involved with a story about appeasing Helen, which (with or without consulting the poem itself) could easily be combined in the biographical manner typical of ancient scholarship.<sup>65</sup>

A similar range of options must be applied to Khamaileon himself, the original authority for the commentator’s assertions. Ewen Bowie has proposed that “what Chamaeleon said . . . was not that Stesichorus composed two *Palinodes*, but that the *Palinode* had two beginnings (*archai*), or, as Aristides 33.2 puts it, a second prelude (*prooemion*)”,<sup>66</sup> a statement which was both misunderstood

61 *Helen* 64 (192); cf. above, pp. 11–13; also LSJ s. v. For *ᾠδὴ* and the *ἀρχή* quotation formula in the work of commentators/scholiasts, cf. Alkaios Z 36 LP (359 *PLF*) (= Athenaios 3.85f.; [Dikaiarkhos F 99.2 Wehrli]) Καλλιᾶς δ’ ὁ Μυτιληναῖος ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς παρ’ Ἀλκαίῳ λεπάδος παρὰ τῷ Ἀλκαίῳ φησὶν εἶναι ᾠδὴν ἢς ἡ ἀρχή; Solon F 1 West (= Plutarch *Solon* 8.2.3) ὄχλου δὲ πολλοῦ συνδραμόντος, ἀναβὰς ἐπὶ τὸν τοῦ κήρυκος λίθον, ἐν ᾠδῇ διεξῆλθε τὴν ἐλεγείαν ἢς ἐστὶν ἀρχή (not quite the same sense for *ᾠδὴ*); Ion F 6 Page (745 *PMG*) (= Σ RV ad Ar. *Peace* 834ff.) Ἰὼν ὁ Χίος . . . ἐποίησε δὲ ᾠδὴν ἢς ἡ ἀρχή; Didymus Caecus *Ad Zacchariam* 2.305.3 (4th c. AD) κατὰ τὴν τῆς ᾠδῆς ἀρχήν (and then quite often in Christian texts). Though I have not found a direct parallel for *ᾠδὴ* denoting parts of a single poem, its frequent collocation with the quotation formula suggests that it could readily have been understood from its previous use in the missing portion of the papyrus, viz. ‘[in one *ᾠδὴ*] he finds fault with Homer . . . and in the other (sc. *ᾠδὴ*) with Hesiod; for there were two different (*ᾠδαί*) in/to the *Palinode*; the beginning of one etc.’ Indeed, *ἑτέροι* seems to be an unexpected development, as one can see from the *γάρ* clause, so that an initial singular *ᾠδὴ* would be quite in keeping with the rhetoric of the commentator’s statement.

62 *διαλλάττουσαι*, which need not imply that they were independent or belonged to a different poem, but simply contrasted in content and style; cf. LSJ s. *διαλλαγή* II 2, s. *διαλάσσω* II 4 b, III, IV; also Kannicht (above, n. 2) 30 for other interpretations.

63 cf. below, pp. 18–19.

64 cf. above, n. 55.

65 cf. Lefkowitz (above, n. 1); Arrighetti (above, n. 1). For Konon’s importance in the subsequent transmission of this story, cf. Sider (above, n. 1) 425–6 n. 11.

66 Bowie (above, n. 2) 24.

and embellished by the commentator, and perhaps conflated with other sources somewhat along the lines suggested above.<sup>67</sup> Certainly, my earlier conjecture about the phraseology of the papyrus could be ascribed to Khamaileon as well as, or even instead of, the commentator. On the other hand, of course, Khamaileon could have believed in the existence of two poems by interpreting the reinvocation as the beginning of a new composition. If he did, there is good reason not to place too much faith in this opinion, for the biographical nature of his interpretative method is clear from his surviving fragments.<sup>68</sup> Indeed, he may well have been the first critic to separate the hymnody for biographical reasons, but he was not necessarily right to do so.<sup>69</sup>

It is particularly necessary to exercise caution about the interpretation or authority of this papyrus, and the stories of the *Palinode*'s multiplication more generally, because controversy over the divisions between *and* within poetic works is characteristic of ancient and modern scholarly activity. The Pergamene Krates, for example, athetised the proems to both Hesiodic poems because they seemed transferable and not particularly relevant to the following works,<sup>70</sup> and in fact the opening hymn to Zeus was actually missing from some manuscripts of the *Works and Days*<sup>71</sup> – surely a more than suggestive parallel for the present hypothesis. It is easy to imagine that the melic poets would have presented particular difficulties in this regard until Aristophanes of Byzantium divided their continuously written compositions into cola;<sup>72</sup> indeed, there is ancient evidence that the third triad of Pindar's sixth *Paian* had a separate existence as a *prosodion*,<sup>73</sup> while some modern scholars are inclined to join his third and fourth *Isthmian* odes, principally because they are metrically identical.<sup>74</sup> But a salutary warning about modern judgements is provided by the new Empedokles fragment, which couples material previously felt to belong either to the *Physics* or the *Purifications*, and so adds to the argument for a unified poem with two titles.<sup>75</sup> Consider

67 cf. above, n. 28.

68 cf. esp. Arrighetti (above, n. 1) 141–60.

69 Similar judgements about Khamaileon's procedure are to be found in Woodbury (above, n. 1) 160–2; Arrighetti (above, n. 1) 58–9 n. 75, 85–6; Sider (above, n. 1) 423–4 n. 3; *contra* Gentili (above, n. 1) 274–5 n. 7. It is of course possible that separation had occurred earlier than him, but Plato and Isokrates are not good evidence for it.

70 cf. Σ ad Dionysium Periegetem 55–66 (F. Rühl, "Dionysios Periegetes", *RhM* 29 [1874] 81–7, at 83); also Σ ad *Op. Proleg. Ac* (A. Pertusi, *Scholia vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies* [Milan 1955] 2–3).

71 cf. West (above, n. 39) 136–7.

72 cf. R. Pfeiffer, *A History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford 1968) 183–8; also M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982) 47 for a possible analogy in Hephaestion's statement that Alkman (161[a] *PMG* = TB 13 *PMGF*) wrote a poem "in which seven strophes in one metre were followed by seven in another; we should need the text in order to be sure that it was not really two separate poems."

73 cf. Rutherford (above, n. 31) 329–38 (I owe this reference to Gregory Hutchinson).

74 cf. M. M. Willcock, *Pindar: Victory Odes* (Cambridge 1995) 69–71 for a recent assessment.

75 cf. above, n. 52.

also the joining of the Delian and Pythian ‘halves’ of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*,<sup>76</sup> or the *Catalogue of Women* and the *Theogony*, the *Ornithomanteia* and the *Works and Days*, and the *Iliad* and *Aithiopsis*.<sup>77</sup> One might in addition reflect on the interpolation of other elegiac poetry into the *Theognidea*,<sup>78</sup> while the debate over the origin and appropriateness of the Homeric book-divisions shows no sign of abating.<sup>79</sup> Whatever the truth in any of these cases, together they show that the extended process of transmitting, collecting and sorting these early poetic works was not without its ramifications for the integrity of those texts. It demands no great leap of imagination to see this state of affairs producing the type of separative judgements applied to the *Palinode*.

Regardless of its origin, of course, it is certainly true that by the time of Irenaios and Hippolytos the story is established that there were two *Palinodes*. Through an examination of the chief early witnesses to this composition, I have tried to show in this section that the shortcomings of ancient scholarship and its methods, faced with the type of poem along the lines suggested in the first section, well explains the emergence of this story. At every stage in the process of interpreting and illuminating the text of Stesikhoros, there were more than enough opportunities, and no little reason, for these scholars to get it wrong.

### Conclusion

The famous story of Stesikhoros’ blinding and recantation can, I suggest, be explained as the traces of a *persona* narrative within a single poem devoted to Helen. When one considers the vicissitudes of textual transmission in the ancient world, it is not surprising that the *Palinode / Helen* should have been described in the ways it was. Nonetheless, hidden beneath this edifice of biography and multiplication – indeed its ultimate cause – is an episode in which Stesikhoros established a poetic authority to challenge Hesiod and Homer, and so to sing a new song. Most of the early fragments and *testimonia* can be accommodated within this hypothesis; those which cannot are open to question on other grounds.

76 cf., e.g., R. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* (Cambridge 1982) 99–132; contra A. Miller, “The ‘Address to the Delian Maidens’ in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo: Epilogue or Transition”, *TAPA* 109 (1979) 173–86; also above, n. 22.

77 For the *Iliad* and *Aithiopsis*, cf. Σ T ad 24.804 (with H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca ad Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera) V: Y – Ω* [Berlin 1977] ad loc., 642); A. Bernabé, *Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum Testimonia et Fragmenta: Pars I* (Leipzig 1987) ad *Aithiopsis* F 1, 69–70; Burgess (above, n. 7) 140–2; for the *Theogony* and *Catalogue* (*Theog.* 1021–2 = *Cat.* F 1.1–2 MW), cf. J. S. Clay, *Hesiod’s Cosmos* (Cambridge 2003) 162–4; for the *Ornithomanteia* and *Works and Days*, cf. Σ vet. ad 828a; also F 312 & 355 MW; West (above, n. 39) ad *Op.* 828, 364–5.

78 cf. M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin 1974) 40–61.

79 cf., e.g., O. Taplin, *Homeric Soundings* (Oxford 1992) 285–6; B. Heiden, “The Placement of the Book-Divisions in the *Iliad*”, *JHS* 118 (1998) 68–8.

I close by venturing some comments about the structure and content of this poem:<sup>80</sup> known variously as either *Helen* or *Palinode*, it had a two-fold (διττά **193.7**) hymnodic structure (ῥυμνοὺς **TA 41**) concerned with the life and deeds of Helen.<sup>81</sup> Introduced by the invocation χρυσόπτερε παρθένε (Μοῖσα) (**193.10–11**),<sup>82</sup> its first segment told a ‘conventional’ story of Tyndareus’ daughter, focusing (*inter alia*?) on her marriage (**187, 188, 189, 223**) and betrayal of Menelaos (**190 & 191**).<sup>83</sup> At the end of the first hymnody, the poet constructed an episode in which he narrated an encounter with Helen very probably in a dream (**TA 19**), after which he may have awoken blind. Then, within a transitional χαῖρε address to Helen,<sup>84</sup> he generated the famous three verses οὐκ ἔστ’ ἔτυμος λόγος οὔτος | οὐδ’ ἔβας ἐν νηυσὶν ἐυσσέλμοις | οὐδ’ ἴκεο πέργαμα Τροίας (**192**) and, moving ἐφ’ ἕτερον προοίμιον (**241**), the ‘new’ invocation | δεῦρ’ αὐτε θεὰ φιλόμολπε (**193.9–10**) heralding the ‘palinodic’ segment of the poem.<sup>85</sup> As to the subject matter and course of that segment, the surviving evidence enables us to say only that it involved Egypt and an εἶδωλον transported in Helen’s place to

80 cf. Kannicht (above, n. 2) 38–41.

81 On metrical grounds all the actual fragments (i.e. **187, 188, 192, 193, 223**) could be ascribed to the same poem (on the metre of **257 + 241**, cf. above, n. 18), which would belong to the first category of Stesikhoros’ work in West (above, n. 72) 49, in which “iambo-trochaic elements were also present (sc. in addition to the dactylic cola), mainly at the ends of periods.” The two verses quoted by Khamailion (**193**) respond to οὐκ ἔστ’ ἔτυμος λόγος οὔτος (**192.1**) as  $-D -$ ; **192.2** (οὐδ’ ἔβας ἐν νηυσὶν ἐυσσέλμοις)  $e - D$  (with resolution; for the transmitted εὔσέλμοις, cf. West [op. cit.] 53, who interprets  $lk - -$ ; also C. W. Willink, “The Metre of Stesichorus *PMG* 15/192”, *Mnemosyne* 55 [2002] 709–11 for other interpretations); **192.3** (οὐδ’ ἴκεο πέργαμα Τροίας)  $-D -$ ; **187.1** (πολλὰ μὲν Κυδώνια μᾶλα ποτερρίπτουν ποτὶ δίφρον ἄνακτι)  $tr D - D -$  (Haslam [1974] 43  $e \cup D - D -$ ; Page would delete μὲν, giving  $D^2 - D -$ ); **187.2** (πολλὰ δὲ μύρσινα φύλλα)  $D -$ ; **187.3** (καὶ ῥοδίονους στεφάνους ἴων τε κορωνίδας οὔλας)  $D \cup D -$  **188** (λιθαργύρεον ποδανιπτῆρα)  $\cup D - x$ ; **223.1** (οὔνεκα Τυνδάρεος)  $D$ ; **223.2** (ρέζων ποκὰ πᾶσι θεοῖς μόνας λάθετ’ ἠπιοδώρου)  $-D \cup D -$ ; **223.3** (Κύπριδος· κείνα δὲ Τυνδαρέου κόρας)  $E ia$  ( $lk ia$  acc. to West [op. cit.] 49 n. 50; cf. M. Haslam, “Stesichorean Metre”, *QUCC* 17 [1974] 7–57 at 38 for a different reading and interpretation of 3 & 4; also 44 n. 84); **223.4** (χολωσαμένα διγάμους τε καὶ τριγάμους ἐτίθει)  $\cup D \cup D$ ; **223.5** (καὶ λιπεσάνορας)  $D ?$  (incomplete); cf. Haslam (op. cit.) esp. 43–4.

82 suppl. West (above, n. 41) 137 n. 3, adducing Empedokles 3.3 λευκώλενε παρθένε Μοῦσα. For the epithet, cf. Alkman S1 *PMGF* χρυσόκομα φιλόμολπε (addressed apparently to Apollo) and Stesikhoros’ own second invocation from the *Helen / Palinode* δεῦρ’ αὐτε θεὰ φιλόμολπε. Though I have inverted the order in which the invocations appear in P.Oxy. 2506, one could retain the papyrus’ order (cf. Sappho F 1 LP) and so render Lobel’s reconstruction (τ)ῆ(ς) (line 9) unnecessary.

83 **190** might lead one to conclude that a larger story may have been told in the first segment.

84 cf. above, n. 17.

85 This second invocation could have come before the three verses, though cf. above, n. 46. The *Homeric Hymn to Dionysos* (1) opens with a priamel detailing false stories of Dionysos’ birthplace (1–6) before the poet introduces his own with the typical ἔστι δέ τις introduction (8); cf. A. Hoekstra, in: A. Heubeck/A. Hoekstra, *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey; Volume II: Books IX–XVI* (Oxford 1989) ad *Od.* 13.92, 169–70; also I. de Jong, *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey* (Cambridge 2001) ad *Od.* 3.293–6, 83.

Troy (**192**, **193**.13–16), but more detailed discussion of this issue is beyond the scope of the current article.

Correspondence:

Adrian Kelly

Fulford Junior Research Fellow

St. Anne's College

Oxford OX2 6HS

United Kingdom

e-mail: [adrian.kelly@classics.ox.ac.uk](mailto:adrian.kelly@classics.ox.ac.uk)