

JAMES A. D. IRVINE

KERES IN STESICHORUS' *GERYONEIS*: P. OXY. 2617 FR. 1 (A)–(B) = SLG 21
RECONSIDERED

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 115 (1997) 37–46

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

KERES IN STESICHORUS' *GERYONEIS*: P. OXY. 2617 FR. 1 (A)–(B) = SLG 21
RECONSIDERED¹

A. Previous Treatments

The text of our fragment is printed thus by Lobel (P. Oxy. vol. XXXII (1967) p. 3):

(a)	(b)
]νμεν[] . . . νεσωκυπετα[
] [] . . [] . νεχόισαι [
] επ[.] άξανεπ[.] χθονα . [
] απε . ηκεφαλαχαρ[
] . σωα . [.] ε . . . [

Gap of indeterminable length between (a) and (b); metre provides the connective.

The essential problem to be considered is: what is the reason for the presence of these ‘swift-flying’ ladies, forming the grammatical subject, and what, specifically, are they doing?

It is very probable that this fragment follows fr. 4 col. I (= SLG 15), which describes the adverse turn that Geryon’s battle with Heracles is taking – the next likely fragment in the sequel after a gap of eight lines is 4 col. ii, which, from the simile of the wilting poppy (adapted from the death of Gorgythion (*Il.* VIII 306 f.), we may deduce to be its conclusion². The main arguments are given by D. L. Page³. I quote: “The first line is the beginning of an epode and the top of a column. Epod. 1 begins col. XII in the sequence and fr. 4 i and ii represent columns XI–XII. As the top of col. ii is missing from fr. 4, there is an obvious possibility that the present fragment stands at the top of the column represented by fr. 4 ii, giving the immediate sequel to fr. 4 i . . . It would be an odd coincidence, if fr. 1 does not, after all, belong to fr. 4 col. ii but comes from *the corresponding position* [my italics] in a later or earlier sequence, not less than 390 lines distant.”

Page was unable to advance a suggestion as to what events are in progress here and bequeathed it to ‘an ingenious interpreter’. This role was rapidly occupied by P. Lerza⁴. She made the (seemingly un-

¹ I am very grateful to Professor P. J. Parsons, Dr. M. L. West and Professor Dr. Rudolf Kassel for their comments on a draft of this paper, and to Dr. J. Rea for making the papyrus available to me.

² On the exact structure of the battle see now E. Tsitsibakou-Vasalos, Stesichorus *Geryoneis* SLG 15 i–ii, *Hellenica* XLI (1990) 7 f. My doubts about her theory, which accords with that of P. Lerza (see below) in respect of the helmet episode, will emerge in what follows.

³ Stesichorus: The Geryoneis *JHS* XCIII (1973), 154, cf. the Table of Sequences p. 148.

⁴ Su un frammento della *Gerioneide* di Stesicoro, *Atene e Roma* n. s. XXIII (1978), 83 f., with additional arguments in Nota a Stesicoro, *ibid.* XXIV (1979), 41 f. I record here, for the sake of completeness, the suggestion of F. R. Adrados (Propuestas para una nueva edición e interpretación de Estesicoro, *Emerita* XLVI (1978), 264) that we should connect the epithet with Heracles’ adventure with the Stymphalian birds, whom he would also associate with the highly obscure fr. 247 PMG (ἀκεσταλίων ὀρνίθων). They do not appear to play any relevant role in the proceedings we are considering, and are in too close proximity with the combat with Geryon to be associated with the (in any case nebulous) Sequence E of Page’s analysis, wherein it is possible that fr. 181 and 182 PMG may be fitted, concerned with various Arcadian adventures of Heracles. Adrados confesses that the incident in question is no more than an ‘otra aventura arcadia de Heracles’, which *might* be connected with the visit paid to Pholus attested for the *Geryoneis* in fr. 181, if the attribution to our poem is correctly made by Athenaeus (499E cf. A). Of this episode Page (op. cit., 149) says merely that ‘one can say no more than that it seems easier to find a place for it on the return journey to Tiryns than on the outward journey’. From the point of view of literary convention, an appendix to the poem, after the heroic death of Geryon, consisting of sundry other feats of Heracles in a different arena, is to say the least unwelcome.

avoidable) deduction that, in such a context, ὠκυπέτα[ι (ἐχοίσαι) can only refer to winged female deities or daemones, and restored accordingly:

καὶ τὰ]ν μὲν [– ~ δαί]μονες ὠκυπέτα[ι
 ῥά γε πικρὸν ὄλεθρ]ον ἐχοίσαι
 [– ω –] ἐπ[λ]άξαν ἐπ[ι] χθόνα·

More recently, Massimo Lazzeri⁵ has introduced a valuable refinement, based on a careful reading of fr. 14 (and greater attention to the papyrus we are discussing), to which I return. He suggests:

τὸ]ν μὲν [δολιό]φρονες ὠκυπέτα[ι
 τόκα Μοῖραι πότμ]ον ἐχοίσαι
 πίπτοντ' ἀμφ]επ[ι]άξαν ἐπ[ι] χθόνα·

For detailed criticism of these reconstructions, see under C. Let us first examine the main thesis.

In what follows I take it for granted (in the first instance; further reasons will emerge) that the deities in question are the Keres. (Lazzeri (op. cit., 93 f.) concedes the equation, for his purpose, of Moira and Ker.) The context – a death scene – and the descriptive epithet seem decisive (cf. ὠκυπέτα μόρω S. Tr. 1043: vase paintings need not be adduced to prove its appropriateness: see LIMC VI 1 s. v. Ker, p. 16 f. passim). The gratuitous arrival on scene of the Gorgons, the Sirens or the Harpies need not be contemplated.

There is another consideration, which I adduce at the outset, which makes the Keres an especially attractive presence. It has long been noted that Geryon's reply to Menoitēs' attempt to dissuade him from battle, which occupies most of fr. 13 (= SLG 11), is a direct and elaborate allusion to the famous speech (*Il.* XII 322 f.) of Sarpedon to Glaucus.⁶

ὦ πέπον, εἰ μὲν γὰρ πόλεμον περὶ τόνδε φυγόντε
 αἰεὶ δὴ μέλλοιμεν ἀγήρω τ' ἀθανάτω τε
 ἔσσεσθ', οὔτε κεν αὐτὸς ἐνὶ πρώτοισι μαχοίμην
 οὔτε κε σὲ στέλλοιμι μάχην ἐς κυδιάνειραν·
 νῦν δ' ἔμπης γὰρ κήρες ἐφεστᾶσιν θανάτοιο
 μυρίαί, ἃς οὐκ ἔστι φυγεῖν βροτὸν οὐδ' ὑπαλύξαι,
 ἴομεν, ἢ ἐ τῷ εὖχος ὀρέζομεν, ἢ ἐ τις ἡμῖν.

(Cf. Semonides fr. 1 20 f. West οὕτω κακῶν ἅπ' οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ μυρίαί | βροτοῖσι κήρες κἀνεπίφραστοι
 δύαι | καὶ πῆματ' ἐστίν, Mimnermus fr. 2 West 5 f., Hes. *OD* 100 f.).

It would be most attractive if this allusion were answered and, as it were, realized so movingly in the text of the poem itself.⁷

Following and adding to Page's hint about the context, Lerza refers the feminine demonstrative, which she, following Page, restores in the first line directly to the ἵπ]πόκομος τρυφάλει(α) of fr. 4 col. i l.16 and volunteers (1978, 86) the following translation:

⁵ Osservazioni su alcuni frammenti della *Gerioneide* di Stesicoro, *Bollettino dei classici* ser. III fasc. XVI (1995), 83 f.

⁶ See now E. Tsitsibakou-Vasalos, SLG 11 5-26: The dilemma of Geryon, *Hellenica* XLI 1 (1991-2), 245 f.

⁷ It is of some interest that E. Tsitsibakou-Vasalos (art. cit. in n. 2, 21) finds it an appropriate restoration in SLG 15 col. ii 2 f., writing κ]ιχῶν στ]υγερ[ο]ῦ | θ]ανάτοιο π[ικρὰς | κ]εφ[αλ]ῆ π]ερί [κ]ήρας] ἔχων.

“Esso dunque (*scil.* l’elmo) le dee dal veloce volo, avendo (= recando) appunto la morte funesta, ... lo avevano colpito; tanto da gettarlo a terra.” That indeed a daemonic agency could make such a direct intervention is, she considers (*op. cit.* (1979), 42), indicated by *Il.* XVI 788 f. (the death of Patroclus):

τοῦ δ’ ἀπὸ μὲν κρατὸς κυνέην βάλε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων· (793)

To this, Lazzeri makes the cogent objection that the appearance of fr. 14 fin. and the conventions of narrative gives us every reason to think that the helmet incident has already been concluded and that a new subject is requisite, which he considers to be Geryon himself, thus translating:

‘Allora le Moire insidiose dal rapido volo, che hanno il destino, afferrarono quello (*scil.* Gerione), che cadeva a terra.’

There are various objections to this. Apollo and his other Olympian colleagues are envisaged throughout the *Iliad* as active participants in the combat. The sinister and elusive collective, the Keres, are not, and this is even truer of the Moirai. The latter exist to ‘bind’ – in an abstract sense, their practical contribution having been concluded at birth – (*Il.* IV 517, XXII 5, *Od.* III 269), to overcome (*Od.* XXII 413) and to seize (*Od.* II 100) the moribund; they are κραταιή as a collective singular (*Il.* XIX 410). The roles of a Ker in Homer are as follows: They lead (e.g. *Il.* XI 332) or carry (*Od.* XIV 207) warriors to Hades, they conquer (*Od.* XI 171) or envelope (*Il.* XXIII 78-9) victims. In all these cases their activities are part of a formula, not those of independent intervenors. In one case they are more vividly depicted:

ἐν δ’ Ἔρις ἐν δὲ Κυδοιμὸς ὀμίλεον, ἐν δ’ ὀλοή Κήρ,
ἄλλον ζῶν ἔχουσα νεούτατον, ἄλλον ἄουτον
ἄλλον τεθνηῶτα κατὰ μόθον ἔλκε ποδοῖν·
εἶμα δ’ ἔχ’ ἄμφ’ ὅμοισι δαφοινεὸν αἵματι φωτῶν.
ὀμίλευν δ’ ὡς τε ζωὴ βροτοὶ ἠδ’ ἐμάχοντο,
νεκρούς τ’ ἀλλήλων ἔρυνον κατατεθνηῶτας (*Il.* XVIII 535-40).

As is well known, a philological problem is attached to this, in that [Hes.] *Scut.* 156-9, deleted by Solmsen in the OCT, are identical to *Il.* I. c. 535-8 with the exception of one word. The obvious assumption, that the later poem has borrowed, or been interpolated, from the earlier, has recently been challenged by F. Solmsen, *Hermes* XCIII (1965), 1 f.; additional arguments are advanced by J. Michael Lynn-George, *Hermes* CVI (1978), 369 f. Their opinion is accepted by M. W. Edwards in vol. V (1991) of the Cambridge commentary; the traditional argument is re-stated by M. Van der Valk, *REG* LXXIX (1966), 478 f. in an appendix.

I am not persuaded that their case is proven. Lurid activities by Keres may indeed accord more with the taste of the writer of the *Scutum* – and Lynn-George further suggests that *Scut.* 248-57, where the Keres are engaged in a similar conflict over the corpses, may be the model for 156-9. Here, however, we are in both cases dealing with a shield description, Achilles’ and Heracles’ – different canons can apply equally well to Homer in a special formulaic genre and it is not controversial to point out that there is a great deal else in the Shield of Achilles which scholars have wished to call ‘un-Homeric’. As I have pointed out, and here Lynn-George agrees with me, Keres are not elsewhere envisaged as active participants in specialized warfare – but all we have before us is a visual description of the very activity with which they are elsewhere associated, namely conveying the dead (or, by the same token, those fated to die) to Hades. That ἐν δὲ introduces the Homeric description, as against the same words with a verb of craftsmanship, thus destroying the Homeric artifice of *not* presenting the Shield as a *fait-accomplé*, but an ongoing creation, seems too precise a distinction; the context makes it perfectly clear. The main modification to Solmsen – that the Homeric 539-40 is genuine, necessitating the replacement by ὀμίλεον of ἐθύνεον [Hes.] by the supposed Hesiod > Homer interpolator (to match 539) involves making the verb of 539 agree with the fighting *men* of 533-4, which, it is argued on the grounds of ἀλλήλων as against ἀμφοτέρων, it does anyway.

I doubt this very much: ὀλοὴ Κήρ does not mean that only two are present, it goes quite against the testimony of *Scut.* 251 (δῆριν ἔχον περὶ πιπτόντων, of an unspecified number of Keres) and makes little sense; what possible interest could the mortal warriors have in fighting over the corpses of their enemies? Note too Eustathius ad *Il.* 1160 46: καὶ ἡ τοῦ Ἡσιόδου ἀσπίς τοιαῦτα δαιμόνια ἔχει ὀμιλοῦντα τῇ μάχῃ. Furthermore, ὡς εἴ τε ζωοὶ βροτοὶ loses its poignancy, and is certainly not to be compared with 418 (Hephaestus' ἀμφίπολοι χρύσειαι who are ζωῆσι νεήνισιν εἰοικυῖαι) – they *are* robots. (Nor do we need Eustathius' ingenious speculations as to how the Keres may have been attached to the shield.)

Vase paintings indeed show them attendant on a death scene perpetrated by *another hero* or as minuscule armed warriors occupying the scales in the Kerostasia (LIMC loc. cit. nos. 60-64) and some horrific Geometric paintings show two of them (or of equivalent Todesdämonen) in the form of lions carrying off a warrior *already dead* to Hades, as the surroundings, which show funeral festivities, indicate.⁸

Secondly, though it may be true, with Quintilian⁹, that Stesichorus “redundat atque effunditur”, it seems unlikely that he would overdetermine the action to the degree Lerza suggests. Whatever the exact relationship between the two sets of fragments, it does seem indubitable from the tenour of fr. 4 i that the loss of Geryon's helmet, the only way whereby Heracles *could* prosecute the battle with any hope of success, was a direct result of the subtle tactics we are told he adopted to that end.¹⁰

Fr. 4 col. i 5 f.

]τα νόφ διέλε[ν]
]ν
]πολὸν κέρδιον εἶν
]οντα λάθραι πολεμε[ῖν

ant.

]κραταιῶι·
]· ξ κατεφράζετ[ό] οἱ
 πι]κρὸν ὄλεθρον·
 χῶ μὲν στέρνων ἔ]χευ ἀσπίδα πρόσ[-
 θ', ὁ δὲ πέτρῳι]
 κροτάφοιο καθί]κετο· τοῦ δ' ἀπὸ κρα-
 τὸς ἄφαρ μεγάλαι]
 καναχᾶι πέσεν ἰπ]πόκομος τρυφάλει',
 ἃ δ' αὐτόθι μίμνεν] ἐπὶ ζαπέδῳι·

⁸ 1. Cantharos, Copenhagen Nat. Mus. 727 (= LIMC I B 1 2), illustrated in J. M. Davison, *Attic Geometric Workshops*, *YCS XVI* (1961) pl. 128; discussed by B. Schweitzer, *Die geometrische Kunst Griechenlands* (1969), 57 (in favour of identification with Keres), P. Muller, *Löwen und Mischwesen der archaischen griechischen Kunst* (1978), 283 Anm. 34 (against). 2. Ath. Nat. Mus. 14475 (= LIMC *ibid.* 3), illustrated in Schweitzer l. c. Taf. 70K.

⁹ The critique is well-known, but in view of some of the issues here treated, it is worth quoting (*inst. or.* X I 62): ‘Stesichorum quam sit ingenio validus materiae quoque ostendunt, maxima bella et clarissimos canentem duces et epici carminis onera lyra sustinentem. Reddit enim personis in agendo simul loquendoque debitam dignitatem, ac, si tenuisset modum, videtur aemulari proximus Homerum potuisse, sed redundat atque effunditur, quod, ut est reprehendendum, ita copiae vitium est.’

¹⁰ This last point is correctly apprehended by F. De Martino, *Noterelle alla Gerioneide di Stesicoro*, *AFLB XXV-XXVI* (1982), 101.

The restorations are by Page (to which I add the critical apparatus of P.Oxy.), who (l. c. 150–1) explains thus “Heracles distinguished between two courses of action. One course seemed to him much better, πολὺ κέρδιον εἶν, than another. The better course was to fight by stealth, λάθραι πολεμεῖν, the worse course was presumably to confront Geryon openly. κραταιῶι probably described Geryon, ἀνδρὶ or φωτὶ κραταιῶι . . . The shielded and helmeted adversary seems impenetrable; knock his helmet off, and aim promptly at the head. Before he could retrieve his helmet, Heracles shot him through the forehead”. The deceitful battle *by Heracles* goes on in fr. 4 ii 6 f.

σιγάι δ' ὄ γ' ἐπι-
κλοπάδαν [ἐ]νέρεισε μετώπωι·

It is not a conventional encounter (to say the least!) and this consideration answers Lerza's main argument: “Eracle, con una mossa d'attacco (un colpo di clava?) ha disarmato Gerione dell'elmo, ed esso è caduto a terra (fr. 4 i). Ma ecco che, come nella tradizione epica, non è l'uomo che agisce: egli è solo uno strumento nelle mani della divinità” (p. 86).

In general, it ascribes to Stesichorus an utterly extraordinary narrative technique. We have heard at some length of Heracles preparations for battle, concentrating on exactly the issue of how to breach Geryon's seemingly impenetrable panoply. The bathos inherent in introducing, quite without warning, the Keres to save him further trouble, is most unwelcome, not to say incredible.

While accepting Lerza and Lazzeri's inevitable conclusion that Keres are indeed in question, I should like to propound a different interpretation of their presence in the *Geryoneis* here.

B. Reconstruction

What explanation can be given for the activities of the Keres here? I suggest that the well-known motif of the Kerostasia is introduced in just such a brief compass as Homer is wont to do.¹¹

Consider the following, and note especially their lapidary, almost allusive, nature, characteristic of a formular theme:

1. ἄλλ' ὅτε δὴ τὸ τέταρτον ἐπὶ κρουνοὺς ἀφίκοντο
καὶ τότε δὴ χρύσεια πατήρ ἐτίταινε τάλαντα,
ἐν δὲ τίθει δύο κῆρε τανηλεγέος θανάτοιο,
τὴν μὲν Ἀχιλλῆος, τὴν δ' Ἔκτορος ἵπποδάμοιο,
ἔλκε δὲ μέσσα λαβῶν· ῥέπε δ' Ἔκτορος αἴσιμον ἦμαρ,
ᾗχετο δ' εἰς Αἶδαο, λίπεν δὲ ἐ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων.
(*Il.* XXII 208-213)
2. Ἔκτορι δὲ πρωτίστῳ ἀνάγκιδα θυμὸν ἐνήκεν·
ἐς δίφρον δ' ἀναβὰς φύγαδ' ἔτραπε, κέκλετο δ' ἄλλους
Τρῶας φευγέμεναι· γνῶ γὰρ Διὸς ἱρὰ τάλαντα.
(*Il.* XVI 656-658)

¹¹ I learnt after this article was written that F. De Martino (op. cit. n. 10, 101) has considered, in very brief compass (four sentences), a similar suggestion ('a terra forse non vanno né il proiettile né l'elmo, ma le Chere medesime. Le Chere pesano'). He offers as confirmation *Il.* VIII 68 (quoted below), and the possibility of a *kerostasia* in the *Aethiopsis* to which he adds the *Titanomachia* (unwisely, as the evidence for the latter extends no further than its presence in an account as late as Nonnus). In the next part of the article I hope to have shown reason not to accept Lazzeri's objections - 'L'ipotesi ... appare ... complesso un tentativo di ricostruzione in tal senso se pensiamo alle espressioni superstite del frammento, alle incertezze d' interpretazione, ai precedenti omerici e ad un' eventuale strutturazione della *kerostasia*.'

3. αἰψά τε φυλόπιδος πέλεται κόρος ἀνθρώποισιν
ἦς τε πλείστην μὲν καλάμην χθονὶ χαλκὸς ἔχευεν,
ἄμητος δ' ὀλίγιστος, ἐπὴν κλίνησι τάλαντα
Ζεὺς, ὅς τ' ἀνθρώπων ταμίης πολέμοιο τέτυκται.
(*Il.* XIX 221-224)
4. ὄφρα μὲν ἠὼς ἦν καὶ ἀέξετο ἱερὸν ἦμαρ,
τόφρα μάλ' ἀμφοτέρων βέλε' ἤπτετο, πίπτε δὲ λαός,
ἦμος δ' ἠέλιος μέσον οὐρανὸν ἀμφιβεβήκει,
καὶ τότε δὴ χρύσεια πατήρ ἐτίταινε τάλαντα·
ἐν δὲ τίθει δύο κῆρε τανηλεγέος θανάτοιο,
Τρώων θ' ἵποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων,
ἔλκε δὲ μέσσα λαβῶν· ῥέπε δ' αἴσιμον ἦμαρ Ἀχαιῶν,
αἱ μὲν Ἀχαιῶν κῆρες ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλοβοτείρη
ἔζεσθην, Τρώων δὲ πρὸς οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἄερθεν.
(*Il.* VIII 66-74)
-
5. Iuppiter ipse duas aequato examine lances
sustinet et fata imponit diversa duorum,
quem damnet labor et quo vergat pondere letum.
(*Verg. Aen.* XII 725-7)

Other *allusive* references include: A. Ag. 438 f. ὁ χρυσομοιβὸς δ' Ἄρης σωμαίων | καὶ ταλαντοῦχος ἐν μάχῃ δορός κτλ. (though cf. Fraenkel ad loc.), *Septem* 21 καὶ νῦν μὲν εἰς τόδ' ἦμαρ εὖ ῥέπει θεός, *Pers.* 345 f. ἀλλ' ὦδε δαίμων τις κατέφθειρε στρατὸν | τάλαντα βρίσας οὐκ ἰσορρόφῃ τύχῃ, *Su.* 822 σὸν δ' ἐπίπαν ζυγὸν | ταλάντου; more generally *Theognis* 157 f. Ζεὺς γάρ τοι τὸ τάλαντον ἐπιρρέπει ἄλλοτε ἄλλως | ἄλλοτε μὲν πλουτεῖν, ἄλλοτε μηδὲν ἔχειν. Cf. *AP* appendix ep. ded. 100 1 οὐδὲ Τύχης σε δάμασσε παλιγκλίναντα τάλαντα. Naturally it could translate to common, banal metaphor; thus Diotimus (*AP* VI 267 3) can use it of a barrister: οὐ γὰρ ἀφαυρῶς | ἐκ Διὸς ἰθείης οἶδε τάλαντα δίκης.

The last of the Homeric citations (4), which is of especial interest in the present case, poses some difficult textual problems, and has troubled editors from Aristarchus onwards, who athetized 73-4. The use of the dual for the plural in 74, despite Zenodotus' suffrage, wants parallel¹²; nor is a plural desirable, as 72 leads us to assume that one Ker is placed in each scale representing either party – as is invariably the case in vase representations of the Kerostasia and as is implicitly the case with Hector and Achilles in example (1). The scholia rightly reject the idea that there were two in each case, and record the conjecture (as it seems to be) ἔζεσθην, by analogy with e. g. κόσμηθεν – a form and sense unattested. Nineteenth century critics (Leaf, Nauck) were quick to condemn the lines as an interpolated explanation of the preceding; more recently, other counsels have prevailed. XXII 213 leads to expect some form of expansion on the bald ῥέπε δ' αἴσιμον ἦμαρ, giving us every reason to assume that this example is early (as does the formulaic nature of these scenes¹³) and Kirk¹⁴ excuses the anomaly thus: “κῆρ could surely become multiple for a collective subject when required; and the dual verb could refer loosely to the two scales rather than the κῆρες themselves”. The first argument is very plausible (see

¹² P. Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique* II (1953), 28 para 36, cf. 29 II.

¹³ Cf. W. Kullmann, *Die Quellen der Ilias* (*Hermes Einzelschr.* XIV 1960), 316 f.

¹⁴ Cambridge commentary vol. II (1990), p. 304.

above p. 4); the second encourages us to assume that Homer's intellect was insufficient to retrace the true sense when once the word *δύο* stood in the offing. This is possible, if unwelcome. A more attractive solution is propounded by G. Schoeck¹⁵. It is generally accepted¹⁶ that the incident here related in VIII, the rescue of Nestor from Hector by Diomedes, is in a certain sense a Doppelgänger of the similar rescue of the same by the same by Antilochus from Memnon at the cost of his own life. ('Die kleine Incongruenz ist die Folge der Umdeutung der Szene von zwei Einzelkämpfern auf die ganzen Völker'. The apparent impressionism of mingling Trojan and Greek fatalities is thus excused, not implausibly in the context of a formular system of epic motifs (op. cit., 30): 'So bilden in der Phantasie Homers offenbar der Tod Memnons, der Tod des Antilochus und die Wagnung ein bewegliches System, dessen einzelne Glieder in wechselnden Kombinationen wie Sternbilder miteinander auftauchen und verschwinden.')

While respectful of D. L. Page's prudent critique¹⁷ of the basic assumptions of Kullmann op. cit, which partly reappear in Schoeck, namely the latent presupposition that Homer had before him something alarmingly similar to the Cyclic *texts* whose fragments we possess, I think this a case where the method has a chance of success. Firstly, we are speaking not of a text but of a famous *theme*. And secondly, the immense popularity of the Achilles–Memnon kerostasia in vase painting should be considered. The *Aethiopsis* is closely germane to our inquiry, as it may well emerge that it is not only Iliadic motifs which Stesichorus had before his eyes in the passage we are considering.

It became *the* kerostasia in this context, Achilles, Hector and Antilochus being unattested in this context: ABV 140 3, Haspells ABL 227 28 pl. 36 1, ARV² 72 24, 186 50, 518 1, 651 11, Paris Louvre G 399, Leiden Rijksmus. AMM 1. The series begins in the late sixth century and ends with the end of the fifth; there was an archaizing revival in the third century – see C. C. Van Essen, *Bull. Ant. Bech* XXXIX (1964), 126 f., Paribeni, EAA su. 1970, 645 f. We do not, of course, have any *literary* evidence that a Kerostasia occurred in the *Aethiopsis*, though the idea has been widely canvassed since the time of F. G. Welcker (*Der epische Cyclus oder die Homerischen Dichter* II (1849), 175). Nor is it advisable to concoct any; the attempt by A. Severyns (*Le Cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque* (1928), 318 f.) to deduce from such scholia as that on *Il.* VIII 70, XXII 209; Eust. ad *Il.* 699 31 etc., which relate the present Kerostasia to Aeschylus' treatment of the Memnon myth in the *Psychostasia*, that the annotators are omitting a "middle term", namely the Epic Cycle, would hold a certain attraction, were it not that they provide the middle term themselves – their concern is not with the episode itself but with Aeschylus' interpretation of the Κῆρες as Ψυχαί. (Cf. the concern of a scholiast at *Od.* XXIV l. 1 to assure us that Hermes was *not* ψυχοπομπός in Homer.) See note 19 below for a different approach to the problem. Proclus (in his summary) and Apollodorus (*epit.* V 3) do not include it: Quintus of Smyrna has a variant version whereby favourable and unfavourable Keres appear on the battlefield beside the heroes (*II* 509 f.), in addition to a more traditional brief allusion:

Ἔρις δ' ἴθυνε τάλαντα
 ὑσμίνης ἀλεγεινά, τά δ' οὐκ ἔτι ἴσα πέλοντο· (*II* 540-1)

It is possible that Aeschylus' version is the object of the parodic "weighing of verses" at Ar. *Ran.* 1364 f.¹⁸: Cercidas fr. 4 24 f. p. 204 Powell, with its parody of Homer, shows that this is not a necessary conclusion (a similar parody (of *Il.* IX 69) occurs in an epigram of Macedonius at A. P. XI 380 3 f.).

However the traditional argument remains cogent. There is little doubt, from the coincident motifs discussed and from the allusive manner of reference to Antilochus' death at *Od.* IV 189 – τόν ῥ' Ἡοῦς ἔκτεινε φαεινῆς ἀγλαὸς υἱός – that a version of the story was known to Homer. And it is at least the best explanation of the

¹⁵ *Ilias und Aethiopsis: Kyklische Motive in homerischer Brechung* (1961), 29 f.

¹⁶ By, for example, M. Davies, *The Epic Cycle* (1989), 4.

¹⁷ *CR* n. s. XI (1961), 205 f.

¹⁸ Cf. especially 1393-4:

(Δι.) καὶ τὸ τοῦδέ γ' αἶ ῥέπει·
 θάνατον γὰρ εἰσέθηκε, βαρύτατον κακόν.

sudden upsurge in the popularity of the Achilles – Memnon Kerostasia in vases from circa 540 onwards, a date probably amenable to the *Aethiopsis* and, obviously, independent of Aeschylus' influence. As it is only in the latter case that the testimony (such as it is) is unanimous for Zeus holding the scales, the almost total predominance of Hermes in this role in the vases need not constitute an objection (pace Davies op. cit.), even if we were to insist on exact correspondence of literature and art. And the assumption that Aeschylus, *did* follow an epic original in the idea is, to say the least, attractive.¹⁹

In general on the Kero-/Psychostasia, cf. J. E. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (1903), 163 f., A. B. Cook, *Zeus* II 733 f., III 1148 f., E. Wüst, *Die Seelenwägung in Ägypten und Griechenland* ARW 36 (1939), 162 f., id. RE XXIII 2 1439 f. s.v. Psychostasie, esp. 1446 f., W. Schadewaldt, *Von Homers Welt und Werk* (1944), 164, G. Björck, *Eranos* XLIII (1945), 58 f., R. B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought* (1955), 397 f., W. Pötscher, *WS* LXXIII (1960) 14 f., B. C. Dietrich, *Rh. Mus.* CVII (1964), 97 f., id., *Death, Fate and the Gods* (1965), 240 f., A. Dihle, *Totenglaube und Seelenvorstellungen im 7. Jh. vor Christus*, *Gedenkschrift für A. Stuiber* (1982), 9 f., J. Bremmer, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul* (1983), 113 f.

It seems, therefore, quite possible that the *Aethiopsis* gives further evidence of the importance of the kerostasia theme in epic, and further reason why we may look for it in Stesichorus' lyric epic.

There are two further important reasons why a kerostasia is a welcome addition to the plot of the *Geryoneis*, accompanying the main argument for its plausibility, namely our assured knowledge that Iliadic motifs occurred in the poem – to those mentioned one might add the likelihood of a 'messenger speech' from Menoites to Geryon, announcing the death of Eurytion and the hound Orthos (fr. 42 = SLG 10; cf. Apollodorus II 5 10), and the moving reminiscence of Hecuba's speech of dissuasion to Hector in *Il.* VI in Callirhoa's similar speech to Geryon (fr. 19 and 11 = SLG 12 and 13). Firstly, there is its position in the narrative structure. We are aware from fr. 3 = SLG 14 that col. VIII presented a Council of the Gods which concerned the fate of Geryon. (It seems quite possible, from a reconstruction of the Oltos painter's vase²⁰, that Iris, included by him behind Athena and Heracles, was conveying a message from the former to the latter, adding yet another Iliadic touch). This is a most appropriate preliminary to a kerostasia, and the two motifs are logically conjoined at *Il.* VIII 1-52, XVI 431-461, XXII 166-187: Quintus of Smyrna II 164-182 follows Homer, at *Aen.* XII 791-842 the order is reversed.

Secondly, the place for a kerostasia is *at the height and decisive (if not concluding) point of a longer conflict*, such as it would occupy here – cf. *Il.* VIII 65 f., XXII 208 f., *Aen.* loc. cit., Quintus loc. cit. Similarly in two examples from later Epic: at Nonn. *Dion.* II 553 Zeus concludes his own duel with Typhoeus thus (ἰσοτόπου δὲ τάλαντα μάχης ἔκλινε Κρονίων), whereas at Triphiodorus *excid. Il.* 506 f. it indicates the beginning of the end, as Pallas forbids Helen to make further attempts to persuade the inmates of the Horse to betray themselves (ἤδη δὲ Τρώεσσιν ὀλέθριον εἶλκε τάλαντον | Ζεὺς ταμίης πολέμοιο).²¹

¹⁹ See C. Robert, *Bild und Lied: archaeologische Beiträge zur Geschichte der griech. Heldensage* (1881) 143 f. Plutarch's discussion of Aeschylus' Psychostasia (*de aud. poet.* 16F-17A) is too well known to require citation here (the only other significant source is Pollux IV 130). The assumption which Plutarch makes that Aeschylus' source is the Iliad has been sensibly questioned by Taplin (*The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (1977) p. 431 f.); he rightly doubts whether Plutarch had read the play, to which I would only add that his phraseology distinctly suggests that he is *describing a vase painting* (of which he would have had no shortage; see above), in which Eos and Thetis are both present by the scales, supplicating for their sons, just as they do appear in iconography. But, apart from the extreme unlikelihood of Zeus appearing on the stage in the fifth century, Taplin has shown good reason for thinking that the Aeschylean psychostasia, if such there was, must have taken place off stage. It is at least possible that Aeschylus did *not* introduce Zeus, and *did* accord with the iconographic evidence, the latter in turn reflecting the *Aethiopsis*, in casting Hermes in this role. There is no means of telling whether the other salient difference alleged between Aeschylus and Homer – the substitution of the actual souls of Memnon and Achilles for the Keres – tells us anything of the *Aethiopsis*, though it certainly cannot be rejected.

²⁰ ARV² 62 84; cf. M. Robertson, *Stesichorus and the Vase Painters*, *CQ* n. s. XIX (1969), 210.

²¹ The point is well apprehended by Milton, who describes the conclusion of the "preventative" visit of Gabriel to Satan in the Garden of Eden thus: 'Th' Eternal, to prevent such horrid fray/Hung forth in Heav'n his golden Scales../.In these he puts two weights/The sequel each of parting and of fight;/The latter quick up flew, and kickt the beam;../.The Fiend lookt up

C. Restoration

Lerza's suggested restoration is faulty in point both of metre (there is no room for a cretic in this dactylo-anapaestic system) and language (ῥα is impossibly positioned). But, more importantly for the present purpose, it also misrepresents the papyrus evidence. I have examined the original, and what follows exceeds only marginally in ambition Lobel's reading of l. 1.

Lobel suspected, and Page (in SLG) tentatively accepted, that letter three of fr. 1 (b) was omicron, letter two rho. I find both all but inevitable; in any event, Lerza's mu for the latter is out of the question. More seriously, Lerza (unlike Lazzeri) ignores the undoubted presence of a letter in first place. Lobel describes it as 'a medial dot on a single fibre' – a slightly more optimistic statement would be 'remains of a right hand stroke' – compatible, of course, with many letters. (By contrast, the first omicron in l. 2 should not be reported as a certainty.)

I suggest a restoration along these lines:

τοῖ]ν μὲν [δαμασί]φρονες ὠκυπέτα[ι
 ῥέπον αἶψα τάλαντ]ον ἐχοῖσαι [
 Γαρυόνα καὶ] ἐπ[λ]άξαν ἐπ[ι] χθόνα· [

In the next sentence I assume that the consequences of the loss of the helmet are rehearsed.

Translation

"And, in the case of the twain (Heracles and Geryon), straightway did the swift-flying conquerors of the spirit who had control of the balance pertaining to Geryon incline downwards, dashing it to the earth."

Notes

1. δαμασίφρονες: only known from Pind. *Ol.* XIII 78 (δαμασίφρονα χρυσόν). For the verb in this connection cf. *Od.* XI 171, 398 (τίς νύ σε κῆρ ἐδάμασσε τανηλεγέος θανάτοιο), III 410, VI 11 (ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἤδη κηρὶ δαμειὶς Ἀιδόσδε βεβήκει). Lazzeri's δολιόφρων is not acceptable in this context and the examples he quotes (95 f.) indicate this – they are all concerned with specific divine machinations, a concept that is irrelevant by its own nature to the function of the Keres or Moirai. His best example is *A. Cho.* 946 f. ἔμολε δ' ἧ μέλει κρυπταδίου μάχας | δολιόφρων Ποινά and that of course refers specifically to the two δόλοι at present under consideration, that of Clytaemestra and that of Orestes.

Δαμασίφρονες ὠκυπέται *per se* might seem a surprisingly allusive – if dramatic – way to introduce the Keres. The context of a kerostasia will have made the identification inevitable, of course.

2. ῥέπον, τάλαντον: see 1, 4: 1-4 supra. ἐχοῖσαι: not, obviously, intended to suggest that as well as occupying the scales, they were also holding them (the role of Zeus in Homer – here we know not); rather in the general sense suggested by the translation and evinced by e. g. *Il.* V 749 πύλαι ... ἄς ἔχον ὦραι.

3. ἐπ[λ]άξαν: They "dashed Geryon's (doom-laden) balance to the ground"; cf. Pind. *Nem.* X 71 Ζεὺς δ' ἐπ' Ἴδα πυρφόρον πλάξε ψολόεντα κεραυνόν, *Il.* V 503 f. κονισάλω, ὄν ῥα δι' αὐτῶν | οὐρανὸν ἐς πολύχαλκον ἐπέπληγον πόδες ἵππων.

4. ἐπὶ χθονί: The papyrus traces favour alpha from the pronounced slope of the right-hand stroke, sense tends to favour iota as the correct text. In either event, cf. *Il.* VIII 73 (quoted above). Commenting there, Kirk (op. cit.) rather prosaically observes "the desired meaning is not that the scale actually *settles*

and knew/His mounting scale aloft:no more; but fled/Murmuring, and with him fled the shades of night' (*Paradise Lost* IV 996-fin.).

on the earth (whose standard epithet ‘much nurturing’ is admittedly quite ironic here), but merely that it moves towards it. This apparent expansion of the simple ‘went towards the house of Hades’ is un-
gainly and could be rhapsodic, but one cannot (of course) be sure”. It is no more ungainly than Hades’
fear, during the theomachia (*Il.* XX 61-5) that Poseidon’s tumult above on Earth would cause the roof of
his kingdom to split open and reveal to mortal man the realms of foul decay, loathsome even to the
Olympians (cf. VIII 14, XXII 482). Nor is it mistaken to bear in mind the primitive magical connota-
tions that contact with the earth suggests.

Balliol College, Oxford

James A. D. Irvine