VI RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN POEMS

The first part of this final chapter outlines some modern scholarship on the ways in which ancient poems and poetic traditions developed around one another and interacted with each other. The second part of the chapter is more to do with ancient textual transmission and presents a catalogue of evidence for ancient editorial manipulation of the boundaries between poems, here described as 'cropping' and 'splicing'.

1. Modern scholarship: neoanalysis and other 'systemic' interpretations

Modern scholarship on 'epic interactions' has to tread a fine line between pure literary exegesis and strong claims about historical actualities. Of these, exegesis is relatively theoretical, and is to some extent the creation of modern literary critics; claims about actualities relate more to source criticism and to testable models of the development of Archaic poetry.

Neoanalysis, the study of the Homeric epics' adaptation of non-Homeric material, tends towards the latter. (Here 'non-Homeric' means especially Cyclic legend and poetry.) The scholarship is extensive, so for more in-depth coverage the reader should refer to one of the core works of neoanalytic scholarship; many of these are in German but several serviceable surveys in English exist.[1]

The classic paradigm of the neoanalytic approach is the 'Memnon theory', according to which the Iliadic story of Achilles, Patroclus, and Hector draws on the story of Achilles, Antilochus, and Memnon that we find attested for the **Aethiopis*.[2] The asterisk on **Aethiopis* indicates a conjectural pre-Homeric form of the *Aethiopis* legend, so as to avoid equating Arctinus' *Aethiopis* with the legend, and to avoid the unnecessary assumption that it was specifically Arctinus' poem that the *Iliad* used as a model.

[1] Core works: Pestalozzi 1945 (the Memnon theory); Kakridis 1949 (methodology); Kullmann 1960 (*Iliad*); Danek 1998 (*Odyssey*). English-language surveys: Clark 1986; Dowden 1996; Willcock 1997; Edwards in Finkelberg 2011b: ii.566–7. See also two collections of essays: Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis 2012; Fantuzzi and Tsagalis 2015a.

[2] Schadewaldt 1965: 155–202 is the most influential treatment; in English see Burgess 2009: 72–92, with bibliography.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1. Adaptation of the **Aethiopis* in some major plot-lines of the *Iliad*

***Aethiopis*, 'Memnonis'**	***Iliad*, 'Patroclus sequence'**	***Iliad*, 'Achilles sequence'**
Thetis prophesies that Achilles will die after killing Memnon	—	Thetis prophesies that Achilles will die after killing Hector
Memnon kills Antilochus	—	Hector kills Patroclus
Achilles kills Memnon	Patroclus kills Sarpedon	Achilles kills Hector
Divine scales used to represent the duel's outcome	—	Divine scales used to represent the duel's outcome
Achilles attacks gates of Troy	Patroclus attacks gates of Troy	Achilles considers attacking gates of Troy, *Il.* 22.378–84
Achilles killed by Paris and Apollo	Patroclus killed by Hector, Euphorbus, and Apollo	—
Battle over Achilles' corpse; Aias and Odysseus recover the body	Battle over Patroclus' corpse; Menelaus and others recover the body	—
Funeral and games for Achilles	Funeral and games for Patroclus	—
Thetis, Nereids, and Muses lament the dead Achilles	Thetis and Nereids lament (living) Achilles, *Il.* 18.35–69	—

Table 1 shows some of the main parallels. It follows Burgess in distinguishing two distinct sequences of motifs in the Iliadic story: in each sequence, characters act out parts of a single story pattern.[3] Since the point of this story pattern is that Achilles dies at the end, it appears that the **Aethiopis* version is primary: Achilles can only die once, so in the *Iliad* several elements relating to his death are transferred to Patroclus, creating a 'Patroclus sequence'. The parallels are not exact, of course, and the theory has weathered criticism from many different angles.

Recent studies have defined neoanalysis as the study of 'motif-transference' from pre-Homeric epic to Homer.[4] In its most orthodox

[3] Burgess 2009: 93–7.
[4] Kullmann 1984: 309; Burgess 2006: 149, 2009: 59; Currie 2006: 4–5; Tsagalis 2011: 218.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

form, neoanalysis is based around specific texts and specific poems, and aims to analyse the chain of dependencies between them. In this sense it is a successor to the older, analytic school of Homeric scholarship: analysis aimed to establish which variant of a repeated element *within Homer* was the original and which the copy; neoanalysis works with whole poems and tries 'to establish which poem was the donor and which the recipient' of a given story element.[5] However, few now doubt that Homeric epic drew on *precursors* of the Cyclic epics, whether written or purely oral, and not on the specific poems known to Hellenistic scholars. In other words, to use the terminology outlined in Chapter III, modern neoanalysis is the study of motif-borrowing between strands of oral epos legend. Still looser forms of neoanalysis also allow for the possibility of non-poetic legend as source material; however, it then becomes hard to tell the difference between neoanalysis and the study of traditional tropes in the most general sense.

Neoanalysis traditionally focuses on the *Iliad*, where Kullmann's opus *Die Quellen der Ilias* (*The Sources of the Iliad*, 1960) analyses numerous episodes as Cyclic borrowings: the omen of the sparrows at Aulis (*Il.* 2.301–30), foreshadowings of Astyanax's death in the sack of Troy (24.727–38), and so on. But the *Odyssey* provides plenty of grist for the mill too. There, Danek's *Epos und Zitat* (*Epic and Citation*, 1998) has had an especially great impact on the study of Odysseus' wanderings (*Od.* 9–12). Danek sees traces of an **Argonautica* in some of the fantastic elements (Circe, the Laestrygonians, etc.), existing alongside an older **Odyssey*.[6] The **Argonautica* provided the monsters and magic; the older **Odyssey* offered the more mundane aspects of the homecoming. Some further Cyclic elements include the stories that Nestor, Menelaus, and others tell about events at Troy; the returns of Menelaus and Agamemnon (*Od.* 3.262–312, 4.351–586, 11.405–34); and many more. But Danek often considers the evidence for borrowing too thin to conclude that a specific poem was the source material. In many cases he judges (rightly) that it is extravagant to postulate specific texts as sources; oral epos legend and non-poetic legend are more likely candidates.[7] Most interesting are occasions when the *Odyssey* outlines possible alternatives for how the story will develop, only for one alternative to be rejected

[5] Currie 2006: 4.
[6] See also (more speculative) M. L. West 2005.
[7] See similarly pp. 57–63 above.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and suppressed. Danek sees these not as allusions to other poems but as traces of alternate versions of the *Odyssey* itself: an **Odyssey* where Telemachus visits Crete, an **Odyssey* where Odysseus is reunited with Laertes at an early stage, and so on. The *Odyssey* is not just played against a Cyclic backdrop: there is a whole landscape of potential **Odysseys* in the background.

There are various bastions of resistance to neoanalysis. One form of resistance is to distance Homer from the Cyclic epics. An influential study by Griffin argues that, unlike the Cyclic poems, Homeric epic conscientiously avoids fantastic elements and morally base elements.[8] However, even if this is right, it does not impugn neoanalysis as a purely analytic tool (as Griffin himself points out).

A second avenue of resistance is to reverse the relationship: the Cyclic epics plunder Homer, not the other way round. According to this view, the Cyclic epics were composed with an agenda of filling in the gaps around Homer. To this end, each epic took isolated Homeric references to minor events and built larger poetic edifices out of these titbits.[9] In cases such as the Memnon theory where the parallels are very extensive, this is simply the wrong objection (the Cyclic poets are supposed to have focused on *minor* points). But the argument still pops up every now and then: for example, in scholarly discussions of Eugammon's *Telegony*.

Eugammon himself is certainly post-Homeric – he can have lived no earlier than 631 BCE, when his home city of Cyrene was founded – and it is sometimes inferred that his story of Telegonus' wondrous spear, made from a poisonous ray's sting, is derived from a distorted interpretation of Teiresias' prophecy of Odysseus' death 'from the sea' (*Od.* 11.134). But as we saw in Chapter III and in Danek's analysis, to postulate that a given story belongs to a specific poem and had no previous existence is nearly always the extravagant alternative, not the parsimonious one. It is also an argument from silence: new evidence can disprove it. And, as it happens, robust evidence for a pre-Homeric **Telegony* legend does exist. The basic story of Odysseus' confrontation with Telegonus is a variant of a very old Indo-European folktale, the 'mortal combat of the father and son' (also known as the 'Sohrāb and Rostam' type), which

[8] Griffin 1977.

[9] This was Welcker's view of the Cycle; see Kullmann 1960: 18–19, who calls the process *Herausspinnung* ('spinning off'). The same argument still appears in West's characterization of the 'cyclic approach' (M. L. West 2013: 18–20; similarly 57, 132, 167, 245, 289–90).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

has several extremely close parallels in Indian, Persian, Irish, German, and Russian epic and folktales.[10] There is no doubt that it is very old and very traditional. A sceptic – someone who dislikes the idea that the Telegonus legend informed the Homeric *Odyssey* – might take refuge in claiming that, even if the story-type is old, still Telegonus himself was Eugammon's invention; or, if Telegonus should be proven to be old, still his magic spear is late. These cannot be ruled out (in fact, the last suggestion may be true: the one surviving image of Telegonus shows him armed with a bow, not a spear[11]). But they are still arguments from silence. The notion that the Cyclic poets created their material by reworking hints given in Homer may well be true in some cases, but is indefensible as a default presumption.

But a third objection to neoanalysis, and by far the most serious one, is that it is catastrophically vulnerable to confirmation bias. Any story is a complex set of data; when you look for parallels and patterns in two complex datasets, you will invariably find them. It is therefore dangerously easy for neoanalysis to rely on arguments from similarity and coherence. For example: one criterion that has been used to detect neoanalytic borrowings is 'fissures in a narrative' – that is, inconsistencies or apparent failures of logic.[12] Eurycleia's recognition of Odysseus in *Odyssey* 19 has no lasting impact on the epic's plot; this supposed 'fissure', therefore, could possibly be a result of 'motif transference' from an older poem – in this case, an older **Odyssey*.[13] But a possibility in principle is a far cry from evidence.

The underlying epistemological question is whether a given parallel is a case of systematic adaptation of a prior narrative or merely a trope, a conventional stock element or an echo with no broader significance.[14] The table above omits one **Aethiopis* episode which is

[10] See M. L. West 2007: 440–2; Gainsford 2012a: 267–72.

[11] *LIMC* 'Kirke' 54 (Budapest Museum of Fine Arts 50.101; Acrae, Sicily, *c.*400 BCE) shows Circe giving a bow to Telegonus (named); no spear is visible in the fragment. Telegonus' counterparts in the Indian variants use bows. M. L. West 2013: 307–15 conjectures that the tip of Telegonus' spear, a ray's poisonous sting, came from an alternate story of Odysseus' death, supposedly reported in a fragmentary oracle in Aesch. *Psychagogoi* fr. 275 Radt. This cannot be right: on the symbolic character of oracles, especially their animal imagery, see pp. 28–31; and the argument requires an assumption that Odysseus was invulnerable, something for which no evidence exists.

[12] Tsagalis 2011: 220–1.

[13] Danek 1998: 379–82; Currie 2006: 16–20.

[14] On this distinction see also Kullmann 1984: 311–16 (neoanalytic adaptations are somehow distinct from oral traditional tropes); Finkelberg 2011a (neoanalytic adaptations are special because Homer is special).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

especially liable to this criticism. In *Iliad* 8.80–115 Nestor, trapped with a disabled chariot and threatened by Hector, is rescued by Diomedes. Ostensibly this episode draws on a moment in the **Aethiopis* where Antilochus rescues Nestor from Memnon (leading to Antilochus' death at Memnon's hands).[15] But, in the *Iliad*, the parts of the poem where adaptation is beyond doubt – the 'Achilles sequence' and the 'Patroclus sequence' in the table above – have no connection to the Nestor episode in Book 8. That episode is isolated from other parts of the **Aethiopis* narrative: it might as well be a stock scene. By contrast, the Achilles and Patroclus sequences feature extensive borrowings and both sequences revolve around a tightly focused cluster of three characters (Achilles, Patroclus, and Hector): these clearly represent systematic exploitation of older material.

Some recent studies have been taking these methodological problems very seriously, and have pondered the standard of evidence required for demonstrating a neoanalytic link between poems, as opposed to a vaguer kind of echo.[16] But the Memnon theory remains a *rara avis*: other cases where echoes can be corroborated are few indeed. So it is hard to see prospects for a reliable, universally applicable, methodology whereby neoanalysis can attain any degree of certainty about adaptations, other than in exceptionally well-established cases.

Let us turn from neoanalysis to a more purely literary kind of criticism on the interplay between poems. As with neoanalysis, the scholarship often takes Homer as its departure point.

Many critics, led especially by Nagy's book *The Best of the Achaeans*, see the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as complementary: the Homeric epics developed around one another, responding to each other and resonating in unique ways. Together they form a complete system, in terms of their mutual evaluation of one another and their celebration of two complementary ideals of heroism: *Iliad* vs. *Odyssey; kleos* ('fame') vs. *nostos* ('homecoming'); Achilles vs. Odysseus; *biē* ('might') vs. *mētis* ('artifice').[17]

This vision makes Homer a walled garden. His poetry ends up being 'special' in ways not shared by Hesiod, the Cycle, or any other

[15] The main extant source for the **Aethiopis* episode is Pind. *Pyth.* 6.28–42, with scholia. See Kelly 2006: 3–12 (with extensive bibliography); Burgess 2009: 74–5.

[16] See especially Currie 2006; Tsagalis 2011.

[17] Nagy 1979, esp. 45–9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hexameter poems.[18] That is all very well for a type of criticism designed to celebrate the Homeric epics' pre-eminence after the fact. But if this form of criticism also makes claims about the historical development of hexameter poetry, in terms of cause and effect, then its dependence on teleology becomes a problem.

The problem is that it pre-emptively excludes all hexameter poetry other than the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* from consideration.[19] There is no doubt that the Homeric epics stand out from the crowd: they are uniquely long, uniquely elevated, uniquely excellent. No-one seriously believes that the *Aethiopis* was as pre-eminent as the *Iliad*. But a walled garden? The idea that Arctinus was somehow forbidden from drawing on the epic tradition in the same ways that Homer did is surely wishful thinking. The reverse is also true: as neoanalysis shows, the *Iliad* plays far more heavily on an **Aethiopis* tradition than it does on the *Odyssey*; and the *Odyssey* depends much more on an **Oresteia* tradition than it does on the *Iliad*.[20]

Finkelberg tries to shore up the garden wall by distinguishing different kinds of intertextual play. For her, the Homeric epics possess reciprocity: they do not presuppose each other specifically but only a common inherited tradition, so their interplay is relatively subtle. Where one poem plays specifically on another, by contrast, the relationship is asymmetrical and much more obvious: the *Iliad* plays on an **Aethiopis*, but Arctinus' *Aethiopis* did not play on the *Iliad* (so far as we know).

> This allows the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* not only to distance themselves from the Cycle poems but also to turn these poems into raw material, as it were, for creating something completely new. . . .Homer uses his tradition in a highly idiosyncratic way.[21]

Even this form of the 'walled garden' approach has problems, though. If the *Iliad* is playing specifically on an **Aethiopis*, then it is playing on a form of the **Aethiopis* that is in some sense canonical. That is: we have to presuppose more solidity in this hypothetical **Aethiopis* than in the Homeric *Odyssey*! So this interpretation involves a strong historical

[18] Griffin 1977 is a seminal statement of this view.

[19] E.g. Austin 1991: 233–4: 'Mycenaean history crystallized into two separate epics evolving concurrently and synergistically, celebrating two kinds of hero'. Epics on Heracles, Oedipus, or Jason may as well not have existed.

[20] See above, and see also Slatkin 1991: 21–49 (**Aethiopis*); Olson 1995: 24–42 (**Oresteia*).

[21] Finkelberg 2011a: 200.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

claim: that prior to the *Iliad* the **Aethiopis* had reached a canonical form, while the *Odyssey* was still fluid.

Opposing the 'walled garden' approach is a trend of interpreting all hexameter as a coherent whole, with systemic organization on a large scale. Thalmann sees hexameter as unified by a single world-view, defined by symmetry and antitheses, and geared towards making the cosmos intelligible rather than a mere jumble of events.[22] Slatkin develops this view by interpreting each sub-genre of hexameter as 'a classification of cultural phenomena': heroic poetry is complementary to wisdom literature, Homer to Hesiod, but they all 'exist within, and serve to complete, a conception about the way the world is ordered'.[23] For Ford, epic is a chronological continuum stretching from Hesiod's Chaos all the way to Eugammon's Telegonus without a break: poems anticipate or reflect other parts of the continuum, creating resonances and an overall unity.[24]

The most complete statement of this 'systemic' reading is Clay's influential interpretations of the Homeric *Hymns* and the Hesiodic poems. For Clay, not only is the *Odyssey* a response to the *Iliad*, but the *Works and Days* is a response to the *Theogony*; the *Catalogue* forms a triptych with them both;[25] the *Hymns*, too, pursue a well-defined agenda that links the divine realm to the mortal world. Hexameter is thus a much larger system than just Homer, but it is still a system. So the *Hymns* describe mythological moments: stories that change the cosmos, and authorize individual gods' roles and the relationship between gods and mortals. The *Theogony* and *Works and Days* 'form a unified whole embracing the divine and human cosmos' respectively. And heroic epic describes a time when the mortal and divine spheres were more closely linked than in the present.[26] As Clay writes: 'one might argue that the Homeric Hymns were created *in order* to fill the perceived gap between Hesiod and Homer and thus to provide accounts of the major events in the evolution of Olympus'.[27]

This picture of hexameter as a larger unity has a certain appeal – but only until one inquires about the origin of the system. Who devised and enforced this division of labour? Where does it leave the dozens of other

[22] Thalmann 1984: 1–6.
[23] Slatkin 1991: 260.
[24] Ford 1992: 45.
[25] Similarly Ormand 2014: 6–9. Graziosi and Haubold 2005: 36–8 argue instead that the poems were *read* as a triptych in antiquity.
[26] Clay 1989; 2003, esp. 166.
[27] Clay 1989: 268 (Clay's emphasis).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hexameter poems that are attested: the Thebaids, the Heracleas, the Descents to Hades? Clay's tightly knit top-down organization can hardly have been a code of unbreakable rules followed unquestioningly by the Cyclic poets, Eumelus, Musaeus, and others.

A more careful approach is to think about the poems' complementary character in terms of later reception, rather than in terms of their historical composition. This is the tactic followed by Graziosi and Haubold.[28] One reason is simply that our selection of extant texts is pre-determined and out of our control. For us, the extant poems constitute a 'found' canon, with literally no existence other than as a coherent system, and this illusory coherence has guided a lot of modern interpretation. But in antiquity, too, by the fifth and fourth centuries BCE the Hesiodic and Homeric poems were already *read* as complementary. Plato and Aristotle saw Hesiod and Homer as systemic canons, in much the same way that Ford and Clay do.

And comparable principles may have operated in other corpuses too. It would be unsurprising if new evidence emerged one day that showed similar kinds of relationships between the Derveni *Theogony* and the Orphic *Hymns*, for example; or between the Epimenidean *Theogony*, the *Birth of the Kouretes and Korybantes*, and the *Genealogies*. If ancient readers perceived these poems as complementary and resonating with one another, as they did the Homeric and Hesiodic canons, it could help explain how the Orphic and Epimenidean poems gravitated into their own groups and created their own canons.

2. Ancient transmission: cropping and splicing

In the centuries after their composition, some poems were combined or edited by either 'splicing' or 'cropping'. Here 'splicing' refers to the editorial practice of joining two originally separate poems and publishing them together as a single continuous text. 'Cropping' describes situations where poems were abbreviated after composition, either to avoid overlaps with other poems or to publish an extract as a separate poem.[29] The remainder of this chapter is a catalogue of the evidence for 'cropping' and 'splicing' at the boundaries between poems.[30]

[28] Graziosi and Haubold 2005, esp. 21–34.

[29] 'Cropping' was coined by Burgess 2001, 'splicing' by the present author.

[30] For previous partial surveys see Burgess 2001: 135–43 (Epic Cycle); Cingano 2009: 109–30 (Hesiodic corpus).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Individual cases of editing cannot in general be dated. In one case, the *Hymn to Apollo*, if the poem we have is a result of splicing, it is most likely that it dates to the Archaic period.[31] If Burgess' 'cropping hypothesis' about the Epic Cycle is correct, that should probably be dated to the fourth century, on the supposition that compilation of the Cycle post-dates the literary sense of 'cyclic'.[32] No substantial splicing or cropping would have taken place after the Hellenistic period.

(a) The Hesiodic Theogony *and* Catalogue(s) of Women

Th. 1021–2 = *Cat.* fr. 1.1–2. In one ancient papyrus and two medieval copies the *Theogony* ends at line 1020; 1021–2 appear in some manuscripts added in a second hand; in only one are they an integral part of the text.[33] This indicates that at some point the *Theogony* and *Catalogue* were spliced together in some, but not all, editions.

West argues that the splice extends much further into the *Theogony*.[34] The authenticity of the last section of the poem, from line 901 (or 930 or 965) onwards, has often been doubted.[35] Since this section is largely devoted to a 'little catalogue' of goddesses who had sex with mortal men (965–1020) – an inversion of the *Catalogue*'s theme of women who had sex with male gods – the whole thing could be a large splice designed to join a shorter proto-*Theogony* to the *Catalogue*. West's suggestion that 1021–2 was intended to point readers to a subsequent scroll on the shelf is also possible; that would be a milder form of splicing (the doing of a librarian rather than an editor).[36]

Cat. fr. 2 poses a related problem. The source of the fragment, John Lydus, discusses Latinus and Graecus as eponymous ancestors of the Latins and Greeks. Lydus elliptically mentions 'brothers'; then, naming Hesiod's 'catalogues' as his source, quotes *Theog.* 1013 ('Agrius and Latinus' [=*Cat.* fr. 2.1]) and *Cat.* fr. 2.2 (on Hellen's children). The

[31] Either because the hymn was compiled for the 523/522 Pythia–Delia (Janko 1982: 112–15; Chappell 2011: 72–3) or because one part of the hymn was designed with the other in mind (Chappell 2011: 62).

[32] See pp. 27–8.

[33] M. L. West 1966: 437.

[34] M. L. West 1966: 48–50, 1985: 126–7; Most 2006: xlix. However, West's insistence that *Cat.* fr. 1 was not the beginning of the original *Catalogue* is uncompelling. Muse invocations can certainly occur inside a poem but *Cat.* fr. 1 is an absolutely typical proem; see pp. 45–8.

[35] M. L. West 1966: 397–9, with bibliography; cf. Kelly 2007: 389–96, applying a new test from internal structural evidence, with inconclusive results.

[36] M. L. West 1966: 437.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reference to 'brothers' is puzzling, for fr. 2.2 makes it clear that Graecus is Pandora's son, and not related to Latinus or his mother, Circe. Various emendations and transpositions have been proposed,[37] but it is fairly clear that Lydus is quoting from two separate sources.

If the last section of the *Theogony*, the 'little catalogue', is indeed a splice between a proto-*Theogony* and the *Catalogue*, an ancient reader might well refer to both of them jointly as 'Hesiod's catalogues'. On this reading, then, Lydus combines *Theog.* 1013 and *Cat.* fr. 2.2 because they do indeed both come from 'Hesiod's catalogues', plural: one from the 'little catalogue' in the *Theogony*, the other from the *Catalogue of Women*.

(b) The Catalogue of Women *and the* Shield

Shield 1–56 = *Cat.* fr. 138.8–63, the story of Heracles' birth. *Shield* argument *a* (=*Cat.* fr. 139 = Hes. test. 52) informs us that the passage comes from *Cat.* Book 4; its testimony is confirmed by two overlapping papyri containing *Cat.* fr. 138.1–7 and *Shield* 1–18.[38] The simplest inference is that the *Shield* poet himself took the passage from the *Catalogue* and used it for the opening of his poem.[39]

West and Most, by contrast, argue that the passage was interpolated into the *Shield* after both poems were composed.[40] They do so for contradictory reasons: West, because the passage is too similar to *Shield* 78–88, where Heracles refers to the birth story again (but without repetition); Most, because the passage is too dissimilar to the rest of the poem (but this is not a poem known for its structural or thematic perfection). Neither position is very compelling.

(c) The Catalogue of Women *and the* Cypria

We do not have the end of the *Catalogue*, but in the last major fragment, fr. 155.94–180, the marriage of Helen is followed by Zeus planning a

[37] Hirschberger 2004: 172 summarizes a range of views; Dräger 1997: 27–42 is the most detailed discussion.

[38] Hirschberger 2004: 362.

[39] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1905: 122; Russo 1965: 33 n. 34; Janko 1986: 39 (comparing *Hymn. Hom. Ap.*); Effe 1988: 161. Few now believe that the same poet composed both poems. Among those who do, their further views diverge greatly: for Van der Valk 1953: 277–9, the poet recycled his own material when composing the *Shield*; for Martin 2005: 173–5, all 480 lines of the *Shield* come from *Cat.* Book 4.

[40] M. L. West 1966: 49–50 n. 5, 1985: 136; Most 2006: lviii–lix.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

major war to destroy the races of mortals and demigods (99 ἀϊστῶσαι. . .ὀλέσθαι).[41] This plan has often been linked to a fragment of the *Cypria* describing Zeus's plan for the Trojan War (*Cypria* fr. 1.4–7):[42]

> κουφίσαι ἀνθρώπων παμβώτορα σύνθετο γαῖαν,
> ῥιπίσσας πολέμου μεγάλην ἔριν Ἰλιακοῖο,
> ὄφρα κενώσειεν θανάτωι βάρος. οἱ δ' ἐνὶ Τροίηι
> ἥρωες κτείνοντο, Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή.

. . .[Zeus] resolved to relieve the all-nurturing earth of mankind's weight by fanning the great conflict of the Trojan War, to void the burden through death. So the warriors at Troy kept being killed, and Zeus' plan was being fulfilled.

It would seem that a similar *Dios boulē* ('Zeus's plan') lies behind the passage near the end of the *Catalogue*. The *Catalogue* follows up its *Dios boulē* passage with a digression, whose relevance is uncertain, about the passing of seasons and a snake's life cycle (124–44 and probably as far as 147).[43]

There is no indication that the end of the *Catalogue* and the start of the *Cypria* were ever actually spliced together. However, on a mythological level (rather than textual), Clay has insisted that *Cat*. fr. 155 is designed to embed the Trojan War in a 'a continuum with the cosmogonic background and the dynamics of the succession myth' – a continuum that stretches from the *Theogony* to the fall of Troy and the returns.[44]

From *Cat*. fr. 155.95 onwards there are several abrupt shifts in topic and in tone. The less than organic character of the passage may result from an attempt to forge a link between 'Hesiodic' and 'Homeric' forms, between the *Catalogue* and heroic epic, by combining echoes of both types of poetry. **Hesiodic echoes:** the end of the heroes

[41] On this passage see Koenen 1994: 26–34; Clay 2003: 168–74; González 2010; Ormand 2014: 202–16.

[42] Thus Koenen 1994: 26–9; Clay 2003: 168–72; Finkelberg 2004: 11–15; Cingano 2005: 118–19 (with further bibliography); González 2010: 395. Clay argues that the *Catalogue*'s reference to γένος. . .πολλόν ('plentiful race' of mortals, *Cat*. fr. 155.98–9; Most: 'most of the race') also echoes the *Cypria*'s μυρία φῦλα ('countless races', *Cypr*. fr. 1.1). Finkelberg adduces further parallel passages.

[43] The passage resists interpretation. Clay 2003: 173–4 suggests that the passage describes a storm at Aulis, followed by the omen of the birds and the snake (cf. *Il*. 2.301–30; *Cypr*. arg. 6). However, the frequentative verbs at 124–8 would be incomprehensible in a passage describing a one-off event. See also above, p. 13.

[44] Clay 2003: 171.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Cat.* fr.155.96–*c.*106) evokes the Hesiodic Myth of the Races (*WD* 156–73);[45] and the passage where trees bow before Boreas, and a snake gives birth and retires underground in winter ('the hairless one'; *Cat.* fr. 155.124–43), closely echoes the Hesiodic description of Boreas bending trees and an octopus gnawing its foot in hidden places ('the boneless one'; *WD* 504–28). **Homeric echoes:** the catalogue of Helen's suitors (*Cat.* frs. 154, 155.1–75, 156) resonates with the catalogues in the *Cypria* and the *Iliad*; and lines 118–19 (καὶ π]ολλὰς Ἄΐδηι κεφαλὰς ἀπὸ χαλκὸν ἰάψ[ει]ν / ἀν]δρῶν ἡρώων, 'and] the bronze was going to send to Hades many heads of heroic men') evoke *Il.* 1.3–4 (πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν / ἡρώων, '[Achilles' wrath] sent to Hades many strong souls of heroes').

(d) The Works and Days *and the* Bird Omens *(or* Ornithomancy*)*

The *Works and Days* ends (826–8):

> . . . εὐδαίμων τε καὶ ὄλβιος ὃς τάδε πάντα
> εἰδὼς ἐργάζηται ἀναίτιος ἀθανάτοισιν,
> ὄρνιθας κρίνων καὶ ὑπερβασίας ἀλεείνων.

Happy and blessed is he who knows all these things and does his work without giving offense to the immortals, distinguishing the birds and avoiding trespasses.

A scholion on line 828 (=Hes. test. 80) reports: 'At this point some people add the *Bird Omens*, which Apollonius Rhodius. . .marks as spurious.' Apollonius' testimony, then, would make this a case of splicing.[46]

Some argue instead that *WD* 828 'distinguishing the birds' is programmatic for a subsequent episode, the *Bird Omens*, which has been cropped.[47] The question hinges on a phrase in Pausanias' overview of the Hesiodic corpus:

Βοιωτῶν δὲ οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἑλικῶνα οἰκοῦντες παρειλημμένα δόξῃ λέγουσιν ὡς ἄλλο Ἡσίοδος ποιήσειεν οὐδὲν ἢ τὰ Ἔργα· . . .ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἑτέρα κεχωρισμένη τῆς προτέρας, ὡς πολύν τινα ἐπῶν ὁ Ἡσίοδος ἀριθμὸν ποιήσειεν, ἐς γυναῖκάς τε ᾀδόμενα καὶ ἃς μεγάλας

[45] Thus Cingano 2005: 119.
[46] Thus Cassanmagnago 2009: 969–70 n. 192; Kelly 2007: 387–9 corroborates this view with internal structural evidence.
[47] M. L. West 1978: 364–5; Most 2006: 189 (implicitly, by translation); Cingano 2009: 103–4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ἐπονομάζουσιν Ἠοίας,...καὶ ὅσα ἐπὶ Ἔργοις τε καὶ Ἡμέραις.

The Boeotians who live around Helicon say that of the poems commonly ascribed to him Hesiod composed nothing but the *Works*....But there is another opinion, different from the first one, according to which Hesiod composed a very great number of hexameter poems: the poem about women; and what they call the *Great Ehoiai*;...and everything ἐπί the *Works and Days*.[48]

The cropping interpretation takes ἐπί in the scholastic sense of 'after': thus 'everything after *WD* 828', referring to the *Bird Omens*.

However, the non-specialist meaning 'in addition to, besides' is a much better fit for Pausanias' non-academic register, and also for his flow of logic: he is specifically discussing whether Hesiod wrote anything other than the *Works and Days*. Therefore 'everything ἐπί the *Works and Days*' means simply the entire Hesiodic corpus. The passage has no implications for the *Bird Omens*.

This more conservative interpretation of ἐπί removes the challenge to Apollonius' testimony. The *Bird Omens* and *Works and Days*, in that case, were composed independently, and one was later spliced onto the other.

(e) The Hymn(s) to Apollo

Of all cases of splicing and cropping, this is the most problematic. As we saw in chapter I, it is often supposed that this *Hymn* was compiled from a 'hymn to Delian Apollo' (1–178) and a 'hymn to Pythian Apollo' (179ff.). The former ends with a fairly standard 'farewell':

> αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν οὐ λήξω ἑκηβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα
> ὑμνέων ἀργυρότοξον ὃν ἠΰκομος τέκε Λητώ.

And myself, I shall not cease from hymning the far-shooter Apollo of the silver bow, whom lovely-haired Leto bore.

The niceties of formal hymnic structure suggest that the subsequent passage is the start of a new hymn: a bridge passage beginning at 179 ('O Lord, Lycia too is yours, and lovely Lydia...') leads into the 'Pythian' hymn, with a new attributive section, and by 207 ('How shall I hymn you, fit subject as you are in every respect?') we are clearly

[48] Paus. 9.31.4–5 (Hes. test. 42).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at the start of a new hymnic narrative.[49] The question is whether this structural shift is also a case of splicing. Richardson's recent commentary has complicated the question further, arguing for a single hymn with a three-part structure.[50] There is little prospect of resolving the matter to everyone's satisfaction.

(f) The Thebaid *and the* Epigoni

We have only the barest hint of a splice between these two lost poems. The first line of the *Epigoni* is preserved as follows (fr. 1):

> Νῦν αὖθ' ὁπλοτέρων ἀνδρῶν ἀρχώμεθα, Μοῦσαι.
>
> *But now, Muses, let us begin on the younger men.*

The word 'younger' looks like it must mean: *in comparison to* the heroes of the previous Theban war, the Seven against Thebes. If it refers to a poem on that subject (which is by no means certain), the line could be either a splice that postdates both poems or, alternatively, a sign that the *Epigoni* was composed as a sequel to the *Thebaid*;[51] Alcidamas and Herodotus regarded both poems as Homeric (*Epigoni* test. 1, 5).

(g) The Epic Cycle

Proclus' summaries of the Trojan epics form a single continuous narrative without overlaps. However, other evidence makes it clear that some poems originally covered more ground and overlapped with one another: for example, the *Little Iliad* contained episodes that are also attested for the *Aethiopis* and the *Sack of Ilion*. There are at least three ways of interpreting these discrepancies.

(1) Bethe believed that the *Cypria*, *Aethiopis*, *Little Iliad*, and *Sack of Ilion* were originally a single poem;[52] this thesis could explain confusion in the attribution of individual fragments. However, it requires ignoring almost all the attribution evidence that we *do* have, and should not be taken seriously.

[49] Thus Janko 1981: 12, 16–17.
[50] N. Richardson 2010: 9–13. See also pp. 21–2 above.
[51] M. L. West 2003a: 9.
[52] Bethe 1929: 211–16.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(2) Davies argues that not just the epics but also Proclus' summaries originally extended further, and that the overlaps in the summaries were excised by a Byzantine epitomizer.[53] This thesis addresses a textual question in Proclus, albeit perhaps not conclusively.[54] But it does not account for places where there is evidence of interference with a poem's actual text: specifically, at the interfaces between the *Cypria* and *Iliad*, *Iliad* and *Aethiopis*, and *Odyssey* and *Telegony*.

(3) Burgess, following Monro, prefers a 'cropping hypothesis': an editorial process trimmed the poems themselves, excising overlaps and inconsistencies, and deleting episodes at the beginnings and ends so as to create a continuous streamlined 'cycle'.[55]

Burgess' cropping hypothesis has the most explanatory power. It is also the most drastic: it requires the premises that ancient editors were willing to do great violence to their texts (even if only in a special Cyclic edition), and that uncropped editions must have continued to exist alongside the cropped Cycle, or no evidence of discrepancies would survive. But we have good evidence of extreme violence in at least one case (the start of the *Aethiopis*); and persuasive evidence, to my mind, in another (the end of the *Odyssey*). Furthermore, the evidence outlined above for cropping and splicing in non-Cyclic poems adds to its plausibility in the case of the Cycle. As things stand, Burgess' cropping hypothesis is the one to beat.

Cypria

Beginning. Not generally disputed in terms of where the plot begins. See above on a thematic link to the end of the *Catalogue of Women*.
End. Proclus' summary has the poem end with the Greeks awarding Briseis and Chryseis to Agamemnon and Achilles; the death of Palamedes; Zeus's plan to remove Achilles from combat; and a catalogue of Trojan allies. This would appear to lead directly into the *Iliad*.

However, *Cypria* fr. 31 appears to refer to the death of Astyanax in the sack of Troy; fr. 34 Bernabé (om. West) explicitly refers to

[53] Davies 1986: 96 and 101–4, 2001: 2, 7, 58–9; similarly M. L. West 2013: 15–16.

[54] Viz. the sense of Proclus' phrasing ἐπιβάλλει τούτοις (*Cypr.* arg. 1). Davies 1986: 101–2 argues for an intransitive meaning, 'After this comes [the *Cypria*]', instead of the older interpretation '[Proclus] adds to this'. ἐπιβάλλει is certainly intransitive after the end of the *Cypria* summary (ἐπιβάλλει δὲ…Ἰλιὰς Ὁμήρου, 'after [this] comes Homer's *Iliad*').

[55] Monro 1883: 316–21, 1901: 342–6; Burgess 2001: 135–48.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Polyxena's death. *Tabula Iliaca* 3C Sadurska groups together three scenes, of which the first two belong in the *Cypria* and the third in the *Iliad*.[56] The argument that the *Cypria* originally extended beyond the end of Proclus' summary has been put most forcefully by Burgess, who contends that the *Cypria* originally covered the entire Trojan War; he sees this corroborated by a Hellenistic reference to Cyprias as the author of a poem named as *Iliaca*.[57]

Iliad

Beginning. Not disputed in terms of plot. An alternate proem is recorded which Bethe thought served to provide a bridge between the *Cypria* and the *Iliad* (=Cyclic *Iliad* test. Bernabé; om. West), but there are competing interpretations.[58]
End. Not disputed in terms of plot content. A couplet is recorded that appears to replace the *Iliad*'s final line with two lines that link directly to the arrival of Penthesileia (*Aeth*. fr. 1); this could in principle be a splice but is better interpreted as an internal fragment from within the *Aethiopis* (see below).

Aethiopis

Beginning. Proclus has the plot begin with Penthesileia's arrival at Troy. Fr. 1 consists of two lines that link Hector's funeral to Penthesileia's arrival (see also *Iliad*, end, above). It is obvious that the lines are not part of a proem: there is no sense of a beginning, no Muse invocation, and the lines refer to Hector's funeral as an event that has only just been narrated.[59] Hence, either the lines are an attempt to splice the *Aethiopis* onto the *Iliad*[60] or they are taken from within the *Aethiopis*.[61]

[56] See further Kopff 1983: 58 and n. 13; *contra* Horsfall 1979: 49 (but Horsfall does not consider the possibility of a longer *Cypria*).
[57] Burgess 1996, 2001: 135–40, 2002.
[58] Bethe 1929: 384. Others interpret the passage as a quotation from a hymnic prelude: Ford 1992: 27; M. L. West 2011a: 81.
[59] This point leads Davies 1988: 48, 2001: 58–9 (following Wilamowitz) to reject the fragment as altogether spurious; however, he does not consider the possibilities that it could be a splice or an internal quotation.
[60] Thus M. L. West 2001: 283–5; Scafoglio 2004: 307–8.
[61] Thus Burgess 2001: 140–2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Pictorial evidence from the Hellenistic and Roman eras suggests that Proclus' summary is a cropped form of the original *Aethiopis*. Four third-century-BCE Homer cups, MB 23–26 Sinn (=*Aeth*. test. 11 Bernabé), show three scenes as though linked: Priam's ransom of Hector's corpse; Priam and Penthesileia at Hector's grave; and Achilleus and Penthesileia in battle. This would indicate that the ransom of Hector appeared in the original *Aethiopis*, as well as in the *Iliad*.[62] *Tabula Iliaca* 9D Sadurska contains the same grouping, along with several further scenes from the *Aethiopis*. Weitzmann has independently interpreted a second-century-CE sarcophagus lid from the Villa Borghese as further evidence that the *Aethiopis* included Hector's funeral.[63] Images from the late Archaic and classical eras provide no guidance, unfortunately.[64]

In chapter V we saw mythographic evidence from Ptolemy the Quail, Dictys of Crete, and Philostratus, which suggested a version of the story where Penthesileia's arrival was interleaved with Hector's death, ransom, and burial, and where Andromache was present at Hector's ransom.[65] The reconstructed story goes as follows: Penthesileia arrives outside Troy; Hector goes to greet her, but Achilles ambushes and kills him on the way; Priam and Andromache ransom Hector's body; Penthesileia enters Troy during the funeral and makes a compact with Priam at Hector's grave.[66] Sources such as Ptolemy the Quail and Dictys must be treated very cautiously, of course. But, though

[62] The thesis that the Homer cups attest to a version of Hector's ransom in the *Aethiopis* has been argued most forcefully by Kopff 1983. See also Horsfall 1979: 47–8, arguing that the illustrations on Homer cups derive from picture-books of the Cycle (without the poems' full text) which also provided the basis for the *Tabulae Iliacae*.

[63] Weitzmann 1959: 43–6.

[64] The ransom of Hector was popular in Attic vase-paintings *c.*520–480 BCE (Friis Johansen 1967: 127–38; Lowenstam 2008: 51–63), but vase-painters of the time had their own language of tropes and cannot be expected to represent any poetry meticulously, or even at all (Lowenstam 1992, 2008: 1–12; Snodgrass 1998, esp. 127–50). The most that can be said is that in those decades the Iliadic version of the ransom enjoyed more prestige than the *Aethiopis* version, as indicated by the fact that many vases show Hermes accompanying Priam. Some scenes show Priam accompanied by a woman or women: see especially *LIMC* 'Achilleus' 645 and 643 (Kassel Antik. T.674; Athens NM CC.889). Schwarz 2006 links these to Dictys, as I do above, but identifies the lead woman as Polyxena; I suggest Andromache instead (see Gainsford 2012b: 65 n. 34, arguing that Polyxena's role in Dictys is probably a Dictyean invention).

[65] See pp. 99–102.

[66] Dictys *apud* Septimius 3.20–27, Malalas 5.24, Cedrenus 224.4–225.2; Ptolemy *apud* Photius cod. 190, 151.ii.37–152.i.1. (Ptolemy at 151.i.29–32 reports a version of Achilles' death that is either incompatible with the *Aethiopis* or else extremely telescoped; but this does not indicate that he avoided material from the *Aethiopis*, since it has always been obvious that Ptolemy is a hodge-podge of different stories.)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dictys by himself does not provide clear evidence, he does provide good corroboration for the pictorial evidence. The text of *Aethiopis* fr. 1 also sits well with this reconstruction.

When we take the mythographic reconstruction in conjunction with the pictorial evidence, it appears that the *Aethiopis* itself originally contained an account of Hector's death and funeral. These events may have framed Penthesileia's arrival at Troy along roughly the same lines as the Dictys narrative. If so, (1) *Aethiopis* fr. 1 was not originally the start of the poem, but part of its internal narrative; (2) these opening episodes of the *Aethiopis* were cropped so as to avoid overlap with the *Iliad*.

End. Proclus has the poem end with the quarrel over Achilles' arms. Two sources put subsequent events in the *Aethiopis* too: test. 8 Bernabé (om. West; pictorial, *Tabula Iliaca* 1A Sadurska), Aias' madness; fr. 6 West (sch. Pind. *Isth*. 4.58b), Aias' suicide.

Little Iliad

Beginning. Proclus has the plot begin with the award of Achilleus' arms to Odysseus. However, test. 7 Bernabé (Arist. *Poet*. 1459a–b) reliably puts the judgment of the arms in the *Little Iliad*; fr. 2 depicts Greek spies eavesdropping on Trojan women debating whether Aias or Odysseus was braver, an incident that is the deciding factor in the judgment of the arms.[67] (*Tabula Iliaca* 7Ti Sadurska can be disregarded: it depicts several *Aethiopis* scenes in its border, and an inscription reads *Little Iliad*, but it is clear that the inscription refers only to the central panel.)

End. Proclus has the plot end with the wooden horse being taken into Troy and the Trojans celebrating their supposed victory. However, three witnesses put events from the sack of Troy in the *Little Iliad* as well: fr. 16.I Bernabé ('Homer cup' MB 27 Sinn) associates Priam's death with the *Little Iliad*; fr. 28 (sch. Ar. *Lys*. 155) describes Menelaus' encounter with Helen during the sack of Troy; and fr. 29 (Tzetzes, sch. Lycoph. *Alex*. 1268) quotes the poem's description of Neoptolemos' acts in the sack of Troy (including the killing of

[67] In addition, two fragments are attached to the *Little Iliad* that both look like opening lines: fr. 1 (=fr. 28 Bernabé) and fr. 1 Bernabé. While it is in principle possible that these may indicate two different poems by the same title (Bernabé's conclusion), it is most likely that we have a case of a double-barrelled invocation: see Scafoglio 2006 and above, pp. 45–8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Astyanax, *contra Sack of Ilion* arg. 4, where Odysseus is the killer). This testimony implies that parts, at least, of the sack of Troy were narrated in the original *Little Iliad* and were cropped.

Sack of Ilion

Beginning. Not disputed.
End. Not disputed.

Returns

Beginning. Not disputed.
End. Not disputed. However, the *Returns* contained a catalogue of dead heroes (frs. 3–9, omitted by Proclus), apparently following a pattern similar to that of *Odyssey* 11. This may imply one of the following: (1) (least likely) the *Returns* overlapped with the *Odyssey*; (2) the *Odyssey* borrowed from an earlier **Returns*; (3) the *Returns* borrowed from the *Odyssey*; or (4) (most likely) independent duplication: that is, a visitation to the Underworld was a traditional set piece, one that we also see in the fragments of the *Minyas*.

Athenaeus refers to the *Returns* as the *Return of the Atreidai* (*Returns* frs. 3, 12). This could conceivably be a separate poem, but it is more likely that Agamemnon's and Menelaus' homecomings were excerpted and disseminated separately; or, more likely still, that that part of the *Returns* was known under an informal title, as is the case with various episodes in Homer.

Odyssey

Beginning. Not disputed.
End. After the reunion of Odysseus and Penelope, the transmitted text ends with a second underworld scene; a reunion with Laertes; and an abortive confrontation with the Suitors' families. However, the *Odyssey* scholia report that the Alexandrian scholars Aristarchus and Aristophanes placed the 'end' of the *Odyssey* at 23.296. (Two Roman-era copies have the text continue beyond that point.[68])

[68] P.Oxy. 956, second/third century CE; p.Ryl. 53, third/fourth century (at fol. 91v).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

These scholia are extraordinarily controversial.[69] One school of thought takes them to mean that all of *Odyssey* 23.297–24.548 (the 'Epilogue') is a post-Homeric interpolation, added in the late Archaic period. In the opposite camp, some dismiss the Alexandrians as simply too eager to delete; others treat their use of the word 'end' (*peras* or *telos*) as metaphorical, referring to the climax of the plot rather than the end of the text. A third point of view sees the Epilogue as somehow related to the Cyclic *Telegony*. Merkelbach, following Schwartz, argues that much of the Epilogue was copied from the *Telegony* (supposedly by the 'B poet', a hypothetical reviser of the original *Odyssey*); Huxley considers that the *Telegony* took *Odyssey* 23.296 as its starting point, leaving an overlap between the two epics.[70]

A still more elegant explanation is that the Cyclic *Odyssey*[71] was a cropped form of the original *Odyssey*, designed to lead continuously into the *Telegony*, and that the cropping took place at 23.296. When the Cycle was compiled into a single, streamlined narrative, the burial of the Suitors appeared in both epics (*Od.* 24.412–19, *Teleg.* arg. 1); therefore, one of the two had to be removed. The editor(s) chose to crop the *Odyssey* rather than the *Telegony*. It seems likely that the *Odyssey* fell victim because some ancient readers, like some modern critics, were dissatisfied with the closing scenes of the *Odyssey*.

This interpretation has the merit of taking literally the scholiasts' use of the word 'end'; it accommodates many of Merkelbach's observations; it explains why a shorter *Odyssey*, ending at 23.296, would break off with an unanswered μέν ('on the one hand', answered in the transmitted text by 23.297 αὐτάρ ('then'); in the Cyclic *Odyssey*, the response would presumably come in the subsequent *Telegony* passage); and it fully explains not only Aristarchus' and Aristophanes' interference but also their continued emendations to the *Odyssey* text after 23.296. It does not imply, however, that Aristarchus and Aristophanes were *responsible* for Cyclic cropping: it implies only that they were aware of the Cyclic form of the text.

[69] See especially Page 1955: 101–36; Erbse 1997; Moulton 1974; S. West 1989; Kullmann 1992: 291–304; Kelly 2007: 384–7.

[70] Merkelbach 1969: 142–55; Huxley 1960: 27–8. Huxley's suggestion is perhaps prefigured by Kazantzakis' *Odyssey* (1938), which opens immediately after the slaughter of the Suitors.

[71] The existence of a Cyclic *Odyssey* is attested by two scholia: test. 1, 2 Bernabé.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Telegony

Beginning. Proclus has the plot begin with the burial of the Suitors. Alternative witnesses claim otherwise, but they also contradict one another:

(1) Pseudo-Apollodorus epit. 7.33–4 groups together the reunions of Odysseus, Penelope, and Laertes as one set of episodes, and creates a second group from Odysseus' sacrifices to Hades, Persephone, and Teiresias, and the *Telegony* narrative. These groupings are consistent with *Odyssey* 23–24 but inconsistent with Proclus' *Telegony* summary.

(2) Clement of Alexandria claims that Eugammon 'took the whole book about the Thesprotians from Musaeus'.[72] This could indicate either that the *Thesprotis* was a separate poem which covered much of the same ground as the first part of the *Telegony* or that 'Thesprotis' was an informal reference to a part of the *Telegony*.[73] Clement tells us in the same passage that Panyassis took his account of the sack of Oichalia from Creophylus: there we can be certain that he is referring to two entirely separate poems. So the first option looks more likely.

(3) Scholia on *Od*. 23.296 state that Aristophanes and Aristarchus made that line the end of the *Odyssey*. This suggests cropping of the Cyclic *Odyssey* (see *Odyssey*, end, above).

(4) Alternatively, *Od*. 23.297–24.548 could be a late splice between the *Odyssey* and the *Telegony* (an alternative to Merkelbach's thesis; see *Odyssey*, end, above).

End. Not disputed. However, an interpolated line in *Theogony* 1014 that refers to Telegonus suggests some cross-editing between the two poems. This could account for the confusing fact that *Theogony* 1015–16 has two further children of Odysseus and Circe, Agrius and

[72] Clem. Al. *Strom*. 6.25.1 (=*Teleg*. test.).

[73] If a *Thesprotis* existed as a separate poem, several conjectures exist for how it may have opened: (a) exactly as in Proclus' *Telegony* summary; (b) Odysseus departs Ithaca after renouncing Penelope for her infidelity with the Suitors (Peradotto 1990: 73–4 n. 13); (c) like (b), but after Penelope gives birth to the god Pan (Servius auct. *ad Aen*. 2.44); or (d) after a dispute between Odysseus and the Suitors' families, resulting in Odysseus being exiled to Aetolia (ps.-Apollod. epit. 7.40; cf. Plut. *Quaest. Graec*. 294c–d: similar but Odysseus emigrates to Italy). As to how the *Thesprotis* ended, the most likely scenario involves an aetiology for cults to Odysseus in Thesprotia and/or Aetolia, at towns founded by Odysseus or focused around his grave: see Arist. fr. 508 Rose; Nicander *FGrH* 271–2 F 7; Lycoph. *Alex*. 799–804; Herodian, *De prosod. cath*. 303.7, 382.20–22 Lentz; sch. H *Od*. 11.122; sch. vet. Lycoph. *Alex*. 799 and 800; Steph. Byz. s.v. Βούν(ε)μα (see also Τραμπύα); Eust. *Od*. 11.120 (402.26–28 Stallbaum). See also the summary of Sophocles' lost *Euryalus*. Eugammon's *Telegony* could also have covered the same aetiology.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Latinus, living in the 'holy islands' while at the same time ruling over the Etruscans. The *Theogony* passage is a mess. Mythographic accounts support different parts of it: in pseudo-Apollodorus epit. 7.37 Circe sends Telegonus and Penelope to live in the Isles of the Blessed; in pseudo-Hyginus *Fabulae* 127 Latinus is the son of Circe and Telemachus, and they all live in Italy near Etruscan lands. It seems that the fates of all these characters have become muddled in *Theogony* 1011–16, perhaps as a result of a scrambled quotation from the *Telegony*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0533245115000085 Published online by Cambridge University Press