Classical Quarterly **53.1** 1–14 (2003) *Printed in Great Britain*

ILIAD AND *AETHIOPIS*

An influential doctrine holds that major portions of the *Iliad* were formed on the model of an epic that related the death of Achilles much as it was related in the Cyclic *Aethiopis*. I shall argue that there is much good in the theory, but that it requires a significant modification. Important conclusions will follow about the genesis of the *Iliad*, its status as an instant and authoritative classic, and the situation of epic poetry in the late seventh century.

THE CONTENTS OF THE *AETHIOPIS*

Before embarking on the argument it will be convenient to have in view Proclus' synopsis of the *Aethiopis*' contents, preserved before the text of the *Iliad* in the tenth-century manuscript known as Venetus A. I give it here in translation, with additions and amplifications (in square brackets) from the parallel account in the Apollodorus epitome (5.1 + 3–6), whose past tenses I have altered to presents for consistency, and with some supplementary notes. The poem was divided into five books, and its length may therefore be estimated at some 2,500–3,000 lines. It was attributed to Arctinus of Miletus.

The Amazon Penthesilea arrives to fight with the Trojans, a daughter of the War-god, of Thracian stock. [She has involuntarily killed Hippolyte, and is purified by Priam. When a battle is fought she kills large numbers, including Machaon.] She dominates the battlefield, but Achilles kills her and the Trojans bury her. And Achilles kills Thersites after being abused by him and insulted over his alleged love for Penthesilea. This results in a dispute among the Achaeans about the killing of Thersites. Achilles then sails to Lesbos, and after sacrificing to Apollo, Artemis, and Leto, he is purified from the killing by Odysseus.

Memnon, the son of [Tithonus and] Eos, wearing a panoply made by Hephaestus [and accompanied by a large force of Aethiopians], arrives to assist the Trojans. Thetis prophesies to her son about the encounter with Memnon.[a] When battle is joined, Antilochus is killed by Memnon,[b] but then Achilles kills Memnon. And Eos confers immortality upon him after prevailing on Zeus.[c]

Achilles puts the Trojans to flight and chases them into the city, but is killed by Paris and Apollo. [At the Scaean Gates he is shot by Alexander and Apollo in the ankle.] A fierce battle develops over his body, in which Ajax [kills Glaucus. He hands over Achilles' armour to be taken to the ships; as for the body, he] takes it up and carries it towards the ships, with Odysseus fighting the Trojans off.[d]

Then they bury Antilochus, and lay out the body of Achilles. Thetis comes with the Muses and her sisters, and laments her son.[e] And presently Thetis snatches her son from the pyre and conveys him to the White Island. When the Achaeans have raised the grave-mound, they organize an athletic contest [in which Eumelus wins in the chariot-race, Diomedes in the sprint, Ajax in the discus, Teucer in the archery. They offer Achilles' armour as the prize for the outstanding hero]. And a quarrel arises between Odysseus and Ajax over the arms of Achilles.[f]

[a]This is understood to mean that she warned Achilles that if he fought Memnon, he would kill him, but be killed himself directly afterwards. Cf. *Il.* 18.96.
[b]The circumstances are assumed to be as related by Pindar, *Pyth.* 6.28–42. One of the horses drawing Nestor's chariot was hit by an arrow shot by Paris, preventing Nestor's escape from the onset of Memnon. He shouted to his son Antilochus for help, and Antilochus came and fought Memnon, losing his own life but saving his father's. It is further conjectured that Achilles had

been avoiding Memnon because of his mother's warning, but that now, incensed by the death of his young friend Antilochus, he joined battle with him. Antilochus' death at Memnon's hands is recalled in *Od.* 3.112, 4.187–8; cf. *Od.* 24.78 for his place in Achilles' affections and 11. 522 for Memnon.

[c]The evidence of vase paintings and of the (pseudo-)Aeschylean *Psychostasia*[1] makes it practically certain that the *Aethiopis* contained a scene similar to *Il.* 22.209–13, in which the mortal destinies (κῆρες) of Achilles and Memnon were weighed against each other in Zeus' golden scales.

[d]For the famous battle for Achilles' body, cf. *Od.* 24.37–42; Aristonicus on *Il.* 17.719. In the *Little Iliad* (fr. 2 Bernabé = Davies) Achilles' arms were awarded to Odysseus in preference to Ajax on the basis of their relative contributions to the recovery of the corpse, as assessed by Trojan girl spectators.

[e]The arrival of the Nereids and the lament of the Muses are described in the account of Achilles' obsequies in *Od.* 24.43–92; cf. Pind. *Isth.* 8.57–60. So are the raising of the tumulus and the funeral games; not, however, the translation to Leuke, for in both of the *Odyssey*'s underworld scenes Achilles is in Hades with the other Achaean heroes. It is reflected in Pind. *Ol.* 2.79–83 and *Nem.* 4.49.

[f]The quarrel over the arms is also recalled in the *Odyssey*, 11.544–60. According to sch. Pind. *Isth.* 4.58b, the *Aethiopis* included Ajax's suicide. Proclus' summary omits it to avoid an overlap with the *Little Iliad*.

PRECURSORS OF THE NEOANALYSTS

More than 150 years ago Friedrich Gottlob Welcker in his pioneering work on the Epic Cycle observed some of the parallelisms between the *Aethiopis* and the *Iliad*. In accord with prevailing assumptions inherited from Aristarchus, he took it as axiomatic that the *Iliad* came first and that all similarities in the Cyclic poems were the result of imitation. Thus he sees the weighing of Achilles' and Memnon's destinies in the *Aethiopis* as repeated from that of Achilles' and Hector's destinies in *Iliad* 22, and the posthumous transportation of Memnon's body to the east by his mother Eos as an imitation of the translation of Sarpedon's body to Lycia by Sleep and Death in *Iliad* 16. The battle for Achilles' body and its rescue by Ajax and Odysseus was an imitation of the battle for Patroclus' body in *Iliad* 17.[2] Welcker notes that while 'Homer' shows signs of acquaintance with some elements of the saga that found full expression in the Cyclic poem, he appears ignorant of others:[3] he looks ahead to Achilles' death, but when Thetis states that this will follow directly after Hector's death (*Il.* 18.96), and when Zeus in *Il.* 15.69–71 gives the impression that once Hector is dead there will be nothing to stand in the Achaeans' way and stop them taking Ilion, Welcker inclines to infer that these events were not, in the poet's mind, to be delayed by the arrival of Amazon and Aethiop armies and the renewed battles that ensued. Achilles' posthumous translation to Leuke, likewise, he recognizes to be a post-Iliadic idea, perhaps the invention of Arctinus himself.[4]

Until and beyond the end of the nineteenth century, scholars who perceived what seemed significant links between the two epics either took the *Iliad* to be primary[5] or, in cases where the converse relationship seemed more probable, were able to

[1] See M. L. West, '*Iliad* and *Aethiopis* on the stage: Aeschylus and son', *CQ* 50 (2000), 338–52, esp. 345–6.

[2] F. G. Welcker, *Der epische Cyclus* II (Bonn, 1849), 189, 191.

[3] Ibid., 200, 'die Poesie des Arktinos enthielt, außer der vollen Ausführung von vielen Bestandtheilen der Sage die bei Homer schon durchblicken, nicht wenige Thatsachen und Personen die wir bei diesem gar nicht berührt finden'.

[4] Ibid., 220–2.

[5] See references in Wolfgang Schadewaldt, *Von Homers Welt und Werk* 3 Aufl. (Stuttgart, 1959), 406–7 (n. 4).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

accommodate this in their theories of the *Iliad*'s composition: the passages in question came in what they regarded as late additions to the poem. Thus Wilamowitz and others, believing *Iliad* 8 to be 'late', were ready to allow that the episode in which one of Nestor's horses is wounded and he has to be rescued from Hector (8.80ff.) was derived from the similar scene reconstructed for the *Aethiopis*, where he was saved by Antilochus.[6] Elard Meyer saw that the Nereids' appearance with Thetis at *Il.* 18.35–69 was a reflection of their lamentation for Achilles, but he considered the scene to be the addition of a *Bearbeiter*.[7] Carl Robert thought it very possible that the Thersites episode in *Iliad* 2 was later than the story of his death at Achilles' hands (*Aethiopis*), but in any case it 'gehört zu den jüngeren Zuthaten'.[8] He also regarded as a late addition the funeral games for Patroclus, in which Antilochus' closeness to Achilles (23. 556) seemed to him to presuppose the *Aethiopis*.[9]

In fact there were quite a number of cases where, on an unprejudiced assessment, the *Aethiopis* appeared to have had the primary version and the *Iliad* the secondary. There was no obvious instance of the converse. In 1906 Otto Gruppe drew the consequence:

> Der Sagenstoff der *Aithiopis* ist dem Dichter der *Odyssee* und sehr wahrscheinlich auch dem der *Ilias* bekannt. Man nimmt allerdings gewöhnlich an, dass die zahlreichen übereinstimmenden Züge . . . in der *Ilias* ursprünglich seien; genauere Prüfung wird uns jedoch überzeugen, dass vielmehr der Dichter der *Ilias* der Nachahmer gewesen sei, und zwar geht die Uebereinstimmung so weit, dass er und der Verfasser der *Odyssee* wahrscheinlich nicht bloss den Stoff der *Aithiopis*, sondern auch schon dessen Formulierung, d.h. sehr wahrscheinlich die *Aithiopis* selbst kannten.[10]

This distinction between the subject-matter of the *Aethiopis* and its instantiation in the text known to classical readers is of course a necessary one, and subsequent scholars have generally been scrupulous in drawing it. Few of them have been as decisive as Gruppe in claiming that the *Aethiopis* itself preceded the *Iliad*. The usual thesis is that the *Iliad* poet knew a poem with similar contents (but perhaps lacking the Amazon episode).

Dietrich Mülder broke new ground in taking an essentially unitarian view of the *Iliad* while finding in it reflexes of various hypothetical older poems, not all of them connected with the Trojan War. As one *Grundschicht* of the epic he postulated an '*Achilleis*' which included the death of Achilles.[11] A later poet shortened the focus so that the death of Hector became the climactic event, the Achilles material being then distributed between Achilles and the new figure of Patroclus.[12] The account of Patroclus' death, the battle for his body, and his funeral were all modelled on those of Achilles.[13] The Nereid scene with Thetis' lament in *Iliad* 18 was based on a lament for Achilles, either when he died or (more probably) when he first set out from Phthia.[14]

Löwy assumed a 'Memnonlied' whose account of Achilles' death was the model for Patroclus' death in the *Iliad* and the source of the weighing of destinies motif;

[6] Ulrich von Wilamowitz, *Homerische Untersuchungen* (Berlin, 1884), 372, cf. id., *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin, 1916), 45–6; Carl Robert, *Studien zur Ilias* (Berlin, 1901), 164–5; Erich Bethe, *Homer. Dichtung und Sage. Erster Teil: Ilias* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1914), 100, 110–11, 231.

[7] Elard Hugo Meyer, *Indogermanische Mythen* II: *Achilleis* (Berlin, 1887), 108.

[8] Robert (n. 6), 470, cf. 566.

[9] Ibid., 570.

[10] Otto Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte* I (Munich, 1906), 680, cf. 681 n. 6, 682 nn. 1 and 5, 683 n. 2.

[11] Dietrich Mülder, *Die Ilias und ihre Quellen* (Berlin, 1910), 78–81, 319.

[12] Ibid., 160, 168–70. [13] Ibid., 181–91, 266, 270. [14] Ibid., 193, 197.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Memnon himself was the model for Sarpedon. On the other hand, the main framework of the *Iliad* must have existed beforehand, otherwise the Memnon poet would not have been forced to concentrate on Achilles' demise. He brought his opponent from so far away only because Troy's natural defenders had already been used up. It was anomalous for Achilles and Memnon both to be wearing armour made by Hephaestus, and Achilles' was evidently primary. The use of Antilochus' death as a mechanism for bringing Achilles into the battle was, in Löwy's opinion, more naturally taken as an imitation of the Patroclus episode than vice versa. So the *Iliad*'s narrative and that of the Memnon poem each showed the influence of the other: a good example of 'epische Schichtung'.[15]

THE NEOANALYSTS

It was above all Schadewaldt's *Iliasstudien* of 1938 that established the superiority of unitarianism over the old type of analysis which strained to detect multiple layers of composition in the Homeric poems and the contributions of different poets and redactors. Analytic intelligence was still to be applied, but focused on the poet's aims and procedures and on the links binding the various parts of the poem together. If we are all unitarians now, it is due not least to Schadewaldt.

This power-shift in the republic of Homeric studies favoured the growth of what was and is called Neoanalysis, a kind of analysis for unitarians, where the object of inquiry was the prior context of narrative motifs that the poet could be argued to have taken over from earlier compositions. The pioneers of the movement were a Greek and a Swiss scholar, J. Th. Kakridis and Heinrich Pestalozzi.[16] Their essential ideas, so far as they concern the *Iliad*'s relationship to the *Aethiopis*, had been anticipated by Gruppe, Mülder, and others, but in the new unitarian climate their approach was seen to supplement the prevailing critical dialectic in an illuminating way, and it found a receptive audience at least in Germany. It was taken up and developed by Alfred Heubeck and especially by Schadewaldt, and given its definitive expression in 1960 in a major work by Wolfgang Kullmann.[17]

Since then there has been little further extension of Neoanalytic reasoning, but the conclusions already reached, with a fair degree of consensus among the scholars involved, have continued to carry conviction with many students. In this country, it is true, they received short shrift from Page, who found them disagreeable to his own assumptions,[18] and they are of course left aside by such writers as are interested only in the qualities of the *Iliad* as it is and not in how it came to be so, as if the latter were not

[15] E. Löwy, 'Zur Aithiopis', *Neue Jahrbücher* 33 (1914), 81–94, , esp. 88–90.

[16] J. Th. Kakridis, "Ἡ σκηνὴ τῶν Νηρηίδων εἰς τὸ Σ τῆς Ἰλιάδος", *Ἀθηνᾶ* 42 (1930), 66–78; id., *Ομηρικές έρευνες* (Athens, 1944), translated as *Homeric Researches* (Lund, 1949); Heinrich Pestalozzi, *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias* (Erlenbach and Zurich, 1945).

[17] Alfred Heubeck, 'Studien zur Struktur der Ilias (Retardation, Motivübertragung)', in *Gymnasium Fridericianum* (Erlangen, 1950), 17–36, repr. in J. Latacz (ed.), *Homer. Die Dichtung und ihre Deutung* (Darmstadt, 1991), 450–74; Wolfgang Schadewaldt, 'Einblick in die Erfindung der Ilias', in *Varia Variorum. Festgabe für K. Reinhardt* (Cologne, 1952), 13–48, cited from *Von Homers Welt und Werk* 4. Aufl. (Stuttgart, 1966); Wolfgang Kullmann, *Die Quellen der Ilias, Hermes Einzelschriften* 14 (Wiesbaden, 1960). Two other important works of that era that are at least partly Neoanalytic in tendency are Ernst Howald, *Der Dichter der Ilias* (Zurich, 1946) and Karl Reinhardt, *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter* (Göttingen, 1961).

[18] See his reviews of Kullmann (n. 17) and Georg Schoeck, *Ilias und Aithiopis* (Zurich, 1961) (originally published under the title *Die homerische Assoziationstechnik als Basis der Erfindung*) in *CR* 11 (1961), 205–9; 13 (1963), 21–4.

essential to the understanding of the former, a thing's nature (*natura*, *φύσις*) being inseparable from the sources and manner of its growth. Three British scholars who have accepted Neoanalytic thinking with decisiveness are Malcolm Willcock, Richard Janko, and Ken Dowden.[19] In Germany Kullmann has continued to explain and defend his position with clarity and eloquence.[20]

I may be excused a more detailed review of Neoanalyst writings and arguments, as there exist a number of excellent surveys of the subject to which the reader may be referred.[21] What concerns us here is the major thesis that may be formulated as follows:

> The poet of the *Iliad* knew, if not the *Aethiopis* itself, a poem that related in very similar terms the arrival of Memnon at Troy, his success on the battlefield, his killing of Antilochus as he tried to save his father Nestor, the mobilization of Achilles despite his mother's warnings, the weighing of the two heroes' destinies, the defeat of Memnon, Achilles' assault on Troy, his death at the Scaean Gates, the battle for his body, the lamentations for him involving the Nereids and Muses, his funeral, and the funeral games held in his honour.

> This *Memnonis* (as some scholars have labelled it) served as a model for much of the last third of the *Iliad*. Patroclus' *aristeia* was based on that of Achilles in the *Memnonis*, Memnon's role as exotic ally of the Trojans being taken by the Lycian Sarpedon. Sarpedon's posthumous transportation to his homeland by Sleep and Death is a reflex of Memnon's translation to an immortal life. When Patroclus charges on towards Troy in contravention of Achilles' injunctions, and is killed at the Scaean Gates by Hector and Euphorbus with assistance from Apollo, this is adapted from the death of Achilles, who was killed at the Scaean Gates by Paris with the assistance of Apollo.[22] The story of Achilles' death is likewise the source of the long battle for Patroclus' body in *Iliad* 17, and of the Nereid scene at the beginning of 18. Patroclus also corresponds to Antilochus in the *Memnonis*, taking his place as the great friend of Achilles whose death motivates him to return to the field and take vengeance on the enemy who killed him. Hector takes the place of Memnon. The elaborate funeral and funeral games for Patroclus—grander than his true status warrant—are again modelled on those for Achilles in the other poem.

THE FLAW IN THE *MEMNONIS* THEORY

Certainly, the extensive parallelism between *Iliad* 16–23 and the *Aethiopis* cannot be fortuitous, and it is not to be explained away as the consequence of two poets drawing independently on stock motifs.[23] There is an intimate relationship between the two

[19] M. M. Willcock, 'The funeral games for Patroclus', *BICS* 20 (1973), 1–11; id., 'Antilochos in the Iliad', *Mélanges Édouard Delebecque* (Aix-en-Provence, 1983), 479–85; id. 'Neoanalysis', in I. Morris and B. Powell (edd.), *A New Companion to Homer* (New York, Leiden, and Cologne, 1997), 174–89; R. M. Janko, *The Iliad: A Commentary* IV: *Books 13–16* (Cambridge, 1992), 312–14; Ken Dowden, 'Homer's sense of text', *JHS* 116 (1996), 47–61.

[20] W. Kullmann, 'Zur Methode der Neoanalyse in der Homerforschung', *Wien. Stud.* 15 (1981), 5–42; id., 'Oral poetry theory and Neoanalysis in Homeric research', *GRBS* 25 (1984), 307–23, repr. in I. J. F. de Jong (ed.), *Homer: Critical Assessments* (London and New York, 1999), 1.145–60; id., 'Ergebnisse der motivgeschichtlichen Forschung zu Homer (Neoanalyse)', in J. Latacz (ed.), *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung*, *Colloquia Raurica* 2 (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1991), 425–55; these all reprinted in his *Homerische Motive* (Stuttgart, 1992).

[21] Albin Lesky, 'Homeros', *RE* suppl. xi (1967), 687–846 (also as Sonderausgabe), esp. 759–63 (= 73–7 of the Sonderausgabe); Alfred Heubeck, *Die homerische Frage. Ein Bericht über die Forschung der letzten Jahrzehnte* (Darmstadt, 1974), 40–8; Kullmann (as n. 20); M. E. Clark, 'Neoanalysis: a bibliographical review', *CW* 79 (1986), 379–94; Willcock (n. 19, 1997).

[22] H. Mühlestein, 'Euphorbos und der Tod des Patroklos', *SMEA* 15 (1972), 79–90 = his *Homerische Namenstudien* (Frankfurt, 1987), 78–89, has argued that Euphorbus ('good herdsman') was an invented figure based on Paris. This is accepted by Janko (n. 19), 414–15; cf. Dowden (n. 19), 54 n. 38.

[23] The line taken by Bernard Fenik, *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad*, *Hermes Einzelschriften* 21 (Wiesbaden, 1968), 239–40.

narrative sequences. Surely one must have been modelled on the other. And once one has set aside the prejudice that Cyclic material must be secondary, there can be no serious doubt that the Achilles story was primary and served as the matrix for the narrative about Patroclus in the *Iliad*.

The death of Achilles, after all, was a theme very much on the *Iliad* poet's mind. He is constantly looking forward to it, and indeed creates the expectation that it will occur before the end of the poem.[24] He had presumably told the story himself. When he told it, he no doubt treated it in much the same fashion as is reconstructed for the putative *Memnonis*. Willcock has observed that the reflection of Achilles' death in that of Patroclus

> surely derives from the fact that Homer himself, the composer of the *Iliad*, had on other occasions sung of the death of Achilles in the Skaean gate, the recovery of his body, and the arrival of Thetis and the Nereids to mourn. There is no need to hypothesize an external source.[25]

At this point it may seem that I am endorsing the *Memnonis* theory, with the elegant but minor simplification that the *Memnonis* was part of the *Iliad* poet's own repertoire, or if you like his own composition. But another, rather more important simplification is necessary.

The problem with the *Memnonis* theory is, in a word, Memnon. The *Iliad* contains not the slightest hint that the story of Achilles will involve such a person, or that such a person exists. This shining fact has not escaped notice, and some of the Neoanalysts have tried to deal with it. Pestalozzi says it is quite understandable because the *Iliad* normally does not reach outside its own frame, except for Achilles' death and the fall of Troy[26]—a ruinous exception, if Achilles' death is so closely connected with Memnon. The reader of Kullmann's *Die Quellen der Ilias* will be left in no doubt of the extent to which the *Iliad* does take note both of anterior and of subsequent events in the Troy saga. For Schoeck the 'Merkwürdigkeit' of Memnon's absence is explained by the consideration that from the Iliadic heroes' point of view he does not exist because he has not yet come to Troy.[27] But why has the poet not brought him to Troy, if he is to play such a major role in the story before Achilles' death? The Lycian contingent is there from the beginning: why not the Aethiopians?

But this Aethiop army is something that the *Iliad* poet not only does not mention, but cannot have imagined. For him the Aethiopes are a virtuous people who live at the ends of the earth, by Oceanus (1.423, 23.205–7). The gods go from time to time to feast with them. Clearly they lie outside the community of nations and have no dealings with other men. The idea that a troop of them should turn up for the closing phases of

[24] Wilamowitz ([n. 16, 1916], 77–9, 513) thought that in the genuine *Iliad* of Homer, which lacked the funeral games and the ransoming of Hector, the fighting resumed after Patroclus' obsequies and the poem ended soon afterwards with Achilles' death.

[25] [Willcock's footnote:] 'When Homer sang, on other occasions, of the death of Achilles, he doubtless included the lavish funeral of the hero and magnificent funeral games . . . *Iliad* 23 no doubt carries the resonance from that other song, for, as with the Nereids, Patroclus does not, in heroic terms, rate the honors paid to him: Heubeck [n. 17, 1991], 465–6'—Willcock (n. 19, 1997), 188. Cf. also M. W. Edwards in the Cambridge *Iliad* commentary, vol. V on Books 17–20 (Cambridge, 1991), 17–19.

[26] Pestalozzi (n. 16), 8, cf. 41.

[27] Schoeck (n. 18), 22. I suppose this is what Dowden (n. 19), 58, means when he writes 'Memnon, naturally, does not appear in the *Iliad*.'

the Trojan War is, on the *Iliad*'s terms, as fantastic as would be the arrival of a legion of Phaeacians or Hyperboreans.[28]

The conclusion is plain and unavoidable. The *Iliad* poet knew the story of Achilles' death at the Scaean Gates, and the events that followed it in the *Aethiopis*, but he did not know the Memnon episode that preceded it in the Cyclic epic.

THE SOLUTION

What, then, in his version, were the circumstances in which Achilles made his last assault on Troy? He gives us a strong clue at 18.95–6, when he makes Thetis say, on hearing her son state his resolve to make Hector pay for Patroclus' death,

> ὠκύμορος δή μοι, τέκος, ἔσσεαι, οἷ' ἀγορεύεις·
> αὐτίκα γάρ τοι ἔπειτα μεθ' Ἕκτορα πότμος ἑτοῖμος.

Achilles is to die 'straight after Hector'. Whatever the poet has in mind at this point, it is not that after killing Hector Achilles will return to the ships, spend the next two days on Patroclus' funeral and funeral games, sit through an eleven-day truce, then take up arms against the Amazons, kill Penthesilea and Thersites, sail off to Lesbos for purification, return to Troy, and fight and defeat Memnon, before at last falling to Paris' arrow.[29]

The Neoanalysts explain the lines as the mechanical adaptation of a similar prophecy in the *Memnonis*, that Achilles would die 'straight after Memnon'.[30] Something of the sort no doubt lies behind the sentence in Proclus' summary of the *Aethiopis*, καὶ Θέτις τῷι παιδὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Μέμνονα προλέγει.[31] But we have seen that the *Iliad* poet did not know the Memnon story; and even on the assumption that he did, it would make no sense for him to have Thetis prophesying Achilles' death αὐτίκα μεθ' Ἕκτορα.

In the *Iliad*, as the poet finally left it, Achilles does not die 'straight after Hector'. His death has been put off to an unspecified date, still (we imagine) in the near future. But the prophecy in 18.96 must reflect an earlier conception of the narrative plan—very likely a version that the poet had actually sung—in which Achilles after killing Hector did just what Patroclus does after killing Sarpedon: forgot the advice he had been given and went on pursuing the enemy to the gates of Troy.[32]

A curious feature of the poet's organization of the battle in 21–2 has not been sufficiently remarked. At the end of the Theomachy, while the other gods return to Olympus, Apollo goes in to Troy to defend its walls from the danger of imminent capture (21.515–20); it is as if he were being put in position to help Paris kill Achilles.

[28] Penthesilea's monstrous regiment is not quite so out of this world, as the *Iliad* knows of Amazons in central Anatolia (3.189); but they were the foes of Priam's Phrygian allies, and it is not apparent why they should have wanted to assist the Trojans. Normally they are aggressors wherever they go. The capering Myrina of *Il.* 2.814 (Kullmann [n. 17], 303) has nothing to do with Penthesilea's expedition: she was dead and buried before it appeared on the horizon. She was later identified as an Amazon, but necessarily from an earlier generation; some made her the wife of Dardanus (Eust. 351.21).

[29] This has often been noted: Welcker (n. 2), 200; Carl Robert, *Bild und Lied* (Berlin, 1881), 114; Reinhardt (n. 17), 350; Uvo Hölscher, review of Kullmann (n. 17), *Gnomon* 38 (1966), 113–27, esp. 114–15.

[30] Pestalozzi (n. 16), 9; Schadewaldt (n. 17), 167, 192–3; Kullmann (n. 17), 38, 311.

[31] Welcker (n. 2), 173.

[32] This was seen by Eduard Schwartz, *Zur Entstehung der Ilias* (Strasbourg, 1918), 27–8.

Priam, seeing his cohorts in rout before Achilles, orders the gates to be opened so that they can take refuge in the city. Apollo contrives that all the Trojans get safely in, except for Hector, and that Achilles too is kept outside. So the stage is cleared for Achilles' pursuit of Hector round the walls; the Achaeans will be watching from the stalls, the Trojans from the balcony, and the gods from the gods.

This disposition, with the army fleeing before their champion is overthrown, is already anticipated at 21.224–6 and 294–7. But it reverses the usual sequence. Elsewhere the champion is killed first, and then his followers, seeing that he has fallen, lose heart and turn to flight.[33]

What would have happened if the *Iliad* poet had followed this standard pattern in the case before us? An ineluctable chain of events would have been set in motion. With the battle raging around him, there could be no question of Achilles' going back to the ships after killing Hector. The Trojans would have turned to flight, and Achilles must have led the Achaeans in hot pursuit, right to the gates of Troy. Then verily the Danaans would have taken the city *ὑπὲρ μόρον* on that very day,[34] had not Apollo quickly spoken to Paris . . .

That was surely what happened in the *Iliad* the poet had previously sung; that was still what he had in mind when he made Thetis predict Achilles' death *αὐτίκα μετ' Ἕκτορα*. Achilles fell shortly after killing Hector. There followed the long battle for his body that in our poem has been transposed to become the battle for Patroclus' body; the lamentation by Thetis and the Nereids that in our poem has been transposed to make a lament for Patroclus; the magnificent funeral and funeral games that in our poem have become Patroclus'.

The influence of the earlier version may be seen in 22.376ff. After stripping Hector's corpse, Achilles exhorts the Achaeans to join him in attacking the city and to find out whether the Trojans will continue to resist. At 385 he suddenly changes his mind, remembering that Patroclus still lies unburied at the ships. The battle is abandoned for the day, and there is no more of it in the poem.[35]

A NEW PROBLEM

The composition and elaboration of the *Iliad* is likely to have occupied its author for much of his life.[36] Naturally there were some changes of plan along the way. The major change here identified gave the epic the glowing final chapter that it now has, the ransoming of Hector. Achilles' mortality still hangs over the poem, but his death is deferred to some point beyond it.

However, this creates a difficulty. Suppose, having heard the *Iliad* to the end, we entreat the poet to tell us tomorrow how Achilles did die. He has provided for the resumption of the fighting on the day after Hector's funeral (24.667–70, 779–81).

[33] Cf. 5.27–9/37; 11.744–6; 16.290–2; 21.206–8; *Od.* 9.58–61; Proclus, *Cypria* 149 Severyns, *ἔπειτα Ἀχιλλεὺς αὐτοὺς τρέπεται ἀνελὼν Κύκνον τὸν Ποσειδῶνος*, with the parallel account in Apollod. epit. 3.31, *ἐκβαίνει μετὰ Μυρμιδόνων Ἀχιλλεὺς καὶ λίθον <βα>λὼν εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν Κύκνου κτείνει· ὡς δὲ τοῦτον νεκρὸν εἶδον οἱ βάρβαροι, φεύγουσιν εἰς τὴν πόλιν*; Proclus, *Aethiopis* 189 S., *ἔπειτα Ἀχιλλεὺς Μέμνονα κτείνει . . . τρεψάμενος δ' Ἀχιλλεὺς τοὺς Τρῶας καὶ εἰς τὴν πόλιν συνεισπεσὼν κτλ.*; Fenik (n. 23), 13.

[34] Cf. 16.698; 20.29–30; 21.517.

[35] Cf. Schwartz (n. 32), 28, who takes the change of plan to betoken a change of poet: 'wenn irgendwo, so ist es hier deutlich, daß ein anderer Dichter das Wort ergreift'; Howald (n. 17), 139–40; Schadewaldt (n. 17), 168–9; Reinhardt (n. 17), 362, 376; Lesky (n. 21), 761 = 75.

[36] So Dowden (n. 19), 48.

When the fighting resumes, he will have to devise a new sequence of events to bring Achilles storming at the Scaean Gates. No problem, one might say. With Hector dead the Achaeans will have a clear run across the plain. But an epic song calls for more than that. There must be serious resistance first—another champion to carry all before him for a while, to hold back the Achaean tide; only when he is overcome will it be able to burst forward and once again reach Troy. But who could this champion be? The best remaining warrior on the Trojan side is Aeneas. But he is earmarked to survive the fall of the city to perpetuate its kingship (*Il.* 20.300–8). For this very reason he has been advised by Poseidon to avoid facing Achilles and to fight in the front line only after Achilles is dead (20.332–9).

Our poet, then, having shaped the *Iliad* as he has, will find himself in an embarrassing position when it comes to composing a song about the death of Achilles while maintaining consistency with his *magnum opus*. He has painted himself into a corner.

A younger poet found a solution, but it involved breaching the integrity of the given scenario by bringing in an entirely new hero to fill the gap left by Hector: Memnon. We observe in the late seventh century a sudden fashion for filling out and prolonging the tale of Troy's defeat by having new heroes and armies arrive unheralded from foreign parts to fight on behalf of that home of lost causes. Inevitably they all failed.[37] We can list four of them:

1. Rhesus and his Thracians (*Il.* 10, interpolated).[38]
2. Penthesilea and her Amazons (*Aethiopis*).
3. Memnon and his Aethiopians (*Aethiopis*).
4. Eurypylus the son of Telephus and his Mysians (*Little Iliad*).

The Achaeans for their part receive new blood after Achilles' death in the form of his son Neoptolemus, who is as unknown as the rest to the *Iliad* poet;[39] it was he who vanquished Eurypylus in the *Little Iliad*, and he had a full part in the *Iliou Persis* and *Nostoi*.

Memnon was a newcomer to mythology, with no accomplishments to his name before he came to Troy and met his death; an empty personage altogether.[40] His coming had a specious justification, in that as the son of Eos and Tithonus he was Priam's nephew. Aeschylus' *Memnon* apparently contained a scene in which he explained this under questioning from Priam.[41] In the *Aethiopis* he cut a splendid figure, the handsomest man on the scene (*Od.* 11.522), kitted out with a ἠφαιστότευκτος πανοπλία.[42] Achilles, of course, has armour from the same atelier. But such divine

[37] On their similarities, cf. B. Fenik, *Iliad X and the Rhesos* (Brussels and Berchem, 1964), 28–40; id. (n. 23), 149–50.

[38] Cf. G. Danek, *Studien zur Dolonie* (Vienna, 1988); M. L. West, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad* (Munich and Leipzig, 2001), 10–11.

[39] The two passages in which he appears, 19.326–37 and 24.466–7, are surely interpolated. He is, however, known to the *Odyssey* (11.492–540).

[40] Uvo Hölscher, review of Schadewaldt (n. 17), *Gnomon* 27 (1955), 385–99, esp. 396–7.

[41] West (n. 1), 344. Tithonus' place in the Trojan genealogy is stated at *Il.* 20.237. There if anywhere the poet might have mentioned Memnon if he had known anything of him (Reinhardt [n. 17], 349).

[42] Proclus' phrase; cf. Hes. *Th.* [984] *Μέμνονα χαλκοκορυστήν*; Virg. *Aen.* 1.489 *Eoasque acies et nigri Memnonis arma*; 1. 751 (Dido's questions to Aeneas), *nunc quibus Aurorae uenisset filius armis*; 8.383–4 (Venus to Vulcan), *arma rogo genetrix nato: te filia Nerei, | te potuit lacrimis Tithonia flectere coniunx*. The last passage has been taken to imply a scene in the *Aethiopis* in which Eos visited Hephaestus to ask for arms for her son, as Thetis does in *Iliad* 18 (E. Fraenkel,

equipment ought to be the special property of one hero, not of two, and Achilles' set, fully and naturally accounted for as it is in the *Iliad*, is clearly primary, Memnon's wantonly derivative.[43]

To prove himself a worthy antagonist of Achilles, Memnon must begin by enjoying a spell of success on the battlefield. This is only possible so long as he does not meet Achilles. The poet apparently used the motif of a warning by Thetis to keep Achilles away from him: she told him (adapting *Il.* 18.96) that he was destined to die soon after Memnon. Having no special animus against Memnon, Achilles was content to hold himself back. To override this restraint when the time came, the poet imitated the *Iliad*'s powerful mechanism. He had Memnon kill Antilochus, a friend of Achilles', so arousing the latter's fury and his need for vengeance. His friendship with Antilochus, however, though mentioned casually in the *Iliad*, is never developed or explained as Patroclus' is, and the use of his death in the *Aethiopis* remains a pale shadow of the Patroclus drama in the *Iliad*.[44]

It is often maintained that certain passages in the *Iliad* hint at the role that Antilochus is to play in the *Memnonis*. As mentioned earlier, many have thought that the episode in which one of Nestor's horses is wounded and he is rescued from Hector by Diomedes (8.80ff.) was derived from the episode related in the *Aethiopis* where he was saved by Antilochus.[45] That Antilochus is chosen to take the news of Patroclus' death to Achilles (17.652ff.), and that he holds his hands as they weep together (18.32–3), has been taken as an indication of a special relationship between them,[46] though there has been no sign of it hitherto, and Achilles does not say a word to Antilochus after hearing the news. Particular significance has been attached to an incident at the funeral games. Achilles proposes to award the second prize in the chariot race to Eumelus despite his having finished last. Antilochus, who has actually come in second and wants his rightful prize, protests that Eumelus could be found another one. Achilles readily agrees, *χαίρων Ἀντιλόχωι, ὅτι οἱ φίλος ἦεν ἑταῖρος* (23.556).[47] But seven lines later, when he sends Automedon to fetch the extra prize, Automedon is designated likewise as his *φίλος ἑταῖρος* (563).

Phil. 87 [1932], 242 = *Kleine Beiträge* ii.173). But Virgil, whose knowledge of the poem may have been indirect, perhaps extrapolated the visit from Memnon's possession of the arms.

[43] Löwy (n. 15), 90; *contra* Pestalozzi (n. 16), 43; Schoeck (n. 18), 47.

[44] Cf. Löwy (n. 15), 90; Robert (n. 6), 446–7, 'wie die Aithiopis dies Verhältniss [Antilochus' friendship with Achilles] noch weiter ausgebildet hat, so dass er zu einem zweiten Patroklos wird, ist bekannt'; Bethe (n. 6), 100, 'dies Verhältnis ist in der Ilias ganz unbekannt bis auf *Ψ* 556. Die Aithiopis aber hat es ausgestaltet'; Reinhardt (n. 17), 353–4, 'wenn derselbe Achill . . . die Rache für Antilochos, da er auch *sein* Freund ist, übernimmt, so werden Tod und Rache aneinander geknüpft, aber die Verknüpfung ist viel lockerer als im Falle des Patroklos'.

[45] Besides the scholars cited in n. 6, cf. Pestalozzi (n. 16), 9–11; Schadewaldt (n. 17), 163; Peter Von der Mühll, *Kritisches Hypomnema zur Ilias* (Basel, 1952), 147–8; Kullmann (n. 17), 31–2, 314; Reinhardt (n. 17), 357, 364; Schoeck (n. 18), 20–2; E. Heitsch, 'Homerische Dreigespanne', in W. Kullmann and M. Reichel (edd.), *Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen* (Tübingen, 1990), 153–74; Willcock (n. 19, 1997), 179–81. On the other hand, Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien*, *Abh. d. phil.-hist. Kl. d. sächs. Akad.* 43(6) (Leipzig, 1938), 97, n. 2, had considered that the poet of the *Aethiopis* could equally well have taken the passing crisis described in *Iliad* 8 and developed it with the heightened pathos typical of post-Homeric epic. Hartmut Erbse, 'Nestor und Antilochos bei Homer und Arktinos', *Hermes* 121 (1993), 385–403, esp. 393–8, argues at length for the primacy of the *Iliad* passage.

[46] Bethe (n. 6), 100, 'hier ist kaum ein anderer Zweck denkbar als der, den Antilochos einmal wieder zu nennen, und zwar soll er offenbar als naher Freund Achills erscheinen'; Schadewaldt (n. 17), 191; Willcock (n. 19, 1997), 181–2.

[47] Robert (n. 6), 570, 'andererseits setzt das enge Verhältniss, in dem Antilochos zu Achilleus

In all, the evidence amounts to very little. If the *Iliad* poet (or an early diasceuast) had really wanted to convey that Achilles had a greater than average affection for Antilochus, he could have done much more about it. When Achilles dies, his bones are to be united with Patroclus' in one container (23.83–91, 244–8): there is no provision for Antilochus to join them.[48]

THE MOTHER OF ALL EPICS

Forty years ago, having done our Parry and Lord, we knew it was foolish to talk of earlier or later books of Homer, to suggest that two similar passages might sometimes be related as imitation to model, or to try to identify relationships between one poem and another, seeing that they were all transient entities, constantly changing their shape, like clouds drifting through the boundless troposphere of oral epic; any passing similarities that we might perceive between two of them resulted merely from their being formed from the same common elements.

It was good for us to go through that phase. But sooner or later we had to come to terms with the fact that the epics of which we have any knowledge, the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the Cyclic poems, were not oral poems—at any rate, not in the same sense as the oral poems that Parry and Lord described—but written texts. They belong in a period of history at which, while oral epic no doubt continued to exist, some poems were being written up and so taking on a more stable identity and a (more or less) fixed form.[49] By the end of the seventh century it is clear that certain of these poems, identifiable with epics current in the classical period, were widely familiar. The Lesbian poets knew Hesiod, the *Iliad*, some Homeric Hymns, and if not the *Cypria*, *Iliou Persis*, and *Nostoi*, at any rate poems containing much of the same material.[50] Alcman must have known the *Aethiopis* or something closely related, for in *PMGF* 68 he couples Ajax with the bloodthirsty Memnon, whom we have seen to be not a traditional participant in the Trojan War but a figure invented to meet a difficulty created by the *Iliad* poet. Memnon is unknown to seventh-century art, though a popular subject from the first quarter of the sixth century. Vase painters had begun to depict recognizably Iliadic scenes from *c.* 630. Two artists of *c.* 580–70, Sophilos and Kleitias, both chose to paint the funeral games for Patroclus rather than those for Achilles, which is some indication of the *Iliad*'s dominant status at Athens.[51]

We cannot tell whether the *Iliad* was the first epic to be written up. But no other poet, we may assert, devoted so much time and craftsmanship to the construction of a

steht (556), die Aithiopis voraus'; Bethe (n. 6), 100; Schadewaldt (n. 17), 191; Von der Mühll (n. 45), 361; Kullmann (n. 17), 316; Willcock (n. 19, 1997).

[48] Reinhardt (n. 17), 351. In *Od.* 24.76–9, on the other hand, Achilles is told that his bones are in a golden urn, mixed with those of Patroclus, while Antilochus' are there separately: *χωρὶς δ' Ἀντιλόχοιο, τὸν ἔξοχα τῖες ἁπάντων | τῶν ἄλλων ἑτάρων μετὰ Πάτροκλόν γε θανόντα*. This reflects the *Aethiopis* or another version of the *Memnonis*. Cf. Schoeck (n. 18), 106. See also Erbse (n. 45), 398–403, for criticism of the view that Antilochus is represented as a special friend of Achilles.

[49] Cf. Dowden (n. 19), with his conclusion (61) that 'Homer, his contemporaries and his immediate predecessors . . . were knowingly producing fairly fixed products.'

[50] M. L. West, 'The view from Lesbos', in M. Reichel and A. Rengakos (edd.), *Epea Pteroenta. Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullman* (Stuttgart, 2002), 207–19.

[51] Sophilos: Athens 15499; Kleitias: Florence 4209 (the François Vase). Cf. A. M. Snodgrass, *Homer and the Artists* (Cambridge, 1998), 117–20. On the handle of the same vase Kleitias painted Ajax carrying Achilles' corpse, as in the *Aethiopis* and *Little Iliad*, so he can hardly have been unfamiliar with the poetic account of the funeral games for Achilles.

gigantic, yet coherent and many-splendoured narrative. Structural analysis shows that he did not compose it sequentially from *A* to *Ω* but started with a much more compact design, into which he later inserted many additional episodes and retardations.[52] Nineteenth-century critics such as Hermann, Grote, and Christ reached some valid conclusions about the stages of the process, but went wrong in their assumption that a different poet had to be postulated for each stratum of composition.[53] To quote the late George Goold:

> Indeed, it may be said once and for all that Analytical Scholarship in general, when freed from the stultifying shackles of multiple authorship, invariably projects a more satisfying and convincing picture of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* being put together than either the Unitarian or the Oralist schools.[54]

There can be little doubt that one poet was responsible for the whole *Iliad*, except for the *Doloneia* and probably some minor interpolations elsewhere.[55] It is perfectly possible to accept this and still hold that there are 'early' and 'late' portions. Some parts may have been composed and written down thirty or forty years before others.

This great act of creation occurred in the middle decades of the seventh century, as many lines of evidence indicate and many modern scholars agree.[56] The end product became known and acclaimed and acknowledged as authoritative. Other poets had to take it as a given and accommodate their narratives to it. To tell of Achilles' death it was necessary to invent a Memnon as the successor to Hector. He appears in art around the end of the century, and he is known to the poet of the *Odyssey* (11.522) as well as to Alcman (above). Evidently a *Memnonis* established itself not too long after the *Iliad*, perhaps around 630 or 620; the *Iliad* poet might still have been alive.

The Memnon poet's account of Achilles' death, with all the ensuing episodes (battle for the body, lamentation by Nereids, funeral and games), corresponded, as we have seen, to the *Iliad* poet's earlier version, before he transferred the whole sequence to Patroclus. This raises interesting questions. How did the younger poet come to have the earlier version? Had he heard the older poet recite it? Had it continued to be recited by other rhapsodes? Was it in written circulation?

Epics on other parts of the Trojan saga, related to the poems of the classical Cycle

[52] Cf. D. Young, *Arion* 6 (1967), 306; M. L. West, *CR* 19 (1969), 258–9; G. P. Goold, 'The nature of Homeric composition', *ICS* 2 (1977), 1–34, esp. 9–12, 17–19, 32–3; J. Pinsent, 'The Odyssized *Iliad*', in J. Pinsent and H. V. Hunt (edd.), *Homer 1987. Papers of the Third Greenbank Colloquium*, *Liverpool Classical Papers* 2 (1992), 75–84; Dowden (n. 19), 50.

[53] For a convenient summary of their theories see R. C. Jebb, *Homer: An Introduction to the Iliad and the Odyssey* (Glasgow, 1887), 119–28.

[54] Goold (n. 52), 19. He continues: 'Thus Eduard Schwartz in his magnificent book on the *Odyssey* (how can one mention such a work save in terms of the highest praise?) describes down to the most trivial minutiae the processes by which the poem was enlarged until it attained its final form. Replace his several authors distorting their predecessors' compositions by a single author expanding his own, and one obscurity after another disappears.'

[55] Cf. West (n. 38), 11–14.

[56] Cf. E. Heitsch, *GGA* 220 (1968), 180–1; W. Burkert, *Wien. Stud.* 89 (1976), 5–21 = *Kleine Schriften I: Homerica* (Göttingen, 2001), 59–71; O. Taplin, *Homeric Soundings* (Oxford, 1992), 33–5; H. van Wees, *G&R* 41 (1994), 1–18, 131–55; id. in I. Morris and B. Powell, *A New Companion to Homer* (New York, Leiden, and Cologne, 1997), 692; M. L. West, *Mus. Helv.* 52 (1995), 203–19; J. P. Crielaard in J. P. Crielaard (ed.), *Homeric Questions* (Amsterdam, 1995), 274; M. W. Dickie in Ø. Andersen and M. W. Dickie (edd.), *Homer's World* (Bergen, 1995), 29–56; W. Kullmann, ibid., 57; J. Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas* (London, 1999[4]), 274; W. Kullmann, *Gnomon* 73 (2001), 658, 'Latacz' Ansatz der Ilias im 8. Jh. . . . beruht auf reiner Konvention und kann nicht richtig sein.'

if not identical, were no doubt solidifying at the same period. The *Odyssey* (at any rate in its final form) comes quite late in the series. Its poet not only knew and imitated the *Iliad*. He knew the *Memnonis*. He shows an extensive acquaintance with the subject matter of the *Little Iliad*,[57] and must have known, if not that very text, something quite similar. He was familiar with the Ἀχαιῶν νόστος as a subject of epic song (1.326, 10.15), and composed his own epic against that background; his references to the other heroes' returns are in fair agreement with the content of the Cyclic *Nostoi*.[58] The song that he puts in Demodocus' mouth at 8.500–20, which began with the Trojans wondering what to do with the Wooden Horse after the apparent departure of the Achaeans and then described the sack of Troy, corresponds remarkably well in its scope to the Cyclic *Iliou Persis*. The *Odyssey* reflects Greek knowledge of distant shores (Egypt, Libya, and as I hope to show elsewhere, the northern Euxine) at an epoch no earlier than the second half of the seventh century. Taking into account its familiarity with the post-Iliadic *Memnonis* and with poems that gave a major role to the post-Iliadic Neoptolemus, we may be inclined to date it down to the last quarter of the century. Not that there is any compelling reason to put it before 600; the Lesbian poets, for all their enthusiasm for Ionian epic, show no knowledge of it.[59]

I have spoken of the *Odyssey* poet's knowing 'the *Memnonis*' rather than the *Aethiopis*, because two important motifs contained in the *Aethiopis* find no echo in the *Odyssey* or are contradicted in it: the Amazon episode, and Achilles' translation to Leuke. The absence of allusion to Penthesilea and her army may be fortuitous, but their story had no organic connection with that of Memnon and Achilles' death, and it could well have been a secondary addition.[60] As for the translation to Leuke, it is incompatible with Achilles' presence in Hades together with other Achaean heroes in both Nekyiai, and the poet seems to have no notion of it. It may, however, be presupposed by Alcaeus' reference to Ἀχίλλευς ὁ τὰς (or γᾶς) Σκυθίκας μέδεις (fr. 354).[61] Its presence in the *Aethiopis* excellently suits the ancient ascription of that epic to a Milesian poet, Arctinus, as Leuke belongs in the zone of late seventh-century Milesian exploration and colonization.

With the fixing of epic poems in written texts, rhapsodes' creativity was able to express itself in novel ways: by adding new sections to these texts, transcribing passages

[57] Ajax's defeat over the armour of Achilles (11.543ff.); Deiphobus as Helen's last husband (cf. 4.276, 8.517); Neoptolemus and Eurypylus (11.506ff., 519–20); Odysseus' entry into Troy disguised as a beggar (4.242ff.); Epeios' building of the horse (8.492ff.).

[58] The Cyclic poem, on the other hand, seems to have made only one brief allusion to Odysseus' return (Neoptolemus' path crossed with his at Maronea), no doubt because a separate *Odyssey* was already current. Cf. Howald (n. 17), 166.

[59] Cf. D. Meyerhoff, *Traditioneller Stoff und individuelle Gestaltung. Untersuchungen zu Alkaios und Sappho* (Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York, 1984), 13. Alcaeus' mention of the spring Artakia (440) and of the Phaeacians (441) may have belonged in an Argonautic context. There are of course considerably earlier artistic representations of the Cyclops story, but nobody supposes this to have been an invention of the *Odyssey* poet. The hexameter(?) fragment ascribed to Alcman that refers to Circe's preparation of Odysseus' men for their approach to the Sirens (*PMGF* 80) is of doubtful authorship.

[60] Pestalozzi (n. 16), 5; Schadewaldt (n. 17), 158. Howald (n. 17), 127, writes that of the motive for introducing it 'läßt sich kaum mehr sagen, als daß es für einen hervorragenden Helden gleichsam eine Anstandspflicht war, auch mit einer Amazone sich gemessen zu haben; auch Herakles und Theseus haben ihr Amazonenabenteuer'. When Proclus in his life of Homer lists an Ἀμαζονία among the works attributed to him, followed by the *Little Iliad* and *Nostoi*, this is probably equivalent to the *Aethiopis*; it is not good evidence for the separate currency of the Amazon part. Penthesilea appears in art from *c.* 600.

[61] H. Hommel, *Der Gott Achilleus*, *Sitz. d. Heidelb. Ak., phil.-hist. Kl.* (1980[1]), 9–12.

from one into another, or making forced combinations of separate pieces. Parry and Lord and their followers thought to banish all such concepts from Homeric criticism. And indeed they are probably inappropriate concepts, so long as we are talking about the time before the poems were written down. But in the period between about 620 and 520 operations of this sort were not only possible, they were repeatedly performed. The poet of the *Doloneia* interpolated his work in the *Iliad*; it never had an independent existence, being designed from the start to be inserted in its present place. The author of the *Memnonis* perhaps made use of an already formed account of Achilles' death and what followed it. The Amazon episode, I have suggested, was prefixed subsequently.[62] In the *Odyssey* a long description of Alcinous' house and garden has been transposed from a speech in Book 6 to a narrative context in Book 7.[63] A sequel to the *Odyssey*, telling of Odysseus' adventures in Thesprotia, was augmented by the addition of a new and unconnected romantic fiction, the tale of Telegonus. A sixth-century poet extended Hesiod's *Theogony* to some five times its original length by appending the *Catalogue of Women*. Another took a 56-line section from the *Catalogue of Women* and made it serve as an introduction to the *Shield of Heracles*.[64] Another again, perhaps to be identified as Cynaethus of Chios, conflated a Pythian and a Delian hymn to Apollo into a chimerical Delian–Pythian hymn.[65] The Athenian Onomacritus collected and arranged oracles of Musaeus, and was convicted of interpolating spurious ones (Hdt. 7.6).

Once we shake the oralists off our backs and recognize the status of written texts in this period and the use made of them, we begin to gain insights into their interrelationships and chronology, and a nebulous process of development begins to take on sharper outlines. It becomes clearer than before that the creation of the *Iliad* was not just a miracle in itself, but the most momentous event in literary history: the catalytic achievement that precipitated and conditioned the formation of a corpus of written epic in the following decades. This is not to say that the Cyclic epics are post-Iliadic in substance. Much of their material was certainly the subject of earlier song. But we can now take it as established that the stabilization of this material in the fixed poems current in the fifth and fourth centuries did not take place until after the completion of the *Iliad*.

All Souls College, Oxford M. L. WEST
martin.west@all-souls.ox.ac.uk

[62] Whether the variant ending of the *Iliad* that runs it into the *Aethiopis* goes back to the Archaic period is doubtful.

[63] M. L. West, 'The gardens of Alcinous and the oral dictated text theory', *Acta Antiqua Acad. Scient. Hungaricae* 40 (2000), 479–88.

[64] M. L. West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford, 1985), 125–8, 136.

[65] M. L. West, *CQ* 49 (1999), 368–72.