18 | *Ilias parva*

ADRIAN KELLY*

Though it is the one of the best attested members of the 'Epic Cycle', and the only poem of that group to have taken its title from one of the Homeric epics, the *Ilias parva* illustrates how difficult it is to reconstruct, let alone understand, the history of Greek epic poetry after Homer.

AUTHOR – TITLE – DATE

The author most widely named in modern literature, Lesches from the city of Pyrrha[1] on Lesbos, is also the most cited figure in ancient discussions, but only from the middle of the fourth century BC; as with other 'Cyclic' poems, the earliest attestations take the form of 'the one who made the *Ilias parva*', while the inevitable Homeric attributions are few and late.[2] The poem's epithet is therefore doubly surprising, for such differentiations usually qualify works by the same author,[3] and yet the title was settled as early as Aristotle.[4] A range of similarities with the *Iliad* (and *Odyssey*) can reasonably be invoked as the cause, as perhaps can the first word of

* I would like to thank the editors of this volume, and Bill Allan, Bob Corthals, Patrick J. Finglass, Nick Sekunda and Bert Smith for their help with this article and its contents.

1 Mytilene, according to Proclus.

2 The making formula is used 15x (*PEG* T 7 = T 5 D. = p. 118 W.; *PEG* T 10 = T 2 / F 6 D. = F 6 W.; *PEG* F 2 = D., W.; *PEG* F 3 = D., W.; *PEG* F 5[I] = D., W.; *PEG* F 7–9 = F 8, 10 and 11 D. = F 8, 12 and 14 W.; *PEG* F 21 = F 20 D. = F 29–30 W.; *PEG* F 24 = F 4 D. = F 4 W.; *PEG* F 25 = F 9 D. = F 11 W.; *PEG* F 28–31 = F 1, 6, 7, and 22 D. = F 1, 6, 7 and 20 W.), Lesches 23x (*PEG* T 1–6 = T 3, 4^{B} 6, and 7 D. = pp. 118 and 120 W.; *PEG* T 10–11 = T 2 / F 6 D. = F 6 W.; *PEG* F 5[II], 9–23 = D., W.) and Homer only 2x (*PEG* T 8–9 (= T 1 D. = p. 120 W.) = *Suda* and Ps.-Herodotean *Life of Homer*; cf. also *PEG* F 27 (= "Hom." F 1 D. = F 32 W.). The crucial figure in advancing Lesches' claims seems to have been his fellow Lesbian, the fourth-century Phaenias of Eresos; cf. Mosshammer (1979: 229–33); Davies (1989c: 5–6); West (2013: 35–7) opts for an earlier Lesbian, Hellanicus (*EGM* F (dub) 202c), but relies on both emendation and addition to the fragment to do so.

3 Cf. West (1978: 22 n. 4); also Hirschberger (2004: 26–30).

4 The epithet is twice qualified (*PEG* T 3 = T 3 and 6 D. = p. 118 W.; *PEG* F 31 = F 22 D. = F 20 W.), and the poem is once the '*Lesser Iliad*' (*PEG* T 8 = T 1 D.), but there is no indication that it was generally understood as a qualitative rather than quantitative description.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

PEG F 28 (= F 1 D. = F 1 W.), though it may not have been the poet's own choice.[5]

The meagre linguistic evidence of the fragments does not help to determine the date of the *Ilias parva*, for none of those features usually judged to be 'late' lack some genuinely Archaic epic parallel or explanation.[6] A post-Homeric genesis is overwhelmingly likely, tallying with the ancient chronographers[7] and the poem's title, and modern scholars' datings therefore range rather freely between the seventh and sixth centuries BC.[8] The earliest reliable *terminus ante quem* comes with its first, roughly contemporaneous quotations, (i) in Aristophanes' *Knights* (1056–7) of 424 BC (*PEG* F 2 = D. = F 2 W.) and (ii) on two potsherds (*PEG* F 28 = F 1 D. = F 1 W.) from the Black Sea region, one (420–410 BC) from Chersonesos and another (less precisely datable) from Olbia.[9] Getting back beyond this point, as we shall see, is fraught with difficulty.

PREDECESSORS AND COMPETITORS

The material covered in the *Ilias parva*, from the quarrel between Ajax and Odysseus over Achilles' arms to the sack of the city, was popular from the very beginning of the visible record. In terms of other epic representations, the poem was competing with at least the *Iliou persis* in covering the city's destruction, and also with the *Aethiopis* in treating the fate of Ajax. These narratives are undated and undatable, and so their precise relationship with our poem will remain unknown,[10] but Homer was already familiar with most of the episodes later attested for the *Ilias parva*: Ajax's disgrace

[5] Cf. Nachmanson (1941); also below, pp. 326–7, esp. n. 57 for the Homeric intertexts. West (2013: 163) ascribes the title to a 'currency in the region of Ilion' shared with the *Iliad*, and thinks the epithet a secondary development. For *PEG* F 28 (= F 1 D. = F 1 W.) as the opening line, cf. below, pp. 329–31.

[6] *Contra* Wackernagel (1916: 181–2), Davies (1989a: 95–8); and cf. below, pp. 329–43 for examples.

[7] According to whom Lesches is to be placed in either the eighth (Phaenias: F 33 Wehrli) or seventh century (Eusebius: *PEG* T 5 = T 4^{B} D.) BC, but these dates are unreliable; cf. Mosshammer (1979), Davies (1989c: 5–6); also Most (2006: 186) and Kivilo (2010: 23–4) for Plutarch's report of Lesches' connection with the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*.

[8] For example, Griffin (1977), *PEG* and West (2003a) opt for different parts of the seventh century; Wackernagel (1916), Davies (1989a) and West (2013: 171–2) for the sixth; cf. Burgess (2001: 8–12).

[9] See Vinogradov (1969=1997: 385; 1990=1997: 408 n. 59, 419), who cites Milesian involvement in the area to explain the poem's popularity there; see also Burgess (2001: 165–6).

[10] Bethe (1929: 211–16) argued that the *Ilias parva* originally included the *Aethiopis* and *Iliou persis*, but the more likely conception (e.g. Davies (1989c: 60–1) is that the *Ilias parva* overlapped with both of these originally independent poems, before the creation of the Cycle; see Burgess, above in this volume; also Severyns (1928: 357–9).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

and suicide (*Od.* 11.543–65), the retrieval of Philoctetes (*Il.* 2.716–25, *Od.* 8.219–20), Deiphobus' marriage to Helen (*Od.* 4.276, 8.517), Neoptolemus' arrival and defeat of Eurypylus (*Od.* 11.519–22), Epeius' construction of the wooden horse and its deployment (*Od.* 8.492–8, 11.523–32), Odysseus' spying mission into Troy (*Od.* 4.242–59), the death of Astyanax (*Il.* 24.735)[11] and, more generally, the city's sack (*Od.* 1.2 etc.). None of this proves that Homer knew these tales from a fixed text or even a single orally circulating poem,[12] but it does show a well-known epic background within which the poet of the *Ilias parva* was able to work.

The early melic poets similarly reflect a continuing taste for this material:[13] in the seventh to sixth centuries BC, both Sappho (F 16, 44 Voigt) and Alcaeus (F 42, 44 Voigt) detail several episodes from the broader Trojan War, the latter including a narrative of Cassandra's rape (306 A(h) V), a story also treated by Ibycus in the mid sixth century (*PMGF* 303(a)), along with the meeting of Menelaus and Helen (*PMGF* 296). His elder contemporary Stesichorus wrote an *Iliou persis* (*PMGF* 196–205), but the state of this text makes it impossible to detect any influence.[14]

The fifth-century Athenian tragedians generally avoided retelling stories from the two Homeric epics,[15] but many plays covered material also known in the *Ilias parva*, and yet the same problems recur. Consider, for instance, Odysseus' frequently negative reception in tragedy:[16] in Euripides he is the instigator or perpetrator of the murder of Astyanax (*Trojan Women*), Polyxena (*Hecuba*) and Iphigeneia (*IA* and *IT*), and the 'corruptor' of Neoptolemus in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*.[17] This might represent a reaction against the *Ilias parva*'s depiction of Odysseus (see below), but equally it could reflect the negative character known from Pindar (*Nem.* 7.21–7, 8.26–34; cf. also F 260, esp. 1–7),[18] with the same mixture of qualities for which

[11] *Contra* Kullmann (1960: 186–7); cf. Burgess (2012) and below in this volume, p. 338.

[12] *Contra* West (2012: esp. 230), but his chronology of early Greek epic is unconvincing.

[13] Cf. Pallantza (2005: 17–89); Bowie (2010b).

[14] See Pallantza (2005: 94–7); Finglass and Noussia-Fantuzzi, below in this volume, pp. 344–54 and pp. 430–9; Finglass and Davies (forthcoming). Tantalizingly, the little-known *Iliou persis* of the sixth century Argive elegiac poet Sacadas may have taken an anti-Odysseus line, and thus could be linked with the *Ilias parva*'s pro-Odysseus position (see below); cf. Bowie (2010b: 81–2; 2014).

[15] For tragedy and the Trojan War, cf. Anderson (1997: 105–76); Fantuzzi (2006: 140–8); Pallantza (2005: 201–310); Zeitlin (2009); Sommerstein, below in this volume.

[16] See Stanford (1968: 102–17); Montiglio (2011: 1–19). Equally, his depiction in the *Ajax* points to a more favourable reception; see Blundell (1989: 95–105); also Garassino (1930) for the many lost plays.

[17] See, e.g., Blundell (1989: 184–93, 205–14); *contra* Heath (1999: 145–7).

[18] See also *Isth.* 4.49–60, and Kirschkowski (2009). For Pindar's relationship with Homer, see Mann (1994), Kelly (2006: 13–24).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

he was later excoriated in Gorgias' *Palamedes* (*VS* 82B 11a).[19] The specific influence(s) of, or on, the *Ilias parva* in this period cannot be traced with any confidence, for Odysseus' currency is too widespread.

Early pictorial art also reflects the popularity of the poem's material, within the general preponderance of non-Homeric Trojan War themes in the Archaic period,[20] but it is again very difficult to see the *Ilias parva*'s precise influence. For example, the suicide of Ajax finds no fewer than six separate representations before the end of the seventh century,[21] but the popularity of the theme has no necessary link with the *Ilias parva* (even if more than Proclus' rather terse summary had survived), because the episode was also treated in the *Aethiopis* (*PEG* F 5 = F 1 D. = F 6 W.) and known already to Homer (see above).[22] So too with the widespread images of Astyanax's death, most notably the seventeenth metope of the 'Mykonos pithos' (second quarter of the seventh century BC),[23] for the adult figure – if it is not a generic illustration – could be Neoptolemus (*PEG* F 21 = F 20 D. = F 29–30 W.) or Odysseus (*Il. Pers.* arg. line 268 Severyns), or it could represent a widespread story rather than a specific version.[24]

In sum, many of the stories found in the *Ilias parva* were prominent from the beginning of Greek myth's visible history, and attest to a rich culture of storytelling, in several media, from which the poem emerged at some point before, or during, the fifth century BC.

[19] See Stanford (1968: 96); Montiglio (2011: 8–9, 30). This negativity does not (*contra* Stanford) begin with Pindar, even laying aside the epic *Iliou persis* (see above, n. 14), nor probably with Epicharmus (*contra* Mahaffy (1873–4); cf. Phillips (1959: esp. 58–9) and now Kerkhof (2001: 123–9), but must have been possible, for such a complex character, from the earliest period. For defences of Odysseus' character in fifth- and fourth-century literature, see Stanford (1968: 96–9, Alcidamas and Antisthenes); Montiglio (2011: 20–37, Antisthenes, 38–65 Plato). For a recent discussion of Odysseus in Archaic and Classical art, see von den Hoff (2009).

[20] See, e.g., Cook (1983), Snodgrass (1998); *contra* Friis Johansen (1967), Ahlberg-Cornell (1992).

[21] *LIMC* 'Aias' I 110, 118, 120–1, 125–6; cf. Friis Johansen (1967: 30–1); Ahlberg-Cornell (1992: nos. 52–6, 74–5); Gantz (1993: 633–4); Finglass (2011: 28–9).

[22] The same qualifications apply to the emergence of the contest over Achilles' arms as a popular artistic theme around the first quarter of the fifth century BC; cf. von den Hoff (2009: 58–9).

[23] *LIMC* 'Astyanax' 27; cf. Anderson (1997: 188–9, and 182–91 more generally).

[24] Similarly, in Menelaus' encounter with Helen (*PEG* F 19 = D. = F 28 W.), found first on the same pithos (met. 7: *LIMC* 'Helene' 225; Ahlberg-Cornell (1992: no. 62, 78–80, fig. 120, 327); Anderson (1997: 187)), his sword is drawn threateningly as she uncovers herself, but supplication in this form is so well and early evidenced that the artist need not have relied on our, or indeed any single, poem; see Ahlberg-Cornell (1992: 79, 186); *contra* Kahil (1988: 499–500, 537–48). On more general reasons to treat the evidence of art with extreme caution when reconstructing the history of early Greek epic, see Lowenstam (1997), Hedreen (2001: 3–10).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

CONTENTS OF THE POEM

The usual method for reconstructing any Cyclic poem is to match its fragments with Proclus' summary (supplemented by Ps.-Apollodorus or not), and in our record of Proclus the *Ilias parva* extended only from the quarrel between Odysseus and Ajax over Achilles' arms to the moment when the Trojans take the horse into Troy. However, our poem certainly went further, since an impressive range of ancient sources (*PEG* T 2 = T 7 D. = p. 118 W.; *PEG* T 7 = T 5 D. = p. 118 W.; *PEG* F 10–18 = F 12–18 D. = 15, 16, 21–7 W.; *PEG* F 20–22 = F 20, 22–3 = F 17, 19, 29–30 W.; *PEG* F 31 = F 22 D. = F 20 W.) indicate that it included the sack. Truncation occurs between the time of Pausanias and Proclus, or in the process of the latter's work being excerpted, and so we may doubt his assertion that the *Ilias parva* contained four books.[25] Proclus' report of the poem's beginning is more secure; quarrels are a standard epic introduction, and no ancient source clearly attributes any earlier episode to the *Ilias parva*.[26]

The plot of the poem moved in regular stages of increasing Trojan defeat, with the opening quarrel, killing of the Greeks' flocks, and Ajax's subsequent suicide (*Ilias parva* arg. lines 208–10 Severyns, *PEG* F 2–3 = D., W.) followed by the capture of Helenus and his revelation of the importance of Philoctetes, who is fetched from Lemnos and kills Paris in a duel; his body being despoiled, the Trojans bury him (arg. lines 211–15 Severyns). After Deiphobus marries Helen (arg. line 216 Severyns, *PEG* F 4), the second stage seems to have been the arrival of Neoptolemus (arg. lines 217–18 Severyns, *PEG* F 5 = D., W.), the 'appearance' of Achilles to him and his combat with, and killing of, the most recent Trojan allied arrival, Eurypylus (arg. lines 218–20 Severyns). The Trojans are besieged, the wooden horse is planned and constructed (arg. lines 221–3 Severyns, *PEG* F 8 = F 10 D. = F 12 W.), and there are two missions into Troy, one where Odysseus scouts alone after disguising himself as a beggar (*PEG* F 6–7 = F 8 D. = F 8–9 W.), the second in which he, together with Diomedes, removes the Palladium from the city

[25] *Contra* West (2013: 168–9). This might also explain Sinon's absence from Proclus' summary, despite the fact that he did appear in the poem; cf. *PEG* T 3 = T 3 and 6 D. = p. 118 W. (an illustration on the *Tabulae Iliacae* (tablet 1A): Squire (2011: 36–7, fig. 5)) and *PEG* F 9[III] (= F 11^{C} D. = F 14 W.); West (2013: 204–5). On the process by which Proclus' work has survived, see Davies (1986); West (2013: 1–51).

[26] Cf., however, Burgess (2001: 24–5), also on *PEG* F 24 = F 4 D. = F 4 W. (concerning Achilles being blown off course to Scyros after the encounter with Telephus), though this probably fell in a flashback: see below, pp. 340–2. For introductory quarrels, see *Il.* 1.6–7, *WD* 27–41, *Od.* 8.75–82 etc. West (2013: 167) thinks the quarrel was chosen 'to establish a mood of despair among the Achaeans as a starting-point'.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

(arg. lines 224–9 Severyns), though this seems also to have occasioned a quarrel between the Iliadic companions (*PEG* F 25 = F 9 D. = F 11 W.). The final stage is the actual loading of the horse (*PEG* F 8 = F 10 D. = F 12 W.) and the Greek removal to Tenedos, while the Trojans take the horse into the city and celebrate their apparent victory (arg. lines 230–6 Severyns). Here Proclus stops, but other sources continue – it was the middle of the night (*PEG* F 9 = F 11 D. = F 14 W.), a series of people killed (or saved) during the course of the fighting (*PEG* F 10–15 = F 12–16 D. = F 15–16 and 21–4 W.; *PEG* F 17–18 = F 18 D. = F 26–7 W.), Priam slain at the doors of his own house (*PEG* F 16 = F 17 D. = F 25 W.), Helen reclaimed by Menelaus (*PEG* F 19 = D. = F 28 W.), Aethra rescued (*PEG* F 20 = F 23 D. = F 17 W.), Astyanax murdered (*PEG* F 21 = F 20 D. = F 29–30 W.), Aeneas and Andromache taken as booty by Neoptolemus (*PEG* F 21 = F 20 D. = F 29–30 W.; cf. *PEG* F 22 = F 22 D. = F 19 W.).

This breathless outline immediately reveals three connected features.[27] The first is a focus on night-time and ambush:[28] Ajax's destruction of the flocks, Helenus' capture, the making, filling and deployment of the horse, Odysseus' spying mission into Troy, the theft of the Palladium, the destruction of the city after the retreat to Tenedos. These episodes anticipate Troy's last night in a series of preliminary Greek successes, using equally underhanded and indirect means. The second feature is the horse's function as a narrative frame for the two missions into Troy, linked with the Palladium as a votive for Athene that is vital for the destruction of the city through theft and deception.[29] Similarly important is the third feature, the quasi-magical token required for Troy's overthrow:[30] the summonings of Neoptolemus (and the restoration of his father's divinely made arms) and Philoctetes (with Heracles' bow),[31] and the theft of the Palladium.[32] The possession of each token is followed by Trojan death of numerically increasing importance (Paris in a duel, Eurypylus and a number of his men, the

[27] West (2013: 167–9) ventures a somewhat speculative reconstruction into twelve days of action, does not see any structural connection between episodes, and faults the poem for its lack of organic unity.

[28] See Dué and Ebbott (2010: 82).

[29] Anderson (1997: 18–20, esp. 190). On the Palladium, see Severyns (1928: 349–52); Bethe (1929: 254–6); Smith (1981: 26–7); Gantz (1993: 641–6). Its thematic significance is also noted in the motif's repetition on tablet 1A of the *Tabulae Iliacae*; see Squire (2011: 172–4).

[30] See Hedreen (2001: 154–5) for others.

[31] See Anderson (1997: 96–7) on its thematic significance.

[32] See Davies (1989c: 63). Helenus' capture is only explicitly linked with the first event (arg. lines 211–13 Severyns), but the structural parallels suggest a strong correlation, and Philoctetes' importance was already known to Homer (*Il.* 2.724–5, *Od.* 8.219–20); see also West (2013: 181–4).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

citizenry), and the equivalence between the horse and the Palladium thus combines the token-sequence with an ambush-sequence at Troy's final moment.[33]

But perhaps the narrative's most important characteristic is that Odysseus comes out of the *Ilias parva* very well:[34] he captures Helenus and the secret(s) to taking Troy, brings Neoptolemus to the army and restores his father's arms to him, sneaks into Troy (twice) at night, bringing back information and the Palladium as preparation for the sack, persuades the leading Greeks to get into the horse (*PEG* F 8 = F 10 D. = F 12 W.) and then commands them (*PEG* F 26 = F13 W.), saves the wounded Trojan Helicaon during the sack (*PEG* F 12 = F 13 D. = F 22 W.), thus repaying the hospitality of the aged Agenor (*Il.* 3.123–4, 205–8), and he does *not* kill Astyanax (*PEG* F 21 = F 20 D. = F 29–30 W.). Even the story that Odysseus tried to murder Diomedes during their mission to steal the Palladium (*PEG* F 25 = F 9 D. = F 11 W.), upon which the latter forced him back to the camp (the proverbial 'compulsion of Diomedes'), may have been told so as to flatter Odysseus.[35] Unsurprisingly for a poem so concerned with ambush and trickery, the *Ilias parva* celebrates Odysseus' military effectiveness and heroic stature, from his victory over Ajax in the opening contest to his stratagem's triumph in the city's destruction, and it does so in such a sustained manner as to suggest that its author may have been responding to a specific, negative treatment of this slippery character.[36]

This may be related to the poem's engagement with its tradition in more general ways. For instance, the *Ilias parva* places Priam's death (*PEG* F 16 = F 17 D. = F 25 W.) at the door of his house, after being dragged from the altar of Zeus Herkeios, where he is usually killed.[37] This seems to be a combination of Priam's vision of his own death in Homer (*Il.* 22.59–71,

[33] *Contra* West (2013: 200): '. . . it lacks all connection with the surrounding episodes'.

[34] See, e.g., Welcker (1849: 269–76); Monro (1884: 23–4); Holt (1992: 327–8).

[35] *PEG* F 25[III] (= F 9 D. = F 11 W.) has Diomedes as the driver, but F 25[II] = F 9 D. = F 11 W. (from the Augustan mythographer Conon) has Odysseus in that role, which would fit better with the *Ilias parva*'s general programme; cf. West (2013: 202–3).

[36] Cf. above, pp. 319–21, but which treatment? The *Ilias parva*'s depiction of Odysseus might suggest a generally positive view of the entire sack (see Castriota (1992: esp. 117–18) for a similar purpose to Polygnotus' depiction of these events in Delphi), since *PEG* F 21[II] (= D. = F 18 W.) has Neoptolemus kill Astyanax ἰδίαι, while arg. lines 217–18 Severyns makes no mention (*pace* Anderson (1997: 60 n. 21)) of Achilles' shade demanding Polyxena's sacrifice. The epic *Iliou persis* could, then, have been the *Ilias parva*'s target, as it focused on Greek sacrilege (see Finglass, below in this volume, pp. 344–54), but Neoptolemus' role as Astyanax' killer was central to artistic representations (cf. Castriota (1992: 97–9); Anderson (1997: 53–9, 192–3)), and the sacrilegious element is already known to Homer; see Clay (1983).

[37] *Il. pers.* arg. lines 257–8 Severyns; cf. Kullmann (1960: 217 n. 1); also *LIMC* s.v. 'Priamos', 85–114.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

esp. 66, 71) with the rest of the poetic and artistic tradition,[38] though the *Ilias parva* is also capable of open disagreement with its Homeric predecessor, e.g. substituting the immortal horses given by Zeus as compensation for Ganymedes' rape (*Il.* 5.265–7) with a golden vine made by Hephaestus (*PEG* F 29 = F 6 D. = F 6 W.), in that fragment also making Ganymede the son of Laomedon, not Tros (*Il.* 5.266, 20.252).[39]

Competitiveness of this sort is in fact typical of the poem: Odysseus fights while Ajax lifts Achilles' corpse (*PEG* F 2 = D., W.), whereas in some sources the roles shift;[40] Odysseus was not self-wounded before his mission, but by Thoas (*PEG* F 7 = F 8 D. = W.);[41] there were thirteen[42] men in the horse, not fifty *vel sim.* (*PEG* F 8 = F 10 D. = F 12 W.); the Trojan ally Coroebus is killed by Diomedes, not Neoptolemus (*PEG* F 15 = F 16 D. = F 24 W.), the Greek healer Machaon by Eurypylus, not Penthesileia (*PEG* F 30 = F 7 D. = F 7 W.), and Astyanax by Neoptolemus, not Odysseus (*PEG* F 21.3–5 = F 20.3–5 D. = F 29.3–5 W.); Aeneas was taken as a prisoner by Neoptolemus and so did not escape before or during the sack of the city (*PEG* F 21.9–11 = F 20.9–11 D. = F 30.4–6 W.);[43] Aeneas' wife was called Eurydice, not Creousa (*PEG* F 22 = D. = F 19 W.); and Achilles was not hidden on Scyros by Thetis, but came there after the failed attack on Mysia (*PEG* F 24 = F 4 D. = F 4 W.). These are all precise points of difference, suggesting an engagement with relatively fixed traditions or versions of these tales, and several (*PEG* F 2 = D., W.; *PEG* F 8 = F 10 D. = F 12 W.; *PEG* F 21.3–5 = F 20.3–5 D. = F 29.3–5 W.) seem to be weighted in Odysseus' favour.[44] In short, the poet of *Ilias parva* worked hard to create his own, distinctive version of this popular material.

Finally, the *Ilias parva* also contained a great deal of combat narrative, to judge from the list of killed and wounded given by Pausanias: Meges was wounded in the arm (*PEG* F 10 = F 12 D. = F 15 W.), Lycomedes on the

[38] Kullmann (1960: 216–17); Anderson (1997: 28–38).

[39] See below, pp. 342–3.

[40] See, e.g. *PEG* F 32 dub. (POxy. 2510) which has Odysseus lift the body; also Edwards (1991: 131–2); West (2013: 175–6); see also below, p. 332.

[41] Cf., however, arg. lines 224–5 Severyns (Ὀδυσσεύς τε αἰκισάμενος ἑαυτὸν κατάσκοπος εἰς Ἴλιον παραγίνεται 'Odysseus disfigures himself and enters Ilion to reconnoitre'); Proclus' extant summary shows the influence of the Odyssean version (4.244–6), though West (2013: 196) feels no contradiction. This is not unknown elsewhere in the *Ilias parva*, for the first solo mission into Troy (arg. lines 24–6 Severyns) looks like it was modelled on Helen's story (*Od.* 4.242–64) rather than drawing upon an independent tradition; cf. Severyns (1928: 347–9).

[42] Severyns' emendation for the 3000 cited in Ps.-Apollod. *Epit.* 5.14; see Severyns (1928: 355–6), West (2013: 203–4).

[43] See below, p. 336.

[44] Perhaps also Thoas' wounding of Odysseus (*PEG* F 7 = F 8 D. = W.), since self-harm may have been less admirable, as Herod. 3.154.2–160.2 (a servile act); see Liapis (2011: 206).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

wrist (*PEG* F 11 = F 12 D. = F 16 W.), a supplicating Astynous was killed by Neoptolemus (*PEG* F 13 = F 14 D. = F 21 W.), Eioneus[45] by Neoptolemus, Admetus by Philoctetes (*PEG* F 14 = F 15 D. = F 23 W.), Coroebus by Diomedes (*PEG* F 15 = F 16 D. = F 24 W.), Axion by Eurypylus (*PEG* F 17 = F 18 D. = F 26 W.) etc. Though any poem dealing with events before and during the sack would have this kind of narrative, its extent and detail may have been one reason for the poem's titular comparison with the *Iliad*.[46]

HOMERIC AND UN-HOMERIC

Modern scholars have deemed much of the *Ilias parva* 'un-Homeric', e.g. in its use of quasi-magical tokens like the Palladium or Heracles' bow, the prominence of oracles (though cf. *Od.* 8.79–82) or the stress on ambush and deception (though cf. *Od.* 14.258–70).[47] Aristotle famously compared Homer's structural unity ('one part with many episodes') to the narratives of the *Cypria* and *Ilias parva*, since their poets 'composed about one hero, or one time or one action, with many parts' (*Poetics* 1459a30–b7 = *PEG* T 7 = T 5 D. = p. 118 W.) and, however meaningful we find it, this must reflect real differences in the authors and in their audiences' tastes. Yet, as with the linguistic features mentioned earlier and discussed in the commentary, a separative comparison can be overdone: for example, the *Ilias parva*'s 'frank avowal of Zeus' homosexual abduction of Ganymedes'[48] (*PEG* F 29 = F 6 D. = F 6 W.) is neither so frank nor removed from Homer's mention of both the rape and its purpose (*Il.* 20.232–5), and produces its own gift (a golden vine) to parallel or replace the compensation of divine horses (*Il.* 5.265–7).[49] Here 'unHomeric' means little more than 'not by Homer', despite its usual negative connotation.

The more disparaging critical tendency becomes clear in discussions of the *Ilias parva*'s most substantial fragment (*PEG* F 21 = F 20 D. = F 29–30 W.),[50] in which Astyanax's death is briefly summarised (*PEG* F 21.3–5 = F 20.3–5 D. = F 29.3–5 W.). Little should be extrapolated about

[45] For the suggestion that this figure (Rhesus' father at *Il.* 10.435) may be linked with Cimonian military activity in Thrace in the 470s–460s BC, see Castriota (1992: 90–1).

[46] See Graziosi (2002: 175–80).

[47] See, e.g., Severyns (1928) *passim* but esp. 333–4, Griffin (1977) (though the requisite portion is not reproduced) and Davies (1989c: 60–70, esp. 66–7) on ambush; *contra* Dué and Ebbott (2010), who suggest that Homer used (and not only in the suspect *Doloneia*) a tradition of ambush poetry.

[48] Davies (1989c: 65), where he also claims that Homer knew nothing of the cupbearer story, though cf. *Il.* 20.234 (οἰνοχοεύειν).

[49] See below, pp. 342–3. [50] See below, pp. 335–40.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

the poem as a whole,[51] firstly because the two sources which quote the lines (Σ Lycophr. 1268, Σ Eur. *Andr.* 14) only do so to illustrate the fact that Neoptolemus took Andromache and Aeneas as his prisoners. We have no way of knowing, therefore, whether the quoted passage was the actual narration of the event in the *Ilias parva* rather than a summary contained in a speech or flashback.[52] On the other hand, if this was the entirety of the child's demise in the poem, its author may have aimed deliberately to compress and thus sideline the whole story, and its usual association with Odysseus, in keeping with his pro-Odysseus programme.[53] Whatever the original context, *PEG* F 21 (= F 20 D. = F 29–30 W.) should not lead us to 'suspect that a poem which handled such a scene in such a style as this contained, in Iliadic terms, no high points at all'.[54]

Indeed, the summary above suggests that the *Ilias parva* had an exciting narrative, sprinkled with quarrels, ambushes, oracles and lots of fighting, but it could interpose quieter events as well. The fall of Ajax, the rescue of Aethra by Theseus' sons (*PEG* F 20 = F 23 D. = F 17 W.), the reclaiming of Helen (*PEG* F 19 = D. = F 28 W.) – a highlight in itself[55] – and Helicaon's sparing (*PEG* F 12 = F 13 D. = F 22 W.) all suggest considerable variety amidst the fighting, while the overheard (and then quoted?) conversation between two Trojan women about the relative merits of Odysseus and Ajax displayed in the battle over Achilles' corpse (cf. *Od.* 11.547) sounds fascinating. Their opposition – the first speaker spins Odysseus' action as cowardice (*PEG* F 2.2 = D., W.), the second as a typically brave and manly endeavour (*PEG* F 2.3–5 = D., W.) – is not only Homeric in its dynamic (if not its speakers; cf. *Il.* 7.345–64) but shows, as Homer does, considerable sophistication in its awareness of the ways in which the same narrative event may be turned to different rhetorical ends.[56]

However the relationship is to be understood in other cases, Homer was already a giant to the poet of the *Ilias parva*: he incorporates specific scenes from both the *Iliad* (Priam's fear of death) and the *Odyssey* (the spying mission), revels in combat narrative, and generally approves of Odysseus.[57]

[51] *Contra* Davies (1989c: 69–70), Griffin (1977: 51–2), West (2013: 219–22).

[52] See Bravo (2001).

[53] See above, p. 324, for other such indications.

[54] Griffin (1977: 51). West (2013: 169–71) is similarly dismissive of the poem's 'more comical and romantic elements' (170). For indication that the poet was, nonetheless, both aware of the emotional potential in this event, see below, p. 339 n. 108.

[55] See above, n. 24.

[56] Compare the hostile spin put on Odysseus' actions by Eupeithes (*Od.* 24.425–37) and the differences between Odysseus' various accounts of his adventures; cf. Kelly (2008); also below, pp. 331–2.

[57] Further points of similarity with the *Iliad* include the opening quarrel over τιμή, Paris' unsuccessful involvement in a duel (arg. lines 213–15 Severyns), the chief Trojan/ally killed by

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

But this should not count against the later poem – even the title suggests an ancient opinion about its qualities and affiliations for which modern critics should have more regard.

ONE POEM OR MANY?

The existence of more than one *Ilias parva* may be suggested by a second opening Muse invocation (*PEG* F 1), Tzetzes' claim that many people wrote '*Iliads*' (*PEG* T 11 = T 2 D.), and several small factual differences within the record.[58] Most interesting is the evidence of a first-century AD papyrus which contains a fragmentary summary of a Trojan War narrative.[59] The extant portion of this papyrus is reminiscent of Proclus' précis of the *Ilias parva* in both style and content, but (i) places the theft of the Palladium before the summoning of Neoptolemus and right after the capture of Helenus, and (ii) has Coroebus killed by Diomedes and Odysseus well before the city's destruction, much like Rhesus in *Iliad* book 10. The similarities suggest a connection with a poetic text covering the same events, in much the same way, as our poem.[60]

Much of this evidence could be reconciled with a single tradition,[61] but the *Ilias parva*'s transmission was so tenuous that we cannot preclude the concurrence of different versions. Though not great, these differences are telling, and show the influence of the Homeric poems,[62] e.g. in using the story of Odysseus' self-wounding (*Od.* 4.244–6, *Ilias parva* arg. lines 224 Severyns) rather than the original wounding by Thoas (*PEG* F 7 = F 8 D. = F 8 W.), or making Coroebus into a late-arriving ally killed, like Rhesus, by Odysseus and Diomedes on a mission (*PEG* arg. 2.3–4 (PRylands 22.3–4)) rather than a victim of the final night's fighting (*PEG* F 15 =

a Peleid (arg. lines 219–20 Severyns), and a closing focus on Trojan mourning and suffering; cf. also Anderson (1997: 39–40, 53–4). Given the perennial scholarly fascination with the Homeric simile, we note here the *Ilias parva*'s cucumber simile (*PEG* F 23 = F. dub. 3 D. = F 31 W.), though it is an image not found in Homer; cf. below, p. 340.

58 Cf. esp. Bernabé (1984); the relevant section of his *PEG* edition is entitled '*Iliades Parvae*'.

59 PRylands 22; cf. Hunt (1911). Neither Davies nor West include this summary in their editions, but *PEG* prints it as the *Ilias parva*'s second argument.

60 Bernabé (1984: 148); cf. also West (2013: 166–7).

61 For multiple (re-)invocations (*PEG* F 1; *PEG* F 28 = F 1 D. = F 1 W.) in the same poem, see below, pp. 329–31.

62 See Finkelberg (2000: esp. 6–11); Burgess (2001: 19–21, 201–2 nn. 64–8) on the analogous and notorious case of the agreement between the *Cypria* (according to Proclus) and Homer on Paris' voyage to Troy from Sparta, *against* Herodotus' report (2.117); see above, p. 325 and n. 41.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

F 16 D. = F 24 W.).[63] In effect, the papyrus' source treats the *Ilias parva* much as that poem treated its forebears, recomposing through recombination. Whether it proves the existence of another *Ilias parva* or not, this evidence is at least a salutary reminder of how much of this kind of poetry has been lost.

COMMENTARY ON SELECTED FRAGMENTS

PEG F 1, from Plut. *Sept. sap. conv.* 154a

Μοῦσά μοι ἔννεπε ἔργα, τὰ μήτ' ἐγένοντο πάροιθε
μήτ' ἔσται μετόπισθεν.

Muse, sing to me the deeds [West; 'those things' MSS], which never occurred before and will not be hereafter . . .

PEG F 28 = F 1 D. = W., from Ps.-Herod. *Vita Homeri* 9.31 Wilamowitz

Ἴλιον ἀείδω καὶ Δαρδανίην εὔπωλον,
ἧς πέρι πόλλα πάθον Δαναοὶ θεράποντες Ἄρηος.

Ilion do I sing and Dardania well-foaled, for which the Danaans suffered much, servants of Ares.

The existence of two *incipits* has suggested to some scholars multiple poems,[64] but the latter is more likely to be the opening of the *Ilias parva*: while *PEG* F 1 is only linked in a general – and disputed – manner with Lesches, *PEG* F 28 is identified explicitly as the start of the *Ilias parva* itself, and is also inscribed on two fifth-century Black Sea

[63] Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.341–6, 407–8, 424–6. Coroebus has also been plausibly identified on the early fifth-century BC 'Vivenzio hydra' (*LIMC* 'Koroibos' I 2), lying at the feet of Oilean Ajax as the latter pursues Cassandra (see Serbeti (1992: 103)), but he later becomes a byword for foolishness; see Langerbeck (1958: 45–7); Ambühl (1992 s.v. (2)). An Iliadic role in this recomposition is suggested by his similarity to Rhesus in being killed by Odysseus and Diomedes, and to Othryoneus in coming to Troy to marry Cassandra (see Janko (1992: 93 on *Il.* 13.361–82)), a motive which may have been shared with Eurypylus in the *Ilias parva* (cf. *PEG* F 29 F 6 D. = F 6 W., and *Od.* 11.519–21 with Σ *Od.* 11.521, which explicitly links him with Othryoneus). The papyrus' Coroebus is thus a recreation of both the *Ilias parva*'s Eurypylus and the *Iliad*'s Othryoneus and Rhesus, rather than an independent 'late-arriving ally' (as Memnon, Penthesileia, Eurypylus etc.).

[64] Bernabé (1984); see also above for PRylands 22. Of modern editors, only Bernabé takes *PEG* F 1 as the incipit, and only West fails to include it.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

ostraca.[65] Yet the poem may have found room for *PEG* F 1 as well: the *Iliad* had an alternative beginning[66] and on several occasions addresses or reinvokes the Muse (*Il.* 11.218, 14.508, 16.112), while the rhetorical positioning of both fragments is well paralleled in Archaic epic (Muse invocation (*PEG* F 1): cf. *Il.* 1.1–2, *Od.* 1.1, *WD* 1–2, *Thebais PEG* F 1 (= D., W.), *HHomHerm* 1, *HHom* 9.1, 14.1–2, etc.; first person statement (*PEG* F 28): cf. *Th.* 1, *HHomDem.* 1, *HHomAp.* 1, *HHomAphr.* 1–2, etc.), and can easily be combined within the same text, even the same passage (cf. *Il.* 2.484–9 (Muses 484 > first person 493), *Theog.* 1–110 (first person 1 > Muses 104–15), *WD* 1–10 (Muses 1–2 > first person 10), and sometimes the same line (*Epigonoi PEG* F 1 = D., W.).[67]

There is nothing in the language of either fragment to indicate lateness or an untraditional quality: the heavy first syllable in *aeidō* (*PEG* F 28.1) is paralleled at *Od.* 17.519 (with light first syllable at 520), while the fact that *PEG* F 1.1a = *HHomAphr.* 1a may suggest direct influence, but it may of course be merely an underrepresented formula.[68] In *PEG* F 28 (= F 1 D. = W.), the expressions *Danaoi, therapontes Arēos* (4x Hom.) and *poll' epathon* (21x, 4x* Hom.) are formulaic, while the epithet *eupōlon* is confined in Homer (5x) to a formula for Troy. Given the consistent rivalry between the two lines of the royal family (and the priority of Dardania's foundation: *Il.* 20.216–18), the transfer of *eupōlon* may be intended to contrast the survival of Dardanian Aeneas[69] and the success of his descendants next to the demise of Priam's line.[70] The epithet would have additional point in this context, since Anchises secretly sired Aeneas' team from Laomedon's divinely given horses (*Il.* 5.265–72; cf. also 23.291–2, 348). *PEG* F 29 = F 6 D. = F 6 W. (see below) replaces these horses with another gift, and we do not know whether the *Ilias parva* retained this or a similar story in some other form; if not, then *eupōlon* would effectively allude to the Homeric story whilst opposing

[65] As Lowenstam (1997: 47 with n. 83) notes, poetic inscriptions almost always come from the beginnings of texts.

[66] For the text see Introduction, above in this volume, n. 6.

[67] On the Douris cup (Μοῖσα μοι ἀ⟨μ⟩φὶ Σκάμανδρον ἐύρ⟨ρ⟩οον ἄρχομ' ἀεί[ν]δε⟨ι⟩ν), see most recently Lowenstam (1997: 46–7) and Sider (2010). Scafoglio (2006) also argues that both *PEG* F 1 & 28 are authentic, but implausibly relates them (à la Snell) to different stages in Greek thought, and so treats them as evidence for an evolving text.

[68] For imperative verb + *erga ta*, cf. Hes. *WD* 398.

[69] Cf. below, p. 336 and n. 90 on *PEG* F 21 (= F 20 D. = F 29–30 W).

[70] For significant epithet alteration of this sort, cf. *WD* 653 (Ἑλλάδος ἐξ ἱερῆς Τροίην ἐς καλλιγύναικα 'from sacred Greece to Troy of the beautiful women') with Edwards (1971: 80–1). For West (2013: 173), the generality of *PEG* F 28 is a function of the 'diffuse' nature of the poem's contents.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

it, figuring Dardania as 'well-foaled' for other reasons. Though the relative expression in line 2 (*hēs peri*) could apply simply to both cities in line 1, its attraction into the singular lends an emphasis to Dardania which may also be suggestive in this context.[71]

PEG F 2 = D., W., from Σ Aristoph. _Eq._ 1056 a

Αἴας μὲν γὰρ ἄειρε καὶ ἔκφερε δηϊοτῆτος
ἥρω Πηλείδην, οὐδ' ἤθελε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς.
*
πῶς ἐπιφωνήσω; πῶς οὐ κατὰ κόσμον ἔειπες;
<καί κεν γυνὴ φέροι ἄχθος, ἐπεί κε ἀνὴρ ἀναθείη,
ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν μαχέσαιτο.>

For Ajax raised and bore out of the fighting the hero Peleus' son, nor was godlike Odysseus willing . . .

*

How have you spoken? How have you not spoken in accordance with order? '<Even a woman could carry the burden, when a man should put it upon her, but she would not fight.>'[72]

Comprising a quotation from Aristoph. *Knights* 1056–7 (lines 3–4) and the back-story in the scholia ad loc. (lines 1–2), this fragment comes from the discussion between two Trojan women about the relative virtues of Ajax and Odysseus. The scholia provide the context: once Ajax and Odysseus quarrelled over the arms of Achilles, Nestor proposed to solve the dispute by sending a spy to eavesdrop on the Trojans and see which of the two they valued more. The *Odyssey* knows a similar story: Thetis sets out the arms and 'the children of the Trojans made the decision (viz, in Odysseus' favour) and Pallas Athene' (*Od.* 11.546–7). Scholars generally separate the two, on the grounds (i) that Homer's expression 'made the decision' (*dikasan*) requires a more formal setting; and (ii) 'children of the Trojans' (*paides Trōōn*) is an unusual way of referring to two (or more) Trojan women. The second objection is certainly stronger than the first: the H scholiast on *Od.* 11.547 suggests an analogy with *huies Achaiōn*, before relating it to the Trojans

[71] Cf. *Il.* 14.66–7 (τεῖχος δ' οὐκ ἔχραισμε τετυγμένον, οὐδέ τι τάφρος, / ᾗ ἔπι πολλὰ πάθον Δαναοί 'and the wall we built has done us no good, nor the ditch either / where the Danaans endured so much', transl. by Lattimore), where the relative refers to both antecedents (Janko (1992: 158)), but in our fragment both antecedents are of the same gender; the examples collected by *GH* 21 are not comparable.

[72] The Aristophanic quotation of lines 4–5 continues 'for she would shit (χέσαιτο), if she fought', which may conceal an original 'she would withdraw' (χάσαιτο); cf. *PEG* p. 76.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

slain by Odysseus during the battle, whilst the HVQ scholia add the detail that Agamemnon questioned Trojan prisoners, who judged Odysseus to the best 'because he grieved his enemies the most'. At any rate, it is not the same version as told in the *Ilias parva*, the propensity of which to differ from established tradition was noted earlier. It would be particularly apt for this poem to use yet another, secretive night mission towards Troy, especially in so doing to grant the prize to Odysseus, the master of such activity.

The roles played by each figure in the rescue of Achilles' corpse are also interesting.[73] All iconographic and most literary sources (starting with *Aeth.* arg. lines 193–5 Severyns) agree with this fragment in having Odysseus fight whilst Ajax carries the body, though the battle over Patroclus' corpse – which is often held to be an allusion to the struggle over Achilles – sees the Aiantes fight whilst Menelaus and Meriones lift the body (*Il.* 17.715–21). Probably not uninfluenced by this Iliadic scene, the BPQ scholia to *Od.* 5.310 assign Odysseus the carrying role, as does a fourth-century papyrus (*PEG* F (dub.) 32). Since all surviving versions give Odysseus the greater glory and success because he 'harmed' his enemies the most (either in general or because he killed many Trojans during the fight), the reversal of roles in these latter sources may have been purposed to lessen his credit.[74]

PEG F 5 = D., W., from Σ Hom. _Il._ 16.142b

ἀμφὶ δὲ πόρκης
χρύσεος ἀστράπτει, καὶ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶι δίκροος αἰχμή.

and about it a collar of gold flashes as lightning, and on it a two-fold spear-head

Invoked (by an Homeric scholion) to explain the fact that only Achilles could wield the famous ash spear of Peleus (*Il.* 16.142–3), and (by a Pindaric scholion) to justify its description as 'very angry' (*Nem.* 6.53) on the grounds that it could inflict two wounds at once, *PEG* F 5 is probably reacting directly to Homer's choice of verb (ἐπίστατο: not 'knew' but 'was able') to refer to Achilles' privileged ability; both scholia cite the *Ilias parva* as authority for the notion that the spear required special knowledge or skill, and instruction thereto may have been part of the purpose behind the appearance of Achilles' shade to his son (*Ilias parva* arg. line 218 Severyns).[75] The weapon itself had

[73] See Edwards (1991: 132); West (2013: 175–6).
[74] See above, pp. 324–5, for the reputation of Odysseus.
[75] See Severyns (1928: 338–42); also West (2013: 189).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

a long prehistory, probably imagined as early as the *Iliad* as Cheiron's gift to Peleus on the occasion of his marriage to Thetis,[76] but Homer describes neither this nor any other spear as having a double-headed point.[77] Though there are some limited literary reflexes of this feature (Aesch. *TrGF* F 152, Soph. *TrGF* F 152), it has left no discernible iconographic footprint.[78]

The fragment's phrasing most closely matches the description of Hector's spear (*Il.* 6.319–20 = 8.494–5), and it could have occurred in a number of contexts: a depiction of Achilles' panoply in the *Hoplôn krisis* (arg. lines 208–10 Severyns), Odysseus giving his father's arms to Neoptolemus (arg. lines 217–18 Severyns), the appearance of Achilles to his son (see above), an arming scene in preparation for Neoptolemus' combat with Eurypylus (arg. lines 219–20 Severyns), or perhaps the extensive combat scenes during Troy's final night (cf. *PEG* F 10–17 = F 12, 13–18 D. = F 15–16, 21–6 W.). The verb 'flashes as lightning' (*astraptei*) is usually confined to Zeus in early Greek epic, whether his direct actions (*Il.* 2.353, 9.237, 8.75, 10.5, 17.595) or his weaponry (Hes. *Theog.* 689), but the *Ilias parva*'s striking metaphor is merely a development of a common Homeric combination;[79] the present tense (*astraptei*), though easily emended to a past, would indicate that the description was found in a speech, which would fit very well in the first or third situations above.[80]

[76] Whilst Homer explicitly describes Peleus' horses and armour as wedding gifts on several occasions (*Il.* 16.381–2, 17.194–7, 17.443–4, 18.84–5, 23.276–8), the spear is not so sourced (cf. *Il.* 16.140–4, 19.387–91); cf. Kullmann (1960: 234–5, 232–6 more generally), with *Cypr. PEG* F 3 = D. = F 4 W. (= Σ *Il.* 16.140).

[77] The formula ἔγχεσιν ἀμφιγύοισιν (9x Hom.) is generally held to refer instead to the shape of a single spear-point; cf. *LfgrE* s.v. ἀμφίγυος; Janko (1992: 64 on *Il.* 13.147). Double spear-points are not unknown in the material record of the Mycenaean and later periods (see Cook (1925: 798–806); also Sekunda (1992: 24) for a (now lost) fifth-century Lycian relief of a 'sickle-soldier' so armed) but they receive no mention in Trümpy (1950), Snodgrass (1964) or Höckmann (1980). Bert Smith suggests to me a misinterpretation of the common two-spear motif from Mycenaean art onwards; some role may also have been played by 'spear-pairs' in Homeric poetry (*Il.* 3.18 etc.) and funerary deposits from the Geometric period onwards; cf. Höckmann (1980: 301–2, 308, 311–12).

[78] Pausanias 3.3.8 locates a bronze spear of Achilles in the temple of Athene at Phaselis, though he speaks only of 'its spear head and butt-spike'.

[79] Cf. the formula χαλκοῦ . . . στεροπήν 'the shining . . . of bronze' (*Il.* 11.83, 19.363 ~ *Od.* 4.72, 14.268, 17.437); also τῆλε δὲ χαλκὸς | λάμφ' ὥς τε στεροπὴ πατρὸς Διός 'and the bronze afar off / glared, like the lightning of Zeus father' (*Il.* 10.153–4 ~ 11.65–6, transl. by Lattimore). Davies (1989a: 95–6) calls it a 'post-Homeric . . . extension', but the poet did not have to stretch the language very far.

[80] Homer usually describes the prizes in the funeral games in his own voice (and in the past tense), but cf. e.g. *Il.* 23.560–2, 832–5, and more generally 9.121–57, *Od.* 4.613–9, 8.403–5 (a sword!), 430–2 for such descriptions of objects, with present and future orientation, in character speech; see also Grethlein (2008). West (2013: 188–9) notes that Odysseus does

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

PEG F 9 = F 11 D. = F 14 W., from Clement of Alex. *Strom.* 1.21.104

νὺξ μὲν ἔην μέσση, λαμπρὰ δ᾽ ἐπέτελλε σελήνη.

Night was in its middle, and a bright moon was rising.

This fragment accompanied the description of Troy's sack, and apparently marked the hour when Sinon raised the torch to the Greeks on Tenedos (Σ Lycophr. 344). In early epic, the moon's appearance facilitates vision (*Il.* 8.555–6) and is linked with the sun (*Od.* 4.45 = 7.84, 24.148; also *HHomAphr.* 89), whilst its absence indicates the opposite (*Il.* 17.367, *Od.* 9.144–5), so presumably the poet was here underlining the nocturnal visibility required for the work at hand.[81]

As the fall of Troy was an obvious target for early chronological speculation, there was much discussion about precisely which date is revealed here: probably because of its epithet, some argued for a full moon in the middle of the month (12th day: Hellanicus *EGM* F 152), others that a moon rising at or around midnight falls in the last part of the month (24th: Damastes *EGM* F 7).

The latter view seems now to hold the field, but the imperfect *epetelle* need not mean that the rising began at midnight (Hes. *WD* 567, 597–8 uses a form of *prōtos* to mark the start of astronomical phenomena), merely that it was in process and had not yet been completed, which could indicate the period closer to the full moon (as Hellanicus thought). In either case, the poet was unconcerned with this kind of calculation.[82]

The dialect of the second hemistich (*lamprē d᾽ epetelle selēnē*) is interesting, since most sources read *lamprā* for *lamprē*, with final alpha usually interpreted as an Atticism and therefore another sign of the 'lateness' of this poem.[83] However, the early archaic formula *lamprān te Selēnēn* (Hes. *Theog.* 19, 371)[84] shows that *lamprā* in *PEG* F 9 cannot support such a conclusion. Other (very late) sources (Clement, Eusebius) extend the alpha

describe the armour in Quintus of Smyrna (7.194–204), though he is inclined towards emendation.

[81] For the narrative associations of night, see above, p. 323.

[82] As Grafton and Swerdlow (1986: 217–18) term it, 'the application of a marvellously precocious | scientific method to entirely fantastic data'. On the entire issue, cf. West (2013: 208–12), though he daringly combines *Titanomachia PEG* F 14 with this fragment, and endorses the very tentative speculation of Grafton and Swerdlow (1986: 216–8) that the *Ilias parva* specified that the Greeks sacked Troy for seventeen days before sailing home.

[83] See Wackernagel (1916: 181–2), Davies (1989a: 95–8, esp. 96–7).

[84] See West (1966: 81), Edwards (1971: 102–3), both of whom also judge it a sign of Attic influence on Hesiod's dialect, but not a corruption in the transmission.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

throughout the verse (*selana* for *sēlēnē*; *mesata* for *mesatē*), perhaps as a result of hypercorrection.[85]

PEG F 21 = F 20 D. = F 29–30 W., from Σ Lycophr. 1268

αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλῆος μεγαθύμου φαίδιμος υἱός
Ἕκτορέην ἄλοχον κάταγεν κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας
παῖδα δ᾽ ἑλὼν ἐκ κόλπου ἐϋπλοκάμου τιθήνης
ῥῖψε ποδὸς τεταγὼν ἀπὸ πύργου, τὸν δὲ πεσόντα
ἔλλαβε πορφύρεος θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταιή (5)
{ἐκ δ᾽ ἕλετ᾽ Ἀνδρομάχην, ἠΰζωνον παράκοιτιν
Ἕκτορος, ἥν τε οἱ αὐτῶι ἀριστῆες Παναχαιῶν
δῶκαν ἔχειν ἐπίηρον ἀμειβόμενοι γέρας ἀνδρί·
αὐτόν τ᾽ Ἀγχίσαο κλυτὸν γόνον ἱπποδάμοιο
Αἰνείαν ἐν νηυσὶν ἐβήσατο ποντοπόροισιν (10)
ἐκ πάντων Δαναῶν ἀγέμεν γέρας ἔξοχον ἄλλων}.

But great-hearted Achilles' glorious son led away Hector's wife to the hollow ships. And seizing his son from the fold of the well-tressed nurse he hurled him, grabbing by the foot, from the tower, and when he fell dark death and powerful fate took him. {And he took out Andromache, the well-belted wife of Hector, whom the best of the all-Greeks gave to him, granting a pleasing prize to the man, and him, the glorious son of Anchises the horse-tamer Aeneas, he embarked on [MSS; 'planned' Schwartz] his sea-faring ships of all the Danaans to take as a prize outstanding beyond others.}

Homer knew that Neoptolemus left Troy with his 'noble prize' (*Od.* 11.533–5), the nature of which is subject of this fragment, though its extent, authenticity and placement have been questioned: Σ Eur. *Andr.* 14 attributes lines 6–11 to the Hellenistic poet Simias of Rhodes (F 6 Powell), and the return to Andromache in line 6 seems rather strange after lines 1–2. Some, therefore, follow the scholion[86] or rearrange the lines to avoid the problem,[87] but an economical hypothesis is that two passages from different parts of the poem have been run together, the first (lines 1–5) from the destruction of the city (e.g.), and the second (lines 6–11) from the later division of spoils.[88]

[85] i.e., 'restoring' all the alphas for the normal epic eta. Otherwise still unexplained, the alphatized verse has been considered the result of Doric or Aeolic influence (West 1966: 80 n. 2; *contra* West 2013: 209), and Bowie (2014) argues that the citations in Clement are to be ascribed to the *Iliou persis* of the sixth-century Argive elegist Sakadas.

[86] Debiasi (2005: 180–1).

[87] Huxley (1969: 199) reorders the lines 6, 7, 8, 3, 4, 5, 1, 2, 9, 10, 11.

[88] West (2003a: 139–40; 2013: 219–20).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

Aeneas' captivity is told only here, but it is later reflected in Hellanicus' story (*EGM* F 84) that he founded Rome after travelling with Odysseus to Italy from the Molossians,[89] who presumably comprised or were within Neoptolemus' realm (cf. *Nost.* arg. lines 299–300 Severyns). Within the poem, the event parallels the earlier capture of Helenus (*Ilias parva* arg. lines 211–12 Severyns), who also survives the sack and leaves the Troad, but it does not contradict the widespread story that Aeneas' dynasty would continue in sovereignty (*Il.* 20.307–8, *HHomAphr.* 196–7),[90] since neither passage specifies the location for that future rule.[91] The bondage must therefore have been temporary in the *Ilias parva*, as in the case of Helenus and in the later tale that Neoptolemus released Hector's descendants to return to the Troad so as to rejoin Aeneas' son Ascanius and resettle Troy (Hellanicus *EGM* F 31.24–7). That Neoptolemus is associated with all of these stories may suggest a common epic source. One may further speculate that the *Ilias parva* was deliberately figuring Aeneas in the role of Helenus as Neoptolemus' primary male captive, since this would concord with the poem's characteristic continuity factor, i.e. in having the man unwillingly spared by the father in the *Iliad* now spared, captured and then apparently freed by the son.[92]

As the poem's most substantial fragment(s), *PEG* F 21 allows some cautious appreciation of its style and merits.[93] Firstly, there is a heavy preponderance of formular units:

> 1 Ἀχιλλῆος μεγαθύμου φαίδιμος υἱὸς: = *Od.* 3.189; Ἀχιλλῆος μεγαθύμου: 2x* Hom. φαίδιμος υἱὸς: 10x* Hom., (acc.) 5x* Hom., 2x Hes.; 2 κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας: 14x (11x*) Hom. (esp. *Il.* 5.26, 21.32 κατάγειν); 4 τὸν δὲ πεσόντα: 3x Hom.; πεσόντα: 9x* Hom.; 5 ἔλλαβε πορφύρεος θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταιή: 3x* Hom. (always prec. by τὸν δὲ κατ' ὄσσε in prev. line); θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταιή: 6x* Hom; μοῖρα κραταιή: 9x* Hom.; 7 Ἕκτορος: 20x* Hom.; ἀριστῆες Παναχαιῶν: 6x* Hom., (acc.) 2x* Hom.; 9 ἱπποδάμοιο: 22x* Hom., 2x* Hes. (F); 10 νηυσίν . . . ποντοπόροισιν: 6x (4x*) Hom.; 11

[89] Though cf. *EGM* F 31.19–33, where Aeneas leaves the area under treaty and sails to Pallene.

[90] *Contra* West (2013: 220–1), who thinks it 'very un-epic' as well. For the pro-Dardanian leanings of *PEG* F 28 (= F 1 D. = F 1 W.) and *PEG* F 29 (= F 6 D. = F 6 W.), see my comments ad loc.

[91] Homer says only that Aeneas and his children 'will rule over the Trojans' (Τρώεσσι ἀνάξει *Il.* 20.307), the *Hymn* that his son 'will rule among the Trojans' (ἐν Τρώεσσι ἀνάξει 196) and will have lots of descendants; see Olson (2012: 1–9, esp. 4 and 9); also Edwards (1991: 298–301) more generally.

[92] See below, p. 339 on *PEG* F 21.1–2 (= F 20.1–2 D. = F 29.1–2 W.), p. 341 on *PEG* F 24 (= F 4 D. = F 4 W.) and p. 343 on *PEG* F 29 (= F 6 D. = F 6 W.) for other examples of this tendency.

[93] See also above, pp. 326–7 for the usual negative judgements, esp. with regard to Astyanax's death, and reasons not to follow them.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

πάντων Δαναῶν: 1x* Hom., also *Il.* 1.90 (συμπάντων Δαναῶν); ἀγέμεν: 7x (3x*) Hom.; ἔξοχον ἄλλων: 9x* Hom., 1x* *HHom.*, 2x Hes. (F).

There are also several other, less definitely formulaic, parallels with Archaic epic:

1 Ἀχιλλῆος μεγαθύμου: cf., e. g., Ἰφίτου μεγαθύμου (2.518) etc., 32x* Hom.; 2 Ἑκτορέην: cf. *Il.* 2.416, 10.46; Ἑκτορέην ἄλοχον: cf. *Od.* 3.264 (Ἀγαμεμνονέην ἄλοχον); 3 κόλπου ἐυπλοκάμοιο τιθήνης: cf. *Il.* 6.466 (πάϊς πρὸς κόλπον ἐϋζώνοιο τιθήνης), also 6.400, 483, *HHomDem.* 187; 4 ῥῖψε ποδὸς τεταγὼν ἀπὸ πύργου: ~ *Il.* 1.591* (ἀπὸ βήλου), 24.735* (ῥῖψε χειρὸς ἑλών ἀπὸ πύργου; cf. *HHomAp.* 318 ῥίψ' ἀνὰ χερσὶν ἑλοῦσα), also *Il.* 8.13, Hes. *Theog.* 868, *HHomHerm.* 256; 6 ἐκ δ' ἕλετ': ~ *Il.* 1.369* (ἐκ δ' ἕλον), 9.130* (ἐξελόμην), 9.272* (ἐξέλεθ'), also *HHomAp.* 489 (ἐκ δὲ κτήμαθ' ἕλεσθε), *Il.* 11.696–7; ἠΰζωνον παράκοιτιν: cf. *Il.* 9.590 (ἐΰζωνος παράκοιτις), also *HHomDem.* 212, 234, 243, 255; 8 δῶκαν ἔχειν: cf. Theogn. 1.1057 (ἔδωκαν ἔχειν), also *HHomAphr.* 212, Mimn. *IEG* 4.1, Theogn. 2.1387 (ἔδωκεν ἔχειν), also Hes. *Theog.* 219, 905–6.

This is the language of a poet fluent in the oral-traditional style of composition, with one telling sign of the strains imposed thereby: the form *ēüzōnon* (line 6) (for Homeric *eü–*) seems to violate 'the traditional formulaic system' (i.e. for καλλίζωνος),[94] yet such violations are well known in Homer[95] and necessitated here by unique location of *eüzōnos* at the strong caesura, the placement and spelling *ēü–* being paralleled by Homer's alternation in the adjective *ēüs* / *eüs*, the former at strong medial caesura (6x, (acc.) 3x), the latter weak (3x, (acc.) 2x).[96] Given Andromache's story and associations, one also suspects the specific influence of *eüzōnoio tithēnēs* (*Il.* 6.467) and

[94] West (2013: 171).

[95] Cf. Friedrich (2007). This alternation is probably not a formula system anyway, for it is only found once (Hes. *Cat.* F 26 M.-W. = F 17 Hirsch.) and the words are otherwise used in different conditions: *kallizōnos* qualifies unnamed groups to the verse-end (*gynaikes Il.* 7.139; *gynaikas HHomAp.* 154 (acc); *gynaikōn Il.* 24.298, *Od.* 23.147; *thygatres HHomAp.* 446), while *eΰzōnos* qualifies only one of these words (*gynaikas*) from the start of the verse (*Il.* 9.366, 23.261), being otherwise deployed to the verse-end with singular nouns (*gynaikos Il.* 1.429, 23.760; Hes. *Cat.* F 195.31 M.-W. = 91 Hirsch.; Ps.-Hes. *Scut.* 31; *tithēnēs Il.* 6.467; *parakoitis Il.* 9.590) and names (*Il.* 9.667 (verse-initial), *HHomDem.* 212, 234, 243, 255, Hes. *Cat.* F 26.23, 33a.7, 221.1 M.-W. = F 17.23, 25.7, *10.1 Hirsch.). This distribution reflects individual prosody and word-placement. Of course, a formula system is a reified combination of these factors, but it can violate them if required, as e.g. in declining *meropōn anthrōpōn* (9x Hom.) into unmetrical *meropes anthrōpoi* (*Il.* 18.288); cf. Parry (1928 = 1972: 191–239).

[96] ἐΰς is also used after the strong caesura before a vowel to close the foot (5x Hom., scanned ˘ ˘ |), and so enabling different following conditions from those of *ēüs* (scanned – | –). West (2013: 171) thinks it significant that the alternation *ēü–* / *eü–* occurs 'only where the second syllable is short, as in ἠΰκομος, ἠϋγένειος, and the like'.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

eüzōnos parakoitis (9.590),[97] indicating that specific reminiscences helped to shape the way in which formular units (viz, *eüzōnos* + sing. noun to verse-end from medial caesura: 4x Hom., 4x *HHom.* etc.) were manipulated and regenerated.

This may also be supposed in the similarities between *PEG* F 21.3–4 and two particular Iliadic passages foreshadowing the death of Astyanax (6.467–70 and 24.736–9). Some scholars have concluded that there was a tradition surrounding the death of Hector's son[98] – a popular theme in early Greek art[99] – but two Homeric examples of the verse-initial expression *rhipse(i) podos/cheiros* (1.591, 24.735; cf. *PEG* F 21.4), especially when one of them refers to Hephaestus, do not prove the existence of formulae explicitly associated with Astyanax. The poet instead seems to be consciously reworking the language of the *Iliad* in order to renovate his own traditional dialect.

This suggests that the oral epic tradition evolves with the appearance of fixed texts, assimilating them into its compositional processes. Such a continuity may also be observed in several features in the language of *PEG* F 21, sometimes judged as straightforwardly 'late' or 'untraditional'.[100] The use of *nu* mobile to 'make position' (*katagen koilas* line 2) is a frequent occurrence in Homer.[101] For *te* in a relative clause denoting non-habitual action (*hēn te* line 7), cf. *Il.* 5.467–8, 7.452, 12.236, 17.174, 19.88, 22.116, *Od.* 4.136.[102] The epithet *epiēron* (line 8) is not found elsewhere before the fifth century (cf. *epiēranos Od.* 19.343),[103] but adjectival compounds of adverbial and prepositional expressions are extremely common in Homer.[104] For noun–epithet separation in *auton t' Agkhisao klyton gonon hippodamoio* (line 9), cf. *Il.* 2.23 = 60, 4.370, 7.38, 11.450);[105] *hippodamoio* is not elsewhere applied to Anchises, but it is very frequently applied to the Trojans (*Il.* 2.230 etc.) and to several other characters of his generation (e.g. Antenor

[97] For other signs of direct interaction with the *Iliad*, see above, p. 327 n. 57.

[98] Burgess (2012: 176–82); cf. Anderson (1997: 54–6).

[99] See above, p. 321.

[100] See Wackernagel (1916: 181–2), Davies (1989a: 95–8), West (2013: 171–2, 221–2).

[101] See also *PEG* F 29.1 and 4 (= F 6.1 and 4 D. = F 6.1 and 4 W.). Janko (1982: 66) notes that the *Ilias parva* concords with Homeric statistics, though the sample is too small for any firm conclusion about the poem as a whole (1982: 189 and 273–4).

[102] 'An oddity': Davies (1989a: 96), citing Ruijgh (1971: 916) (as West 2013: 221); cf. also Ruijgh (1971: 421–3): 'plus irregulier', though he concludes (918) that 'l'emploi de τε épique dans les fragments épiques entre Homère et l'épopée hellénistique semble s'accorder avec l'emploi homérique'.

[103] See West (2013: 171), with some diffidence: 'no logical reason . . . why ἐπίηρος should not already have been coined by a sixth-century poet'. Homer's compound *epiēra* (2x) is a 'fossilised' result of the more common expression *epi* (dat.) *ēra* + *pherein* (4x).

[104] Risch (1974: 187–9 (§ 69a), 112–15 (§ 40)).

[105] *Contra* Dihle (1970: 148). West (2013: 221) surprisingly thinks the whole verse typically Cyclic in its 'prolixity'.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

Il. 6.299, 14.473), as well as being used as a name in itself (*Il.* 11.335); *kl–* (in *klyton* line 9) fails to 'make position' as it sometimes does in Homer (cf. *Od.* 1.366 = 18.213, 12.215, 12.421, 20.92).[106] Some of these are minority phenomena in Homer, but the indirect parallels are easy extensions of traditional resources, and the size of the sample is too small to be sure that the snapshot is representative of the poem as a whole. That the language of this fragment reflects a post-Homeric stage of development is in any case probable, given the evidence for direct interaction with the *Iliad*, but these cases do not indicate an especially late date for the poem, nor that its poet was untraditional.

In the relationship between sentence and verse structure, *PEG* F 21 (= F 20 D. = F 29–30 W.) shows a relatively high proportion of lines with necessary enjambment (lines 1–2, 3–4, 4–5, 7–8, 9–10), which may (once more, if representative) be a function of a post-Homeric date.[107] More likely, enjambment expresses the poet/speaker's awareness of the emotional potential of the subject matter, notwithstanding the brevity of its description (note especially the cluster in lines 3–5).[108]

Artistry of other sorts is evident: the pointed reminders of Achilles (*Achillēos*) and Hector (*Hektoreēn*) in lines 1–2 highlight the continuity of their antipathy in the *Ilias parva*, as the former's son now claims the latter's wife before killing his son;[109] that none of these figures is given their own name (if not a misleading impression of the wider passage) highlights the relational aspect of their identities.[110] Furthermore, note the structural sophistication of lines 6–11, where three verses are allotted to each prize, with considerable syntactical and phraseological variation balancing out the patterned similarities: the last verse in each case describes the gift in general terms and uses an infinitive to denote possession (*echein* 8 / *agemen* 11), whilst the first two verses naming the gifts are also linked chiastically, with Andromache's name (line 6) followed by her husband's (line 7) finding its response in Anchises' name (line 9) appearing before Aeneas' (line 10). Finally, the status of that second prize is reinforced (line 11) by sonant

[106] *Contra* West (2013: 221).

[107] For a comparison between archaic and later epic in these terms, cf. Barnes (1979: esp. 7–8). Notopoulos (1964: 30–1) hastily takes this as evidence of the poem's orality.

[108] For necessary enjambment expressing 'urgency and animation' in Homer, see Graziosi and Haubold (2010: 13), drawing on the work of Bakker (2005). This effect is particularly noticeable in speeches, which might lead one to speculate that lines 1–5 were contained in a speech; cf. above, p. 327. On the criticism that the death of Astyanax did not receive a proper treatment here, see above, pp. 326–7.

[109] See above, p. 336 on *PEG* F 21.9–11, and below, p. 341 on *PEG* F 24 and p. 343 on *PEG* F 29 for other examples.

[110] See Anderson (1997: 54).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

repetitions, with central *agemen geras* enclosed by *ek pantōn Danaōn . . . exochon allōn*. However successful or appealing one judges these features to be, their presence suggests that the poet was not unaware of verbal art.

PEG F 23 = F dub. 3 D. = F 31 W., from Athenaeus 3.73a

ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀέξηται σικυὸς δροσερῶι ἐνὶ χώρωι

and as when a cucumber grows in a watery place . . .

The ascription of this fragment to Lesches depends on a relatively certain emendation in Athenaeus (3.73e Olson),[111] but there is no indication of context. While the syntax is too common to need exemplification, the image is certainly unique in early Greek epic,[112] as are many images of peaceful human collaboration with nature in the Homeric poems.[113] The development of the young is often compared there to saplings (*Il.* 18.56–7 = 437–8, *Od.* 6.162–8, 14.175), and frequently with location specified (cf. also *Il.* 17.54), so it is not impossible that West is right to link this rather unusual image to Neoptolemus' growth (in conjunction perhaps with *PEG* F 24 = F 4 D. = F 4 W.: see below).[114]

PEG F 24 = F 4 D. = F 4 W., from Σ Hom. *Il.* 19.326

Πηλεΐδην δ' Ἀχιλῆα φέρε Σκῦρόνδε θύελλα,
ἔνθ' ὅ γ' ἐς ἀργαλέον λιμέν' ἵκετο νυκτὸς ἐκείνης.

and a storm bore Peleus' son Achilles to Scyros, where he came into the difficult harbour during that night.

This fragment is invoked by an Homeric scholiast to explain Achilles' reference to his son's presence on Scyros (*Il.* 19.326), and explicitly set against the version of 'some' who relate the story that Achilles was hidden there by his mother before the Trojan War. The *Cypria* (arg. lines 125–31 Severyns

[111] Olson (2006: 45) cautiously restores the author's name as 'Dieuches' (*SH* 379).

[112] It is first found elsewhere in dactylic hexameter poetry in Praxilla *PMG* F 1.3, where the dead Adonis enumerates things he misses most and includes the 'seasonal cucumbers' after the sun, stars and moon (lines 1–2 ~ *Il.* 18.484–5). Zenobius, who quotes the fragment to illustrate the proverb 'foolish as the Adonis of Praxilla', suggests that the effect of the third verse is bathetic, but it may rather have played on the similarity between 'cucumbers' (σικύους) and Praxilla's home city of Sicyon, thus alluding – perhaps in an erotic way (*hōraious*) – to the local participants of the festival at which this poem may have been performed; see Snyder (1989: 57–8) and (more speculatively) Sumler (2010: 468–9).

[113] Edwards (1991: 35); see also Scott (2009: 205).

[114] West (2013: 185); see also above, p. 328 n. 57.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

and F 20) tells us that Achilles married (*gamei*) Deidameia, daughter of king Lycomedes, in the aftermath of the Teuthranian setback, arriving in the *Ilias parva* apparently on the day (*nyktos ekeinēs* line 2) they set out from Mysia.[115] Though this would make Neoptolemus barely old enough to hold a weapon, early epic can treat long periods of time in a very imprecise manner (Odysseus' ten years' wandering leaves a considerable gap after seven years with Calypso (*Od.* 7.259–60) and one with Circe (10.469), as does Helen's reference (*Il.* 24.765–6) to her twenty years since leaving Menelaus, while the story of Iphitus and his bow (*Od.* 21.11–41) seems to synchronize Heracles and Odysseus),[116] and the story adds greatly to the poem's 'continuity' factor, since Neoptolemus is now begotten directly after his father's encounter with Telephus.[117] Storms were a constant threat for the journeying hero, and frequently linked with erotic encounters: aside from the overtures made to Odysseus by Nausicaa and Alcinous, and his extended sojourn with Calypso, cf. e.g. *Il.* 14.249–56, 15.26–8 (Heracles), *Cypria PEG* arg. lines 98–100 Severyns (Paris and Helen).

PEG F 24 (= F 4 D. = F 4 W.) must be a flashback set in the context of Neoptolemus' arrival or summoning (arg. lines 216–18 Severyns), but it is unclear whether it was contained in character- or narrator-text: the latter might be indicated by *PEG* F 23 (= F dub. 3 D. = F 31 W.) as similarly concerned with Neoptolemus' backstory,[118] were it not for (i) the uncertainty of the simile's reference, and (ii) the use of similes in Homeric character-speech, especially in youthful comparisons (see above). If in character speech, then possible candidates could include Helenus' revelations (arg. lines 211–12 Severyns), a subsequent council scene in the Greek camp, or self-identification on Scyros.

The language is once again traditional: verse-initial *Pēleïdēn Achilēa* only occurs 1x Hom. (*Il.* 23.542), but in other cases is formulaic (9x*); *thyella* is frequently linked with forms of *pherō* (9x Hom., 1x Hes.); though *ekeinēs* (line 2) may be a 'very recent arrival'[119] in Homer (i.e. with *e–*), it is there (18x), and therefore only a much larger sample of verses from the *Ilias parva* than we currently have could make any point about proportions. Strikingly,

[115] Severyns (1928: 288–91) separates the *Cypria* and the *Ilias parva*, the former containing the story of youthful confinement as well as the formal marriage (under the influence of the latter), thus creating a more coherent story; differently West (2013: 104, 184).

[116] See Severyns (1928: 288–91); Brügger (2009: 259–60); Crissy (1997).

[117] See Anderson (1997: 38–48) for the poet's construction of the Achilles – Neoptolemus/Telephus – Eurypylus nexus. For other examples of this feature, see above, pp. 336 and 339 on *PEG* F 21.9–11 and *PEG* F 21.1–2, and below, p. 343 on *PEG* F 29.

[118] West (2013: 184–5).

[119] Davies (1989a: 95–6), citing Janko (1982: 237).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

the harbour at Scyros is 'difficult' (*argaleon*) in that it was hard to attain; cf. the common 'difficult' road/seas/winds etc.[120]

PEG F 29 = F 6 D. = F 6 W., from Σ Eur. *Tr.* 822

ἄμπελον ἣν Κρονίδης ἔπορεν οὗ παιδὸς ἄποινα
χρυσείην, φύλλοισιν ἀγαυοῖσιν κομόωσαν
βότρυσί θ' οὕς Ἥφαιστος ἐπασκήσας Διὶ πατρί
δῶχ', ὃ δὲ Λαομέδοντι πόρεν Γανυμήδεος ἀντί.

the vine which the son of Cronus provided as recompense for his son, golden, plumed with leaves brilliant [Jortin; 'gentle' MSS] and grape clusters, which Hephaestus adorned and gave to father Zeus, and he provided it to Laomedon for Ganymedes.

This description must have been associated with the arrival of the Trojan ally Eurypylus (son of Telephus), since Σ *Od.* 11.520 relates that this vine was given by Priam to Eurypylus' mother, Astyoche, so that she would send her son to Troy. The *Ilias parva* makes him a prominent figure,[121] with his victims including Machaon (*PEG* F 30 = F 7 D. = F 7 W.) and Axion (*PEG* F 17 = F 18 D. = F 26 W.), whilst his death at the hands of Neoptolemus begins the final stage of the Trojan siege (arg. lines 219–21 Severyns). Divinely made heirlooms or gifts are well known in early Greek epic (cf., e.g., *Il.* 2.100–8; *Od.* 4.613–19 etc.),[122] and the ring-composition between *eporen hou paidos apoina* (line 1) and *poren Ganymēdeos anti*[123] (line 4) neatly surrounds the physical description and Hephaistian origin (lines 2–3), emphasising the purpose for which it was given.

PEG F 29 diverges from the *Iliad* on two points: the first in making Ganymedes the son of Laomedon and not Tros (*Il.* 5.265–6, 20.231–5), and the second in making the 'recompense' for this rape (*hou paidos apoina PEG* F 29.1. ~ *huios poinēn Il.* 5.266) an Hephaistian vine instead of divine horses (*Il.* 5.265–7).[124] The mistaken notion that the *Ilias parva*'s depiction of Ganymedes' rape is unhomeric in its 'frank avowal of homosexual desire' has been already discussed above,[125] but of more interest is the poet's decision to make Ganymedes Priam's brother: while the story casts Eurypylus as a

[120] See *LFGE* s.v., B1c; also *Od.* 11.101, 22.137. West (2003a: 127) translates 'with difficulty'.
[121] See West (2013: 190–1). [122] See further Latacz *et al.* (2003: 37–8).
[123] For anastrophe of *anti* (another 'late' feature acc. to Wackernagel (1916: 181–2), cf. *Il.* 13.447, 14.471, 23.650; also 8.163, 24.254, Hes. *Theog.* 893.
[124] *HHomAphr.* 202–4, 210–17 agrees with the *Iliad* on both points; cf. also Severyns (1928: 342–7).
[125] See above, p. 326.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020

tragically noble figure (already at *Od.* 11.519–22), duped by a greedy mother into going to war (as Amphiaraus by Eriphyle; cf. 15.246–7, 11.326–7),[126] the new genealogy isolates the infection, as it were, within the line of Laomedon and Priam as the prime arena for the events which eventually doom the city (cf. *Il.* 20.301–8). Certainly, the ring-compositional emphasis on the gift's purpose ironically underscores Priam's responsibility and limited vision: an item given to compensate a parent for a child's loss is now used, by that child's brother, to bribe another parent into losing her child.[127] Moreover, in a poem which opens with the topic *Dardaniēn eupōlon* (*PEG* F 28 = F 1 D. = F 1 W.), this new gift may also have cancelled the Homeric slur that Aeneas' father had surreptitiously bred from Laomedon's horses (*Il.* 5.265–72), though it is possible that the story was retained elsewhere in the poem, or that Aeneas had an immortal team sourced in some other way. On the other hand, it would be entirely characteristic of the *Ilias parva* to downplay the divine origin of Aeneas' team so as to undermine the significance of their capture by Diomedes.[128]

CONCLUSION

At some point after the creation of the Homeric poems in the eighth or seventh centuries BC, and (at least) before the last quarter of the fifth century, the *Ilias parva* was composed by someone whom later antiquity knew as Lesches of Lesbos. Its narrative was so engaged with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as perhaps to have earned – or justified – the title which prioritized that relationship. Its central figure was Odysseus, whose triumphs characterize and determine the poem's focus on ambush and deception. Its poet was inventive and skilled: he had a noticeable talent for striking metaphor and expressive syntax, he was traditionally trained and fluent, whilst at the same time interacting directly with the Homeric poems. Though the smaller and lesser of the *Iliads* famous in antiquity, its meagre remains give us reason enough to regret its loss.

[126] See West (2013: 191) for further parallels, esp. the expression *gynaiōn heineka dōrōn* (*Od.* 11.521 of Astyoche, *Od.* 15.247 of Eriphyle).

[127] See above, pp. 336 and 339 on *PEG* F 21.9–11 (= F 20.9–11 D. = F 30.4–6 W.) and *PEG* F 21.1–2 (= F 20.1–2 D. = F 30.1–2 W.), and p. 341 on *PEG* F 24 (= F 4 D. = F 4 W.) for this type of generational continuity.

[128] See above, pp. 330–1 and n. 69 on *PEG* F 28.1 (= F 1.1 D. = F 1.1 W.).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford, on 28 Nov 2019 at 11:14:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511998409.020