Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in Hyginus' *Fabulae*[1]

R. SCOTT SMITH
University of New Hampshire
scott.smith@unh.edu

Hyginus' *Fabulae* is an enigmatic text. Not only is it the only self-standing mythographical collection transmitted in Latin from the Classical period, but it also happens to be unique among mythographical texts in its varied form and structure. It includes both narrative summaries and lists; provides both overviews of entire sagas (e.g., *Fab.* 1-27, the Argonaut adventure) and one-off entries (e.g. *Fab.* 28, Otus and Ephialtes); and draws on several source-types, including (summaries of) tragedies, epic narratives, catalogs, and doubtlessly other mythographical collections.[2] Despite its unique position in the history of mythography and its reputation in antiquity (by 207 CE, at least) as being "known to all" (*Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* p. 103-4

[1] I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers of *Polymnia* for their close reading and suggestions, which greatly improved this article. Of course, all remaining errors or infelicities are my own.

[2] For overviews of Hyginus see FLETCHER (2022, 2013), SMITH (2022), and SMITH and TRZASKOMA (2007: xlii-lv).

Flammini), the *Fabulae* remains a rather neglected work – a symptom both of its perceived derivative nature and of the problematic state of the text, which often renders interpretation difficult.[3] Here, as part of a volume dedicated to mythographical responses to Homer, I intend to fill one small gap in Hyginian studies by considering, holistically, the ways in which Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are recast, manipulated, and redeployed as they are integrated into a new and unique format. While some commentators have offered occasional insights into some of the Homeric material in the *Fabulae*, or have treated one entry at length (e.g., ALVES 2013 on *Fab.* 125), no analysis yet exists that considers the material systematically.

This study will approach the text, problematic as it is, as we have it rather than seek to recover some putative original lying beneath the surface. A great deal of effort has gone into the questions of who "Hyginus" was, when he lived, whether the original language was Latin or Greek, how the surviving text relates to some authorial intention, and what counts as original and what as interpolation.[4] I instead prefer to view the *Fabulae* as the endpoint of an evolutionary process, reflecting the way in which someone at some point chose to present the material to an audience of specifically Latin readers. Multiple versions of the *Fabulae* certainly existed in antiquity, of which ours "is just a snapshot, one moment of its life frozen in time" (FLETCHER 2013: 162). Such an approach invites us to consider, for instance, the peculiar narrative of *Odyssey* 14-22 in *Fab.* 126 not as an interpolation full of howlers, but as part of the overall strategy of one author of the *Fabulae*. It is with this text that we will deal, using "Hyginus" as shorthand for the existing work.

What follows here is not a line-by-line assessment of how Hyginus employs or manipulates specific material from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; that will be left for a new philological and mythographical commentary of the *Fabulae*, which is sorely needed.[5] Instead, this essay will cast a wide lens on the topic to achieve two goals. First, it will look to establish the ways in which Homer's epics are recast and redeployed into new forms, taking into consideration not only the original texts themselves, but also the rich storehouse of Homeric exegesis and the long and varied reception of the epic tradition (see below). Second, it will consider the goals of Hyginus' reshaping of the epic material into a form that is nowhere else encountered in Homeric exegesis or mythographical texts. Given the lack of a programmatic statement on the

[3] There is no need to rehearse the difficulty Micyllus, the first editor, had in reading the Beneventan script, or the fact that the original text was lost after Micyllus' transcription. See MARSHALL (2002, p. vi-viii).

[4] See ROSE (1963, p. iii-xvi); BORIAUD (2003, p. vii-xiii); FLETCHER (2022), with further bibliography, and (2013). On the original language of the *Fabulae* (including the excerpts of Ps.-Dositheus), see CAMERON (2004, p. 33-38).

[5] ROSE (1963) remains serviceable, though outdated; see also GUIDORIZZI (2000), DEL HOYO and GARCÍA RUIZ (2009), and GASTI (2017), all of which provide commentary with their translations.

part of Hyginus, any explanation will have to remain in the realm of speculation, but it is no giant leap to suggest that the material in the *Fabulae* reflects the ways in which Hyginus wanted his readership to encounter "Homer" – that is, not primarily as a literary text, but as a repository of mythical data that can be presented in a variety of formats. Unlike Apollodorus' *Bibliotheke* (*Epit.* 4.1-4.8, 7.1-7.33), which provides narrative summaries of the epics as part of his wider project, or the book-by-book *hypotheseis* of the epics,[6] Hyginus reshapes and recasts the material in innovative ways that integrates it with data from the epic cycle or rewrites the episodes to follow a strict – and non-literary – chronological order.

Such effacement of the literary status of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* may seem surprising given their centrality in education, both in the Greek world and among Latin speakers of the Roman empire, and their pervasiveness as cultural touchstones.[7] Yet, Homer's name does not appear at all in the *Fabulae* except in *Fab.* 183, which is problematic and does not, as far as we can tell, point to any material in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. In fact, we rarely find *any* source cited in the *Fabulae*.[8] One may compare the numerous sources cited in the *De Astronomia*, also attributed to Hyginus,[9] or in Apollodorus' *Bibliotheke*.[10] When Hyginus does refer to a specific source, the citation is often suspect.[11] Thus, the absence of Homer's name may be part of a broader plan of the *Fabulae* to downplay authorship in the service of presenting something approaching an abstract mythical system. A similar situation occurs in the catalog and narrative of the Argonaut adventure in *Fab.* 14, which effaces the

[6] For a survey of book-by-book summaries see the overview of VAN ROSSUM-STEENBEEK (1997, p. 69-72).

[7] SMITH and TRZASKOMA (2022); CRIBIORE (2001, p. 194-197); MARROU (1982, p. 162-163); BONNER (1977, p. 213).

[8] See WERTH (1901, p. 15-17) for list and discussion; generally see FLETCHER (2022, p. 203-205).

[9] It is highly likely that the same Hyginus is responsible for both the *Fabulae* (under its original title *Genealogies*) and the *De Astronomia* given the likely cross-reference at *Astr.* 2.12.2. As SMITH (2022, p. 101) puts it, "it seems rather improbable that the Hyginus of *On Astronomy* was referring to a second, wholly unknown work entitled *Genealogies* in Latin." The six citations of Homer in Hyginus' astronomical work are owed to his source, Ps.-Eratosthenes' *Catasterisms*; studies have shown that his citations line up, in the same order, as the Greek epitome of that work (ZUCKER, 2015). The low number is doubtlessly owed to the facts that catasteristic literature is a post-Classical activity, and that when Homer mentions constellations, it is usually without narrative content. All references to Homer, then, are likely drawn from Homeric exegesis or indirectly from other sources.

[10] See the articles in PÀMIAS (2017), esp. FOWLER (2017); TRZASKOMA (2022, p. 158-159). Apollodorus' *Bibliotheke* contains five references to Homer (though none in his summaries of the epics).

[11] WERTH (1901, p. 15-17). On problematic source attributions in mythographical works see CAMERON (2004, p. 89-123).

author of Apollonius' *Argonautica* in favor of presenting the material as data.[12] Furthermore, Hyginus' willingness to present divergent information, or include additional details, also places him in the camp of those authors who feel both a debt to Homer while looking for "ways of escaping the bondage of that debt" (HUNTER 2004: 250), though without the ax-grinding that characterizes the anti-Homerist stance of Dares, Dictys and Philostratus.

Of course, "Homer" means more than just the textual repository for the texts of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and his status as a cultural authority that "stands by all of us" as we move from infancy through each of our stages of life reminds us that Homer was as powerful as an *idea* as he was as the author of a *text* (Heraclitus, *Homeric Problems* 1.5-7). As Hunter puts it regarding Greek literature of the Roman Empire, "it is now Homer's cultural power, rather than the detailed interpretation of his verses, which holds our attention."[13] And it is not only in Greek literature and culture that Homer looms; Farrell reminds us there was "pervasive Homeric presence in material culture and social practice" (2004: 254) in the Roman world that went well beyond the Homeric texts themselves. It is thus not surprising that in breaking down and reshaping the material in Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Hyginus also transmits post-Homeric interpretations or developments that are not found in the texts themselves. In other words, Hyginus not only looks to Homer as a textual source but also projects the epics through the lens of other writers, commentators, and artists, whether consciously or not.

One final point: this essay privileges the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* because of their special status as the most important (not to mention complete) epics from the Trojan War Cycle. That these epics were what gave Homer his special place in the history of reception is well known and exemplified by the relief entitled *The Apotheosis of Homer* by Archelaus of Priene (3rd c. BCE), where Homer is flanked by kneeling personifications of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. This is not to say that Hyginus was not similarly recasting material from other epics, for instance the *Aethiopis* or the *Ilias Mikra*, or that we can always separate the reception of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* from the broader reception of the Trojan War. Even so, it is the longstanding importance of these texts as central literary texts in education and their wide readership beyond the schools that make Hyginus' presentation so striking and worthy of study. After all, Proclus did not feel the need to summarize any of the contents of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* when he presented his epitome of the epics. The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were simply in a different class of texts. With this in mind, it is time to turn to what the *Fabulae* itself can tell us.

---

[12] The only reference to Apollonius is an offhanded remark on a variant at 14.8: "Apollonius of Rhodes calls [Salamis] Atthis." Otherwise, the Greek author is completely absent, even though many details are drawn from Apollonius' epic (though the catalog of Argonauts, like Hyginus' ship-catalog, contains radical variants and depends on other sources).

[13] HUNTER (2004, p. 250). See also HUNTER (2018), as well as the series of articles on Homeric reception in FINKELBERG (2011, p. 706-14).

I. "Homer" in Hyginus' *Fabulae*: Overview

The *Fabulae* contains only a single explicit reference to Homer, and it is problematic. *Fab.* 183, entitled *Equorum Solis et Horarum Nomina*, first offers a list of names of the Sun's horses given by Eumelus (fr. 11 Tsagalis; fr. 7 Bernabé), followed by those Homer supposedly transmits: *item quos Homerus tradit, Abraxas †iotherbeeo†.*[14] Nowhere in the extant epics do we find any references to the Sun's chariot team; Marshall simply notes in the apparatus "de hoc Homero nihil novimus."[15] Rose follows Bursian's conjecture, that an interpolator reproduced magical names on a gem (*Abraxas Soter Bel Iao*), and reminds us that Homer's *Odyssey* is employed as a peg for a magical text at *P.Oxy.* 412, where we also read the name "Abraxas" among other divinities of various types.[16] Despite the attractiveness of this suggestion, that a magical text somehow found its way into a list in the *Fabulae* here and only here seems far-fetched. Rather, I suggest that, as elsewhere, Hyginus is aware of and drawing on exegesis on Homer, though the exact source is hardly recoverable.[17]

Despite a reluctance to cite Homer, Hyginus does reproduce and reconfigure material from Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in ten *fabulae* within what we might call the "Trojan War Cycle" that runs, in chronological order, for fifty-one entries from *Fab.* 77 (Leda) to 127 (Telegonus):[18]

> *Fab.* 97 (*Those Who Went to Sack Troy and How Many Ships They Had*), which engages with and expands on the Catalog of Ships in *Iliad* 2
> *Fab.* 106 (*The Ransoming of Hector*), in effect a selective summary of the *Iliad*

[14] Throughout I use the text of MARSHALL (2002).
[15] WERTH (1901, p. 16). SCHMIDT (1872, p. 36) brackets as an interpolation both the reference to Homer's names as well as those of Ovid.
[16] BURSIAN (1866, p. 774-5). *P.Oxy.* 412 is a bizarre bit of magical "fan fiction:" see MIDDLETON (2014) for a reevaluation of the text.
[17] It is highly unlikely that Hyginus found the names directly in a text of Eumelus; perhaps Hyginus found (and misinterpreted) this material from Homeric exegesis, as we see hinted at in Schol. *Il.* (T) 23.295b (Erbse), which explain the two genders of horses mentioned in the *Iliad*, Aithe and Podargos, by comparing those of "the writer of the Titanomachy" (=Eumelus). One can imagine a scenario where the compiler of the list in *Fab.* 183 found the names of some horses given by Eumelus in Homeric exegesis, and the compiler awkwardly and inappropriately tried to add Homeric names as well. On this interpretation, the garbled text might hide (for example) Balios, Xanthos and Pedasos (Achilles' horses at *Il.* 16.147–154) or Lampios and Phaethon (Dawn's horses at *Od.* 23.247).
[18] Other entries briefly cover specific events in the epics: at *Fab.* 141.2 (*The Sirens*) Ulysses' successful sailing past the Sirens is mentioned as fulfilling their fate; similarly, at *Fab.* 199.2 (*The Other Scylla*), Ulysses' encounter with Scylla is seen as the latter's revenge against Circe, who poisoned the waters in which she bathed. At *Fab.* 273.13 (*Those Who Established Competitions up to Aeneas, the Fifteenth*), Hyginus incompletely and inaccurately records the funeral games Achilles gives in honor of Patroclus in *Iliad* 23.

Fab. 112 (*Challengers and Participants in Duels*), engaging with the *Iliad*, not exclusively
Fab. 113 (*The Deaths of Illustrious Men and Their Killers*), engaging with the *Iliad*, not exclusively
Fab. 114 (*How Many Each Achaean Killed*), engaging with the *Iliad*, not exclusively
Fab. 115 (*How Many Each Trojan Killed*), engaging with the *Iliad*, not exclusively
Fab. 118 (*Proteus*), drawing on *Od.* 4 for Menelaus' homecoming (*Od.* 4.351-592).
Fab. 121 (*Chryses Jr.*), the story, doubtlessly post-Homeric, of Orestes and Chryses Jr. is prefaced by a summary of the action of *Iliad* 1 and predicated on the detail that Agamemnon sent Chryseis home pregnant
Fab. 125 (*The Odyssey*), a lengthy and fairly accurate summary of the epic, with heavy focus on books 9-12
Fab. 126 (*The Recognition of Ulysses*), a somewhat garbled account of Ulysses' activities on Ithaca (*Od.* 14-22)

II. A Summary of the *Iliad*?

Fab. 106, which occupies roughly one Teubner page, is entitled *Hectoris Lytra* (*The Ransom of Hector*) in the text but simply *Hector* in the Table of Contents. Because lost plays of Aeschylus and Ennius also bear a similar title, and because there are some slight discrepancies between Hyginus' and Homer's accounts, some have interpreted this entry as reflecting a tragic source, although the *fabula* begins and ends precisely at the same points as the *Iliad* itself.[19] The basic contents of the *fabula* derive entirely from the epic, though the narrative is highly selective. The account starts with Agamemnon's taking of Briseis after he returns Chryseis to Chryses (*Il.* 1), leading to Achilles' angry withdrawal to his tent and cithara-playing (*Il.* 1, 9). When the Greeks are hard-pressed by Hector (*Il.* 11-15), Patroclus upbraids Achilles, who gives him his arms. With these, he routs the Trojans and kills Sarpedon, only for himself be killed and despoiled by Hector (*Il.* 16). At this point Achilles reconciles with Agamemnon (*Il.* 19) but when Achilles sets out to attack without armor,[20] his mother Thetis procures arms from Vulcan

[19] BORIAUD (2003, p. 84) n. on *Fab.* 106.1 sees Hyginus "in all probability" giving the outline of the Ennian version; GUIDORIZZI (2000, p. 362 n. 549), who notes minor discrepancies between Hyginus' and Homer's accounts, is also inclined to see Ennius' tragedy as the immediate source, though he also considers the possibility that Hyginus has "mixed up" various sources (cf. Gasti *ad loc.*). ROSE (*ad loc.*) points to the *Iliad* as the primary source, as does VAN ROSSUM-STEENBEEK (1997, p. 72).

[20] The text suggests that Achilles did in fact proceed into battle unarmed, against Homer and common sense: *tum contra Hectorem cum inermis prodisset*. Perhaps we should correct to *...prodire voluisset*, "when he was *about* to go forth."

(*Il.* 18).[21] These two scenes are out of order, but the delivery of the arms seems to be postponed so as to lead directly into the next action (*quibus armis*). With these arms Achilles kills Hector and drags him around the walls of Troy (*Il.* 22). Finally, Priam, led by Mercury, enters the Greek camp, ransoms his son with gold, and buries him – ending the entry with the same event as the epic itself (*Il.* 24).

Hyginus's account, then, includes only the chain of events from the *Iliad* that directly lead to Hector's demise, thus fulfilling the promise of the title and the goal of the *Iliad* itself. There is no mention of Menelaus' and Paris' duel, Pandarus' breaking of the truce, Diomedes' *aristeia* and wounding of Aphrodite, Hector's and Ajax's duel, the building of the beach wall, the embassy to Achilles, the night raid on Rhesus' forces, the wounding of the Greek leaders, the burning of the ships, etc. – all of which are found in Apollodorus' more extensive summary (*Epit.* 4.1-4.6) and in the book-by-book summaries that serve more directly to report the epic content. Although the material derives from the *Iliad*, Hyginus has markedly reduced the scope and organized his brief narrative to fit within his globalizing narrative of the Trojan War – it is but one episode among many.

It is necessary here to discuss the two discrepancies, first, that the Nereids and not Thetis bring Vulcan's arms to Achilles, and second, the specification that Priam ransomed Hector with gold (*auro repensum*) instead of the more general "fine gifts" in the *Iliad*. Both of these have been used to support the tragic source thesis. To take the former, while it is true that the Aeschylean trilogy ending with the *Ransom of Hector* contains a play called the *Nereids*, there is no evidence that it included a scene where the Nereids deliver the arms to Achilles, nor is it found in the fragments of Ennius' adaptation of the trilogy (*Hectoris Lytra*). It is hardly necessary to point to a literary source at all, however, since there are numerous images in Greek and Roman art showing the Nereids delivering the arms.[22] In terms of the later discrepancy, we do have evidence that Aeschylus' *Phrygians* (or *Ransoming of Hector*), one of Ennius' likely sources, specified that Priam paid Hector's weight in gold (schol. Hom. *Il.* 22.351b – c Erbse), a detail that Ennius may have followed even though no fragment survives to confirm that it was present in his play. However, the payment in gold is deeply embedded elsewhere in Latin literature as well: Plaut. *Merc.* 487-88, Verg. *Aen.* 1.483-84, *Ilias Latina* 981.

[21] That Hyginus dwells ever so briefly on Achilles' new arms is explained not only because they are necessary for Hector's death, but also because it prepares the reader for the judgment of the arms that is the focus of the next entry (*Fab.* 107, *Armorum Iudicium*).

[22] As noted by GUIDORIZZI (2000, p. 363 n. 551) (citing *LIMC* s.v. "Nereides" nos. 315-70); see also extensive bibliography at MILLER (1986, p. 159 n. 2), starting with HEYDEMANN (1879). ROSE (*ad loc.*) attributes the discrepancy to a faulty memory of the part of Hyginus, a less likely scenario.

The expanded Servian commentary on the Vergilian lines also preserves a summary of the events similar in form to Hyginus', including the exact phrase found in Hyginus, *auro repensum*.[23] Thus, there is no imperative to insist that Hyginus was following Ennius rather than what might be called the mythological *koine* of the time.

Another possible point in favor of seeing the *Iliad* as the most visible model for this *fabula* is the retention of a Homeric epithet: *quo Chryseida Chrysi sacerdoti Apollonis Zminthei reddidit [Agamemnon]*.[24] The meaning of the obscure *Smintheus* was widely debated since Homer used it as an epithet of Apollo at *Iliad* 1.39, and ancient commentators were generally split between those who interpreted the epithet as deriving from *sminthoi*, a Cretan word for mice (hence Apollo as god of plagues), or from a real placename, Sminthe, a city in the Troad, an interpretation favored by Aristarchus (Apoll. Soph. s.v. "Smintheu;" cf. Steph. Byz. s.v., Schol. (A, D) *Il.* 1.39). As it happens, this is one of the few instances where Hyginus uses a divine epithet in the *Fabulae* and so it is all the more noteworthy. As elsewhere in this text, this epithet probably refers to the geographical setting,[25] and – in addition to highlighting the *Iliadic* context – may be preparing the reader for the narrative events at *Fab.* 120-121, where the post-Iliadic action takes place specifically in Zminthe (*Fab.* 120.).[26]

III. Lists and Catalogs: Duels, Deaths of Prominent Characters, and a List of Combatants

Several lists – *Fab.* 97 and 112-115 – also show engagement with the contents of the *Iliad*, though integrating the data into a wider matrix of the

[23] It is worth quoting the narrative *historia* preserved in the expanded Servius (DS) ad *Aen.* 1.483 in full: *sane huius rei ordo talis est. Patroclus cum iratum Achillem propter Briseidem sublatam ut adversum Troianos pugnaret exorare non posset, petit ab eo arma quae Peleo Vulcanus fecerat; quibus indutus dum Achilles crederetur, fugatis Troianis omnibus etiam plurimos interemit, ipse vero ab Hectore occisus est. quo dolore Achilles conpulsus, inpetratis per matrem a Vulcano armis, Hectorem proelio superatum peremit, eiusque corpus ad currum religatum circa muros Ilii traxit, quod post placatus auro repensum Priamo reddidit.*

[24] It is impossible to know for certain whether Hyginus is specifically thinking of the Homeric model, for the epithet was widely discussed outside of Homeric exegesis (see, e.g. Strabo 13.1.18, Aelian *Nat. An.* 12.5), but the fact that it is included in the report of the action of *Iliad* 1 is telling.

[25] Most epithets in Hyginus focus on geographic associations and often are used when temples or statues are involved: *Fab.* 186.6 (Diana of Metapontum), 223 (Olympian Jupiter), 225 (Mercury of Cyllene, Jupiter of Dodona), 254 (Argive Juno; cf. 273). The only example of a non-geographic epithet I could find is at *Fab.* 91.6, where Neoptolemus kills Priam on the altar of Jupiter Herceus.

[26] After retrieving the statue of Diana among the Taurians, Orestes and Pylades are driven *ad insulam Zminthen.* Although labeled as an *insula*, Zminthe is probably meant here to be a promontory or peninsula, a loose usage as is seen at *Fab.* 15.2 (*insulam Tauricam*) and 79.2 (*Taenariam insulam*).

Trojan War. We will start with the latter set of *fabulae*, which are unique in their mythographical approach, to establish the ways in which the *Iliadic* material is amalgamated with events from beyond the scope of the epic. The list at *Fab.* 112 (*Challengers and Participants in Duels*), for instance, starts with the duel between Menelaus and Paris in *Iliad* 3 and moves, accurately and in mostly proper order,[27] to Hector's death (112.1-4).[28] This occupies the first three-fourths of the entry. But then the *fabula* continues with post-*Iliadic* engagements, for instance Achilles' duels with Penthesilea and Memnon, Philoctetes' with Paris, and finally Neoptolemus' victory over Eurypylus – the final duel in the war before the horse is built.[29] One might expect to encounter a duel from before the events of the *Iliad*, but neither Proclus' summary of the *Cypria* nor the surviving fragments indicate any duel before those of the *Iliad*. In other words, Hyginus seems to be reproducing the fact that duels involving speech-acts in the Trojan War start with that of Menelaus and Paris in the *Iliad*.

Further integration is also found in added details. In the "Iliadic" part of the *fabula*, Hyginus reports the exchange of objects between Ajax and Hector after their duel (*Il.* 7.299-305) but connects them to events beyond the scope of the *Iliad*: *Aiax Hectori donavit balteum, unde est tractus, Hector Aiaci gladium, unde se interfecit*. This information is clearly derived from Homeric exegesis as evidenced by Eustathius and elsewhere (cf. *Fab.* 107.3), where the connection was already made explicit.[30] Furthermore, we might point to the "afterlife" of Euphorbus, whose reincarnation as Pythagoras is highlighted in the Hyginian *fabula*.[31] Thus, the list, though it starts with the first significant duel

---

[27] Achilles' encounter with Aeneas (*Il.* 20) and Agenor (*Il.* 21) are presented out of order as taking place after Hector's death (*Il.* 22).

[28] The criterion for these duels seems to be speech-acts (hence the title *provocantes*), which are found for all duels in the *Iliad* (the strange inclusion of the non-existent "another Glaucus" notwithstanding). Whether the battles between Achilles and Penthesilea and Memnon included speeches is not clear but it seems likely given the elaborate summary in Proclus' *Aithiopis* and given Hyginus' inclusion of them here.

[29] See Proclus' summary of *Ilias Mikra*, where Eurypylus' death immediately precedes the building of the horse; Apd. *Epit.* 5.12; Homer, *Od.* 11.505-533; cf. *Little Iliad* fr. 7 West). See Del Hoyo and Garcia Ruiz (*ad loc.*, 199-200 n. 491), who note that the additional duels may derive from the epic cycle.

[30] See EUSTATHIUS (682.47-48): Αἴας μὲν γὰρ τῷ τοιούτῳ ξίφει ἑαυτὸν κατειργάσατο, Ἕκτωρ δὲ τῷ δωρηθέντι ζωστῆρι ἄρματος ἐκδεθεὶς ἀπελωβήθη μετὰ θάνατον. Cf. Tzetz. ad Lycophr. 464-66 (drawing in part on Soph. *Ai.* 661-65). One might compare the summary of *Iliad* 7 in Ps.-Dositheus which mentions the exchange only: *et accipiebant Aeas quidem ab Hectore gladium, ab Aiace autem Hector balteum* (FLAMMINI, 2004, p. 109).

[31] Hyginus specifically recalls that Pythagoras "recalled that his soul passed into bodies," echoing the personal statement Pythagoras was said to give in his lives (DK 14.8 = Diog. Laert. 8.1.4-5), but Hyginus seems to be drawing on Ovid for the phrase *in corpora transisse* (Ovid, *Met.* 15.167 *in corpora transit*). This would add further support for the notion that Ovid's presence in the *Fabulae* is greater than previously recognized: see FLETCHER (2013: 149-156).

in the *Iliad*, in fact encompasses the whole war and establishes connections between that epic and the broader mythical tradition.

The next list at *Fab.* 113 (*The Deaths of Illustrious Men and Their Killers*) is essentially an addendum to the previous entry. It likewise includes the deaths of prominent figures drawn primarily from the *Iliad*, but it also covers both pre- (Hector's killing of Protesilaus) and post-*Iliadic* events (Apollo's killing of Achilles, Menelaus' of Deiphobus, Neoptolemus' of Priam). That there are errors (again, perhaps caused during transmission)[32] is less important for our purposes than the fact that this list, like the previous one, sees the *Iliad* as part and parcel of the whole war.

Fab. 114 (*How Many Each Achaean Killed*) has been rather ignored because the numbers are wildly inaccurate when compared to the actual numbers in the *Iliad*. This led Rose *ad loc.* to dismiss their contents as *grammaticorum quisquilias* with a mere three lines of commentary. Boriaud and Guidorizzi have no comment. Be that as it may, Hyginus' list includes not only characters found in the *Iliad*, but also Protesilaus, Philoctetes, and Neoptolemus.[33] As it happens, the numbers given for Philoctetes (3) and Neoptolemus (6) are close or agree entirely with the numbers we know as reported in the fragments of the *Little Iliad* (2 and 6 respectively). Although we do not learn of any specific Trojan killed by Protesilaus from the *Cypria*, Apollodorus reports that he killed several barbarians before he was killed by Hector (*Epit.* 3.30), rendering Hyginus' report of four Trojans killed entirely plausible.

The numbers reported in *Fab.* 114, then, are not limited to the information in the *Iliad*, but meant to reflect the entire Trojan War. If this is the case, comparison with just the *Iliad* will naturally lead to discrepancies. Achilles' total – 72! – may include both those he killed in the *Iliad* (24 named figures in the main narrative) and those he killed in raids prior to the Trojan

---

[32] For instance, Hector not Deiphobus kills Autonous (*Il.* 11.301); Achilles not Ajax kills Hippodamas (*Il.* 20.480); depending on which Chromius is meant at 113.2, it is either Diomedes (5.160-64), Ulysses (5.677) or Teucer (8.275) who is the killer, not Ajax; and Pylaemenes is killed by Menelaus (5.577-79), not Achilles. See DEL HOYO and GARCIA RUIZ (2009, p. 201-202). One wonders if the use of *idem* was the source of the confusion, leading to three misattributions. In typical fashion, SCHMIDT (1872, p. 100) aggressively "corrects" the *fabula* to bring it more in line with the *Iliad* and other sources.

[33] It is worth pointing out here that Homer's *Catalog of Ships* includes both Protesilaus and Philoctetes, alluding to their participation in the broader war. Four Greeks who kill a Trojan on the battlefield are omitted in Hyginus' count: Euryalos (killed 4 in book 6), Meges (killed 3 *passim*), Automedon and Lycomedes (1 each in book 17). In the list of Trojans (*Fab.* 115), two names appear that are not present in the *Iliad* (Gargasus and Clytus), and four are omitted: Antiphos (1 in book 4), Peiroos (1 in book 4), Helenos (1 in book 13) and Polites (1 in book 15).

War and after. Turning to *Fab.* 115 (*How Many Each Trojan Killed*), Hector's total of 31 is three more than reported in the *Iliad*, but perhaps the number is meant to include Hector's killing of Protesilaus as reported in the *Cypria* and Apollodorus, and perhaps others. As it happens, several of the numbers for the Trojan fighters in *Fab.* 115 agree with those in the *Iliad*[34] – perhaps explained by the fact that Trojan fighters are confined mainly to Homer's *Iliad*, with few exceptions. The *Cypria*, it turns out, is almost singularly focused on the Greek side; the only Trojan to kill someone is Hector (Protesilaus). Similarly, in post-Iliadic events, the Trojans virtually recede from view, supplanted by allies such as Penthesilea, Memnon, and Eurypylus. At any rate, the point here is not to try and rectify the numbers given in Hyginus, which is impossible in certain cases, and we must be aware that textual corruption may be responsible.[35] Rather, the key takeaway is that none of these entries (*Fab.* 112-115) is focused solely on the *Iliad* itself, but seeks to integrate that information into the wider matrix of the Trojan War, in a form otherwise not found in mythographical texts or Homeric scholarship.

IV. The Catalog of Ships in Hyginus' *Fabulae* (*Fab.* 97)

The last point is important for our fuller discussion of *Fab.* 97, which bears the title *qui ad Troiam expugnatum ierunt et quot naves* in the text. The header immediately evokes the famous Catalog of Ships at *Iliad* 2.484-760 (henceforth "Catalog"), but by no means is it intended to merely replicate the original, as has been long recognized and will be evident presently.[36] Hyginus' enumeration of Greek heroes and their ships is but one of many adaptations of the Catalog, most of which diverge, to a lesser or greater extent, from Homer's text.[37] While Apollodorus' list (*Epit.* 3.11) closely adheres to his Homeric model for the Greek contingents in the order and the number of ships,[38] other catalogs may be accurate in reporting the contingents and number of ships but vary in terms of order of presentation, or even present radically different versions. The catalog of ships in Dictys of Crete's *Ephemeris Belli Troiani* (ch. 17), for instance, rearranges the order

[34] "Numerus Graecorum ab Alexandro Sarpedone Polydamante Acamante Agenore occisorum cum homerico Iliadis convenit" (SCHMIDT, 1872, p. 101).

[35] For instance, the figures given for Odysseus (12) and Menelaus (8) are lower than those reported in the *Iliad* (19 and 10 respectively).

[36] One might also point to the catalog of Argonauts in *Fab.* 14, which varies considerably from that in Apollonius' *Argonautica* and relies, to some degree, on another catalog with otherwise unknown names corroborated on papyri.

[37] For a summary of catalogs and their relationship to the Homeric original see ALLEN (1921, p. 23-31). On the Homeric catalog itself see EDWARDS (1980), KIRK (1985) (*ad loc.*), and VISSER (1997).

[38] Apart from one contingent out of order and the total number of ships being slightly off, Apollodorus follows Homer's. See WAGNER (1891, p. 416), ALLEN (1921, p. 26-27).

considerably, moving Agamemnon and Menelaus to the front of the list among other changes in order (his other catalog and the addition of four other participants will be addressed below).[39] The *Ilias Latina*, which likewise follows Homer's data closely, similarly rearranges the order and moves Agamemnon and Menelaus up so as to immediately follow the Boeotian contingent.[40] Dares' *Historia de Excidio Troiae*, like Dictys' *Ephemeris*, privileges Agamemnon and Menelaus moving them to the very beginning, just in front of the Locrians; his numbers generally line up with Homer's but for some exceptions, but his order is as varied as those of the previous two authors.[41] We may also point to Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis* 164-302, where the chorus of Chalcidian women recount what they see on their arrival at Aulis. Their report features not one but two catalogs, first a list of prominent Greek fighters the women see on arrival at Aulis, starting with Agamemnon and Menelaus (164-230), then a more systematic account of the *naustathmos*, starting with Achilles' ship and ending with that of Telamonian Ajax (231-302). The account often includes details drawn from Homer, but there are differences in presentation, omissions of principal characters, and only a few reports of the number of ships (though always in line with the Homeric model).

This brief survey of other catalogs reveals a variety of responses to the original, but scholarship has tended to see changes made to Homer's catalog as debasement. For instance, Dictys' addition of four further Greeks – Thersander, Calchas, Mopsus and Epeus – prompts a derisive statement from Allen, "The assaults to which the Catalogue was subject all its life are well exemplified" (1921: 28). Smith similarly renders judgment on both Dares' and Dictys' lists, pointing to the former's giving Nireus 53 ships instead of 3 (the "greatest absurdity"), before concluding, "[Dares'] list is therefore inferior to those of the *Ilias Latina* and Dictys, who it has been shown would have been excellent but for an addendum unjustified by Homer's text" (1980: 244).

Such criticisms, which assume later catalogs ought merely to replicate the original, completely ignore the larger context of literary works in which they are found. Dictys' addition for four other Greek fighters, for instance, serves at least two purposes.[42] First, it includes Greeks who are important to the Trojan War but are not included in the Catalog, for instance Calchas, whose

---

[39] See SMITH (1980, p. 243-244). On Dictys generally see MERKLE (1989) and DOWDEN (2022). Dictys actually presents *two* catalogs, one a mustering of support in Argos to prepare for war (1.12-13), the other a ship-catalog proper (1.17).
[40] See GREEN (2019).
[41] See VON FLESCHENBERG (1908, p. 96-115). On Dares generally see CLARK (2020) and DOWDEN (2022).
[42] See MARBLESTONE (1970: 109-110).

role in *Iliad* 1 and elsewhere is important for the development of the action. The addition of the other three figures widen the scope beyond the epic, recognizing that there were Greeks who fought at Troy but whose roles were post-Iliadic, for example Epeus, the builder of the Trojan Horse. But more importantly, these additional players anticipate their roles in events that *actually take place in Dictys' work*. In book 2 Thersander dies at the hands of Telephus in Mysia (Dictys 2.2; cf. *Cypria* Arg. 7 West, Hesiod, *Cat.* fr. 117 Most; Apd. *Epit.* 3.17; Paus. 9.5.14); Epeus repairs ships (Dictys 2.44) and collects wood (3.12) before building the Trojan Horse (5.9, 5.11). Calchas plays his normal role as prophet throughout. Mopsus does not appear in the Latin version; perhaps his competition with Calchas in Colophon (see Hesiod *Melamp.* fr. 214 Most; Apd. *Epit.* 6.2-6.4) was present in the Greek original but was lost during translation and abridgement.[43]

With this in mind let us turn now to the catalog in Hyginus (*Fab.* 97). It is important to realize at the outset that much of the list may be corrupt not because of the incompetence of Hyginus, but because of the problematic history of the text itself.[44] The number of ships often diverges substantially from Homer's, as do the geographical origins.[45] Furthermore, although Hyginus, in contrast to Homer, is keen to provide both fathers and mothers for participants,[46] many of the names may be unattested at best or lost forever through corruption at worst. A case that lies somewhere in the middle may show how difficult assessment of names can be. At 97.2 Patroclus is said to be the son of Menoetius and "Pilomella" (as Micyllus presents it in the *editio princeps*); from Schol. (V) *Od.* 4.343 and Eustathius *ad loc.* we learn that Philomela was his mother's name, so Muncker (and subsequent editors) print "Philomela." And yet, we learn from Apollodorus that the mother's name varied widely:[47] Sthenele, Periopis, or Polymele, the last of which might also work paleographically in Hyginus. Similarly, some names of otherwise unknown participants found in Hyginus may simply be corruptions of known characters. At 97.13 Marshall and Rose both conservatively print the name "Cycnus," a son of Ocitus, as found in Micyllus' *editio princeps*. No Cycnus is found in Homer's catalog, but the name is almost certainly a corruption of "Guneus," who listed as son of Ocytos at Apd. *Epit.* 3.11 (Homer does not provide his father's name) – a correction proposed by Bunte and followed by Schmidt. If this is correct, as it seems it

[43] See DOWDEN (2022, p. 135-136), MERKLE (1989, p. 113-123, p. 263-286).
[44] See above note 3.
[45] ALLEN (1921, p. 26-27). The theory of SCHMIDT (1866) that Hyginus' text substantially preserves the order of combatants of the Ps.-Aristotelian *Peplos* unnecessarily seeks an alternative source for Hyginus' catalog and in any case misunderstands the breadth of heroes in that text (see now GUTZWILLER 2010, p. 222-227).
[46] See von FLESCHENBERG (1908, p. 98).
[47] A point mooted by BUNTE (*ad loc.* p. 86 with note).

is, Cycnus is not an additional player in the war, but rather the corruption of a known Greek fighter listed in the Homeric catalog.

Rather than rehearsing the numerous discrepancies between Hyginus and Homer's catalog, we will here focus on the additions of several Greek fighters to Hyginus' list. For ease of organization, we'll first consider the additions to the beginning of the list, mostly attendants of major characters left out of Homer's catalog, and second, the additions made, like those in Dictys', at the end.

Like the catalogs in Dictys and Dares, Agamemnon and Menelaus are given pride of place. They are immediately followed by other major players in the Trojan War: Achilles, Ajax son of Telamon, Ulysses, Diomedes, Ajax son of Oileus, and Nestor. It is perhaps worth pointing out that these players are also given the highest number of "kills" in *Fab.* 114, highlighting their importance to the war itself. The six fighters added to the first part of the catalog are relatives and associates of these major characters:

> 1) Achilles' entourage: **Phoenix** son of Amyntor, 50 ships; **Automedon**, Achilles charioteer, from Scyros, 10 ships; and **Patroclus** son of Menoetius and Philomela (?), from Phthia, 10 ships.
> 2) Ajax son of Telamon is accompanied by his half-brother, **Teucer**, who leads 12 ships.
> 3) Nestor's two sons, **Thrasymedes** and **Antilochus**, are explicitly given ships (15 and 20 respectively), but the order is confused. The way it is presented in Micyllus' text and printed by Marshall and Rose, Thrasymedes would be the brother of *Nestor*, the son of Neleus and Eurydice, though the latter is Nestor's wife in *Od.* 3.404-463. It's likely that Hyginus or possibly Micyllus has inadvertently reversed the order, and Thrasymedes was originally *Antilochus'* half-brother.[48]

These additions are clearly meant to complete, to a large extent, the full cast of characters which are important to the *Iliad*, and beyond in the case of Antilochus. In other words, Hyginus is making up for the missing characters that are not found in Homer's original – again, producing his own matrix of information. A comparison with Dictys' presentation reveals some unexpected similarities. Although Dictys does not add these characters to his catalog of ships proper (1.17), he includes all but one of these in a separate mini-catalog of characters that show up in Argos before the full marshalling

[48] This is how Ruhl in Roscher's lexicon takes it (vol. 5, s.v. Thrasymedes, col. 865-866), who clearly accepted Scheffer's inverting the order found in Micyllus' edition. Perhaps the text should be corrected so as to follow the model of Ajax and Teucer earlier in the *fabula*: *Nestor Nelei et Chloridis <Amphionis> filiae filius Pylius, navibus XC. Antilochus Nestoris <ex Anaxibia> filius Pylius, navibus XX. Thrasymedes frater <eius> ex Eurydice Pylius, navibus XV*.

of the Greek fighters at Aulis.[49] At 1.13, Ajax son of Telamon is the first to arrive, accompanied by his half-brother Teucer.[50] Soon afterwards Nestor shows up with two sons, Antilochus and Thrasymedes (here Anaxibia is the mother of them both). When Achilles arrives (1.14), he is accompanied by both Patroclus and Phoenix. Automedon is not mentioned, but it looks like Hyginus, in his solitary catalog, is trying to do what Dictys achieved by adding a second catalog of fighters.

As we saw in Dictys, Hyginus also provides additional names at the end, though without attributing any ships to them (97.15):

> **Calchas** Thestoris filius Mycenis augur. **Phocus** Danai filius architectus. **Eurybates et Talthybius** internuntii. **Diaphorus** iudex. **Neoptolemus** Achillis et Deidamiae filius ab insula Scyro.

Von Fleschenberg (1908: 98) argues that the first five in the list are to be viewed as the "staff of the Greek heroes" and thus do not have command of any ships. Similarly Neoptolemus, who enters the war late, does not have an army of his own but inherits his father's men. Calchas, Eurybates and Talthybius are, like the additions to the first part of the list, meant to account for their presence in the *Iliad*. "Phocus son of Danaus" (*sic* Marshall and Rose, following the *editio princeps*) hardly seems possible, both for genealogical (neither Phocus is ever son of Danaus) and chronological reasons (a son of Danaus is far too early to serve in the Trojan War). We are doubtlessly facing a corruption for "Epeus son of Panopeus," as Muncker saw long ago. Epeus, as we saw in Dictys, is a builder (*architectus*) in general and engineer of the Trojan Horse. The name Diaphorus, or what name lies beneath, remains a mystery, as is the indication that he was a "judge" (*iudex*). The inclusion of Epeus (if we are correct) and Neoptolemus, however, moves the catalog beyond the *Iliad* and points, once again, to the conclusion of the Trojan War, as we see in the later lists (*Fab.* 112-113). In every case, then, the *Iliad* has been rewritten so as to organize its material in new ways for a new readership, to offer them a more complete view of the important actors of the whole Trojan War.

---

[49] Dares for his part includes *three* catalogs: an account of the small group that assembles in Sparta, commits to war and names Agamemnon commander (ch. 11); a list of major Trojan and Greek characters in the war, with brief comments on their looks and personality (ch. 12-13); and a catalog of ships proper (ch. 14).

[50] The *Ilias Latina* (line 195) includes Teucer, giving him the three ships given to Nireus in Homer's catalog.

V. Homecomings: *Fab.* 118, 125-126

A similar sort of rewriting – or perhaps we may call it reordering – is encountered in Hyginus' presentation of the material in the *Odyssey*. As we will see presently, Hyginus breaks down the material in the *Odyssey* and reorganizes it into a rather strict chronological presentation, as we find in Apollodorus' *Epitome* (ch. 7). But Hyginus continues to draw on the epic in ways not seen in his Greek counterpart. As a point of departure, we start with *Fab.* 118, which recounts Menelaus' homecoming as part of a series of *nostoi* listed at *Fab.* 116: *at Ulissem ventus detulit ad Maronem, Menelaum in Aegyptum, Agamemnon cum Cassandra in patriam pervenit*. Hyginus then treats them in reverse order, which is, strictly speaking, chronologically correct (see also Apd. *Epit.* 6.29). Agamemnon returns home first (*Fab.* 117, with Orestes picking up from 119-122 after), Menelaus after eight years (*Fab.* 118) and Ulysses after ten (*Fab.* 125-126). The material of *Fab.* 118, however, is drawn from *Odyssey* 4.351-557, with some minor changes,[51] whereas Apollodorus follows the tradition where Proteus is the Egyptian king. Proteus is a *marinus divinus*, able to change into different forms (*Od.* 4.415-8, 455-9), and his daughter Idothea gives Menelaus the information to capture him. More importantly, Hyginus focuses on the *hecatomb* that is the centerpiece of the Odyssean narrative, pointing both to the need to perform it (*id fieri debere* = *Od.* 4.478; cf. 352) and his fulfillment thereof (*Menelaus hecatomben fecit* = *Od.* 4.582), before he can return home, which happens in the eighth year (*post octavum annum*) after he left Troy (=*Od.* 4.82). Of course, in Homer this last point is made well before the narrative involving Proteus; Hyginus has characteristically flattened the Homeric narrative to create chronological coherence for the ease of the reader, while also adding an important translation for his Latin readers (*cum centum armenta occiduntur*).

Fab. 125, entitled "*Odyssea*" in both the text and Table of Contents, points by its title to the Homeric epic. The relationship between Homer's work and Hyginus' "summary" has been recently analyzed by Alves (2013: 51-76), which shows that, despite the epic being "declaradamente central" (52), Hyginus has a tendency to eliminate or reduce the emotional aspects of the epic poem in favor of presenting bare events of the epic. *Fab.* 125 adheres closely to Homer in terms of detail and, to some degree, its order. Naturally, the act of summarizing is selective, and Hyginus not unexpectedly privileges the episodic events told in *Od.* 9-12. Yet the level of detail given to any one episode varies widely. For instance, in the section on Ulysses' visit to the dead, Hyginus does not report his conversation with Tiresias (125.11-12),

[51] As Rose ad loc. points out, Hyginus attributes Menelaus' delay in returning home to the gods' anger over the fall of Troy. In addition, Hyginus specifies that Eidothea instructs Menelaus and his men to bind Proteus with a chain (*catena*), whereas they simply use their arms in the Homeric original. Cf. Ovid, *Fasti* 1.370, where *vincula* is used.

although it is implied in the later parts of the entry (125.15, *bis*). Hyginus also does not include the catalog of women and heroes Ulysses meets, only briefly mentioning his conversation with his mother "about the end of his wandering" (125.12).[52] By contrast, the Elpenor episode is given several lines, and the encounter with the Cyclops is elaborately recounted, including direct speech that replicates the wordplay found in the original (*Utis me excaecat*) – perhaps reflecting its popularity in literature and domestic art.

The last point made also leads us to consider whether Hyginus knew the original Greek. From the very beginning, Hyginus seems to engage with the original:

> Ulyxes cum ab Ilio in patriam Ithacam rediret, tempestate ad Ciconas est delatus, quorum oppidum Ismarum expugnavit praedamque sociis distribuit. (*Fab.* 125.1)

> Ἰλιόθεν με φέρων ἄνεμος Κικόνεσσι πέλασσεν,
> Ἴσμάρῳ. ἔνθα δ' ἐγὼ πόλιν ἔπραθον, ὦλεσα δ' αὐτούς.
> ἐκ πόλιος δ' ἀλόχους καὶ κτήματα πολλὰ λαβόντες
> δασσάμεθ'... (*Od.* 9.39-42)

One might wonder whether Hyginus is following Homer or a pre-existing summary, such as that found in Apd. *Epit.* 7.2, which similarly reports the episode. But Hyginus seems to be over-interpreting the word ἄνεμος as "storm" (*tempestate*),[53] whereas Apollodorus rightly reads that Odysseus simply set sail and this was the first port of call (ἀναχθεὶς δὲ ἀπὸ Ἰλίου προσίσχει πόλει...). This suggests that Hyginus knew Homer and was giving it his own spin. Even so, the summary not unexpectedly leaves out some details. For example, Hyginus leaves out the aftermath of this episode, when the Cicones call for reinforcements and drive Odysseus' men off, killing six per ship, as is reported in Apollodorus. Yet, throughout the whole *fabula* Hyginus hews closely to the original. As mentioned above, the episode involving the Cyclops includes a transliteration of the Greek Οὖτις (*Od.* 9.366 = Hyg. *Fab.* 125.5 *Utis*). The numbers in Hyginus' account mostly line up with those in the *Odyssey*: the Laestrygonians destroy eleven ships (*Od.* 10.130-132 = *Fab.* 125.7); Ulysses sends twenty-two men with Eurylochus (*Od.* 10.208 = *Fab.* 125.8); and Scylla kills six men (*Od.* 12.245 = *Fab.* 125.14). In a remarkable

[52] ALVES (65-66) remarks on the strangeness of this omission given Hyginus' predilection for including catalogs, though reporting such a catalog within a narrative would be unique for the *Fabulae*.

[53] Hyginus' language here echoes other passages and is somewhat formulaic: *Fab.* 16, *tempestate...delati sunt* (Argonauts driven back to Cyzicus); *Fab.* 27 *tempestate est delatus* (Medus diverted to king Perses); *Fab.* 127 *tempestate est delatus* (Telegonus driven to Ithaca); *Fab.* 194 *delatum tempestate* (ship puts in at Corinth).

synthesis of separate episodes, Hyginus reports (*Fab.* 125.15) that both Tiresias (*Od.* 11.100-115) and Circe (*Od.* 12.127-141) warn Ulysses to abstain from touching the Cattle of the Sun.

Of course, there are discrepancies. After his men kill the cattle of the Sun, Ulysses is said to swim to "the island of Aeaea", not to Ogygia, where he stayed with Calypso "for a whole year", not seven, as in Homer's epic (ALVES: 71). As Gasti notes, Apollodorus also contradicts the Homeric model; at *Epit.* 7.25 we learn Odysseus stayed only for five years. In terms of the location, Hyginus is not so much "confused" (GASTI, *ad loc.*) as following a tradition found in Latin poets and geographers: Aeaea is identified as Calypso's island at Pomponius Mela 2.120 and Propertius 3.12.21. Polyphemus cries out "No-one is blinding me" (*excaecat*) instead of "No-one is killing me" (*Od.* 9.408, Apd. *Epit.* 7.7), though this is in fact what Ulysses was doing. After Alcinous sends Ulysses back to Ithaca, Hyginus strangely reports that he experienced another shipwreck because *Mercury* was angry.[54]

Hyginus' account also includes additional details, mostly in terms adding genealogical or mythographical information. A good example of this is the description of the Sirens. Hyginus adds the names of their parents (Melpomene and Achelous), the specific location (Sicily), as well as the fact that they were fated to die when a ship successfully passed them by. More vividly, as Alves points out (p. 68), Hyginus provides a physical description of the Sirens, whereas they are left undescribed in the Homeric text. That many additional genealogical details in the *fabula* are suspect at best does not detract from the fact that Hyginus is attempting to connect the material to the wider mythological story world, albeit erroneously.[55]

Expanding the lens outward, we also see that Hyginus rewrites the epic into a new order. Rather than summarizing the epic in book-by-book fashion, Hyginus rearranges the episodes to follow a strict chronological order. Most prominently, the flashbacks that comprise *Od.* 9-12 are shifted forward to the beginning of the summary, meaning that *Fab.* 125 starts with the episode immediately after the fall of Troy, Ulysses' engagement with the Cicones

[54] The presence of this detail may be owed to the start of the following *fabula*, which begins with Ulysses suffering shipwreck such that he arrives in *Ithaca* naked. *Fab.* 126 is, compared to *Fab.* 125, a rather more garbled summary of the last half of the *Odyssey*; yet, the prominence of this second shipwreck at the beginning may have prompted a writer to align *Fab.* 125 with it. In other words, it may very well be a later addition to an earlier summary, though I have no explanation for the presence of Mercury in the account.

[55] At 125.6 Aeolus is said to be the son of Hellen, not an uncommon conflating of the two Aeoluses (son or descendant of Hippotes at *Od.* 10.2). Nausithous is son of Calypso (Hes. *Th.* 1017) not of Circe as at *Fab.* 125.10. At *Fab.* 125.13 Scylla is said to be daughter of Typhon, which agrees with the genealogy in the *praefatio* to the *Fabulae* but nowhere else.

(*Od.* 9.39-61). In this rearrangement, Hyginus' narrative is similar to that found in Apd. *Epit.* 7.1-33, which likewise rearranges the episodes chronologically, which flattens the material in the epic (see also ALVES: 52-53):

> **Homer, reordered**
> Book 9 (*Fab.* 125.1-5; Apd. *Epit.* 7.1-7.9) Cicones, Lotus-Eaters, Cyclops
> Book 10 (*Fab.* 125.6-10; Apd. *Epit.* 7.10-7.16), Aeolus, Laestrygonians, Circe
> Book 11 (*Fab.* 125.11-12; Apd. *Epit.* 7.17) Visits the Dead: Elpenor (ch. 11), Anticlia (ch. 12)
> Book 12 (*Fab.* 125.13-15; Apd. *Epit.* 7.18-7.23) Buries Elpenor, Sirenes, Scylla, the Cattle of the Sun, and Charybdis
> Book 5 (*Fab.* 125.16-17; Apd. *Epit.* 7.24) Calypso, Raft capsizes, Ulysses saved, makes it to Phaeacia
> Books 6-8, 13 (*Fab.* 125.18; Apd. *Epit.* 7.25) Phaeacia, returns to Ithaca (briefly told)
> Books 13-24 (*Fab.* 125.19-20; Apd. *Epit.* 7.26, 33) arrives at Ithaca, Euryclia recognizes him; he, Telemachus and two servants, kill the suitors with Minerva's help (very briefly told)

Even so, in one case Hyginus goes even further than Apollodorus in rearranging the events to fit a strict chronological narrative. He reports that the warning of the seer Telemus that Polyphemus would be blinded by Ulysses at the *beginning* of the Polyphemus episode, whereas this information is kept to the end of the episode in the *Odyssey* (9.507-12) and in Apollodorus' narrative – emphasizing Polyphemus' late realization that the prophecy had come true. Hyginus instead puts the detail at the chronologically correct point. We recall that a similar reordering occurs in *Fab.* 118.

Fab. 126, entitled *Ulyssis Agnitio* (*Recognition of Ulysses*) in the Table of Contents (*Cognitio* in the header in the text, apparently in the same sense), is a rather confused attempt to expand on the second half of the *Odyssey*, which was covered in just a few lines in the previous entry. In contrast to the rather faithful account of the *Odyssey* in *Fab.* 125, this narrative reports much information found in the later books of the *Odyssey*, but often combined in strange ways, as if the whole were composed from memory by a writer whose knowledge of the epic was general and vague. Rose remarks (*ad loc.*, 92-93), "Huius capitis balba oratio...interpolatorem manufestissime prodit, atque ceteris indoctiorem." Guidorizzi identifies the numerous modifications (*varianti*) in Hyginus' account, attributed to both a misunderstanding and synthesis of the Homeric account, calling the entry the work of "un goffo interpolatore" (n. 634, p. 393-394). Of course, corruption during transmission may have made things look worse than they are, but there are

indeed some strange statements.[56] For instance, immediately after claiming Ulysses arrived in Ithaca naked after a shipwreck, perhaps vague echo of his arrival on the island of the Phaeacians,[57] Hyginus seems to conflate perhaps *three* episodes involving dogs: *quem [Ulixem] canis cum agnosceret et ei blandiretur, Eumaeus eum non recognoscebat quoniam Minerva eum et habitum eius commutaverat* (126.1). There are four savage dogs at Eumaeus' hut that *attack* Ulysses in disguise (*Od.* 14.21-22, 29-36) but *fawn* upon Telemachus (16.1-6); but perhaps this is meant to capture the moment Ulysses' old dog Argus recognizes him outside the palace in book 17 (lines 290-306) and is simply out of place in Hyginus' narrative.

In fact, *Fab.* 126 seems to grab pieces from all over the second half of the *Odyssey*, rearranging them in a new order, and sometimes attributing actions to the wrong players, but internally the narrative is coherent. In Hyginus' account, after the *sybotes*[58] Eumaeus receives Ulysses into his home and asks him who he is,[59] the swineherd gives him a report of the situation in Ithaca:

> Post Ulyssis profectionem cum iam tempus intercederet, proci Penelopen in coniugium petentes venerunt. quos illa condicione ita differt, 'Cum telam detexuero, nubam:' quam interdiu <texebat, noctu> retexebat[60] et sic eos differebat. nunc autem illi cum ancillis Ulissis discumbunt et pecora eius consumunt.

This passage is remarkable because it is the only place in Hyginus' *Fabulae*, and to my knowledge anywhere in mythographical texts, where direct speech is set within direct speech.[61] Of course, this is not at all what Eumaeus says in book 14; Penelope's weaving ploy is drawn from Penelope's flashback in

---

[56] See GASTI and GUIDORIZZI (*ad loc.*) for a list of errors.

[57] It could also be a vestige of Odysseus' invented tale that he escaped to the shores of Ithaca after being stripped and bound by Thesprotian sailors (*Od.* 14.334-359).

[58] Hyginus preserves the Greek term from *Od.* 14 *passim*, glossing it into Latin (*hoc est subulcus pecoris*) and later he uses, uniquely in Latin literature, the Greek *mnester*, another sign of his knowledge of the Greek text (or a scholarly source that retains it). See DEL HOYO and GARCIA RUIZ (2009, p. 216 n. 543). In fact, Eumaeus is also rarely attested in Latin literature.

[59] Hyginus reports that Eumaeus asked who Ulysses was and heard his false story *before* bringing him into his house for food and drink – a gross violation of hospitality. Perhaps Hyginus was thinking of the more elaborate feast prepared later in the evening (*Od.* 14.411-454).

[60] Micyllus's edition gives *detexebat*, which would have to have a different meaning from the previous use; I accept Barth's correction to *retexebat* and Rose's supplement.

[61] This *fabula* is marked by heavy dependence on direct speech: Ulysses tells Eumaeus "Crastino die perduc me in regiam ad Penelopen" (*Fab.* 126.5); Eumaeus tells the suitors "Habetis ecce alterum mendicum qui cum Iro vos delectet," to which Melanthius (who is confused throughout with Antinous) replies "Immo inter se luctentur et victor accipiet ventriculum farsum et harundinem unde victum eiciat" (126.6-7). At 126.8 Eumaeus presumably proposes to give Ulysses the bow, but the text is lacunose after the initial "demus." As VAN ROSSUM-STEENBEEK remarks (1997, p. 72 n. 48), this dependence on direct speech is unparalleled in other summaries of the epics.

book 19 (lines 138-152), and by then the suitors had caught on and demanded her to choose a new husband. Even so, Hyginus' narrative is understandable, the report itself is accurate, and it introduces the famous weaving ruse at a reasonable place in this story. Immediately after, when Hyginus recounts that Minerva restores Ulysses to his true form, it is Eumaeus and not Telemachus (*Od.* 16.172-214) who rejoices at his return. Yet, elements of the *Odyssey* are preserved: Minerva's disguising of and then revealing Ulysses, the embrace, and the tears of joy. But Hyginus' account misattributes this scene to Eumaeus, who has something of an unexpected starring role in this *fabula*. By elevating Eumaeus' role here and throughout the *fabula*, Hyginus entirely erases Telemachus, who is not mentioned at all in the account.[62]

There is a tendency to dismiss such inaccurate narratives and focus on their mistakes rather than what they are trying to achieve in the context. Clearly, someone was uncomfortable with the limited narrative of Ulysses' actions in Ithaca in *Fab.* 125 and sought to make up for the missing bits. Leaving aside the misattributed actions, the main events of *Od.* 14-22 are recorded: Ulysses' disguise and his time with Eumaeus; Penelope's weaving ruse; Ulysses' beggary amidst the suitors and his victory over Irus; Euryclia's (and perhaps Argus') recognition of Ulysses and his silencing of her; Ulysses' command to bring out the bow, the suitors' inability to string it, and his own success at doing so; his killing of the suitors, the mutilation of the disloyal shepherd Melanthius, and the punishment of the handmaidens who slept with the suitors.[63]

It is perhaps surprising that the *fabula* that is most keenly interested in ensuring a whole epic is covered is the one that is the least reliable in its report of the actions contained within. The author of that account, the *goffo interpolatore* (Guidorizzi) even more *semidoctus* (Rose) than the original "Hyginus," saw a need to supplement the brief mention of Ulysses' time on

---

[62] Eumaeus is the subject of action throughout the narrative (whether accurately reflecting the *Odyssey* or not) ten times: he does not recognize Ulysses, asks him who he is and takes him into his cottage (126.1-2); he reports the situation in Ulysses' palace (126.2); he cries and embraces Ulysses when Minerva restores him to his true form (126.4); he takes Ulysses to the palace (126.5-6) and leads him into the company of the suitors (126.6); he leads Ulysses to Euryclia (126.7); and he suggests Ulysses get a turn with the bow and then hands the bow to him (126.8). Telemachus plays no role in any action, neither in killing the suitors nor the sinful handmaidens described in *Od.* 22.

[63] Some commentators (Rose, Guidorizzi) have pointed out that Hyginus' detail that Ulysses punished the slavewomen "at Penelope's request" (*rogatu Penelopes*) misrepresents the original. It does, however, make perfect sense within the context of Penelope's character, whose faithfulness to her husband is notably juxtaposed to their wanton behavior. It may also be an extrapolation from Telemachus' speech at *Od.* 22.463-464, where he remarks that the slavewomen cast insults on his mother Penelope.

Ithaca in *Fab.* 125. To be sure, the account is often at variance with the events as reported in the original epic, but there is no reason to suspect that the author is not earnestly trying to organize and transmit the contents of *Odyssey* 14-22 to present to his readers. In fact, if one makes allowances for the mistaken names (some due to corruption in transmission?) and actions taken out of order, *Fab.* 126 actually presents a reasonable summary of events.

Conclusion

Nowhere else in Homeric exegesis or in other mythographical texts do we find anything like what is presented in Hyginus' *Fabulae*. Unlike Apollodorus' continuous summary, the *hypotheses* of individual books found in Ps.-Dositheus, Ausonius, and papyri, or the narrative images presented in the *Tabulae Iliacae*, Hyginus' *Fabulae* seeks to create a new matrix in which the Homeric epics are encountered. The complexity of human interactions in the *Iliad* is reduced to the concatenation of eight or so events that lead directly from Agamemnon's taking of Briseis away from Achilles to Priam's ransoming of Hector. The rest of the *Iliad* – the duels, the confrontations, the battles – has been reconfigured into catalogs and integrated with mythical data from other parts of the Trojan cycle. Some of these (unique) forms reflect what must have been an industry of counting and cataloging among *grammatici*, as one imagines lying behind the criticisms found in Seneca (*Ep.* 88.6-7, 36-40) but which have not survived outside of Hyginus' work. Hyginus' presentation of the Catalog of Ships also redefines the role of the catalog; it not only reorders the list to give pride of place to the most important characters (note those presented first have the highest number of kills in *Fab.* 114), but it also introduces characters that contribute substantially to the Greek cause in the *Iliad* and beyond that were not originally in Homer's Catalog. His attempt to identify both mothers and fathers of these heroes reflects the goals of the *Fabulae* more generally (cf. *Fab.* 14) and points to post-Homeric exegesis on the participants of the Trojan War.

Hyginus' *Odyssey* (*Fab.* 125-126), in turn, is presented in more a more conventional way through narrating Ulysses' travels in episodic fashion, but the narrative has been rewritten into a strict chronological order, like Apollodorus's *Bibliotheke*, to fit into the broader presentation of the Trojan War. It starts right after Troy falls and continues until the suitors are punished. Hyginus' account also updates the myth based on post-Homeric work, including descriptions of (for example) the Sirenes and offering genealogies for characters, even if sometimes erroneously.

In every case, the role of Hyginus – or rather, the many Hyginuses at work – is one of a creative author (or authors), recasting the epic materials into a matrix that emphasizes the characters in the war and the main events

in which they are involved. The *Iliad*, an epic of war and loss, is viewed simply one part of the larger Trojan conflict, and as such finds itself reduced to lists of duels and of the deaths of important characters; the tallies of "kills" only serve to highlight the horrific loss of life in war. Hyginus' *Odyssey*, in turn, revolves around the main episodes of Ulysses' life, but the scenes have been reorganized and updated to follow him from Troy to Ithaca rather than to be refracted through the flashbacks of the original (*Fab.* 125). *Fab.* 126 is a strange bird indeed, for it similarly attempts to rewrite the last 8 books of the *Odyssey* in linear and chronological form, but it misidentifies actors so much that one gets the impression it was composed by someone with a vague memory of the actions but is not quite sure about the actors involved. Despite its mistaken identities, the main aspects of the final part of the *Odyssey*, like the rest, are presented to the reader through a creative act of refashioning myth in new and innovative ways.

Bibliography

ALLEN, T. (1921), *The Homeric Catalog of Ships*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

ALVES, D. M. (2013), *Ciclos Mitológicos nas Fabulae de Higino: Tradução e análise*. Thesis: Campinas.

BONNER, S. F. (1977), *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

BORIAUD, J.-Y. (2003), *Hygin. Fables*. 2nd ed. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

BUNTE, B. (1857), *Hygini Fabulae*. Leipzig: Libraria Dykiana.

BURSIAN, C. (1866), « Zu Hyginus ». *Jahrbücher für classischen Philologie*, 12, p. 773-84.

CAMERON, A. (2004), *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CLARK, F. (2020), *The First Pagan Historian: The Fortunes of a Fraud from Antiquity to the Enlightenment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CRIBIORE, R. (2001), *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

DEL HOYO, J. and GARCÍA RUIZ, J. M. (2009), *Higino: Fábulas*. Madrid: Biblioteca Clásica Gredos.

DOWDEN, K. (2022), « Antihomerica », in SMITH, R. S. and TRZASKOMA, S. M. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Mythography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 134-141.

EDWARDS, M. W. (1980), « The Structure of the Homeric Catalog ». *The Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 110, p. 81-105.

FARRELL, J. (2004), « Roman Homer », in FOWLER, R. (ed), *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Cambridge University Press, p. 254-271.

FINKELBERG, M. (ed) (2011), *The Homer Encyclopedia*. Chichester and Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

FLAMMINI, G. (2004), *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana Leidensia*. Munich and Leipzig: K. G. Saur.

FLETCHER, K. F. B. (2013), « Hyginus' *Fabulae*, Toward a Roman Mythography », in TRZASKOMA, S. M. and SMITH, R. S. (eds), *Writing Myth: Mythography in the Ancient World*. Leuven, Paris and Walpole, MA: Peeters, p. 133-164.

FLETCHER, K. F. B. (2022), « Hyginus, *Fabulae* », in TRZASKOMA, S. M. and SMITH, R. S. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Mythography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 199-210.

FOWLER, R. L. (2017), « Apollodorus and the Art of the Variant », in PÀMIAS, J. (ed), *Apollodoriana. Ancient Myths, New Crossroads*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, p. 158-175.

GASTI, F. (2017), *Igino. Miti del Mondo Classico*. Milan: Rusconi.

GREEN, S. J. (2019), « How Many Ships Does It Take to Sack Troy? Do the Math with the *Ilias Latina* ». *Classical World*, 112, p. 161-168.

GUIDORIZZI, G. (2000), *Igino. Miti*. Milan: Adelphi.

GUTZWILLER, K. (2010), « Heroic Epitaphs of the Classical Age: The Aristotelian *Peplos* and Beyond », in BAUMBACH, M., PETROVIC, A. and PETROVIC, I. (eds), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, p. 219-249.

HEYDEMANN, H. (1879), *Nereiden mit den Waffen des Achilles*. Halle: Niemeyer.

HUNTER, R. (2004), « Homer and Greek Literature », in FOWLER, R. (ed), *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 235-253.

HUNTER, R. (2018), *The Measure of Homer: The Ancient Reception of the Iliad and Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

KIRK, G. S. (1985), *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume 1: Books 1-4*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MARROU, H. I. (1982), *A History of Education in Antiquity*. LAMB, G. (trans). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

MARBLESTONE, H. J. (1970), *Dictys Cretensis: A Study of the* Ephemeris Belli Troiani *as a Cretan Pseudepigraphon*. Diss. Brandeis University.

MARSHALL, P. K. (2002), *Hyginus Fabulae. Editio Altera*. Munich and Leipzig: K. G. Saur.

MERKLE, S. (1989), *Die Ephemeris belli Troiani des Diktys von Kreta*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

MIDDLETON, F. (2014), « Illusions and Vanishing Acts: Homeric Recension, Athetesis, and Magic in *P.Oxy.* 412 (*PGM* XXIII) ». *Helios*, 41, p. 139-162.

MILLER, S. G. (1986), « Eros and the Arms of Achilles ». *American Journal of Archaeology*, 90, p. 159-170.

PÀMIAS, J. (ed) (2017), *Apollodoriana. Ancient Myths, New Crossroads*. Sozomena 16. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter.

ROSE, H. I. (1963), *Hygini Fabulae*. Leiden: A. W. Sythoff.

SCHMIDT, M. (1866), « Versuch über Hyginus. Hygin. Fab. c. 97 oder die ursprüngliche Ordnung der Epigramme des aristotelischen Peplos ». *Philologus*, 23, p. 47-71.

SCHMIDT, M. (1872), *Hygini Fabulae*. Jena: Hermann Dufft.

SMITH, L. F. (1980), « The Thousand Ships ». *L'Antiquité Classique*, 49, p. 241-246.

SMITH, R. S. and TRZASKOMA, S. M. (2022), « Mythography and Education », in SMITH, R. S. and TRZASKOMA, S. M (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Mythography*, Oxford. Oxford University Press, p. 409-427.

SMITH, R. S. and TRZASKOMA, S. M. (2007), *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae*. Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett.

SMITH, R. S. (2022), « Mythography in Latin », in SMITH, R. S. and TRZASKOMA, S. M. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Mythography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 97-114.

TRZASKOMA, S. M. (2022), « Apollodorus the Mythographer, *Bibliotheca*," in R. Scott SMITH and Stephen M. TRZASKOMA (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Mythography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 151-162.

VAN ROSSUM-STEENBEEK, M. (1997), *Greek Readers' Digests? Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri*. Leiden and New York: Brill.

VISSER, E. (1997), *Homers Katalog der Schiffe*. Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner.

VON FLESCHENBERG, O. S. (1908), *Dares-Studien*. Halle: Verlag von Max Niemeyer.

WAGNER, R. (1891), « Die Sabbaitischen Apollodorfragmente ». *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 46, p. 378-419.

WERTH, A. (1901), *De Hygini Fabularum Indole*. Leipzig: Teubner.

ZUCKER, A. (2015), « Hygin et Ératosthène: Variation mythographique ou restitution d'un original perdu ». *Polymnia*, 1, p. 83-125.