The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer & the Epic Cycle

JONATHAN S. BURGESS

The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle

The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle

JONATHAN S. BURGESS

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY PRESS
Baltimore & London

© 2001 The Johns Hopkins University Press
All rights reserved. Published 2001
Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper
2 4 6 8 9 7 5 3 1

The Johns Hopkins University Press
2715 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218-4363
www.press.jhu.edu

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Burgess, Jonathan S., 1960–
The tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the epic cycle / Jonathan S. Burgess.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.
ISBN 0-8018-6652-9 (hardcover)
1. Homer—Knowledge—Troy (Extinct city) 2. Epic poetry, Greek—History and criticism. 3. Trojan War—Literature and the war. 4. Troy (Extinct city)—In literature. 5. Influence (Literary, artistic, etc.) 6. Literature and history—Greece. 7. Lost literature—Greece. 8. Cycles (Literature). 9. Homer—Influence. I. Title.
PA4037 .B84 2001
883′.01—dc21

00-011637

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

For Jane

Contents

List of Illustrations ix
Acknowledgments xi
Note to Reader xiii
List of Abbreviations xv

Introduction 1

ONE
The Epic Cycle and the Tradition of the Trojan War 7
Origins of the Cycle Poems
The Manufacture of the Epic Cycle
The "Cyclic" Tradition of the Trojan War
"Cyclic" Trojan War Images
Later Manifestations

TWO
Homer and the Tradition of the Trojan War 47
"Cyclic" Myth in the Homeric Poems
The Date of the Homeric Poems
Iliadic Images
Cyclops: Image and Folktale
Homeric Passages

THREE
The Epic Cycle and Homer 132
Cropping around the Homeric Poems
Extent of the Cycle Poems
Homeric Influence on the Epic Cycle?
Non-Homeric Aspects of the Epic Cycle

Conclusion 172

APPENDIX A
Photius and Proclus 177

APPENDIX B
Schematization of R. Cook's Tables 181

APPENDIX C
Trojan War Images to 600 B.C.E. *183*

APPENDIX D
Blinding and Escape Images 188

APPENDIX E
Select Epic Passages Featuring Leaves 190

Notes 193
References 259
Index 279

Illustrations

A. Suicide of Ajax. Corinthian bronze mold. 19

B. Trojan horse. Bronze fibula fragment. 20

C. Peleus wrestles Thetis. Amphora fragment. 23

D. Achilles raids cattle. Boeotian relief amphora. 26

E. Achilles and Troilus. Protocorinthian aryballos. 29

F. Penthesileia and Achilles. Terracotta shield fragment. 32

G. Penthesileia and Achilles. Late Protocorinthian vase fragment. 34

H. Phrontis. Terracotta plaque fragment. 37

I. Death of Astyanax. Protoattic vase fragment. 38

J. Embassy of Menelaus and Odysseus to Troy. Bronze tripod leg. 40

K. Achilles receives armor from Thetis (Phthia). Amphora fragment. 41

L. Hector and Achilles. Corinthian cup. 67

M. Departure of Patroclus. Corinthian aryballos. 72

N. Battle over Euphorbus. Rhodian plate. 79

O. Agamemnon duels Koon. On lost chest of Kypselos. 87

P. Trojan War figures on horseback. Corinthian pyxis. 90

Q. Mourning Achilles. Corinthian olpe. 91

R. Nereids mourn Achilles. Corinthian hydria. 93

S. Blinding of Cyclops. Protoargive krater. 98

T. Blinding of Cyclops. Krater. 99

U. Blinding of Cyclops. Krater. 100

V. Blinding of Cyclops. Chalcidian amphora. 104

W. Blinding of Cyclops. Red-and-white-style pithos. 105

X. Escape from Cyclops. Protoattic oinochoe fragment. 109

Acknowledgments

About half of this book originated as a chapter in my 1995 dissertation, "The Death of Achilles in the *Iliad*." The 1996 *TAPA* article, "The Non-Homeric *Cypria*," which was derived from that chapter, has been reconstituted into its original setting by permission of the editor of *TAPA*. An oral version of this article was presented at the APA annual meeting in Atlanta in 1994. I would like to thank my dissertation committee, John Grant, Father M. Owen Lee, Wallace McLeod, with Sam Solecki and Martin Mueller as external readers, for all their advice. Thanks are especially owed to my supervisor, Emmet Robbins, for his nurturing direction of the dissertation, the bulk of which will be better represented by a forthcoming project on the death and afterlife of Achilles. Several new sections have been orally presented: versions of a paper on Trojan War themes in early Greek art at the CAAS spring meeting at Rutgers University in 1995, at the Leeds International Latin Seminar in 1996, and at the University of Toronto in 1997; a paper on the *Iliad* "leaves" simile at the conference Homer and the Lyric Age at Concordia University in 1997; versions of a paper on Cyclops images in early Greek art at the University of Toronto in 1998 and at McMaster University in 1999; and a paper on Leuke at the Other Worlds conference at the University of Pennsylvania in 2000. I thank the audiences for their helpful responses. The composition of old and new material into a new whole was largely accomplished during the academic year 1998–1999.

I thank the Department of Classics at the University of Toronto for its continuing assistance of my research in countless ways, including the Nor-

wood Travel Grant in 1997–1998, which allowed me to visit many museums in Europe and North America. For gracious hospitality in Rome, I thank Christer Bruun and his family, and for the generous provision of accommodation in Athens for my family, I am most grateful to Maria Delivoria-Papadopoulos.

For assistance and various kindnesses in regards to this project I would also like to thank Theodorus Antoniadis, Egbert Bakker, Alison Barclay, Francis Cairns, Erwin Cook, Drew Griffith, David Howorth, Katina Janeteas, Julia Lougovaya, Robert Nickel, Lada Onyshkevych, Amy Raymond, Catherine Rubincam, Maria Shaw, Anthony Snodgrass, Aara Suksi, José Torres-Guerra, John Wevers, and students in my graduate seminars, in the Research Opportunity Program, and in the Mentorship Program. Apologies if I have overlooked anyone.

For assistance with the illustrations, I would like to thank especially Hans Goette, Craig Mauzy, Ivor Kerslake, Meg Miller, Martina Meyer, and Mrs. P. Stavrinidi. I am also grateful for the work exerted on this book at the Johns Hopkins University Press by my editor, Maura Burnett, as well as Sam Schmidt, Bonnie Jones, and Brian MacDonald. The manuscript benefited enormously from the energetic and engaged input of the reader for the press, Gregory Nagy, to whom I extend my gratitude. Errors and opinions expressed remain my own. I am very grateful for financial assistance in the final stages of production from the Social Sciences and Humanities Council of Canada.

Let me also note that I have benefited greatly from classes on Homer taught by Dorothy Koonce, Bob Rabel, and Wallace McLeod, and in addition I would like to mention early mentors, Peter Westervelt Sr. and Hubert Martin Jr., without whom I would not be in this business. I greatly appreciate the support and interest displayed over the years by my parents and Ellen Aspinall. The steadfastness shown toward the dissertation by Corky is still fondly recalled. Thanks to William and Adelaide for making everything a joy. The work is dedicated to my wife, with love, for her years of support and patience.

Note to Reader

In referring to the Epic Cycle poems I employ what seem to be the most commonly used titles. These are Latinized or Anglicized (*Cypria, Aethiopis, Little Iliad, Nosti, Telegony*), except for *Iliou Persis.* These titles are used exclusively, even in reference to editions that may use different forms (thus I refer to the *Iliou Persis* fragments in Bernabé and Davies, although these editors use the forms *Ilii Excidium* and *Iliupersis* respectively). For other ancient proper names I tend to use traditional, Latinized spellings, but more direct transliterations for less common names (apologies for the inconsistency). *Cycle* or *Cyclic*, capitalized but without quotation marks, refers to the poems that we specifically know were collected together in the Epic Cycle; with quotation marks and capitalized these terms are used in reference to mythological traditions from which these poems are derived. By *Homeric poems* I mean the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* exclusively (textual references are to the Oxford Classical Text edition). *Pre-Homeric* is necessarily vague, because I do not favor an early, single date for the composition of the Homeric poems. It generally refers to a time before these poems or poetic traditions became identifiably distinct from the larger tradition. *Pre-Iliadic* is used similarly and does not refer to mythological events leading up to the story of the *Iliad. Non-Homeric* (as in the title of Burgess 1996) refers to what is independent of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

For mythological representations I use primarily the catalog numbers in the newly completed *Lexicon Iconigraphicum Mythologiae Classicae* (*LIMC*), though museum catalog numbers are also routinely given. Representations

often appear in more than one article of the *LIMC* because of their portrayal of multiple characters; preference is given to major articles or entries with corresponding photographs (indicated by asterisk, unless more than three entries are listed at once; the abbreviation ill. indicates that an illustration is in the text of the article); cross-references are now available in the appendices of the *LIMC*. For the convenience of the reader captions to the illustrations follow the identifications that are favored in my argument, where it is made clear that these identifications are in fact often disputed.

Dates given in text are B.C.E. unless otherwise noted.

Abbreviations

Bernabé	*Poetae epici Graeci. Testimonia et fragmenta.* Vol. 1. Ed. A. Bernabé. Leipzig, 1987. Corrected edition 1996.
CAH	*The Cambridge Ancient History.* 2nd ed. Ed. J. Boardman and N. G. L. Hammond. Cambridge, 1970–.
Davies	*Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta.* Ed. M. Davies. Göttingen, 1988.
D-K	*Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker.* 6th ed. 3 vols. Ed. H. Diels and W. Kranz. Zurich, 1951.
FGH	*Fragmente der griechischen Historiker.* Ed. F. Jacoby. Leiden, 1923–.
LIMC	*Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae.* Ed. by H. C. Ackermann and J. R. Gisler. Zurich, 1981–1999.
L-P	*Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta.* Ed. E. Lobel and D. Page. Oxford, 1955.
M-W	*Fragmenta Hesiodea.* Ed. R. Merkelbach and M. L. West. Oxford, 1967.
Nauck	*Euripides. Tragoediae.* Ed. A. Nauck. Leipzig, 1901–1903.
NCH	*A New Companion to Homer.* Ed. I. Morris and B. Powell. Leiden, 1997.

OCD	*Oxford Classical Dictionary.* 3rd ed. Ed. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth. Oxford, 1996.
Pfeiffer	*Callimachus.* 2 vols. Ed. R. Pfeiffer. Oxford, 1949–1953.
PMG	*Poetae melici Graeci.* Ed. D. L. Page. Cambridge, 1962.
PMGF	*Poetarum melicorum Graecorum fragmenta.* Vol. 1. Ed. M. Davies. Oxford, 1991.
Radt	*Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta.* Vols. 3, 4 (Aeschylus, Sophocles). Ed. S. Radt. Göttingen, 1977–1985.
RE	*Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.* Ed. G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, K. Mittelhaus, and K. Ziegler. Stuttgart, 1893–.
SEG	*Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum*. Ed. P. Roussel et al. Leiden, 1923–.
Sinn	*Die Homerischen Becher.* Ed. U. Sinn. Berlin, 1979.
West	*Iambi et elegi Graeci.* 2nd ed. 2 vols. Ed. M. West. Oxford, 1989–1992.

The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle

Introduction

The poems of the Epic Cycle are now lost. But what we know about them from ancient evidence is extremely important for our understanding of myth about the Trojan War. The poems in the Cycle share the same mythological tradition with the famous Homeric poems, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey,* and in fact the Epic Cycle is even more representative of the Trojan War tradition than the Homeric poems. If the tradition of the Trojan War were a tree, initially the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* would have been a couple of small branches, whereas the Cycle poems would be somewhere in the trunk.

The Homeric poems are rightly supposed to be very different from other poems of their age, including the poems of the Epic Cycle. This difference is usually understood in aesthetic terms, in the sense that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are thought to be far superior in poetic quality. But a more historic approach would treasure any information that survives about non-Homeric epic.[1] Such evidence informs us about mythological material missing or assumed in the Homeric poems. Turning aside from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* also makes us aware that other epics had different purposes and functions than the Homeric poems. One may cherish the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as wonderful, beautiful poems and also appreciate the richness of the mythological and poetic traditions from which they came. But too often scholars seek to prove their love of the Homeric poems by ignoring or denigrating the traditions behind them.

The tradition of the Trojan War had a long and complex development before the Homeric poems were composed. Indo-European concepts may

lie embedded within the story, and Near Eastern influences also undoubtedly had an effect.[2] Whether a sack of the city in Asia Minor now identified as Troy was the historical inspiration for the story remains an open question.[3] After the magnificent archaeological discoveries of the past century it has seemed natural to consider the story of the Trojan War a largely historical saga and associate it with palaces, treasure, and kingly heroes. But the city level of Troy most suitable for the role (VI) was judged to have been destroyed by an earthquake, while the next level (VIIa) now seems to have been violently destroyed only after its alleged Mycenaean attackers met their end. Recent work has indicated a wider circuit for the city walls than previously realized but will probably not reverse current skepticism about reflections of the Bronze Age in Homer.[4] Yet a historicist perspective remains valuable as long as one allows that inspiration for the story may have been more complex than the sack of a city at one place and time. Interaction between Mycenaeans and the natives of Asia Minor, intermittently or repeatedly involving Troy, may have been the reality that set the stage for the myth.[5] It is not unlikely that essential elements of what became the myth of the Trojan War began in the Bronze Age and developed as Greek tribes undertook a series of migrations in the post-Mycenaean period. Whatever its origins, the story of the Trojan War took on a life of its own and soon developed its own mythological functions.

The post-Mycenaean period was never really a "Dark Age" nor was the eighth century B.C.E. a Greek "renaissance," though these hyperbolic terms have been used by classicists to ease comprehension of often obscure data. Some continuity of Greek culture existed from the Bronze to Iron Age, and reconsideration of the middle centuries has been encouraged by recent discoveries at Lefkandi, which revealed that a surprising degree of wealth and international trade was possible for tenth-century Euboea at least.[6] Nonetheless it can be said that in the eighth century there began a remarkable period of change, or at least intensification of earlier trends. There is also archaeological evidence for disturbance at Bronze Age sites at this time, apparently the result of ritual activity, and this suggests a revival of interest in the distant past.[7] If epic about the heroic age flourished at this time also, as is often supposed, there is no need to see an interrelationship. Ritual activity at Bronze Age sites and heroic poetry were probably two independent manifestations of a fascination with previous ages.

The epic verse tradition apparently developed in Asia Minor, where a distinctive poetic idiom featuring the Ionic dialect came to be used for epic verse.[8] Whether the Trojan War was a subject of song on the mainland at an early point in time cannot be known.[9] But certainly subject matter and characters in the tradition originated in places throughout the Greek world, with the mainland well represented by mythic strata from places as distant as Thessaly and Pylos. The term *Panhellenic* is usually associated with the resurgence of the Greek world after a Dark Age, but it might also be applied to the mixture of various mythical material during the time of migrations from the mainland.[10] By the Archaic Age a great number of different elements had been incorporated at different times into the sophisticated whole of the Trojan War tradition. In addition, the relation of Trojan myth to other myths had become established, as we can see by Homeric references to Heracles or the Theban War.

The dating of the Homeric poems to the eighth century is becoming increasingly questionable, as I note in Chapter 2. Here let me point out that the eighth-century date has often served a desire to separate the Homeric poems from other early Greek myth and poetry. An influential schematic approach has portrayed the world of the Homeric poems as intensely foreign to later ages, even the Archaic Age.[11] According to this view, the *Iliad* reflects a dim and distant beginning of Greek (or even human) thought and culture. Many scholars have rejected this as simplistic and misleading.[12] In addition the "Oriental revolution" has been used as a wedge between the Homeric poems and the Archaic Age. Certainly swift developments in the Greek world of the eighth century and early seventh century could have caused major changes in the story of the Trojan War, not least from Near Eastern influences. But because Near Eastern contact with Greek culture is undoubted for the Bronze Age, the dating of Near Eastern elements in Greek myth is very uncertain.[13] Finally, some scholars have portrayed Homer as a primitive oral poet to be contrasted with sophisticated literates of the seventh century.[14] This view both underestimates the aesthetic possibilities of oral composition and neglects the continuation of orality through the Archaic Age and beyond.[15] In any event all attempts to paint Homeric poetry as different from the myth and poetry of the Archaic Age depend on the early dating of the Homeric poems, which is not at all certain.

The transmission of the story of the Trojan War must certainly have been

oral at an early date. What is not sufficiently realized, however, is that the oral tradition of the Trojan War could not exclusively belong to bards.[16] Epic verse would have played a major role in spreading and preserving traditional stories, but surely these stories did not depend on bardic performances. Other verse genres, such as those hinted at in the Homeric poems themselves, would have narrated traditional stories.[17] In addition, there would have been nonprofessional, unmetrical renderings, which are also amply portrayed in Homeric epic (e.g., Phoenix on Meleager in book 9 of the *Iliad,* or Odysseus on himself in books 9–12 of the *Odyssey*). Homeric "prose" narratives are necessarily presented in hexameters, but this only underscores the permeability of genre and media boundaries (Odysseus is compared with a bard at *Od.* 11.368). In this regard we also need to consider folktales that would have been contemporary to epic traditions. Although by definition folktales would involve anonymous or generic characters in no specific time or place, they share motifs and narrative patterns with traditional myths. And not only words narrated early Greek mythology, for Greek artists enthusiastically portrayed it also, as will be stressed in this book. So narrative of the myth of the Trojan War in different verse genres must have existed concurrently with nonprofessional, unmetrical renderings and artistic representations, with all these media constantly interacting with folktales. Although evidence for oral traditions obviously does not survive, it would be foolhardy to doubt that there existed a multifarious, pervasive tradition of the Trojan War in the Archaic Age that cut across lines of genre, media, function, class, and gender.[18]

Throughout the Archaic Age, this huge and manifold tradition of the Trojan War in all its media would be slowly evolving. In this book I explore the relation between the Epic Cycle and the Homeric poems within the context of the larger mythological tradition of the Trojan War. The traditional nature of the Homeric poems is taken for granted, for they undoubtedly are based on traditional mythological material and employ traditional techniques of oral composition. I follow a unitarian approach in recognizing the unity of the poems but display little interest in attributing the celebrated results of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* to one monumental poet. Indeed, outside of the title and discussion of the views of others, reference to "Homer" is avoided. Modern literary theory does not favor overemphasis of the author, and there never has been much of a case for Homer as a historical per-

son. A lengthy Homeric poetic tradition would not have compromised the unity of its narrative and might even have contributed to it. Gregory Nagy (see esp. 1996a:109–111) has persuasively argued for a long-term performance tradition of the Homeric poems, and something of the same can be suspected for the Cyclic poems. It is not unlikely that in the Archaic Age fluid yet coherent performance traditions were creating and re-creating individual poems about the Trojan War, including the Homeric and Cyclic poems.

Eventually these poetic traditions would become stabilized and recorded. It might be that the textual manifestation of one poetic tradition would preserve details of myth and culture that seem earlier than those found in the textual manifestation of another poetic tradition. Or certain material associated with a later period might be found in one poem but not another. But the dating of material mentioned within epic poetry is often very uncertain. Different poetic functions would cause some but not other material to be mentioned in any given poem. The fluidity of the oral traditions from which our fixed texts are derived makes the exact dating of them illusionary. In any event obtaining precise dates for the Homeric and Cyclic poems, even if possible, would be largely irrelevant. The Homeric and Cyclic poetic traditions belong to the same mythological tradition, which does not seem to have gone through any abrupt or radical changes in the Archaic Age. In my view the chances that any given poem would become dominant or influence other poems at this time are remote. So it is enough to think of the texts within the Homeric and Cyclic traditions as generally resulting from the mythical tradition of the Trojan War as it was known in the Archaic Age.

Certainly the Homeric poems and the Epic Cycle poems concentrate on different topics, have different styles, and were created with different purposes in mind. And the generation of their final manifestation undoubtedly occurred in different ways, perhaps at different times. But if the Homeric and Cyclic performance traditions were ever concurrent, as they probably were within the Archaic Age, then they necessarily would reflect the same general mythological material. There is no "early" version of the Trojan War on which the Homeric poems are based, as opposed to a "later" version of the Trojan War represented by the Epic Cycle. The essential story of the Trojan War in the Archaic Age cannot be separated into different temporal strata to which individual epics can be assigned.

I repeatedly stress that the influence of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* on their

mythological tradition was not great in the Archaic Age, although this is routinely assumed. Whether individual or tradition, Homer has been overemphasized at the risk of losing sight of the larger mythological tradition. Scholars who fancy the individual poet of genius tend to argue that his inventiveness and sophistication instantly outdated the preexisting tradition and overshadowed attempts to continue this tradition. Even scholars who favor the traditional nature of the Homeric poems tend to portray them as receiving the tradition whole and subsuming it into the Homeric tradition. However the composition of the Homeric poems is accounted for, it is usually thought that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* became quickly dominant. Two consequences follow: no pure representative of the pre-Homeric tradition becomes possible once Homer has muddied the waters, and any use of the preexisting tradition by the Homeric poems becomes obscure because of the very success of the Homeric poems.

Such exaggeration of the early influence of the Homeric poems necessarily devalues the Epic Cycle. Also challenged is the practice of neoanalysis, an important methodology for my study which uses post-Homeric texts as evidence for pre-Homeric traditions. But the initial influence of the Homeric poems has been more assumed than proved. These poems were not at first published as texts to be passed around a reading public. And a Homeric performance tradition, no matter how cohesive and Panhellenic, would not have had a deep effect on its culture. The lengthy Homeric poems could not possibly have been performed so often and in so many places so as to transform the tradition of the Trojan War. When they were first performed, they would have been understood in the context of their tradition, not as representing some independent version of the Trojan War. The eventual success of the Homeric texts in later ages, when the Trojan War tradition was indeed dominated by the Homeric poems, should not blind us to the lack of Homeric influence in the Archaic Age. I intend to focus on the Epic Cycle in order to reach a better understanding of that eclipsed tradition of the Trojan War.

ONE

The Epic Cycle and the Tradition of the Trojan War

Our earliest literary evidence for the tradition of the Trojan War as a whole is the Epic Cycle. This was a collection of poems about the origins of the gods, the Theban War, and the Trojan War.[1] The poems in the Trojan War section were called the *Cypria,* the *Aethiopis,* the *Little Iliad,* the *Iliou Persis,* the *Nosti,* and the *Telegony.* Although the poems in the Cycle are unfortunately lost, we do know much about them through summaries and testimony from the ancient world.[2] The Trojan War poems in the Cycle were not the first poems to tell the story of this legendary war and the subsequent return of heroes homeward, and they need not be regarded as the best. But they do reach back to the Archaic Age, when the tradition of the Trojan War was still a living one. As time passed and literacy grew, a limited number of epics were recorded and began to be viewed as representatives of the Trojan War tradition. The Trojan War poems of the Epic Cycle are examples of these recorded specimens. By the fifth century B.C.E. they may have been a source for authors such as Pindar and the tragedians when they wrote of myth about the Trojan War. Eventually the Epic Cycle provided the only surviving examples of early epic poetry about the Trojan War (besides the Homeric poems), and so later ages relied on the Cycle as a source for the tradition. For these reasons the Trojan War poems in the Epic Cycle are central to our understanding of the story of the Trojan War in antiquity.

It is essential to realize that the Epic Cycle developed in different stages.

The earliest ancient information about the Cyclic poems cites individual poems, and only later is there an awareness that these poems constituted an "Epic Cycle." Clearly the Cyclic poems were not initially meant to be joined together. Testimony about individual Cyclic poems often differs from the summary of the Epic Cycle that we possess, indicating that the process of manufacturing the Epic Cycle involved editorial manipulation of the Cyclic poems. Although I argue that the Epic Cycle was established during the Hellenistic period, I also stress that many different stages of the material in the Epic Cycle preceded this occurrence, and many different forms of the Epic Cycle followed it. In a sense the Epic Cycle was a moving target.

Origins of the Cycle Poems

Ancient testimonia that provide the names of the authors of the poems in the Epic Cycle should be regarded with suspicion.[3] Until the late fifth century many epic works, including poems in the Epic Cycle, were thought to be composed by Homer.[4] This suggests that authors were not known for the poems when they were ascribed to Homer. Perhaps the poems were not associated with any author at first, or perhaps the names of their traditional authors had become lost. Early on any epic poem could easily be conceived of as belonging to "Homer," the mythological figure generally regarded as the source of traditional narrative epic (whereas "Hesiod" would be credited with traditional didactic epic). When unhappiness with such generic attribution to Homer first arose, scholars such as Aristotle used anonymous phrases such as "the poet of the *Cypria.*" Eventually various candidates for the authorship of the Cyclic poems were proposed. The fact that often many authors are given for single works casts great doubt on the veracity of these ascriptions, and they remained uncertain throughout antiquity.[5] Though the ascription to authors played an important role in the history of how the Epic Cycle poems were understood, it seems inadvisable to regard them as historically accurate.

Truth has been thought, nonetheless, to lie behind the ascriptions, at least the ones most commonly repeated in antiquity.[6] It has been supposed that ancient stories about Cyclic poets obtaining their poems from Homer as students or relatives were invented to honor Homer or alternatively that they were invented to bolster fading reputations of the poems. [7] Both theories place the stories back to the fifth century at least, on the assumption that

the Cycle poems were then still esteemed.[8] Though undoubtedly fictional, the anecdotes could be based on ancient ascriptions known by the start of the Classical Age. But the anecdotes about the Cyclic poets and Homer are likely to be later than the fifth century, the result of attempts to join older traditions attributing the poems to Homer with newly invented attributions.[9] Even if the supposed authors are historical figures who did compose in the Archaic Age, that does not mean they composed the particular poems found in the Epic Cycle.[10] Many if not all of the attributions were probably unfounded guesswork.

The date of the poems in the Epic Cycle remains uncertain. The ancient anecdotes that speak of Cyclic authors as pupils or relatives of Homer are hardly reliable. A report by Pausanias that Callinus discussed "Homer"'s *Thebais* (fr. 6 West), if true, would mean that one Cyclic poem was known to a seventh-century author, but the testimonium does not seem trustworthy (see note 239 in Chapter 2). Early artwork on "Cyclic" themes need not reflect the specific poems in the Epic Cycle, although many scholars make that unnecessary assumption.[11] Aristarchus was certain that the poets of the Cycle were at least later than Homer, as his term *neoteroi* ("more recent") for them and other authors suggests, but his conception of the relation between the Homeric poems and the Epic Cycle was very naive.[12] Sometimes the contents of the Epic Cycle have been described as "late" or post-Homeric, but the uncertainties of that type of argument will be demonstrated in Chapter 3.

Other evidence leads to two extremes. Arctinus, the supposed author of the *Aethiopis* and the *Iliou Persis,* is dated in the eighth century by chronologies found in such sources as Eusebius and the *Suda,* perhaps based on Hellenistic scholarship. Other Cyclic authors follow in the seventh or sixth century according to this ancient chronology. Acceptance of the ancient ascriptions of authorship has sometimes led to acceptance of the ancient dating.[13] However, Wilamowitz effectively questioned the ancient dating scheme, and his arguments are still influential.[14] Among other things the ancient dating is inconsistent, as testimonia for Arctinus amply displays: Cyrillus states that he was born at the time of the first Olympiad, whereas Eusebius reportedly states that he flourished then; yet Eusebius is also reported to associate him with the fourth Olympiad, and the *Suda* states that he was born at the eighth Olympiad.[15] And so on. Thus the evidence that

appears most authoritative is revealed to be guesswork, or at least hopelessly garbled. And even if it were certain that the alleged poets date from that time, we could still not be sure that they are the authors of the specific poems in the Epic Cycle.

On the assumption that the Cyclic poems are derivative from the Homeric poems, their date has often been linked to the date of the Homeric poems. Scholars used to be more comfortable with the ancient dating of the Epic Cycle poems because the Homeric poems were dated earlier than they tend to be today.[16] The date now commonly accepted for the Homeric poems, the late eighth century, is contemporary with the earliest ancient dating of the Cyclic poems. This correspondence has undoubtedly been a factor in current skepticism toward the ancient dating of the Cyclic poems. Another strategy is the respectful modification of the ancient dating to accommodate current datings of Homer.[17] But the assumption behind these approaches to the issue, that the Cyclic poems must presuppose the Homeric ones, is unnecessary.

If ancient dating of Cyclic poems as early as the eighth century is one extreme, the other is modern and points to the sixth century on the basis of linguistic analysis of fragments. A century ago Wilamowitz concisely made such an argument.[18] But this approach to dating is more uncertain than its adherents care to admit. The fragments add up to something more than a hundred lines of verse for several poems, which hardly provides enough evidence for such analysis. Disquieting, too, is the extreme variance of conclusions made by experts. Davies speaks of the "Attic context" of the *Cypria,* as seen by Wackernagel, yet Janko dates this poem to the seventh century.[19] And Janko states that "there is nothing to support Wackernagel's view" that there are Atticisms in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite,* which Janko closely links to the *Cypria.*[20] The theory of the Attic nature of the Cyclic poems originated at a time when it was widely believed that some parts of the *Iliad* could be dated "later" than other parts on the basis of linguistic evidence. That endeavor has been largely discredited because it displayed little sensitivity to the mixed nature of traditional language and to the effect that transmission can have on a text.[21] And the continuous recomposition recently posited for the Homeric tradition by Nagy and others necessarily raises questions about the validity of attempting to pinpoint early epics to one point in time. It would be better to regard late forms, especially Atticisms,

as evidence for fluid performing traditions that continued down through the Archaic Age, with Athens as a stage in the process.[22] The essential composition of an epic need not date from the latest forms found in its fixed text.

The composition of one poem in the Epic Cycle, it is true, might be dated to the sixth century for external reasons. If its common ascription to Eugammon of Cyrene is correct, then the *Telegony* could not have been composed until after Cyrene was founded in the late seventh century.[23] But here one encounters the usual difficulties with the ancient ascriptions. Eusebius reportedly ascribed the *Telegony* to Cinaethon, the Spartan poet credited with the Cyclic *Oedipodia* and dated to the eighth century.[24] And there is the claim by Clement that Eugammon stole from an earlier poem about the Thesprotians (Thesprotia was prominent in the *Telegony*).[25] But there is evidence to support a connection between the *Telegony* and Cyrene. Eustathius reports that in the *Telegony* a certain Arkesilaos was born to Penelope. A number of kings named Arkesilas ruled Cyrene during the reign of the Battiads in the early history of Cyrene, and the *Telegony* may have specified that Arkesilaos the son of Penelope was their mythical forebear.[26] There is good reason, therefore, to believe that a Cyrenean composed the poem, as was reported in antiquity, if not unanimously. But the relatively late date of one poem in the Epic Cycle has no bearing on the date of other poems in the Epic Cycle. It is true that there is also reason to suspect that the *Aethiopis* reflects Milesian colonization of the Black Sea that apparently begins in the late seventh century, if the poem is correctly ascribed to a Milesian poet and its contents reflect knowledge of that area. Yet this conclusion is not certain, and my examination of the contents of the poems in Chapter 3 casts doubt on the view that the Cyclic poems generally reflect a post-Homeric world.

Notably, the two most recent editors of the fragments, Bernabé and Davies, follow different extreme positions on dating. This variance should underscore the need to avoid dogmatism on the matter. Most scholars either take an agnostic stance or vaguely settle on a seventh-century date. Rather than seek a specific date, I conceive of their composition as developing in oral performance traditions over a period of time in the Archaic Age. Such a circumstance for poetic composition not only defies precise dating but also challenges the need for it. The paucity of fragments of the Cycle poems makes it difficult to discover evidence of techniques of oral compo-

sition, but I do not see how they could have been composed through writing in the Archaic Age.[27] Even their fixation through writing is probably not of a very early date, because they were undoubtedly too long to record easily. I assume that the Cyclic poems were "crystallized" in performance traditions sometime in the Archaic Age and fixed in writing by the end of this period.[28]

The Manufacture of the Epic Cycle

Besides meager fragments, we possess the Trojan War section of a summary of the Epic Cycle. This summary of the Epic Cycle was included in a large work by Proclus about ancient poetry and poets called the Χρηστομάθεια Γραμματική (the title refers to "useful literary knowledge"). We are not sure whether this is the Neoplatonist from the fifth century C.E. (as stated in the *Suda*) or a lesser-known Proclus from the second century C.E. Proclus reportedly speaks of reading the poems himself, and some believe that the Epic Cycle poems would not have been preserved down to the fifth century C.E.[29] What we know in general about the *Chrestomathy* depends on a description of it by Photius (ninth century C.E.).[30] All that remains of the *Chrestomathy* are a few excerpts placed in early manuscripts of the *Iliad,* including the summary of the Trojan War section of the Epic Cycle. A long and complicated process led to the summary by Proclus, which does not always accurately represent the earlier fixations of the poems that constitute the Epic Cycle. Earlier I referred to the "ultimate" fixed form of the Cyclic texts after long oral traditions. In fact, it seems that this stage was not the last.

It should first be realized that the poems we find in the Epic Cycle were not the only ones of their type in the Archaic Age. Evidence from antiquity, often consisting of no more than a title, suggests that the material we find in the Cycle was also related in epic poetry now lost.[31] Confusion over authors and titles may account for some of the evidence for alternative versions of the poems in the Epic Cycle, and multiple forms of the same poems may have resulted from performance traditions, but there can be no doubt that many different poems shared the same contents.

The few surviving indications of poetic treatment of the Trojan War for the Archaic Age represent only the tip of the iceberg. Oral culture continued through the fifth century B.C.E., and we might well imagine that there were thousands of poets of varying skills and success throughout the ancient

Greek world who sang of the Trojan War. Thomas (1992:105) compares the loss of oral poetry that "continued long after Homer but simply never got preserved at all" to the loss of texts in the Middle Ages. Somehow some poems about the Trojan War became recorded. The poems of the Epic Cycle, for instance, would probably have been recorded by the beginning of the Classical Age. At first the recording and survival of epic poems about the Trojan War would have had less to do with their intrinsic poetic value than with circumstantial factors, such as the availability of writing material (see Chapter 2) and the functional value of the poems for specific communities. Eventually certain ones were selected long after their composition (whether by chance or merit) and manipulated to be part of a continuous series of works now known as the Epic Cycle.

In my view this manufacture of the Epic Cycle would involve the interference with fixed texts by individuals who stood outside any authentic compositional or performance tradition for these poems. As I demonstrate shortly, the textual boundaries for the Cycle poems that are found in Proclus cannot be the dimensions of their oral traditions or the fixed texts arising from them.[32] It seems to me most plausible to explain such manipulation as resulting from editorial activity imposed on the fixed texts of the poems. Rhapsodes, however, may have prefigured an editorial manufacture of the Epic Cycle by joining together song performances from different epics.[33] Theoretically rhapsodies could have been presented in accordance with a narrative chronology. The story of the Trojan War might be presented in this manner, for example (comparable with the Trojan War section of the Epic Cycle), or even the sum of the mythical past in all its theogonic and heroic material (comparable with the Epic Cycle in its entirety). A presentation of the Trojan War in this manner would not be a complete, detailed account, but rather a rough suggestion of the story through the use of epic from various sources.[34] In mythological terms the Trojan War would have always existed as a loosely unified story, and so the tradition itself can be described as a "cycle" (itself part of the larger cycle of the mythological past). Even if an epic about the Trojan War was never actually used in connection with other epics to present the larger story of the war, its inherent nature as belonging to the tradition of the Trojan War would qualify it as part of the "potential performance" of the whole story.[35] If a patchwork narrative of the Trojan War was ever constituted by means of rhapsodes performing

epic material from different sources, this presentation would be conceptually related to the Trojan War section of what became known as the Epic Cycle.

Let us explore the possibility of a rhapsodic Epic Cycle further. One possible setting for such activity is epic performance at the Panathenaic festival at Athens. Ancient testimonia for the so-called Pisistratean recension refer to the acquisition of Homeric poetry or the arrangement of its performance by leaders of Athens (usually Pisistratus or his sons, but even Solon and Pericles are so credited).[36] The testimonia begin in the fourth century B.C.E., and when referring to Homeric poetry, they probably mean the *Iliad* and *Odyssey.*[37] Well into the Classical Age, however, "Homer" often meant epic poetry in general (see Chapter 2). Would performance of epic poetry at the Panathenaea (which I think is the extent of the "recension") have focused on only the *Iliad* and *Odyssey,* and, if so, would contemporary witnesses have clearly passed on that specification?[38] It is not necessary to conclude so.

An exclusive focus on the Homeric poems seems less certain when one considers that there would not have been enough time during the festival to perform all of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey.*[39] Time would only have been sufficient to present certain episodes of the Homeric poems. And the competing rhapsodes would have had no motivation to finish all of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in a hurried rush. Surely they would have been more interested in a pace leisurely enough to allow effective performance of separate Homeric episodes. Indeed, the Panathenaic "rule" for sequential performance that we hear of vaguely from the ancient sources might have been designed to meet the problems that were caused by a mix of material from the poems.[40] Care might also have been taken to perform certain select Cyclic episodes that followed the order of the narrative of the Trojan War as it was known from traditional myth. I doubt that the Epic Cycle as we know it was created in sixth-century Athens, but the joining of material from different epic traditions by rhapsodes then might be considered a rough, approximate prototype of the Epic Cycle. And the regulation of the performance of epic poetry at the Panathenaea might be thought to prefigure the type of editorial activity that later led to its manufacture.[41]

But opportunity for rhapsodic "Cycles" would probably have waned as time went on, even at the Panathenaic festival. Undoubtedly the performance traditions of Cyclic poetry weakened relative to the performance tra-

ditions of the Homeric poems. Certainly it is difficult to conceive of rhapsodes in the Archaic Age or early Classical Age establishing a fixed form of an "Epic Cycle" that would be lasting. The Epic Cycle as we know it seems to be of a later date. The earliest possible reference to a "cycle" of epic poetry is in a syllogism attributed to the "Eristics" by Aristotle.[42] Some conclude from this evidence that the Epic Cycle was known in Aristotle's time, but that has been disputed.[43] In the *Poetics* Aristotle discusses individual poems of the Epic Cycle without any indication that they belong together, which may indicate that the Epic Cycle as a collection of a limited number of specific poems did not then exist. Interestingly enough, it is the poetry of Homer that is described as a "cycle" or "circle" in the syllogism reported by Aristotle (the Greek word κύκλος, which by convention is translated as "cycle" in the context of the "Epic Cycle," means "circle"). It is true that the poems of the Epic Cycle were sometimes ascribed to Homer. But the testimonium of Aristotle might instead reflect the persistence of the common (though not shared by Aristotle) equation of Homer with the genre of epic poetry. The "cycle" (κύκλος) mentioned in the testimonium would thus have a broad, metaphorical significance and would not refer to the Epic Cycle specifically.

Nagy has interestingly traced the metaphorical use of κύκλος to the Indo-European past, adding this analysis to his explanation of the etymology of the name *Homerus* itself.[44] The conceptual basis of the Epic Cycle was probably in existence long before its actual manufacture. I have already considered the possibility that various prototypes of the Epic Cycle were created in rhapsodic performance (perhaps at the Panathenaic festival). Beyond that the Epic Cycle can be seen as a late outgrowth of a very ancient image of the epic genre as a circle or "cycle." It is ironic that the Homeric poems, so intertwined with the "cycle" of the epic tradition both in origins and in initial public perception, later became set in opposition to the representational manifestation of the "cycle" of epic poetry known as the Epic Cycle.

For the manufacture of this Epic Cycle, I consider the Hellenistic period a likely time.[45] The adjective κυκλικός, which most scholars believe refers to the Epic Cycle, is found frequently in scholia that reach back to Aristarchus in the Hellenistic period.[46] And when Callimachus proclaimed that he hated "cyclic" epic (ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν), this most probably was a reference to the poems of the Epic Cycle.[47] One can imag-

ine scholars of the Hellenistic period being interested in the construction of such a collection of epic poems. Although I view this construction as a rather rigid arrangement of fixed and recorded texts after imposition of a certain amount of editorial manipulation, it might be viewed as an extension of earlier experiments by rhapsodes in the joining of verse from different epics.

It is also intriguing that a "Cyclic" text of the *Odyssey* is mentioned in the scholia.[48] Perhaps there was a version of this poem that was adapted to its place in the Epic Cycle (though the summary of the Epic Cycle by Proclus merely mentions where the Homeric poems fit in without trying to summarize them). We do not have any remarks in the scholia about a "Cyclic" edition of the *Iliad*, but such might be suggested by a different version of the *Iliad*'s proem known to Aristoxenus. Theoretically this condensed introduction could have served to link quickly and smoothly the *Cypria* to the *Iliad*.[49] Two lines of verse most critics think served as an artificial join between the *Iliad* and the *Aethiopis* may also date from this time (῝Ως οἵ γ' ἀμφίεπον τάφον ῞Εκτορος· ἦλθε δ' Ἀμαζών, ῎Αρηος θυγάτηρ μεγαλήτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο; discussed in Chapter 3). Because these are verse joins, their origins may lie in rhapsodic performance, perhaps from a time earlier than the Hellenistic period.[50] But it is doubtful that rhapsodes themselves would have been responsible for the creation of the Epic Cycle. That I attribute to scholarly editorial activity, even if prefigured by the occasional creation of Cycle-like narratives through rhapsodic performance. In any event, evidence seems to indicate that the Epic Cycle was in existence by the Hellenistic period, although much remains obscure.

Some of this evidence, like the possible verse joins just mentioned, suggests that the Epic Cycle at first consisted of verse. Apparently it was such an arrangement of poems that Proclus summarized in prose. That Proclus actually used verse for his summary is implied by his statement, as reported by Photius, that the poems were still preserved in his day. His further remark, that the poems were valued more for their "sequence" than poetic worth, points toward the motivation of the prose summary. Apparently after respect for the poetry of the Epic Cycle faded, there still existed an interest in the raw data of its narrative. Indeed, summaries other than the one by Proclus were also made. The description of the Trojan War in Apollodorus's *Epitome* is essentially a summary of the Epic Cycle.[51] A Dionysius of variously attributed origin who lived in the Hellenistic period (sometimes called

Dionysius the Cyclograph) is reported to have made a prose summary of mythic material,[52] and a Pisander who apparently lived in the third century C.E. reportedly created a mythological summary in verse that successfully rivaled the Epic Cycle.[53] A papyrus fragment contains a summary of material apparently from the *Little Iliad,* with wording and sequence different from that of Proclus.[54] The Iliac tables, which were small Roman plaques that joined images of indifferent quality to text about epic poetry, are another manifestation of the desire to provide summaries of old poetry.[55] Their information sometimes varies from Proclus, which may be caused by the carelessness of their manufacture, but perhaps they are based on a different summary, or even a different constitution of the Epic Cycle, for Stesichorus is cited for the *Iliou Persis* on one.[56]

Eventually, summaries of the poems in the Epic Cycle about the Trojan War were added to early manuscripts of the *Iliad.* The famous Venetus A of the tenth century C.E., our earliest complete manuscript of the *Iliad*, contained in addition to a life of Homer summaries of all the Trojan War poems in the Cycle (the *Cypria,* the *Aethiopis,* the *Little Iliad,* the *Iliou Persis,* the *Nosti,* and the *Telegony*). The summary of the *Cypria* is actually missing in this manuscript because of damage, but nine other later manuscripts of the *Iliad* give the summary of the *Cypria* (alone, without the summaries of the other poems). These summaries are consistent with what Photius tells us about the *Chrestomathy* by Proclus, and so undoubtedly they are his work.[57] His summaries of poems in the Epic Cycle that were not about the Trojan War were not included in the manuscripts and did not survive. A brief listing of basic information, which could include title, author, number of books, or reference to the authorship of Proclus, precedes the actual summaries of the poems.[58] Where the contents of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* fit into the narrative of the Cycle is also briefly indicated. It may safely be concluded that the Trojan War section of the summary of the Epic Cycle by Proclus was excerpted (in whole or part) from its original context (the *Chrestomathy*) and placed in manuscripts of the *Iliad* as background information for readers of the *Iliad.*

In sum, somehow selected poems from the Archaic Age about the birth of the gods, the Theban War, and the Trojan War were assembled together into a collection of verse called the Epic Cycle, probably in the Hellenistic period. Perhaps this collection functioned as a small library that presented

mythical events in chronological order. Subsequent to that time Proclus, among others, made a prose summary of this Epic Cycle. Then the Trojan War section of this summary was excerpted and used in the manuscript tradition of the *Iliad.*

The process of making the Epic Cycle produced discrepancies between earlier versions of the poems and the summary that we possess. A comparison between the testimonia and Proclus quickly demonstrates that earlier forms of the poems have been shortened; sometimes it seems that material within them has been omitted or changed. Three major opportunities for tampering occurred in the process just outlined: the manufacture of a verse Cycle from poems, the making of a prose summary of this Cycle, and the placing of excerpts from this summary in manuscripts of the *Iliad.* In addition, changes could have been made at any time during the transmission of the poems, or during the transmission of the verse version of the Epic Cycle, or during the transmission of the prose version of the Epic Cycle, or during the transmission of the Trojan War section in the manuscript tradition of the *Iliad.* Why would these changes have been made? The various purposes of the Epic Cycle in its different manifestations might have provided motivation for the changes. A desire to provide a continuous overview of mythical events could have led to the removal of superfluous parts. The desire to provide background information for the Homeric poems might have led to the removal of material unnecessary for that purpose, or the change of material contradictory to the Homeric poems.

Growing devaluation of the poems would have made manipulation of the poems more permissible. It does not seem that the poems themselves were scorned at first, but attitudes eventually changed.[59] Herodotus suspected that the *Cypria* was un-Homeric not in terms of quality, but because he believed the two poems disagreed on a detail. Later Aristotle in the *Poetics* criticized the architectural arrangements of the Cyclic poems in comparison to the Homeric poems, though he did not criticize the quality of the poetry within the Cyclic poems. In the Hellenistic period we sense a new attitude. Aristarchus as a rule considered the Cyclic poems later than and inferior to Homer. This view seems to be the result of professional rivalry with his predecessor Zenodotus, who had taken a different attitude toward such poems.[60] The scholia, apparently following the lead of Aristarchus, use the term *cyclic* to refer to inept or uninspired phraseology. Callimachus found

A. Suicide of Ajax. Corinthian bronze mold. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G 437. Courtesy of the Ashmolean Museum.

the "cyclic" poem hateful.[61] Horace in the *Ars poetica* (Epic Cycle test. 24 Bernabé = "fragmenta incerti loci" fr. 9 Davies) and Pollianus (Epic Cycle test. 21 Bernabé = 8 Davies) offered more specific and scathing criticisms.[62] Thus demonstration of one's appreciation of Homeric poetry by despising other poems of his tradition grew popular, an attitude unfortunately still prevalent today.[63]

It is easy enough to conclude that poetic qualities of the Homeric poems were absent in the Cyclic poems, but there were also differences of poetic strategy and cultural function between the poems (see Chapter 3). As the Cyclic poems became increasingly devalued in relation to the Homeric poems, they would have been increasingly susceptible to tampering. The summaries seem to give an inexact representation of the earlier state of the Cyclic epic poems. Were the poems manipulated so they would fit together better as an Epic Cycle? If so, why do we sometimes find repeated material? Were the poems actually manipulated, or did Proclus simply create a smoother epitome by misreporting what he found in the Cycle? Or were changes instead made at some other time in the long, complicated history of the Epic Cycle? The summaries by Proclus may provide answers to these difficult questions.

Evidence of tampering that involved changes or omissions of detail is limited. The one apparent change of any importance involves the contents of the *Cypria.* Herodotus stated that the *Cypria* and the *Iliad* differed about the voyage of Paris and Helen from Sparta. He claimed that in the *Cypria* they traveled immediately to Troy, enjoying smooth sailing. He interpreted *Iliad* 6.289ff. to indicate that Paris stopped at Sidon.[64] Yet the summary of the *Cypria* by Proclus states that after Hera raised a storm against Paris and Helen, they ended up at Sidon, which Paris sacked. Perhaps Herodotus accurately reported the *Cypria* as it existed in his time, but his remark prompted someone to tamper with a few lines of the *Cypria* in order to align it with the *Iliad.* Then Proclus would have unwittingly included the change

B. Trojan horse. Bronze fibula fragment. London, British Museum 3205.
©The British Museum. Used by permission.

in his epitome.[65] That the change had already occurred by the time Proclus encountered the poem is suggested by Apollodorus's agreement with Proclus on this detail (*Epit.* 3.4).[66]

Among other possible explanations is the existence of more than one poem entitled "Cypria."[67] Some might wonder if variance in the poem's title is possible evidence for this, although I think it more probable that the testimonia refer to one poem about which there was disagreement concerning authorship and title. One might also wonder, at a time when Nagy has theorized on multiformity in the Homeric tradition, whether variance in content resulted from an active performance tradition for one single *Cypria* (see Finkelberg 2000; cf. Allen 1908:82). Yet above I argued that by the Classical Age the *Cypria* was probably a fixed text not represented by a living performance tradition, and so I assume that this discrepancy between Herodotus and Proclus does not imply that there were different versions of the *Cypria* within one tradition. A different explanation has been made by Severyns, who supposes that the summary of Proclus was changed upon being placed within the Homeric manuscript tradition.[68] But other indica-

tions suggest that no changes were made to the internal contents of the summary when excerpts of it were placed in the *Iliad* manuscripts.

It has also been suspected that the summary by Proclus does not accurately report Achilles' adventures at Scyros.[69] There are very different accounts, the most famous being that Achilles hid there dressed in feminine garb. This story has been attributed by scholia to the Cycle, but Proclus does not indicate it was in the *Cypria* and even mentions a potentially contradictory account of Achilles reaching Scyros after the first, failed Teuthranian expedition. In my view it is not unlikely that the hiding of Achilles at Scyros occurred in the *Cypria*. The silence of Proclus on this is entirely understandable as resulting from the difficulties of summarizing a poem that wove the strand of Achilles' biography into the larger war story. The account in Proclus of Achilles ending up in Scyros later in his life is in no way incompatible with an earlier sojourn there (just as we need not be troubled that Odysseus reaches Aeolia, Aeaea, and the channel between Scylla and Charybdis twice in the course of the *Odyssey*).

Evidence of omissions and changes of the internal contents of the poems in the Epic Cycle is slight. It does not appear that anyone extensively changed, omitted, or manipulated details of the poems in their fixed state. Some tampering did occur, however, with the removal of the beginnings and endings of the earliest fixed versions of the poems.

There is no reason to think that the composition of any of the poems in the Epic Cycle occurred with any awareness of the other poems later found in the Cycle,[70] despite the common belief that the poems were designed to join together. The apparent unity of the Epic Cycle is actually an illusion caused by later manipulation of the poems selected to construct it. Often the poems in their earlier fixed state apparently covered the same material. For example, Proclus ends the *Aethiopis* before Ajax's suicide, which follows in his summary of the *Little Iliad*. But a scholiast to Pindar reveals that the *Aethiopis* narrated the suicide.[71] And there is evidence, especially the authority of Pausanias, that the *Little Iliad* narrated the sack of Troy, although Proclus ends the poem after the Trojans drag the wooden horse inside the city.[72]

In addition, two poems of the Epic Cycle could sometimes differ about the material they shared. For instance, the summary of the *Iliou Persis* by Proclus states that Odysseus killed Astyanax, but a fragment of the *Little Iliad* states that Neoptolemus killed Astyanax. A scholiast reports that the

author of the *Cypria* related that Polyxena died after having been wounded by Odysseus and Diomedes in the taking of Troy (fr. 34 Bernabé = 27 Davies), but more commonly she is said to have been slaughtered at the grave of Achilles, as in the summary of the *Iliou Persis* by Proclus (Bernabé 1987:89; Davies 1988:62). It is also striking that Aeneas fled from Troy before its fall in the *Iliou Persis* (Proclus), whereas a fragment of the *Little Iliad* reports that Neoptolemus left Troy with Aeneas as his captive. This may be only an apparent contradiction, for the relevant portion of the fragment has also been ascribed to a non-Cyclic author.[73]

An inescapable conclusion from the testimonia examined so far is that Proclus can give a false indication of where a poem actually ended.[74] A closer examination of the beginnings and endings in the summaries reveals that there is indeed much that is odd about how poems in the Cycle join with each other. The division between the *Aethiopis* and the *Little Iliad* occurs between the dispute over Achilles' arms (στάσις) and the judgment on them (κρίσις). It is unlikely that a poem would have narrated only the rise of a dispute without continuing on to narrate its conclusion, or that a poem would have started with the conclusion of a dispute without having narrated its beginning. Even without testimonia, one would be able to guess that Proclus does not report the ending of the *Aethiopis* and the beginning of the *Little Iliad* as they existed in earlier fixations of the texts. But why would a division be made at this point? Why would not one poem or the other be used to tell the whole story of the dispute over the arms of Achilles?

Let us leave those questions unanswered for now and look at the division between the *Little Iliad* and the *Iliou Persis.* According to the summary by Proclus, the *Little Iliad* ends with the Trojans holding a victory feast after having hauled the wooden horse into the city. The beginning of the *Iliou Persis* contains this same victory feast, which occurs after a dispute over what to do with the wooden horse. Here two poems do not join together smoothly, for there is an overlap between them. One event, the victory feast, occurs in both. Yet the destruction of part of the wall in the *Little Iliad* is not found in the *Iliou Persis.* And the Trojan debate over the wooden horse found in the *Iliou Persis* is not indicated for the *Little Iliad.* This all seems very odd indeed (see Davies 1989a:74). Because the two poems independently presented two variant traditions of the story, it is unlikely that the rep-

C. Peleus wrestles Thetis. Amphora fragment. Kavalla Museum A 1086. Courtesy of the Kavalla Museum.

etition was caused by a recapping of the *Little Iliad* in a rhapsodic introduction to the *Persis.*

In any event we know that someone has shortened the end of the *Little Iliad* a great deal, for it once went on to narrate the sack of the city. Apparently this was done in an effort to avoid overlap with the *Iliou Persis.* If someone made this major change, why would he not have taken the much smaller step of making the two poems join smoothly together? Why is overlap and inconsistency allowed at this artificial division between the two poems?

It is worth wondering what were the dimensions of the *Little Iliad* in its earlier fixed state. A frequently discussed piece of evidence concerning the

contents of the *Little Iliad* comes from chapter 23 of the *Poetics* by Aristotle. Listed there are the titles of plays that could be composed from the material in the *Little Iliad* (test. 7 Bernabé = 5 Davies). The material indicated by these titles corresponds to the material of both the *Little Iliad* and the *Iliou Persis* as found in the summary of the Epic Cycle by Proclus. This passage would thus seem to agree with other evidence, already presented, that the *Little Iliad* narrated the fall of Troy. But the listing of titles of plays in the *Poetics* passage is very odd and commonly considered an interpolation, and I take a skeptical stance toward it.[75] Disregarding it in no way challenges my previous conclusion, backed up by numerous testimonia, that the *Little Iliad* narrated the fall of Troy. It does allow us to continue further in our investigation of the dimensions of the *Little Iliad.* The listing of titles in Aristotle would confirm that the poem began where Proclus reports it does; we may now wonder if the earlier fixed manifestation of the *Little Iliad* did have a different beginning than the one reported by Proclus.

One fragment attributed to the *Little Iliad* tells how Achilles was blown to Scyros after his encounter with Telephus, an event from the early years of the war (*Little Iliad* fr. 24 Bernabé [under "incerti operis fragmenta"] = 4 Davies; cf. the summary of the *Cypria* by Proclus). This fragment, however, is often thought to be from a retrospective passage of the *Little Iliad* in which Neoptolemus is fetched from Scyros.[76] But if this fragment does not necessarily indicate that the *Little Iliad* narrated the beginnings of the Trojan War, another one does. The *Vita Homeri Herodotea* states that the *Little Iliad* opened with the lines Ἴλιον ἀείδω καὶ Δαρδανίην εὔπωλον/ἧς πέρι πολλὰ πάθον Δαναοί θεράποντες Ἄρηος,[77] which might suggest that the whole war will be narrated, especially because they stress the suffering of the Greeks, not the Trojans.[78] A final piece of evidence to consider is a Homeric bowl. One scene on it, labeled as belonging to the *Little Iliad,* features Hector, who of course died long before the beginning given to the poem by Proclus.[79] The evidence is not conclusive, but the *Little Iliad* may have told the story of the whole Trojan War. In Chapter 3, the possibility that the *Cypria* also narrated the story of the whole war is considered.

But for now, let us return to our examination of how the Cyclic poems join together in the summary of the Epic Cycle by Proclus. Recapitulation of content may also occur between the *Iliou Persis* and the *Nosti.* The summary by Proclus indicates that in the *Iliou Persis* the Greeks sailed off and

Athena planned a disaster for them at sea. Yet we read in Proclus that the *Nosti* began with the Greeks still at Troy. It is true that at the end of the summary of the *Iliou Persis* there is a chronological problem, for we are told of deeds done at Troy after we are told of the departure of the Greeks.[80] Perhaps the deeds done at Troy (division of spoils, deaths of Astyanax and Polyxena) occurred as the Greeks were planning to leave but had not actually set sail; Athena could then be preparing her vengeance. Or perhaps a narration of atrocities at Troy occurred as a flashback to explain the anger of Athena.[81] But if Proclus is not mistaken to suggest that the Greeks actually set sail in the *Iliou Persis,* then the *Iliou Persis* and the *Nosti* did actually overlap.

Recent analysis of the division of books in the Homeric poems has emphasized the frequency with which their beginnings and endings briefly round off or recapitulate material.[82] Could the aspects of the Epic Cycle that I have enumerated be compared with the breaks between Homeric books? Perhaps, one might reason, bards or rhapsodes used repetition when joining the Cyclic poems together. I do not think so. First, the scope of the material involved suggests alternative versions of the same stories, not brief "rounding off" or recapitulation (which presumably would not be included in the summary by Proclus). Second, Proclus indicates that the poems in the Epic Cycle could disagree about details, for example, in the recovery of the wooden horse as told by the *Little Iliad* and the *Iliou Persis.* Recapitulations would not actually change the story. The breaks between poems in the summary by Proclus are not comparable with the divisions between books in the Homeric poems. Clearly Cyclic data have not been arranged into a completely harmonious whole. Some effort has been made to create a continuous narrative of the Trojan War with no major redundancy or contradictions, yet minor instances of overlap or inconcinnity were allowed to remain between the poems. What conclusion can we draw about when and how the earlier fixed states of the poems were changed?

Severyns argued that the discrepancies between the poems and the summary by Proclus result from tampering with the summary when it was placed in the *Iliad* manuscripts, and his view has been recently championed by Davies.[83] Severyns supposes that Proclus had summarized the full extent of the poems but that repeated material in his summary was later omitted; as well, material contradictory to the Homeric poems was changed. The attraction of this theory is that the placement of the summary within manu-

D. Achilles raids cattle. Boeotian relief amphora. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 99.505 (528).
© 2001 Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. All rights reserved. Used by permission.

scripts of the *Iliad* would provide an excellent motive for changing its nature. The summary by Proclus was used to provide a background for that poem, which is why sections of the summary about the birth of the gods or the Theban War were not included. It is easy to imagine that the summary would be even further manipulated—whether at first or later in the manuscript tradition—so that it would best serve its purpose. Anything that did not help provide a background to the *Iliad,* such as redundancy, could have been eliminated.

Yet there are problems with this theory. Severyns convincingly demonstrated that the original wording of Proclus was carefully and accurately preserved when the Trojan War section of the summary of the Epic Cycle was removed from its larger context, the *Chrestomathy.*[84] First-person verbs used by Proclus are unchanged, as is his reference at the beginning of his summary of the *Cypria* to his later discussion of its authorship, although that

passage was not excerpted and passed along into the *Iliad* manuscripts. The reference was senseless after this Trojan War section of the summary was extracted from its original context (the *Chrestomathy*) and placed in the manuscripts, yet it was preserved nonetheless. As Davies (1986:102) points out, the reference to the mythological stories that Nestor tells to Menelaus in the *Cypria* serves no purpose in introducing the *Iliad,* yet Proclus chose to report these details, and they were retained when the summaries were placed in the manuscripts. In the memorable phrasing of Davies (1986:102), the summaries that we find in the *Iliad* manuscripts are "bleeding chunks." In other words, it is clear that no one after Proclus simply rewrote his summary; what we possess are his words with only the addition of headings.

It is very unlikely that the process that so conscientiously passed on the summary of Proclus would have suppressed elements that contradicted the Homeric poems. As suggested earlier, the one clear example of a change of the internal contents of the poems may have occurred by the time of Apollodorus. If so, it did not occur after the summary was placed in the manuscripts of the *Iliad.*

Omission of endings or beginnings of the summaries of the poems is a somewhat different matter. Severyns has convincingly demonstrated that any undesirable section could simply be left out when excerpts were taken from the *Chrestomathy* and placed in the Homeric manuscripts—as seems to have happened, for example, with the explanation by Proclus of the authorship of the *Cypria*. Does this mean that parts of the summaries of the poems themselves (like the ending of the *Aethiopis* and the *Little Iliad*) were omitted at this stage?[85] That again is very unlikely. For the divisions between the poems that we have examined would not have been made by someone who left out whatever he wanted from a prose summary. Why would the *Aethiopis* be cropped so that two events that are closely linked, dispute over arms and decision of the dispute, be split between two poems? Why would any overlap at all have remained between the other poems? The summary we have does not look as if it has been made over by someone who felt free to create a smooth, seamless story by eliminating beginnings or endings to the summaries. And the discrepancies between the summary and the poems in this regard are significant and sometimes radical, which contradicts the characterization of the exceptor(s) by Severyns as painstakingly faithful and respectful of the original words of Proclus. I therefore conclude that no

major changes, internal or external, were made to the summaries of Proclus when they were used in manuscripts of the *Iliad*.

Where should we look then, if the undoubted misrepresentation of the earlier fixed forms of the poems did not occur after selections from Proclus were placed in manuscripts of the *Iliad?* Was Proclus somehow to blame for the discrepancies? Suspicious eyes have frequently been cast in his direction. A theory arose among German scholars of the late nineteenth century that he did not summarize the poems themselves, but instead used a prose summary, which itself may have been based on previous prose summaries.[86] A distorted picture of the fixed forms of the poems could have easily arisen at any number of points in such a prose summary tradition. The Trojan War section of Apollodorus's epitome, which was published in the late nineteenth century, is very similar to Proclus's summary and encouraged the view that Proclus used a similar summary.

Photius has passed along comments of Proclus that bear on this issue: λέγει δὲ ὡς τοῦ ἐπικοῦ κύκλου τὰ ποιήματα διασῴζεται καὶ σπουδάζεται τοῖς πολλοῖς οὐχ οὕτω διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν ὡς διὰ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ πραγμάτων (And he says that the poems of the Epic Cycle are preserved and of interest to most not for their worth but for the sequence of events in it). These words, besides providing further evidence of the low esteem into which the Epic Cycle eventually slipped, imply that the poems were available to Proclus in verse form. Instead of supposing that Proclus is lying, or senselessly repeating the words of predecessors though they no longer were valid in his day, we should conclude that he based his summary on the poems, and not on prose summaries of them. Does that mean he knew the full extent of the poems and used them as a source, but chose not to include all of their contents? That is as unlikely as the proposition that the summary of Proclus was altered after he wrote it. If Proclus simply desired to create a smoothly running narrative of the Trojan War, he would not have divided the poems at odd places or allowed the same material to be repeated. The peculiar beginnings and endings of the poems in the summary suggest that Proclus has not tried to remove difficulties. On the contrary, they are testimony that he conscientiously reported all that he knew of the poems, no matter how awkward the result. The poems that he knew must have already had their beginnings and endings cropped.

Because there would have been no purpose in composing poems with

E. Achilles and Troilus. Protocorinthian aryballos. Athens, Canellopoulos Museum 1319.
Courtesy of the Acropolis Museum and the Canellopoulos Museum.

such odd transitions between them, and because the earliest manifestations of the Cycle poems had been composed independently of one another, we are forced to conclude that sometime between the composing of the poems and the time of Proclus the early fixed forms of these poems were shortened so that they would fit together but cropped in such a way that they only fit roughly together. I have demonstrated that the Epic Cycle was manufactured in verse form sometime after the composing of the poems, probably during the early Hellenistic period. This must be the time when this crop-

ping occurred. But why would the creation of a verse Epic Cycle result in such awkward transitions between the poems? If the poems were cropped, why were they not cropped so that they fit together more harmoniously?

Perhaps the transitions reflect divisions that already existed in these poems.[87] Those who manufactured the Epic Cycle in the Hellenistic period may have been familiar with book division established for the earlier fixed versions of the Cyclic poems.[88] They could thus have omitted books from the beginnings and endings of the poems but respected the full extent of the books they retained. A selection of books from the poems in their earlier fixed form would cause general continuity to be achieved but would allow a slight awkwardness to remain at the joins. For example, inconcinnity between the *Little Iliad* and the *Iliou Persis* could have arisen because the compilers of the Cycle did not break off until "the first convenient stopping-point" (Monro 1883:320). This break could have come at the end of a book (perhaps based on the conclusion of a rhapsodic performance unit, a possibility discussed later). The references to books in the introduction to each section of the summary need not indicate the total number of books of the poems, though that is rarely noticed (see Monro 1901:342 n.3). One can easily change customary translations of Proclus from, for example, "following are the five books of the *Aethiopis*" to "following are five books of the *Aethiopis*."[89] In addition, the word φερόμενα (transmitted) in the phrase τὰ λεγόμενα Κύπρια ἐν βιβλίοις φερόμενα ἕνδεκα (the so-called Cypria, transmitted in eleven books) calls attention to the *transmission* of books, as if that is of significance. It certainly would be significant if some books had not been included in this transmission; perhaps this is an oblique acknowledgment that a selection of books included in the Epic Cycle is being summarized, not the complete poem. Indeed, underlying the report by Photius that Proclus discussed their ἀκολουθία (sequence) may be an explanation of how selections from the earlier fixed manifestations of the poems were used to achieve a continuous Cycle.[90]

Although the awkward endings and beginnings that we find in Proclus would not have been created for the earliest fixed manifestations of these poems, they may have been established for books of the poems because a division between books is different from an ending or a beginning of a poem. A sudden or jarring division between events need not be considered inappropriate, for the work is still regarded as a whole, as the sum of its books.

We can imagine a book ending with the quarrel over the arms of Achilles and the next book beginning with the resolution of the quarrel, though such an ending or beginning would be intolerable for an epic poem.

It would be unusual, though not impossible, for the arising and judgment of the quarrel to be divided in both the *Aethiopis* and the *Little Iliad,* with the result that later a book from one poem could be conveniently joined to a book from the other poem to narrate the episode. A smooth transition would not result every time books from different poems were joined together; the division between poems in Proclus is usually not smooth—for example, between the *Little Iliad* and the *Iliou Persis.*

This discussion assumes that the division of the poems of the Epic Cycle into books preceded the manufacture of the Epic Cycle. The date of book division for Homeric poems is often assigned to the Alexandrian period. But the prior existence of titles for some Homeric episodes suggests that some simple form of division, at least, was known in the Classical Age, and some have supposed that earlier rhapsodes or even Homer himself required stopping points for the performance of the poems.[91] I incline to the view that that the origin of the canonical books—actually called ῥαψῳδίαι (rhapsodies) in antiquity—lies in performance by rhapsodes.[92]

So some system of division could have been established for early fixed forms of the poems of the Epic Cycle before the Cycle was manufactured. These divisions might very well have been suggested by the needs of performance. If parts of the Cyclic epics were performed at the Panathenaic festival, then some division of the Cyclic epics could have then resulted. The divisions might also have arisen for performance in other periods, or they might reflect the exigencies of recording the poems on writing material. The existence of such divisions, whatever their origin and nature, would well explain the odd transitions in the summary we possess.

The evidence that lines of verse were created or changed at the beginning and ending of the *Iliad* to join it to the Epic Cycle suggests that such passages were created to join the truncated poems together when a verse Cycle was manufactured in the Hellenistic period, or that rhapsodes created them when joining poetry from different epics in performance. But care was not taken to eliminate the remaining redundancy or inconcinnity. It appears that only slight joins were created, enough to connect various performance units from different poems but not enough to smooth the awkward transitions.

F. Penthesileia and Achilles. Terracotta shield fragment. Nauplion Museum 4509. Courtesy of the Nauplion Museum and the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Athens. Neg. no. 70 /1392.

If the Cyclic poems were shortened in the early Hellenistic period, why do later scholars sometimes seem to know their original dimensions, speaking as if they had read these poems outside of the context of a compilation or summary?[93] The earlier fixed manifestations of the poems need not have disappeared after abridgments and summaries were made of them. A limited number of scholars may have possessed complete texts of them, although most would be more familiar with the more useful Epic Cycle.[94] Of course, the likelihood of the continued existence of the poems decreases as time goes by.

According to my interpretation, the poems in the Epic Cycle were not meant to join together to form an Epic Cycle.[95] Abridgments of the earlier fixed forms of the poems were made to form a verse account of the origins of the gods, the Theban War, and the Trojan War. Books or sections of the individual poems were used in the manufacturing of the Epic Cycle, which created a generally continuous narrative. However, the transitions between the poems can be awkward because no effort was made to change the earlier scope of the books when different poems were joined together. Such a process explains why slight overlap and inconcinnity exists between the poems in the summary of the Trojan War section of the Epic Cycle.

The "Cyclic" Tradition of the Trojan War

Trojan War material found in the Epic Cycle has very old roots and continued to be used by poets and artists throughout antiquity. The present survey divides the material chronologically. First, I consider art and literature of the Archaic Age that narrated Trojan War material present in the Epic Cycle. Because we do not know their date and extent of initial influence, such evidence may not reflect the specific poems later placed in the Epic Cycle. In this time period we should not consider the "Cyclic" tradition as one that results from, or is limited to, the poems we know were part of the Epic Cycle. But early evidence of Trojan War myth demonstrates that whatever the date of the Trojan War poems in the Epic Cycle, their tradition existed at an early date. Second, I discuss later art and literature that could well have been influenced by the Trojan War poems in the Epic Cycle. Eventually the living epic tradition of the Trojan War died out, and these poems became its surviving representatives. Later poets and artists would often have relied on the poems of the Epic Cycle as a source for the story of the Trojan War. By "Cyclic" tradition I mean essentially the living pre-Homeric tradition of the Trojan War that led to the Trojan War poems in the Epic Cycle and continued with the Cycle as a major manifestation of it. This tradition preceded the Homeric poems but then in turn was gradually overshadowed by them.

Early poems in the "Cyclic" tradition would have been oral and, of course, are now lost. The tradition of the Trojan War is undoubtedly pre-Homeric, and some concepts in it may reach back to the Bronze Age. The sack of a city, for instance, was a generic topic for Bronze Age artists and may have

G. Penthesileia and Achilles. Late Protocorinthian vase fragment.
Aigina Museum 2061.
Courtesy of the Aigina Museum and E. Walter-Karydi.

been the subject of song as well.[96] More specifically, the weighing of souls (a "psychostasia") that artists and Aeschylus linked with the duel between Achilles and Memnon (a story told in the *Aethiopis*) seems to be conceptually linked with the weighing of the heart in Egyptian eschatology.[97] Memnon's mother Eos is a multiform of the Indic dawn goddess Uṡas; her care for her son as well as her gestalt may derive from very old Indo-European traditions.[98] Whether elements in Cyclic poems are derivative from the Homeric poems or relatively innovative is discussed in Chapter 3; for now it is enough to recognize that aspects of the Cycle such as these may have origins that reach far back into prehistory.

Seventh-century poets well knew Trojan War material also found in the Epic Cycle.[99] In Hesiodic poetry, besides general knowledge of the Trojan War and the Theban War together as a time when heroes died (*Erg.* 156–173), we find the birth of Achilles (*Theog.* 1006–1007) and the gathering

at Aulis (*Erg.* 651–653). We also find fruitful unions between Odysseus and Circe and Odysseus and Calypso (*Theog.* 1011–1018, in a part of the poem often suspected of being a late addition). Undoubtedly many oral "Cyclic" epics existed in the early Archaic Age, and some poems similar to the ones in the Epic Cycle were recorded by writing, as a few hints from the ancient world demonstrate (see note 31). Poets of nonepic genres also composed works about the Trojan War. Alcman refers to Memnon (fr. 68 *PMG*), and some suspect he knew of Odyssean material from a non-Homeric source (fr. 80 *PMG*). Alcaeus and Sappho have an "obsessive" interest in myth about the Trojan War that may be independent of Homer.[100] Stesichorus composed an *Iliou Persis* and a *Nosti*[101] and Ibycus composed verse about Trojan War topics (e.g., the death of the Trojan maiden Polyxena after the sack of Troy, and Achilles with Medea at his afterlife island Leuke).[102] The recently published Simonides fragment about the battle of Plataea in the fifth century B.C.E. refers to such "Cyclic" material as the death of Achilles and the fall of Troy.[103]

Early Greek poets employed "Cyclic" material long before the Attic tragedians did. By this I mean they were interested in Trojan War mythology also contained in the Epic Cycle poems, not that they were directly inspired by the Epic Cycle poems. It would seem that there was a "Cyclic" tradition of the Trojan War throughout the Archaic Age, with the poems of the Epic Cycle not its origin or its center but rather simply representative of the tradition. Undoubtedly these few indications of "Cyclic" Trojan War material in early Greek poetry represent only a small fraction of what must have been vigorous and extensive mythology about the Trojan War.

"Cyclic" Trojan War Images

Art is more revealing than literature on this matter and confirms the impression that "Cyclic" myth about the Trojan War was well known in the Archaic Age. As discussed in Chapter 2, reflections of the Homeric poems in art are surprisingly late and infrequent. A completely different picture emerges when we look for images about "Cyclic" Trojan War themes. No matter how one judges the number of Homeric scenes in early art, it must be admitted that non-Homeric images of the Trojan War precede Homeric images and remained far more popular throughout the seventh century and into the sixth century. A brief perusal of the graphs supplied by

Fittschen (1969) and R. Cook (1983) makes this manifestly clear. For the purposes of demonstration I have provided a time chart in Appendix B that summarizes Cook's findings. The apparent lateness of Homeric themes as compared with "Cyclic" themes in early iconography is remarkable. Although identification of these early scenes is often uncertain, and different scholars have reached very different conclusions, all major interpreters of early Trojan War images agree that the "Cyclic" images far outnumber the Homeric ones.[104]

In Appendix C I give a list of what I think are likely Trojan War images for the early Archaic Age, down to 600 B.C.E. Because specific poems are probably not responsible for these representations, I have thought it best not to use the titles of poems for section headings (cf. Fittschen 1969; R. Cook 1983; Ahlberg-Cornell 1992). Instead, I have divided the images into four sections of the Trojan War story: preparatory, siege, sack, and returns. By the first term I mean the incidents that were necessary for the start of the war and events undertaken during preparation for the war. By *siege* I refer to events that occurred after the Greeks arrived in Troy for ten whole years until the sack of the city. *Sack* refers to the destruction of the city by the stratagem of the wooden horse. Images about the return of the conquering Greeks from Troy are categorized under the term *returns*, which is not used here to refer to the Epic Cycle poem of that name.

My list of early Trojan War representations is not as extensive as some, but for this period inscriptions are rare, the iconography often uncertain, and the artifacts frequently broken. Indeed, it must be admitted from the start that many of the identifications that I accept as plausible are not certain at all. Yet some conclusions can be drawn from this artistic evidence with assurance. Ajax seems to have been a popular figure for artists, for we have multiple images of his rescue of the corpse of Achilles and his suicide (Appendix C, nos. 26–36; Figure A).[105] Artists were not fixated on one character or episode, however. The range of plausible Trojan War images extends over the course of the story. Representations of the judgment of Paris are certain at an early date (nos. 3–4), as are also depictions of the wooden horse (nos. 37–39; Figure B). There seem to be some early depictions of Peleus seizing Thetis among Nereids (no. 2; Figure C), Achilles raiding the cattle of Aeneas (no. 10; Figure D), Achilles waylaying Troilus (nos. 11–15; Figure E), as well as Achilles fighting Penthesileia (nos. 20–23; Figures F, G) and

H. Phrontis. Plaque fragment. Athens, National Archeological Museum 14935. Courtesy of the National Archeological Museum.

murders in the family of Agamemnon (nos. 44–47).[106] There are relatively few representations of material narrated by the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; they are categorized in Appendix C within the sections *siege* and *returns* respectively. Whether these representations reflect those poems in particular or traditional stories that the Homeric poems happened to narrate is examined in Chapter 2. It should be stressed, however, that the representation of action that is narrated in a particular poem does not necessarily mean that the poem was the inspiration for the artist. One can with greater confidence link images to traditional myth than to specific poems.

Very few representations from the late Geometric period are on my list. It seems certain that some artists at this time were beginning to portray mythical scenes, but few images can be linked with specific mythological subjects securely.[107] A late Geometric image of a shipwreck has too rashly been linked with Odysseus, as has a vase from the same period that some think depicts Paris putting Helen on a boat.[108] But other representations of around this time can be identified with greater confidence. At first glance a plaque fragment depicting rowers in a boat (Appendix C, no. 43; Figure H) is hardly impressive, but the greater size of the helmsman suggests he is of special significance. Because the artifact was found at Sounion where a cult for Phrontis is suspected, this depiction is arguably that of Phrontis, the

I. Death of Astyanax. Protoattic vase fragment. Athens, Agora Museum P 10201a. Courtesy of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens: Agora Excavations.

helmsman of Agamemnon who died at Cape Sounion (*Od.* 3.278–285).[109] Sometimes late Geometric iconography alone is enough to secure the identification of specific mythological subjects indisputably. For instance, the addition of wheels on the hooves of a horse, as seen on a bronze fibula from the late eighth century (no. 37; Figure B), is all that is needed to portray the wooden horse.

The late Geometric terracotta shield that shows a warrior fighting Amazons (Appendix C, no. 20; Figure F) is certainly mythical, but Heracles as well as Achilles has been identified as the hero.[110] The centaur depicted on the other side may well be Chiron, however, and this allows confidence that the famous encounter between Achilles and Penthesileia is depicted. Another late Geometric image, a vase fragment that seems to show a man grabbing a youth by the leg (no. 41; Figure I), has been interpreted as the death of Astyanax, though some have plausibly thought it represents a dance or acrobatic scene.[111] Because the death of Astyanax was a well-known story to which the *Iliad* apparently alludes, the image on the sherd may well depict this scene.

A second candidate for the death of the Trojan prince occurs a genera-

tion later (Appendix C, no. 42), on the famous relief vase from Mykonos that certainly depicts the wooden horse (no. 38). Many images of violence against women and children, however, appear on the panels below the wooden horse. Specific characters cannot be meant for most, but two panels resemble later, certain iconography for the death of Astyanax and the confrontation of Menelaus and Helen. A persuasive and successful argument for the mixture of anonymous and specific scenes of violence during the sack of Troy has been made by Kannicht.[112]

Identification of Trojan War images continues to be difficult when one turns to seventh-century artifacts. It is unfortunate that the difficulty has been increased by the tendency to misinterpret "Cyclic" images as Homeric. A bronze tripod leg from the late seventh century shows a number of scenes on separate panels, including a mistress-of-animals icon and an apparent depiction of Achilles leading Troilus up to an altar to be slain (Appendix C, no. 14). One panel depicts three men walking from the left to the right (no. 9; Figure J). The middle figure has a cap on his head, which reminds scholars of the later artistic use of the *pilos* to identify Odysseus.[113] Many scholars have identified this as the embassy to Achilles.[114] The figure behind Odysseus is identified as Ajax, the figure in front usually as Phoenix. Yet the front figure carries a caduceus before him that identifies him as a herald (poor preservation has made details about what he carries over his shoulder almost impossible to make out). It is likely that a mythological scene is depicted, and tempting to conclude that an embassy is shown, but the obvious mythological candidate is the embassy of Menelaus and Odysseus to Troy, not the embassy to Achilles.[115] Indeed, a sixth-century representation identifies by inscription Ajax, Odysseus, and the herald Talthybios as the three Greek participants in the embassy to Troy.[116]

A choice between similar events also presents itself in the case of an early image that shows a shield between a man and a woman (Appendix C, no. 6; Figure K). One thinks of Thetis presenting armor to Achilles, and many have proposed that the artifact is an early illustration of the *Iliad*.[117] But this probably reflects the departure of Achilles from Phthia before the war. Achilles actually possesses two sets of divine armor in the course of the *Iliad*, having obtained the first set from Peleus. The *Iliad* alludes to the departure of Achilles several times (9.438–442, 11.765–813, 18.324–327, 16.220–224), but claims that Peleus received the first set of armor from the gods at his wed-

J. Embassy of Menelaus and Odysseus to Troy. Bronze tripod leg.
Olympia Museum B 3600.
Drawing by Martina Meyer.

ding (17.194–197, 18.84–85). Euripides portrayed Thetis and the Nereids bringing newly Hephaestan-made armor to Achilles at Phthia (*Electra* 432–485), an account that probably follows an old tradition.[118] Friis Johansen persuasively argued that the earliest images of the arming of Achilles indicate Phthia as the location, and his view can still stand despite a skilled rebuttal recently made by Lowenstam.[119] Traditionally Achilles would have had only one set of armor, because two would preclude the undoubtedly ancient quarrel over Achilles' arms by Odysseus and Ajax.[120] The story of the armoring at Phthia should be regarded as earlier and, initially, better known than the manufacture and bestowal of armor in *Iliad* books 18–19.

In much the same way it is occasionally claimed that an image commonly

K. Achilles receives armor from Thetis [Phthia]. Amphora fragment.
Mykonos Museum 666.
Courtesy of the École Française d' Athènes. ©EFA.

regarded as the earliest depiction of Achilles and Memnon dueling (Appendix C, no. 25) actually depicts Ajax and Diomedes fighting for the weapons of Sarpedon, an incident in *Iliad* 23's games for Patroclus. The inspiration for this interpretation is the set of armor shown lying on the ground between the warriors, whereas the corpse of Antilochus is sometimes shown in later representations of the duel between Achilles and Memnon.[121] But Antilochus was not an indispensable element of the story of Achilles and Memnon, although that has been assumed in modern scholarship.[122]

Because we do not really know the details of early forms of this myth, it is easy to suppose that the artist might be portraying the stripped armor of Antilochus after his corpse has been successfully removed from the scene. The armor could also serve to symbolize the corpse of Antilochus. In any event what is much more significant about the image is the alarmed observing women on each side of the duel; these must be the mothers Thetis and Eos, as often in later images. They cannot be explained if the image is thought to represent Ajax and Diomedes.[123] Friis Johansen is surely right to affirm that the schema of women flanking warriors insures that this is Achilles and Memnon, as in fact the work is interpreted "generally, and with the greatest feasibility."[124]

Sometimes a representation that can only be generally associated with the Trojan War is unnecessarily linked with the narrative of the *Iliad.* A mid-seventh-century stand identifies by inscription Menelaus as one of five men in elaborate dress carrying spears (Appendix C, no. 7). The apparently Doric form of the name (MENELAS) has sometimes been thought significant, but spelling was haphazard at this time and the artist may have simply run out of room.[125] It has been often suggested that this is an illustration of the *Iliad.*[126] But the representation seems to show a gathering of men who are warriors (they hold spears) for whom battle is not imminent (they wear civilian dress). It seems reasonable to see Menelaus with other chiefs or his troops at Aulis, where the Greeks famously gathered for the war. But perhaps one should not dare to guess more than that a scene from sometime in the Trojan War is depicted. In any event there is certainly nothing about the image that suggests a scene narrated in the *Iliad.* A similar case in which a generic scene featuring Patroclus has been too hastily associated with the *Iliad* (no. 16; Figure M) is discussed in Chapter 2.[127] My use of four general headings instead of poem titles has the advantage of allowing one to list images that seem to belong to the Trojan War without identifying their context too closely. The Menelaus stand can simply be listed under *preparatory* (it could possibly be listed under *siege*), and the Patroclus vase under *siege*. A fragment just large enough to give most of the name of Antilochus and show that he is standing in battle behind another warrior cannot be placed in any certain context, but can also be categorized under *siege* with confidence.[128]

The interpretation of a number of other representations listed in Appendix C is uncertain, but this is not the place to rehearse the many argu-

ments about them. All the identifications listed there have seemed plausible to earlier scholars, and usually a greater number of candidates are put forward for Trojan War images. My discussion has demonstrated that scholars recognize the prevalence of early representations of Trojan War material found in the Epic Cycle, despite a prejudice that favors Homeric over "Cyclic" interpretations. Some "Cyclic" scenes probably appear in late-eighth-century art, and seventh-century art definitely represents episodes we now associate with such poems as the *Cypria, Aethiopis, Little Iliad,* and *Iliou Persis.* Although we should not view the artwork as evidence for specific poems, most of the Trojan War scenes portrayed in early art correspond to episodes in these poems. That is why scholars who make graphs of them use the titles of the various poems in the Epic Cycle as section headings. This correspondence between early art and the poems of the Epic Cycle suggests that these poems accurately continued a stable tradition about the Trojan War.

Certainly other mythical subjects besides the Trojan War were also depicted in early Greek art; Heracles in particular was represented much more frequently.[129] On the other hand, many myths of undoubted antiquity and popularity were neglected by the artists.[130] Obviously we cannot expect art to give an exact indication of the state of early Greek myth. But artwork does demonstrate that the Trojan War tradition from which the Trojan War poems in the Epic Cycle are derived was at least as old as the late eighth century. The "Cyclic" tradition of the Trojan War is essentially the tradition of the Trojan War, though of course the Trojan War poems in the Epic Cycle should not be equated with the tradition of the Trojan War. The tradition of the Trojan War would have been multifarious, ever changing, and often self-contradictory. The Cyclic Trojan War poems represent different poetic manifestations of the stories within the tradition. Not surprisingly, given the wealth of material with which to work and the possibility of innovation, these poems were not always consistent with each other. Nor could they, despite their number and apparent size, represent all that was contained within the tradition of the Trojan War. For example, the arrival and demise of Rhesos, an episode narrated in the much-suspected book 10 of the *Iliad,* may well be traditional (Fenik 1964), although there is no evidence that it was narrated in the Epic Cycle. A quarrel between Achilles and Odysseus, narrated allusively at *Odyssey* 8.72–82, also cannot be found in the Epic Cycle.[131]

And artists of the late Archaic Age were fond of depicting Ajax and Achilles at a gaming board, an incident for which we know no literary version.[132]

But on the whole it seems that the Trojan War poems of the Epic Cycle well represent the traditional story of the Trojan War. The artistic evidence implies that at least some themes in the Epic Cycle are independent of the Homeric poems and based on a tradition that preceded and survived them. No scholar has been able to explain away this evidence. Kirk (1962:285) would have us believe that the early representations reflect new, nontraditional myth. In fact, he considers "Cyclic" themes in art evidence for an eighth-century date for Homer, on the assumption that "Cyclic" material was invented to complete the Homeric poems. Because he cannot explain why the artwork does not reflect the Homeric poems, his argument is very problematic. The lack of Homeric scenes in early art suggests that these mythical episodes could not have been based on the Homeric poems or intended to complete them. They must be based on a pre-Homeric tradition that was known by the time the Homeric poems were composed. It is difficult enough to argue that within a generation the Homeric poems eliminated the genuine Trojan tradition that preceded them and inspired new myth to complete their stories; that artists would ignore such dominant poems and instead choose to portray the new, nongenuine myths inspired by them is inconceivable.

Later Manifestations

As the living oral tradition of the Trojan War died out, the poems of the Cycle became increasingly relied upon as a source for the story of the Trojan War throughout antiquity. Gradually their reputations suffered, and the lack of papyri finds for the Cyclic poems indicates that they did not have a wide public audience. But as long as they were available—whether in the form of the early, independent poems, or as part of the verse Epic Cycle, or summarized in epitomes—they continued to be of use to artists, poets, and scholars interested in the complete story of the Trojan War. It is possible that a living tradition of the Trojan War survived in part outside the influence of the Epic Cycle, but the Cycle must be considered a major source for literature about the Trojan War in later times. Because the summary by Proclus does not provide us with as much information about these poems as we wish, all post–Archaic Age art and literature that may have used them

for sources should be examined in trying to reconstruct the contents of these poems. The better sense that we have of the poems of the Epic Cycle, the more we can potentially know about pre-Homeric myth.

Evidence for the contents of the poems of the Epic Cycle does exist outside of Proclus. Because the fifth century was probably a time when the Cycle poems became authoritative representatives of their tradition, art or literature might then begin to reflect them, casting indirect light on their contents. Numerous literary works were based on material in the Epic Cycle, and there are countless allusions to "Cyclic" myth in surviving literature. For example, Pindar was very much interested in "Cyclic" material and perhaps depended on the poems we know in the Epic Cycle as a source.[133] The anecdote by Athenaeus that Sophocles enjoyed using the Epic Cycle for source material, whatever its truth, underscores the fact that Athenian tragedy represents a glorious manifestation of the "Cyclic" tradition.[134] The account of the Trojan War in Apollodorus is invaluable because it is undoubtedly largely based on the Cycle and is usually more detailed than Proclus.[135] Vergil certainly relied on the Epic Cycle as one of his sources in the *Aeneid,* and not just for the memorable narration of the fall of Troy in book 2 (Kopff 1981). And the Cycle also seems to be an important source for the narration of post-Iliadic events in the Trojan War by Quintus of Smyrna.[136] These authors were creative and inventive, but it is clear that they are retelling traditional stories. The traditional foundation in other late authors is considerably harder to ascertain. Philostratus (author of the *Heroicus*) and Dictys/Dares are "anti-Homerist" authors who purport to give a realistic "correct" view of the war, and as a result their works are self-consciously sophisticated, exuberantly inventive, and perversely idiosyncratic. Nonetheless, they apparently use the Cycle in this endeavor, and occasionally their works can be sifted for potentially traditional material.[137] Of course, caution must be employed when using them. The same can be said for the verse of Lycophron and Tzetzes on the Trojan War, which seems to contain much late and obscure material. As we have seen already in this chapter, the most direct evidence for the poems in the Epic Cycle comes from scholars who lived centuries after their composition but provide us with many useful testimonia.

Art, on the other hand, continues to supply information about the Trojan War throughout antiquity. The Homeric bowls and Iliac tables call for

special attention, for they claim to represent the Epic Cycle. Perhaps they were part of a tradition of illustrated texts of the Epic Cycle or a tradition of art work that featured "Cyclic" material.[138] There are some odd aspects about their contents, and caution should again be applied when using the evidence they provide.[139] On the whole, however, it is justifiable to believe that art and literature throughout antiquity, no matter how late, may contain some pre-Homeric myth.[140] How much is traditional and how much is invented is the question facing any scholar. A second question is the influence of Homeric poetry. The eventual dominance of the Homeric poems has led many to think that Cyclic composition was based on the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey,* not on traditions reaching back to pre-Homeric time. In the next chapter I consider this question of Homeric influence before turning to the relationship between the Epic Cycle and the Homeric poems in Chapter 3.

TWO

Homer and the Tradition of the Trojan War

"Cyclic" Myth in the Homeric Poems

Greek mythology was well developed before the Homeric poems were composed. The texts themselves refer repeatedly to mythical material outside of the Trojan War.[1] The *Iliad* clearly presupposes a well-developed Trojan legend that extended far beyond the short period of the *Iliad*'s dramatic time. It frequently mentions the death of Achilles and the fall of Troy and alludes to such events as the judgment of Paris (24.28–30), the wound of Philoctetes and his coming return (2.718–725), and the death of Protesilaus (2.698–699). In the *Odyssey* the Trojan War is a matter of song for Phemius (1.325ff.), Demodocus (8.72ff., 499–520), and the Sirens (12.189–190). The *Odyssey* mentions many details about post-Iliadic events, such as the killing of Antilochus by Memnon (4.186–188), the death of Achilles followed by a fight over his corpse, an elaborate funeral, and funeral games (5.308–310, 24.36–92), the quarrel over the arms of Achilles by Ajax and Odysseus and the subsequent suicide of Ajax (11.553–565), the killing of Eurypylos by Neoptolemus (11.519–521), a reconnaissance mission into Troy by Odysseus (4.240–259), the wooden horse (4.271–289, 8.499–520), the returns of various heroes (1.325ff., 3.130–192, 4.351–586), and the murder of Agamemnon (1.35ff., 4.193–198, 512–537, 24.96–97).[2]

The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were composed with knowledge of a well-

developed story about the war much like that told by the Trojan War poems of the Epic Cycle. In the past many scholars who were uncomfortable with a Homer who is familiar with "Cyclic" material argued that interpolations from "later" myth were added to the Homeric poems. Aristarchus pioneered the practice of condemning passages where knowledge of "Cyclic" material is demonstrated, such as *Iliad* 24.28–30, where the judgment of Paris is mentioned.[3] The practice was continued by German analysts and others who labeled some sections of the Homeric poems "Cyclic," and thus late.[4] Because frequent references to the larger Trojan War are not easily disentangled from the *Odyssey,* it has sometimes been argued that new material unknown to the *Iliad* was used in the *Odyssey.*[5]

But was "early," pre-Homeric myth about the Trojan War more circumscribed than the story told in the Epic Cycle? The study of oral poetics has shown that the Homeric poems inherited the mechanics of poetic composition that developed over centuries, and it is only natural to suppose that they inherited traditional stories, not just technique. The Homeric poems directly refer to an extensive range of material about the story of the Trojan War. This legend is the background for the poems, and it is constantly assumed in the poems that the Trojan War is known and understood. There seems no way of separating this material from the Homeric poems in the form that we recognize them. Thus one can conclude that an expansive legend of the Trojan War had already developed by the time the Homeric poems were being composed. As we saw in the preceding chapter, the stories narrated in the Epic Cycle did not originate with the poems of the Cycle. The Trojan War tradition was in existence long before either the Cyclic or Homeric poems came into being. The Trojan War is essentially "Cyclic" material in the sense that the poems of the Epic Cycle eventually recorded traditional narratives more directly and comprehensively than the Homeric poems did.

Of much relevance here is ad hoc invention, a term that refers to Homeric invention of details to suit the poetic needs of specific passages. The phenomenon has been celebrated as an indication of originality, and sometimes it is suggested that Homeric allusions to extra-Iliadic myth need not refer to traditional material.[6] Ad hoc invention of details undoubtedly exists in the Homeric poems. For example, many of the minor warriors mentioned in the *Iliad,* along with the details of their minibiographies regularly sup-

plied upon their death, are probably not traditional. But most passages discussed as ad hoc invention involve the creation of details, not myth made out of whole cloth.[7] Sometimes a character with a motive to misrepresent the past adds details that do not correspond to tradition. Sometimes the fleshing out of traditional stories is necessary because of the expansive narrative of the Homeric poems. Usually the larger context of the passage remains elliptical, which suggests that the audience is expected to be familiar with the basic story. Thus the existence of ad hoc invention does not question the traditional foundation of Homeric allusions to the Trojan War. I see no reason to suspect any of those listed here as pure invention.

One can still argue that the Homeric testimony for the "Cyclic" story of the Trojan War only occurred in a later manifestation of the Homeric poems that incorporated myth not known to an earlier, supposedly more authentic manifestation. But how do we identify the "later" myth that is so radically different that it contaminates portions of the poems, making them somehow inauthentic? Most scholars now take a unitarian approach to the Homeric poems, even if they posit a relatively long and complicated process of composition. A "unitarian" approach to the early mythological tradition of the Trojan War is also advisable. Undoubtedly different elements and motifs entered the tradition at different times, but these were all molded into a coherent whole. Even if we could be sure that some mythological elements are relatively late (and the difficulty of this task will be pointed out in Chapter 3), it is very risky to deem them post-Homeric because "Cyclic" myth is virtually indistinguishable from the tradition of the Trojan War as we know it. "Cyclic" myth is also part of the weave of the Homeric poems as we know them, and there is no point in trying to root it out.

The Date of the Homeric Poems

The date of the Homeric poems is not known, even if the standard opinion of the generation past was that they were composed in the late eighth century.[8] The eighth-century date is sometimes supported by the belief that Cyclic poems dependent on Homer date from the seventh or even the eighth century, thus establishing a terminus ante quem for the time of the Homeric poems. But the dates of poems in the Epic Cycle are hard to establish with confidence, and their dependence on Homer is debatable in any case. A common schematic approach, which places the age of epic before

the age of lyric, also encourages an eighth-century date. But the schematic notion that 700 B.C.E. marks the end of an epic age and the beginning of a lyric age is too arbitrary. It happens that the earliest lyric poets are identified as living in the seventh century, and so valued epic poets have been dated before them.[9] Recently it has been popular to describe "Homeric society" as a reflection of eighth-century Greece.[10] Although many scholars have successfully used an anthropological approach to discover functional and coherent societal patterns in the Homeric epics,[11] when these perspectives are overemphasized as reflections of reality they can also lead to an overly artificial picture. The poems may largely reflect one particular period, but it would be mistaken to separate their representations of culture and society completely from earlier and later periods.

When we turn to the poems themselves for specific internal evidence for their date, we find that some *realia* and practices in the poems may be dated to the seventh century or later.[12] Agamemnon's shield sports a Gorgon (*Il.* 11.36–37), which does not appear on shields in the archaeological record before the seventh century. A brooch of Odysseus at *Odyssey* 19.226–231 has been dated to the first half of the seventh century; a golden lamp used by Athena earlier in the same book (*Od.* 19.34) was not in use between the Bronze Age and the seventh century.[13] Some passages seem to imply knowledge of the apparently Archaic Age concepts of the polis and hoplite warfare. There are also hints of Panhellenic activity at places such as Delphi, Delos, and Olympia, which could be judged to reflect the seventh century.[14] The range of geography displayed by the poems is unquestionably wider than has been generally admitted, and many passages suggest the age of colonization that began in the eighth century but continued down into the seventh.[15] M. West proposes that a Homeric passage on the destruction of the Achaean wall (*Il.* 12.17–33) reflects the use of river waters to level Babylon in the seventh century, and the argument is plausible enough to give one pause.[16]

Perhaps the strongest Archaic Age aspect of the Homeric poems is their description of artwork, which may best be associated with the new and energetic era of Orientalizing art. It is true that analogy has more often been made in the past between Geometric art and the Homeric poems.[17] The theory starts from the assumption of an eighth-century Homer and seeks to find contemporary correspondences. Essentially the more orderly aspects

of oral composition are related to the repetitious arrangement of Geometric representations. Though clever, this idea is obviously no real argument for the date of the poems. When one pursues the implications of the analogy, its inadequacies quickly become apparent. On an impressionistic level it is hard to think of Homeric poetry as the poetic equivalent of eighth-century art. Taplin (1992:85) comments, "If I were to press the analogy between Homer and the visual arts, the poetry has, it seems to me, broken out of the patterned regulation of Geometric." And when one turns to actual descriptions of artistic representation in the Homeric poems, especially the fluid and vivid scenes on the shield of Achilles, the artwork of a later age comes to mind.[18] Recently Snodgrass has recognized the seeming paradox of an eighth-century Homer imagining the "future course of the visual arts" (1998:41) and argued that the technique of Geometric art is more flexible than commonly believed.[19] His defense of eighth-century representation is skilled but does not establish that the Homeric poems describe imagery of that time. Homeric description of artistic imagery actually confirms other evidence for the continuance of the Homeric tradition down into the Archaic Age.

The shield of Achilles, as described in *Iliad* 18, cannot match exactly any artifact in the real world, being made of precious materials by a divine craftsman who bestows upon it supernatural qualities. But it was not imagined in a cultural vacuum, and when we look for analogous artifacts we must turn not to the Bronze Age, as was once thought, but to bronze and silver circular items of the early seventh century.[20] The artifacts show multiple figures on concentric bands, and often a coherent narrative is indicated, like the siege of a city. And it is not only the generally vivid and active tone of the imagery of the scenes on the shield of Achilles that reminds one of Orientalizing art, but often the very content of specific scenes. Some images are reminiscent of Geometric art but quite a few are first found in the Orientalizing period or even later. The Homeric shield of Achilles may very well mix the artistic techniques of different periods with a healthy sense of imagination, but it could hardly have been composed before the seventh century.

On the whole this various evidence seems to suggest that the compositional traditions of the Homeric poems continued into the Archaic Age, and some evidence has even been linked with Athens of the sixth century.[21] Discussion of the Panathenaic festival and the "Pisistratean recension" often

leads to the view that the epics reached a definitive form, at least, in sixth-century Athens.[22] The Homeric poems are not chock-full of novelties from the Archaic Age, but there is too much evidence to weed out arbitrarily as intrusions. The evidence supports the argument for a long Homeric compositional tradition leading to fixation of texts only in the sixth century. A Homeric performing tradition that remained continuously fluid, yet became increasingly stabilized, would explain the presence of elements from different time periods, including the Archaic Age. However one accounts for the fixation of the texts we have today, it seems that there is an Archaic Age "layer" in the poems, just as it seems there is a Mycenaean layer. It is dubious practice to consider reflections of the Archaic Age interpolations just because one prefers to believe that a poet named Homer lived before that time.

Of course, many of these artifacts can be difficult to date precisely, and new archaeological discoveries may necessitate the conclusion that they existed earlier than once thought, as Snodgrass (1998:77–78) warns. As well, increasingly it seems that many practices associated with the Archaic Age have earlier roots; much depends on the dating of slowly evolving practices. The degree of their reflection in the poems is also complicated, especially because the poetry pretends to describe an earlier age and so can suppress contemporary elements. The issues will remain complex and continue to frustrate attempts to date precisely a single poet or poem. But if 700 can no longer be viewed as a strong division between ages, then the Homeric poems, whatever their date, cannot be viewed as alien to the Archaic Age. As the Greek renaissance is dated earlier and deemed less dramatic, even those who insist on an eighth-century Homer will have difficulty in portraying such a poet as living in a radically different world than what poets in the seventh and sixth century experienced or working with radically different mythological traditions than those of the Archaic Age.

But there is still the internal evidence of linguistic forms to consider. On the basis of such evidence, Janko (1982) has insisted that the Homeric poems must date from the eighth century, and he came to conclusions about the relative dating of many other poems as well. Yet, however admirable the scholarship of his fundamental study, essential aspects of his methodology are open to question. Certainly forms change over time in a manner that is observable, and the formulaic system of oral composition resulted in relative degrees of normal practice. But Janko's study displays an unsettling con-

fidence that epic verse everywhere was developing in the same way in a robotically steady manner. The statistical quantification of forms here does not make enough allowance for the varying length of the different poems that are being compared, and indeed the very meagerness of what survives in some cases can only lead to misleading percentages. Variance in diction and form between poems was also undoubtedly caused by subject matter, poetic function, local dialects, and the preferences or ability of composers. The epic tradition on the whole was a swirling flux of crosscurrents, which a rigid statistical analysis cannot hope to measure.[23] And even if we accept conclusions about chronological relativity, that means nothing about the historical time of the poems. An unverifiable argument about Hesiod and the Lelantine War is the peg on which Janko hangs the whole frame of his relative dating to a historical timeline.[24] Finally, the very desirability of assigning specific dates to individual poems is open to question. Assuming a moment in time for the fixation of early epic does not change the fact that a lengthy process of oral composition lay behind it.

Iliadic Images

When do artistic representations first reflect the Homeric poems? Because only a small percentage of ancient artwork has been recovered, conclusions based on it may be misleading.[25] But my schematization of R. Cook's tables (1983) in Appendix B strikingly shows Iliadic representations as first occurring in the late seventh century; the proposed Odyssean images are earlier but are exclusively about a Cyclops. The issue of the Cyclops representations requires discussion of folktale, to be addressed separately later in this chapter. But it is already apparent that the tables by Cook suggest rather late and little Homeric influence on early Greek artists. Not everybody would agree with this view. Interpretation of mythological representations is preceded by knowledge of myths based on ancient literature. It is extremely difficult to avoid imposing on ambiguous iconography a meaning suggested to us from our familiarity with famous poems. And in the cases that involve the Trojan War, most people will have the Homeric poems on their minds and will find it second nature to impose a Homeric interpretation on scenes that can possibly allow it. Because it is commonly assumed that these poems were an essential part of early Greek culture, it seems only reasonable to assume that the iconography was inspired directly by the

Homeric poems. Sometimes scholars even argue that representations of non-Homeric scenes actually reflect Homer.

Overoptimistic belief in Homeric influence on early Greek artists is apparent in Ahlberg-Cornell's ambitious survey of myth in Greek art down to 600. She proposes that the *Iliad* was the first epic represented in art. Central to her argument (1992:32–35, 62–63) is the contention that some apparent depictions of the Siamese twins Aktorione and Molione in Geometric art are based on recollections of them by Nestor in *Iliad* 11 and in one case his recollection of them in book 23. The images may indeed depict Aktorione and Molione, but they do not certainly depict Nestor.[26] If they did, it would be an extraordinary leap of imagination to insist that remarks by Nestor in the *Iliad*, not Pylian epic, are their inspiration.[27] Ahlberg-Cornell does raise many important issues about early Greek art, and a great amount of information is presented in her useful, if unevenly edited, survey.[28] But her attempt to show that the *Iliad* inspired artists from the eighth century onward should be firmly rejected.

The major flaw in Ahlberg-Cornell's approach is her assumption that material which may well be traditional is specifically Homeric. The same problem has bedeviled interpretation of a late Geometric jug (Louvre CA 2509). Friis Johansen (1961) has argued that the work depicted the duel between Ajax and Hector that we know of from book 7 of the *Iliad.* Because he dated the jug to the middle of the eighth century at the latest, too early for the *Iliad,* he concluded that the duel was a traditional episode in the pre-Homeric tradition. Kirk, on the other hand, has discussed the vase as early evidence for the *Iliad,* citing Friis Johansen's work but not indicating his thesis (or his full title, *Aias und Hektor: Ein vorhomerisches Heldenlied?,* which would have revealed the thesis).[29] Admittedly Kirk is cautious about identifying the representation as mythological, which in fact is very uncertain.[30] But even if the scene did depict Ajax and Hector, it would not automatically follow that the *Iliad*'s portrayal of them was the inspiration. Although the Homeric duel would seem to be appropriate for a time when Achilles has withdrawn from battle, many have been troubled by its unmotivated and inconsequential nature. That may suggest that the episode was imported into the story of the *Iliad* from traditional, pre-Homeric myth.[31] It is always necessary to distinguish between representations of material that happen to be in the Homeric poems and representations inspired by the Homeric

poems. In the case of the Geometric jug, it is problematic for Kirk to assume that a representation of Ajax dueling Hector would reflect the *Iliad* and not tradition. When this same duel does become represented for certain in late-seventh-century art, that does not necessarily indicate that the artists knew the *Iliad* specifically.

Many in the past have taken a more conservative view of early Iliadic images, with views that are comparable to those represented in R. Cook's tables (1983; see Appendix B). Fittschen in his thorough study on myth in early Greek art and Friis Johansen in his study on the *Iliad* in early Greek art both concluded that the late seventh century is the earliest time in which scenes probably reflect the *Iliad*.[32] Kannicht (1982:85) admitted, despite his expectations to the contrary, that the *Iliad* is "virtually neglected by seventh-century art." Snodgrass (1998) pursued the implications of R. Cook's arguments (1983) in the first major study that does not express surprise, regret, or apologies for the absence of early Homeric images. He firmly places the earliest time for artistic reflection of the Homeric poems in the late seventh century and, what is more, he sees meager evidence for Homeric influence on artists for the period down to 550:

> First, if a picture has legendary or mythical but otherwise equivocal subject-matter and we are uncertain whether or not it portrays an event narrated in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* then, other things being equal, there is perhaps a one-in-ten chance, perhaps slightly better, that it does so. Secondly and more debatably, when we are sure that the subject-matter *is* taken from the events narrated in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* then, other things being equal, there is appreciably less than a one-in-ten chance that they demonstrably reflect a knowledge of the poem. (1998:150)

Snodgrass also notes that there seems to exist a "broad level of agreement" between a few studies about the Homeric influence on early Greek art.[33] Yet there are a number of early depictions of the Cyclops, which are routinely thought to prove Homeric impact that is earlier than the late seventh century; and, as we saw, some scholars see other early Homeric depictions. On the other hand, a few scholars think Homeric influence on artists is even later than the seventh century. To many philologists, this very divergence of opinion about the seemingly hard evidence of artifacts will seem unsettling, and one can sympathize with Homerists for failing to give proper

attention to early mythological representations. But because the artistic evidence is extremely valuable when so much literature from the Archaic Age has not survived, it will be profitable to come to terms with it. A helpful starting point would be the exploration of the different approaches to the Homeric question by several prominent interpreters because identification of early representations depends greatly on the assumptions that are held about the Homeric poems.

The greatest student of mythological iconography of our time, Karl Schefold, has repeatedly claimed that Homer caused a revolution among artists in the early eighth century.[34] Schefold's wide-ranging surveys of mythological iconography are in fact firmly welded to his explanation of the genesis of the Homeric poems, as well as other epics. His views belong to the analyst school of thought, whereby it is thought that different parts of the Homeric poems came into existence at different times at the hands of different poets. The analyst school of thought is commonly associated with nineteenth-century German scholars, but it still has its adherents today, and Schefold makes it clear that he has followed the analyst Von der Mühll in his thinking. It is proposed that one poet, named Homer, created the kernels of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in the early eighth century, and only subsequently in the sixth-century did an "*Iliad* poet" and an "*Odyssey* poet" expand the poems into what we have today. According to Schefold, the eighth-century Homer had an enormous and immediate impact on artists, at least in tone if not so much in content, but iconography reflecting the Homeric poems as we know them does not begin until the sixth century.

Central to Schefold's argument is the assumption that artwork is strongly influenced by poetry. The absence of artistic images of a myth suggests to him that the myth was not yet known. By this reasoning Schefold can suppose that the stories of the Calydonian boar hunt, the Theban Wars, and the voyage of the Argo did not exist until around 600. Moreover, Schefold believes that different ages are identifiable by a cultural unity of art, literature, and politics. Thus, Solon at the beginning of the sixth century is thought to have instituted a new Greek cultural attitude that manifests itself in literature and is subsequently mirrored by iconography. Schefold sees an epic age lasting to around 600, a Solonian age arising for the first half of the sixth century, and lyric and dramatic ages following.

Schefold's schematic view of literature, in which different genres domi-

nate different time periods, is widely shared. But the attractive simplicity of this viewpoint becomes quickly complicated when correlated to the artistic evidence. For obvious reasons, Schefold supposes that the seventh century must have had some "lyric" representations, whereas epic content in artwork of the late sixth century is said to be the result of an "epic" renaissance then. And characterizations of images sometimes seem arbitrarily fitted to the overarching argument. It is not immediately obvious that eighth-century representations with novel and energetic iconography must be inspired by "Homer." But, like many scholars, Schefold feels a need to praise a genius named Homer, and so this ghostly figure is imagined to be effecting artistic revolutions in the eighth century. It is also not clear that some sixth-century representations reflect the spirit of the Homeric poems. But this is when Schefold thinks that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* have finally been completed, and so he finds evidence of a new "inner" tone in the representations. Of course, Schefold deserves praise for his magisterial command of the evidence and his recognition of how important iconography is in the study of myth. But for this period as for later ones, his interpretation of iconography strains to serve the theoretical edifice to which he adheres.

Friis Johansen shares some of these qualities with Schefold. He expects artists to follow the *Iliad* closely, and when he does not find any examples, he sees fit to draw conclusions that are reminiscent of those of the analysts. Because the early Attic representations that he thought were inspired by the *Iliad* only featured the last third of the poem, he concludes that the *Iliad* as a whole was not known by Attic artists until the late sixth century. He supposes that at first only parts of the poem had been performed, with different parts favored in different places. Although he is willing to allow that the whole of the *Iliad* was known in Corinth and elsewhere, he concludes that at first only the last third of the poem was known in Athens. He attributes the more evenly representative Iliadic iconography that he sees occurring in Attic art at the end of the sixth century to a Pisistratean recension that made the whole of the poem known to Athenians.[35]

Many Homerists find this argument unacceptably beholden to analyst assumptions; Friis Johansen displays a readiness to conceive of the *Iliad* as a fragmented text and a willingness to credit a recension with its successful unification. Yet let us first recognize that Friis Johansen's argument does have its merits. First is its attention to the origin of artifacts, an aspect that

is often ignored when iconography is employed in the study of mythology. Most of our early artistic evidence is either Corinthian or Attic, for instance, and it may not represent mythological variations in other parts of the Greek world.[36] It also must be admitted that the performance of the whole of the *Iliad* must have been a daunting task, and, as Andrew Ford (1997a) has recently reminded us, the performance of portions of the poem must be considered a real possibility. Friis Johansen assumes too great a connection between art and poetry, however, when he thinks that the absence of iconography for a part of the *Iliad* indicates ignorance of that part by the artists and, by extension, by the artists' locale as well. In general he conceives of a curiously static state of affairs for the transmission and performance of the poem, as analysts tend to do. Why would different portions of the text exist in different places? If we assume that it was often necessary for portions of the poem to be performed, why would only some portions be performed in one place for long periods of time? And though Friis Johansen denies that the seeming favoritism toward certain topics by a place could be attributed wholly to chance, it must be acknowledged that surviving artifacts are too rare to indicate accurately the literary tastes of different regions. We must praise Friis Johansen for admitting that early Greek art did not suggest what he expected, the early cultural dominance of the *Iliad.* Again, however, we must reject the conclusions reached to account for the artistic evidence.

Also instructive are the views of Steven Lowenstam, who has produced several sophisticated and provocative articles on the relationship between art and literature. In many respects his approach to the Homeric question is close to my own; for instance, he follows Nagy and others in believing that there was a long, fluid tradition of Homeric poetry. I hesitate to summarize his work further, for he has the ability to consider an issue from a wide variety of perspectives, often allowing that a number of complex scenarios could explain a question. In the interest of clarity and in an attempt to distinguish his approach from that of others, however, I attempt to isolate and critique several strands of thought in his writing.

First of all, Lowenstam might be said to be Homer-centric in his approach to art and epic. Because he is very skeptical about early artistic representation of our texts of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey,* it may seem odd that I would characterize him as displaying a type of Homeric bias. But his focus is certainly on the narratives known from the Homeric poems, although he

is aware that artists preferred episodes narrated by other poems in the Epic Cycle.[37] While he denies that artists certainly knew our versions of the Homeric poems until the fifth century, he sees much evidence of artists paying attention to poetry remarkably similar to, yet different from, the Homeric poems. Here the argument is subtle: he stresses discrepancies between representations and our Homeric texts, yet insists that the artists must be closely following poetic sources. As a result he concludes that some artifacts reflect variance within "Iliadic and Odyssean myth."[38] Sometimes it seems that these variants are conceived as earlier manifestations of the Homeric tradition—that is, the fluid performance traditions that led to our texts of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey.* At other times Lowenstam suggests that the variants existed in traditions that were rivals to the Homeric tradition, even nonepic traditions. These very similar but distinctly different poetic treatments of the Iliadic and Odyssean narratives would essentially be shadows of the Homeric poems. The narratives of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are thus given a remarkable prominence in the tradition of the Trojan War. They are not expansive treatments of minor parts of the large story of the Trojan War; rather, the poems are surviving treatments of "Iliadic and Odyssean myth."

In my view this conflation of poetic and mythological traditions serves to exaggerate the importance of the Homeric poetic tradition. For example, Lowenstam has argued that a red-figure vase by Makron showing Agamemnon leading Briseis away by the hand reflects a variant of the *Iliad* in which Agamemnon sends heralds to take her away from Achilles.[39] Several passages of the *Iliad* seem to suggest what the vase shows and not what actually happens in the *Iliad.* I find Lowenstam's argument convincing but, much differently, would conclude that Agamemnon took Briseis in what was a small episode in traditional myth about the Trojan War, the wrath of Achilles. The Iliadic tradition subsequently expanded and modified this story and thus puts forward its own particular variant of the traditional episode. There is no "Iliadic myth" that encompasses all possible variants of the episode. The Iliadic tradition is a contained offshoot of the tradition of the Trojan War that cannot be classified as "Homeric myth." But at times the argument of Lowenstam seems to suggest that a large, multifarious Homeric tradition, in all its permutations or splinterings, dominated the epic tradition of the Trojan War.

Certainly the surviving data of early Greek epic for students of oral-

formulaic composition comes primarily from the Homeric texts, and oralist analyses of these data easily slip into the perception that the Homeric poems are somehow equivalent to the tradition of the Trojan War, epic or otherwise. Stated so baldly, that is obviously not true. But it is actually often assumed that the Homeric tradition inherited a tradition that was essentially a simpler prototype and also that the Homeric tradition, once it began, became representative of the Trojan War story. No doubt the wrath of Achilles and the return of Odysseus were common poetic topics, but I do not believe that they were ever treated in as expansive a manner as they are in the Homeric poems. The traditional incidents at the heart of the *Iliad* would normally have involved only a small number of episodes. In the Homeric poems many new scenes and situations are built out of the traditional episodes and much is added in between them.[40]

Many conceive of the Troy story as saga with detailed commemoration of deeds worthy of notice because they are heroic and noble. If that were so, there could be many different versions of the battles fought at Troy and, I suppose, even of the battles that the *Iliad* tells us were fought in the period of a few weeks in the tenth year of the war. But I view the Troy story as being a series of major actions spread over ten years, each of importance for the overall narrative. From this perspective I find it hard to believe that the Homeric poems are typical of the Trojan War tradition. I do agree that the Homeric performance tradition was long-standing and fluid, and minor variances within the Homeric performance tradition may be reflected in early Greek art. Lowenstam has succeeded in articulating this possibility, although I doubt that much evidence for it exists. I find it hard to believe, however, that the Homeric performance tradition was so broad that there existed major variance within it that might affect early Greek representations, especially in the sixth century when we might expect significant crystallization of the Homeric poems. Nor am I comfortable with the idea of "shadow" versions of the Homeric poems that existed outside of the Homeric performance traditions or even in nonepic genres. I do think that there are images of traditional episodes on which Homeric poetry is based and also images that manipulate Homeric narrative for certain purposes or creatively transform Homeric narrative.[41] But this artistic evidence does not justify the portrayal of Homeric poetic traditions as Homeric myth, a proposal that in itself might be characterized as Homer-centric.

I would also take issue with Lowenstam's view that artists were dependent on poetry, and his opposition to the view that other nonmetrical storytelling could be their source.[42] Mythological traditions do not require poems and often consist of nonmetrical, nonprofessional narrative. In ancient Greek traditions these must have overwhelmed professional metrical narratives, and it is not unlikely that artists knew the myths from such sources. There is no need to assume that artists needed poems to be inspired to create a mythological representation, although that possibility should be considered. Lowenstam correctly points out that a profusion of names on some vases suggests the world of epic, not folk, traditions.[43] These certainly do not constitute the majority of artifacts, however, and whether the phenomenon suggests specific poems as a source is debatable.

Lowenstam has produced some of the most stimulating work on the relation of iconography to literature. A more extensive treatment of his views on the reflection of the Homeric performance tradition in early Greek art would be welcome and important. In discussing some of his ideas, as well as those of Schefold and Friis Johansen, I have stressed that evaluation of the artistic evidence is dependent on one's approach to the Homeric question. Schefold and Friis Johansen reflect an analyst perspective; in the case of the former, the evidence is fitted to an analyst theory, whereas in the case of the latter an analyst theory is fitted to the evidence. Lowenstam employs ideas that are very current among Homerists, yet I have objected to a certain Homer-centric approach to myth in his argument. By looking at the theories of these three scholars, we have gained some insight into how evaluation of iconography is necessarily linked to how the Homeric poems are thought to relate to the tradition from which they came. The degree of originality and tradition in the Homeric poems has been steadily explored over the past half-century, with notable success, through the methodology of neoanalysis. Through this perspective, we can evaluate what is and is not "Homeric" in considering early Homeric influence on artists.

Neoanalysis refers to a unitarian approach to the Homeric poems (usually the *Iliad*) that employs analyst techniques.[44] Like analysts, neoanalysts look for discrepancies in the texts, but only discrepancies in the poetic narrative, not discrepancies of language, *realia,* or logic in the discredited manner of analysis. Whereas analysts theorized that the *Iliad* was a compilation of material from various sources, neoanalysts believed that it was a unity

whose composition was strongly influenced by non-Homeric poetry. Neo-analysts usually assume that one poet is responsible for the *Iliad,* and thus they should be distinguished from the analysts, who have believed that many authors contributed to the composition of the *Iliad.*

In more general terms neoanalysis can be described as a willingness to explore the influence of pre-Homeric material on the Homeric poems. In this respect theories concerning the effect of folktales or Near Eastern motifs on the Homeric poems are comparable.[45] But neoanalysis has been especially concerned with the pre-Homeric tradition of the Trojan War as it is represented by the Epic Cycle. Because the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* often contain direct references to such a tradition, neoanalysts propose that there are also indirect reflections of this "Cyclic" tradition within the Homeric poems. It has long been noticed that the *Iliad* and the Epic Cycle share certain motifs that seem to belong more naturally to the latter. Analysts sometimes thought that "late" parts of the *Iliad* had incorporated "late" myth of the Epic Cycle. Building on this research, neoanalysts have argued that Homer extensively reused "Cyclic" material in a highly original manner. Much of their focus has been on events told in the *Aethiopis,* for neoanalysts suspect that the *Iliad* is modeled on a story of Achilles killing Memnon to avenge the death of Antilochus.

Issues raised by this school of thought are particularly relevant to the interpretation of early Greek art. For one thing, neoanalysts have correctly seen that in mythological terms the Homeric poems represented only a small portion of the Trojan War tale. Neoanalytical methodology takes the material of the Epic Cycle seriously and assumes that much of it is traditional and older than the Homeric poems. Such a methodology is well suited to analysis of early Greek art, where representations of the Troy story emphasize "Cyclic" episodes over Homeric ones. But the work of neoanalysts is particularly relevant because they have tried to separate the "Homeric" from the traditional in Homeric poetry. To look for reflection of the Homeric poems in early Greek art, one must have some sense of what distinguishes the Homeric poems from their tradition. Deciding what constitutes the "Homeric" is admittedly difficult and always subjective, and there is no reason to believe that neoanalysts have always been correct in their opinions. But consideration of their arguments is an excellent way to ad-

dress the issue. Because neoanalysts have focused on the *Iliad,* I turn to the question of Iliadic representations first.

Of particular importance is the interest of neoanalysts in Homeric invention: they generally believe that a single poet (Homer) reused traditional material but was very inventive in doing so. Often it seems that they have gone too far in their faith in Homeric invention. For instance, the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon in book 1 of the *Iliad* is sometimes described by neoanalysts as a Homeric invention.[46] But the occurrence of other quarrels between heroes in myth (cf. the quarrel between Odysseus and Achilles at *Odyssey* 8.72–82 and the one between Agamemnon and Achilles in the summary of the *Cypria* by Proclus) suggests that it was a typical motif.[47] And there is no reason to think that a preexisting, extra-Iliadic quarrel has been imitated in the *Iliad.* Sometimes neoanalysts have thought that Achilles withdrew after a prophecy from his mother, Thetis, before meeting Memnon and, furthermore, that this episode was the inspiration for his withdrawal in the *Iliad.* But if heroic withdrawal is a typical motif, there would be no compelling reason to consider Achilles' withdrawal in the *Iliad* an imitation of this motif; besides it is not at all certain that such a withdrawal even occurred in the *Aethiopis,* the earliest known version of Achilles' encounter with Memnon.[48] It seems preferable to believe that the wrath of Achilles toward Agamemnon was a traditional episode that Homer greatly expanded.

It may very well be that all major characters and events in the Homeric poems are traditional.[49] Although the phenomenon of ad hoc invention undoubtedly exists in the Homeric texts, one needs to be careful about assuming that major elements have been invented. The Homeric poems could pass off invented elements as seemingly traditional; Calypso in the *Odyssey,* for instance, is often considered an invented character,[50] and Odysseus's "Cretan" tales in the *Odyssey* demonstrate the ease with which plausible-sounding stories can be created.[51] In my view the tradition of the Trojan War was so well developed that extensive invention would have been quite unnecessary. On the other hand, the expansiveness and sophisticated artistic purposes of the Homeric poems would require the invention of much minor detail.

Several proposals by neoanalysts about Homeric invention have a direct bearing on specific representations in early Greek art. If a character is not

traditional but a product of Homeric invention, then any early representation of that character would have to be attributed to Homeric inspiration. There has long been speculation that the characters of Hector and Patroclus were invented for the story of the *Iliad*,[52] with neoanalysts in particular proposing as the inspiration the characters of Memnon and Antilochus in the story of the *Aethiopis*.[53] The *Iliad's* account of Hector slaying Patroclus is thought to recast the story of Memnon slaying Antilochus.

It has also often been thought that Hector is intrinsic to the story of the war, and if this is so, then the character must precede the *Iliad*.[54] The *Iliad* is noticeably casual in its first references to him (1.242; 2.802, 807, 816), and supporters of the argument for Homeric invention never quite manage to explain this away. Hector also enjoys an existence in extra-Iliadic mythology. The most noticeable example is his slaying of Protesilaus.[55] Kullmann challenged the pre-Homeric nature of this incident by pointing out that Homer refers (*Il.* 2.701) to Protesilaus's killer vaguely as a "Dardanian man." He suggested that the idea of Hector killing Protesilaus is derived from the firing of the ship of Protesilaus at *Iliad* 15.705.[56] Kullmann did not think that the *Cypria* poet was inspired by the *Iliad,* for in *Die Quellen der Ilias* he argued that this poet (among other Cyclic authors) did not know the *Iliad*.[57] As a result, he vaguely suggested that the detail of Hector killing Protesilaus has somehow been mistakenly placed in the summary of the *Cypria* by Proclus. On the whole this argument is not convincing. If the death of Protesilaus is pre-Iliadic, as I think is likely, it would not be surprising Hector was said to be his slayer and the *Iliad* passage simply did not bother to spell out the details, as is common with allusions. Focus of attention on Hector might be avoided at this point because Hector is featured later in book 2 (at 802ff.). Or perhaps, as Stanley (1993:290) has recently suggested, an "obtrusive note of historical irony in the (alleged) obscurity of the killer" is at play here; in other words, the poet is ostentatiously distancing himself from a well-known detail in myth.

There is also artistic evidence for Hector in non-Homeric myth. On two Greek vases from the early sixth century Hector is portrayed coming to the aid of Troilus when Troilus is ambushed by Achilles.[58] The ambush of Troilus is a favorite subject of early artwork and probably pre-Homeric (though we cannot be certain that Hector's involvement is also early). Other artifacts of a later date also portray Hector in this and other non-Homeric

incidents; as a result, Touchefeu-Meynier believes that Hector is pre-Homeric and further notes that even pictures of Hector in Iliadic scenes are often not in accord with the *Iliad*.[59] That might indicate that these settings, and Hector as well, are actually traditional, not "Homeric."

There is additional evidence to consider. Sappho's lines about the wedding of Hector (44 L-P) may very well be based on traditions that are independent of the *Iliad*. The same could be argued for the non-Iliadic concept that Apollo was the father of Hector, found in Stesichorus (224 *PMG*), Ibycus (295 *PMG*), and in later sources (see Gantz 1993:562). Page claims that the formulaic nature of epithets referring to Hector signifies that he has a long-standing existence in tradition.[60] Then there is the old hypothesis that Hector is a very old figure who originated in mainland myth.[61] Although this is impossible to prove, if it has any validity it obviously precludes his Homeric invention. Another speculative yet respectable theory is that Paris and Hector represent a primitive motif of unequal brothers or that they are even evolved from a long-standing motif of twins in Indo-European myth. This tells us nothing of the origin of Hector, but it certainly reduces any seeming luster of freshness about him.[62] All of these arguments are debatable, but their cumulative weight causes me to believe that Hector belongs to the pre-Iliadic tradition.

Whether Andromache and Astyanax were pre-Homeric is a related issue, since they are his wife and son.[63] For this reason Kullmann has tried to prove that they were invented by Homer and that their appearance in extra-Iliadic myth is derivative from the *Iliad*.[64] The argument is highly questionable. Kullmann acknowledged that in a fragment of the *Little Iliad* Andromache is taken captive and Astyanax killed by Neoptolemus (fr. 21 Bernabé = 20 Davies), but maintained that this poem is post-Homeric and derivative from the *Iliad*. The argument is surprising for he also proposed at that time that the *Iliou Persis* (among other Cyclic poems) was pre-Homeric. The summary of the *Iliou Persis* by Proclus indicates that Andromache and Astyanax were also in that poem.[65] A testimonium confirms that the poet of the *Iliou Persis* did indeed include the death of Astyanax (fr. 5 Bernabé = 3 Davies).[66] In addition, a testimonium suggests that the death of Astyanax was at least mentioned in the *Cypria* (fr. 33 Bernabé = 25 Davies), another poem that Kullmann then supposed was pre-Homeric. Clearly the argument of Kullmann does not hold water. But it is most important for our purposes to rec-

ognize that Astyanax was a character in many Cycle poems. Although it is not now argued that the poems of the Epic Cycle predate the *Iliad,* there is reason to suspect that the material in the poems is largely based on pre-Homeric traditions. The presence of Astyanax in "Cyclic" myth may reflect his traditional status, not any Homeric influence.

As many scholars have seen, Andromache's foreboding of his death at *Iliad* 24.734–739 is probably an allusion to pre-Homeric myth.[67] Astyanax, like Hector, does have a Greek name, and the name denotes Hector's role as defender of the city (*Il.* 6.403), as Hector's may. But that hardly proves that Andromache and Astyanax are inventions first found in the *Iliad.*[68] As Andromache relates (*Il.* 6.402), Astyanax also has a second name, "Skamandrios." It would be of no obvious profit and indeed of some awkwardness for this byname to be given to a newly created figure, and that suggests Astyanax is a figure in myth of long standing.

Of great relevance to this issue are the two early representations, from the late eighth and early seventh centuries, commonly thought to portray the death of Astyanax.[69] If these are early representations of Astyanax, I would doubt that, at such a date, they could be inspired by the *Iliad.* Undoubted depictions of his death begin to appear in the sixth century, often as part of images showing multiple horrors that occurred during the fall of Troy.[70] Undoubted depictions of Astyanax in the presence of his parents, as in the famous passage in book 6 of the *Iliad,* are practically nonexistent at an early date (see note 59). If this character was invented for the *Iliad,* the memorable scene that features him there had little effect on artists.

If the two early artifacts that are supposed to depict the death of Astyanax do indeed represent that scene, the alarmed woman shown would be Andromache. Is there any good reason to consider her a Homeric invention? Andromache's name has an Amazonian ring to it, and it is doubtful that this name would be chosen for her if she was invented for the *Iliad.* We do not hear much about Andromache in Greek myth, but perhaps the details in the *Iliad* concerning her life before her marriage to Hector (e.g., the tragedy that befell her family, 6.413–428; the headdress given to her by Aphrodite, 24.468–472) are based on pre-Homeric myth. They may be ad hoc invention, but the other details in the *Iliad* about Thebe and Eetion imply that her father and her hometown were part of pre-Homeric myth.[71] Sappho's poem about the marriage of Andromache to Hector (44 L-P) could be based

L. Hector and Achilles. Corinthian cup. Bibliothèque Royale Albert I Brussells, Médailles. Courtesy of the Bibliothèque Royale Albert I. © Bibliothèque Royale Albert I Brussells, Médailles.

on pre-Homeric myth, if a non-Homeric tradition was known to the poets of Lesbos, as I have already suggested. On the whole it is reasonable to conclude that Andromache and Astyanax, as well as Hector, are pre-Iliadic characters.

That Hector is a traditional character, not one invented for the story of the *Iliad,* now seems justifiable. So if the late Geometric jug discussed earlier did indeed depict Ajax and Hector, that would not present certain evidence for the date of the *Iliad.* The duel between Ajax and Hector is depicted on two small Corinthian vases from the later seventh century, with inscriptions that assure the identifications.[72] These are sometimes regarded as important indications of the influence of the *Iliad* on early art, but the possibility that the duel is traditional lessens their relevance to that issue considerably. The same conclusion can be applied to a few representations of the duel between Achilles and Hector that begin in the sixth century (Figure L).[73] Because their encounter was probably traditional, these images do not necessarily imply the influence of the *Iliad.*

Interestingly, a persistent tradition about the corpse of Hector varies from the *Iliad*'s narrative. In this alternative version Hector is dragged to death by Achilles' chariot, not simply mistreated in such a way after his death.[74] Our sources for these variants are later than the *Iliad*, but the traditions on which they are based could be pre-Homeric. Indeed, it is often suspected that the Homeric poems suppress brutal and supernatural aspects of the tradition that it follows (see Chapter 3). The earliest depictions of Hector being dragged tend to show the *eidolon* and tomb of Patroclus, whereas later Roman representations frequently show the walls of Troy in the background. The former would thus seem to indicate the dragging of the dead corpse of Hector around the tomb of Patroclus, whereas the latter might imply the tradition of Hector being dragged to his death.[75] The earliest artistic rendering of the dragging (ca. 550) is a fragment and thus cannot indicate the surrounding physical circumstances.[76] Yet in general the early representations do not well correspond with the details of the dragging in *Iliad* 22 and 24 (Hector is usually faceup, not facedown as in the *Iliad;* Iris is often present; Achilles sometimes runs besides his chariot). Although the *Iliad* could be responsible for the earliest representations, such discrepancies may have been caused by the continuing popularity of the episode in non-Homeric myth.[77] In the very least the tradition about Hector being dragged to death, whatever the date of its origin, demonstrates that episodes narrated within the *Iliad* could have a life of their own independently of the Homeric version.

The same could be said about the later ransom of the corpse of Hector. In one version Priam weighed out the body of Hector with gold.[78] It has been assumed that this version is derived from the Iliadic passage in which Achilles refuses Hector's request for proper treatment of his body, to which Achilles proclaims that he would not release it even if Priam weighed it out with gold (*Il.* 22.349–350).[79] But let us note that even if Priam does not end up weighing the body with gold, Zeus instructs him to give gifts (24.143–148) and Priam selects out precious robes, vessels, and talents of gold to take along (228–237), which he subsequently gives to Achilles (502). Although we remember the Iliadic episode as a scene of pathos and pity, it does assume an economic basis for the persuasion of Achilles. This economic element might have been more prominent in pre-Homeric myth. It certainly is in the tradition of Priam weighing out the body of Hector with gold, a tradi-

tion to which the comments of Achilles in book 22 may allude. Thus the story of Priam recovering the corpse of Hector from Achilles could be traditional and pre-Homeric, and its earliest representations, which begin in the second quarter of the sixth century, may not be inspired by the *Iliad.*[80] These representations are simple in nature with no details that signify a non-Homeric "economic" version of the ransom, but the details do not suggest the Homeric version either.

A much different perspective on this episode in early Greek art has recently been given by Raubitschek (1998). Inspired by the early depiction of the *lusis* of Hector on a Corinthian plate, he closely links images of the *lusis* with the Homeric text. His essay begins with a quotation by Mark Edwards about the conclusion of the *Iliad* being a "mighty adaptation" of a theme. Edwards was making an analogy between battles over the corpse of a fallen warrior and Priam's plea to Achilles to release Hector. Apparently Raubitschek is attracted by the suggestion that the scene is extraordinarily powerful, for he goes on to suggest that artists in the early sixth century likewise recognized the episode's excellence and thus were inspired to depict it. The casual reference to "illustrations" is troubling, and one is not reassured when told that the non-Homeric presence of Hermes in these images is only the "most striking innovation" (1998:305).

But an unusual aspect of the Corinthian plate, it is true, especially suggests to Raubitschek that the artist knew of the *Iliad.* Priam is shown stretching out his right hand to touch the chin of Achilles. At *Iliad* 24.477–479 Priam is said to embrace the knees of Achilles and kiss his hands. There is some controversy about the meaning of the Greek of a later passage (505–506), which has Priam claim either to have stretched his hands to the mouth of Achilles or to have brought the hands of Achilles to his mouth. But given the undoubted sense of the first passage, Priam must be claiming the latter.[81] So the Corinthian artist and other early artists who showed Priam reaching to the chin of Achilles are not illustrating the *Iliad,* unless they failed to understand the text properly. It is always possible that the early audience would find some lines as ambiguous as later scholars. But would it not be just as possible that non-Homeric versions of this episode told of Priam touching Achilles on the chin, and that the artists had this conception in mind?

The earliest Greek representations of the *lusis* are not very Homeric no

matter how one wishes to interpret 24.505–506. Hermes is sometimes present, though in the *Iliad* he insists he cannot be, and sometimes Trojans (Andromache or ransom bearers) accompany Priam. In addition, the earliest schema has both Achilles and Priam standing, though in the *Iliad* Priam falls down to the knees of Achilles who is sitting or reclining at dinner. It seems that Raubitschek indirectly tries to address this problem by stating that "the moment illustrated by the artists" (307) is when Achilles pushed Priam back and made him stand. But, of course, Priam was not then still clinging to the chin of Achilles, if he ever had been; and recourse can hardly be made to the technique of *synopsis*, by which actions of different time are depicted in the same image. Does the gesture of supplication on the Corinthian plate, though, suggest the pity displayed by Achilles in book 24 of the *Iliad?* Not necessarily, for it is entirely conceivable that Priam would be obsequious as well as generous in non-Homeric versions of his efforts to release his son. There is no indication of gold or gifts in the early representations but there is hardly room for that in these simple images; later images sometimes show the attendants of Priam hauling in the loot.

At the end of his essay Raubitschek strongly implies that the episode was exclusively Homeric, stating that Homer "introduced the element of pity (*eleos*) into epic poetry," which in turn inspired the early illustrations. The assertion that Homer introduced the concept of pity to poets and artists in the Archaic Age is an example of the common hyperbolic exaggeration of both the novelty and early influence of the *Iliad.* The disagreements with the Homeric text, including the touching of Achilles' chin on the Corinthian plate, can best be explained as agreements with an alternative version.

The sixth century, when portrayals of the dragging and ransom of Hector begin, is certainly late enough for Homeric influence to be possible. But my discussion has demonstrated that alternative traditions about these episodes could have been an early and continuing part of mythology about the Trojan War. That is enough to be suspicious of any claim for Homeric influence on an early image of Hector. One could argue that the memorable portrayal of Hector in the *Iliad* was special and therefore more likely to attract attention than non-Homeric traditions about Hector. Undoubtedly the expansive nature of the poem allowed a subtle characterization of him not generally achieved by myth and poetry. But that is why the absence in early art of the most famous Homeric passage featuring Hector, his encounter

in book 6 with his wife and child at the walls of Troy, is so striking. Not an event or action of the sort that would regularly be narrated in myth and poetry, it is a moving conversation that reveals his ambivalence between loyalty to his family and loyalty to his city. We would suspect that representations of such a scene were inspired by the *Iliad* or its tradition. Some images depict Hector setting off for battle, and others might depict him doing this. One Iliadic detail in some of them is the presence of Kebriones, who serves as the charioteer of Hector in the course of *Iliad.*[82] Because he is a minor character who does not occur in non-Iliadic sources, we might suspect that he is a Homeric invention. Therefore, a few sixth-century vases that depict the departure of Hector may indeed result from the existence of the *Iliad.* Yet the artists do not care to represent any details that would identify these images as specific scenes of the *Iliad.* And no early representation even begins to suggest the meeting between Hector and Andromache.

The whole question of invention arises again with a Corinthian aryballos from the end of the seventh century that labels a warrior on a chariot "Patroclus" (Appendix C, no. 16; Figure M). The vase has indeed been thought to reflect the *Iliad,* most recently by Snodgrass.[83] Not long afterward some vases represent the funeral games of Patroclus, and these are featured in arguments about the Homeric influence on artists as well. To evaluate conclusions based on the evidence of the vases, we need to review the argument for the Homeric invention of Patroclus, especially as it has been pursued by neoanalysts. But even if it can be demonstrated that Patroclus is also traditional, as I try to do here, we need to move beyond that and consider other neoanalytical arguments about Patroclus. They have supposed that the actions of Patroclus in the *Iliad* resemble the actions of Achilles in myth about his death. If that is correct, as I think it is, then we can view the Iliadic portrayal of Patroclus as unusual and unique, and a rare opportunity is presented for evaluating whether artists were inspired by tradition or the *Iliad* in particular.

The Homeric invention of Patroclus is as open to question as the Homeric invention of Hector.[84] The *Iliad* introduces Patroclus at 1.307 simply as the "son of Menoetius," which suggests that the poem assumes that the audience knows who this is.[85] Patroclus is also sometimes present in non-Iliadic myth, which could indicate that he had a mythical role that was independent of the *Iliad.* Interestingly the *Cypria* mentions that Patroclus

M. Departure of Patroclus. Corinthian aryballos. Basel, private collection.
Courtesy of the Antikenmuseum Basel und Sammlung Ludwig;
photograph C. Niggli.

sold Lycaon (Proclus); although Patroclus is not mentioned in connection with the selling of Lycaon at *Iliad* 21.34–135, he is at *Iliad* 23.746–747: υἷος δὲ Πριάμοιο Λυκάονος ὦνον ἔδωκε/Πατρόκλῳ ἥρωϊ Ἰησονίδης Εὔνηος.[86] Pindar (*Ol.* 9.70–79) describes Patroclus sharing exploits with Achilles on the Teuthranian expedition.[87] And the Sosias cup depicts Achilles bandaging Patroclus, an incident that is not described in the *Iliad;* perhaps it occurred during the Teuthranian expedition.[88] In addition, some black-figure vases show him at Phthia with Achilles before the Trojan War (cf. Nestor's remembrance of Patroclus being present when he came to recruit Achilles at *Iliad* 11.765–784).[89] The presence of Patroclus at this time could very well be traditional. Finally, Apollodorus (*Bibl.* 3.10.9) includes Patroclus among the suitors of Helen, admittedly an unlikely scenario because his status is not as high as that of most of the other suitors.

Patroclus is not often present in extra-Iliadic myth, but this is not surprising, for I suspect that he was never a major mythological character. His occasional appearance in extra-Iliadic myth is therefore significant, especially since not every instance can be explained as derivative from Homeric poetry. For all these reasons it is hard to believe that Patroclus was invented for the *Iliad.* A more persuasive argument is that the Homeric characterization of him is a widening of his traditional role.[90] His friendship with Achilles and his death at the hands of Hector could easily be traditional. The prediction of Zeus at 8.470–477 that Achilles will rouse himself during a battle over the corpse of Patroclus *among the ships* might even be thought to reflect a tradition in which Hector killed Patroclus there.[91] Be that as it may, two aspects of the *Iliad*'s depiction of Patroclus are probably idiosyncratic to the Homeric tradition: the tragic link between the wrath of Achilles and the death of Patroclus, and the use of Patroclus's death to reflect the death of Achilles.

Neoanalysts have often pointed out that the behavior of Patroclus in the *Iliad* is unusual. Because the story of his death is similar to the story of the death of Achilles, they propose his actions are modeled on those of the great hero.[92] First, Patroclus corresponds to Achilles when he kills Sarpedon.[93] In the story narrated in the *Aethiopis* (Proclus) and elsewhere, Achilles defeated in a duel Memnon, the king of the Aethiopians who had come to defend Troy. Like Achilles, Patroclus meets a significant foreign ally of Troy and

defeats him. From what we know of Patroclus from the previous books of the *Iliad,* where he is usually shown performing chores for Achilles, this is a unexpected feat.[94] Although the extra-Iliadic evidence for Patroclus suggests that Patroclus was a capable warrior, the *Iliad* may well have been the first poem to have Patroclus kill Sarpedon.[95]

The surprising behavior of Patroclus continues when he routs the Trojans and proceeds to attack Troy, and neoanalysts have compared this action with Achilles' attack on Troy after the death of Memnon, as narrated in the *Aethiopis* (Proclus) and elsewhere.[96] At 16.698–711 it is remarked that Patroclus would have taken the city if Apollo had not prevented him; Thetis at 18.454–456 makes the same claim when speaking to Hephaestus. Indeed, we are practically invited to think of Achilles' later attack on the city at 16.707–709, where Apollo says to Patroclus that Troy is not fated to be taken by either him or Achilles. Such an attack on Troy is very unusual; Andromache recalls a joint attack on the walls of Troy by a group of Greek leaders (6.433–439), but there is no account in myth of a single hero other than Achilles attacking the walls of Troy. It seems that a motif that belongs to traditional myth about Achilles, and which cannot be said to be typological, has been transferred to the Patroclus of the *Iliad.*[97]

Among the many arguments of neoanalysts, perhaps the proposal that the death of Patroclus corresponds to the death of Achilles has gained the widest acceptance.[98] First, Patroclus dies near the walls of Troy, an essential aspect of Achilles' death in the *Iliad* and elsewhere.[99] Apollo convinces Patroclus to retire from the walls, but it seems that he does not retire far. At 17.403–404 it is reported that the later battle over his corpse is beneath the walls. And the ghost of Patroclus says at 23.80–81 the words καὶ δὲ σοὶ αὐτῷ μοῖρα, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ, /τείχει ὕπο Τρώων εὐηφενέων ἀπολέσθαι, which may essentially mean, "You *also* (besides me) must die under the city wall." In his attack on the city Patroclus is acting exactly as Achilles seems to have done in the traditional account of his death. Second, Patroclus is slain by a combination of mortal and divine (Euphorbos, Hector, and Apollo), just as Achilles is (Paris and Apollo). Third, the secondary role of Apollo in the slaying of Patroclus is reminiscent of his role in the slaying of Achilles.[100] At 16.721–725 Apollo approaches Hector in the guise of a mortal and urges him to kill Patroclus, and adds that Apollo will grant him the glory of the deed (cf. 18.456). Apollo subsequently makes Patroclus

helpless with a stunning blow that knocks off his armor.[101] The fact that Apollo is involved in the death of Patroclus seems to be evidence that this scene imitates the death of Achilles, for the famous participation of Apollo in the slaying of Achilles is probably a specific motif that belongs to that hero's story.

Some critics, however, have argued that the participation of Apollo in a heroic death is a typical motif.[102] It is true that in one version of the death of Meleager Apollo is said to kill him.[103] But the manner in which Meleager died in this "heroic" version may have been quite different from the manner in which Achilles died. It appears as if Apollo killed Meleager by himself, a concept that does not normally apply to Achilles' story. But even if the motif of heroic death through Apollo was a "doublet" associated with two characters in early Greek myth, Achilles and Meleager, that does not mean that it would be unremarkable if Achilles' *therapon* died in a manner famously associated with Achilles. The participation of Apollo in the slaying of Patroclus necessarily evokes the death of Achilles.

The death of Patroclus does not exactly reflect the death of Achilles, however. Achilles is slain by bow and arrow, Patroclus by spears. Instead of one mortal, here two are the mortal agents of the slaying. Yet these differences do not negate the correspondence. If the *Iliad* reused traditional material, it need not have and often could not have preserved all details exactly. If the *Iliad* had exactly mimicked the death of Achilles in book 16, much of the *Iliad* as we know it would have to be jettisoned. Paris would have killed Patroclus, and the wrath of Achilles would have to be directed at him. And the requirements of tradition need to be taken into consideration. Apparently Paris is usually killed by Philoctetes (as in the summary of the *Little Iliad* by Proclus), and Patroclus may have been traditionally killed by Hector, for all we know. Thus the differences between the death of Patroclus and the death of Achilles are necessary for the story of the *Iliad,* and the similarities are so strong that an audience familiar with the tradition of the Trojan War would recognize them.

Musing on these issues we can turn our attention, then, to the earliest artifact representing Patroclus, the late-seventh-century aryballos that identifies him as a warrior on a chariot accompanied by a charioteer (Appendix C, no. 16). If Patroclus was invented for the *Iliad,* this vase would necessarily reflect that poem, but we have concluded that Patroclus was probably tra-

ditional. The more pertinent question is whether we can detect in the vase an Iliadic as opposed to a traditional portrayal of Patroclus. The scene is unremarkable and, except for the inscription, wholly generic. It has often been viewed as Iliadic, however, and recently Snodgrass confessed (1998:104–105) to a "strong temptation to see, in a picture of [Patroclus] *setting out in a chariot,* a reflection of a famous moment in the *Iliad*" (104, his emphasis). Indeed, many will feel that because Patroclus is alone, and not shown as the attendant of Achilles, the departure of Patroclus in book 16 of the *Iliad* has to be represented.

There is no reason to conclude that a portrayal of Patroclus as a warrior with a charioteer belongs exclusively to book 16 of the *Iliad,* however. We should not assume, as some do, that Patroclus would normally be the charioteer of Achilles.[104] At 17.426–440, it is true, the divine horses of Achilles mourn Patroclus as a "charioteer," and a little later (475–477) Automedon describes him as the most skilled at handling Achilles' horse. Yet at *Iliad* 10.401–404 Odysseus credits this skill to Achilles alone. The horsemanship of Achilles is mentioned at the description of his death at *Odyssey* 24.39–40,[105] and Achilles in book 19, standing next to Automedon on the chariot, refers to himself as the current "charioteer," whom his team is admonished to bring back as they had not brought back their former "charioteer," Patroclus, when he had fought without Achilles. In fact, in Homeric usage charioteer can sometimes refer to the warrior riding beside the one who guides the horses.[106] The flexibility and inconsistency of these Homeric passages does not lead to the conclusion that Patroclus was the charioteer of Achilles.

Patroclus is most regularly described as the *therapon* of Achilles, the usage of which term goes beyond reference to charioteering.[107] In non-Iliadic myth Patroclus could be a participant in battle, as already noted. This seems to be confirmed at *Iliad* 16.241–245 when Achilles in his prayer to Zeus says:

> . . . τῷ κῦδος ἅμα πρόες, εὐρύοπα Ζεῦ,
> θάρσυνον δέ οἱ ἦτορ ἐνί φρεσίν, ὄφρα καὶ Ἕκτωρ
> εἴσεται ἤ ῥα καὶ οἶος ἐπίστηται πολεμίζειν
> ἡμέτερος θεράπων, ἦ οἱ τότε χεῖρες ἄαπτοι
> μαίνονθ', ὁππότ' ἐγώ περ ἴω μετὰ μῶλον Ἄρηος.

> Grant glory to him, far-thundering Zeus, and embolden the heart in his breast,
> in order that even Hector know whether my companion knows how to fight even
> alone, or only then his hands are invincible, when I go along the battle of Ares.

The verse implies that Patroclus is an experienced warrior who fought alongside Achilles. It does not suggest that Patroclus was acting as charioteer for Achilles in battle, but rather it specifies that he fought in the company of Achilles (cf. Pindar *Pyth.* 9.70–79). Presumably Patroclus and Achilles were portrayed in early Greek myth fighting near each other on the battlefield but in separate chariots. The late-seventh-century aryballos could thus simply represent behavior typical of Patroclus in early Greek myth.[108]

But the Homeric passage also suggests that Patroclus never fought when Achilles was not somewhere on the field. Is the absence of Achilles on the aryballos meant to signal that the story of the *Iliad* is being portrayed? The artist of this unremarkable aryballos had low ambitions. The iconography is typical and does not demonstrate any specific knowledge of the *Iliad;* in fact it fails to show the mortal trace horse Pedasos that is featured as part of the team of Patroclus in book 16.[109] The inscription might have been added as an afterthought to give this generic representation a heroic flavor, as Snodgrass (1998:104–105) argues.[110] But his assumption that this afterthought must have been inspired by the *Iliad* is questionable, since we have seen non-Iliadic evidence for Patroclus engaging in battle. On the whole it is asking too much of this little vase for certain information about the existence or status of the *Iliad,* although it does confirm an early interest in the mythology of Patroclus.

The role of Euphorbos in the death of Patroclus is of particular importance, for a Rhodian plate from the late seventh century shows Menelaus and Hector squaring off over his corpse (Appendix C, no. 19; Figure N). This Rhodian plate has often been thought to represent the *Iliad.* At first glance the scene suggests the beginning of book 17 of the *Iliad,* when Menelaus kills Euphorbos after the death of Patroclus but is forced to retire at the approach of Hector. Here, it would seem, we have a scene that can be thought to belong to the story of the *Iliad* and not to tradition. It has been argued that Euphorbos was invented for his role in the *Iliad,* modeled on the killer of Achilles, Paris.[111] If that were so, the Rhodian plate

would necessarily have been inspired by the *Iliad* or its performance tradition. Yet some have argued that there was an Argive tradition about Euphorbos that is followed by this artifact.[112] Although that is very likely to have been the case, we need to consider carefully whether that implies that the representation is completely independent of the *Iliad.*

The shield of Euphorbos was displayed in Hera's sanctuary outside Argos. Pythagoras was said to claim Euphorbos as a former self upon seeing it there, and the shield was still being shown to travelers centuries later.[113] The Rhodian plate would seem to be connected to this Argive tradition in two ways. First, the alphabet used for the inscriptions is Argive, or at least a modified Argive alphabet.[114] Second, its iconography suggests what the Argive tradition apparently presumes: that Menelaus gained possession of the armor of Euphorbos. The *Iliad* does not indicate that this occurred. On the contrary, it specifies that Menelaus retreated from the corpse at the onset of Hector.

The Rhodian plate pictures Menelaus on the left, which is typically the position of a duel's winner.[115] In addition, the head of a corpse between two warriors usually points toward the winner, and here the head of Euphorbos is directed toward Menelaus, who actually bestrides it. What is more, the shield and helmet of Euphorbos are identical to those of Menelaus but dissimilar to those of Hector, and our impression is thereby strengthened that Menelaus is in control of the corpse.[116] When all the pieces of the puzzle are put together, it seems possible to suppose that the artist is following an Argive tradition, not a passage in the *Iliad.*

But it is worth asking why there would be an Argive tradition about Euphorbos. Local traditions do not usually arise unless they serve the interests of a certain place.[117] Snodgrass (1998:107, 109) suggests that the retreat of Menelaus might have been intolerable for Greek patriotism or more specifically local pride: "Menelaus was the son of King Atreus of Mycenae or Argos" (107). That seems quite possible, but we might pause over his dismissal of the possibility that the Argive tradition is "anti-Homeric"—that is, a reaction to the Homeric text.[118] Arguably the Argive tradition, despite its variance to the Homeric text, was ultimately inspired by the *Iliad* or its tradition.[119] If there did exist an Argive desire to portray Menelaus favorably, this would not necessitate Euphorbos. Yet this character, quite possibly a Homeric invention, is featured on the plate. Why would the artist,

N. Battle over Euphorbus. Rhodian plate. London, British Museum 60.4-4.1 (A 749).
©The British Museum. Used by permission.

then, contradict the Homeric passage? In literature at least, there is plenty of evidence for manipulative use of Homeric passages at an early date.[120] Perhaps the first purveyors of the Argive tradition were aware of the Homeric passage but were only interested in employing it in accordance to local concerns. Interest in significant artifacts as heirlooms is evident both in the Homeric poems and in archaeological finds; the desire for such at Argos, especially if they could be linked with local mythology, could have easily taken precedence over fidelity to the text.

Fehling (1991:87–88) ascribes the retreat of Menelaus in our text of the *Iliad* to a sixth-century redactor, on the supposition that the plate reflects the original state of the poem. Most modern Homerists will readily reject that as analyst overspeculation. But would a fluid Homeric performance tradition, or even an early textual tradition, necessarily have been stable in regards to the encounter between Menelaus and Hector? I have resisted the idea that significant variance existed within the Homeric performance

tradition. But the passage is not essential to the story of the *Iliad,* and the details of the outcome of the encounter between Hector and Menelaus are not narrated all that clearly in our text. The Rhodian plate may faithfully reproduce a performance of the *Iliad* that was slightly different from the *Iliad* that we have. But, in the end, this is even more speculative than the theory that there was an Argive tradition about Euphorbos.

A decision must ultimately rest on whether Euphorbos seems truly independent of the *Iliad.* There might have been an Argive tradition about Euphorbos, but this in turn might have arisen in reaction to the *Iliad.* It is important to note that Euphorbos never had a mythological role outside of his participation in the death of Patroclus. Although the slaying of Patroclus by Hector may very well have been traditional, it would usually have been a rather minor episode. The Homeric version of this episode is probably greatly expanded and manipulated so as to resemble the death of Achilles. In my view it is not likely that in non-Homeric myth a stable tradition ever developed about the details to the story, such as who struck Patroclus before Hector. It has been pointed out that the number of participants in the death of Patroclus is uneconomical, and the conclusion has been drawn that Euphorbos is awkwardly included as a necessary nod to tradition. But Homeric narrative is regularly uneconomical, and Euphorbos serves well both as a Paris figure and as an expendable buffer between two antagonists who cannot be allowed to kill each other, Menelaus and Hector.

As I have argued, there is no need to think that there were traditions that were slightly different "shadows" of the *Iliad.* Surely the death of Patroclus was narrated outside of the *Iliad,* but probably not with the degree of detail that we find in the *Iliad.* For that reason I doubt that Euphorbos was normally part of the Trojan story. An independent Argive tradition about Euphorbos certainly developed, but why this would have *originated* at Argos, or anywhere outside the Homeric tradition, is not clear. Caution is advisable. It seems that the Cycle poems often preserved traditional details otherwise unknown; for all we know, Euphorbos was present in Cyclic and other lost poems about the Trojan War. There is no question that early Greek art has happened to preserve traditional material otherwise lost in the literary record. But following the neoanalytical view that Euphorbos appeared first in the *Iliad*'s version of the death of Patroclus as part of an innovative expansion of that traditional episode to evoke the death of Achilles,

I conclude that the Rhodian plate and the Argive tradition are actually "Iliadic-derived" phenomena. That is, the Iliadic tradition is their ultimate, if perhaps vague, inspiration. The Rhodian plate may follow an Argive tradition, and the Argive tradition may contradict the *Iliad* passage. As a result the Rhodian plate is no illustration of the *Iliad.* But the Argive tradition about Euphorbos would not exist until after the *Iliad* was in existence, and the Rhodian plate is evidence for a degree of impact by the Homeric poem.

The issue of Patroclus returns in the early sixth century with depictions of his funeral games. It is possible that these games are not traditional but were invented for the story of the *Iliad.* Neoanalysts have suggested that the games in honor of Patroclus reflect traditional myth about the funeral games for Achilles after his death.[121] Certainly the motif of funeral games is typical and cannot be said to belong to the story of Achilles. We may well wonder, however, if they are as appropriate for Patroclus as they are for Achilles. In addition, some have suspected that the wrestling match between Odysseus and Ajax in book 23, among other incidents, foreshadows their contest over the arms of Achilles.[122] So, although funeral games are a typical motif, the inappropriateness of them for Patroclus and possible allusions within them to later events encourage the view that, in general, book 23 of the *Iliad* reflects the games for Achilles. Patroclus thus continues in death to represent Achilles as he did in books 16–17 of the *Iliad.*

If the funeral games for Patroclus seem to be an Iliadic innovation of traditions about Achilles, then vases depicting the games for Patroclus might be considered to have been inspired by the *Iliad.* A fragment of an early-sixth-century dinos signed by Sophilos actually identifies its representation as the "games of Patroclus."[123] On what remains of the vase a team of horses races toward spectators; an inscription indicates that Achilles was among these. Only the end of the lead racer's name survives, "-os," or maybe "-ios."[124] The surprise is that in book 23 of the *Iliad* Diomedes is the winner. The vase is not necessarily portraying the end of the race, but suspicion of divergence from the *Iliad* would seem to be confirmed when we turn our attention to the François vase of the same time period. There Achilles is identified awaiting the finish next to an eared amphora (apparently a prize) as five chariots race toward him. All of this corresponds to the *Iliad.* But Diomedes is identified as the third-place racer, and none of the other drivers even take part in the Homeric version. It is usually thought that the painter is confused

or forgetful, but a few have proposed that there was a different version of the episode.[125] Yet could there have been a variant completely independent of the *Iliad?* Conceivably an early performance tradition of the poem would not have been consistent on the details for which the vases have been faulted. That would mean that the vases depict an essentially Iliadic episode. And if versions of the story were radically different from the Homeric version, could they have existed without the *Iliad* or its tradition? The very concept of games for Patroclus might have originated in the Iliadic tradition, as a neoanalyst perspective suggests. There are other candidates for depictions of these funeral games in the Archaic Age.[126] If any are valid, we might ask why so many artists would be interested in the games for a less than major character. Even if the artists created these images with no knowledge of the *Iliad,* it might still be said that the very currency of the story being represented is "Homeric-derived."[127]

Representations of the battle over the corpse of Patroclus might also be considered Homeric, if a neoanalyst view of the episode is justified. The earliest plausible candidates date from the middle of the sixth century, and many are not certain.[128] Their relevance to our line of inquiry is that neoanalysts have compared the Iliadic portrayal of the battle over Patroclus with the traditional battle over the corpse of Achilles.[129] A battle over a slain warrior is a typical motif, and so a connection between the Iliadic scene and myth about Achilles is not immediately obvious. For a battle to occur over the corpse of Patroclus would not be especially remarkable, even if he was not a major figure (as suggested earlier, this struggle could have traditionally happened among the ships). Some unusual aspects about the Iliadic battle over the corpse of Patroclus, however, might suggest that the *Iliad*'s version of the death of Patroclus mimics the battle over Achilles as it was commonly told in myth. At *Iliad* 17.384 and *Odyssey* 24.41 it is specified that the battle over the corpse of Achilles lasts for the duration of a day, and the battle over the corpse of Patroclus lasts for a day.[130] Neoanalysts have also compared the storm wind that ends the battle over Achilles described at *Odyssey* 24.42 with the mist that Zeus spreads over the sky in *Iliad* 17.[131] These correspondences are not that persuasive. More compelling is the correspondence between the Iliadic battle over the corpse of Patroclus and the traditional battle over the corpse of Achilles, for in both Ajax kills a Trojan who has tried to tie a thong to the ankle of the corpse in order to drag it

off.[132] This detail does not exist in representations of the battle over Patroclus, however.[133] If it did, it would be revealing, since it would be an artistic depiction of an element that arguably the *Iliad* added to the battle over Patroclus so that it would reflect the battle over Achilles. Some of the vases do show Ajax defending the corpse, and he does so in both the Iliadic battle over Patroclus and the battle over Achilles in myth. However, Ajax is often pictured making a brave stand against attacking Trojans in the *Iliad.* If this is a typical role for him, his defense of the corpse of Patroclus is not necessarily a Homeric addition, and his presence in depictions of the battle over Patroclus is therefore not necessarily inspired by the *Iliad.*[134]

The neoanalyst argument that the Iliadic version of the battle over the corpse of Patroclus reflects a traditional battle over the corpse of Achilles is compelling. Yet it is also plausible that a battle over Patroclus was traditional. The sixth-century artistic representations of the battle over the corpse of Patroclus do not contain significant details that would link them to an Iliadic as opposed to a traditional version. A significant number of early representations of the scene might be an indication of Homeric influence, but the images are not that early and the number is debatable, because some of the representations are not necessarily a battle over the corpse of Patroclus specifically. For these reasons the scene in early Greek art does not necessarily suggest the *Iliad* as a source.

It may seem surprising that a different conclusion was reached concerning the similar case of funeral games for Patroclus. Let me review the reasoning. Both battles over a corpse and funeral games seem to be typical motifs. Neoanalysts have argued the Iliadic portrayal of both in connection with Patroclus is in imitation of traditional accounts of a battle over the corpse of Achilles and subsequent funeral games for him. For a character of Patroclus's stature, however, I have judged it possible for traditional myth to depict a battle over his corpse but unlikely that funeral games would be held for him. If that is so, then the Iliadic portrayal of the battle over the corpse of Patroclus is an exaggeration of a traditional episode (to the point where the traditional battle over Achilles is suggested), whereas the funeral games for Patroclus represent an episode of Homeric invention (with the result that the games necessarily reflect the traditional games for Achilles). There is nothing in representations of the battle over the corpse of Patroclus to suggest clearly an Iliadic rather than a traditional account. But any representa-

tion of funeral games for Patroclus, according to my neoanalytical perspective, must result from its portrayal in the *Iliad.* The two early-sixth-century representations of the chariot race in the games for Patroclus, it is true, do not correspond closely to the Iliadic account and even seem to contradict it. For that reason, a connection between the poem and the representations should not be stressed. But ultimately, if we look at the matter from a neoanalytical perspective, the representations are "Homeric-derived."

Our search for early possibilities for representations of the *Iliad* based on the issue of tradition and invention, which has so far focused on Hector and Patroclus, can now be expanded to consider another major character, Diomedes. Some have wondered whether he has been imported into the Trojan War from myth about the Epigoni, where he most naturally belongs, to serve as a foil for Achilles in the *Iliad.*[135] That I find hard to believe, unless it occurred at a very early date, because he is a constant presence in the Cycle and he is also portrayed in artistic images of the sixth century in a fair number of different Trojan War episodes.[136]

Diomedes is rarely the primary figure, however, whether in the Cycle or in the *Iliad.* It is remarkable, therefore, that he shines in an *aristeia* at books 5–6 of the *Iliad.* There, in the absence of Achilles and with the assistance of Athena, he is the most effective Greek warrior. There are a few representations in the sixth century that probably show Diomedes with Athena and so might be thought to have been inspired by the *Iliad* or its tradition. A shield band from the early sixth century shows Athena and an unidentified warrior on a chariot,[137] a vase of a somewhat later date shows a warrior with his charioteer faced by Athena,[138] and a clay plaque also from the middle of the century shows Athena with Diomedes (inscribed) on a chariot.[139]

Many will find it natural to associate the *aristeia* of Diomedes with the *Iliad,* and in this case there are no serious problems of correspondence if one wants to think so. It might even be felt that the *aristeia* of Diomedes is only possible during the absence of Achilles. If that is so, perhaps only the *Iliad*'s expansive version of the wrath of Achilles had room to fit in the *aristeia* of Diomedes. Yet, as we saw with the case of the duel between Ajax and Hector, Trojan War myth could have allowed others besides Achilles their moments of glory. Arguably, the cooperative venture between Diomedes and Athena could have occurred anytime during the war, or even in the story of the Epigoni.[140] Athena is constantly aiding heroes in Greek myth, and

references are made in the *Iliad* to her assistance of Tydeus, the father of Diomedes (4.390, 5.115–120, 10.284–94). It should be noted, also, that other representations of Diomedes in this period hardly correspond to our *Iliad.* A Corinthian vase fragment from ca. 600 depicts Diomedes and Ajax in no obvious Iliadic fashion.[141] The lost Chalcidian vase of ca. 530 that depicts the battle over the corpse of Achilles includes Sthenelos bandaging Diomedes' fingers, which only vaguely reminds us of his shoulder wound that was miraculously healed by Athena in book 5 of the *Iliad* (239ff.).[142] Late Archaic artists also depicted Diomedes, in contradiction to the *Iliad,* taking part in the embassy to Achilles.[143] To my mind these depictions do not suggest the vague influence of the *Iliad,* variant performances of the Iliadic tradition, or creative reaction to the *Iliad.* They suggest rather his long-standing status as a character associated with traditional Trojan War episodes. Perhaps images of Diomedes and Athena in the first half of the sixth century are further reflections of the *Iliad,* but that cannot be assumed, and on the whole the early artistic evidence does not portray an Iliadic Diomedes.

So far I have rejected extreme claims for Homeric invention of major characters, and instead I have explored the possibility of early Greek art reflecting idiosyncratically Homeric portrayal of them. The presence of less important Homeric figures in early Greek art is potentially more revealing, especially those figures who might be suspected more justifiably of being Homeric invention.[144] One relatively minor character so suspected is Phoenix. Phoenix describes himself as the pedagogue of Achilles in book 9 of the *Iliad,* but because this role is usually played by Chiron in Greek myth, many have regarded Phoenix as a Homeric replacement of Chiron.[145] If that is so, then it would be very significant that a handful of vases explicitly depict Phoenix by the middle of the sixth century.[146] Yet though we must give Chiron pride of place as pedagogue of the hero, that does not necessarily make Phoenix an untraditional character.[147] First, the words of Phoenix should be taken with a grain of salt, because they are made in the midst of a rhetorical plea in which Phoenix is trying to establish his special claim on the hero. Second, the role claimed by Phoenix does not necessarily conflict with the mythological role of Chiron (acknowledged by the *Iliad* at 11.832). Certainly it was traditionally said that Achilles was raised by Chiron after Thetis left Peleus, but it is overstrict logic to conclude that Achilles (or Thetis) would never visit the home of Peleus thereafter.[148] Finally, Cyclic

myth is very tolerant of doublets anyway, and so the desire to decide whether Chiron or Phoenix is primary in the role of Achilles' educator is misguided.

Let us turn to the representation of an even less prominent figure, Koon, who in the *Iliad* (11.248–263) is slain by Agamemnon in the course of his *aristeia.* His encounter with Agamemnon was depicted on the chest of Kypselos, now lost but described by Pausanias (Figure O).[149] The representation is important because Koon is not a major figure and the chest is thought to date from a relatively early date, probably the first half of the sixth century.[150] Unfortunately the lack of a secure date limits the usefulness of the artifact for our purposes. But the image of Koon has been thought to suggest an intimate knowledge of the *Iliad* at a relatively early date.[151] As with Euphorbos, the question arises whether Koon could have been a traditional figure outside of myth. Koon is the son of Antenor, and the *Iliad* is clearly aware of traditional material regarding him and his family. At 3.205–224 Antenor recalls his reception of the embassy of Menelaus and Odysseus seeking the return of Helen. At 7.344–378 his opposition to Paris might reflect arguments arising then.[152] In non-Homeric myth Antenor and family were said to be spared at the sack of the city.[153] None of this demonstrates that Koon specifically was a traditional character. Perhaps a more pertinent question is whether the encounter between Agamemnon and Koon is traditional. One could suppose, as I did in the case of the Ajax-Hector duel and the *aristeia* of Diomedes, that the *aristeia* of Agamemnon could have existed independently of the *Iliad.* It is not certain that Koon would be traditionally part of this episode, however. He is not a major opponent, nor does he play an important narrative role. He is simply another victim, and minor figures killed in the course of the *Iliad* are often thought to be invented figures. On the other hand, one could suppose that a tradition about an *aristeia* of Agamemnon in the Trojan War included a stable account of his victims in catalog fashion, including the figure Koon. Encouraging the view that the *aristeia* of Agamemnon in the *Iliad* is based on tradition is the fact that the episode is not essential for the plot of the poem. Indeed, one might even conclude that there is something odd about the *aristeia* of Agamemnon in the context of the *Iliad.* Although it would be unfair to suggest that Agamemnon is not a worthy warrior, such a role is not stressed in the poem, and in fact the overall characterization of his leadership is anything but positive.

O. Agamemnon duels Koon. On lost chest of Kypselos.
Drawing by Martina Meyer (after Massow).

While I am inclined to view the encounter between Koon and Agamemnon as traditional, I recognize that the obscure status of Koon justifies suspicion that he is a product of Homeric invention. There is a chance, therefore, that this representation is some sort of reflection of the *Iliad.* For the sake of argument, let us allow that this is possible but explore further the implications. We cannot conclude that the image's concentration on a detail of the *Iliad* must imply intimate knowledge of the whole of the *Iliad.* Indeed, interest in Agamemnon may have led to a relatively minor episode of the *Iliad* being seized upon in apparent disregard of the poem's essence. First, no other scene on the chest is certainly Homeric (Snodgrass 1998:111–115), which does not suggest an artist who has been overwhelmingly impressed by the *Iliad.* Second, the hexameters that Pausanias says were written on the image are non-Homeric (see Lowenstam 1997:53), which hardly suggests an immediate or strong Homeric inspiration. Finally, most modern readers would think that the honor of Agamemnon runs counter to

his characterization in the *Iliad.* The choice of the artist to focus on a moment in the *aristeia* of Agamemnon does not suggest an appreciation of the whole of the poem. At best the image might be considered an "*Iliad*-derived" representation.

At this point several conclusions can be made about the influence of the *Iliad* on early Greek art. As Snodgrass has best shown, its influence is not as great as is usually assumed. By focusing on the issue of tradition and invention, especially as it has been pursued by neoanalysts, I have rejected the extreme argument that major figures like Hector and Patroclus are products of Homeric invention but have allowed that minor figures might be. I also accept the basic neoanalytical position that the *Iliad,* though based on tradition, is at the same time an idiosyncratic portrayal of traditional material. In my examination the lack of early Homeric representations is confirmed, and just as revealingly, the best candidates for Homeric representation do not seem to demonstrate a strong influence on the part of the poem.

Many of the images involving Hector cannot be securely linked with the *Iliad.* In fact artists provide some evidence of strong non-Homeric traditions about Hector, even of events narrated in the *Iliad.* The presence of the his charioteer Kebriones in some sixth-century vases was thought significant, since he is a minor character. But even here the images were generic rather than specific to the poem. Images involving Patroclus included some of the earliest strong candidates for Homeric reflection. Ultimately the seventh-century depiction of him on a chariot was not considered specifically Iliadic. However, the Rhodian plate of the late seventh century that depicted one of the slayers of Patroclus, Euphorbos, was thought a better indicator of early Homeric influence. Even though I thought that the theory of an Argive tradition about Euphorbos was plausible, from a neoanalyst perspective I judged the character of Euphorbos a Homeric invention. The Rhodian plate therefore does not represent the *Iliad,* but it might be said to be "Homeric-derived." Depictions of the chariot race at the funeral games for Patroclus from the early sixth century were judged similarly, despite their variance from the Homeric account. This conclusion was based on my belief that funeral games for Patroclus first occurred in the Iliadic tradition. Sixth-century images of the battle over the corpse of Patroclus may similarly be "Homeric-derived," but in my view this episode is traditional and the iconography does not depict Iliadic as opposed to traditional details. In

the case of Diomedes, I did not think that the earliest, sixth-century representations of him were specifically Homeric, and in the case of Phoenix I rejected the argument that he was a Homeric invention, which would make sixth-century depictions of him significant. Though I do not see why the slaying of Koon by Agamemnon should not be traditional, for the sake of argument I allowed that Koon might be a character of Homeric invention. In that case the image of Koon on the chest of Kypselos would have been made after the existence of the *Iliad.* This is not difficult for me to believe, at least for the common dating of this artifact. What is more important is the extent and degree of Homeric influence that the representation of Agamemnon and Koon suggests. For a number of reasons I stressed that the image could not signify a strong interest in the *Iliad.*

I do not see any evidence for representation of the *Iliad* earlier than the late seventh century, and in fact it seems that many "Cyclic" images have been misidentified as Homeric. But since I assume that the *Iliad* or its tradition was in existence by the end of the seventh century, I see no need to deny the possibility that some images from that time and later were inspired by the *Iliad.* What is interesting is the lack of influence on the part of the Iliadic tradition that the artistic evidence suggests. There are few early Iliadic representations, and some of the more plausible candidates seem to be only indirectly or obscurely related to the poem. Allowance must be made for iconographical limitations and for the independence or creativity of the artists, but not to buttress a Homer-centric approach to the Archaic Age tradition of the Trojan War. It would seem that the poem often credited with changing its mythological tradition (or even its culture) at the end of the eighth century was first noticed by only a few artists a century later. A down-dating of the Homeric traditions, which I suggested at the beginning of this chapter, would make the initial absence of Iliadic iconography less startling, yet I would think that the Iliadic tradition was in existence for some time before the first appearances of its influence in early Greek art. Overall the evidence of art indicates that by the end of the seventh century the *Iliad* was in existence and was known, but its effect on artists was infrequent and often weak, and would continue to be so for some time. What is especially remarkable is the rarity of specifically Iliadic scenes that one would expect if the poem was well known and influential.[154]

The evidence of art is a rather blunt tool, and the absence of an episode

P. Trojan War figures on horseback. Corinthian pyxis. Paris, Louvre E 609 (LA 298). Courtesy of the Musée du Louvre.

does not prove that it was not known. For example, the death of Achilles is rarely represented in early art, whereas the scene of Ajax carrying his corpse, which necessarily presupposes Achilles' death, is frequent.[155] As was noted in Chapter 1, missing in the earliest Greek art are scenes from myths like the journey of the Argo, the Calydonian Boar hunt, and the Theban Wars, but we should hardly conclude that these were invented at a late date. The lack of Homeric scenes in early art does not prove that the Homeric poems did not yet exist. If we look at all the available evidence of early art, however, we can conclude that non-Homeric themes about the Trojan War were far more popular than Homeric ones. It is a weak counterargument to com-

Q. Mourning Achilles. Corinthian olpe. Brussels, Musée du Cinquantenaire A4. Courtesy of the Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire, Musée du Cinquantenaire.

plain that "Cyclic" episodes are so numerous that artistic representations of them are bound to be more numerous.[156] "Cyclic" myth is often denigrated as late, even derivative, whereas the Homeric poems are often conceived of as the dominant force their culture. If that were so, no amount of "Cyclic" episodes would persuade artists to portray the "Cyclic" scenes and ignore the Homeric ones.

Interest in "Cyclic" material continues to be strong throughout the Archaic Age, and early "Homeric" representations are often mixed in amid "Cyclic" representations. Snodgrass (1998:119, 140) stresses that the Homeric scenes on the François vase and on the chest of Kypselos were overwhelmed by non-Homeric images. In a different way an early sixth-century

Corinthian vase depicts Trojan War characters on horseback (Figure P) in a manner impossible for the chronology of the Trojan War story.[157] The rather rough imagery mixes such "Homeric" characters as Patroclus and Hector with "Cyclic" ones such as Protesilaus, Palamedes, and Memnon. This may simply support my argument that Hector and Patroclus are not purely "Homeric." But it is also interesting to note that the depiction portrays Protesilaus and Palamedes, who died early on in the war, in the same scene with Memnon, who arrived in Troy only toward the end of the war. It may be that the artist is being as careless with his identifications as with his artwork, or perhaps the vase reflects no greater ambition than to suggest the Trojan War, and no particular episode. Another sort of admixture, one that is more plausibly significant, is displayed on another Corinthian vase from the second quarter of the sixth century in Brussels (Figure Q).[158] Thetis bends over Achilles, who touches his forehead in grief as he reclines on a couch by a table with dishes. Odysseus and Phoenix are also present, as are two women who might be Nereids. The scene is sometimes said to mix freely different scenes from books 18 and 19 of the *Iliad.* It might, indeed, but in iconographical terms it does more than that. A grieving Achilles is familiar in later representations of the embassy, among other scenes. And he is shown on a couch amid food in representations of the ransom of Hector that begin in the sixth century. As well, the resemblance of this vase to another by the same painter has not been taken into account: a hydria in Paris that shows Nereids mourning around a bier on which the dead Achilles lies (Figure R).[159]

We have true mix of iconography on this vase. Its artist is either allowing iconographical traditions to take precedence over content, or he is making explicit connections between different episodes of the story of Achilles. Either is possible, but I prefer the latter. Neoanalysts have demonstrated that the *Iliad* cannot be read in isolation from "Cyclic" material, and one of their best-received propositions is that the beginning of book 18, where Achilles grovels in the dust as the Nereids mourn about him, is reminiscent of the funeral of Achilles.[160] It would seem to me that the artist of the Brussels vase has also linked the story of the *Iliad* to myth about the death of Achilles.[161] Like the later books of the *Iliad,* the image evokes the death of Achilles while he is still alive. The evidence of early Greek art not only indicates that the *Iliad* did not quickly dominate the mythological tradition

R. Nereids mourn Achilles. Corinthian hydria. Paris, Louvre E 643.
Courtesy of the Musée du Louvre.

from which it came, but it also suggests that the *Iliad* was first understood as being inextricably tied to it.

Other candidates for representations of the *Iliad* in early Greek art have been proposed. Many are hardly worth considering, since they result from a Homer-centric approach toward early Greek myth and art. For instance, a fragmented relief amphora from the second quarter of the seventh century that depicts women carrying a square object has often been thought to show

the offering of a robe to Athena by Trojan women at *Iliad* 6.85–95. That strains credibility, and it would be willful to view this as certain evidence.[162]

At what time can we be absolutely certain that the *Iliad* is being represented by artists? A sixth-century vase depicting the embassy to Achilles identifies by inscription the herald Odios. This character is only known from book 9 of the *Iliad.* As with the representation of Koon, some regard this an indication that the *Iliad* is the inspiration.[163] The Amasis Painter depicted Poseidon urging on Greeks, which is a scene from book 13 of the *Iliad.* It is easy to imagine that this episode originated with the Homeric poem and was not a regular part of myth about the war. Most famously the Euphronios cup depicted Sleep and Death lifting the Lycian Sarpedon off the battlefield, a scene narrated in book 16 of the *Iliad.*[164] It would seem, then, that after a few plausible representations of the *Iliad* from the late seventh and early sixth century the poem was certainly being represented in the second half of the sixth century. But even then one cannot claim absolute certainty. For instance, Lowenstam argues that the Euphronios vase follows a Lycian tradition of the episode, not the Homeric passage.[165] It may be relevant that some other early depictions thought to portray Sleep and Death with Sarpedon probably portray Sleep and Death with the corpse of Memnon.[166] Apparently the *Iliad* was not the only factor responsible for these early depictions of Sleep and Death with Sarpedon.

Lowenstam further claims that assured illustrations of the Homeric texts first occur in the fifth century.[167] This view is extreme and not in accord with my analysis, but the argument is entirely feasible. Indeed, the suggestion of Friis Johansen that a great number of Attic depictions at the end of the sixth century reflect the influence of the Panathenaic festival is something of a mirage. The candidates proposed are actually not that strong, and it seems the ready acceptance of Friis Johansen's view has less to do with the iconographical evidence than with an interest in shoring up the hazy evidence for a "Pisistratean recension," however that is understood.[168]

The Cyclops: Image and Folktale

The second quarter or the seventh century is often viewed as a terminus ante quem for the date of the *Odyssey* because representations of the blinding of a Cyclops begin then.[169] The issue is especially important because most scholars consider the *Odyssey* to be later than the *Iliad,* and the exist-

ence of early images of the *Odyssey* would shore up the debatable evidence for an eighth-century *Iliad.* Seventh-century images of a Cyclops, however, may reflect not the *Odyssey* but rather a traditional episode about Odysseus, or, since the scenes are not inscribed, a figure other than Odysseus. Much of the material in the *Odyssey* resembles folktales and can hardly be thought to originate with that poem.[170] The poem seems to have incorporated a number of stories that probably have origins that long precede it; as Kirk says (1974:169), they are "for the most part not only independent from but older than Odysseus himself, or mythical Troy, or Ithaca." The Polyphemus episode in particular has been compared since the nineteenth century with folktales about the blinding of an ogre. The earliest known version was recorded in the twelfth century C.E., though most have been recorded within the last two centuries. The majority of the folktales have been recorded in Europe, the Near East, and North Africa.[171] Some have suggested the Near East as an origin for the Cyclops, but this cannot be decided upon conclusively.[172] Most scholars who have studied the folktales are of the opinion that they come from oral traditions that are independent of the *Odyssey.*[173]

Although the folktale analogues have received a lot of attention, comparisons between them and the Homeric Polyphemus episode have not utilized the artistic evidence.[174] On the other hand, study of the images has often referred exclusively to the *Odyssey* passage without taking sufficient account of the folktale analogues.[175] In considering this "triangle" of thematically related material—namely the Homeric Polyphemus episode, the folktale analogues, and early Greek art that apparently represents the actions found in these narratives—my ultimate goal is to judge whether the *Odyssey* is responsible for the early images that show the blinding of a giant or an escape from him under sheep, as is often assumed. Because the Homeric episode is commonly thought to be derived from a folktale, we should at least wonder whether the early Greek images also have some connection with a folktale. Even if artists are portraying Odysseus in particular, the possibility should be considered that a folktale-like version of the Polyphemus episode, and not the *Odyssey* itself, was their source. The examination of this "triangle" of material has its limits, however. In particular one should not slip into the illusion that a pre-Homeric folktale can be reconstructed from modern analogues. If such a folktale was known in the Greek world in the early Archaic Age, it would not necessarily have shared the tendencies of

the modern analogues, nor would it have been narrated in any consistent fashion. But examination of the modern folktales can certainly alert us to the possibilities of this type of tale and, in my view, is necessary before judging the likely inspiration for the depictions of the blinding of a Cyclops or the escape from him.

First, it is necessary to point out elements of the Homeric episode (*Od.* 9.105–566) that are relevant to study of the analogues and the artwork. Odysseus, in his narrative to the Phaeacians, first remarks on the qualities of the Cyclops, noting that they do not have agriculture, nautical abilities, or political organization. Odysseus and his men landed at the "Goat Island" opposite the land of the Cyclops, but Odysseus subsequently sails his ship across the way because he is curious about signs of habitation there. He then leads twelve of his companions to a cave that became visible upon landing. Because of a vague foreboding, Odysseus packs the very strong wine that he had received from Maron of Thrace. The Greeks find cheese, milk pails, and sheep in the cave, light a fire, and eat some cheese. Polyphemus returns with his sheep and blocks the cave entrance with a massive rock, effectively trapping Odysseus and his men. Two of the companions are snatched up and eaten. Two more victims are so treated the next morning. Odysseus and his men sharpen part of a wooden stake that belongs to the giant. That evening Polyphemus eats two more men. Upon becoming drunk by Maron's wine, he is told that his guest's name is "Οὖτις," which in the nominative case would sound like οὔ τις, "nobody." Odysseus and four companions harden the stake in the fire and blind the giant with it. The other Cyclopes, who came running at the hullaballoo, are not impressed when they hear from Polyphemus that nobody had hurt him (to add to the wordplay, the word "one," τις, is repeatedly preceded by a form of the negative particle, μή, just before Odysseus reports his self-satisfaction with the triumph of his μῆτις, "cunning"). Odysseus then ties his companions below three rams bound together; Odysseus hangs on below the biggest ram unbound. Thus they escape with a good supply of sheep for their companions, though first Odysseus risked their lives by taunting Polyphemus, as well as inspiring the monster to curse Odysseus to his father Poseidon.

Next let me survey the major tendencies of the folktale elements, though it should be stressed that there is no primary or authentic version among the

many variants.[176] Time and place are vague. The hero is anonymous or a generic type (e.g., soldier, smith). He seeks adventure, or needs shelter, and is brought into the hands of the giant by chance.[177] He may have a varied number of companions, though often he is the only one to survive the ordeal. A solitary giant demonstrates, by action or intention, his cannibalistic nature. The hero does not usually give a false name, though a separate folktale type features this trick, with "Myself" rather than "No-one" being the name. Wine is not prominent in the analogues, or at least is not necessary; the giant is attacked after he falls asleep. He can be one-eyed, or have one of two eyes blind, or have sight in both eyes. The weapon most commonly used to blind the giant is a metal spit that has been used to roast companions; often, however, the hero effects the giant's blindness when pretending to heal a blind or sore eye. The subsequent escape is usually made under the cover of sheepskins, not live animals. The giant then almost captures the hero by giving him a magic ring that reveals the location of its wearer. The hero escapes by cutting a finger off with the ring; the giant often dies by falling or drowning when he follows the flung ring.

With the major elements of the Homeric episode and the folktale analogues in mind, we can proceed to consider what the artistic images are designed to show. In the Archaic Age there are a good number of representations of the blinding of a giant (Figures S–W); depictions of men under sheep are less frequent at first but become very popular by the end of the sixth century (Figure X). These are certainly not exact illustrations of the episode found in the *Odyssey.* But it is often suggested that faithfulness to the text is iconographically impossible, and in fact this explanation is plausible for a number of differences between the images and the text. First, the monster depicted in the images is sometimes not of impressive size, and he usually suffers his attack in a sitting or reclining position. In the *Odyssey* the giant is compared, with some hyperbole, to a mountain peak (190–192). When he is blinded he is on is back, with his neck turned at a slant (ἀνακλινθεὶς πέσεν ὕπτιος . . . κεῖτ' ἀποδοχμώσας . . . αὐχένα [leaning he fell on his back . . . he lay there turning his neck to the side], 371–372). The turned neck might seem to allow the Greeks to thrust horizontally into his eye, but in the deed a vertical thrust is apparently described, for Odysseus at the end of the stake is lifted high.[178] In any event it should be readily ac-

S. Blinding of Cyclops. Protoargive krater. Argos Museum C 149.
Courtesy of the École Française d' Athènes. ©EFA, E. Sézaf.

knowledged that artists desiring to portray the Homeric story would be faced with obvious problems of space and dimension, and we cannot label an image non-Homeric on these criteria.

Another discrepancy between the Homeric text and the early images that may have no significance concerns the monster's eyes. A central eye is never shown for the giant in all of the early images. Hesiod, using questionable etymology, described this as an essential feature of the Cyclops (*Theog.* 143), and although the Homeric text does not specify that Polyphemus is single-eyed, it refers to his eye in the singular several times and only one blow is needed to blind him.[179] The folktale analogues often feature a giant with

T. Blinding of Cyclops. Krater. London, British Museum 1947.7-14.18.
Courtesy of the British Museum. ©The British Museum.

U. Blinding of Cyclops. Krater. Rome, Mus. Cap., Pal. Cons. Castellani 172.
Drawing by Martina Meyer.

two eyes, whether one or both work, and so the early representations arguably correspond to them better than to the *Odyssey.* Yet it is often thought that artists would have found it awkward to portray a central eye on a monster's head seen in profile, and all the early images depict the monster's head in profile. The depiction of an eye on one side of the head, and not in the center of the face, would thus not necessarily indicate a giant with two eyes. It may have been meant to signify a single, central eye. In later art variety is employed for the giant's eyes: he is also represented as central-eyed or three-eyed.[180] The variance might reflect a multiplicity of traditions, but it could also reflect continuing iconographical experimentation, or even uncertainty at the reticence of the Homeric text.

A third discrepancy is that only the Aristonothos vase (Appendix D, no. 2; Figure U) shows five blinders, which is the number in the Homeric text.[181] The other early vases show three or less, which is comparable with the tendency of the folktales.[182] But here again the discrepancy can be explained by reference to space; as well, the number of companions in the Odyssean episode is neither important nor readily ascertained.

I do not regard these apparent discrepancies between the *Odyssey* and the representations significant. There are also a number of minor correspondences between the Odyssean episode and the images that I likewise regard as inconclusive. Polyphemus cries out and then draws out and hurls the stake; occasionally the images display details that can be linked with these actions. Sometimes the presence of rocks in the images indicates a cave setting, but cave dwellings, if not necessary, are also not unusual for the folktale giants either.[183] Objects identified as a cheese basket and a milk pail are behind the monster in the Aristonothos vase (Appendix D, no. 2; Figure U), and it has been noticed that the Homeric text gives some attention to such. But these objects need not be exclusively Homeric, and in fact sheep are routinely present in the analogues.[184]

Because a tale type involving the blinding of an ogre is suspected to date back to at least Homeric times, it is worth wondering whether the images even portray Odysseus, his companions, and Polyphemus, as opposed to nonmythological characters from folktale.[185] It is certainly remarkable that the images usually do not distinguish between the blinders. Occasionally one is portrayed differently and so is routinely identified as Odysseus.[186] This is unjustified since the analogues also routinely focus on one individual,

even among a group of victims. In the blinding and escape scenes Odysseus is rarely identified by inscription and not until the sixth century.[187] Of some relevance is the occasional presence of swords.[188] This is not impossible for a folktale but well matches Odysseus and his fellow Trojan War survivors (in the Homeric version, Odysseus considers using his sword on Polyphemus at 299–302). As well, the Eleusis amphora also depicts the decapitation of Medusa by Perseus, an early Etruscan ivory pyxis seems to show men escaping under rams next to an image of the Scylla, and Circe is depicted on the back of a sixth-century vase that shows humans offering wine to a giant.[189] These artifacts, at least, would seem to depict the world of myth, not folktale, and so undoubtedly they are meant to depict Odysseus. But it needs to be stressed that an image that certainly depicts Odysseus need not represent the *Odyssey,* or even epic poetry for that matter.

A few major differences between the Homeric account and the folktales seem to be significant for interpretation of the representations. In the analogues the weapon used to blind the giant is very often a spit that the monster uses to roast his human victims, though Page is wrong to state that a wooden stake is an idiosyncrasy of the *Odyssey.*[190] The use of a spit is a pleasing narrative device: the weapon is ready at hand and is fittingly turned on the owner who had misused it. In the *Odyssey,* however, a wooden stake is used to blind Polyphemus. There is no mention of a spit being in the cave of Polyphemus, who apparently eats his victims raw.[191] Odysseus comes upon the trunk of an olive tree that the Cyclops has left to dry in his cave so that he could use it as a walking stick (ῥόπαλον, 319). This seems to the Greeks to be equal in length and width to a mast of a twenty-oared ship. Odysseus and his men cut six feet (ὄργυια, 325) off of it, shave it down, sharpen it to a point, and harden the point in a fire. Later the Greeks heat the stake (μοχλός, 375, etc.) in fire until it glows and is about to catch fire. Denys Page thought it illogical for the olive wood to glow terribly (διεφαίνετο δ' αἰνῶς, 379) and asserted that the text here reveals its derivation from a version in which a spit was used, as in so many of the analogues.[192] Page's remarks about the consequences of subjecting olive wood to flame have been questioned,[193] but his basic argument still seems convincing. The red-hot spit is renowned as a dangerous weapon; not so a heated wooden stake. The initial treating of the wooden point in fire to harden it is understandable, but it seems unnecessary and unhelpful to heat

it just before the blinding (the firebrands used in some of the analogues seem more natural).

That a wooden stake is less common in the analogues than a spit is not especially significant, since an ancient Greek version of this tale type need not have matched the tendencies of the modern analogues. But the *Odyssey*'s use of the wooden stake in unusual ways does imply knowledge of a variant with a spit. Why would the Homeric narrative go out of its way to favor a wooden stake over a spit? A wooden stake would be consistent with the Homeric portrayal of the Cyclops as so primitive that he lacks metal utensils of any sort. Not only does he eat his food raw, but he does not possess the skill of metalworking.[194] Significantly, the stake is said to come from an olive tree, not likely to produce a long straight pole. The detail might reflect Athenian culture, as Erwin Cook has argued, or in the very least evoke the human civilization of which olive cultivation was part.[195] It certainly is remarkable that similes evoking skills of culture (shipping and, ironically, metalworking) are employed just at the moment when a weapon identified as paleolithic by Burkert is applied to the eye of Polyphemus.[196] In the Homeric version Odysseus is trapped within a primitive environment and yet is inventive with the means at his disposal. Furthermore, Odysseus is associated by the narrative description of his actions (his own telling, we must remind ourselves) with human culture. As many have seen, the Polyphemus episode is a prolonged meditation on the polarity of nature and culture, and the contrast is made most pointedly at the moment of the blinding of the Cyclops.[197]

Early Greek blinding scenes frequently suggest a spit, not a trunk.[198] Usually the weapon is very thin and held in the hands of the attackers. The first certain representation of a wooden weapon being used to blind a giant occurs on a vase in the late fifth century in London (Appendix D, no. 16; Figure V).[199] This rather quirky and non-Homeric representation shows a whole, unworked trunk and also satyrs, which remind us that Odysseus's encounter with Polyphemus was treated by Euripides in his satyr play *Cyclops,* as well as in lost comedies. The earliest vase that may possibly show a wooden stake is the recently published Etruscan pithos from the later seventh century (no. 5; Figure W). The weapon thrust toward a giant here by three men is thicker at its base end, and this detail prompted Snodgrass (1998:96–98) to identify the vase as the first plausible rendering of the

V. Blinding of Cyclops. Chalcidian amphora. London, British Museum B154 (1866.8–5.3). Courtesy of the British Museum. ©The British Museum.

W. Blinding of Cyclops. Red-and-white-style pithos. Malibu, Getty Museum 96.AE.135.
Gift of Barbara and Lawrence Fleischman. Courtesy of the J. Paul Getty Museum.

Homeric Polyphemus episode. Certainly the image is no illustration of the *Odyssey;* among other matters there are only three attackers and the victim sits on a well-wrought stool. And the weapon, its swelling at the base aside, cannot be described as made from a tree trunk the thickness of a ship mast. Some will object that this quibbling asks too much of the artist, whether of his ability or inclination. As was admitted already, iconographical issues, not to mention varying skills and purposes, often produce renderings that do not accurately reflect either reality or texts. The Aristonothos vase (no. 2; Figure U) might be cited as a very relevant example. Its blinding scene seems to portray a spit, yet the other side depicts sailors who are disproportionally large in comparison to their ship and its mast.[200] One could argue that this artist's depiction of a long thin weapon is an artistic rendering of an olive wood stake the size of a mast and, furthermore, that all the depictions

of long thin weapons are meant to convey the Homeric story of a blinding by wooden stake. In addition, the number of carriers might be thought to convey the impression of a weighty trunk, not a thin spit. At least three attackers are usually shown on the vases, while in many of the modern analogues a single attacker is able to manage a spit.[201] It may also be worth wondering whether the length of these weapons extends beyond what is appropriate for a spit, even a giant's spit.[202]

Yet, if we relax our demands on the artists, why should we not view the weapons as inexact renderings of a spit rather than inexact renderings of the Homeric narrative? Precisely because this study demonstrates the lack of early Homeric influence, I am inclined to follow the former line of thought and not the latter. The majority of the early representations seem to depict a weapon that is more easily interpreted as a spit than the Homeric weapon. Those who would like to think that the early images were inspired by the *Odyssey* text have some explaining to do. But it has not been demonstrated that the Homeric weapon is shown or explained why it should not be. Reference to the independence or creativity of the artist is very well, but if based on a fundamental Homeric bias, then it can turn out to be nothing more than special pleading in service of old-fashioned author worship. The tendency of the analogues to use a spit has at least made us aware that this is a common variant of the tale type that the early artists may have been following.

The use of wine is a second major difference between the Polyphemus episode and the modern analogues. In the *Odyssey* passage much attention is given to the wine of Maron that Odysseus gives to the Cyclops. When Odysseus relates to the Phaeacians that he set out with this very potent wine because of a foreboding, he takes the opportunity to explain in a digression how he happened to come into possession of it (196–215; cf. 161–165). Later Odysseus offers this wine to Polyphemus (347–363), who is so taken by its taste that he overindulges. The folktale analogues rarely feature wine in this way; wine is present in a few analogues, but in none is it essential to the story.[203] In vase painting of the Archaic Age the scene of Odysseus actually offering wine is rare, although it becomes more popular in Hellenistic and Roman art.[204] Yet some vases representing the blinding of a giant include the detail of a drinking vessel. Among the earliest representations, the Eleusis amphora shows the giant with a cup in his hand as he is being

blinded, and a few more vases in the sixth century do the same.[205] And it has been wondered whether an allusion to the Maronian wine can be seen in the pithos shown in the seventh-century Etruscan blinding scene, or in some vessels depicted on a ship to which men under rams escape on a late seventh-century ivory pyxis.[206] If the presence of wine in the story can be regarded as a Homeric innovation, then there is good reason to conclude that these artifacts were inspired by the *Odyssey.*

The Polyphemus episode, however, never explicitly states that it was essential to make the Cyclops drunk before he could be blinded. Polyphemus becomes drunk, to be sure, but he is blinded only after he falls asleep. If Odysseus had not had the foreboding that inspired him to pack the wine, presumably he could have still blinded the Cyclops in his sleep, as often happens in the analogues. Is drunkenness necessary for the "Nobody" name trick to succeed then? Odysseus informs Polyphemus of his name while the Cyclops is in his cups, and O'Sullivan argues that "Polyphemus swallows the name with the wine."[207] Or does the trick depend more on the stupidity of Polyphemus, who continues to think that he has been bested by "Nobody" even the next day after he has slept off the effects of the wine (455)? In the end Polyphemus himself blames his drunkenness for his defeat (452–454). The portrayal of Polyphemus gurgling when asleep, "heavy with wine" (374), supports his belief that Odysseus had put him in an unusually vulnerable state with wine. And it can easily be seen that one might more confidently attack a monster with its senses dulled by wine, necessary or not.

But the Homeric narrative does not explicitly support the claim of Polyphemus that wine had defeated him. And in hindsight the care with which the wine of Maron is introduced seems surprising. One might see the wine as another cultural artifact employed against the primitive Cyclops, but such a significance is muted by the fact that Polyphemus and his kind already possess wine (110–111, 357–358).[208] The best explanation is that the *Odyssey* here is following a prototype in which the drunkenness of the giant was stressed.[209] Maronian wine may be a Homeric invention, but the use of wine to inebriate the giant may have existed in an ancient Greek version of this tale type. Certainly in the Homeric version the need to bring it, the occasional attention given to it, and the blame of it by Polyphemus all suggest that wine is intermittently conceived of as an essential element. That it is not actually an essential element in this version, that its function is not

carefully explained, reveals that the wine is no innovation. Rather, it seems to be assumed that the audience will know this important yet unevenly explained feature of the tale. Some may be bothered by the implication that the Homeric poem is inconsistent or even clumsy in this aspect, but Page is persuasive, if too energetic at times, in his demonstration of how pre-Homeric material can cause small but revealing problems in this Homeric episode. And if wine was a standard element of a Greek folk version current in the Archaic Age, then it could have gone without saying that the wine caused the Cyclops to let his defenses down.[210] Much the same is thought about the Homeric reticence about the single eye of Polyphemus.

Another major difference frequently seen between the modern analogues and the Polyphemus episode concerns the manner of escape. In the Homeric poem Odysseus ties three sheep together for each of his companions and hangs below the ram. In the folktales the skins of sheep are commonly worn by those who escape from the giant, though there are a number of versions in which live animals are used.[211] There are a few seventh-century depictions of men beneath rams, most famously a fragmented pot at Aegina that does not date later than the earliest blinding scenes (Appendix D, no. 18; Figure X). In the second half of the sixth century depictions of an escape, now sometimes with an ogre included in the scene, begin to become very popular.[212] The representations are hardly exact representations of the Homeric scenes: three sheep astride are never portrayed, there are too few escapers, and on the later images one or more of the escapers brandishes a sword, which does not occur in the Polyphemus episode. But if the use of live animals is to be regarded as Homeric, then we have some very early and, eventually, very many examples of Homeric influence on Greek artists in the Archaic Age.

Because a few analogues used live animals, the motif cannot be regarded as idiosyncratically Homeric. In considering the possible motivation for using live animals or skins, one might wonder if the trouble of killing and skinning sheep in the giant's abode, skated over so lightly in the folktales, would be too awkward in the more realistic Homeric narrative.[213] Certainly in the Homeric narrative the difficulty of finding and preparing a wooden stake is readily undertaken, but as we have seen, certain effects were thereby achieved. The use of live animals may be seen to have produced certain ad-

X. Escape from Cyclops. Protoattic oinochoe fragment. Aigina Museum 566, inv. 10824.
Courtesy of the Aigina Museum and the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Athens. Neg. no. NM 2612.

vantages. There is the famous scene of pathos when Polyphemus addresses his ram (447–460).[214] The issue of sacrifice is important here as well, as Burkert has seen.[215] It is a significant moment when Odysseus sacrifices the ram under which he rode to Zeus, without achieving the Olympian's favor. It is hard to imagine how Odysseus would perform this sacrifice while in the cave, and the futility of his action cannot be underscored until after Odysseus has escaped, revealed his name, and been cursed by Polyphemus. Much is also made in the Homeric text of the food that is gained for the entire fleet as a result of an escape with live sheep. Of course, the Greeks had already hunted an abundance of goat on "Goat Island," but the fact that the companions of Odysseus had initially urged him to drive off the sheep before meeting their owner reveals that a fresh supply of different meat would be highly valued.[216] The Cyclops episode can also be associated with myths

about stealing herds from an underworld figure. A well-known example in Greek myth is the story of Heracles and Geryon, whose underworld significance has been persuasively demonstrated.[217] Polyphemus and his cave have often been seen as symbolic of the underworld. From this mythological perspective, the taking of live animals is an important typological motif. The use of skins in the analogues may work perfectly well to effect the narrative sequence of the escape, but the use of live animals is necessary for this more profound connotation to come into play.

So there are several good reasons for the use of live sheep instead of sheepskins. The depictions of only live animals by early Greek artists might seemingly attest to the influence of the Homeric text. But some of the reasons for using live animals could be appropriate for myth about Odysseus in general and not the *Odyssey* in particular. The ineffective sacrifice to Zeus might be in any version, and there is no reason to think that the need for meat would not be in non-Homeric accounts. Indeed, one might suspect that the issue of food might be more imperative in versions in which "Goat Island" is not present.[218] For that reason it may be best to conclude that the escape scenes in early Greek art reflect myth about Odysseus but not a specific epic poem about him.

In the end, the use of folktale comparanda to analyze the early Greek blinding and escape scenes might seem to have led to mixed results. If one regards the use of a spit as folktale-like, then these early Greek representations should be judged as non-Homeric. On the other hand, if one regards wine and live animals for the escape as Homeric, then the images should be judged as Homeric. But as I have indicated already, one must not equate the modern folktales with the presumed Homeric source.[219] We should have no confidence that an ancient Greek folktale about the blinding of an ogre would have existed in a single, consistent version. And if we allow that the Cyclops episode was traditionally part of the return of Odysseus, then the Homeric version may be building on myth about Odysseus and Polyphemus, not some folktale about the blinding of an ogre. The modern folktale analogues merely alert us to possible variations in which this type of tale might be told. We are glad to learn that a spit can be used as weapon, for the early art seems to show this non-Homeric weapon. The failure on the part of the modern analogues to give a functional role to wine should not

force us to conclude that early scenes with wine vessels are inspired by the Homeric text. Rather, it seems from small indications that the Homeric narrative is based on a version of the tale in which wine is featured. It is only reasonable to conclude that the images also, and independently, follow this version. Something similar may be suspected for the escape. The tendency of modern analogues to employ skins, not live animals, tells us nothing about how an ancient version of the tale would be told. Both variants are equally valid for the story, although the use of live animals might be thought to fit the need of food by Odysseus and his men on their long journey home.

Blinding and escape scenes of the Archaic Age, therefore, cannot be said with any confidence to have been inspired by the *Odyssey.* On the other hand they might easily be thought to be depictions of myth about Odysseus. Of course, the images need not all illustrate the same version of the encounter between Odysseus and the Cyclops. It is always possible that some are inspired by a particular epic about Odysseus, including the Homeric text. But most of the images do not seem to be inspired by the *Odyssey,* and two considerations should encourage this impression. First, the earliest variants of the name of Odysseus in Greek art all employ a lambda, not a delta, in the spelling (e.g., "Olyteus"). The spelling with a delta does not occur until the sixth century, and not until the fifth century for blinding and escape scenes.[220] It is difficult to believe that the early artists were inspired by the *Odyssey* specifically when none of them use the form of the name employed by the poem for its hero. Second, no other scene from the *Odyssey* is plausibly the subject of art until the sixth century.[221] And then the scenes notably come from the deep-sea adventures of Odysseus that are readily suspected of being in non-Homeric sources. The earliest plausible scene besides the blinding and escape, an odd rendering of a bird hovering over someone at a mast, is described by Schefold as non-Homeric.[222] Sometimes the isolation of the blinding and escape representations is explained by supposing that the Homeric episode was performed as an independent song. Certainly the extent of the *Odyssey* would have discouraged early performance of its whole, and so it is reasonable to suppose that rhapsodes performed parts of it and the *Iliad.* A "Cyclopeia" might have been one such rhapsody.[223] But why artists would focus only on this rhapsody and not other Homeric rhapsodies is still not explained by this suggestion. And I do not see that the im-

ages represent the Homeric episode no matter how it was presented. Scenes that might be thought idiosyncratically Homeric, and not just traditionally associated with myth about Odysseus, begin in the fifth century.[224]

The Greek roots of the name Polyphemus can be interpreted to suggest that the name means "Much-famed." Thus the very name of this monster might suggest that his story was well known before it was treated by the Homeric narrative.[225] If so, the number of early blinding and escape images might simply attest to the impact of myth about Odysseus and Polyphemus, whatever way it was told. As Burkert (1987:46) says, the episode "owed its success to its intrinsic structure and dynamics, and not to special poetical skill." What are the implications of this statement? First, the narrative is a powerful one, especially in its sudden reversal of the giant's apparent invincibility.[226] It has also often been thought that the story has some connection with ritual. Germain has failed to convince many that the tale should be closely linked with a specific North African sheep ritual, but Burkert has demonstrated that in structure as well as by connotation the tale achieves much of its power by ritual associations.[227] Furthermore, the tale of being trapped in a cave can be easily understood as being symbolic of the underworld. In the *Odyssey* it has certainly been identified as one of many underworld multiforms in the *Odyssey*'s account of the wanderings (see Burgess 1999). In later Greco-Roman art the scene was regarded as having funerary implications, and such a profound meaning may have always been inherent in the myth.[228]

All of this goes far in explaining why the encounter between Odysseus and Polyphemus might have been powerful enough to engage the interests of early Greek artists. The version of the episode in the *Odyssey* might be a particularly sophisticated one, but it was not needed to make the tale well known. The blinding and escape images therefore do not necessarily reflect the *Odyssey* nor do they present any firm evidence for the date of the *Odyssey.* Undoubtedly many will continue to insist that one or another of the early images must reflect Homeric influence. For the purposes of my larger argument there is no need to resist such conclusions strenuously. Yet on the whole the artistic evidence once again suggests the lack of early influence on the part of a Homeric text.

A different approach has sought to avoid this conclusion with the claim that early artists did not possess the ability to portray the sophisticated na-

ture of the Homeric poems and therefore avoided Homeric themes. Sometimes this line of thought develops into the paradoxical notion that non-Homeric representations actually reflect the spirit of Homeric poetry.[229] For those predisposed to view Homeric poetry as primary and other Trojan myth as derivative, this view may seem an attractive way of explaining away the evidence of art. But artists of the Archaic Age could have portrayed scenes from the Homeric poems.[230] The absence of inscriptions on art scenes early in this period would make some scenes difficult to convey. Yet gods are iconographically easy to portray, and one would think that artists aware of a famous *Iliad* could portray a scene such as Thetis and the Nereids in *Iliad* 18. Scenes that are frequent in later art—for example, the ransom of Hector's body—could easily have been represented by iconography without script. And even after labeling by inscription became common in the seventh century, we find no rush to represent scenes from the Homeric poems,[231] like the meeting between Hector and Andromache or the duel between Hector and Achilles in the *Iliad*. Similar questions can be applied to the reflection of the *Odyssey* in art. Why is only the story of the Cyclops portrayed in art before the sixth century? If the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* had dominated the tradition from which they came in the Archaic Age, would artists with the ability to indicate at least some of their scenes from the late eighth century onward and virtually any scene from the early seventh century onward have refrained from portraying them?

Chance has decided what representations have been preserved and discovered. Because only a small percentage of ancient artwork has been recovered, conclusions based on it may be misleading (see Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:154–155). But it is hard to see why chance would have such a prejudice against Homeric scenes. The evidence of art may not prove anything about the date of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and the poems found in the Epic Cycle, but on the whole it does indicate that the Homeric poems were not well known in the seventh century, whereas "Cyclic" myth about the Trojan War certainly was. If we lower the date of origin for the Homeric poems to the seventh century and allow that their performance tradition only gradually developed down into the next century, the lack of Homeric influence on early artists should not be surprising. If we date the Homeric poems to the eighth century, then we must conclude that they did not heavily influence the tradition of the Trojan War for some time. This lack of influence would

not be overly surprising given the strictures on performance and reception in the early Archaic Age.

Homeric Passages

The earliest Greek inscriptions begin in the eighth century.[232] Some contain a line or two of verse, and some refer to contests or leisure activities. It has been supposed on the basis of this meager evidence that there was an early literate aristocracy much interested in texts of the Homeric poems.[233] But as one surveys the earliest inscriptions, one can only conclude that the very few who were literate were barely literate. The attempts at verse consist of only a few lines at most, and these often have to be corrected by modern editors to fit the apparent metrical scheme.[234] Sometimes the inscription trails off into incomplete and unskilled abecedarias, as if the inscriber became exhausted by even the most feeble attempt at recording verse.[235] One most easily concludes from this evidence that by the beginning of the Archaic Age the composition of verse was normally oral. It appears that the ability to put words in verse was widespread, and not an ability mastered only by a few professional bards. Some of those who could compose verse orally happened to have picked up the new skill of writing. They laboriously managed to get down small, faulty examples of what usually flowed freely from their mouths. There is no reason to think on the basis of this evidence that the long epics had been recorded by writing or read by readers.

An eighth-century verse inscription has been thought to reflect the *Iliad* because it apparently refers to "Nestor's cup." But a reference to Nestor's cup is not necessarily a reference to *Iliad* 11.632–637, for Nestor's cup could have existed in mythology independently of Homer, as is increasingly recognized.[236] An attractive suggestion, unfortunately overlooked, has been made by Kullmann: that Nestor's cup would have been a feature of a meeting before the war between Menelaus and Nestor, a scene that the *Cypria* narrated.[237] Certainly if such a massive, prized object was known in myth, its most natural setting would be the home of Nestor, not the battlefield of Troy.

Lowenstam (1997:45–48) surveys a neglected type of later inscriptional evidence, that of verses painted on Greek vases. He reports that of the two dozen lines of epic verse found on vases of the sixth and fifth century, none come from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. This evidence surely points, once again, to

a lack of early Homeric influence. It also strengthens my contention that early Greek artists were not much concerned with the Homeric poems.

"Panhomerists" (Gentili 1988:58) believe that literature of the seventh century reflects Homeric poetry and that this necessitates an eighth-century Homer.[238] But the assumption that Homeric poetry has cast a great shadow over seventh-century literature is problematic. There is no direct mention of Homeric poetry in this early literature, and testimonia about early authors discussing Homer are unreliable.[239] Direct quotations of Homeric poetry do not begin until the end of the Archaic Age. We are left to look for allusions to the Homeric poems or imitation of them. Numerous phrases in early lyric poetry may appear to be based on "Homeric" passages, but a generally known oral or at least traditional system of phraseology is probably the cause. Positive identification of allusion or imitation is thus very difficult.[240] Longer passages frequently suspected of imitating Homeric poetry are usually gnomic in nature and thus hardly "belong" to the *Iliad* or *Odyssey.* A good example is a battle exhortation of Tyrtaeus 10.21–30, often thought in the past to reuse *Iliad* 22.71–76, but now increasingly recognized as an independent manifestation of a commonplace.[241] That the thought better fits a martial context rather than the *Iliad* passage is a certain indication that it is pre-Homeric.

To what degree can we confidently say that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* have influenced early Greek literature? Fowler's recent discussion of this issue provides a thorough and thoughtful guide on the issue. He concludes that just a few seventh-century fragments probably reflect the *Iliad.*[242] He stresses that these reflections are very imprecise and do not imply that there was a widely known fixed text of the *Iliad.* M. West considers a fragment of Alcaeus (44.6–8 L-P) the first certain example of the influence of the *Iliad* (it describes Achilles calling on Thetis and her intercession with Zeus on his behalf), which is possible but debatable.[243] The fragment concerns narrative that is fundamental to the plot of the *Iliad,* but this material may all be traditional. A more plausible early candidate is a fragment of Sappho (44 L-P) which portrays the Trojans pouring from Troy in song to welcome and escort the newly married Hector and Andromache back to the city. This has been compared with book 24 of the *Iliad* (696–718) in which the Trojan population comes forth to bewail the returning corpse of Hector.[244]

Early reflections of the *Odyssey* are even more difficult to find. Fowler

(1987:33) concludes that only one passage in Archilochus reflects that poem (frr. 131–132 West; Fowler joins the two fragments together). He thinks that the reflection is very imprecise and that it does not imply that there was a widely known text. In my view the supposed Homeric connection is not very impressive. A fragment of Alcman (80 *PMG*) mentions Odysseus and Circe, but Fowler notes suspicions that it reflects an *Odyssey* different from the one we know. Because much of the deep-sea tales of Odysseus are suspected of having an existence in various non-Homeric forms, including nonepic forms, the Homeric inspiration for this fragment is not compelling at all.

Burkert has argued that passages in Stesichorus are the first indubitable instances of Homeric influence. He notes the correspondences between a few reconstructed phrases in the *Geryoneis* and a passage in the *Nostoi* to passages in the Homeric poems. "Stesichoros has thus become the clearest terminus ante quem for the text of Homer as we know it," he concludes.[245] But even here certainty cannot be reached, as Lowenstam has demonstrated forcefully.[246] Among other things, he points out the circularity of supplementing fragments of Stesichorus with Homeric passages and then noting their correspondence to Homeric passages. However, the fragment that contained Helen remarking on a bird omen to Telemachus (fr. 209 *PMG*) does seem based, though only loosely, on the departure of Telemachus from the home of Menelaus in book 15 of the *Odyssey.* It is my impression that this scene originated with the Homeric poem and would not have been part of traditional myth or poetry.[247] As Reece (1988:8) states, the scene "is but a minor episode in the subplot of Homer's *Odyssey.*" On the other hand, Stesichorus apparently changes the order of events, gives a different omen, and uses a crow instead of the Homeric eagle.

The Hesiodic *Shield* is commonly recognized to imitate the Homeric ecphrasis of the shield of Achilles.[248] The Hesiodic poem is usually dated to the second half of the seventh century or the early sixth century. Caution is necessary in regard to its supposed connections to the hazily understood Sacred War, and also one must resist the aesthetic pose that noisily insists that unpleasant images (e.g., the snot of Achlus) must reflect a late and decadent period. Iconographical arguments point to the late seventh century, or perhaps a bit later if the naming of figures in the centauromachy (178–190) indicates multiple inscriptions of the sort one finds with the François vase (ca. 580–570), which includes the Thessalian centauromachy.[249] The Homeric

shield, unlike the Hesiodic *Shield,* has no mythological scenes. Despite several correspondences to the shield of Achilles the Hesiodic *Shield* is largely independent of the Homeric one. The poem is not highly respected, but some of its awkwardness can be ascribed to the miserable state of its textual preservation. And some lines in it were even good enough to find their way into the Homeric shield of Achilles (156–159 = *Il.* 18.535–538, except for one word). The Hesiodic shield may be another example of early sixth-century poetry that seems somewhat but not slavishly influenced by a Homeric passage.

But many will maintain that more passages in early Greek poetry must display Homeric influence. Indeed, there is often among scholars a tacit assumption that identifying a Homeric source for a passage is a basic goal of research. Discovery of such "intertextuality" is made with much satisfaction, even celebration. All emerge as winners in this game: Homer, who invented the poetry worthy of imitation; the alluder, who refers to a Homeric phrase with wit; and the scholar, who is able to decode the poetic play at work. Usually the actual demonstration of influence is skated over lightly, as if too obvious to be worthy of comment. Variance between a model and the passage alluding to it is not troubling, but rather is welcomed, since it "triggers" our recognition of the allusion with subtlety. Certainly this picture of intertextuality is appropriate for the Hellenistic and Roman eras. Whether it is for the Archaic Age, however, is another matter. If we approach the matter from a historical perspective, our first assumption should be that this sort of intertextuality is unlikely to originate with poets or to be understood by their audience. It is debatable whether anyone had a firm sense of texts that could be securely associated with individual authors at a time when culture was primarily oral. We have postulated a dim and slowly growing influence of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in the Archaic Age, and an awareness of Homer as a poet of mythic proportions by the end of this era. It is not clear that the two phenomena were always understood as being directly related, and it can frequently be demonstrated that they were not so understood.

A good centerpiece for discussion of these issues is *Iliad* 6.146–149, the famous simile of the generation of leaves:

οἵη περ φύλλων γενεή, τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν.
φύλλα τὰ μέν τ' ἄνεμος χαμάδις χέει, ἄλλα δέ θ' ὕλη

τηλεθόωσα φύει, ἔαρος δ' ἐπιγίγνεται ὥρη·
ὣς ἀνδρῶν γενεὴ ἣ μὲν φύει ἣ δ' ἀπολήγει.

As is the generation of leaves, so that of men. The wind pours some leaves on the ground, a tree in bloom grows others and the season of Spring comes. Thus the generation of men grows and withers.

This simile is frequently treated as the creation of a single genius, but I would argue that it is a traditional image and that the apparent reflection of it at Mimnermus fragment 2.1–5 West need not be an allusion at all. On the other hand, Simonides fragment 19.1–2 West seems most definitely to be an allusion: a line from the *Iliad* is quoted word for word and attributed to the "Chian man." Because we seem to have two very different usages of the leaves simile, an opportunity arises to trace changing attitudes in the Archaic Age. The possibility that Mimnermus is alluding to a Homeric passage needs to be examined more closely, and the nature of the allusion in Simonides needs to be examined as well.

In the famous simile in book 6 of the *Iliad,* Glaucus refers to the generation of leaves and generations of humankind. The key word here is γενεή: Glaucus turns from Diomedes' interest in his lineage to remarks about the cycle of life. Some see wit, others terror, in the abruptness of the shift.[250] Probably we have something in between at play. I have always admired the lifelike naturalness of speech in Homer, the way that conversations follow the sudden inspiration of the moment, despite the strictures of meter and formula. Here there is indeed a stream-of-consciousness quality to the words of Glaucus. They have their own proper logic within the larger context: first, Diomedes wondered whether Glaucus was a god; Glaucus in effect announces his mortality. Second, mortality might indeed be on his mind as he faces Diomedes. And, finally, the play on the word γενεή is more than just a pun: Glaucus's lineage will forestall an untimely hastening of the cycle of life and death for him.[251]

In Mimnermus 2.1–10 we find these words:

ἡμεῖς δ', οἷά τε φύλλα φύει πολυάνθεμος ὥρη
ἔαρος, ὅτ' αἶψ' αὐγῇς αὔξεται ἠελίου,
τοῖς ἴκελοι πήχυιον ἐπὶ χρόνον ἄνθεσιν ἥβης

τερπόμεθα, πρὸς θεῶν εἰδότες οὔτε κακὸν
οὔτ' ἀγαθόν· Κῆρες δὲ παρεστήκασι μέλαιναι,
ἡ μὲν ἔχουσα τέλος γήραος ἀργαλέου,
ἡ δ' ἑτέρη θανάτοιο· μίνυνθα δὲ γίνεται ἥβης
καρπός, ὅσον τ' ἐπὶ γῆν κίδναται ἠέλιος.
αὐταρ ἐπὴν δὴ τοῦτο τέλος παραμείψεται ὥρης,
αὐτίκα δὴ τεθνάναι βέλτιον ἢ βίοτος·

But we, as the leaves which the much-blossoming season of Spring brings forth when they grow quickly in the light of the sun, like them enjoy the blossoms of youth for a short measure of time, knowing from the gods neither good nor evil. Black Fates stand by, one holding the arrival of grievous old age, the other of death. The fruit of youth grows briefly, as much as the sun spreads upon the land. But when this height of season passes, to die forthwith is better than life.

Most editors and commentators on this passage think that this is an obvious Homeric allusion.[252] Homer is portrayed as the inventive genius; Mimnermus, the clever adapter. At first glance, that is an understandable conclusion to make. There are several verbal parallels, which can be pointed out most readily by making a list of two columns:

Iliad 6	*Mimnermus fr. 2*
οἵη	οἷά
φύλλων, φύλλα	φύλλα
φύει . . . φύει	φύει
ἔαρος . . . ὥρη	ὥρη ἔαρος, ὥρης
ἐπιγίγνεται	γίνεται

When I read arguments for Homeric allusion here, however, I become disquieted by the assertion that Mimnermus is actually alluding to more than one passage. Scholars have claimed that Mimnermus in this poem also refers to the two fates of Achilles (*Il.* 9.410–416), or Sarpedon's famous exhortation to Glaucus (*Il.* 12.310–328), or even an unremarkable phrase in the *Odyssey* about Zeus giving good and evil (*Od.* 4.237).[253] The problem is that the so-called allusion loses focus if it actually employs numerous Homeric passages at once. An image is evoked of Mimnermus flipping through his

well-thumbed Homeric texts, lighting upon snatches of Homeric poetry here and there, and extracting them for a hodgepodge of allusion. Where Mimnermus got his text and how his audience is supposed to follow his multiple allusions are not explained. We are, it seems, on the trail of generic thoughts that are freely sprinkled throughout early Greek poetry; to consider any one manifestation primary, either within the Homeric corpus or in early Greek poetry would be a mistake.

A second problem is that there are numerous and various manifestations of this particular comparison between leaves and humanity throughout the Homeric poems. Apollo compares humans to leaves at *Iliad* 21.464–466 in a way that is very similar to the simile in book 6, as many have noticed. Deluded by the notion that the famous simile in book 6 must somehow be an original passage, some have thought the book 21 passage to be secondary to the book 6 one. Leaf judged the passage in book 21 so poor an imitation of the book 6 passage that he suspected parody. That just goes to show how misguided it is to label different instances of a commonplace as original and secondary.[254]

The arguments for viewing the passage in book 21 as derivative from the passage in book 6 are not cogent by themselves, and they fail completely once the other comparable epic passages are taken into account.[255] In Appendix E, I have listed epic passages about leaves that are reminiscent in some way to the simile in *Iliad* 6. In five of these a comparison is made between leaves and humans. Six contain a collocation of words familiar from both *Iliad* 6 and Mimnermus 2. Though we are usually not dealing with formulaic composition in these passages, nonetheless the same words and phrases tend to occur in passages about leaves. Some correspondences may be coincidental, but most are the natural typology of images about leaves. When leaves are mentioned, trees, blossoming, seasons, and the like also tend to be mentioned. Of course, it would be wrong to conclude from these similarities that any one of the epic passages is primary and the others secondary. We should not assume that Mimnermus fragment 2 is imitating the *Iliad* book 6 passage. Rather, the poetic image of leaves has countless shades of coloring and lightly falls into place in a number of different contexts. That any two passages might resemble each other in early Greek poetry is hardly remarkable.

Griffith acknowledges that humans are compared to foliage many times in the *Iliad* and suggests that this simile is "already *almost* conventional in Homer."[256] It is more natural to conclude that it had become a commonplace in pre-Homeric times. This has already been suspected by those who have struggled to follow the logic of Glaucus in his use of the image. It is too harsh to describe his employment of the simile in book 6 as mistaken or wrong; earlier I indicated the logic by which the simile fits its context.[257] Yet the simile is not an obvious outgrowth of its context, and it is difficult to conceive of it being invented for the speech of Glaucus in book 6. Instead, its use there looks like the creative use of a gnomic statement. That conclusion is only strengthened when we turn to a parallel that has been noticed in the biblical book of Ecclesiasticus:

> Remember that death is not to be postponed;
> the hour of your appointment with the grave is undisclosed.
> Before you die, do good to your friend;
> reach out as far as you can to help him.
> Do not miss a day's enjoyment
> or forego your share of innocent pleasure.
> Are you to leave to others all you have labored for
> and let them draw lots for your hard-earned wealth?
> Give and receive; indulge yourself;
> you need not expect luxuries in the grave.
> Man's body wears out like a garment;
> for the ancient sentence stands: You shall die.
> In the thick foliage of a growing tree
> one crop of leaves falls and another grows instead;
> so the generations of flesh and blood pass
> with the death of one and the birth of another.
> All man's works decay and vanish,
> and the workman follows them into oblivion.
>
> 14.12–20, trans. Snaith

The existence of a comparison between leaves and the mortality of humanity in non-Greek literature might suggest that the image does not be-

long to *Iliad* 6, or even to Greek literature. It has been thought, however, that the Ecclesiasticus passage is derivative from the Homeric one.[258] Ben Sira, the author of Ecclesiasticus, apparently lived in the second century, at a time when Judaea would have been part of the Hellenistic world. But it is should not be assumed that Ben Sira's world was completely dominated by Greek culture, and Ecclesiasticus can hardly be described as an offshoot of Greek literature. It stands in a long tradition of wisdom literature whose most ancient roots lie in the Near East and Egypt. It is possible to view the contents of this passage as distinctly Hebraic.[259]

Collins (1997:40) says of the leaves imagery shared by the *Iliad* and Ecclesiasticus, "the sentiment was probably proverbial by the Hellenistic age, and does not require any extensive acquaintance with Homer." By this he may mean that an influential Homeric phrase would have then become so commonplace that its origin would have been forgotten.[260] I would suggest that the simile had always been such a commonplace that it had no origin to be forgotten. Further passages from the Bible are also comparable.[261] Take, for instance, Isaiah 40.6–8: "All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field: The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: because the spirit of the Lord bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever."

The multitude of biblical examples suggests that this type of simile was part of gnomic thought in Hebrew traditions. We have already supposed that it was in Greek traditions. If we needed to judge whether the concept originated in either the East or West, it would be best to guess East. But it is enough to recognize that the simile is a piece of folk wisdom that reaches far back into the pre-Homeric past. The analogy between humanity and vegetation is striking and profound but an obvious one, and it is easy to see how it could become proverbial anywhere at any time. As such it was used in a number of places in the Homeric poems, including its unusual use in *Iliad* 6. Mimnermus is not alluding to the *Iliad;* he is reusing a traditional commonplace.

A much different situation occurs in Simonides 19 West, which quotes the essential hexameter line of the simile that we know from *Iliad* 6 and attributes it to a poet from Chios:

ἓν δὲ τὸ κάλλιστον Χῖος ἔειπεν ἀνήρ·
"οἵη περ φύλλων γενεή, τοίη δὲ καὶ ανδρῶν"·
παῦροί μιν θνητῶν οὔασι δεξάμενοι
στέρνοις ἐγκατέθεντο· πάρεστι γὰρ ἐλπὶς ἑκάστωι
ἀνδρῶν, ἥ τε νέων στήθεσιν ἐμφύεται.

One thing the Chian man said was best: "as is the generation of leaves, so even of men." Few mortals hearing this place it in their chests. For hope is present in each man, which grows in the breast of the young.

For a long time it was debated whether this fragment was written by Simonides or Semonides. On the basis of a new papyrus find it is now widely agreed that the poem is by Simonides, and it is so identified by West in his second edition of *Iambi et elegi Graeci*.[262] Of course, if it was written by Semonides and Semonides was dated to the seventh century (as he commonly is, though this is by no means certain), then we would have a remarkably early quotation of Homeric poetry.[263] But now we can be reasonably sure that it was Simonides at the end of the Archaic Age who said, "and this was the best thing the man of Chios ever said: 'As is the generation of leaves, so is that of men.'" Interpretation of the reference to the "man of Chios" in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* has caused much controversy.[264] But it is difficult to doubt that here it must mean Homer. Simonides apparently praises Homer at fragment 11.15–18 West, and he refers to Homer directly by name on two occasions, fragments 564 *PMG* and 20.14 West. The last had once been joined to fragment 19 on the authority of Stobaeus, and many now think that the two fragments must be part of the same poem.[265]

Davison does well to remind us, however, that Simonides' Homer may not be our Homer.[266] As I have pointed out, the Homeric corpus had not been restricted to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* at the beginning of the Classical Age. Simonides himself refers to "Homer and Stesichorus" narrating Meleager's attendance at the funeral of Pelias (564 *PMG*), although no such incident is in our Homeric poems. A new Simonides fragment (fr. 11 West) praises Homer but alludes to extra-Iliadic Trojan events (apparently the death and funeral of Achilles, certainly the fall of Troy).[267] Can we be sure that Simonides would have been able to identify the *Iliad* as the poem to which the leaves simile belonged?[268]

That question cannot be easily answered. Ford has recently explored the nature of quotation in the late Archaic Age and in the Classical Age.[269] He demonstrates how poetic lines were taken out of context for use in competitive wordplay by intellectuals of the day. For instance, Simonides gives us no indication of what character spoke the simile comparing leaves to humanity, and thus he does not distinguish between Homer and his characters. Like Mimnermus, he does not employ the thought of the simile in the same way that the Homeric passage does. He seems solely interested in a short quotation that he can claim is authoritative and, what is more, "very excellent." Many scholars seem to imply that Simonides is pronouncing on what he thinks is the best within the Homeric corpus. But according to Ford's analysis, such snatches of poetry imply that there was little concept of or interest in poems as unified entities. Considerable evidence suggests that this poet was fond of references to earlier poets.[270] But this obsession with the personas of his predecessors does not necessarily indicate that he knew their work well, and the quotation of this hexameter by Simonides does not prove his knowledge of the *Iliad* as a whole.

I would not conclude, however, that there is no connection between the simile of *Iliad* 6 and the quotation of it by Simonides. By the time of Simonides the Homeric poems were becoming well known, perhaps largely through recitation at the Panathenaic festival. Simonides may well have known the poem, if he did not know the poem well. In the very least I think that we can assume the passage in *Iliad* 6 is responsible for the words of Simonides, though perhaps indirectly. But it is the mythical Homer, and not the *Iliad,* that is of interest to Simonides. He counts on his audience to recognize Homer as a great epic poet but does not demand that it has any extensive knowledge of the *Iliad.*

It is therefore misguided for modern critics to use Simonides as an ancient confirmation of their sense that the *Iliad* is a uniquely excellent poem. And not only do they misrepresent the views of Simonides on the *Iliad,* they adopt his mythical sense of Homer as a great poet. A myth about Homer is apparently desired in the modern world as much as it was in the ancient world.[271] It seems a common inclination to feel that the poet we admire so much must have been immediately beloved and influential. As a result the assumption has grown that Homer invented the leaves simile and other early Greek poets took it from him. From this perspective Mimnermus fragment

2 becomes an allusion to *Iliad* 6, and Simonides fragment 19 a confirmation that Mimnermus is alluding to Homer.

In my view Simonides is actually mistaken to ascribe the line to Homer. I have argued that the concept of comparing leaves to humanity was pre-Homeric and that early instances of this simile were independent of its manifestations in the Homeric poems. Not only the concept but the very words of *Iliad* 6.146 could have been generic and common. By the time of Simonides it would have still been a poetical commonplace. But because Homer had by then become a famous poet of mythical proportions, and because a poem associated with him contained the traditional line, it was now possible to credit the invention of a bit of folk wisdom to "Homer." Something comparable is present in some famous remarks of Xenophanes. He suggested that Homer and Hesiod invented the Greek pantheon and that everyone had always learned of matters from Homer (frr. 10, 11 D-K). Of course, these sentiments are patently false. But because the newly famous Homer is understood as a figure from the past, concepts of no known origin can be linked with him. The simile comparing leaves to humanity was an archaic sentiment that did not belong to any one poet or poem, but when a need arose to identify its origin, a figure of similarly hazy antiquity fit the bill. The Homeric instance of the simile need not have been as equally ancient as the traditional concept of it; everything from beyond a couple of generations would have seemed equally prehistoric.

Of interest to this discussion is a bit of verse ascribed to Musaeus (fr. 5 D-K):

> ὣς δ' αὔτως καὶ φύλλα φύει ζείδωρος ἄρουρα·
> ἄλλα μὲν ἐν μελίῃσιν ἀποφθίνει, ἄλλα δὲ φύει·
> ὣς δὲ καὶ ἀνθρώπων γενεὴ καὶ φῦλον ἑλίσσει.
> —Clement *Str.* 6.5

As the grain-giving earth produces leaves—some wither on the ash trees, others grow—thus the generation and race of mankind turns.

Here we have yet another comparison between leaves and man, with the same general collocation of imagery we have seen before. It is amusing that Clement, who quotes this passage, compares this with the passage in *Iliad*

6, remarking that Homer has taken an image from Musaeus and changed it. Musaeus was believed to be a predecessor to Homer; often he was believed to be an ancestor of Homer in the ancient lives. And so, upon finding similar passages in Musaeus and Homer, Clement quite naturally labels Musaeus the original and Homer the derivative.

No one in the modern world will believe this; we consider Musaeus a purely mythical figure. But Clement is making the same type of mistake that Simonides is. He attributes a traditional commonplace to a single poet that he believes lived in the distant past. The greater antiquity of Musaeus causes Clement to describe him as the inventor of the concept, whereas for Simonides the authority of Homer, as well as his antiquity, is decisive in granting him the credit. When rejecting Clement's naive supposition that Musaeus invented the simile, we need to recognize that Simonides was just as naive. And though it is thought that there is more historicity to Homer than Musaeus, we should understand that Homer was largely a mythical figure in the ancient world. This is especially true at the end of the Archaic Age, when the word Homer was practically a synonym for epic poetry.

The situation becomes much different once we move out of the Archaic Age and the ancient world becomes more literate. The Homeric poems became widespread and were commonly used educational texts.[272] Naturally enough it is proper to see the *Iliad* as the ultimate source of later analogies between leaves and humanity. Poets were influenced directly by the Homeric poems or, as is so often the case in postantiquity, by poets who were influenced by Latin poets who had been influenced by the Homeric poems.[273] Of the later literary passages thought to result from the Homeric simile, one type plays on a connection between leaves and mankind. A second tends to describe the shades of the dead as leaves blowing in the wind; some just focus on the leaves and wind. Bowra made a strong distinction between the two types, supposing that the second type has its origins in Orphic traditions. Whether or not that is right, I think he was correct to distinguish the two types. Although it is interesting to compare examples of the second type to examples of the first type, they should probably not be considered reflections of the Homeric simile.

In the past we have often been tempted to assume that the earliest Greek poets knew and loved Homeric poetry just as we know and love Homeric

poetry. There is certainly evidence that the name Homer, at least, was becoming known in the sixth century. Stesichorus reportedly referred to Homer (and Hesiod) by name in his palinode (fr. 193 *PMGF*), as did pre-Socratics.[274] Simonides refers to Homer directly and to the "Chian" man, and so does the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (172), as noted earlier.[275] And Xenophanes directly referred to Homer.[276] But we have seen that the evidence for allusion to Homeric poetry in the Archaic Age is very slim. And quotation of actual verse of the Homeric poems is very rare before the fifth century. Only Simonides directly quotes a line of the *Iliad.* Many have been surprised by the few indications of early knowledge of Homeric poetry and, as a result, have exaggerated the significance of the little evidence that they can find. But precisely because I do not see how the Homeric poems could have been dominant in the Archaic Age, I approach early Greek poetry not expecting to see Homeric influence. This is most appropriate in view of the historical circumstances.

The evidence of literature about Homer's influence in the Archaic Age is similar to the evidence of art. It can be argued that early Greek art and literature both contain some reflections of Homer, but the possibilities are not numerous and the first probable reflections date from the end of the seventh century. We can find a greater number of probable reflections of the Homeric poems in art and literature in the sixth century, but even these do not occur in large numbers. For "Homeric" literary passages I considered the earliest plausible candidates to be a fragment of Sappho, a fragment of Stesichorus, and the Hesiodic *Shield.* Sometimes there seemed to be only a loose connection with Homeric poetry, and we are reminded that some of the early "Homeric" images also had a tenuous connection with the Homeric poems. In the case of Simonides actually quoting a line found in the *Iliad,* we saw that this author probably did not have a very clear conception of the Homeric poem as a whole. The evidence of art and literature is mutually supportive, and it suggests that the influence of the Homeric poems was minimal throughout the Archaic Age.

The conclusion that the Homeric poems did not immediately dominate the tradition of the Trojan War may seem surprising, for a different view is widespread: that the influence of the Homeric poems was so strong they caused the tradition to die out.[277] The theory may be appealing because it

seems to confirm our own high estimation of the poems, but we have seen that there is actually little evidence to support it. All available evidence indicates that myth about the Trojan War in general was known from the late eighth century onward; on the other hand, probable evidence for knowledge of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* does not exist until late in the seventh century. My argument should not be misconstrued as a low opinion of the worthiness of the poems, for I yield to no one in admiration of them. But an interdisciplinary, historical analysis reveals that these poems were not immediately influential despite their excellence. Why would this be so?

At first the Homeric poems may not have been well received. It would display great cultural bias to assume anachronistically that what we regard as excellent was always regarded as such. Perhaps the long, expansive Homeric poems were found failing or unsatisfying in comparison to other epics about the Trojan War. They would not have quickly satisfied a desire for the narrative of the story. Nor would the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* function to meet the concerns of local communities, if we follow the distinction between Homeric Panhellenic poetry and local poetry that Nagy has established (see Chapter 3). "Typical" epic poems that were readily understood and full of wondrous stories could have been preferred at first to what were undoubtedly idiosyncratic poems.[278]

But even if the Homeric poems were immediately welcomed as outstanding wherever they were heard, the spread of their fame would have been limited for logistical reasons. Greek culture remained predominantly nonliterate until well into the fifth century. Those who suppose literacy immediately killed off living traditions have overestimated its spread and use (on this point, see especially Thomas 1992:44–51). And the limited growth of literacy would have prevented single texts from having great influence. Writing materials were rare and the recording of long epic poems would have been difficult at an early period.[279] In the unlikely event that the Homeric poems were written down at an early date, there can be no doubt that publication of them would occur only through oral recitation.[280] That would have limited the influence of poems that would have required days to perform. It is even possible to ask whether the Homeric poems were ever performed as a whole before the Panathenaic festival (Dowden 1996:50–51). The Homeric poems, despite their excellence, could not have become known immediately to all of Greece. And listeners who enjoyed them could

only come away with a general sense of their worthiness, not with detailed knowledge of them. It cannot even be assumed that a privileged few—poets, for instance—possessed a text of the poems. If any did, they would not have written for an audience that had texts of the Homeric poems.[281]

It certainly is a problem to understand how in a largely oral society an apparently thriving and widespread oral tradition could be quickly eliminated through the influence of texts of the Homeric poems. As Thomas (1992:48) says, "How could a written text have such authority in a society which still relied almost overwhelmingly on oral communication and was to continue to do so for at least another three centuries?" It is doubtful that many copies of fixed texts of such length could have been manufactured, and they would not become well known through oral recitation. We must therefore conclude that the pre-Homeric tradition of the Trojan War resisted the influence of the Homeric poems and remained vibrant and widespread throughout the Archaic Age.

A remarkable result of the limited publication of the Homeric poems is the fact that epics other than the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and material not from the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* were often ascribed to "Homer." Reports that claim Callinus considered the *Thebais* to be by Homer (fr. 6 West) and that Archilochus considered the *Margites* to be by Homer (fr. 303 West) should be mistrusted, but they may have been generated by a genuine belief in later times, fueled by the myth of Homer. The report at Herodotus 5.67 that in the early sixth century the Sikyonian tyrant Kleisthenes banned Homeric poetry that sung of Argos may mean that poetry about the Theban story (perhaps the *Thebais* and *Epigoni* of the Epic Cycle) was considered Homeric at that time (and also by Herodotus at a later date, though he admits doubt about Homeric authorship for the *Epigoni* at 4.32).[282] Simonides (fr. 564 *PMG*) ascribes some material that is not in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* to Homer. Pindar at *Pythian* 4.277–278 quotes as Homeric a line that does not seem to be from the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*.[283] Many think *Isthmian* 4.37–41 implies that material from the *Aethiopis* is Homeric.[284] A testimonium suggests that Pindar considered Homer the actual author of the *Cypria* (*Cypria* test. 2 Bernabé = 1 Davies). The testimonium may be doubted, but perhaps a belief that Homer composed that poem generated the story. Further examples can be adduced, for false attributions to Homer continued throughout antiquity.[285]

Because Herodotus is the first to refer directly to poems by title,[286] all early references to Homer do not necessarily mean the *Iliad* and *Odyssey.* The first doubts about false ascriptions to Homer are also found in Herodotus; he questions Homeric authorship for the *Cypria* (2.116–117) and the *Epigoni* (4.32). Soon afterward, it seems, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* became commonly viewed as the only or main Homeric works. Plato quotes the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* exclusively, Xenophon's *Symposium* 3.5 links Homer with those two poems only, and Aristotle in the *Poetics* focuses on them as quintessentially Homeric.[287]

Because the reputation of the poems of the Epic Cycle is low in the modern world, some are troubled that Homer was once considered their author and try to explain away the evidence for such ascriptions.[288] Yet the phenomenon is really testimony to the growing esteem for Homeric poetry. This practice of ascribing non-Homeric material to Homer probably reflects not only the obscurity of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* but also the success of the mythological figure of Homer as the greatest of poets. Though by the end of the sixth century the Homeric poems had caused the name Homer to become famous as that of a great poet, the poems themselves were not readily available. Thus confusion easily arose as to what exactly was Homeric poetry. One would think that as long as Greek society remained nonliterate, fixed texts would have had difficulty in gaining recognition. The act of performing, not skill in composing an idiosyncratic text, would have been valued. Yet the Homeric poems, whenever they were performed, must have turned attention to their excellent qualities. That would have eventually made the name Homer very famous as that of a great poet. Yet the limitations of publication and the absence of titles would have made it unclear what exactly was Homer's corpus of work. Poems about epic topics became associated with his name, even if, as we might suppose, they were quite different from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey.* Indeed, eventually the whole genre of epic poetry became equated with Homer. By convention "Homer" became a convenient label for the genre even for those who knew or suspected he was not the author of all heroic poetry.[289]

Herodotus, who first uses titles for poems, who first directly quotes Homer, and who first casts doubt on false attributions to Homer, seems to represent a time of growing literacy in which a more precise conception of Homeric poetry developed. But some evidence discussed here shows that

the name Homer was becoming celebrated before that time, and it is hard not to believe that the fame of this mythical figure was caused by the growing appreciation of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey,* as a small amount of artistic and literary evidence in the Archaic Age indeed suggests. We should conceive of the influence of the Homeric poems as growing gradually over a long period of time, beginning some time before Herodotus and continuing long after him. Just as there is reason to doubt the sudden creation of the Homeric poems (what Nagy has termed the "big bang" theory),[290] there is reason to doubt an immediate and overwhelming influence on the part of the poems. It has been shown in this chapter that at first, in the Archaic Age, the influence of the Homeric poems was quite limited. This has enormous implications about the nature of the poems of the Epic Cycle in the Archaic Age, especially in terms of their relation to the Homeric poems. That issue is explored in the next chapter.

THREE

The Epic Cycle and Homer

Because the Homeric poems were not greatly influential in the Archaic Age, the pre-Homeric tradition of the Trojan War must have continued to thrive after they were composed. The evidence of art shows that "Cyclic" themes, that is, material found in the Trojan War poems of the Epic Cycle, were well known from at least the beginning of the seventh century. It appears that the poems of the Epic Cycle are based largely on a tradition that reaches back into a pre-Homeric past. Were they also influenced by the Homeric poems? Undoubtedly the Homeric poems became increasingly influential as time went on, and certainly by the end of the sixth century the name *Homer* had become famous as that of a great poet. If the poems of the Epic Cycle were composed after the Homeric poems, as most assume, their contents could then be based on both pre-Homeric traditions and Homeric poetry.

There are two extreme views on this issue. According to one, the poems of the Epic Cycle are based entirely on the Homeric poems and not on any genuine tradition.[1] This view is very unlikely for many reasons. We have seen that the Homeric poems extensively allude to "Cyclic" material that apparently existed in a widely developed tradition that preceded them. Not all of these allusions can be condemned as interpolations. Others have suggested that the apparent allusions to "Cyclic" material are only ad hoc details invented for background verisimilitude. It that were true, then the fuller accounts of such material in the Epic Cycle would be nothing but the expansion of details mined from the Homeric poems.[2] But not all of the

Homeric allusions to "Cyclic" material can be explained away in this manner, and artistic evidence in particular gives ample testimony that "Cyclic" material existed at early date.

According to a second extreme view, the poems of the Epic Cycle influenced the Homeric poems. Such an argument necessarily depends on dating the poems before the Homeric poems. Analysts who tended to place the Cycle somewhere between early and late parts of the *Iliad* pioneered this line of thought (T. Allen [1924: 72] must have been thinking of them when he labeled the concept a fad of "singular perversity"), and neoanalysts at one time generated much controversy by sometimes advocating this idea.[3] Today the leading practitioners of neoanalysis do not argue that poems in the Epic Cycle preceded the Homeric poems or that written texts were available to Homer. The change is the result of scholarship on oral poetics, which has been increasingly recognized as compatible with neoanalysis.[4] After all, the Parry-Lord school of thought believes that a long pre-Homeric tradition lies behind the compositional techniques it observes in the Homeric poems. Neoanalysts also assume that there was a strong pre-Homeric tradition. But whereas oralists focus on the poetic craft of this tradition, neoanalysts are interested in the contents of the tradition. Acceptance of the tradition as oral removes the need to regard specific texts (real or imagined) as an influence on the composition of Homeric poetry. Instead, pre-Homeric oral traditions can be regarded as the background for Homeric poetry. Of course, this oral tradition is lost, but neoanalysts argue that its contents can be discerned from post-Homeric poetry that continued its traditions, like the poems of the Epic Cycle.[5] Now neoanalysts tend to speak not of pre-Homeric poems but rather of pre-Homeric traditional motifs—ideas, episodes, and plots—that had an influence on the Homeric poems. Modern scholars who have been influenced by neoanalytical arguments are usually careful to point out that they are following this more sophisticated conception of the pre-Homeric tradition.

The new focus on pre-Homeric motifs, not texts, seems to have eliminated a practice once common in neoanalysis, the attempt to find in the *Iliad* word-for-word quotations of pre-Homeric texts.[6] If there was no Homer with written texts open before his eyes, then he could not have quoted lines or passages from them. In recent Homeric studies, however, intertextuality has often been wedded to orality with the supposition that over a long pe-

riod of time different fluid and oral poetic traditions could influence each other.[7] The methodological foundation for this type of analysis is obviously uncertain. Modern interest in intertextuality focuses on texts, whereas the study of oral poetics is focused on the historical circumstances of poetic composition. Because scholars of early epic have only a few surviving texts to contend with, those who see links between them have felt forced to resort to a joining of the intertextual and oralist perspectives, whether compatible or not. And so allusion is described in terms that seem to imply recorded texts influencing one another, though the texts are instead described as fluid oral traditions. As one critic has said, it is a bit like having your cake and eating it too.[8]

As it happens, the search for intertextuality in early oral epic has often yielded profitable and convincing results. And it is certainly true that a certain agonistic spirit prevailed among early Greek poets. We can assume that the Homeric and Cyclic epic traditions were composed with rival poetic versions of the Trojan War in mind. There may be a strong case for seeing the Iliadic and Odyssean traditions as aware of each other, because I have portrayed these as distinctive. But I would assume that the interconnections between Cyclic poetic traditions and between the Cyclic and Homeric traditions are usually best attributed to the common mythological tradition that they share, not to self-conscious interaction and rivalry between such poetic traditions. Three points made in this study are highly relevant to this issue: (1) there probably was a dense and multifaceted web of traditional narrative in the Archaic Age; (2) it is extremely unlikely that Cycle poems were composed with each other in mind; and (3) the Homeric poems were not especially influential or important at first. Even if a poetic tradition about the Trojan War did succeed in establishing itself over time and space, that would not mean that other poetic traditions about the Trojan War would be concerned with it or even aware of it. Poetic tradition would be working within the larger mythological tradition of the Trojan War, which would be only slowly changing in reaction to the manifestations made of it in various media.

Most scholars probably think that the poems of the Epic Cycle, though influenced by the Homeric poems, do contain pre-Homeric traditions not derived from the Homeric poems.[9] Opinion varies widely on the extent of the traditional material in the Cyclic poems, however. An obstacle to crediting the Cycle with a great amount of traditional material is its apparent

dependence on the Homeric poems.[10] The poems in it seem to surround the Homeric poems and seem to have detailed knowledge of them, which leads many to believe that they are based more on the Homeric poems than on a pre-Homeric tradition. In addition, their tone and cultural practices are frequently very different from that of the Homeric poems. This presents a different obstacle to crediting them with much traditional material, for it is usually concluded that these non-Homeric aspects are "late"—that is, they originated in post-Homeric times. If that is true, then much of the material in the Epic Cycle was not based on pre-Homeric myth but was invented in a later and different time from that of the Homeric poems.

I would suggest that the Cyclic epics in their early fixed manifestations were not only based on long-standing traditions but were also independent in content and form from the Homeric poems. This is certainly not the *communis opinio,* even if it is not as radical as the extreme view that would have Cyclic poems influencing the Homeric ones. Clearly the Cyclic poems appear to precede and follow the Homeric poems in the summary of them that we possess, but they were not necessarily composed for that function. As we saw in Chapter 1, a distinction must be made between earlier fixations of the poems and the later manufacture of the Epic Cycle. The manner in which the poems seem to surround the Homeric poems in the Epic Cycle may be illusory. In addition, the apparent dependency of some material in the Epic Cycle on the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is often better explained as resulting from shared traditions, not from the influence of the Homeric poems on the poems of the Epic Cycle. Finally, the common listings of "late" material in the Epic Cycle are very misleading and need to be challenged. Often it is apparent that such "late" material is implicit if suppressed in the Homeric poems. And aspects of the poems in the Epic Cycle that are undoubtedly non-Homeric do not indicate that they date from a later time. Often it seems that "Cyclic" material is more traditional than the idiosyncratic nature of the Homeric poems.

Cropping around the Homeric Poems

The apparent encircling of the *Iliad* by the *Cypria* and the *Aethiopis* should be examined first. Did the *Cypria* always lead up to the *Iliad* and then the *Aethiopis* proceed from where it finished, as it appears from Proclus's summary? That is usually assumed, and this apparent surrounding of the

Homeric poems has been considered the main characteristic of the Epic Cycle since antiquity (see Epic Cycle test. 11, 12 Bernabé = 6, 10 Davies). First of all, that view of the Epic Cycle disregards the theogonic and Theban War sections of the Cycle that cannot be said to surround the Homeric poems. Indeed, the neglect of these sections of the Epic Cycle has made the Homeric poems seem more central to the Epic Cycle than they really were. And the obvious tampering with the early dimensions of the poems in the Epic Cycle should at least make us wonder if the same type of tampering occurred with the ending of the *Cypria* and the beginning of the *Aethiopis.*

At first glance the *Cypria* does seem to introduce the *Iliad.* According to Proclus, the *Cypria* stops short of the *Iliad,* and the last events listed in his summary of the poem seem to look forward to events in the *Iliad:*

> καὶ ἐκ τῶν λαφύρων Ἀχιλλεὺς μὲν Βρισηΐδα γέρας λαμβάνει, Χρυσηΐδα δε Ἀγαμέμνων. ἔπειτά ἐστι Παλαμήδους θάνατος, καὶ Διὸς βουλὴ ὅπως ἐπικουφίσηι τοὺς Τρῶας Ἀχιλλέα τῆς συμμαχίας τῆς ῾ΕΕλλήνων ἀποστήσας, καὶ κατάλογος τῶν τοῖς Τρωσὶ συμμαχησάντων.

> And from the loot Achilles chooses Briseis as his prize; Agamemnon Chryseis. Then there is the death of Palamedes, and the plan of Zeus to aid the Trojans by removing Achilles from the Greek alliance, and the catalog of Trojan allies.

The mention of Briseis and Chryseis and the plan to remove Achilles from the alliance certainly seem like preparation for the *Iliad.* Monro (1884:4–5) has suggested that the *Cypria* did not originally contain this plan to remove Achilles, arguing that because the *Cypria* opens with a plan of Zeus to begin the Trojan War (according to Proclus), a second plan of Zeus has no place in the poem. But this second plan could be a continuation of the first one. Zeus at the start of the *Cypria* apparently intends to destroy Greeks as well as Trojans by causing the Trojan War,[11] and Achilles' withdrawal causes many Greek deaths, as the proem of the *Iliad* stresses. And though we have seen that the summary of the Epic Cycle often does not accurately reflect the extent of the poems in their earlier forms, there is not much evidence that the internal details of the poems were misrepresented. In this case there

is no reason to doubt Proclus in his report that in the *Cypria* Zeus planned to remove Achilles from the Greek alliance.

Others have argued that the ending of the *Cypria* actually does not agree with the *Iliad.* T. Allen suggests that the *Cypria* is narrating a variant account of the wrath of Achilles, pre-Homeric in origin, in which the murder of Palamedes is the cause of Achilles' withdrawal.[12] The unfortunately concise summary by Proclus does not provide us with enough information to disprove this theory, but it seems unlikely. In my opinion, the narration of the death of Palamedes in the *Cypria* has little bearing on our investigation. It does separate the capture of Chryseis and Briseis from its apparent conclusion, the quarrel of book 1 of the *Iliad,* but this quarrel does not have to follow immediately after their capture. Kullmann differently argues that the *Cypria* is preparing for the *Aethiopis,* not the *Iliad.* He sees the plan of Zeus in the *Cypria* to remove Achilles from the Greek alliance fulfilled by actions of Achilles in the *Aethiopis*—Achilles temporarily departs from Troy to be purified of a murder— and Kullmann believes that he withdraws from battle after a prophecy from Thetis.[13] But why would the *Cypria* mention Briseis and Chryseis at all if it did not know the story of Achilles' quarrel with Agamemnon and subsequent withdrawal from battle?

A more compelling point made by Kullmann is that Zeus's second plan in the *Cypria* does not exactly correspond to the request of Thetis in the *Iliad.* In the *Cypria* the quarrel is part of Zeus's plan, and his purpose is to help the Trojans. In the *Iliad,* Zeus agrees to a request by Thetis after the quarrel, and the request is to honor her son. The help given to the Trojans is only a means to achieve this end, not the end itself. Davies (1989a:50) acknowledges this discrepancy, but prefers to think that either the *Cypria* revised the story of the *Iliad,* or that the summary of the *Cypria* was changed so that it appeared to introduce the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon, though in fact it originally did not. Why the *Cypria* would revise a poem it strives to introduce is unclear; on the other hand, I have pointed out that there is little evidence that the summary of Proclus does not accurately reflect the internal details of the Cyclic poems. The best explanation is that the quarrel of Achilles and Agamemnon was traditional and the *Cypria* independently narrated a version that was slightly different from the one told in the *Iliad.*

As noted, the summary indicates that the *Cypria* did not end with the

capture of Briseis and Chryseis. It continues on with the death of Palamedes and a catalog of Trojan allies. The quarrel over these women does not have to follow immediately after their capture, and so it is natural for the *Cypria* to include additional material at this point. The *Cypria*'s catalog of Trojan allies, however, suggests that the *Cypria* did not intend to introduce the *Iliad.* In this conclusion I am not following Kullmann's argument that this catalog of Trojan allies is a reference to Penthesileia, Memnon, and Eurypylus.[14] If Apollodorus follows the *Cypria* in the contents of the catalog (he does in its placement in the narrative), then the allies come from neighboring towns. Huxley (1969:140–141) best explains why a catalog would exist at this point in the *Cypria.* Inhabitants of sacked neighboring towns would flee to Troy, and the whole of Asia Minor would now be roused to defend Troy. So the *Cypria* has placed its catalog of Trojan allies at a logical point in the story; the same cannot be said for the *Iliad.* That alone should lead us to suspect that pre-Homeric tradition, not the *Iliad,* is the source for this catalog in the *Cypria.* Certainly the versions in the *Cypria* and the *Iliad* were very similar, if Apollodorus has based his version on the *Cypria.*[15] But that does not mean that the *Cypria* has copied the *Iliad*'s account (or vice versa). The similarity is easily explained by supposing that both poems followed a stable tradition about the catalog. And similarity between the two versions suggests independence: why would the poet of the *Cypria* duplicate material in a poem that he is introducing?

Interestingly, the catalog of Trojan allies is missing from the summary of the *Cypria* in one manuscript of the *Iliad.* It would seem that someone omitted it because it duplicated the catalog in book 2 of the *Iliad* (Huxley 1969:140–141). M. West agrees (1966a:402) that these catalogs would have been similar and concludes that such duplication would not have been tolerated in the Epic Cycle, suggesting that one catalog of Trojan allies appeared in either the *Cypria* or the *Iliad,* not both. Davies (1986:96 n.39) has called this idea "the merest speculation"; elsewhere he (1989a:50) supposes that the *Iliad* originally did not have the Trojan catalog. If one must make a choice, it does seem that such a catalog would more naturally belong to the *Cypria.*

Yet if the *Cypria* in its earlier fixed form was not meant to introduce the *Iliad,* then it is no surprise that both it and the *Iliad* contain a version of a traditional catalog of the Trojans.[16] M. West's assertion that the Cycle did

not tolerate duplication is largely true, but not always true. It is possible that the editors of the Cycle allowed the catalog of Trojan allies to stand in the *Cypria* because it existed within the last book of the *Cypria* included in the Cycle. As I have suggested, some books from the beginnings and endings of the earlier forms of the Cyclic poems might have been excluded when the Epic Cycle was manufactured, with the complete form of retained books preserved even if they did not join smoothly with other poems in the Epic Cycle. The Trojan catalog could have thus been preserved as a final item of the last book retained from the earlier form of the *Cypria,* even though the Trojan catalog of the *Cypria* duplicated information in the *Iliad.*

This proposal infers that the earlier fixed form of the *Cypria* did not end where the summary says that it does, with a Trojan catalog. Is there any evidence that it continued after its catalog of Trojan allies? Surprisingly, two testimonia about the *Cypria* mention events concerned with the sack of Troy. A line of verse attributed to Stasinus, the reputed author of the *Cypria,* stating that it is foolish to spare the children of a slain man (fr. 33 Bernabé = 25 Davies), is usually thought to refer to the death of Astyanax.[17] A scholiast reports that the author of the *Cypria* related that Polyxena died after having been wounded by Odysseus and Diomedes in the taking of Troy (fr. 34 Bernabé = 27 Davies).[18] These details should not be in a poem that ends before the events of the *Iliad,* and no satisfactory explanation of them has been offered. Some critics have suggested that the attributions are wrong, which I do not think is correct.[19] Others have argued that the deaths of Astyanax and Polyxena were related in predictions or proleptic digressions in the *Cypria.*[20] This explanation deserves consideration, certainly as it has been most persuasively pursued by M. Robertson (1990). He refers to the presence of Polyxena in early artifacts depicting the death of her brother Troilus. Her presence in the *Cypria*'s narration of the death of Troilus might lead naturally to the mentioning of her fate. But the scholion about Polyxena suggests a complete account of her death and burial. That would be too detailed for a prediction by a character, and rather tangential and distracting as a digression by the poet (one might also wonder why a poem designed to introduce the *Iliad* would be so concerned with post-Iliadic events). A third solution to the problem should not be denied out of hand because it is not compatible with the poem's supposed introductory nature: the possibility that the *Cypria* in its earlier fixed form covered the whole Trojan War,

including a simpler version of major events in the *Iliad.*[21] Such would fit the character of a poem that we know had enough narrative overview to describe Zeus planning the war, and the cosmographical reach to depict Zeus chasing Leda to the ends of the earth (πείρατα γαίης, fr. 9.10 Bernabé = 7.10 Davies). This need not mean that the *Cypria* is earlier than the *Iliad,* or its source. Nor does it necessarily mean that the *Cypria* was composed without any awareness of the *Iliad.* It would mean that the *Cypria* in its earlier manifestation was no mere appendage to the *Iliad.*

Does the *Aethiopis* begin where the *Iliad* ends? The last line of the *Iliad* (24.804) runs: Ὣς οἵ γ' ἀμφίεπον τάφον Ἕκτορος ἱπποδάμοιο (thus they busied themselves about the burial of horse-taming Hector). The scholia report a variant that seems to indicate that the *Aethiopis* was directly attached to the *Iliad:* Ὣς οἵ γ' ἀμφίεπον τάφον Ἕκτορος· ἦλθε δ' Ἀμαζών, / Ἄρηος θυγάτηρ μεγαλήτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο (thus they busied themselves about the burial of Hector; and an Amazon came / the daughter of great-hearted man-slaying Ares).[22] The summary of the *Aethiopis* by Proclus begins with reference to this Amazon, Penthesileia. If the variant ending of the *Iliad* was the beginning of *Aethiopis,* then it would be undeniable evidence that the poems of the Epic Cycle were built around the *Iliad.* That seems to be a common assumption. But though some have accepted these lines as the beginning of the *Aethiopis,* most scholars, including the two most recent editors of the fragments, Bernabé and Davies, consider the verses to be manufactured by a rhapsode or grammarian as a join.[23] It is extremely doubtful that the *Aethiopis* or any other epic poem would begin without a proem. It is particularly hard to believe, as many seem to do, that the poet of the *Aethiopis* chose to begin his poem by changing the final word of the last line of the *Iliad.* The *Aethiopis* may have been designed to provide a sequel to the *Iliad,* but I do not think it could have started so abruptly.

Because the boundaries to these poems set by Proclus are often inaccurate, we should wonder if the poem as it was first fixed actually began with the arrival of Penthesileia. Some evidence suggests that it did not. A set of Homeric bowls portrays three scenes (with inscriptions): the ransom of Hector's corpse, the arrival of Penthesileia, and Achilles meeting Penthesileia in battle.[24] On the basis of this evidence, Kopff has argued that the *Aethiopis* originally contained the ransom of Hector and his funeral (at least) before continuing on to narrate the arrival of Penthesileia.[25] The more common in-

terpretation is that scenes have been brought together from two different works, the *Iliad* and the *Aethiopis,* perhaps under the influence of the join just discussed (fr. 1 Bernabé = Davies p. 48 ["fragmentum spurium"]).[26] Kopff counters in two ways: first, by pointing out that these bowls do not otherwise contaminate scenes from different works and, second, by arguing that the bowls and the Iliac tables stem from different traditions.

The attempt to disassociate the bowls from the tables is central to Kopff's argument. He groups the tables, Apollodorus, and the Epic Cycle in a tradition that has shortened the poems in order to present a continuous narrative. If the bowls are to provide evidence for an *Aethiopis* with a beginning different from the one in Proclus, they cannot belong to this tradition. In addition, the Iliac tables can be inaccurate, and Kopff wants to portray the bowls as reliable reflections of the poems they illustrate. Webster (1964:147–153) has brought into question the accuracy of the bowls, demonstrating that they do not always report episodes of their sources in the proper order. On the other hand, testimonia confirm some information on the bowls and tables that would otherwise seem wrong. For example, another set of Homeric bowls indicates that Priam died in the *Little Iliad* (fr. 16 [I] Bernabé = test. 7 [I] Davies; Sinn MB 27–29]), and an Iliac table indicates that the madness of Ajax occurred in the *Aethiopis* (test. 8 Bernabé = 3 Davies; Sadurska 1964:30).[27] Although these events do not fit in the boundaries for the poems that Proclus provides, other testimonia confirm that these events did indeed occur in those poems. Perhaps Kopff has correctly argued that a set of Homeric bowls reveals that the *Aethiopis* started earlier than Proclus would lead us to believe.[28]

Once again it is possible that an earlier manifestation of a poem in the Epic Cycle narrated material also covered by the *Iliad,* and so was cropped. Fick once argued that the first line of the "join" between the *Iliad* and the *Aethiopis* never belonged to the *Iliad* in any form, and pointed out that ὥs usually introduces new material in Homeric poetry.[29] If this argument is correct, then the two lines may be created by rhapsodes in performance of parts of the *Iliad* and the *Aethiopis.* The alternate form of the last line of the *Iliad* as we know it and the alternate versions of the second line of the join (see note 22) might suggest the multiformity of rhapsodic performance. The join would not testify to the beginning of the *Aethiopis* in its earlier fixed manifestation, but rather would have resulted from rhapsodic presentation of a

part of the Cyclic poem in conjunction with the end of the *Iliad.* Alternatively, both verses could have been in the *Aethiopis,* not at the beginning, but at a later point (Kopff 1983:60–61). In accordance with my theory about the manufacture of the Epic Cycle, these lines could have begun a book about the arrival of Penthesileia, which once followed a book about the funeral of Hector. After a verse Epic Cycle portrayed the lines as the beginning of a sequel to the *Iliad,* the first line could have become incorporated into the *Iliad* with a slight change. The line δώμασιν ἐν Πριάμοιο, διοτρεφέος βασιλῆος (24.803) could be an early ending of the *Iliad,* with dissatisfaction over its anticlimactic nature leading to the incorporation from the *Aethiopis* of the line that now ends our *Iliad.* Rhapsodic performance could also lie behind the development of such a change, especially if the "books" of the Aethiopis reflect performance units.

We know that the *Aethiopis* included the suicide of Ajax, despite the indication of the summary by Proclus that it stopped before that. Did the *Aethiopis* once continue even further, beyond the suicide of Ajax? Kullmann (1960:225, 359) has argued that the poem originally joined with the *Iliou Persis,* noting that the author of both was said to be Arctinus. The attributions to authors are probably too unreliable for this argument to be persuasive. We cannot decide with confidence on the boundaries of the *Aethiopis,* and there is no need to think that the *Aethiopis* and the *Iliou Persis* were once parts of the same poem. But evidence might suggest that either the *Aethiopis* continued much further than its boundary in Proclus or the *Iliou Persis* began much earlier than its boundary in Proclus (or both). Dionysius of Halicarnassus reports that Arctinus spoke of the stealing of the *palladion* (*Iliou Persis* fr. 1 Bernabé = Davies pp. 65–66 ["fragmentum dubium"]), an event which occurs only in the *Little Iliad* section of Proclus. In addition, a fragment attributed to the *Iliou Persis* discusses Machaon and Podaleirios (fr. 4 Bernabé = 1 Davies). Some conclude it refers to the cure of Philoctetes, which occurs in the *Little Iliad* section of Proclus; Kullmann links it with the madness of Ajax, which was related in the *Aethiopis.*[30]

There is only one clear case of a major internal omission in Proclus (as opposed to cropping at the beginnings and endings): the *nekyia* in the *Nosti* to which numerous testimonia attest.[31] Of course, Proclus cannot report everything in a summary, but the omission of such an important episode is suspicious. Perhaps it was omitted because a *nekyia* exists in the *Odyssey.*[32]

If the Cyclic *nekyia* occurred at the end of the *Nosti* and featured Odysseus, and thus was even more redundant than suspected, it would follow that the *Nosti* once also narrated the return of Odysseus.[33] A brief meeting between Odysseus and Neoptolemus in Thrace is mentioned by Proclus, which suggests the poem in its earlier state offered more about Odysseus.[34]

The *Telegony* itself seems to overlap with the *Odyssey.* The Cyclic poem opens with the burial of the suitors. But a burial of the suitors occurs in book 24 of the Homeric poem.[35] It is possible that the *Telegony*'s opening told of the climactic finish of the suitors, and so was cut when the Cyclic poem was placed next to the *Odyssey* in the Epic Cycle. The beginning of the book used to begin the Epic Cycle's excerpt of the *Telegony* must have included the burial of the suitors, but this duplication of the Homeric material would have been left in because book divisions, and not sense divisions, seemed to have been used in the manufacture of the Epic Cycle.

Extent of the Cycle Poems

Several Epic Cycle poems seemingly extended beyond the boundaries indicated by Proclus. The *Cypria* might have given an account of the whole war, just as the *Little Iliad* might have narrated the complete story of the Trojan War. Aristotle's comments in the *Poetics* might confirm our impression that these two poems narrated the whole war. In chapter 23 he complains that most poets either write about a single person, a single period, or one πρᾶξις of many episodes. He then specifically mentions the *Cypria* and the *Little Iliad,* apparently as poems about one πρᾶξις of many episodes.[36] This has surprised many: how can the *Cypria* and the *Little Iliad* as found in the summary by Proclus be considered to be about one matter?[37] Young's (1983:165–166) paraphrase of this passage is useful and, I think, points the way to a solution: "Aristotle is allowing *the epic poet in general* [his emphasis] his many μῦθοι, and the right to compose his 'epic mass' as a whole, chronologically from beginning to end. *Any other epic poet* [his emphasis] would have done just that, and that is just what other epic poets did with their own subjects. But Homer's *Iliad* is not that generic 'Iliad,' and Homer was not just any other epic poet." Young nowhere suggests that poems of the Epic Cycle told the story of the whole war. But he has correctly interpreted Aristotle to be speaking of poets who do compose true "Iliads"—that is, poems about the whole war. It must be more than a coincidence that the

Cypria and the *Little Iliad* are specified by Aristotle in this context. Heath's (1989:49–50) discussion of the passage leads to the same conclusion, again without the conscious design of the scholar, because Heath does not suspect that the *Little Iliad* or the *Cypria* told the story of the whole war. He defines Aristotle's conception of an Iliad "embracing the whole Trojan War" as a "unified *praxis* of many parts" (50). Following Aristotle's words, he also states that the *Cypria* and the *Little Iliad* "have a unified *praxis* of many parts" (50). It naturally follows from this wording (though it is not argued by Heath) that these poems are generic Iliads that told the story of the whole war. Commentators have been tempted to think that Aristotle understands the *Cypria* and *Little Iliad* to be poems that narrated the whole war, but they have been unable to reach that conclusion because it contradicts the common understanding of the poems in the Epic Cycle as appendages to the Homeric poems. But putting all prejudice aside, we might plausibly take Aristotle's admittedly enigmatic words to mean that earlier versions of the *Cypria* and the *Little Iliad,* which Aristotle would have known, were "Iliads."[38]

It is common to think that the pre-Homeric tradition consisted of short lays, not long poems telling the story of the whole war.[39] The short songs by Phemius and Demodocus in the *Odyssey* are thought to be representative of pre-Homeric epic, and old analyst views about lays leading to longer cycles still seem to have a vague influence on thought about this matter. Certainly the odd episode and motif here and there might have origins that are independent of the Trojan story. But it is probable that the basic plot of the story of the Trojan War was primary in the development of the Trojan War tradition. The fundamental outlines of the story—Paris and Helen, Aulis, the sack of the city—were not cobbled together late in the day.

Causal and thematic links exist between a great many traditional episodes, even when they are separated by much narrative time.[40] The Trojan War is not just a list or jumble of episodes. It is a story that works as a whole and was understood as a whole. Many incidents logically lead to later incidents. This is obvious in some cases, as when the judgment of arms leads to the suicide of Ajax. But often closely connected incidents occur at much different times in the course of the war—a long time passes until "the other shoe drops." In other cases two incidents may not be related in terms of narrative but nonetheless are repeated instances of a theme or motif. Here is a list of incidents that might be paired for such reasons:

Zeus plans war	the fall of Troy
Paris takes Helen	embassy of Menelaus and Odysseus
Paris takes Helen	Menelaus captures Helen
summoning of Odysseus	the wooden horse
summoning of Achilles	summoning of Neoptolemus
sacrifice of Iphigeneia	sacrifice of Polyxena
ditching of Philoctetes	return of Philoctetes
capture of Chryseis, Briseis	anger of Achilles
death of Troilus	death of Achilles
death of Troilus	death of Astyanax
death of Troilus	sacrifice of Polyxena
rape of Cassandra	trouble on returns
Cassandra becomes concubine	murder of Agamemnon
escape of Aeneas	Trojan renewal[41]

Repeated elements are characteristic of the legend: there are two expeditions, multiple defenders of Troy, many conditions to be met before Troy falls, and multiple instances of immortality. Some episodes, it is true, are not essential for the story, and undoubtedly some episodes were added to the tradition relatively late. Yet the evidence of early Greek art and the Homeric poems attests that the majority of "Cyclic" episodes had been incorporated into the story very early on.

Expanded, self-standing songs about individual episodes (like the *Iliad*) undoubtedly existed, but it is not necessary to view this type of song as preceding a unified complete story of the Trojan War. If anything, the narrative of the whole war preceded narrative focus on single episodes.[42] But there is no need to place the different types of narrative strategy represented by the Homeric poems and the Cyclic poems on a diachronic timeline. Both types—the complete overview of the war and songs focusing on individual episodes—would have coexisted. Indeed, the increase in the amount of episodes as the tradition grew would have made accounts of the whole more difficult and expansions on individual episodes more feasible. It is tempting to imagine that two separate genres of narrating the war developed, one chronicle-like in its cataloging of events, another more meditative in exploration of particular episodes.

Poems of greater scope would necessarily require a style that was con-

cise.[43] The poems of the Cycle certainly covered more ground than the Homeric poems, perhaps even giving accounts of the whole war in their earlier fixed manifestations. Fragments from them do appear to have a swiftly moving pace. For example, it is striking that a fragment of the *Little Iliad* simply mentions the death of Astyanax (*Little Iliad* fr. 21 Bernabé = 20 Davies). Neither the characters nor the narrator offers comment, whereas in the *Iliad* the fate of Astyanax was pondered with much pathos by his parents. The fragment is disappointing when viewed from a Homeric perspective, and naturally enough the passage has been cited in criticism of the Cycle.[44] Yet the different treatment of the Trojan prince's fate is not indicative of different artistic standards but rather symptomatic of the poems' varying purposes in Trojan War narrative. And parts of the Homeric poems fit what has been characterized as the style of Epic Cycle poems. The songs of Demodocus might be so described, or the catalog of ships in book 2 of the *Iliad,* the catalog of adventures that Odysseus relates to Penelope in book 23 of the *Odyssey* (310–343), and the many brief biographies of minor figures who die in battle narrative. These are patches of the Homeric poems characterized by a quickening of pace and a focus on action, and so they might be thought to give us a glimpse of the "Cyclic" style.[45]

Why then would there be need of many poems to complete the Epic Cycle if some told the whole story? Perhaps the longest ones did not give equal attention to all periods of the war and were selected for that part of the story which they told especially well or in great detail. The poems may also have variously expressed local concerns. Given the multifarious and flexible nature of the tradition that I am assuming, I would not claim that different poems would always tell one story in the same way. There may have been countless very different poems on a generally agreed sequence of major traditional events of the Trojan War.

As the tradition grew, undoubtedly it would become increasingly difficult to supply a detailed narrative about all the events in this long war. The narrator of *Iliad* 2 when calling upon the Muse confesses an inability to name the masses, at least, who fought at Troy.[46] Nestor states it would take him five or six years to tell the whole war (*Od.* 3.113–117; not the swiftest storyteller, though!). The song of the Sirens, which features all that happened at Troy (*Od.* 12.189–190), is perhaps deadly because listeners wither away before its seductive strain comes to an end.[47] But these accounts apparently

lack the selection and arrangement that traditional mythopoetic process provides. It is conceivable that various poets could swiftly relate the war from its beginnings to its end. Fehling (1991:49) estimates that the whole story of the Trojan War could have equaled two or three Homeric books, or about two to three hours of performance. Considered from this perspective, we can more easily understand how "Cyclic" poems of great reach could have established and maintained influence over the tradition while the practically unreadable and unperformable Homeric poems suffered in obscurity.

Homeric allusions to events from the whole war assume that the audience knows the story of the whole war. The same can be said about the performances of Phemius and Demodocus[48] and the poems of the Epic Cycle.[49] Ford (1992:40–41) has related this phenomenon to the genre of epic poetry in general: "The basis for this genre of singing, then, is the fiction that behind the telling of each story exists one divinely superintended tale, one connected whole that never alters, though parts of it may be performed in this or that time and place" (41). Dowden (1996:51) similarly speaks of the "supertext" that contains the whole story of the war. Previous scholars have often supposed that there actually was some sort of "heroic chronicle," "Faktkanon," or "Ur-kyklos" that represented the pre-Homeric corpus on the Trojan War.[50] One should not suppose, however, that there existed a single, unified, and rigid canonical account of the war that was the source of all accounts. Instead, there must have been countless very different poems on a generally agreed sequence of traditional events. In Chapter 1, I referred to the "performance potential" of the story of the Trojan War through the joining together of parts of Trojan War stories. It follows from the analysis here that some poems of the Cycle in and by themselves achieved the potential narrative of the "connected whole" or the "supertext" of the Trojan War.

If such poems did exist as an actuality and not only as a possibility, one might expect this would elicit comment in the ancient scholia.[51] But there are a number of ways in which to meet this objection. First, we may wonder whether the scholia, though extensive, result from such haphazard selection and summary of ancient academic activity that it cannot be assumed to indicate the totality of evidence then known.[52] Second, the ultimate state of the scholia may reflect commentary on a truncated Epic Cycle transmission, as opposed to the complete yet relatively rarer texts of the individual poems that I hypothesized earlier. Finally, we see that comment in the scho-

lia and by other ancient commentators often arises on points of variance. If the Cyclic poems narrated "Iliadic" events so briefly that they did not happen to contain variant details, then such compatibility would fail to excite interest on the part of the scholiasts.[53]

What can we conclude about the possible dimensions of the Cycle poems? Nothing is proved if they seem to surround the Homeric poems in Proclus. The Epic Cycle as we know it surrounds the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey,* but a close examination has shown that the poems could have duplicated Homeric material, contradicted it, or heedlessly moved right on past it in their great grasps of Trojan War material. What we know about them now certainly does not suggest that they functioned to "introduce" or "finish up" the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey.* Some ancient testimonia even suggest that earlier forms of the poems told the story of the whole war. So the possibility that the poems of the Epic Cycle were composed independently of the *Iliad* should be taken seriously. What has been commonly regarded as preparation to the *Iliad* may have actually narrated the wrath of Achilles before finishing with an account of the fall of Troy. What has been commonly regarded as a mopping up of sundry episodes in the final year of the war may have actually started at the beginning and finished with the sack, sharing material with Cyclic and Homeric poems along the way.

If the Epic Cycle poems did narrate the whole story, then Aristotle's censure of their scope would be all the more understandable. Certainly such a poem would not have the leisurely realism of Homeric poems. But it may well have achieved the charm of catalog poetry, which manages to present in allusive fashion a large amount of information, yet expand at times to present a vivid encapsulation of some episode. One might compare the *Catalog of Women,* without concluding from this comparison that this type of poetry would be a late and derivative development of the sixth century.[54] Much of the narrative of the *Theogony,* the *Works and Days,* and the Homeric hymns may proceed at a pace and style that would have also been found in the Cycle poems.[55] Parts of the Homeric poems themselves exhibit the "Cyclic" style, as I have pointed out. Recognition that the style of such passages is different from the typical Homeric style does not necessitate scorn for them.

Homeric Influence on the Epic Cycle?

The apparent encircling of the Homeric poems by the poems of the Cycle is thus illusory and the result of the production of the Cycle, not an indication of the nature of their earlier manifestations. But it is also thought that the Cyclic poems are dependent on the Homeric poems in content as well. In particular, the Epic Cycle is often believed to have used details in the Homeric poems as a source to expand upon.[56] The relation between the Cyclic poems and pre-Homeric myth is considered problematic, therefore. If the Epic Cycle sometimes built new stories from bits of the Homeric poems, then it cannot be trusted to represent traditional material. But there is no certain evidence that the Epic Cycle poems were composed with knowledge of the Homeric poems. That will become clear when we examine several cases in which specific and deliberate use of the Homeric poems on the part of the Cyclic poems is suspected.

The *Cypria* has often been regarded as a poem that owes its existence to the *Iliad,* both in structure and in content. We are told by Proclus that at the beginning of the *Cypria* Zeus developed a plan with Themis to lighten Gaia, the earth, from the burden of excessive humanity by means of the Trojan War. Scholia also give reports of the poem's plan, substituting Momus for Themis, adding the Theban War, and specifying that the births of Achilles and Helen were instrumental to the plan. A fragment is also supplied, which ends with the words Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή, also found at the fifth line of the *Iliad* (fr. 1 Bernabé = 1 Davies).[57] It has been assumed that the *Cypria* has simply lifted the idea of a plan from the *Iliad.*[58] But recognition that the plan of Zeus at the beginning of the *Cypria* is similar to long-standing myths (Near Eastern and Indo-European) undercuts the view that it is simply an expansion of an Iliadic passage.[59] And there is much disagreement about whether the "plan" mentioned in *Iliad* 1 refers ahead to Thetis conferring with Zeus to honor her son or to the larger plan of Zeus in regard to the war. Scholars favor the former, though the Greek does not easily mean that.[60] The Iliadic plan of Zeus may very well refer to the plan of Zeus to lessen humanity by means of the war. Achilles' withdrawal causes many Greek deaths, as the proem of the *Iliad* stresses, and so the story of the *Iliad* suits the purposes of the plan of Zeus as narrated by the Cyclic poem. But perhaps it is best to suppose that the reference to the plan of Zeus at *Iliad*

1.5 can suggest both the Iliadic and Cyclic manifestations of this phrase, not just one or the other.[61] In any case it is extremely dubious to regard the plan of Zeus in the *Cypri*a as secondary or derivative, an invented story based on the proem of the *Iliad.* As happens so often, the alleged priority of a Homeric passage is probably a Homeric allusion to traditional myth, which the Epic Cycle is more directly representing.

At *Iliad* 9.145 and 287 the three daughters of Agamemnon offered to Achilles are named Chrysothemis, Laodike, and Iphianassa. Nowhere do the Homeric poems mention Iphigeneia or her sacrifice, and it has been suspected since antiquity (schol. *Il.* 9.145) that the story did not yet exist. Or in the very least, it is supposed, the name Iphianassa is a Homeric invention employed as an alternative or substitution for the more familiar Iphigeneia. The *Cypria* reported four daughters for Agamemnon, including both an Iphigeneia and an Iphianassa (fr. 24 Bernabé = 17 Davies). It is usually assumed that the Cyclic poem took the name *Iphianassa* from the *Iliad* and, in an effort to join the Homeric passage with traditional mythology, naively presented Iphianassa as a separate person from Iphigeneia.[62] But there are multiple reasons to be cautious before reaching such a conclusion. Although the Homeric poems do not mention Iphigeneia, that does not mean that the story of her sacrifice is post-Homeric. In fact, many suspect that it is pre-Homeric, and it is often thought that the tale underlies the confrontation between Calchas and Agamemnon in book 1 ("seer of evil, never yet have you spoke a good thing").[63]

The fact that the daughter of Agamemnon to be sacrificed is called "Iphimedeia" in the Hesiodic *Catalog of Women* (fr. 23a.17 M-W) and called "Iphianassa" by Lucretius (85) certainly points to the mutability of the name of the character. It is undeniable that the daughter of Agamemnon featured in the myth about the incident at Aulis was known by various names with *Iphi-* as a prefix. One possible variant is that Iphigeneia and Iphianassa were two sisters. Indeed, this would contribute to confusion over the name of the one offered for sacrifice. And such semiduplication for two siblings is not inherently ridiculous for a culture that reused certain significant roots so often for proper names (cf. Kallidike, Kleisidike, and Kallithoe, three of the four daughters of Metaneira listed at *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 109–110). Sophocles certainly finds the existence of two sisters with similar names entirely plausible when a sister Iphianassa is referred to as alive long after the death of

Iphigeneia (*Electra* 155). Rather than concluding that he gullibly followed the *Cypria* or simply joined the Homeric passage to traditional myth (the accusation leveled at the *Cypria*), we might suppose that he was following a traditional variant. The same might be said of the Homeric account. If the tale of human sacrifice was pre-Homeric, as I think we should suspect, it is hard to see the point of inventing Iphianassa as a substitute for Iphigeneia in *Iliad* 9. The Homeric account would not well suppress or avoid the tale by supplying a name so similar to Iphigeneia (see Gantz 1993:582). Iphianassa is a valid alternative to Iphigeneia, but because in book 9 she is referred to as still alive in the ninth year of the war, there can be no allusion to an incident at Aulis here. It is thus possible that the Homeric passage is following a traditional variant in which Iphigeneia and Iphianassa are two sisters. Hypothetically, then, the *Iliad* implicitly follows what the *Cypria* explicitly (yet independently) narrated. Much remains uncertain, but the multiple possibilities caution against readily assuming that the *Cypria*'s account of the daughters of Agamemnon was influenced by the *Iliad.*[64]

Scholia to the *Iliad* (see *Cypria* fr. 28 Bernabé = 22 Davies) report that there existed different versions of the capture of Chryseis in Hypoplacian Thebe, a matter only briefly mentioned in the *Iliad* (1.366).[65] In the *Cypria,* a scholion reports, Chryseis went to Thebe to attend a sacrifice for Artemis. It appears that the *Cypria* felt a need to supplement the *Iliad* by explaining why Chryseis was captured in a town other than Chryse.[66] If that is so, it would be revealing and significant. The poet of one of the poems in the Epic Cycle would have intimate knowledge of the *Iliad* (here one line) and would be concerned with explaining a "Homeric problem," just as scholars in subsequent ages were. Kullmann argues against this impression by proposing that the *Cypria* simply gives a fuller account of a traditional story.[67] That argument does not, on first consideration, counter the impression that the story in the *Cypria* is explaining a detail in the *Iliad.* But his view is more persuasive when one considers the testimonium that reports that Briseis was captured at Pedasos in the *Cypria,* and not at Lyrnessos, as the *Iliad* reports (*Il.* 2.690).[68] Why would the *Cypria* explain an obscure "problem" in the *Iliad* about the capture of Chryseis, yet contradict the *Iliad* about the capture of Briseis? The view of Wilamowitz (1884:374) that the poet of the *Cypria* knew book 1 of the *Iliad* but not book 2 will satisfy few today. If we follow those critics who think the *Cypria* is influenced by the *Iliad,* a curious picture of

the *Cypria* emerges: it is concerned with supplementing and justifying the *Iliad* on a minor detail concerning Chryseis, but contradicts the *Iliad* on a similar matter concerning Briseis. A better explanation of such general similarity with minor differences is that the *Iliad* and the *Cypria* independently belonged to the same tradition. If the *Cypria* and the *Iliad* were both based on the same mythical tradition, then correspondence between the two would not necessarily be the result of influence.[69]

There is some indication that details related to the story of Chryseis and her capture belong to pre-Homeric tradition. The numerous and detailed references in the *Iliad* to the sacking of cities in the Troad, especially Thebe, suggests that the capture of these cities was part of pre-Homeric myth.[70] The use of an article of demonstrative force before the name of Chryses at *Iliad* 1.11 suggests that he was a known figure.[71] Taplin correctly points out that it would not be unusual for Chryseis to dwell in Thebe, for she could have lived with a husband in Thebe and been later ransomed to her father in Chryse.[72] But the plausibility of Chryseis living in Thebe does not exclude the possibility that traditionally she was visiting there when captured. In addition, if some accounts of her visit there are designed to explain the situation in the *Iliad,* that does not mean that the one in the *Cypria* is.[73]

A certain handmaid of Helen named Aithra, daughter of Pitheus, is mentioned in passing at *Iliad* 3.144. A character of such a name was the mother of Theseus in Greek mythology. There was a traditional tale in which Aithra was captured by the Dioscuri when they rescued the young Helen at Athens. Aithra was made a slave to Helen and brought over to Troy with her, only to be rescued by the sons of Theseus, Akamas and Demophon, at the end of the war. This story of Aithra was narrated in the Epic Cycle, as evidence about the *Cypria, Little Iliad,* and *Iliou Persis* indicates.[74] Scholars have found it difficult to believe that the *Iliad* is briefly alluding to a Cyclic story, though few have gone so far as to suggest that the story of Aithra at Troy was invented on the basis of one Homeric line.[75] Most likely the story was so well known that the Homeric poem could mention Aithra by name without feeling compelled to relate her story (thus Kullmann 1960:247, 354), but prejudice against the Epic Cycle has caused many scholars to shy away from this obvious explanation.

The apparent existence of another figure in both Homeric and Cyclic poetry has also caused controversy. At *Odyssey* 4.248 Helen seems to say that

Odysseus disguised himself as Dektes for his spy mission into Troy. A scholion reports that there was a Dektes in the Epic Cycle, but adds that the Cyclic poet mistakenly misread the Homeric line by considering the word δέκτης a personal name, not a noun, as Aristarchus thought it was.[76] If so, we would have an extraordinary example of a Cyclic poet manufacturing material from a close but erroneous reading of the Homeric text. But there is no other occurrence of the word δέκτης meaning "beggar," as Aristarchus thought it meant. It looks like we simply have another case of Aristarchus resorting to desperate measures to avoid the appearance of Homeric poetry using Cyclic material. Admittedly the syntax of the following relative clause is awkward. But line 245 explicitly states that Odysseus resembled a slave (οἰκεύς). It is very unlikely that Helen would say that Odysseus disguised himself as a beggar after stating that he resembled a slave, and so the Aristarchus explanation should be rejected.[77]

Shortly thereafter in this book Menelaus relates how Odysseus restrained the Greeks in the wooden horse when Helen attempted to get them to reveal themselves. It is specified at 4.285–289 that Antiklos in particular needed to be restrained. This warrior is not mentioned in the *Iliad* and the scholia report that Aristarchus athetized these lines because Antiklos was "from the Cycle."[78] Again we see Aristarchus operating under misguided assumptions about the Epic Cycle, for it certainly is not justifiable to exclude the lines on his grounds. If we accept that the lines are authentic, there is no reason to think that a Cyclic poem was inspired by them in its narrative about Antiklos.[79] Antiklos must have been a figure known to have taken part in the wooden horse episode. Controversy reveals once again how the Homeric poems and the Cyclic poems are derived from the same tradition.

In the *Telegony* Odysseus is killed by a weapon that was made from the τρυγών, identified as the stingray.[80] This story is usually assumed to be derived ludicrously from the prophecy of Teiresias that death for Odysseus will come ἐξ ἁλός (*Od.* 11.134–135).[81] The Greek phrase could be translated as "away from the sea" or "from the sea." This weapon is very plausible if we understand it to be poisonous; the stingray has a venomous tail that at least one ancient source (Ael. *NA* 1.56) thought inflicted incurable wounds. What is more, the element of poison might explain why Teiresias can predict a "gentle" death for Odysseus (ἀβληχρός). This prediction of the death of Odysseus seems to employ the common motif of the misunderstood ora-

cle.[82] The Cyclic poem has not misused a Homeric passage; the Homeric poem is alluding to a traditional story of misinterpreted oracle that the *Telegony* happened to narrate.

Sometimes phrases in the Cyclic fragments correspond to Homeric phrases, and this has been thought to be a sign of Cyclic use of the Homeric texts. For instance, a fragment of the *Nosti* which describes Medea scraping off the old age of Aison is reminiscent of the passage in which Phoenix fantasizes the same for himself, and the *Little Iliad* passage about Astyanax being seized from his nurse's bosom evokes the famous scene of the prince cowering to his nurse's bosom in fear of Hector's shining helm, as well as Andromache's later vision of him being hurled off the walls.[83] But such apparently detailed correspondences are best explained as the result of oral formulaic poetics. The phraseology of both fragments corresponds to various passages in early Greek literature. Such similarity in phraseology indicates not exact quotation but rather suggests that the Cyclic and Homeric poems stem from the same poetic tradition. Where one might suspect that the phrasing is not just generic, the question of priority once again arises. Indeed, I am tempted to think that the parallel references to the nurse of Astyanax are more than coincidental. It is likely enough that the phraseology became commonly used in poetic descriptions of the death of Astyanax (not just the *Little Iliad,* of course). The Homeric passages could all the more effectively allude to the death of the prince if they employed language traditionally used in scenes of his death.

Another claim is that the poems of the Epic Cycle attempted to supplement and expand the Homeric poems by inventing an unusual amount of detail, and especially a proliferation of characters.[84] For example, the scholia claim that the poet of the *Nosti,* among others, expanded upon *Odyssey* 4.12 by giving a name to the slave mother of Megapenthes mentioned there. S. West (1988: ad loc.) comments that the *Nosti* "elaborating on this passage . . . rescued Megapenthes' mother from anonymity." By this line of reasoning the Cyclic poems display ad hoc invention in reaction to the Homeric poems. But this argument seems to reverse what typically happened. It is certainly possible that Cyclic poems added invented details to traditional myth, especially if the poems served to connect local traditions to longstanding traditions (as in the case of the *Telegony*). But the tradition of the Trojan War covered numerous episodes, and undoubtedly this involved a lot

of characters and detail. The pre-Homeric Trojan story was already very well developed by the time of the Homeric tradition. Detail and expansion in it cannot be considered a mark of the late Archaic Age. As we saw in the case of Chryseis and Briseis, detail in the Cyclic poems is not necessarily based on Homeric passages. If Homeric poetry did not happen to specify details found in the Cyclic poems on every occasion it could (as at *Od*. 4.12 in regards to the slave mother of Megapenthes), that does not mean that the details are untraditional. On the other hand, the Homeric poems have been credited with an unusual amount of ad hoc invention. As I argued in Chapter 1, this is true in the sense that the Homeric poems greatly expanded traditional material and therefore needed to create supplemental details. By doing so the Homeric poems were not supplementing the Cyclic poems specifically, but they were supplementing traditional episodes. Because of the expansive nature of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey,* the creation of untraditional detail was probably more typical for Homeric poetry than it was for Cyclic poetry. The Homeric poems themselves seem to have invented a plethora of minor detail and characters, as when they provide cannon fodder for battle scenes, yet no one calls them decadent for that reason.

One could go on enumerating correspondences between the Cycle and the Homeric poems for which someone has suspected borrowing on the part of a Cyclic poet. It has been amply shown by neoanalysts, however, that the Epic Cycle poems best represent the context in which corresponding motifs would have originally occurred. When similarity is seen between a Cyclic passage and a Homeric passage, it is most likely that the Homeric passage is borrowing from or alluding to traditional material that led to the Epic Cycle. Of course, the Homeric poems played an increasing, if slowly developing role in the tradition of the Trojan War, and some "Homeric-derived" elements may eventually have entered the Cyclic poetic traditions, just as they gradually entered iconography about the Trojan War. Although I believe that the Homeric and Cyclic traditions arose independently of one another, eventually performance of a mixture of poetry from Cyclic and Homeric epic could conceivably have allowed mutual influence, at least to the extent that the poetic traditions were still fluid. But it is misguided to assume that the Cyclic poems owe their origin and being to the existence of the Homeric poems. Even the passages just discussed, in which there had been some reason for suspecting Homeric influence in some particular and

specific way, do not suggest such a picture. In each case we have seen that the evidence for Cyclic dependence on the Homeric poems is far from convincing.

What about the very title of the *Little Iliad?* If its poet knew and used the title *Little Iliad,* that might indicate he knew of the *Iliad* and thus firmly establish one poem at least as post-Homeric. But the term Iliad is generic and well applies to any poem about the Trojan War. And we first find direct mention of titles for epic poems in Herodotus (Chapter 2). I suspect that titles for early epic poems were invented long after the poems were composed. For epic poetry, the proem is sufficient to indicate the subject of a poem. The phenomenon of titling was probably introduced later than the Archaic Age, which would help explain the early confusion over ascription. If the title *Little Iliad* is an allusion to our *Iliad,* the allusion was probably made by a scholar who had no role in the composition of the poem.

A larger issue is whether it would have even been possible, in practical terms, for the Cycle traditions to make use of the Homeric tradition in the ways that have been assumed. Those who think that an author of the *Cypria* is responding to a single line in the *Iliad* about the capture of Chryseis, for instance, seem to assume that this author would possess a text, for one is not likely to notice such a minor detail by auditory reception. And critics frequently seem to assume that there were Cyclic authors who not only possessed texts, but pored over them in a scholarly fashion. This activity is difficult to posit for any age in which the poems of the Cycle can be placed.

Let us consider the matter in relation to the Hesiodic *Catalog,* which is often said to have similarly supplemental purposes. Because it continues the *Theogony,* M. West has compared it to the Cyclic poems and suggested that this type of poem dates from the sixth century, "a period of editorial activity, largely agglutinative in character."[85] Without addressing the issue of literacy and use of texts, he argues (1985:126ff.) that the poet of the *Catalog* imitates the *Theogony* in a very detailed manner. For example, he (1985:128–130) suggests that somebody composed one fragment (26.18–20 M-W) by drawing from three places of the *Theogony* (3, 9, 68). Is it really likely that a poet would thumb through the *Theogony* and patch together phrases from three separate lines? Seemingly "Homeric" or "Hesiodic" phrases may well be traditional, and we cannot easily ascertain imitation on this basis (West himself has challenged the common assumption that "Homeric" phraseology in

lyric poetry indicates Homeric influence, as noted earlier). West also provides an unlikely psychological profile of the poet of the *Catalog* that is reminiscent of the common view of Cyclic poets. The catalog poet is supposed to revel in "gratuitous variation" (1985:129), yet he is also "studiously imitative" of the *Theogony* (1985:130). This type of shifting and contradictory criteria for assessing imitative poetry has helped create the impression that early poetry is heavily dependent on Homeric and Hesiodic poetry.

In any event, a larger question remains: would poets of even the sixth century necessarily possess texts? It has been supposed that perhaps the Homeridae at least possessed rare texts of the Homeric poems.[86] There is some evidence of poets sending manuscripts to others before the establishment of a book trade in the fifth century, and some critics suppose that poets were literate and in possession of texts long before society in general was.[87] Could the Cyclic poets have possessed the Homeric texts, which they could then have imitated in a detailed manner? Some evidence for intricate study of the Homeric texts exists at the end of the sixth century, the latest possible time for composition of the poems of the Epic Cycle. A line variant of the *Iliad* is ascribed to Theagenes.[88] In Aristotle there is a reference to the use of a line in the *Iliad* by the Athenians during a dispute with Salamis that may have occurred in the sixth century.[89] But we are still far from being certain that epic poets even as late as the sixth century would possess the Homeric texts. I suspect that Burkert (1979b:56) is close to the truth when he suggests that "poets were literate by then [the end of sixth century], but most of their training must still have been based on hearing other specialists performing in view of their audience, and memorizing." One might then argue that poets who had memorized the Homeric texts could easily base their own poetry on the smallest of Homeric details.[90] Yet that must remain speculative. Intricate knowledge of the Homeric texts may not have been possible when the Cyclic poems were composed, no matter how late we date this. It is just as easy and, I would suggest, more plausible to explain correspondences between the poems of the Epic Cycle and the Homeric poems as the result not of imitation but of a shared tradition.

Non-Homeric Aspects of the Epic Cycle

I hope to have now at least raised doubts about evidence of extensive influence of the Homeric poems on the composition of Cyclic poetry and

about the Cycle's encircling of the Homeric poems. A different issue is the charge that the Cycle repeatedly betrays its lateness in its themes and cultural practices. This view has its roots in the attitude of Aristarchus, and recently Griffin (1977) in a well-known article has tended to popularize it. Griffin well establishes that the Cycle contains many non-Homeric aspects. But though he (1977:39) announces at the beginning that he is not concerned with the issue of the date of the Epic Cycle, and though he (1977:40–41) seems to accept certain elements in it as pre-Homeric, he repeatedly suggests that the good taste of Homer must be earlier than the alleged bad taste of the Cycle.[91] A quick survey of the supposed late material demonstrates that its "lateness" is highly questionable. It can often be demonstrated that Homeric knowledge of these aspects is evident but suppressed.[92] Other aspects date from a time that is at least contemporaneous with the earliest period to which the Homeric poems are usually dated.

Proof that the poems of the Epic Cycle contained some post-Homeric details would not necessarily mean that the core of their contents is post-Homeric. None of the essential material in these poems is conclusively post-Homeric. Many of the early critics readily dated "late" elements in the Epic Cycle to the eighth century, since they supposed this was a post-Homeric period. Unfortunately, modern critics have repeated the same ideas, only with later dates for the Homeric poems and the poems of the Epic Cycle. The shifting date in this line of argument leads one to suspect that it is not based on historical, cultural, or sociological knowledge but rather on prejudice about the relation between the Homeric tradition and the Epic Cycle. For the sake of argument I assume a late-eighth-century date for the Homeric poems, but the possibility that they should be dated later increases the difficulty of maintaining that there are post-Homeric elements in the Epic Cycle.

One claim is that the Cycle is full of exotic elements that demonstrate geographical knowledge impossible in Homer's time.[93] The *Aethiopis* is frequently cited because it features Trojan allies from a distant land, the Aethiopians and the Amazons. Of course, the Homeric poems display knowledge about Aethiopians (*Il.* 1.423, 23.206; *Od.* 1.22–25, 4.84, 5.282, 287), and other early references to them include Hesiod *Theogony* 984–985 (with Memnon; cf. the reference to "dark" people at *Works and Days* 527), a fragment of the *Catalog* (150.15–18 M-W), and a fragment of Mimnermus (12

West). The Homeric poems also refer to Amazons (*Il.* 3.189, 2.814 [perhaps; see note 1 in Chapter 2], 6.186), and they are often featured in early Greek myth. The earliest Amazonomachy in art, from the late eighth century, is often interpreted as Penthesileia fighting Achilles (Figure F).[94] No one should regard the *Aethiopis* as singular or late because it features Aethiopians or Amazons. One might object that they are too fabulous to be fighting at Troy, but that would wrongly exclude supernatural elements from the tradition of the Trojan War. Greek myth is full of encounters with people and monsters not of this world, and there is no reason to suppose that legend about the Trojan War would be any different.

The Greeks probably first encountered African Aethiopians in the seventh century.[95] Does that mean that the story of the *Aethiopis* originated after this date, as Forsdyke suggests?[96] One would not think so, for Memnon, as the son of Eos the Dawn goddess, should come from the East, and early Greek literature often specifies an eastern location for Aethiopians. Eos herself has also been linked with Indo-European traditions, because there seems to have been a dawn goddess who prefigured both the Indic Uṡas and the Greek Eos.[97] But there is evidence that mythological Aethiopians could have been conceived of as African earlier than is commonly supposed, and so if the Aethiopians of the *Aethiopis* were African, that would not be cause to think that the poem is late. Some early literary passages may suggest African Aethiopians: *Odyssey* 4.84, in which Menelaus visits Aethiopians in the course of a swing round the Levant and North Africa, and Hesiod fragment 150.15–18 M-W, where Aethiopians are listed among African peoples. The etymology of the name suggests it refers to dark skin, and, surprisingly, the darkness of the Aethiopians is sometimes insisted upon even when an eastern location is specified (*Prometheus Bound* 808–810; Euripides fr. 771 [*Phaethon*] Nauck). Art as early as the sixth century depicts African Aethiopians; Memnon in early art is not depicted as an African, but at times his retinue is.[98]

Obviously, conceptions of the Aethiopian homeland were inconsistent and ever changing, and it is perhaps best not to insist on the priority of East to South. Where the *Aethiopis* placed the homeland of the mythological Aethiopians is not clear. If it did conceive of the Aethiopians as African, the poem would not need to be dated to the late seventh century or even later. Indeed, myth about African Aethiopians could easily have arisen before

there was strong contact with the historical Aethiopians.[99] That is not to say that myth of the Aethiopians should be divorced from the historical Aethiopians; on the contrary, vague knowledge of distant lands (or the distant past) is often the best inspiration for mythological narrative. So any African inspiration for myth about Memnon could easily date from before the Archaic Age.[100] If the *Aethiopis* followed the variant in which the Aethiopians were African, there is no justification for labeling the *Aethiopis* post-Homeric. African infiltration into early Greek mythology is underscored by the fact that not only North Africa but even pygmies are mentioned in the Homeric poems (*Il.* 3.6).[101]

The homeland of Amazons also varied in early Greek myth (in the *Aethiopis,* according to Proclus, Penthesileia comes from Thrace).[102] It is sometimes thought that the Greek conception of these warrior women was inspired by nomads of the North and East. If that is so, pre-Homeric myth about Amazons could easily have been based on vague knowledge of these areas. Perhaps Amazons are entirely fictional and poets simply bestowed likely enough homelands on them. Certainly their presence in Troy need not have originated in late myth.

In the *Aethiopis* Achilles is translated to "White Island," ἡ Λευκὴ νῆσος. This island has been central to the issue of geographical knowledge in the Cycle. Achilles was worshiped in historical times in the northern Black Sea area, including at an island in the Black Sea identified as Leuke (Fidonisi in modern Greek, Zmeinyy in Russian). Milesians led colonization of the Black Sea, and some scholars have concluded that the *Aethiopis* reflects Milesian colonization of the Black Sea.[103] Because such colonization is now often dated to the seventh century, it might be thought that the poem is necessarily later than an (eighth-century) *Iliad*—indeed, that a central aspect of it, the afterlife of Achilles, could only have been invented after that time. The main difficulty in assessing this theory is that scholars are vague about how they conceive of the relationship between the *Aethiopis,* Milesian colonization of the Black Sea, and worship of Achilles in the Black Sea.

Eusebius dated the earliest Black Sea colonization to the eighth century, but certain archaeological evidence begins in the second half of the seventh century. Some, however, have followed the ancient dating, though this is supported mostly by hints in early Greek literature.[104] Early epic passages suggest knowledge of the Black Sea. *Theogony* 337–345 lists rivers from that area,

including the Istros (the Danube), and *Iliad* 2.851–857 lists Trojan allies from the Anatolian shore of the Black Sea. And the early epic poet Eumelus composed Argonautic myth that featured a Black Sea Colchis.[105] The literary evidence may reflect precolonial contact and exploration of the Black Sea, and not colonization. But such initial contact may have been enough to inspire myth about the area. Indeed, myth of exotic lands would likely have arisen before these places were well known. Thus, even if one thinks that the story of Achilles' translation to Leuke was invented after Greeks knew of the Black Sea, the literary evidence alone is enough to show that some knowledge of the Black Sea area is pre-Homeric. In addition, there is some evidence of intermittent Greek contact with the Black Sea before the Archaic Age.

It should first be stressed that there is no reason to think that the *Aethiopis* specified the Black Sea island later known as Leuke, though this has been assumed.[106] We do not actually know where the account of the *Aethiopis* placed the paradise Leuke. Many scholars have pointed out that Leuke could have existed as a mythical place long before any island in the Black Sea was called Leuke.[107] That seems likely because in early Greek poetry paradisiacal settings need to be distant and inaccessible.[108] A general mythological association of Achilles with the North may have provided the initial background for the concept of his northern immortality.[109]

But if the mythological concept of Leuke preceded Greek colonization of the Black Sea, that does not mean it would have arisen without some connection to historical circumstances. Early contact with northern Europe has been underestimated, though it is proved by the ability of the early Mycenaeans to obtain amber, among other things.[110] Mycenaeans are thought to have made some penetration into the Black Sea area, and intermittent precolonial contacts can be suspected.[111] Vague knowledge of the Black Sea area may have encouraged the idea that Leuke was situated there. In that case I think that a secure and stable identification of the Black Sea island with the afterlife location of Achilles would not have been established until much later. This scenario is paralleled throughout much of the Mediterranean world as Greek civilization overran what was once regarded as the edges of the earth. The most relevant example would be the Black Sea location for the journey of the Argo: the eastern edge of the world via the Black Sea would have been the exotic locale of its distant voyage, with

specific places like the city Colchis only being incorporated into the legend at a relatively late date.[112]

Although I later note the possibility that the *Aethiopis* reflected the interests of Miletus, that does not mean that worship of Achilles by Milesian colonizers led to the invention of myth about the afterlife of Achilles. There is nothing inherently post-Homeric about the localization of his immortality in the far North or even in the Black Sea. If the *Aethiopis* reflects Milesian colonization of the Black Sea, then details of this poetic manifestation of the myth may not have been possible before the late seventh century. But the myth itself in its basic form could have been in existence long before then. We see, then, that the claim that the Epic Cycle contains foreign or exotic material from a post-Homeric age repeatedly falters on close examination.

Certainly it has been suspected that a major difference between the Epic Cycle poems and the Homeric poems might be their connection to place. In his encompassing account of the evolution of early epic, Nagy has distinguished the Panhellenic nature of the Homeric poems from the local nature of the Cyclic poems. By this he notes that the Homeric poems seem to be largely free of references to elements that would interest one locale exclusively, whereas the Cycle poems have been thought to be full of such. As many do, Nagy associates the Homeric poems with the growth of a Panhellenic feeling in the early Archaic Age. To be successfully received throughout the Greek world, Nagy argues, the Homeric poems could not appear to serve the interests of any one location. Yet he recognizes that normally poems would have just this function and supposes that Cycle poems were examples of this type of poem.[113]

The *Telegony* seems to be a clear example of a poem rooted to one place, for it was ascribed to a poet of Cyrene, whose kings were linked by name, and undoubtedly lineage, to a character featured in the poem. One in search for further instances of genealogical myth in the Cyclic poems might immediately turn to the *Nosti.* Certainly traditions of the “returns” of the Trojan heroes proved to be a motherlode for peoples eager to trace their lineage back to the Trojan War.[114] Difficulties arise in reaching conclusions, however. First of all, the comprehensiveness of a poem like the *Nosti* results in a Panhellenic perspective, not a local one, at least from what we can tell from the summary. One promising detail is the specification that Neoptolemus settled among the Molossians, according to Proclus, but it is not

clear how this can be linked with the poem's commonly ascribed author, Agias of Troezen.[115]

Moving back to the *Cypria,* let us note that its title may be of significance.[116] It has been considered an allusion to Aphrodite (because she is at times featured in the poem) but is more commonly thought to refer to Cyprus as the place where the poem was composed.[117] If the title refers to the island then the place of origin for the poem may be established (if the link is not late guesswork). Such a possibility might be relevant to a curious testimonium in which it is apparently stated that two sons of Helen, one by Menelaus, one by Paris, went together to Cyprus.[118] This would indeed suggest that the *Cypria,* like the *Telegony,* provided a genealogical link to the heroic age.[119] One cannot be certain, however, and other indications give cause to some disquiet. Janko does not think from the linguistic evidence of fragments that the poem originated at Cyprus, although he is willing to allow it was performed there.[120] We have also seen that the stories of city sacking in it have been seen as Aeolic in some way.[121] And details in the episode of the Dioscuri narrated in the *Cypria* have even been linked to a Spartan custom of burying the dead on the field of battle.[122] The multiplicity of possible local connections would seem to blur our impression of the poem's allegiance to a single region's concerns.

Turning to the *Aethiopis,* we have seen that the poem is often closely linked to Miletus, the homeland of its ascribed author Arctinus, and Proclus reports that the poem referred to the paradise island Leuke, identified otherwise with an island in the Black Sea where Milesians dominated colonization. Was the *Aethiopis* a Milesian poem that reflects Milesian colonization of the Black Sea, as many have thought?[123] The connection between the *Aethiopis* and Miletus should not be hastily assumed. The ascription of authorship to Arctinus and therefore the labeling of the poem as Milesian is uncertain, but it does appear to be more than a coincidence that a Milesian poet was credited with composition about a "White Island" and Milesians knew of a "White Island" in the Euxine. It is always possible that no author of the *Aethiopis* was known, and so ancient scholars, associating the Black Sea island identified as Leuke with Milesian colonization, chose the name of a Milesian author from the past. Yet let us assume for the sake of argument that this is a Milesian aspect to the *Aethiopis*, and then proceed to explore the implications of this.

The question of how worship of Achilles began is a complex one.[124] Although Achilles was worshiped in many areas of the Mediterranean, hero cult usually centers around a grave site at which the spirit of the hero is believed to affect the surrounding area for better or worse.[125] For Achilles this grave site would be located on the shores of the Hellespont near Troy.[126] The place where his mortal remains were buried was an obvious place for cult activity, yet worship of Achilles readily arose elsewhere, because hero cult did not require a tomb site.[127]

The burial of Achilles in the Troad is foretold in *Iliad* 23 and reported in *Odyssey* 24. The summary of the *Aethiopis* by Proclus also indicates that Achilles was buried there. It has been thought, however, that the *Aethiopis* disagreed with the Homeric account about the burial of the hero in the Troad. This impression is based on the Cyclic poem's narration of Thetis snatching Achilles off of the pyre. But other evidence that we have from antiquity specifies that the mortal part of Achilles was burned on the pyre and buried when his immortal part went to his island of paradise.[128] There is no reason to suspect that such a conception was not present in the *Aethiopis* itself. Even though the *Aethiopis* indicates a different sort of afterlife for Achilles (Leuke) than the *Odyssey* does (Hades), there is no disagreement about the burial of the bones of Achilles in the Troad.

Worship for Achilles is documented for the Olbia area, the Tendra (a spit of land called the *dromos* of Achilles in antiquity), the Chersonese, and at Leuke. The island Leuke was not inhabited, but remarkably enough was visited, and the ancients reported seaman tales of the ghost of Achilles being seen or heard there.[129] The once outlying paradise of Leuke took on some aspects of hero cult. Myth and hero cult must have often coexisted as two different but compatible approaches to the heroic, and often the two adapt to one another or are conflated with one another. In this case Greek colonists would have to reconcile their direct knowledge of an island identified as Leuke with the mythological concept of Leuke, and they would have the opportunity to visit a location that in mythological terms was supernatural.[130] Back in the Aegean world, report of the actual Leuke would merge with the mythological conception of Leuke. The conflation of the actual and mythological Leuke was probably unproblematic for most Greeks, because confusion in poetical and geographical references to the location

of Leuke throughout antiquity suggests that the Black Sea continued to be regarded as an unreal corner of the world.

Dedicatory inscriptions to Achilles from as early as the late sixth century have been found in the Black Sea area, where Achilles continued to be worshiped into Roman imperial times (when he was known as "Pontarches"). Early literary references include a fragment of Alcaeus (with phraseology similar to that of dedicatory inscriptions) referring to Achilles as ruler over "Scythia" (Ἀχίλλευς ὀ τὰς Σκυθίκας μέδεις, 354 L-P). Pindar *Nemean* 4.49–50, which refers to a "shining" island in the Euxine as the domain of Achilles, is the first poetical reference to a Leuke in the Black Sea. Euripides also refers briefly to the immortality of Achilles at Leuke (*Andr.* 1259–1262, *IT* 427–438). The remarks of Alcaeus best fit a mythological, not historical, conception of the afterlife of Achilles in the Black Sea area, whereas the later poetical allusions reflect actual topography associated with the cult of Achilles, if in only a confused manner. Later prose writers were commonly confused about the nature of Leuke; not only was the exact location of the offshore island disputed, but it often became confused or conflated with the *dromos* of Achilles or Berezan, a peninsula near Olbia that became an island by late antiquity.[131]

Although Milesians certainly played a major role in the worship of Achilles in the Black Sea area, including at the island identified as Leuke, the worship had its Panhellenic aspects.[132] We do not even know that Milesian colonists were responsible for introducing worship of Achilles into the Black Sea area, though their importance in the cult in later times is undoubted.[133] Achilles is connected with the sea through Thetis, and his worship may have been initiated by precolonial sailors, who seem at least to have maintained a fascination with his presence at Leuke, whether Milesian or not.[134] Native input into the worship, perhaps even an early conflation of Achilles with a Scythian divinity, has also been entertained as a possibility.[135]

The very fact that the *Aethiopis* narrated myth about Leuke does not necessarily mean that it reflected cultic worship of Achilles. If it did, it is not necessary to assume that it reflected Milesian forms of worship of Achilles. Another cause for hesitation about the Milesian context for the *Aethiopis* is the fact that two early inscriptions of what is thought to be the opening lines to the *Little Iliad* have been found in the northern Black Sea[136]—the earli-

est direct citation of Epic Cycle verse that is known. This raises the question of why a verse of the *Little Iliad* has been found in the northern Black Sea if the *Aethiopis* is to be linked with the city that colonized the area. Of course, chance had a hand in what verse happened to be found there. In the end it would be too skeptical to insist that the *Aethiopis* could have had nothing to do with Miletus. Certainly the story of Achilles' immortality need not have originated with the *Aethiopis,* but it is justifiable to suspect that the poem represented a Milesian manifestation of the story of Achilles' immortalization.

It should be concluded that there are indications of the local nature of the poems of the Epic Cycle. In the very least it appears that the poems were well suited to serve the interests of specific communities. One difficulty in realizing firm conclusions is the lack of information about specific details in the Cyclic poems. Another difficulty is that it is not always clear to which community some Cyclic poems should be connected. Some of the apparently contradictory evidence might be attributed to the inevitable cross-pollination of local traditions. What is more, all such local manifestations of the Trojan story would be derived from a tradition that is essentially Panhellenic. But it cannot be doubted that certain accounts of the traditional tale of the Trojan War were manipulated to suit the needs of specific localities, and some of the Epic Cycle poems might represent this type of poem. Distinguishing between local and Panhellenic concerns in early Greek epic remains a viable methodology for understanding the different functions of Cyclic and Homeric poetry.

Several religious attitudes displayed by the Cycle have attracted much attention. Achilles receives purification after killing Thersites in the *Aethiopis,* and it is probable that Penthesileia comes to Troy to receive purification for murder.[137] It is often thought that this practice is post-Homeric and that the Cycle is therefore from a later time.[138] But many scholars have challenged the view that this practice is post-Homeric.[139] Examples of blood purification seem to have existed in early Greek myth, myth that may have pre-Homeric roots.[140] The Homeric poems display knowledge of purification in general (e.g., *Il.* 1.314, *Od.* 22.481–482), and some conclude that silence on purification for murder is simply suppression.[141] Others have suspected that the exile for murders frequently mentioned in the *Iliad* actually implies or assumes purification.[142] A scholiast on *Iliad* 24.480 thought the

line "anachronistically" referred to purification; some conclude he had a different text that explicitly referred to it.[143] Purification for murder may actually date far back in prehistory. Lloyd-Jones (1983:76) notes that it is probably rooted in Indo-European culture,[144] and Burkert (1992:55–64) makes a case for Near Eastern origins for this practice. Parker thoroughly and convincingly argues that one cannot assume it is post-Homeric; he (1983:135) concludes, "If Homer had been lost, indeed, and only the mythological evidence survived, no one would have doubted for a moment that these rites [of blood purification] were primeval."

The immortality that is frequently granted to heroes in the Epic Cycle has been called a post-Homeric concept.[145] Castor and Polydeuces receive an alternate immortality (ἀθανασία) in the *Cypria* (Proclus; cf. *Od.* 11.299–304, Pind. *Nem.* 10.55–91, *Pyth.* 11.61–64), where immortality (ἀθάνατος) is also given to Iphigeneia after Artemis rescued her (Proclus; cf. *Cat.* fr. 23 M-W); in the *Aethiopis* Eos gives immortality (ἀθανασία) to Memnon and Thetis snatches Achilles from the pyre and conveys him to ἡ Λευκὴ νῆσος; and at the end of the *Telegony* Circe makes Telegonus, Telemachus, and Penelope immortal (ἀθάνατος). That such passages contradict the stress on mortality in the *Iliad* is true; however, to claim that heroic immortality reflects the taste of a later age is a dubious proposition. For example, although the *Aethiopis* differs with the *Odyssey* on the nature of Achilles' afterlife (Leuke instead of Hades), nearly every other source in antiquity agrees with the Cyclic poem that he went to a paradise island (the Islands of the Blessed were sometimes substituted for Leuke). This suggests that the Homeric account is unusual, not primary.[146] It is unlikely that the concept of immortality for heroes is eschatologically later than the Homeric concept of Hades.[147]

Immortality for heroes is a feature of several passages of early Greek poetry. For one thing, it is a relatively common feature of the Homeric poems.[148] The concept of immortality also seems to be implied indirectly by the numerous references in Homeric poetry and other early poetry to seizure by winds or deities.[149] And the motif of a paradisiacal abode of afterlife for the dead dates back at least into the second millennium in Mediterranean culture.[150] For all these reasons it is clear that the poems of the Cycle should not be dated late because they contained immortality for heroes.[151]

At times it has been suggested that the poems in the Epic Cycle pre-

suppose hero cult and that this is evidence of a post-Homeric date.[152] Certainly the Cyclic poems frequently narrate immortality for heroes. Does this imply knowledge of hero cult? Earlier I noted that the narration of Achilles' immortality in the *Aethiopis* need not necessarily reflect Milesian cult worship of this hero. And the issue of the relationship between myth and ritual has been controversial throughout the last century.[153] Although hero cult and myth about heroic immortality undoubtedly have a complex relationship, one does not simply result from the other. It has been suggested that hero cult was inspired by Homeric epic, but this is very unlikely, although controversy over the dating and classification of hero cult persists.[154] No one today argues that hero cult was practiced continually from Mycenaean times, but there seems to be evidence that some forms of hero cult existed before the composition the Homeric poems, even if one dates them to the eighth century. And though the Homeric poems do not emphasize hero cult, internal evidence reveals that they are aware of its practice. Rohde was impressed by Homer's general silence about hero cult, but he felt the funeral of Patroclus reflected the practice.[155] Other internal evidence includes the sacrifices offered to Erechtheus at *Iliad* 2.546–551, the importance of the tomb of Aiputios at *Iliad* 2.603–604, the treatment of the corpse of Sarpedon at *Iliad* 16.674–675, and the mention of demigods at *Iliad* 12.23.[156] So if the Epic Cycle does contain material that arose under the influence of hero cult, that would not lead to the conclusion that poems in it are post-Homeric.

Do the poems in the Epic Cycle actually display knowledge of hero cult? Aside from the theory that an ascribed Milesian author for the *Aethiopis* links that poem with Black Sea worship of Achilles, the most promising evidence that the Epic Cycle demonstrates a knowledge of hero cult is the frequent appearance of the ghost of Achilles near his grave site, and especially the sacrifice of Polyxena there.[157] The supposed grave site of Achilles was accorded some attention in the ancient world. According to my interpretation, the burial of Achilles at Troy does not preclude his afterlife existence on a far-off paradise. It is entirely plausible that Cycle poems would narrate the hero's immortality at Leuke and also allude to cult activity at Achilles' gravesite in the Troad. It is possible, but we do not actually know to what extent the Cyclic references to the ghost of Achilles at his graveside presuppose cult worship of the hero there. Yet, if the Cyclic poems were more explicit about their knowledge of hero cult than the Homeric poems,

this variant stance would be more of a degree than an opposition. The Cyclic episodes about the ghost of Achilles by themselves are directly comparable with Homeric passages: shades of the dead also appear in *Iliad* book 23 and *Odyssey* books 11 and 24, and human sacrifices are made at the grave of Patroclus in *Iliad* 23.[158]

It has been well demonstrated that in general the Cycle has more supernatural content than the Homeric poems do.[159] This is not an indication of decadence on its part. To speak of dignity and realism as the norm of epic is to confuse the Homeric poems with their tradition. Some supernatural devices are known by or demonstrably reflected in the Homeric poems but suppressed (e.g., invulnerable armor; see P. Kakridis 1961). It is easily supposed that supernatural elements entered the epic tradition at an early date.[160] Folktales commonly contain them, and I argued that the tradition of the Trojan War contained folktale aspects from its beginning. Comparison with other traditions suggest that, if anything, the supernatural precedes more realistic treatments of traditional material.[161] Yet we should hardly reclassify the Cycle poems as fairy tales divorced from reality; in fact, it appears that the Cycle could also be very graphic.[162] In any event, it might be safely said that both the Homeric and the Cyclic poems belonged to a tradition that embraced a wide range of supernatural and realistic material. The Homeric poems probably stayed on the realistic side of this range more steadily than the Cyclic poems, and one might suspect that they moved along the spectrum in a more sensitive and sophisticated manner. But if the Cycle poems are non-Homeric in this regard, they are not necessarily post-Homeric. If anything one might conclude that in their supernatural aspects the Cyclic poems better represent the norm or original nature of the tradition of the Trojan War .

Another claim is that erotic material in the poems of the Epic Cycle reveals the poor taste of a later age.[163] What are the erotic elements of the Epic Cycle? There are actually very few candidates for such a label. Achilles has an encounter with Helen in the *Cypria* (Proclus), though we do not really know the nature of this episode. There is also the killing of Penthesileia by Achilles in the *Aethiopis.* We are told that Thersites mockingly alleged an erotic interest in her on the part of Achilles (Proclus), and later tradition suggested that he became attracted to her in the course of this encounter. But Vermeule, noting that the relationship between sex and death is a re-

curring theme found in the *Iliad,* has effectively mocked critics who consider the episode "Alexandrian" in taste.[164] One might add the sudden marriages between Telegonus and Penelope and Telemachus and Circe at the end of the *Telegony* (Proclus). Perhaps this produced the second son of Penelope called Arkesilaos, discussed in Chapter 1 as a mythological forebear for the ruling family at Cyrene. It is part of Nagy's argument (1990b:72n.99) that local communities joined themselves genealogically with heroes through stories of their sexual encounters, although this is the only erotic episode in the Cycle that can be linked to a specific genealogical claim by a community. In any event the simple existence of erotic episodes does not imply late, post-Homeric poetry. As Kullmann (1960:46) points out, erotic elements were present in non-Greek literature of undoubted antiquity, and so there is no need to label such material as intrinsically late. Central to myth about the Trojan War is an erotic incident, the intrigue between Paris and Helen.

The multimarriage ending of the *Telegony* has often been the object of mirth and scorn, but Malkin (1998:126) points out that a plot summary would make the *Medea* or *Oedipus Tyrannus* seem as ludicrous. One might add that a summary of the Homeric poems could make them open to the same charges leveled against the Cycle (" . . . and then Thetis obtained a divine shield for Achilles, with figures that magically moved. Upon accepting Agamemnon's formal apology, Achilles haggles with Odysseus over whether lunch should be served or not. Upon arming, Achilles had a conversation with his horse, who delivers a prophecy, and proceeded upon indiscriminate slaughter. He duels with Aeneas, who is rescued when Poseidon hurls him through the air behind ranks. Meanwhile the Olympian gods have squared off, with some inconsequential jostling and joking eventually resulting. Achilles offends the river Skamandros by littering his waters with corpses, and the god runs the nearly drowned hero ragged before Hephaestus comes to the rescue with his flames . . .").

This investigation largely confirms the general impression that the content of the Cycle poems was much different from the content of the Homeric poems. It has become clear, however, how difficult it is to reach firm conclusions about the details of these differences. And the many claims that characteristic elements in the Cycle are late or post-Homeric have turned out to be very dubious. It seems these views have been inherited from earlier times without proper reassessment in the light of recent scholarship.

Now the Homeric poems are commonly dated to the late eighth century, and even this date may be too early. The schematic approach that portrays an early "Homeric" age as radically different from following ones has lent credibility to the belief that there are "new" elements in the Epic Cycle, but that approach is surely misguided. It often appears as if detractors of the Cycle's "late" elements are simply uncomfortable with the nature of Greek myth. "The supreme absurdities of the Wooden Horse" would inspire similar charges of lateness if that episode were not so obviously part of the pre-Homeric tradition.[165]

Although the Cycle poems often display non-Homeric characteristics, the view that the Epic Cycle is full of new, untraditional material must be questioned. Because I have also shown that the poems of the Cycle may not be dependent on Homer, either in their structure or in their details, it seems entirely justifiable to view the poems of the Epic Cycle as largely traditional. I hope to have shown that the influence of Homeric traditions on them and the presence of late elements in them are greatly exaggerated. As a result, there has been unnecessary hesitation in using the Cycle to explore pre-Homeric tradition. I believe it presents a good picture of the material and tone of the tradition from which the Homeric poems are derived.

Conclusion

In this study I have tried to situate the Trojan War poems of the Epic Cycle within the context of the tradition of the Trojan War, particularly in relation to the Homeric poems. First, I outlined major stages in the development of the Epic Cycle. I proposed that the Cyclic poems existed independently of one another as just several of innumerable epic poems within thriving oral mythological traditions. Each individual poem that we know of as part of the Epic Cycle would have been continually re-created and eventually crystallized in performance traditions of the Archaic Age (similar to Homeric performance traditions, as explored in the work of Nagy). As far as their date is concerned, I take a largely agnostic stance because of the scarcity of evidence and because of the inappropriateness of fixing long-term poetic traditions to a single point in time. There is some reason to suspect, however, that the *Aethiopis* and *Telegony* poetic traditions were continuing to develop at the end of the seventh century.

The Cyclic poems were probably not well known in the Archaic Age, but the fame of their mythological tradition seems to be proved by the extensive representation of the story of the Trojan War in art of the period. Fixed versions of the Cyclic poems became generally known in the Classical Age, but it would only be in the Hellenistic period that a collection of previously independent epic poems would have been gathered together to form an "Epic Cycle." The development of the Epic Cycle would have resulted in changes to the earlier fixed versions of the individual poems, and so the

summary of the Epic Cycle by Proclus is a very misleading indicator of the extent of these poems in their earlier state.

Although I maintain that the Epic Cycle as we know it was "manufactured" by editorial activity in the Hellenistic period, I also suggested that the Cycle would have been prefigured by rhapsodic performance of material from different epics (not necessarily the ones of the Epic Cycle). Indeed, the general conceptual foundation of the Cycle, that specific poetic narratives belong together within a larger mythological superstructure, must be very ancient. The manufacture of the Epic Cycle at one particular historical time should thus be seen as one aspect of a long continuum of related or comparable conceptions of mythological cycles. By the Archaic Age fluid mythological material was seen to belong together as part of a larger narrative, even if its consistency or temporal unity could not always be pressed. In this sense theogonic material, the Theban "cycle," and the Trojan "cycle," among other material, came to be conceived of as a coherent mythological account of the past, a loose arrangement of which is already assumed in Homeric and Hesiodic poetry. The Epic Cycle is a number of available epics artificially manipulated into a collective whole, but this in itself is one manifestation of the age-old "cycle" of the mythological past. In a sense the Epic Cycle was manufactured to be a fixed, literate substitution for traditions that were dying out.

Next I examined the role of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in the early tradition of the Trojan War, emphasizing their lack of influence in the Archaic Age. This conclusion can be reached by considering the practical limitations to publishing at the time, particularly for the lengthy Homeric poems, and also by examination of early Greek art and poetry. When we put aside our fascination with the Homeric poems and knowledge of their eventual domination of their tradition, we actually find little evidence of early Greek artists and poets being inspired by the *Iliad* and *Odyssey.* I assume that the Iliadic and Odyssean poetic traditions were developing during the Archaic Age, and so there is no need to deny the existence of a few Homeric-derived images and passages by the end of the seventh century. But overall it is apparent that the oral tradition of the Trojan War continued to thrive in many media, ignorant of or at least without awe of the Homeric poems.

Having established the development of the Epic Cycle and the lack of

early Homeric influence, I then examined the relation between Homeric and Cyclic traditions. The apparent lack of early Homeric influence should encourage us to believe that the poems of the Epic Cycle accurately reflect the pre-Homeric traditions of the Trojan War. In my opinion there is no reason to view the poems of the Epic Cycle as derivative from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, either in form or matter. If the presentation of the extent of Cyclic poems in Proclus is inaccurate, it is misguided to assume that earlier manifestations of the Cyclic poems were designed to "fill in the gaps" around the Homeric poems. Also debatable is the belief that the Cyclic poems created supplemental material in reaction to details in the Homeric poems. Although the general aspects of the Cyclic poems seem to be different from the general aspects of the Homeric poems, the common attempt to label Cyclic material as late or "post-Homeric" in content should be challenged. As far as we know, the Cycle poems developed in the same Archaic Age culture that the Homeric poems did. Much that is classified as distinctively "Cyclic" is actually acknowledged within the Homeric poems. The differences between the Cyclic and Homeric traditions, then, are not a matter of priority but rather of narrative strategies and cultural functions. In this sense I found Nagy's analysis (1990b:70–79) of Cyclic poetry as relatively "local" in comparison with the "Panhellenic" nature of Homeric poetry more promising than attempts to make distinctions along temporal or aesthetic lines.

The Homeric and Cyclic traditions have many points of contact not because they directly influenced each other but rather because both have a place within the tradition of the Trojan War in the Archaic Age. Celebration of the beauty of the Homeric poems has led to an exaggerated sense of their initial historical importance, but it is clear that at first they did not encompass or dominate this tradition. Both the Homeric and Cyclic traditions are poetic manifestations of a fluid yet stable and unified tradition that existed in many media. They belong to the same tradition, and it would be mistaken to regard Homeric poetry as more mythologically authentic than Cyclic poetry. The Cyclic poems were not Homeric spin-offs and seem to represent their larger tradition better than the Homeric poems do. But if the Homeric poems have distinctive qualities in comparison to the more typical Cyclic poems, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* still exist in a symbiotic relationship with their tradition. Their excellent poetic qualities may have fooled some into thinking that they should be regarded as free of their tradition,

but the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* can hardly be fully appreciated without a strong awareness of the larger tradition of the Trojan War. They would have been comprehended within this context in the Archaic Age, and we cut ourselves off from the richness of this resonance when we seek to praise Homer at the expense of the extra-Homeric tradition. To this larger, extra-Homeric tradition belonged the poems of the Epic Cycle, and as such they should be valued and appreciated. Characterization of the Epic Cycle as dependent on the Homeric poems has too long, I believe, obscured its connection with long-standing traditions. The poems of the Cycle cannot be appreciated as poetry because they are lost, but through fragments, testimonia, and summaries they can be valued as a window into ancient myth about the Trojan War.

APPENDIX A

Photius and Proclus

Photius on Proclus (*Bibliotheca* 319a21)

He [Proclus] explicates also the so-called Epic Cycle, which begins with the mythological union of Uranus and Gaea from which resulted for Uranus three children, the "Hundred-Handers," and three Cyclopes. He goes through myths about the gods told among the Greeks, and notably whether there is any historical truth in them. And the Epic Cycle, filled out from different poets, continues until the arrival of Odysseus at Ithaca, where he is killed by his unwitting son Telegonus. And he says that the poems of the Epic Cycle are preserved and of interest to most not for their worth but for the sequence of events in it. He gives also the names and fatherlands of those who composed the Epic Cycle.

Summary of the Trojan War section of the Epic Cycle by Proclus

Added to these is the so-called *Cypria,* transmitted in eleven books; concerning its composition I will speak later in order to not impede the narrative here. The contents are as follows. Zeus plans with Themis concerning the Trojan War. Strife, present among the gods feasting at the wedding of Peleus, instigates a quarrel over beauty among Athena, Hera, and Aphrodite, who are brought by Hermes at the command of Zeus to Alexander at Ida for judgment; Alexander chooses Aphrodite, excited by marriage to Helen. Then at Aphrodite's suggestion he builds a ship and Helenus makes predictions concerning future events to them, and Aphrodite bids Aeneas to sail with him. And Cassandra reveals what will happen.

Arriving at Lakedaimonia, Alexander is hosted by the sons of Tyndareus, and later in Sparta by Menelaus; and Alexander gives gifts to Helen during a feast. And after this Menelaus sails off to Crete, having bid Helen to provide the guests what they need until they leave. Meanwhile Aphrodite brings Helen and Alexander together, and after their

union they sail off in the night with a great load of treasure. Hera rouses a storm against them. And Alexander, brought to Sidon, sacks the city. And after sailing to Ilion he celebrates his marriage to Helen.

Meanwhile Castor and Polydeuces were caught stealing the cattle of Idas and Lynkeus. And Castor is killed by Idas; Lynkeus and Idas by Polydeuces. And Zeus bestows on them immortality that alternates by days.

And after these events Iris reports to Menelaus what has happened at home. He returns and plans an expedition against Ilion with his brother, and Menelaus goes to Nestor. Nestor in a digression tells him how Epopeus seduced the daughter of Lykourgos and was destroyed, the story of Oedipus, the madness of Heracles, and the story of Theseus and Ariadne. Then they gather the leaders, traveling through Greece. And they caught Odysseus pretending to be insane because he did not want to join up, after Palamedes advised them to seize his son Telemachus threateningly.

And after this they gather at Aulis and perform a sacrifice. And the omen of the snake and the sparrows appears and Calchas foretells to them what will occur. Then setting out they reach Teuthrania and plunder it as if Ilion. Telephus defends and kills Thersandros the son of Polynices and himself is wounded by Achilles. As they sail off from Mysia, a storm falls on them and scatters them. Achilles sets in at Scyros and marries the daughter of Lykomedes, Deidameia. Then Telephus, having come to Argos in accordance with an oracle, is healed by Achilles, so as to guide the sail to Ilion.

And with the fleet gathered a second time at Aulis Agamemnon shot a stag in the hunt and said he surpassed even Artemis. Enraged, the goddess kept him from sailing by sending storms. After Calchas told them of the anger of the goddess and bid them sacrifice Iphigeneia to Artemis, they attempt the sacrifice after summoning her as if for marriage to Achilles. Artemis snatches her away and conveys her to the Taurians and makes her immortal, and places a stag instead of the maiden by the altar. Then they sail to Tenedos. And while they are feasting Philoctetes is bit by a snake and left behind at Lemnos because of the smell, and Achilles summoned late quarrels with Agamemnon.

Then the Trojans hold them off as they are landing at Ilion, and Protesilaus is killed by Hector. Then Achilles turns them back when he slays Kyknos the son of Poseidon. And they take up the corpses and send an embassy to the Trojans, demanding Helen and the goods back. When those refuse, they then attack the walls. Then setting out, they plunder the land and surrounding cities. And after these events Achilles desires to look upon Helen, and Aphrodite and Thetis brought them together. Then Achilles restrains the Achaeans in their desire to return home. And then he rustles the cattle of Aeneas, sacks Lyrnessos, Pedasos, and many of the surrounding cities, and slays Troilus. Patroclus takes Lykaon to Lemnos and sells him, and Achilles chooses Briseis as his prize from the loot, Agamemnon Chryseis. Then there is the death of Palamedes, and the plan of Zeus to aid the Trojans by removing Achilles from the Greek alliance, and a catalog of Trojan allies.

Following what was summarized is the *Iliad* by Homer, after which are five books of the *Aethiopis* by the Milesian Arctinus, containing these events. The Amazon Penthe-

sileia arrives to aid the Trojans, the daughter of Ares, Thracian by birth; Achilles kills her as she fought at the fore, and the Trojans bury her. And Achilles slays Thersites when mocked and insulted by him for his supposed love for Penethesileia. And a quarrel results among the Achaeans about the murder of Thersites. Afterward Achilles sails to Lesbos, and sacrificing to Apollo, Artemis, and Leto, he is purified of the murder by Odysseus.

Memnon the son of Eos arrives, with Hephaestan-made armor, to defend the Trojans. And Thetis foretells to her son events concerning Memnon. And when battle occurs Antilochus is slain by Memnon. Then Achilles slays Memnon, and Eos gives him immortality, having asked for it from Zeus. When routing the Trojans into the city, Achilles is killed by Paris and Apollo. And when a fierce battle arose over the body, Ajax taking it up carries it to the ships, with Odysseus fighting off the Trojans. Then they bury Antilochus and lay out the corpse of Achilles. And Thetis, arriving with the Muses and her sisters, bewails her son. And after this, snatching him from the pyre, Thetis conveys her son to the island Leuke. The Achaeans heap up a mound and hold games, and a quarrel arises between Odysseus and Ajax about the armor of Achilles.

Then in turn come four books of the *Little Iliad,* by Lesches of Mytilene, containing the following. The judgment of arms occurs, and Odysseus wins by the will of Athena. Ajax, driven mad, slaughters the herd of the Achaeans and kills himself.

After this Odysseus seizes Helenos in ambush, and when that one foretells about the sack of the city, Diomedes brings Philoctetes back from Lemnos. This one, healed by Machaon, duels Alexander and kills him. And the Trojans take up and bury his corpse after it is abused by Menelaus. After these events Deiphobus marries Helen, and Odysseus brings Neoptolemus from Scyros and gives him the arms of his father. And Achilles appears to him. Eurypylos son of Telephus arrives as ally to the Trojans, and Neoptolemus kills him as he fought at the fore; the Trojans are besieged.

And Epeios constructs the wooden horse at Athena's suggestion, and Odysseus disfigures himself and goes into Ilion as a spy. And recognized by Helen he consults with her about the sack of the city, and killing many Trojans he returns to the ships. And after this he conveys the Palladion out of Ilion with Diomedes. Then placing the best men into the wooden horse and burning down their tents, the rest of the Greeks set out to Tenedos. The Trojans, supposing they are free from harm, lead the wooden horse into the city, wrecking part of the wall, and feast as if they had defeated the Greeks.

Following these come two books of the *Iliou Persis,* by the Milesian Arctinus, containing the following. The Trojans ponder the horse suspiciously, and standing about it deliberate what they should do. And some think it best to hurl it down a cliff, others to burn it; others thought they should dedicate it to Athena. And at length the opinion of the last prevailed. They turn to feasting as if freed from the war. At that moment two snakes appear and kill Laocoon and one of his children. Troubled by the omen, Aeneas and his followers slip out to Mount Ida. And Sinon sets out fire signals to the Achaeans, after entering the city by deceit. They sailed from Tenedos, and those from the wooden

horse attack their enemies, and killing many they sack the city by force. And Neoptolemus kills Priam as he fled to the altar of Zeus Herkeios. Menelaus finds Helen and takes her to the ships, having killed Deiophobus. Ajax the son of Ileus, pulling off Cassandra by force, drags down also the image of Athena. Angered at this the Greeks want to stone Ajax, but he flees to the altar of Athena and is rescued from threatening danger. Then the Greeks sail off and Athena devises destruction for them at sea.

And Odysseus kills Astyanax; Neoptolemus chooses Andromache as his prize. And they distribute the rest of the loot. Demophon and Akamas find Aithra and take her with them. Then having burned the city, they slaughter Polyxena at the grave of Achilles.

Joined to these are the five books of the *Nosti,* by Agias of Troizen containing the following. Athena instigates a quarrel between Agamemnon and Menelaus about the sail home. Agamemnon remains to appease the anger of Athena, but Diomedes and Nestor set out and arrive home safe. Menelaus sails off after these and arrives at Egypt with five ships, the rest destroyed at sea.

Calchas, Leontes, and Polypoites with their people travel by foot to Kolophon and bury Teiresias there when he died. The shade of Achilles appeared and tried to stop Agamemnon and his followers as they were sailing off by foretelling what would befall them. Then the storm at the Kapherides rocks is related, and the destruction of Lokrian Ajax.

Neoptolemus makes the trip by foot at the advice of Thetis, and arriving at Thrace he meets Odysseus at Maroneia. And he finishes the rest of his journey and buries Phoenix upon his death. He is recognized by Peleus when he arrives among the Molossians. Then after Agamemnon is murdered by Aegisthus and Clytemnestra comes the vengeance of Orestes and Pylades, and the arrival home of Menelaus.

After these things is the *Odyssey* of Homer; then two books of the *Telegony* by the Cyrenean Eugammon, containing the following. The suitors are buried by their relatives. And Odysseus, having sacrificed to the Nymphs, sails off to Elis to look at his herds and is entertained by Polyxenos, receiving as a gift a krater; and on this was the story of Trophonios, Agamedes, and Augeas. Then sailing back to Ithaca, he accomplishes the sacrifices spoken of by Teiresias.

And after these events he arrives at the Thesprotians and marries Kallidike, the queen of the Thesprotians. Then war occurs between the Thesprotians and the Brygians, with Odysseus leading. Then Ares routs the followers of Odysseus, and Athena battles him. Apollo separates these. After the death of Kallidike, Polypoites the son of Odysseus receives the kingship, and Odysseus returns to Ithaca.

Meanwhile Telegonus, sailing in search of his father, lands at Ithaca and ravages the island. Odysseus in defense is killed by his unwitting son. Telegonus upon realizing his error takes the body of his father and Telemachus and Penelope to his mother. She makes them immortal, and Telegonus lives with Penelope; Telemachus with Circe.

APPENDIX B

Schematization of R. Cook's Tables

APPENDIX C

Trojan War Images to 600 B.C.E.

PREPARATORY: 9 representations from ca. 675–600

Peleus wrestles Thetis

1. Terracotta plate. Heraklion Museum 28645A. 650–625.
LIMC, "Peleus," no. 78 (ill.).
2. Amphora fragment. Kavalla Museum A 1086. Ca. 600.
LIMC, "Thetis," no. 8* (Figure C).

Judgment of Paris

3. Protocorinthian oinochoe; Chigi vase. Rome, Villa Giulia 22679. Ca. 630.
Identifications by inscription. *LIMC,* "Alexandros," no. 5*.
4. Laconian ivory comb. Athens, National Museum 15368. Ca. 620.
LIMC, "Paridis Iudicium," no. 22*.

Peleus presents Achilles to Chiron

5. Protoattic amphora fragment. Berlin Inv 31573 (A9). 650–625.
LIMC, "Achilleus," no. 21*.

Achilles receives armor from Thetis (Phthia)

6. Amphora fragment. Mykonos Museum 666. Ca. 670.
LIMC, "Achilleus," no. 506* (Figure K).

Menelaus and others

7. Protoattic stand. Berlin Inv 31573 (A 42). Ca. 650.
LIMC, "Menelaos," (vol. 8 suppl.) 4*.

Sacrifice of Iphigeneia

8. Protoattic krater fragment. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 6.67. 650–630.
LIMC, "Iphigeneia," no. 2 (ill.).

Embassy of Menelaus and Odysseus to Troy

9. Bronze tripod leg. Olympia Museum B 3600. 625–600.
LIMC, "Achilleus," no. 437 (ill.) (Figure J).

SIEGE: 27 representations from the end of eighth century to ca. 600

Achilles raids cattle

10. Boeotian relief amphora. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 99.505. Ca. 625.
LIMC, "Achilleus," no. 389* (Figure D).

Achilles and Troilus

11. Relief vase fragment. Tenos Museum. Ca. 680–670.
LIMC, "Achilleus," no. 280*
12. Protocorinthian aryballos. Athens, Collection Canellopoulos 1319. 650–625.
Inscription for Troilus; abecedaria. *LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 331* (Figure E).
13. Corinthian aryballos. Heraklion Museum. 625–600.
Ahlberg-Cornell 1992: fig. 78.
14. Bronze tripod leg. Olympia Museum B 3600. 625–600.
LIMC, "Achilleus," no. 375 (ill.).
15. Bronze shield bands. Olympia Museum B988, B1801, B1802, B4962. Ca. 600.
LIMC, "Achilleus," no. 376* (ill.).

Departure of Patroclus

16. Corinthian aryballos, Basel, private collection. Ca. 630.
Identified by inscription. *LIMC,* "Automedon," no. 1* (Figure M).

Ajax duels Hector

17. Corinthian aryballos. Paris, Louvre MNC 669. Ca. 625.
Identifications by inscription. *LIMC,* "Aias I," no. 34*.
18. Corinthian aryballos. Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 480. Ca. 625.
Identifications by inscription. *LIMC,* "Aias I," no. 33*.

Menelaus fights Hector over Euphorbos

19. Rhodian plate. London, British Museum A 749. Ca. 630–610.
Identifications by inscription. *LIMC,* "Euphorbos I," no. 1* (Figure N).

Penthesileia and Achilles

20. Terracotta shield fragment. Nauplion Museum 4509. Ca. 700.
LIMC, "Amazones," no. 168* (Figure F).
21. Late Protocorinthian vase fragment. Aigina Museum 2061. Ca. 630.
"Amazon" inscribed. *LIMC,* "Penthesileia," no. 11* (Figure G).
22. Attic terracotta relief fragment. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 42.11.33. Ca. 600.
Identification of Achilles and "Ainia" by inscription. *LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 720*.
23. Bronze relief shield bands. Olympia Museum B 112; B 1910, etc. Ca. 600.
Penthesileia identified by inscription on later examples. *LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 721 (ill.).

Antilochus in battle

24. Attic relief vase fragment. Athens, National Museum 3492. Ca. 650.
Identified by inscription. *LIMC,* "Antilochos I," no. 7*.

Achilles duels Memnon

25. Melian amphora. Athens, National Museum 3961 (911). 650–630.
LIMC, "Achilleus," no. 846; Ahlberg-Cornell 1992: fig. 106.

Ajax carries corpse of Achilles

26. Amphora impression. Ischia Museum. End of eighth century.
Snodgrass 1988: fig. 15; Ahlberg-Cornell 1992: fig. 45.
27. Terracotta plaque impression. Samos Museum T 416. End of eighth century.
LIMC, "Achilleus," no. 865; Ahlberg-Cornell 1992: fig. 44.
28. Ivory gem. Athens, National Museum Perachora II A 23. End of eighth century.
LIMC, "Achilleus," no. 864; Ahlberg-Cornell 1992: fig. 46.
29. Terracotta relief. Naples, National Museum Stg 106. Ca. 650.
LIMC, "Achilleus," no. 861 (ill.).
30. Terracotta mold. Lemnos Museum 1205. Second half of seventh century.
LIMC, "Achilleus," no. 860*.
31. Bronze shield bands. Olympia Museum B 1921, B 1687, B 1911. Second half of seventh century.
LIMC, "Achilleus," no. 862 (ill.).

Suicide of Ajax

32. Protocorinthian aryballos. Berlin V. I. 3319. 700–675.
LIMC, "Aias I," no. 118; Ahlberg-Cornell 1992: fig. 110.
33. Corinthian bronze mold. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum G 437. Ca. 650.
LIMC, "Aias I," no. 125* (Figure A).

34. Ivory gem. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 42.11.13. Second half of seventh century.
Ajax identified by inscription. *LIMC,* "Aias I," no. 110*.
35. Corinthian krater. Paris, Louvre E 635. 625–600.
Ajax identified by inscription. *LIMC,* "Aias I," no. 120*.
36. Corinthian aryballos. Paris, Louvre A473 (S424). Ca. 600.
LIMC, "Aias I," no. 121*.

SACK: 6 representations from late eighth century to 670

Wooden horse

37. Bronze fibula fragment. London, British Museum 3205. End of eighth century.
LIMC, "Equus Troianus," no. 22* (Figure B).
38. Melian relief amphora. Mykonos Museum 2240. Ca. 670.
LIMC, "Equus Troianus," no. 23*.
39. Relief vase fragment. Tenos Museum. Ca. 675–650.
LIMC, "Equus Troianus," no. 24; Ahlberg-Cornell 1992: fig. 118.

Menelaus recovers Helen

40. Melian relief amphora. Mykonos Museum 2240. Ca. 670.
LIMC, "Helene," no. 225*.

Death of Astyanax

41. Protoattic vase fragment. Athens, Agora Museum P 10201a. Ca. 720.
LIMC, "Astyanax I," no. 26* (ill.) (Figure I).
42. Melian relief amphora. Mykonos Museum 2240. 675–650.
LIMC, "Astyanax I," no. 27*.

RETURNS: ca. 14 representations from 700–600

Phrontis

43. Terracotta plaque fragment. Athens, National Museum 14935. Ca. 700.
LIMC, "Phrontis," no. 2; Schefold 1993: fig. 154 (Figure H).

Death of Agamemnon

44. Steatite seal. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 42.11.1. Ca. 700.
LIMC, "Agamemnon," no. 94*.
45. Terracotta relief. Heraklion Museum 11512 (6089a). 625–600.
LIMC, "Agamemnon," no. 91*.

Orestes seizes Aegisthus (Aegisthus nets Agamemnon?)

46. Protoattic krater. Berlin Inv 31573 (A32). 680–670.
LIMC, "Aigisthos," 36*.

Clytemnestra slays Cassandra

47. Bronze tripod leg. Athens, National Museum 58171. Ca. 650.
LIMC, "Kassandra I," (vol. 7 addenda) no. 199*.

Blinding of Cyclops and escape from Cyclops

48–56. Eight artifacts down to ca. 600 listed in Appendix D.

APPENDIX D

Blinding and Escape Images

Blinding, to ca. 400

1. Protoattic amphora. Eleusis Museum 2630. Ca. 670.
LIMC, "Polyphemos I," (vol. 8 suppl.) no. 16 = "Odysseus," no. 94 = "Kyklops, Kyklopes," no. 17*.
2. Aristonothos krater. Rome, Mus. Cap., Pal. Cons. Castellani 172. 675–650.
LIMC, "Polyphemos I," no. 16bis* = "Odysseus/Uthuze," no. 56 (Figure U).
3. Protoargive krater fragment. Argos Museum C 149. Ca. 650.
LIMC, "Polyphemos I," no. 15 = "Odysseus," no. 88* (Figure S).
4. Bronze relief fragment. Vathy, Samos, Museum B 1680. Ca. 650.
LIMC, "Polyphemos I," no. 25*.
5. Red-and-white-style pithos. Malibu, Getty Museum 96.AE.135. Ca. 650–625.
LIMC, "Polyphemos I," no. 27bis; Snodgrass 1998: fig. 38; Hamma and True 1994:183, 185; Andreae and Presicce 1996:146, fig. 6 (Figure W).
6. Bronze relief plaque fragment. Olympia Museum M 108. Sixth century.
LIMC, "Polyphemos I," no. 26; Ahlberg-Cornell 1992: fig. 154.
7. Corinthian alabastron. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 76.12.6. 575–550.
LIMC, "Polyphemos I," no. 17* = "Odysseus," no. 89.
8. Chalcidian skyphos. Reggio Calabria, National Museum 11723. Ca. 550.
LIMC, "Odysseus," no. 90; De Franciscis 1966: pl. 11c.
9. Laconian cup. Paris, Cabinet des Médailles 190. Ca. 550.
LIMC, "Polyphemos I," no. 18* = "Odysseus," no. 67.
10. Bronze shield band. Olympia Museum B 520. 550–525.
LIMC, "Polyphemos I," no. 27*.
11. Chalcidian amphora. London, British Museum B 154 (1866.8-5.3). 530–510.
LIMC, "Polyphemos I," no. 19 = "Odysseus," no. 91 = "Kyklops, Kyklopes," no. 21* (Figure V).

12. Hydria. Rome, Villa Giulia Mengarelli 2 (2600). Ca. 520.
LIMC, "Polyphemos I," no. 20* = "Odysseus/Uthuze," no. 57 = "Kyklops, Kyklopes," no. 23*.
13. Attic oinochoe. Paris, Louvre F 342. 525–500.
LIMC, "Polyphemos I," no. 21 = "Odysseus," no. 95 = "Kyklops, Kyklopes," no. 18*.
14. Skyphos. Berlin V. I. 3283. 525–500.
LIMC, "Polyphemos I," no. 22 = "Odysseus," no. 96 = "Kyklops, Kyklopes," no. 22*.
15. Amphora. Berlin F 2123, now lost. Early fifth century.
LIMC, "Polyphemos I," no. 23 (ill.) = "Odysseus," no. 92.
16. Krater. London, British Museum 1947.7-14.18. Ca. 420–410.
LIMC, "Polyphemos I," no. 24* = "Odysseus," no. 93 = "Kyklops, Kyklopes," no. 27* (Figure T).

Wine offering, to ca. 400

17. Attic kylix. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 99.518. 550–525.
LIMC, "Polyphemos I," no. 2* = "Odysseus," no. 68.

Escape, to ca. 600

18. Protoattic oinochoe fragment. Aegina Museum 566, inv. 10824. 675–650.
LIMC, "Odysseus," no. 109* (Figure X).
19. Ivory pyxides (2). Florence Museo Archeologico 82193, 73846. End of seventh century.
LIMC, "Odysseus/Uthuze," nos. 60–61*.
20. Bronze tripod leg. Olympia Museum B 7000. End of seventh century.
LIMC, "Odysseus," no. 127.
(Down to ca. 400, cf. *LIMC,* "Odysseus," nos. 100–129, "Odysseus/Uthuze," nos. 60–62, "Polyphemos I," nos. 33–50.)

APPENDIX E

Select Epic Passages Featuring Leaves

Underlined words indicate a form of a root also found in *Iliad* 6.146ff. Double underlined words indicate a form of a root also found in Mimnermus fragment 2 but not in *Iliad* 6. Italics indicate close counterparts for words in *Iliad* 6 or Mimnermus fragment 2. Boldface numbering indicates passages which relate humanity to leaves.

Il. 1.234-236 — ναὶ μὰ τόδε σκῆπτρον, τὸ μὲν οὔ ποτε φύλλα καὶ ὄζους
φύσει, ἐπεὶ δὴ πρῶτα τομὴν ἐν ὄρεσσι λέλοιπεν,
οὐδ' ἀναθηλήσει·

***Il.* 2.467-468** — ἔσταν δ' ἐν λειμῶνι Σκαμανδρίῳ ἀνθεμόεντι
μυρίοι, *ὅσσα* τε φύλλα καὶ ἄνθεα γίγνεται ὥρῃ.

***Il.* 2.800** — λίην γὰρ φύλλοισιν *ἐοικότες* [cf. *Il.* 21.464] ἢ ψαμάθοισιν

***Il.* 21.464-466** — . . . οἵ φύλλοισιν *ἐοικότες ἄλλοτε* μέν τε
ζαφλεγέες *τελέθουσιν,* ἀρούρης καρπὸν ἔδοντες,
ἄλλοτε δὲ *φθινύθουσιν* ἀκήριοι.

Od. 5.483 — . . . φύλλων γὰρ ἔην χύσις ἤλιθα πολλή
Cf. *Od.* 19.443 — . . . ἀτὰρ φύλλων ἐνέην χύσις ἤλιθα πολλή

***Od.* 7.104-106** — αἱ μὲν ἀλετρεύουσι μύλης ἔπι μήλοπα καρπόν,
αἱ δ' ἱστοὺς ὑφόωσι καὶ ἠλάκατα στρωφῶσιν
ἥμεναι, οἷά τε φύλλα μακεδνῆς αἰγείροιο·

***Od.* 9.51** — ἦλθον ἔπειθ' *ὅσα* φύλλα καὶ ἄνθεα γίγνεται ὥρῃ

W&D 420-422

τῆμος ἀδηκτοτάτη πέλεται τμηθεῖσα σιδήρῳ
ὕλη, φύλλα δ' *ἔραζε* χέει, πτόρθοιό τε λήγει·
τῆμος ἄρ' ὑλοτομεῖν μεμνημένος ὥρια ἔργα·

H. H. Dem. 472-473

αἶψα δὲ καρπὸν ἀνῆκεν ἀρουράων ἐριβώλων.
πᾶσα δὲ φύλλοισίν τε καὶ ἄνθεσιν εὐρεῖα χθὼν . . .

Notes

Introduction

1. Griffin 1977 influentially celebrated the Homeric poems in comparison to the Epic Cycle. The value of the Epic Cycle has best been realized by the school of thought known as neoanalysis, especially the work of Kullmann, to be discussed further in the next chapter. Also notable in its use of the Epic Cycle is M. Anderson's 1997 work that focuses on the fall of Troy in early Greek art and poetry.

2. M. West 1973, 1988 makes ambitious attempts to trace Greek epic's various origins and developments. For Indo-European concepts in Greek myth, cf. Puhvel 1987; Nagy 1990a:14–15; Baldick 1994 (who proposes relatively late influences between Indo-European texts, which is different from inheritance of concepts). See Mallory 1989 for an overview of Indo-European issues. M. West 1997 attempts a comprehensive account of possible Near Eastern influences on the Greek world, which often occurred only after the Dark Age (see Burkert 1992), though Near Eastern influence in the Bronze Age (Webster 1958; S. Morris 1997) is probable. See also Mondi 1990; Penglase 1994; Burgess 1999; R. Griffith 1997a, 1997b, 1997c, 1998, 1999 (in these articles and others Griffith explores early Egyptian influence, often using the provocative work of Bernal as a starting point).

3. Nilsson 1932 demonstrated that much of Greek myth originated in Mycenaean times. Vermeule 1964 remains a useful study of the Greek Bronze Age; Bennet 1997 and Hood 1995 give recent overviews of the Bronze Age background for the Homeric poems. Page 1959 and Wood 1985 are prominent examples of the historicist approach to the Trojan War. Relevant articles can be found in Davies and Foxhall 1981 and Mellink 1986; see also now the special edition of *Classical World* 91.5 (1998) devoted to the issue of the historicity of the Trojan War.

4. A survey of the major excavators at Troy and their various theories can be found in McDonald and Thomas 1990. For a summary of recent archaeological work, see Korfmann 1998. Burkert 1995 demonstrates that first-millennium Greeks had no real knowledge of the date of the Trojan War. Doubts on the antiquity of the legend have been re-

cently expressed at Powell 1997b:189; Raaflaub 1998a:400 ("Conceivably, therefore, the mythical material of which [the Homeric epics] are composed emerged in the time span of only two or three centuries before Homer and was combined to form the outline of a grand war story centering on the site of Troy not too long before Homer himself"). Fehling 1991:27, 57 argues that the story of the war as a whole was conceived of by one poet in the late eighth century.

5. Cf. Webster 1958:101–117; Vermeule 1986; M. West 1988:156–162; S. Morris 1989:533–534; E. Sherratt 1990. It is notable that Bronze Age artifacts in the Homeric poems more readily correspond to the early rather than later Mycenaean period.

6. See Antonaccio 1995a:236–243, 1995b, for the relevance of Lefkandi to Homeric studies. On the Dark Age in general, see Snodgrass 1971; Osborne 1996:19–51. Langdon 1997:2 gives a recent statement on the shift of view on the period: "Although the romantic appeal of the notion will linger for a long time to come, the Dark Age of Greece now appears to have been a less blighted, impoverished, and isolated time—that is, less "dark" an age—than previously believed." But cf. I. Morris 1997:543–544.

7. See Antonaccio 1995a, for a survey of the sites; discussion and further bibliography is given in Chapter 3.

8. Janko 1982 is a fundamental study of the linguistic forms in early epic. Recently Euboea has been suggested as a developing ground for Homeric epic (M. West 1988:166–167; Powell 1991:231–233).

9. On the possibility of a mainland tradition in the Bronze and early Iron Ages, cf. Webster 1958:91–135; Janko 1982:83–84; M. West 1988:151, 166; S. Morris 1989; McDonald and Thomas 1990:465–472; Latacz 1996:49–52; Pavese 1998:73–74, 81–82.

10. M. West 1985 and M. Lang 1995 provide interesting speculations on the early melding of locally developed traditions. In recent times some have suggested a late date for the story of the Trojan War because of its Panhellenic nature: cf. E. Cook 1996; Raaflaub 1998a:401; Kullmann 1999:110. On Panhellenic poetry of the shared culture of city-states after the Dark Age, the work of Nagy is essential (e.g., 1979:5–9; 1990b:52–115), where Snodgrass 1971:421, 435 is cited for this emerging Panhellenism.

11. Displayed, in different ways, by Fränkel 1975; Dodds 1951; Snell 1953; Adkins 1960. A distinction between poet and characters is not always clearly made, with the result that the time of composition can be confused with the primitive archaism that the poems strive to convey for the heroic age. On the other hand, it would be mistaken to approach the "Homeric world" with the biases of our time, and I recognize the value of identifying distinctive characteristics of Homeric society with anthropological methodology.

12. E.g., Lloyd-Jones 1983; Mueller 1984:3, 6, 27, 192; Fowler 1987:3–13; Stanley 1993:248; Rose 1992:23 n.41.

13. See note 2. Burkert 1992:5–6 links early dating by German scholars of the recording of Homeric poetry in writing with a desire to isolate it from the Oriental revolution (which he dates as 750–650). Powell 1997b argues for the relatively late creation of some myths, inspired by Eastern iconography, in the eighth and seventh centuries. This is undoubtedly correct to some extent, but can be exaggerated. For instance, Powell assumes

(176–177) an eighth-century date for Near Eastern siege engines as the inspiration for the conception of the Trojan horse, whereas a Bronze Age context is favored in the fuller discussion of this hypothesis by S. Morris 1995.

14. See Thomas 1992:102–103 for a critique of this view.

15. On the continuing predominance of oral culture, see Havelock 1982; Pfeiffer 1968:24ff.; Davison 1968:86–128; Nagy 1996b:32; and now in general esp. Harris 1989; Thomas 1992. Nagy 1996a convincingly posits the oral and performative nature of Homeric epic beyond the Archaic Age. For a fresh perspective on the dichotomy commonly made between orality and literacy, see Bakker 1997:7–32. The work of Milman Parry (1971) and Albert Lord (1960) is fundamental for the techniques of oral composition as manifested in the Homeric poems.

16. E.g., Powell 1997b stresses the dominance of epic poetry, an attitude not uncommon in Homeric criticism.

17. The variety in types of song mentioned in the Homeric poem (surveyed at Davison 1968:90–92; Thomas 1992:105–106; Ford 1997b:400–401) suggests that pre-Homeric poetry existed in genres other than epic. See further M. West 1973:179; Nagy 1974; 1979:222–264; 1990b:17–51; Fowler 1987:9–12; Hurwit 1985:137–138; Suter 1993:8 n.2; Rose 1992:46; Thalmann 1998:87.

18. Dalby 1998:197–198 establishes the normality of amateur poetry composition through comparative evidence. Plato *Rep.* 377c refers to stories being told to children by female caregivers (on which see Dowden 1992:53); Skinner 1993 convincingly demonstrates the probability of oral mythological traditions among ancient Greek women. Folktale aspects of Homeric epic are discussed in Chapter 2 in reference to the Cyclops episode in the *Odyssey.* On nonpoetic traditions as a source for iconography, see R. Cook 1983; Snodgrass 1979:119–120; 1998:9–10. Lowenstam 1997:26, 37, 55 helpfully comments on Cook's vague use of the term "folk tale." On the categorization of traditional narrative, see Bascom 1984; Dowden 1992:6–7; Graf 1993:6–8; Hansen 1997:444–445.

Chapter One: The Epic Cycle and the Tradition of the Trojan War

1. Opinion has varied on exactly what poems outside of the Trojan War section were included in the Cycle. See Davies 1986:96–97.

2. The most recent collections of what we know about the Epic Cycle are Bernabé 1987 and Davies 1988a. The Bernabé edition, though not without its quirks, provides the most information. The planned accompanying commentary for the Davies edition has not appeared, but other notable contributions by Davies include a slim volume (1989a) that surveys the fragments and a "*prolegomena*" (1986) that displays very learned scholarship. See Appendix A for a translation of the summary by the ancient scholar Proclus of the Trojan War poems in the Cycle.

3. Testimonia on dates and authors can be found in Bernabé and Davies 1988a; cf. the convenient graph in Notopoulos 1964:38.

4. Cf. Murray 1934:297–299; T. Allen 1924:249–270; Davison 1962:236; Pfeiffer

1968:43–44, 73; Bernabé 1987:2–3; Most 1990:48–49; Nagy 1990b:78–79; Richardson 1993:25–35.

5. E.g., in Athenaeus and Pausanias; see Murray 1934:342–343.

6. In the recent edition by Bernabé they are presented as if valid without explanation. T. Allen 1924:69–71 argued that ancient scholarship belatedly but accurately established who the true authors were. Although I take a skeptical stance, at times I consider the ascriptions in conjunction with other historical evidence for establishing the date or location of the poems.

7. See *Cypria* test. 2–3, 7, *Aethiopis* test. 6, *Little Iliad* test. 8 Bernabé; *Cypria* test. 1, 3–4, 7, *Little Iliad* test. 1 Davies.

8. Cf. Merkelbach 1969:138–141; Lloyd-Jones 1973. Aelian reports that one of the stories was known to Pindar (*Cypria* test. 2 Bernabé = 1 Davies), which is best regarded as dubious.

9. See Lefkowitz 1981:16, 21–22. Nagy 1979:279–288, 296–316; 1990b:75–76 discusses such stories not as historical truth, but as mythological attempts to find a connection between Cyclic and Homeric traditions.

10. Davies 1986:100. Dihle 1970:146 suggests that they were historical poets who composed not the poems in the Epic Cycle but oral prototypes of them. Kullmann 1960:215; 1986:116–117 reasons that it would be unusual to attribute both the *Aethiopis* and the *Iliou Persis* to Arctinus if names were being grasped out of thin air.

11. E.g., Jouan 1980:90, 100–101 uses artwork as termini ante quem for the poems of the Epic Cycle; Powell 1991:221 claims that the earliest "Cyclic" artwork establishes a terminus ante quem for the Homeric poems; and recently Scaife has linked early representations with the *Cypria.* For effective opposition to the direct linkage between "Cyclic" representations and poems, see Davies 1989b:100 n.64; Snodgrass 1998:38, 116; and M. West 1995:204 ("Artistic representations of some episodes that were treated in the Cycle appear from the late eighth century B.C.E onwards, and it is sometimes argued that these presuppose the Cyclic poems, which themselves presuppose the *Iliad.* Utterly fallacious").

12. The attitude of Aristarchus toward the Cycle is illuminated by Severyns 1928; see also Kullmann 1960:18; Janko 1992:25–29. Aristarchus seems to have assumed that Homer is the root of all Greek literature, and that Homer invented most of the myth in his poems. Ballabriga 1990:6, 27 laments the lasting influence of Aristarchus in this regard, even among oralists; Wilamowitz 1884:374 ascribed the tendency to disparage the Epic Cycle to the influence of Aristarchus. Note that even Hesiod was considered one of the *neoteroi* by Aristarchus (see Severyns 1928:31ff.).

13. E.g., A. Lang 1893:348; Jebb 1905:153; T. Allen 1924:68–69, 75–76; Severyns 1928:313; Whitman 1958:85; Notopoulos 1964:36; Kirk 1962:286, 1985:4; Huxley 1969:144; Rankin 1972:41 n.15; Powell 1991:218; Hedreen 1991:328 n.105; Dowden 1996. Bernabé 1987 seems to follow the ancient dating for all the poems in his edition, a practice that Davies 1989c severely criticizes ("far too early" and "misleadingly dogmatic and specific dates," 5).

14. Davies 1986:93–100; 1989a:3–6 persuasively favors the skeptical view of Wilamowitz 1884:331–355 concerning ancient biography and dating of the Cyclic authors. A

skeptical view can also be found at Murray 1934:339–345; Forsdyke 1956:11; Lesky 1967:135; M. West 1996:531.

15. *Aethiopis* test. 1–4 Bernabé; test. 2 Davies.

16. E.g., Jebb 1905:153; A. Lang 1893:348; T. Allen 1908:88; Evelyn-White 1914:xxx; Severyns 1928:313. Cf. Forsdyke, who places Homer in the ninth century (1956:11), and the first Cyclic poems in the seventh (1956:121–122). Comparable now is Powell 1991:218. The date of the Homeric poems is discussed in Chapter 2.

17. E.g., Wade-Gery 1950:38, 55; Kirk 1962:69, 286; 1985:4; Coldstream 1977:343. Cf. Holmberg 1998:472 n.59, who supports a late-sixth-century date for the Cyclic poems on the assumption of a sixth-century "fixation" of the Homeric poems.

18. Wilamowitz 1884:366, whose argument as later developed by Wackernagel has recently been championed by Davies (see esp. 1989b, though at 1989a:5 he allows that there may have been earlier oral versions of the Cyclic texts, which he dates to the sixth century). The low dating is supported at Dihle 1970:148–149 and Lloyd-Jones 1973:118–119. Griffin 1977:39 n.9 finds it persuasive, but not necessarily for a date as late as the sixth century. Kullmann 1960:362–369 presented an opposing position, and at 1991:427 n.6 he states that the argument of Davies is inadequate. Bernabé 1987 lists linguistic and grammatical peculiarities for each poem at the beginning of his edition.

19. Davies 1989a:3; Janko 1982:200 and passim.

20. Janko 1982:171, and on the Homeric hymn, 152, 176. I do not necessarily support all aspects of his analysis, which I criticize in Chapter 2 in regard to his dating of the Homeric poems. Cf. Richardson 1974:52–56, who contests the argument, made by Wackernagel among others, that there are numerous Atticisms in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Jensen et al. 1999:23 points out that for Wackernagel Atticisms in the Homeric poems "were crucial for understanding the development of the epic tradition, while nowadays they are treated as a superficial oddity by most scholars."

21. Not that the practice has disappeared; see, e.g., Kirk 1962:179–210, 301–334. Dihle 1970:149 specifically compares Cyclic linguistic forms with "late" parts of the *Iliad*.

22. Nagy 1998a describes the Homeric Atticisms as evidence for an Athenian phase of a long-standing Homeric performance tradition (to be distinguished from peculiarities arising from transmission at Athens of a preexisting text).

23. For a discussion of the sources for the Greek settlement at Cyrene, see Osborne 1996:8–17.

24. *Telegony* test. 2 Bernabé = 4 Davies. Other reports have Eusebius ascribing the poem to Eugammon; see *Telegony* test. 1 Bernabé; 2 Davies.

25. *Telegony* test. 3 Bernabé = 3 Davies. Pausanias 8.12.5 mentions a *Thesprotis*.

26. *Telegony* fr. 3 Bernabé = 2 Davies; see Huxley 1969:172; Griffin 1977:43; M. West 1996:531, with Bernabé's notes to fr. 3 for earlier bibliography. On the Battiads, see Hdt. 4.159–165, 200–205, with Pind. *Pyth.* 4, 5.

27. Lord 1960:150, 156 seems to imply they were orally composed; Notopoulos more explicitly presents an argument that they were. Kirk 1966 criticizes his methodology for ascertaining oral composition (Davies 1989b:99 supports Kirk on this issue). At 1962:69,

97–98, 311 Kirk describes the style of the earlier Cyclic poems as a "decadent" oral one, with some characteristics of literate composition. Huxley 1969:151–152 cites ἀείδω, "I sing," in the opening lines of the *Little Iliad* (fr. 28 Bernabé = 1 Davies) as evidence for its oral composition.

28. Here I borrow terminology and concepts from Nagy's theory of the evolution of the Homeric texts (see esp. 1996a:109–110), discussed in Chapter 2. On performance traditions for the Epic Cycle poems, see esp. Nagy 1990a:70–79. Nagy suggests a performance tradition for the Homeric poems that continues past the Archaic Age. I assume that performance traditions for the Cyclic epics did not survive as long as Homeric performance traditions because of the gradual predominance of the Homeric poems within the epic tradition.

29. See Rzach 1922:2351; Bernabé 1987:5; Wilson 1983:39–40 for overviews of this issue. Scholars who favor a fifth-century date include Wilamowitz 1884:330; Murray 1934:340; T. Allen 1924:51–60; Vian 1959:88; Lesky 1967:136; Kullmann 1986:116; a second-century date, Monro 1901:341; Severyns 1928:75; Scheliha 1943:355; Lloyd-Jones 1973:119; Schein 1984:18 n.4. Severyns 1938: 2:68–69; 1953:122 demonstrates that Proclus did use the poems and did not work from a previous summary (as has been argued); at 1938: 2:91–92 he reckons that the poems disappeared between the second and sixth centuries C.E., since Pausanias indicates first-hand knowledge of the *Cypria* (10.31.2; *Cypria* fr. 30 Bernabé = 20 Davies) and John Philoponos (sixth century C.E.) in his commentary on the *Analytica posteriora* of Aristotle (Epic Cycle test. 2 Davies) indicates that the Cyclic poems had been lost before his time. See also Huxley 1969:123.

30. See Epic Cycle test. 13 Bernabé; test. 1 Davies; with more complete text at T. Allen 1912:95–98. On Photius in general, see Wilson 1983:89–119. The most intensive student of Photius and Proclus has been Severyns (1938, 1953). Appendix A gives the relevant Photius passages and the Proclus summaries in translation, or see Severyns 1938: 2:65–68 (Photius passages in French); Evelyn-White 1914 and Huxley 1969 (Proclus summaries).

31. The Cycle's theogony: cf. Hesiod's *Theogony,* Presocratic theogonies, and Orphic theogonies (see Bernabé 1987:8; Huxley 1969:19; M. West 1983:125–126; Kirk, Raven, and Schofield 1983:21–33). Slight variance in the title of the *Oedipodea* might mean there were multiple poems of this name; see Huxley 1969:41; Bernabé 1987:17. The *Thebais:* cf. the Ἀμφιαράου ἐξέλασις (*Thebais* test. 7, 8 Bernabé = fr. 9 Davies; see Torres-Guerra 1995). The *Cypria:* cf. a *Palamedeia* (fr. 42 Bernabé = "dubia et spuria" fr. 4 Davies). The *Aethiopis:* cf. an *Amazonia* (test. 12 Bernabé = 2 Davies); see also *Little Iliad* fr. 32 Bernabé, considered doubtful by Bernabé (M. West 1966b:22 doubts this verse is ancient). On the *Little Iliad,* see Huxley 1969:150; Bernabé 1987:72 for the possibility that there were many poems called *Little Iliad* (thus *Iliades Parvae* is used in Bernabé 1987; Davies 1989c:6 calls this an "eccentric" view). The *Nosti:* cf. the *Return of the Sons of Atreus* (frr. 4, 11 Bernabé = 8–9 Davies; notes at Bernabé 1987:93); see *Nosti* test. 2 Bernabé for multiple *Returns.* Also relevant is Clement's claim that the *Telegony* took material from a *Thesprotis* (*Telegony* test. 3 Bernabé = 3 Davies). In general see Murray 1934:341–343; cf. M. West's criticism (1971:67–69) of Huxley's repeated reference to variants.

32. Cf. Nagy 1990b:72, 76, who supposes that oral Cyclic traditions would have been contained within parameters established in self-conscious distinction to each other and the Homeric traditions. Nagy 1996a in general argues that authentic performance traditions for the Homeric poems would result in textual variance down through antiquity, whereas I am assuming a more rigid state of early fixed forms of the Cyclic poems. This is explainable as the result of Cyclic performance traditions dying out as the Homeric poems gradually became predominant within the epic tradition.

33. See Pavese 1998 for a wide-ranging study of rhapsodic epic. Performance by rhapsodes is seen as essential to the Homeric tradition in Nagy 1996a and is discussed in Jensen et al. 1999. The modern distinction between creative poet and rhapsode has been over-stressed; see Sealey 1957; Jensen 1980:112–124; Jensen et al. 1999:76; Nagy 1990a:42–43; 1990b:21–28; 1996a:60–74; 1996b:82–89; Pavese 64–65.

34. Cf. the interesting observation at E. Cook 1999:159 n.29 that in the course of *Odyssey* 8 material also found in the Trojan War poems of the Epic Cycle is narrated (or reflected) in chronological order; this is specifically related to Nagy's concept of "rhapsodic sequencing" (Nagy 1996a:71–73; 1999). It has often been observed that the *Iliad* presents a picture of the whole war through chronological arrangement of allusions to or reflections of pre-Iliadic and post-Iliadic narrative. Thus Homeric poetry itself reflects the conceptual basis of the Epic Cycle and arguably even makes use of a rhapsodic phenomenon in which the whole war is sketched out through the sequential performance of various portions of the story.

35. I borrow the phrase from Muellner 1996:52 (potential connections between the *Theogony* and the *Iliad* are interestingly explored at Muellner 1996:52–93).

36. For sources and discussion cf. Davison 1955; Jensen 1980; Jensen et al. 1999; Shapiro 1989:43–47; 1993; Janko 1992:29–32; Nagy 1992:42–53; 1996a:69–71, 77–80, 110–113; 1996b:73–75; 1999; Stanley 1993:264–296; Boyd 1994, 1995; Seaford 1994:148–153; Haslam 1997:82–83. I agree with Nagy's description of this "recension" as an important phase in the Homeric performance tradition, not the construction or editing of texts.

37. Thus Murray 1934:300; Friis Johansen 1967:235–236; Richardson 1993:27; Nagy 1996a:71; and (cautiously) Davison 1955:13.

38. See Wilamowitz 1884:362–364 (he is skeptical about the "Pisistratean recension" in general); Ford 1997a:87–88. Lycurgus in particular insists on the performance of Homeric poetry alone at the Panathenaic festival (*Leoc.* 102), and in his time this would have probably been understood as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey,* but the tradition of what happened two centuries earlier may have evolved over time, or even become misunderstood (cf. now the similar view at Haubold 2000:151 n.23).

39. See Burkert 1987:49–50, 60 n.44 ("This much is certain for simple practical reasons, though it is not always acknowledged: there never could be a question of reciting the complete text of the *Iliad* at a rhapsodic contest," 49). He adds that the "Panathenaic rule" does not necessitate performance of the whole of Homer, just narrative order. See also Boyd 1994; Ford 1997a:88. For the view that all of the Homeric poems were performed, see Stanley 1993:401 n.36; S. West and M. West at Jensen et al. 1999:70.

40. For this "rule," see the Platonic *Hipparchos* 228b and Diogenes Laertius 1.57, with the discussion at Nagy 1999:128–132. He notes at 130 n.23 that even if the "rule" were to be regarded as a single historical event, it would have occurred some time after Panathenaic performance of epic began.

41. Wolf 1985:146; Verrall 1910:164–196 argued that the Pisistratean recension included the manufacturing of the Epic Cycle. T. Allen 1924:76 denied it; Davies 1986:93 calls this theory "idle speculation." Jensen et al. 1999:27 (cf. 79) explores the possibility that Panathenaic performance involved the "whole story of the Trojan War" as presented from "individual forms of the well-known myths"; this is judged "very reasonable" by Cantilena at Jensen et al. 1999:47. Cf. Shapiro 1993:103; Burgess 1996:88; Ford 1997a:87–88. An *exclusion* of Cyclic poems in sixth-century Athens is seen by Shapiro 1993:104; Janko 1992:30–31; Snodgrass 1998:5. It may be that over time Cyclic poetry that had once been part of the festival became gradually excluded; thus Nagy at Jensen et al. 1999:67 speaks of Panathenaic epic performance as a "bottleneck" from which the Homeric poems emerge in a privileged position.

42. Epic Cycle test. 1, 8 Bernabé; 2 Davies. See Bernabé's note under test. 8 and Pfeiffer 1968:73; Davies 1986:94–95.

43. E.g., at Monro 1883:321–327; see further bibliography at Davies 1986.

44. See Nagy 1996b:38, 89–91 (cf. Nagy 1979:297–300), where reference is made to Pfeiffer (1968:73) remarks on a pre-Aristotelian "vulgate" concept of the epic genre as a cycle.

45. See M. West 1983:129 for the development of such an argument.

46. Monro 1883:328–334 denies that the term refers to the Epic Cycle, but see Severyns 1928:155–159; Pfeiffer 1968:230; Davies 1986:95; Blumenthal 1978. The scholia are gathered at Bernabé 1987:7–8.

47. Epigram 28 Pfeiffer (Epic Cycle test. 20 Bernabé = 5 Davies). See now Cameron 1995:387–412, ch. 14 "The Cyclic Poem," where it is argued that Callimachus is referring to the Cycle poems, not contemporaries.

48. *Ad Od.* 16.195, 17.25. See Bernabé 1987:99–100; Davies 1986:95.

49. For the proem see Bernabé 1987:64, or the apparatus in the Oxford Classical Text or the new Teubner edition of the *Iliad.* M. West 1966a:49–50; 1983:129; 1996 bases his argument for the manufacture of the Cycle in the Hellenistic period on this evidence. See also Davies 1986:93 n.21, 95; "often (and reasonably) interpreted as linking *Iliad* and *Cypria*" (95).

50. Muellner 1996:97 describes the proem known to Aristoxenus as a multiform which was not the result of "some secondary editorial intervention" (he presents detailed analysis of its correspondences in epic diction and formula at 97 n.10).

51. See M. West 1983:124–126; Davies 1986:104–109; 1989a:7–8.

52. See Wilamowitz 1884:360–361; A. Lang 1893:327–328; Monro 1883:326–327.

53. John Philoponos (sixth century C.E.) in his commentary on the *Analytica posteriora* of Aristotle (Epic Cycle test. 2 Davies). See Severyns 1928:75–76; 1938.2:91.

54. Cf. Bernabé 1987:75 (who prints the text); Davies 1988a:53.

55. Sadurska 1964 is the standard edition and study; relevant text can be found in the recent editions of the Epic Cycle as testimonia.

56. Sadurska 1964:29; see Bernabé 1987:87. Horsfall 1979 gives a skeptical treatment of the reference to Stesichorus; countered at Malkin 1998:191. Kopff 1983 regards the Iliac tables as a variant branch of the Epic Cycle tradition. See also van Rossum-Steenbeek 1998 for a study that focuses on papyri containing hypotheses of literary works, with occasional reference to the Iliac tables and some of the encyclopedic works just discussed.

57. The most thorough edition of the Proclus summaries is Severyns 1963; see also the editions listed at the beginning of References.

58. The headings can be found in the editions by Severyns, Allen, and Davies. Changes may have been made to these, and a slight interpolation to the introduction to the *Aethiopis* seems to have been added. See Severyns 1953:245–252, who argues that two different hands are responsible, the second being Arethas. Cf. Davies 1986:102–103.

59. See Scaife 1995, who well distinguishes between the post-Aristotelian disfavor into which the Cycle fell and its initial reception.

60. Severyns 1928:44; see this work in general for Aristarchus and the Epic Cycle.

61. At Cameron 1995:387–412, ch. 14, "The Cyclic Poem," it is argued that the criticism of Callimachus resembles Aristarchus (directed at non-Homeric aspects of language and style) more than Aristotle.

62. Horace complains (*Ars P.*136ff.) about the "scriptor cyclicus" and quotes lines that are similar to the proem ascribed to the *Little Iliad* (fr. 28 Bernabé = 1 Davies). Monro 1884:332–333 argues that Horace is speaking of contemporaries, not poets of the Epic Cycle (cf. Epic Cycle test. 25 Bernabé), but most (e.g., Pfeiffer 1968:230; Davies 1986:95; Cameron 1995:395) assume Horace is referring to the Epic Cycle. Brink 1971, ad loc. points out that this proem is not exactly like that of the *Little Iliad,* but thinks Horace is speaking of poets of the Epic Cycle with Aristotle *Poetics* ch. 23 in mind. Pollianus echoes Callimachus but may imply a different type of criticism: see Cameron 1995:396–399.

63. See Wilamowitz 1884:374 for pithy criticism of the modern attitude, which he ascribes to the influence of Aristarchus. See also Scaife 1995; Holmberg 1998:459–461, 471–473. There are too few fragments to justify scorn of Cyclic poetry, as Nagy 1996b:22 points out. That the scholia sometimes describe phraseology within the Homeric poems as "Cyclic" suggests that the gulf between Homeric and Cyclic was exaggerated.

64. Herodotus 2.117; *Cypria* fr. 14 Bernabé = 11 Davies. Sidon was sacked in 677, but one cannot use this evidence to place the *Cypria* or the Homeric poems before that date (see Burkert 1976:20).

65. Thus Monro 1901:344; T. Allen 1908:81–82; Davies 1989a:41; Bernabé 1987:52–53 (after well summarizing other interpretations).

66. The mythological handbook is probably incorrectly ascribed to the Athenian Apollodorus of the second century B.C.E., but can be dated to the first or second century C.E. For what is worth, Dictys, who can be dated to the second century C.E. or later, also agrees with the version in Proclus, whereas a relatively quick journey for Paris, as

Herodotus reports for the *Cypria,* is found in the fourth century B.C.E. orator Alcidamas (*Od.* 13ff.) and in the fifth century C.E. epic poet Colluthus (*Rape of Helen* 387–388).

67. Murray 1934:343; Huxley 1969:134. Huxley refers to the attribution of the poem by Demodamas to Kyprias of Halikarnassos (reported by Athenaeus, *Cypria* test. 8 Bernabé = test. 12, fr. 4 Davies). Kyprias is mentioned as the author of an *Iliaka* in a new inscription from Halikarnassos (see Isager 1998; Lloyd-Jones 1999a, 1999b); cf. also *Cypria* test. 9 Bernabé = fr. 7 Davies, with remarks at Lloyd-Jones 1999a:11. Huxley (1967) argues on the basis of ancient testimony about Kyprias of Halikarnassos that Herodotus is referring to a variant of the *Cypria.* This theory remains problematic, however. Intriguingly, a scholiast to Lycophron and a scholiast to the *Iliad* refer to *authors* of the *Cypria* (quoted at Severyns 1938: 2:94, who sees nothing more than carelessness or ignorance).

68. Severyns specifically explains this contradiction between Proclus and Herodotus at 1953:282 as part of a larger argument.

69. See Kullmann 1960:190–192; Severyns 1928:285ff.; *Cypria* fr. 19 Bernabé = "fragmenta incerti loci" 4 Davies, with their notes. In art the Scyros episode is first represented in the fifth century B.C.E. and only popular in Roman art (see *LIMC,* "Achilleus," nos. 94–185).

70. There is a story of a contest between Arctinus and Lesches reported by Clement *(Aethiopis* test. 5, *Little Iliad* test. 4 Bernabé), which Huxley 1969:159 and T. Allen 1908:85; 1924:73–74 surprisingly treat as factually based. Nagy 1990b:76 treats this not as historical truth but as myth that reflects rivalry between traditions. But as I noted earlier, I disagree with Nagy's (1990b:72–80) portrayal of oral Cyclic traditions operating within the boundaries that we find in Proclus.

71. Fr. 5 Bernabé = 1 Davies. See Monro 1883:319; Huxley 1969:149; Davies 1989a:60.

72. See fr. 9–22 Bernabé; fr. 11–23 Davies.

73. Fr. 21 Bernabé = 20 Davies; quoted by Tzetzes *ad* Lycophron 1268, who also reports that Aeneas was a captive of Neoptolemus in the *Little Iliad ad* Lycophron 1232 (Bernabé 1987:81; *Little Iliad* "dubia" fr. 1 Davies). The scholiast to Euripides *Andr.* 14 attributes the second half of this fragment (6–11), which includes Aeneas as captive, to the Hellenistic poet Simias. "One of the great insoluble mysteries associated with the Epic Cycle": Davies 1989a:72. The implication that Aeneas will not relocate the Trojan race seems idiosyncratic, but see Malkin 1998:138–140 on pairings of Trojans and Greeks in traditions of the "returns." For minor differences between Cycle poems, some of which are debatable, see Monro 1884:33–34. Hedreen 1996 points out the falsity of the distinction, based on iconographical evidence, of *Little Iliad* and *Iliou Persis* traditions about the recovery of Helen.

74. Cf. Seaford 1994:146–147 on the vulnerability of the endings of epics.

75. Else prints his text of this passage at 580 with two sets of brackets, having decided that interpolations were made by two different hands under the influence of Proclus; he explains his reasoning at 1957:588–593.

76. Thus Bethe 1966:69–70; Monro 1901:366; Davies 1989a:66.

77. *Little Iliad* fr. 28 Bernabé = 1 Davies. The antiquity of the verse is testified by fifth-century inscriptions found in the north Black Sea area, discussed further at in Chapter 3.

78. Bethe 1966:64–65; Monro:1901:364; Kullmann 1981:39–40 suggest this proem is meant to introduce the final fall of Troy, not the whole war. Bernabé lists it under "alterius Iliadis Parvae vel aliarum Iliadum Parvarum fragmenta," supposing that the *Little Iliad* cited is not the *Little Iliad* in the Cycle (he considers a different fragment [fr. 1 Bernabé] to be the proem of this *Little Iliad*).

79. Sinn MB 32 (see comments at p. 53); cf. *Little Iliad* test. 1 Bernabé; 7 Davies.

80. In the edition by Allen the summary of Proclus is actually "tacitly reshuffled" (Davies 1986:100) in order to obviate this difficulty.

81. As Gregory Nagy suggests to me. Davies 1989a:76 suggests that trouble at sea was foretold at the time of the sack of Troy.

82. See Jensen et al. 1999: esp. 14–20. Controversy over the origins of Homeric "book" division (to use conventional modern terminology for the separate scrolls used in antiquity) is discussed below.

83. See Severyns 1953: esp. 279–284, 341–346 (cf. 1928:245, 325, 357–358); Davies 1986:96, 101–104. Although the scholarly and painstaking arguments of Severyns are useful, Davies goes too far in presenting his explanation of apparent divergences between Proclus and the testimonia as a certainty.

84. Severyns 1953:122, 281; Davies 1986:101–102. On the intransitive use of ἐπιβάλλει in the text (thus it is not a third-person reference to Proclus), see Severyns 1953:122; Davies 1986:102.

85. Severyns 1953:282 specifies these endings in his explanation of the discrepancy between Proclus and the testimonia.

86. See Bernabé 1987:5; Davies 1986:107–109. Wilamowitz 1884:331; Rzach 1922:2352–2353; Murray 1934:353; M. West 1996:531; Lesky 1966a:81 have thought that Proclus did not know the poems; T. Allen 1908:68–74; 1924:56; Davies 1989a:7–8 have thought that he did. The question of the date of Proclus is closely linked with this issue, for it is usually suspected that the poems no longer survived in the fifth century.

87. To some degree I here follow Monro 1883:316–321 (see also J. Kakridis 1949:90), whom Davies 1986:96 strongly opposes.

88. See, besides the summary of Proclus passim, *Titanomachy* test. 2 Bernabé = fr. 8 Davies; *Nosti* fr. 11 Bernabé = 8 Davies (Athen. 7.277d, 9.399a respectively) for ancient testimonia on Cyclic book division. Presumably the references to Cyclic books refer to the recording of units of the poems on separate scrolls. Huxley 1969:126 argues that book divisions for the Cycle would not have been made before the Hellenistic era.

89. Monro 1883:314 translates this phrase similarly. There is no article before book numbers in Proclus except in reference to those of the *Nosti.*

90. Monro 1883:316. If the ποιήματα ("poems") that Proclus says are still preserved in his day were the earlier fixed forms of the poems (independent of the Cycle), then he would be well aware of the discrepancy between the earlier fixed forms of the poems and the selections of them in the Epic Cycle. If Proclus is instead affirming that the Epic

Cycle still existed in verse form, then he may not have been aware that the Cycle did not contain the entirety of the earlier fixed texts of the Cyclic poems. So even if one takes his wording to refer to the total number of books in the poems, his authority for this may well be questioned.

91. For an excellent survey of the issue, see Jensen et al. 1999. E.g., Hdt. 2.116 refers to the exploits of Diomedes, Thuc. 1.10 to the catalog of ships, and Plato *Ion* 539b to battle at the wall as if these were independent units. For further references, see Jensen et al. 1999:10. Many such passage titles are collected at Aelian *VH* 13.14, translated at Nagy 1996b:78. It has also been suggested that the inscription identifying a sixth-century vase image (discussed in Chapter 2) as the games of Patroclus should be included in this category (Shapiro 1989:44; Jensen et al. 1999:10).

92. See esp. Nagy 1996a:181–184, with his remarks at Jensen et al. 1999:64–68. Nagy recognizes that performance units would have varied from the canonical book divisions the further one goes back in time and suggests (1996b:88 n.72, and Jensen et al. 64) that rhapsodic performance corresponding to the canonical book divisions was subsequent to an earlier threefold division of the Homeric poems for performance. This division has often been entertained, notably in recent times by Taplin 1992 (further bibliography collected at Jensen et al. 1999:26 n.25). Ford 1997a argues that the Homeric poems are so lengthy that necessarily parts of them would have been performed independently.

93. Paus. 10.25.5–9; Athen. 7.277d, 9.399a. At one time it was suspected, rather unreasonably (e.g., by Wilamowitz 1884:338–346), that these authors were lying when they spoke as if they had read the poems themselves, not summaries.

94. Cf. Kopff's thesis (1983) that there existed a branch of transmission ("H") that was more faithful to the early dimensions of the Cyclic poems than a manipulated branch of transmission ("C") represented by such evidence as Proclus and the Iliac tables.

95. See Monro 1883:316–317; Rzach 1922:2377; Murray 1934:341 (who effectively ridicules the notion of a cooperative venture). The assumption that Proclus presents an early state of the poems' dimensions can lead to misleading conceptions. E.g., T. Allen 1908:85; 1924:72 faults the Cyclic poets for awkward endings and beginnings, though these should not be ascribed to them. Cf. the unrealistic proposition at Severyns 1928:324–25, 356–358; 1953:324–325 that the poet of the *Little Iliad* intentionally duplicated the contents of the *Aethiopis* and the *Iliou Persis* when filling in the gap between them.

96. E.g., on the silver rhyton found at Mycenae, as discussed by Vermeule 1986:89. S. Morris 1989 provocatively links themes of the frescoes at Thera with Greek poetry; at 1997 she discusses the Trojan horse and the death of Astyanax by reference to Near Eastern iconography and traditions that she thinks originate in the Bronze Age.

97. See Dietrich 1965:294–296; Vermeule 1979:76–77, 160–162; R. Griffith 1998:215 (who pursues the thesis that Amenhotep III was the historical prototype for Memnon). Cf. Kullmann 1960:32–33. Onians 1951:397–398; Reinhardt 1961:386 downplay the possibility. In a forthcoming study I will explore thematic links between a Mycenaean fresco and the *psychostasia.*

98. Most thoroughly demonstrated at Boedeker 1974, followed at Nagy 1979:205 section 42 n.3; Slatkin 1991:28–33.

99. M. West 1988:151 provides a brief survey of Trojan War material in seventh-century literature.

100. See M. West 1973:191; 1988:151; Gentili 1988:37–38. The quotation is from M. West 1988:151.

101. Fr. S88–147, 196–205, 208–209 *PMGF*. Some recently found fragments of his have been interpreted as narrating the death and funeral of Achilles (Garner 1993). Pausanias 3.19.11–13, on the "palinode" of Stesichorus to Helen, might be interpreted as indicating that this poet composed about Leuke, the afterlife island of Achilles.

102. Fr. 282, 307, 291 *PMG*.

103. Fr. 11 West. Apparently lines 1–11 are about the death of Achilles; later at lines 15–18 Homer is praised, but in reference to material not found in the Homeric poems.

104. Snodgrass 1998:140–142, summarizing the results in Fittschen 1969; Kannicht 1982; R. Cook 1983; and Ahlberg-Cornell 1992. See also Notopoulos 1964:27; Snodgrass 1980:70–73; Jensen 1980:105–106; and Friis Johansen 1967:26–41, esp. 38–39 (Homeric scenes were "undeniably eclipsed" by "Cyclic" ones in early art), 228–229. Kirk's statements on this issue are very misleading. He (1962:285) has claimed that non-Homeric representations in art dominated only "between c. 680 and 640"; elsewhere he (1985:4) rather grudgingly notes that artists had an "equal or greater interest in subjects described not in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* but in poems of the Epic Cycle."

105. A few scholars are skeptical about the earliest corpse-carrying images (e.g., Kemp-Lindemann 1975:223–227; T. Carpenter 1991:206–207) because of a lack of inscriptions and because the corpse on one early example is identified as someone other than Achilles (*LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 863; Olympia B 236). But most find the identification likely; see esp. Kossatz-Deissmann 1981:192 and now Snodgrass 1998:36–38.

106. There are a large number of candidates for "Oresteia" images, but their interpretation is very uncertain. Often it is not clear whether the murder of Agamemnon or Aegisthus is portrayed. Besides the relevant *LIMC* articles, see Schefold 1993:151–154 and the thorough study by Prag 1985.

107. See now the discussion of Snodgrass 1998:12–66.

108. *LIMC,* "Odysseus," no. 193 (Munich N.I. 8696); "Alexandros," no. 56 (ill.; London, BM 1899.2-19.1). For sensible discussion, see Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:26–27; Snodgrass 1998:33–36.

109. Cf. Abramson 1979; Kearns 1989:41–42, 131, 205; Antonaccio 1995a:166–169; Schefold 1993:151. Abramson well summarizes and supports the thesis, originally made by Picard, that a hero cult for Phrontis existed at Sounion. Both he and Kearns rightly argue that the brief *Odyssey* passage must presuppose the cult (*pace* Antonaccio). The image would have been inspired by cult worship of Phrontis, for whom we can hypothesize a concurrent mythological and cult existence. The brief allusion in the *Odyssey* suggests that his story was known in pre-Homeric myth.

110. Schefold 1993:10, 105, 363 n.1 champions the Heracles interpretation, but with no cogent arguments.

111. The original publication, with a mythological interpretation, is Brann 1959. Cf. Fittschen 1969:23–26 and Schefold 1993:146–147 for the acrobatic and mythological interpretation respectively. Reconstructions that follow the two interpretations are placed side by side at Biers 1987:107 fig. 5.1. I thank Maria Shaw for discussing the iconographical details with me (she favors a nonmythological interpretation).

112. Kannicht 1982:82–84. Recent detailed analyses that are also optimistic about these identifications on the Mykonos pithos include Hurwit 1985:173–176; Osborne 1998a:53–57 (but not "as episodes known from some version heard or read," 56); Stansbury-O'Donnell 1999:139–142. M. Anderson 1997:182–191 argues that only Helen is certainly shown on the Mykonos pithos; Touchefeu-Meynier 1984; S. Morris 1995:226 take a cautious stance on the early candidates for the death of Astyanax.

113. See Touchefeu-Meynier 1992a:967 for this iconographical aspect of Odysseus.

114. E.g., Friis Johansen 1967:51–57; Kossatz-Deissmann 1981 at *LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 437 (ill.); Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:64; Schefold 1993:120.

115. Thus Fittschen 1969:176; Brommer 1983:34; Stanley 1993:352. The infamous problem of the duels in *Il.* 9 has led some to suppose that an earlier version of the embassy to Achilles did not feature Phoenix. The tripod leg could arguably depict Ajax, Odysseus, and a herald on their way to Achilles. If so, I would consider this image to depict a non-Homeric episode later expanded in the *Iliad,* not a variant or original Iliadic scene. But attractive is Fehling's suggestion (1991:21 n.59) that the duels of book 9 reflect the embassy of Menelaus and Odysseus to Troy.

116. *LIMC,* "Menelaos," (vol. 8 suppl.) no. 9* (Vatican 35525 [Astarita 565]). See Scaife 1995:187–189 for discussion.

117. Thus Kemp-Lindemann 1975:157; Kossatz-Deissmann 1981 (at *LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 506*; cf. her comments at no. 509); Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:66–67. At Fittschen 1969 this work is included under the *Iliad* in the fold-out graph, yet uncertainty is expressed at 177. Barringer 1995:24 n.34 denies that the image need show Achilles and Thetis specifically.

118. The episode does not necessarily conflict with the tradition that Thetis left the house of Peleus when Achilles was an infant, for it would be easy for Thetis to visit Achilles periodically from the sea, as she does in the *Iliad* (see note 148 in Chapter 2).

119. Friis Johansen 1967:92–127, 257–260; Lowenstam 1993. Lowenstam makes several excellent observations about iconographical details, and one would be well advised to be aware that certainty cannot be reached. But he does not overturn the whole of Friis Johansen's argument, which has been accepted by, e.g., R. Cook 1983:2; M. Edwards 1990:317–321; 1991:156–157; T. Carpenter 1991:199–200; Schefold 1993:134; Snodgrass 1998:143–145, 149. Kossatz-Deissmann 1981:71–72, 122 largely accepts the theory. For a recent thorough study of depictions of the arming of Achilles, see Barringer 1995:17–48.

120. See Pestalozzi 1945:51–52; P. Kakridis 1961:288–290; M. Edwards 1991:140–141; Fehling 1991:45. P. Kakridis 1961:290 n.1 traces this conclusion back to analysts who considered the *Iliad*'s two sets a mistake of a redactor.

121. See Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:70–71, with bibliography at 70 n.23. Ahlberg-Cornell idiosyncratically argues that the image reflects both the "Cyclic" episode and the Iliadic incident. Cf. the argument of Schefold 1993:144 that the duel was narrated differently in the seventh century. Kossatz-Deissmann 1981 (*LIMC,* "Achilleus") under no. 846 doubts Achilles and Memnon are depicted; at 1992 (*LIMC,* "Memnon") 460 she hesitates to identify any work before the sixth century as Achilles and Memnon dueling.

122. The standard view is derived from an analogy to Patroclus in the *Iliad;* see Burgess 1997 for an argument against it.

123. I will explore this image and other early candidates for the duel between Achilles and Memnon in a future project.

124. Friis Johansen 1967:279–280; Gantz 1993:623 has recently agreed with this opinion.

125. Ferrari 1987, followed at Snodgrass 1998:102–103, proposes that the figures are a chorus and that the name represents the content of their song. Though this is an attractive argument, there are no examples of an inscription being used in such a manner at this time. The uniformity of the appearance for all the figures is unsurprising and does not argue against the depiction of Menelaus (cf. my discussion of Cyclops-blinding images in Chapter 2). For the theory that this and many other Protoattic artifacts originated in Aegina, where Doric was spoken, see S. Morris 1984.

126. Friis Johansen 1967:26, 32, 85; Schefold 1993:135; Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:63.

127. Similarly, Lowenstam 1992:184–186 argues that the later Sosias cup (*LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 468*; Berlin F 2278) which depicts Achilles healing a wounded Patroclus reflects the concerns of the *Iliad.* It is much more easily thought to depict an episode from the early years of the war not contained in our surviving literature. Kossatz-Deissmann 1981, at the entry to *LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 468*, supposes that it illustrates a scene from the *Cypria* (a view earlier held at R. Carpenter 1946:55; Kullmann 1960:193–194; see Lowenstam 1992:185 n.70 for further bibliography).

128. The order of its placement on my list in Appendix C does not necessarily imply that the image should be linked with his death by Memnon, though his defense of his father Nestor against Memnon was a well-known episode (see Burgess 1997).

129. A point emphasized at Jensen 1980:106; Snodgrass 1980:71; R. Cook 1983:2. For surveys of other epic material in early Greek art, see Fittschen 1969 and Ahlberg-Cornell 1992. That we do not know of early Greek epics that can account for his popularity in artwork leads to the conclusion that epic poetry in general was not a prime source for early Greek artists or even a dominant force in early Greek mythology.

130. Kannicht 1982:76 notes that some myths whose early date is testified by the Homeric poems are missing in early art; see also Snodgrass 1980:120–122; Burkert 1987:47 ("The parallelism of art and literature cannot be pressed"). A recurrent problem in Schefold's work is his insistence on dating the origin or nature of early Greek myth from their first manifestations in Greek art.

131. Though Kullmann 1960:100, 272 links it with the anger of Achilles toward Agamemnon at a feast in Tenedos, an episode of the *Cypria* (Proclus). See Nagy

1979:22–25 for discussion of it as a traditional tale. Some have taken it for ad hoc invention; see Hainsworth 1993a *ad* 8.75; Garvie 1994:249–250; Broeniman 1996 for recent overview and bibliography.

132. *LIMC,* "Achilleus," nos. 391–427. S. West 1988:89 suggests that these images "presumably reflect an episode in one of the Cyclic epics." Recently their relevance toward contemporary Athens has been suggested; see Kossatz-Deissmann 1981:103 for a survey of this and earlier interpretations.

133. E.g., the prominence of "Cyclic" opponents of Achilles at *Ol.* 2.81–83, *Isth.* 5.39–42, *Isth.* 8.54–55. On Pindar's use of "Cyclic" material, see King 1987:56–66, 122, esp. 66. Nisetich 1989 well demonstrates Pindar's respect for Homer, but his assumption (22) that Pindar could not value Cyclic poets that we do not value is problematic. It is possible that Pindar knew the poems of the Epic Cycle because society was becoming thoroughly literate in the fifth century , but I suspect that even for authors of his age the "Cyclic" tradition was not just a few texts. Nagy 1990b:414–437 argues that Pindar's use of "Cyclic" material is more than "merely borrowings from the Cycle" and suggests that Pindar is "drawing upon a continuum of epic tradition" (416).

134. Epic Cycle test. 18 Bernabé = 4 Davies. The anecdote implies that Sophocles used language found in the *Titanomachy.* See *Titanomachy* fr. 4 Bernabé = 8 Davies with Severyns 1938.2:88, and for the Sophoclean parallels, see the apparatus under *Titanomachy* fr. 4 in Bernabé 1987. For "Cyclic" material in Attic tragedy, see Jouan 1966; M. Anderson 1997:105–176.

135. Davies 1986:104–109 cautions that one cannot tell when Apollodorus turns to other sources.

136. The influence may be indirect and other sources are also probably used. In addition, Quintus employs an expansive style, employing Homeric poetry as his model, which undoubtedly results in significant departures from his sources. See Combellack 1968:8–9; Vian 1959:86–109, esp. 108–109. J. Kakridis 1949:75–83 bases a brilliant argument about pre-Homeric myth on information gained from Quintus.

137. For the principles of composition behind Dictys/Dares, see R. Frazer 1966:5–15; Usener. Of course, the conceit that their work represents contemporary documents of the Trojan War is a fraud. T. Allen 1924 has not found favor in his theory that they inherit a true tradition (ch. 7, "Dictys of Crete: The Heroic Chronicle"; 130–176); his compilation of similarities and variances between Dicty/Dares and the Cycle is useful, however. Kullmann 1960:70 n.9; Lord 1960:158 believe that there may be wheat among the chaff. For the principles of composition in Philostratus, see G. Anderson 1986.

138. Cf. Weitzmann 1959:31–39; Horsfall 1979:46–48; Kopff 1983:58.

139. Horsfall 1979; Webster 1964:104–108.

140. Good remarks on the ability to use post-Homeric evidence for pre-Homeric traditions can be found at Willcock 1973:4–5; Mueller 1984:28; Brillante 1990:113; Mondi 1990:157; Slatkin 1991:9–16. This methodology is essential to neoanalysis, discussed in Chapter 2.

Chapter Two: Homer and the Tradition of the Trojan War

1. Myth mentioned in the Homeric poems that is not about the Trojan War includes theogonic material (*Il.* 14.201 = 302), theomachic material (e.g., *Il.* 2.781–783, 8.479–481, 14.203–204, 20.54–66), the journey of the Argo ("well known to all," *Od.* 12.70; Jason is mentioned at *Il.* 7.469, 21.40–41, 23.746–747; *Od.* 12.72), the Theban Wars (*Il.* 4.370–410, 5.800–813, 14.110–127; *Od.* 11.326–327, 15.244–247), Pylian heroic warfare (*Il.* 7.132–157, 11.668–762, 23.630–643), the Calydonian boar hunt (*Il.* 9.527–549), Heracles (*Il.* 14.266, 324, 15.24–30, 640, 19.96–133, 20.144–148; *Od.* 8.224, 11.267, 601–627, 21.22–30), Theseus (*Il.* 1.265; *Od.* 11.322–324, 631), Perseus (*Il.* 14.320; cf. *Od.* 11.634–635), Bellerophon (*Il.* 6.155–255), Oedipus (*Il.* 23.679–680; *Od.* 11.271–280), Amazons (*Il.* 3.189, 6.186, perhaps 2.814 [see scholia ad loc. and Kullmann 1960:303]), and centaurs (*Il.*1.268, 11.832).

2. See Kullmann 1960:5–11 for a complete list of events from the Trojan War to which the *Iliad* possibly alludes. T. Allen 1924:75–76 lists passages from the *Odyssey* that refer to material found in the Epic Cycle. Cf. Finkelberg 1998:79–80.

3. A classic defense of the authenticity of the judgment of Paris passage, and indeed a demonstration of how the myth is essentially interwoven into the whole of the *Iliad,* is Reinhardt 1997 (a recent translation); see also Davies 1981. I do not see how Powell's implication (1997b:178, 182, 189), on iconographical grounds, that the judgment of Paris is relatively late can be easily squared with his argument (1991) for the fixation of the *Iliad* at an early date.

4. See Kullmann 1960:18–21 for a survey of this type of argument, which is exemplified at, e.g., Rzach 1922.

5. Wade-Gery 1950:2, 84 n.109, 85 n.114; Forsdyke 1956:12–13, 26, 97, 111, 131. The end of the *Odyssey* (23.297ff.) has often been suspected to be an interpolation which reflects the *Aethiopis* tradition; for defense of it, see Heubeck 1992:313–314, 353–355, with bibliography on the issue.

6. Willcock 1964, 1977; Braswell 1971; Jones 1992, 1995. March emphasizes creativity in early Greek poetry in general. Andersen 1990 represents the extreme to which this line of thought can lead ("The epic poem does not 'refer to' and is not 'based on' tradition," 44). For corrective discussion, see Nagy 1996b:113–146; 1998b:84–85; Slatkin 1991:115–122; M. Edwards 1990:313; Muellner 1996:118 n.54.

7. As Willcock 1964:147; 1977:44 n.12, 53; Braswell 1971 admit. Willcock's supposition (1964:143 n.2) that the past adventures of Nestor are invented is his only extensive alleged example of ad hoc invention, and I think he is mistaken in this.

8. Recently expressed by a majority of authors in *NCH*; also espoused by, e.g., Webster 1958:208–208; Kirk 1962:282–287; 1985:1–10; Heubeck 1974:71–73; Janko 1982, 1998; Latacz 1966:56–65; Graham 1995; Rutherford 1996b:17–18. Powell 1991:187–220 argues for a date of ca. 800; Malkin 1998:266 favors a ninth- or even tenth-century recording.

9. M. West 1995:204 points out that this sequence was not always followed in antiquity. The variety in types of song mentioned in the Homeric poems suggests that pre-Homeric poetry existed in genres other than epic.

10. See esp. I. Morris 1986, 1997; Raaflaub 1991, 1997, 1998b, for speculation on the reflection of eighth-century society in the Homeric poems. It is revealing that both have recently submitted to the lowering of the date of the Homeric poems to the seventh century (Raaflaub 1998b:170, 177, 188; Morris in a seminar at the University of Toronto, December 1998). There are undoubtedly eighth-century elements in the Homeric poems, but the unlikelihood of a uniform "Homeric society" has been effectively demonstrated at Snodgrass 1974; E. Sherratt 1990; Olson 1995:184–204; Seaford 1994:5–6; Osborne 1996:147–153. See also Cartledge as quoted at Raaflaub 1998b:169.

11. Notably Adkins 1960; Redfield 1975. Muellner 1996:51 notes that a coherent Homeric social system may very well serve as an alternative to the real world.

12. See esp. the recent, thorough discussion by Crielaard 1995, who concludes that "all in all, a date of the Homeric world in the early seventh century seems possible" (274). For seventh-century dating of the Homeric poems, cf. R. Carpenter 1946:179; Kullmann 1960:381; 1981:30; 1995; 1999; M. West 1966a:46; 1995; Burkert 1976:5–21; 1987:44; 1992:204 n.32; S. West 1988:33–34, 192, 198; Taplin 1992:31–33; van Wees 1994; 1997:692; E. Cook 1995:3 n.9 (for initial orally dictated text); Dickie 1995; Osborne 1996:159.

13. Bibliography is enormous on these and following issues; I suggest recent or important treatments, where further bibliography can be found. Gorgon shield device: cf. Powell 1991:202–204; Hainsworth 1993a ad loc.; M. West 1995:210; *LIMC,* "Gorgo, Gorgones." Brooch: cf. Lorimer 1950:511–514; Russo 1992 ad. loc.; Powell 1991:200–210. Athena's lamp: cf. Lorimer 1950:509–510; Russo 1992 ad loc.; Powell 1991:201–202; E. Cook 1995:163–165.

14. Hoplite warfare: cf. Powell 1991:204–205; van Wees 1994, 1997; M. West 1995:209; Osborne 1996:151–152, 175–176. Polis: Nagy 1979:116; Hurwit 1985:73–85; Scully 1990:100–112; Seaford 1994; Crielaard 1995:239–247; Raaflaub 1997:629–633. Panhellenic sites (*Il.* 9.404–405; 11.697–701; *Od.* 6.162–165; 8.79–82): Dickie 1995:37–38; Crielaard 1995:257–258.

15. On geography, see Dickie 1995:34–50; Crielaard 1995:224–235. In Chapter 3 I focus on the Black Sea. On the *Odyssey* in particular, cf. R. Carpenter 1946:90–111 and S. West 1988:33–34, 192, 198 (who suspect seventh-century reflections); Graham 1995 and Malkin 1998 (who focus on eighth-century colonization).

16. M. West 1995:211–218, opposed at Janko 1998:1 n.5. West is concerned with narrowing down the time period for when the *Iliad* was created and recorded, whereas I would prefer to think that the Archaic Age was just one background of a long, drawn-out creative process in the Homeric poetic traditions. Cf. Burkert's argument (1976) that Achilles' reference to Egyptian Thebes dates the *Iliad* after 663, which is open to objections: the city's second-millennium glory might well have persisted as a traditional motif, and it cannot be regarded as certain that the city became a byword for wealth only after its destruction.

17. Notably Whitman 1958:87–101. See Canciani 1984:79 n.359 for bibliography and 79–83 for an overview. The argument has recently been accepted at Hurwit 1985:93–106; Schein 1997:348; Stansbury-O'Donnell 1999:40–42, 60–63, esp. 200 n.53. More promis-

ing, in my view, are the interesting parallels that Mackay makes between the oral compositional techniques of epic and the iconography of vase painting in the late seventh and sixth centuries (Mackay 1995; Mackay, Harrison, and Masters 1999).

18. Besides the shield of Achilles, notable examples of Homeric ecphrasis are the battles that Helen represented in her weaving (*Il.* 3.125–128), the monsters and slaughter on the baldric of Heracles (11.609–614), and the hound and fawn on the brooch of Odysseus (*Od.* 19.226–231). See Crielaard 1995:216–217 for a survey of representational art in the Homeric poems. He correctly stresses the life-like nature of Homeric artifacts and representations, of which the robots of Hephaestus (*Il.* 18.417–421) are a memorable example. Comparable are the moving parts of the Trojan horse in the *Iliou Persis* (fr. 2 Bernabé = 2 Davies; see Faraone 1992:102–104), even if Davies 1989a:78 characterizes this as "yet one more instance of the Epic Cycle's predilection for the fantastic, the miraculous and the picturesque." In my view the energy of Homeric ecphrasis invites comparison to Orientalizing artistic style, and the multiplicity of scenes on the shield of Achilles invites comparison to sixth-century works such as the chest of Kypselos and the François vase.

19. Snodgrass 1998:40–66. Cf. Stansbury-O'Donnell 1999:40–42, 60–63.

20. On these issues see esp. Fittschen 1973, who sees a connection with "Homer's age" rather than with the Bronze Age. See now also M. Edwards 1991:200–209 and M. West 1995:210; 1997:99–101, 389–90; Crielaard 1995:217–219, who generally favor early-seventh-century analogues. Burkert 1992:104 compares the narrative imagery of a seventh-century Cypriote bowl to Homeric narrative in general. The technique of metal-inlay described for Achilles' shield has reminded scholars of the well-known Mycenaean daggers, and some consider the *kyanos* referred to in adjective form at *Il.* 18.564 to be the dark niello of the Mycenaean period (*ku-wa-no* is found on a Linear B text; see Chadwick and Ventris 1973:340, 344), but it could refer to the later blue glass paste.

21. For specific Athenian elements in the Homeric poems, see further Sealey 1957:346–348; Jensen 1980:167–171; E. Cook 1995:161–170. The seated statue of Athena (*Il.* 6.90–92) has been thought late (even Panathenaic), but see Kirk 1990 ad loc.; Powell 1991:206. Also, Shive 1996 has demonstrated that the burial practice at 7.332–338 need not reflect fifth-century Athens.

22. Cf. Chapter 1; the argument for late-developing Homeric epics has been strongly espoused (in very different ways) by, e.g., Sealey; Jensen 1980; Jensen et al. 1999; Ballabriga 1990; Stanley 1993:279–296; Seaford 1994:148–153; E. Cook 1995; Nagy 1996a:107–206; 1996b:29–112.

23. Janko's conclusions are expressed at 1982:196 with graph at 200. Hoekstra 1986; Ballabriga 1990:27; M. West 1995:204–205; Clay 1997a:490–492 provide critiques of his methodology. To be fair, Janko is certainly not unaware of these issues; see esp. 1982:5–26, 81–87, 191–193.

24. As Taplin 1992:33 n.39 notes. M. West 1995:218–219 is now willing to jettison the "unreliable premises" (219) of his similar dating of Hesiod by reference to the Lelantine War (1966a:41–46).

25. See Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:154–155 for discussion.

26. Cf. Hampe 1981 (*LIMC,* "Aktorione"). Of the many scenes that show the twins fighting a man, he identifies Nestor in only one (*LIMC,* "Aktorione," no. 3*; Athens Ag. P 4885); usually he interprets the man as Heracles or believes no identification can be made. Snodgrass 1998:17–20, 26–33 thinks that several candidates do represent the mythical Aktorione/Molione, but questions Ahlberg-Cornell's Iliadic interpretation.

27. Ahlberg-Cornell 1992 is no more convincing when she argues that a stand from ca. 710 (Munich 846) has one scene that depicts Ajax dueling Hector and another that shows them exchanging gifts (58–62). Snodgrass 1998:78–82 doubts the Iliadic interpretation, and in a future project I will pursue the Achilles/Memnon interpretation first suggested by the stand's publisher. But if Ajax and Hector are depicted, once again we could not necessarily conclude that the *Iliad* was the inspiration.

28. Notably, a comparison of her conclusions with those of Fittschen 1969, Kannicht 1982, and R. Cook 1983 at 158–164, and extensive tables and graphs on chronological appearance, geographical location, and material of the art (192–215).

29. Kirk 1962:284–85, pl. 5A (with comments). He suggests its date is 735; a date of ca.720 is now commonly assigned to it.

30. The thesis of Friis Johansen 1961 has been rejected by art historians; see Fittschen 1969:39–41; Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:28–29; Snodgrass 1998:20–22, 26. Yet Lesky 1967:78 thought the thesis possible, Silk 1987:4 calls the jug the "most plausible" eighth-century representation of the *Iliad,* and Kirk 1985:4 in the first volume of the new commentary on the *Iliad* still raises it as a possibility.

31. Schefold 1993:141 thinks it was a traditional story. Kullmann 1960:82 argues that the duel in book 7 was invented for the *Iliad* in imitation of the duel between Paris and Menelaus, citing older bibliography. Finkelberg 1998:135 seems to think that the inconclusiveness of both duels is a sign of their untraditional nature.

32. Fittschen 1969:172–177 considers several possibilities but concludes that there are no certain representations of the *Iliad* before the late seventh century. He is tempted to think that two art scenes before that time could be about the *Iliad,* though he admits he is uncertain about their interpretation. It is noteworthy that Kannicht follows Fittschen 1969 in his discussion of epic in early art but cannot agree with any of his proposals for depiction of the *Iliad* before the end of the seventh century. Friis Johansen 1967 (revised translation of a 1934 monograph) cannot positively identify any scenes as Iliadic before that time.

33. Snodgrass 1998:141, in reference to Fittschen 1969; Kannicht 1982; R. Cook 1983; and Ahlberg-Cornell 1992; in the following pages he calculates their findings statistically. Yet recognition of this broad agreement should not obscure the great need for the study by Snodgrass, though this has been doubted in some early reviews. In discussion of early Greek iconography the radically Homeric bias (e.g., Kannicht 1982 and Ahlberg-Cornell 1992) and the literature-dependant approach (e.g., Schefold 1966, 1992, 1993 and Shapiro 1994) are prominent still. Though in theory fine-art historians now routinely reject the need to link images to texts, in practice the association of iconography with Homer is often overwhelmingly tempting.

34. In a series of monographs Schefold has essentially surveyed all of the mythological field. Immediately relevant is his work on Greek myth in early Greek art down to 550, translated in 1966 and in turn updated and expanded in 1993; his study of late Archaic mythological iconography was translated in 1992. For a brief summary of his views, see 1993:9–10, with graph on p. 11.

35. Friis Johansen 1967:40, 223–243. Increased interest in the *Iliad* is similarly linked to Panathenaic performance at Davison 1955:14; Shapiro 1989:104; Pavese 1998:82. But see my subsequent discussion for a different view by Lowenstam.

36. Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:199–213 provides tables that include geography as a statistical element.

37. See Lowenstam 1992:166, 170, 184–186; 1997:24–25. His "Iliadic" analysis of the Sosias cup and the arming of Achilles might be attributed to a Homeric bias.

38. See esp. Lowenstam 1997; cf. 1992:168–169, 177–178, 187–188; 1993:216. At 1993:213 he cautiously questions "the general view" that "the Homeric tradition was more stimulating to the painters than the variant versions of the same stories."

39. Lowenstam 1997:39–44; *LIMC,* "Agamemnon," no. 52* (Paris, Louvre G 146).

40. Snodgrass 1998:69–70 lists twenty-two "memorable episodes" from the *Iliad;* about half of these I would label "Iliadic" rather than traditional. It is problematic for him to conclude from these calculations (143) that "approximately half of the great poetic moments of the Trojan story, down to the fall of Troy, were to be found in the *Iliad.*" In my view only a very small fraction of the traditional elements in the story, however these should be measured, are covered by the *Iliad.*

41. For a thorough discussion of the various reasons for differences between artistic and literary versions of stories, see Lowenstam 1992 (cf. Lowenstam 1997:49–50).

42. Lowenstam 1992:170 n.18; 1997:26, 66. Scaife 1995 also sees artists dependent on poetry (see esp. 185–186), especially in this case the *Cypria;* Kannicht 1982:73 vividly demonstrates the common fallacy that myth equals language equals epic poetry.

43. For instance, the Chalcidian vase (Melbourne 1643-D4) that Lowenstam discusses at 1997:29–34, and the Corinthian hydria (Vatican 35617) that he discusses at 1997:35–37, 39, 51. For a discussion of a lost vase by the Inscriptions Painter (to whom the Melbourne vase is ascribed) that depicts the battle over the corpse of Achilles (*LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 850*), see Burgess 1995:226–227. I argue that the artist is precise about details concerning the traditional death of Achilles, but I would resist the view that details on the scene reflect a poem, e.g., the *Aethiopis.*

44. J. Kakridis and Pestalozzi, who reached their conclusions independently (see Kakridis 1949:65 n.1), are considered the originators of the school. Kakridis 1949:1–10 first coined the term *neoanalysis* and defined its method. Davison 1962:254–258 and Kullmann 1986:118ff. discuss Mülder and Welcker respectively as prototypical neo-analysts; see Kullmann 1960:18–28; 1981:6–7; 1991:428–429 for surveys of earlier scholars who influenced neoanalysts. For a concise summary of its arguments, see Willcock 1997. For more complete bibliography and explanation see Kullmann 1981, 1991; M. E. Clark 1986.

45. Kullmann 1991 includes these topics in an overview of *motivgeschichtliche Forschung*, the term that he proposes as a replacement for the term *neoanalysis*.

46. Schadewaldt 182 (cf. 454 n.2); J. Kakridis 1971:4, 23, 59, 65ff.; Heubeck 1978:13; Kullmann 1984:316. See Reinhardt 1961:20 for an opposing view.

47. See Nagy 1979:21–25.

48. See my critique of the neoanalytical "vengeance theory" (Burgess 1997).

49. See Combellack 1950, 1976 for a skeptical view on Homeric invention.

50. Thus, e.g., Woodhouse 1930:44, 46–53; S. West 1988:73. Combellack 1950:343–349 is skeptical, though. Clarke 1981:217–218 reviews the issue.

51. Yet Reece 1994, by exploring these lies as possibly traditional, demonstrates the uncertainty of deciding upon Homeric invention.

52. See esp. Scheliha (1943:220–222 on Hector), who is frequently cited by neoanalysts. At 388–389, 391–392 Scheliha provides further bibliography of previous scholars. Homeric invention is often favored by Homerists as a sign of Homer's genius: cf. Scott 1921:206–212; Bassett 1938:185–187 (Hector only); Wade-Gery 1950:36. For opposing arguments, see Combellack 1944; 1962:195–196 (on Hector); Whitman 1958:156; Reinhardt 1961:359–362 (on Hector); Fenik 1964:32 n.6; Schein 1984:14, 27–28 (who provides further bibliography at 42 n.57); Wathelet 1989:136–138 (on Hector and his family). Bibliography on Patroclus specifically is provided later.

53. Schadewaldt 1965:177 thinks both Hector and Patroclus are Homeric inventions. Kullmann 1960:42–44, 182–188 argues that Hector is a Homeric invention (but cf. 358–359). Dowden states in an article influenced by neoanalysis, "Neither Patroklos nor Hector seem to be figures particularly well embedded in the epic tradition" (1996:53).

54. Reinhardt 1961:360; Willcock 1983:483; Fehling 1991:12–13.

55. Thus in the *Cypria,* according to Proclus, and at Apollod. *Epit.* 3.30, Soph. fr. 497 Radt. Sometimes in myth the slayer is said to be someone else; see J. Frazer 1921: 2:198 n.1.

56. Kullmann 1960:273–274. This would seem to contradict his usual line of reasoning, in which specific actions in pre-Homeric myth are thought to be reflected vaguely by Homeric passages.

57. Kullmann 1960:204–220, 358–379 proposed that all the poems of the Epic Cycle except for the *Little Iliad* are pre-Homeric.

58. *LIMC,* "Hektor," no. 50* (Florence 4209, the François vase) and "Achilleus," no. 365* (Louvre E 638) both show Hector, inscribed, in this scene. Hector does not appear in earlier representations of this episode.

59. Touchefeu-Meynier 1988:482, 497. Schefold 1993:139–140 is wrong to portray an uninscribed generic departure scene on an early-seventh-century pithos (fig. 140, NM 17762) as Hector and Andromache with Astyanax (question mark given in the illustration caption); see M. West 1995:207 n.21; Touchefeu-Meynier 1988:930; Friis Johansen 1967:251. The first certain depiction of Hector with Andromache is in the sixth century; the first of the departure scene with Astyanax the fifth century: see *LIMC,* "Andromache I," nos. 3–6.

60. Page 1959:248–251. Combellack 1962:195–196 and Schein 1984:27 agree with him. Cf. Whallon 1979, who assumes a pre-Homeric Hector in discussing the development of his epithets.

61. Bethe 1929:76–83. Murray 1934:223–227 made the theory well known among English-speaking scholars, and it has been recently supported at Janko 1982:92. For older bibliography on this hypothesis, see Scheliha 1943:388–399, who doubts it. As a unitarian who championed Homeric invention, Scott 1921:218–222 vociferously opposed the theory. M. West 1988:159 n.62 notes that it is a difficult argument to maintain with assurance.

62. Cf. Scheliha 1943:388–399; Reinhardt 1961:360; Clarke 1981:215; Friis Johansen 1967:229–230; Robbins 1994:33–34.

63. It is a desperate argument to suppose that Astyanax was originally the son of a different royal figure at Troy, as Scheliha 1943:364; Kullmann 1960:187 n.4 suggest.

64. Kullmann 1960:186–188, 351–353. See also 1968:31 n.39. But even Scheliha 1943:110–111 saw that Astyanax is traditional, though this hampers her argument that Hector is a Homeric invention. Fehling 1991:29 affirms the intrinsic importance of the death of Astyanax for the story of the Trojan War.

65. Kullmann 1960:352–353 placed a question mark in parentheses next to his citations of the report by Proclus that Astyanax and Andromache were in the *Iliou Persis* and added enigmatically that this passage actually belongs to the *Little Iliad,* not the *Iliou Persis*. In the same work Kullmann had briefly mentioned that he does not think that Proclus is always accurate in assigning data to the proper poem (50–51); apparently this suspicion underlies his doubts about Proclus's accuracy concerning the contents of the *Iliou Persis.* The edition of the Cycle that Kullman then promised (50–51) might have provided a clearer demonstration of his argument, but he has never completed this project.

66. At times in the ancient world confusion arose over the titles of the *Little Iliad* and the *Iliou Persis;* Davies reports (in his notes to *Iliou Persis* fr. 3) that Robert attributed this testimonium to the *Little Iliad.* But Davies as well as Bernabé, Allen, and Bethe all assign it to the *Iliou Persis.* And the two poems apparently disagreed over who killed Astyanax: a fragment of the *Little Iliad* (fr. 21 Bernabé = 20 Davies) indicates that Neoptolemus killed Astyanax, but Proclus in his summary of the *Iliou Persis* reports that Odysseus killed Astyanax. Kullmann's denial of the contradiction (1960:50–51, 217 n.3) is inadequate.

67. See discussion of this issue at Severyns 1928:365ff; he is skeptical, but notes that many believe that the death of Astyanax is pre-Homeric. More recently Macleod 1982:51; M. Edwards 1987:29, 32, 211, 299, 314; Schein 1984:190; Fehling 1991:44; Taplin 1992:281; Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:82 have thought that Andromache's foreboding of her son's death is an allusion to the death of Astyanax. M. Edwards 1987:211; Taplin 1992:122 find Hector's prayer for his future well-being in *Il.* book 6 ironic and even ominous (see also Kirk 1990:212). Cf. *Il.* 22.63–64, where Priam envisions that infants will be dashed to the ground when Troy falls. For the argument (which dates back to Aristarchus) that the Cyclic poets derived the death of Astyanax from the *Iliad,* see Monro 1884:25; 1901:369,

376; Kullmann 1960:186–187, 352–353; 1968:31 n.39; Richardson 1993 *ad* 24.734–739. Similarity between Homeric phraseology and Cyclic fragment phraseology concerning Astyanax is discussed in Chapter 3.

68. Combellack 1950:351; 1976:47–48 stresses that Greek names have no decisive bearing on this issue. Clarke 1981:215 calls the evidence of the names "equivocal." On Hector's name, see also Mühlestein 85.

69. The Protoattic sherd (Appendix C, no. 41; Figure I) and a similar scene on the well-known Mykonos relief pithos that depicts the wooden horse (Appendix C, no. 42), discussed in Chapter 1.

70. See *LIMC,* "Astyanax I," nos. 7–34; see further M. Anderson 1997:192–199.

71. Thus Redfield 1975:14. Kullmann 1960:186 acknowledges that the passages are probably not ad hoc invention, but thinks that Andromache was not necessarily part of such myth. Robbins 1990:10 n.28; Taplin 1992:222 n.30 argue that Homeric consistency of details need not imply traditional material; cf. Kullmann 1960:13. See also Kirk 1990:211, 214–215.

72. Appendix C, nos. 17–18; see also *LIMC,* "Aias I," no. 40. Cf. Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:58–61; Snodgrass 1998:112, 138–139, 177.

73. Hector faces Achilles on an early-sixth-century Corinthian vase (*LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 558*; Brussels Bibl. Royale 3 [Med. 5060]; Figure L), which depicts a group of Trojan War characters that is inconsistent with the *Iliad* (Phoenix and Sarpedon are attendants of Achilles and Hector; Aeneas duels Ajax; the attendant for Aeneas is non-Homeric; see Friis Johansen 1967:70–75). Later in the century a vase shows Hector and Achilles dueling over corpse, while Eos is shown with her dead son on the other side (*LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 562; Louvre CA 4201); in a curious analogue to neoanalysis the schema, despite the inscriptional identification of Achilles and Hector, is more appropriate for the duel between Achilles and Memnon (see Friis Johansen 1967:212–214). In addition the duel is apparently on an Etruscan work from the second half of the sixth century (*LIMC,* "Achle," no. 118*; Copenhagen NM 14066) whose other side has been thought to depict Paris shooting Achilles (see discussion at Burgess 1995:227).

74. Cf. Murray 1934:126–127; Bowra 1930:107–109; Vermeule 1979:95, 234 n.11; Kopff 1981:930; 1983:59. Literary sources include Soph. *Ajax* 1031, Eur. *Androm.* 107–108, 399, Ver. *Aen.* 1.483, 2.272–273, 286, Hyg. *Fab.* 106.

75. See *LIMC,* "Achilleus," nos. 584–641. Friis Johansen 1967:138–153; Schefold 1992:257–260 discuss the earliest representations. In *Iliad* book 22 Hector is dragged from the walls to the ships; at the beginning of book 24 Hector is dragged repeatedly around the tomb. Lowenstam 1992:177–178 argues that scenes that appear to show Achilles first attaching Hector to the chariot and the tomb and eidolon of Patroclus cannot correspond to one Homeric scene. Representation of walls need not preclude the Homeric tradition: a vase in Boston (*LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 586*; Boston MFA 63.473) depicts (with some difficulty) Priam and Hecuba and the tomb in one scene.

76. *LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 584* (Brussels, Mus. Cinqu. M 831). Friis Johansen 1967:152 believes that the tomb was not represented on this artifact (and thus he links it with the

book 22 dragging). Snodgrass 1998:137–138 thinks that it corresponds in detail to the *Iliad* better than later examples and is inspired by that poem, but he allows that the episode could be pre-Homeric.

77. Lowenstam 1992:177–178, 187, 191 also envisions a non-Homeric tradition for the episode, opposing the depiction of Iris on vases with the *Iliad*'s focus on Thetis as an intermediary between Zeus and Achilles (where Iris is an intermediary between Zeus and Thetis).

78. See Kopff 1983:60. The version was present in the lost Aeschylean tragedy *Phryges* (Radt 1977–1985: 3:365) and mentioned at Lycophron 269 (for the possible existence of this motif in Ennius and Accius, see Kossatz-Deissmann 1981:148). Scales are first represented in this episode on a fifth-century Melian relief (*LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 662*; Toronto ROM 926.32), and though not numerous at first, continue down into the Roman period (e.g., the Berthouville silver bowl, *LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 688*; Paris Cab. Med.). See *LIMC,* "Achilleus," nos. 642–718, "Achle," nos. 120*-121, and cf. Friis Johansen 1967:49–51, 127–138; Schefold 1992:261–264; Miller 1995:457–458 (where the assumption that the early images of the scales version were inspired by Aeschylus is opposed).

79. Thus scholia and Richardson 1993 ad loc.

80. The *lusis* is shown at that time on a bronze relief mirror handle (with subsequent shield bands using the same schema) and on a few Attic vases (see *LIMC,* "Achilleus," nos. 642*, 647, 650, 653), and on a Corinthian plate (Princeton University Museum; Raubitschek fig. 1). Snodgrass 1998:133 is undecided on the Homeric nature of the mirror handle ("no conspicuous departure from the version in the *Iliad,* but also no very specific acknowledgment of it").

81. See Richardson 1993 ad loc., who reaches this conclusion. Raubitschek 1998 gives only the translation convenient to his argument ("Priam's claim . . . is vividly depicted on the plate," 306) and does not indicate the controversy over interpretation of the Homeric passage.

82. *LIMC,* "Kebriones," nos. 1, 3*, 4, 5*, with inscriptions assuring the identification of Kebriones. These date from the second and third quarters of the sixth century. Friis Johansen 1967:80–82, 221 discusses Kebriones as Iliadic, which Snodgrass 1998:127 finds worthy of consideration. See further R. Cook 1983:2. Kossatz-Deissmann 1990:978 notes that the Kebriones scenes do not represent any Iliadic scene exactly.

83. Snodgrass 1998:103. Schefold 1993:41, 139 gives an excessively Iliadic interpretation.

84. On the issue in general, see bibliography at note 52; often Hector and Patroclus are discussed together. For Patroclus in particular, see Scheliha 1943:235–291; Dihle 1970:159–161. The case against Homeric invention has been made at Reinhardt 1961:19–22; Kullmann 1960:59–60, 131, 152, 193–9; Janko 1992:313–314; Fehling 1991:31–32. Schadewaldt 1965:454 n.1 admits that formations of the name Patroclus in the oblique cases may be pre-Homeric; on this character's nonepithet formulas, see Page 1959:286.

85. As Leaf 1900–1902; Kirk 1985; Willcock 1978–1984 ad loc. all agree. Reinhardt 1961:21–22 effectively stresses this point. See also de Jong 1987:95, who states that as a rule

Homeric poetry does not elaborately introduce traditional characters whom the audience knows. See Scheliha 1943:252–253 for an opposing view.

86. See Combellack 1944:238–239; 1976:46; Kullmann 1960:194 n.2. It is difficult to understand why there would be Homeric invention of this detail, *pace* Andersen 1990:36–37 (who challenges Combellack and Kullmann).

87. Kullmann 1960:189–203, 265 argues that this expedition was pre-Homeric. R. Carpenter 1946:55–59 argued that it was based on Aeolic expansion and prior to the story of the fall of Troy.

88. *LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 468* (Berlin F 2278), ca. 500. At Chapter 1, note 127, I doubted the argument of Lowenstam that it reflects the *Iliad.*

89. *LIMC,* "Achilleus," nos. 466–467. Willcock 1977:46–47 and Andersen 1990:40–41 consider 11.765–784 and Phoenix's account of the same episode (9.253–259; cf. 18.58, 437) ad hoc invention; de Jong 1987:173–175 is more moderate. Some of the details are ad hoc invention, but that does not mean that the recruitment of Achilles at Phthia was not traditional (see Kullmann 1960:258–259).

90. See, e.g., Bowra 1930:12; Heubeck 1954:93–94; Whitman 1958:156; Kullmann 1981:11; Janko 1992:313–314.

91. Mueller 1984:179 discusses this passage as a discrepancy; for the history of this issue see further Kirk 1990 ad loc. Dares 19 reports that Patroclus died in battle among the ships (in the first year of the war).

92. It is not always noticed that the neoanalysts differ greatly on why this correspondence exists. I assume here that the *Iliad* has not simply copied another plot (Schadewaldt 1965) or been drawn into a known pattern (Schoeck 1961), but is playing off the tradition of Achilles' death for allusive purposes (this generally is how Slatkin 1991 employs neoanalytical methodology; see also Dowden 1996:55). In such a manner the death of Achilles is foreshadowed through the actions of Patroclus.

93. Pestalozzi 1945:16, 44–45; Heubeck 1991:463–464; Schadewaldt 1965:169; Kullmann 1960:318; Schoeck 1961:15–16, 23–29, 58–61. Fenik 1964:34 n.5; Schein 1984:26; Janko 1992:313 also see Sarpedon as a Memnon figure.

94. Thus Whitman 1958:200, who concludes that he is playing the part of Achilles. McLeod 1987:37 stresses the surprising transformation of Patroclus in the second half of the poem.

95. For the theory that Homer imported Sarpedon as a traditional Lycian hero into myth about the Trojan War, see Scheliha 1943:262, 397; Kullmann 1960:175 with n.4; Heubeck 1974:166; Janko 1992:313–315. If so, the earliest depiction of Sarpedon on an early-sixth-century Corinthian vase (*LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 558*; Brussels Bibl. Royale 3 [Med. 5060]) would necessarily postdate the poem, though its mishmash of epic characters does not correspond to the *Iliad* (see note 73). More plausibly Iliadic is the fragmented vase in the Vatican depicting a battle over Sarpedon (35617; ca. 560–540), though its non-Homeric characteristics are stressed by Lowenstam, as I noted earlier. Cf. the famous Euphronios vase (*LIMC,* "Sarpedon," no. 4*; New York MMA 1972.11.10) that

shows Sleep and Death lifting the corpse of Sarpedon off the field (in which Lowenstam sees a Lycian tradition). See Nagy 1990a:122–142 on Sarpedon and hero cult.

96. Pestalozzi 1945:45; Schadewaldt 1965:195; Schoeck 1961:15–16, 68–74. See also Whitman 1958:201, 345 n.55; Schein 1984:6; Janko 1992:399. Other neoanalysts and scholars at least imply this correspondence when comparing the deaths of the two.

97. On typological versus specific, see Kullmann 1984. Cf. the critique of neoanalysis on this issue at Nagy 1990a:130–131.

98. J. Kakridis 1949:85–88; Pestalozzi 1945:16, 45; Heubeck 1954:93–94; 1974:40–41; 1991:465; Schadewaldt 1965:169, 194–195; Kullmann 1960:321; 1981:9, 19; 1984:310; 1991:440; Schoeck 1961:15–16, 68–74. Kullmann 1981:9 points out that this proposal has met with much agreement. See, e.g., Scheliha 1943:264, 397–398; Whitman 1958:201, 345 n.52; Reinhardt 1961:354; Ramage 1962:293; Fenik 1964:34 n.5; Nagy 1979:63; Sinos 1980:55; Mueller 1984:53; Lowenstam 1981:116–117; Schein 1984:26, 155; de Romilly 1983:33; A. Edwards 1984:76–79; Ledbetter 1993; M. Edwards 1991:18; Janko 1992 *ad* 16.777–867; Garner 1993:153–154. Scheliha and Garner provide bibliography of scholars who preceded neoanalysts in observation of the correspondence.

99. E.g., *Il.* 22.360, Apollod. *Epit.* 5.3, Hor. *O.* 4.6.3–8. The *Aethiopis* seems to have had Achilles killed as he broke through the gates (Proclus).

100. As at Verg. *Aen.* 6.56–58, Ovid *Met.* 12.597–609; and probably in the *Aethiopis* and in Apollodorus (*Epit.* 5.3). But the roles of Apollo and Paris could vary: see Burgess 1995:235–236.

101. It is often thought that a metope in Paestum shows this moment (*LIMC,* "Patroclus," [vol. 8 suppl.] no. 19*). It does show someone being stabbed in the back, but that it shows Patroclus reaching for a magically flying corselet, or that this would reflect our passage, is dubious. Cf. R. Cook 1983:4; Friis Johansen 1967:277–278; Schefold 1993:247 (Foce del Sele, Heraion metope 21).

102. Notopoulos 1964:34–35; Fenik 1968:238; Thalmann 1984:50–51. Fenik 1968:217 also compares the death of Patroclus to the death of Alcathous at 13.434–444, where Poseidon is said to blind and immobilize Alcathous before Idomeneus slays him. But Poseidon is not actually portrayed as striking Alcathous. In fact, at 351ff. it is made explicitly clear that Poseidon, fearful of Zeus, limits his activity to rousing the Greeks in the form of a man. Poseidon is simply used in this passage to express the state of mind in Alcathous poetically.

103. Paus. 10.31.3 reports that this version was in the Hesiodic *Catalog* and in the *Minyas;* and two papyrus fragments specify Apollo as the slayer of Meleager, Hesiod fr. 25, 280 M-W. Fr. 25 is ascribed to the *Catalog,* fr. 280, to a lost poem about the descent of Perithous to Hades (but see March 1987:34; Hainsworth 1993a:132). Meleager's death by Apollo is sometimes called the "heroic" variant as opposed to the "folklore" variant involving the firebrand that contains Meleager's life-force. J. Frazer 1921:1:64–65 nn.4–5; Willcock 1964:153–154; Hainsworth 1993a:119–120 well survey the variants of this story. Bacchylides 5, Ovid *Met.* 8.445ff. best illustrate the folklore variant, to which J. Kakridis

1949:11–42, 127–148 compared modern Greek analogues. It should not be assumed that the Homeric version suggests the heroic variant. Apollodorus (*Bibl.* 1.8.3) tells the folklore version and then as an afterthought essentially summarizes the *Iliad*'s version (not identifying it as such). He does not conclude this Homeric-seeming version with the death of Meleager by Apollo; apparently Meleager dies in fighting as a result of Althaea's curse. The Homeric version is essentially a variant of the folklore version (*pace* Bremmer 1988:43), with the curse of Althaea substituted for the firebrand. See further the refutation of Bremmer's argument for epic origin of the tale at Muellner 1996:146 n.32.

104. Snodgrass does not assume this, but rather suggests that Patroclus has borrowed Automedon, the charioteer Achilles uses later in the *Iliad,* along with the arms of Achilles. It should be noted that the charioteer on the aryballos is not identified, and there is no reason to assume that it is Automedon or, if so, that Patroclus had not used him as a charioteer before—16.145–147 suggests that Automedon had previously served Patroclus in some subordinate role in battle.

105. *Il.* 16.775–777 (death of Kebriones) and 18.26–27 (mourning of Achilles) share phraseology with the *Odyssey* passage (see also Garner 1993:159–160 on a possible analogue in a fragment of Stesichorus). Although the *Iliad* 18 passage omits reference to horsemanship, neoanalysts have argued that the phraseology in book 18 alludes to the death of Achilles: Pestalozzi 1945:18; J. Kakridis 1949:84–85; Schadewaldt 1965:168; Kullmann 1960:38–39, 330; 1991:441 n.65; Schoeck 1961:43, 68–69. De Romilly 1983:26–28 well discusses the issues involved.

106. See Cunliffe 1963, s.v. ἡνίοχος, ἡνιοχεύς.

107. See Nagy 1979:292–293 for a survey of passages, amid a broader discussion of the term as meaning "ritual substitute." For an example of a *therapon* as an independent warrior, see *Il.* 13.246–329.

108. A more convincing depiction of *Iliad* 16 occurs on a red-figure cup of ca. 475 (*LIMC,* "Patroklos," no. 16*); although there are no inscriptions a man with a cloak over his head, typical of iconography for Achilles, is shown nearby a departing warrior.

109. Discussed as a minor discrepancy at Snodgrass 1998:104–105. Moore 1982 proposes, with some difficulty, that an amphora attributed to Exekias (*LIMC,* "Patroklos," no. 18; formerly Zurich, Coll. Roš) shows the death of Pedasos.

110. Artists could sometimes be incapable of skilled mythological narration or at least be indifferent to it (cf. Lowenstam 1997: esp. 49–50). Corinthian work in particular could show scenes with arbitrary labeling of heroes (see Friis Johansen 1967:70–75, 82–83; Schefold 1993:314), e.g., Figures L (*LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 558*; Brussels Bibl. Royale 3 [Med. 5060]) and P (*LIMC,* "Nestor," no. 5 [ill.]; Louvre E 609).

111. The proposal has been most thoroughly argued at Mühlestein 1987:79–89; similarly Paton 1912:3; M. Edwards 1991:18, 64; Janko 1992:312, 410, 414–415; Dowden 1996:54 n.38, 56. An excellent point-by-point critique of Mühlestein's argument has been made at Nickel 1997:138–141, but I think that on the whole the correspondence between Euphorbos and Paris is convincing. Kullmann 1960:316; Schoeck 1961:121 argue that Euphorbos was introduced to function as an immediate object of reprisal, but neoanalysts

neglect the Euphorbos ~ Paris correspondence because they are more interested in the supposed correspondence between Patroclus and Antilochus than Patroclus ~ Achilles (see Burgess 1997; Fehling 1991:85 is a recent and explicit favoring of the Patroclus ~ Antilochus correspondence).

112. Notably Schefold 1993:17–18, 143; Snodgrass 1998:105–109.

113. Pythagoras: schol. *Il.* 17.29–30 (cf. schol. Apoll. Rhod. 1.643–648), and memorably Horace *Ode* 1.28.9–15; see Hubbard and Nisbet 1970 ad loc. for other sources. Paus. 2.17.3, among other late sources, tells of the shield's display. Cf. the display of other mythological artifacts, e.g., Nestor's cup (Athen. 466e = 489c; 781d; see Malkin 1998:159), the shield of Ajax that Alexander saw at Troy (Ps. Callisthenes 1.42.11), and Helikaon's sword at Apollo's temple at Delphi along with a tripod purported to be the prize for the chariot race at the games for Patroclus (Athen. 6.232c).

114. The lambda in the name "Menelas" is Argive, but the beta in "Euphorbos" does not have the idiosyncratic Argive form. See Jeffery 1990:153–154, 354; B. Cook 1987:56 (with good illustration). Snodgrass 1998:107, 175 notes that it has long been theorized that the artist was copying Argive bronzework.

115. Schefold 1993:17–18 stresses this, but Snodgrass 1998:106 cautions that the "rule" is more typical of Athenian work.

116. Snodgrass 1998:108 ascribes the disharmony of armor between Hector and Euphorbos to the artist's indifference and denies that the names of Hector and Menelaus have accidentally been confused. In my view the apparent mistake is intentionally significant of Menelaus's possession of Euphorbos. Euphorbos is a common name (it receives five separate entries in the *LIMC*), and in fact is given to a Greek warrior on a scene by Exekias (*LIMC,* "Euphorbos III," no. 1*, Philadelphia MS 3442; see Schefold 1993:270), but it is hard to believe that Menelaus is defending a Greek corpse on the Rhodian plate.

117. A point that Lowenstam 1997:56 stresses. On the issue of Panhellenic versus local poetic traditions, see Chapter 3. See Dowden 1992:74–92 for a recent survey of local characteristics in Greek myth.

118. Snodgrass 1998:109. The term *anti-Homerist* usually refers to authors of late antiquity who set out to contradict Homeric poetry in a perverse fashion (e.g., Dictys, Dares, and Philostratus, author of the *Heroicus;* see Chapter 1), which is not exactly what is implied in this discussion.

119. Kullmann 1960:181 n.1 argues that both the plate and the Argive tradition result from the influence of the *Iliad.*

120. See Ford 1997a for the lack of context displayed in early appeals to Homeric authority.

121. J. Kakridis 1949:88; Pestalozzi 1945:29–33; Schadewaldt 1965:173 (in his graph), 180, 195; Heubeck 1991:465; Kullmann 1960:110, 333–335; 1981:42; 1984:310–311; 1991:441 n.65; Schoeck 1961:15, 92–108. Schein 1984:26; Sinos 1980:61; M. Edwards 1990:321–322; 1991:18; Dowden 1996:55 also make the comparison. Kullmann 1981:7 n.6 notes that Löwy earlier developed this interpretation.

122. E.g., Scheliha 1943:65–66; Whitman 1958:263–264; Kullmann 1960:335; Willcock 1973:5; Schein 1984:25; Dowden 1996:54–55. Some of these scholars believe that other post-Iliadic events are also foreshadowed in these games.

123. *LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 491* (Athens NM 15499). The inscription has been linked with the episode titles that were used from the fifth-century onward to indicate segments of the Homeric poems (see Chapter 1). If so, this would suggest a Homeric origin for the image.

124. On the broken inscription, see Lowenstam 1997:28. Shapiro 1994:35 suggests that the race runs a circular course around the stands (but see Friis Johansen 1967:91 n.155).

125. Cf. Schefold 1993:349 n.3; Lowenstam 1997:27–28, 51; Snodgrass 1998:119–120. Lattimore 1997 argues that the iconography is a creative response to the *Iliad.* Artistic creativity in this case is also explored at Lowenstam 1992:168–169, 176–177, 182, 189.

126. Schefold 1992:260–261: an interesting artifact in Basel (ca. 560, *LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 492*; BS 1424), which shows athletic contests but no chariot race; Shapiro 1994:35–38 (figs. 21, 22): an amphora (Florence 3773), ca. 560, which I think can indeed be said to show the scene "with reasonable certainty" (35; note also that the neck shows Thetis and Nereids presenting arms to Achilles). Friis Johansen 1967:89–90 rightly doubts an aryballos in Syracuse of ca. 640–630 (*LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 494). Because none of these or other possibilities (see further under *LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 494) have inscriptions one cannot be certain that they show the games of Patroclus or even a mythical scene. Schefold 1992:261 argues unpersuasively for a hydria in Vienna showing a helmeted Diomedes (inscribed) on a chariot amid other standing figures, including two women holding wreaths (ca. 560, *LIMC,* "Diomedes I," no. 11; Vienna Kunsthist. Mus. IV 3613).

127. This is considered but not favored by Lowenstam (cf. 1992:176, 189; 1997:22, 27–28).

128. Cf. Friis Johansen 1967:191–200; Schefold 1992:250–254; 1993:311–312; Moore 1980:421–424; Kossatz-Deissmann 1997:951, who refers to possibilities listed in other *LIMC* articles. I do not accept Friis Johansen's argument (1967:73–74, 191) that the early-sixth-century Corinthian vase with a haphazard jumbling of Trojan War figures (*LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 558*; Brussels Bibl. Royale 3 [Med. 5060]) alludes to the battle over the corpse of Patroclus.

129. Pestalozzi 1945:17–22, 45; Heubeck 1991:465; Schadewaldt 1965:170; Kullmann 1960:80–81, 328–330; 1981:18–19; 1991:441 n.65; Schoeck 1961:15–16. This position can also be found at Scheliha 1943:264, 398; Whitman 1958:170; Willcock 1987:192–193; Schein 1984:26; M. Edwards 1990:312; 1991:62, 132. For earlier scholars who made this comparison, see Kullmann 1981:6 n.3, 7 n.5; 1991:428. For a contrary opinion, see Combellack 1962:195; Ramage 1962:293.

130. Other battles over corpses in the *Iliad* do not share this intensity and duration. Cf. the report of Thetis to Hephaestus at 18.453 that the fighting that occurred *before* the death of Patroclus lasted all day.

131. Pestalozzi 1945:20–21; Schadewaldt 1965:170; Kullmann 1960:327–329; Schoeck

1961: esp. 32–37, 66. This correspondence does not seem especially strong: mist is present at other times in the *Iliad* than during the battle over the corpse of Patroclus (notably at 16.567ff. during the battle over the corpse of Sarpedon), and whereas the storm wind in the *Odyssey* ends the battle over Achilles' corpse and helps the Greeks, in the *Iliad* mist is present throughout the battle and is a hindrance to the Greeks. At 16.567ff. Zeus sends mist to intensify the battle, not to end it, and at 17.644 Ajax famously pleads for Zeus to clear it up.

132. See Pestalozzi 1945:19–20; Schadewaldt 1965:170; Kullmann 1960:328; 1981:19; Schoeck 1961:64–65, 129–132; Rabel 1991:129–130; M. Edwards 1991:90. Fenik 1968:233 is uncertain, describing the dragging off of a corpse as typical (the use of a thong is not, however). The lost sixth-century Chalcidian vase that pictures the battle over the dead Achilles (*LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 850*) shows Ajax stabbing Glaucus as he tries to attach a thong to the ankle of Achilles; no other source specifies this detail. At *Il.* 17.288–303, Ajax kills Hippothous as he tries to drag off the corpse of Patroclus with a thong. The Trojan killed is different, but the death of Glaucus cannot occur in the battle over Patroclus if myth required him to live on to be killed later by Ajax in the battle over the body of Achilles. Interestingly, Rabel, Edwards, and Kemp-Lindemann 1975:220 link the attempt to drag off Achilles' corpse with Achilles' mutilation of Hector's corpse by dragging (a thong is also used then).

133. Occasionally the corpse of Patroclus or a corpse thought to be Patroclus is shown grasped by warriors fighting over it; a fragmented vase (Metaponto 125064) proposed by Schefold 1993:311–312 shows multiple scenes of an unidentified corpse grasped by the foot.

134. Schoeck's attempt (1961:32–37, 49–53, 81–84) to characterize all Iliadic scenes of Ajax fighting defensively as reflections of the battle over Achilles is very dubious. Also note that though Ajax traditionally carries the corpse of Achilles to safety, in *Iliad* 17 Menelaus and Meriones carry the corpse while Ajax and the Locrian Ajax defend. Odysseus, who traditionally defends while Ajax carries the corpse of Achilles, may be excused from the Iliadic scene, for he has been wounded.

135. See M. Lang 1995:154; Fehling 1991:42 with n.138; Clarke 1981:223. Sthenelos recalls their Epigonic past at *Il.* 4.404–410. Kullmann 1960:85–89 argues that he is a pre-Homeric character in Trojan as well as Theban myth whose characterization is manipulated to reflect Achilles. On his correspondence to Achilles, especially regarding his foot wound and the story of Achilles' heel, see Burgess 1995.

136. See *LIMC,* "Diomedes I." It is doubtful that a Protocorinthian lekythos in Athens (NM Perachora II 27) that displays an arrow about to strike a warrior's shin illustrates his wounding in *Iliad* 11 (*LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 848 [ill.]; see Burgess 1995:227), or that the seventh-century Melian amphora that shows two warriors dueling over armor reflects his duel with Ajax in the games of *Il.* 23 (*LIMC,* "Aias I," no. 74*; Athens NM 3961 (911); see Chapter 1).

137. *LIMC,* "Diomedes I," no. 17 (Olympia B 974 a–b); see Snodgrass 1998:134–135.

138. *LIMC,* "Diomedes I," no. 9* (Basel BS 451).

139. *LIMC,* "Diomedes I," no. 12* (Berlin F 764); see Snodgrass 1998:121–123. Lowen-

stam 1997:53–54 denies that this is Homeric. Less certain is a fragmented vase of ca. 560 (*LIMC,* "Diomedes I," no. 10; Athens Acr. 464).

140. Kullmann 1960:88 argues that a prototype for his Iliadic *aristeia* occurred in the Theban story. It is worth noting that Helenos at 6.98 calls Diomedes the most powerful of the Achaeans without reference to Achilles' absence.

141. *LIMC,* "Diomedes I," 106* (Bonn 1114.2). Let me add that I do not think that the appearance of Dolon alone under the handle of an early-sixth-century Corinthian cup (*LIMC,* "Dolon," 1*; Brussels Bibl. Royale 3 [Med. 5060]; Figure L) indicates knowledge of the *Iliad*'s depiction of Dolon (as supposed at Friis Johansen 1967:75; Lowenstam 1992:183–184; Williams 1986:663), especially since the cup presents such an odd collocation of characters (see note 73). In *Iliad* 10 Diomedes and Odysseus capture Dolon, but these characters are first shown together at the end of the sixth century and at the early fifth century (*LIMC,* "Dolon," nos. 11*, 12*, 13*). There is no need for me to doubt the authenticity of book 10 of the *Iliad,* which narrates Diomedes' encounter with Dolon, but the fact that it has been doubted both in antiquity and in modern times may suggest that Dolon existed in non-Homeric traditions anyway.

142. *LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 850*. R. Cook 1983:4 argues that the image of Sthenelos and Diomedes does not reflect the *Iliad.*

143. *LIMC,* "Achilleus," nos. 433 (ill.), 448*, 453*. See Kossatz-Deissmann 1981:113–114; Lowenstam 1992:169, 179–80; 1993:214 n.80. Cf. Lowenstam 1997:31–34 on the mid-sixth century Chalcidian vase (*LIMC,* "Diomedes," no. 19*; Melbourne 1643-4) that depicts Diomedes in a battle scene that does not match any *Iliad* passage closely.

144. On the depiction of obscure figures as a measure of Homeric influence, see Snodgrass 1998:72, 129.

145. Thus Scheliha 1943:222–232, 384, who gathered earlier views, noting that most favor invention. The oddness of the Homeric Phoenix as Achilles' educator is stressed at Robbins 1993; Scaife 1995:180–183; Griffin 1995:95–96; Mackie 1997. March 1987:23–25 differently argues that Phoenix is primary in this role, Chiron secondary.

146. In Chapter One I rejected the interpretation of the late seventh-century Olympian shield band (Figure J) which would have Phoenix leading an embassy to Achilles. But from the early to mid-sixth century several images include Phoenix (*LIMC,* "Nestor," [vol. 7 addenda] no. 34*, "Achilleus," nos. 478*, 558*, "Aias I," no. 122*). See further *LIMC,* "Phoinix II," (vol. 8 suppl.).

147. Kullmann 1960:133, 224 thinks he may be pre-Homeric, noting that Phoenix appears in the Cycle (cf. *Cypria* frr. 19, 21 Bernabé = *Cypria* fr. 16 Davies, "fragmenta incerti loci" 4 Davies; *Nosti* [Proclus]; *Little Iliad* argumenta 2 Bernabé).

148. E.g., Friis Johansen 1967:198–205 and Kossatz-Deissmann 1981:53–55 reach unjustified conclusions in discussion of vases depicting the bestowal of Achilles to Chiron (*LIMC,* "Achilleus," nos. 19–49). The good number of depictions that include a woman, sometimes specified as Thetis, need not contradict the *Iliad,* nor is it necessary to postulate a "Homeric" and "non-Homeric" version of this episode. Similarly, the various Iliadic passages that imply Thetis in the home of Peleus or away from the home of Peleus

do not have to be regarded as contradictory. The bestowal of arms to Achilles when he left Phthia by Thetis is an apparently traditional example of the presence of Thetis visiting the home of Peleus. Similar arguments for variant traditions based on iconography have been made for the judgement of Paris (thus Kossatz-Deissmann 1994:186); see Hedreen 1996 for argument against such an approach concerning the capture of Helen by Menelaus. Relevant to my argument for the mythological compatibility of Phoenix and Chiron as educators of Achilles is Mackie's insight that Phoenix and Chiron complement each other in the teaching of "normal" and "exceptional" things respectively; "Achilles' complexity as an individual requires double, or even multiple, tutelage" (1997:4).

149. Paus. 5.17.5–19; *LIMC,* "Koon," no. 1 (the only entry). See further Snodgrass 1998:109–116 with bibliography at 176, where many of the other identifications of Homeric scenes by Pausanias are rightly doubted. A very large illustration of von Massow's reconstruction can be found at Schefold 1993:190–191, fig. no. 190a-b.

150. On the dating see Shapiro 1990:138. Analogy is often made to the François vase, which also has multiple representations with a lot of inscriptions.

151. As Friis Johansen 1967:68–70; Snodgrass 1998:115–116, 126 conclude. Contra: Schefold 1993:317; Lowenstam 1997:53.

152. Nickel 1997:307–312 discusses this passage as "a scene which could be easily placed at the beginning of the war" (310) in seeking to explain the origin of the mysterious "wrath" of Paris (see *Il.* 6.326, 335–336).

153. See Gantz 1993:594–596, 651–654; Scaife 1995:186–187; M. Anderson 1997:63 n.2, 242–243, 254. Kullmann 1960:177–180 argues that several sons of Antenor are pre-Homeric, though not Koon. Espermann 1980 argues that passages about Antenor and his family are found in "later" parts of the *Iliad,* wrongly in my view. Wathelet 1989:89–95 suggests that the family of Antenor, including Koon, was part of pre-Homeric traditions. Cf. Lowenstam 1997:29–34, 51 on representations of two other sons of Antenor, Helikoon and Eurymachos.

154. Snodgrass 1998:148 stresses the lack of interest shown by artists in major incidents of the *Iliad.*

155. On the death of Achilles in early Greek art, see Burgess 1995. The early Ajax depictions were noted in Chapter 1.

156. Snodgrass 1998:142–143 is unnecessarily concerned, I believe, with answering such an argument.

157. *LIMC,* "Nestor," no. 5 (ill.) (Louvre E 609 [CA 298]). See Friis Johansen 1967:82.

158. *LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 478* (Brussels Mus. Cinqu. A4). See Friis Johansen 1967:46–49; Snodgrass 1998:135–136; Barringer 1995:27–28 (who remarks that the image "seems to be a collage of several episodes of the *Iliad* or of episodes concerning Achilles at Troy," 27).

159. *LIMC,* "Achilleus," 897* (Louvre E 643).

160. Cf. *Od.* 24.43–84, the summary of the *Aethiopis* by Proclus, Pindar at *Pyth.* 3.100–103, *Isth.* 8.56–60, Apollod. *Epit.* 5.5, Quintus of Smyrna 3.525–787. See also Garner 1993:160 on recently found fragments of Stesichorus. J. Kakridis 1949:65–75 persua-

sively argued for the correspondence between the beginning of *Iliad* 18 and the funeral of Achilles in myth. Other neoanalysts who have pursued this argument include Pestalozzi 1945:26, 32, 42; Heubeck 1991:465; Schadewaldt 1965:166; Kullmann 1960:331–332; 1984:310; 1991:441; Schoeck 1961:43–44. Many have agreed, e.g., Whitman 1958:202–203, 346 n.60; Griffin 1980:28; Schein 1984:129–132; M. Edwards 1987:270; 1990:312; Stanley 1993:290–291. Cf. Nagy 1979:113; Rutherford 1996b:145–146. Scholars who preceded neoanalysts in observation of the correspondence are cited by Scheliha 1943:398; Kullmann 1981:6 n.3, 7 n.5; 1991:428; Schadewaldt 1965:166.

161. For such temporal sophistication on the part of artists, see Scaife 1995: esp. 183–184, on the Lydos plate showing Neoptolemus, Peleus, and Achilles together (*LIMC,* "Achilleus," no. 187*; Athens NM 507).

162. *LIMC,* "Hekabe," no. 12 (Boston MFA 99.506 [529]). The Homeric interpretation is now rarely entertained; cf. Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:58. Friis Johansen 1967:271–275 best argues against the Homeric interpretation, although his suggestion that it pictures Hypsipyle carrying her father Thoas in a chest, an episode from Argonautic legend, is not convincing, and the same can be said for Ferrari's (1983:134) argument that it shows Thetis and the Nereids transporting Achilles in a shroud to Leuke. In Chapter 1 I argue that some other proposals for early reflections of the *Iliad* better fit non-Iliadic myth.

163. R. Cook 1983:1; Snodgrass 1998:124–125, 147.

164. *LIMC,* "Sarpedon," no. 4* (New York MMA 1972.11.10). A similar scene was depicted earlier by Euphronios (*LIMC,* "Sarpedon," no. 3*; privately owned).

165. Lowenstam 1997:29 (cf. Lowenstam 1992:175–176). He points out that one of the two onlookers of the main action is not known in the *Iliad* and links the other with a similarly named Lycian in Quintus of Smyrna.

166. That Sleep and Death originally attended to the body of Memnon is an old argument most recently championed by neoanalysts. For the artistic evidence, see Clark and Coulson 1978 with the reply by Bothmer 1981. Although the latter makes some valid points, he barely mentions the controversy in his *LIMC,* "Sarpedon" article (Bothmer 1994). See now the discussion of non-Homeric details in both Euphronios depictions of this scene at Stansbury-O'Donnell 1999:103–106. Putting the question of priority aside (see Nagy 1990a:130–131), we can at least see that artistic conflation did occur.

167. Lowenstam 1997:65 with n.142.

168. Shapiro 1989:44–45 challenges Friis Johansen's conclusions differently than Lowenstam when he complains that Friis Johansen underestimated earlier Iliadic imagery and adds that Odyssean images in the 520s are scanty. Cf. Shapiro 1993:104. Fellman 1972:34 supposes that the "Pisistratean recension" is responsible for resurgence of interest in the blinding of the Cyclops in the sixth century.

169. E.g., Fittschen 1969:192–194; Friis Johansen 1967:34–35; Janko 1982:230; T. Carpenter 1991:233–234; Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:94–96; Schefold 1993:162 (for a kernel of our *Odyssey*); Shapiro 1994:49–55; Spivey 1997:84–89; Malkin 1998:41–42; Taplin 2000:52 ("arguably"). For skeptical views, see Jensen 1980:106; Jensen et al. 1999:79–80; R. Cook 1983:4–5; Burgess 1996:79 n.11; Lowenstam 1997:53; Snodgrass 1998:89–100; Osborne

1998a:60; 1998b:15 n.10 ("there is . . . *no* reason to believe that the artist conceived himself to be 'illustrating' a specific literary text," on the Eleusis amphora [Appendix D, no. 1]); Scodel 1999:83.

170. On folktale and Homeric epic, see the recent overview by Hansen 1997, with previous studies by R. Carpenter 1946; Page 1973; Hoelscher 1978; Hansen 1990. Peradotto 1990:33–99 provides a sophisticated examination of the distinction between epic and folktale; on classification, see my Introduction.

171. Versions have also been reported from Ireland, the African continent, and Korea. See Glenn 1971:134.

172. Knox 1979 cites third-millennium cylinder seals that depict one-eyed monsters; Pojakov 1983 discusses a seventh-century Phoenician text about a one-eyed giant. For speculation on the Near Eastern origins of the false name used in the Homeric episode by Odysseus, "Οὖτις," see Oberhuber 1965; Arbeitman 1995. See Burkert 1979a:157 n.27; Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:96, fig. 157, for the Sumerian image of a one-eyed sun-goddess (ca. 2000 B.C.E.). Near Eastern images thought to represent Gilgamesh and Enkidu attacking Huwawa/Humbaba have been suspected as a prototype for images of Perseus decapitating Medusa (see Burgess 1999:177–178). That the attackers in these Near Eastern images hold down their victim with their legs seems strikingly reminiscent to me of a number of early Greek representations that depict the initial blinder kicking or holding down the giant with his leg (Appendix D, nos. 1, 8, 11–12). Glenn 1971:142 surveys various views on the origin of the folktale.

173. Grimm 1887: esp. 455 argued so in the first academic comparison of the folktales to the Homeric episode. Skeptics are listed at Glenn 1971:136 n.13, to which add O'Sullivan 1987. Very few skeptics, though, have argued that the tale was wholly invented for the *Odyssey;* see Glenn 1971:141 with n.32.

174. Page 1955 dismisses the artists as indifferent to realism (11), though he notes that a couple of relevant vases had been published shortly before the time of his writing (20 n.19); Glenn (1971:145) recognizes that study of relevant representations would be helpful but states it is outside the scope of his article.

175. The relevance of the analogues to the imagery is recognized at Courbin 1955:35–49; Röhrich 1962; Touchefeu-Meynier 1968:64–65, 282–283, 301; 1992a:957; 1992b:159; 1997:1017–1018; R. Cook 1983:4–5; Snodgrass 1998:89–100; Jensen 1980:106; Jensen et al. 1999:79–80.

176. The best-known treatment of the folktale analogues is Page 1955; the most readily accessible collection of analogues can be found under appendix 13 of vol. 2 of Frazer's 1921 Loeb edition of Apollodorus. Glenn produced a thorough study of motifs in the Homeric version and the analogues, whereas Calame has provided the most sophisticated treatment of the narrative logic within the tale type. See E. Cook 1995:93–110 for a recent good discussion, with current bibliography.

177. For this aspect, see esp. the analysis at Calame 1995:152.

178. ἐφύπερθεν ἀερθεὶς (383), though Aristarchus proposed ἐρεισθεὶς: see Heubeck 1989 ad loc.

179. *Od.* 9.331ff., 383, 394, 397; see Page 1955:14–15. Mondi 1983 argues that the Cyclopes originally did not have a single eye, but this is problematic, especially in regards to the *Theogony* passage.

180. On the analogues, Glenn 1971:154–156. On the iconography, Fellmann 1972:35–36; Touchefeu-Meynier 1992b:159; 1997:1019. Pipili 1987:33 demonstrates that on the sixth-century Laconian vase (Appendix D, no. 9) the weapon is not directed toward a supposed second eye on the unseen side of the face, as has been supposed.

181. See Page 1955:13 for the Homeric narrative; Fellmann 1972:36–37 for the iconography.

182. Glenn 1971:150–151 surveys the numbers in the analogues. Some sixth-century vases show four blinders (Appendix D, nos. 7–9, 12), which if not exactly the same as the Homeric episode, would be unusual in the modern analogues.

183. See Glenn 1971:152–153. Schefold 1992:295–296; Pipili 1987:33 suggest that the snake on the sixth-century Laconian vase (Appendix D, no. 9), usually considered merely decorative, indicates a cave as the setting.

184. R. Cook 1983:4. Although this is not emphasized in the analogues, the stealing or partaking of a giant's food could conceivably serve to deepen a sense of the victims' entanglement in the world of the giant. Persephone's pomegranate seeds are analogous (and the Homeric Polyphemus episode has been described as an underworld multiform; see Burgess 1999). Germain 1954:70 finds the midday a curious time for Odysseus to visit shepherds and speculates that a tradition lay behind the Homeric version in which the victims are marauders.

185. Jensen et al. 1999:79–80 raises this issue, which is too often ignored. See also Touchefeu-Meynier 1968:301; Lowenstam 1997:53; E. Cook 2000.

186. The body of the front blinder is white, not black as that of the two others on the Eleusis amphora. On the Aristonothos krater the last blinder pushes off the wall. On the sixth-century Laconian cup the last blinder alone has a beard, though it is the first one who offers the giant a cup. These are Appendix D, nos. 1, 2, 9, respectively; small details have been thought significant on other pots as well. On the issue, see Fellmann 1972:35; Touchefeu-Meynier 1992a:954, 967–968.

187. On the Kleitias fragment in Basel (*LIMC,* "Odysseus," no. 100; Coll. Cahn HC 1418). On the nature of inscriptions identifying Odysseus in art, see my discussion later in this chapter. Polyphemus is not identified by inscription on any ancient artifact, as far as I know, though the blinded giant depicted on the wall of the Etruscan tomb of Orcus (Tarquinia) is labeled "Cuclu" (*LIMC,* "Kyklopes," no. 26*).

188. Appendix D, nos. 2, 11, 13–14, and often on the escape scenes.

189. Appendix D, nos. 1, 17, 19. The Scylla image is a snakelike creature with three canine-like heads. This does not exactly correspond to the Homeric Scylla (12.85–100), even if it is said to be multiheaded and, in an etymological wordplay, to have the voice of a puppy.

190. Page 1955:9 says that "the *Odyssey,* alone among all versions of this folk-tale, substitutes a log of olive-wood for the spit" but immediately confesses this to be an exag-

geration in a footnote. A wooden stake is used in, e.g., J. Frazer 1921: 2:appendix 13, nos. 9, 24 (a firebrand in nos. 21, 28) and in several of the tales gathered at Germain 1954:55–78. See Glenn 1971:164–166, who calls the wooden stake "a rare alternative" (164). In the analogues an iron spit can be present in a cave dwelling, though in one such analogue (Frazer no. 9) a wooden stick is employed nonetheless. In a sense the tale type that features the blinding of a giant is a variant of the motif of unique vulnerability (as in the myth of Achilles' heel; see Burgess 1995). The eyes are the most plausibly vulnerable part of a seemingly invincible giant (even if Odysseus thinks he could kill Polyphemus with a sword). In one analogue the giant is actually said to be invulnerable (Frazer no. 36); cf. the Irish tale in which the eye is identified as a uniquely vulnerable spot (Thompson 1955–1958: Z 311.1) and another in which hot spits are thrust into the uniquely vulnerable soles of a victim's feet (Z 312.1). Davies 1988b:287 n.58 calls attention to the various ways in which folktale giants are almost but not quite insuperable. Of course, blinding but not killing an ogre allows him to remove obstacles that trap victims in his abode.

191. O'Sullivan 1987:18 doubts this. It is true that the Cyclops lit a fire "for supper" (ποτιδόρπιον, 234) and that later he is said to have "made supper" (ὁπλίσσατο δόρπον, 291) with his victims, but the text is completely silent about any special preparation of the bodies or roasting. The fact that Polyphemus eats all parts of his humans, entrails included, "like a lion" (292), suggests that he eats his victims raw.

192. Page 1955:4, 9–11. Courbin 1955:49 suggests that the simile of a turning drill (383–388) reflects knowledge of a version with a spit, an instrument devised to be turned over fire.

193. E. Cook 1995:104 n.32 asserts from personal experience that olive wood can be brought to a glow in a fire.

194. As Calame (1995:170) stresses, the absence of metalworking as well as the eating of raw meat indicates a lack of civilization. I do not agree with Burkert (1983:133–34) that the culture-nature dichotomy must have long existed in non-Greek versions. That Cyclopes later became known as smithies at Aetna, as Burkert notes, is ironic but of no importance for this discussion.

195. See E. Cook 1995:106–109 for development of this idea.

196. Burkert 1983:133. Calame 1995:170 n.41 criticizes Burkert for regarding the wooden stake as a primordial motif instead of a Homeric idiosyncrasy; O'Sullivan 1987:17 attempts to argue that a wooden stake in an original version could been changed to metal in subsequent, dependent versions. Deciding upon priority of wooden or metal weapon is less important that ascertaining the possible variants in this tale type.

197. Kirk 1970:162–171 explores a structuralist approach to the nature/culture theme in this episode. See also Clay 1997b:118–119 for a persuasive account of the polarity.

198. Cf. Courbin 1955:47–49; Touchefeu-Meynier 1968:64–66; Fittschen 1969:194; Snodgrass 1998:95. In my view most early representations show a spit, though some could be interpreted either way, e.g., Appendix D, nos. 5, 11–13. The widening head of the weapon on the Eleusis amphora (no. 1) may indicate that it is a spear, according to Snodgrass (1998:90). Yet its outlines are not clear and the coloring diffuse; I wonder if the

glowing of metal is meant to be depicted (alternatively, I suppose one might argue for flames). The club that Polyphemus sports in some later images is not a reference to the Homeric olive trunk (Cohen at Buitron and Cohen 1992:35), but more probably results from the influence of Alkyoneus iconography.

199. Other good examples include the wall painting in the Tomb of Orcus (*LIMC,* "Kyklopes," no. 26*) and a Roman ivory comb (*LIMC,* "Polyphemos 1," no. 31*; New York, private collection).

200. Walling 1993:41–45, discussing the simile that compares the olive wood of Polyphemus to the mast of a twenty-man ship (321–324), asserts that this ship must have been a "big, even very big, merchantman" and adds that the Aristonothos vase may depict such a ship. Fellmann 1972:15 compares the smallness of the blinded giant on this vase to the large size of the sailors and suggests that the artist is more interested in dramatic action than physical exactitude.

201. E.g., J. Frazer 1921: 2:appendix 13, analogues nos. 4–5, 7, 14, 21–22, 31, 34–35.

202. See Courbin 1955:48 (who notes, "Mais, chez un géant, tout est gigantesque").

203. See Glenn 1971:138, 161–162, who like Page 1955:4, 6–8; Röhrich 1962:62 views the inebriation of the giant as a Homeric innovation. It has long been argued that its absence in the analogues proves their independence from the Homeric version (see Glenn 1971:138–141). Malkin 1998:41 n.33 describes a drinking vessel in an image as a "quote" of the *Odyssey.*

204. Cf. Fellmann 1972:50–78. For Hellenistic and Roman, cf. *LIMC,* "Odysseus," nos. 69–87, "Odysseus/Uthuze," nos. 54–55, "Polyphemos I," nos. 5–14.

205. Appendix D, nos. 1, 5, 8–9, 12. That the giant should hold a wine cup as he is blinded is a favorite example of synoptic technique, or the depiction of chronologically distinct actions in one image, for which see esp. Snodgrass 1982. On the Laconian pot (Appendix D, no. 9) the giant actually holds limbs of a victim as he is offered wine with his blinding! Cf. Stansbury-O'Donnell 1999:1–3, who argues that a synoptic analysis of the Eleusis amphora is Homer-centric, since the imagery could illustrate a version in which an attack is made on a drunken, not passed-out, Cyclops.

206. Appendix D, nos. 5 (Figure W), 19. For wine allusion in the former image, see Hamma at Hamma and True 1994:184; Snodgrass 1998:96; in the latter Schefold 1993:338.

207. O'Sullivan 1987:12–15, quotation from 13. Similarly Glenn 1971:162; Scodel 1999:86 (who remarks, "Otherwise, presumably, even a stupid giant might consider 'Nobody' a peculiar name").

208. See E. Cook 1995:96 n.7; cf. 170. It appears that there is no need to cultivate grapes to obtain wine.

209. Heubeck 1989 *ad* 346–52 recognizes that the wine is not functional in the narrative and suggests it might have been borrowed from an "old folktale" or from another story altogether. Page 1955:6, following Meuli, suggests that this is possible. In one tale type an ogre is made drunk before being overcome (Thompson 1955–1958: G 521). Mundy 1961:231–232 notes that in a closely related Persian folktale, in which the giant has a sec-

ond pair of eyes after being blinded, wine is always a functional motif. Mundy argues that wine is naturally part of our tale type and that it could have dropped out of and into the tradition. Already Grimm 1887:454–455 thought the use of wine so natural that its absence in the analogues was surprising.

210. Cf. Calame 1995:164, who compares the deceptive gift of Maronian wine to the deceptive offer to cure eyesight found in many analogues. The function of both, he concludes, is "to neutralize by trickery the monster's power and, consequently, to set the stage for the first counterordeal (the blinding)." Thus the offer of wine is one manifestation of a motif that is typical of the tale type, and we should hesitate to label any manifestation as more original, primary, or authentic than another.

211. Glenn 1971:167–168 surveys the analogues, which Page 1955:4, 13–14 strongly distinguishes from the Homeric version on this aspect. Burkert 1979a:156 n.20 supposes that the use of skins might be original. I cannot agree with Röhrich's (1962:63) contention that some of these representations suggest skins, not live animals. The Attic lekythos (Cab. Med. 280) that he uses as an illustration on this point really does not suggest this.

212. These are small pots and artifacts; see the end of Appendix D for references. See Touchefeu-Meynier 1992a:958 for a description of three main types of representing this scene.

213. Page 1955:13–14; Glenn 1971:168.

214. Glenn 1971:169–170 discusses nine folktale versions that also have such an address.

215. Burkert 1983:148–149, developed further at E. Cook 1995:109–110.

216. E.g., Glenn 1971:172 and E. Cook 1995:99 conclude that Goat Island eliminates hunger as motive.

217. The argument was influentially set forth by Croon 1952; see Davies 1988b for earlier bibliography. E. Cook 1995:80–87, following Frame 1978:57–73, explores the link between cattle raiding and cosmography as an Indo-European concept. See Davies 1988b:284, 289 for the herd symbolizing the dead. It may be relevant that Davies 1988b:287, following Wilamowitz, describes Geryon, Cacus, and Alcyoneus as multiforms, because iconography of the latter and Polyphemus became conflated.

218. E.g., there is no Goat Island in the *Cyclops* by Euripides, and the search for supplies is the motive for the arrival of Odysseus. Burkert 1979a:33 supposes that the need for food would be a common element in this tale type.

219. An issue emphasized at Calame 1995:esp. 143, 165–66. O'Sullivan 1987 rejects the use of analogues to hypothesize a pre-Homeric folktale source. His arguments are routinely dismissed because he disagrees with the *communis opinio* that the analogues are independent of the *Odyssey,* but in terms of folktale methodology many of his points should be taken seriously.

220. Brommer 1983:18, 66; Wüst 1931:1905–1909. The latter gives an extensive listing of examples with a survey of vain attempts to regard the delta form as primary because it is the epic form. The first Attic work to use the delta spelling (ca. 480, *LIMC,* "Odysseus,"

no. 121*; New York, Coll. Shelby White–Leon Levy) also identifies "Idameneus" as being in the escape scene. Idomeneus is not present in the Homeric account.

221. See R. Cook 1983:4; Snodgrass 1998:98. Many scholars have proposed candidates for illustration of the *Odyssey* from the Geometric period on (e.g., Brommer 1983), but these fail to convince. The favorite candidate is a Geometric oinochoe that seems to show one man among many on the back of a capsized ship; in Chapter 1 I rejected the Homeric interpretation. The late Geometric fragmented oinochoe sometimes purported to show Odysseus and Circe (*LIMC,* "Kirke," no. 56; Vathy, Ithaca Mus.) is a very weak candidate, even if it was found at Ithaca.

222. Schefold 1992:299–300; 1993:338–339.

223. Powell 1991:216. Ford 1997a argues that the Homeric poems were necessarily performed as independent rhapsodies in the Archaic Age.

224. Like the few fifth-century Nausicaa scenes (*LIMC,* "Nausikaa," nos. 2*, 3*, 4*), or the two Melian reliefs that show the bath of Odysseus at Ithaca (*LIMC,* "Eurykleia," nos. 8*, 9*).

225. See Burkert 1979a:23, 153 n.11, who argues that the name is an adjectival filler that signifies the fame of the story. E. Cook 1995:94, 100 memorably refers to "Much-Fame" and "Nobody." Whether the Cyclops would have had this name in non-Homeric versions is difficult to guess. Phemius is called a πολύφημος ἀοιδός at *Od.* 22.376; O'Sullivan 1987:9–10 cites a modern Greek analogue that features "ὁ πολυφουμισμένος δράκος, "the much-famed ogre."

226. Burkert 1979a:31. Calame 1995 analyzes the story as an ordeal followed by a counterordeal, with reversal of power a key theme. Earlier I compared the blinding of a giant with the motif of unique vulnerability, as with the myth of Achilles' heel.

227. Germain 1954:55–129; Burkert 1983:130–134 (cf. 1979a:30–34). For further bibliography and remarks on this type of approach, see Calame 142 n.6. The dancelike synchronization of the blinders on many vases has not been sufficiently explored (but is noticed by Cohen at Buitron and Cohen 1992:62 for one vase).

228. Cf. Fellmann 1972:38–39; Touchefeu-Meynier 1968:283; Renard 1960. It is difficult to tell what function early mythological representations had, but at least one blinding scene, the Eleusis amphora, was put on a vessel intended as a funeral marker. In the end it was used as the burial container for the body of a child (see S. Morris 1984:11). The beheading of Medusa by Perseus is depicted on the body of this vase, and it is tempting to see significant connections between this decapitation, the blinding power of the Gorgons' gaze, and the blinding of the Cyclops: see Osborne 1998a:57–61. At Osborne 1998b:1–5 this thematic imagery is interestingly interpreted as a meditation on death. I reject the contention of S. Morris 1984:44 that the presence of Athena with a rod in the Medusa scene is a reference to *Od.* 16.172, 456.

229. Cf. Friis Johansen 1967:228; Fittschen 1969:177; Schefold 1993:10, 29; and especially Kannicht. Schefold argues that the terracotta shield in Nauplion (Appendix C, no. 20, which he interprets as showing Heracles) demonstrates a new Homeric spirit. Kannicht 1982:86 concludes, after an appropriately skeptical analysis of Homeric represen-

tation in early Greek art, that "the *Iliad* seems already to be implicitly present in the early pictures." Cf. my discussion in Chapter 1 on "Cyclic" images misidentified as Homeric.

230. Thus Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:183, who mocks Kannicht's argument as "remarkable" (but note that she thinks artists *did* portray Homeric scenes at a very early date). On the Homeric scenes one might expect to see in early Greek art, cf. Snodgrass 1998:67–73.

231. Inscriptions identifying figures in art begin at ca. 675 at the earliest; see Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:176–178.

232. See Jeffery 1990:1–42; Osborne 1996:107–112. Powell 1991:119–186 usefully gathers and presents the earliest inscriptions; he presents his argument in concise form in the *NCH*.

233. E.g., Powell 1991:183–184 ("overall our impression is that Greek literacy first flourished in an aristocratic world that is socially symposiastic and temperamentally agonistic, much like the life in the palace of Alkinoos described by Homer"), and Bellamy 1989: esp. 296 ("our ears are assailed by the accents of an unmistakably heroic, Homeric world"; " . . . for both subject and quality could come straight from Odysseus' entertainments at the court of Alkinoos").

234. See Osborne 1996:109,112; Pavese 1998:72 n.11 for effective critiques of the theory that the Greek alphabet was invented to record verse (Powell 1991 is the most prominent recent proponent).

235. For the evidence, see Powell 1991:154–157. Cf. the aryballos from the second half of the seventh century that has an inscription for Troilus but gives an abecedaria for Achilles (Appendix C, no. 12; Figure E).

236. Thus Kirk 1962:283–284; Burkert 1976:19–20; Fehling 1991:41; Taplin 1992:33 n.39; Stanley 1993:267; Danek 1994; M. West 1995:205; Osborne 1996:116–118; Faraone 1996; E. Cook 1996, 2000; Lowenstam 1997:48–49; Snodgrass 1998:52–53; Pavese 1998:82–83; Jensen et al. 1999:79. But the inscription is thought to reflect knowledge of Homer at Snodgrass 1971:431; Coldstream 1977:343; Hurwit 1985:89–91; Thomas 1992:58; Bellamy 1989:296–297; Latacz 1996:61–63; Graham 1995:6–7; Powell 1991:163–167, 208–209; 1997a:23–24; Malkin 1998:156–160. Lowenstam 1997:48–49 well compares the interest in epic for unique possessions like Achilles' spear, Agamemnon's scepter, and the bow of Odysseus; E. Cook 2000 notes several references to valuable drinking vessels in the Homeric poems; Malkin 1998:159 points out that a Nestor's cup was dedicated to Artemis in Capua in Campania (Athen. 466e = 489c; 781d). Cf. my earlier discussion on the shield of Euphorbos.

237. Kullmann 1960:257; 1991:435. The summary of the *Cypria* by Proclus mentions this meeting, and in a fragment of the *Cypria* oft-quoted in antiquity it is probably Nestor who addresses Menelaus and praises wine (fr. 17 Bernabé = 15 Davies). Kirk 1962:283–284 thought Pylian epic would be a natural context for Nestor's cup.

238. E.g., Kirk 1962:282; 1985:4. "All Greek poets worked in the shadow of Homer," proclaims M. Griffith (1975:73). Passages from the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* have also been suspected of Homeric imitation, but I follow M. West in his skepticism about

these. In particular it seems best to conclude that the catalogs of Nereids at *Il.* 18.39–49 and *Theog.* 240–262, which certainly share a great number of names, are independently derived from the same catalog tradition.

239. Testimonia that portray Hesiod speaking of (or competing against) Homer need not be taken seriously (Hesiod fr. 357 M-W and a testimonium about the contest between Homer and Hesiod quoted at T. Allen 1912:218; see Davison 1962:235), nor do the "vague and perhaps corrupt" (Davison 1955:13) testimonia that suggest that Archilochus (fr. 303 West) and Callinus (fr. 6 West) ascribed the *Margites* and *Thebais* respectively to Homer (see esp. Davison 1968:71, 81–82). On the largely unhistorical nature of poetic "lives," see Lefkowitz, with Latacz 1996:24–30 for biographies of Homer.

240. This problem is stressed at Davison 1962:256; 1968:70–85, esp. 84, and thoroughly considered at Fowler 1987:8, 39–52. See also Notopoulos 1964:19–20; Gentili 1988:58; Jensen 1980:105–106; Lowenstam 1997:58; Ford 1997a:90. Kirk 1962:283 acknowledges the problem, but oddly speaks of "common" Homeric phrases found in other poets. These are exactly the kind one would immediately suspect of being traditional. Even less common phrases in the Homeric poems may have existed widely in literature which has not survived. Cf. Janko 1982:225–228 on the issue of imitation in early epic.

241. Richardson 1993:113; M. West 1995:206; Ford 1997a:90. It is essential to recognize that the commonplace does not fit well in its Homeric context; as Lardinois 1995:240 n.32 states, it is ironic that Hector is being urged to stay out of fighting. The case for Homeric allusion has recently been stated at Garner 1990:8–12. Cf. Bonfante 1989:547–548, who argues that the *Iliad* passage's reference to nudity is "startling" in view of her contention that the Homeric poems, which she dates to ca. 800, display an early Greek sense of shame toward nudity. Her conclusion that the Homeric poems mix old with new underscores the difficulties of dating them too early or using them as reflections of culture.

242. See Fowler's conclusions (1987:33). He cites Tyrtaeus frr. 10.21ff., 11.11–14 (and perhaps 29–34) West, and Mimnermus fr. 2 West as "probable or certain" imitations of Homer. Note that Fowler discusses these passages as reflections of Homer with greater caution earlier in his chapter. Stanley 1993:266 agrees with his analysis. Cf. Garner 1990:1–20, who is certain that early lyric poets did allude to the Homeric poems. He specifically disputes Fowler's conclusions at 224 n.12, but I find his discussion at 18–19 of the issues involved very inadequate.

243. M. West 1978:60; 1988:151 n.5; 1995:206–207. Cf. Fowler 1987:37. Jensen 1980:101–102; Lowenstam 1997:59 argue that it does not reflect the *Iliad.*

244. J. Kakridis 1966; Robbins 1995:230 ("it cannot but be read with the more famous picture from the end of the *Iliad* in mind"). Earlier I noted that Sappho may very well be following a pre-Homeric mythological tradition about the marriage. See Nagy 1974:118–139 for a detailed analysis of the metrical and formulaic patterns in this fragment. He describes their apparent similarities to epic as cognate inheritance, but allows that Sappho may have been influenced by the *Iliad.*

245. Burkert 1987:50–51, citing Stesichorus S11.8–24 *PMGF* ~ *Il.* 12.322–328; S13.5

PMGF ~ *Il.* 22.83; 209 *PMG* ~ *Od.* 15.168ff. and 68. A poppy simile suspected as Homeric (S15.ii.14–17 *PMGF* ~ *Il.* 8.306–308) is discussed at Garner 1990:14–18. All of these but S13.5 are discussed as likely Homeric allusion at Fowler 1987:36–39.

246. Lowenstam 1997:58–59. See also Fowler 1987:35–36; Stanley 1993:402 n.44.

247. Reece 1988 explores the seeming paradox that part of the Stesichorus fragment has been thought to allude to *Od.* 15.113–119, although this is regarded as a post-Aristarchan interpolation transposed from 4.613–619. I agree with Reece that the correspondence between 209 *PMG* and *Od.* 15.133ff. is weak and that the Stesichorus fragment as a whole is an inventive reflection of the *Odyssey.* Ballabriga 1990:26 contrasts it with Alcman 80 *PMG* as evidence for the evolution of the *Odyssey* from an earlier prototype to our text.

248. See R. Cook 1937; Fittschen 1973:18–23. It is not improbable that the *Shield* mixes imitation of the Homeric shield of Achilles with an older tradition of ecphrasis independent of the *Iliad,* nor is it impossible that similar scenes on the Homeric and Hesiodic shields are independently derived from an ecphrasis tradition (surely ecphrasis did not begin with *Iliad* 18). Cf. the attempt at Stanley 1993:293–295 to reconstruct a prototype of the Homeric shield ecphrasis. Both the *Shield* and the Euripidean shield of Achilles in the *Electra* feature Perseus and the Gorgons, depicted in early Greek art.

249. R. Cook 1937:208; Fittschen 1973:21. Cf. also the chest of Kypselos, discussed earlier in regards to its Koon image. Portrayals of the Thessalian centauromachy begin in the sixth century (see *LIMC,* “Kentauroi et Kentaurides,” [vol. 8 suppl.] nos. 154–234), though there is an earlier bronze relief that shows Caeneus being pounded into the ground (*LIMC,* “Kaineus,” no. 61*; Olympia BE 11a).

250. Wit: Kirk 1990 ad loc.; fear: Willcock 1976:68–69. Lowry 1995:195–196 adduces other Homeric passages to demonstrate the bravery of Glaucus.

251. Cf. Dawson 1966:43; M. Edwards 1987:203–205; Nisetich 1977:258. Lowry 1995:194–195 surveys some other views and then argues (198–200) that Glaucus with the simile “leaves Diomedes in a forest of indistinction” before establishing his heroic ancestry.

252. M. Griffith 1975:85 n.18 states, “No editors or commentators seem seriously to have doubted Mimnermos’ debt to Z 146ff.” Recently Garner 1990:3–8; Sider 1996:273–274 have expressed confidence that Mimnermus is alluding to the *Iliad* passage, and even Fowler 1987:32–33 suspects so. At Lowry 1995:193–194 it is assumed without argument that Mimnermus employs a “Homeric image.” But recently many have recognized that the traditional nature of the image makes that doubtful: A. Allen 1993:40; Lardinois 1995:234–236; M. West 1995:206; Lowenstam 1997:59. Cf. the description of the Homeric simile at duBois 1988:42–43 as a pre-agricultural image of autochthony. Haubold 2000:163–166 describes the epic *laos* (“people”) as autochthonous; at 41–43, 158–159 he explores the animal and plant imagery associated with this group.

253. Cf. Gerber 1970:65; Garner 1990:4; Dawson 1966:44–47; M. Griffith 1975:78–80, 85 nn.23–24, 86 nn.30–31, 35–36. Compare the following: *Il.* 9.410: φησι θεὰ Θέτις . . . διχθαδίας κῆρας φερέμεν θανάτοιο τέλοσδε ~ Mimnermus 2.5–8; *Il.* 12.326–27: νῦν δ’ ἔμπης γὰρ κῆρες ἐφεστᾶσιν θανάτοιο/μυρίαι ~ Mimnermus 2.5; *Il.* 2.834: κῆρες

γὰρ ἄγον μέλανος θανάτοιο ~ Mimnermus 2.5; *Od.* 4.237: Ζεὺς ἀγαθόν τε κακόν τε διδοῖ ~ Mimnermus 2.4–5.

254. Leaf 1900–1902 ad loc. After finding "incongruous" and "ludicrous" elements in this passage, he continues, "It is hard to believe that any poet could have written such a medley except as deliberate parody." More recently Richardson 1993 ad loc. argues that "the two passages must be related," and Sider 1996:265 describes the book 21 passage as the first allusion to the book 6 simile. Ford 1997a:91–92 more correctly concludes from the book 21 passage that "Glaukos himself is already adapting a gnomic commonplace." M. Edwards 1987:202–203; Lowry 1995:195–198 note that the issue of lineage also occurs in similar contexts, with some shared phraseology (5.627–654; 20.213–214; 21.139–202); in my view the book 6 passage is shot through with so many typological elements that it is impossible to regard it as original or primary.

255. Some of these are discussed at M. Griffith 1975:75–76; Lowry 1995:198–199. My research on this matter was assisted by the searchable database of early Greek epic that was available at the Chicago Homer website<http://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/chicagohomer/> in the spring of 1997.

256. M. Griffith 1975:75–77 (emphasis added).

257. Davison 1968:73 strongly condemns the passage and even suggests that it was wrongly transferred to *Iliad* 6. Without going so far, one may still recognize the basic point that the simile was not invented for the context of book 6, as M. West 1995:206; 1997:365 argues.

258. M. West 1997:365 n.37.

259. See Collins 1997: ch. 2, "Ben Sira in His Hellenistic Context" (23–41). Theognis is the only Greek author that Collins believes (40) is echoed by Ecclesiasticus. Snaith 1974:3 describes the book's Near Eastern and Egyptian heritage. Professor J. W. Wevers (personal communication, March 27, 1997) has told me that the comparison of plant life to mortality is "a common Semitic simile, and need not be Greek in an Old Testament context." He adds that he finds the Homeric passage "quite Hebraic." Other thoughts in the Ecclesiasticus passage remind us of Mimnermus 2 and many other Greek passages, but again one cannot leap to conclusions. The *carpe diem* theme of the Ecclesiasticus passage, for instance, goes back to the Old Babylonian Version of the Gilgamesh Epic (tablet 10.3; Dalley 1989:150; at 153 n.26 she compares Ecclesiastes 9:7–9).

260. Cf. Fowler 1987:32–33, who in reference to Mimnermus 2 describes the thought a commonplace, "but in this case one suspects that it is Homer who has made the thought famous" (32).

261. Various biblical passages are adduced by Heidel 1949:142; Davison 1968:73; M. Edwards 1987:204; M. West 1995:206; 1997:365. In addition to the two quotations here, cf. Psalms 90.5–6, 103.15–18; Job 14.1–21; Peter 1.24–25. M. West 1997:365 credits I. Rodriguez for first comparing the Ecclesiasticus passage to the *Iliad* 6 simile in 1959. Van Uchelen 1994:81–82 discusses several of these passages as examples of a Hebraic image of death.

262. Until recently very many attributed it to Semonides; see bibliography at Gerber

1970:64; Lloyd-Jones 1975:96–97; Sider 1996:267 n.6. For discussion of the issue, see also Davison 1968:73–74; M. West 1974:179–180; 1993:10–11; Sider 1996. Hubbard 1996 continues to argue the case for Semonides as author, supposing that confusion could have arisen among Alexandrian editors. On Simonides in general, see Robbins 1997:243–252; on the new Simonides, see M. West 1993 and the special issue of *Arethusa* 29 (1996).

263. The date of Semonides is not secure; see Brown 1997:70–71. Davison 1968:75–76; Hubbard 1996:256 argue that he could have been a contemporary of Simonides. In that case, the identification of author would have no bearing on my argument.

264. See Burkert 1979a; 1987:54–56.

265. Fr. 19 does not join with fr. 20 West in the manner indicated at Stobaeus 4.34.28, but the two passages may be part of the same poem (cf. M. West 1993:10–11; Sider 1996; Hubbard 1996:261–262).

266. Davison 1968:73, 76–77. I do not see the need, however, to argue that the leaves simile in book 6 is an interpolation, as Davison suggests.

267. Clay 1996:244 notes this and remarks, "Yet there is no reason to think that Simonides ascribed an *Iliou Persis* to Homer. To be sure, by exaggerating Homer's accomplishment, Simonides can rhetorically magnify his own." But the natural conclusion is that Simonides associates Homer with the genre of epic poetry. Also debatable is her argument at 244–245, also found at Rutherford 1996a:180, that the reference to *hemitheoi* at fr. 11.18 is an allusion to *Il.* 12.23, although that is the only Homeric instance of a word found commonly in other poetry, notably *Works and Days* 159–160.

268. Sider 1996:265 n.3 asks, "Would anyone reading Simonides think that he was referring to anything other than this famous passage?" Davison 1968:73 suggests that maybe Simonides took the line from "some other poem." Lowenstam 1997:59–60 argues that Simonides here refers to epic poetry in general. Garner 1990:2 admits that Simonides may not have had our poem but states that "he has selected the line as something unique from some body of verse and incorporated it into his own."

269. Ford 1997a:91–93 on Simonides fr. 19 specifically.

270. Sider 1996:274–275 lists Simonides passages in which he names or echoes predecessors and memorably calls Simonides the "pugnacious poet of intertextuality" (275).

271. On the late and unauthoritative aspects of ancient biographies of Homer, see note 239. Nagy, however, has demonstrated that themes and patterns in such biographies can be very archaic, not in a historical sense, but rather in a mythological or cult sense (1979:296–300 on Homer and Hesiod; see further 301–308, "On the Stories of a Poet's Life").

272. Alcibiades read him as a schoolboy, reports Plut. *Alc.* 7.1; a fifth-century inscription of *Od.* 9.39 was found at Olbia (*SEG* 30.933).

273. Cf. the passages listed at Bowra 1967:240; Garner 1990:v-vi; Sider 1996:280–281. Nisetich 1977:258 n.80 adds from the close of *Finnegan's Wake,* "My leaves have drifted from me." His article makes the case for Pind. *Ol.* 12.15 being an allusion to *Iliad* 6. Cf. also Aeschylus *Ag.* 79–80, τό θ' ὑπέργηρων φυλλάδος ἤδη/κατακαρφομένης τρίποδας

μὲν ὀδοὺς/ στείχει (very old age, with withered leafage having fallen, goes its way on three feet). Nagy 1979:178–189 further explores the use of vegetal imagery, such as the leaves simile, to illustrate themes of life and death in early Greek myth and poetry.

274. Heraclitus A 22, B 42, 56, 57, 105, Xenophanes B 12, Theagenes 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4 D-K; 8.3 of the latter is of particular importance, because it suggests detailed knowledge. Burkert 1987:44, 58 n.6 guesses that Stesimbrotos of Thasos ca. 420 wrote the Derveni papyrus that displays detailed study of Homeric philology.

275. The narrator seems to refer to himself as Homer; interpretation of the passage remains controversial (Burkert 1979b:57; Stanley 1993:291–292 survey critical views on the issue). See especially Nagy 1979:8; 1990b:375–376; 1996a:60–61 on the multilayered *mimesis* at play.

276. Xenophanes B 10, 11 D-K. The first certain references by one author to another seem to be Solon fr. 20 West (cf. Mimnermus fr. 6 West); Ananius fr. 2 West.

277. E.g., Bowra 1952:431–432; Kirk 1976:1–2; Mueller 1984:162. Kirk admits that it is "certainly a problem" (2) to understand how the pre-Homeric epic tradition expired. Sometimes in discussion of his theory of the stages in which epic deteriorates (1962:9–98, 204–205, 301–334) he describes seventh-century Greek epic as decadent and derivative from Homer, which I find an impossibly swift development. See A. Parry 1966:204–210; Jensen 1980:113–114 for criticism of his theory of stages.

278. Friis Johansen 1967:229; Davies 1989a:10.

279. See A. Parry 1966:182 n.14; Heubeck 1974:221; Jeffery 1990:56–57; Powell 1997a:30–31 for discussion of the issue. Papyrus may not have been easily obtainable until renewed contacts with Egypt in the seventh century. Thomas 1992:56, 83 thinks that papyrus could have been available as early as the eighth century, but adds it would have been very expensive. Burkert 1992:30–31 makes a case for a fairly widespread use of leather skins as writing material before then (a practice he thinks came with the alphabet from the East), but it is hard to see how this material could easily have been used to record lengthy epic poems. Thornton 1984:18–20 thinks Homer may have been able to use papyrus or hides for preservation of his poetry but not for composition of it.

280. A point now effectively stressed at Taplin 2000:51; Taplin 1992 seeks to explain the circumstances for the early performance of the whole of the *Iliad.* Two notable suggestions in the past for the recording of the Homeric texts (recently reviewed at Haslam 1997:80–81) were Lord's (1960:124–138) theory of an orally dictated text, and Kirk's (1962:96–101, 301–302) theory of an orally preserved text. The oral-dictation theory is surprisingly still popular (e.g., Janko 1992:37–38; 1998; Powell 1991; Haslam 1997:81). For difficulties with these theories see McLeod 1966:109; Austin 1975:22; Seaford 1994:144–145, 147–148; Bakker 1997:22; Taplin 2000:37. It is often believed that the sophistication and architectural structure of the *Iliad* necessitates writing, but Russo 1992:15–16 and Taplin 1992:8–9, for example, have recently argued persuasively that an oral poet could achieve these results over time, whereas Nagy 1996a; 1996b:19; Seaford 1994:151–152 propose the same resulting from an oral performance tradition.

281. These issues are repeatedly considered by Gentili 1988 and Fowler 1987. See also

R. Carpenter 1946:11; Notopoulos 1964:36; M. West 1978:60; and Nagy 1990a:38–40; 1996a:108–112.

282. Wilamowitz 1884:352; Davison 1955:13; Lloyd-Jones 1973:115; Bernabé 1987:21; Burkert 1987:45; Nagy 1990b:22 n.22, 74 n.111, 78 think that Theban War poetry is meant; Scott 1921:17–19; Friis Johansen 1967:233–34; Haslam 1997:82 n.73 think that the *Iliad* is meant. Cf. the suggestion at Nagy 1990b:74 n.111 that the report of Kynaithos of Chios bringing "Homer" to Syracuse (Hippostratus *FGH* 568 F5) might not be in reference to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey.*

283. Wilamowitz 1884:352 thinks it is based on a line in the *Iliad,* as does Burkert 1987:44, 58 n.10. Nisetich 1989:1 thinks that is possible; Most 1990:48 and Murray 1934:289, 298 state flatly it is not a Homeric line. Many describe *Pyth.* 3.80–83 as a "misunderstanding" of the urns of Zeus described at 24.527–533 (see Richardson 1993 ad loc.; Burkert 1987:44, 58 n.10).

284. Thus Wilamowitz 1884:352; Davison 1955:13; Burkert 1987:46, but Nisetich 1989:1, 9–14 raises doubts that I think are compelling.

285. See T. Allen 1924:249–270 for possible confusion of Homeric with "Cyclic" material by Aristophanes, Hippocrates, Xenophon, and Plato (on the last, cf. Bernabé 1987:3 concerning *Cypria* fr. 18). Allen's discussion concerns early quotations of Homer that do not agree with our *Iliad* and *Odyssey.* Often these misquotations are based on variant texts or faulty memory, but Allen thinks confusion of Homeric and Cyclic poetry may lie at the root of some.

286. See Davison 1962:236; 1968:79. Some testimonia might be interpreted as meaning earlier authors knew titles—e.g., the testimonia about Archilochus speaking of the *Margites* (fr. 303 West), Callinus speaking of the *Thebais* (fr. 6 West; on these two testimonia see n.239 above), Pindar speaking of the *Cypria* (test. 2 Bernabé = 1 Davies), and Hellanicus speaking of the *Little Iliad* (*Little Iliad* test. 10 Bernabé = 2 Davies; see Davison 1962:236). I doubt their authority.

287. See T. Allen 1924:270; Most 1990:48; Richardson 1993:30 on Plato's fondness for quoting of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey,* but note that Plato and Xenophon may have spoken of non-Homeric material as Homeric, that at *Poetics* ch. 4 Aristotle considers the *Margites* Homeric, and that elsewhere Aristotle seems to acknowledge the Cycle was still considered Homeric by his contemporaries.

288. This is the attitude of, e.g., Scott 1921 and Nisetich 1989 (the latter on Pindar). Hainsworth 1993b:43 calls the false ascriptions "a grave injustice."

289. At least some false ascriptions probably fall under this category. I suspect this occurs in respect to an engraving on an Iliac table by Theodorus, which portrays the fall of Troy as well as the *Iliad:* "Θεοδώρηον μάθε τάξιν ῾Ομήρου" (Sadurska 1964:39; see Wilamowitz 1884:353).

290. Nagy 1996a:76, 78, 196; 1996b:70, 73, 83, 92–93.

Chapter Three: The Epic Cycle and Homer

1. This view is displayed, though sometimes with hesitation, at Monro 1884; 1901:350–383; Wade-Gery 1950:80 n.91, 85 n.114; Forsdyke 1956:11–12, 98, 110–137; Andersen 1982:8–9. Kullmann 1960:18–28 usefully surveys research on this topic by scholars from the unitarian, analyst, and neoanalyst schools of thought.

2. Rzach 1922:2378; Murray 1934:196–197; J. Kakridis 1949:93–94 effectively criticize this notion.

3. For an overview of this line of argument, see Kullmann 1991:428–430. Some predecessors of neoanalysts proposed that the *Aethiopis* was prior to the *Iliad* (e.g., Kullmann 1981:6; 1991:428–429 identifies Gruppe as one). J. Kakridis 1949:90–91 at least wondered if the Cyclic poems were prior to the Homeric poems. At times Pestalozzi seemed to equate his reconstructed "Achilleis" with the *Aethiopis* (as Davison 1947:28 complains), and the same criticism can be leveled at Schadewaldt (at 158 he implies his "Memnonis" is the second half of the *Aethiopis*); see Willcock 1997:175–176. Schoeck also spoke of a "Memnonis," but took an agnostic stance about priority between the *Aethiopis* and the *Iliad.* Kullmann 1960 suggested that some poems in the Epic Cycle preceded the *Iliad,* which he dated to 650 (381–382; at 1981:30 he favors the early seventh century), but he was careful to insist that the arguments of neoanalysis do not depend on this view (e.g., 29–50) and presented it as only one of many possible theories (360–379; cf. 1968:19 n.18). At 1981:33 n.76; 1991:429 n.24 he complains that he has been misunderstood on this issue. Recently Kopff 1983 claimed priority for the *Aethiopis* over the *Iliad,* but this type of argument is now rare in neoanalysis. Dowden 1996 refers to a fixed form of the *Aethiopis* influencing the *Iliad,* but this is not quite the same thing.

4. The compatibility, frequently acknowledged today (e.g., in the Heubeck, Janko, and Edwards commentaries), was earlier briefly noted by Notopoulos 1964:41; Willcock 1973:6; Heubeck 1974:47–48, 151; Jensen 1980:31. Schoeck 1961: esp. 12–19 and Fenik 1964 were early admixtures of ideas from both schools of thought. The most thorough comparison of the two fields of research is at Heubeck 1978 and Kullmann 1981:13–18, 29–39; 1984. Schoeck was the first neoanalyst to display an extensive interest in oral poetics (see esp.12ff.), though problematically in my view. Kullmann has insisted that writing was necessary for the composition of the Homeric poems (1981:29–39; 1984:319–321; 1991:428) but recognizes the importance of orality in the pre-Homeric tradition. M. Edwards has remarked that his acceptance of neoanalytical conclusions is "in accord with the results of the studies of Milman Parry and Albert Lord" (1990:323).

5. A. Edwards 1985:219–220; Dihle 1970:149–150; Davies 1989a:5 intelligently discuss the possibilities of "Cyclic" poems in the pre-Homeric oral tradition. I do not think that there were single oral prototypes of each poem in the Epic Cycle, but rather long-standing oral performance traditions along the lines that Nagy has proposed for the Homeric poems. As was demonstrated in Chapter 1, as well as further below, we need not use Proclus as a guide for the boundaries of these poetic traditions. Nor need every poet have limited himself to a certain poetic tradition. Cf. the supposition at Woodhouse

1930:242–243; Lord 1960:151; Willcock 1976:287; M. Edwards 1990:316; 1991:17–18; M. Anderson 1997:56 that the Homeric poet could have composed epics other than the *Iliad* and *Odyssey.*

6. An exception is Dowden 1996, which I find a step backward in this regard, despite the modern phrasing of his argument.

7. See esp. Pucci 1987. The theoretical framework for such an approach can be found in the work of Nagy (1990b:70–79), who applies the methodology of intertextuality to the oral traditions of the Cyclic poems. M. Lang 1983 is a particularly insightful article on "echo and reverberation" between traditions, though I would question her assumption of early Homeric influence. E. Cook 1995:3–4 concludes that the *Odyssey* tradition alludes to the *Iliad* tradition but not vice versa. Cf. Muellner 1996:52–93 on connections between the *Theogony* and *Iliad.*

8. Beye 1993:264, with further discussion of the problems of allusion and intertextuality in early oral epic at 30–34, 262–265. See also Clay 1997b:241–246, reply at Nagy 1998b.

9. This view, well discussed and graphed at Kullmann 1960:360–361, 373–374 (model 3), has been common since Welcker 1865–1882 (his attitude is summarized at Kullmann 1960:18–19; 1986:116–130). There are some recent indications of an optimistic attitude toward the value of the Cycle: cf. Scaife 1995; Dowden 1992:9–10; 1996; Rutherford 1996b:5 ("precious evidence"); M. Anderson 1997.

10. E.g., the connection between the Cycle poems and authentic tradition is deemed problematic on the very first page of the recent mythological handbook by Gantz 1993.

11. See scholia listed at Bernabé 1987:43–44 under *Cypria* fr. 1 = 1 Davies.

12. T. Allen 1924:72–73, citing a few ancient sources that follow this version. Allen otherwise portrays the *Cypria* as an introduction to the *Iliad* and so it is difficult to understand why he does not think it would correspond to the *Iliad* on this matter.

13. Kullmann 1960:109, 212–214, 225–26, 358–359; 1991:438 (Kullmann is more cautious here and admits that the *Cypria* may introduce the *Iliad*). For a critique of the belief that Achilles withdraws from battle in the *Aethiopis,* see Burgess 1997. Bethe 1966:56–149 had earlier proposed that the Cyclic epics, though originally conceived separately, were at one time joined together (see Kullmann's discussion of his theory at 1960:20).

14. Kullmann 1960:214; 1991:438.

15. There is no evidence for the notion that the *Cypria* here is completely different from the *Iliad;* i.e., that it introduces new, non-Homeric information about the Trojan allies to supplement the *Iliad*'s Trojan catalog, as Monro 1901:351 and T. Allen 1908:82 suggested.

16. Despite controversy over its origins, it is widely recognized that the *Iliad*'s catalog of ships is temporally inappropriate for the ninth year of the war and therefore (among other reasons) must have been adapted from traditional material. Although Proclus does not indicate that the *Cypria* contained a catalog of the Greek ships, perhaps it also independently contained a traditional version, occurring at its most natural place, the gathering at Aulis (where Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.11–14 places it; see also Murray 1934:179–180). Proclus or his predecessors might not have specifically mentioned a cata-

log of ships because they considered it obviously part of the gathering at Aulis (two such gatherings are mentioned in the summary of the *Cypria*). Wade-Gery 1950:49–57, 55, 84–85 nn.113, 114 explores the possibility that both catalogs (of ships and Trojan allies) existed in the pre-Homeric tradition and that various post-Homeric manifestations of them may be more traditional than their Homeric versions (he focuses on Hellanicus, but also considers the *Cypria*).

17. Davies 1989a:51 questions this conclusion.

18. More commonly she is said to have been slaughtered at the grave of Achilles, as in the summary of the *Iliou Persis* by Proclus.

19. Jouan 1966:372 n.5 denies the suggestion (e.g., by Welcker 1865–1882: 2:528, following Müller) that *Cypria* fr. 33 Bernabé = 25 Davies belonged to the *Iliou Persis.* Welcker 1865–1882: 2:164; Wilamowitz 1884:181 n.27; Bethe 1966:18, 69 n.5 argued that the *Kupriaka* (τὰ κυπριακά) mentioned in *Cypria* fr. 34 Bernabé = 27 Davies is actually not the *Cypria.* But "*Kupriaka*" was a common variation of the *Cypria*'s title; see Chapter 1.

20. E.g., Rzach 1922:2394; Jouan 1966:373 in reference to the (apparent) Astyanax fragment; Davies 1989a:51; Bernabé 1987:62; M. Robertson 1990:64 in reference to the Polyxena testimonium.

21. Huxley 1969:158 concedes that the *Cypria* might have covered the whole war. Bethe 1966:68–70, 137–138 denies that there could have been a Cyclic version of the events in the *Iliad,* and certainly the alternative version of the *Iliad* (and *Odyssey*) in Dictys/Dares seems based on Homer, and not any Cyclic source. But in Chapter 2 I argue that early art might indicate that there could be variation of the material narrated by the *Iliad,* which suggests to me that it existed outside of the Homeric tradition.

22. *Aethiopis* fr. 1 Bernabé = Davies p. 48 ("fragmentum spurium"). Bernabé and Davies also include a variant of the second line found in a papyrus.

23. Welcker 1865–1882: 1:199; T. Allen 1908:85; Lesky 1966a:83; 1967:138 accept the verses as genuine, but Wilamowitz 1884:373; Monro 1884:12–13; Jebb 1905:154; Rzach 1922:2396; J. Kakridis 1949:90; Kullmann 1960:46; Notopoulos 1964:36–37; Dihle 1970:43 n.54; Griffin 1980:159 n.29; Davies 1989a:61 do not. See further the notes by Bernabé under fr. 1. Kopff 1981:930; 1983:60–61 argues that the lines come from the *Aethiopis,* but not from its beginning.

24. *Aethiopis* test. 11 Bernabé (Sinn MB 23–26).

25. Kopff 1981:930; 1983:57.

26. Cf. Severyns 1928:314; Lesky 1966a:83; Weitzmann 1959:43–44; Horsfall 1979:47. Certainly later artifacts featuring a "cycle" of scenes from the life of Achilles mixed Homeric and "Cyclic" material.

27. But note that the tables generally seem to belong to a tradition of shortened poems.

28. Kopff 1983:60 also cites as evidence a Roman sarcophagus lid (*LIMC,* "Andromache I," no. 40*; Rome Vill. Borg. LXXX, second century C.E.) with two scenes of Andromache mourning interspersed with two scenes of Penthesileia arriving and preparing to fight. He thinks these scenes were based on the *Aethiopis* (similarly Weitzman 1959:45), and that the scene of Andromache mourning occurred during the funeral of Hector. In

addition, Kopff 1983:59 suggests that the *Aethiopis* is the source for early images that portray events from the end of the *Iliad* in a non-*Iliad*ic manner. However, the *Aethiopis* need not be the source for such iconography, if indeed the images do not reflect the *Iliad.*

29. Reported at Leaf 1886–1888 (1st edition, only) ad loc.

30. Kullmann 1960:336; 1981:40–41.

31. *Nosti* frr. 3–9 Bernabé; frr. 3–7, 9 Davies. For discussion, see Rzach 1922:2424–2425; Severyns 1928:385ff.; Huxley 1969:164–165; Bernabé 1987:95.

32. As Monro 1883:319; Bernabé 1987:95 suggest.

33. On the issue of whether Odysseus visited the underworld in pre-Homeric myth, see Heubeck 1989:75–76 (he does not think that he did).

34. Monro 1884:39 characterized this as an innovation based on the Odyssean adventure at Thrace, incorrectly I believe. Note that here the *Nosti* by having Neoptolemus travel on foot fundamentally conflicts with the Odyssean account, where he sails (but see Davies 1989a:82). It might also be mentioned that Eustathius attributed what we think of as the end of the *Telegony* to the *Nosti* (fr. 16 Bernabé [under "fragmenta falsa"] = "dubia et spuria" fr. 1 Davies). This might best be regarded as confusion, but is it possible that the *Nosti* shared the story of the death of Odysseus with the *Telegony?* Eustathius could not have known the verse of any of the Cycle, but perhaps he was privy to information that reflects the earlier manifestation of the *Nosti* independent of its role in the Epic Cycle. If that is so, then at one time the *Nosti* would have shared material with both the *Odyssey* and the *Telegony.*

35. Of course, the controversial issue of where the *Odyssey* originally ended is inextricably tied up with this question. See Heubeck 1992:313–314, 353–355, with bibliography on the issue, and Erbse 1997. I support the unitarian view. Certainly the apparent overlap between the two poems should not be used to argue that the Homeric poem's ending is inauthentic.

36. Monro's attempt (1901:349, 367–368), following a different interpretation of Aristotle's words, to find one hero, one period, and one πρᾶξις for the *Cypria* and *Little Iliad* is very unconvincing (he suggests Paris and Odysseus respectively as the heroes of these poems). Note that Aristotle had previously discussed biographical epics in ch. 8 and historical epics earlier in ch. 23 without reference to the *Cypria* or to the *Little Iliad.* The mention of one hero and one period can be seen as allusions to these previous discussions.

37. E.g., Monro 1901:349; Lucas 1968 ad loc.; Janko 1987 ad loc. Else 1957:580–587 sees that Aristotle is referring to the type of poem that narrates the whole war but never explicitly considers the *Cypria* and *Little Iliad* to be that type of poem. However, he suggests that Aristotle may have anticipated Bethe in thinking that the *Cypria* and the *Little Iliad* were "particularly clear and parallel embodiments of the same idea: a complete chronicle of the War" (587 n.52).

38. Cf. the complaint of Horace in the *Ars poetica* (136ff.) about the "scriptor Cyclicus" who writes of the whole war. The proem ascribed to the Cyclic author, "fortunam Priami cantabo et nobile bellum" (137; Epic Cycle test 24 Bernabé = "fragmenta incerti

loci" 9 Davies), is similar to the lines that apparently opened the *Little Iliad* (fr. 28 Bernabé = 1 Davies).

39. E.g., Bowra 1930:29–30; Hainsworth 1993a:43–44; Jensen 1980:33–34 (adducing comparative evidence, which cannot impose a fractured view of the Trojan War tradition if we find it functioned as a whole). For a different view, see Nilsson 1932:25; Thornton 1984:10–11; Fehling 1991:8–9, 27 (who stresses the unity of the story of the Trojan War, though I cannot agree with his accrediting this to a single, relatively late author).

40. Cf. M. Anderson 1997:14–91, who insightfully explores connections between different elements of the war. These correlations are for the most part different in nature than the ones that I stress later, though I believe that they largely support my fundamental point about the unity of the legend of the fall of Troy. Whereas he would ascribe such connections to individual authors who molded traditional material to their own purposes (see esp. 15), I am more interested in the natural impetus toward thematic reiteration and structural unity within the broad mythological tradition.

41. Most of these will be familiar or self-explanatory except for the ones involving Troilus. It was sometimes said that the murder of Troilus at an altar of Apollo motivated his assistance in the death of Achilles; Polyxena played a major role in the Troilus story and was also romantically associated with Achilles (and the story of his death); the death of Troilus and Astyanax were often linked by ancient artists, resulting in contamination of iconography. See Burgess 1995:229, 235. An excellent example of using iconography to tease out the links between myths of Troilus, Polyxena, and Achilles, despite the lack of early textual evidence, is given by M. Robertson 1990.

42. This is a fundamental observation of J. Kakridis 1949:91–95; cf. M. Lang 1995 on the development of the Iliadic "wrath story" from the larger "war story."

43. Besides J. Kakridis 1949:91–92, see M. Edwards 1987:76; Hoelscher 1978:56.

44. See Hainsworth 1970:9 and Griffin 1977:52. Finkelberg 1998:155–156 concludes from this fragment and remarks by Aristotle on non-Homeric epic in the *Poetics* ch. 24 that the Cycle poems did not contain much dialogue. This is probably true relative to the Homeric poems, though the many prophecies from characters and the digressive stories of Nestor in the *Cypria* (Proclus) reveal some importance to the words of characters.

45. Cf. the attempt at Kirk 1962:159–178 to pinpoint different styles of narration in the Homeric poems, such as the "catalog" or "tired" style.

46. Ibycus fr. 282.12–32 *PMG* states that Muses can tell of the Trojan War but that a mortal cannot.

47. Ford 1992:83. For comparison of the Siren song to the Trojan War tradition, see also Pucci 1996; Finkelberg 1998:74, 95–98.

48. T. Allen 1924:143; Hainsworth 1993a:43 (he adds that a Demodocus would never sing the whole story).

49. See Bethe 1966:139–140; Kullmann 1960:212–214, 225–226, 358–359, who stress that poems in the Epic Cycle look forward and backward to events in the Trojan War. I think their arguments that these poems were once united are very unlikely, but they do establish that the poems function within an awareness of the whole war.

50. T. Allen 1924:130–176; Kullmann 1960:12–13; Schefold 1993:35 and passim.

51. Bethe 1966:68, 137–138 stressed this point when denying that there could have been a Cyclic version of the events in the *Iliad.* There is possible ancient evidence for *Cypria/Iliad* overlap, admittedly more suggestive than conclusive. The use of the title "*Cypria Ilias*" by Naevius (Bernabé 1987:38; cf. *Cypria* frr. 6–7 Bernabé = "dubia" frr. 1–2 Davies) may suggest that the author knew an early version of the poem which covered the events in the *Iliad* or the whole war. An Iliac table implies that the capture of Chryseis is related in the *Iliad* (Sadurska 1964:41; cf. Weitzman 1959:42–43; Horsfall 1979:47); this confusion may have arisen as a result of shared material between the two poems. I also wonder if the charge by Pollianus (Epic Cycle test. 21 Bernabé = 8 Davies) that "Cyclic" poets stole from Homer to such a degree that they even wrote μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά results from a mistaken belief that shared traditional material belonged to Homeric poetry.

52. See Nagy 1996a:33–35, 130, 190–191 for possible instances where the silence of Homeric scholia need not imply nonexistence of certain evidence or practices; Haslam 1997:68 notes the "remarkable" silence of the Alexandrians on "wild" papyri.

53. Cf. the fragment of Alcaeus that narrates the intercession of Thetis with Zeus on behalf of Achilles (44.6–8 L-P), a duplication of "Iliadic" material to which no scholiast, as far as I am aware, makes reference. I noted in Chapter 2 that the apparent allusion to the *Iliad* is debated.

54. As thought at M. West 1966a:47, followed by Davies 1989a:3; 1989b:98 (but Davies is more cautious on this point at 1986:93 n.21). On the supposed secondary nature of the Hesiodic *Catalog,* see my subsequent discussion.

55. Note how the poet announces that he will summarize the tale of the Ages of Humanity at *Works and Days* 106 (ἐκκορυφώσω; see West 1978 ad loc.).

56. E.g., Latacz 1996:61: "On the one hand, these epics do not even in the smallest particular overlap the *Iliad* and *Odyssey;* on the other, they do refer to the smallest particulars of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* to explain and justify them." Dowden 1996:48 claims, "The author of the *Kypria* already regarded the *Iliad* as a text." Cf. Ahl and Roisman 1996:16–26, who complain (17) that most critics "in practice if not always in theory" consider Cyclic material to be variations of Homeric material.

57. Bernabé prints the scholia in the apparatus, Davies with the fragment. The scholia also differ from the fragment in that the former report Gaia requesting that she be lightened of her burden. I do not necessarily think that these discrepancies constitute an erroneous summary of the *Cypria* by Proclus. Davies 1989a:35 suggests that the scholia are using a non-Cyclic source for a story also found in the *Cypria.* Certainly the general outlines of the Cyclic plan of Zeus are agreed upon by the various sources.

58. E.g., by Monro 1884:7; Kirk 1985 *ad* 1.5, who notes that the charge originated with Aristarchus.

59. See Kullmann 1960:47, 210–212, 227–229; 1984:322; 1991:432; Scodel 1982; Burkert 1992:100–104 (with further bibliography at 206 nn.1, 9); Nagy 1990a:15–16; Koenen 1994:22; Mayer 1996; M. West 1997:480–482 (though at 493–494 he labels it a late-arriving

Oriental element unknown to Hesiod and Homer). Davies 1989a:34 claims that "a rather spurious unity was ingeniously imposed" on the *Cypria* by means of this plan. It was noted earlier that a second plan of Zeus in the *Cypria* is similar to the promise to Thetis in the *Iliad,* but not exactly so.

60. See esp. Redfield 1979, who well surveys the possible interpretations of the Iliadic plan, and now Murnaghan 1997; Clay 1999. Kirk 1985 and Willcock 1978–1984 ad loc. follow Aristarchus in supposing that the Iliadic plan is the promise to Thetis. Aristarchus, Redfield, and Willcock agree that ἐξ οὗ in line 6 refers to the starting point of the plan mentioned in line 5, in which case this plan does not exactly refer to the promise to Thetis. If it directs the Muse to begin with the quarrel of Agamemnon and Achilles (thus, e.g., Kirk 1985, Leaf 1900–1902 ad loc.), this does not ensure that the plan is the promise to Thetis. Redfield prefers to associate the phrase Διὸς δ ἐτελείετο βουλή with prophecy and concludes that the wrath of Achilles had been foretold.

61. Davies 1989a:34 suggests that the Iliadic use of the phrase "seems calculated to convey a rather complex effect, impressive but slightly mysterious." The manner in which the phrase could denote the Iliadic plan but connote the Cyclic one is insightfully explored at Slatkin 1991:118–122; Murnaghan 1997; Holmberg 1998:463; Clay 1999.

62. E.g., Davies 1989a:46; Willcock 1978–1984 ad loc.; Hainsworth 1993a ad loc.

63. Cf. Kullmann 1960:198–199, 267–268; Kirk 1985 *ad* 1.108; Dowden 1989:9–19; Taplin 1992:86; M. Clark 1998:21–22. The earliest candidate for a representation of the sacrifice dates from the seventh century (Appendix C, no. 8). There is a strong variant tradition in which the daughter of Agamemnon is rescued from sacrifice (e.g., *Cypria* [Proclus], Hesiodic *Catalog of Women* fr. 23a M-W), which should not necessarily be regarded as secondary. Cf., also, the "Iphimedeia" thought to be indicated on a Linear B tablet found at Pylos (Chadwick and Ventris 1973:287–288, 463).

64. Cf. Henrichs 1987:251: "Full-fledged alternate names, such as Iphigeneia/Iphianassa/Iphimede . . . are usually found in early stages of the mythological tradition, where they often raise questions that are difficult or impossible to answer."

65. Critical views concerning the Homeric passage are summarized by de Jong 1987:20 n.29. Robbins 1990:9–12 discusses how the *Iliad* significantly employs details from the sack of cities neighboring Troy; Minchin 1999:60 describes artifacts linked to Thebe as "instruments of cohesion" for the narrative. Cf. Mueller 1984:38: "Through a stroke of economy pregnant with narrative implications Homer has identified the expedition against Thebe with the expedition during which Chryseis was captured." In my view this would not necessitate Homeric invention.

66. Thus Monro 1901:350; Heubeck 1991:452; 1954:99; Severyns 1928:307–308; Reinhardt 1961:62 ("cheap invention"); Davies 1989a:48; Taplin 1992:85 n.5 (who cites this as conclusive proof that the Epic Cycle is derivative from Homer).

67. Cf. Kullmann 1960:207–209, 287–288 (esp. 288 n.1), 297–301; 1991:438.

68. Schol. *Il.* 16.57; fr. 27 Bernabé = 21 Davies. For discussion, see Wilamowitz 1884:374; Severyns 1928:307–308 ("cheap originality"); Kullmann 1960:207–209, 284–285, 298–301; 1991:437–438. Apollod. *Epit.* 3.33 states that Achilles captured Thebe, Lyrnessos, and

"many other cities," but does not specify at which Chryseis and Briseis were taken. Note that Proclus mentions the capture of both Lyrnessos and Pedasos.

69. Kullmann 1960:369 insisted that since the *Cypria* and the *Iliad* so rarely disagreed they could not be independent of each other, but I do not think we know enough about the *Cypria* to come to this conclusion.

70. Leaf 1912:242–252; Wade-Gery 1950:85 n.114; Kullmann 1960:281–301 consider stories about the capture of towns neighboring Troy pre-Homeric. On the possible link to Aeolic expansion in the Troad, cf. Bethe 1927:66–76; R. Carpenter 1946:58–59; Nagy 1979:140–141, 272–273. A relief amphora from ca. 650 (Appendix C, no. 10) apparently shows Achilles raiding the cattle of Aeneas, a central incident within these forays (cf. *Il.* 20.90–93, 187–190; the summary of the *Cypria* by Proclus; Apollod. *Epit.* 3.32). On Homeric details about Thebe, see Chapter 2.

71. Willcock 1978–1984 ad loc.; de Jong 1987:265 n.103 conclude Chryseis was either traditional or meant to seem so. Cf. the opinion of Murray 1934:204; Friis Johansen 1967:153; Griffin 1995:87–88 that Briseis was untraditional. I do not see that the mention of Briseis in conjunction with the seven women from Lesbos that Agamemnon offers to Achilles at *Il.* 9.128–132, 270–274, 19.245–246 means that Briseis is also from Lesbos; see Hainsworth 1993a *ad* 9.130. At *Il.* 2.690 her place of capture is Lyrnessos. For the theory that Briseis is from Brisa or Bresa of Lesbos, see Reinhardt 1961:50–57.

72. Taplin 1984:18 n.6; 1992:85, with reference also to Briseis, on the theory that she comes from Lesbos. See also Robbins 1990:11 n.31.

73. Severyns 1928:308 suggests that scholiasts invented some accounts as alternatives to the one in the *Cypria* because followers of Aristarchus refused to use a Cyclic poem to explain the *Iliad.*

74. *Cypria* fr. 13 Bernabé = 12 Davies; *Little Iliad* fr. 20 Bernabé = 23 Davies; *Iliou Persis* (Proclus), fr. 6 Bernabé = 4 Davies. Her story begins before the war and continues on through it, giving yet another demonstration that the narrative of the Trojan War was more than a string of unrelated episodes.

75. Aristarchus was tempted to delete the Homeric line, but supposed it might be a case of accidental homonym, as Leaf 1900–1902 ad loc. judged the matter. Willcock 1978–1984 ad loc. believes the Homeric reference to Aithra is insignificant use of a name taken from the "epic stock," whereas Kirk 1985 ad loc. states that it is an Athenian interpolation "almost without doubt." Monro 1884:26–27 remarks that "it might seem, indeed, that the whole story was based on the line of Homer" (26) before rejecting that possibility. M. Anderson 1997:99 sensibly affirms that the passage presupposes the story of Helen's abduction. See now especially Jenkins 1999, who not only supports the line's reference to Helen's abduction but demonstrates how such an allusion would function within the *Iliad.*

76. *Little Iliad* fr. 6 Bernabé = "fragmenta incerti loci" 7 Davies.

77. See S. West 1988 *ad* 4.246–9, who also rejects the reading by Aristarchus. For a discussion of this passage in the context of terms for slaves and treatment of slaves, see Thalmann 1998:65–66.

78. See S. West 1988 ad loc., who concludes that the lines are probably an intrusion. Bernabé lists the lines as a possible fragment of the *Little Iliad* (fr. 26, under "incerti operis fragmenta"); cf. "fragmenta incerti loci" 8 Davies.

79. As Monro 1884:25 argued. M. Anderson 1997:84 is tempted to think the passage an "Odyssean invention," though he recognizes other possibilities.

80. *Telegony* fr. 4 Bernabé. I remarked on this passage in Burgess 1995:234 n.70 in reference to the use of poison in Greek myth.

81. E.g., Bernabé 1987:195; Heubeck 1989:86; Davies 1989a:93–94.

82. Many scholars haven taken the story of the death of Odysseus in the *Telegony* as more than a Cyclic misreading of the Homeric text: cf. Scheliha 1943:415–416; Burkert 1983:157–159; A. Edwards 1985:227 n.28; Ballabriga 1990:26; Nagy 1990a:214; Peradotto 1990:63–74; Edmunds 1997:423–424. The last suggests that the *Iliad* "acknowledges, and repudiates, the variant represented by the *Telegony*"; Peradotto thinks that the Homeric prophecy was never followed exactly by accounts of the death of Odysseus, including that in the *Telegony.*

83. *Nosti* fr. 7 Bernabé = 6 Davies (apparently in the underworld passage); cf. *Il.* 9.446. *Little Iliad* fr. 21.3–4 Bernabé = 20.3–4 Davies; cf. *Il.* 6. 467, 24.735. Bernabé lists correspondences in his notes below fragments. On correspondence between the *Little Iliad* fragment and the *Iliad* lines, see M. Anderson 1997:54–59. Griffin 1977:42, 51–52 asserts that these Cyclic fragments are based on the Homeric comparanda. Cf. also the argument of M. Anderson 1997:38 that the *Little Iliad*'s account of Priam being dragged from the altar of Zeus to the foredoors, according to testimonia (fr. 16 Bernabé; fr. 17 Davies), is an attempt to reconcile tradition to Priam's vision of his death at the foredoors (*Il.* 22.59–71).

84. Thus Forsdyke 1956:12; Griffin 1977:43–44; Davies 1989a:40, 83–84, 89; Hainsworth 1993a:44. Griffin 1977:43 refers to the Cycle's "indiscriminate passion for elaboration," which in terms of children he links with erotic episodes.

85. M. West 1966a:49. This statement should be regarded with extreme suspicion, because the *Theogony* itself catalogs in an agglutinative way, and it is apparent that Hesiod knew other poetry like it (see *Theog.* 43ff.). Cf. Janko 1982:247 n.37, who questions West's dating of the end of the *Theogony* to the sixth century. Janko views the end of the *Theogony* as part of the *Catalog* (221–225, 248), which he considers contemporaneous with the *Theogony* (196, fig. 4 on 200; 1992:14) and by Hesiod (1992:xxv).

86. See Whitman 1958:84; Davison 1968:100. Texts circulating among the general public are out of the question at an early date, despite Powell's (1991:185) fantasy of early colonists packing a copy of the *Iliad* with them. Cf. Latacz's (1996:5–6, 67–68, 142–143) assumption that there were "freely circulating" (6) texts in the Archaic Age.

87. Cf. Havelock 1982:16–18, 34 n.27, 35 n.30; Davison 1968:89; Forsdyke 1956:124; Thomas 1992:13, 113–117. "Craft literacy" is a frequent term of Havelock, not always clearly in reference to poets. He (1982:23) attributes Homer's influence to the spread of Homeric manuscripts. Thomas thinks poets in the Archaic Age possessed texts of their own

work only as an aide-mémoire and to leave to posterity; publication, she thinks, would be entirely oral.

88. Theagenes fr. 8.3 D-K. On Theagenes, see Clarke 1981:61ff; Pfeiffer 1968:9–11; Davison 1962:235–236; Richardson 1993:28 (who describes him as the start of a new attitude toward epic which widened with the sophists of the fifth century; cf. Pfeiffer 1968:43–45, who stresses the absence of critical abilities even in the fifth century).

89. Arist. *Rhet.* 1.15.13 (= 1375b30). See Janko 1992:29–30; Davison 1968:16–17. Davison notes that the reference may be to a fourth-, not sixth-century dispute.

90. Kirk 1966:160 argues for "literate imitation" of Homeric poetry based on memorization in the sixth century.

91. I suspect that most scholars gain the impression from him that the Cycle is bad poetry, and that bad poetry is late (e.g., Hainsworth 1993b:43–45, citing Griffin 1977 at 161 n.3; O. Murray in the transcribed discussion at Kopff 1983:62; Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:23). Davies 1989a carefully describes various Cyclic characteristics as "un-Homeric" without reference to date.

92. On suppression in Homeric poetry, see A. Lang 1893:336–337; Murray 1934:120–145; Griffin 1977:40–41; Schein 1984:46; M. Edwards 1987:137; Mondi 1990:157; Davies 1989a:9; Dowden 1989:11–12. As Mondi points out, it is often possible that the Homeric poems idiosyncratically stand alone in relation to what preceded and followed them (cf. the description by A. Edwards 1985:218 of the *Iliad* as "odd-man-out" for its suppression of immortality). See Rose 1992:36 for the application of the phrase "structured silence" to a work of art's treatment of challenges to its dominant ideology. The argument of Mackie 1997 that Homeric suppression is a "partial process" that deliberately allows retention of un-Homeric elements is particularly insightful; from this perspective we can see how, for instance, the *Iliad* stresses mortality, yet acknowledges Achilles' cultic immortality (Nagy 1979:340–343).

93. Monro 1884:14, 16–17, 32–33; 1901:361, 377; Jebb 1905:155; Evelyn-White 1914:xxx–xxxi; T. Allen 1924:76 n.1; Forsdyke 1956:12, 97–98, 132; Jouan 1980:102. See Kullmann 1960:46; 1991:439 for an opposing view.

94. Appendix C, no. 20.

95. As mercenaries for Psammetichus I; see Braun 1982:32; Snowden 1983:26; MacLachlan 1992:16 n.2. Regular contact would be much later. For an overview of recent scholarship in Nubiology, especially on relations to the Mediterranean world, see Török 1998.

96. Forsdyke 1956:97–98. Drews 1969 replies to a similar argument by viewing the Eastern origins of Memnon as primary. Cf. Heubeck 1989 *ad* 11.14–19 on the controversy concerning whether the "Cimmerians" of the *Odyssey* are related to the historical people called "Gimmerians." He argues that the relation between myth and reality is complex and elusive, noting that the Greeks often applied names derived from myth to real places and people, and concludes and that this possible correspondence of Cimmerians/Gimmerians cannot be used to date the *Odyssey.*

97. Most thoroughly demonstrated by Boedeker 1974; see also Nagy 1979:205 section 42 n.3; Slatkin 1991:28–33; Bremmer 1994:98.

98. See *LIMC,* "Aithiopes" and "Memnon." An early connection between mythological Aethiopians and Africa is stressed at Snowden 1970:144–155 (cf. Snowden 1983:46); R. Carpenter 1946:176; R. Griffith 1998. The last states (1998:213) that the first clear placement of Aethiopians south of Egypt is Hecataeus (1 F 326–327 *FGH*). From Herodotus onward Susa also became another favorite candidate for the homeland of the Aethiopians (see Lesky 1966b:414). *Od.* 1.22–24, where a western as well as eastern set of Aethiopians is specified, could be explained as vague reference to Africans and Indians, but most likely this passage reflects the paradoxical nature of the edges of the earth in early Greek myth (Lesky 1966b:417 ascribes the passage to Ionian rationalism). Lesky 1966b:416 supposes that in mythological logic people near the rising sun would have dark skin, but admits that Menelaus's visit to Aethiopians in *Odyssey* 4 indicates that the *Odyssey* was composed when the conception of the Aethiopian's localization was changing. Romm 1992:50 notes that the passage is indeed surprising. Crielaard 1995:229; Dickie 1995:44 accept Homeric knowledge of Africa.

99. And MacLachlan 1992 stresses that the fabulous characteristics of mythological Aethiopians persisted in the face of detailed knowledge of the historical Aethiopians.

100. See Braun 1982:32, who notes the presence of Egyptian artifacts at eighth-century Greek sites and Dark Age Lefkandi suggests at least indirect knowledge before the seventh century. Of course, Mycenaean contacts with Egypt are undoubted.

101. Because the cranes who fight pygmies are fleeing the rainy season of winter (*Il.* 3.4), they are flying south; that points to Africa. "The war between the cranes and the pygmies is a folk story reflecting some knowledge of a diminutive African tribe," says Willcock 1978–1984 ad loc. Later Greeks explicitly linked mythical pygmies with Africa (see Kirk 1985 ad loc.); admittedly that is not a sure indication that the link was original. See Muellner 1990 for a detailed analysis of the simile, and esp. 99–101 for a discussion of its historical basis, with Egypt seen as a possible conduit of the concept of Pygmies to Greece.

102. In general see the articles in *RE* on Penthesileia and Amazons. Kullmann 1960:46 demonstrates that Forsdyke 1956:104–105 is wrong to find a Thracian origin for Penthesileia unusual. Fenik 1964:13 notes that Rhesus is also from Thrace and suggests that there was a Cyclic interest in Thrace.

103. Cf. Monro 1884:16–17; 1901:360–361; T. Allen 1924:76; Nagy 1979:167 sec. 27 n.1; 1990b:70–71, 421; Hommel 1980:11–13, 21–24; Ferrari 1983:133, 139. Similar issues arise concerning the translation of Iphigeneia to the Tauri in the *Cypria;* for example, Monro 1884:8–9; 1901:352 claims that if Proclus is correct about this detail of Iphigeneia's translation, then "this form of the story is necessarily later than Greek settlements on the northern coasts of the Euxine" (1884:9).

104. Notably Minns 1913:439; Graham 1982:89–92, 122–129; Drews 1976; see discussion at Taylor 1994:386–388; Janko 1982:232–233; Tsetskhladze 1994:111–113;

Crielaard 1995:233–235; Boardman 1998. On the dating of Berezan's founding, dated to 648–647 by Eusebius but with apparently later archaeological evidence, see Solovyov 1999:3–4.

105. The "land Colchis" is specified by Eumelus (*Korinthiaka* fr. 3.8 Bernabé = 2a.8 Davies). The eighth-century date often given to Eumelus may be questioned, however (see Bernabé 1987:106–108 for testimonia). It has often been supposed, largely through the influence of Meuli, that the *Odyssey* transposed details from the eastward journey of the Argo to Odysseus's westward journey (see summary of these views at Kullmann 1991:449–453 and Heubeck 1989). If so, that would make a prominent Black Sea myth most pre-Homeric. Braund 1998:289 strongly affirms that the Black Sea was always part of Argonautic myth.

106. E.g., Nagy 1979:167 n.1; Huxley 1969:149; Hommel 1980:12–13.

107. Thus Welcker 1865–1882: 2:220; Rohde 1925:65, 565 n.102; Robert 1920–1926:1194; Diehl 1953:1; Scheliha 1943:242, 394; A. Edwards 1985:215 n.1; Hedreen 1991:328–329. Monro 1884:17 and Ferrari 1983:133 admit that this is possible. The name may be related to pale shades, "White Rock" (*Od.* 24. 11), and the white poplar associated with Hades (cf. Rohde 1925:565 n.102; Hommel 1980:21 n.53; Nagy 1990a:223–262).

108. At times myth allowed mortals to cross from the actual world into such never-never lands. E.g., Hercules travels to the Hyperboreans at Pind. *Ol* 3.13–35, as does Perseus at Pind. *Pyth.* 10.29–46 (the placement of Croesus there in Bacchylides 3 is more of a translation; see Vermeule 1979:134–135), and Odysseus crosses the line often in the *Odyssey* (Burgess 1999).

109. Hedreen 1991 intriguingly links Achilles with the North in geographical opposition to Memnon. The apparent priority of an eastern localization for the Aethiopians is also a difficulty for his argument, but see my earlier discussion on the early location of the mythological Aethiopians. Cf. MacLachlan 1992:28–29 on Hyperboreans and Ethiopians as "geographical antipodes." Hedreen is inspired by the association of Achilles with the Scythians at Ferrari 1983 on the evidence of vase depictions. I find her thesis problematic at times, but on how Milesian cult could lead to a Scythian persona of Achilles, see Nagy 1990b:71 n.96.

110. See Vermeule 1964:89, 114, 128, 131; A. Sherratt 1994:268–272.

111. On Mycenaean contact, see Hiller 1991; Tsetskhladze 1994:114. The thesis of R. Carpenter that Greek ships were incapable of penetrating the Black Sea before the Archaic Age has long been overturned. Note that it is often thought that the importance of Troy in the Bronze Age depended on its ability to monitor sea passage to the Black Sea (e.g., Korfmann 1986; 1998:380–383; Wright 1998). Artifacts of Geometric date have been associated with the northern Black Sea, though interpretation is controversial (see Tsetskhladze 1994:111–112, 114; 1998b:10–15; Boardman 1998). For Berezan, Solovyov 1999 reasonably concludes that pottery fragments from the third quarter of the seventh century resulted from visits by Greek scouts and traders, with colonization beginning at the end of the century; cf. Tsetskhladze 1998b:20. Taylor 1994:384 believes that the "es-

tablishment of Greek colonies around the Black Sea was a return to and a resumption of relations with a hinterland in which, also, the memory of an earlier occasion was preserved."

112. Thus Minns 1913:436–439; Lesky 1966b; Tsetskhladze 1994:114.

113. See especially Nagy 1979:7–11; 1990a:10–11, 36–82; 1990b:70–78. Nagy 1995; 1996b:43–58 uses Indic traditions in a comparative exploration of the thesis. Note that Nagy envisions the Cyclic traditions not as simply local, but rather less Panhellenic than the Homeric poems within a larger unified tradition of the Trojan War: see Nagy 1990b:60–61, 70–71; 1995:165; see also Janko 1982:25–26. The story of the Trojan War is often seen as becoming Panhellenic during the period of migration at the end of the Bronze Age.

114. See now Malkin 1998:3, 29, 134–138, 207–209.

115. See Davies 1989a:82, with Malkin 1998:134–138 for a discussion of the Molossian tradition about Neoptolemus's return. Lineage there resulting from Neoptolemus is implied by scholia to *Od.* 3.188; Paus. 1.11.1.

116. Titles in the testimonia include τὰ Κύπρια, τὰ Κύπρια ἔπη, τὰ Κύπρια ποιήματα, τὰ Κυπριακά, τὰ Κυπριακὰ ποιήματα, and τὰ Κυπριακὰ συγγράματα, all apparently alternative titles to the same poem; see Severyns 1938: 2:93; Bethe 1966:18; Bernabé 1987:38. As noted in Chapter 1, it is also imaginable that different poems had the same title or similar titles.

117. See Bernabé 1987:38; Davies 1989a:33. Cf. the *Naupaktia* and *Phokais* for titles derived from place; M. West 1995:217 n.43 supposes that the *Iliad*'s title stems from the place of composition. The possibilities of the *Cypria* as a poem from Cyprus are explored at Lloyd-Jones 1973; Burkert 1992:103–104; Nagy 1990b:77. For the title as a reference to Aphrodite (denied as possible at Burkert 1992:207 n.10), see Aelian *VH* 9.15; Huxley 1969:132; Scaife 1995:173. Photius (*Cypria* test. 7 Bernabé = 11 Davies) indicates that Proclus believed that the title should be written as a paroxytone, which Severyns 1938: 2:96–98 discussed with reference to the ascription of the poem to Kyprias (genitive Κυπρία) by Demodamas, according to Athenaeus (*Cypria* test. 8 Bernabé = test. 12, fr. 4 Davies). A new inscription from Halikarnassos (see note 67 in Chapter 1) lists Kyprias as a native poet, though of an *Iliaka*. This has potential relevance to issues discussed in this work, but my initial reaction is an increased skepticism of ancient *testimonia* on Cyclic authors and titles. Emmet Robbins has pointed out to me that as a feminine singular, as at Pind. *Ol.* 1.75, Κυπρία would be equivalent to Κύπρις and refer to the goddess; the title is clearly a neuter plural, however, in the testimonia. Of course, Cyprus could well have been the origin of a narrative featuring Aphrodite, as Huxley 1969:134–135 notes.

118. Fr. 12 Bernabé = 10 Davies. See interpretation at Severyns 1928:380–382.

119. Cf. Lloyd-Jones 1973; Burkert 1992:103–104; Nagy 1990b:77.

120. Janko 1982:176. M. West 1997:628 speculates on epic traditions in Cyprus, seeing possible connections to Near Eastern traditions and Homeric poetry. Nagy 1990b:77 links the *Cypria* with the similarity he sees between the surviving local dialect of Cyprus

with an early linguistic layer of the epic tradition, despite Janko's denial that there is any trace of the Cypriot vernacular in the *Cypria.*

121. See note 70. Cf. the association by Nagy 1990b:75 n.114, following Aloni, of the *Little Iliad* (attributed to Lesches of Lesbos) with rivalry between Athens and Mytilene in the Troad in the sixth century. As Davies 1989a:78 notes, the gifts given to the sons of Theseus by Agamemnon, as specified by a fragment of the *Iliou Persis,* might have been land in the Troad. But note that the Theseids were present in both poems (*Little Iliad* fr. 20 Bernabé = 23 Davies; *Iliou Persis* [Proclus], fr. 6 Bernabé = 4 Davies). Aloni 1986:60–62 argues that the Lesbian tradition countered the use of the Theseids for territorial claim, but this must remain speculation. Herodotus reports that the Athenians justified their takeover of Sigeion because of their part in the Trojan War (5.94), which Burkert 1987:45 supposes is a reference to the sons of Theseus, with the *Little Iliad* and *Iliou Persis* both used as testimony (How and Wells ad loc. suppose the *Iliad*).

122. N. Robertson 1992:166–175. He suggests, as explanation for the incorporation of the custom into the *Cypria,* that it was "seemingly akin" to instances of burial practice in the Trojan War narrative, including an episode in the *Cypria* (174–175). One might also be surprised to think that the *Cypria* was the source of a *negative* tradition about the Cyprian Kinyras (cf. *Il.* 11.20), if there were any reason to think the poem contained this detail (ascribed by M. West 1997:629 n.134; J. Frazer 1921: 2:179 n.3 reports that the idea originated with R. Wagner).

123. Sees note 103.

124. Hedreen 1991 and Hommel 1980 offer recent discussions that usefully gather the inscriptional evidence, which continues to be discovered and published. See also Minns 1913:451–492; Rohde 1925:565 n.102; Escher 1893:222–224; Fleischer 1884–1886:56–63; Robert 1920–1926:1194–1195; Diehl 1953; Farnell 1921:285–289; Bravo 1974:135–148; Kemp-Lindemann 1975:242–248; Ferrari 1983:133–134; Thordarson 1972:120–121. I plan to discuss the topic more thoroughly in a future project on the death and afterlife of Achilles.

125. See, e.g., Rohde 1925:115–124; Burkert 1985:203–208; Snodgrass 1987:159–164. Antonaccio 1995a provides a thorough survey of the evidence, with further bibliography, which is enormous. For recent discussions, see Crielaard 1995:266–273; Whitley 1995; Seaford 1994:109–119, 180–190 (who links hero cult with the rise of the polis); Osborne 1996:103–105.

126. See Escher 1983:223; Fleischer 1884–1886:59; Kemp-Lindemann 1975:244; Heubeck 1992 *ad Od.* 24.84. Herodotus 5.94, Strabo 13.32, Pliny *NH* 5.125 suggest that Achilles was understood to be buried in the Troad; perhaps the most famous example is the offering made on the tomb of Achilles by Alexander the Great (Diodorus Siculus 17.17.3; Arrian *Anabasis* 1.12). Heubeck supposes that the poet of the *Odyssey* may have known of a tomb of Achilles at that site as a well-known landmark and cult site (cf. Nagy 1979:338–343 in reference to the *Iliad*). Hommel 1980:9–10 suggests that the description of Achilles by Alcaeus as lord of Scythia (354 L-P) was part of a hymn composed to be sung at the grave of Achilles there. Cf. the Thessalian hymn sung at the grave site, reported at Philostratus *Heroicus* 208.53.10, which explains that the mortal part of Achilles

was buried at Troy while his immortal part went to Leuke. I do not agree with the implication at Ferrari 1983:133 that Achilles was buried at Leuke. See Escher 1893:240 for criticism of the few ancient sources that do suggest this, notably Apollod. *Epit.* 5.5, where the text is garbled (see J. Frazer 1921 ad loc.).

127. See Osborne 1996:103–104.

128. Thus Philostratus *Heroicus* 208.53.10; pseudo-Aristotelian *Peplos* nos. 4, 5. The ancient conception is accepted at Robert 1920–1926:1193–1194; J. Frazer 1921: 2:216 n.1; Pfister 1970:182. The immortalization of Heracles is comparable. The thesis of Rohde (1925:64–65) that the body of heroes was always transported and rejuvenated in paradise locations has been influential, but is exaggerated, as Nilsson 1949:622 n.13 noted. Cf. Dietrich 1965:345–347.

129. Inscriptions and a very few remains of a temple have been found. For political reasons the island has been infrequently visited, but an archaeological team from the Odessa Archaeological Museum visited it in the late 1980s (Treister and Vinogradov 1993:533–534). For the ghost tales, see Rohde 1925:537, 565 n.102, 567 n.103 and Hedreen 1991:320 n.51.

130. For the comparable case of Dilmun-Bahrain in Mesopotamia myth and history, see Burgess 1999:194.

131. On Berezan see now the study by Solovyov 1999.

132. On Panhellenic participation, see Bravo 1974:135, 141, 144, 148; Hedreen 1991:322. Cf. Malkin 1998:25–26, 95–119 on the cult to Odysseus at the Polis bay cave at Ithaca, where it is described as "proto-Panhellenic." Malkin 1998:100–101 argues against the skepticism of Antonaccio regarding whether ritual activity there had always been associated with Odysseus (cf. the good discussion of his views at E. Cook 2000; for details on the archaeological data, see Waterhouse 1996). Osborne 1996:31 stresses the continuity of a "tradition" there through the Dark Age, though he adds, "definite cult is a little harder to prove."

133. A Milesian origin for the Black Sea cult of Achilles is argued by Farnell 1921:286–287, with reference to an obscure myth about Achilles and Miletus.

134. Hommel's thesis is that the concept of Achilles as a sea divinity who ruled over an island of the dead preceded and inspired worship of him on Leuke in the Black Sea. It has met resistance and is most thoroughly criticized by Hooker 1988. At times Hommel's argument resembles outdated notions of faded gods, but the apparent paradox of Achilles being associated with both the underworld and a paradise island is not that unusual: see Burgess 1999 on conflation of otherworld motifs.

135. Fleischer 1884–1886:54 (cf. 58–59) supposes that the story of Achilles' translation to the historical Leuke was known to Black Sea natives before Greek colonists arrived (Diehl 3 disputes this). For syncretism, cf. Danoff 1962:1173; Bravo 1974:147; Kemp-Lindemann 1975:244; Thordarson 1972:121; Hommel 1980:16 n.35; Malkin 1987:163; Hedreen 1991:322. Interaction by Greek settlers with the native Scythians is undoubted (see, e.g., Graham 1982:127–129; Tsetskhladze 1994:118, 125; 1998b:44–50; Hind 1992–1993:99–100; Treister

and Vinogradov 1993:525–526; Solovyov 1999:4, 7, 28–30, 49, 54, 129–130). Cf. the thesis by Ferrari 1983 that Scythians were associated with Achilles in Greek art.

136. *Little Iliad* fr. 28 Bernabé = 1 Davies. See Vinogradov 1969:142–143; Vinogradov and Zolotarev 1990:109, 119 fig. c (*SEG* 1990:612). Cf. the early graffito at Olbia of a line of the *Odyssey,* mentioned in Chapter 2 at note 272.

137. Thus Apollod. *Epit.* 5.1 (other sources for this story are listed at Bernabé 1987:67). Davies 1986:106 thinks that the *Aethiopis* contained the purification of Penthesileia.

138. Monro 1884:17, 33; 1901:361–362, 377; Jebb 1905:155; Chadwick 1912:236–37; Forsdyke 1956:132; Lesky 1966a:82; Griffin 1977:48; Jouan 1980:102; Andersen 1982:25. Dodds 1951:35–37 influentially argued that Homeric poetry is separate from the Archaic Age in this aspect.

139. See Scheliha 1943:363; Lloyd-Jones 1983:53–54, 70–78; Parker 1983:130–143; Burkert 1992:55–64.

140. See Lloyd-Jones 1983:73; Burkert 1985:186 n.9; but cf. Parker 1983:131 n.102.

141. E.g., A. Lang 1893:340; Rohde 1925:180; Scheliha 1943:363. Dodds 1951:43–44 almost admits this is possible.

142. See Lloyd-Jones 1983:73–74; Parker 1983:135 (who provides further bibliography).

143. See Parker 1983:130, 135 n.125.

144. Dodds 1951:44 admits this is so, but argues that blood purification was unusually stressed in the Archaic Age, unlike Homer's age.

145. Monro 1884:15, 17; 1901:361, 377; Jebb 1905:153–155; Forsdyke 1956:130–131; Jouan 1980:102–103. A passionate proponent of this view is Sourvinou-Inwood, who misuses the evidence of the Homeric poems in support of her argument. See I. Morris 1989 for a critique of her method, which withstands her response.

146. See A. Edwards 1985, an important and convincing analysis. I am inclined to think of the *Odyssey* and the *Aethiopis* as situating themselves within a wide spectrum of afterlife possibilities (see Burgess 1999), rather than being diametrically opposed in regards to the afterlife of Achilles. I will explore this further in a future project on the death and afterlife of Achilles.

147. See esp. Nagy 1979:165–173; cf. 208. Nagy 1995:169–170 notes that in Indic traditions a local hero tends to be immortalized when he becomes incorporated into larger national traditions; this is distinguished from Greek traditions, in which Nagy sees immortality as an aspect of local traditions and immortality suppressed in the Panhellenic Homeric epics.

148. Elysium predicted for Menelaus at *Od.* 4.561–569; Calypso offers to make Odysseus immortal (ἀθάνατος) at *Od.* 5.206–210, 23.336; Leucothea is specified as the immortalized Ino at *Od.* 5.333–335; alternate immortality of Dioscuri at *Od.* 11.299–304; Heracles is described as immortal at *Od.* 11.601–626 (cf. Hesiod fr. 25.25–33 M-W); the immortalized Ganymede is mentioned at *Il.* 20.231–235. As A. Edwards 1985:217 n.7 complains, Griffin 1977:42 downplays the extent of Homeric immortality, especially in the *Odyssey,* a charge that can now be leveled against Sourvinou-Inwood 1995:10–107.

149. Divine rescue: e.g., *Il.* 5.311–318, 20.288–339, 3.373–382; seizure by winds: e.g., *Od.* 20.61–82, cf. 1.241, 14.371; *Il.* 6.345–348. See Rohde 1925:56–57; Vermeule 1979:162–177; Nagy 1979:192–197; 1990a:240–246; A. Edwards 1985:221–223.

150. See Burgess 1999 for a survey of Near Eastern and Mediterranean traditions, particularly as they relate to the *Gilgamesh Epic* and the *Odyssey.*

151. See esp. A. Edwards 1985, who convincingly demonstrates that a special afterlife for Achilles is both the pre-and post-Homeric norm.

152. E.g., Monro 1884:16, 32; 1901:360–361, 377; Jebb 1905:153.

153. See Versnel 1990; I. Morris 1993 for thorough reviews of the complicated history of critical views on ritual and myth.

154. For the argument that hero cult was based on epic poetry, see Coldstream 1976; 1977:346–352; Farnell 1921:280–342; Hooker 1988:4–5. Price 1979 gives the strongest argument against this view, adducing several examples of pre-Homeric hero cults (Antonaccio 1995a is more cautious about interpretation and classification of this evidence). Nagy has most energetically explored the concurrent existence of heroes in myth and cult (see 1979:10, 69–210, esp. 114–117). Snodgrass 1987:159–164 suggests a separate development of epic poetry and hero cult until the late eighth century. The recently found burial at Lefkandi, dated to the tenth century, has been described as a "heroon"; for a skeptical view, see Antonaccio 1995b:14; Sourvinou-Inwood 1995:55 n.123, 94, 116.

155. Rohde 1925:12–19. Nagy 1979:116–117 follows his lead for the funeral of Patroclus. Cf. Farnell 1921:5–11.

156. On Sarpedon, see Nagy 1990a:122–142; and M. West 1997:386 for Near Eastern parallels.

157. The summary of the *Little Iliad* by Proclus states that Achilles appeared to Neoptolemus. A fragment of a different prose summary of the *Little Iliad* states that this appearance occurred next to Achilles' tomb (*Little Iliad,* argumenta 2 Bernabé). The summary by Proclus of the *Iliou Persis* and Apollod. *Epit.* 5.23 state that Polyxena was slaughtered at Achilles' grave. No reason is given for this action, but later poets linked it with a request by the ghost of Achilles (see J. Frazer 1921: 2:240 n.1; Gantz 1993:658–659). In the summary of the *Nosti* by Proclus, Achilles appears to Agamemnon before his departure to give him a warning. Monro 1884:32 linked the slaughter of Polyxena with hero cult of Achilles.

158. Kullmann 1960:339, 355 compares Achilles' encounter with the shade of Patroclus with appearances of ghosts in the Cyclic poems.

159. Griffin 1977:40–41, preceded by Monro 1884:10; 1901:352–354. Nagy 1990b:72 n.99 counters that the "fantastic and the miraculous elements in the Cycle characterize the religious ideology of local cults, reflecting the more localized interests of individual city-states or groups of city-states."

160. Cf. Bowra 1952:5; Kullmann 1960:48–49; M. West 1985:138.

161. Hansen 1997:461–462 notes the suppression of the supernatural folktale motifs in the Homeric poems; Propp 1984:88 believed that rational variants are later than more su-

pernatural ones in folk tale. Cf. Chadwick 1912:110–114 on the diachronic priority of the supernatural in Teutonic heroic tradition.

162. See Kullmann 1960:223. One reason Wilamowitz 1884:181 n.27 suspected that a story about the wounding of Polyxena did not belong to the *Cypria* was because he deemed the account too realistic for epic poetry.

163. Rzach 1922:2394; Forsdyke 1956:131; Griffin 1977:43–45; Jouan 1980:102. Nagy 1990b:72 n.99 notes that the production of children from heroic intrigues could serve the genealogical interests of local communities.

164. Vermeule 1979:157–158; cf. Mueller 1984:138 ("sex and violence are the stuff of the Trojan War").

165. The quote is from Forsdyke 1956:131, who in fact thinks the wooden horse is a post-Homeric tale interpolated into the *Odyssey.* On the theory of the possible origin of the wooden horse as a Near Eastern battering ram, see S. Morris 1995, with bibliography. For the wooden horse as a magical talisman, see Faraone 1992:94–112, who nicely surveys other approaches. Most interpretations assume that the episode developed from very old traditions.

References

Editions of the Epic Cycle and Proclus

Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta. Ed. by M. Davies. Göttingen, 1988.
Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns, and Homerica. Ed. H. G. Evelyn-White. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass., 1914.
Hymni, Cyclus, fragmenta, et cetera. Vol. 5 of *Homeri opera.* Ed. T. W. Allen. Oxford, 1912.
Poetae epici Graeci. Testimonia et fragmenta. Vol. 1. Ed. A. Bernabé. Leipzig, 1987. Corrected edition 1996.
Der troische Epenkreis. Ed. E. Bethe. Stuttgart, 1966. Originally published 1919.

Editions of Proclus only

Die Quellen der Ilias, pp. 52–57. Ed. W. Kullmann [Allen's text with changes listed on p. 51 n.8]. *Hermes* Einzelschriften 14. Wiesbaden, 1960.
La Vita Homeri et les sommaires du Cycle. Texte et traduction. Vol. 4 of *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclos.* Ed. A. Severyns. Paris, 1963.

Works Cited

Abramson, H. 1979. "A Hero Shrine for Phrontis at Sounion?" *CSCA* 12:1–19.
Adkins, A. W. H. 1960. *Merit and Responsibility.* Oxford.
Ahl, F., and H. M. Roisman. 1996. *The Odyssey Re-Formed.* Ithaca, N.Y.
Ahlberg-Cornell, G. 1992. *Myth and Epos in Early Greek Art.* Jonsered, Sweden.
Allen, A. 1993. *The Fragments of Mimnermus.* Stuttgart.
Allen, T. W. 1908. "The Epic Cycle." *CQ* 2:64–74, 81–88.
———, ed. 1912. *Hymni, Cyclus, fragmenta, et cetera.* Vol. 5 of *Homeri opera.* Oxford.
———. 1924. *Homer: The Origins and the Transmission.* Oxford.
Aloni, A. 1986. *Tradizioni arcaiche della Troade e composizione dell' Iliade.* Milan.
Andersen, Ø. 1982. "Thersites und Thoas vor Troia." *SO* 57:7–34.
———. 1990. "The Making of the Past in the *Iliad.*" *HSCP* 93:25–45.

Andersen, Ø, and M. Dickie, eds. 1995. *Homer's World: Fiction, Tradition, Reality.* Bergen, Norway.

Anderson, G. 1986. *Philostratus.* London.

Anderson, M. J. 1997. *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art.* Oxford.

Andreae, B., and C. P. Presicce, eds. 1996. *Ulisse. Il mito e la memoria.* Rome.

Antonaccio, C. 1995a. *An Archaeology of Ancestors.* Lanham, Md.

———. 1995b. "Lefkandi and Homer." In Andersen and Dickie 1995:5–27.

Arbeitman, Y. L. 1995. "Odysseus 'by Any Other/by No Name' Chez Polyphemos." *Emerita* 63:225–244.

Austin, N. 1975. *Archery at the Dark of the Moon.* Berkeley.

Bakker, E. J. 1997. *Poetry in Speech.* Ithaca, N.Y. and London.

Baldick, J. 1994. *Homer and the Indo-Europeans.* London.

Ballabriga, A. 1990. "La question homérique. Pour une réouverture du débat." *REG* 103:16–29.

Barringer, J. M. 1995. *Divine Escorts: Nereids in Archaic and Classical Greek Art.* Ann Arbor, Mich.

Bascom, W. 1984. "The Forms of Folklore: Prose Narratives." In *Sacred Narrative,* ed. A. Dundes, 5–29. Berkeley.

Bassett, S. E. 1938. *The Poetry of Homer.* Berkeley.

Bellamy, R. 1989. "Bellerophon's Tablet." *CJ* 84:289–307.

Bennet, J. 1997. "Homer and the Bronze Age." In *NCH*, 511–533.

Bernabé, A., ed. 1987. *Poetae epici Graeci: Testimonia et fragmenta.* Vol. 1. Leipzig. Corrected edition 1996.

Bethe, E. 1927. *Die Sage vom troischen Kriege.* Vol. 3 of *Homer. Dichtung und Sage.* Leipzig.

———, ed. 1966. *Der troische Epenkreis.* Stuttgart. Originally published 1929.

Beye, C. R. 1993. *Ancient Epic Poetry.* Ithaca, N.Y.

Biers, W. R. 1987. *The Archaeology of Greece*. Rev. ed. Ithaca, N.Y.

Blumenthal, H. J. 1978. "Callimachus, Epigram 28, Numenius fr. 20, and the Meaning of κυκλικός." *CQ* 28:125–127.

Boardman, J. 1998. "Olbia and Berezan: The Early Pottery." In Tsetskhladze 1998a:201–204.

Boedeker, D. D. 1974. *Aphrodite's Entry into Greek Epic.* Leiden.

Bonfante, L. 1989. "Nudity as a Costume in Classical Art." *AJA* 93:543–570.

Bothmer, D. von. 1981. "The Death of Sarpedon." In *The Greek Vase,* ed. S. L. Hyatt, 63–80. Latham, N.Y.

———. 1994. "Sarpedon." *LIMC* 7.1:696–700.

Bowersock, G. W., W. Burkert, and M. C. J. Putnam, eds. 1979. *Arktouros.* Berlin and New York.

Bowra, C. M. 1930. *Tradition and Design in the Iliad.* Oxford.

———. 1952. *Heroic Poetry.* Oxford.

———. 1967. *From Virgil to Milton.* 2nd ed. London.

Boyd, T. W. 1994. "Where Ion Stood, What Ion Sang." *HSCP* 96:110–117.

———. 1995. "Libri Confusi." *CJ* 91:35–45.

Brann, E. H. T. 1959. "A Figured Geometric Fragment from the Athenian Agora." *AntK* 2:35–37.

Braswell, B. K. 1971. "Mythological Innovation in the *Iliad*." *CQ* 21:16–26.

Braun, T. F. R. G. 1982. "The Greeks in Egypt." *CAH*, 2nd ed., III.3:32–56.

Braund, D. 1998. "Writing and Re-inventing Colonial Origins: Problems from Colchis and the Bosphorus." In Tsetskhladze 1998a:287–296.

Bravo, B. 1974. "Une lettre sur plomb de Berezan: Colonisation et modes de contact dans le Pont." *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 166:135–141.

Bremmer, J. N. 1988. "La plasticité du mythe: Méléagre dans la poésie homérique." In *Métamorphoses du mythe en Grèce antique,* ed. C. Calame, 37–56. Geneva.

———. 1994. *Greek Religion. Greece and Rome* New Surveys in the Classics no. 24. Oxford.

Brillante, C. 1990. "History and the Historical Interpretation of Myth." In Edmunds 1990:93–138.

Brink, C. O. 1971. *Horace on Poetry: The Ars poetica.* Cambridge.

Broeniman, C. 1996. "Demodocus, Odysseus, and the Trojan War." *CW* 90:3–13.

Brommer, F. 1983. *Odysseus.* Darmstadt.

Brown, C. G. 1997. "Iambos." In Gerber 1997:13–88.

Buitron, D., and B. Cohen. 1992. *The Odyssey and Ancient Art.* Annandale-on-Hudson, N.Y.

Burgess, J. S. 1995. "Achilles' Heel: The Death of Achilles in Ancient Myth." *ClassAnt* 14.2:217–243.

———. 1996. "The Non-Homeric *Cypria*." *TAPA* 126:77–99.

———. 1997. "Beyond Neo-Analysis: Problems with the Vengeance Theory." *AJP* 118.1:1–19.

———. 1999. "Gilgamesh and Odysseus in the Otherworld." *EMC/CV* 18:171–210.

Burkert, W. 1976. "Das hunderttorige Theben und die Datierung der Ilias." *WS* 10:5–21.

———. 1979a. *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual.* Berkeley.

———. 1979b. "Kynaithos, Polycrates, and the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*." In Bowersock, Burkert, and Putnam 1979:53–62.

———. 1983. *Homo Necans.* Trans. P. Bing. Berkeley.

———. 1985. *Greek Religion.* Trans. J. Raffan. Cambridge, Mass.

———. 1987. "The Making of Homer in the Sixth Century B.C.: Rhapsodes versus Stesichorus." In *Papers on the Amasis Painter and His World,* ed. D. von Bothmer, 43–62. Malibu, Calif.

———. 1992. *The Orientalizing Revolution.* Trans. M. E. Pinder and W. Burkert. Cambridge, Mass.

———. 1995. "Lydia between East and West or How to Date the Trojan War: A Study in Herodotus." In Carter and Morris 1995:139–148.

Calame, C. 1995. *The Craft of Poetic Speech in Ancient Greece.* Trans. J. Orion. Ithaca, N.Y., and London.

Cameron, A. 1995. *Callimachus and His Critics.* Princeton, N.J.

Canciani, F. 1984. *Die Denkmäler und das frühgriechische Epos. Archaeologia Homerica* II: N. Bildkunst, 2. Ed. F. Matz and H. G. Buchholz. Göttingen.

Carpenter, R. 1946. *Folk Tale, Fiction, and Saga in the Homeric Epics.* Berkeley.

Carpenter, T. H. 1991. *Art and Myth in Ancient Greece.* London.

Carter, J., and S. Morris, eds. 1995. *The Ages of Homer.* Austin, Tex.

Chadwick, H. M. 1912. *The Heroic Age.* Cambridge.

Chadwick, J., and M. Ventris. 1973. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek.* 3rd ed. Cambridge.

Clark, M. 1998. "Chryses' Supplication: Speech Act and Mythological Allusion." *ClassAnt* 17:5–24.

Clark, M. E. 1986. "Neoanalysis: A Bibliographical Review." *CW* 79:379–394.

Clark, M. E., and W. D. E. Coulson. 1978. "Memnon and Sarpedon." *MH* 35:65–73.

Clarke, H. H. C. 1981. *Homer's Readers.* Newark, Del.

Clay, J. S. 1996. "The New Simonides and Homer's *Hemitheoi.*" *Arethusa* 29:243–245.

———. 1997a. "The Homeric Hymns." In *NCH*, 487–507.

———. 1997b. *The Wrath of Athena.* 2nd ed. Lanham, Md.

———. 1999. "The Whip and Will of Zeus." *Literary Imagination* 1:40–60.

Coldstream, J. N. 1976. "Hero-Cults in the Age of Homer." *JHS* 96:8–17.

———. 1977. *Geometric Greece.* London.

Collins, J. J. 1997. *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age.* Louisville, Ky.

Combellack, F. M. 1944. "Homer and Hector." *AJP* 65:209–243.

———. 1950. "Unitarians and Homeric Originality." *AJP* 71:337–364.

———. 1962. Review of Kullmann 1960. *AJP* 83:193–198.

———, trans. 1968. *The War at Troy: What Homer Didn't Tell, by Quintus of Smyrna.* Norman, Okla.

———. 1976. "Homer the Innovator." *CP* 71:44–55.

Cook, B. F. 1987. *Greek Inscriptions.* Berkeley.

Cook, E. 1995. *The Odyssey in Athens.* Ithaca, N.Y.

———. 1996. Review of Latacz 1995. *BMCR* 96.10.3. <*http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/*>.

———. 1999. "'Active' and 'Passive' Heroics in the *Odyssey.*" *CW* 93:149–167.

———. 2000. Review of Malkin 1998. *BMCR* 00.03.02. <*http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/*>.

Cook, R. M. 1937. "The Date of the Hesiodic Shield." *CQ* 31:204–214.

———. 1983. "Art and Epic in Ancient Greece." *BABesch* 58:1–10.

Courbin, P. 1955. "Un fragment de cratère Protoargien." *BCH* 79:1–49.

Crielaard, J. P. 1995. "Homer, History, and Archaeology." In Crielaard and Gieben 1995:201–288.

Crielaard. J. P., and J. C. Gieben, eds. 1995. *Homeric Questions.* Amsterdam.

Croon, J. H. 1952. *The Herdsman of the Dead.* Utrecht.

Cunliffe, R. J. 1963. *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect.* Norman, Okla.
Dalby, A. 1998. "Homer's Enemies: Lyric and Epic in the Seventh Century." In Fisher and van Wees 1998:195–212.
Dalley, S. 1989. *Myths from Mesopotamia.* Oxford.
Danek, G. 1994. "Der Nestorbecher von Ischia, epische Zitiertechnik und das Symposion." *WS* 107:29–44.
Danoff, C. M. 1962. "Pontos Euxeinos." In *RE* Suppl. 9, cols. 866–1175.
Davies, J. K., and L. Foxhall. 1981, eds. *The Trojan War: Its Historicity and Context.* Bristol.
Davies, M. 1981. "The Judgement of Paris and *Iliad* Book XXIV." *JHS* 101:56–62.
———. 1986. "*Prolegomena* and *Paralegomena* to a New Edition (with Commentary) of the Fragments of Early Greek Epic." *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* 1 *phil.-hist. Kl.*, 2:91–111.
———, ed. 1988a. *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta.* Göttingen.
———. 1988b. "Stesichorus' *Geryoneis* and Its Folk-tale Origins." *CQ* 38:277–290.
———. 1989a. *The Epic Cycle.* Bristol.
———. 1989b. "The Date of the Epic Cycle." *Glotta* 67:89–100.
———. 1989c. "Kinkel Redivivus" (review of Bernabé 1987). *CR* 103:4–9.
Davison, J. A. 1947. Review of Pestalozzi 1945. *CR* 61:28.
———. 1955. "Pisistratus and Homer." *TAPA* 86:1–21.
———. 1962. "The Homeric Question." In *Companion to Homer,* ed. A. J. B. Wace and F. H. Stubbings, 234–265. London.
———. 1968. *From Archilochus to Pindar.* London.
Dawson, C. M. 1966. "Σπογδαιογέλοιον: Random Thoughts on Occasional Poems." *YCS* 19:37–76.
De Franciscis, A. 1960. "Metauros." *Atti e memorie della Società Magna Grecia*, no. 3:21–67.
de Jong, I. J. F. 1987. *Narrators and Focalizers.* Amsterdam.
de Romilly, J. 1983. *Perspectives actuelles sur l'epopée homériques.* Paris.
Dickie, M. W. 1995. "The Geography of Homer's World." In Andersen and Dickie 1995:29–56.
Diehl, E. 1953. "Pontarches (2)." In *RE* 22.1, cols. 1–18.
Dietrich, B. C. 1964. "The Judgment of Zeus." *RhM* 107:97–125.
———. 1965. *Death, Fate, and the Gods*. London.
Dihle, A. 1970. *Homer-Probleme.* Opladen, Germany.
Dodds, E. R. 1951. *The Greeks and the Irrational.* Berkeley.
Dowden, K. 1989. *Death and the Maiden.* London and New York.
———. 1992. *The Uses of Greek Mythology.* London and New York.
———. 1996. "Homer's Sense of Text." *JHS* 116:47–61.
Drews, R. 1969. "Aethiopian Memnon: African or Asiatic?" *RhM* 112:191–192.
———. 1976. "The Earliest Greek Settlements in the Black Sea." *JHS* 96:18–31.
duBois, P. 1988. *Sowing the Body.* Chicago and London.
Edmunds, L, ed. 1990. *Approaches to Greek Myth.* Baltimore.
———. 1997. "Myth in Homer." In *NCH*, 415–441.

Edwards, A.T. 1984. "Aristōs Achaion: Heroic Death and Dramatic Structure in the *Iliad*." *QUCC* 17:61–80.

———. 1985. "Achilles in the Underworld: *Iliad, Odyssey,* and *Aethiopis*." *GRBS* 26:215–228.

Edwards, M. W. 1987. *Homer: Poet of the Iliad.* Baltimore.

———. 1990. "Neoanalysis and Beyond." *CA* 9:311–325.

———. 1991. *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Vol. 5. Cambridge.

Else, G. F. 1957. *Aristotle's Poetics: The Argument.* Cambridge, Mass.

Erbse, H. 1997. "The Ending of the Odyssey: Linguistic Problems." In Jones and Wright 1997:263–320.

Escher, J. 1893. "Achilleus" (1). In *RE* 1.1, cols. 221–245.

Espermann, I. 1980. *Antenor, Theano, Antenoriden. Ihre Person und Bedeutung in der Ilias.* Meisenheim am Glan, Germany.

Evelyn-White, H. G., ed. 1914. *Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns, and Homerica.* Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.

Faraone, C. A. 1992. *Talismans and Trojan Horses.* Oxford.

———. 1996. "Taking the Nestor's Cup Inscription Seriously: Erotic Magic and Conditional Curses in the Earliest Inscribed Hexameters." *ClassAnt* 115.1:77–112.

Farnell, L. R. 1921. *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality.* Oxford.

Fehling, D. 1991. *Die ursprüngliche Geschichte vom Fall Trojas, oder: Interpretationen zur Troja-Geschichte.* Innsbruck.

Fellmann, B. 1972. *Die antiken Darstellungen des Polyphemabenteuers.* Munich.

Fenik, B. C. 1964. *Iliad X and the Rhesus: The Myth.* Brussels.

———. 1968. *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad. Hermes* Einzelschriften 21. Wiesbaden.

———, ed. 1978. *Homer: Tradition and Invention.* Leiden.

Ferrari [Pinney], G. 1983. "Achilles Lord of Scythia." In *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography,* ed. W. G. Moon, 127–146. Madison, Wis.

———. 1987. "Menelās." *JHS* 107:180–182.

Finkelberg, M. 1998. *The Birth of Literary Fiction in Ancient Greece.* Oxford.

———. 2000. "The *Cypria*, the *Iliad*, and the Problem of Multiformity in Oral and Written Tradition." *CP* 95:1–11.

Fisher, N., and H. van Wees, eds. 1998. *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence.* London.

Fittschen, K. 1969. *Untersuchungen zum Beginn der Sagendarstellungen bei den Griechen.* Berlin.

———. 1973. *Der Schild des Achilleus. Archaeologia Homerica* II: N. Bildkunst, 1. Ed. F. Matz and H. G. Buchholz. Göttingen.

Fleischer, C. 1884–1886. "Achilleus." In Roscher 1.1:11–66.

Ford, A. 1992. *Homer. The Poetry of the Past.* Ithaca, N.Y.

———. 1997a. "The Inland Ship: Problems in the Performance and Reception of Homeric Epic." In *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text,* ed. E. J. Bakker and A. Kahane, 83–109, 243–244. Cambridge, Mass.

———. 1997b. "Epic as Genre." In *NCH* 396–414.
Forsdyke, J. 1956. *Greece before Homer.* New York.
Fowler, R. L. 1987. *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric.* Toronto.
Frame, D. 1978. *The Myth of Return in Early Greek Epic.* New Haven, Conn.
Fränkel, H. 1975. *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy.* Trans. M. Hadas and J. Willis. Oxford.
Frazer, J. G., ed. 1921. *Apollodorus: The Library.* 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.
Frazer, R. M., trans. 1966. *The Trojan War: The Chronicles of Dictys of Crete and Dares the Phrygian.* Bloomington, Ind.
Friis Johansen, K. 1961. *Aias und Hektor: Ein vorhomerisches Heldenlied?* Historik-Filosofiske Meddelelser udgivet af det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab 39.4. Copenhagen.
———. 1967. *The Iliad in Early Greek Art.* Copenhagen.
Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth.* Baltimore.
Garner, R. 1990. *From Homer to Tragedy.* London and New York.
———. 1993. "Achilles in Locri." *ZPE* 96:153–165.
Garvie, A. F. 1994. *Homer, Odyssey Books VI–VIII.* Cambridge.
Gentili, B. 1988. *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece.* Trans. A. T. Cole. Baltimore.
Gerber, D. E. 1970. *Euterpe: An Anthology of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry.* Amsterdam.
———, ed. 1997. *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets.* Leiden.
Germain, G. 1954. *Genèse de l'Odyssée.* Paris.
Glenn, Justin. 1971. "The Polyphemus Folktale and Homer's Kyklopeia." *TAPA* 102:133–181.
Graf, F. 1993. *Greek Mythology.* Trans. T. Marier. Baltimore.
Graham, A. J. 1982. "The Colonial Experience of Greece." In *CAH*, III.3:83–162.
———. 1995. "The *Odyssey*, History, and Women." In *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey,* ed. B. Cohen, 3–16. Oxford.
Griffin, J. 1977. "The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer." *JHS* 97:39–53.
———. 1980. *Homer on Life and Death.* Oxford.
———, ed. 1995. *Homer Iliad IX.* Oxford.
Griffith, M. 1975. "Man and the Leaves: A Study of Mimnermos fr. 2." *CSCA* 8:73–88.
Griffith, R. D. 1997a. "Homeric ΔΙΙΠΕΤΕΟΣ ΠΟΤΑΜΟΙΟ and the Celestial Nile." *AJP* 18:353–363.
———. 1997b. "Criteria for Evaluating Hypothetical Egyptian Loan-Words in Greek: The Case of Αἴγυπτος." *ICS* 22:1–6.
———. 1997c. "The Voice of the Dead in Homer's *Odyssey* and in Egyptian Funerary Texts." *SMEA* 39:219–240.
———. 1998. "The Origin of Memnon." *ClassAnt* 17:212–234.
———. 1999. "Elysium Revisited." *JIES* 27:79–85.
Grimm, W. 1887. "Die Sage von Polyphem." In *Kleinere Schriften,* vol. 4, ed. G. Hinrichs, 428–462. Gütersloh, Germany.

Hainsworth, J. B. H. 1970. "Criticism of an Oral Homer." *JHS* 90:90–98.
———. 1993a. *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Vol. 3. Cambridge.
———. 1993b. *The Idea of Epic.* Berkeley.
Hamma, K., and M. True, eds. 1994. *A Passion for Antiquities.* Malibu, Calif.
Hampe, R. 1981. "Aktorione." In *LIMC* 1.1:427–476.
Hansen, W. F. 1990. "Odysseus and the Oar: A Folkloric Approach." In Edmunds 1990:241–272.
———. 1997. "Homer and the Folktale." In *NCH*, 442–462.
Harris, W. V. 1989. *Ancient Literacy.* Cambridge, Mass.
Haslam, M. W. 1997. "Homeric Papyri and Transmission of the Text." In *NCH*, 55–100.
Haubold, J. 2000. *Homer's People.* Cambridge.
Havelock, E. A. 1982. *The Literate Revolution in Greece and Its Cultural Consequences.* Princeton, N.J.
Heath, M. 1989. *Unity in Greek Poetics.* Oxford.
Hedreen, G. 1991. "The Cult of Achilles in the Euxine." *Hesperia* 60:313–330.
———. 1996. "Image, Text, and Story in the Recovery of Helen." *ClassAnt* 15:152–184.
Heidel, A. 1949. *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels.* 2nd ed. Chicago and London.
Henrichs, A. 1987. "Three Approaches to Greek Mythography." In *Interpretations of Greek Mythology,* ed. J. Bremmer, 242–277. London and Sydney.
Heubeck, A. 1954. *Der Odyssee-Dichter und die Ilias.* Erlangen, Germany.
———. 1974. *Die Homerische Frage.* Darmstadt.
———. 1978. "Homeric Studies Today: Results and Prospects." In Fenik 1978:1–17.
———. 1989. "Books IX–XII." In *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey,* ed. A. Heubeck, S. West, and J. B. Hainsworth, 2:3–143. Oxford.
———. 1991. "Studien zur Struktur der Ilias (Retardation-Motivübertragung)." In *Homer. Die Dichtung und ihre Deutung,* ed. J. Latacz, 450–474. Darmstadt. Originally published 1950.
———. 1992. "Books XXIII–XXIV." In *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey,* ed. A. Heubeck, S. West, and J. B. Hainsworth, 3:313–418. Oxford.
Hiller, S. 1991. "The Mycenaeans and the Black Sea." *Aegeum* 7:207–215.
Hind, J. G. F. 1992–1993. "Archaeology of the Greeks and Barbarian Peoples around the Black Sea (1992–1993)." *AR* 39:82–112.
Hoekstra, A. 1986. Review of Janko 1982. *Mnemosyne* 39:158–163.
Hoelscher, U. 1978. "The Transformation from Folk-Tale to Epic." In Fenik 1978:51–67.
Holmberg, I. 1998. "The Creation of the Ancient Epic Cycle." *Oral Tradition* 13:456–478.
Hommel, H. 1980. *Der Gott Achilleus. SHAW* Abhandlung 1, 7–52.
Hood, S. 1995. "The Bronze Age Context of Homer." In Carter and Morris 1995:25–32.
Hooker, J. T. 1988. "The Cults of Achilles." *RhM* 131:1–7.
Horsfall, N. 1979. "Stesichorus at Bovillae?" *JHS* 99:26–48.
Hubbard, M., and R. G. M. Nisbet. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book 1.* Oxford.

Hubbard, T. K. 1996. "'New Simonides or Old Semonides? Second Thoughts on *POxy* 3965, Fr. 26." *Arethusa* 29:255–262.
Hurwit, J. M. 1985. *The Art and Culture of Early Greece.* Ithaca, N.Y.
Huxley, G. L. 1967. "A Problem in the *Kypria*." *GRBS* 8:25–27.
———.1969. *Greek Epic Poetry.* London.
Isager, S. 1998. "The Pride of Halikarnassos. Editio princeps of an inscription from Salmakis." *ZPE* 123:1–23.
Janko, R. 1982. *Homer, Hesiod, and the Hymns.* Cambridge.
———, ed. 1987. *Aristotle: Poetics.* Indianapolis, Ind.
———. 1992. *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Vol. 4. Cambridge.
———. 1998. "The Homeric Poems as Oral Dictated Texts." *CQ* 48:135–167.
Jebb, R. C. 1905. *Homer.* 7th ed. Glasgow.
Jeffery, L. H. 1990. *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece.* 2nd ed. Oxford.
Jenkins, T. E. 1999. "Homēros ekainopoiēse: Theseus, Aithra, and Variation in Homeric Myth-Making." In *Nine Essays on Homer,* ed. M. Carlisle and O. Levaniouk, 207–226. Lanham, Md.
Jensen, M. S. 1980. *The Homeric Question and the Oral-Formulaic Theory.* Copenhagen.
———, et al . 1999. "Dividing Homer: When and How Were the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* Divided into Songs?" *SO* 74:5–91.
Jones, P. V. 1992. "The Past in Homer's *Odyssey*." *JHS* 112:74–90.
———. 1995. "Poetic Invention: The Fighting around Troy in the First Nine Years of the Trojan War." In Andersen and Dickie 1995:101–111.
Jones, P. V., and G. M. Wright, eds. 1997. *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation.* Oxford.
Jouan, F. 1966. *Euripide et les légendes des Chants Cypriens.* Paris.
———. 1980. "Le Cycle épique: État des questions." In *Association Guillaume Budé, Actes du Xe Congrès* (Paris), 83–104.
Kakridis, J. T. 1949. *Homeric Researches.* Lund, Sweden.
———. 1966. "Zu Sappho 44 LP." *WS* 79:21–26.
———. 1971. *Homer Revisited.* Lund, Sweden.
Kakridis, P. J. 1961. "Achilleus' Rüstung." *Hermes* 89:288–297.
Kannicht, R. 1982. "Poetry and Art: Homer and the Monuments Afresh." *ClassAnt* 1:70–92.
Kearns, E. 1989. *The Heroes of Attica. BICS* suppl. 57. London.
Kemp-Lindemann, D. 1975. *Darstellungen des Achilleus in griechischer und römischer Kunst.* Bern and Frankfurt.
King, K. C. 1987. *Achilles.* Berkeley.
Kirk, G. S. 1962. *The Songs of Homer.* Cambridge.
———. 1966. "Formular Language and Oral Quality." *YSC* 20:155–174.
———. 1970. *Myth: Its Meaning and Functions in Ancient and Other Cultures.* Cambridge and Berkeley.
———. 1974. *The Nature of Greek Myths.* London.
———. 1976. *Homer and the Oral Tradition.* Cambridge.

———. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Vol. 1. Cambridge.
———. 1990. *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Vol. 2. Cambridge.
Kirk, G. S., J. E. Raven, and M. Schofield. 1983. *The Pre-Socratic Philosophers.* 2nd ed. Cambridge.
Knox, M. 1979. "Polyphemos and His Near-Eastern Relations." *JHS* 99:164–165.
Koenen, L. 1994. "Cyclic Destruction in Hesiod and the Catalogue of Women." *TAPA* 124:1–34.
Kopff, E. 1981. "Virgil and the Cyclic Epics." *ANRW* II 31.2:919–947.
———. 1983. "The Structure of the *Amazonia* (*Aethiopis*)." In *The Greek Renaissance of the 8th Century B.C.,* ed. R. Häag, 57–62. Stockholm.
Korfmann, M. 1986. "Troy: Topography and Navigation." In Mellink 1986:1–16.
———. 1998. "Troia, an Ancient Anatolian Palatial and Trading Center: Archaeological Evidence for the Period of Troia VI/VII." *CW* 91:369–385.
Kossatz-Deissmann, A. 1981. "Achilleus." In *LIMC* 1.1:37–200.
———. 1990. "Kebriones." In *LIMC* 5.1:977–978.
———. 1992. "Memnon." In *LIMC* 6.1:448–461.
———. 1994. "Paridis Iudicium." In *LIMC* 7.1:176–188.
———. 1997. "Patroklos." In *LIMC*, vol. 8 suppl.:948–952 .
Kullmann, W. 1956. "Ein vorhomerisches Motiv im Iliasproömium." *Philologus* 99:167–192.
———. 1957. "Zur ΔΙΟΣ ΒΟΥΛΗ des Iliasproömiums." *Philologus* 100:132–133.
———. 1960. *Die Quellen der Ilias. Hermes* Einzelschriften 14. Wiesbaden.
———. 1968. "Vergangenheit und Zukunft in der *Ilias.*" *Poetica* 2:15–37.
———. 1981. "Zur Methode der Neoanalyse in der Homerforschung." *WS* 15:5–42.
———. 1984. "Oral Poetry Theory and Neoanalysis in Homeric Research." *GRBS* 25:307–324.
———. 1986. "Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker über Homer und den epischen Kyklos." In *Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker: Werk und Wirkung,* ed. W. M. Calder III, A. Köhnken, W. Kullmann, and G. Pflug, 105–130. *Hermes* Einzelschriften 49. Stuttgart.
———. 1991. "Ergebnisse der motivgeschichtlichen Forschung zu Homer (Neoanalyse)." In Latacz 1991:425–455.
———. 1995. "Homers Zeit und das Bild des Dichters von den Menschen der mykenischen Kultur." In Andersen and Dickie 1995:57–75.
———. 1999. "Homer and Historical Memory." In Mackay 1999:95–113.
Lang, A. 1893. *Homer and the Epic.* London.
Lang, M. L. 1983. "Reverberation and Mythology in the *Iliad.*" In *Approaches to Homer,* ed. C. A. Rubino and C. W. Shelmerdine, 140–164. Austin, Tex.
———. 1995. "War Story into Wrath Story." In Carter and Morris 1995:149–162.
Langdon, S., ed. 1997. *New Light on a Dark Age.* Columbia, Mo.
Lardinois, A. P. M. H. 1995. "Wisdom in Context: The Use of Gnomic Statements in Archaic Greek Poetry." Ph.D. diss., Princeton University.
Latacz, J., ed. 1991. *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung.* Stuttgart.
———. 1996. *Homer: His Art and His World.* Trans. J. P. Holoka. Ann Arbor, Mich.

Lattimore, S. 1997. "The Chariot Racers on the François Vase." Abstract of unpublished paper. *AJA* 100:359.

Leaf, W., ed. 1886–1888. *The Iliad.* 2 vols. London.

———, ed. 1900–1902. *The Iliad.* 2nd ed. 2 vols. Repr., Amsterdam, 1971.

———. 1912. *Troy: A Study in Homeric Geography.* London.

Ledbetter, G. M. 1993. "Achilles' Self-Address: *Iliad* 16.7–19." *AJP* 114:481–491.

Lefkowitz, M. R. 1981. *The Lives of the Greek Poets.* London.

Lesky, A. 1966a. *A History of Greek Literature.* Trans. J. Willis and C. de Heer. London.

———. 1966b. "Aithiopika." In *Gesammelte Schriften*, 410–421. Bern.

———. 1967. *Homeros.* Stuttgart. Also in *RE* Suppl. 11.

Lloyd-Jones, H. 1973. "Stasinos and the *Cypria.*" *Stasinos* 4:115–122.

———. 1975. *Females of the Species: Semonides on Women.* London.

———. 1983. *The Justice of Zeus.* 2nd ed. Berkeley.

———. 1999a. "The Pride of Halicarnassus." *ZPE* 124:1–14.

———. 1999b. "The Pride of Halicarnassus. Corrigenda and Addenda." *ZPE* 127:63–65.

Lord, A. B. 1960. *The Singer of Tales.* Cambridge, Mass.

Lorimer, H. L. 1950. *Homer and the Monuments.* London.

Lowenstam, S. 1981. *The Death of Patroklos.* Königstein, Germany.

———. 1992. "The Uses of Vase-Depictions in Homeric Studies." *TAPA* 122:165–198.

———. 1993. "The Arming of Achilleus on Early Greek Vases." *ClassAnt* 12:199–218.

———. 1997. "Talking Vases: The Relationship between the Homeric Poems and Archaic Representations of Epic Myth." *TAPA* 127:21–76.

Lowry, E. R., Jr. 1995. "Glaucus, the Leaves, and the Heroic Boast of *Iliad* 6.146–211." In Carter and Morris 1995:193–203.

Lucas, D. W., ed. 1968. *Aristotle. Poetics.* Oxford.

Mackay, E. A. 1995. "Narrative Tradition in Early Greek Oral Poetry and Vase-Painting." *Oral Tradition* 10:282–303.

———, ed. 1999. *Signs of Orality.* Leiden.

Mackay, E. A., D. Harrison, and S. Masters. 1999. "The Bystander at the Ringside: Ring-Composition in Early Greek Poetry and Athenian Black-Figure Vase-Painting." In Mackay 1999:115–142.

Mackie, C. J. 1997. "Achilles' Teachers: Chiron and Phoenix in the *Iliad.*" *G&R* 44:1–10.

MacLachlan, B. 1992. "Feasting with Ethiopians: Life on the Fringe." *QUCC,* n.s., 40:15–33.

Macleod, C. W., ed. 1982. *Homer, Iliad Book XXIV.* Cambridge.

Malkin, I. 1987. *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece.* Leiden.

———. 1998. *The Returns of Odysseus.* Berkeley.

Mallory, J. P. 1989. *In Search of the Indo-Europeans.* London.

March, J. R. 1987. *The Creative Poet. BICS* suppl. 49. London.

Mayer, K. 1996. "Helen and the ΔΙΟΣ ΒΟΥΛΗ." *AJP* 117:1–15.

McDonald, W. A., and C. G. Thomas. 1990. *Progress into the Past.* 2nd ed. Bloomington, Ind., and Indianapolis, Ind.

McLeod, W. 1966. "Studies on Panyassis—An Heroic Poet of the Fifth Century." *Phoenix* 20:95–110.
———. 1987. "The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as Great Literature." In *Approaches to Teaching Homer's Iliad and Odyssey,* ed. K. Myrsiades, 34–40. New York.
Mellink, M. J., ed. 1986. *Troy and the Trojan War.* Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Merkelbach, R. 1969. *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee.* 2nd ed. Munich.
Miller, M. C. 1995. "Priam, King of Troy." In Carter and Morris 1995:449–465.
Minchin, E. 1999. "Describing and Narrating in Homer's *Iliad.*" In Mackay 1999:49–64.
Minns, E. H. 1913. *Scythians and Greeks.* Cambridge.
Mondi, R. 1983. "The Homeric Cyclopes: Folktale, Tradition, and Theme." *TAPA* 113:17–38.
———. 1990. "Greek Mythic Thought in the Light of the Near East." In Edmunds 1990:142–198.
Monro, D. B. 1883. "On the Fragment of Proclus' Abstract of the Epic Cycle Contained in the Codex Venetus of the *Iliad.*" *JHS* 4:305–334.
———. 1884. "The Poems of the Epic Cycle." *JHS* 5:1–41.
———, ed. 1901. *Homer's Odyssey: XIII–XXIV.* Oxford.
Moore, M. B. 1980. "Exekias and Telamonian Ajax." *AJA* 84:417–434.
———. 1982. "The Death of Pedasos." *AJA* 86:578–581.
Morris, I. 1986. "The Use and Abuse of Homer." *ClassAnt* 5:81–138.
———. 1989. "Attitudes Toward Death in Archaic Greece." *ClassAnt* 8:297–320.
———. 1993. "Poetics of Power. The Interpretation of Ritual Action in Archaic Greece." In *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece,* ed. C. Dougherty and L. Kurke, 15–45. Cambridge.
———. 1997. "Homer and the Iron Age." In *NCH*, 534–559.
Morris, S. P. 1984. *The Black and White Style.* New Haven, Conn.
———. 1989. "A Tale of Two Cities: The Miniature Frescoes from Thera and the Origins of Greek Poetry." *AJA* 93:511–535.
———. 1995. "The Sacrifice of Astyanax: Near Eastern Contributions to the Siege of Troy." In Carter and Morris 1995: 221–246.
———. 1997. "Homer and the Near East." In *NCH*, 599–623.
Most, G. 1990. "Canon Fathers: Literacy, Mortality, Power." *Arion,* 3rd ser., 1:35–60.
Mueller, M. 1984. *The Iliad.* London.
Muellner, L. 1990. "The Simile of the Cranes and Pygmies: A Study of Homeric Metaphor." *HSCP* 93:59–101.
———. 1996. *The Anger of Achilles.* Ithaca, N.Y.
Mühlestein, H. 1987. *Homerische Namenstudien.* Frankfurt am Main.
Mundy, C. S. 1961. "The Cyclops in Turkish Tradition: A Study in Folktale Transmission." *Internationaler Kongress der Volkserzählungsforscher in Kiel und Kopenhagen*, 229–234. Berlin.
Murnaghan, S. 1997. "Equal Honor and Future Glory: The Plan of Zeus in the *Iliad.*" In *Classical Closure,* ed. D. H. Roberts, F. M. Dunn, and F. Fowler, 23–42. Princeton, N.J.

Murray, G. 1934. *The Rise of the Greek Epic.* 4th ed. Oxford.
Nagy, G. 1974. *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter.* Cambridge, Mass.
———. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans.* Baltimore.
———. 1990a. *Greek Mythology and Poetics.* Ithaca, N.Y.
———. 1990b. *Pindar's Homer.* Baltimore.
———. 1992. "Homeric Questions." *TAPA* 122:17–60.
———. 1995. "An Evolutionary Model for the Making of Homeric Poetry: Comparative Perspectives." In Carter and Morris 1995:163–180.
———. 1996a. *Poetry as Performance.* Cambridge.
———. 1996b. *Homeric Questions.* Austin, Tex.
———. 1998a. "Aristarchean Questions." *BMCR* 98.7:14.
———.1998b. "Homer as 'Text' and the Poetics of Cross-Reference." In *Verschriftung und Verschriftlichung*, ed. C. Ehler and U. Schaefer, 78–87. Tübingen.
———. 1999. "Homer and Plato and the Panathenaia: Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives." In *Contextualizing Classics,* ed. T. M. Falkner, N. Felson, and D. Konstan, 127–155. Lanham, Md.
Nickel, R. 1997. "Paris in the Epic Tradition: A Study in Homeric Techniques of Characterization." Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto.
Nilsson, M. P. 1932. *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology.* Repr., Berkeley, 1972.
———. 1949. *A History of Greek Religion.* 2nd ed. Oxford.
Nisetich, F. J. 1977. "The Leaves of Triumph and Mortality: Transformation of a Traditional Image in Pindar's *Olympian* 12." *TAPA* 107:235–264.
———. 1989. *Pindar and Homer.* Baltimore.
Notopoulos, J. A. 1964. "Studies in Early Greek Oral Poetry." *HSCP* 68:1–77.
Oberhuber, K. 1965. "Odysseus—Utis in Altorientalistischer Sicht." In *Festschrift Leonhard C. Franz,* ed. O. Menghin and H. M. Ölberg, 307–312. Innsbruck.
Olson, S. D. 1995. *Blood and Iron.* Leiden.
Onians, R. B. 1951. *The Origins of European Thought.* Cambridge.
Osborne, R. 1996. *Greece in the Making, 1200–479* BC. London and New York.
———. 1998a. *Archaic and Classical Greek Art.* Oxford.
———. 1998b. "Death Revisited, Death Revised. The Death of the Artist in Archaic and Classical Greece." *Art History* 11:1–16.
O'Sullivan. J. N. 1987. "Observations on the Kyklopeia." *SO* 62:5–24.
Page, D. L. 1955. *The Homeric Odyssey.* Oxford.
———. 1959. *History and the Homeric Iliad.* Berkeley.
———. 1973. *Folktales in Homer's Odyssey.* Cambridge, Mass.
Parker, R. 1983. *Miasma.* Oxford.
Parry, A. 1966. "Have We Homer's *Iliad?*" *YCS* 20:175–216.
Parry, M. 1971. *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry.* Ed. A. Parry. Oxford.
Paton, W. R. 1912. "The Armour of Achilles." *CR* 26: 1–4.

Pavese, C. O. 1998. "The Rhapsodic Epic Poems as Oral and Independent Poems." *HSCP* 98:63–90.
Penglase, C. 1994. *Greek Myths and Mesopotamia.* London and New York.
Peradotto, J. 1990. *Man in the Middle Voice.* Princeton, N.J.
Pestalozzi, H. 1945. *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias.* Zurich.
Pfeiffer, R. 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship.* Vol. 1. Oxford.
Pfister, F. 1970. *Götter-und Heldensagen der Griechen.* 2nd ed. Heidelberg.
Pipili, M. 1987. *Laconian Iconography of the Sixth Century B.C.* Oxford.
Pojakov, T. 1983. "A Phoenician Ancestor of the Cyclops." *ZPE* 53:95–98.
Powell, B. 1991. *Homer and the Origin of the Greek Alphabet.* Cambridge.
———. 1997a. "Homer and Writing." In *NCH*, 3–32.
———. 1997b. "From Picture to Myth, from Myth to Picture. *Prolegomena* to the Invention of Mythic Representation in Greek Art." In Langdon 1997:154–193.
Prag, A. J. N. W. 1985. *The Oresteia: Iconographic and Narrative Tradition.* Warminster.
Price, Th. H. 1979. "Hero Cult in the 'Age of Homer' and Earlier." In Bowersock, Burkert, and Putnam 1979:219–228.
Propp, V. 1984. *Theory and History of Folktale.* Ed. A. Liberman. Trans. A. Y. Martin, R. Martin, et al. Minneapolis.
Pucci, P. 1987. *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad.* Ithaca, N.Y.
———. 1996. "The Song of the Sirens." In *Reading the Odyssey,* ed. S. Schein, 191–199. Princeton, N.J.
Puhvel, J. 1987. *Comparative Mythology.* Baltimore.
Raaflaub, K. A. 1991. "Homer und die Geschichte des 8.Jh.s v. Chr." In Latacz 1991:205–256.
———. 1997. "Homeric Society." In *NCH*, 624–648.
———. 1998a. "Homer, the Trojan War, and History." *CW* 91:386–403.
———. 1998b. "A Historian's Headache: How to Read 'Homeric Society'?" In Fisher and van Wees 1998:169–194.
Rabel, R. 1991. "Hippothous and the Death of Achilles." *CJ* 86:126–130.
Radt, S., ed. 1977–1985. *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta.* Vols. 3 (Aeschylus), 4 (Sophocles). Göttingen.
Ramage, E. S. 1962. Review of Schoeck 1961. *CW* 55:293.
Rankin, H. D. 1972. "Thersites the Malcontent, a Discussion." *SO* 47:36–60.
Raubitschek, A. E. 1998. "ΕΚΤΟΡΟΣ ΛΥΤΡΑ." *TAPA* 128:305–309.
Redfield, J. M. 1975. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad.* Chicago.
———. 1979. "The Proem of the *Iliad:* Homer's Art." *CP* 74:94–110.
Reece, S. 1988. "Homeric Influence in Stesichorus' *Nostoi.*" *BASP* 25:1–8.
———. 1994. "The Cretan Odyssey: A Lie Truer than Truth." *AJP* 115:157–174.
Reinhardt, K. 1961. *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter.* Ed. U. Hölscher. Göttingen.
———. 1997. "The Judgement of Paris." In Jones and Wright 1997:170–191.

Renard, M. 1960. "Ulysse et Polyphème." In *Hommages à Léon Herrmann,* 655–668. *Latomus* 61. Brussels and Berchem.
Richardson, N. J., ed. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter.* Oxford.
———. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Vol. 6. Cambridge.
Robbins, E. 1990. "Achilles to Thetis: *Iliad* 1.365–412." *EMC/CV* 9:1–15.
———. 1993. "The Education of Achilles." *QUCC* 45:7–20.
———. 1994. "The Divine Twins in Early Greek Poetry." In *Corolla Torontonensis,* ed. E. Robbins and S. Sandahl, 29–45. Toronto.
———. 1995. "Sappho, Aphrodite, and the Muses." *AW* 26:225–239.
———. 1997. "Public Poetry." In Gerber 1997:225–287.
Robert, C. 1920–1926. *Die griechische Heldensage.* Vol. 2 of *Griechische Mythologie.* Ed. L. Preller. Rewritten by C. Robert. 4th ed. Berlin.
Robertson, M. 1990. "Troilos and Polyxene: Notes on a Changing Legend." In *EUMOUSIA,* ed. J.-P. Descœudres, 63–70. Sydney.
Robertson, N. 1992. *Festivals and Legends: The Formation of Greek Cities in the Light of Public Ritual.* Toronto.
Rohde, E. 1925. *Psyche.* Trans. W. B. Hillis. Repr., New York, 1966.
Röhrich, L. 1962. "Die mittelalterlichen Redaktionen des Polyphem-Märchens (AT 1137) und ihr Verhältnis zur ausserhomerischen Tradition." *Fabula* 5:48–71.
Romm, J. S. 1992. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought.* Princeton, N.J.
Roscher, W. H. R., ed. 1884–1937. *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie.* 6 vols. Leipzig.
Rose, P. W. 1992. *Sons of the Gods, Children of Earth: Ideology and Literary Form in Ancient Greece.* Ithaca, N.Y.
Russo, J. 1992. "Books XVII–XX." In *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey,* vol. 3, ed. A. Heubeck, S. West, J. B. Hainsworth, 3:3–127. Oxford.
Rutherford, R. B. 1996a. "The New Simonides: Towards a Commentary." *Arethusa* 29:167–192.
———. 1996b. *Homer. Greece and Rome* New Surveys in the Classics no. 26. Oxford.
Rzach. A. 1922. "Kyklos." In *RE* 11.2, cols. 2347–2435.
Sadurska, A. 1964. *Les tables iliaques.* Warsaw.
Scaife, R. 1995. "The *Kypria* and Its Early Reception." *ClassAnt* 14:164–197.
Schadewaldt, W. 1965. *Von Homers Welt und Werk.* 4th ed. Stuttgart.
Schefold, K. 1966. *Myth and Legend in Early Greek Art.* Trans. A. Hicks. London.
———. 1992. *Gods and Heroes in Late Archaic Greek Art.* Trans. A. Griffiths. Cambridge.
———. 1993. *Götter-und Heldensagen der Griechen in der früh-und hocharchaischen Kunst.* Munich.
Schein, S. L. 1984. *The Mortal Hero.* Berkeley.
———. 1997. "The *Iliad:* Structure and Interpretation." In *NCH*, 345–359.
Scheliha, R. von. 1943. *Patroklos.* Basel.
Schoeck, G. 1961. *Ilias und Aithiopis.* Zurich.

Scodel, R. 1982. "The Achaean Wall and the Myth of Destruction." *HSCP* 86:33–50.
———. 1999. "Odysseus' Evasiveness and the Audience of the *Odyssey*." In Mackay 1999:79–93.
Scott, J. A. 1921. *The Unity of Homer.* Berkeley.
Scully, S. 1990. *Homer and the Sacred City.* Ithaca, N.Y.
Seaford, R. 1994. *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State.* Oxford.
Sealey, R. 1957. "From Phemios to Ion." *REG* 70:312–355.
Severyns, A. 1928. *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque.* Paris.
———. 1938. *Le codex 239 de Photius*. Vols. 1–2 of *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclos.* Paris.
———. 1953. *La Vita Homeri et les sommaires du Cycle. Étude paléographique et critique*. Vol. 3 of *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclos.* Paris.
———, ed. 1963. *La Vita Homeri et les sommaires du Cycle. Texte et traduction.* Vol. 4 of *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclos.* Paris.
Shapiro, H. A. 1989. *Art and Cult under the Tyrants in Athens.* Mainz am Rhein.
———. 1990. "Old and New Heroes: Narrative, Composition, and Subject in Attic Black-Figure." *ClassAnt* 9:114–148.
———. 1993. "Hipparchos and the Rhapsodes." In *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece,* ed. C.
Dougherty and L. Kurke, 92–107. Cambridge.
———. 1994. *Myth into Art.* London and New York.
Sherratt, A. 1994. "The Emergence of Élites: Earlier Bronze Age Europe, 2500–1300 BC." In *The Oxford Illustrated Prehistory of Europe,* ed. B. Cunliffe, 244–276. Oxford and New York.
Sherratt, E. S. 1990. "Reading the Texts: Archaeology and the Homeric Question." *Antiquity* 64:807–824.
Shive, D. 1996. "Ὅμηρον ἐξ Αἰσχύλου σαφηνίζειν: *Iliad* 7.332–338 and *Agamemnon* 433–455." *Phoenix* 50:189–196.
Sider, D. 1996. "As Is the Generation of Leaves in Homer, Simonides, Horace, and Stobaios." *Arethusa* 29:263–282.
Silk, M. 1987. *Homer, The Iliad.* Cambridge.
Sinn, U. 1979. *Die Homerischen Becher.* Berlin.
Sinos, D. 1980. *Achilles, Patroklos, and the Meaning of Philos.* Innsbruck.
Skinner, M. B. 1993. "Women and Language in Archaic Greece, or, Why Is Sappho a Woman?" In *Feminist Theory and the Classics,* ed. N. S. Rabinowitz and A. Richlin, 125–144. New York.
Slatkin, L. M. 1991. *The Power of Thetis.* Berkeley.
Snaith, J. G. 1974. *Ecclesiasticus, or The Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach.* Cambridge.
Snell, B. 1953. *The Discovery of the Mind.* Trans. T. G. Rosenmeyer. Oxford.
Snodgrass, A. M. 1971. *The Dark Age of Greece.* Edinburgh.
———. 1974. "An Historical Homeric Society?" *JHS* 94:114–125.
———. 1979. "Poet and Painter in Eighth-Century Greece." *PCPS,* n.s., 25:118–130.

———. 1980. *Archaic Greece.* London.
———. 1982. *Narration and Allusion in Archaic Greek Art.* London.
———. 1987. *An Archaeology of Greece.* Berkeley.
———. 1998. *Homer and the Artists.* Cambridge.
Snowden, F. M., Jr. 1970. *Blacks in Antiquity.* Cambridge, Mass.
———. 1983. *Before Color Prejudice.* Cambridge, Mass.
Solovyov, S. L. 1999. *Ancient Berezan.* Leiden.
Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1995. *"Reading" Greek Death.* Oxford.
Spivey, N. 1997. *Greek Art.* London.
Stanley, K. 1993. *The Shield of Homer.* Princeton, N.J.
Stansbury-O'Donnell, M. D. 1999. *Pictorial Narrative in Ancient Greek Art.* Cambridge.
Suter, A. 1993. "Paris and Dionysos: *Iambos* in the *Iliad.*" *Arethusa* 26:1–18.
Taplin, O. 1986. "Homer's Use of Achilles' Earlier Campaigns in the *Iliad.*" In *Chios,* ed. J. Boardman and C. E. Vaphopoulou-Richardson, 15–19. Oxford.
———. 1992. *Homeric Soundings.* Oxford.
———. 2000. "The Spring of the Muses: Homer and Related Poetry." In *Literature in the Greek and Roman World,* ed. O. Taplin, 22–57. Oxford.
Taylor, T. 1994. "Thracians, Scythians, and Dacians, 800–140 BC." In *The Oxford Illustrated Prehistory of Europe,* ed. B. Cunliffe, 373–410. Oxford and New York.
Thalmann, W. G. 1984. *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry.* Baltimore.
———. 1998. *The Swineherd and the Bow: Representations of Class in the Odyssey*. Ithaca, N.Y.
Thomas, R. 1992. *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece.* Cambridge.
Thompson, S. 1955–1958. *Motif-Index of Folk Literature.* 2nd ed. Bloomington, Ind.
Thordarson, F. 1972. "Die Ferse des Achilleus—ein skythisches Motiv?" *SO* 47:109–124.
Thornton, A. 1984. *Homer's Iliad.* Göttingen.
Török, L. 1998. "A Periphery on the Periphery of the Ancient World? Ancient Nubia in Six New Books on the Middle Nile Region." *SO* 73:201–217.
Torres-Guerra, J. 1995. "Die homerische *Thebais* und die *Amphiaraos-Ausfahrt.*" *Eranos* 93:39–45.
Touchefeu-Meynier, O. 1968. *Thèmes odysséens dans l'art antique.* Paris.
———. 1984. "Astyanax I." In *LIMC* 2.1:929–937.
———. 1988. "Hektor." In *LIMC* 4.1:482–498.
———. 1992a. "Odysseus." In *LIMC* 6.1:943–970.
———. 1992b. "Kyklops/Kyklopes." In *LIMC* 6.1:154–159.
———. 1997. "Polyphemus I." In *LIMC*, vol. 8 suppl.:1011–1019.
Treister, M. J., and Y. G. Vinogradov. 1993. "Archaeology on the Northern Coast of the Black Sea." *AJA* 97:521–563.
Tsetskhladze, G. R. 1994. "Greek Penetration of the Black Sea." In *The Archaeology of Greek Colonisation,* ed. G. R. Tsetskhladze and F. De Angelis, 111–135. Oxford.
———, ed. 1998a. *The Greek Colonization of the Black Sea Area*. Stuttgart.

———.1998b. "Greek Colonisation of the Black Sea Area: Stages, Models, and Native Population." In Tsetskhladze 1998a:9–68.

Usener, V. K. 1994. "Dictys und Dares über den Troischen Krieg: Homer in der Rezeptionskrise." *Eranos* 92:104–12.

van Rossum-Steenbeek, M. 1998. *Greek Reader's Digests?* Leiden.

van Uchelen, N. 1994. "Death and the After-Life in the Hebrew Bible of Ancient Israel." In *Hidden Futures: Death and Immortality in Ancient Egypt, Anatolia, the Classical, Biblical and Arabic-Islamic World*, ed. J. M. Bremer, Th. P. J. van den Hout, R. Peters, 77–91. Amsterdam.

van Wees, H. 1994. "The Homeric Way of War. The *Iliad* and the Hoplite Phalanx." *G&R* 41:1–17, 131–155.

———. 1997. "Homeric Warfare." In *NCH*, 668–693.

Vermeule, E. 1964. *Greece in the Bronze Age.* Chicago and London.

———. 1979. *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry.* Berkeley.

———. 1986. "'Priam's Castle Blazing.' A Thousand Years of Trojan Memories." In Mellink 1986:76–92.

Verrall, A. W. 1910. *The Bacchants of Euripides and Other Essays*. Cambridge.

Versnel, H. S. 1990. "What's Sauce for the Goose Is Sauce for the Gander: Myth and Ritual, Old and New." In Edmunds 1990:25–90.

Vian, F. 1959. *Recherches sur les Posthomerica de Quintus de Smyrne.* Paris.

Vinogradov, J. G. 1969. "Cyclic Poetry in Olbia." *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* 3.109:142–148 (resume).

Vinogradov, J. G., and M. Zolatarev. 1990. "La Chersonèse de la fin de l'archaïsme." In *Le Pont-Euxin vu par les Grecs,* ed. T. Khartchilava and E. Geny, 85–120. Paris.

Wade-Gery, H. T. 1950. *The Poet of the Iliad.* Cambridge.

Walling, H. T. 1993. *Ships and Sea-Power before the Great Persian War.* Leiden.

Waterhouse, H. 1996. "From Ithaca to the *Odyssey.*" *ABSA* 91:301–317.

Wathelet, P. 1989. *Les Troyens de l'Iliade. Mythe et histoire.* Paris.

Webster, T. B. L. 1958. *From Mycenae to Homer.* London.

———. 1964. *Hellenistic Poetry and Art.* London.

Weitzmann, K. 1959. *Ancient Book Illumination.* Cambridge, Mass.

Welcker, F. G. 1865–1882. *Der epische Cyclus, oder die homerischen Dichter.* 2nd ed. 2 vols. Repr., Hildesheim, 1981.

West, M. L., ed. 1966a. *Hesiod, Theogony.* Oxford.

———. 1966b. "New Fragments of Greek Poetry." *CR* 16:22.

———. 1971. "Greek Epic Poetry." Review of Huxley 1969. *CR* 85:67–69.

———. 1973. "Greek Poetry, 2000–700 B.C." *CQ* 23:179–192.

———. 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus.* Berlin.

———, ed. 1978. *Hesiod, Works and Days.* Oxford.

———. 1983. *The Orphic Poems.* Oxford.

———. 1985. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women.* Oxford.

———. 1988. "The Rise of the Greek Epic." *JHS* 108:151–172.

———. 1993. "Simonides Redivivus." *ZPE* 98:1–14.

———. 1995. "The Date of the *Iliad*." *MH* 52:203–219.

———. 1996. "The Epic Cycle." In *OCD*, 3rd ed., 531.

———. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth.* Oxford.

West, S. 1988. "Books I–IV." In *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey,* vol. 1, ed. A. Heubeck, S. West, J. B. Hainsworth, 1:51–245. Oxford.

Whallon, W. 1979. "Is Hector *Androphonos?*" In Bowersock, Burkert, and Putnam 1979:19–24.

Whitley, J. 1995. "Tomb Cult and Hero Cult. The Uses of the Past in Archaic Greece." In *Time, Tradition and Society in Greek Archaeology,* ed. N. Spencer, 43–63. London and New York.

Whitman, C. 1958. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition.* Cambridge, Mass.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1884. *Homerische Untersuchungen.* Berlin.

Willcock, M. M. 1964. "Mythological Paradeigma in the *Iliad*." *CQ* 14:141–154.

———. 1973. "The Funeral Games of Patroclus." *BICS* 20:1–11.

———. 1976. *A Companion to the Iliad.* Chicago.

———. 1977. "*Ad hoc* Invention in the *Iliad*." *HSCP* 18:41–53.

———, ed. 1978–1984. *The Iliad of Homer.* 2 vols. London.

———. 1983. "Antilochus in the *Iliad*." In *Mélanges Edouard Delebecque*, 477–485. Aix-en-Provence.

———. 1987. "The Final Scenes of *Iliad* XVII." In *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry,* ed. J. M. Bremer, I. J. F. De Jong, and J. Kalff, 185–194. Amsterdam.

———. 1997. "Neoanalysis." In *NCH*, 174–189.

Williams, D. 1986. "Dolon." In *LIMC* 3.1:660–664.

Wilson, N. G. 1983. *Scholars of Byzantium.* London.

Wolf, F. A. 1985. *Prolegomena to Homer.* Trans. and ed. A. Crafton, G. Most, and J. E. G. Zetzel. Princeton, N.J. Originally published 1795.

Wood, M. 1985. *In Search of the Trojan War.* Oxford.

Woodhouse, W. J. 1930. *The Composition of Homer's Odyssey.* Repr., Oxford, 1969.

Wright, J. C. 1998. "The Place of Troy among the Civilizations of the Bronze Age." *CW* 91:356–368.

Wüst, E. 1931. "Odysseus." In *RE* 17.2, cols. 1905–1990.

Young, D. C. 1983. "Pindar, Aristotle, and Homer: A Study in Ancient Criticism." *ClassAnt* 2:156–170.

Index

Page numbers in bold refer to illustration captions.

Achilleis, and *Aethiopis,* 240 n.3

Achilles: and Aeneas, 36, 247 n.70; afterlife of, 35, 129, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 167, 205 n.101, 254 n.126; and Agamemnon, 63, 137, 247 n.71; and Ajax, 36, 44; in art, 69, 70, 89, 92, 94, 162, 206 nn.115, 119, 216 n.73, 218 n.88, 226 n.161, 233 n.235; battle over corpse of, 82; birth of, 34, 149; and Black Sea, 160–162, 164–165; and Chiron, 85–86, 224 nn.145, 148; death of, 47, 74–75, 90, 123, 145, 213 n.43, 219 n.99, 223 n.132, 225 n.155; dispute over arms of, 22, 31, 40, 47, 81; funeral games for, 81; ghost of, 164, 168, 169, 254 n.129, 256 n.157; grave of, 164, 253 n.126; and Hector, 67, **67,** 68–69, 216 n.73; heel of, 223 n.135, 229 n.190, 232 n.226; and Helen, 169; hero cult of, 160, 164–165, 168–169, 253 nn.124, 126, 254 nn.133, 134, 256 n.157; horsemanship of, 76; immortality of, 161, 165, 166, 167, 249 n.92, 256 n.151; and Memnon, 34, 41–42, 212 n.27, 251 n.109; and Miletus, 160, 162, 251 n.109, 254 n.133; mourning of, **91,** 92, 220 n.105; and Odysseus, 43, 63; and Patroclus, 73, 74–75, 76, 256 n.158; and Penthesileia, **32, 34,** 36, 38, 140, 159, 169; at Phthia, 39–40, **41,** 73, 218 n.89, 225 n.148; and Polyxena, 22, 168, 244 n.41; prayer to Zeus, 76–77; raids on cattle, **26,** 36; at Scyros, 21, 24; and Scythia, 165, 251 n.109, 253 n.126, 255 n.135; shield of, 51, 116–117, 211 n.18; and Thetis, **41,** 63, **91,** 92, **93,** 115, 164, 165, 167, 206 n.118; and Troilus, **29,** 36, 39, 64; two fates of, 119; withdrawal of, 63, 137, 149, 241 n.13; wrath of, 148, 246 n.60

ad hoc invention: Epic Cycle and, 154–155; Homeric poetry and, 48–49, 63, 106–107, 155, 207 n.131, 209 n.7, 216 n.71, 218 n.89

Aelian
- *De natura animalium: 1.56,* 153
- *Varia Historia: 9.15,* 252 n.117; *13.14,* 204 n.91

Aeneas, 22, 36, 145, 202 n.73, 247 n.70

Aeschylus, *Phryges,* 217 n.78
- *Agamemnon 79–80,* 237 n.273
- *Prometheus Bound 808–810,* 159

Aethiopians, 99, 158, 159–160, 250 n.98, 251 n.109

Aethiopis, 7, 172, 198 n.31, 225 n.160; Achilles and Memnon in, 63, 73, 74; and the afterlife, 255 n.146; and art, 242 n.28; author of, 9, 11, 163; dating of, 159, 160, 172, 240 n.3; exotic elements in, 158, 159; extent of, 21–22, 27, 30, 31, 135, 140–142; and *Iliad,* 62, 140–141; and Leuke, 161, 163, 165, 166; Memnon and Antilochus in, 64; and Miletus, 162, 163, 166; and Penthesileia, 140, 158–159, 160, 169, 255 n.137; and Pindar, 129
fr. 1 Bernabé = Davies p. 48 ("fragmentum spurium"), 141, 242 n.22
fr. 5 Bernabé = 1 Davies, 202 n.71
test. 1–4 Bernabé; test. 2 Davies, 197 n.15
test. 5 Bernabé, 202 n.70
test. 6 Bernabé, 196 n.7
test. 8 Bernabé = 3 Davies, 141
test. 11 Bernabé (Sinn MB 23–26), 242 n.24
Africans: and Greeks, 159–160, 249 n.95, 250 nn.98, 100, 101. *See also* Aethiopians; *Aethiopis*
Agamemnon: and Achilles, 63, 137, 247 n.71; *aristeia* of, 86–88; and Briseis, 59; and Calchas, 150; daughters of, 150–151, 246 n.63; and Koon, 86, **87,** 87–88; murder of, 37, 47, 145; shield with Gorgon, 50; and Theseids, 253 n.121
Agias of Troizen, 163
Ahlberg-Cornell, G., 54
Aipytios, 168
Aison, 154
Aithra, 152, 247 n.75
Ajax: and Achilles, 36, 44; in art, 36, 39, 90; defending corpses, 82–83, 223 n.134; and Diomedes, 41, 85; and Glaucus, 223 n.132; and Hector, 54–55, 67, 212 n.27, 214 n.53; madness of, 141, 142; and Odysseus, 81; suicide of, **19,** 21, 47, 142, 144; and Zeus, 222 n.131
Ajax (Locrian), 223 n.134
Akamas, 152
Aktorione and Molione, 54, 212 n.26
Alcaeus, 35; on Achilles, 165
fr. 44.6–8 L–P, 115, 245 n.53
fr. 354 L–P, 165, 253 n.126
Alcibiades, 237 n.272
Alcidamas
Odysseus 13ff., 202 n.66
Alcman
fr. 68 PMG, 35
fr. 80 PMG, 35, 116
Alexander the Great, 253 n.126
Alkathoos, 219 n.102
Alkinoos, 233 n.234
Alkyoneus, 230 n.198
Allen, T., 133, 137
Althaea, 220 n.103
Amazonia, and *Aethiopis,* 198 n.31
Amazons, 140, 209 n.1; in art, 38, 159; in Homeric poems, 159; origins of, 160
amber, 161
Amenhotep III, 204 n.97
Amphiaraos, 198 n.31
Ananius
fr. 2 West, 238 n.276
Andromache, 65–66, 67, 74; in art, 66, 242 n.28; and Astyanax, 154, 215 nn.65, 67; and Hector, 66–67, 214 n.59
Antenor, 86, 225 n.153
Antiklos, 153
Antilochus, 41, 42; and Memnon, 47, 64; and Patroclus, 221 n.111
Aphrodite, 66, 163, 252 n.117
Apollo, 219 n.100; and death of heroes, 75; and death of Patroclus, 74–75; as father of Hector, 65; on leaves and humanity, 120; and Meleager, 219 n.103
Apollodorus, 20, 201 n.66, 208 n.135, 227

n.176; on catalog of Trojan allies, 138; and Epic Cycle, 45; *Epitome,* 16
Bibliotheca: 1.8.3, 220 n.103; *3.10.9,* 73
Epitome: 3.11–14, 241 n.16; *3.30,* 214 n.55; *3.32,* 247 n.70; *3.33,* 246 n.68; *5.1,* 255 n.136; *5.3,* 100, 219 n.99; *5.5,* 225 n.160, 254 n.126; *5.23,* 256 n.157
Apollonius of Rhodes
1.643–648, 221 n.113
Archilochus
frr. 131–132 West, 116
fr. 303 West, 129, 234 n.239, 239 n.286
Arctinus, 9, 142, 163; and Lesches, 202 n.70
Ares, 140
Arethas, 201 n.58
Argive tradition, 78–81, 221 n.119
Argonautic myth, 161, 209 n.1, 226 n.162, 250 n.105
Argos, 78, 80
Aristarchus, 9, 15, 18, 48, 158, 196 n.12, 201 nn.60, 63, 227 n.178, 245 n.58, 247 nn.73, 75; on Antiklos, 153; on δέκτης, 153
aristeia: of Agamemnon, 86–88; of Diomedes, 84, 86, 224 n.140
Aristonothos vase, **100,** 101, 103, 230 n.200
Aristotle, 157; *Analytica posteriora,* 198 n.29, 200 n.53; criticism of Cyclic poems, 18, 148; on Epic Cycle authors, 8; on Homer and *Margites,* 239 n.287; on *Little Iliad,* 24; on *Little Iliad* and *Cypria,* 143–144, 243 n.37; on non-Homeric epic, 243 n.36, 244 n.44; *Poetics,* 18, 24, 130, 143–144, 201 n.62
Peplos (ps.-Aristotle) nos. 4, 5, 254 n.128
Poetics ch. 4, 239 n.287; *ch. 24,* 244 n.44
Rhetoric 1.15.13 (=1375b30), 249 n.89
Aristoxenus, 116, 200 n.50
Arkesilaos, 11, 170
Arkesilas, 11
Arrian
Anabasis 1.12, 253 n.126
art: "Cyclic" images, 36–44, 89–91, 92, 196 n.11, 205 n.104; Cyclops images, 53, 55, 94–114; and Epic Cycle, 9, 45–46, 196 n.11; and folktale, 95–96, 110–111; in Homeric poems, 50, 51, 211 n.18; Iliadic images, 37, 53–94; inscriptions in, 113, 114–115, 233 nn.231, 235; in late antiquity, 45–46, 112; in late Geometric period, 37–38, 50–51; mixture of Homeric and "Cyclic" in, 92–93, 94, 242 n.26; Odyssean images, 37, 53, 55, 94–114, 226 n.168, 232 n.221; in Orientalizing period, 50–51
Artemis, 151, 167, 233 n.236
Astyanax, 64–66, 67, 214 n.59, 215 n.63, 242 n.20; and Andromache, 154, 215 nn.65, 67; death of, 21–22, 38, **38,** 39, 65, 66, 139, 145, 146, 215 nn.66, 67; as Skamandrios, 66; and Troilus, 244 n.41
Athena, 232 n.228; and Diomedes, 84–85; golden lamp of, 50; in *Iliou Persis,* 25; statue of, 211 n.21
Athenaeus, 202 n.67, 252 n.117; and Epic Cycle, 45
6.232c, 221 n.113
7.277d, 9.399a, 204 n.93
466e = 489c, 221 n.113, 233 n.236
781d, 221 n.113, 233 n.236
Athens, 11, 14, 51–52, 57, 197 n.22, 200 n.41, 208 n.132, 211 n.221, 253 n.121
Atticisms, 10–11, 22, 197 n.20
Aulis, 144, 150, 241 n.16
autochthony, 235 n.252
Automedon, 76, 220 n.104

Babylon, 50
Bacchylides
3, 251 n.108
5, 219 n.103

Bellerophon, 209 n.1
Ben Sira, 122
Berezan, 165, 251 nn.104, 111, 254 n.131
Bernabé, A., 11, 140
Bible, and Homeric allusions, 121–122
Black Sea: and Achilles, 160–162, 164–165; and Argonautic myth, 161, 250 n.105; and Iphigeneia, 250 n.103; and *Little Iliad,* 165–166; Milesian colonization of, 11, 160–161, 162, 163, 165, 251 n.111; and Mycenaeans, 251 n.111; and Troy, 251 n.111
blood purification, 166–167, 255 n.144
Bowra, C. M., 126
Briseis, 136; and Agamemnon, 59; capture of, 137, 138, 145, 151; and Lesbos, 72, 247 n.71
Burkert, W., 103, 112, 116, 157, 167

Calchas, 150
Callimachus, 15; on Cyclic poems, 18–19, 201 n.61
Epigram 28 Pfeiffer, 200 n.47
Callinus
fr. 6 West, 9, 129, 234 n.239, 239 n.286
Callisthenes (Ps.)
1.42.11, 221 n.113
Calydonian boar hunt, 209 n.1
Calypso, 63, 255 n.148
Cassandra, 145
Castor, 167
centauromachy, 116, 235 n.249
centaurs, 38, 209 n.1
chest of Kypselos, 86, **87,** 88, 91, 211 n.18, 235 n.249
Chiron, 85–86, 224 nn.145, 148
Chrestomathy (Proclus), 12, 17, 26–27
Chryse, 151, 152
Chryseis, 52, 136, 137, 138, 145, 151–152, 156, 245 n.51, 246 n.65, 247 n.71
Chrysothemis, 150
Cimmerians (Gimmerians), 249 n.96
Cinaethon, 11
Circe, 102, 116, 167, 170
Clement, 11, 198 n.31, 202 n.70
Stromateis 6.5, 125–126
Colchis, 161, 162, 251 n.105
Collins, J. J., 122
Colluthus
Rape of Helen 387–388, 202 n.66
Cook, Erwin, 103
Cook, R., 53, 55
Croesus, 250 n.108
Cycle. *See* Epic Cycle
cycle of myth or poetry, 13, 15, 144, 173
"Cyclic" images, 36–44, 89–91, 92, 196 n.11, 205 n.104
"Cyclic" tradition, 6, 33–46, 47–48, 62, 133–135, 208 n.133. *See also* Epic Cycle
"Cyclopeia," 111
Cyclops: in art, 53, 55, 94–114; blinding of, 97, **98, 99, 100,** 102–106, **104, 105,** 111, 226 n.168, 228 n.182, 232 nn.227, 228; drunkenness of, 107, 205, 209, 230 n.203; escape from, 108–110, **109,** 111, 231 n.211; eye(s) of, 98, 101, 108, 228 n.179, 229 n.190; and folktale, 110–111, 229 n.190; origins of, 95–96, 227 n.172; and the underworld, 110, 112. *See also* folktales; Polyphemus
Cypria, 7, 198 n.31; Aristotle on, 143–144; Astyanax in, 21, 65; authorship of, 8, 201 n.67; catalog of Trojan allies, 138; and Cyprus, 163, 252 n.120, 252 n.117; dating of, 10, 201 n.64; daughters of Agamemnon in, 150, 151; erotic content, 169; extent of, 13, 26–27, 64, 135–140, 149, 151, 152, 200 n.49, 241 n.12, 242 n.21, 245 n.51; genealogical myth in, 163; and *Iliou Persis,* 242

n.19; and Kyprias, 252 n.117; Menelaus and Nestor in, 114; and multiformity, 20–21; origins of, 163; plan of Zeus in, 149, 150; Polyxena in, 22; variance in title of, 117, 252 n.116, 242 n.19; voyage of Paris and Helen in, 19–20; Zeus and Thetis in, 137
fr. 1 Bernabé = fr. 1 Davies, 149, 241 n.11
frr. 6–7 Bernabé = "dubia" frr. 1–2 Davies, 245 n.51
fr. 9.10 Bernabé = 7.10 Davies, 140
fr. 12 Bernabé = 10 Davies, 252 n.118
fr. 13 Bernabé = 12 Davies, 247 n.74
fr. 14 Bernabé = 11 Davies, 201 n.64
fr. 17 Bernabé = 15 Davies, 233 n.237
fr. 18 Bernabé, 239 n.285
fr. 19 Bernabé = "fragmenta incerti loci" 4 Davies, 202 n.69
frr. 19, 21 Bernabé = Cypria fr. 16 Davies, "fragmenta incerti loci" 4 Davies, 224 n.147
fr. 24 Bernabé = 17 Davies, 150
fr. 28 Bernabé = 22 Davies, 151
fr. 30 Bernabé = 20 Davies, 198 n.29
fr. 33 Bernabé = 25 Davies, 65, 139, 242 n.19
fr. 34 Bernabé = 27 Davies, 22, 139, 242 n.19
test. 2 Bernabé = 1 Davies, 129, 196 n.8, 239 n.286
test. 2–3, 7 Bernabé; 1, 3–4, 7 Davies, 196 n.7
test. 7 Bernabé = 11 Davies, 252 n.117
test. 8 Bernabé = 11 Davies, 252 n.117
test. 9 Bernabé = fr. 7 Davies, 202 n.67
Cyprus, 163, 252 nn.117, 120
Cyrene, 11, 162, 170

Dares, 45, 208 n.137, 218 n.91, 242 n.21
Davies, M., 10, 11, 27, 137, 138, 140
Davison, J. A., 123
Dektes, 153
δέκτης, 153
Delos, 50
Delphi, 50
Demodamas, 202 n.67, 252 n.117
Demodocus, 47, 144, 146, 147, 244 n.48
Demophon, 152
Dictys, 45, 201 n.66, 208 n.137, 242 n.21
Dilmun-Bahrain, 254 n.130
Diodorus Siculus
17.17.3, 253 n.126
Diogenes Laertius
1.57, 200 n.40
Diomedes: and Ajax, 41, 85; *aristeia* of, 84, 204 n.91; in art, 85, 89, 222 n.126; and Athena, 84–85; and Dolon, 224 n.141; and Glaucus, 118; and Odysseus, 139; origins of, 84, 223 n.135; and Patroclus, 81
Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 142
Dionysius (the Cyclograph), 16–17
Dioscuri, 152, 163, 255 n.148
Dolon, 224 n.141
Dowden, K., 147

Ecclesiastes
9:7–9, 236 n.259
Ecclesiasticus (Ben Sira)
14.12–20, 121–122, 236 nn.259, 261
ecphrasis, 211 n.18, 235 n.248. *See also* Achilles, shield of; Hesiod, *Shield*
Edwards, Mark W., 69
Eetion, 66
Egypt, 34, 122, 236 n.259, 238 n.279, 250 nn.98, 100, 101
eidolon, 68
eleos, 70
Elysium, 255 n.148
Enkidu, 227 n.172
Eos, 34, 42, 159, 167, 216 n.73

Epic Cycle: and ad hoc invention, 154–155; Aithra in, 152; and art, 9, 45–46, 196 n.11; authors of, 8–10; book division of, 30, 31, 143, 203 n.88, 204 n.94; as *cyclic* in scholia, 18; dating of, 5, 9, 10–12, 14, 15, 49–50, 113–114, 132–133, 158, 171, 174, 240 n.3; and Dektes, 153; erotic content in, 169–170; extent of poems in, 25–27, 141, 143–148; genealogical myth in, 11, 162, 163, 170, 257 n.163; geographical knowledge in, 158–163, 164–165, 210 n.14; and hero cult, 167–169; and Homeric bowls, 45–46, 140–141; Homeric influence on, 149–157; and Iliac tables, 17, 45–46, 141, 201 n.56, 245 n.51; immortality in, 167–168; influence on Homeric poems, 133; local nature of, 162–166, 174, 252 n.113; manufacture of, 12–16, 172–173; and neoanalysis, 6, 62; non-Homeric aspects of, 135, 157–171, 174; omissions in summary of, 142–143; performance traditions of, 11–15, 30, 31, 172, 198 n.28, 199 n.32, 200 n.41, 240 n.5; supernatural content in, 169; tampering with contents of, 19–21; theogony in, 198 n.31
  test. 1, 8 Bernabé; 2 Davies, 200 n.42
  test. 11, 12 Bernabé = 6, 10 Davies, 136
  test. 13 Bernabé; test. 1 Davies, 198 n.30
  test. 18 Bernabé = 4 Davies, 208 n.134
  test. 20 Bernabé = 5 Davies, 200 n.47
  test. 21 Bernabé = 8 Davies, 19, 245 n.51
  test. 24 Bernabé = "fragmenta incerti loci" fr. 9 Davies, 19, 243–244 n.38
  test. 25 Bernabé, 201 n.62
  test. 2 Davies, 198 n.29
Epigoni, and Diomedes, 84, 223 n.135
Erechtheus, 168
Eugammon of Cyrene, 11
Eumelus, 161
  Korinthiaka: fr. 3.8 Bernabé = 2a.8 Davies, 252 n.105
Euphorbos: and Argive tradition, 78–81; in art, 77–81, **79,** 221 n.116; battle over, 77–78, **79,** 81; as Homeric invention, 77, 88, 220 n.111; and Patroclus, 74, 77–78, 80; shield of, 78
Euphronios, 94, 166, 218 n.95, 226 n.164
Euripides, *Electra,* 235 n.248
  Andromache 14, 202 n.73; *107–108,* 216 n.74; *399,* 216 n.74; *1259–1262,* 165
  Cyclops 103, 231 n.218
  Electra 432–485, 40
  fr. 771 (Phaethon) Nauck, 159
Europe, northern, Greek contact with, 161
Eurymachos, 225 n.153
Eurypylos, 47
Eusebius, 9, 160, 251 n.104
Eusthathius, 11, 243 n.34

Fehling, D., 79, 147
Fidonisi, 160
Fittschen, K., 55
folktale: blinding of giant, 96–97, 98, 101, 228 n.190, 230 n.209; and Cyclops, 110–111; and epic, 4, 227 n.170; and *Odyssey,* 95–114, 227 n.173, 231 n.219; supernatural content in, 169. *See also* Cyclops; Polyphemus; stake; wine
Ford, Andrew, 58, 124, 147
Forsdyke, J., 159
Fowler, R. L., 115–116
François vase, 81, 91, 116, 211 n.18, 225 n.150
Friis Johansen, K., 40, 42, 54, 55, 57–58, 94

Gaia, 149, 245 n.57
Gantz, G., 151
Ganymede, 255 n.148
γενεή, 118
Geryon, 110
Geryoneis, 116

ghosts, 164, 168, 169, 254 n.129, 256 n.157
Gilgamesh, 227 n.172
Gilgamesh Epic, 256 n.150
  tablet 10.3, 236 n.259
Glaucus, 118, 121, 223 n.132, 235 n.250, 236 n.254, 251
Goat Island, 96, 109, 231 n.218
Gorgons, 232 n.228, 235 n.248
Greeks, and Africans, 159–160, 249 n.95, 250 nn.98, 100, 101
Griffin, J., 158
Griffith, M., 121

Hades, 219 n.103, 250 n.107; Achilles in, 167
Heath, M., 144
Hecataeus
  1 F 326–327 FGH, 250 n.98
Hector: and Achilles, 67, **67,** 68–69, 216 n.73; and Ajax, 54–55, 67, 212 n.27, 214 n.53; and Andromache, 66–67, 214 n.59; in art, 24, 69, 70–71, 88, 92, 140–141, 214 n.58, 216 n.73, 221 n.116; death of, 68–70, 216 n.75; funeral of, 140, 142; as Homeric invention, 64–67, 214 n.53, 215 n.64, 217 n.84; *lusis* of, 69–70, 140, 217 n.80; and Menelaus, 77, 78, 79; in non-Homeric myth, 64–65; and Paris, 65; and Patroclus, 64–65, 73; and Protesilaus, 64; and Troilus, 64
Helen, 211 n.18; and Achilles, 169; and Aithra, 152, 247 n.75; birth of, 149; and Menelaus, 145, 224 n.148; on Odysseus, 152–153; and Paris, 19–20, 37, 144, 145, 170; and Patroclus, 73; and Telemachus, 116
Helenos, 224 n.140
Helikoon, 225 n.153
Hellanicus, 239 n.286, 241 n.16
hemitheoi, 237 n.267
Hephaestus, 74, 211 n.18, 222 n.130
Heracles, 209 n.1, 212 n.26; in art, 38, 43, 232 n.229; baldric of, 211 n.18; and Geryon, 110; and Hyperboreans, 250 n.108; immortalization of, 254 n.128, 255 n.148
Heraclitus
  A 22, B 42, 56, 57, 105 D–K, 238 n.274
Hermes, 69, 70
hero cult, 167–169, 256 n.154. *See also* Achilles
Herodotus: on *Cypria,* 18, 19, 130, 202 n.66; on *Epigoni,* 129, 130; on Homeric authorship, 18, 129, 130; on Theseids, 253 n.121
  2.116, 204 n.91
  2.116–117, 130
  2.117, 201 n.64
  4.32, 129, 130
  4.159–165, 197 n.26
  5.67, 129, 130
  5.94, 253 nn.121, 126
Hesiod: Aethiopians in, 158; *Catalog of Women,* 148, 150, 156–157; on Cyclopes, 98; dating of, 53, 211 n.24; dating of *Theogony,* 248 n.85; and Homer, 233 n.238, 234 n.239
  Catalog of Women: fr. 23 M–W, 167; *fr. 23a M–W,* 246 n.63; *fr. 23a.17 M–W,* 150; *fr. 25 M–W,* 219 n.103; *fr. 25.25–33 M–W,* 255 n.148; *fr. 26.18–20 M–W,* 156; *fr. 150.15–18 M–W,* 158, 159
  Hesiodic fragments: *fr. 280 M–W,* 219 n.103; *fr. 357 M–W,* 234 n.239
  Shield, 116–117, 127, 235 n.248; *156–159,* 117
  Theogony: 148, 156–157, 198 n.31, 228 n.179, 233 n.238, 241 n.7; *3,* 156; *9,* 156; *43ff.,* 248 n.85; *68,* 156; *143,* 98; *337–345,* 160; *984–985,* 158; *1006–1007,* 34; *1011–1018,* 35
  Works and Days (Erg.), 148, 233 n.238; *106,* 245 n.55; *156–173,* 34; *159–160,* 237 n.267; *527,* 158; *651–653,* 35

Hippostratus
568 F5 FGH, 239 n.282
Hippothoos, 223 n.132
Homer: biographies of, 234 n.239, 237 n.271; as epic genre, 14, 15, 130; false attributions to, 129–131, 234 nn.239, 240, 239 nn.288, 289; and Hesiod, 233 n.238, 234 n.239; as historical figure, 4–5, 6, 52, 115, 125; as "man of Chios," 118, 123, 127; and Musaeus, 126; students or relatives of, 8–9
Homeric bowls, 24, 45–46, 140–141
Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite, 10
Homeric Hymn to Apollo, 123, 127
Homeric Hymn to Demeter, 197 n.20; *109–110,* 150
Homeric hymns, 148
Homeric poems: ad hoc invention in, 48–49, 155, 207 n.131, 209 n.7, 216 n.71, 218 n.89; allusions to, 114–127, 233 n.238, 234 nn.240, 241, 242, 244, 245, 235 nn.247, 248, 252, 253, 236 n.254, 237 nn.267, 268; and art, 53–114; Athenian elements in, 211 n.21; book division of, 25, 31, 204 nn.91, 92; "Cyclic" myths in, 47–49; dating of, 3, 5, 10, 49–53, 113–114, 158, 171, 201 n.64, 209 n.8, 210 nn.12, 16, 234 n.241, 240 n.3; as educational texts, 126; and folktale, 4, 95, 227 nn.170, 173, 231 n.219; geographical knowledge in, 158–161, 249 n.96, 250 nn.98, 101; and hero cult, 167–69; heroic artifacts in, 233 n.236; influence in Archaic Age, 127–131; linguistic forms of, 52–53; myth in, 47, 209 nn.1, 2; performance at Panathenaic festivals, 39, 41, 124, 128–129, 199 n.38, 200 n.40; and performance traditions, 6, 14, 58, 60, 113–114, 232 n.223, 238 n.280; quotation of, 115, 122–123, 124, 127, 129, 130, 154, 230 n.203, 239 nn.285, 287; recording of, 114, 128, 129, 238 nn.279, 280; and society, 11, 50, 210 n.10; supernatural motifs in, 158, 169, 170; suppression in, 135, 151, 158, 166, 169, 249 n.92, 255 n.147, 256 n.161; types of song in, 4, 195 n.17, 209 n.9. See also *Iliad; Odyssey*
Horace, on "scriptor Cyclicus," 201 n.62, 243 n.38
Ars poetica, 19; *136ff.,* 201 n.62, 243 n.38
Odes: 1.28.9–15, 221 n.113; *4.6.3–8,* 219 n.99
Huwawa (Humbaba), 227 n.172
Huxley, G. L., 138
Hyginus
Fabulae 106, 216 n.74
Hyperboreans, 250 n.108, 251 n.109
Hypsipyle, 226 n.162

Ibycus, 35
fr. 282 PMG, 205 n.102
fr. 282.23–32 PMG, 244 n.46
fr. 291 PMG, 205 n.102
fr. 295 PMG, 65
fr. 307 PMG, 205 n.102
Idomeneus, 232 n.220
Iliac tables, 17, 45–46, 141, 201 n.56, 239 n.289, 245 n.51
Iliad: and *Aethiopis,* 16, 62, 140–141; and Alcaeus, 115; and art, 37, 53–94, 173; catalog of ships in, 146, 241 n.16; catalog of Trojan allies in, 138–139, 241 n.15; and *Cypria,* 16, 152, 200 n.49, 245 nn.51, 56; dating of, 3, 210 n.16, 240 n.3; and Ecclesiasticus, 121–122, 236 n.261; embassy to Achilles in, 39; in Epic Cycle, 17; funeral of Achilles, reflected in, 96, 226 n.160; Glaucus in, 118, 121; Hector in, 64, 68; and Hesiodic *Shield,* 117; leaves simile in book 6, 117–126, 235 nn.251, 252, 236 nn.254, 257; and Mimner-

mus, 118–120, 122; and *Little Iliad,* 156; proem of, 149, 150; and Sappho, 115, 234 n.244; and Simonides, 122–125; and Stesichorus, 116, 220 n.105, 234 n.245; and *Theogony,* 241 n.7; and Tyrtaeus, 115, 234 n.242; Zeus and Thetis in, 137. *See also* Homeric Poems

1.5, 149–50; *1.11,* 152; *1.242,* 64; *1.265,* 209 n.1; *1.268,* 209 n.1; *1.307,* 71; *1.314,* 166; *1.366,* 151

2, 146; *2.184,* 209 n.1; *2.546–551,* 168; *2.603–604,* 168; *2.690,* 151, 247 n.71; *2.698–699,* 47; *2.701,* 64; *2.718–725,* 47; *2.781–783,* 209 n.1; *2.802ff.,* 64; *2.814,* 159; *2.851–857,* 161

3.6, 160; *3.125–128,* 211 n.18; *3.144,* 152; *3.189,* 159, 209 n.1; *3.205–224,* 86; *3.373–382,* 256 n.149

4. 370–410, 209 n.1; *4.390,* 85; *4.404–410,* 223 n.135

5, 149; *5.115–120,* 85; *5.239ff.,* 85; *5.311–318,* 256 n.149; *5.800–813,* 209 n.1

6, 118–120, 121, 122, 125; *6.85–95,* 94; *6.90–92,* 211 n.21; *6.98,* 224 n.140; *6.146–149,* 117–118, 125; *6.155–255,* 209 n.1; *6.186,* 159; *6.326,* 335–336, 225 n.152; *6.345–348,* 256 n.149; *6.402,* 66; *6.403,* 66; *6.413–428,* 66; *6.433–439,* 74; *6.467,* 248 n.83

7, 54; *7.132–157,* 209 n.1; *7.332–338,* 211 n.21; *7.344–378,* 86; *7.469,* 209 n.1

8. 306–308, 235 n.245; *8.470–477,* 73; *8.479–481,* 209 n.1

9, 206 n.115; *9.128–132,* 247 n.71; *9.145,* 150; *9.270–274,* 247 n.71; *9.287,* 150; *9.404–405,* 210 n.14; *9.410,* 235 n.253; *9.410–416,* 119; *9.438–442,* 39; *9.446,* 248 n.83; *9.527–549,* 209 n.1

10, 43; *10.284–294,* 85; *10.401–404,* 76

11, 54, 223 n.136; *11.20,* 253 n.122; *11.36–37,* 50; *11.609–614,* 211 n.18; *11.632–637,* 114; *11.668–762,* 209 n.1; *11.697–701,* 210 n.14; *11.765–784,* 73; *11.765–813,* 39; *11.832,* 209 n.1

12. 17–33, 50; *12.23,* 168, 237 n.267; *12.310–328,* 119; *12.322–328,* 234–235 n.245; *12.326–327,* 235 n.253

13. 434–444, 219 n.102

14. 110–127, 209 n.1; *14.201 = 302,* 209 n.1; *14.203–204,* 209 n.1; *14.266,* 209 n.1; *14.320,* 209 n.1; *14.324,* 209 n.1

15. 24–30, 209 n.1; *15.640,* 209 n.1; *15.705,* 64

16, 76; *16.145–147,* 220 n.104; *16.220–224,* 39; *16.241–245,* 76; *16.567ff.,* 223 n.131; *16.674–675,* 168; *16.698–711,* 74; *16.707–709,* 74; *16.721–725,* 74; *16.775–777,* 220 n.105

17, 77, 82, 223 n.134; *17.29–30,* 221 n.113; *17.288–303,* 223 n.132; *17.384,* 82; *17.403–404,* 74; *17.426–440, 475–477,* 76; *17.644,* 223 n.131

18, 40, 51; *18.26–27,* 220 n.105; *18.39–49,* 234 n.238; *18.324–327,* 39; *18.417–421,* 211 n.18; *18.453,* 222 n.130; *18.454–456,* 74; *18.456,* 74; *18.535–538,* 117; *18.564,* 211 n.20

19, 40; *19.96–133,* 209 n.1; *19.245–246,* 247 n.71

20. 54–66, 209 n.1; *20.90–93,* 247 n.70; *20.144–148,* 209 n.1; *20.187–190,* 247 n.70; *20.231–235,* 255 n.148; *20.288–339,* 256 n.149

21. 34–135, 73; *21.40–41,* 209 n.1; *21.464–466,* 120

22, 216 n.75; *22.59–71,* 248 n.83; *22.71–76,* 115; *22.83,* 234–235 n.245; *22.349–350,* 68; *22.360,* 219 n.99

23, 41, 54, 81, 164, 169; *23.80–81,* 74; *23.630–643,* 209 n.1; *23.679–680,* 209 n.1; *23.746–747,* 73, 209 n.1

24, 216 n.75; *24.28–30,* 47, 48; *24.143–148,* 68; *24.228–237,* 68;

Iliad (*cont.*)
24.468–472, 66; *24.477–479,* 505–506, 69; *24.480,* 166–167; *24.508,* 68; *24.527–533,* 239 n.283; *24.696–718,* 115; *24.734–739,* 66; *24.735,* 248 n.83; *24.803,* 142; *24.804,* 140
Iliades Parvae, 198 n.31
Iliaka, 202 n.67, 252 n.117
Iliou Persis, 7, 256 n.157; Aeneas in, 22; Andromache in, 65, 215 n.65; Astyanax in, 21–22, 65, 215 nn.65, 66; authorship of, 9; and *Cypria,* 242 n.19; departure of Greeks in, 24–25; extent of, 22–23, 24–25, 31, 215 n.66; Helen in, 202 n.73; and Homer, 237 n.267; and *Little Iliad,* 22–24, 215 n.66; Polyxena in, 22; and Stesichorus, 17; victory feast in, 22
fr. 1 Bernabé = Davies pp. 65–66 ("fragmentum dubium"), 142
fr. 2 Bernabé = 2 Davies, 211 n.18
fr. 4 Bernabé = 1 Davies, 142
fr. 5 Bernabé = 3 Davies, 65
fr. 6 Bernabé = 4 Davies, 247 n.74, 253 n.121
fr. 3 Davies, 215 n.66
immortality: of Achilles, 161, 165, 166, 167; in Epic Cycle, 167–168, 255 n.147; in Homeric poems, 255 n.148, 256 n.149
Indic traditions, 252 n.113, 255 n.147
Indo-European traditions, 65, 149, 159, 167, 193 n.2, 231 n.217
Ino, 255 n.148
intertextuality, 117–131, 133–134, 237 n.270, 241 n.7
Iphianassa, 150, 151, 246 n.64
Iphigeneia, 145, 150, 151, 167, 246 n.64, 250 n.103
Iphimedeia, 64, 150, 246 n.63
Iris, 217 n.77
Isaiah *40:6–8,* 122
Islands of the Blessed, 167
Istros (Danube), 161
Ithaca, 254 n.132

Janko, R., 10, 52–53, 163
Jason, 209 n.1
Job *14:1–21,* 236 n.261
John Philoponos, 198 n.29, 200 n.53

Kaineus, 235 n.249
Kakridis, P., 169
Kallidike, 150
Kallithoe, 150
Kannicht, R., 55
Kebriones, 71, 88, 217 n.82, 220 n.105
Kinyras, 253 n.122
Kirk, G. S., 44, 54–55
Kleisidike, 150
Kleisthenes, 129
Koon, 86, **87,** 87–88, 89, 225 n.153
Kopff, E., 140–141
κυκλικός, 15
κύκλος, 15
Kullmann, W., 64, 65, 114, 137, 142, 151, 152, 170
Kynaithos of Chios, 239 n.282
Kyprias of Halikarnassos, 202 n.67, 252 n.117

Laodike, 150
laos, 235 n.252
Leaf, W., 120
leaves simile in *Iliad* 6, 118–122, 125, 236 nn.254, 257, 261
Leda, 140
Lefkandi, 2, 194 n.6, 250 n.100, 256 n.154
Lesbos, 67, 72, 247 n.71, 253 n.121
Lesches, 253 n.121; and Arctinus, 202 n.70
Leucothea, 255 n.148
Leuke, 35, 129, 160–167, 205 n.101, 226 n.162, 254 n.126
Linear B, 211 n.20, 246 n.63

literacy, 114, 128, 129, 130, 157, 195 n.15, 233 nn.233, 234, 248 n.87
Little Iliad, 7, 198 n.31; Achilles at Scyros in, 24; Aeneas in, 22, 202 n.73; Andromache in, 65, 215 n.65; Aristotle on, 143–144; Astyanax in, 65, 154, 215 n.65; and Black Sea, 165–166; extent of, 22–24, 31; Helen in, 202 n.73; and *Iliad,* 156; and *Iliades Parvae,* 198 n.31; and *Iliou Persis,* 22–24, 215 n.66; Paris in, 75; Philoctetes in, 75; proem of, 203 n.78; sack of Troy in, 21; stealing of *palladion* in, 142; victory feast in, 22
  argumenta 2 Bernabé, 224 n.147, 256 n.157
  "dubia" fr. 1 Davies, 202 n.73
  fr. 1 Bernabé, 203 n.78
  fr. 6 Bernabé = "fragmenta incerti loci" 7 Davies, 247 n.76
  fr. 9–22 Bernabé; fr. 11–23 Davies, 202 n.72
  fr. 16 Bernabé; fr. 17 Davies, 248 n.83
  fr. 16 [I] Bernabé = test. 7 [I] Davies, 141
  fr. 20 Bernabé = 23 Davies, 247 n.74, 253 n.121
  fr. 21 Bernabé = 20 Davies, 65, 146, 202 n.73, 215 n.66
  fr. 21.3–4 Bernabé = 20.3–4 Davies, 248 n.83
  fr. 24 Bernabé ("incerti operis fragmenta") = 4 Davies, 24
  fr. 26 Bernabé ("incerti operis fragmenta") = "fragmenta incerti loci" 8 Davies, 248 n.78
  fr. 28 Bernabé = 1 Davies, 198 n.27, 201 n.62, 203 n.77, 255 n.136
  fr. 32 Bernabé, 198 n.31
  test. 1 Bernabé; 7 Davies, 203 n.79
  test. 4 Bernabé, 202 n.70
  test. 7 Bernabé = 5 Davies, 24
  test. 8 Bernabé; 1 Davies, 196 n.7
  test. 10 Bernabé = 2 Davies, 239 n.286
Lloyd-Jones, H., 167
Lowenstam, Steven, 58–59, 61, 94, 114–115, 116
Lucretius 85, 150
lusis, of Hector, 69–70, 217 n.80
Lycaon, 73
Lycophron: 45, 202 n.67
  269, 217 n.78; *1232,* 202 n.73; *1268,* 202 n.73
Lycurgus
  Leocrates 102, 199 n.38
Lyrnessos, 151, 246 n.68

Machaon, 142
Makron, 59
Maron of Thrace, 96
Medea, 154
Medusa, 102, 227 n.172, 232 n.228
Megapenthes, 154
Meleager, 75, 123, 219 n.103
Memnon, 159, 167; and Achilles, 34, 41–42, 212 n.27, 251 n.109; and Amenhotep III, 204 n.97; and Antilochus, 47, 64; in art, 92, 216 n.73; Eastern origins of, 159, 249 n.96, 251 n.109
Memnonis, and *Aethiopis,* 240 n.3
Menelaus: and Aethiopians, 159, 250 n.98; and Argive tradition, 78; in art, 42, 78, 159, 221 n.116; in *Cypria,* 27, 114; and Elysium, 255 n.148; and Euphorbos, 77; and Hector, 77, 78, 79; and Helen, 145, 224 n.148; and Meriones, 223 n.134; and Nestor, 114, 233 n.237; and Odysseus, 39, **40,** 145, 153, 206 n.115
Meriones, 223 n.134
Metaneira, daughters of, 150
Meuli, K., 250 n.105
Miletus: and *Aethiopis,* 11, 162, 163, 166; and colonization of Black Sea, 160, 162, 163, 165, 166; and cult of Achilles, 160, 162, 251 n.109, 254 n.133

mimesis, 238 n.275
Mimnermus: Homeric allusion in, 119–120, 122, 124–125, 235 n.252
fr. 2 West, 234 n.242, 236 nn.259, 261
fr. 2.1–5 West, 118
fr. 2.1–10 West, 118–119
fr. 2.4–5 West, 235 n.253
fr. 2.5 West, 235 n.253
fr. 2.5–8 West, 235 n.253
fr. 6 West, 238 n.276
fr. 12 West, 158–159
Minyas, 219 n.103
Molossians, 162, 252 n.115
Momus, 149
Monro, D. B., 136
Musaeus, Homer and, 126
fr. 5 D–K, 125–126
Mycenae, 204 n.96
Mycenaeans, 2, 52, 161, 193 n.3, 194 n.5, 204 n.97, 211 n.20; and Black Sea, 251 n.111; and Egypt, 250 n.100
Mytilene, and Athens, 253 n.121

Naevius, *"Cypria Ilias,"* 245 n.51
Nagy, Gregory, 5, 10, 15, 128, 162, 170, 172, 173
Naupaktia, 252 n.117
Nausicaa, 232 n.224
Near Eastern traditions, 3, 149, 167, 193 n.2, 195 n.13, 227 n.172, 252 n.120, 256 n.150, 257 n.165
nekyia, 142–43
neoanalysis, 61–64, 213 n.44; on battles over corpses of Patroclus and Achilles, 82–84, 222 n.131, 223 nn.132, 133, 134; and Euphorbus, 77–79, 220 n.111; on funeral games for Patroclus, 83–84; and Hector, 64, 214 n.53, 215 n.64; and Homeric invention, 62–64, 214 n.52; and Patroclus, 71, 73–75, 214 n.53; and pre-Homeric traditions, 6, 92, 208 n.140; vengeance theory, 213 n.48
Neoptolemus, 21, 24, 47, 65, 162, 202 n.73, 215 n.66, 226 n.161, 243 n.34, 252 n.115
Nereids, **23,** 40, **91,** 92, **93,** 113, 222 n.126, 226 n.162, 234 n.238
Nestor, 27, 54, 73, 114, 146, 212 n.26, 233 n.237, 244 n.44
Nestor's cup, 114, 221 n.113, 233 nn.236, 237
Nosti, 7, 224 n.147; Achilles and Agamemnon in, 256 n.157; authorship of, 162, 163; extent of, 24–25, 243 n.34; and genealogical myth, 162; Medea in, 154; *nekyia* in, 142–143; Neoptolemus in, 143, 162; Odysseus in, 143; and *Odyssey,* 154, 243 n.34
frr. 3–9 Bernabé; frr. 3–7, 9 Davies, 243 n.31
fr. 7 Bernabé = 6 Davies, 248 n.83
fr. 11 Bernabé = 8 Davies, 203 n.88
fr. 16 Bernabé ("fragmenta falsa") = "dubia et spuria" fr. 1 Davies, 243 n.34
test. 2 Bernabé, 198 n.31
Nubia, 249 n.95

Odios, 94
Odysseus, 111, 141, 223 n.134; and Achilles, 43, 63; and Ajax, 81; in art, 37, 39, 92, 94–114, 228 n.187, 232 n.221; and Astyanax, 215 n.66; brooch of, 50, 211 n.18; and Circe, 116; cult of, 254 n.132; death of, 153–154, 248 n.82; as Dektes, 153; and Diomedes, 139; and immortality, 255 n.148; and Menelaus, 39, **40,** 145, 153, 206 n.115; name-trick of, 96, 107, 227 n.172, 230 n.207; in *Nosti,* 143, 243 n.34; and Penelope, 146; and Polyphemus, 96, 101, 102, 106, 107, 109, 231 n.218; reconnaissance of Troy, 47; sacrifice to Zeus, 109, 110; and the underworld, 243 n.33

Odyssey: and the afterlife, 255 n.146; and Alcman, 116; and Argonautic myth, 250 n.105; and Archilochus, 116; and art, 37, 53, 55, 94–114, 226 n.168, 232 n.221; Cyclops episode in, 94–114; ending of, 209 n.5, 243 n.35; in Epic Cycle, 16; and folktale, 95–114, 227 n.173, 231 n.219; *nekyia* in, 142–143; and *Nosti,* 154; post-Iliadic events in, 47; and Stesichorus, 116, 234 n.245, 235 n.247; and *Telegony,* 143. *See also* Homeric Poems

1.22–24, 250 n.98; *1.241,* 256 n.149; *1.35ff.,* 47; *1.325ff.,* 47; *3.113–117,* 146; *3.130–192,* 47; *3.188,* 252 n.115; *3.278–285,* 38; *4.12,* 154, 155; *4.84,* 159; *4.186–188,* 47; *4.193–198,* 47; *4.237,* 119, 236 n.253; *4.240–259,* 47; *4.245,* 153; *4.248,* 152–153; *4.271–289,* 47; *4.285–289,* 153; *4.351–586,* 47; *4.512–537,* 47; *4.561–569,* 255 n.148; *4.613–619,* 235 n.247; *5.205–210,* 255 n.148; *5.308–310,* 47; *5.333–335,* 255 n.148; *6.162–165,* 210 n.14; *8.72–82,* 43, 47, 63; *8.79–82,* 210 n.14; *8.224,* 209 n.1; *8.499–520,* 47; *9–12,* 4; *9.105–566,* 96; *9.110–111,* 107; *9.190–192,* 97; *9.299–302,* 102; *9.331ff.,* 228 n.179; *9.357–358,* 107; *9.371–372,* 97; *9.374,* 107; *9.383,* 228 n.179; *9.394,* 228 n.179; *9.397,* 228 n.179; *9.447–460,* 109; *9.452–454,* 107; *9.455,* 107; *11,* 169; *11.134–135,* 153; *11.267,* 209 n.1; *11.299–304,* 167, 255 n.148; *11.322–324,* 209 n.1; *11.326–327,* 209 n.1; *11.519–521,* 47; *11.553–565,* 47; *11.601–627,* 209 n.1, 255 n.148; *11.634–635,* 209 n.1; *12.70,* 209 n.1; *12.189–190,* 47, 146; *14.371,* 256 n.149; *15,* 116; *15.68,* 234 n.245; *15.113–119,* 235 n.247; *15.168ff.,* 234 n.245; *15.244–247,* 209 n.1; *16.172,* 232 n.228; *16.456,* 232 n.228; *19.34,* 50; *19.226–231,* 50, 211 n.18; *20.61–82,* 256 n.149; *21.22–30,* 209 n.1; *22.481–482,* 166; *23.297ff.,* 209 n.5; *23.310–343,* 146; *23.336,* 255 n.148; *24,* 143, 164, 169; *24.36–92,* 47; *24.39–40,* 76; *24.41,* 82; *24.42,* 82; *24.43–84,* 209 n.5, 225 n.160; *24.96–97,* 47

Oedipodia, 11, 198 n.31

Oedipus, 209 n.1

Olbia, 164, 165, 237 n.272, 255 n.136

Olympia, 50

orality, 3–4, 12–13, 59–60, 114, 133–134, 173, 195 n.15, 211 n.17, 240 n.4

Orcus, tomb of, 228 n.187, 230 n.199

Oresteia images, 36–37, 205 n.106

O'Sullivan, J. N., 107

"Οὖτις" ("Nobody"), 96, 107, 227 n.172, 230 n.207, 232 n.225

Ovid

Metamorphosis: 8.44ff., 219 n.103; *12.597–609,* 219 n.100

Page, D. L., 65, 102–103, 108

Palamedeia, 198 n.31

Palamedes, 92, 137, 138

palladion, 142

Panathenaic festival (Panathenaea), 14, 39, 41, 51–52, 124, 128–129, 199 n.38, 200 nn.40, 41. *See also* performance traditions; rhapsodes

Panathenaic rule, 14, 199 n.39, 200 n.40

Panhellenism, 3, 6, 50, 128, 162, 165, 166, 174, 194 n.10, 210 n.14, 221 n.17, 252 n.113, 254 n.132, 255 n.147

Panhomerists, 115

Paris, 219 n.100; in art, 36, 37; death of, 75; and Euphorbos, 220 n.111; and Hector, 65; and Helen, 19–20, 144, 145, 170; judgement of, 47, 48, 209 n.3, 225 n.148; voyage of, 19, 201 n.66

Patroclus, 41, 42, 71–73, 214 n.53; and Achilles, 73, 74–75, 76, 256 n.158; as Achilles' *therapon,* 75, 76–77; and Antilochus, 221 n.111; and Apollo, 74–75; in art, 71, 73–77, 88, 92, 204 n.91, 219 n.101; and Automedon, 220 n.104; battle over corpse of, 82–84, 132, 133, 223 n.131; death of, 74, 219 n.102; and Diomedes, 81; *eidolon* and tomb of, 68, 216 n.75; and Euphorbos, 74, 77–78, 80; funeral games for, 81–82; funeral of, 168, 256 n.155; and Hector, 64–65, 73; and Helen, 73; Homeric invention of, 71, 73–74, 217 n.84; and Sarpedon, 73–74
Pausanias, 9, 198 n.29; on chest of Kypselos, 86, 87
1.11.1, 252 n.115; *2.17.3,* 221 n.113; *3.1.11–13,* 205 n.101; *5.17.5–19,* 225 n.149; *8.12.5,* 197 n.26; *10.25.5–9,* 204 n.93; *10.31.2,* 198 n.29; *10.31.3,* 219 n.103
Pedasos, 77, 151, 220 n.109, 247 n.68
Peleus, **23,** 36, 85, 224 n.148, 226 n.161
Penelope, 146, 167, 170
Penthesileia, **32, 34,** 36, 38, 140, 142, 159, 160, 166, 169, 242 n.28, 250 n.102, 255 n.137
performance traditions: and book divisions, 25, 30, 31, 141–142, 204 n.92; and dating, 11–12, 53, 210 n.16; and Epic Cycle, 5, 13–15, 147, 172, 173, 198 n.28; and Homeric poems, 6, 58, 60, 113–114, 232 n.223, 238 n.280; and mixture of "Cyclic" and Homeric poetry, 14, 15, 141–142, 155, 200 n.41. *See also* Panathenaic festival (Panathenaea); rhapsodes
Perithous, 219 n.103
Persephone, 228 n.184
Perseus, 102, 209 n.1, 227 n.172, 232 n.228, 235 n.248, 250 n.108
Peter *1:24–25,* 236 n.259
Phemius, 47, 144, 147, 232 n.225
Philoctetes, 47, 75, 142, 145
Philostratus, 45, 208 n.137
Heroicus 208.53.10, 253 n.126, 254 n.128
Phoenix, 4, 39, 85–86, 89, **91,** 92, 154, 224 nn.145, 146, 147
Phokais, 252 n.117
Photius, 12, 16, 17, 28, 198 n.30, 252 n.117
Phrontis, **37,** 37–38, 205 n.109
Phthia, 39–40, **41,** 73, 218 n.89, 225 n.148
pilos of Odysseus, 39
Pindar: on Ajax's suicide, 21; and Epic Cycle, 7, 45, 129, 208 n.133; and Homer, 129, 208 n.133, 239 n.286
Isthmian Odes: 4.37–41, 129; *5.39–42,* 208 n.133; *8.54–55,* 208 n.133; *8.56–60,* 225 n.160
Nemean Odes: 4.49–50, 165; *10.55–91,* 167
Olympian Odes: 1.75, 252 n.117; *2.81–83,* 208 n.133; *3.13–35,* 250 n.108; *9.70–79,* 73; *12.15,* 237 n.273
Pythian Odes: 3.80–83, 239 n.283; *3.100–103,* 225 n.160; *4.5,* 197 n.26; *4.277–278,* 129; *9.70–79,* 77; *10.29–46,* 251 n.108; *11.61–64,* 167
Pisander, 17
Pisistratean recension, 51–52, 57, 94, 199 n.38, 200 n.41, 226 n.168
Pitheus, 152
Plato, 130, 239 n.287
Hipparchus 228b, 200 n.40
Ion 539b, 204 n.91
Republic 377c, 195 n.18
Pliny
Naturalis Historia 5.125, 253 n.126
Plutarch
Alcibiades 7.1, 237 n.272
Podaleirios, 142
polis, 50, 210 n.14
Pollianus, 201 n.62, 245 n.51
Polydeuces, 167
Polyphemus, 95, 96; drunkenness of, 107,

205, 209, 230 n.203; eating habits of, 96, 102–103, 229 n.191; in Euripides' *Cyclops,* 103; name of, 112, 232 n.225; and Odysseus, 96, 101, 102, 106, 107, 109, 231 n.218; and the underworld, 110, 112, 228 n.184
Polyxena, 242 n.20; and Achilles, 22, 168, 244 n.41; death of, 22, 139, 145, 168, 242 n.18, 256 n.157; and Troilus, 244 n.41; wounding of, 21–22, 139, 257 n.162
Poseidon, 94, 96, 219 n.102
πρᾶξις (praxis), 143–144, 243 n.36
Priam, 68–69, 70, 141, 215 n.67, 248 n.83
Proclus, 12, 16–18, 19–21, 28, 136, 141, 142–143, 172–173, 198 nn.29, 30, 203 n.90, 215 n.65
Protesilaus, 47, 64, 92
Psalms: *90:5–6,* 236 n.261; *103:15–18,* 236 n.261
Psammetichus I, 249 n.95
psychostasia, 34, 204 n.97
pygmies, 160, 250 n.101
Pylos and Pylian epic, 54, 209 n.1, 233 n.237, 246 n.63

Quintus of Smyrna, 45, 208 n.136, 226 n.165
3.525–787, 225 n.160

Raubitschek, A. E., 69, 70
Reece, S., 116
Return of the Sons of Atreus, and *Nosti,* 198 n.31
rhapsodes, 13–14, 16, 23, 25, 31, 39, 111–112, 140–142, 173, 199 nn.33, 34, 39, 204 n.92, 232 n.223. *See also* performance traditions, Panathenaic festival (Panathenaea)
Rhesus, 43, 250 n.102
Robertson, M., 139
Rohde, E., 168
Sappho, 35, 127, 234 n.244
fr. 44 L–P, 65, 66–67, 115
Sarpedon, 73–74, 94, 119, 168, 218 n.95, 256 n.157
Schefold, Karl, 56–57, 111
scholia, 15, 18, 200 n.46, 242 nn.52, 53; on *Aethiopis,* 21; on Apollonius of Rhodes 1.643–648, 221 n.113; on *Cypria,* 21–22, 139, 149, 151, 202 n.67, 241 n.11, 245 n.57; on Epic Cycle, 21, 147–148, 153, 200 n.46, 201 n.63; on Euripides' *Andromache* 14, 202 n.73; on *Il.* 2.814, 209 n.1; on *Il.* 9.145, 150; on *Il.* 16.57, 246 n.68; on *Il.* 17.29–30, 221 n.113; on *Il.* 22.349–350, 217 n.79; on *Il.* 24.480, 166–167; on *Od.,* 16; on *Od.* 4.12, 154; on *Od.* 16.195, 200 n.48; on *Od.* 17.25, 200 n.48; Scylla, 102, 228 n.189; Scyros, 21, 24, 202 n.69
Scythia and Scythians, 165, 251 n.109, 253 n.126, 254 n.135
Semonides, 123, 235 n.262
Severyns, A., 25–28
Sidon, 201 n.64
Sigeion, 253 n.121
Simias, 202 n.73
Simonides, 35, 123, 236 n.262, 237 nn.263, 268, 270; on Homer, 127, 237 n.267; and Homeric allusion, 122–125
fr. 11 West, 205 n.103
fr. 11.15–18 West, 123
fr. 19 West, 122–123, 237 n.269
fr. 19.1–2 West, 118
frr. 19 and 20 West, 237 n.265
fr. 20.14 West, 123
fr. 564 PMG, 123, 129
Sirens, 47, 146, 244 n.47
Sleep and Death, 94, 218 n.95, 226 n.166
Snodgrass, A. M., 51, 52, 55, 71, 76, 77, 78, 91, 103, 105
Solon, 56
fr. 20 West, 238 n.276

Sophilos, 81
Sophocles: and Epic Cycle, 45; and *Titanomachy,* 208 n.134
Ajax 1031, 216 n.74
Elektra 155, 150–151
fr. 497 Radt, 214 n.55
Sosias, 73, 207 n.127, 213 n.37
spit, vs. wooden stake in Cyclops story, 102–106, 198, 228–229 n.190, 229 n.196
Stanley, K., 64
Stasinus, 139
Stesichorus, 17, 35, 116, 201 n.56, 225 n.160, 235 n.247; on Homer, 127; pallinode to Helen, 205 n.101
fr. S11.8–24 PMGF, 234 n.245
fr. S13.5 PMGF, 234 n.245
fr. S15.ii.14–17 PMGF, 235 n.245
fr. S88–147 PMGF, 205 n.101
fr. S196–205 PMGF, 205 n.101
fr. S208–209 PMGF, 205 n.101
fr. 209 PMG, 116, 234 n.245
fr. 224 PMG, 65
Stesimbrotos of Thasos, 238 n.274
Sthenelaos, 85, 153, 223 n.135, 224 n.142
Stobaeus 4.34.28, 237 n.265
Strabo 13.32, 253 n.126
Suda, 9
Susa, 250 n.98
synopsis, technique of, 70
Syracuse, 239 n.282

Talthybios, 39
Taplin, O., 51, 152
Teiresias, 153
Telegonus, 167, 170
Telegony, 7, 167, 170; dating of, 11, 172; on death of Odysseus, 153, 154, 243 n.34, 248 n.82; and *Odyssey,* 143
fr. 3 Bernabé = 2 Davies, 197 n.26
fr. 4 Bernabé, 248 n.80
test. 1 Bernabé; 2 Davies, 197 n.24
test. 2 Bernabé 4 = Davies, 197 n.24
test. 3 Bernabé = 3 Davies, 197 n.25, 198 n.31
Telemachus, 116, 167, 170
Teuthranian expedition, 73
Teutonic heroic tradition, 257 n.161
Theagenes, 157
fr. 8.1–4 D–K, 238 n.274
fr. 8.3 D–K, 249 n.88
Thebais, 198 n.31
test. 7, 8 Bernabé = fr. 9 Davies, 198 n.31
Theban myth, 149, 173, 209 n.1, 239 n.282
Thebe (Hypoplacian), 66, 151–152, 246 nn.65, 68
Thebes, Egypt, 210 n.16
Themis, 149
Theodorus, 239 n.289
Theognis, 236 n.259
theogonic myth: in Homeric poems, 209 n.1; non-Homeric, 198 n.31
Thera, 204 n.96
therapon, 75, 76–77, 220 n.107
Thersites, 166, 169
Theseids, 253 n.121
Theseus, 152, 209 n.1
Thesprotia, 11
Thesprotis, 197 n.26, 198 n.31
Thetis, 85, 149, 222 n.130, 224 n.148; and Achilles, **41,** 63, **91,** 92, **93,** 115, 164, 165, 167, 206 n.118; and Achilles' armor, 40; in art, 36, 39, 42, 92, 113, 217 n.77, 222 n.126, 226 n.162; and Hephaestus, 74; prophecy of, 137; and Zeus, 60, 245 n.53, 246 n.59
Thoas, 226 n.162
Thomas, R., 13
Thrace, 160, 243 n.34, 250 n.102
Thucydides
1.10, 204 n.91
Titanomachy
fr. 4 Bernabé = 8 Davies, 208 n.134
test. 2 Bernabé = fr. 8 Davies, 203 n.88

Touchefeu-Meynier, O., 65
Troad: burial of Achilles in, 164, 168, 253 n.126; rivalry between Athens and Mytilene in, 253 n.121; sack of cities in, 36, 151–152, 246 nn.65, 68, 247 n.70
Troilus: and Achilles, **29,** 36, 39, 64; in art, 36, 233 n.235; and Astyanax, 244 n.41; death of, 139, 145, 244 n.41; and Hector, 64; and Polyxena, 244 n.41
Trojan horse. *See* wooden horse
Trojan War: and folktale, 169; historicity of, 2, 193 nn.3, 4, 194 n.5; and Panhellenism, 3, 166, 194 n.10, 252 n.113; pre-Homeric tradition of, 1–3, 33–35, 46, 48, 62, 153–154, 175; supernatural elements in, 159; unity of, 40, 144–145, 244 n.39
Troy: archaeological excavations at, 2, 193 n.4; and Black Sea, 251 n.111; fall of, 47, 123, 139, 145, 148, 239 n.289
Tydeus, 85
Tyrtaeus, and Homeric allusion, 234 n.242
fr. 10.2ff. West, 234 n.242
fr. 10.21–30 West, 115
fr. 11.11–14, 29–34 West, 234 n.242
Tzetzes, 45

underworld: and Achilles, 167, 254 n.134; and Cyclops, 110, 112, 228 n.184; and Odysseus, 243 n.33
Uṣas, 34, 159

Vergil, and Epic Cycle, 45
Aeneid: 1.483, 216 n.74; *2.272–273,* 216 n.74; *2.286,* 216 n.74; *6.56–58,* 219 n.100
Vermeule, E., 169–170
Vita Homeri Herodotea, and *Little Iliad,* 24

Webster, T.B.L., 141
West, M., 50, 115, 123, 138–139, 156–157
West, S., 154
White Island. *See* Leuke
White Rock, 250 n.107
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von, 9, 10, 151
wine, in Cyclops story, 96, 106–108, 110–111, 230 n.206, 231 n.210. *See also* Cyclops; Polyphemus
wooden horse, **20,** 47; in art, 36, 38, 39; and Near Eastern battering ram, 195 n.13, 257 n.165; and Odysseus, 153; in Proclus, 21, 22; as talisman, 257 n.165
wooden stake. *See* spit

Xenophanes: on Homer, 127; on Homer and Hesiod, 125
frr. B 10, 11 D–K, 125, 238 n.276
fr. B 12 D–K, 238 n.274
Xenophon, and Homeric poems, 239 n.287
Symposium 3.5, 130

Young, D. C., 143

Zenodotus, 18
Zeus, 68, 115, 119; and Ajax, 223 n.131; and Leda, 140; mist of, 82, 223 n.131; Odysseus' sacrifice to, 109, 110; plan of, 136, 137, 140, 145, 149–150, 245 n.57; prediction of, 73; and Priam, 68; second plan of, 246 n.59; and Thetis, 60, 245 n.53, 246 n.59; urns of, 239 n.283
Zmeinyy, 160