

The Non-Homeric *Cypria**

Jonathan S. Burgess
University of Toronto

The poems of the Epic Cycle¹ are commonly regarded as minor satellites of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Their authors, whoever they were and whatever their date,² are suspected not only of composing introductions and sequels to the Homeric poems, but also of using the Homeric poems as a source to expand upon.³ The relation between the Cyclic poems and early Greek myth is therefore thought to be problematic.⁴ Certainly many scholars have been willing to consider at least some of the material in the Cyclic poems traditional and pre-Homeric.⁵ If anything, scholars have become more respectful of the Cyclic poems because of

*This paper originated as part of my dissertation (1995), and a version of it was read at the 1994 APA conference in Atlanta. I thank that audience, as well as Emmet Robbins and Gregory Nagy, for discussion of some key issues. Two anonymous readers and Marilyn Skinner improved the paper with helpful comments.

¹Bernabé and Davies 1988 are recent collections of fragments, testimonia, and the summary of the Epic Cycle by Proclus. The edition by Davies has not been supplemented by an intended volume of commentary, but one can gain a good sense of his views from his general survey of the issues (1989a) and his more technical articles (1986, 1989b).

²Testimonia in Bernabé and Davies 1988. Davies 1986: 93–100, 1989a: 3–6 persuasively favors the skeptical view at Wilamowitz 331ff. concerning ancient biography and dating of the Cyclic authors, but I have (1995: 225 n. 31) questioned his trust in Wilamowitz's and Wackernagel's late dating of the Cycle through linguistic analysis of fragments (see esp. Davies 1989b; similarly Dihle 148–49 and Lloyd-Jones 118–19; *contra*: Kullmann 1960: 362ff., 1991: 427 n. 6). Cf. Davies 1989a: 3 on the "Attic context" of the *Cypria*, according to Wackernagel, and Janko 1982: 171 on some forms in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, which he closely links to the *Cypria* (152, 176): "there is nothing to support Wackernagel's view that they are Atticisms." Janko, by the way, thinks the *Cypria* may date as early as 675, though following eighth-century Homeric poems (200 and *passim*). But the controversy over date for both poems is ultimately of no consequence for my argument.

³E.g., Latacz 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." It is exactly these two points that I seek to challenge in this paper. Cf. Ahl and Roisman 16–26, who complain (17) that most critics "in practice if not always in theory" consider Cyclic material to be variations on Homer.

⁴E.g., on the very first page of the recent myth handbook by Gantz.

⁵The most common position since Welcker (see Kullmann 1960: 360ff.). For extreme portrayals of the Epic Cycle as untraditional, see Forsdyke and Andersen 8–9.

two recent critical trends: a) the resurgence of neo-analysis, now practiced from an oralist perspective,⁶ and b) a revived focus on a “Pisistratean recension” as the time of fixation for the Homeric poems.⁷ The former has most plausibly explained how material in the Cyclic poems could be pre-Homeric; the latter necessarily calls into question the supposed dominance of Homer in the Archaic Age. Yet the manner in which the poems of the Epic Cycle seem to “fill in the gaps” between the Homeric poems causes hesitation. If their very form implies the Homeric poems as a precondition of their composition, to what degree did the shadow of Homer loom over their content?

I would suggest that the Cyclic epics, even in their ultimate fixed condition as texts, were independent in content and even form from the Homeric poems. Clearly they are designed to precede and follow the Homeric poems in the summary of them that we possess. But that was not necessarily the original function of the lost poems themselves. In this paper, I will examine the *Cypria*’s apparent introduction of the *Iliad* and argue that this Cyclic poem is in fact not derivative.

That possibility may surprise some who are accustomed to thinking of the Homeric poems as immediately and pervasively dominant in their tradition. But such a conception is not based on solid evidence, and indeed it is hard to imagine how the Homeric poems could have been influential at an early date. Because oral culture continued well into the fifth century,⁸ we cannot assume that epic poets had manuscripts of the *Iliad* to pore over before proceeding to imitate and expand upon them. When we turn to the Homeric poems themselves, we find that they frequently and extensively refer to material found in the Epic Cycle, such as the judgment of Paris (*Il.* 24.25–30), the snake-wound and return of Philoctetes (*Il.* 2.718–25), and the slaying of Antilochus by Memnon (*Od.* 4.187ff.; cf. 11.522).⁹ Such allusions reveal that much of the material in the Epic Cycle is pre-Homeric. When we look for external evidence for early Homeric influence, an honest examination of early lyric poetry does

⁶See the beginning of Burgess 1997, forthcoming in *AJP*.

⁷See, e.g., Jensen; Shapiro 1989: 43–47 and 1993; Nagy 1992: 42–53, 1996: 69–71, 77–80, 110–13; Stanley 264–96; E. Cook.

⁸See Havelock, Thomas, and now especially Nagy 1996 on the oral and performative nature of epic traditions throughout the Archaic Age. I believe there existed a multifarious, pervasive tradition of the Trojan war in the Archaic Age that (simply put) cut across lines of genre, media, function, class, and gender.

⁹See Kullmann 1960: 5–11 for a list of possible allusions to Cyclic material in the *Iliad* and Allen 1924: 75–76 for passages on Cyclic material in the *Odyssey*.

not reveal any extensive knowledge of the Homeric poems.¹⁰ In addition, when Greek artists of the early Archaic Age portrayed the Trojan war, they represented Cyclic themes earlier and in greater quantity than they represented Homeric themes.¹¹ The artifacts demonstrate that the Cyclic poems are consonant with long-standing traditions. That is not to say that Homer alluded to the specific poems of the Epic Cycle or that early artists were illustrating these poems (thus I do not adduce the artifacts as evidence for the date of the Cyclic poems). But it would seem there was a pre-Homeric “Cyclic” tradition, with the poems of the Epic Cycle not its origin or its center but rather simply representative of it. It seems to me that the “Cyclic” tradition (essentially the tradition of the Trojan war) remained resistant to the influence of the Homeric poems throughout the Archaic Age—so resistant for so long, in my view, that even the fixed texts resulting from this tradition were free of Homeric dependence.¹²

¹⁰See M. West 1988: 151. The first chapter of Fowler is a thorough and suitably skeptical analysis of alleged allusions to Homer in the lyric poets; cf. Garner 1ff. for a more traditional view. On close examination many of these passages turn out to be either maxims or common Homeric phraseology, which one would suspect were traditional, not the exclusive property of Homer.

¹¹Generally recognized; see, e.g., Friis Johansen 26ff. and esp. 38–39, 228; Fittschen 169ff.; R. Cook. Yet a more skeptical approach towards Homeric “illustrations” could be taken; a monograph on this issue by Anthony Snodgrass is eagerly awaited. Kannicht honestly addresses the evidence, but his arguments for explaining it away are not compelling. I must again (as in Burgess 1995: 225 n. 31) question Ahlberg-Cornell’s thesis that representations of the *Iliad* begin in the eighth century. Early seventh-century “Cyclopeia” vases need not be inspired by the *Odyssey* (thus providing evidence for that poem’s, and implicitly the *Iliad*’s, date and influence): not only should the well-known folk-tale status of the Polyphemus story give one pause (bibliography gathered at E. Cook 93 n. 1), but also the possible cultural, ritual, and spiritual significance that the tale may have had for artist and patron (see, e.g., Burkert 1979: 30–34; E. Cook 12–13, 93–110, 169–79; I thank Mary Hart and Aara Suksi for suggesting this line of thought). For the possibility of folk or non-epic inspiration for early Greek art, see Snodgrass, R. Cook, and now Hedreen 153–55. Cf. Faraone 86; in reference to his discussion at 106, see Kullmann 1960: 257 and 1991: 435; for the “Nestor’s cup” inscription the *Cypria*, not the *Iliad*, provides the most likely mythic context (if such is desired; Faraone well questions the need).

¹²My argument is largely compatible with Nagy’s conception of the evolution of Cyclic and Homeric traditions (see esp. Nagy 1990a: 70–79; note that Nagy accepts the neo-analytical position that Cyclic traditions are pre-Homeric), though below I will indicate why I would not equate the textual boundaries found in Proclus with the dimensions of the Cyclic traditions or even the fixed texts arising from them (cf. 1990a: 72, 76). Nagy’s pan-Hellenic/local thesis (discussion of possible local elements of the *Cypria* occurs below) is preferable to arguments of “literary” merit in explaining the eventual supremacy of the Homeric poems. The surviving fragments are really too scanty for firm conclusions (see

It first needs to be understood that the summary of the Epic Cycle by Proclus does not always accurately represent the original poems that constitute the Epic Cycle. Above I referred to the “ultimate” fixed form of the Cyclic texts after long oral dissemination. In fact, it would seem that this stage was not the last. The manufacture and transmission of the Epic Cycle was apparently a long and complex process.¹³ There is no reason to suppose that the poems were originally conceived as a group,¹⁴ and it is only in the early Hellenistic period that there seems to have been some gathering of them into a “cycle” of epic verse.¹⁵ One might suspect that the scholars of this age would have been interested in creating such a cycle, and the first evidence of the existence of an Epic Cycle (as opposed to simply the individual poems within it) dates from this time.¹⁶ A different version of the *Iliad*’s proem reported by Aristoxenus may have been designed to join the *Iliad* to the *Cypria*,¹⁷ and a join between the *Iliad* and the *Aethiopis* may also have been created in that period: “Ὡς οἱ γ’ ἀμφίεπον τάφον Ἑκτορος· ἦλθε δ’ Ἀμαζών, / Ἄρῃος θυγάτηρ μεγάλῃτορος ἀνδροφόνου.”¹⁸ Eventually the poems themselves were lost,

cautions in Nagy 1992: 29), and Scaife does right to distinguish between the Cycle’s initial reception and the post-Aristotelian disfavor into which it fell. I fear that Griffin’s critique of the Cyclic fragments, though deservedly well-known, has legitimized a scholarly inclination to ignore or despise the Cycle. Wilamowitz 374 ascribed this tendency to the influence of Aristarchus (whose agenda to establish the priority and isolation of Homer over Cyclic and other early poetry is illuminated by Severyns 1928).

¹³Because of space limitations, I necessarily highlight just certain essential aspects below; I hope to address the issue more thoroughly in a monograph.

¹⁴See Monro 1901: 342ff. and especially Murray 339–41.

¹⁵See M. West 1983: 129 for the development of such an argument. Later in this article I discuss the possibility that manipulative arrangement of the Cyclic poems occurred in the context of sixth-century performance at the Panathenaea, but I do not think this would have created a fixed text of the Epic Cycle.

¹⁶The first possible references occur in Aristotle (*Cyclūs epicus* test. 1, 8, 28 Bernabé; 2 Davies), who, however, refers to individual poems of the Cycle and not the Cycle itself in the *Poetics*. See Bernabé’s note under test. 8; Davies 1986: 94–95.

¹⁷Bernabé p. 64. M. West 1983: 129 bases his argument for a Hellenistic origin of the Cycle on this evidence; cf. his remarks at 1970: 388, 1966: 49–5. See also Davies 1986: 93 n. 21 and 95.

¹⁸*Aethiopis* fr. 1 Bernabé; Davies p. 48 (“*fragmentum spurium*”). A variant of the second line is found in a papyrus. Most scholars consider the verses to be manufactured by a rhapsode or grammarian as a join: see Wilamowitz 373; Monro 1884: 12–13; Kakridis 90; Kullmann 1960: 46; Notopoulos 36–37; Dihle 43 n. 54; Griffin 1980: 159 n. 29; Davies 1989a: 61 and the notes by Bernabé under fr. 1. Kopff’s argument depends on not accepting these lines as the start of the *Aethiopis*. Welcker 1:199; Allen 1908: 85; Lesky 1966: 83, 1967: 138 accept them as the original beginning of the poem.

and only a summary of the Trojan war poems in the Cycle survived in early manuscripts of the *Iliad*.¹⁹ Instead of making simple assumptions on the basis of this summary, we might well wonder how much this long and complicated process obscured our view of the original poems. It does seem that Proclus, the author of the summary, accurately reported the internal contents of the poems, despite one notorious example of the contrary.²⁰ On the other hand, Proclus or his sources cannot be said to have respected the original dimensions of the poems. Numerous testimonia demonstrate that the *Aethiopis* and the *Little Iliad*, for example, originally continued beyond the boundaries for them found in Proclus.²¹ It is therefore necessary to consider whether the ending reported for the *Cypria* is the original ending of that poem.

Certainly 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,
Χρυσήδα δὲ Ἀγαμέμνων. ἔπειτά ἐστι Παλαμήδους θάνατος,
καὶ Διὸς βουλὴ ὅπως ἐπικουφίσῃ τοὺς Τρῶας Ἀχιλλεὺς τῆς
συμαχίας τῆς Ἑλλήνων ἀποστήσας, καὶ κατάλογος τῶν τοῖς
Τρῶσι συμμαχησάντων. (Bernabé p. 43; Davies p. 33)

¹⁹The summary is identified as by Proclus, who is thought to be either an obscure grammarian of the second century or the Neoplatonist of the fifth century (see Bernabé p. 5). Photius (the ninth-century Byzantine scholar) in his *Bibliothēke* provides us with more general information about the summary (see *Cyclūs epicus* test. 13 Bernabé; 1 Davies, *Cypr.* test. 7 Bernabé; 3, 11 Davies; more continuously: Allen 1912: 95–98), including the fact that it included Theogonic and Theban war material. The Cycle's overall dimensions should be kept in mind: the common statement that it was composed around the Homeric poems ignores the fact that much of its contents had nothing to do with the Trojan war.

²⁰Hdt. 2.117 (= *Cypr.* fr. 14 Bernabé; 11 Davies) states that in the *Cypria* Paris reached Troy swiftly on his way home from Sparta with Helen; Proclus in his summary of the *Cypria* reports he was blown off course by a storm to Sidon (as does Apollod. *Epit.* 3.4). Perhaps the remark by Herodotus, who was pointing out that the *Cypria* seemed to contradict *Il.* 6.288–92, inspired someone to tamper with the *Cypria*. Thus Monro 1901: 344; Allen 1908: 81–82; Davies 1989a: 41; Bernabé pp. 52–53 (after well summarizing other interpretations). Note that if Herodotus is correct, the poet of the *Cypria* was either ignorant of the *Iliad* in this detail or content to contradict it.

²¹Besides certain fragments and *testimonia* for the *Cypria* discussed below, see *Aethiopis* fr. 5 Bernabé; 1 Davies; *Iliades parvae* fr. 9–22 Bernabé; *Ilias parva* 11–23 Davies. Obviously the original ending of the *Aethiopis* overlapped with the beginning of the *Little Iliad*, which in turn also narrated, along with the *Iliu persis*, the fall of Troy. Kopff argues that the *Aethiopis* originally began before its starting point in Proclus and actually narrated “Iliadic” material.

Proclus reports a division of spoils in which Achilles received Briseis and Agamemnon received Chryseis. Thereupon followed the death of Palamedes, a plan of Zeus to remove Achilles from the Greek alliance, and finally a catalogue of Trojan allies. The capture of Briseis and Chryseis and the plan to remove Achilles from the alliance seem to lead naturally to the beginning of the *Iliad*. I see no reason to doubt that these details were in the original poem, though Monro argued (1884: 4–5) that the *Cypria* could not have contained a plan to remove Achilles. Since, according to Proclus, the *Cypria* opens with a plan of Zeus to begin the Trojan war, Munro thought that a second plan of Zeus would have 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,²² and Achilles' withdrawal causes many Greek deaths, as the proem of the *Iliad* stresses.²³

But acceptance of the details in Proclus as part of the original poem does not necessarily mean they are leading up to our *Iliad*. Scholia to the *Iliad* (see *Cypr.* fr. 28 Bernabé; 22 Davies) report that there existed different versions of the capture of Chryseis in Hypoplacian Thebe, a matter only briefly mentioned by Homer (*Il.* 1.366).²⁴ In the *Cypria*, one source reports, Chryseis went to Thebe to attend a sacrifice for Artemis. It appears as if the *Cypria* is supplementing the *Iliad* by explaining why Chryseis was captured in a town other than Chryse.²⁵ 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

²²See scholia listed at *Cypr.* fr. 1 Bernabé; 1 Davies.

²³Recognition that the plan of Zeus at the beginning of the *Cypria* is similar to long-standing Near Eastern and Indo-European myths has undercut the view that it is simply an expansion of the plan of Zeus mentioned at *Il.* 1.5. See Kullmann 1960: 227ff., 1984: 322, 1991: 432; Burkert 1993: 100–104 (with further bibliography at 206 nn. 1, 9); Nagy 1990b: 15–16; Koenen 22; Mayer. The apparent discrepancy between the *Cypria* and the *Iliad* regarding this “plan” is discussed below.

²⁴Critical views concerning this detail in Homer are summarized by de Jong 20 n. 29. Mueller 38; Taplin 1986; Robbins 9ff. discuss how Homer significantly employs details concerning the sack of cities neighboring Troy.

²⁵Thus Monro 1901: 350; Severyns 1928: 307–8; Heubeck 1991: 452, 1954: 99; Reinhardt 62 (“cheap invention”); Davies 1989a: 49; Taplin 1992: 85 n. 5 (who cites this as conclusive proof that the Epic Cycle is derivative from Homer).

traditional story.²⁶ That argument does not upon 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 scholion which reports that Briseis was captured at Pedasos in the *Cypria*, and not at Lyrnessus, as the *Iliad* reports (*Il.* 2.690; cf. 19.688–93).²⁷ Why would the author of the *Cypria* desire to explain an obscure “problem” in Homer about the capture of Chryseis, yet contradict Homer about the capture of Briseis? The view of Wilamowitz (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*-poet emerges: he is concerned with supplementing and justifying Homer on a minor detail concerning Chryseis, but contradicts Homer 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. In that case, correspondence between the two would not necessarily be the result of influence.²⁸

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.²⁹ The use of an article of demonstrative force before the name of Chryses at *Il.* 1.11

²⁶Cf. Kullmann 1960: 209, 287ff. (esp. 288 n. 1), 297ff.; 1991: 438.

²⁷Fr. 27 Bernabé; 21 Davies. For discussion, see Wilamowitz 374; Bethe 1966: 138; Severyns 1928: 307–8 (“cheap originality”); Kullmann 1960: 208ff., 284ff., 298ff., 1991: 437–38; Davies 1989a: 48–49. Apollod. *Epit.* 3.33 states that Achilles captured Thebe, Lyrnessus, and “many other cities,” but does not specify at which locations Chryseis and Briseis were taken. Note that Proclus mentions the capture of both Lyrnessus and Pedasos.

²⁸Kullmann 1960: 369 insisted that since the *Cypria* and the *Iliad* so rarely disagreed they could not be independent of each other (suggesting that the *Iliad* was derivative from the *Cypria*), but I do not think we know enough about the *Cypria* to come to this conclusion.

²⁹Thus Redfield 14 on the Homeric details about Thebe (but Robbins 10 n. 28 and Taplin 1992: 222 n. 30 point out that Homer’s consistency of detail need not imply traditional material and cf. Kullmann 1960: 13). Leaf 242–52, Wade-Gery 85 n. 114 and Kullmann 1960: 281ff. consider stories about the capture of towns neighboring Troy pre-Homeric. For the possible Aeolic nature of the city-sack stories, cf. Bethe 1927: 66ff.; Carpenter 56–59; Nagy 1979: 140–41, 272–73 (see also 1990a: 75 n. 114); and Janko 1982: 89–93 (favoring the theory of an Aeolic phase of the epic tradition). A relief amphora from c. 650 (*LIMC* “Achilleus” no. 389) apparently shows Achilles raiding the cattle of Aeneas (thus not only Kossatz-Deissmann under no. 389 but also Kemp-Lindemann 88–89 and Ahlberg-Cornell 53), a central incident within these forays (cf. *Il.* 20.90–93, 187–90; the summary of the *Cypria* by Proclus; Apollod. *Epit.* 3.32).

suggests that he was a known figure.³⁰ Taplin points out (85) 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.³¹ But the plausibility of Chryseis living in Thebe does not exclude the possibility that, according to tradition, she was visiting there when captured. In addition, if some of the numerous accounts of her visit there are designed to explain the situation in the *Iliad*, that does not mean the one in the *Cypria* is so designed. Severyns suggests (1928: 308) 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*.

Some scholars have thought that the ending of the *Cypria* does not well agree with the *Iliad*. Kullmann rather idiosyncratically argued that the *Cypria* is preparing for the *Aethiopis*, not the *Iliad*. He supposed that the plan of Zeus in the *Cypria* to remove Achilles from the Greek alliance is fulfilled by actions of Achilles in the *Aethiopis*—Achilles temporarily departs from Troy to be purified of a murder, and Kullmann believed he withdraws from battle after a prophecy from Thetis.³² Yet it is hard to see why the *Cypria* would mention Briseis and Chryseis at all if it did not know the story of Achilles' quarrel with Agamemnon and subsequent withdrawal from battle. One of the more compelling points made by Kullmann, however, is that Zeus's second plan in the *Cypria* does not exactly correspond to Thetis' request 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 acknowledges this discrepancy (1989a: 50), but prefers to think that either the *Cypria* revised the story of the *Iliad* or that the *Cypria* was inaccurately summarized so that it appeared to introduce the

³⁰Willcock *ad loc.* and de Jong 265 n. 103 conclude Chryses was either traditional or meant to seem so. Murray 204 and Friis Johansen 153 argue that Briseis was not traditional.

³¹Robbins 11 n. 31 argues that the capture and ransom of Andromache's mother is similar; Taplin 1992: 85 (cf. 215 n. 21; 216 n. 21) compares Briseis, if one needed to account for Reinhardt's argument that she comes from Brea of Lesbos.

³²Kullmann 1960: 109, 212–14, 225–26, 358–59. (Kullmann 1991: 438 is more cautious and admits that the *Cypria* may introduce the *Iliad*). On the argument by neo-analysts that Achilles withdraws from battle in the *Aethiopis*, see Burgess 1997. Bethe 1966: 50ff. had earlier proposed that the Cyclic epics, though originally conceived separately, were at one time joined together (see Kullmann's discussion of this theory at 1960: 20).

quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon, though in fact it originally did not.³³ But as I have stated above, we should probably operate under the assumption that the summary is accurate in regard to the internal details of the Cyclic poems. And I do not understand why the *Cypria* would revise the story of a poem it strives to introduce. A better explanation is that the quarrel of Achilles and Agamemnon was traditional and the *Cypria* independently narrated a version which was slightly different from the one told in the *Iliad*.

Note that in its summary the *Cypria* does not end with the capture of Briseis and Chryseis. It continues on with the death of Palamedes and a catalogue of Trojan allies. Allen suggested 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.³⁴ The unfortunately concise summary by Proclus does not provide us with enough information to disprove this theory, but it seems unlikely. In fact, I do not think that the narration of the death of Palamedes in the *Cypria* has much bearing on our investigation. It does separate the capture of Chryseis and Briseis from its apparent conclusion, the quarrel of Book 1 in the *Iliad*, but this quarrel does not have to follow immediately after their capture. If the poet of the *Cypria* was indeed preparing for the *Iliad*, he could have simply included additional material at this point.

The *Cypria*'s catalogue of Trojan allies, however, remains a problem, and in fact its presence suggests that the *Cypria* did not intend to introduce the *Iliad*. In this conclusion I am not following Kullmann's argument (1960: 214, 1991: 438) that this catalogue of Trojan allies is a reference to Penthesileia, Memnon, and Eurypylos. If Apollodorus follows the *Cypria* in the contents of the catalogue (he does in its placement in the narrative), then the allies come from neighboring towns. Huxley best explains (140–41) why a catalogue would exist at this point in the *Cypria*. Inhabitants of the 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 catalogue 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 epics, not the *Iliad*, are the sources for this catalogue in the *Cypria*. True, the versions in the *Cypria* and the *Iliad* were very similar, if

³³Similarly Gantz 610–11. Davies 1986: 96, 101ff., under the influence of Severyns, thinks such tampering with the summary would have occurred after the time of Proclus.

³⁴Allen 1924: 72–73, citing a few ancient sources which follow this version. Allen otherwise portrays the *Cypria* as an introduction to the *Iliad*, so it is difficult to understand why he does not think it would correspond to the *Iliad* on this matter.

Apollodorus has based his version on the *Cypria*.³⁵ But that does not mean the *Cypria* has copied the *Iliad*'s account (or *vice-versa*). It is easily explained by supposing that both poems followed a stable tradition about the catalogue. And similarity between the two versions in fact suggests independence: why would the poet of the *Cypria* duplicate material in a poem that he is introducing?

Interestingly, the catalogue 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 catalogue in Book 2 of the *Iliad* (Huxley 140–41). M. West agrees (1966: 402) that these catalogues would have been similar. Concluding that such duplication would not have been tolerated in the Epic Cycle, he suggests that one catalogue of Trojan allies appeared in either the *Cypria* or the *Iliad*, not both. Davies has called this idea “the merest speculation” (1986: 96 n. 39); elsewhere he supposes (1989a: 50) that the *Iliad* originally did not have the Trojan catalogue. If one must make a choice, it does seem that such a catalogue would more naturally belong to the *Cypria*.

Yet if the *Cypria* was not originally meant to introduce the *Iliad*, it is then no surprise that both it and the *Iliad* contain a version of a traditional catalogue of the Trojans.³⁶ M. West's assertion that the Cycle did not tolerate duplication is largely true, but not always true. Another example of repeated material occurs with the *Little Iliad* and the *Iliu persis*. According to Proclus, the *Little Iliad* ended with the Trojans feasting, having accepted the wooden horse (Bernabé p. 75; Davies p. 53). The *Iliu persis* begins with the Trojans debating what to do with the wooden horse (Bernabé p. 88; Davies p. 62). Deciding to accept it, they celebrate with a feast. The same time frame is thus repeated, and there is some

³⁵There 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 catalogue, as Monro 1901: 351 and Allen 1908: 82ff. suggested.

³⁶Despite controversy over its origins, it is widely recognized that the *Iliad*'s catalogue of ships is temporally inappropriate for the ninth year of the war and therefore (among other reasons) must have been adapted from traditional material. Though Proclus does not indicate that the *Cypria* contained a catalogue of the Greek ships, perhaps it also independently contained a traditional version, occurring at its most natural place, the gathering at Aulis (where Apollod. *Epit.* 3.11ff. places it; see also Murray 179–80). Proclus or his predecessors might not have specifically mentioned a catalogue 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 49ff., 55, 84–85 nn. 113, 114 explores the possibility that both catalogues, that of the ships and that of the 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*).

duplication of events, such as the celebratory feast. I have noted that the manufacturing of the Epic Cycle seems to have truncated the *Little Iliad* so that it does not also narrate the sack of the Troy. If such duplication was denied, we might well wonder, why would such incidents as the celebratory feast be allowed to be duplicated? Similarly, if the original *Cypria* was truncated, as I will argue below, why was duplication involving the catalogue of Trojan allies allowed to stand?

The creators of the Epic Cycle, presumably of the Hellenistic age, might have received the original poems divided into units, or “books.”³⁷ 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 original poems would cause general continuity to be achieved but would allow slight awkwardness to remain at the joins. Inconcinnity between the *Little Iliad* and the *Iliu persis* could have arisen, for example, because the compilers of the Cycle did not break off until “the first convenient stopping-point” (Monro 1883: 320). This point could have been at the end of a book. References to books in the summary’s introduction to each poem in the Cycle need not indicate the total number of books of the original poems, though that is rarely noticed (see Monro 1901: 342 n. 3). One can easily change customary translations of Proclus, to give an example, from “following are the five books of the *Aethiopsis*” to “following are five books of the *Aethiopsis*.”³⁸ In addition, the word “φερόμενα” in the phrase τὰ λεγόμενα Κύπρια ἐν βιβλίοις φερόμενα ἑνδεκά (Bernabé p. 38; Davies p. 30) calls attention to the transmission of books, as if that were 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 is being summarized and not the complete poem. The ποιήματα that Proclus said were still preserved in his day (according to Photius) could be the shortened forms of the original poems. Indeed, underlying the report by Photius that Proclus discussed their “sequence,” ἀκολουθία, may be an explanation of how selections from the original poems were used to achieve a continuous cycle (Monro 1883: 316).

³⁷To some degree I here follow Monro 1883: 316ff., whom Davies 1986: 96 (cf. 1989a: 5) strongly opposes.

³⁸This phrase of Proclus can be found at Bernabé p. 67 and Davies p. 47. Monro 1883: 314 translates similarly. There is no article before book numbers in Proclus except in reference to those of the *Nosti*.

Could the poems of the Epic Cycle have been divided into books, or some other system of grouping, before the Epic Cycle was made?³⁹ The date of book division has frequently been discussed in relation to the Homeric poems. Many suspect that their book division is of Alexandrian date.⁴⁰ But titles for certain Homeric episodes suggest that at least a simple form of division existed as early as the fifth century,⁴¹ and some have supposed that earlier rhapsodes or even Homer himself required stopping points for the performance of the poems.⁴² It is possible that divisions used by the poet or later rhapsodes are equivalent to some or all of the book divisions in the Homeric poems that we now know.⁴³

So a system of division could have also existed in the original poems of the Epic Cycle long before the Cycle was created. These sections might very well be passages appropriate for performance. Testimonia from the fourth century B.C.E. about the “Pisistratean recension” discuss it in connection with “Homer,” a term that probably means the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.⁴⁴ Well into the classical age, however, “Homer” often indicated epic poetry in general (see Pfeiffer 73). Would the organization of the performance of epic poetry at the Panathenaea festival have focused on the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* alone? If so, would contemporary witnesses have transmitted that specification clearly?⁴⁵ The answer is unclear, and some scholars have thought this activity might have included the performance, or even the manufacture, of the epic cycle.⁴⁶ Some division of the Cyclic epics might have then resulted. If not, other explanations for division are plausible, like the exigencies of recording the poems on writing

³⁹Besides Proclus, see *Titanomachia* test. 2 Bernabé, fr. 8 Davies; *Nosti* fr. 11 Bernabé, 8 Davies (Ath. 7.277d, 9.399a respectively) for ancient *testimonia* on Cyclic book division. Huxley 126 denies that book divisions for the Cycle were made before the Hellenistic era.

⁴⁰Wilamowitz 369; and now Taplin 1992: 285ff.; Janko 1992: 31 n. 47; Richardson 20–21; Olson 228–39.

⁴¹Shapiro 1993: 103–4; Richardson 20; Stanley 282–84; cf. Nagy 1992: 41.

⁴²E.g., Taplin 1992 and Stanley *passim* sense three major divisions in the *Iliad*; Nagy 1996: 181–84 proposes more extensive “performance-segregation” for rhapsodes.

⁴³Kirk 306 and Stanley 36–37, 249ff. argue that the book divisions were made before the Alexandrian age. S. West 39–40 sees the twenty-four divisions originating during a “Pisistratean recension,” and Nagy 1996: 181–84 has linked these divisions to performance of the Homeric poems at the sixth-century Panathenaea.

⁴⁴Thus, e.g., Richardson 1993: 27 and Nagy 1996: 71.

⁴⁵See Wilamowitz 362ff. (he is skeptical about the “Pisistratean recension” in general).

⁴⁶Cf. Wolf 146, Verrall 164ff. and Schefold 31, 194 n. 112 for manufacture of the Epic Cycle at that time, an idea Davies 1986: 93 calls “idle speculation.” Shapiro 1989: 46 and Janko 1992: 30–31 allow that the Cyclic poems may have been performed then, only to be ultimately excluded.

material. The existence of such divisions, whatever their origin and nature, would well explain why we have such odd transitions in the summary we possess.

Another pertinent issue is the evidence that lines of verse were concocted or changed at the beginning and ending of the *Iliad* to join it to the Epic Cycle (see above). Perhaps such passages were created to join the truncated poems together when a verse Epic Cycle was first manufactured. But if someone took the trouble to create these, why would they not eliminate redundancy or inconcinnity? Perhaps the explanation is that only slight joins were manufactured and these were not enough to smooth the awkward transitions between poems. After all, these joins would have to be made in verse, which would not invite extensive creation.

A possible objection concerns the testimonia that I have mentioned concerning the full scope of the original poems. If the poems were shortened in the early Hellenistic period, how could scholars of a later date know their original dimensions? Why do they sometimes seem to speak as if they had read these poems outside of the context of a compilation or summary?⁴⁷ The answer may be that the original poems did not immediately disappear after abridgments and summaries were made of them. A limited number of scholars may have possessed complete texts of them, though the world at large would be more familiar with the useful and therefore more popular Epic Cycle.⁴⁸ Of course, the probability of continued existence of the poems decreases as time goes by. If Proclus lived in the fifth century of our era, it is not likely that the original poems were still extant. And even if they were available to him, he may have chosen to use their shortened forms, as best creating a continuous story.

According to my proposal, then, an abridgment of poems, or an Epic Cycle, was made in verse out of books or sections of poems that were originally much longer. This created a picture of the Trojan war that was generally continuous. However, the transitions between the poems are slightly awkward because no effort was made to change the original scope of the books that now represented the beginning and ending of the newly truncated poems. Such a

⁴⁷Such as Pausanias and Athenaeus. There is no need to suspect, as was once done, that these authors were lying when they spoke as if they had read the poems themselves and not merely summaries.

⁴⁸Cf. Kopff's thesis that there existed a branch of transmission ("H") that was more faithful to the original dimensions of the Epic Cycle than a truncated branch of transmission ("C") represented by such evidence as Proclus and the *Iliac Tables*.

process explains why slight overlap and inconcinnity exists between poems in the summary. If this is so, then the editors of the Cycle may have allowed a catalogue of Trojan allies to stand in the *Cypria* because it existed within the last book of the *Cypria* included in the Cycle. The Trojan catalogue could have then been preserved as a final item of the last book retained from the original form of the *Cypria*, even though the Trojan catalogue of the *Cypria* reduplicated information in the *Iliad*.

It follows from this proposal that the original form of the *Cypria* did not end where the summary says that it does, with a Trojan catalogue. Is there any evidence that it continued after its catalogue of Trojan allies? 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*, states that it is foolish to spare the children of a slain man (fr. 33 Bernabé; 25 Davies). These words are usually taken to be spoken in reference to the death of Astyanax.⁴⁹ And a scholiast reports that the author of the *Cypria* related that Polyxena was buried by Neoptolemus after having been wounded by Odysseus and Diomedes in the taking of Troy (fr. 34 Bernabé; 27 Davies).⁵⁰

It is surprising to find Astyanax and Polyxena in the *Cypria*, as least as we understand that poem. Some scholars have suggested that the attributions are wrong;⁵¹ others have argued that the deaths of Astyanax and Polyxena were related in predictions or proleptic digressions in the *Cypria*.⁵² The use of Cyclic titles among the ancients can be problematic, but I will proceed on the assumption that the attributions are correct.⁵³ The second approach to this

⁴⁹Davies 1989a: 51 questions this conclusion.

⁵⁰More commonly she is said to have been slaughtered at the grave of Achilles, as in the summary of the *Iliu persis* by Proclus (Bernabé p. 89; Davies p. 62).

⁵¹E.g., Welcker 2:528 (following Müller), proposing that the (apparent) Astyanax fragment belonged to the *Iliu persis*. Welcker 2:164; Wilamowitz 181 n. 27; Bethe 1966: 18, 69 n. 5, 138 argued that the “*Cypriaka*” (τὰ Κυπριακά) mentioned in the testimonium about Polyxena is actually not the *Cypria*.

⁵²E.g., Rzach 2394 and Jouan 373 in reference to the (apparent) Astyanax fragment; Davies 1989a: 51; Bernabé (under fr. 34); Boardman 64 in reference to the Polyxena testimonium.

⁵³The difficulties of this issue are concisely analyzed by Torres Guerra, forthcoming. For example, Bernabé collects fragments and testimonia under the heading “*Iliades parvae*” on the theory that there were different poems using this title; Torres Guerra argues that the different titles Θηβαίς and Ἀμφιαράου ἐξέλασις refer to the same poem. But Jouan 372 n. 5 effectively denies the suggestion that the *Cypria* had been confused with the *Iliu persis* in regards to the (apparent) Astyanax fragment, and “Κυπριακά” was a common variation of the *Cypria*’s title; see Bethe 1966: 18 and Bernabé p. 38. I would think that the title “αἰ

problem deserves consideration, and certainly Boardman's explanation of Polyxena's presence in the *Cypria* is plausible. He refers to her appearance on early artifacts depicting the death of her brother Troilus. Polyxena's presence in the *Cypria*'s account of the death of Troilus might lead naturally to a mention of her fate. But the scholion about Polyxena suggests a complete narrative 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 original *Cypria* covered the whole Trojan war, including a simpler version of major events in the *Iliad*.⁵⁴ This need not mean that the *Cypria* is earlier than the *Iliad*, or is its source. Nor does it necessarily mean that the poet of the *Cypria* was unaware of the *Iliad*. It would mean that the original version of the *Cypria*, commonly viewed as a mere appendage to the *Iliad*, was in fact no such thing.

Aristotle's comments in the *Poetics* might indicate that is the case. 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.⁵⁵ 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?⁵⁶

Κυπριακαὶ ἱστορίαι" used by Lysimachus (fr. 12 Bernabé; 10 Davies; commonly cited in the *Cypria/Cypriaka* controversy) also refers to the *Cypria*.

⁵⁴Huxley 158 concedes that the *Cypria* might have covered the whole war.

⁵⁵Monro's attempt (1901: 349, 367–68), 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. 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 (Halliwell 30–31 notes that Aristotle often explicitly refers back to earlier parts of the work). Scaife 170 differently understands Aristotle to cite the *Cypria* and the *Little Iliad* as "contrasting examples": apparently the first as an example of a poem with one period and the second as an example of a poem of one *πρᾶξις*.

⁵⁶E.g., Monro 1901: 349; Lucas *ad loc.*; Janko 1987 *ad loc.* Else 580ff. sees that Aristotle is referring to the type of poem which narrates the whole war but never explicitly considers the *Cypria* and *Little Iliad* to be that type of poem. However at 587 n. 52 he suggests that Aristotle may have anticipated Bethe in thinking that "the *Cypria* and the *Little Iliad* were conceived by the same brain" (see n. 32 above; by *Little Iliad* Bethe meant the *Aethiopis*, *Little Iliad* and *Iliu persis*).

Young's paraphrase of this passage (165–66) is useful, and I think points the way to a possible interpretation: "Aristotle is allowing *the epic poet in general* (his italics) his many *μῦθοι*, and the right to compose his 'epic mass' as a whole, chronologically from beginning to end. *Any other epic poet* (his italics) 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 real "Iliads," i.e., poems about the whole war.⁵⁷ It may be significant that the *Cypria* and the *Little Iliad* are specified by Aristotle in this context. One might be tempted to think that Aristotle understands the *Cypria* and *Little Iliad* to be poems which narrated the whole war, if of course such a conclusion did not contradict common conceptions of the Epic Cycle. Putting all prejudice aside, we might plausibly take Aristotle's admittedly enigmatic words to mean that the original versions of the *Cypria* and the *Little Iliad*, which Aristotle would have known, were "Iliads."⁵⁸

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 the part of the story which they told especially well or in great detail. The poems may also have variously expressed local concerns, as I will discuss below. 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

⁵⁷Heath's discussion of the passage (49–50) leads to the same conclusion, again without conscious design on the part of the scholar. He defines Aristotle's conception of an "Iliad embracing the whole Trojan war" as a "unified *praxis* of many parts." Later, following Aristotle's words, he states that the *Cypria* and the *Little Iliad* "have a unified *praxis* of many parts."

⁵⁸My examination in this paper focuses on the *Cypria*, not the *Little Iliad*, but cf. the complaint of Horace in the *Ars poetica* (136ff.) about the "scriptor Cyclicus" who writes of the whole war. The proem of the "Cyclic" author, *fortunam Priami cantabo et nobile bellum* (137), is similar to the one ascribed to the *Little Iliad* (*Iliades parvae* fr. 28 Bernabé; *Ilias parva* fr. 1 Davies). Brink *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 (cf. Monro 1884: 332–33; Pfeiffer 230; Davies 1986: 95). The listing of seven possible drama titles to be derived from the *Little Iliad* in *Po.* 23 would suggest Aristotle's *Little Iliad* did not begin before it did in Proclus, but Else 587ff. argues that the passage is an interpolation (if not, it is additional evidence that the *Little Iliad* went beyond its end boundary in Proclus).

of major traditional events of the Trojan war.⁵⁹ As the tradition of the Trojan war grew, undoubtedly it would become increasingly difficult to supply a detailed narrative about all the events that could be possibly included in this long war. Nestor states it would take him five or six years to tell the whole war (*Od.* 3.113–17; not the swiftest story-teller, though!). The song of the Sirens, which features all that happened at Troy (*Od.* 12.189–90), is perhaps deadly because listeners wither away before its seductive strain comes to an end (Ford 83). Yet it is conceivable that actual poets of the Archaic Age tried to narrate the whole war, with concise synopses of various types resulting. Homer's allusions to events from the whole war demonstrate that he has the complete story in his head and assumes his audience does also. The same can be said about Phemius and Demodocus⁶⁰ and the poets of the Epic Cycle.⁶¹ Ford has related this phenomenon (40–41) to 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." In the case of the Trojan war, some poems of the Cycle may have been actual examples of this "connected whole" of the Trojan war.⁶²

If the *Cypria* covered the wrath of Achilles in its coverage of the whole war, however, one might expect this would elicit comment in the ancient

⁵⁹Fenik 14–15 also stresses variation in the pre-Homeric Cyclic tradition.

⁶⁰Allen 1924: 143 and Hainsworth 43 (he adds that a Demodocus would never sing the whole story).

⁶¹See Bethe 1966: 139–40 and Kullmann 1960: 212–14, 225–26, 358–59, who stress that poems in the Epic Cycle look forward and backwards to events in the Trojan war (though implausibly suggesting that the poems of the Epic Cycle were once united). Of course, the "plan of Zeus" at the beginning of the *Cypria* looks ahead to the fall of Troy; note as well, in the context of the title's possible reference to Aphrodite (discussed below), that *Ibyc.* 282.1–9 directly links "Cypris," Helen, and the "βουλαί" of Zeus with the fall of Troy (cf. the argument of Mayer). Scaife 172 and Nagy 1990a: 77 well appreciate the implicit narrative thrust of the *Cypria*.

⁶²Cf. the speculation by some scholars that there was a pre-Homeric corpus that covered the whole war, e.g., a "heroic chronicle" (Allen 1924: 130ff.), a "Faktkanon" (Kullmann 1960: 12–13), or an "Ur-kyklos" (Schefold 27 and Thornton 10–12). I differ with the implication of these scholars that there existed one such poem or canon which preceded Homer, or at least a rigid sequence which was always adhered to. Lang 149–50 sees that the tradition of the Trojan war early on embraced the span from expedition-gathering to sack. I therefore think that (e.g.) Hainsworth 43–44 and Jensen 33–34 wrongly apply comparative evidence to argue that the Cyclic poems represent late accretions to a relatively small nucleus: see Thornton 10–11.

scholia.⁶³ But there are a number of ways in which to meet this objection. First of all, we may wonder whether the scholia, though extensive, result from such haphazard selection and summary of ancient academic activity that they cannot be assumed to indicate the totality of evidence then known.⁶⁴ Secondly, 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 above. Finally, we see that comment in the scholia and by other ancient commentators often arises on points of variance. If the *Cypria* narrated “Iliadic” events so briefly that it did not happen to contain variant details, such compatibility might fail to excite interest on the part of the scholiasts.⁶⁵

What can we conclude about the possible dimensions of the *Cypria*? Nothing is proved if the *Cypria* ends before the *Iliad* begins in Proclus. The end of its summary in Proclus demonstrates that its poet knew the story of Achilles’ wrath, but the *Cypria*’s conception of the story is not exactly the same as the *Iliad*’s. The *Cypria* also duplicates material found in the *Iliad*. For these reasons, the poem does not well “introduce” the *Iliad*. And ancient testimonia, including Aristotle, may suggest rather that the poem told the story of the whole war. The possibility that the poem was composed independently of the *Iliad* should be taken seriously—and here I mean the actual fixed text used in the Epic Cycle, not just its pre-Homeric tradition. What has been commonly regarded as an introduction to the *Iliad* may have actually narrated the wrath of Achilles before finishing with an account of the fall of Troy. Perhaps that was

⁶³As an anonymous reader remarks. Bethe 1966: 68ff., 137–38 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 p. 38; cf. *Cypria* fr. 6–7 Bernabé; *dubia* fr. 1–2 Davies) may suggest that author knew an original 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 41; cf. Weitzman 42–43, Horsfall 47); this confusion may have arisen as a result of shared material between the two poems. I also wonder if the charge by Pollianus (*Cyclus epicus* test. 21 Bernabé) 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 Homer.

⁶⁴See Nagy 1996: 33ff., 130, 190–91 for possible instances where the *silentium* of Homeric scholia need not imply non-existence of certain evidence or practices.

⁶⁵Cf. the fragment of Alcaeus which 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. Whether Alcaeus alludes to the *Iliad* is debatable: cf. M. West 1978: 60, 1988: 151 n. 5.; Fowler 37; Jensen 101–2.

the type of poem every poet of the Trojan war could perform and needed to be able to perform at times.

Some might feel that if the *Cypria* did narrate the whole story, then Aristotle's censure of too many episodes in a plot would be all the more applicable. Certainly such a poem would not have the leisurely realism of Homeric poems. But it may well have achieved the charm of catalogue 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.⁶⁶ We might also wonder if local concerns were featured, as Nagy has extensively argued about the Epic Cycle in general. For one thing, the title has often been thought to refer to Cyprus.⁶⁷ We have also seen that the stories of city-sacking in it have been seen as Aeolic in some way (see n. 29 above). And recently details in the episode of the Dioscuri narrated in the *Cypria* have been interestingly linked to a Spartan custom of burying the dead on the field of battle.⁶⁸ The multiplicity of possible local connections would seem to call into question the poem's allegiance to a single region's concerns; but, rather than rejecting some or all of these suggestions, we might better suppose that the poem, or rather its tradition, had incorporated a number of local stories within the framework of a pan-Hellenic narrative.⁶⁹

⁶⁶I think immediately of the *Catalogue of Women*, without concluding from this comparison that this type of poetry would be a late and derivative development of the sixth century (as thought M. West 1966: 47, followed by Davies 1989a: 3, 1989b: 89ff.; but Davies is more cautious on this point at 1986: 93 n. 21). Comparison could also be applied to much of the *Theogony*, *Works and Days*, and even some Homeric passages (e.g., the catalogue of ships).

⁶⁷Cf. Lloyd-Jones; Burkert 1993: 103–4; Nagy 1990a: 77. The curious *testimonium* attributed to Lysimachus (fr. 12 Bernabé; 10 Davies) and cited by Nagy apparently states that two sons of Helen, one by Menelaus, one by Paris, went together to Cyprus (see interpretation at Severyns 1928: 380–82), which would indeed suggest that the *Cypria* provided a genealogical link with the heroic age for Cypriots. Others have seen in the title a reference to Aphrodite, who might provide a thematic underpinning (e.g., Huxley 132 and Scaife 173; see discussion at Bernabé p. 38 and Davies 1989a: 33). Of course, Cyprus could well have been the origin of such a narrative; see Huxley 134–35. From the linguistic evidence of fragments, Janko 1982: 176 thinks the poem did not originate at Cyprus, though he is willing to allow that it was performed there.

⁶⁸Robertson 166–75. He suggests, as an 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* (174–75).

⁶⁹Note that Nagy envisions the Cyclic traditions not as simply local but rather as less pan-Hellenic than the Homeric poems, within a larger unified tradition of the Trojan war: see Nagy 1990a: 60–61, 70–71; 1995: 165; see also Janko 1982: 25–26. The story of the Trojan

Thus ultimately I am envisioning the original *Cypria* as a poem that presented an overview of the Trojan war, one of many that were possible, narrated at a swift (yet perhaps variable) pace, and embodying local traditions within the pan-Hellenic nature of the whole story. Subsequently this served in truncated form as part of a verse Epic Cycle; ultimately a prose summary of the Epic Cycle's Trojan war section functioned as an introduction to the *Iliad*. That is all speculation, but sometimes speculation reaches further toward the truth than easy yet dangerous assumptions. Some such assumptions I have challenged in this paper: that the *Cypria* was a derivative text that commented upon a Homeric poem, or that its original dimensions can be complacently equated with its boundaries in the summary by Proclus. Association of the *Cypria* with the *Iliad* has too long, I believe, obscured its connection with long-standing traditions. Being a lost poem, the *Cypria* cannot be appreciated as poetry, but through fragments, testimonia, and summaries it can be valued as a window into ancient myth about the Trojan war.

Works Cited

- Ahl, F., and H. M. Roisman. 1996. *The Odyssey Re-Formed*. Ithaca.
- Ahlberg-Cornell, G. 1992. *Myth and Epos in Early Greek Art*. Jonsered.
- 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.
- Andersen, Ø. 1982. "Thersites und Thoas vor Troia." *SO* 57: 7–34.
- Bernabé, A., ed. 1987. *Poetae epici Graeci: Testimonia et fragmenta*. Vol. 1. Leipzig.
- Bethe, E., ed. 1966. *Der Troische Epenkreis*. Stuttgart. [= *Homer. Dichtung und Sage*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig 1929) 149–297].
- . 1927. *Die Sage vom Troischen Kriege*. Vol. 3. *Homer. Dichtung und Sage*. Leipzig.
- Boardman, J. 1990. "The Greek Art of Narrative." In J.-P. Desœudres, ed., *ΕΥΜΟΥΣΙΑ. Ceramic and Iconographic Studies in Honour of Alexander Camitoglou*. Sydney.
- Brink, C. O. 1971. *Horace on Poetry. The Ars poetica*. Cambridge.
- Burgess, J. S. 1995. "Achilles' Heel: The Death of Achilles in Ancient Myth." *CA* 14.2: 217–43.
- . 1997. "Beyond Neo-analysis: Problems with the Vengeance Theory." *AJP* forthcoming.
- Burkert, W. 1979. *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*. Berkeley.
- . 1992. *The Orientalizing Revolution*. Trans. M. E. Pinder and W. Burkert. Cambridge, Mass.
- Carpenter, R. 1946. *Folk Tale, Fiction, and Saga in the Homeric Epics*. Berkeley.
- Cook, E. F. 1995. *The Odyssey in Athens*. Ithaca.
- Cook, R. M. 1983. "Art and Epic in Ancient Greece." *BABesch* 58: 1–10.
- Davies, M. 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.
- . 1989a. *The Epic Cycle*. Bristol.
- . 1989b. "The Date of the Epic Cycle." *Glotta* 67: 89–100.
- . ed. 1988. *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Göttingen.
- de Jong, I. J. F. 1987. *Narrators and Focalizers*. Amsterdam.
- Dihle, A. 1970. *Homer-Probleme*. Opladen.
- Else, G. F. 1957. *Aristotle's Poetics: The Argument*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Faraone, C. A. 1996. "Taking the 'Nestor's Cup Inscription' Seriously: Erotic Magic and Conditional Curses in the Earliest Inscribed Hexameters." *CA* 115.1: 77–112.
- Fenik, B. C. 1964. *Iliad X and the Rhesus: The Myth*. Brussels.
- Fittschen, K. 1969. *Untersuchungen zum Beginn der Sagedarstellungen bei den Griechen*. Berlin.
- Ford, A. 1992. *Homer. The Poetry of the Past*. Ithaca.
- Forsdyke, J. 1956. *Greece Before Homer*. New York.
- Fowler, R. L. 1987. *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric*. Toronto.
- Friis Johansen, K. 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.
- Griffin, J. 1977. "The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer." *JHS* 97: 39–53.
- . 1980. *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford.
- Hainsworth, B., ed. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 3. Cambridge.
- Halliwell, S. 1986. *Aristotle's Poetics*. Chapel Hill, N.C.
- Havelock, E. A. 1982. *The Literate Revolution in Greece and its Cultural Consequences*. Princeton.
- Heath, M. 1989. *Unity in Greek Poetics*. Oxford.

- Hedreen, G. 1996. "Image, Text, and Story in the Recovery of Helen." *CA* 15.1: 152–84.
- Heubeck, A. 1954. *Der Odyssee-Dichter und die Ilias*. Erlangen.
- . 1991 [orig. 1950]. "Studien zur Struktur der Ilias (Retardation-Motivübertragung)." In J. Latacz, ed., *Homer. Die Dichtung und ihre Deutung*. Darmstadt.
- Horsfall, N. 1979. "Stesichorus at Bovillae?" *JHS* 99: 26–48.
- Huxley, G. L. 1969. *Greek Epic Poetry*. London.
- Janko, R. 1982. *Homer, Hesiod, and the Hymns*. Cambridge.
- , ed. 1987. *Aristotle. Poetics*. Indianapolis.
- . 1992. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 4. Cambridge.
- Jensen, M. S. 1980. *The Homeric Question and the Oral-Formulaic Theory*. Copenhagen.
- Jouan, F. 1966. *Euripide et les légendes des chants cypréens*. Paris.
- Kakridis, J. T. 1949. *Homeric Researches*. Lund.
- Kemp-Lindemann, D. 1975. *Darstellungen des Achilleus in griechischer und römischer Kunst*. Frankfurt.
- Kirk, G. S. 1962. *The Songs of Homer*. Cambridge.
- Koenen, L. 1994. "Cyclic Destruction in Hesiod and the Catalogue of Women." *TAPA* 124: 1–34.
- Kopff, E. 1983. "The Structure of the Amazonia (Aethiopia)." In R. Hägg, ed., *The Greek Renaissance of the 8th Century B.C.* Stockholm. 57–62.
- Kossatz-Deissmann, A. 1981. "Achilleus." In *LIMC* 1.1: 37–200. Kullmann, W. 1960. *Die Quellen der Ilias. Hermes Einzelschriften* 14. Wiesbaden.
- . 1991. "Ergebnisse der motivgeschichtlichen Forschung zu Homer (Neoanalyse)." In J. Latacz, ed., *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung*. Stuttgart.
- Lang, M. L. 1995. "War Story into Wrath Story." In J. B. Carter and S. P. Morris, eds., *The Ages of Homer*. Austin. Latacz, J. 1996. *Homer. His Art and His World*. Trans. J. P. Holoka. Ann Arbor.
- Leaf, W. 1912. *Troy: A Study in Homeric Geography*. London.
- Lesky, A. 1966. *A History of Greek Literature*. Trans. J. Willis and C. de Heer. London.
- . 1967. *Homeros*. Stuttgart. [also in *RE* Suppl. XI]
- Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae (LIMC)*. H. C. Ackermann and J. R. Gisler, eds. Zurich 1981–.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1973. "Stasinos and the Cypria." In *Στασίνοῦ Δ΄ 1968–1972*.
- Lucas, D. W., ed. 1968. *Aristotle. Poetics*. Oxford.
- Mayer, K. 1996. "Helen and the ΔΙΟΣ ΒΟΥΛΗ." *AJP* 117: 1–15.
- Monro, D. B. 1883. "On the Fragment of Proclus' Abstract of the Epic Cycle Contained in the Codex Venetus of the Iliad." *JHS* 4: 305–34.
- . 1884. "The Poems of the Epic Cycle." *JHS* 5: 1–41.
- , ed. 1901. *Homer's Odyssey. XIII–XXIV*. Oxford.
- Mueller, M. 1984. *The Iliad*. London.
- Murray, G. 1934. *The Rise of the Greek Epic*. 4th ed. Oxford. Nagy, G. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans*. Baltimore.
- . 1990a. *Pindar's Homer*. Baltimore.
- . 1990b. *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca.
- . 1992. "Homeric Questions." *TAPA* 122: 17–60.
- . 1995. "An Evolutionary Model for the Making of Homeric Poetry: Comparative Perspectives." In J. B. Carter and S. P. Morris, eds., *The Ages of Homer*. Austin.
- Notopoulos, J. A. 1964. "Studies in Early Greek Oral Poetry." *HSCP* 68: 1–77.
- Olson, S. D. 1995. *Blood and Iron*. Leiden.
- Pfeiffer, R. 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship*. Vol 1. Oxford.
- Redfield, J. M. 1975. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad*. Chicago.

- Reinhardt, K. 1961. *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter*. Ed. U. Hölscher. Göttingen.
- Richardson, N. J. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 6. Cambridge.
- Robbins, E. I. 1990. "Achilles to Thetis: *Iliad* 1.365–412." *EMC/CV* 9: 1–15.
- Robertson, N. 1992. *Festivals and Legends: The Formation of Greek Cities in the Light of Public Ritual*. Toronto.
- Rzach, A. 1922. "Kyklos." In *RE*.
- Sadurska, A. 1964. *Les Tables Illiaques*. Warszawa.
- Scaife, R. 1995. "The *Cypria* and its Early Reception." *CA* 14: 164–97.
- Schefold, K. 1975. "Das homerischen Epos in der antiken Kunst." In *Wort und Bild*. Basel.
- Scodel, R. 1982. "The Achaean Wall and the Myth of Destruction." *HSCP* 86: 33–50.
- Severyns, A. 1928. *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque*. Paris.
- . 1938. *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus*. Vols. 1–2. Paris.
- Shapiro, H. A. 1989. *Art and Cult under the Tyrants in Athens*. Mainz am Rhein.
- . 1993. "Hipparchos and the Rhapsodes." In C. Dougherty and L. Kurke, eds., *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece*. Cambridge.
- Snodgrass, A. M. 1979. "Poet and Painter in Eighth-century Greece." *PCPS* n.s. 25: 118–30.
- Stanley, K. 1993. *The Shield of Homer*. Princeton, N.J.
- Taplin, O. 1984. "Homer's Use of Achilles' Earlier Campaigns in the *Iliad*." In J. Boardman and C. E. Vaphopoulou-Richardson, eds., *Chios*. Oxford.
- . 1992. *Homeric Soundings*. Oxford.
- Thomas, R. 1992. *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- Thornton, A. 1984. *Homer's Iliad*. Göttingen.
- Torres Guerra, J. Forthcoming. "Die homerische *Thebais* und die *Amphiaraos-Ausfahrt*."
- Verrall, A. W. 1910. *The Bacchants of Euripides and Other Essays*. Cambridge.
- Wade-Gery, H. T. 1950. *The Poet of the Iliad*. Cambridge.
- Weitzmann, K. 1959. *Ancient Book Illumination*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Welcker, F. G. 1865–82. *Der epische Cyclus, oder die homerischen Dichter*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Repr. Hildesheim 1981.
- West, M. L., ed. 1966. *Hesiod, Theogony*. Oxford.
- . 1970. "The Epic Cycle." In *OCD*.
- , ed. 1978. *Hesiod, Works and Days*. Oxford.
- . 1983. *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford.
- . 1988. "The Rise of the Greek Epic." *JHS* 108: 151–72.
- West, S. 1988. "Books I–IV." In A. Heubeck, S. West, J. B. Hainsworth, eds., *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Vol. 1. Oxford.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von. 1884. *Homerische Untersuchungen*. Berlin.
- Willcock, M. M., ed. 1978. *The Iliad of Homer*. Vol. 1. London.
- Wolf, F. A. 1985 [orig. 1795]. *Prolegomena to Homer*. Trans. and ed. by A. Crafton, G. Most, and J. E. G. Zetzel. Princeton.
- Young, D. C. 1983. "Pindar, Aristotle, and Homer: A Study in Ancient Criticism." *CA* 2: 156–70.