to identify with Achilles' resistance to the hypocrisies of society, then pulls the rug from under us by showing us the dangers of that autonomy. The Achilles of Book 9 sees all humans as abstractly equal in their common mortality, but this view cares nothing for the specific kinds of interactions that bind people together. This emotionless view of abstract equality explains why Achilles can sit and watch his companions die, pitilessly. It also explains the boundless wrath that is unleashed in battle after the death of Patroclus. It is a short step from viewing humans as abstract, in an unfeeling way, to killing them.

But even though H. is at pains to emphasize Achilles' liminality, on the fringes of a political world he both challenges and still belongs to, the analysis still glosses over too many details. Achilles *cannot* simply watch his companions die. When he is unable to identify the wounded Machaon, far from ignoring him, he sends out Patroclus to find out more. And this act of viewing is the beginning of the evils. The poem lingers over the problems of what Achilles can and cannot sit and watch. This suggests that he takes some sort of satisfaction in those deaths, and yet cannot not care. This in-between world, where suffering can be neither fully enjoyed nor ended, is Achilles' world for much of the poem. The analysis of Achilles' changing wrath is also too imprecise. Achilles' wrath is hardly boundless: however berserk he goes in battle, he kills only Trojans. Achilles now adheres to the ethnic identification (with Greeks) that he earlier rejected. His martial excesses also have a clear pattern. They are all precise violations of human taboos: the killing of suppliants, human sacrifice, etc.

H.'s interpretation is ultimately an existentialist–humanist reading of the poem, with the well-known strengths and weaknesses of such an approach. Consider H.'s analysis of Achilles' rejection of Hector's appeal for a truce concerning their mutual burial before they fight. For H., because making promises is somehow intrinsically human, Achilles descends into bestiality before finally returning to humanity in the meeting with Priam at the poem's close. But why is breaking promises, or violating taboos, any less human than creating them? Too much of what is human is shied away from here. When Achilles wants to eat Hector, it is surely not true to say that he descends to the level of the bestial, though it may be true to say that some Greeks (Hesiod and Aristotle among them) would have thought so. He remains all too human, wishing he could violate a human taboo.

Princeton University MARK BUCHAN

REVALUING THE EPIC CYCLE

J. S. BURGESS: *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Pp. xvi + 295, ills. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001. Cased, £31. ISBN: 0-8018-6652-9.

Burgess argues that the beauties of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* have since antiquity fooled scholars into assuming that the *Cypria*, *Little Iliad*, and other lost Trojan War epics were post-Homeric, derivative, and without independent cultural value. He sees this 'Homer-centric' bias as an inversion of the actual preferences of archaic poets, painters, and audiences: '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' (p. 1). Central evidence is that in archaic art 'Cyclic' images of Troy predominate, while images inspired by the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* emerge surprisingly late. Far from being 'Homeric spin-offs', the Cyclic epics offer a

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.276 Published online by Cambridge University Press

window on a fluid and stable extra-Homeric tradition of myths. Whatever their dates, these epics are 'pre-Homeric' in the sense of being composed before Homer became a dominant influence.

In reconstructing the generative phase of epic without Homer at the center, Burgess brings to bear the perspectives of neoanalysis, oral poetry theory, performance studies, and recent skepticism about early Homeric influence on art and poetry. As his title indicates, he focuses not on the linguistic and poetic qualities of the texts, but on the larger mythological tradition behind them, especially as it can be read from archaic iconography. With these different criteria, he reworks Jasper Griffin's influential arguments for the 'uniqueness of Homer' (*JHS* 97 [1977], 39–53) to the Cycle's advantage.

In Chapter 1, 'The Epic Cycle and the Tradition of the Trojan War', he posits a Cyclic performance tradition collateral to what Gregory Nagy has formulated as the centuries-long, multi-stage 'crystallization' of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* without writing. In both of these oral traditions, poems evolved independently and no poem influenced the production of others in ways now traceable. Since questions of priority and derivativeness mean little *vis-à-vis* performers drawing on common traditions, Burgess remains agnostic about the dates of composition, for which ancient evidence is shaky and already 'Homer-centric'. He sees a high degree of congruence between the predominately 'Cyclic' images in art and the later summaries of the epics. Indeed, *pace* Aristarchus, κυκλικῶς now denotes authenticity: 'Often it seems that "Cyclic" material is more traditional than the idiosyncratic nature of the Homeric poems' (p. 135).

By the time of Herodotus, fixed versions of the Cyclic poems were becoming known, though not necessarily as epics composed to fill gaps in a 'cycle'. It is only in a third stage, presumably at the hands of Hellenistic scholars, that the Epic Cycle summarized by Proclus was 'manufactured' by cropping the individual poems. Tampering at this stage could also have produced the post-Homeric linguistic forms and Atticism that have persuaded many scholars of the lateness of the poems. If book divisions had already been made, the overlaps in the summaries and their incongruence with the fragments could have resulted from the dropping of whole books from an original *Cypria* or *Little Iliad* that recounted the whole war. Action-packed condensations (little 'Trojan cycles', as it were) may have long been part of performance culture, perhaps with the regionalism that Nagy finds in the Cycle. The impression that the Cyclic poets were plugging in the gaps around the Homeric epics may therefore be mistaken. Burgess credits all of the epics with the same degree of mythographic authenticity, while restricting scholarly tampering to language and length, but not matter. He does not relate these hypothetical editors to the contentious and creative reception of 'Cyclic' matter and style by scholar-poets such as Antimachus, Callimachus, and Apollonius Rhodius.

The second chapter, 'Homer and the Tradition of the Trojan War', almost half of the volume, debunks claims for early Homeric influence by extending and refining Anthony Snodgrass's iconographic studies and Robert Fowler's survey of lyric poetry. Burgess explains and applies his neoanalytic perspective with admirable clarity, and allows gradations of influence for particular cases, including the rubric 'Homeric-derived' for attenuated influence without homage. The divergent textual details used here to distance pots and poems from Homer are naturally not available for testing the congruence of 'Cyclic' images with the later plot summaries. He concludes with intriguing speculations about the unperformability of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and about how the myth of Homer may have evolved separately from the poems.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.276 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chapter 3, 'The Epic Cycle and Homer', points out that allegedly 'late' themes in the Cycle (e.g. immortality, the supernatural, Eros) are present to some degree also in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and could often be argued as early. Rather than being derivative and uninspired, the more straightforward 'Cyclic' style may express an aesthetic more like that of the *Homeric Hymns* and Hesiodic catalogue poetry. These stylistic features may suggest the 'norm or original nature' (p. 169) of the Trojan War tradition from which the Homeric poems evolved.

The negative results of this book are impressive, as Burgess demonstrates the multiple levels on which Homer worship has been built into scholarship, both ancient and modern. His trenchant dismantling of the claims for early Homeric influence shows the rare gift of handling texts and images in tandem and with equal acumen. His reconstructions of early poetic culture rely on some highly controversial theories of Nagy, but are theoretically sophisticated and hardly more speculative than the myth (of Homer) that they replace. He carries his point that not even the Homeric epics are well served by being praised, needlessly, at the expense of related traditions that have much yet to offer.

Amherst College FREDERICK T. GRIFFITHS

SOLON'S POLITICAL POEMS

C. MÜLKE: *Solons politische Elegien und Iamben (Fr. 1–13; 32–37 West). Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar.* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 177.) Pp. 414. Munich and Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2002. Cased. ISBN: 3-598-77726-4.

Mülke's book is a revised Tübingen dissertation accepted in late 2000 and directed by Kannicht. Unlike many dissertations, which should not appear in book form so soon after completion, this one is fully deserving of publication. It combines thoroughness with sound critical judgement, and is a major contribution to the study of Solon's poetry.

For the most part, M. adopts West's text. I have noticed nine departures, but only a few are of any consequence. He rightly rejects West's daggering of ὠιδήν in fr. 1.2, retains Aristotle's ἀπαρκεῖ in fr. 5.1, prefers ἄτη over ἄτηι in fr. 13.13, and retains ἀρχὴ δ' ἐξ ὀλίγου in fr. 13.14. All these readings are defended with cogent arguments. Where the text of the *Ath. Pol.* is uncertain, he has examined the papyrus in person and recorded what can be deciphered.

There are few omissions in the bibliography, but it would have been more convenient if a number of references had been listed in the bibliography rather than cited only on a particular passage. In some instances a reference is cited in full several times but omitted in the bibliography. An extreme example is Demont's *La cité grecque . . .*, which appears with full title, including the series, three times on one page (p. 154).

I do not feel competent to pass judgement on the historical and political aspects of the commentary, but my impression is that in these areas he frequently goes on at greater length than is necessary. In his treatment of controversial passages I generally feel that he is right, or at least has given the most plausible explanation. There are, however, a few passages where I should like to take issue. One is fr. 13.73. After stating that no limit to wealth lies revealed and that those who have the greatest livelihood strive to double it, Solon asks: τίς ἂν κορέσειεν ἅπαντας; M. rejects the view held by

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.276 Published online by Cambridge University Press