Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*

ENGAGING HOMER
IN LATE ANTIQUITY

CALUM ALASDAIR MACIVER

BRILL

Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*

Mnemosyne

Supplements

Monographs on Greek and
Latin Language and Literature

VOLUME 343

Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*

Engaging Homer in Late Antiquity

By

Calum Alasdair Maciver

BRILL

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual "Brill" typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.nl/brill-typeface.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

PREFACE

Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica* has been part of my life since 2004: a Masters by research dissertation (2005) and a PhD (examined in 2008) have now culminated in this book, a thorough revision of the latter doctoral thesis. There are many more miles to travel with this demanding text, but I feel I have at least gained a foothold somewhere on the mountain of *Arete*.

It is on this page that I am obliged to express my many debts to many people. The great majority of my work on Quintus was done at the University of Edinburgh, both as a postgraduate student and, subsequently, as a member of the teaching staff. I am unable fully to express my great gratitude to and fondness for its Classics department, to my friends, colleagues, and former teachers associated with it. My primary debt is to Douglas Cairns. He has been both an excellent supervisor and friend from the start and always encouraging in my continuance in *academe*. His insightful scholarship has ever been an example to follow, unlike his taste in Glasgow football teams. Stephanie Winder never failed to lose faith in me when I had none, and her flair in the interpretation of post-Homeric poetry was matched only by her friendship and support. Roger Rees was the one responsible for my introduction to Quintus, and as my MSc supervisor, and as supervisor of the initial stages of my PhD, he more than helped me lay the foundations of this book. I also acknowledge here the original thesis examiners, Richard Hunter and Michael Lurie, for the intense nature of the *viva voce* examination, and for their recommendations.

Much of the transformation of this work from its version as a thesis took place in the congenial environment of the Klassisch-Philologisches Seminar at the University of Zurich, where I held a Study Abroad Postdoctoral Fellowship (2008–2009) funded by the Leverhulme Trust. I thank the Trust for the award of the fellowship, and for their support, and I gratefully acknowledge all of my scholarly friends at Zurich with whom I discussed Quintus, especially Manuel Baumbach, Silvio Bär, Nicola Dümmler, and Fabian Zogg. I would like to thank too Katerina Carvounis for kindly sending me her Oxford DPhil thesis on *Posthomerica* 14.

Various versions and portions of this book were shared with audiences in a number of European universities, and I have benefited from the input of a number of scholars, not only specialists on Imperial Greek literature.

But it is the postgraduate community at Edinburgh which had to hear more papers on the *Posthomerica* than any other audience, and so their patience and humour is gratefully acknowledged here.

To the editors at Brill, and especially Milinda Hoo, thanks are due for the publication of this monograph and for the speed and efficiency with which they brought it to fruition. I also express my thanks for the comments of the anonymous reader of the manuscript.

The editions used for ancient authors are the most recent unless otherwise stated; all translation is my own unless otherwise stated. For Quintus Smyrnaeus, I use the edition of Vian 1963–1969, and for the *Iliad* that of M.L. West 1998 and 2000 (but with altered orthography and punctuation). For the Iliadic *Scholia*, I use Erbse 1969–1988, and for the Odyssean *Scholia*, Dindorf 1850. I do not always italicise some Greek words, such as gnome, or gnomai, due to frequency of occurrence. I also use the word Posthomeric as an adjective for the poem the *Posthomerica*—that is, it is the adjectival form of the title of that poem. Ancient authors and works are abbreviated after those listed in the Liddell-Scott-Jones Greek lexicon (9th edition).

This book would never have appeared, and I would never have plunged myself into the world of Classics, had it not been for my father. He gave me the impetus to study Latin independently back in 1999, in a period of illness between school and university; thereafter I abandoned all ideas of Law for the world of languages, myth, and epic poetry. I do not appreciate enough his wisdom and support. My brother (and former student flatmate) Iain has constantly been an interested hearer of Quintus-things, and he and his wife Sarah and wee Annie have always been the most fantastic of hosts when hosts were needed in Edinburgh.

I dedicate this book to the memory of my mother, whose love I will always carry with me.

December 2011, University of Leeds

INTRODUCTION

Quintus of Smyrna's Posthomerica

This study is concerned with the Imperial Greek hexameter poem the *Post-homerica* by Quintus of Smyrna. My purpose in this book is to examine the *Posthomerica* as a *poem* worth reading and interpreting in its own right, principally by means of analysis of Quintus' appropriation and use of the Homeric poems (though I do cover too a much wider range of intertextuality, including Hesiod, Aratus, Apollonius Rhodius, and Stoic philosophy, as they have impact on the literary and ethical significance of the text). In English, the last, book-length, encompassing treatment of the *Posthomerica* was the dissertation by George Washington Paschal in 1904.[1] My study is therefore the first monograph in over a century to focus on the poetic and literary nature of the poem and the first to assess critically the poem's Homeric intertextuality in relation to the work's aims and thematic concepts. I have chosen three key areas of the poem's poetic fabric to assess this intertextuality: the poem's similes, gnomai, and ecphrasis. Within this broader framework, I discuss aspects one would expect from study of epic, including characterisation, ethics, narratology, fate, and the gods. Thus the many features of the *Posthomerica*, from plot construction and narrative sequence to the poet's voice and style are discussed against both the epic tradition and Quintus' inevitable and calculated use of this epic tradition. In this introduction, I outline what we know to date about the author and the poem's composition. Fuller treatments of this topic can be found elsewhere, but it is nevertheless important to understand the cultural and literary environment of the *Posthomerica*.[2] Historical context and an understanding or

---

[1] Other book-length treatments focus on one particular aspect of the *Posthomerica*. The most important book to date in this respect is the magisterial work by Vian (1959) on the poem's sources, but note that he does not discuss, in most instances, the literary impact of the sources on the *Posthomerica*. Mansur (1940) wrote a short but unfairly negative account of characterisation in the *Posthomerica*; Gärtner (2005) wrote a monograph on the parallels between Vergil's *Aeneid* and the *Posthomerica*; and Ph.I. Kakridis (1962), in a privately printed book in modern Greek, wrote a useful monograph on the *Posthomerica*—a work which amounts to a short running commentary on the whole poem.

[2] The fullest and most scholarly introduction is still Vian 1963.vii–liii, but Baumbach and Bär 2007.1–26 is more up to date.

estimation of intended readership is important. The *Posthomerica* was not written in a vacuum, and the ideals of an age can point to interpretation. This is not the end of interpretation, however, as far as this book is concerned, and nor should the historical author receive too much onus where interpretation is concerned.[3] As modern readers, we have cultural histories and assumptions that partly construct our interpretation of the text, which combine with readings of Quintus' cultural history and assumptions. The intertextual dialogue between the modern reader of Quintus and Homer and Quintus as ancient reader of Homer is what underpins this book, and thus, necessarily, I also outline my understanding of intertextuality (in chapter I (i)).

Put briefly, Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica* is a 14 book epic poem written in Greek hexameters, in which are narrated the events of the Trojan War which occur after the conclusion of the *Iliad*, but before the events narrated in the *Odyssey*. Thus, the poem includes episodes such as the respective arrivals and deaths of Penthesileia and Memnon, the death of Achilles, the *hoplōn krisis*, the arrivals of Neoptolemus and Philoctetes into the war, the deaths of Eurypylus and Paris, the building of the wooden horse, and the sack of Troy. The poem ends with the disastrous voyage home of the Greeks. The *Posthomerica* is usually given an approximate date of composition of the third century CE.[4] There is little external evidence about the poem or indeed Quintus.[5] In some of the MSS titles, we find a Latin *praenomen* 'Kointos', despite the fact that the poem is in Greek; we also find the title for the poem, τὰ μεθ' Ὅμηρον—literally 'the things after Homer'.[6] The 'of Smyrna' attached to Quintus comes from the only piece of 'autobiographical' information in the poem—the Muse-invocation in book 12, or the so-called 'in-proem', where the primary narrator states that he was divinely inspired while tending his sheep in Smyrna.[7]

---

[3] Heath 2002.120 makes valid remarks on the usefulness of a positivist approach, but goes too far in my opinion. Ancient readings should not automatically be privileged over modern readings. Cf. the remarks in Maciver 2007.259–260 (n3).

[4] The most recent treatments of the date of the *Posthomerica* are those by Bär 2009.14–23 and by Baumbach and Bär 2007.2–8. See also James and Lee 2000.4–9, James 2004.xvii–xxi, and Gärtner 2005.23–26.

[5] Cf. Baumbach and Bär 2007.1: "As to his biography, we know virtually nothing about our poet."

[6] Vian, in his title to his editions of Quintus (1963, 1966, and 1969) translates as "la suite d'Homère".

[7] *Posthomerica* 12.306–313, for which see the thorough discussion by Bär 2007.40–61, and my discussion in chapter I.

This summary condenses the findings of a great deal of complex and at times tenuous scholarship from the renaissance to the present day. I do not have any new evidence to offer in this introduction on these points, but in what follows I give the current state of knowledge on Quintus' date and biography. Theories on the *Posthomerica*'s dating have ranged from a place in the Epic Cycle, to the Hellenistic times, to the late fifth century CE.[8] The current *communis opinio* for a date of the third century is based on three points: allusions in the *Posthomerica* to earlier poetry, allusions to the *Posthomerica* in later poetry, and the dates of two papyri. It is generally agreed that the date of Oppian is a firm *terminus post quem* for the *Posthomerica*.[9] His poem on fishing, the *Halieutica*, because of its dedication to the joint rulers Marcus Aurelius and his son Commodus, can be dated with precision to 176 CE to 180 CE (the latter date the death of Marcus Aurelius, the former the start date of Commodus' joint-rule). Scholars have identified allusions in the *Posthomerica* to the *Halieutica*, consisting of passages (two are similes) with fishing as subject matter, of such a technical nature as to suggest reliance upon Oppian on Quintus' part, rather than the other way round.[10] As a firm *terminus post quem*, the evidence is not strong (allusions as evidence for dating can never be definitive), but it is the only evidence available. As a *terminus ante quem*, it has been asserted that Triphiodorus, the author of the 691 line epyllion *The Sack of Troy* (Ἰλίου ἅλωσις) which can be given an approximate dating, is indebted to Quintus. The case is strong, though still, as with the evidence between Oppian and Quintus, not beyond doubt.[11] A papyrus fragment (*POxy.* 2946) dates Triphiodorus to no later than the end of the third century.[12] Thus we can tentatively date the *Posthomerica* to sometime between the respective compositions of Oppian and Triphiodorus, of around the early to middle third century CE.[13]

---

[8] Summarised in Gärtner 2005.23–26.

[9] Restated in the latest introduction on the *Posthomerica*, in Bär 2009.15–16, who discusses the relevant passages in Quintus and Oppian (including the dedications to the Roman emperors).

[10] The passages at *Posthomerica* 7.569–575, 9.172–177, and 11.62–65 are compared with *Halieutica* 4.640–646, 3.567–575, and 4.637–639 respectively; so James and Lee 2000.6n24 following Vian 1954.50–51. Kneebone 2007.285–305 focuses on the first of these parallels in an excellent discussion of Oppian in the *Posthomerica*.

[11] On Triphiodorus and Quintus, see above all Gerlaud 1982.8 and 40–41; see also James and Lee 2000.5.

[12] Further discussion can be found in Baumbach and Bär 2007.2–3. For arguments against Triphiodorus' indebtedness to Quintus, see Gärtner 2005.25.

[13] Gottfried Hermann, in the early nineteenth century, demonstrated that since Quintus does not follow the metrical innovations of Nonnus (fifth century CE), we must pre-date him. See Hermann 1805.*passim* and James and Lee 2000.5.

There are still other considerations of less weight.[14] The most recent of these, the *Vision of Dorotheus* (ὄρασις Δωροθέου), a fragmentary text discovered on a fourth / fifth century CE papyrus and published in 1984, has been used as evidence for the dating and identification of Quintus.[15] The *Vision* is a 343 verse hexameter poem (as it survives in its fragmentary state), written in an amalgam of *koine* and Homeric Greek. As surmised from the surviving text, the poem concerns a first person narrator, Dorotheus, and his vision of service in God's palace as a gate-keeper. The narrative involves the narrator's prying into matters and secrets of the heavenly palace away from his duties at the gate, and the resulting punishment and reinstatement which he receives. In two places, at line 300 of the papyrus and in the subscription at the end, Dorotheus refers to himself as the son of the poet Quintus: ὁ Κυντιάδης Δωρόθεος (line 300) and τέλος τῆς ὁράσεως / Δωροθέου Κυίντου ποιητοῦ (subscription). Thus we have Dorotheus the son of Kuntos (= *Kuintos*) and 'the end of the vision of Dorotheus the son of Quintus (*Kuintos*) the poet', or less probably, 'the end of the vision of Dorotheus Quintus the poet'.[16] In our manuscripts of the *Posthomerica* we find the name spelt as Κόιντος, which, arguably, is equally a Greek transliteration of the Latin *praenomen* Quintus.[17] Recent scholarship has mostly accepted, with only slight caution, the idea that the Quintus referred to by Dorotheus as his father is indeed the author of the *Posthomerica*. As James and Lee state, "in the absence of rival candidates and of any historical difficulty it is reasonable to assume that the father in question is none other than our poet."[18] The papyrus can be more or less securely dated to around 400 CE, and has therefore been used as another *terminus ante quem*. But there is little scope for identifying Quintus Smyrnaeus as the father of Dorotheus with any certainty. In the absence of firm biographical information on Quintus in the *Posthomerica* or from external sources, we simply cannot connect the two *personae* on the basis of

---

[14] See Baumbach and Bär 2007.3–4 for these.

[15] Kessels and van der Horst 1987 is the most up to date introduction, edition, and translation of the *Vision*. Further discussion of the papyrus (*PBodm.* 29) in relation to Quintus can be found principally in James and Lee 2000.7–9, with further bibliography, and Vian 1985.

[16] The use of the patronymic at line 300 seems to point to the former translation for the subscription; see, further, Baumbach and Bär 2007.5.

[17] Cf. James and Lee 2000.8.

[18] James and Lee 2000.8; cf. Baumbach and Bär 2007.5–6 and Gärtner 2005.25–26. Bär 2009.18–23 is much more cautious and gives detailed discussion of the evidence. He does, however, give the surprising and unfounded conclusion that Dorotheus could have been a pupil of Quintus.

two references to a certain Quintus the poet in one papyrus. Granted Quintus Smyrnaeus is the only Quintus *surviving* in sources who wrote an epic poem,[19] but nevertheless the evidence is not substantial enough to draw the type of conclusions made. Furthermore Francis Vian, one of the few sceptics, has shown that the severe linguistic deficiencies of the *Vision* make it unlikely that he was either the son of Quintus, or someone sufficiently versed in Quintus' style of poetry.[20]

The evidence from the *Posthomerica* itself and the references to it in Byzantine scholarship are similarly inconclusive. The earliest evidence we have for the author's name is in a Homeric *scholion* on *Iliad* 2.220 (which refers to Quintus the poet), references to Quintus in Eustathius of Thessalonica, the 12th century CE scholar who wrote a vast commentary on the Homeric poems, and repeated references to Quintus or Quintus Smyrnaeus (Κόιντος ὁ Σμυρναῖος) in Tzetzes, the 12th century Byzantine commentator, scholiast, and poet.[21] The Byzantine commentators presumably reflect earlier scholarly traditions in the treatment of the *Posthomerica*. The manuscripts of the *Posthomerica* similarly identify the author as Quintus: for example, Κόιντου εἰς τὰ μεθ᾽ Ὅμηρον πρῶτον ('the first book to the things after Homer by Quintus') is found in MS M.[22] Quintus is a Roman name of course, but it was not uncommon in the Imperial period for those in the Greek part of the empire to be known by a Latin *praenomen*, sometimes with a place-name added.[23] The epithet Smyrnaeus, as mentioned above, is taken from the only biographical information we have in the poem, at book 12. I will discuss the implications of the in-proem, and the apparent biographical details, in chapter I, but as far as Quintus' name goes, he has become Quintus Smyrnaeus in the scholarly tradition because the primary narrator states that he was inspired by the Muses while tending his sheep on the plains of Smyrna (12.310). The early printed editions of the *Posthomerica* refer to the author as Quintus Calaber, since the *Posthomerica*, in the Byzantine period, was first rediscovered by a cardinal Bessarion

---

[19] As Vian 1985.48 argues, there were surely other versifiers around with the name Quintus.

[20] Full discussion in Vian 1985.48, and see also Baumbach and Bär 2007.6n28 and Bär 2009.19.

[21] Further details and exact references can be found in Vian 1963.vii–viii.

[22] Dated to the beginning of the 16th century: see Vian 1963.viii and his table of *sigla* at 1963.liv–lv. See, further, Köchly 1850.viii.

[23] Further discussion on the *Posthomerica*'s relationship with Roman poetry can be found most recently in Maciver 2011, esp. 297–299.

in Calabria (the heel of Italy) sometime between 1453 and 1462.[24] This epithet survived even as late as Thomas Jefferson, who used an excerpt from Quintus as the last entry in his book of literary commonplaces.[25]

---

[24] Bessarion's discovery was related by the Byzantine scholar Lascaris, who made a copy of the MS Bessarion discovered. His handwritten preface can be found printed in Köchly 1850.cxi–cxii, and further discussion and translation of Lascaris in James and Lee 2000.2–3. On the *editio princeps* and other early printed editions, see Baumbach and Bär 2007.17–18.

[25] Entry 407 as listed in the edition of Wilson 1989. Suitably for the end-stage of Jefferson's life, he chose an excerpt from *Posthomerica* 6.431–434, in which Eurypylus, the Trojan ally, declares that he cares not if death is near, as no one lives forever.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES: BEING HOMER LATER

i. *Reading Quintus Reading Homer*

There is an entry for Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica* in the Cambridge History of Classical Literature (volume I: Greek Literature), albeit in the epilogue, written by B.M.W. Knox. In his short discussion of the *Posthomerica* (half a page for a 14 book Greek epic, in a volume of almost 1,000 pages) Knox quotes from a passage of the poem chosen at random (an attack by the Trojan ally Eurypylus on the Greeks in a bid to encourage the Trojans to keep fighting, 6.513–518). Of the six-line excerpt he states: "every word in these lines can be found in the Homeric corpus. All but three of them occur, in fact, in exactly the same grammatical form and most of them stand in the same position in the line in both poets. Quintus' lines are thoroughly predictable; what we are faced with is a kind of Homeric canto on a vast scale."[1] Knox's (unnecessarily negative) findings reflect one of the most immediately recognisable traits of the *Posthomerica*: it is strongly imitative of the Homeric poems, not only in metre, formulae, language, and style, but also in narrative sequence and construction, and characterisation; in fact, almost every facet of the poem's fabric can be traced to the Homeric poems. James and Lee similarly remark in the introduction to their commentary that "probably no other poem on a comparable scale reproduces the language of its models as closely as does the *Posthomerica* that of the Homeric epics."[2] In purely linguistic terms, for example, 720 of the adjectives in the *Posthomerica* are from Homer against only 220 that are not. Of these 720, 149 are used more than ten times by Quintus.[3] Similarly remarkable is the fact that, on average, every one in ten words in the *Posthomerica* is a Homeric *hapax legomenon*.[4] Quintus' imitation is pervasive and intense: so much so that

---

[1] Easterling and Knox 1985.715.
[2] James and Lee 2000.21.
[3] Vian 1959.182, and 182–192 for statistics and analysis. See also Bär 2009.58 who lists Quintus' *Lieblingswörter* and their frequency.
[4] Appel 1994a.94 and further discussion in Bär 2009.63.

it led one scholar to remark that "if the *Posthomerica* were the oldest surviving piece of poetry, the argument put forth [by Milman Parry in his studies on oral verse-making] would necessarily lead to the conclusion that this poem was an oral composition."[5] Oral composition it is certainly not, but the reader does meet 'Homer' in the act of reading any part of the *Posthomerica*.

It is not surprising, therefore, that three of the surviving manuscripts of the *Posthomerica* were found sandwiched between manuscripts of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.[6] It is most likely that the placing of the *Posthomerica* between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* stems from a tradition pertaining to the poem's early transmission, namely that the *Posthomerica* was identified and used as a suitable means of filling in the story of the Trojan War from the point at which the *Iliad* stops until the point at which the *Odyssey* begins. It has been argued recently, therefore, that the *Posthomerica*'s survival through the Middle Ages is down to its nature as an Iliadic sequel rather than for its literary qualities.[7] This line of thinking follows on from the traditional (but disputed) view that the reason Quintus chose to write a fourteen book epic poem on the Trojan War was to fill in the gap left by the Epic Cycle, which (it is argued) was no longer extant by his time.[8] Indications that the Cycle was in fact not available to Quintus are drawn from the *Posthomerica* itself. Scholars have argued that the numerous divergences from the details and narrative sequence of the stories of the Cycle suggest that Quintus did not have them to hand, since otherwise, he would have followed them closely.[9] In the *Posthomerica*, for example, Neoptolemus arrives at Troy before the Greeks fetch Philoctetes, a sequence contrary to the traditional version in the *Ilias Parva*. The logic of this kind of argumentation is unsound. Quintus, as a creative poet, need not follow the traditional version of events, just as Euripides felt that he could manipulate traditional myths for the purposes of his plays. Similarly, a poet does not need a gap, or an excuse, to write a poem. The Epic Cycle was obviously extant in Callimachus' time, yet he railed against all those poets who wrote large-scale mythological epics (including epics on the Trojan War).[10] By Quintus' time,

---

[5] Hoekstra 1965.17, discussed by James and Lee 2000.25.

[6] For the MSS, see mostly recently Bär 2009.24n53 (who follows James and Lee 2000.1 and 1n3).

[7] James and Lee 2000.1 and Baumbach and Bär 2007.16.

[8] Gärtner 2005.28n10 lists the scholars for and against this idea; the largest number think that Quintus did not have direct access to the Epic Cycle by his time.

[9] See, chiefly, Vian 1963.xxviii–xxix and James and Lee 2000.6–7.

[10] *AP* 12.43 (28 Pfeiffer); cf. Hopkinson 1988.86.

it is surely likely that the Epic Cycle was still 'around'. According to John Philoponus of the sixth century (CE), the third century epic poet Pisander of Laranda's 60 book epic poem was of such stylistic quality that the Epic Cycle fell out of favour, and by the time of John Philoponus was no longer extant.[11] So the Epic Cycle might not have been available to Nonnus two centuries (or more) after Quintus, but there is insufficient evidence to argue for or against the existence of the Epic Cycle when Quintus wrote the *Posthomerica* (in my opinion there were surely significant portions extant);[12] it can be concluded, however, that Quintus did not have to follow the exact details of the Cycle (as he sometimes does on various points), Quintus did not need an excuse to be creative, and the *Posthomerica*'s survival through the Middle Ages only as a guide to what happened after the *Iliad*, rather than on account of its literary qualities, is disproved by the very fact that it was considered worthy enough as a 'Homeric' *poem* to be placed between *the* Homeric poems; that is, that the epic was intrinsically good enough to be even considered to accompany the great Homeric poems.

This physical situation between manuscripts of the Homeric poems accidently reflects the poetological aims of the poem. The *Posthomerica* is very like the *Iliad* in its language and epic apparatus (that is, in its poetic framework): the Homeric poems are the code model. But when it comes to scrutinising the actual verbal interplay between Homer and the *Posthomerica*, Quintus reads Homer, interprets Homer, and changes Homer. The Homeric poems are also, continually, the exemplary model.[13] "Reading Quintus Reading Homer", the sub-chapter heading, expresses the nature of my study. I read how Quintus imitates, manipulates, comments on, differs from, in sum, reads, Homer. The emphasis on reading underscores the fact that throughout this book, it is my reading of the *Posthomerica* and the Homeric intertexts that constructs this relationship between the two texts. 'Reading', however, is a fluid term, and must be defined. My 'reading' is not 'reading' in the ancient sense, but is something similar. I take into account ancient educated reading, but my work with the text is formed through use of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, commentaries, *lexica*, and modern studies of the world of

---

[11] See Shorrock 2001.28–31 for further excellent discussion.

[12] Baumbach and Bär 2007.1n2 make the excellent point that the Cycle should not be thought of as a unified 'text' but as a collection which probably existed in parts, variously according to region.

[13] The ideas are borrowed from Conte 1986.31, where he similarly states that "Homer is often, indeed nearly always, Virgil's 'exemplary model' … but he is also constantly the 'code model'".

post-Homeric literature. I emphasise that by reader, I mean myself (and not an ideal or exemplary) reader. I do, however, take into account, throughout this book, the idea of the educated ancient reader, and the contemporary culture in which the *Posthomerica* was composed. I identify and interpret the intertextuality, discuss what this intertextuality does to our reading, and where relevant, take into consideration tendencies in ancient interpretation of Homer that I also read in the text. Thus, while it is my reading of Homeric intertextuality within the *Posthomerica*, Quintus too read Homer and constructed a text inbuilt with Homer, and thus the setting and use of Homeric intertexts points to Quintus' reading of Homer.

Thus intertextuality underpins this study, but the term, first coined by Julia Kristeva,[14] has been interpreted and applied by many, in many different ways, in very different contexts.[15] Despite the numerous studies on intertextuality in recent Classical scholarship, and its more prevalent recognition in work on Classical texts now, there is no one fixed, universal definition or understanding of the theory in modern scholarship (Classics and outside of Classics), and for this reason the following summary of my position is necessary. In this book, intertextuality describes the interaction of texts, including the reader, involved in the process of reading.[16] There is a textual system, in the process of reading, between the text being read, the reader reading the text, the combination of texts which make up the text read, and the combination of texts, cultural, social, and literary, which 'make up' the background and capabilities of the reader. This is the umbrella term I use to encompass all ideas of relationships between texts activated when I, the reader, engage the *Posthomerica*.[17]

Often coupled with Kristeva's theory of intertextuality is the idea of the 'death of the author', proclaimed with far-ranging consequences by Roland Barthes.[18] Structuralists and post-Structuralists jettisoned the notion that the author's intention is of importance, let alone retrievable. Their arguments built on Barthes's eradication of the author, in that they identified

---

[14] Kristeva 1969.

[15] "Yet the term [intertextuality] remains, nearly a quarter of a century later, an important part of the fabric of contemporary terminology, used indiscriminately by students of allusion of every stripe and critical inclination" Pucci 1998.15.

[16] Cf. Barthes 2001a.1473.

[17] Conte 1986.29 best describes the reader as text: "Readers ... who approach the texts are themselves already a plurality of texts and of different codes, some present and some lost or dissolved in that indefinite and generic fluid of literary *langue*." Cf. Pucci 1998.15 and 31.

[18] Cf. Barthes 2001b.1469: "To give a text an Author is to impose a limit on that text, to furnish it with a final signified, to close the writing."

text as a multi-dimensional space rather than as a line of words with one message from an all-powerful author.[19] This stance freed the text from the shackles of fundamentalism, associated in Classical scholarship with philological historicism which itself was often coupled with the old-fashioned tendencies of *Quellenforschung*.[20] As a result, power shifted to the reader, and the author's intentions became intentionally ignored. All meaning is constructed at the level of the reader,[21] and the intertextual possibilities of a work depend on the competencies and breadth of reading of each individual reader.[22]

The central role of the reader is fundamental. The story, however, does not, and cannot, end there. A concept as broad as intertextuality will not do for a certain type of textual behaviour in Classical literature: the tight verbal imitation apparent in Alexandrian and Roman poetry. The term usually applied to this behaviour is *allusion*, and while it could be argued that allusion, in linguistic and etymological terms, signifies an author and authorial intention, and that it is therefore contradictory to the precepts of intertextuality, the generality of intertextuality fails to express the philological specificity inherent in a play between one text and another, where specific words and backgrounds to words are important.[23]

The word 'allusion' has been proven to be a perfectly valid and useable term, even in the post-Barthes / Kristeva era.[24] The term intertextuality, on the other hand, has seldom been used in discussion of the *Posthomerica*, even though many of its principles have been applied to the poem long before the term came into fashion.[25] Words like 'sources', 'conscious

---

[19] Barthes 2001b.1468.

[20] Cf. Conte 1986.27: "The philologist who seeks at all costs to read intention into imitation will inevitably fall into a psychological reconstruction of motive."

[21] Cf. Martindale 1993.17 and Hinds 1998.48.

[22] Cf. D. Fowler 2000.127: "Meaning is realized at the point of reception, and what counts as an intertext and what one does with it depends on the reader."

[23] Cf. Pucci 1998.46: "Stock-in-trade terms such as *intertextuality* or *influence* fail to render the fullness of allusive form and function, yet, because allusion arises in language and is returned to language, to deny its essential textuality is to set the allusion afloat on a sea of endless potential meanings, to make it function like some Postmodern chimera, now here according to the reader, now gone owing to the death of the author. This will not do …" Cf. Hinds 1998.48.

[24] I refer to the works by Conte 1986, Hinds 1998, and Pucci 1998. Lyne 1994.189 advises that we should drop the word altogether for its associations with the concept of a dominant author. Contrast Irwin's polemic (2004.229) against intertextuality.

[25] See, especially, Vian 1959, 1963, 1966, and 1969. The collection edited by Baumbach and Bär (2007) marks a new trend in studies on the *Posthomerica*.

allusion', and the (undeniably useful) tendencies and outcomes of *Quellen-forschung* have held sway instead. Searches for sources and the desire to find 'conscious' as opposed to 'unconscious' allusion have usually been coupled by excellent close analysis of the texts. Such academic pursuit shares most of the traits of intertextuality, but has an over-attention to authorial intention. By avoiding the terminology of the past, and by use of new words associated with the new and energising strides made in study of other Classical works, the *Posthomerica* can be resurrected from the author-centred, positivist attitudes shown in previous studies. An allusion (~intertext) may be constituted by one similar or identical word if rare or unusual, or more if the words are very common, but these parameters need not exclude the possibility of one single common word being read as an allusion.[26] A working definition of allusion is provided by Joseph Pucci (1992.47):[27]

> The literary allusion is the verbal moment in a subsequent text of a specific and verifiable moment in a prior text, generated through the collusion of authorial and readerly intent, neither controlled nor limited by the language that constitutes it, in which a bundle of potential meanings obtains, retrievable at any given time only in part.

So is the author really dead, if we need to take account of him when it comes to allusion? I do not hesitate to incorporate an idea of the author Quintus, and to give him a role in the intertextuality of the poem. This Quintus is not necessarily *the* historical Quintus Smyrnaeus, nor are the descriptions of his aims, readings, and devices in the *Posthomerica* necessarily what *the* historical Quintus actually aimed for, read, or devised. I as a reader construct an author based on my reading both of the *Posthomerica*, the literary intertextuality of the *Posthomerica*, and the cultural, historical *sedes* in which the poem was first written. My 'Quintus' will differ from anyone else's 'Quintus', and I do not say that my Quintus is the correct one (we cannot reconstruct a correct, absolute Quintus). My Quintus is only a reading.[28]

The resurrection of the author in my idea of the author does not banish the reader again to the darkness of trying to reconstruct an irretrievable intention in a past moment of time. Rather, the author, with intentions, posits an undefined (and unknowable even to himself / herself) number

---

[26] Cf. Kelly 2008.166.

[27] Cf. Conte 1986.35.

[28] Cf. Hinds 1998.50: "For us as critics, the alluding poet is ultimately and necessarily a figure whom we ourselves read out from the text." Conte 1994.134 hints at a similar idea: "Readers do not read authors' intentions; they read texts."

of allusions in a text, which lies dormant until the activation of it by the reader who has read the same text alluded to by the author.[29] The reader will never know whether he / she has coincided with the intentions of the historical author, but there is nothing to stop the reader from stating that he / she reads Quintus alluding to Vergil, for example.[30] In real historical (and historicist) terms, when the reader has read an allusion which actually does not coincide with the intentions of the historical author, this does not make such a reading invalid or even less valid, since intention is not only unknowable in historical terms, but in fact the intentions of the text put into the public domain by the author are out of his / her control when it comes to intentions anyway. To be more precise, the reader can never, strictly speaking, know whether he / she has found precisely an author's intentions, but such a collision of reader's and author's intentions is (unknowably, but hypothetically) possible, and therefore many readings (within realistic boundaries of common sense) are possible. It is on this basis that this book should be read: a constructed Quintus alludes, and we read this activity and interpret it, according to the capacities of our reading.

ii. *A Late Antique Aesthetic?*

The *Posthomerica* is a poem of extremes. The *Iliad* has one large scale ecphrasis (the shield of Achilles in *Iliad* 18), whereas the *Posthomerica*, approximately half the size of the *Iliad*, has three (the shield of Achilles in book 5, the shield of Eurypylus in book 6, and the baldric and quiver of Philoctetes in book 9). Similarly, when it comes to other poetic devices like similes, where the *Iliad* has 197 long and 153 short similes in total, the *Posthomerica* has 226 long and 79 short similes: the *Posthomerica* has 29 more long similes, despite its smaller compass.[31] Ideas of immensity, extremity, unspeakable-ness, and above all utter grief and pain, occur constantly in the *Posthomerica*, portrayed through a small number of frequently deployed adjectives. For example, ἀλεγεινός occurs 81 times in the *Posthomerica* whereas it occurs only 21 times in the *Iliad*; ἄσπετος / -ον 17 times in

---

[29] Cf. Pucci 1998.40: "The shared creation of allusion thus points to its dual intentionality, wherein the author intends the potential for meaning, and the reader intends the actualization of that potential." Cf. Hinds 1998.49.

[30] "The idea of a reader who sees exactly the same cues within the *topos* as the author, and constructs them in the same order and in the same way, will always in the final analysis be unattainable" Hinds 1998.46.

[31] Further, full discussion of these statistics can be found in chapter IV (i).

the *Iliad* in contrast to 63 times in the *Posthomerica*; στονόεις eight times in the *Iliad* unlike 82 times in the *Posthomerica*; and σμερδαλέος seven times in the *Iliad* but 39 times in the *Posthomerica*.[32] Such a concentration of vocabulary, with far less breadth and variety than found even in the (orally derived) Homeric poems, gives the reader the impression of hyperbole. Battles, wounds, physical size, prowess, cowardice, and flight are so often painted in strong but familiar terms in the *Posthomerica*, creating a distinct Posthomeric flavour.

This aspect of the *Posthomerica* has generated much negative reception. When scholarship is not criticising the *Posthomerica* for being overly imitative of Homer, it is criticising the poem for its monotony or its extremes. Samples of such scholarship will follow, but I want to suggest here that the *Posthomerica* has been approached from the wrong stance. The *Posthomerica* does elicit critical reactions on account of its (apparent) lack of resemblance to the simpler refinements of Classical poetry: but it should be remembered that the *Posthomerica* is not 'Classical'.[33] Neil Hopkinson, in his anthology of Imperial Greek verse, rightly states in his introduction that the poetry, genres, and styles are so varied in Imperial verse, from Mesomedes to Nonnus and Babrius, that no overarching description of common style is possible; nor is it possible to discuss trends or readership due to lack of evidence.[34] In terms of Greek epic of the Imperial period, Malcolm Campbell rightly states that "our ignorance of trends and developments in Greek epic composition between Apollonius and Quintus is all but total."[35] As a result of this lack of categorisation for Imperial Greek poetry, for example a term such as Alexandrian and the connotations which such a label brings, and as a result of the gap in extant epic poetry before Quintus back to Apollonius, critics tend to approach Quintus Smyrnaeus (and to a lesser extent, Nonnus and his 48 book *Dionysiaca*) without a sufficient idea of the nature and demands that such poetry has inherently.[36] This is something which Michael

---

[32] Cf. Bär 2009.580 provides a full list of adjectives which occur 20 times or more in the *Posthomerica*.

[33] Cf. Shorrock 2001.3 on Nonnus: "Nonnus' 'failure' is to be understood rather as the failure of modern critics to come to terms with Late-Antique allusive poetry and to engage with the particular, unique, demands of the *Dionysiaca*."

[34] Hopkinson 1994.9. For surveys of the literature of this period, see Cameron 2004b, and for an idea of a Late Antique aesthetic, cf. Elsner 2004.

[35] Campbell 1981a.*preface*.

[36] Cameron 2004b.329, among others, has argued, rightly, that mythological epic certainly never died out in this period.

Roberts discussed in relation to Latin poetry of Late Antiquity. "To appreciate late antique poetry properly, it is necessary to view it on its own terms rather than from the perspective, conscious or not, of classical authors."[37]

So what of labels for the *Posthomerica*? In terms of dating, the *Posthomerica* can certainly be described as post-Homeric and post-Alexandrian, and is often broadly described as Late Antique or 'late'. Recently, the editors of proceedings from a conference on Imperial Greek poetry in 2008 entitled the collection "Signs of Life? Studies in Later Greek Hexameter Poetry",[38] and thus provided a new angle on 'lateness'. 'Later' implies a comparison with earlier, and bridges the gap created between the two periods (Classical / Hellenistic and Late Antique) when the implicitly pejorative 'late' only is applied to Imperial Greek poetry. Lateness, however, is a product of an earlier literary tradition. Roberts is correct that later poetry should be viewed on its own terms, but these terms themselves inherent in the texts are a cumulative amalgam of earlier aesthetics and literary schools. Silvio Bär, building on observations by others in earlier studies, makes a sound case for Quintus' affinities with the "alexandrinischen Dichtungsideal".[39] He bases his conclusions chiefly on the fact that Quintus rarely repeats Homeric phrasing word for word, but invariably alters aspects of the phrasing in a manner which Bär ascribes to the *ars allusiva* of Apollonius.[40] Other Alexandrian traits, such as the scholarly signalling of an allusion (known as an Alexandrian footnote), are also evident in the *Posthomerica*.[41]

In size and the nature of its subject matter, however, the *Posthomerica* is certainly not Alexandrian, if we take the term Alexandrian to imply the poetic ideals of Callimachus.[42] There exists a wide diversity of opinions on what the labels Alexandrian or even Callimachean actually signify, and any definition here cannot by rights do justice to this range of scholarship. A recent attempt at summarising the concepts concentrates on one key idea, namely that Callimachean signifies a break with the past, along with a recreation of that same past.[43] The nuance I am more interested in is the

---

[37] Roberts 1989.3.
[38] *Ramus* special number, vol. 37 (1 and 2), edited by Carvounis and Hunter.
[39] Bär 2009.62.
[40] Bär 2009.62 makes much use of the observations of Appel 1994b.
[41] See primarily Maciver 2012, and also Bär 2009.12, 57, and 77.
[42] Cf. Vian 1963.xl: "Quintus s'inspire d'une longue tradition scolaire. On a dit qu'il ne goûte pas la poésie savant et artiste de l'école callimachéene; sa conception de l'épopée est celle-là meme que combattait Callimaque."
[43] See Hunter 2006.3–6 for a summary of the nuances of these terms, and for his own interpretation.

scholarly nature of the poetry. The Alexandrian scholar-poet famously pro-
claimed that a big book was a big evil,[44] and advocated instead the 'slender
muse', the refined, demanding, sophisticated style of poetic creation, in the
prologue to his *Aetia*.[45] This difference in styles does not mean that there are
not Callimachean aspects to the *Posthomerica*. The *Posthomerica* demands
a wide breadth of reading and scholarly insight in much the same way as
Alexandrian poetry. The Homeric texts, omnipresent in the *Posthomerica*,
are received by Quintus through ages which interpreted and re-assessed
the poems in the light of their own literary and philosophical interpreta-
tive trends. The Homeric poems are refracted through these media and cast
by Quintus in his post-Classical, post-Alexandrian, 'later' poem. Quintus
is both anti-Callimachean and Callimachean, a poet of 'big evil' in Calli-
machus' definition, but also a poet of refined intertextual intricacies which
lie latent until activated by the capable reader. The *Posthomerica* is caught
somewhere between two trends: between the definitive Alexandrian epic
of Apollonius Rhodius, and the baroque and bizarrely original epic of Non-
nus which spawned its own followers.[46] A facile study of the *Posthomerica*
can overlook the density of learning and originality of Quintus against the
Homericity of his poem, but Quintus, as evidenced by his place in liter-
ary history, is post-Alexandrian and thus should be read as such. Quintus
read much, as Francis Vian stated,[47] and demands the same of the reader.
To write epic after Homer and then also after Apollonius (to mention key
extant Greek epic) is to inscribe the past, to declare unavoidable indebt-
edness within a genre pre-determined by interpretation of Homer.[48] It is
not my intention in this book, however, to establish and discuss the links
between the *Posthomerica* and Hellenistic poetry.[49] My focus is primarily on
the function of Homeric intertextuality within the poem, without pinning
Quintus to any particular school of poetry. As I have made clear, Quintus'
date, coupled with a lack of evidence for the development of later Greek
epic, makes any categorisation difficult.

---

[44] *Fr.* 465 Pfeiffer.

[45] Pfeiffer 1.24. For further discussion of the bookish nature of Callimachean poetic aes-
thetics, see Cameron 1995.24–70 and Hopkinson 1988.98–101.

[46] For programmatic references to aesthetics and aims in Nonnus, see *Dionysiaca* 1.13–
15, and for further discussion, see Shorrock 2001.17 and 34. On the followers of Nonnus, see
Shorrock 2001.1, and for full discussion, Miguelez Cavero 2008.

[47] Vian 1963.xxviii–xxxv.

[48] Cf. Goldhill 1991.285–286: "To write epic is to write within a genre which cannot escape
the past."

[49] I do discuss this, however, in Maciver 2012.

More recently, attempts have been made to situate the *Posthomerica* within the movement termed 'the Second Sophistic'.[50] The Second Sophistic was a term coined by Philostratus in his *Lives of the Sophists* (481) to denote the reinvention of the first Sophistic (that is, the age of the Sophists and high rhetoric in Athens in the fifth and fourth centuries BCE—though it is never noted that Philostratus does not apply the second Sophistic especially to the Imperial period, but rather to the time very shortly after the first Sophistic).[51] Scholars tend to put the movement within a historical frame of around 50 CE to 250 CE,[52] the latter date coinciding with the death of Philostratus, though theories range about the scope, function, and above all significance of the Second Sophistic.[53] It is not my intention to deal with these views in detail here (further discussion can be found elsewhere), but it is important to question whether Quintus could have *belonged* to such a movement. Taking the Second Sophistic to refer to a cultural phenomenon which was defined by a marked recreation of the cultural, rhetorical, and linguistic practices in prose (written and spoken) which marked the first Sophistic, to further establish identity for the Greeks under Rome as Greeks with a powerful heritage, then Quintus can only narrowly be associated with such a phenomenon. The Second Sophistic, as far as it was a literary phenomenon, was marked by rhetorical prose written predominantly in Attic dialect.[54] Quintus wrote poetry, not prose, in a Homeric, and not Attic, dialect.[55] That is not to say that there was a flourishing, to an extent, of poetry during this period, but Ewen Bowie has shown that poetry by sophists was the exception rather than the rule, and epic poetry especially was unlikely.[56] Quintus, of course, presumably received the typical rhetorical education as a member of a local elite, and thus, presumably, could be termed, as appropriate for the period, a *pepaideumenos*, or someone educated, taught in the sophisticated

---

[50] See principally Bär 2010.*passim*, Bär 2009.85–91, and Baumbach and Bär 2007.8–15.

[51] The best account of the Second Sophistic is Whitmarsh 2005, which should be supplemented with Schmitz 1997.

[52] Dates as interpreted by Swain 1996.1–2.

[53] As discussed by Whitmarsh 2001.17–20.

[54] Cf. Whitmarsh 2005.42–43.

[55] Baumbach and Bär 2007.12 try to get round this by arguing that Homer was extremely important in Second Sophistic writing (i.e. Lucian's *Verae Historiae*); but Second Sophistic epic poetry was relatively non-existent (Scopelianus being the sole possible exception—first century CE—as Baumbach and Bär note). See, also, Korenjak 2003.130–136.

[56] Bowie 1989.256: "[Epic] required long hours of composition and virtuoso skills as well as a mixture of flair and *paideia* ... these requirements may not have been easily compatible with a sophistic career."

arts of rhetoric. The readership of the *Posthomerica* can also be assumed
to have been *pepaideumenoi*, like the author: a literary, erudite audience
capable of understanding and unlocking the learning of the text. But to put
Quintus' *Posthomerica* within the cultural and literary phenomenon of the
Second Sophistic is surely misguided: the *Posthomerica* may have sections
or even large episodes which exhibit rhetoric and rhetorical form reminis-
cent of similar Second Sophistic practices,[57] but taken as a whole, Quintus'
Homeric epic is an epic indebted to Homer and the post-Homeric epic and
poetic tradition, rather than, but not to the exclusion of, prose writings. The
recent collection of papers edited by Baumbach and Bär (2007) on Quintus
Smyrnaeus has the sub-heading "Transforming Homer in Second Sophistic
Epic", but there is no such thing as Second Sophistic epic: in a sense this is
a contradiction in terms. In the vacuum of labels and movements for the
Posthomerica, however, the editors (in the title of the book and in their
introduction) sensibly attempt to interrogate Quintus' work in the light of
contemporary reactions to the past in that era's literature. Any connections,
however, between Homeric-imitative epic and the Second Sophistic can
only be tentative.[58]

Categorisation, then, according to known schools and trends for the
Posthomerica proves relatively elusive. There is still another level of epic-
construction and reading when it comes to approaching later epic, beyond
categorisation. Michael Roberts also argues that readers were misunder-
standing (and as a result criticising) later Latin poetry because they were
approaching the poetry with an idea of a Classical aesthetic of propor-
tion and unity as opposed to lack of proportion in poetry that has the
tendency to be episodic and digressive. As Roberts states, "Late antique
poetry is not like this. The seams not only show, they are positively adver-
tised."[59] The *Posthomerica* is rightly termed episodic and digressive,[60] just
as the later *Dionysiaca* fills up its 48 books with manifold digressions and
mythological tales in narrative that (seemingly) meanders from the main
storyline of the life of Dionysus.[61] Size clearly matters for Imperial hexam-

---

[57] For example, the series of speeches between Ajax and Odysseus in *Posthomerica* 5
exhibit some of the tendencies both of epideictic oratory and of courtroom practice: as
discussed by Bär 2010.

[58] Baumbach and Bär 2007.15 recognise this, but also argue that "there is no reason to
generally question such a possible link either".

[59] Roberts 1989.3.

[60] See most recently Appel 1994c.1–13 and contrast Schenk 1997.

[61] Cf. Shorrock 2001.8: "As anyone who has attempted to read the *Dionysiaca* will know,
the story of Dionysus very soon disappears into an apparent chaos of images and characters."

eter poets, and while *epyllion* (epic in miniature) exists in the shape of the poems like Triphiodorus' *Sack of Troy* (early fourth century), Colluthus' *Rape of Helen* (fifth century), and Musaeus' *Hero and Leander* (fifth century), and even in sections of the *Posthomerica* and *Dionysiaca*,[62] unusually large, later, epics exist in the face of the *famous* and predominant epics of the past. Aside from the *Posthomerica* and the *Dionysiaca* we know of other large-scale epics approximately contemporary with Quintus, like the massive 60 book epic on world history written by a certain Pisander of Laranda, in Greek, in the early third century CE (the Ἡρωικαὶ θεογαμίαι, the *Heroic Marriages of the Gods*), or more unusual works like the *Ilias leipogrammatos* by Pisander's father Lucius Septimius Nestor, in 24 books, in each book of which an individual letter of the alphabet was entirely excluded. From the extant information and material, we can surmise that these remains of epics indicate a more widespread phenomenon of larger-scale epic-writing.[63] Rather than bow to the weight of tradition these epic poets dare to recreate on a large scale, to redefine Homer, whether with missing letters (Nestor of Laranda), or to outweigh Homer in scale and ambition (like the epic of Pisander of Laranda).[64] "The heroic grandeur of a Homer challenges imitation at the same time as it creates the fear of inferiority".[65] In the case of these later Greek epic poets, any anxiety of influence in redesigning and exacerbating the limits of Greek epic is dissipated in the light of these monstrously large epics. Quintus falls somewhere in between these extremes: an epic approximately half the length of the *Iliad* is not extreme in its literary context of the third century, and certainly not as daring in length as the *Dionysiaca*, but the poem's overtly Homeric style does imply extreme boldness in the face of an overwhelmingly reverential reception of Homer.[66]

---

[62] For bibliography on *epyllion*, see Hopkinson 1994.139 for Musaeus, Gerlaud 1982 for Triphiodorus, and Livrea 1968 for Colluthus. The Paris and Oenone episode in *Posthomerica* 10 is commonly viewed as an *epyllion* within the epic; there are many aspects of *epyllion* in Nonnus—Shorrock 2001.22.

[63] Cf. Schubert 2007.343 argues that if we take into account the papyri fragments of Imperial epic poetry, then what survives today is "presumably only the tip of a huge iceberg". This does not mean we should then term such verse 'Second Sophistic Epic', as I discuss above.

[64] On the two poets of Laranda, in relation to Quintus see Vian 1963.xxiii, and in general see Keydell 1935.

[65] Hardie 1993.100.

[66] Cf. Schmitz 2007: "We are entitled to wonder if he was particularly brave and clever or particularly stupid and ingenuous to pick this fight against an adversary so much greater than himself."

It is the nature of these epics, and for our purposes the *Posthomerica*, however, which defies the Classical aesthetic. For Aristotle, the genius of the *Iliad* was down mainly to its structure and confines of plot. Homer, unlike the composer of the *Cypria* or *Ilias Parva*, succeeded because he selected one section of the Trojan story (the wrath of Achilles and the attendant circumstances) for the *Iliad* and concentrated upon it, building episodes like the catalogue of ships around it to diversify the composition.[67] The *Posthomerica* is very different in this respect. It sets out in a chronological order the key events which took place after the end of the *Iliad* in the Trojan story. Each book of the poem is clearly centred around one particular character, event, or aspect, with other minor themes interlaced. The table below outlines the key themes, and additional characteristics, of each book.[68] Unlike most other post-Homeric epics, there is no single unifying character or theme underlying the whole construction of the *Posthomerica*'s plot.

Table 1. Key themes and characteristics.

Book 1	Exploits and death of Penthesileia	
Book 2	Exploits and death of Memnon	Death of Antilochus
Book 3	Death of Achilles	
Book 4	The funeral games for Achilles	
Book 5	The judgement of arms	Death of Ajax and description of the shield of Achilles
Book 6	The arrival and exploits of Eurypylus	Description of the shield of Eurypylus
Book 7	The arrival and exploits of Neoptolemus	
Book 8	The combat between Neoptolemus and Eurypylus	The death of Eurypylus
Book 9	The mission to get Philoctetes	
Book 10	The death of Paris	The death of Oenone
Book 11	Further fighting around Troy	
Book 12	The wooden horse	Sinon, Laocoon, and Cassandra; the Muse invocation and catalogue of heroes
Book 13	The sack of Troy	Death of Priam; capture of Helen
Book 14	The beginnings of the journey home for the Greeks	Helen before the Greeks; the lesser Ajax and his *hybris*

The only innovation in the sequence of episodes is the placement of the arrival of Neoptolemus early in the chronology, in contrast to the traditional, Cyclic order, which places the arrival of Philoctetes and the death of Paris before the arrival of Neoptolemus.[69] This difference (Quintus here follows

---

[67] Aristotle *Poetics* 1459a–b; cf. the discussion of Halliwell 1986.257–261.

[68] A more detailed critical summary of the contents of each book can be found in James 2004.239–265.

[69] Further discussion of this innovation can be found in Vian 1963.xxviii–xxix and 1966.49.

the sequence in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*) points to one of the central unifying elements in terms of plot within the *Posthomerica*. As a result of this change in sequence Neoptolemus enters proceedings much earlier than was traditional, and thus the central books of the *Posthomerica*, books 6–8, are occupied by the rivalry and eventual combat between the new-comer for the Greeks, Neoptolemus the second Achilles, and the new-comer for the Trojans, Eurypylus—both a Hector figure and through ancestry a Heracles figure. From book 7 onwards, Neoptolemus fills the void left first by Achilles (killed in *Posthomerica* 3) and then by Ajax (suicide in *Posthomerica* 5).[70] Thus the second half of the *Posthomerica*, despite the episodic nature of the poem's parts, is unified by a central character, in a similar way to the original Homeric poems.[71] There are various thematic means of unifying the epic, especially in relation to running ethical themes—I discuss these in chapter II in relation to the emblems on the shield of Achilles. The following diagram attempts to illustrate the unifying sequences and connections of the *Posthomerica* beyond the episodic nature of the plot, and in addition to the figure of Neoptolemus in the second half of the epic as a balance to Achilles and Ajax in the first. It becomes clear that the poem is inlaid with carefully constructed structures which either echo each other, or which help to construct the epic as a series of thematic blocks.

  This is one possible way of arranging the *Posthomerica* thematically.[72] The first sequence, books one to four, involves arrivals and deaths. Penthesileia and Memnon are depicted and their exploits narrated in very similar ways: broadly there is a strong focus on their respective arrivals, the hopes these bring, their exploits, and eventually their death at the hands of Achilles.[73] Both are mourned. Then in a repeat of that sequence, but with a singular focus, book three is dominated by the prowess and exploits of Achilles, and his unwillingness to die even after he has been fatally shot by Apollo. Once dead, he is emphatically mourned, and funeral games for him take up most of the fourth book. Already in book four, with Achilles dead, Ajax fills that large void, and his preeminent prowess is explicitly made clear in book five

---

[70] Cf. James 2004.xxx: "This arrangement also maximises the proportion of the epic in which Neoptolemus is the dominant hero."

[71] Fuller discussion of Neoptolemus' role in the poem can be found in chapter IV (iii).

[72] For other observations on structure, see Schenk 1997.*passim* and esp. 365–368. Schenk well points out the fact that the fall of Troy is referred to in several vital places in the poem as the most important event about to happen (369–371): the poem looks ahead to its *telos*.

[73] On the relationship between the poem's first two books, see Vian 1963.47 and on a broader level Goţia 2007.85–106.

Arrival of Penthesileia, killed by Achilles

Arrival of Memnon, killed by Achilles. Memnon is mourned.

Death of Achilles by Paris / Apollo. Achilles is mourned.

Games in honour of Achilles.

Shield of Achilles. Contest for Achilles' arms. Death of Ajax. Ajax is mourned.

Arrival and successes of Eurypylus. Shield of Eurypylus.

Embassy to Neoptolemus. Shield of Achilles described and given to him. Arrival and success of Neoptolemus.

Combat and death of Eurypylus by Neoptolemus.

Eurypylus is mourned. Embassy to Philoctetes. Ecphrasis of his weapons. Arrival and success of Philoctetes.

Death of Paris by Philoctetes. Paris mourned.

Stalemate before wall. Successes of Aeneas.

Stratagem: wooden horse. Feigned departure of the Greeks.

Sack of Troy.

Stratagem: sacrifice of Polyxena. Actual (fateful) departure of the Greeks.

Diagram 1. Thematic structures of the *Posthomerica*.

(line 130: *Ajax who excelled the other Danaans by far*).[74] The second sequence couples books five and six together, in that both contain a shield description of equal length, and as a result the reader is led to compare and contrast the status and conduct of Eurypylus with Achilles. The fifth book is connected in a chiastic organisation with book four too though. The sequence of Achilles' death, his mourning, and then the games in his honour in which Ajax is so successful is reversed by the contest for the arms of Achilles which Ajax loses, and then Ajax's suicide. We then come to the third, central sequence of the poem. The opening stages of the sequence in book seven echo the events of book six: after the arrival and exploits of Eurypylus we get the arrival and exploits of Neoptolemus, and as a result the two figures are

---

[74] On Ajax and his very favourable depiction, see Vian 1963.132.

clearly meant to be set against each other before their single combat.[75] The embassy to get Neoptolemus is, however, matched by the embassy to fetch Philoctetes, and this and its results balance, in an ABAB sequence, the previous embassy: the results of the embassies are the deaths of two highly valued enemies, Eurypylus and Paris. The poem then turns to its climax, the sack of Troy, and the final four books concentrate on these events. Once again, however, the events are arranged carefully in terms of structure. With the sack of Troy in book 13 as the pivot, the Greeks invent two stratagems to overcome their difficulties: the wooden horse and their feigned departure unlock Troy, while the sacrifice of Polyxena is the stratagem required for their less successful, actual, departure from Troy. In a sense too, the successive departures of the Greeks at the end of the poem balance the successive arrivals of the Trojan allies at the beginning.

The episodic design of the *Posthomerica* does not preclude patterning of these episodes. The diagram exhibits one way of organising the interlaced thematic overlay imposed on the poem, structures which have the tendency to bring together a poem that would otherwise be overly disjointed. The figures of Achilles and Ajax are replaced by Neoptolemus and Philoctetes as fundamental role players driving the narrative forward, and the central combat of the poem between Eurypylus and Neoptolemus brings a focal point before the events leading to the sack of Troy, a focal point which echoes the focal point of the *Iliad*, the combat between Achilles and Hector. The *Posthomerica* cannot be like the *Iliad*: its purpose, at the absolute basic level, is to tell the story of the Trojan War where the *Iliad* leaves off up to the point at which the *Odyssey* begins. There is no one central character to focus on through all those varied and pre-narrated, traditional events. As Vian states, Quintus does very well, within such strictures, to create unifying devices like the early arrival of Neoptolemus into the epic and his subsequent role as a second Achilles.[76] Structural devices are not inbuilt simply to alleviate the potential for boredom in reading an episodic epic: the careful arrangement of sequences, down to the level of scenes within a book to the broader overall structures, brings the reader to connect characters with other characters, to link events with events previous or

---

[75] Cf. Duckworth 1936.81–83 on the centrality of the combat between Eurypylus and Neoptolemus, and 81 on Neoptolemus: "Neoptolemus is Quintus' hero, and his activity serves to unify the epic from the first hints of his coming to the downfall of Troy."

[76] Vian 1963.xxvi.

still to happen, and allows the reader a continual broader view of the narrative. The narrator foreshadows post-Posthomeric events and directs the reader to pre-Posthomeric legends (Homeric and non-Homeric), and within the poem weaves an intricacy which binds the narrative's many elements together.[77]

The *Posthomerica* is long and episodic, very Homeric and non-Homeric, post Alexandrian and Alexandrian, anti-Callimachean but also Callimachean, given to extremes but at times subtle with its vocabulary, and obvious in its intertextuality and demanding of its reader. It is extremely difficult to tie down the *Posthomerica* with definitions and labels, and equally difficult to give the poem an easily definable aesthetic, let alone an aesthetic that can be readily applied to other poems of an approximate era. In the rest of this book, however, it will be assumed that the *Posthomerica* is a demanding text with intricate possibilities for interpretation; the extremes of Late Antiquity will overlap with the tendencies and varieties of earlier poetic schools.

I cannot move on in this study without first dealing with the famously negative reception Quintus has received in modern scholarship, and so I will briefly here summarise and explain this bias. In 1876 one scholar expressed his surprise at such bias, after a careful, unprejudiced reading of the poem: "I must say I was somewhat surprised at the disparaging verdict by which he is almost put out of the category, so to say, of poets deserving any consideration at all."[78] This account by Frederick Paley is not surprising, given that so much apparently imitative literature, including the *Aeneid*, was criticised in Victorian and 20th century scholarship for lack of originality (and hence purity). What is surprising, however, is that the astonishment of Paley should be repeated in the 21st century. To begin a book about a poem by discussing negative views of it, only to rebuff these views by means of one's own innovative scholarship, has become clichéd practice in the re-evaluation of traditionally non-canonical Classical texts.[79] It is perhaps more necessary for the *Posthomerica* than for most other texts: if, for example, one delves into the useful monograph on Quintus and Vergil by Ursula Gärtner (2005), one discovers a similar prejudice to that found by Paley in the 19th century. Gärtner calls Quintus an *armer Dichterling* and compares his poem to

---

[77] On foreshadowing in the *Posthomerica* see Duckworth 1936, and on external pro- and ana-lepses, see Schmitz 1997.

[78] Paley 1876.7.

[79] Cf. the preface in Hershkowitz 1998.vii and most recently (in terms of later Greek hexameter poetry) Carvounis and Hunter 2008.

the undigested contents of a shark's stomach (*Haifischmagen*).[80] Recently, a small revival in Quintean studies has quietly been gaining momentum, reflected chiefly by the proceedings of an international conference which sought to re-assess the poem in the light of modern analytical trends.[81] The poem, however, is still a long way from receiving the kind of rejuvenating attention given to comparable Latin epics that, as a consequence, are now no longer perceived as 'fringe'.[82] Such has been the dominant critical bias against Quintus that in 1999 Ernst Günther Schmidt published an article entitled "Quintus von Smyrna—der schlechteste Dichter des Altertums?"[83] Thorough discussion of the extremely negative bias against the *Posthomerica* is not possible here, but there are two 20th century figures chiefly to blame for the trend.[84] The late Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones, a scholar of profound influence, in a review of a translation of the *Posthomerica* by Combellack in 1969, made the memorable statement: "The anaemic pastiche served up by Quintus is utterly devoid of life."[85] As has been remarked recently, this statement has become the *locus classicus* in introductions to papers on Quintus.[86] Lloyd-Jones's remark stems from a tradition of modern scholarship which was resolutely set against Quintus, with its font, principally, the extremely influential Wilamowitz-Möllendorff at the beginning of last century. In his extensive review of Greek literature, he had the following remarks for Quintus: "*das Öde Nachplappern müsste einschläfern, wenn nicht zuweilen die Albernheiten so stark würden, dass man lachen kann.*"[87] So the *Posthomerica*, as read by these two scholars, is a laughable anaemic pastiche, a boring parroting of Homer. Rudolf Keydell, after Francis Vian perhaps the foremost scholar of the *Posthomerica* in the 20th century, similarly found the *Posthomerica* not up to his required tastes: he remarked in his encyclopaedia entry on the *Posthomerica* that the poem was flat, without feeling and life

---

[80] Gärtner 2005.286, rightly criticised by James 2006, who draws attention to other items of unfair bias in her book. Cf. Maciver 2009.

[81] Baumbach and Bär 2007. The conference in 2006 was followed by the first ever panel on Quintus Smyrnaeus at the UK Classical Association conference in 2008.

[82] On the rejuvenation of Statius see Zeiner 2005.1–11, and on Valerius Flaccus, Hershkowitz 1998.*passim*; Hardie 1993 did much to rehabilitate study of post-Vergilian Latin epic.

[83] Schmidt 1999—the title is of course semi-ironical.

[84] For a brief summary of negative scholarship on the poem, see Baumbach and Bär 2007.23–25.

[85] Lloyd-Jones 1969.101.

[86] Baumbach and Bär 2007.23.

[87] Wilamowitz-Möllendorff 1905.216. Wilamowitz's remarks should be taken in context: as James 2007.157 rightly points out, Wilamowitz similarly criticised Bacchylides and even parts of the *Odyssey*.

("*der Ausdruck ist matt, ohne Fülle und Leben*").[88] Remarks such as these from three legends of scholarship have clearly had a wide-ranging dominance over scholarship of the *Posthomerica*.[89] Apart from the unprejudiced work of Vian, the neglect of this poem has been remarkable.[90] In the twentieth century, there were two particular issues which overshadowed other work on the *Posthomerica*: the principle point was the so-called 'Latin question', that is, whether or not Quintus had read the *Aeneid* (and Latin literature generally), and if so, whether there were allusions in the poem that could prove this once and for all, or areas of the poem which could conclusively count against 'direct influence'.[91] The other issue was whether or not Quintus had access to the Epic Cycle.

I touched on the reasons for the unduly critical reception of the *Posthomerica* in the introduction. As with Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*, however, the scholarship of the last two centuries on the *Posthomerica* marks a contrast with the generally favourable reaction to the poem after its discovery. With Nonnus, the favourable reception of the *Dionysiaca* in the Renaissance was not matched by modern scholars' prejudice against its non-Classical style, dominant until only recently.[92] Constantine Lascaris, the Byzantine scholar who related the discovery of the *Posthomerica* by Bessarion,[93] went further to include his own summary of the nature and style of Quintus' poem. He states that in imitating Homer in every respect, in diction, similes, digressions, and *gnomai*, and in all other aspects, Quintus was most Homeric: ὁμηρικώτατος δὲ γενόμενος ἠθέλησε τὰ τῷ Ὁμήρῳ παραλελειμμένα τῆς Ἰλιάδος Ὁμηρικῶς ποιῆσαι ("being most Homeric [*or*, so extremely Homeric] Quintus wished to construct in a Homeric way the things left over by Homer from the *Iliad*").[94] This idea of being so Home-

---

[88] Keydell 1963.1295.

[89] Synopses of scholarship on the *Posthomerica* can be found in Vian 1959.7–15, Gärtner 2005.30–37, and most recently, Baumbach and Bär 2007.17–23.

[90] The commentary on book 12 by Malcolm Campbell in 1981 is the only full-scale book in the twentieth century to appear after Vian's edition (with the exception of some Spanish and Dutch translations). Campbell's negative appraisal of the poetic qualities of the *Posthomerica*, however, undermines his work.

[91] See, principally, Gärtner 2005.30–37, and esp. 30, for a detailed list of scholars (dating from 1783 onwards) for and against Vergilian influence. See also, most recently, James, 2007.145–157 and Maciver 2011.

[92] Summarised by Shorrock 2001.2–3.

[93] See introduction, note 24.

[94] Text as reprinted in Köchly 1850.cxi–xii. Statius writes something very similar in the proem to his *Achilleid* (1.3–4): "*quamquam acta viri multum inclita cantu / Maeonio* (*sed plura vacant*)".

ric is the very reason modern scholarship has posited for the poor quality of the *Posthomerica*—in its apparent lack of originality lies its greatest flaw. But for Lascaris this epithet he attaches to Quintus is "a term of praise".[95] He states that Quintus was the best poet (ποιητὴς ἄριστος ἐγένετο) and greatest imitator of Homer in every respect (ζηλωτὴς τοῦ Ὁμήρου πάντα).[96]

iii. (M)use-less Singing: Quintus' Art?

To read epic after Homer is to read the past. Homer is inscribed in every word and device, and every innovation is read as such only because of the strong shadow of the literary archetype.[97] A proem of an epic evinces and eschews Homer, evokes and revokes.[98] The opening words set out in what ways a new, essentially literary epic stands out against the primary epic benchmark. In this sense, proems are Homeric because they are proems, and not Homeric because they show in what ways the poems they introduce will differ from Homer. From Homer we learn to read the poem in the proem, to search for an essence of the meaning, a bold signpost to follow, a *mēnis* or *andra* to pursue.[99] All extant epic poems from Homer to Nonnus begin with a proem, with the exception of the *Posthomerica*,[100] which begins as follows (1.1–4):

> Εὖθ' ὑπὸ Πηλείωνι δάμη θεοείκελος Ἕκτωρ
> καί ἑ πυρὴ κατέδαψε καὶ ὀστέα γαῖα κεκεύθει,
> δὴ τότε Τρῶες ἔμιμνον ἀνὰ Πριάμοιο πόληα
> δειδιότες μένος ἠὺ θρασύφρονος Αἰακίδαο.

> After godlike Hector had been slain by the son of Peleus, and the pyre had consumed him and the earth covered his bones, then the Trojans stayed penned up in the city of Priam in fear of the noble might of the un-shirking grandson of Aeacus.

---

[95] Carvounis 2005.16.

[96] Such is the careful construction of this Homeric style that the 19th century German scholar Herrmann echoed Lascaris by stating that Quintus' poem was the best Greek epic poem *nach Homer* (Hermann 1840.257, as discussed in Baumbach and Bär 2007.24).

[97] Cf. Bloom 2001.1800; cf. Hardie 1993.1–3 and *passim* on the *Aeneid* and its *Nachleben*.

[98] Cf. Goldhill 1991.287, Hainsworth 1991.vii, Hunter 1993.120, Clare 2002.9–23, and Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004.89–94.

[99] Cf. Goldhill 1991.2.

[100] The *Aethiopis* is another exception, especially significant in the light of the *Posthomerica*'s opening subject matter, as I discuss below in this section.

This is not a traditional opening to an epic poem.[101] There is no impera-
tive, no address to a goddess or Muse. From Homer onwards a poet received,
and ascribed in verse, inspiration from the Muses (or another god). All the
responsibility for what the poet sang lay with them.[102] For a literary epic,
this is a bold innovation. A proem sets out in what ways a new, essentially
literary epic stands out against the primary epic benchmark—the *Iliad*.
As a result of this lack in the *Posthomerica*'s opening, there is no imme-
diate indication of the aims of the poem. Imperial Greek proems range
from the openly panegyrical and political (as in the *Halieutica* and *Cyneget-
ica*) to the poetically subversive: Nonnus explicitly incorporates Homer and
acknowledges his debt in two places in particular.[103] At the beginning of the
Dionysiaca the narrator asks the Muse (goddess) to tell him of Dionysus (εἰ-
πέ, Θεά), an opening which is clearly phrased to incorporate both the *Iliad*
and *Odyssey* proems with echoes of ἔννεπε in εἰπέ and of course the Θεά in
the *Iliad*. In the second proem at the beginning of the second half of the
poem (25.1–270), the narrator speaks of Homer as father (ἔγχος ἔχοντα καὶ
ἀσπίδα πατρὸς Ὁμήρου 25.265).[104] Not only does this imply a special rela-
tionship, it also makes Nonnus out to be the natural heir of Homer. He has
the spear and shield of Homer, artefacts which metaphorically relate to the
upcoming battle descriptions, but which also are the heirlooms inherited
by the heir. Perhaps even more significant is the explicit, effusive praise for
Homer. The narrator speaks of the brilliance and immortality of Homer,
the herald of Achaea (25.253) and reverentially speaks of Homer's book
(254). This praise, however, is tempered by the claim that Homer wasted his
energies on a theme lesser to the one that the *Dionysiaca* contains (25.255–
260). Thus the poetic 'son' and heir of the immortal Homer gets to sing
the theme which was even worthier of Homer. The *persona* fictionalised by
the narrator of the *Dionysiaca* is Homer's progeny and his theme is a bet-
ter one than the immortalised book. The son respects the father but rebels
too.[105]

---

[101] Further exegesis of the opening lines of the *Posthomerica* can be found in brief com-
ments by Schenk 1997.377 and the more thorough discussion by Bär 2007.32–40.

[102] Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004.1.

[103] Full discussion at Hopkinson 1994c.9–14, with analysis of the meta-poetic and intertex-
tual implications *vis-a-vis* the Homeric poems.

[104] Further cogent discussion in Hopkinson 1994a.122, who also discusses the idea of the
48 books of the *Dionysiaca* as a rivalrous combination of the two 24 book Homeric poems.

[105] Cf. D'Ippolito 1964.40, Hopkinson 1994c.12–13, and Shorrock 2001.119: "It is the story of
Nonnus' ongoing relationship with Homer, his own anxious endeavour to break free from
the powerful influence of his father."

Triphiodorus, whose work is miniature in comparison to that of Quintus and Nonnus, still manages to insert a delicately intricate proem to match the mastery of his *epyllion*.[106] Beyond obvious Homeric reference, his text may even be attempting to distance itself from its predecessor the *Posthomerica* by having the narrator ask the Muse to tell the tale with quick song (ταχείη λῦσον ἀοιδῇ, *Iliou Halosis* 5) with regard to a war which is given the epithet of long-wearying (line 1: πολυκμήτοιο). Like Nonnus, he attempts to combine reference to the proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in his own proem, with line 5 echoing the 'speak Muse' of the *Odyssey* and the famous quarrel of *Iliad* 1: ἔννεπε, Καλλιόπεια, καὶ ἀρχαίην ἔριν ἀνδρῶν. A proem is thus part of the epic machinery that constructs an epic's identity. The *Posthomerica*, the most 'Homeric' of poems after Homer,[107] and certainly epic, unlike its forebears does not begin with a proem, but also does not begin this way *because* of Homer. Conditioned to look to the opening lines for a proem and for an interpretative key, it is to the opening lines of the *Posthomerica* that the reader looks anyway for an index to the poem's aims and meanings.[108]

The fact that there is no proem can also, in itself, convey information in a similar way to the presence of one. There is no proem because the *Posthomerica* can be read as 'still' the *Iliad*. There are various bases for this reading. Most importantly, there is an absence of autobiographical material in the poem that can be taken as actually autobiographical: the programmatic in-proem in book 12 implies no details that could not be ascribed to Homer himself. Similarly, the Homeric language and style of the poem make the conceit of the *Posthomerica*, that it is still the *Iliad*, more likely—the continuum becomes possible. But the opening lines furnish further support for this claim. A temporal conjunction (line 1) and its correlative, a temporal demonstrative adverb (line 3), link the *Iliad* to the subject matter of the *Posthomerica*. The fact that the poem begins with a conjunction, εὖτε (line 1), is extremely unusual.[109] The 'when' it refers to is the death of Hector (as lines 1–2 illustrate). The conjunction in this form is used only twice in the

---

[106] In this respect I disagree with the unfair criticism by Whitby 1994.118, who writes that "Triphiodorus has perhaps attracted more attention than the quality and scale of his poem deserve".

[107] Contrast Hopkinson 1994b.9 on Nonnus, who calls the *Dionysiaca* the "most unHomericlike of epics".

[108] Cf. Clare 2002.9: "The classical epic tradition as established and exemplified by the Homeric poems and the epic cycle demands that the parameters of epic be declared in advance."

[109] "Temporale Konjunktion '(sobald) als'" (Frisk 1960.595). See also Boisacq 1950.299, and Cunliffe 1924.184.

Iliad: at 1.242, in an indefinite temporal clause within a speech of Achilles, and at 5.396, a temporal clause within a speech of Dione. In both Iliadic instances, εὖτε qualifies a pre-positioned main clause which emphasises the result of the action introduced postpositively by εὖτε. In the *Posthomerica* this practice is followed: of the majority of the 62 usages of the conjunction, εὖτε is in the second half of the overall temporal construction (that is, after the main clause which is itself introduced usually by a temporal demonstrative adverb). Here, however, at the beginning of the poem, this practice is not followed.[110]

The poem's opening is therefore designed not to signal an opening, but rather a linking with the *Iliad*.[111] As the statistics reveal, εὖτε rarely takes first place when a temporal construction involving temporal correlatives occurs in the *Posthomerica*. Nine of the temporal occurrences of the conjunction occur within similes. The use of the word as the first word in a long narrative poem, when it is usually read as a linking word mid-narrative, suggests that it does not begin a new poem, but rather links two narratives—the narratives of the *Posthomerica* and the *Iliad*. The word is strategically chosen to signal linkage in the reader's eyes. The reader is deprived of an explicit proem in the *Posthomerica*, and instead is encouraged to look back to the *Iliad*, both because of the subject matter of the first two lines, and because of the first word. Through the use of a traditional proem, a poet "imposes a precise delimitation upon the 'contents' of the poem. By indicating its essential themes (this or that story—or part of a story) he outlines the limits of a discourse which was undefined as long as it was merely virtual."[112] There are no such precise limits given in the opening of the *Posthomerica*, but still the reader, through habit of reading epic, analyses the opening lines for such delimitation—for such an indication of the poem's aims. The *Posthomerica*'s position in relation to the story of the *Iliad* is then hinted at

---

[110] Of the 62 occurrences of εὖτε, the temporal uses are: *Posthomerica* 1.1, 1.40 (within a simile), 1.54, 1.205, 1.664 (within a simile), 2.202, 2.223, 3.236 (within a simile), 3.386 (occurs in same order as 1.1), 4.175 (expansive), 4.554 (within a simile), 5.367 (within a simile), 5.387 (within a simile), 5.611, 6.128, 6.295, 8.264, 9.75 (occurs in same order as 1.1), 9.297, 9.335, 10.153 (occurs in same order as 1.1), 10.242, 10.469, 10.479, 11.148, 13.21 (occurs in same order as 1.1), 13.153 (within a simile), 13.418, 14.48 (within a simile), 14.89 (within a simile), and 14.569.

[111] Schenk 1997.377 is correct to identify the opening lines of the poem as a direct "Anschluss" to the end of *Iliad* 24. Keydell 1965.1273 anticipates this view: "Qu[intus] wollte ein Epos schreiben, das die Lücke zwischen Ilias und Odyssee ausfüllte; das wird dadurch deutlich, dass er auf ein Prooemium verzichtet hat." See also Ph.I. Kakridis 1962.11 and Bär 2007.32–33.

[112] Conte 1992.147.

by the correlative τότε (line 3) and the subject matter of lines 3 and 4. The story of the *Posthomerica* is the events that, chronologically, immediately follow the death and burial of Hector: the Trojans remain (past continuous) in the city of Troy, now without Hector, in fear of the might of Achilles (lines 3–4): δὴ τότε Τρῶες ἔμιμνον ἀνὰ Πριάμοιο πόληα / δειδιότες μένος ἠὺ θρασύφρονος Αἰακίδαο.

Two names are mentioned in the first line, Achilles (Πηλείωνι) and Hector (θεοείκελος Ἕκτωρ). On a thematic level, then, the later stages of the *Iliad* are signposted within the first line. The position of Hector's name in the line, θεοείκελος Ἕκτωρ, preceded immediately by epithet, balances intertextually with the name of Achilles and his patronymic epithet as the two last words in *Iliad* 1.1, Πηληιάδεω Ἀχιλῆος.[113] The epithet used of Hector here—θεοείκελος—is used only of Achilles in the *Iliad*.[114] The placement and description of Hector who has been slain (as the last two words in the first line) is thus an indication of correlative positioning by the poet with his epic archetype. Quintus uses an adjective reserved for Achilles in the *Iliad*, and in the first line of the *Posthomerica*, gives it to Achilles' greatest opponent. Similarly, the mention of Achilles in patronymic (Πηλείωνι) echoes the patronymic used for him in the first line of the *Iliad*. But the situation and place on the mythological timescale is not the *Iliad*'s plot: that is signalled as past, and thus the *Posthomerica* begins with the past—a literary and mythological past that was the key action and climax of the *Iliad*. The passive aorist δάμη (line 1) denotes this—the action between Achilles and Hector is not the subject of *this* poem. The verb δάμη also indicates that Hector's death has realised the fulfilment of the μῆνις of Achilles: the first line of the *Iliad*'s proem, and all the action that results from this μῆνις in the *Iliad*, is summarised as completed in the first line of this poem.[115]

With δάμη, there is also an association with the *last* line of the *Iliad*, in its echo of ἱπποδάμοιο (*Iliad* 24.804),[116] and the occurrence of Hector in both places. The intertext directs the reader's memory again to the end of the *Iliad* and the completion of its story. Thus the first line of the *Posthomerica*

---

[113] Cf. Bär 2007.37.

[114] *Iliad* 1.131 (address to Achilles by Agamemnon) and 19.155 (same words, this time address of Odysseus to Achilles). In the *Posthomerica*, the adjective is used again only at 12.324, of the Greeks who entered the wooden horse.

[115] For further remarks on the nature of Achilles' 'wrath' spoken as the first word in the poem, see, above all, Muellner 1996.

[116] The epithet is used in the singular, of Trojans, predominantly of Hector, in the *Iliad*: 7.38, 16.717, 22.161, 22.211, and 22.804.

encompasses the whole *Iliad*, echoing as it does its first and last line. In another sense, the echo of ἱπποδάμοιο at the end of the *Iliad* ensures that Quintus does not follow the example of the *Aethiopis* that gave a textual variant for the end of *Iliad* 24.804 instead of ἱπποδάμοιο, and then began *in medias res* with the story of Penthesileia.[117] Instead of immediately starting with the arrival of Penthesileia (which in fact comes at 1.18), Quintus, through (intertextual) analepsis, recapitulates the end of the *Iliad*, and allows a careful poetological bridging between the events of both poems. The narrator also gives an actual analepsis of the end of the *Iliad*, at *Posthomerica* 1.9–17, where, by means of the reported memories of those within Troy's walls, he quickly recounts the immediate mythological context of the poem. A similar technique is employed in *Posthomerica* 4. Nestor opens the Funeral Games in honour of Achilles at 4.129–143 and 146–170 (his words are reported indirectly in the primary narration), by singing of Achilles' heroic deeds up until the point of his death (146–170). Nestor dwells, in particular, on those events which occurred before the action of the *Iliad*.[118]

The patronymic used for Achilles is also significant for a sense of completion of the story of the *Iliad*. Πηλείωνι δάμη echoes Πηλείωνι δαμείς at *Iliad* 22.40.[119] There in *Iliad* 22, Priam, who has just seen Achilles coming like a star across the plain, pleads with Hector not to remain outside the walls of Troy because of the inevitable death he will receive at the hands of Achilles. The echo here in *Posthomerica* 1.1 reminds the reader that Priam's fears were realised within the action of the *Iliad*. Quintus therefore points back to the pathos of Priam's entreaty to his son. The reader might even go so far as to see the tenor of the *Iliad*'s action and Homer's narrative and poetic technique as encoded within the *Posthomerica*'s first line, simply because of the link to that famous, pathetic scene in *Iliad* 22.

---

[117] See *Aethiopis Fr.* 1 which survives quoted by *Scholion* T, on *Il.* 24.804 (cf. M.L. West 2003.114–115): ἦλθε δ' Ἀμαζών takes the place of ἱπποδάμοιο in *Iliad* 24.208 and then the *Aethiopis* continues with its succeeding line: Ἄρηος θυγάτηρ μεγαλήτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο (see Severyns 1928.314). See also the *apparatus criticus* in M.L. West 2000.369.

[118] Cf. Vian 1963.133 and 130.

[119] The occurrences of this patronymic in the *Iliad* are: (accusative) 1.197, 2.674 = 17.280, 2.770, 8.474, 9.181, 9.694, 10.323, 13.113, 16.281, 18.261, 18.267, 20.27, 20.45, 20.366, 21.327, 21.599, 22.7, 22.193, 22.214, 22.278, 23.35, and 23.793; (genitive) 10.392, 16.195, 17.208, 18.226, 19.75, 20.80, 20.88 = 20.333, 20.113, 20.118, and 24.465; (dative) 1.188, 17.214, 18.166, 20.294, 21.306, 22.40, 23.249, and 24.458. In the *Posthomerica*, it occurs 24 times: 1.1, 1.101, 1.569, 1.775, 2.234, 2.403, 2.493, 3.193, 3.281, 3.410, 3.350, 3.459, 3.505, 3.513, 3.532, 3.549, 3.574, 3.606, 3.787, 4.299, 5.111, 7.631, 9.7, and 9.183.

Therefore, from the very start of the epic, the reader is made very aware of the inextricable conjunction of the *Posthomerica* with the *Iliad*.[120] This fact, together with the overwhelmingly Homeric nature of the poem's language and style, adds to the perceptive reader's impression that the aim of the poem is to be 'still the *Iliad*'. This illusion—the reader knows this poem is not the *Iliad*, and that this poet is not Homer, but a much later writer of a different cultural and literary background—influences reading of the whole of the *Posthomerica*.[121] A studied attempt on the part of the poet to make the poem as 'Homeric' as possible makes any differences in the epic technique in relation to the Homeric epics all the more noticeable and worthy of discussion.

What, then, of the potential autobiographical in-proem of book 12? This section of the poem still remains controversial: at an international conference on Quintus in 2006, delegates will remember this passage as the one which provoked more dissent and argument than any other.[122] To date theories as to the meaning of this important passage have become more sensible but even yet there is no consensus of interpretation nor have all angles for analysis been explored. The most recent treatment by Silvio Bär (2007) has emphasised the common sense approach of taking much of the passage as meta-poetical in significance, and the following brief discussion relies on some of his observations and conclusions.[123] The narrator, before listing the heroes who entered the wooden horse in preparation for the grand plan to sack Troy, digresses (*Posthomerica* 12.306–313):

> τούς μοι νῦν καθ' ἕκαστον ἀνειρομένῳ σάφα, Μοῦσαι,
> ἔσπεθ' ὅσοι κατέβησαν ἔσω πολυχανδέος ἵππου·
> ὑμεῖς γὰρ πᾶσάν μοι ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θήκατ' ἀοιδήν,
> πρίν μοι ⟨ἔτ'⟩ ἀμφὶ παρειὰ κατασκίδνασθαι ἴουλον,

---

[120] The *Argonautica*, in its opening verse, highlights its relation to the *Iliad* in the last two words of the line: κλέα φωτῶν (line 1) is a Homeric intertext, echoing *Iliad* 9.189 and *Odyssey* 8.73 (so Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004.90–91).

[121] Cf. Vian 1966.7 on the shield of Achilles in *Posthomerica* 5: "Dans ce long exercice de description, Quintus a voulu compléter Homère: … sur d'autres points où il se sépare de son modèle, il semble moins avoir fait oeuvre personelle que suivre une 'interprétation' du Bouclier homérique qui avait cours en son temps."

[122] The international conference hosted by Zurich University (see the proceedings by Baumbach and Bär 2007).

[123] Bär deals in detail with the conflicting arguments, and discusses the possible significances of each line. He is careful at times not to position himself on either side of scholarly divides, however.

310 Σμύρνης ἐν δαπέδοισι περικλυτὰ μῆλα νέμοντι
    τρὶς τόσον Ἕρμου ἄπωθεν ὅσον βοόωντος ἀκοῦσαι,
    Ἀρτέμιδος περὶ νηὸν Ἐλευθερίῳ ἐνὶ κήπῳ,
    οὔρεϊ οὔτε λίην χθαμαλῷ οὔθ’ ὑψόθι πολλῷ.

Tell me clearly now, Muses, in answer to me, the names of those men, each one, as many as went inside the cavernous horse. For you inspired me with all my song, before the soft down was spread over my cheeks, as I was shepherding my excellent flocks in the plains of Smyrna, three times as far from Hermos as you can hear a man shouting, about the temple of Artemis in the garden of Freedom, on a mountain neither too low nor too high.

For the first and only time in the poem the primary narrator addresses the Muses. He wants clear and precise knowledge as to who each person who entered the horse was. It is interesting that all extant lists of the heroes who went into the horse differ in the literary traditions, and thus the plea for accuracy is rivalrous: his account is to be trusted before the others as he pleads for the Muses’ help (the narrator emphasises *now* at line 306)—his catalogue of heroes is inspired. The request for inspiration is then elaborated by a *gar* clause—you, Muses, should give me this inspiration because all of my song is down to you in the end—you were there from the beginning, you gave me my power of song (ὑμεῖς γὰρ πᾶσάν μοι ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θήκατ’ ἀοιδήν).[124] The reader is then treated to an account of when and where this first inspiration took place.

The key influence is the Muse invocation in Hesiod’s *Theogony* 22–28, in which the narrator speaks of the Muses who taught Hesiod his beautiful song as he tended his sheep on sacred Helicon. The similarities are very clear. Furthermore, the address to the Muses by the Iliadic narrator before the catalogue of ships in *Iliad* 2.484–492 is also present as an intertext, especially appropriate given that this invocation comes before the catalogue of heroes.[125] An address to the Muses is an assumption in itself of a poet figure’s worth as one to receive this inspiration. Quintus weaves Hesiodic and Homeric invocations within the fabric of this in-proem, and thus increases the poetic credibility of Quintus’ creation. This is a new epic poem, but one in the tradition of Homer and Hesiod, inspired by the same Muses who inspired those archaic poems. But there is a further intertextual reference, which affects this relationship between the *Posthomerica* and those archaic

---

[124] I follow Campbell 1981.103 in taking ἀοιδή to signify the ability to compose poetry rather than specifically to signify only the *Posthomerica*.

[125] The parallels between the passages are listed and discussed in detail by Bär 2007.41–47.

poems. While the in-proem evokes Muse-invocations in both Homer and Hesiod, it is the highlighted allusion to Callimachus here which is vital for an understanding of how intertextuality in the *Posthomerica* functions.

1 ποιμένι μῆλα νέμοντι παρ' ἴχνιον ὀξέος ἵππου
   Ἡσιόδῳ Μουσέων ἑσμὸς ὅτ' ἠντίασεν (...)

   When the band of Muses met the shepherd Hesiod tending his sheep by the footprint of the fiery horse ...   (*Aetia* 1 *fr.* 2)

This passage comes from the famous dream of Callimachus in the *Aetia*. The real meaning of the dream has been subject to much debate.[126] For our purposes, it is important to emphasise the presence of Callimachus within the primarily Hesiodic and Homeric framework of the passage: ποιμένι μῆλα νέμοντι is clearly echoed by περικλυτὰ μῆλα νέμοντι at 12.310. Quintus points to the allusion to Callimachus, given that it is a near quotation, and thus the presence of Callimachus takes on an added significance. In poetological terms, the poet highlights that the archaic epic of Homer and Hesiod is read, or refracted, through the lens of Hellenistic poetry.[127] This passage, through these allusions, becomes programmatic for how to read the intertextuality of the poem as a whole: it is a map of the literary position of the *Posthomerica*. The poem derives mostly from archaic epic, but by its lateness is post-Alexandrian and therefore the reader should at least be aware of the possibility of Alexandrian allusive practice and learnedness beyond and through the generic Homeric epic intertextuality. We should expect subtlety and refinement after the traits of Callimachus. The *Posthomerica* is not Alexandrian, but a later text which derives some of its style and texture from the display of learning in Alexandrian texts. The in-proem symbolises the intertextual engagement of the reader with the *Posthomerica*.

This passage contains complications, however, beyond its intertextuality. For example, the last line (313—that the narrator was inspired while tending his sheep on a mountain neither too low nor too high) has been interpreted as a programmatic reference to the style of the *Posthomerica*, namely that it is of neither high nor low style, but appropriates a middle way.[128] This interpretation by Hopkinson has been countered recently by James who claims that heroic poetry that seeks to be edifying morally naturally belongs

---

[126] See Cameron 1995.366–373 for full references.

[127] Cf. Bär 2007.50.

[128] Hopkinson 1994a.106, who further states (106–107) that Quintus produces "modest innovation within traditional parameters".

to the high style of poetry.[129] It is very difficult to explain away the persuasive interpretation of Hopkinson: the multiple intertexts in the passage and its programmatic nature by rights of it being an in-proem give strength to the assumption that there is something beyond the literal in the line. What it is important to emphasise is that Quintus cannot be undercutting the intrinsic value of his own poetry, which is something Hopkinson implies. The very fact that Quintus inserts Homer, Hesiod, and Callimachus into the passage would immediately undercut this remark. Quintus is simply being (poetically) modest. This reference is a sort of *recusatio*, that the poet figure was found by the Muses and inspired while he was but a youth and not aiming for the heights of poetic grandeur but not without aims at the same time. The reference is specifically to be pinned upon the poet figure, and by transference Quintus, at the outset of his writing, not at the completion of his epic. The humble shepherd with modest aims is lifted by the Muses to higher things. The conceit is that 'Quintus' is no longer the 'shepherd': the use of 'before' in line 309 emphasises this.

But Quintus was never a shepherd according to this passage, and nor are we to assume that he ever was: any attempts to read the biographical in these lines makes a mockery of the sophistication, learning, and allusiveness of the piece.[130] The sheep are there because the sheep are in Hesiod and in Callimachus. Nor is at all likely that he was from Smyrna, given that this was one of the reputed birthplaces of Homer: the reference adds to the already inherent idea that we are to read Quintus as a second Homer. In fact, there is nothing in this passage which points away from Homer. Part of the conceit, in keeping with the nature of the rest of the poem, is that every piece of information in the poem could readily fit with the poet figure Homer himself. It is only the learned reader, a reader demanded by the literariness of the text, who can see beyond this initial biographical detail to the stylised aims of the text.

In a similar connection, the adjective used of the sheep in the Posthomeric passage, περικλυτά at 12.310, is of extreme importance for interpretation of the position of Quintus in relation to the other poets he inscribes into this passage. The sheep are of excellent quality, or alternatively, renowned. The adjective has a double significance. Like κλυτός,[131] it can have a meaning

---

[129] James 2004.xviii, with further discussion in Bär 2007.59–60.
[130] See Bär 2007.52–55 for discussion and scholarship to date.
[131] Cf. *Posthomerica* 6.324 for a similar programmatic use of the adjective. Full discussion can be found in Maciver 2012.

'excellent', of quality.[132] On the other hand, it has a meaning, like κλυτός, of 'famous, renowned', only on a more intensive level: 'exceedingly heard of'. The poet figure's 'sheep' are extremely well-known because he has inherited them.[133] He receives his poetry (*or* his sheep) from Callimachus who received them himself from Homer and Hesiod. They are extremely well known and Quintus points to why this is the case—he is writing within a tradition. This is an epic poem like Homer's, like the poetry of Hesiod and Callimachus, and the narrator pays homage to these figures: the excellent sheep are extremely excellent because Quintus writes in the tradition of Homer (and Hesiod).[134]

The adjective has further significance. It can also be interpreted to reflect an agonistic dialogue between the poetry of Quintus and his predecessors. On the one hand Quintus' poetry is caught within a literary tradition—he is bound within constructs and measures established before him, which he receives and reflects, and in this passage, points to. Quintus, through his narrator, acknowledges this debt. But the περι- of the adjective not only intensifies its meaning but points to superiority, in comparison. The 'shepherd' of the passage has sheep which are of superior quality to other sheep. By transference, Quintus' poetry is of eminently superior quality to other poetry, and by implication, even the poetry of the three he imbeds in the passage: Homer, Hesiod, and Callimachus.[135] That is quite a claim to place within what is ostensibly a salute to the poetic merits of predecessors, and certainly undercuts the implied criticism made by Hopkinson of the limitations of the *Posthomerica*'s style.

These 'sheep' are therefore unanxious sheep in terms of literary tradition. If, following the influential claims of Harold Bloom, every poet is caught in a conflict of anxiety of influence against overwhelming predecessors, then Quintus takes up this fight by claiming superiority.[136] The Homeric nature of the *Posthomerica* makes it difficult to identify where Quintus posits himself as differing from the Homeric poems in style and poetic aims. This poetologically-charged passage, however, brings the key authors together who are necessarily part of the texture of the *Posthomerica*. As mentioned,

---

[132] So LSJ *s.v.* περικλυτός 2.

[133] It has been noted that the adjective is used in the *Odyssey* frequently as an epithet of a bard: cf. *Od.* 1.325, 8.83, 8.367, and 8.521: so Bär 2007.51 and 51n77.

[134] The importance of Hesiod for the *Posthomerica* becomes clear in chapter II.

[135] Cf. Bär 2007.51, who similarly writes of the *imitatio / aemulatio* implied by the adjective.

[136] Cf. Schmitz 2007.65.

on a superficial level this is merely another Homeric passage. As a continuation of the *Iliad* by a poet who disguises himself as 'still Homer', this is how, initially, we are meant to read the passage. Quintus is careful to disguise the late identity of the poet figure and the *Posthomerica*, and essentially it is Homer, or at least a *second*-Homer whose initiation is referred to. Quintus writes of his understanding of Homer's poetic inspiration, and then lays claim to it.

Intertextuality exposes this disguise. Hesiod has infiltrated the passage, and Callimachus is inserted in too. This one adjective of sheep, within a carefully constructed allusion to Callimachus, creates a tension between the represented authors, and vivifies the actual identity of the *Posthomerica* as a *new* poetic creation, thus shattering the conceit propounded throughout the poem, and set up in its opening lines. Anxiety of influence is usually displayed, in poems after Homer, in the openings of the poems. Proems set out how they are indebted to, yet surpass, their epic predecessors. In the only clearly programmatic section of the poem, rather than lay open the later date of the poem and draw attention to the uniqueness of the *Posthomerica*, Quintus leaves the identities and rivalrous poetic conceits within allusions which point to debt and difference. Far from such 'sheep' being openly anxious, they are not of Quintus, since he receives them from others, but with them, as eminently superior, he, conversely, surpasses the poetic efforts of his epic predecessors, and points to the demanding and rewarding high literary form of his work.

ECPHRASIS AND THE EMBLEMS OF THE PAST

i. *Reading Directions in Ecphrasis*

Construction of an epic poem requires incorporation of traditional epic apparatus, for that text to be identified as 'epic'. Inclusion of an ecphrasis—for my purposes in this chapter, a verbal description of a visual work of art—forms part of this epic apparatus.[1] The fact that Quintus includes ecphrasis in his epic also brings, because of his date, a number of assumptions about ecphrasis and its function which had been developed by every creator of ecphrasis, especially in this narrow 'words for art' sense, after Homer. In this category Apollonius' description of Jason's cloak at *Argonautica* 1.721–781 is relevant, since, unlike Achilles' shield in the *Iliad*, this artefact is finished, and such a status brings with it a closer attention to the detail of the smallest (finished) objects; in the same connection, Apollonius ensures that his ecphrasis has a greater degree of realism in description.[2] Similarly, Apollonius' ecphrasis has a more easily discernible "programmatisch-poetische Funktion" than the Iliadic shield of Achilles.[3] These two features in particular, the finished object described, and the emblematic nature of that object's description for the poetic and thematic nature of the surrounding narrative, both figure large in my discussion of Quintus' shield, and in that sense Quintus' ecphrasis too has a neo-epic nature of description.[4]

In this chapter, I make use of the technical terms set down by Andrew Becker.[5] He states in relation to the Iliadic shield of Achilles that the *referent* is the world imagined or proposed, the *medium* is the worked metal,

---

[1] Cf. A.S. Becker 1990.139n1. For recent discussions of ecphrasis in Classical literature, see especially the special issue of *Classical Philology* for 2007 (volume 1). The discussion of the mountain of *Arete* in this chapter is a more fully developed version of what is found, with variations, in Maciver 2007.

[2] Cf. Manakidou 1993.121–142 and especially 125.

[3] The description of Manakidou 1993.142.

[4] That is not to say that the original Homeric shield of Achilles was not interpreted in similar ways; in fact, the statement (by Bartsch and Elsner 2007.ii) holds true that "the one thing we can say for certain about ekphrasis is that in its ever-shifting relationships to the texts in which it is embedded it is not still".

[5] A.S. Becker 1990.139–153, and for the definitions, 1990.140.

the *creation* is the making of the work, the *source* is Hephaestus, and the *interpreter* is the bard.[6] He also describes two processes in reading ecphrasis: "'Appropriation' means bringing the text, or image, into one's own world and ways of understanding, while 'divestiture' describes the opposite process."[7] In the *Posthomerica*, there are three ecphraseis, two of which are large-scale shield descriptions. The first of these, a description of the scenes depicted on the shield of Achilles, is both the most complex to read in its inheritance, and also the most important in function.[8] In this chapter, I deal with the complexities involved in reading this shield against its model, the shield of Achilles in *Iliad* 18, and interpret the innovation on the shield in the context of the poem's 'Homeric' aims.

The description of a shield that was also described in the *Iliad* provides the reader with an epic set-piece description unparalleled in the *Posthomerica*: the shield, more than any other part of the *Posthomerica*, represents in focus the poem's intertextual dialogue with the Homeric poems. Similes and gnomai, or in fact, any other poetic device available to the poet, do not allow the reader the same foundation for assessing the poem's engagement with the *Iliad*, since the shield of Achilles in *Posthomerica* 5 is the same shield as that given to Achilles in *Iliad* 19, and made by Hephaestus in *Iliad* 18.[9] The shield is the same artefact, with the same mythological inheritance—the *actual* shield made by Hephaestus as described in *Iliad* 18. This poetic fiction (the 'physicality' of the shield, and the shield's famous description in *Iliad* 18) restricts the poet's freedom. Unlike the reading of the rest of the poem, where identification of allusions is down to the reader's breadth and ability of reading, this shield has one principal source—the Iliadic shield of Achilles, which is not only identifiable, but identified and engrained in the Posthomeric shield of Achilles, in its very name and nature. The poet has to create within a framework already created, and read and known by the reader, and has to deal with the fact that every innovation on the Posthomeric shield will be read and interpreted with an urge for identification and interpretation of the Iliadic shield within this new ecphrastic description.

---

[6] 1990.140.

[7] A.S. Becker 1990.141.

[8] The other two ecphraseis are a description of the shield of Eurypylus (*Posthomerica* 6.200–291), and a description of the baldric and quiver of Philoctetes (*Posthomerica* 10.179–205), both of which have strong associations with the labours of Heracles.

[9] Strictly speaking of course, the shield of Achilles does not ever physically exist. It is an idea, a poetic creation, and an illusion at the level of reading.

At first reading, the shield of Achilles in *Posthomerica* 5 broadly follows the Homeric model.[10] However, a closer perusal of the scenes shows them to be, in certain cases, markedly original, bearing no similarity to scenes described on the Iliadic shield. An overview of the scenes on the Posthomeric shield illustrates some of these differences.[11] The shield is described over 95 lines (*Posthomerica* 5.6–101), with 12 scenes in total, whereas the Iliadic shield has ten scenes described over 130 lines (*Iliad* 18.478–608). The Posthomeric shield description follows the Iliadic model by opening with a cosmological scene (5.6–16),[12] but then, for the rest of the scenes on the shield, it becomes more difficult to align the description with the Iliadic model. Lines 17–42, which Köchly describes as war scenes,[13] contain a description of beasts and hunting (17–24), a description of war and personifications of war (25–37), and finally a short scene containing a description of the apotropaic Gorgons (38–42). Structurally, these scenes seem to be based on the City at War (*Iliad* 18.509–540), but are markedly different in their subject matter and tenor.

To these opening scenes, eight are added that depict peaceful scenes of labour.[14] The division of these scenes of peace from the earlier scenes of war is clearly demarcated by lines 43–44:

> καὶ τὰ μὲν ἂρ πολέμοιο τεράατα πάντα τέτυκτο·
> εἰρήνης δ' ἀπάνευθεν ἔσαν περικαλλέα ἔργα.

> Such then were the wondrous works of war that were depicted; and apart from them there were very beautiful works of peace.

This division, so explicitly expressed, encourages a reading of the shield in two sections—that depicting scenes of war and those that describe peaceful activities or ideas. This separation echoes the division in the Iliadic shield (*Iliad* 18.490) between the City at Peace (*Iliad* 18.490–508) and City at War (*Iliad* 18.509–540). Again, however, the scenes of peace on the Posthomeric shield are mostly original. They begin at line 45 with a depiction of

---

[10] Cf. James and Lee 2000.33. Köchly (1850.258) aptly sums up the nature of this indebtedness: "*Poterat enim singulas res fidissime secundum Homerum sed aliis verbis enarrare.*"

[11] See James and Lee 2000.33–34 for some discussion of the differences between the Posthomeric and Iliadic scenes; Köchly 1850.258–261 still gives the best discussion of the relationship between the shields' scenes, and possible parallels. There are many discussions of the scenes on the Iliadic shield: a good starting-point is Edwards 1987.278–286.

[12] See *Iliad* 18.483–489 for the depiction of the cosmos that opens the shield of Achilles. Köchly 1850.258 only writes of *this* scene that Quintus closely follows Homer ("*Homero duce*").

[13] Köchly 1850.258, whose division of the shield into scenes I follow here.

[14] Köchly 1850.259: "*quatuor illis imaginibus octo subiungit pacificos labores complexas.*"

cities with gardens (45–48), before the most markedly original scene on the shield—the mountain of *Arete* (49–56), which in turn is followed closely by a related scene depicting ploughing and harvesting (57–65). Four scenes involving divinities (69–72—Venus rising, 73–79—the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, 80–87—ships in tempestuous conditions, which are then calmed by the arrival of Poseidon—88–96), follow a scene that depicts banquets and dances (66–68)—an echo of *Iliad* 18.494–495.

It becomes clear that the shield of Achilles in the *Posthomerica* exhibits strong originality, despite being the same artefact described in the *Iliad*, and while still managing to stay based structurally on its model. There are problems involved in reading this originality on the shield, however. To choose this literary set-piece description—the most famous in Classical antiquity, and one given to interpretation and re-interpretation by critics and allegorists, ancient and modern,[15] is to set a Posthomeric description as inscribed with interpretation of the Iliadic description. Changes, manifest originality, and close imitation of the Iliadic ecphrasis obtain a greater impact in a reading of the relationship between the *Posthomerica* and the *Iliad* as both ecphrastic descriptions are aligned because they describe the same 'object'. The shield of Achilles, therefore, focuses the intertextual engagement between the reader and the *Posthomerica*, the *Posthomerica* and the *Iliad*, and the reader of the *Iliad* and the *Posthomerica*. The shield can act proportionally in relation to the poem as a whole: the extent to which the *Posthomerica* exhibits traces of interpretation of Homer in relation to the poet's use of the Homeric texts (especially the *Iliad*) is read in emblem here in the extent to which description of the scenes on the shield echoes but does not replicate description of the scenes on the Iliadic shield by the Iliadic primary narrator. The *Posthomerica* itself is emblematically represented (or, read) in the Posthomeric shield of Achilles, in the extent to which the shield exhibits originality within this Homeric template.

The nature of the description in *Posthomerica* 5, that is, the signs given by the narrator that emphasise that the narration is an experience and an interpretation, in itself differs from the Iliadic ecphrasis.[16] The ways in which a narrator, who describes a 'physical' object, reacts to what he sees, and transgresses, in his description, the boundaries inherent to physical objects,[17]

---

[15] Cf. Buffière 1956.54.
[16] According to A.S. Becker 1995.28, "any description is necessarily an interpretation; a describer selects and organizes an infinite variety of aspects of phenomena."
[17] That is, the narrator uses narration—signifiers of temporal sequence and action—and

controls what we understand about the 'object'.[18] We, as readers, only have this interpretation, this ecphrasis, which is essentially a narrator's attempt to describe the indescribable, a shield of Achilles which has the status of an impossible object, a poetic creation with an illusionary existence and unstable 'plastic' form.[19] Thus, even the nature of the description in the *Posthomerica* points to differences. At the very beginning of *Posthomerica* 5, the lines that precede and introduce the ecphrasis contain vocabulary inscribed with meaning and which comments on the nature of the ecphrasis.

> ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ πολλοὶ μὲν ἀπηνύσθησαν ἄεθλοι,
> δὴ τότ' Ἀχιλλῆος μεγαλήτορος ἄμβροτα τεύχη
> θῆκεν ἐνὶ μέσσοισι θεὰ Θέτις. Ἀμφὶ δὲ πάντῃ
> δαίδαλα μαρμαίρεσκεν ὅσα σθένος Ἡφαίστοιο
> 5 ἀμφὶ σάκος ποίησε θρασύφρονος Αἰακίδαο.

> But when the many contests were completed, then the goddess Thetis placed the immortal armour of great-hearted Achilles in the middle of them. The carefully wrought armour glittered everywhere such as the strength of Hephaestus made upon the shield of brave-minded Aeacides.

> (*Posthomerica* 5.1–5)

Thetis places the armour down among the Greeks as a sign that this is the new contest for them, after all the contests described in the Games in honour of Achilles in *Posthomerica* 4 (as made clear by 5.1). At 5.3–5, the ornate armour is given its first description. It is said to sparkle: δαίδαλα μαρμαίρεσκεν (line 4). These words direct the reader's memory back to the opening of the Iliadic ecphrasis and to ποίει δαίδαλα πολλά (*Iliad* 18.482). The significant word here is δαίδαλα. As soon as this word is used, it immediately activates the Iliadic shield of Achilles in the reader's memory, since Hephaestus is said to "work cunningly, embellish" the shield at *Iliad* 18.479. Quintus, by using δαίδαλα as a preface to his ecphrasis, reaffirms the Iliadic narrator's statement about Hephaestus' creation; that is, Quintus, through the primary narrator, gives the same aesthetic judgement as Homer: Hephaestus' creation is ornate, manifold, and cunning. Both primary narrators 'have'

---

signs of lifelikeness, such as description of noise and emotion, to express what he sees before him on an apparently stable work of art.

  [18] "To look into *ecphrasis* is to look into the illusionary representation of the unrepresentable, even while that representation is allowed to masquerade as a natural sign, as if it could be an adequate substitute for its object" Krieger 1992.xv.

  [19] Cf. Krieger 1992.17: "[The shield of Achilles] is a fictional 'impossible' object that only a poet could transcribe." That is, the shield of Achilles does not, and did not ever, exist physically.

access to the shield, and summarise their reaction to what they see with δαί-
δαλα.[20] Its use here in the *Posthomerica* is an approbation of the description
of the Iliadic ecphrasis, since, on a non-illusional level, this is all Quintus
has to read and work from. On an illusional level, the adjective echoes the
subjective comment of the Iliadic narrator on the creation of Hephaestus,
and equates the status of the Posthomeric narrator with the Iliadic narra-
tor. From this level, there is an 'equation' of the poet of the *Posthomerica*,
Quintus, with Homer. Quintus also 'sees' the creation of Hephaestus, and
describes it as δαίδαλα. Hephaestus in the *Iliad* constructs a shield that has
been called magical,[21] in a place of construction that bespeaks speciality
and magic.[22] Quintus restates this nature of the shield, and affirms that his
description is of the very same, magical shield that he, just like the primary
narrator of the *Iliad* before him, will now describe. The verb used with δαί-
δαλα, μαρμαίρεσκεν (line 4), echoes the opening of the ecphrasis at Moschus
2.43: ἐν τῷ δαίδαλα πολλὰ τετεύχατο μαρμαίροντα.[23] The allusion heightens the
reader's expectations of further similarities in description here in the shield
of Achilles, but both in function and detail the two ecphraseis bear little
resemblance—Quintus in fact misleads the reader in this respect. Other
uses of δαίδαλα add to this sense of potential interaction with the tradi-
tion of Hellenistic poetry: the adjective is also found, in ways similar to its
use here in the *Posthomerica*, at Theocritus 1.32, 18.33, 24.42, and at Apollo-
nius 1.729 and 3.43.[24] Quintus, as a post-Hellenistic poet, is trapped within a
tradition where Homer was read and reread, imitated, emulated, and ren-
ovated. Quintus cannot write in a vacuum, and cannot present a shield of
Achilles that bypasses literary tradition. This reading by Quintus is in a sense

---

[20] In the *Iliad*, δαίδαλα is always used of works of art, whether explicitly or obliquely: cf.
Il. 5.60, 14.179, 18.400, 18.482, 19.13, and 19.19. In the *Posthomerica*, the word is also restricted
to ecphrasis: it is used five times in total—at 5.4, 5.41, 5.101, 6.198, and 10.187.

[21] Cf. Laird 1993.20: "And the notion that it is a magic shield might help us imagine it …
perhaps we might conceive of it as a kind of mosaic of little video scenes." Laird is perhaps
misguided to assume "a mosaic of little video scenes", since, as he himself points out at
1993.20n15, Homer draws attention to physical details of the shield at 18.481–482, 519, 549,
574, and 607. Against Laird's idea of magic scenes, cf., e.g., de Jong 2011.1.

[22] For example, the attendants of Hephaestus are robots (18.417–420), and his bellows
(18.468–473) and tripods have a life of their own: cf. Edwards 1991.209.

[23] So James and Lee 2000.39, who also correctly point out the significant use of the verb
at *Posthomerica* 2.206–207, where Achilles' armour, there worn by Achilles, is described as
shining like lightning bolts. The parallel highlights the shield's first owner, and the legacy the
armour brings.

[24] In post-Hellenistic, but pre-Quintean hexameter, the adjective occurs at Oppian *Cyn.*
1.355, 1.496, and 3.347 (the last example has the participle μαρμαίροντα).

daidalos, since his reworking of the Iliadic ecphrasis within the illusion that it is still the creation of Hephaestus is an idea that is ornate, conceited, and cunning. The reader reads how Quintus differs from Homer, what poetic methods he uses, and what intertextual influences feed into his description, because the shield of Achilles cannot be anything but the original shield given to Achilles by Hephaestus in the *Iliad.*

In the *Iliad*, there is only one overt reference to the lifelikeness of the scenes described, at 18.548–549 (ἀρηρομένη δὲ ἐῴκει / χρυσείη περ ἐοῦσα). Examination of the rest of the ecphrasis provides some hints of disobedient ecphrasis, which imply lifelikeness.[25] With 'disobedient' I allude to Andrew Laird's distinction between a limiting by the poet within the boundaries inscribed by an actual work of art by definition, and the departure "from the discipline of the imagined object". For example, indications of sound occur at 18.493, 495, 502, 530, 569–572, 575, and 586. The narrator also acts as interpreter, where he gives the characters in the description emotional and mental states—evident, for example, at 18.496, 511, 526, and 604–605.[26] In the *Posthomerica*, however, we find multiple, explicit statements on the lifelikeness of what the Posthomeric interpreter sees. Unlike the Iliadic primary narrator, the Posthomeric primary narrator shuns the illusion that the figures in the ecphrasis actually move and talk, and instead posits himself between the reader's possible participation in reading a real moving world, as experienced in reading the Iliadic ecphrasis, and the fictional artefact, where plasticity and fixity are inherent.[27] Comments on lifelikeness occur at 5.13, 24, 28, 42, 68, 84, 90, and 96.[28] The expression φαίης κε ζώοντας at line 13, for example, actively engages the reader of the ecphrasis—the interpreter of the ecphrasis opens a dialogue with the narratee, and elicits a reaction— we as readers, if we could see what the primary narrator could see, would say that the figures were actually living.[29] This explicit address towards the

---

[25] Laird 1993.19. I disagree with James and Lee 2000.42 who claim that 18.539 is a comment on lifelikeness—rather, it is an emphasis that the personified deities described there behave like mortals.

[26] Appropriation is most apparent in the use of similes within the description, evident at 18.600–601. The interpreter of the scenes before him draws attention to his need to relate what he sees to his world and the world of the archaic audience, in order to relate properly the referential world of the shield.

[27] Such an emphasis on likeness draws attention to the role of the interpreter—cf. A.S. Becker 1990.146, who also notes that "the expression of similarity … breaks the focus on the referent by drawing attention to the difference between the visual representation and the world it represents" (A.S. Becker 1990.145).

[28] James and Lee 2000.42.

[29] "The focalizee here functions as focalizer, yet, of course, as a focalizer who is instructed

reader shatters the illusion that what is being described is a real, moving world—the potentiality of φαίης κε ensures that the focus is redirected to the worked medium, away from the referent.[30]

The signs of lifelikeness given by the Posthomeric narrator not only draw attention to his status as mediator between the illusional ecphrastic world he describes and the supposed physical object, neither of which we can see; they also draw attention to the status of Quintus as a late reader of Homer, where the primary narrator describes a shield that is constructed, not in the process of construction, and thus a remove away from the 'present' experience the Iliadic narrator was involved in.[31] The past tense in ποί-ησε (*Posthomerica* 5.5) is programmatic for the distance in poetic composition from the *Iliad* whose shield description begins with the continuous ποίει (*Iliad* 18.483). Quintus can simulate the conditions in which Homer presents the shield in *Iliad* 18, that is, he can give the impression, through the Posthomeric narrator of the ecphrasis, that the actual shield of Achilles is before him, but in actual fact, we know that he writes in the shadow of Homer, in the shadow of a poem and a shield of Achilles that has been finished, and read by readers up to and including Quintus' era.[32] The Posthomeric primary narrator's comments on lifelikeness point to a non-Iliadic status, an appearance of post-Homeric poetic endeavour that is *daidalos* in the manifold elements of the literary tradition that feed into its poetic construction.

---

by the [external primary-narrator-focalizer] what to see, think" de Jong 2004.55. For the five occurrences of φαίης / ἴδοις / γνοίης κε in the *Iliad* (4.223–225, 4.429–431, 5.85–86, 15.697–698, and 16.366–367), see de Jong 2004.54–55. A similar optative is found in the ecphrasis of Jason's cloak at Apollonius *Argonautica* 1.765.

[30] Cf. A.S. Becker 1995.29; as he states, attention is being drawn to "two types of interaction that create what we see: that between the describer and the referent and that between the describer and the audience".

[31] That comments on lifelikeness are principally a later (post-archaic) phenomenon, and a common feature of post-Homeric ecphrasis, is evident from the four examples in Apollonius (1.739, 763, 764, and 765–767), the one example in Moschus (2.47), and the nine examples in the other ecphraseis in the *Posthomerica* (6.201, 211, 221, 231, 240, 280, 10.185, 194, and 202). Cf. James and Lee 2000.42. Explicit notes on lifelikeness also occur in early ecphrasis though: cf. Hes. *Sc.* 189.

[32] There are other elements in the Posthomeric shield of Achilles that point to Late Antiquity: throughout the ecphrasis a tendency for hyperbole is evident. Note, in particular, line 11 ἀπειρέσιος ... ἀήρ—how can limitless air be made or depicted? To use the terminology of A.S. Becker 1990.141, we have to assume appropriation here, where the image is brought into our world and way of understanding—a limitless sky cannot be depicted—the bard has created an illusion, where we are led to believe that a referential world has been created.

There are two lines at the end of the Posthomeric account of the shield of Achilles (*Posthomerica* 5.97–98) that enable the reader to unlock the complexities of reading originality in the description.

> Ἄλλα δὲ μυρία κεῖτο κατ' ἀσπίδα τεχνηέντως
> χερσὶν ὑπ' ἀθανάτης πυκινόφρονος Ἡφαίστοιο.

> And there were countless other scenes skilfully depicted on the shield by the immortal hands of cunningly minded Hephaestus.   (*Posthomerica* 5.97–98)

This line-couplet completes the description of the individual scenes on the shield of Achilles. What are of particular interest here are the opening words of line 97. The emphasis in the expression ἄλλα δὲ μυρία implies that there are an inexhaustible number of scenes on the shield of Achilles, and that neither the Iliadic nor Posthomeric primary narrator described all of the scenes on the shield, but rather only decided to describe some of them, according to their own interpretations of the world of the shield.[33] The statement at the end of the Posthomeric ecphrasis adjusts our reading of the Iliadic ecphrasis—we now assume that in fact the Iliadic narrator did not describe all of the scenes possible. Limitation is implied in the introduction to the ecphrasis by ὅσα (line 4). It focuses the reader's poetic memory of the Iliadic shield: the relative leads the reader to expect as many things as were originally described in the Iliadic shield account. Instead, we get many different scenes that at the end of the ecphrasis seem just part of an endless spectrum. The fact that ὅσα is specifically used of the artificial construction by Hephaestus reinforces the idea that the scenes we have described to us in the Posthomeric ecphrasis were devised by Hephaestus himself—scenes' devising that we, in a poetically conceived way, assume Homer saw. The poet has access to the full shield of Achilles with its spectrum of scenes, and therefore we assume that those scenes that are markedly different from those on the Iliadic presentation are those that Quintus chose for description, but which Homer passed over. We also assume that the scenes that bear some resemblance to scenes in the Iliadic ecphrasis are those that Quintus (re-)constructed according to his interpretative bias.[34]

---

[33] I am not stating that there is anything in the shield of Achilles in the *Iliad* that implies that there were more scenes not described by the Iliadic narrator. Cf. Putnam 1998.167: "We are shown its full contents, which would be readily comprehensible to the viewer in the narrative and to the hearer-reader outside." Without the *Posthomerica*, Putnam's comments are valid.

[34] Cf. Maciver 2007.283n87: "The Iliadic interpreter selected and described scenes appropriate for the literary and thematic content (and context) of the *Iliad*; the Posthomeric

This reading of *Posthomerica* 5.97–98 solves the interpretative problem caused by literary tradition.[35] Hephaestus made one set of armour for Achilles in *Iliad* 18, which the Iliadic primary narrator described, which Homer himself composed, and which was passed down to, and through, antiquity. Quintus, who constructed a Homeric-emulative text, presents a different account of the shield.[36] Here, in these lines, Quintus has a means of keeping his 'Homeric' status, and a means of constructing a Quintean shield appropriate for a Quintean epic, within an explicit framework and epic apparatus that is heavily indebted to Homer. Further, there is the poetic conceit that markedly late ideas on the Posthomeric shield, such as the mountain of *Arete* (5.49–56), were there all along on the shield of Achilles, that Hephaestus actually constructed such scenes, that they belong to the *Iliad* as much as they do to the *Posthomerica*.[37] The *Iliad* thus becomes Posthomeric, as the *Posthomerica* strives to be Homeric.

ii. (Re-)*reading the Shield of Achilles*

> The paradigms that are used as metaphors for the *locus* of a metaphysical narrative are directed sometimes at a central point at the inaccessible heart of the text, and sometimes at a fabulous scene representing the 'beyond'.
>
> Dällenbach 1989.181

The shield of Achilles in the *Posthomerica* differs from Homer again in the ways in which it functions within the whole narrative. I have suggested that the shield of Achilles in the *Posthomerica* can be read as an emblem.[38] The

---

interpreter of the same shield selected certain scenes appropriate for the *Posthomerica*, and described scenes described on the Iliadic account of the shield in a way appropriate to the nature of the description (by the Posthomeric primary narrator) in the *Posthomerica*."

[35] Cf. a similar concluding statement at 6.292–293, at the end of the description of the shield of Eurypylus. There, unlike here, μυρία is not used, thus implying that there were not many more scenes. Cf. the comments at Maciver 2007.282n86. Cf. also Hardie 1986.346: "The scenes on the shield of Aeneas … are to be understood as merely a selection from the multiplicity of images wrought by Vulcan on its surface, and summarized in the lines that introduce the ecphrasis (625–629)."

[36] For the limiting sense of ὅσα, cf. *Posthomerica* 1.791, of the goods worthy of Penthesileia.

[37] Cf. the comments on the mountain of *Arete* in Maciver 2007.283.

[38] Cf. Putnam 1998.166, on the shield of Aeneas: "The course of the *ekphrasis*, when examined against the backdrop of the *Aeneid*, shows that the sweep of Roman events is mimicked by synecdoche in the contents of the epic itself."

word emblem implies representation, concentration, and epitome. Certain scenes in the ecphrasis typify this symbolism. The first scene I want to discuss in this respect is the shortest in the ecphrasis. 5.17–24 describe wild animals and hunters with dogs:

> ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' εὖ ἤσκηντο κατ' οὔρεα μακρὰ λέοντες
> σμερδαλέοι καὶ θῶες ἀναιδέες· ἐν δ' ἀλεγειναὶ
> ἄρκτοι πορδάλιές τε· σύες δ' ἅμα τοῖσι πέλοντο
> 20 ὄβριμοι ἀλγινόεντας ὑπὸ βλοσυρῇσι γένυσσι
> θήγοντες καναχηδὸν ἐυκτυπέοντας ὀδόντας.
> ἐν δ' ἀγρόται μετόπισθε κυνῶν μένος ἰθύνοντες,
> ἄλλοι δ' αὖ λάεσσι καὶ αἰγανέῃσι θοῇσι
> βάλλοντες πονέοντο καταντίον, ὡς ἐτεόν περ.

> And round about were well-fashioned in the great mountains fierce lions and shameless jackals, and here grievous bears and leopards. Along with them were stout boars chomping noisily their grievous well-formed teeth under their gory cheeks. And here hunters behind were driving on the fierce dogs, while others in turn toiled opposite them hurling stones and swift spears—depicted so vividly they appeared real.

This scene, the second of the ecphrasis, contains the first clearest departure from the overall structure of the Iliadic shield, which, after a similar opening, continues on to a description of two cities (18.490–540), beginning with the city at peace (490–508). Here we get a description of wild animals that populate the mountains (*Posthomerica* 5.17–21) overlapping with a description of hunters with dogs hunting wild boars (5.19–24). The reader looks to the Iliadic shield for a parallel scene, but does not find one as early in that ecphrasis, implying a different sequence of description. The non-specificity of fixed position in the Posthomeric ecphrasis, unlike its Iliadic counterpart, makes differences in description of the 'same' shield easier for the reader to interpret.[39] The reader, therefore, should not look for exact corresponding positions in the Iliadic description. *Iliad* 18.579–581 provide a short passage that exhibits some similarity:

---

[39] Edwards 1991.207, of the Iliadic shield, states that "each scene is introduced by a new verb of action", and goes onto suggest divisions for the arrangement of scenes. In the Posthomeric ecphrasis, ἀμφί, which opens the scene here, suggests that the narrator does not describe the shield in an order that exactly replicates how and in what sequence Hephaestus created scenes on the shield. LSJ *s.v.* ἀμφί F 1 and 2 gives the meaning "on all sides", which reflects the vagueness here: the primary narrator is not focusing on individual sections of a manufactured artefact, but is creating the illusion of a limitless imagined world (referent) outside the strictures of the medium. Cf. James and Lee 2000.40: "Quintus is no more explicit about ... the arrangement of his scenes ... leaving unstated the obvious fact that they are all located on land or sea."

σμερδαλέω δὲ λέοντε δύ’ ἐν πρώτῃσι βόεσσιν
580 ταῦρον ἐρύγμηλον ἐχέτην· ὃ δὲ μακρὰ μεμυκὼς
εἴλκετο· τὸν δὲ κύνες μετεκίαθον ἠδ’ αἰζηοί.

And two fierce lions held onto a loud-bellowing bull—the best in the herd.
And the bull was dragged as it mooed loudly, and men with their hounds
pursued after it.

The fact that the scene on the Posthomeric shield involves animals and
hunting aligns it with the Iliadic scene, as does the mere mention of lions in
both ecphraseis as fierce (σμερδαλέοι 5.18, 18.573–586). There are relevant
passages elsewhere in the *Iliad* for this scene, the most important being
11.414–420:[40]

ὡς δ’ ὅτε κάπριον ἀμφὶ κύνες θαλεροί τ’ αἰζηοὶ
415 σεύωνται, ὃ δέ τ’ εἶσι βαθείης ἐκ ξυλόχοιο
θήγων λευκὸν ὀδόντα μετὰ γναμπτῇσι γένυσσιν,
ἀμφὶ δέ τ’ ἀΐσσονται, ὑπαὶ δέ τε κόμπος ὀδόντων
γίνεται, οἳ δὲ μένουσιν ἄφαρ δεινόν περ ἐόντα,
ὥς ῥα τότ’ ἀμφ’ Ὀδυσῆα Διῒ φίλον ἐσσεύοντο
420 Τρῶες·

As when hounds and sturdy youths harry a boar on both sides, and he shoots
forth from the dense thicket whetting his white tusk between his chomping
jaws, and they dash after it. There is a grinding of the teeth from beneath,
but they remain without hesitation even though it is fearsome. So then the
Trojans harried on both sides Odysseus, dear to Zeus.

Here we have a simile in the *Iliad* deployed to illustrate how the Trojans
harried Odysseus in battle. The clear similarities between both passages
alter the complexion of the ecphrastic scene.[41] Since this section of the
shield description is quickly followed by explicit associations of war (5.25–
42), and given that the narrator himself divides the shield description into
two distinct sections—scenes describing war and scenes describing peace
(5.43–44)—our initial reading is altered, and we now view this part as
intrinsically part of a continuous series of martial scenes which lasts until
line 42. The secondary presence of the martial world is further implied by
the adjective ὄβριμοι as an epithet for σύες (*Posthomerica* 5.19 and 20). The

---

[40] So Vian 1966.19n1, who also compares *Il.* 13.474–475, Hesiod *Sc.* 388, and Apollonius
Argonautica 3.1351 (for which see the note of Hunter 1989.248–249). James and Lee 2000.43
further compare Hes. *Sc.* 168–177 and 302–304.
[41] The textual correspondences are clear: *Il.* 11.414–415 is echoed at least in meaning
by *Posthomerica* 5.22. 11.416–417 clearly resembles verbally and thematically 5.21–21. For
καναχηδόν (5.21), compare further Hes. *Sc.* 160, and especially 164.

close identification of this adjective with human personalities or military accoutrements both within the *Iliad* and the *Posthomerica* militarises the description of the boar at *Posthomerica* 5.19.[42] Furthermore, the baldric of Heracles, an ecphrasis related at *Odyssey* 11, is present here as an added source, particularly if one compares *Odyssey* 11.611 with *Posthomerica* 5.19: ἄρκτοι and σύες occupy the same metrical position in both passages—but in the Odyssean passage the context is clearly martial, as line 612 proves, with its mention of combats, battles, and man-destroying slaughter.[43]

It is interesting that a *simile* in the *Iliad* is the strong intertextual presence here. This does not shatter the illusion that the Posthomeric primary narrator is selecting elements on the shield that were there all the time: such selection and description is unavoidably influenced by the literary inheritance that the poet of the *Posthomerica* receives. He himself is a reader of the *Iliad* in an un-complex sense, just like the readers of the *Posthomerica*. In a more complex sense, the poet has the opportunity to extend the range of meanings for his ecphrastic scenes. The scenes on the Posthomeric shield of Achilles derive from the Iliadic shield of Achilles, and scenes and poetic imagery from the whole *Iliad*, both of which vary the meaning and the significance read in the Posthomeric ecphrastic scene. Thus, ὡς ἐτεόν περ (*Posthomerica* 5.24) is provided with extra meaning by means of the 'real life' situation of Odysseus who is compared to the wild boar. By using this technique in an ecphrasis that is supposed to be describing scenes on the same shield as that described in *Iliad* 18, Quintus is drawing attention to the intertextual nature and poetics of the *Posthomerica*: other texts feed into the picture Quintus constructs; this is how his poem works, and how we are to read it.

The description of animals and hunting inevitably leads to comparison with the *Posthomerica*'s similes. Not only do several Homeric passages provide a new complexity to the passage beyond initial reading, but the scene itself behaves an index to some of the poem's content. Not all of the animals used in the *Posthomerica*'s similes are mentioned in this scene.[44] There

---

[42] According to James and Lee 2000.44, "Quintus' very frequent use of the epic [word] conforms to the Homeric practice of confining it mostly to warriors and weapons, so that its present application is abnormal."

[43] As Vian 1966.203 notes. Cf. Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989 on 11.612, who state that it is modelled on *Il.* 7.237, and 24.348 = Hes. *Th.* 228.

[44] The animals mentioned in the scene occur in the following similes in the poem: lions—1.5, 1.277, 1.524, 1.587, 1.665, 2.248, 2.299, 2.330, 2.576, 3.142, 3.171, 3.267, 3.276, 3.497, 4.337, 5.188, 5.406, 6.132, 6.396, 6.410, 6.532, 7.464, 7.487, 7.516, 7.716, 8.238, 9.241, 9.253, 10.184, 10.242, 11.163,

are, however, specific instances where some of the animals described occur together in short passages in the narrative. The most significant of these is *Posthomerica* 9.240–244:[45]

240   ὡς δ' ὅτε σῦς ἐν ὄρεσσι νεηγενέων ἀπὸ τέκνων
     θῶας ἀποσσεύῃσι, λέων δ' ἑτέρωθε φανείη
     ἔκποθεν ἐσσύμενος, τοῦ δ' ἵσταται ἄσπετος ὁρμή
     οὔτε πρόσω μεμαῶτος ἔτ' ἐλθέμεν οὔτ' ἄρ' ὀπίσσω,
     θήγει δ' ἀφριόωντας ὑπὸ γναθμοῖσιν ὀδόντας.

> As when a boar in the mountains chases away jackals from the newly-born young, but a lion on the other side appears, shooting up from somewhere, and the boar stops its almighty on-rush, eager neither to go yet still further on, nor back in its tracks, but stands there whetting its foaming tusks on its jaws.

Deiphobus, while attacking Greeks, spots Neoptolemus and stops in wonder.[46] Again we have a boar, jackals, and a lion, all in one simile. One key parallel exists between 9.244 and 5.20–21. Thematically these lines describe the same thing: a boar (or boars) whetting its tusks on its jaws. Verbally the key echoes exist in θήγει (9.244 and 5.21), and ὀδόντας (9.244 and 5.21). The similarity of content suggests that this simile is an unfolding of what is in microcosm on the shield. This idea of explication becomes clearer with *Posthomerica* 5.239–252, and in particular the role of Odysseus there as reflector of the words of the primary narrator:

     "τέχνῃσι⟨ν⟩ δ' ἀγρόται κρατεροὺς δαμόωσι λέοντας
     πορδάλιάς τε σύας τε καὶ ἄλλων ἔθνεα θηρῶν·
     ταῦροι δ' ὀβριμόθυμοι ὑπὸ ζεύγλης δαμόωνται
250   ἀνθρώπων ἰότητι. Νόῳ δέ τε πάντα τελεῖται·
     αἰεὶ δ' ἀφραδέος πέλει ἀνέρος ἀμφὶ πόνοισι
     πᾶσι καὶ ἐν βουλῇσιν ἀνὴρ πολύιδρις ἀμείνων."

> '*By their skills* hunters overcome stout lions and leopards and boars and the species of other animals; *by the will of men* stout-hearted bulls are tamed to carry the yoke. Thus everything is brought about through *know-how*. Always the man of much knowledge is better in the matter of all toils and in councils than the man without intelligence.'

---

and 13.263; jackals—2.298, 6.132, 7.504, 9.241, 10.181, 12.518, and 13.133; bears—2.284, 10.181, and 14.318; leopards—1.480, 1.541, 3.202, 10.183, and 12.580; boars—2.284, 2.576, 3.276, 3.682, 6.532, 8.238, 9.240, 10.184, 13.127, 13.149, 14.33, and 14.318; and hunters—3.143, and 5.374.

[45] Cf. James and Lee 2000.43.

[46] Vian 1966.22on5 states that the simile draws upon two earlier similes in the poem—2.242–250 and 2.298–300. The simile of course has as its primary model *Il.* 11.414–418, as James 2004.295 notes.

This passage is the opening of Odysseus' main speech to Ajax in the *hoplōn krisis* episode in book 5 (123–321). Odysseus' aim is to prove the usefulness and necessity of words and wit for a hero, as he attempts to answer the censures of Ajax, especially at *Posthomerica* 5.186–190, where he states that Odysseus is the inferior in terms of bravery and strength, and that Odysseus has to rely on his famous *dolos* instead of having real stout heart within him.[47] This speech has been treated to a number of studies,[48] but what I want to emphasis are the examples Odysseus uses to prove his premise (242) that plans and words increase the strength of a man.[49] Where Odysseus speaks of hunters who overcome lions, leopards and boars and other kinds of beasts (5.247–248), the reader is reminded of the description, on the shield of Achilles, of hunters hunting boars (5.19–24) and the mention of lions (5.17) and leopards (5.19)—the other animals of that scene (jackals and bears—5.18–19) are paralleled by the vaguer reference to the kinds of other animals (5.248).[50] The fact that the two heroes are staking their claim for the shield of Achilles which has been described earlier in book 5 makes Odysseus' echoes of the shield all the more pertinent. Odysseus sets himself up as an author-figure here. The repetition of *mētis* by which various people achieve difficult tasks reflects the *mētis* Odysseus applies to devise an argument that not only demonstrates the importance of *mētis* in real life, but the importance of *mētis* to win the contest for the arms of Achilles, which he demonstrates by addressing situations that require *mētis*.[51] By reiterating the content of scenes on the shield,

---

[47] Cf. James and Lee 2000.81.

[48] See most recently the study of Bär 2010, and my forthcoming article on the *krisis* as a contest of 'flyting'.

[49] Odysseus sets the premise and brings in a series of gnomic examples that build on the premise. This corresponds to the description of the gnomic priamel set down by Race 1982.29: "Any *gnome* or *sententia* can be expanded by specific examples and comparisons, inasmuch as it is a generalized statement." On the conflict between words and deeds that recurs in this contest between Odysseus and Ajax, cf. Stanford 1954.139, who writes that it was "a literary commonplace as old as Homer and a favourite topic in every period of classical and renaissance literature".

[50] Also, Odysseus' description of sailors crossing a stormy sea (5.245–246), and bulls tamed to carry the yoke (5.249), resonate with other scenes on the shield—respectively 5.80–87, where sailors are described struggling on a stormy sea, and 5.60, where oxen are described carrying the yoke. Cf. James's and Lee's brief comment (2000.94).

[51] It is of course no accident that one of Odysseus' epithets in the Homeric poems is πολύμητις. In the *Iliad* it is used only of Odysseus: *Il.* 1.311, 1.440, 3.200, 3.216, 3.268, 4.329, 4.349 = 14.82, 10.148, 10.382, 10.400, 10.423, 10.488, 10.554, 19.154, 19.215, 23.709, and 23.755. It is used only once in the *Posthomerica*, of Athene (12.154).

Odysseus demonstrates that he appreciates its aesthetic and emblematic value, and is therefore a worthy recipient of the shield.[52]

Odysseus' status as an expositor and initiate of the shield is further illustrated where he summarises the scenes on the shield he offers to its rightful heir Neoptolemus at *Posthomerica* 7.200–204.

> 200 "τεύχων ἄμβροτα κεῖνα, τὰ σοὶ μέγα θαῦμ⟨α⟩ ἰδόντι
> ἔσσεται, οὕνεκα γαῖα καὶ οὐρανὸς ἠδὲ θάλασσα
> ἀμφὶ σάκος πεπόνηται ἀπειρεσίῳ τ' ἐνὶ κύκλῳ
> ζῷα πέριξ ἤσκηται ἐοικότα κινυμένοισι,
> θαῦμα καὶ ἀθανάτοισι."

> "[Hephaestus took delight in making] those immortal things, which will be a great wonder to you as you look upon them, because the land and heaven and sea are artistically worked here and there on the shield, and creatures in a boundless circle are fashioned all round—they look as though they are moving, a wonder even to the immortals."

As he persuades Neoptolemus to come and join them in the war, Odysseus extols the scenes and workmanship of the shield. He behaves as an appreciator of its aesthetic value. Verbal parallels show that he has viewed the shield in a similar way to the describer of the shield in book 5.[53] Note how the familiar note of wonder connected to ecphrasis, spoken by Odysseus here at 7.204—θαῦμα καὶ ἀθανάτοισι—resonates with a similar comment made by the primary narrator at 5.40—ἀπειρέσιον δ' ἄρα θαῦμα. He not only summarises some of the content of the shield,[54] but he reacts to the shield in the manner of the description given by the primary narrator in the ecphrasis in book 5.[55]

I have shown that the scene of hunting on the shield reflects other passages in the *Posthomerica*, contains Homeric resonances in its identity,

---

[52] Cf. Baumbach 2007.120–121. Odysseus' priamel also closely resembles that spoken to Antilochus by Nestor at *Iliad* 23.313–318 (so Vian 1966.207n9), which has implications for both speakers in book 5: Odysseus inherits the sage-figure role of Nestor, and speaks down to the inexperienced Antilochus-figure, Ajax (I discuss this in detail in my forthcoming article, mentioned above).

[53] At 7.201 Odysseus parallels the vocabulary in 5.7: οὐρανὸς ἠδ' αἰθήρ· γαίη δ' ἅμα κεῖτο θάλασσα; ἤσκηται ἐοικότα κινυμένοισι (7.203) echoes ἤσκητο and ἤσκηντο (5.6 and 5.17 respectively), and especially the narrator's comment on lifelikeness at 5.42—ἔσαν ζωοῖσιν ἐοικότα κινυμένοισι.

[54] Odysseus summarises the content of the shield at 7.203 with the encompassing word ζῷα. It can be argued that his focus on the earth, heavens, and sea (7.201) is also a summary of the whole shield, validating Byre's comment about 5.6–7, that they "are a programmatic introduction to the entire ekphrasis, the scenes of which fall into divisions according to the elements of the cosmos they represent" (Byre 1982.186).

[55] Cf. Baumbach 2007.121.

and in these intertextual and especially intratextual parallels is not only explicated but is itself a concentration, in description, of what the poem attempts to narrate. The preceding discussion has also made clear that Odysseus reflects the ecphrastic description of the shield of Achilles by the primary narrator.[56] I have not made clear what is meant by this particular type of 'reflection'. Reflection in a discrete literary text is a type of *mise-en-abîme*.[57] A *mise-en-abîme* is "any internal mirror that reflects the whole of the narrative by simple, repeated or 'specious' (or paradoxical) duplication".[58] Odysseus' speech to Ajax, in which he echoes parts of the ecphrasis in book 5, and his later summary of the shield at 7.200–204, are examples of explications of the shield of Achilles, which, as an ecphrastic *mise-en-abîme*, reflects the rest of the narrative. According to Dällenbach, among the indicators for *mise-en-abîme* are "(a) homonymy between the characters of the inserted and enclosing narrative; (b) virtual homonymy between a character and the author; (c) homonymy between the titles of the inserted and enclosing narrative; (d) repetition of an evocative setting and a combination of characters; and (e) textual repetition of one or more expressions relating to the primary narrative within the reflexive passage".[59] So far, my discussion of the shield and correspondences has satisfied, to a lesser and greater degree, all of these criteria, and in particular, (b) and (e). I have demonstrated the textual correspondences that exist between the shield and extra-ecphrastic settings: the fact that the textual parallels lead us back to the shield for further interpretation gives the shield a vital importance over the poem's thematic discourse.[60] I have also shown that a character within the text, in this case Odysseus, can verbally reflect the primary-narrator-spoken discourse, in this case the ecphrasis in book 5.[61]

---

[56] Studies have presented cases for the relevance of the Iliadic shield of Achilles within the *Iliad*: see, in particular, Taplin 2001.342–364, and for the shield as symbolism, Shannon 1975.29; cf. also de Jong 2011.9–11. The shield in the *Posthomerica* is bound into the narrative in a much more intricate and encompassing way.

[57] Dällenbach 1989.8: "The *mise en abyme*, as a means by which the work turns back on itself, appears to be a kind of *reflexion*."

[58] Dällenbach 1989.36. The title of the book—"The Mirror in the Text"—aptly sums up the nature of *mise-en-abîme*.

[59] Dällenbach 1989.46–47.

[60] Cf. Dällenbach 1989.59: "Such transpositions present a paradox: although they are microcosms of the fiction, they superimpose themselves semantically on the macrocosm that contains them, overflow it and end up by engulfing it, in a way, within themselves."

[61] Dällenbach 1989.52 illustrates the type of secondary narrator that operates as mouthpiece of the primary narrator—in *mise-en-abîme*, especially those famed for their speaking-prowess.

It is not possible to discuss all of the scenes on the shield in relation
to their function as *mise-en-abîme*. There are, for example, vivid parallels
in the narrative with the scene which describes the personifications of
war (5.25–72).[62] Before I focus on the key and central scene of the shield,
namely the mountain of *Arete* (*Posthomerica* 5.43–56) and its function as an
emblem of the key ethical content of the poem, I will determine the value
and significance of the personified abstraction *Dike* (5.46) that impinges on
reading of *Arete* that closely follows it (5.50). Furthermore, I will discuss the
central place *Dike* has as a focus of multiple statements in the poem which
reflect the philosophy implied by the term. This will serve as an introduction
to the key term, *Arete*, its function, and philosophical status. The scenes of
peace (line 45 onwards) begin with a description of *Dike* and the tribes of
men she watches over (5.45–48):

> καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄρ πολέμοιο τεράατα πάντα τέτυκτο·
> εἰρήνης δ' ἀπάνευθεν ἔσαν περικαλλέα ἔργα.
> 45 ἀμφὶ δὲ μυρία φῦλα πολυτλήτων ἀνθρώπων
> ἄστεα καλὰ νέμοντο· Δίκη δ' ἐπεδέρκετο πάντα·
> ἄλλοι δ' ἄλλ' ἐπὶ ἔργα χέρας φέρον· ἀμφὶ δ' ἀλωαὶ
> καρποῖσι βρίθοντο· μέλαινα δὲ γαῖα τεθήλει.

And such was the construction of all the wondrous things of war. Besides
these were outstandingly fair works of peace. And round about countless
tribes of much-suffering people dwelt in fair cities, and Justice oversaw every-
thing. They were all engaged in numerous manual tasks, and, round about,
the fields abounded with crops, and the rich soil flourished.[63]

(*Posthomerica* 5.43–48)

Lines 45–48 lead the reader first to Hesiod, then to Alexandrian poetry, and
to other lines in the *Posthomerica* itself. The mention of tribes of men who
dwell in cities that Justice oversees echoes Hesiod's *Works and Days* 225–
237.[64]

> 225 οἳ δὲ δίκας ξείνοισι καὶ ἐνδήμοισι διδοῦσιν
> ἰθείας καὶ μή τι παρεκβαίνουσι δικαίου,
> τοῖσι τέθηλε πόλις, λαοὶ δ' ἀνθεῦσιν ἐν αὐτῇ·
> εἰρήνη δ' ἀνὰ γῆν κουροτρόφος, οὐδέ ποτ' αὐτοῖς
> ἀργαλέον πόλεμον τεκμαίρεται εὐρύοπα Ζεύς·
> 230 οὐδέ ποτ' ἰθυδίκῃσι μετ' ἀνδράσι λιμὸς ὀπηδεῖ

---

[62] Cf. Maciver 2007.277–280 for further discussion of this scene.

[63] On the significance of the adjective in the phrase πολυτλήτων ἀνθρώπων (5.45), see
Vian and Battegay 1984.*s.v.* πολυτλῆτος: "qui a beaucoup souffert, infortuné". See also Vian
1966.203.

[64] On which see James and Lee 2000.51.

οὐδ' ἄτη, θαλίης δὲ μεμηλότα ἔργα νέμονται.
τοῖσι φέρει μὲν γαῖα πολὺν βίον, οὔρεσι δὲ δρῦς
ἄκρη μέν τε φέρει βαλάνους, μέσση δὲ μελίσσας·
εἰροπόκοι δ' ὄιες μαλλοῖς καταβεβρίθασι·
235 τίκτουσιν δὲ γυναῖκες ἐοικότα τέκνα γονεῦσι·
θάλλουσιν δ' ἀγαθοῖσι διαμπερές· οὐδ' ἐπὶ νηῶν
νίσονται, καρπὸν δὲ φέρει ζείδωρος ἄρουρα.

But those who give straight judgements to strangers and those who already
in-dwell a land, and do not in any respect diverge from the just path, their
city flourishes, and the people flourish in it; child-nourishing Peace is in their
land, and far-seeing Zeus never decrees grievous war against them. Neither
famine nor disaster ever accompanies men who act justly; but with pleasure
they tend the fields which are their care. The earth bears them much produce,
and on the mountains the oaktops bear acorns and bees among them. Their
woolly sheep are laden with fleeces; their women bear children who look like
their parents. They travel continually with good things, and do not travel on
ships, for the grain-giving earth bears them fruit.

Beyond thematic resemblances between the texts, verbal parallels imbed
Hesiod within the Posthomeric passage.[65] Hesiod is not, strictly speaking,
presenting a picture of the Golden Age, but he does construct a picture
of the results for a city under the oversight of Justice that at least bears
resemblance to the ideals of that age.[66] The implication in Hesiod is that
where Justice prevails, humans can approach the conditions of the Golden
Age. This picture of the oversight of Justice in Hesiod and the fruitful results
of such a status is imitated at *Posthomerica* 5.46 where personified Justice
is described as watching over everything.[67] The primary narrator does not
indicate to the reader how *Dike* watches over everything. The reader is
just told of an action, not of its nature, and the primary object of that
action, *panta*, is non-specific.[68] It is up to the reader to imagine how *Dike*

---

[65] For example, *Posthomerica* 5.47 ἄλλοι δ' ἄλλ' ἐπὶ ἔργα χέρας φέρον echoes Hesiod *Op.*
231 μεμηλότα ἔργα νέμονται. 5.47–48 ἀμφὶ δ' ἀλωαὶ / καρποῖσι βρίθοντο echoes Hesiod *Op.* 237
καρπὸν δὲ φέρει ζείδωρος ἄρουρα. Cf. *Iliad* 8.307, and (following Vian and Battegay 1984.252)
Posthomerica 2.600, where, in an idyllic digression, the twelve lovely-tressed maidens of the
sun accompany the wailing *Eos*. Line 48 μέλαινα δὲ γαῖα τεθήλει can be read against the whole
of *Op.* 232–237, and verbally with 227 τοῖσι τέθηλε πόλις and 232 τοῖσι φέρει μὲν γαῖα πολὺν βίον.

[66] For the Myth of Ages in Hesiod (*Op.* 106–201), see M.L. West 1978.172–177. See, in
particular, the parallel between *Op.* 236–237 and *Op.* 116–117, as noted by M.L. West 1978.216—
there is, in fact, a verbatim echo between 117 and 237, strengthening this idea of a return to
the ideal state of the Golden Age through conduct overseen by Justice.

[67] "Literal ekphrasis has moved, via the power of words, to an illusion of ekphrasis",
Krieger 1992.18.

[68] The expression of the all-seeing *Dike* (Δίκη δ' ἐπεδέρκετο πάντα 46) directs the reader's
attention, in a very broad sense, to Homer and the trial scene on the Iliadic shield

watches—the passage in Hesiod can provide insight. The description of *Dike* echoes *Works and Days* 267–268:

> πάντα ἰδὼν Διὸς ὀφθαλμὸς καὶ πάντα νοήσας
> καί νυ τάδ᾽ αἴ κ᾽ ἐθέλησ᾽ ἐπιδέρκεται.

> The eye of Zeus, seeing all and understanding all, beholds these things too, if so he will.

What aligns these two texts is the verb ἐπιδέρκομαι. It is non-Homeric, and occurs in Hesiod only here, and at *Theogony* 760 (of the sun). Due to its rareness, the allusion lends a greater significance to reading of the verb and its subject in the *Posthomerica*. The subject of the verb in Hesiod is the eye of Zeus; in Quintus it is *Dike*. Zeus has been replaced by a personified abstraction. In the Posthomeric world minor deities have greater roles,[69] and personifications of abstractions are a common phenomenon in the poem.[70] The same verb, however, occurs at *Posthomerica* 10.47–48 with the eyes of Zeus as subject, where he looks down on the battlefield from above.[71] This idea of the eye of Zeus looking over everything reflects the radical nature of the god, in that he was "originally the sky".[72] *Dike* as a goddess similarly has an all-seeing capacity, and in many ways mimics the role of the Iliadic and Hesiodic Zeus.

In view of the clear cosmological opening to the ecphrasis (6–16), a reading of *Dike* as a goddess in her own right, but one who mirrors the status and function of Zeus (as the sky or sun) is valid. Such a reading is encouraged by the later identity and moral and cosmological nature of *Dike*.[73] However, an inclination to apply any possible morality inherent in

---

(18.497–508), simply on the basis that *Dike* is mentioned. *Dike* and cognate verb occur at 18.506 and 508. James and Lee 2000.51, following Keydell 1963.1280, suggest that *Odyssey* 19.109–114 has an influence on the passage here, and include the possibility of 19.114 (ἀρετῶσι δὲ λαοί) influencing the inclusion of a description of a mountain of *Arete*. This is a plausible suggestion, and adds to the figure's intertextual scope.

[69] Cf. Wenglinsky 2002.79–80.

[70] Cf. Gärtner 2007 and James 2004.xxviii, and especially Wenglinsky 2002.78: "The appearance of a greater number of personifications is the most obvious difference between the *Posthomerica* and the *Iliad*, and is typical of late epic."

[71] The verb is used only of divinities in the *Posthomerica*: 1.185 (again, significantly, of Zeus), 2.617 (of Dawn, who gets authority from Zeus to oversee everything), here in the ecphrasis—5.46, and at 13.378.

[72] M.L. West 1978.223. For a list of passages similar to *Op.* 267–268, see also M.L. West 1978.223–224. Note the phrasing in the description of the Homeric sun at *Il.* 3.227 ("invoked together with Zeus in swearing an oath" M.L. West 1978.223), and at *Od.* 11.119 and 12.323.

[73] "*Dike* means basically the order of the universe, and in this religion the gods maintain a cosmic order. This they do by working through nature and the human mind, and not by

the Hesiodic picture of *Dike* must be tempered with reserve. Some critics have denied a moral meaning for *Dike* in Hesiod. Gagarin, for example, argued that *Dike* has a specific non-moral meaning, and one that relates mainly to the "process for the peaceful settlement of disputes ... that *dike* does not apply to actions outside this narrow area of law and does not have any general moral sense".[74] Due to the arable context of the scenes of peace on the Posthomeric ecphrasis (47–65), and the general subject matter of much of the *Works and Days*, it seems plausible that a Hesiodic meaning of this kind can be read here for *Dike* in the ecphrasis. A great deal of intertextual weight in these opening lines, including the scene of the mountain of *Arete*, lies with Hesiod's *Works and Days*, especially in relation to the Hesiodic ideal of the results of just actions. In the central portion of the shield of Achilles, Quintus has inscribed Hesiod within an overall Homeric intertextual framework. Hesiod wrote a didactic poem, with an emphasis on how to live, and on the results of justice and *hybris*, addressed to his brother Perses.[75] The allusions analysed above make clear the connection with Hesiodic, and in particular, with an abstract, didactic part of the *Works and Days*. The parallelism encourages application of the purpose and nature of the Hesiodic passage(s) to the Quintean ecphrasis here (however that purpose and nature is to be read).

So *Dike* personified in the *Works and Days* perhaps does not signify divine justice, despite the figure's close identification with Zeus.[76] Later (post-Hesiod) significations for the personification (and abstraction) demand a more generous reading to encompass all nuances of meaning. There are more texts that feed into the reading of this figure's meaning here in the *Posthomerica*. First, an intratext's use and meaning is vital for our reading of *Dike* on the shield: the only other place where *Dike* is personified in the poem.

---

means of extraneous interventions. The notion of a cosmos, of a universe regulated by causal laws, was a prerequisite of rational speculation about cosmology, science and metaphysics" Lloyd-Jones 1983.161–162. For later (Stoic) readings of Zeus as the sky, cf. *SVF* 1.169 (Zeno), and 2.1076–1077 (Chrysippus) (so Kidd 1997.162). Cf. my discussion of *Moira* in chapter III as an entity more powerful than Zeus in the *Posthomerica* as regards outcomes.

[74] Gagarin 1973.81. For the possibility of *dike* as having a moral meaning in Homer and Hesiod in certain instances, see Dickie 1978.91–101, and D.L. Cairns 1993.153–154, who comes up with further instances for a moral signification.

[75] Sinclair 1966.xiii calls the *Works and Days* a "didactic and admonitory medley". Cf. Nussbaum 1960.214.

[76] "*Dike* in Hesiod oversees only one activity, the litigation of disputes" Gagarin 1973.91.

"ἐπεὶ Θέμιν οὔ ποτ' ἀλιτροὶ
370 ἀνέρες ἐξαλέονται ἀκήρατον, οὕνεκ' ἄρ' αὐτοὺς
εἰσοράᾳ νυκτός τε καὶ ἤματος, ἀμφὶ δὲ πάντη
ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ φῦλα διερίη πεπότηται
τινυμένη σὺν Ζηνὶ κακῶν ἐπιίστορας ἔργων."
ὣς εἰπὼν δηίοισιν ἀνηλέα τεῦχεν ὄλεθρον·
375 μαίνετο γάρ οἱ θυμὸς ὑπὸ κραδίη μέγ' ἀέξων
ζηλήμων· καὶ πολλὰ περὶ φρεσὶ θαρσαλέῃσι
Τρωσὶ κακὰ φρονέεσκε τὰ δὴ θεὸς ἐξετέλεσσε
πρέσβα Δίκη. Κεῖνοι γὰρ ἀτάσθαλα πρῶτοι ἔρεξαν
ἀμφ' Ἑλένης, πρῶτοι δὲ καὶ ὅρκια πημήναντο,
380 σχέτλιοι, οἵ ποτε κεῖνο παρ' ἐκ μέλαν αἷμα καὶ ἱρὰ
ἀθανάτων ἐλάθοντο παραιβασίῃσι νόοιο.
τῶ καί σφιν μετόπισθεν Ἐριννύες ἄλγεα τεῦχον.

"Since culpable man never escapes pure *Themis*, because she beholds them
night and day, and everywhere traversing the air she flies to the tribes of
men, punishing, with Zeus, those who have committed evil deeds." With
these words Menelaus brought unpitying death to his enemies. For his raging
anger grew within his heart because of his jealousy, and he devised many
evils in his bold mind for the Trojans, which the austere goddess Justice duly
accomplished. For the Trojans were the first to do the criminal acts with
regard to Helen, and were the first to break their oaths, the wretches, who
ignored the black blood and holy things of the gods because of their mental
aberrations. Therefore the *Erinnyes* brought miseries upon them afterwards.
(*Posthomerica* 13.369–382)

Menelaus has just slain Deiphobus (*Posthomerica* 13.355), and here (I have
begun the quotation mid-speech) speaks of *Themis* to his slain enemy
(13.369–373). He implies that Deiphobus rightly died by his hands, since
wrongdoers cannot escape *Themis* (13.369–370), since she punishes, with
Zeus, those who have done wrong (13.373). The primary narrator then takes
up the theme started by the secondary narrator, and expands upon it to
cast judgement upon the Trojans as culpable for all the miseries of the
war (13.376–382). Note the similarities between 13.371 εἰσοράᾳ and 5.46 ἐπε-
δέρκετο. This description also echoes the all-seeing *Themis* described at
Posthomerica 13.299—Θέμιν πανδερκέα, which itself draws together *Dike* and
Themis as entities, since πανδερκέα echoes the operation of *Dike* at 5.46 (ἐπε-
δέρκετο πάντα). *Themis*, traditionally, has a close association with *Dike*—it
is described as the mother of *Dike* at Hesiod *Theogony* 901–906.[77] 13.373

---

[77] See *OCD s.v.* "*Themis*". On the nature and role of these personified abstractions in Greek
religion (because of Homer), see Burkert 1985.185. In a personified role, *Themis* appears at

underscores the involvement of Zeus in the process of Justice, where *Themis* (as synonymous with *Dike*) acts as the enforcer of vengeance against those guilty of evil acts.[78] This clear definition of the role of Justice stresses its divine nature, and its moral essence. The *Themis* and righteous vengeance that Menelaus speaks of (369–373) are accomplished by the goddess *Dike*. τὰ δή (377) makes this clear: δή lays stress that the antecedent (πολλὰ … κακά in the same line) will indeed be carried out by *Dike*, and thus Menelaus' actions are made legitimate.[79] 13.378–382 then make emphatic why *Dike* accomplishes the things Menelaus desires against the Trojans. The primary narrator puts all the blame for the Trojan War on the Trojans, and their failure to keep within the bounds of *Dike* due to their oath-breaking (379–381). The particle γάρ (378) is important here: it creates a causal link between Menelaus as a secondary narrator speaking a gnome about *Themis* and her actions against unjust men, and the primary narrator and his explanation of why the Trojans deserved to be visited by *Themis*, through Menelaus in this way. The betrayal of the bias of the primary narrator against the Trojans is further made clear by σχέτλιοι, οἵ (13.380). The abstract, moral qualities (deities) found throughout the poem act primarily because of, and against, the Trojans, according to the (biased) narrator . Thus the Trojans fail to keep within the bounds of the ideal constructed on the shield of Achilles in *Posthomerica* 5.45–48: when Justice oversees life and is respected, then life flourishes. The Trojans exemplify a negative explication of the ecphrastic ideal.

There is another strong verbal echo of the ecphrastic *Dike* within the *Posthomerica* at 13.468–473, again with an emphasis on another personified abstraction, this time *Aisa*. An anonymous speaker, on seeing the flames of Troy, concludes that Fate watches over all the affairs of men, and that there was nothing that the gods could do to save Troy:

Posthomerica 4.136, 8.73, 12.202, 13.299, and 13.369. Vian, with his usual insight, translates *Themis* as "la Justice personifiée" (Vian and Battegay 1984.*s.v.* Θέμις (2)). 13.372 ἀνθρώπων … φῦλα echoes 5.45 μυρία φῦλα πολυτλήτων ἀνθρώπων. Cf. James 2004.330 (on 12.202–214): "Also relevant is her identification with personified Justice, which is implied at Hesiod *Theogony* 901–906, where as Zeus' second wife she produces Justice and Peace among her offspring. It is fully explicit at … 13.369–378."

[78] Cf. *Posthomerica* 7.75–79, discussed in chapter III: the fortunes of men originate from the lap of Zeus, and all things are from Zeus, but only *Moira* sees them and allocates them (randomly) to mortals in the world of the *Posthomerica*.

[79] Cf. Denniston 1954.218, and 204: "δή denotes that a thing really and truly is so." The fact that the particle occurs in the primary narrative draws attention to the primary narrator and his reading and exposition of Menelaus' intentions, and their results.

καί τις ἁλὸς κατὰ βένθος ἔσω νεὸς ἔκφατο μῦθον·
"Ἤνυσαν Ἀργεῖοι κρατερόφρονες ἄσπετον ἔργον
470 πολλὰ μάλ' ἀμφ' Ἑλένης ἑλικοβλεφάροιο καμόντες·
πᾶσα δ' ἄρ' ἡ τὸ πάροιθε πανόλβιος ἐν πυρὶ Τροίη
καίεται οὐδὲ θεῶν τις ἐελδομένοισιν ἄμυνε.
πάντα γὰρ ἄσχετος Αἶσα βροτῶν ἐπιδέρκεται ἔργα."

And someone in the sea's depth, in a ship, commented as follows: "The strong-minded Argives have accomplished at last their ineffable task after much exertion for the sake of bright-eyed Helen. The once all-prosperous Troy is now completely in flames, and none of the gods defended those eager for their help. For unrestrained Fate watches over all the works of mortals".

(*Posthomerica* 13.468–473)

Fate carried out the *telos* of the Greeks, since she watches over mortals' deeds (πάντα γὰρ ἄσχετος Αἶσα βροτῶν ἐπιδέρκεται ἔργα 13.473). The most significant verbal parallel for our purposes exists between 5.46 (Δίκη δ' ἐπεδέρκετο πάντα) and 13.473 (πάντα γὰρ ἄσχετος Αἶσα βροτῶν ἐπιδέρκεται ἔργα). Note in particular how the form, metrical position, tense, and person of the verbs match exactly.[80] The parallel draws together *Dike* and *Aisa*.[81] These verbal parallels create a synthesis of the abstracts' values, and a blurring of their distinctions. Further, the echoes broaden the range of significances for *Dike* described in the ecphrasis, and in many ways, the reader rereads the ecphrastic *Dike* that watches over the tribes of men as also *Themis*, and then also *Aisa*. The reader gives an exponential value to *Dike*.

The passage quoted above which describes the role of *Aisa* occurs within a *tis*-speech (13.468).[82] Thus, the primary narrator's words in the ecphrasis at 5.46, and then a secondary narrator's words reinforced immediately and expanded by the primary narrator's words—both at 13.369–382, are echoed by an anonymous speaker. The fact that the speaker belongs to neither side in the war is significant. We get the voice of someone who has not suffered personally on account of Helen. The neutrality of the speaker allows the

---

[80] Also relevant are πάντα ... βροτῶν ... ἔργα (473) and ἔργα ... ἀνθρώπων ... πάντα (5.44, 45, 46 respectively).

[81] See Aeschylus *Ch.* 647–651 for the close connection between *Dike* and *Aisa* (so *DNP s.v.* "*Aisa*"). See further the note by Garvie 1986.221–223 on these lines, and for extensive parallels.

[82] Cf. de Jong 1987. 2 on the function of *tis*-speeches: "[They] offer the hearer/reader the opportunity to get a glimpse of the mind of the masses, which are normally bound to silence in epic." I prefer to see *tis*-speeches as the primary narrator's way of giving the primary narratee a point of view of events other than that given by identifiable characters. The very choice of the poet not to give the speaker an identity reveals an attempt to separate the words spoken from bias on account of a speaker's personality or status.

poet to give someone words to speak that validate, in a seemingly impartial way, the words of the primary narrator. What this anonymous *tis*-speaker actually implies here is that the Greeks accomplished their task because of the oversight and control of Fate: the connecting explanatory particle in πάντα γὰρ ἄσχετος Αἶσα (473) denotes this. The anonymous speaker shows that the divine workings within the world of the Trojan War as depicted by Quintus' primary narrator, and secondary narrators who are caught up in the strife and bloodshed, also exist in the 'real' world, a world of peace, and that thus the poet's idea of morality and divinity is one cosmologically relevant.

The emphasis that Justice (whether *Themis* or *Dike*) is closely imitative of the all-seeing idea of Zeus, that it echoes the functions of Fate in the *Posthomerica*, and that it has an active interest against wrong-doers, must be applied to the meaning of the personified abstraction at 5.46.[83] The reading of *Dike* must be expanded beyond a simplistic, perhaps non-moral, Hesiodic meaning, into one that takes account of Quintean development and exposition of the meaning and function of the term. The fact that the Trojans overstepped the boundaries of *Dike* (or, *Themis*), and as a result incurred the consequences of such action (13.378–381), brings into contrast the peaceful and idealistic nature of the cities that *Dike* watches over (5.46).[84] The opposition exacerbates the demarcation between the peace scenes (5.43 ff.) and the scenes of war (especially 5.25–42) on the shield. The Trojans, because of their oath-breaking, caused *Eris* and eventually received the punishment dealt actively to them by the *Erinnyes*, both of whom are described as personifications on the shield (5.31).[85] Thus the Trojans exemplify the opposite of the ideal presented in the scenes of peace where *Dike* presides (5.46), and the strife and war apparently caused by the Trojans, mirrors the scenes of war focused in 5.25–42.

---

[83] The words spoken by the primary narrator at 1.31–32 provide another interpretative layer to the discussion of this passage. There the gnome is spoken with reference to the *Erinnyes* who haunt Penthesileia (1.30–31). There are thematic echoes between those lines and 13.369–370, since both mention the inability of wrong-doers to escape punishment. At 13.373, although it is stated (in the words of Menelaus) that *Themis* is the one that carries out this vengeance on behalf of Zeus, 382 suggests that the actual active function of punishment is carried out by the *Erinnyes*. The parallel with Penthesileia in book 1 strengthens this point.

[84] For *Dike* as lapsing "constantly into vengeance" in Greek literature, see J.E. Harrison 1922.506. It seems that Troy once was the sort of prosperous city under the oversight of *Dike*: note the emphasis on the prior prosperity of the city at 13.471: τὸ πάροιθε πανόλβιος.

[85] For personified *Eris* in the *Iliad*, see the cogent intertext at *Il.* 4.440, which is echoed at 5.29 (as Vian 1966.19 notes). On the meaning and role of the *Eris* in the *Iliad* (including its place on the Iliadic shield at 18.535–537), see Kirk 1985.380–381.

Further light can be shed on our reading of *Dike* if we take into consideration Aratus *Phaenomena* 100–114, which describes the state in which mortals lived when *Dike* yet abode on earth.[86] Aratus' *Phaenomena*, a hexameter didactic poem of the early third century BCE, relates celestial *phenomena* such as constellations and the nature of weather.[87]

100   λόγος γε μὲν ἐντρέχει ἄλλος
        ἀνθρώποις, ὡς δῆθεν ἐπιχθονίη πάρος ἦεν,
        ἤρχετο δ' ἀνθρώπων κατεναντίη, οὐδέ ποτ' ἀνδρῶν
        οὐδέ ποτ' ἀρχαίων ἠνήνατο φῦλα γυναικῶν,
        ἀλλ' ἀναμὶξ ἐκάθητο καὶ ἀθανάτη περ ἐοῦσα.
105   καί ἑ Δίκην καλέεσκον· ἀγειρομένη δὲ γέροντας
        ἠέ που εἰν ἀγορῇ ἢ εὐρυχόρῳ ἐν ἀγυιῇ,
        δημοτέρας ἤειδεν ἐπισπέρχουσα θέμιστας.
        οὔπω λευγαλέου τότε νείκεος ἠπίσταντο,
        οὐδὲ διακρίσιος περιμεμφέος οὐδὲ κυδοιμοῦ·
110   αὔτως δ' ἔζωον· χαλεπὴ δ' ἀπέκειτο θάλασσα,
        καὶ βίον οὔπω νῆες ἀπόπροθεν ἠγίνεσκον,
        ἀλλὰ βόες καὶ ἄροτρα καὶ αὐτὴ πότνια λαῶν
        μυρία πάντα παρεῖχε Δίκη, δώτειρα δικαίων.
        τόφρ' ἦν ὄφρ' ἔτι γαῖα γένος χρύσειον ἔφερβεν.

There is, however, another tale current among men, that once she actually lived on earth, and came face to face with men, and did not ever spurn the tribes of men and women of old, but sat in their midst although she was immortal. And they called her Justice: gathering together the elders, either in the market-place or on the broad highway, she urged them in prophetic tones to judgements for the good of the people. At that time they still had no knowledge of painful strife or quarrelsome conflict or noise of battle, but lived just as they were; the dangerous sea was far from their thoughts, and as yet no ships brought them livelihood from afar, but oxen[s] and ploughs and Justice herself, queen of the people and giver of civilised life, provided all their countless needs. That was as long as the earth still nurtured the Golden Age.[88]

Where we have in Quintus an abbreviated description of the oversight of Justice as men work the land, in Aratus we read an extended description of the role of Justice in the Golden Age.[89] Both texts depict idealistic states for

---

[86] Cf. James and Lee 2000.51.

[87] The best study of the poem is Kidd 1997.

[88] Text and translation of Kidd 1997.ad loc. I have altered the translation at 103, where Kidd's rendering "ancient men and women" is unfortunate.

[89] On the relationship of the *Phaenomena* with the *Works and Days*, see Kidd 1997.8–10, and, in particular, 9: "The myths that link the *Phaenomena* most clearly with the *Works and Days* are those of Dike [*sic*] (*Op.* 213–285) and the Ages (109–201), which Aratus combines in 98–136."

humankind when *Dike* prevails over everything.[90] The contexts in both the Posthomeric ecphrasis and Aratus contain a contrast between war and its consequences, and the idealistic results when Justice is incorporated into human life. This passage in Aratus contrasts with a later description of the Bronze Age (Aratus 125–133), where there are mentioned wars, blood, the sword, and the slaying of oxen.[91] Such a division of Ages is similar to the division on the Posthomeric shield of Achilles between the gruesome scenes of War and the scenes of Peace. The two references to *Dike* in Aratus (105 and 113) find a parallel at 5.46, and are in particular what draw these passages together in the reader's mind.[92] The parallel is strengthened by the echo between 113 πάντα παρεῖχε Δίκη and 5.46 Δίκη δ' ἐπεδέρκετο πάντα.

Aratus presents, in many ways, his own redevelopment of Hesiod, appropriate for his own literary and cultural environment.[93] The ethos and aim of the *Phaenomena* is Stoic.[94] The Quintean meaning and presentation of *Dike* has both the initial Hesiodic value and the later, Stoically influenced, Aratean value and presentation.[95] Such a hybrid reading for *Dike* conditions reading of *Arete* at *Posthomerica* 5.50 and its value throughout the poem. My discussion that follows on the mountain of *Arete* and its Stoic inheritance as a moral allegory validates the possibility for such a Stoic value for *Dike* in the poem. I have shown so far that we can read a Hesiodic (perhaps non-moral) meaning for *Dike*, an Aratean, Stoic meaning, and a Quintean meaning that incorporates both the Hesiodic and Aratean passages, and clarifies them into a reading of *Dike* that is at once moral and closely connected to, or imitative of, the archaic idea of the oversight and involvement of Zeus in the cosmos. I have also shown that the Hesiodic, Aratean, and Quintean passages involve a separation between the idealistic state where Justice prevails and is revered, and the opposite ideal where wars and bloodshed occur, and especially in the case of the *Posthomerica*, where Justice is an inescapable avenger of evil deeds. The poet elicits a reading based on

---

[90] Note, in particular, the emphasis on the closeness between people and gods (a Golden Age ideal) made explicit at *Phaenomena* 104.

[91] This lack of war in the Golden Age is also made clear by lines 108–109.

[92] The description of the tribes of men and women (ἀνδρῶν ... φῦλα γυναικῶν 102–103) is echoed by *Posthomerica* 5.45 (φῦλα ... ἀνθρώπων).

[93] Cf. Sale 1966 and Kidd 1997.10–12. See also *OCD s.v.* "Aratus".

[94] Cf. Kidd 1997.10 on the proem of the *Phaenomena*: "While the character and language of the proem are clearly Hesiodic, its content strongly reflects the cosmic beliefs of the contemporary Old Stoa, especially as they are expressed in Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus*."

[95] On Aratus' signification for *Dike* as a Stoic interpretation of Hesiod, see Sale 1966.162–163.

textual correspondence within the *Posthomerica* that expounds the full value of terms loaded with a specific intertextuality. This presence of Hesiod's *Works and Days* within an ecphrasis that is primarily based on the Iliadic shield of Achilles, and purports to be one and the same thing, is seen again in the mountain of *Arete*. I move now to assess the meaning and intertextuality of the *Arete* in the next scene. We will see that Homer, Hesiod, and other later sources all contribute to the overall meaning.

iii. *Unfolding Ecphrasis: The Mountain of* Arete

The mountain of *Arete* is an emblem of a running theme, or ethic, found throughout the *Posthomerica*, and holds a central importance as a signifier of the poem's philosophy.[96] I will demonstrate that the mountain of *Arete* can be read as a *mise-en-abîme* of the key ethic of the poem, and will discuss how the scene on the shield and its narrative correspondences interact in their intertextuality and function.

> αἰπύτατον δ' ἐτέτυκτο θεοκμήτῳ ἐπὶ ἔργῳ
> 50 καὶ τρηχὺ ζαθέης Ἀρετῆς ὄρος· ἐν δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ
> εἱστήκει φοίνικος ἐπεμβεβαυῖα κατ' ἄκρης
> ὑψηλὴ ψαύουσα πρὸς οὐρανόν. ἀμφὶ δὲ πάντη
> ἀτραπιτοὶ θαμέεσσι διειργόμεναι σκολόπεσσιν
> ἀνθρώπων ἀπέρυκον ἐὺν πάτον, οὕνεκα πολλοὶ
> 55 εἰσοπίσω χάζοντο τεθηπότες αἰπὰ κέλευθα,
> παῦροι δ' ἱερὸν οἶμον ἀνήιον ἱδρώοντες.

> Highest of all on that work of divine craftsmanship was depicted the rugged mountain of sacred *Arete*, and here *Arete* herself was standing mounted aloft on top of a palm, stretching up towards the heavens above. And in all directions round about pathways made difficult by dense thorn bushes kept men back from the noble path, because many shrank back in awe of the sheer paths, and few ascended, persevering, up the sacred way.
> (*Posthomerica* 5.49–56)

The unrealism and the figurative nature of the scene immediately strike the reader. A mountain is something easy enough to visualise, but a mountain of a personified abstraction, *Arete*, is something altogether different.[97]

---

[96] The shield of Eurypylus also holds meaning for the main narrative, and especially the role of Eurypylus, since the shield depicts the twelve labours of Heracles. Cf. the treatment of that ecphrasis by Baumbach 2007.133–139.

[97] Cf. Maciver 2007.261: "[The scene] is one that strikes the reader as allegorical in nature: that is, a description of a mountain of *abstract quality* is clearly not an actual, geographic mountain."

It is clear that the primary narrator is narrating something not found in the everyday life of the reader, but rather a symbol, something enigmatic and philosophical.[98] Despite the unworldly-ness of the scene, however, the primary narrator is eager to stress that it actually was designed by Hephaestus on the worked metal. The adverb that opens the scene at line 49 (αἰπύτατον) is an explicit focus by the primary narrator on the worked medium: it suggests the highest position on the shield.[99] In the same line, the primary narrator, with ἐτέτυκτο (line 49), explicitly indicates that the mountain of *Arete* was made by Hephaestus in that process of making the shield described in *Iliad* 18.[100] Every time there is a focus on the workmanship and the artificer, as is the case with this verb, and the accompanying words θεοκμήτῳ and ἔρ-γῳ (line 49), an illusion in our reading is formed. It is drawn to our attention that these scenes were actually physically depicted by Hephaestus, and that therefore, this line which opens the description of the mountain of *Arete* emphasises that this scene is not just an interpretation of an Iliadic shield scene, but that it was actually on the physical shield that Achilles carried into battle. That is, the narrator strains to point out that this scene which describes the mountain of *Arete* is truly Hephaestean even though it was not described by the Iliadic primary narrator. The distinction, of course, between an ecphrasis and referential world and plastic depiction and physicality is purely fictional, as the basis for ecphrastic description is illusionary: the bard's re-focus onto a worked artefact creates an impression of interpretation on the part of the narrator who 'views' a work of art that is only theoretical, and that exists only according to words of the omniscient poet figure such as the Homeric narrator or the Posthomeric narrator.

The mountain of *Arete* is non-Homeric but is physically and centrally on the shield of Achilles made by Hephaestus—it is highest (αἰπύτατον) of all the depictions narrated by the Iliadic or Posthomeric narrator in the

---

[98] Contrast the Iliadic shield of Achilles: "Even more remarkable is the choice of decorative motif; the shield displays not monstrous horrors to terrify its bearer's opponents, as do the shield of Agamemnon and the baldric of Herakles (*Od.* 11.609–614), but scenes familiar to the poet's audience from their everyday life" Edwards 1991.200. Byre 1982.*passim* has no reservations in treating the mountain of *Arete* as an allegory.

[99] The superlative does not occur in the *Iliad*. Of the occurrences of the positive form, the majority in the *Iliad* are used with ὄλεθρος in a metaphorical sense: 6.57, 10.371, 11.174, 11.441, 12.345, 12.358, 13.773, 14.99, 14.507, 16.283, 16.859, 17.155, 17.244, and 18.129. In a literal sense, it is used at *Iliad* 2.538 (city), 2.603 (mountain), 2.829 (mountain), 6.327 (wall), 11.181 (wall), 13.317 (of a person), 15.71 (Troy itself), and at 5.367, 5.868, and 15.84, of Olympus.

[100] The forging and decorating of the shield is described in general terms at *Iliad* 18.468–482.

respective texts.[101] This emphasis on the height and prominence of the scene within the shield reflects the fundamental importance of the figure. It is no accident that more attention has been paid to these lines by scholars than to any other part of the *Posthomerica*.[102] Most of this scholarship has been centred on possible sources for the depiction of the mountain of *Arete* here, with less attention paid to its function.[103] The idea presented as the mountain of *Arete*, the arduous and difficult journey to the top of the mountain, and the emphasis on hard work, is replicated (or even explicated) throughout the *Posthomerica* in numerous gnomai spoken both by primary and secondary narrators.[104]

The mountain of *Arete*, like the lines that describe the personified *Dike* that watches over mortals (5.46), has an intertextuality that begins with Hesiod. The first passage I wish to discuss is Hesiod *Works and Days* 287–292:

> τὴν μέν τοι κακότητα καὶ ἰλαδὸν ἔστιν ἑλέσθαι
> ῥηιδίως· λείη μὲν ὁδός, μάλα δ' ἐγγύθι ναίει·
> τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἱδρῶτα θεοὶ προπάροιθεν ἔθηκαν
> 290 ἀθάνατοι· μακρὸς δὲ καὶ ὄρθιος οἶμος ἐς αὐτήν
> καὶ τρηχὺς τὸ πρῶτον· ἐπὴν δ' εἰς ἄκρον ἵκηται,
> ῥηιδίη δὴ ἔπειτα πέλει, χαλεπή περ ἐοῦσα.

> It is easy for you to get inferiority and lots of it: the way is smooth, and it lies very nearby. But the immortal gods placed sweat in front of *arete*. The road to it is great and steep and rough at first. But when the top is attained, then it is easy, despite its previous difficulty.[105]

---

[101] Baumbach 2007.112 states that the opening lines of the ecphrasis that describe the heaven, air, and sea (5.6–16) are in the centre of the shield, and the ocean, described last by the narrator (5.99–101), is on the rim. This interpretation does not take account of the mountain of *Arete* as described as made highest on the shield—it would be more suitable for that scene to take the position of the shield's boss, if indeed we should assign position to any of the scenes.

[102] This scholarship is summarised in Maciver 2007.259nn1 and 2. See also Vian 1966.203–205 and James and Lee 2000.52–54.

[103] Cf. Maciver 2007.259 and especially 259n3. Byre 1982.184–195 is interested in finding the source of the original image of the *phoenix* and the personified *Arete* that sits on it (*Posthomerica* 5.50–52). Bassett 1925.414–418 argues that Quintus' depiction of the mountain of *Arete* is influenced by Cebes' *Tabula*. See Maciver 2007.261n8.

[104] I am not the first to argue that the mountain of *Arete* is echoed elsewhere in the *Posthomerica*, but I am the first to describe this echoing, to functionalise it, and to discuss the effect of the interactions in the text. Cf. Wenglinsky 2002.144: "Quintus' references to *Arete* (Excellence) approach, more nearly than does anything else in the *Posthomerica*, developed allegory linked with larger themes of the poem." I define, analyse, and discuss gnomai in full in the next chapter.

[105] For χαλεπή περ ἐοῦσα (292), see M.L. West 1978.230.

In this passage Hesiod explains to his brother Perses the two opposite ideals that he can attain. One of them, inferiority (κακότητα 287), is easy to get (287–288), but the other, *arete*, is attainable only with sweat (289) and a long and arduous trek up to it (290–291).[106] The parallels between this passage and the mountain of *Arete* in the *Posthomerica* are clear.[107] What is also similar is the close conjunction of *arete* (or *Arete* in the case of the *Posthomerica*) with *Dike* in the contexts of both passages, in Hesiod and Quintus. Hesiod dwells on the theme of *dike* and *hybris* at 202–285, and at 274–285 deals particularly with the personified *Dike*, just as personified *Dike* is found at *Posthomerica* 5.46. Hesiod connects the importance of right conduct and adherence to Justice with the theme of hard work.[108] So too, seemingly, does Quintus. In the scenes of peace on the shield of Achilles, *Arete* follows when *Dike* is present overseeing the work of men. Men strive to get to the top of the mountain of *Arete*, and just as in Hesiod *Arete* is synonymous with hard work,[109] so too, in Quintus, the way to get to the top of the mountain of *Arete* is through hard work, or sweat (5.56).[110] *Posthomerica* 5.57–65 depicts harvesting and arable farming with ploughs and oxen, with much hard work involved. This scene compliments the toil necessary to get up the mountain of *Arete* described at 5.56, and thus implies a simplistic explication of the mountain of *Arete*, in a manner that is Hesiodic.

It is useful to assess how much of the function of the Hesiodic passage transfers to our reading of the mountain of *Arete* in the ecphrasis. In the middle of the shield of Achilles, Quintus echoes an allegorical passage from the *Works and Days* that was imitated throughout antiquity.[111] It is valid, therefore, to read an aspect of Hesiodic didacticism and allegory in the mountain of *Arete* in the *Posthomerica*.[112] The primary narratees of this

---

[106] According to M.L. West 1978.229, *kakotes* and *arete* are "not 'vice' and 'virtue' but inferior and superior standing in society, determined by material prosperity". Cf. O. Becker 1937.56–58.

[107] Cf. Maciver 2007.263 and see James and Lee 2000.52 for the verbal parallels: the clearest echoes are seen in τρηχύ 5.50, of τρηχύς 291, οἶμον 56, of οἶμος 290, ἱδρώοντες 56, of ἱδρῶτα 289, and αἰπά 55, of ὄρθιος 290.

[108] Cf. M.L. West 1978.38–39: "We are switched over from the righteousness theme to the work theme."

[109] On this passage in Hesiod, and in particular the possible values of *arete*, see Michna 1994.93–107.

[110] Cf. Hesiod *Op*. 298–299 that builds on the picture given at *Op*.287–292, and especially the imperative at 299: ἐργάζεο. Cf. M.L. West 1978.50–51.

[111] Cf. M.L. West 1978.229 and Hommel 1949–1950.157–165. Cf. also Vian 1966.203–204.

[112] Cf. Maciver 2007.263: "The fact that, in the central scene on the shield of Achilles, a Hesiodic intertext occurs, which itself is allegorical and didactic—a specifically gnomic part of a didactic text—suggests didacticism on the part of Quintus here."

ecphrasis are told how to achieve, in life, *Arete*, which lies at the end of sweat and a difficult journey. This didacticism in the ecphrasis, lent from Hesiod, and the figure's application to the reader, fits with the later post-Hesiodic intertextuality of the mountain of *Arete*. Not only does Quintus read Hesiod in this way, but he reads Stoics reading Hesiod in this way. The mountain of *Arete*, while primarily Hesiodic in its inheritance, is a Stoic image by the time of Quintus.[113] In the three Lucianic passages following, the mountain of *Arete* is perceived as the most readily identifiable stereotype associated with Stoicism as a philosophy generally, at least in the time of Lucian.[114]

There is a tradition before Lucian, however. The story first related by Prodicus, and transmitted in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, begins a tradition that derives from Hesiod,[115] but which focuses on a specific idea of cross-roads, and a choice between two specific and contrasting ways. Such a choice confronts Heracles, between a long and difficult path to virtue,[116] as personified in the figure of *Arete*, and a shorter and easier path to vice, as personified by *Kakia*. This idea of a choice at the crossroads was received and adapted by later writers up to the time of Quintus, and continues right up to the Middle Ages.[117] One of the key developers of the idea was Cebes (1st Century CE), who presented, in his *Tabula*, a contrast between *Paideia* and *Pseudopaideia*,[118] and the two ways of *Arete* and *Apate*.[119]

---

[113] See James and Lee 2000.52–54 for discussion of the possible influences on this scene, and Vian 1966.203–204.

[114] On Stoicism generally in Quintus, cf. Wenglinsky 2002.18: "Like many educated men, [he] seems to have subscribed to vaguely Stoic beliefs, which are expressed throughout the poem. Given the popularity of the philosophy of the period of and before the *Posthomerica*'s composition, this is hardly surprising, and perhaps unavoidable."

[115] Cf. James 2000.52–53, who states that the post-Hesiodic literary tradition begins with this passage in Xenophon *Memorabilia* 2.1.22–23. For the development throughout literary tradition of Prodicus' myth, as read in Xenophon, see Waites 1912.9–18. Waites (1912.11) suggests that Prodicus originally might have been influenced by the idea of the two ways of the Pythagorean symbol Y. See the references in Vian 1966.203–204. Cf. Fitzgerald and White 1983.24 for a similar interpretation of Cebes' two ways of *Arete* and *Apate* (*Tabula* 15.3–33.2): "The choice between them coincides with the decision made at the crossroads of life, symbolised by the letter Y. The *Tabula* is therefore not Stoic, but Neo-Pythagorean." Byre 1982.191–195 gives this Pythagorean signification specifically for the palm and *Arete* who stands on top of it at *Posthomerica* 5.50–52.

[116] It is a path that involves *ponos* and sweat (Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.21).

[117] See Waites 1912.19–42.

[118] Cf. Waites 1912.13 and C.P. Jones 1986.24: the latter emphasises the popularity of Cebes.

[119] Fitzgerald and White 1983.14 state "that the underlying structure of the content is really nothing more than an expanded form of the Prodicus myth". Bassett 1925.414–418 argues strongly for the relevance of Cebes as a source for the Posthomeric ideal of *Arete* on the shield of Achilles, in that the abstraction is non-moral in both authors.

There is, however, a clear difference between the tradition that follows Xenophon, and the presentation of the mountain of *Arete* on the Posthomeric shield of Achilles. Xenophon *Memorabilia* 2.1.22–23, and all the literature that derives from it, contain the idea of two ways, one to *Arete* and one to *Apate* or *Kakia*.[120] In Quintus, on the other hand, there is only one way, the noble way (ἐὺν πάτον 5.54 or ἱερὸν οἶμον 5.56) to the top of the mountain of *Arete*, and no suggestion of another path to an opposite ideal. There are many paths that prevent men from getting to the one true path (5.52–54), but there is no mention of the end of these paths.[121] We may read to an extent the Prodicus myth in the mountain of *Arete* on the Posthomeric shield, but the concentration on one way, one specific mountain, and the emphasis on the journey up the path to the ideal at the top of the mountain, derives more from contemporary (or slightly earlier) Stoic influences, rather than any sense of Pythagorean or Neo-Pythagorean ideals.[122]

The mountain, or hill, of *Arete*, is found in Lucian's *True Histories*. The *ego* in the dialogue, the first person narrator as main character within the text and personified projection of the author, after seeing so many famous figures from mythology and literature on the 'Isle of the Blessed', wonders why the Stoics are not also present.[123]

> τῶν δὲ Στωϊκῶν οὐδεὶς παρῆν· ἔτι γὰρ ἐλέγοντο ἀναβαίνειν τὸν τῆς ἀρετῆς ὄρθιον λόφον.
>
> None of the Stoics were present; for they were said to be too busy trying to get up the steep hill of *Arete*. (Lucian *Verae Historiae* 2.18.11–12)

The point of the satire here is that a life in pursuit of *Arete* is a Stoic ideal, but here on the Isle of the Blessed none of them are present because of their insistence on the necessity of climbing the mountain of *Arete*— it keeps them even from a life of blessedness. What is important for the purposes of discovering the Stoic inheritance of the mountain of *Arete* in the *Posthomerica* is that it is the Stoics themselves, in Lucian, who climb the mountain of *Arete*. The mountain of *Arete* is to be read there in Lucian as an identifying emblem of Stoicism: it is so much theirs that it keeps them

---

[120] See Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.22–23, and Cebes *Tabula* 15.3–33.2 (for which see Fitzgerald and White 1983.24).

[121] See the discussion at Maciver 2007.264n23.

[122] It is interesting to note the connection between the myth of Heracles at the crossroads, its potential, if understated presence, as the mountain of *Arete* on the shield of Achilles, and the twelve labours of Heracles on the shield of Eurypylus in *Posthomerica* 6.198–293.

[123] *Verae Historiae* 2.18.11–12.

from 'heaven'.[124] The catalogue of philosophical schools in the *True Histories* is not necessarily tied down to one defined period of eminence: thus the Stoics and the hill of virtue need not relate to the contemporary attitudes of Lucian's readership or even of Lucian himself. However, Quintus *has* this image on the shield, and the one philosophical school this image belongs to is Stoicism (whether it was a strong philosophical force in his time or not).[125]

A similar idea occurs at Lucian *Vitarum Auctio* 23. Lucian satirises the philosophies and the exponents of the philosophies of antiquity up to and including the age in which he writes. He selects stereotypes of each philosophy that will be immediately identifiable for the reader, that is, the most recognisable tenet of the philosophical schools (otherwise the satire and stereotype would be without effect). At chapter 23, he ridicules Stoicism by making the interlocutor in the dialogue ask Chrysippus about the mountain of *Arete*.

> τί πράξεις πρὸς τὸ ἀκρότατον τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀφικόμενος;
>
> What will you do after you reach the very top of ⟨the mountain⟩ of *Arete*?

There is no explicit mention here of a mountain or hill, but the superlative adjective (ἀκρότατον) juxtaposed with *Arete* (τῆς ἀρετῆς),[126] the verb of motion (ἀφικόμενος), and the preposition taking an accusative of motion towards (πρὸς τὸ ἀκρότατον) imply that we should assume one here. Chrysippus, one of the chief figures of Stoicism after Zeno, is asked, of all the details in Stoicism, specifically about the mountain of *Arete*.

In the *Hermotimus*, the eponymous interlocutor Hermotimus, a Stoic, attempts to defend his philosophy.[127] Discussion centres, at length, around the mountain of *Arete* of the Stoa (see especially chapters 2–15). At *Hermotimus* 2, the Stoic interlocutor quotes Hesiod as the origin of the image that the Stoics inherited or read for their own philosophical purposes.

> ἡ δ᾽ Ἀρετὴ πάνυ πόρρω κατὰ τὸν Ἡσίοδον οἰκεῖ καὶ ἔστιν ὁ οἶμος ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν μακρός τε καὶ ὄρθιος καὶ τρηχύς, ἱδρῶτα οὐκ ὀλίγον ἔχων τοῖς ὁδοιπόροις.

---

[124] Cf. Maciver 2007.265: "Both this passage and the scene in the Posthomeric ecphrasis describe a hill (or mountain) of *Arete* (λόφος—ὄρος, Q.S. 5.50) which is steep (ὄρθιος—αἰπὰ κέλευθα Q.S. 5.55; Cf. ὑψηλή Q.S. 5.52) and which few are able to climb. In Lucian we read an additional element—that Stoics themselves climb the mountain." On the hill of virtue, see Georgiadou and Larmour 1998.198.

[125] On Lucian's satire and Stoicisim, see C.P. Jones 1986.27–29 and Georgiadou and Larmour 1998.40–44.

[126] See LSJ *s.v.* ἄκρος 1.

[127] See Maciver 2007.265–266 for further discussion of this section of the dialogue, and in more detail, von Möllendorff 2000b.

Arete according to Hesiod dwells very far away and the way to her is long and steep and rough, with lots of sweat involved for the travellers.

(Lucian *Herm.* 2)

Here we have a Stoic reading of Hesiod. The Stoic interlocutor Hermotimus cites the literary example of Hesiod, who was not a Stoic, and manipulates the reference into something Stoic. Hesiod did not envisage an *Arete* that had a Stoic meaning, but the Stoic Hermotimus, speaking for the Stoa, posits Stoic concepts onto an archaic literary passage. This is exactly how the reader reads Quintus with his implication of the mountain of *Arete* within the shield of Achilles. The image is Hesiodic, and fits with other Hesiodic echoes prior to it in the ecphrasis, such as in the description of *Dike* at 5.46. However, we must remember that it is the Late Antique poet Quintus reading Hesiod. The meaning of *Arete*, and the purpose of the image on the shield, will recall Hesiod, but at the same time have a later, and in this case, Stoic, meaning and function too.[128] The *Arete* described in the Posthomeric ecphrasis contains Homeric and Hesiodic significances, but also carries the later moral force given to it by Stoicism.[129]

Arete un-personified of course occurs too in the *Posthomerica*. The abstract quality *arete* is mentioned five times in the *Posthomerica* (all in the words of secondary narrators) outside of the description of *Arete* on the shield of Achilles (5.50) and twice in the speech of the deified Achilles to his son Neoptolemus (14.195 and 14.200).[130] All five occurrences seem to contain an Iliadic meaning of 'excellence' in battle-conduct.[131] In Homer, *arete* signifies excellence in relation to particular skills, such as horsemanship (as suggested by *Iliad* 23.571), speed of foot (*Iliad* 20.411), or even horses' speed (of Achilles' horses at *Iliad* 23.276). More typically, however, *arete* in the *Iliad*

---

[128] This will be seen clearly below when I examine the correspondences of the image. These correspondences all bespeak Stoicism, and lead us to strengthen our Stoic reading of the mountain of *Arete*. Contrast Michna 1994.167, who states that it establishes nothing other than an archaic-epic moral.

[129] There is an immediate difference from Hesiod, of course, in the fact that the *Arete* of the mountain of *Arete* is personified. This point of the scene has received less attention than the fact that *Arete* stands aloft a palm (εἱστήκει φοίνικος ἐπεμβεβαυῖα 5.51). Vian 1966.204 comments on the uniqueness of the image in literature, and suggests (1966.205) an oriental physical influence outside of the literary sources. Byre 1982.191–195 convincingly argues for an identification of the Pythagorean symbol Y, of the parting of two ways, with the palm mentioned at 5.51. He argues for this on the basis of Roman funerary motifs and a passage in Persius (5.35), cited in Servius' discussion of the Golden Bough at *Aeneid* 6.136 (Byre 1982.192–193).

[130] It occurs at *Posthomerica* 1.732, 3.124, 5.592, 7.651, and 7.668.

[131] Cf. LSJ *s.v.* ἀρετή: "Goodness, excellence of any kind, in Hom[er] esp. of manly qualities".

signifies courage or prowess in battle.[132] Of the five examples of the quality (un-personified) in the *Posthomerica*, 7.651, where Phoenix tells Neoptolemus of the courage of Achilles,[133] and 7.668, where Neoptolemus, in answer, places this *arete* firmly in relation to conduct in battle,[134] are the most Iliadic in meaning. Similarly, Hera at *Posthomerica* 3.124 speaks of Apollo's jealousy of Achilles' *arete*,[135] which should be read as Achilles' prowess in battle, since Hera mentions the equal valour of his replacement Neoptolemus, immediately before mention of Achilles' *arete*, and goes so far as to explain this jealousy of Achilles' *arete*: because he was the best of men (3.124).

The other two instances in the *Posthomerica* share this meaning, since they can be related to the context of battle. They also, however, have another shade of meaning that varies our simplistic reading of *arete* as prowess in battle. Odysseus, in his lament for Ajax (*Posthomerica* 5.574–597), speaks of their quarrel about prowess, which, he says, is always a healthy delight for right-minded men.

> "ἀλλά μοι ἀμφ'ἀρετῆς νεῖκος πέλεν, ἧς πέρι δῆρις
> τερπνὴ γίνεται αἰὲν ἐύφροσιν ἀνθρώποισι."

> "But our quarrel was about *arete*, for which the rivalry is always a delight for right-minded men".   (*Posthomerica* 5.592–593)

The context of this speech is the suicide of Ajax.[136] If, however, we take a look at what Odysseus said in the verbal contest with Ajax, we find that he emphasises the necessity for skills other than prowess in battle.[137] So when we read that Odysseus calls their contest the contest of *arete*, we alter a more simplistic 'prowess-reading' of *arete*, and incorporate a more nuanced meaning of excellence, in words and wit as well as martial deeds.[138]

---

[132] As is clear from *Iliad* 8.535, 11.90, 11.762, 13.237, 13.275, 13.277, 13.374, 14.118, and 22.268. On *arete* as prowess in battle in the *Iliad*, cf. Adkins 1960.31–37, Sharples 1991.4, and Michna 1994.82. On *arete* in Greek literature generally, see the study by Michna 1994, and cf. my discussion at Maciver 2007.262.

[133] Phoenix connects this courage, *arete*, specifically to the godlike body and strength of Achilles (7.651–652).

[134] The juxtaposition of *arete* with a term for battle could not be clearer: ἀρετὴν ἀνὰ δηιοτῆτα 7.668.

[135] *Posthomerica* 3.123–124: ἀλλ' Ἀχιλῆι / ἀμφ' ἀρετῆς ⟨ἐ⟩μέγηρας. On the jealousy of Apollo as suggested by Hera, cf. Vian 1963.100n4: "Souvenir de l'ancienne conception de la jalousie des dieux."

[136] For which see James and Lee 2000.127–128 and 132.

[137] His speech at *Posthomerica* 5.239–252 makes these points, and especially his self-referential words at 5.241–242.

[138] See my discussion above of Odysseus' speech at *Posthomerica* 5.239–252 in this respect, and cf. the brief comments at Maciver 2007.277n73.

Ironically, Odysseus refers to the *arete* required to gain the shield of Achilles which bears the mountain of *Arete*.[139]

At *Posthomerica* 1.723–740, Thersites rebukes Achilles for his apparent lust for Penthesileia, who lies dead before him.[140] He calls Achilles woman-mad, and alleges that Achilles has no mind for *arete* and the deeds of war.

> "Ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ φρένας αἰνέ, τί ⟨ἤ⟩ νύ σε⟨υ⟩ ἤπαφε δαίμων
> θυμὸν ἐνὶ στέρνοισιν Ἀμαζόνος εἴνεκα λυγρῆς
> 725 ἤ νῶιν κακὰ πολλὰ λιλαίετο μητίσασθαι;
> καί τοι ἐνὶ φρεσὶ σῇσι γυναιμανὲς ἦτορ ἔχοντι
> μέμβλεται ὡς ἀλόχοιο πολύφρονος ἥν τ᾽ ἐπὶ ἕδνοις
> κουριδίην μνήστευσας ἐελδόμενος γαμέεσθαι.
> ὥς ⟨σ᾽⟩ ὄφελον κατὰ δῆριν ὑποφθαμένη βάλε δουρί,
> 730 οὔνεκα θηλυτέρῃσιν ἄδην ἐπιτέρπεαι ἦτορ,
> οὐδέ νυ σοί τι μέμηλεν ἐνὶ φρεσὶν οὐλομένῃσιν
> ἀμφ᾽ ἀρετῆς κλυτὸν ἔργον, ἐπὴν ἐσίδῃσθα γυναῖκα."

> "O Achilles with your twisted mind, what *daimon* deceived your spirit just now for the sake of that wretched Amazon who plotted so many evils for us? A woman-mad desire in your heart is what you care about, as though you were hoping to marry a maiden as your prudent wife whom you wooed with gifts. Would that Penthesileia had anticipated you in combat with her spear-cast, since your heart delights so much in women, and no longer is the famous work of *arete* of concern to you in your destructive mind, as soon as you catch sight of a woman".
> (*Posthomerica* 1.723–732)

The speech of Thersites is resonant with intertextuality. To an extent, we have replayed before us here the scene in *Iliad* 2.211–277, but this time the recipient of abuse is Achilles and not Agamemnon. We (rightly) expect a similar outcome for Thersites here as he received in the *Iliad* after his speech of abuse.[141] The specific concern for us in this passage is the mention of

---

[139] Cf. Maciver 2007.277: "The irony is made the more cutting since Odysseus speaks the words over the dead Ajax who has obviously failed in such an ideal."

[140] In a respect, all of the occurrences of *arete* in the *Posthomerica* are in some way related to Achilles, including its occurrence in Odysseus' lament of Ajax, since they had argued over who had rescued Achilles' body, and therefore, who was worthy of Achilles and his armour.

[141] The *Posthomerica* explicitly engages in dialogue with that Iliadic scene: Achilles, after killing Thersites in retaliation for the abuse (1.743–749), reminds the dead Thersites of the unsuitability of attacking superiors (1.758), and of the outcome of his last recorded speech of abuse, at *Iliad* 2, where Odysseus punished him (1.759–760, relating to *Iliad* 2.265–269— cf. James 2004.274). The addressee is therefore also an unsuitable target for Thersites, as the words spoken by Achilles (*Posthomerica* 1.758), and the Homeric intertextuality where Thersites praises the prowess of Achilles (*Iliad* 2.239), make clear. On the intertextuality of this scene generally, and, in particular, the influence of the version in the *Aethiopis*, see Vian 1963.40n2.

arete. Thersites alleges that Achilles no longer has a mind for the famous work of *arete* (1.731–732). The whole speech of Thersites reinforces the impression that this *arete* refers specifically to the deeds of war.[142] This is made more distinct by the opposition created throughout by Thersites between the deeds of war and the lust for women. What is implied in his speech is the destructiveness of *desire* for women. Thersites portrays Achilles as foreign because of this lust. The fact that he calls Achilles woman-mad (γυναιμανές 1.726) itself brings Paris into the equation. The adjective is used only of Paris, by Hector, in the *Iliad*,[143] and its repetition here, of Achilles, and at 1.735, of the Trojans generally, sets up an opposition between the virtuous, battle-loving Greeks and the women-mad Trojans, and more particular, reflects a Thersites who casts Achilles, the warrior par-excellence, as a Paris figure.[144] To Thersites, Achilles is Trojan-like and unlike the Greeks themselves who cherish ideals of martial *arete*.

The effect of this un-heroic lust for women is made no clearer than in the gnome at 1.736–738, where Thersites states that such desire is the most destructive thing for mortals, and that it makes even a wise man, such as Achilles, senseless. Primarily, the opposition is between a martial prowess (*arete* in this context) and the opposite of strength and sense, the state of being 'woman-mad'.[145] While a similar opposition is apparent in Hector's words to Paris in *Iliad* 3 for example,[146] Thersites' moralising emphatically censures lust.[147] In a sense, Thersites comments on the cause of the Trojan War, Paris' lust, first by highlighting its effects and then aligning Achilles with the woman-mad Trojans by means of the same loaded adjective (*gynaimanes* 1.726 and 1.735). Thersites comments on the un-heroic

---

[142] Note the statement at 1.739–740, where Thersites states that the glory of victory and the deeds of war are the delights of a warrior (ἀνδρὶ γὰρ αἰχμητῇ νίκη⟨ς⟩ κλέος ἔργα τ' Ἄρηος / τερπνά). Cf. Michna 1994.150–153.

[143] It occurs just twice in Homer, at *Iliad* 3.39 and 13.769. It also occurs in Chariton (5.2.6.5), and implies that it is of the nature of a non-Greek to be woman-mad. Thus it is clear that Thersites emphasises how un-heroic, un-Greek, and most of all how unmanly it is to have such a lust for women. In effect, he calls Achilles a *barbaros*.

[144] There is here a clear role-reversal, since Thersites, through intertext, is made a figure of authority, as Hector, while Achilles becomes a battle-shirking, woman-mad, Paris. Note the parallels between that exchange in *Iliad* 3 and the words of Thersites here: 1.726, 735 ~ *Il.* 3.39; 1.729 ~ *Il.* 3.40; and 1.731–732 ~ *Il.* 3.45.

[145] The idea of losing strength because of desire for women or their bed is repeated in Thersites' speech: note, for example, 1.733 and 1.734. The conclusion of the speech emphasises that the bed of women pleases only the battle-shirker (φυγοπτολέμῳ 1.740).

[146] Hector portrays Paris as unmanly and battle-shirking at *Iliad* 3.44–45, making a connection between beautiful, womanly looks and a lack of courage.

[147] As illustrated especially by the expression ἐς λέχος ἱεμένης (1.737).

behaviour of Paris, his lack of *arete*, and the impropriety and dangers of such conduct, and then applies these details to Achilles. Achilles should not allow himself to become affected by this lust, since true men desire the deeds of war.

This stark opposition between desire and *arete* is also found in texts such as Cicero's *de Finibus*, where the Stoic Chrysippus, it is stated (*de Finibus* 2.14.44), considered the rivalry between pleasure (*voluptas*) and virtue (*virtus*) as the central issue (*discrimen*) behind the idea of the chief good in life.[148] It is this *voluptas* that the Stoics wanted to limit, and *virtus* that they wanted to strive for. Thersites' gnome reflects this tension, while staying within the sphere of the Homeric world. The destructiveness of the desire for pleasure Thersites speaks of is illustrated in the Trojan War itself, which formed the repercussions for Paris on account of his madness for women. Thersites comments on the Homeric Paris by abusing the Posthomeric Achilles.

So far, then, we need not read a meaning for *arete* in the *Posthomerica* far beyond one that contains an idea of prowess in battle. A clear emphasis is put, by Thersites, on the martial nature of *arete* that real men desire. Thus the *Posthomerica* adheres to Iliadic ideals and values, while containing scope for the reader to interpret other, post-Homeric philosophical presences. There is one gnome, however, that Thersites speaks in this speech that leads the reader away from the Homeric plain and a possible Stoic-Epicurean conflict. It describes the necessity of *ponos* to achieve *kudos*. Its close juxtaposition with the dangers of lust is designed to mark a contrast, and to highlight this gnome as an opposite ideal to the one implied by Thersites in relation to Achilles' conduct.

> πόνῳ δ' ἄρα κῦδος ὀπηδεῖ   (*Posthomerica* 1.738)
>
> *Kudos* results from *ponos*.

The gnome is a mannered allusion to Hesiod *Works and Days* 313:[149]

> πλούτῳ δ' ἀρετὴ καὶ κῦδος ὀπηδεῖ (*Arete* and *kudos* follow upon wealth).

This gnome in Hesiod builds on the theme set out throughout the *Works and Days* on the necessity of hard work to gain *arete*, which, along with

---

[148] "*Quam quidem certationem homo et acutus et diligens, Chrysippus, non contemnit, totumque discrimen summi boni in earum comparatione positum putat.*" Cf. Waites 1912.13–15.

[149] So Vian 1963.164, where he calls the echo a "transposition". It also closely resembles *Il.* 17.251 and the statement that honour (*timē*) and *kudos* come from Zeus: human endeavour (*ponos*) has replaced Zeus.

kudos, attends wealth (*ploutos*).[150] The connection between *arete* or *kudos*,
and wealth, leads the reader back to the allegorical picture presented at
Works and Days 287–292.[151] This gnomic link in Hesiod with 287–292 is acti-
vated here in the speech of Thersites, but with the particular Posthomeric
adaptation of the Hesiodic ethic. The reader notes here the replacement of
wealth (πλούτῳ *Op.* 313) by toil (πόνῳ *Posthomerica* 1.738).[152] Thersites, in
speaking of the nature of *arete*, with this gnome taps into the proverbial
series of which the mountain of *Arete* on the shield of Achilles is the centre
and motivation. There is no actual mention of *arete* at 1.738, but given the
subject of Thersites' speech, the careful allusion to Hesiod and the close con-
nection between *Arete* and *ponos* throughout the *Posthomerica*, it is safe to
interpret this statement as part of that nexus. In what follows, I will discuss
the two chief correspondences of the mountain of *Arete* in the main narra-
tive, both of which contain this idea of *ponos* as a necessity towards [*A*]*rete*
or *kudos*,[153] and will argue that underneath this superficial Homeric meaning
of military prowess for *arete*, the influence and heritage of the mountain of
Arete and the effect it has on our reading of its explications in the main nar-
rative, create another meaning for the term that is more closely connected
to Stoic principles, and comes closer to the idea of a moral, personified *Arete*
rather than simple virtue in battle. Thersites, in his verbal abuse of Achilles,
has connected the two strands that lead into our understanding of *Arete* in
the *Posthomerica*: the Homeric intertextuality, in keeping with the overall
tenor of the poem, and the Quintean, here Stoic, readings of Homer and
Hesiod.

   In the description of the mountain of *Arete*, there is no mention of *ponos*.
The only hint we as readers get of the hard work required to get to the top
of the mountain is sweat: ἱδρώοντες (5.56). This description of the need for

---

[150] On this gnome in Hesiod, see M.L. West 1978.234–235, who cites parallel passages in
lyric that illustrate the connection between *arete* and *kudos*, and wealth.
[151] So M.L. West 1978.234.
[152] The ethic on *ponos*, or the "commonplace of toil as a necessary means to virtue or
glory" as James and Lee 2000.52 call it, is found at *Posthomerica* 1.72–73, 1.738, 2.76–77, 3.8–9,
5.595–597, 6.451, 7.52–55, 7.67–92, 9.104–105, 9.507–508, 12.71–72, 12.292–296, 12.388, 13.248–
250, 13.476–479, and 14.207–208. I follow the most recent list of correspondences with the
mountain of *Arete* listed in Maciver 2007.259n2. See also Vian 1966.203 and James and Lee
2000.52.
[153] It is difficult to differentiate between *Arete* and *arete* (hence my use of square brackets).
In the first text of the *Posthomerica* there would have been no differentiation of course. It is
reasonable to expect, however, a close similarity in the meanings of the personified, and un-
personified, abstraction.

exertion to climb the mountain echoes the Hesiodic allegory (*Works and Days* 289), which also mentions only sweat (ἱδρῶτα) as a hint of the toil needed to get to *Arete*. When the reader examines the correspondences with the mountain of *Arete*, and especially the two expansions that closely reflect the figure (at *Posthomerica* 14.195–200 and 12.292–296), we read an emphasis on *ponos* as the route to *Arete*.

At *Posthomerica* 14.180–222, the deified Achilles appears to his son Neoptolemus in a vision.[154] He speaks a hortatory speech replete with instruction on how to conduct himself before others, and throughout his life.[155] His words distinctly echo the mountain of *Arete* described in ecphrasis and which we are to assume was emblazoned on the very shield Achilles himself carried into battle post-*Iliad* 18.

195 "κεῖνος δ' οὔ ποτ' ἀνὴρ Ἀρετῆς ἐπὶ τέρμαθ' ἵκανεν
ᾧ τινι μὴ νόος ἐστὶν ἐναίσιμος· οὕνεκ' ἄρ' αὐτῆς
πρέμνον δύσβατόν ἐστι, μακροὶ δέ οἱ ἄχρις ἐπ' αἴθρη
ὄζοι ἀνηέξη⟨ν⟩θ'· ὁπόσοισι δὲ κάρτος ὀπηδεῖ
καὶ πόνος, ἐκ καμάτου πολυγηθέα καρπὸν ἀμῶνται
200 εἰς Ἀρετῆς ἀναβάντες ἐυστεφάνου κλυτὸν ἔρνος."

"That man never arrived at the heights of *Arete* whose mind is not right within him. Her trunk is difficult to climb, and the great branches stretch out right into heaven; to as many as strength and *ponos* attend, they pluck the fruits of great delight after much exertion, climbing up the glorious tree of fair-crowned *Arete*." (*Posthomerica* 14.195–200)

Achilles expounds (with modification) to his son, a secondary narratee, in *Posthomerica* 14, what was narrated to us, the primary narratees, in *Posthomerica* 5. He talks of a tree of *Arete* (Ἀρετῆς ... ἔρνος 14.200), that only a right-minded person (14.196) can climb, if this person has strength and *ponos* (14.298–299). The mountain of *Arete* has become the tree of *Arete*.[156] Achilles tells Neoptolemus that if he wants to pluck the fruits of *Arete*, he must be right-minded, and have strength and *ponos*. The close correlation between this figure and the *mountain* of *Arete*, and the implication that Achilles is here explaining the figure on the shield, implies that we as readers

---

[154] The passage, like the mountain of *Arete*, has received some attention from scholars: Vian 1969.159–162 summarises some findings. See James 2004.340 for the motivation of Achilles' speech in the literary tradition of the Trojan War, in the Epic Cycle, and in Euripides' *Hecuba*.

[155] Cf. Vian 1969.160.

[156] It is difficult to ascertain what this tree is in relation to the description of the mountain on the shield. It may be the *phoenix* spoken of at 5.51, and is thus a zoomed-in focus of the broader picture presented on the ecphrasis.

should re-read the mountain of *Arete* in the light of his words. We can now equate the sweat spoken of as necessary to get to the top of the mountain of *Arete* (ἱδρώοντες 5.56) as synonymous with the *ponos* required to pluck the fruits of *Arete*, and the *ponos* spoken by Thersites at *Posthomerica* 1.738 that is the necessary concomitant of the (un-personified) *arete*.[157] We now read the mountain of *Arete* at the centre of the repeated gnomai on the necessity of having *ponos* to achieve *Arete* or *kudos*, because of this exposition by Achilles.[158]

Achilles is the ideal secondary narrator to expound the allegory, because not only was it on his shield, but because he seems to have reached the top of the mountain of *Arete* himself, in reality.[159] He is now deified and living a life of blessedness: he is plucking the fruits of great delight, after all his exertion.[160] It is implied that he lived a life of *ponos*, and wants his son to follow suit. However, while the ideal that Achilles presents is primarily for his son, and relates to conduct in battle and the context of the battlefield,[161] its correlation with the mountain of *Arete* lifts it to the level of the reader. The generality of both figures—the mountain of *Arete* and the tree of *Arete*—is contained in their gnomic nature—they apply to everyone.[162] In Achilles' description of the tree of *Arete* this is emphasised by ὁπόσοισι (14.198). It is for whomsoever *kartos* or *ponos* attend—not just Neoptolemus or his fellow heroes.[163] We, the readers, can achieve the *Arete* spoken

---

[157] Vian 1966.204.

[158] The close connection between *ponos* and *Arete* is implied by the words of Nestor to Neoptolemus before the Greeks enter the wooden horse (12.262–263): νῦν γὰρ τέρμα πόνοιο θεοὶ καὶ ἀμύμονα νίκην / ἧμιν ἐελδομένοισι φίλας ἐς χεῖρας ἄγουσιν. The echo between τέρμα πόνοιο (12.262) here and Ἀρετῆς ἐπὶ τέρματα (14.195) links the two ideas.

[159] Cf. Maciver 2007.273: "Achilles assumes the *persona* of a didactic narrator by presenting his son with the primary narrator's (ecphrastic) vision of the way to live."

[160] The fact that he is deified and speaks in his role as a father figure makes him an ideal mouthpiece of the poet, or more correctly, primary narrator who first narrated the ideal of *Arete* on the shield of Achilles. Cf. Dällenbach 1989.52 on the suitable figures for *mise-en-abîme*.

[161] *Posthomerica* 14.187–191 imply this: Achilles instructs Neoptolemus specifically on how to conduct himself in battle. Shortly after these lines, he then extends his speech onto the figure of the tree of *Arete*, so it is natural to link his prior words to the allegory.

[162] Cf. my discussion in the following chapter.

[163] James and Lee 2000.53, following Köchly 1850.266, have argued that Achilles' speech here along with the mountain of *Arete* in *Posthomerica* 5 apply to Achilles himself, who chose the short but glorious life spoken of at *Il*. 9.410–416. It is not the case that, either here or in the scene on the shield, 'a short but glorious' life is the idea put forward by these images. *Posthomerica* 5.56 in fact emphasises the very opposite idea—*Arete* is only obtained after a long hard effort that takes time. Wenglinsky is the most recent scholar to align both images

of on the shield of Achilles and reiterated here by Achilles in *Posthomerica* 14 if we have the necessary *ponos* in life.

It is clear from the context of Achilles' allegory on *Arete* that there is something here that has a meaning beyond mere prowess, and that the *ponos* required is not simply endurance on the battlefield. In both allegories, destination is implied: in the mountain of *Arete*, the aim is to get to the top of the holy way of sacred *Arete*. There is something inherent in the divinity expressed in the scene that befits afterlife and celestial rest rather than mere martial prowess. On the shield of Achilles, the repeated picture of the blessedness of the gods in contrast to the suffering of mortals combines with the divinity of *Arete* and the sacred way to her for example: the gods are already living a life of *Arete*.[164] So too here in book 14, it is a god, the deified Achilles, who speaks to his son Neoptolemus on the necessity of *ponos* to pluck the fruits of blessedness, of *Arete*, of something moral and to be achieved by virtuous characters.[165] We live a life of *ponos*, that is, an arduous climb up the mountain of *Arete*, which is a journey through a life of hardship and endurance, symbolised by the ruggedness and sheer height of the path on the mountain. There are many rugged paths that keep men away (ἀτραπιτοὶ θαμέεσσι διειργόμεναι σκολόπεσσιν 5.53) and men shrink back at the height of the mountain (εἰσοπίσω χάζοντο τεθηπότες αἰπὰ κέλευθα 5.55). After that, the traveller through life, who must have the right kind of outlook (14.196), must climb the difficult trunk of the tree of *Arete*,[166] and once that is done, only then may that person enjoy the fruits of *Arete*. This reward at the end of the 'journey' reflects the blessedness implied in Hesiod's allegory of the path to *Arete*: ῥηιδίη δἤπειτα πέλει (*Works and Days* 292).

---

on *Arete* closely with Achilles: cf. Wenglinsky 2002.146: "In both 5.49–56 and 14.195–200, *Arete* is connected with Achilles. It is satisfactory to see no more profound significance in this association than that Achilles is for Quintus a paragon of virtue."

[164] Note in particular *Posthomerica* 5.69–79. Note too that *Arete* at 5.50 is described as sacred (ζαθέης). The adjective is also used of Achilles at 14.304, whose very shield contained the image of sacred *Arete*. It is used only of the divine in the *Posthomerica*, at 2.444, 3.88, 3.545, 4.575, 5.50, 6.146, 8.295, 10.127, 11.42, 12.482, 13.276, 13.435, 14.87, 14.304, and 14.413. In the *Iliad*, it is used only of places: 1.38, 1.452, 2.508, 2.520, 9.151, and 9.293. Cf. James and Lee 2000.54.

[165] Cf. Wenglinsky 2002.147: "The emphasis placed on the possibility of such an afterlife, moreover, constitutes one of Quintus' greatest departures from Homeric sensibilities. Two who enjoy such an afterlife, of course, are Achilles and Neoptolemus, the deification of the former being clearly established in the *Posthomerica*, and that of the latter predicted. The notion of a blessed afterlife attained through merit is logically associated with these heroes, and this may well be why Quintus twice inserts idiosyncratic and detailed references to *Arete* in passages involving Achilles and Neoptolemus."

[166] *Posthomerica* 14.197: πρέμνον δύσβατόν ἐστι.

The verbal and thematic connection between the mountain, and the tree, of *Arete* is obvious, but how does the Stoic nature of the mountain of *Arete* apply to Achilles' presentation of *Arete* in *Posthomerica* 14? On the surface, we can assume that the extremely close relationship between the two figures means they share the same intertextuality and function,[167] and that therefore we can read a Stoic influence in both. When we examine the immediate context of the figure of the *tree* of *Arete*, we similarly find Stoic instruction in the words of Achilles to Neoptolemus. At 14.201–203, the lines that immediately succeed the description, Achilles exhorts his son to show indifference to pain, and exhorts him not to rejoice too much in anything good.

> "ἀλλ' ἄγε κύδιμος ἔσσο. Καὶ ἐν φρεσὶ πευκαλίμῃσι
> μήτ' ἐπὶ πήματι πάγχυ δαΐζεο θυμὸν ἀνίῃ,
> μήτ' ἐσθλῷ μέγα χαῖρε."

> "In that case, be glorious. And in your shrewd mind do not torture yourself too much over bitter sorrow, nor rejoice overmuch in good fortune".
>
> (*Posthomerica* 14.201–203)

The first exhortation of Achilles to Neoptolemus is to be glorious (κύδιμος 14.201).[168] Then he tells him not to be torn too much by pain (14.202), and to hide his joy when fortune is good (14.403). This particular exhortation is another expression, found elsewhere in the poem,[169] of the Stoic ideal of *apatheia*. Achilles tells his son to follow the ideals of Stoicism. Plutarch (*Moralia* 102 F) states that it is of the nature of educated and disciplined men to be not too joyous in prosperity, and to maintain a becoming attitude when there is adversity. Plutarch is discoursing on the strict Stoic precept of *apatheia*. It is as though Achilles tells Neoptolemus what this *ponos* is that is required to get to *Arete*: if you want this ideal, you will have a life of *ponos*, and this is exactly what *ponos* will involve.[170] Achilles' presentation of the

---

[167] This is reflected in the fact that both Vian 1969.184n3 and James and Lee 2000.53 imply that the tree of *Arete* is a mere development of the mountain of *Arete*.

[168] Thus *kudos* can be read as closely contingent upon a life of *ponos* and the pursuit of *Arete*. On the basis of the allegory, Achilles, as illustrated by the particle and imperative ἀλλ' ἄγε (cf. Denniston 1954.201), exhorts his son to get *kudos*. Cf. the gnome of Thersites at *Posthomerica* 1.738, discussed above, where he states that *kudos* and *arete* follow *ponos*.

[169] Cf. also James 2004.300. Note especially the gnome spoken by Odysseus at *Posthomerica* 5.596–597, where he enlarges on the necessity of *apatheia* pointedly in relation to the previous conduct of the now dead Ajax.

[170] Cf. Vian 1969.162 on these lines adding an aspect of the *Arete* of a sage to the earlier concentration in the speech on conduct in battle connected with martial *Arete*. Cf.

tree of *Arete* involves a non-moral, militaristic significance for *Arete* and a life in combat, and also a related meaning that is Stoic, which builds on the figure of the mountain of *Arete*, and suggests a life of blessedness after a life of *ponos*.[171]

There is one more passage I wish to discuss in relation to the idea of *ponos* and *Arete*. It occurs in *Posthomerica* 12, where Nestor commends the conduct of Neoptolemus, and suggests that because of *ponos*, they the Greeks are about to achieve their aim of sacking Troy.

> "ἐσσὶ πατρὸς κείνοιο βίῃ καὶ ἐύφρονι μύθῳ
> ἀντιθέου Ἀχιλῆος· ἔολπα δὲ σῇσι χέρεσσιν
> Ἀργείους Πριάμοιο διαπραθέειν κλυτὸν ἄστυ.
> 290 ὀψὲ δ' ἄρ' ἐκ καμάτοιο μέγα κλέος ἔσσεται ἡμῖν
> πολλὰ πονησαμένοισι κατὰ κλόνον ἄλγεα λυγρά.
> ἄλγεα μὲν παρὰ ποσσὶ θεοὶ θέσαν ἀνθρώποισιν,
> ἐσθλὰ δὲ πολλὸν ἄπωθε· πόνον δ' ἐς μέσσον ἔλασσαν·
> τοὔνεκα ῥηιδίῃ μὲν ἐς ἀργαλέην κακότητα
> 295 αἰζηοῖσι κέλευθος, ἀνιηρὴ δ' ἐπὶ κῦδος,
> μέσφ' ὅτε τις στονόεντα πόνον διὰ ποσσὶ περήσῃς."

> "You really are—in strength and in wise speech—like your father, the godlike Achilles. I hope that the Argives will raze to the ground Priam's famous city, by your hands. Great glory will fall to us at last from battle toil, we who have suffered so many grievous pains in battle. The gods set troubles at the feet of men, and they thrust good far away; and *ponos* they drove in between them; therefore, the path to grievous *kakotes* is easy for men, but the one to *kudos* is difficult—which someone attains only by a trek of painful *ponos*".
>
> (*Posthomerica* 12.287–296)

We read here another reworking of Hesiod's allegory at *Works and Days* 287–292. It is interesting to note that in this explication of the mountain of *Arete*, and in its reading of the Hesiodic allegory, we are presented with two ways, one to *kakotes*, and one to *kudos*, which replaces *Arete* here. This reading is more in keeping with the tradition of Prodicus' version. I would now say that *kudos* follows on from *Arete*, that is, it is concomitant with the gaining of *Arete*, rather than being synonymous with *Arete*.[172] This time

---

also Vian 1969.162n2 on the Stoic nature of 14.201–203, which he states, leads the reader on from the symbol of the Tree of *Arete*.

[171] Keydell 1949–1950.87–88 has suggested Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* as a parallel for Achilles' vision to Neoptolemus. Vian 1969.162 correctly argues that the parallels are too imprecise to be taken seriously.

[172] Contrast Maciver 2007.275n67. This use of *kudos* fits with the words of Thersites (discussed above) on the results of *ponos*. *Kudos* occurs 23 times in the *Posthomerica*, with the Iliadic meaning of 'glory won in war' (cf. LSJ *s.v.* κῦδος): at 1.108, 1.738, 2.77, 3.197, 4.87, 4.305,

Nestor presents his own version here to Neoptolemus whom he commends for his eagerness to be the first of the heroes to enter the wooden horse. Clearest of all in terms of Hesiodic parallels is the echo of *Works and Days* 287–288 (τὴν μέν τοι κακότητα καὶ ἰλαδὸν ἔστιν ἑλέσθαι / ῥηιδίως· λείη μὲν ὁδός) in *Posthomerica* 12.294–295 (ῥηιδίη μὲν ἐς ἀργαλέην κακότητα / ... κέλευθος), while 12.295 (ἀνιηρὴ δ' ἐπὶ κῦδος) resembles, in meaning, *Works and Days* 290 (μακρὸς δὲ καὶ ὄρθιος οἶμος ἐς αὐτήν). Nestor's words also lead back to the mountain of *Arete*: the description of paths reminds the reader of the steep paths described at 5.55 on the shield (αἰπὰ κέλευθα), and the difficult path to *kudos* (12.295 ἀνιηρὴ δ' ἐπὶ κῦδος) echoes the many ways (ἀτραπιτοί 5.53) that keep men from the noble path (ἐὺν πάτον 5.54) and the holy way (ἱερὸν οἶμον 5.56) that few ascend. The necessity of sweating up the mountain of *Arete* (5.56) is echoed here at 12.296.[173]

We can read, therefore, Nestor's words as an expansion of Hesiod's figure on *Arete*, but also as a reflection and expansion of the mountain of *Arete*. Nestor applies the meaning of the mountain of *Arete* specifically to the situation in which the Greeks find themselves. The verbal correspondence between Nestor's summary of their situation at 12.290–291 and the gnomic summary he speaks at 12.292–296 binds the original ecphrastic image to the narrative context. The Greeks have gone through much *ponos* (12.291), and are about to achieve the fruits of this *ponos*, namely, *Arete*, which itself will lead to *kleos* for them (12.290). There is also implied here an application of the mountain of *Arete* to Neoptolemus. Nestor says that Neoptolemus is so like his father, and then hopes that by his hands they will sack Troy. Such reference to likeness to Achilles foreshadows Achilles' presentation of the tree of *Arete* to Neoptolemus in *Posthomerica* 14.[174] The Greeks will achieve their *kleos* by the hands of Neoptolemus. Here it is clear that the *Arete* that the Greeks are in pursuit of, through *ponos*, is martial and is related to military glory, *kleos* (12.290) or *kudos* (12.295). In the world in which Nestor finds himself, this is how he interprets and applies the figure of the mountain of *Arete* presented on the shield of Achilles. Within the world of the *Posthomerica*, according to Nestor, they will achieve *kleos* after much *ponos*: he is not proved wrong.

4.322, 4.577 5.520, 6.451, 7.383, 7.566, 7.657, 8.472, 9.29, 12.252, 12.273, 12.295, 13.193, 13.248, 13.288, 14.113, and 14.118.

[173] Note also the resemblances between 12.292 and 5.53. The exertion up the mountain of *Arete* is reflected at 12.296 (στονόεντα πόνον).

[174] A verbal parallel draws the two passages together: 12.290 (ἐκ καμάτοιο μέγα κλέος ἔσσεται ἡμῖν) is echoed by 14.199 (ἐκ καμάτου πολυγηθέα καρπὸν ἀμῶνται).

These two expansions in *Posthomerica* 14 and 12 of the mountain of *Arete* on the shield of Achilles, set forth by characters who are suitable, authoritative, reflections of the primary narrator,[175] illustrate the importance of the central image of that ecphrasis for construction of meaning in the *Posthomerica* as a whole. Within the action of the *Posthomerica*, the characters seek after the rewards of *Arete* that will signal an end of their martial lives of *ponos*. Outside of the world of the *Posthomerica*, we as readers are told that a life of *ponos*, of sweat up the difficult but holy path towards *Arete* at the top of the mountain of *Arete*, and from there, a climb up the tree of *Arete* to pluck its fruits and consequently enjoy an afterlife of bliss, is what we must undertake. This is how to live, as long as we have the right qualities of right-mindedness, strength, and a willingness to endure hardships and the Stoic life, to be apathetic to external circumstances, whatever they might be.

The shield of Achilles is a meeting point. Despite the overtly 'Homeric' nature of the poem, the differences in presentation of the shield of Achilles in the *Posthomerica* are vital for an understanding of the ways in which Quintus as reader, and we the readers, construct its own poetic identity.[176] The shield of Achilles is like the *Posthomerica* that contains it. The shield is unavoidably Homeric in its heritage, in its name, and in its style. The *Posthomerica* is Homeric in its heritage, story, style, poetics, and language. Many of the scenes on the shield, and much of the structure, bears resemblance to the Iliadic shield. Yet the innovation on the shield, and the essentially non-Homeric intertextuality of these scenes, within the overall Homeric template, mimics the originality and non-Homeric elements of the *Posthomerica* which become evident within (or despite) a strongly Homeric style. Given the poetical conceit that we are to read this shield as *the* shield 'seen' by the bard of the *Iliad*, we are to assume that the Stoical elements were always on the shield. But Quintus is not simply vandalising the simplicity of the Homeric shield: he is reading Stoicism on the shield and in the *Iliad*, and is expounding these readings and making them more *explicit* in his own epic. I have proven that while a broadly Homeric and Hesiodic intertextuality can be read for both terms, the philosophical and cultural

---

[175] Cf. Maciver 2007.275: "Nestor, as the old man figure—one of the *personae* that naturally reflect the primary narrator in *mise-en-abîme*—acts as a mouthpiece for the exposition of the mountain of *Arete*, in a similar role to Achilles in book 14."

[176] As I have argued elsewhere (Maciver 2007.283): "In essence, the extent to which the poet exerts his own 'Homeric values' in relation to his reading and re-evaluation of the Homeric texts (especially the *Iliad*) is focused here in the extent to which he decides to describe scenes on the shield not described by the narrator of the *Iliad*."

context of the *Posthomerica* also has an impact on the terms' intertextuality and function. Stoicism is the key strand of intertextuality that we should take into consideration. To understand the Stoic ethic of *ponos* as necessary for *Arete*, we must read and understand the mountain of *Arete*. The shield of Achilles is very un-Homeric, Stoic, and functional, while still very Homeric, within the *Posthomerica*, a very Homeric, but un-Homeric, poem.

CHAPTER THREE

SPEAKING MORALITY THROUGH GNOMAI

i. *Homeric Voices? Narrators and Narratees*

> Quintus' artificiality is ... apparent in his fondness for introducing platitudinous maxims.
>
> Mansur 1940.58

> Given the importance that the ancients themselves attached to gnomic expressions in their literature, it is surprising how little attention they have received in recent scholarship.
>
> Lardinois 1997.213

In the previous chapter there was a marked occurrence of gnomai as correspondences with the mountain of *Arete*. In this chapter I will define gnomai and assess their importance in the poem. By doing so, I will continue discussion of the ethical content, philosophical tenor, and especially the mix of Stoicism and Homeric ideals which, as I have shown, construct a large part of the *Posthomerica*'s identity. The *Posthomerica* is permeated with gnomai, something that has not gone unnoticed.[1] Köchly shapes the scholarly view of this phenomenon: "*Ipsa Quinto maxime pecularis est. Frequentissime enim et paene ad nauseam usque locos communes admiscuit, qui maximam partem sapientiam vulgarissimam produnt.*"[2] A similar view of the 'vulgarity' of these gnomai is found in Vian.[3] More recently, James notes the "unnecessarily negative" bias in scholarship on "the uncomfortable mix of traditional epic paganism with Stoic doctrine" evident in gnomai, and states himself that "certainly it is the aspect of the work that amounts to some degree of modernization of Homeric epic".[4]

---

[1] See the summary of scholarship on gnomai in the *Posthomerica* at Maciver 2007.269n41. There has been no specific study on gnomai in the *Posthomerica*, other than, most recently, the statistics and brief discussion in Maciver 2007.269–271.

[2] Köchly 1850.xcv.

[3] Vian 1963.xxxvii.

[4] James 2004.xxviii.

The high volume of gnomai is indeed noteworthy and an aspect of the poem which will strike the reader. I will begin with analysis of where and how gnomai are used in the *Posthomerica*, positing discussion within the framework of the Homeric-imitative nature of the poem. Most of the gnomai in fact not only echo Homeric gnomai but also share similar functions. There are, however, significant alterations to the ethical and philosophical content of some important gnomai within the poem that, despite their broad Homeric intertextuality, contrast with the precepts read in the Homeric poems.

In its broadest sense, a γνώμη, according to Aristotle, is a general statement.[5] Quintilian similarly calls the gnome, or Latin 'sententia', a *vox universalis*.[6] Such a definition fits the idea of the gnome in all its occurrences, whether literary or in the sense of traditional spoken sayings.[7] This is the key idea behind wisdom sayings, or gnomai: while they occur in specific literary contexts, with specific meanings for those literary contexts, they are general and universal in meaning and specification. The epic gnome, because of this generality, operates at different levels, with differing levels of application. On the one hand, it operates on a specific literary, intra-textual level:[8] that is, it functions within its textual setting and affects reading of that specific textual setting and its context within the whole literary work. On the other hand, the gnome operates at the reader's level, due to the universal generality of the gnome's meanings and potential meanings, through the reader and his / her literary and cultural background. Stenger writes that, as the expression of "*Volksweisheit*", the gnome appears to deprive every contradiction of basis.[9] Gnomai manipulate listener (or reader) response because they create empathy, and therefore gain the desired reaction—they appeal to the world of the addressee, which is shared by the poet and / or the speaker in the text. Gnomai demand reader-participation with the text to achieve their full force.

---

[5] *Rhetoric* 1394a21–22.

[6] Quintilian 8.5.3, where he equates '*sententiae*' with gnomai. I find that many *sententiae* in Latin literature, especially in Senecan tragedy, have an added dimension of wit through placement and rhetoric. Cf. Tarrant 1985.21. Cf. Canter 1925.85–99 for detailed discussion of Senecan rhetoric.

[7] Cf. *DNP s.v.* "gnome": one must differentiate between literary gnomai incorporated into speeches in Homer and the more independent gnomai such as those found in Pindar.

[8] Cf. Maciver 2007.269n40 (following Lardinois 1997.214).

[9] Stenger 2004.8.

A working definition of the epic gnome, in Homer and Quintus, is as follows:[10] it is a wisdom saying, mostly found in the climax of exhortatory speeches, and mostly spoken by those famed for wisdom or oratory. The content of the gnome is designed to add force to the main argument of a speech or to add reason for action. The general truth of the gnome appeals to all listeners, that is, it is a universal statement with which they can concur and then apply its relevance to the context in which they are found.[11] Gnomai can also occur in the primary narrative, often echoing gnomai in the secondary narrative. These gnomai are, in particular, aimed at a readership, and create a didactic atmosphere for the poem: we as readers are instructed. The format of the gnome usually includes an explanatory particle such as γάρ to build on and conclude the previous arguments in a speech or narrative. The gnome can vary from a generic statement on something or someone's qualities, or more specifically to expressions on matters such as fate or death. The essential aspect of a gnome is that it expresses a matter that is broadly true for an audience inside the epic in an epic situation, or / and, from there, to the reader of the poem.

When it comes to analysing the specific function of gnomai within the literary text, they must never be read apart from their context. According to Lardinois, gnomai in the *Iliad* are accompanied by a statement of explanation, which gives a vital focus or point of identification for the gnome itself.[12] For example, at *Posthomerica* 2.36–40, Priam consoles the Trojans after the death of Penthesileia by pointing to the arrival of Memnon. His speech is designed to counter the speech by Thymoetes (2.10–25), who, vexed by the deaths of Hector and Penthesileia, suggested flight from a doomed Troy as the best recourse for the Trojans.

> "αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἀσπασίως μοι ὑπέσχετο πάντα τελέσσαι
> ἐλθὼν ἐς Τροίην· καί μιν σχεδὸν ἔλπομαι εἶναι.
> Ἀλλ' ἄγε τλῆτ' ἔτι βαιόν, ἐπεὶ πολὺ λώιόν ἐστι

---

[10] This definition is based on my reading of all the gnomai in Homer and Quintus; I am also indebted to works by Lardinois 1997, Stenger 2004, the article on the gnome in *DNP*, and Boeke 2007—the latter work is particularly useful on cosmology and gnomai (in Pindar), esp. 11–27.

[11] Cf. Boeke 2007.13: "The gnomai of antiquity reflect the views of ancient communities on the nature of their world and how this world works with regard to both human and extra-human realities. Moreover, gnomai generally have enough authority to pronounce on how life should be lived in the world they portray."

[12] Lardinois 1997.218. I prefer not to use the word 'explanation' for the contextual statement that, both in Homer and in Quintus, more frequently provides an introduction or premise which a gnome then proceeds to explain: the gnome itself is really the 'explanation'. I instead use the expression 'contextual statement'.

θαρσαλέως ἀπολέσθαι ἀνὰ κλόνον ἠὲ φυγόντας
40   ζώειν ἀλλοδαποῖσι παρ' ἀνδράσιν αἴσχε' ἔχοντας."

> "But he gladly promised to me to accomplish all these things after arrival in Troy, and I believe he is in fact near at hand. So then, come, bear up a little longer, since it is far better to perish in battle bravely than to flee and to live among foreign men, bearing shame". (*Posthomerica* 2.36–40)

Priam asks the people to endure until the hope-giving arrival of Memnon. He concludes this exhortation, and his speech, with a gnome, advising that it is better (πολὺ λώιόν ἐστι 38) to die in battle (θαρσαλέως ἀπολέσθαι ἀνὰ κλόνον 39) than to bear the consequences of shameful flight (ἠὲ φυγόντας / ζώειν ἀλλοδαποῖσι παρ' ἀνδράσιν αἴσχε' ἔχοντας 39–40).[13] The gnome marks a conclusion (or last word) on Priam's previous argument on the benefits of surviving until the arrival of Memnon, and is used as a means of persuasion: the general truth of his gnome builds on the specificity of the situation.[14] They should stay because Memnon will arrive, and because, as a general truth, it is better rather to die in war than live in the cities of foreigners after fleeing shamefully. A listener, and then a reader of this speech, could sympathise with the veracity of the gnomic statement, and hence be convinced by his speech. Note the presence of ἐπεί (2.38) as an indicator that the gnome is an explanation, or last word, on his previous statements.[15] The gnome challenges Thymoetes' assertion that flight from a city about to perish was better than facing Achilles in battle (2.23–25). Staying until Memnon arrives, and then fighting and even dying for Troy is the more honourable option. Priam, with this gnome, also appeals to the warrior's heroic code, and the ethos of the *Iliad*.[16] Dying in war is what a warrior does, bravely (θαρσαλέως).[17]

This is the pattern with the majority of gnomai in the *Posthomerica*. The gnome, spoken usually by a character famed for speaking or for their leadership, is applied to the narratees in the text, to their situation, and

---

[13] This advice is echoed by Neoptolemus to the Greeks at *Posthomerica* 11.219. The exact opposite of this advice is given by Menelaus to the Greeks at *Posthomerica* 6.30.

[14] That is, the 'sucker-punch'. Cf. Stenger 2004.8 on gnomai in the *Iliad* giving legitimacy to advice given by experienced heroes like Nestor.

[15] Conjunctions such as γάρ and ἐπεί "indicate that the gnome provides an argument for the preceding remark" Lardinois 1997.219–220.

[16] Cf. Finley 1978.105: "The main theme of a warrior culture is constructed on two notes— prowess and honour. The one is the hero's essential attribute, the other his essential aim."

[17] "[Death] is what the hero faces every time he goes into battle. It is clear in Homer that the soldier would, in general, prefer not to fight" Griffin 1980.92. Priam's position of authority also persuades the listeners. They fear Priam and thus do not openly dissent (2.64–65). Cf. Schofield 2001.225.

to similar situations. In addition, the gnome extends to the world of the reader, and can bear information with which the reader can equally concur or empathise. I shall treat all gnomai as existing specifically within their context, but also as having a wider application both within the written text, and at the level of the reader's cultural and literary background. It is important to give the figures for gnomai in the *Posthomerica* before further discussion, however: the sheer scale of gnomai in the poem led Paschal to declare that Quintus "was … a pious poet, a preacher of morality to the young; in this of course, differing widely from Homer".[18] This is not a line of argument I follow myself, but the statistics are remarkable. There are a total of 132 gnomai in the *Posthomerica*.[19] Lardinois finds 154 gnomai in the *Iliad*.[20] The *Posthomerica* has proportionately more gnomai than the *Iliad*,[21] even though it is slightly more than half as long as the *Iliad*, at 8,772 lines long. When we take into account the frequency of speeches in each epic (24% of text in the *Posthomerica* versus 44% of text in the *Iliad*),[22] and keep in mind that gnomai mostly occur in speeches,[23] the *Posthomerica* has a remarkably large proportion of gnomai. There are two possible reasons for this volume. One may be the overtly Homeric-imitative nature of the poem: Quintus attempts to emulate a typical Homeric feature by outdoing Homer in frequency and placement of the device; the other reason could

---

[18] Paschal 1904.42–43.

[19] I separate 'strings', that is, combinations of gnomai, unlike Ahrens 1937.12–38 for the *Iliad*. I also make no distinction between an *enthymeme* and a gnome, since an *enthymeme* is a gnome. For the significance of an *enthymeme*, see Aristotle *Rhetoric* 1394b21–22 and Maciver 2007.269n43. Cf. Morales 2004.107n45 and her discussion of gnomai in Achilles Tatius.

[20] Lardinois 1997.215; Lardinois is not altogether correct in his totals: he finds seventy-three gnomai more for Ahrens's total of 81 (Ahrens 1937.12–38). He adds *Il.* 2.24–25, which Ahrens 1937.14 already has in his list; Lardinois also adds *Il.* 9.309, 312–313, and 12.212–214, which are not in fact gnomai: cf. the discussion at Maciver 2007.269–270n44. There are, therefore, 150 gnomai in the *Iliad*. For the sake of convenience, I will keep to Lardinois' published figures.

[21] There is one gnome for every 66 lines of text, on average, in the *Posthomerica*, and one out of a total 102 lines on average in the *Iliad*. I have divided here from the accurate total of 8,772 lines of the *Posthomerica* rather than the total given in James and Lee 2000.1 of 8,800 lines.

[22] Cf. Elderkin 1906.2–3: "Quintus in the Posthomerica has 24 per cent speech—2073.5 verses in a total of 8,786." Of the other epics, the *Iliad* has 44% of the whole epic; *Odyssey*: 66%; *Argonautica*: 29%; *Posthomerica*: 24%; and Nonnus: 36% (Elderkin 1906.2). The low figure in the *Posthomerica* may be accounted for by the high incidence of battle narrative, and the diverse, episodic nature of the subject matter.

[23] James and Lee 2000.12 and Lardinois 1997.218.

be the excessive tendencies of later Greek poetry.[24] Whatever the reason is, this amount of 'wisdom-text' has an unavoidable control on the ethical themes of the poem. In this way, gnomai behave as a thematic unifier of the *Posthomerica*, and bearer of Posthomeric ethics: the high concentration makes this possible.

Of these gnomai, 33 are in the words of the primary narrator in the *Posthomerica*,[25] unlike the Homeric epics, that have only three in the words of the Iliadic primary narrator, and two in the words of the Odyssean primary narrator.[26] There is a clear gulf in poetic practice here. Why does Quintus place a large number of gnomai in the mouth of the primary narrator? It does seem, at least superficially, that such an amount of gnomic material in the main narrative gives the *Posthomerica* a moral flavour.[27] A narrator's voice which could be read as synonymous with a reconstructed poet's voice and which speaks frequent universally applicable precepts implies didacticism.[28]

---

[24] See Campbell 1981.132§ 388, and Hopkinson 1994a.5 and 1994b.123, both of Nonnus.

[25] *Posthomerica* 1.31–32, 72–73, 116–117, 809–810; 2.83–85, 263–264; 3.9–10; 4.64, 66–69, 379, 434–435; 7.9–10, 390, 635–636; 9.194, 347–349, 385; 11.274–277, 282; 12.342–343, 388; 13.12–13, 204–205, 248–250, 269–270, 287–289 (×2 gnomai), 495, 559; and 14.53–54, 98–100, 112–114, and 389.

[26] *Il.* 16.688–690 (applied to Patroclus), 20.265–266 (applied to Aeneas), 21.264 (applied to Achilles); *Od.* 5.79–80, and 16.161 (Lardinois 1997.230, 232).

[27] Huart (1973.41, 112, and 114) identifies this function in gnomai; cf. Stickney 1903.2, who gives this particular sense to Hesiodic gnomai.

[28] The variety of subject matter and incidence of gnomai spoken by the primary narrator in the *Posthomerica* is non-Homeric, since all three gnomai spoken by the primary narrator in the *Iliad* have a single theme, that of man's inferiority to the gods. In terms of subject matter, those spoken by the primary narrator occur evenly spread among categories that I have constructed for all of the gnomai in the *Posthomerica* (the gnomai spoken by the primary narrator are marked *). Fate / furies: 1.31–32*; 6.434; 7.67–92, 289; 9.416–420*, 449–506, 507–508; 11.274–277*; 13.495, 559*; 14.98–100*; bravery v cowardice / flight ("*necessitatem vel fortitudinem roboris et victoriae matrem praedicavit*" Köchly 1850.xcv): 2.38–40, 76–78, 275–276; 6.30–31, 46, 389; 8.18–19; 9.86–87; 11.219–220; 11.282*; 12.62–63, 67–72 (×3 gnomai); 12.230–233 (×2 gnomai), 388* (most of these gnomai are spoken in hortatory speeches); death: 1.115–117*, 809–810*; 2.263, 393–394; 3.523–524; 5.553–555; 7.52–55, 280–286, 657–658; 9.194*; 13.204–205*; 14.205–206; the gods or related matters: 1.502–503; 3.458, 642–643; 4.106; 7.9–10*, 52–55, 67–92; 8.262–264; 10.19, 301–303; 12.206–209, 12.292–296, 560–561; 13.369–373; 14.98–100*, 256; *kudos* through *ponos*: 1.72–73*, 736–740; 2.76–78; 3.9–10*; 4.64*, 322; 5.595–597; 6.449–451; 7.52–55 (of endurance of evil fate), 67–92, 635–636*; 9.104–109, 507–508; 12.71–72, 230–231, 265, 292–296, 388*; 13.248–250*, 476–479; 14.112–114, 207–208; social status: 1.464–466, 502–503, 736–740, 751–754, 758; 2.83–85*, 158–160, 318; 3.76; 7.39–40, 390*; 11.492–493; 12.342–343*, 13.202, 269–270*, 287–289*; 14.53–54*, 193, 389*; and age: 2.325–326; 4.434–435*; 5.155–156; 13.193–194. None of the gnomai in the *Posthomerica* are repeated verbatim, despite the similarity in content.

A primary narrator, moreover, also implies a primary narratee. Every gnome pronounced by the primary narrator has a target recipient. Even an explanatory conjunction such as γάρ signals the guiding of the primary narrator to enable the primary narratee to understand what is being said, why a character is behaving in such a way, why a character dies or events take place in the ways they do.[29] The primary narrator points to his understanding of the way the world of the story, narrated, works. We construct the cultural assumptions of the poet by reading these gnomic insights into the philosophical and ethical workings of his poetic world. This insight into the working of this 'world', or didacticism as we receive it in reading the text, is evident especially in the poem's gnomai that contain a running theme, and that echo each other with their information. I have shown that the *Posthomerica* contains a recurring ethic loosely summarised as '*kudos*, or *Arete*, is achieved only through (painful) ponos'. The gnome is centralised in the words of the primary narrator in the description of the shield of Achilles, and reflected in gnomai spoken by both primary and secondary narrator(s). Thus, gnomai behave as the explicators of this centralised gnome, and point back, as we read and interpret them, to the mountain of *Arete* on the shield of Achilles. In order to interpret the central figure of the ecphrasis, we need to interpret the information in the gnomai. For a Homeric-emulative poem, this recurrence of gnomai in the primary narration builds an overall mood of wisdom, of ethical values, and the necessity of following them that is directed at the first recipients of this advice: the readers as primary narratees. From there the secondary narrators share this wisdom of the Posthomeric world with the addressees in the poem itself. Thus the gnomic communications among characters in the *Posthomerica* mirror the very reading process involved in interpreting gnomai read in the primary narration.

Gnomai, in their subject matter and context, have an appropriate point of contact with the characters who speak them.[30] In the *Posthomerica*, speaker-prominence and reputation from the Homeric texts seem to be reflected in the proportions of gnomai per character. Of the 99 spoken gnomai in the *Posthomerica*, the two characters famed for speaking in the *Iliad*, Nestor and Odysseus, have the greatest number, 19 and 11 respectively.[31] Compare the 19

---

[29] Cf. de Jong 1997.311.

[30] This has been established for the *Iliad*'s speeches: see, especially, Mackie 1996.*passim*, and Martin 1989.120. Contrast Stickney 1903.40.

[31] For Nestor as an astute user of gnomai and digressions in the *Iliad*, cf. Lardinois 2000.650–651. In the *Posthomerica*, Nestor has three gnomai in book 2: 275–276, 325–326,

of Achilles and 11 of Agamemnon in the *Iliad*. Those two characters speak a large proportion of the speeches in the *Iliad*, and therefore, arguably, speak the greatest number of gnomai.[32] The case is no different in the *Posthomerica*: Nestor, in particular, frequently speaks as the authoritative sage figure,[33] the means of directing the Greek army's conduct in the right direction in the *Posthomerica*.[34] Of the other speakers, Deiphobus has seven gnomai in the poem,[35] as does Neoptolemus, despite the fact that he appears in the narrative only from book 7 onwards.[36] Achilles has five,[37] Thersites and Philoctetes have four each,[38] and Ajax, Memnon, Diomedes, and Menelaus all have three gnomai each,[39] while Priam, Paris, Eurypylus, and an anonymous *tis* speaker (not necessarily the same one) all have two each. It is interesting to note that few gnomai are spoken by the gods. This may be due to the lack of dissent or need of persuasion among them, or simply because of the rarity of their appearances in the epic.[40]

393–394; one in each of the books 3–5: 3.523–524; 4.322; 5.155–156; ten in book 7: 3–40, 52–55 (×3 gnomai), 67–92 (×6 gnomai); one in book 8: 473; and two in book 12: 265, 292–296. The only gnomai Odysseus speaks occur in books 5 and 12: nine in book 5: 242–252 (×6 gnomai), 262–265, 574–575, 595–597; and two in book 12: 230–233 (×2 gnomai). As the statistics make clear, significant clusters of gnomai occur within single speeches. These statistics broadly reflect Iliadic proportions: Nestor speaks 10 gnomai in total: *Il.* 1.274, 278; 4.320; 8.143–144; 63–64; 11.792, 801; 14.63; 23.315–318, 319–325; and Odysseus speaks 13 gnomai: 2.196–197, 204, 290–291, 292–294, 297–298; 9.249–250, 256; 11.408–410 (to himself); 19.162–170, 182–183, 221–224, 227, 228–229. Odysseus' gnomai in the *Iliad* also occur in clusters.

[32] "The two speak respectively 823 and 588 lines" Griffin 1986.52. The gnomai in the *Iliad* for each are: Achilles: 1.63, 218; 9.309, 312–314, 318 (gnomai according to Lardinois 1997.215), 319, 320, 341–342, 406–409; 16.52–54; 18.107–110, 328; 21.184–185, 190–191, 193; 23.103–104; and 24.524, 525–528, 529–533. Agamemnon's gnomai: 2.24–25, 61–62; 4.235; 5.331–332; 7.409–410; 9.116–117; 14.80, 81; and 19.79–80, 81–82, 90–91.

[33] The content of Nestor's gnomai does not have overwhelming uniformity of subject matter: what *is* significant is the emphasis in two of them on age, which have a direct bearing, in context, on the status of Nestor as an aged, experienced sage (*Posthomerica* 2.325–326 and 5.155–156).

[34] This was also Nestor's role in the *Iliad* (Martin 1989.103). It is clear that Nestor's chief role in the *Posthomerica*, on the basis that he speaks the largest number of gnomai, is that of councillor and director; cf. Mansur 1940.27–28. He speaks the second largest number of speeches in the poem: cf. Elderkin 1906.27: "Neoptolemus though not appearing until the poem has reached its middle point, is given the greatest number of speeches—19. Nestor stands next with 14."

[35] All occur in the same speech: *Posthomerica* 9.86–109.

[36] The seven are: *Posthomerica* 7.289, 8.18–19, 11.219–220, 12.67–92 (×3 gnomai), and 13.240.

[37] 1.758, 3.76, 14.193, 14.205–206, and 14.207–208.

[38] Thersites: 1.736–740 (×4 gnomai); Philoctetes: 9.520–524 (×3 gnomai), and 11.492–493.

[39] Ajax: 1.502–503, 3.439–443, and 3.458; Memnon: 2.148–150, 2.154–155, and 2.318; Diomedes: 4.106, 6.46, and 13.202; and Menelaus: 6.30–31, 13.369–373, and 14.168.

[40] Cf. Wenglinsky 2002.1–2. The gnomai are: Priam: 2.38–40 and 2.158–160; Paris: 2.76–78

Gnomai lace the words of the *Posthomerica*'s characters and influence the construction of identities and themes in our reading of speeches. There has been recent fruitful research into the gnomai of the *Iliad* that utilises techniques of analysis developed from studies of wisdom sayings in other fields and cultures. André Lardinois, an exponent of this new research, has identified six categories for spoken gnomai in the *Iliad*, on the basis of a gnome's context:[41] a first person plural ~ indirect second person gnome; a first person singular ~ indirect second person gnome; a third person singular / plural ~ indirect second person gnome; an indirect second person gnome with substitute addressee; an indirect second person gnome with substitute speaker (for example *Iliad* 9.252–256, where Odysseus uses the words of Peleus as a ploy to bring in a third emotional referent); and a direct second person gnome.[42] These rather enigmatic category headings will be clarified through discussion of specific examples in both the *Iliad* and the *Posthomerica*.

Lardinois, of *Iliad* 11.469–471, writes that Menelaus, in trying to persuade Ajax to help him relieve Odysseus, uses an exhortation in the contextual statement (ἀλλ' ἴομεν καθ' ὅμιλον 469), referring specifically to himself and Ajax, but indirectly to Ajax alone, since he, Menelaus, was willing to go into battle anyway.[43]

> "ἀλλ' ἴομεν καθ' ὅμιλον· ἀλεξέμεναι γὰρ ἄμεινον.
> 470 δείδω μή τι πάθῃσιν ἐνὶ Τρώεσσι μονωθεὶς
> ἐσθλὸς ἐών, μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Δαναοῖσι γένηται."

> "Come on, let's go into the thick of the action; for it is better to lend aid. I fear lest somehow that good man suffers isolated among the Trojans, and lest great longing come upon the Greeks".   (*Iliad* 11.469–471)

The contextual statement (ἀλλ' ἴομεν 11.469) is followed by a gnome: "for it is better to lend aid" (469). Lardinois calls this a "first person plural / indirect second person gnome", which makes the "request sound more

---

and 10.301–303; Eurypylus: 6.389 and 6.434; and *tis*: 12.560–561 and 14.256. The other spoken gnomai in the *Posthomerica* are: Theano: 1.464–466; Calliope: 3.642–643; Tecmessa: 5.553–555; Teucer: 6.449–451; Deidameia: 7.280–286; Lycomedes: 7.297; Phoenix: 7.657–658; Helenus: 8.263–264; Ganymede: 8.441–442; Polydamas: 10.19; Calchas: 12.62–63; *Themis* (personified): 12.206–209; Ilioneus: 13.193–194; a sailor: 13.476–477; and Athene: 14.432.

[41] Lardinois 1997.222.

[42] The 'indirect second person gnome with substitute addressee' and 'indirect second person gnome with substitute speaker' categories do not occur in the *Posthomerica* and are therefore irrelevant.

[43] 1997.222.

friendly",[44] since the gnome is spoken both as a self-encouragement, but also as an encouragement directed specifically towards the other member(s) of the group, other than the speaker. A very similar first person plural / indirect second person gnome occurs at *Posthomerica* 1.502–503, where Ajax encourages Achilles to enter battle with him, since the Greeks are sorely pressed by Penthesileia.

> "ἀλλ' ἴομεν, μὴ Τρῶες ὑποφθάμενοι παρὰ νηυσὶν
> 500 Ἀργείους ὀλέσωσι, καταφλέξωσι δὲ νῆας,
> νῶιν δ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ἐλεγχείη ἀλεγεινὴ
> ἔσσεται. οὐ γὰρ ἔοικε Διὸς μεγάλοιο γεγῶτας
> αἰσχύνειν πατέρων ἱερὸν γένος, οἵ ῥα καὶ αὐτοὶ
> Τροίης ἀγλαὸν ἄστυ διέπραθον ἐγχείῃσι
> 505 τὸ πρὶν ἅμ' Ἡρακλῆι δαΐφρονι."

> "Come on, let's go, lest the Trojans get to the ships before us and slaughter the Argives and set fire to the ships. Then there will lie a shameful reproach upon both of us. For it is not right for the offspring of great Zeus to shame the holy *genos* of their fathers, fathers who before, with shrewd Heracles, even themselves sacked the glorious city of Troy with their spears".
>
> (*Posthomerica* 1.499–505)

The context makes clear that Ajax, sitting with Achilles apart from the battle and in mourning, has heard the rout caused by the Trojans nearby (Αἴας / οἰμωγῆς ἐσάκουσε 495–496), and suggests to Achilles that they both go to assist the Greeks (ἀλλ' ἴομεν 499). An addition of an *exemplum* in Ajax's short speech to Achilles further characterizes Ajax (1.503–505): he says that their forefathers sacked Troy—therefore, *a fortiori*, they must do the same. Ajax, as in the *Iliad* model above, uses this 'friendly' gnome to coerce Achilles out of mourning for Patroclus. We read an Ajax who learns from the gnomic practice used towards him by Menelaus in the *Iliad*. He appropriates the gnomic function used by Menelaus towards him in the *Iliad*, and uses it, respectfully, as a means of persuading Achilles. Thus intertextuality provides a literary continuum between epics, and proves that the words spoken by Menelaus to him in the Iliadic model were understood as polite by Ajax.[45] Ajax understanding and reconstructing the example of Menelaus reflects the poet figure Quintus reading and rewriting the gnomic function constructed by Homer.

The gnome and its context, of course, echo a far more famous passage in the *Iliad*, the dialogue between Glaucus and Ajax on their common ancestry:

---

[44] 1997.223.
[45] Of Ajax in the *Posthomerica*, Mansur writes that "Quintus has made a fine character of Ajax, who is ennobled and more heroic than in Homer" 1940.15.

note especially *Iliad* 6.208–210, and, specifically, 6.209.[46] The allusion allows Ajax to appropriate the heroic code of the *Iliad*, the scene of friendship between Glaucus and Diomedes, and the result.[47] Thus the *Iliad* here adds an entirely new layer of meaning (and reading) to the Posthomeric gnome. Ajax echoes Homeric ideologies that help to remind Achilles of his duty to the Greeks, and to follow the example of his ancestors. In this instance then, Quintus closely follows, and manipulates, Homeric gnomic function, and adds vivifying, Homeric meaning.[48]

Lardinois also writes of the first person singular / indirect second person gnome.[49] This is a gnome that applies primarily to the speaker, but has implications for the addressee too. Lardinois uses *Iliad* 1.218 as an example, where Achilles tells Athene that it is better for him that he obey her, since the gods will listen to a man who obeys them.

> "χρὴ μὲν σφωῖτερόν γε, θεὰ, ἔπος εἰρύσσασθαι
> καὶ μάλα περ θυμῷ κεχολωμένον· ὣς γὰρ ἄμεινον·
> ὅς κε θεοῖς ἐπιπείθηται μάλα τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ."

> "It is necessary for me, goddess, to pay heed to the word that you two speak, even though I am angered in heart—for thus it is better: the gods listen to the man who obeys them". (*Iliad* 1.216–218)

While the gnome and contextual statement apply primarily to the speaker—Achilles himself—Achilles' words have implications for Athene.[50] Achilles is constructing indirectly in this gnome the reciprocal idea of '*do ut des*', and implies he wants something in return from the gods for his obedience. A cogent example of such a gnome occurs at *Posthomerica* 6.434. Here Eurypylus, over the dead Machaon, answers his opponent's 'death-bed' prophecy—a prophecy that foretold his (Eurypylus') death—by saying that he does not care:

> "Νῦν μὲν δὴ σύ ⟨γε⟩ κεῖσο κατὰ χθονός· αὐτὰρ ἔγωγε
> ὕστερον οὐκ ἀλέγω, εἰ καὶ παρὰ ποσσὶν ὄλεθρος
> σήμερον ἡμετέροισι πέλει λυγρός. οὔ τι γὰρ ἄνδρες
> ζώομεν ἤματα πάντα· πότμος δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται."
435 ὣς εἰπὼν οὔταζε νέκυν.

---

[46] μηδὲ γένος πατέρων αἰσχυνέμεν, an echo found by Vian 1963.31n4.

[47] The allusion, moreover, underscores the close ties of kin and friendship between the two heroes: see Vian 1963.31n3.

[48] The other first person plural / indirect second person gnomai in the *Posthomerica* are: 2.76–78, 148–150, 154–155, 158–160; 3.523–524 (a good example of polite persuasion); 4.106; 5.155–156; 6.30–31, 449–451; 8.473; 9.499–506; 10.19; and 12.62–63, and 292–296.

[49] 1997.223.

[50] Particularly his words on the result of obedience—the gods listen (1.218).

"Now lie there in the dust. But I do not care for what will be, even if today
baneful death stands by my feet. For men do not live forever—a fateful end
is earmarked for all." So speaking Eurypylus stabbed the corpse.

<div align="right">(Posthomerica 6.431–435)</div>

The reply of Eurypylus primarily concerns himself—he acknowledges that
men do not live forever, and does not care even if his death is near. More
significant is the fact that his addressee is dead. Men do not live forever,
as illustrated by the dead Machaon: the narrative situation reinforces the
truth of the gnome—it is indirectly applicable to the (dead) addressee.
Eurypylus the speaker of the universal truth has been the effecter of the
same universal truth. The prophecy and reply of Eurypylus also echoes
Iliad 22.355–367, where Hector foretells Achilles' death and Achilles answers
over the corpse of Hector that he himself will receive his death at the
(divinely) appointed time.[51] Thus, again, intertextuality is important: it here
foreshadows Eurypylus' death and lends irrefutable proof to Eurypylus'
statement that (432–433) he does not care if death is near.[52]

There is also found in the *Posthomerica* what Lardinois calls a third
person singular or plural / indirect second person gnome, exemplified by
Iliad 2.196–197:[53]

195 "μή τι χολωσάμενος ῥέξῃ κακὸν υἶας Ἀχαιῶν·
     θυμὸς δὲ μέγας ἐστὶ διοτρεφέων βασιλήων,
     τιμὴ δ' ἐκ Διός ἐστι, φιλεῖ δέ ἑ μητίετα Ζεύς."

"May he not in anger do some harm to the sons of the Achaeans! For the anger
of god-supported kings is a big matter, to whom honour and love are given
from Zeus of the counsels".[54]   (*Iliad* 2.195–197)

Here Odysseus politely speaks a gnome about the honour of kings as coming
from Zeus. Odysseus is seeking support for Agamemnon, and speaks these
words to the other Greek leaders in an attempt to convince them about
Agamemnon's decisions and authority. The gnome applies to Agamemnon
(third person singular), but also, indirectly, has a message for the addressees
of Odysseus—Agamemnon's authority is divinely-given, and therefore they

---

[51] Cf. *Il.* 16.852–853 for a similar prophecy of Patroclus to Hector.
[52] Cf. Stenger 2004.28. The other first person singular / indirect second person gnomai are:
3.642–643; 7.52–55, 280–286, 289, 657–658; 8.18–19, 441–442; and 9.94–95. For foreshadowing
through gnomai, cf. *Posthomerica* 1.31–32 of Penthesileia (spoken by the primary narrator).
No one cannot escape their furies—therefore she will meet her death.
[53] Lardinois 1997.223.
[54] Translation of Lattimore 1951.ad loc.

should reverence this.[55] In the *Posthomerica*, a significant occurrence of such a gnome occurs at 3.439–443, spoken by Ajax in the middle of a speech of lamentation for Achilles. His gnome is indirectly directed at the man who shot Achilles with an arrow.

435 "Ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ, μέγα ἕρκος ἐυσθενέων Ἀργείων,
κάτθανες ἐν Τροίῃ Φθίης ἑκὰς εὐρυπέδοιο
ἔκποθεν ἀπροφάτοιο λυγρῷ βεβλημένος ἰῷ,
τόν ῥα ποτὶ κλόνον ἄνδρες ἀνάλκιδες ἰθύνουσιν·
οὐ γάρ τις, πίσυνός γε σάκος μέγα νωμήσασθαι
440 ἠδὲ περὶ κροτάφοισιν ἐπισταμένως ἐς Ἄρηα
εὖ θέσθαι πήληκα καὶ ἐν παλάμῃ δόρυ πῆλαι
καὶ χαλκὸν δηίοισι περὶ στέρνοισι δαΐξαι,
ἰοῖσίν γ' ἀπάνευθεν ἐπεσσύμενος πολεμίζει·
εἰ γάρ σευ κατέναντα τότ' ἤλυθεν ὅς σ' ἔβαλέν περ,
445 οὐκ ἂν ἀνουτητί γε τεοῦ φύγεν ἔγχεος ὁρμήν"

"O Achilles, great bulwark of the Argives great in might. You have perished in Troy far from broad-planed Phthia, struck down by a baneful arrow from an unknown source, such as cowardly men shoot into the fray. *For no one who is adept at handling the great shield, and knows to set well the helmet on his brows for war, and knows to brandish the spear in his hand, and to cleave enemies' chests with bronze, fights with arrows, running away.* For if he who shot you had come opposite you at that time, he would not have escaped unwounded the onrush of your spear". (*Posthomerica* 3.335–345)

Ajax (while outwardly lamenting Achilles) is referring to true warriors (in the third person), and conversely to the cowards who use arrows. No man who knows how to use the real weapons of war would ever use an arrow—therefore the person who shot the arrow is not a real warrior. The gnome is directed (indirectly) at the person who shot the arrow, of whom Ajax is ignorant. The reader, aware of the archer's identity, applies the gnome to Apollo. The gnome also refers indirectly to the dead Achilles, the warrior par excellence, as the post-gnome narrative at lines 444–445 make clear: the shooter could never have faced Achilles and have escaped uninjured—Achilles, a hero who certainly knew how to brandish a true warrior's weapons.[56] Here the gnome has the force of abuse, rather than the politeness of the *Iliad* example.

---

[55] Lardinois 1997.224: "The implication of this saying is that the Greek commanders should obey their leader and stop running away."

[56] Cf. the similar gnome the dying Achilles himself speaks at *Posthomerica* 3.76, directed at the shooter of the arrow. The other third person singular, indirect second person gnomai in the poem are: 1.751–754 (which itself echoes *Il.* 2.196–197); 2.325–326; 3.76; 5.242–252, 262–265; 6.46 (an abusive gnome); 7.67–92 (used as encouragement / consolation, itself an echo of *Il.* 24.524–525, for which see Ahrens 1937.38); and 9.507–508.

Again, however, intertextuality adds another dimension. At *Iliad* 11.390, Diomedes speaks a gnome to Alexander, saying that arrows are a blank weapon of a useless fighter:

> "οὐκ ἀλέγω, ὡς εἴ με γυνὴ βάλοι ἢ πάϊς ἄφρων·
> 390 κωφὸν γὰρ βέλος ἀνδρὸς ἀνάλκιδος οὐτιδανοῖο."

> "I do not care, no more than if a woman or a witless child had shot me; for it is the blank weapon of a cowardly, worthless man".   (*Iliad* 11.389–390)

Diomedes has just been shot by Paris' arrow, and consequently has to be carried away from battle. The parallel merges, in the *Posthomerica*, the identity of Apollo the killer of Achilles, with the mythically traditional culprit, Paris: Apollo is cast in the figure of Paris, and thus Quintus manages to merge two traditional accounts of the killing of Achilles. The irony is reinforced in both the model and this passage: the arrow is, in fact, far from a useless weapon, and the gnomai are thus undermined by the statuses of those struck by the arrows. Diomedes was carried from battle, and Achilles was killed.

The only other category identified by Lardinois that applies to the *Posthomerica* is the direct second person gnome,[57] which he describes as used by a speaker in a position of authority, or by one who wishes to claim authority.[58] Such a definition applies (broadly) to this poem. They are one of the most common types of gnomai in the *Posthomerica*,[59] and similarly range from having a function of abuse to the more typical use employed by those who hold authority over others, namely, to get the desired action as a result of hortatory, or peremptory, speeches.[60] As Lardinois notes, they can also be used in entreaty between members of the same family, or between those who are close.[61]

I have shown, in my discussion of gnomai and their function in relation to the categories set down by Lardinois, that intertextuality brings an entirely

---

[57] 1997.229.

[58] 1997.226–227; cf. Lardinois 2000.643 (where he lists the direct second person gnomai), who writes that "of the forty-three second person gnomai in the *Iliad*, thirty-four are spoken by persons in a clear position of authority over their addressee".

[59] The following are the direct second person gnomai in the *Posthomerica*: 1.464–466, 736–740, 758; 2.38–40, 275–276, 393–394; 4.322; 5.574–575, 595–597; 6.389; 7.39–40, 297; 8.262–264; 9.86–87, 104–109, 520–524; 10.301–303; 11.219–220, 492–493; 12.67–72, 206–209, 230–233, 265, 560–561; 13.193–194, 240, 369–373; and 14.168, 193, 205–206, 207–208, and 432.

[60] Cf. the abusive, direct second person gnomai that Thersites speaks in abuse of Achilles at *Posthomerica* 1.736–740, discussed in chapter II.

[61] Lardinois 1997.227–228.

new and vivifying dimension to the function of gnomai. Not only do the Posthomeric gnomai exhibit functions that resemble the ways in which the Homeric gnomai can be read, they also echo actual Homeric gnomai which lend their significance from their Iliadic contexts. I now move on to discuss specific examples of this dynamic of intertextuality, but within a nexus of Posthomeric intratextuality, where gnomai echo other gnomai in the *Posthomerica* often spoken by different narrators. More significantly, I will also show that some of the key series of gnomai spoken by secondary narrators are laced with post-Homeric, Stoic, content.

ii. *Fate, Gods, and the Sayings of Nestor*

In the *Posthomerica*, secondary narrators frequently echo, or foreshadow, gnomai spoken by the primary narrator. Gnomic argumentation within secondary narrator-discourse often becomes validated because of thematic and verbal parallels within primary narration.[62] The canvass becomes more expansive with textual interactions with previous literature, especially with the Homeric poems. I will focus on the case of Nestor as reflector of primary narrator-spoken gnomai and ethics, and will illustrate how the Homeric and non-Homeric ideologies are found in dialogue and thus how a tension is created within a text that is at once profoundly Homeric, and by its date and (therefore) thematic tendencies, un-Homeric. I begin, however, with an example from *Iliad* 16.688, spoken by the primary narrator concerning the impending death of Patroclus; it is repeated by Hector at *Iliad* 17.176,[63] with only slight alterations:

> νήπιος· εἰ δὲ ἔπος Πηληϊάδαο φύλαξεν
> ἦ τ' ἂν ὑπέκφυγε κῆρα κακὴν μέλανος θανάτοιο.
> ἀλλ' αἰεί τε Διὸς κρέσσων νόος ἠέ περ ἀνδρός.

> Poor fool! If only he had guarded the word of the son of Peleus he would have escaped the evil fate of black death. But the mind of Zeus is always stronger than the mind of a man.   (*Iliad* 16.686–688)

---

[62] There is grounding, on a purely theoretical and narratological level, for hearing the voice of the primary narrator of the *Posthomerica* in the words of secondary narrators. "The narrating activity of the narrator [primary narrator-focalizer] is permanent throughout the whole text: it is his voice which is responsible for the *diegesis* as well as the *mimesis*" de Jong 2001.482. de Jong derives this conclusion partly from Plato's discussion of Homer at *Republic* 3.392c–394d (see de Jong 2001.481). As Lardinois (1997.233) points out, the ancients had no difficulty in identifying the narrator's voice in the speeches of heroes. Cf. Huart 1973.19.

[63] Lardinois 1997.231.

~

"νῦν δέ σευ ὠνοσάμην πάγχυ φρένας οἷον ἔειπες,
ὅς τέ με φὴς Αἴαντα πελώριον οὐχ ὑπομεῖναι.
175 οὔ τοι ἐγὼν ἔρριγα μάχην οὐδὲ κτύπον ἵππων·
ἀλλ' αἰεί τε Διὸς κρέσσων νόος αἰγιόχοιο,
ὅς τε καὶ ἄλκιμον ἄνδρα φοβεῖ καὶ ἀφείλετο νίκην
ῥηϊδίως, ὁτὲ δ' αὐτὸς ἐποτρύνει μαχέσασθαι."

"But now I despise your heart for what you said that I cannot stand up to
mighty Ajax. In no way am I the one who shudders at battle and the din of
horses. But the mind of Zeus the aegis-bearer is always stronger. He puts to
flight even the warlike man, and easily takes away Victory, when he himself
has stirred up a man for the fight".   (*Iliad* 17.173–178)

The first Iliadic passage is spoken by the Iliadic primary narrator, and marks
the death of Patroclus which follows almost immediately. The warrior does
not heed the advice of Achilles, but instead goes charging into the thick of
the fighting that eventually leads to his death at the hands of Hector. The
gnome on the superiority of Zeus' mind over mortals' implies the reason
for Patroclus' drive into battle—it is caused by Zeus, as Patroclus lives out
his destiny.[64] Hector, in the second passage, is speaking to Glaucus, and
asserts his own prowess in battle. Then we get an almost identical gnome
that the primary narrator spoke with reference to Patroclus.[65] We should do
more with this echo than to put it down to the mechanics of repetition in
oral poetry, or even just to read the primary narrator's superseding voice
in Hector's speech. A death is being foreshadowed, because the first use of
the gnome prefigured Patroclus' death: we recall the result of that gnome.
The gnome spoken by Hector, with its full implications, contradicts his
own boast at 17.175.[66] Hector unknowingly echoes the voice of the primary
narrator, and enlarges on the strengths of Zeus over mortals, and as a
result, he forecasts his own death.[67] This Iliadic example demonstrates how

---

[64] In the *Iliad*, Patroclus' death is foreshadowed in the words or thoughts of Zeus at 8.476,
15.65–67, and 16.644–655, and predicted by the primary narrator at 11.604, 16.46–47, 251–252,
686–687, and 692–693: see de Jong 2004.85 for references.

[65] The verbal differences are unimportant, the most obvious being the substitution of ἠέ
περ ἀνδρῶν (16.688) with αἰγιόχοιο (17.176). The possibility of MSS. corruption seems excluded
by the strength of MSS. testimony for these readings, and the fact that αἰγιόχοιο is the *lectio
difficilior*. See the critical apparatus ad loc. of M.L. West 2000.

[66] The impending doom of Hector is again made explicit at 17.201–208, in Zeus' forecast.

[67] "Probably the poet intended the ironic parallel, that these solemn verses, which intro-
duce the battle-frenzy by which the gods doom Patroklos, are repeated by Hektor just before
he arrogantly dons the armour of Akhilleus and calls up the gloomy prognostications of Zeus"
Edwards 1991.79–80.

reading echoes and interactions between gnomai in different narrators' voices can affect reading of outcomes in the narrative.

Nestor, with his Homeric reputation for wisdom and as a carrier of moral advice,[68] is a suitable secondary narrator to evoke comparison with the primary narrator: the gnomai spoken by both narrators echo and interact, reflect and refract upon each other, and transfer from their textual, gnomai-related level to meta-literary levels, as the reader reads Nestor the poet figure. Since Nestor speaks the greatest number of gnomai of all the characters in the *Posthomerica*, it is appropriate to examine the longest series of gnomai (and therefore the most prominent) in the poem, in his consolation of Podaleirius.

At the beginning of *Posthomerica* 7, Podaleirius is on the point of killing himself in grief at the death of his brother Machaon. Sometimes he reaches for a sword, at other times a poison (καὶ ῥ' ὁτὲ μὲν βάλε χεῖρας ἐπὶ ξίφος, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε / δίζετο φάρμακον αἰνόν 7.25–26). Nestor (at 7.30) is called upon to console him, and to prevent him from doing himself any harm. He speaks two consolatory and hortatory speeches, replete with gnomic advice. The second speech contains gnomai on death and Fate (*Posthomerica* 7.67–92). The first speech (*Posthomerica* 7.38–55, of which I give an excerpt below) contains an internal analepsis of Nestor's own conduct after the death of his son Antilochus,[69] designed to illustrate that if *he*, Nestor, could endure bereavement, so can Podaleirius.

> "τέτλαθι δ' ἄλγος
> 45 ἄσπετον, ὥς περ ἔγωγε Μαχάονος οὔ τι χερείω
>   παῖδ' ὀλέσας δηίοισιν ὑπ' ἀνδράσιν, εὖ μὲν ἄκοντι,
>   εὖ δὲ σαοφροσύνη⟨σι⟩ κεκασμένον· οὐδέ τις ἄλλος
>   αἰζηῶν φιλέεσκεν ἑὸν πατέρ' ὡς ἐμὲ κεῖνος,
>   κάτθανε δ' εἵνεκ' ἐμεῖο σαωσέμεναι μενεαίνων
> 50 ὃν πατέρ'. ἀλλά οἱ εἶθαρ ἀποκταμένοιο πάσασθαι
>   σῖτον ἔτλην καὶ ζωὸς ἔτ' ἠριγένειαν ἰδέσθαι,
>   εὖ εἰδὼς ὅτι πάντες ὁμὴν Ἀίδαο κέλευθον
>   νισόμεθ' ἄνθρωποι, πᾶσίν τ' ἐπὶ τέρματα κεῖται
>   λυγρὰ μόρου στονόεντος· ἔοικε δὲ θνητὸν ἐόντα
> 55 πάντα φέρειν ὁπόσ' ἐσθλὰ διδοῖ θεὸς ἠδ' ἀλεγεινά."

---

[68] On Nestor in the *Posthomerica*, cf. the unfortunate comments of Mansur 1940.28: "We have in Quintus an abridged edition of Nestor … because of his years Quintus cannot idealize him … so overlooking his extraordinary shrewdness he leaves him boastful as before and a bit absurd."

[69] Memnon kills Nestor's son Antilochus at *Posthomerica* 2.256–259. On internal analepseis, cf. de Jong 1997.309.

"Endure, then, unspeakable distress, just as even I lost my son at the hands
of our foes, a son in no respect inferior to Machaon. He excelled both with
his spear and with his wisdom. There was no other young man who loved his
father as much as he loved me, and he died because of me as he tried to save
his father. But despite his death, I still managed to eat bread and to live to see
the light of day, *knowing well as I did that all men travel on the same path to
the House of Hades, and there lies for all the gloomy goals of grievous fate. And
it is proper for a mortal to put up with all the ills that god sends, both good and
ill*".   (*Posthomerica* 7.44–55)

Nestor explains that he was able to endure the greatest grief, as evidenced
by his ability to eat despite the death of his son and to live to see dawn. This
ability to carry on was despite the nature of Antilochus' devoted character
and the reason for his death—to save Nestor his father (7.47–50).[70] The
implication is that, *a fortiori*, Podaleirius should too be able to endure (7.44).
Nestor ends the speech with the (gnomic) reason for his endurance. He
knows well that all men die anyway (7.52–53), and moreover, it is fitting
for one that is mortal to put up with all the eventualities of life (7.54–55).
Nestor's words echo a famous Iliadic scene, the encounter between Achilles
and Priam in *Iliad* 24, and prequel the gnomic content of his second speech
to Podaleirius. There Achilles begins with a gnome on the pointlessness of
grief (οὐ γάρ τις πρῆξις πέλεται κρυεροῖο γόοιο 24.524),[71] expands upon it with a
longer gnomic explanation on the role of Zeus in dealing out good and bad
fortunes to mortals (24.525–532), and ends with an exhortation that Priam
should stop grieving (ἄνσχεο, μηδ' ἀλίαστον ὀδύρεο σὸν κατὰ θυμόν 24.549).[72]
What is different about Achilles' exhortation in the *Iliad* is that he, Achilles,
just like the exhorted Priam, grieved—Nestor, in the *Posthomerica*, did not
in any extended, demonstrable way.

Achilles insists that both he and Priam eat, after grieving side by side
(*Iliad* 24.507–512), and after loading the body of Hector on to a wagon

---

[70] Note the gnome by the primary narrator concerning the grief of Nestor for Antilochus,
that there is no greater grief for mortals than when their children die before their eyes
(οὐ γὰρ δὴ μερόπεσσι κακώτερον ἄλγος ἔπεισιν / ἢ ὅτε παῖδες ὄλωνται ἑοῦ πατρὸς εἰσορόωντος
Posthomerica 2.263–264). Nestor's ability to eat is made to seem, therefore, all the more
impressive.

[71] Cf. Griffin 1980.69 on the grief Achilles and Priam shared together: "As the great enemies
Priam and Achilles meet and weep together, we see the community of suffering which links
all men, even conqueror and captive, slayer and father of the slain."

[72] Note the similarities between this exhortation by Achilles and the exhortation that
opens Priam's speech at *Posthomerica* 7.38, especially in the use of the imperatives (ἴσχεο
7.38 and ἄνσχεο *Il.* 24.549).

(24.590). He then gives a mythological paradigm on the sorrows of Niobe,[73] and the fact that even she, despite her far greater losses, could still eat (24.601–620, and especially 613: ἡ δ' ἄρα σίτου μνήσατ', ἐπεὶ κάμε δάκρυ χέουσα). By means of this Iliadic passage, Nestor's advice to Podaleirius has a triple point of reference. Nestor himself could eat despite his grief for Antilochus, and so, therefore, should Podaleirius. Nestor echoes Achilles' exhortation to Priam: despite the grief Achilles and Priam both felt, they ate, for even Niobe, who lost twelve children, could eat. Nestor's internal analepsis of his own grief and reaction to it in *Posthomerica* 2 becomes an (intertextual) external analepsis of the actions of Achilles and Priam in *Iliad* 24, and from there to the actions of Niobe in the face of her most extreme misfortune, as invented by Achilles to suit his purposes with Priam.[74]

Nestor's reason for endurance is made explicit at the end of his speech. He eats, and ceases from grief, less out of necessity than because of a desire to behave in an unemotional way, as someone acceptant of the realities of life.[75] The gnomai that Nestor speaks have a Homeric inheritance. The first two gnomai of the three, that all men walk the same path to the House of Hades, and that for all the goals of Fate are firmly marked (7.52–54), echo a similar sentiment spoken by Hector to Andromache in *Iliad* 6, as he attempts to console her about his possible death in battle.[76] The intertextuality of the third gnome of the set is particularly interesting. On the one hand, it has a vague Odyssean inheritance. The necessity of bearing what good or evil befalls one already occurs in *Odyssey* 14.444–445, where Eumaeus informs his guest (a disguised Odysseus) that god both gives as easily as he takes away, just as he pleases.[77] On the other hand the gnome, together with the two that precede it, has a later philosophical, arguably Stoic nature. Vian (rightly) compares Seneca's *Consolatio ad Marciam*.[78] Seneca there emphasises the virtue and sense of abstaining from grief for her

---

[73] "Paradeigma may be defined as a myth introduced for exhortation or consolation" Willcock 2001.437.

[74] Cf. Willcock 2001.437–438: "The Niobe story shows that, in order to produce his parallel in the paradeigma, the author of the *Iliad* is prepared to *invent the significant details of the myth*" (Willcock's italics).

[75] I am implying here that the participle εἰδώς (7.52) is causal—Nestor ate and stayed alive to see dawn *because* he was aware of the precepts that he then proceeds to state (ὅτι … 7.52). Cf. Goodwin 1894.335§1563.2.

[76] *Iliad* 6.488–489.

[77] A similar sentiment is spoken by Odysseus himself to one of the suitors at *Odyssey* 18.132–135, where he states that man bears the sorrow that the gods send, when it comes.

[78] See Vian 1966.97n2 for the Senecan parallels.

dead son. The whole tenor of the Stoic essay is echoed in (both of) Nestor's speeches to Podaleirius. Its emphasis on endurance and the concealment of grief are the most similar themes.[79] For example, Nestor's words at 7.40–41, that mourning like a woman will not bring Machaon back from the dead, while echoing primarily the words of Achilles to Priam in *Iliad* 24,[80] also echo Seneca's emphasis on the futility of grief.[81] Nestor emphasises at 7.52–54 that the *termata* of death lie in wait for all—a theme Seneca puts weight upon in his consolation.[82] We read Nestor's speech working back to Homer, but we also read in his words the philosophy of the post-Homeric, Late Antique world. Nestor is a Homeric hero and a Stoic sage.[83]

I have punctuated my discussion of Nestor's words, as well as earlier discussion of the shield of Achilles, with references to Stoicism (intentionally capitalised). Is it appropriate, however, to apply the tenets of this philosophical system to the *Posthomerica* as though Quintus were himself a Stoic? In addition to my coverage of Stoicism in the previous chapter, I have elsewhere argued for reading Stoicism in the *Posthomerica*.[84] It has been argued that Stoicism by the time of the *Posthomerica* was on the decline,[85] and that, therefore, a definitive statement that the *Posthomerica* was influenced by Stoicism should not be made.[86]

There are two aspects which, to an extent, support this standpoint. First, there remains only fragmentary information on the history of the rise and

---

[79] On the internalisation of grief as Stoic, see Sherman 2005.146–147.

[80] Achilles twice exhorts Priam to cease from grieving, because grief is useless, at *Iliad* 24.524 and 24.549.

[81] Cons. Marc. 6.2: "*Sed si nullis planctibus defuncta revocantur, si sors immota et in aeternum fixa nulla miseria mutatur et mors tenuit quicquid abstulit, desinat dolor qui perit.*" Cf. Sherman 2005.136: "[For Seneca] grief dwells on what can't be recovered rather than what still remains."

[82] *Cons. Marc*. 11.2: "*Decessit filius tuus; id est, decucurrit ad hunc finem.*"

[83] On the Nestor's consolation of Podaleirius, Vian 1966.97 writes: "C'est pour le poète l'occasion d'utiliser les lieux communs des Consolations stoiciennes."

[84] In Maciver 2007.*passim*.

[85] According to Sherman the "ancient school of Stoicism spans the period from 300 BCE to 200 CE."

[86] Cf. the opinion of Gärtner 2007.239 on Stoic influences, for example: "Stoischen Einfluss sollte man m.E. nicht überbewerten, da z.B. die Willkür des Schicksals hierdurch nicht erklärt wird. Die Betonung des Schicksals man mit der Zeitströmung begründen. Auch die Darstellung der Eigenverantwortung des Menschen und der Vernunft wären m.E. aus stoischer Sicht problematisch." It is not useful, however, to explain the emphasis on Fate in the *Posthomerica* as down to the influences of the period of composition of the poem, but then declare, without references, that there is insufficient clarity or that there are some philosophical contradictions in the poem against Stoicism being attributed to the poem.

decline of the Stoa. There is general consent in modern scholarship that Stoicism as a philosophical and political influence had declined by the third century CE,[87] and that it had been superseded by newer schools such as Neoplatonism.[88] Therefore, and secondly, if the *Posthomerica* is to be dated to the third century CE, then it is unlikely that orthodox, unadulterated Stoicism would have had a great influence on Quintus to the extent that he would devise a Stoic ethical pattern for his epic poem. I have shown in relation to the figure of the mountain of *Arete* (in chapter II), that there are repeated thematic indicators of a philosophy or system of ethics throughout the *Posthomerica* that bears resemblance to Stoicism more than to any other philosophical or ethical system. The systematic and widespread embedding of ethics, particularly through gnomai, suggests reliance upon a system with which the contemporary reader of Quintus would identify. Even as a modern reader, I identify strong indications of Stoicism, indications that surely would be even clearer to an ancient reader of the *Posthomerica*. In the absence of the claims of other philosophies to the content of the (particularly gnomic) moral themes of the poem, and in the face of lack of certainty about the precise date of composition of the poem, it is surely sensible to apply the term Stoicism to these moral values in the *Posthomerica*.[89]

Nestor states that he knew that all men travel the same path to death and that all have their deathly fate marked for them (7.52–54). He eats because he knows all die anyway, and that there is nothing he can do about it. He eats because it is the morally right thing to do, because it is fitting for him to bear all the good things and bad things that (a) god brings in his way. Nestor seems more like an impassive, Stoic figure rather than a Homeric hero who eats because others greater than himself or in greater grief than him were able to eat. His concluding gnome, therefore, refers to himself and explains why he could eat (that is, it is a first person gnome), but the target of its moral is Podaleirius—this is how mortals should behave, just as he, Nestor, behaved,[90] aware of the cosmic eventualities within which he exists (it is

---

[87] See, recently, Sellars 2006.3.

[88] Cf. Gill 2003.33: "In the third and fourth centuries AD and later, Neoplatonic and Christian writers built on key Stoic ideas and absorbed them into their systems."

[89] Cf. Maciver 2007.266n28: "The scarcity of sources for philosophies of this period, and the dubious validity of a date of third century AD for Quintus, mean that any argument against Stoicism in the *Posthomerica* does not rest on a firm basis."

[90] Cf. Sherman 2005.106: "The truly virtuous and wise can act without the vulnerabilities of ordinary emotions, and those of us who are not wise can still act like sages by not indulging our emotions."

also therefore an indirect second person gnome—in its full function it is a first person singular / indirect second person gnome).[91]

Intratextual parallels affect Nestor's words.[92] Two correspondences are spoken by the primary narrator. The first of these illustrates most clearly the Stoic nature of Nestor's conduct and character. There it is stated that grief fell upon all of the Argives for Antilochus and out of respect for Nestor (*Posthomerica* 3.5–7):

5   περὶ δ' ἔστενον ὄβριμοι υἷες
Ἀργείων· πάντας γὰρ ἀμείλιχον ἄμπεχε πένθος
Νέστορι ἦρα φέροντες.

And all the mighty sons of the Argives groaned; for bitter grief possessed them all as they showed respect towards Nestor.

Nestor himself, however, displays different emotions, because of his wisdom (*Posthomerica* 3.7–9):

ὅ δ' οὐ μέγα δάμνατο θυμῷ·
ἀνδρὸς γὰρ πινυτοῖο περὶ φρεσὶ τλήμεναι ἄλγος
θαρσαλέως καὶ μή τι κατηφιόωντ' ἀκάχησθαι.

But Nestor's spirit was not greatly broken. For it belongs to a prudent man to suffer pain bravely in his mind and not to give into torment in any way.

The primary narrator here emphasises the exceptional nature of Nestor's resilience in comparison to all those around him, even though it is his own son that has died. This internalisation of grief marks a strong difference from the outpouring of grief in the *Iliad*, and of course in the passage echoed by Nestor's consolation of Podaleirius, *Iliad* 24 and the grief of Achilles and Priam.[93] The reason for this resilience is given in a gnome: a prudent or discreet man does not show his emotions,[94] but bravely, and internally, suffers the *algos* (3.8–9).[95] This gnome is spoken by the primary narrator, and therefore belongs to the main fabric of the poem. As discussed above,

---

[91] Cf. Brennan 2005.43 on the Stoic Sage: "The Sage must simply follow nature—their own human nature, and the nature of the cosmos at large—and by doing so the performance of a virtuous action is guaranteed."

[92] On Nestor's words reflecting one of the poem's themes, cf. Vian 1966.99: "On retrouve les memes idées disséminées dans la reste du poème."

[93] Cf. Sherman 2005.135: "Thus, archaic warriors are permitted to grieve openly and in the bosom of their enemy. By the time of … the later Stoics, however, a man's public wailing has become distasteful."

[94] Cf. LSJ *s.v.* πινυτός, who give the meaning "prudent, discreet".

[95] Cf. Vian 1963.xvii, where he states that Nestor is "le porte-parole de la pensée stoîcisante du poète".

there are only three gnomai in the *Iliad* in the words of the primary narrator, all of which emphasise mortals' relationship to the gods. In the *Posthomerica*, gnomai in the primary narration have an intricate and widespread influence in the reading of characterisation and construction of themes: here the primary narrator highlights an ethic, a way to conduct oneself, and illustrates that it is Nestor who fulfils this ethic, and in the consolation of Podaleirius, Nestor himself speaks and encourages the same ethic that was first spoken by the primary narrator.[96]

Ideally, a Stoic sage is not influenced by passions such as sorrow or fear.[97] Nestor does not grieve because (Stoic) prudent men do not grieve.[98] This sentiment echoes one of the basic tenets of Stoicism that the Stoic sage is able to withhold emotions, that he fulfils the ideal of *apatheia*.[99] This is not the only place where the primary narrator comments on a character's ability for endurance in harsh or bitter circumstances. In *Posthomerica* 12, where the Trojans mutilate Sinon to get the truth from him about the wooden horse, the primary narrator passes comment on Sinon's ability for endurance under torture (12.387–388):

ὣς φάτο κερδοσύνῃσι καὶ οὐ κάμεν ἄλγεσι θυμόν·
ἀνδρὸς γὰρ κρατεροῖο κακὴν ὑποτλῆναι ἀνάγκην.

So Sinon spoke—with craftiness, and he was not overcome in heart by the injuries: for it is of a stout man to endure evil compulsion.

Sinon's endurance under torture is an exhibition of Stoic qualities, especially when we take into account the primary narrator's gnome applied to this conduct.[100] These words themselves echo the gnome spoken in relation to Nestor in *Posthomerica* 3 (ἀνδρὸς γὰρ πινυτοῖο περὶ φρεσὶ τλήμεναι ἄλγος

---

[96] Cf. Kneebone 2007.299–300: "Consulting Nestor once again, we are shown that grief and anger should be channelled into more productive ends: too much emotion emasculates, and burdens are to be borne with stoicism." For brief discussion of this gnome and its relation to other, similar gnomai in the *Posthomerica*, cf. Maciver 2007.275–276.

[97] Cf. Brennan 2005.38: "Stoic Sages live without these four passions [desire, pleasure, fear and dejection]."

[98] Cf. James 2004.281: "[Lines 8–9 are] probably a conscious reference to the wise man's freedom from emotion according to Stoic philosophy."

[99] See my discussion above on *apatheia* in relation to the instructions Neoptolemus receives from his father (chapter II (ii)). Cf. Rist 1978.259 on *apatheia* as "a characteristic excellence of the sage."

[100] Cf. Rist 1978.259: "The picture-book Stoic wise man is devoid of passions, emotionless, and unfeeling." Cf. Epictetus (as reported by Arrian), *Discourses* 1.29, on the necessity of steadfastness.

3.8) and the description of Nestor's behaviour (ὅ δ' οὐ μέγα δάμνατο θυμῷ 3.7). The primary narrator gives the reason for Sinon's endurance, as indicated by γάρ (12.388): a mighty man, such as Sinon, endures *ananke*.[101]

This Stoic sentiment of endurance against all ills occurs again in *Posthomerica* 5, but this time in the words of Odysseus who ends his speech of lamentation for Ajax with a gnomic sentiment on the unseemliness of giving way to passion, since a real wise man puts up with all the ills that assail him (*Posthomerica* 5.595–597):

> 595   "οὐ γὰρ ἔοικε μέγ' ἀσχαλάαν ἐνὶ θυμῷ·
> ἀνδρὸς γὰρ πινυτοῖο καὶ ἄλγεα πόλλ' ἐπιόντα
> τλῆναι ὑπὸ κραδίη στερεῇ φρενὶ μηδ' ἀκάχησθαι."

> "For it is not fitting to rage greatly in one's heart. For it is of a prudent man to endure in his heart with a strong mind all the ills that assail him and not to get troubled."

Specifically, ἀνδρὸς γὰρ πινυτοῖο (5.595–597) echo the very same words spoken by the primary narrator at 3.8, and resemble those spoken of Sinon at 12.388 (ἀνδρὸς γὰρ κρατεροῖο).[102] The primary narrator and Odysseus echoing the primary narrator establish a key behavioural trait of a wise or strong man in the world of the *Posthomerica*: endurance. When we as readers take the theme established by these gnomai to the words of Nestor in *Posthomerica* 7, we construct Nestor as a believer in and doer of Stoic precepts as set out by the primary narrator. In particular, the part of his first speech in which he declares that it is fitting for a mortal to put up with anything that comes his way (πάντα φέρειν ὁπόσ' ἐσθλὰ διδοῖ θεὸς ἠδ' ἀλεγεινά 7.55) mirrors the very gnomai (spoken by the primary narrator) applied to his conduct and to the conduct of Sinon, and by its absence, to Ajax by Odysseus.[103] Nestor asks Podaleirius to behave like himself and embody the ideals propounded in the *Posthomerica* by the primary narrator—ideals which he himself advocates.

---

[101] LSJ *s.v.* ἀνάγκη translate primarily as "force, constraint, necessity", and then "violence, punishment, esp. of torture". Both senses are used here: the broader sense of necessity, and suitable for this specific context, violence in the form of torture. Vian and Battegay 1984.*s.v.* ἀνάγκη translate simply as "nécessité".

[102] The idea of endurance through trying circumstances occurs in all three gnomai (3.8–9, 12.388, and 5.597).

[103] Strictly speaking, the gnome Odysseus speaks is a third person singular, indirect second person gnome, as it indirectly transfers what is generally true to Ajax who failed to adhere to such a precept. However, in a sense the gnome is also indirectly applicable to Odysseus himself—he did not give into anger, but rather used his skill in words to outwit Ajax.

The second speech of Nestor (*Posthomerica* 7.66–95), like the first speech, contains an admixture of Homeric intertextuality and Stoic philosophy. It is made up of a series of six gnomai that build on the idea that concludes his first speech (7.53–55), namely, that all men die, and that it is right to bear all the things—good and bad—that a god puts in our path.[104]

ὣς φάτο· τὸν δ' ὁ γεραιὸς ἀκηχέμενον προσέειπε·
"Πᾶσι μὲν ἀνθρώποισιν ἴσον κακὸν ὤπασε δαίμων
ὀρφανίη⟨ν⟩· πάντας δὲ καὶ ἡμέας αἷα καλύψει,
οὐ μὲν ἄρ' ἐκτελέσαντας ὁμὴν βιότοιο κέλευθον,
70 οὐδ' ⟨οἵ⟩ην τις ἕκαστος ἐέλδεται, οὕνεχ' ὕπερθεν
ἐσθλά τε καὶ τὰ χέρεια θεῶν ἐν γούνασι κεῖται,
Μοίρης εἰς ἓν ἅπαντα μεμιγμένα. Καὶ τὰ μὲν οὔ τις
δέρκεται ἀθανάτων, ἀλλ' ἀπροτίοπτα τέτυκται
ἀχλύι θεσπεσίῃ κεκαλυμμένα· τοῖς ⟨δ'⟩ ἐπὶ χεῖρας
75 οἴῃ Μοῖρα τίθησι καὶ οὐχ ὁρόωσ' ἀπ' Ὀλύμπου
ἐς γαῖαν προΐησι· τὰ δ' ἄλλυδις ἄλλα φέρονται
πνοιῇ⟨ς⟩ ὣς ἀνέμοιο· καὶ ἀνέρι πολλάκις ἐσθλῷ
ἀμφεχύθη μέγα πῆμα, λυγρῷ δ' ἐπικάππεσεν ὄλβος
οὔ τι ἑκών. ἀλαὸς δὲ πέλει βίος ἀνθρώποισι·
80 τοὔνεκ' ἄρ' ἀσφαλέως οὐ νίσεται, ἀλλὰ πόδεσσι
ἄλλοτε μὲν ποτὶ πῆμα πολύστονον, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
εἰς ἀγαθόν. μερόπων δὲ πανόλβιος οὔ τις ἐτύχθη
ἐς τέλος ἐξ ἀρχῆς. ἑτέρῳ δ' ἕτερ' ἀντιόωσι.
85 παῦρον δὲ ζώοντας ἐν ἄλγεσιν οὔ τι ἔοικε
ζωέμεν· ἔλπεο δ' αἰὲν ἀρείονα μηδ' ἐπὶ λυγρῷ
θυμὸν ἔχειν. καὶ γάρ ῥα πέλει φάτις ἀνθρώποισιν
ἐσθλῶν μὲν νίσεσθαι ἐς οὐρανὸν ἄφθιτον αἰεὶ
ψυχάς, ἀργαλέων δὲ ποτὶ ζόφον. ἔπλετο δ' ἄμφω
90 σεῖο κασιγνήτω, καὶ μείλιχος ἔσκε βροτοῖσι
καὶ πάις ἀθανάτοιο· θεῶν δ' ἐς φῦλον ὀίω
κεῖνον ἀνελθέμεναι σφετέρου πατρὸς ἐννεσίῃσιν."

So he spoke; and the old man addressed the grieving Podaleirius: "A daemon provides equally for all men baneful bereavement. The earth will cover all of us, even though we do not travel the same path of life nor is that path such as each of us hope for, because both good and evil fortunes lie on the knees of the gods above, all mixed together into one by the Fates. And none of the gods sees those fortunes which have been made invisible, wrapped in a divine mist. Fate alone gets her hands on them and hurtles them towards earth from Olympus, but without looking where she throws them. And they, one after another, are borne as though by gusts of wind. Often a good man is overwhelmed by great trouble, but, unwillingly, wealth falls to a pernicious

---

[104] For brief discussion of this speech, see, most recently, Gärtner 2007.222–224.

man. Blind is life for mankind. Therefore, not unerringly do men go, but with their feet sometimes into trouble that brings great grief, and sometimes, in turn, into good. No mortal lives a completely happy life from beginning to end: different people meet with a different fate. It is not right, since life is short, to live life in sorrow; hope always for better things and do not hope to have a heart stuck in grief. For there is a saying among men that the souls of the good go into everlasting heaven for ever and the souls of the cruel into darkness. There were the following two things for your brother: he was both gentle to men and he was the son of a god. I believe that he has gone into the race of the gods by the intercessions of your father".

<div style="text-align: right">(Posthomerica 7.66–92)</div>

Nestor in his first speech emphasised his ability to endure grief, and why he was able to endure grief—because of his knowledge of the certainty of death and the necessity in life for endurance of all the things a god can send one. In this second speech, we do not read an internal analepsis, nor is the emphasis on a cessation from grief. Instead, Nestor philosophises on why no one is truly always happy, and on the role of Fate and destiny in human life. This speech is remarkable for its almost uninterrupted series of gnomai that are designed, as the context suggests, to console Podaleirius. This is particularly clear from the comment by the primary narrator that Nestor soothed Podaleirius with his words as he helped him up from the ground (7.94). But the content of his speech reflects the religious and philosophical preconceptions of the poet, especially given that some of the gnomai are similar to gnomai spoken by the primary narrator. I will focus on the part of Nestor's speech (*Posthomerica* 7.70–79) that functions both as a marker to Homer and the function of Fate in the *Iliad*, and also as an indicator of the philosophy and divine apparatus of the *Posthomerica*, that derives from, but also substantially differs from, the portrayal of Fate and the gods in Homer.[105]

Nestor again echoes the scene between Priam and Achilles in *Iliad* 24 in his gnome at 7.70–79 on the origin and reception of good and bad fortunes for mortals. To summarise again, Nestor states that both good and evil fortunes lie on the knees of the gods (71), but they are invisible even to them (72–73). Fate, who has mixed the fortunes into one (72), without looking at

---

[105] I will not discuss the gnome at 7.87–92 on the destination of souls after death, and its relation to the destination of Machaon's soul. Nestor states that the souls of the good go to heaven (7.88) and the souls of the bad to darkness (7.89). According to Vian 1963.xvii, this view of the afterlife can be found "depuis l'époque hellénistique, dans les écrits stoiciens et jusque dans les croyances populaires." Vian 1963.xvii–xviii continues discussion of the Stoic heritage of Quintus' depiction of souls and the afterlife. Cf. also James 2004.xxviii.

them, hurls them randomly towards earth (75–76),[106] with the result that some bad fortunes fall to good men, and conversely, some good fortunes fall to bad men (77–78).[107] In *Iliad* 24, Achilles speaks an extended gnome on the origin of good and evil fortunes, a passage echoed here clearly in the *Posthomerica*.[108] Achilles begins with a gnome on the pointlessness of grief,[109] and then explains that it is Zeus who deals out these varying fortunes to mortals (*Iliad* 24.527–532).

> "δοιοὶ γάρ τε πίθοι κατακείαται ἐν Διὸς οὔδει
> δώρων οἷα δίδωσι κακῶν, ἕτερος δὲ ἐάων·
> ᾧ μέν κ' ἀμμείξας δώῃ Ζεὺς τερπικέραυνος,
> 530 ἄλλοτε μέν τε κακῷ ὅ γε κύρεται, ἄλλοτε δ' ἐσθλῷ·
> ᾧ δέ κε τῶν λυγρῶν δώῃ, λωβητὸν ἔθηκε,
> καί ἑ κακὴ βούβρωστις ἐπὶ χθόνα δῖαν ἐλαύνει,
> φοιτᾷ δ' οὔτε θεοῖσι τετιμένος οὔτε βροτοῖσιν."

> "For there are two urns that stand in the threshold of Zeus, and they give varying gifts—the one urn evil, the other good. When Zeus who delights in thunder mixes these and bestows them on someone, sometimes that person meets with ill, and sometimes good. But when Zeus bestows on someone a portion from the urn of ills, he makes the man a failure, and grinding poverty drives him over the shining earth, and he walks honoured neither by gods nor mortals."

This extended gnome spoken by Achilles is unique in the *Iliad* for illustration of the insight a character has into the exact workings of Zeus and Fate in the affairs of mortals.[110] For my purposes, it is important to emphasise the role Zeus is given in the fortunes of characters in the world of the *Iliad*.[111] It

---

[106] In this sense it is clear that *Moira* is the personification of Fate. Cf. Gärtner 2007.221: "Schliesslich ist sie eine Schicksalsmacht, die generell die Geschicke der Menschen bestimmt." The *Moirai* are described at Hesiod *Th*. 211–225 as the daughters of Night, and at *Th*. 904–906 as the children of Zeus and *Themis*. On the significance of these two genealogies, cf. Dietrich 1965.59–60.

[107] On the role of *Moira* in ancient thought, cf. *DNP s.v.* "Moira": "[It has been as] den Grenzbereich zwischen Chaos und Ordnung repräsentieren." Dietrich 1965.59–90 discusses at length the development of the influence of the *Moirai* through antiquity in cult and literature.

[108] A parallel noted and discussed briefly by Vian 1966.97–99.

[109] The parallel between Iliadic and Posthomeric passages implies that we should infer a gnome here too in the *Posthomerica* on the pointlessness of grief, even though it is not explicitly given.

[110] On the significance of Achilles' gnome, see e.g. Edwards 1987.310 where he compares Helen's gnome on the power Zeus has to bestow both good and ill fortunes on mortals (*Odyssey* 4.236–237). Cf. also N.J. Richardson 1993.329.

[111] According to N.J. Richardson 1993.330, "the jars of Zeus can be regarded as a moral allegory."

is Zeus who mixes the urns, and bestows upon mortals good and bad fortunes (24.529–530).[112] The differences in the gnome spoken by Nestor are marked,[113] and enhanced by the similarities in contexts: both gnomai are spoken within speeches of consolation, and both of Nestor's speeches recall Achilles' words to Priam in *Iliad* 24.

The differences centre on the roles of Zeus and Fate. In *Iliad* 24, Zeus is spoken of as the one who mixes the urns (ἀμμείξας 24.529) and bestows their contents upon humans (δώρων οἷα δίδωσι 24.528). In the *Posthomerica*, the fortunes—good and bad—are mixed into one by the *Moirai* (Μοίρης εἰς ἓν ἅπαντα μεμιγμένα 7.72).[114] Thus the action of Zeus is recalled, but the agent of the action is changed: according to Nestor, the fortunes that lie on the knees of the gods are invisible to the immortals (ἀπροτίοπτα 7.73), wrapped up in a divine mist (7.74).[115] It is significant that there is no mention of urns in the Posthomeric passage. Instead, the fortunes are said to lie on the knees of the gods: θεῶν ἐν γούνασι κεῖται (7.71). This expression occurs twice in the *Iliad* (17.514 and 20.435) and three times in the *Odyssey* (1.267, 1.400, and 16.129). Its use (only here and 6.10 in the *Posthomerica* in this sense) seems to have been converged with the image of the urns in *Iliad* 24, since the good and bad fortunes (7.71) are said to have been all mixed into one (7.72)—not an idea we would associate with the *threads* of fate. More importantly, it is *Moira*, Fate, who dispenses these fortunes (οἵη Μοῖρα τίθησι 7.75), in a purely haphazard way (οὐχ ὁρόωσ' ἀπ' Ὀλύμπου 7.75), unlike Zeus in the *Iliad* who allots the fortunes from the urns in premeditation.[116]

The (pointed) difference is vital for an understanding of the mechanics of Fate and the divine apparatus in the *Posthomerica* in contrast to the

---

[112] The *scholion* bT, on *Il.* 24.527–528, compares *Od.* 1.33–34, where Zeus states that men suffer evil by their own foolishness, not because of the gods.

[113] Cf. Gärtner 2007.224: "Hier hat Quintus entscheidend geändert."

[114] On the meaning of *moira* and *Moirai* (personified), cf. Gärtner 2007.221, and 222–224, where she discusses this Posthomeric passage. It is surprising that she entirely omits mention of late philosophical influences on Quintus in the depiction of these abstractions.

[115] According to Edwards 1991.112–113, "the image is from spinning (in a sitting position) the thread of fate." The MSS' θεῶν at 7.71 has been questioned by editors (see Vian 1959.163 and Gärtner 2007.223), as it clashes with the non-Homeric role of the *Moirai* as all-superior to the gods and Zeus especially. The difficulty can be resolved, as I show in my discussion.

[116] As implied especially by the emphasis on his agency—λωβητὸν ἔθηκε 24.531. Vian summarises the differences between the Iliadic and Posthomeric passages: "Les différences entre les deux conceptions sont en fait considérables: dans l'*Iliade*, Zeus distribue les sorts en pleine connaissance de cause, alors que le pur hasard règne en maître chez Quintus" Vian 1966.97–98.

Homeric poems.[117] It is clear that Nestor gives Fate a role that completely supersedes the powerful place Zeus had in the *Iliad*. However, Fate is rarely mentioned in the *Iliad* in connection with its relationship to determinacy of action by Zeus.[118] While Fate has an important role in the poem,[119] it is Zeus who seemingly has the final say in the outcomes of battles and in the whole action of the *Iliad*. He is able to intervene to change the outcomes decreed by Fate,[120] as evident especially in Hera's answer in *Iliad* 16 to her husband's threat to intervene to save Sarpedon.[121] The gnome by Nestor points the reader to Achilles' gnome and the role he assigns Zeus in the affairs of mortals in the *Iliad*, and then the reader reads Nestor taking this role from Zeus, and giving it specifically to *Moira*:[122] it is she who deals out the fortunes, not Zeus.[123]

The function of Fate in the *Posthomerica*, whether or not in its guise as *Moira*, becomes clearer through analysis of other similar gnomai which reflect Nestor's philosophy. The first two gnomai I will discuss are spoken

---

[117] Of the numerous works on Fate in the *Iliad*, see e.g. Jones 1996.114–116 and Dietrich 1965.*passim*.

[118] "In fact, Homer does not concern himself with the theological problem of the relationship of the gods and fate" Edwards 1987.136. The role of Fate in the *Posthomerica* is much clearer, however. Cf. Vian 1959.163–164: "L'idée d'un Destin supérieur aux dieux est conforme à l'inspiration stoicienne du discours de Nestor, et elle reparaît avec une telle insistance dans l'oeuvre qu'elle fait manifestement partie du 'système philosophique' de l'auteur."

[119] Cf. Edwards 1987.127: "In the *Iliad* [Fate's] power is shown primarily in the determination of the length of a man's life; the day of his death is set at the time of his birth." Cf. Jones 1996.114.

[120] At *Iliad* 16.433–438, for Sarpedon, and at *Iliad* 22.167–181, for Hector. On the possibility of such intervention, see Edwards 1987.136. Very often, however, the relationship between Zeus and Fate in the *Iliad* is unclear. Cf. Jones 1996.116: "The idea of fate is muffled by the poet. It looms large in certain contexts, only to be swept under the carpet in others. Even gods appear at times to be ignorant of its existence."

[121] She tells him to go ahead (ἔρδε 16.443), but warns him of the consequences (16.443–447). The imperative implies Zeus *can* intervene and change destiny.

[122] According to Vian 1966.98n1, *Moira* is here identical to *Tyche* which was often personified as a deity in the Imperial period. This cannot be the case here, given the extremely careful manipulation by Quintus of the Iliadic identities. Dietrich 1965.78–79 states that eventually the *Moirai* evolved in popular belief to become all-powerful and complex deities of fate. Cf. Wenglinsky 2002.79.

[123] The myth of Er as represented in Plato's *Republic* Book 10 has been suggested as an influence on the representation of *Moira* and the distribution of good and bad fortunes here in the *Posthomerica* (Plato *Republic* 10.617d–e—Vian 1966.98 and James 2004.307). The similarities are few and unremarkable, however. Hesiod also presents a similar representation in the *Works and Days* (*Op.* 90–104), though it is closer to the description by Achilles in *Iliad* 24 (see N.J. Richardson 1993.329) because of the mention of a jar (*Op.* 97) and an emphasis on the superiority of Zeus (*Op.* 99—see the apparatus in Solmsen et al. 1990.ad loc. on the possibility of interpolation here).

by the primary narrator and assert the primacy of Fate. At *Posthomerica* 11.272–277, the primary narrator summarises, in an extended gnome, the superiority of Fate over the immortals, and the ineluctability of the thread that she spins for all mortals when they are born.

> Αἶσα γὰρ ἄλλα πολύστονος ὁρμαίνεσκεν·
> ἄζετο δ' οὔτε Ζῆνα πελώριον οὔτέ τιν' ἄλλον
> ἀθανάτων· οὐ γάρ τι μετατρέπεται νόος αἰνὸς
> 275 κείνης, ὅν τινα πότμον ἐπ' ἀνδράσι γεινομένοισιν,
> ἀνδράσιν ἢ πολίεσσιν, ἐπικλώσηται ἀφύκτῳ
> νήματι· τῇ δ' ὑπὸ πάντα τὰ μὲν φθινύθει, τὰ δ' ἀέξει.

> For *Aisa* who causes many groans stirred up other things. She is a respecter neither of Zeus the mighty nor any other of the immortals. For her terrible mind is in no respect turned aside, whatever the destiny for men when they are born, for men or cities, that is spun by her inescapable thread. For by her all things fade, and all things grow.   (*Posthomerica* 11.272–277)

Aisa (11.272), translated as "La Destinée" by Vian,[124] and as "Fate" by James,[125] can be read as interchangeable with, or synonymous with, *Moira*.[126] Both personifications signify equivalent functions.[127] Here the primary narrator digresses with a gnomic description of the function of Fate. The initial idea presented here is, superficially at least, Homeric:[128] the poet is careful not to create a too un-Homeric picture of the gods. The idea of the thread of destiny as fixed from the day of one's birth occurs, for example, three times in Homer.[129] However, there is a particular emphasis in this passage on Fate as more powerful than the gods, including Zeus. She is described as not respecting mighty Zeus (11.273). She has a more pre-eminent place in the

---

[124] Vian 1969.59.

[125] James 2004.183.

[126] Cf. LSJ *s.v.* Αἶσα: "Like Μοῖρα, the divinity who dispenses to everyone his lot or destiny." Gärtner 2007.221 states that *Moira*, personified or un-personified, and *Moirai* "lassen sich ähnliche Beobachtungen machen wie zur Aisa".

[127] On the specific nature and function of *Aisa* in the *Posthomerica*, see now the brief discussion by Gärtner 2007.214–219.

[128] Cf. Vian 1963.xv: "Leur figure [of the Olympians] s'est moins modifiée, car Quintus subit la tyrannie de la tradition." Cf. also James and Lee 2000.11: "As regards the function of the traditional Olympian deities in the *Posthomerica* it is impossible to make any positive deduction for the author's personal beliefs and attitudes, because obviously the undertaking to narrate the Trojan War in the Homeric manner entailed maintenance of what may be termed the Homeric divine machinery."

[129] At *Iliad* 24.209–211 (*Moira*), 20.127–128 (*Aisa*), and *Odyssey* 7.196–198 (the *Klothes*): so Dietrich 1962.86—see Dietrich 1962.*passim* for discussion of these Homeric passages. In the *Iliad* this is the primary function of Fate—cf. Jones 1996.114 (and see note 119, this chapter).

structure of the universe, and it is explicitly stated throughout the *Posthomerica* that Zeus and the other gods cannot change what Fate prescribes.[130] This emphasis echoes perhaps the clearest indication of the role of Fate *vis-a-vis* the gods, in Zeus' words at *Posthomerica* 2.171–172, in the divine council scene. Zeus states that none of the gods need go supplicating him for their favoured ones, since the *Keres*, the Fates of death, are no respecters even of the gods (Κῆρες γὰρ ἀμείλιχοί εἰσι καὶ ἡμῖν 2.172).[131]

The same idea is reinforced at *Posthomerica* 14.97–100, where the primary narrator states that the gods who favoured Troy could not have changed the outcome of the War, since they and not even Zeus can easily change Fate.

> ἀλλ' οὐ ὑπὲρ Αἶσαν ἐελδόμενοί περ ἀμύνειν
> ἔσθενον· οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ μόρον οὐδὲ Κρονίων
> ῥηιδίως δύνατ' Αἶσαν ἀπωσέμεν, ὅς περὶ πάντων
> 100 ἀθανάτων μένος ἐστί, Διὸς δ' ἐκ πάντα πέλονται.

> But they were not strong enough to defend Troy, despite their desire, by overstepping Fate. For even the son of Chronus himself is not able, beyond destiny, to thrust Fate away lightly, Zeus who is the strongest of all the gods, and from whom are all things.

What is emphasised in this excerpt is the inability of the gods to over-ride Fate in their desire to save their favoured Trojans. Even Zeus himself, who is the strongest and the originator of everything, cannot lightly thrust Fate away (99). The 'lightly' (ῥηιδίως) here can be read as an intertextual springboard to the two particular instances in the *Iliad* when Zeus seemed willing and able to change the course of Fate in favour of Sarpedon and Hector, but decided not to do so.[132] I read Quintus restating the power of the Iliadic Zeus here in the *Posthomerica*, but Quintus also emphasising that Zeus is (and was in the *Iliad*) unable, lightly as it seemed in the *Iliad*, to dispense with the destinies allotted to characters by Fate.[133] The adverb

---

[130] Cf. Vian 1963.xvin3 for a list of places in the *Posthomerica* where it is clear that Zeus is subordinate to Fate. Vian 1963.xvi elaborates further on the new role for Zeus: "C'est là l'un des traits marquants de la religion de Quintus, lui-même n'est plus que le docile exécuteur des arrêts du Destin: cette subordination est proclamée avec insistance. Ainsi les forces cosmiques impersonelles tendent partout à l'auteur, symbolise l'ordre nouveau: les Moires toutes-puissantes sont maintenant les filles du Chaos primordial."

[131] Cf. Wenglinsky 2002.177: "Certainly Quintus here articulates no clearer statement of the relationship between Fate and the gods."

[132] At *Iliad* 16.433–438 for Sarpedon and at *Iliad* 22.167–181 for Hector.

[133] It is of course true that 'lightly' is associated generally with the easy living of the Homeric gods (as is made clear, e.g., by Griffin 1980.188–189), but the adverb has particular connotations in this reading of Homer by Quintus.

'lightly' becomes a signpost, an ironic pointer to what seemed light, but impossible, for Zeus to do in the *Iliad*.[134]

The last words of this excerpt potentially cause a conflict with this argument on the all-powerfulness of Fate over the gods.[135] It is stated that all things are from Zeus (Διὸς δ' ἐκ πάντα πέλονται 14.100), and it is therefore implied that Fate is too. This origin of Fate and the allocations of Fate does not reverse previous statements in the poem that her thread is inescapable (11.276–277), that she does not care for the gods (11.273–274), and significantly in this context, that by her all things fade and grow (τῇ δ' ὑπὸ πάντα τὰ μὲν φθινύθει, τὰ δ' ἀέξει 11.277). All things may be from Zeus (14.100), but there is no indication in the fact that all things are from Zeus that he in some way constructs Fate, or dispatches fortunes to mortals. They may originate from his knees, or in the *Iliad* from his urns, but in the *Posthomerica* he has no agency in the operation of Fate. It is clear from Nestor's words in *Posthomerica* 7.72–74 that the gods, including Zeus, do not see what fortunes men receive, and it is also clear from the primary narrator's words in *Posthomerica* 11.276–277 that it is *Moira* who threads mortals' destinies. Thus Zeus is the originator, but not the knower or dispenser, of the destinies of mortals in the *Posthomerica*.[136]

These two sets of discursive gnomai, spoken by the primary narrator, underscore the pre-eminence of Fate in the *Posthomerica*, to an extent that is non-Homeric.[137] Nestor, in *Posthomerica* 7, echoes, in his gnomai of consolation, gnomai spoken by the primary narrator elsewhere in the poem that

---

[134] In this respect I disagree with Gärtner 2007.219 (who follows Wenglinsky 2002.191–192) in her interpretation of the adverb ῥηϊδίως (99) in this passage: "Ein wenig differenziert wird jedoch das Verhältnis zu Zeus. Von ihm heisst es nun lediglich, dass er sich Aisa *nicht leicht* widersetzen kann; möglich scheint es jedoch, zumal im Anschluss seine Allmacht betont wird."

[135] Contrast Wenglinsky 2002.192: "Quintus then retreats even further from the notion that Zeus is subservient to Fate, declaring that all things, including presumably Fate itself, are 'from Zeus' (14.100). The notion is not at all at odds with the picture of the relationship between Fate and the gods in the *Iliad*."

[136] The function of Zeus as the origin of all things is reflected in grammar: Διός (14.100) is a genitive of origin. This function of Zeus as the origin of Fate is reflected neatly in the expression Διὸς Αἶσα, which occurs in the *Posthomerica* at 3.487 and 10.331, and similarly in the *Iliad* only at 9.604 and 17.321. On the expression and the interplay between *Aisa* and Zeus, cf. Gärtner 2007.214, where she states that, in her opinion, Fate and Zeus' will coincide in the *Iliad*.

[137] That is not to say that *Moira* did not have a significant role in the *Iliad*. A hero understood his own future death as down to both to a particular god and to *Moira* herself: the gods and *Moira* seem, in a vague and undefined sense, to share roles. Cf. Dietrich 1965.199.

express a similar philosophy on Fate. Nestor thus mirrors the projected pre-
conceptions of the poet figure as read in the words of the primary narrator.
Similar sentiments are also found in the speeches of other secondary nar-
rators. These secondary narrators are made to mimic the gnomic advice
of Nestor to Podaleirius. Odysseus and Diomedes in *Posthomerica* 9.414–
425 are reported by the primary narrator as giving consolatory gnomai to
Philoctetes on the role and function of the *Moirai*, thus exempting them-
selves and the other Greeks from any blame. Similarly, Agamemnon, on
Philoctetes' return among them at Troy, consoles Philoctetes and exhorts
him to cease from any anger, because he and the other Greeks are not to
blame for what happened, but the *Moirai* (*Posthomerica* 9.491–508).

When Odysseus and Diomedes encounter Philoctetes on Lemnos, they
are quick to excuse themselves from any wrongdoing (*Posthomerica* 9.414–
425):

<div style="text-align:center">κακῶν δέ οἱ οὔ τιν' Ἀχαιῶν</div>

415 αἴτιον ἔμμεν ἔφαντο κατὰ στρατόν, ἀλλ' ἀλεγεινὰς
    Μοίρας, ὧν ἑκὰς οὔ τις ἀνὴρ ἐπινίσεται αἶαν,
    ἀλλ' αἰεὶ μογεροῖσιν ἐπ' ἀνδράσιν ἀπροτίοπτοι
    στρωφῶντ' ἤματα πάντα, βροτῶν μένος ἄλλοτε μέν που
    βλάπτουσαι κατὰ θυμὸν ἀμείλιχον, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
420 ἔκτοθε κυδαίνουσαι, ἐπεὶ μάλα πάντα βροτοῖσι
    κεῖναι καὶ στονόεντα καὶ ἤπια μηχανόωνται,
    αὐταὶ ὅπως ἐθέλουσιν. ὃ δ' εἰσαΐων Ὀδυσῆος
    ἠδὲ καὶ ἀντιθέου Διομήδεος αὐτίκα θυμὸν
    ῥηιδίως κατέπαυσεν ἀνιηροῖο χόλοιο,
425 ἔκπαγλον τὸ πάροιθε χολούμενος, ὅσσ' ἐπεπόνθει.

> And they said that there was no one in the Achaean army responsible for
> his ills, but the grievous *Moirai* were responsible, and no man can travel far
> from them on earth, but always, invisible, they wheel about hapless men
> every day, sometimes harming in their grievous desire the strength of mortals,
> and at other times, for no apparent reason, they raise them to glory, since
> they themselves devise all the grievous and kindly things for mortals, just
> as they wish. And Philoctetes, listening to Odysseus and godly Diomedes
> immediately and easily put a stop in his heart to his bitter anger, though he
> had been extremely angry before, for all the things he had suffered.

Within a mere nine lines here we have a concise illustration of the power
of gnomai to console and reassure stricken characters in the world of the
Posthomerica.[138] The literary tradition that reported the extreme resentment

---

[138] On the role of the *Moirai* in this passage, see now Gärtner 2007.224–225.

of Philoctetes towards the Greeks is resolved in a matter of a few lines.[139] The reported words here of Odysseus and Diomedes echo Nestor's extended speech on the nature of the *Moirai*. For example, according to Nestor, the *Moirai* dispense fortunes that sometimes cause the good to suffer ill, and the bad to receive good fortune (7.77–78). Similarly, Philoctetes is told that sometimes the *Moirai* devise ill for mortals, and sometimes they glorify them (9.418–420).[140] In response to the similar statements of Nestor, Podaleirius stops grieving, but only reluctantly.[141] What is remarkable here is the speed of the conciliatory reaction of Philoctetes. It is emphasised that he *immediately* and *easily* shrugged off his anger (αὐτίκα θυμὸν / ῥηιδίως κατέπαυσεν ἀνιηροῖο χόλοιο 9.423–424). Philoctetes mirrors the ease with which Nestor was able to withhold his grief after the death of his son Antilochus, and also mirrors the way in which Sinon was resolute in the face of torture. The afflicted Greek hero of archaic literature deals easily with his anger because of the gnomai on *Moirai* spoken by Odysseus and Diomedes. Anger is pointless when one understands the Stoic concepts that underpin the workings of the *cosmos* and human life.[142]

When Philoctetes arrives in Troy, he is met with a similar series of exhortatory and conciliatory gnomai, only this time from Agamemnon. Agamemnon stresses the *Posthomerica*'s recurrent philosophical code on the *Moirai* (*Posthomerica* 9.491–508):

> "Ὦ φίλ', ἐπειδή πέρ σε θεῶν ἰότητι πάροιθε
> Λήμνῳ ἐν ἀμφιάλῳ λίπομεν βλαφθέντε νόημα,
> μὴ δ' ἡμῖν χόλον αἰνὸν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ σῇσι βαλέσθαι·
> οὐ γὰρ ἄνευ μακάρων τάδ' ἐρέξαμεν, ἀλλά που αὐτοὶ
> 495 ἤθελον ἀθάνατοι νῶιν κακὰ πολλὰ βαλέσθαι
> σεῦ ἀπὸ νόσφιν ἐόντος, ἐπεὶ περίοιδας ὀιστοῖς
> δυσμενέας δάμνασθαι, ὅτ' ἀντία σεῖο μάχωνται.
> ....
> πᾶσαν ἀν' ἤπειρον πέλαγός τ' ἀνὰ μακρὸν ἄιστοι

---

[139] For a summary of this literary tradition pre-and post-Quintus, which is represented principally by Sophocles' *Philoctetes*, see Jebb 1898.xxii–xl. Sophocles' *Philoctetes* seems not to have a strong influence on Quintus' telling of the same story—cf. Vian 1966.172 and James 2004.315.

[140] Cf. James 2004.319.

[141] At 7.93 he is raised from the ground unwillingly and at 7.95 he constantly turns back to the tomb and continues to groan aloud (ἐντροπαλιζόμενον καὶ ἔτ' ἀργαλέα στενάχοντα).

[142] Philoctetes too thus conforms to the ideals of Stoic *apatheia*. He comprehends the ethical and philosophical workings presented in the *Posthomerica* by the primary narrator, and represented here (as indirectly reported) in the words of Odysseus and Diomedes, and follows the precepts attached to such a philosophy. On Stoic readings of *apatheia* in Homer, and especially in the character of Odysseus, cf. Buffière 1956.316.

500 Μοιράων ἰοτητι πολυσχιδέες τε πέλονται
     πυκναί τε σκολιαί τε, τετραμμέναι ἄλλυδις ἄλλη·
     τῶν δὲ δι’ αἰζηοὶ φορέονθ’ ὑπὸ Δαίμονος Αἴσῃ
     εἰδόμενοι φύλλοισιν ὑπὸ πνοιῆς ἀνέμοιο
     σευόμενος· ἀγαθὸς δὲ κακῇ ἐνέκυρσε κελεύθῳ
505 πολλάκις, οὐκ ἐσθλὸς δ’ ἀγαθῇ· τὰς δ’ οὔτ’ ἀλέασθαι
     οὔτ’ ἄρ’ ἑκών τις ἑλέσθαι ἐπιχθόνιος δύνατ’ ἀνήρ·
     χρὴ δὲ σαόφρονα φῶτα, καὶ ἢν φορέηθ’ ὑπ’ ἀέλλαις
     οἴμην ἀργαλέην, στερεῇ φρενὶ τλῆναι ὀιζύν.”

> “Dear friend, since previously we in fact left you behind on sea-girt Lemnos by the will of the gods, in our warped thinking, don’t then put bitter anger in your heart against us. For not without the workings of the blessed ones did we do these things. In fact the gods themselves wished to inflict us with many evils once you were out of the way, since you are the master at destroying the enemy with your arrows whenever they fight against you. Over the whole land and the great sea the [paths of life] are hidden by the will of the *Moirai* and are split into many parts and are crowded and winding, turning in all directions.[143] Along these men are carried by the Fate of a *Daimon* like leaves driven by blasts of wind. A good man often finds himself on an evil path, and a man lacking this goodness often finds himself on a good path. No mortal man is able to avoid them nor can any man willingly choose them. It is necessary for the prudent man to bear pain with a stout mind, even if he is carried on a grievous path by the winds.”

Agamemnon speaks a series of gnomai that are applicable to all, but indirectly aimed at Philoctetes—he should fit into this pattern of behaviour. After stating how much the Greeks suffered in his absence (9.494–497),[144] Agamemnon restates what Philoctetes heard from the mouths of Odysseus and Diomedes:[145] the paths of life are hidden by the *Moirai* (9.499–500), with the result that sometimes the good meet with an ill path, and the bad with a good path (504–505). Despite the nature of fortune, a man must bear these things bravely (507–508). His speech similarly taps into the nexus of consolatory gnomai on the role of the *Moirai* in human life spoken by secondary narrators, and also reiterates the philosophy voiced by the primary narrator.[146] The understanding Agamemnon has of the workings of the poetic,

---

[143] There is a hiatus *post* 9.497 (for which see the *apparatus criticus* in Vian 1966.200). I follow James 2004.161 in inserting ‘the paths of life’.

[144] On the Sophoclean intertextuality of these lines, see Vian 1966.200n1.

[145] It is interesting to note that Agamemnon in fact begins his speech by laying stress on the will of the gods (θεῶν ἰότητι 9.491). It is to be assumed that the reference to the gods is inclusive, that is it refers to the *Moirai* and the gods on whose knees the fortunes to be dealt to mortals lie.

[146] Cf. also *Posthomerica* 7.76–77 and the similar reference to human fortunes carried

fictional world he is constructed within, as constructed by the poet and reflected in the gnomai by the primary narrator, is something Philoctetes understands and with which he empathises. Not only does Philoctetes state that he is not angry (9.518), he in fact speaks a gnome emphasising that it is not right for a man to be angry (οὐδ' αἰεὶ χαλεπὸν θέμις ἔμμεναι οὐδ' ἀσύφηλον 9.521),[147] and that a good man's outlook should be flexible (9.520).[148]

Gnomai are used by secondary narrators to appease those grieving or angry. Yet it does appear that the results of this appeasement are unrealistic, or at least un-Homeric.[149] Philoctetes is immediately pacified as soon as Agamemnon, and before him Odysseus and Diomedes, speak a philosophical concept existent in the Posthomeric world to which heroes should aspire. Nestor philosophises at length on the same theme in *Posthomerica* 7, with the aim of getting Podaleirius to cease from a very Iliadic action of grieving at length for a loved one. The heroes of the *Posthomerica*, as these examples illustrate, are constructed to embody a non-Homeric philosophy, a series of ideals that befit a Stoic Sage more than a traditional Homeric hero.[150] Nestor merely echoes a philosophy recurrent in the *Posthomerica*, found in the words of the primary narrator and other secondary narrators. Such gnomic advice does not merely remain at the textual level of the *Posthomerica*. The poet places Nestor in an Iliadic situation of consolation

---

as though by gusts of wind (τὰ δ' ἄλλυδις ἄλλα φέρονται / πνοιῇ⟨ς⟩ ὣς ἀνέμοιο)—cf. with 9.504–505 above.

[147] Cf. Odysseus' words as he mourns for the dead Ajax at *Posthomerica* 5.574–575, discussed above, and more importantly in this context, cf. Nestor's own words at 7.38–40 on the need for Stoic *apatheia*.

[148] Agamemnon's speech resembles the Homeric embassy to Achilles, and Agamemnon's promise of gifts to Achilles, in *Iliad* 9. See Vian 1966.200n6 for the parallels. The parallel between the passages draws together the reactions of Achilles and Philoctetes to Agamemnon's overtures. Cf. Schmitz 2007.77: "So readers are invited to dwell on the behavior of Philoktetes as opposed to Achilles, the moral implications of wrath and forgiveness, and the rules of social interaction in a heroic world, and they see that Quintus is writing a poem that is very similar, yet not identical to the *Iliad*: his heroes are ethically superior to their Iliadic predecessors."

[149] This tendency for characters to seem moral and un-dissenting is not something that should be read as necessarily negative. Rather characters behave as befits those who embody a philosophy, a set of moral standards. Contrast Mansur 1940.69: "When all the heroes excel in the same way, they carry no conviction. Quintus … has not the ability to create a diversity of new situations which will reveal different traits and so make real people. As much as anything else, lack of the creative gift is responsible."

[150] I have not entered into the possibility that Quintus' Stoicism derives from Vergil. This would be another study altogether, made more complicated by the still-current debate on the likelihood of Latin influence on the *Aeneid*.

in the face of overwhelming grief. Nestor's words echo the Iliadic Achilles' exhortation to Priam that they should eat, despite their grief. Nestor's words end with a gnomic emphasis that marks a post-Homeric, Stoic way of thinking. Nestor the Homeric hero has become Nestor the Stoic hero. But Nestor's philosophising, in his status as a Homeric hero who exists in the Homeric poems as well as the *Posthomerica*, leads the reader to reread the Homeric situations of grief and consolation. Given the constant and thorough imitation of Homer throughout the *Posthomerica*, and the poetological indicators that encourage the reader to read the *Posthomerica* as still Homer, this new morality and ethics which recall Homer but differ from Homer, suggest both a reading of Homer and a revision of Homer. Quintus reads Homeric heroism, but 'updates' it into a neo-Homeric heroism with the kind of morals and ethics that befit a Homeric hero for Quintus' era, or at least a Homeric hero that embodies the ideals of the poet projected in the poem. We are supposed to read Nestor as the same Nestor of the *Iliad*, the same hero who offered advice in the *Iliad* just as he offers advice here in the *Posthomerica*. But the advice Nestor offers in the *Posthomerica* is clearly not Homeric in its gnomic values. The words of Nestor mark him both as a Homeric and neo-Homeric counsellor.

POSTHOMERIC SIMILES, HOMERIC LIKENESSES

i. *Penthesileia: A New Dawn*

> We sometimes have a feeling as if [Quintus] must have
> proceeded on the principle that if only he puts enough
> similes into a passage that his narrative will be properly
> impressive and he need not worry about other things.
>
> <div align="right">Combellack 1968.17</div>

This study of the *Posthomerica* so far has focused on the layers of thematic and philosophical content of the poem. The *Posthomerica* is very Homeric and also strives to create an identity as a close continuation of the *Iliad*. Quintus has also imposed Stoic ethical doctrine on the ideals of Homer which he receives, and indications are that Quintus *reads* Homer in this way. This Stoic version of Homer does not purport to be anything other than Homeric. In the final section of this book, I turn to analyse more specifically the narrative mechanics of the poem: how do the similes of the *Posthomerica* work within the narrative, and (in keeping with the focus of this book) how should we read and interpret their Homeric intertextuality. As with gnomai, so with similes: the *Posthomerica* has many. I begin with discussion of this volume of similes, before analysis of the similes of book 1 and of the role of Penthesileia, in the same connection. In the other parts of this chapter, I focus on the presentation of Helen in *Posthomerica* 14 and the means Quintus uses to cast her as an adulteress; and in part iii I assess the central role of Neoptolemus in the epic and the role imagery has in this respect.

Some would argue that an extensive use of similes reflects a poet, and especially a poet of battle scenes, unable to use the main narrative to describe accurately the full extent of the details of his story: "multiple similes ... present a poet helpless before the difficulties of his task."[1] The reason behind the sheer volume of similes in the *Posthomerica* surely lies

---

[1] Hunter 1993.135.

elsewhere. If we assess the volume of similes in the *Posthomerica* we find
that Quintus again surpasses Homer.[2] There are 305 similes in the *Posthome-*
rica, that is, 226 long similes, and 79 short similes.[3] Of the amount of text
taken up by similes, that is, the simile and the closely associated narrative
before and after it, 1050 lines of the *Posthomerica*, out of a total of 8,772
lines, are taken up by simile text (11.96%). The *Iliad* has 197 long, and 153
short, similes.[4] The *Posthomerica* has 29 more long similes than the *Iliad*:
this in itself is not insignificant. If similes are inherently Homeric, and inher-
ently epic, then the *Posthomerica* is very Homeric, and very epic: in this
respect, Quintus perhaps achieves his aim. To construct any simile in any
text is an evocation of Homer.[5] Construction of ostentatiously Homeric-
imitative similes within a text that overtly imitates Homer exacerbates this
idea. Every simile points to Homer, but, as with the other areas of the poem's
poetics, also to differences to general Homeric patterns and to particular
similes imitated.

The literary culture of Quintus also plays a part. Oppian (second cen-
tury CE), for example, a close literary predecessor of Quintus, also has a
strong concentration of similes in his text.[6] A large volume of similes was

---

[2] I insert here a brief summary of scholarship on the *Posthomerica*'s similes. The most
recent study, and the only dedicated piece of research longer than article-length, is the
unpublished thesis of Spinoula 2000. The study restricts itself to animal similes. Köchly
1850.lxxxi–ii devotes a small section of his *prolegomenon* to similes. Niemeyer 1883–1884 pro-
vides non-expository statistics of the poem's similes. Excepting brief mentions in studies of
the poem before 1950 (see especially Paschal 1904.38–40), Vian is the first to devote two spe-
cific studies to similes in Quintus (1954, which is helpful especially for its *Quellenforschung*,
and 2001, which lists echoes and imitations of Apollonius in Quintus' similes). James and
Lee 2000.19–20 and James 2004.xxv–vi contain brief discussion. Vian (1963, 1966, and 1969) is
annotated throughout with notes on possible Homeric models for the similes.

[3] James 2004.xxvi finds 222 long similes. By short similes, as opposed to long similes,
I mean those that lack a conjugated verb after the particle of comparison (cf. Edwards
1991.25 and Nünlist 2009.284 on the categorisation by the Homeric *scholia*); they occur in
the *Posthomerica* at 1.222, 277, 345, 352, 513; 2.207, 212–213, 522–523, 623–624; 3.177, 264–265,
276, 369–370, 497, 556–557; 4.196, 260, 337, 513; 5.119, 188, 404; 6.131–132, 152, 197, 294, 353, 368,
410, 477, 606; 7.346, 387–388, 433–434, 446, 516, 560, 567, 596, 645, 653, 695; 8.184, 197–198,
237–238, 363, 364, 371; 9.77, 159, 253, 295; 10.101, 247, 248, 434, 440; 11.132–133, 163, 224, 265, 300,
368, 374–375, 464–465; 12.150, 187, 202, 365, 504, 538; 13.156–157; and 14.223, 271, 465, 473, 525,
550, 555, and 600.

[4] Lee 1964.3–4. Cf. Edwards's 1991.24 statistics. Bonnafé 1983.82 writes that 7.2% of the
Iliad's total of 15,693 verses is made up of simile text (1,128 lines).

[5] Cf. Effe 2001.169: "The new epic can only be articulated as such by constant evocation of
the genre's most authoritative representative—and by distancing himself from him through
innovation."

[6] Cf. James 2004.xxv–vi: "[Quintus] seems to have been influenced by the recent example
of Oppian, whose didactic epic the *Haleutika* has a simile frequency of one every 36.9 lines."

not an unusual feature of Imperial Greek hexameter poetry. The case is not different for Imperial Latin poetry. Claudian (late fourth century) has 145 similes in the 8,468 lines which constitute his major poems, against, by means of comparison, the 105 similes of the *Aeneid* within 9,898 lines of hexameter. Quintus is exhibiting some of the extreme (non-pejorative) traits that his literary period displayed, as well as an emulous attempt for identification as (a new) Homer. Also, in a sense, the *Posthomerica*, through its extensive use of ('Homeric') similes, behaves as a simile of Homer. That a Homeric-imitative text is filled with similes suggests that similes were a vital element in Homer, to the constructer of the imitating text. Quintus, however, contrary to the view of Combellack cited at the top of this chapter, did not *randomly* fill his poem with similes simply in order to seem Homeric.[7] Each simile is posited for maximum effect in terms of its context, in terms of its place within the structure of the poem itself, and in relation to the simile's intertextuality and what that intertextuality brings to its meaning.

A.S. Way, in the appendix to his Loeb edition, provides detailed (although incomplete) lists of similes in the *Posthomerica* under headings of subject matter.[8] I would classify the similes in the *Posthomerica* under four very broad categories:[9] similes with animals, or hunters and animals, as subject matter;[10] elemental similes, that is, similes related to celestial elements, the sea, trees and plants, and crops;[11] mythological similes, that is, similes

---

Apollonius, on the other hand, has 82 extended similes in the *Argonautica*, on average 1 simile for every 71 lines (so Carspecken 1952.61).

[7] Cf. also Keydell 1963.1295.

[8] Way 1913.627–628.

[9] In the lists that I provide, I do not include the similes of book 1, since these are summarised in the table of similes at the end of this section. Some of the similes overlap into two categories. I include only long similes.

[10] 2.196–200, 248–251, 282–287, 298–300, 330–336, 371–378, 379–387, 471–480, 575–582; 3.142–148, 170–174, 181–185, 201–205, 221–227, 267–268, 270–274, 353–357, 358–365, 589–591; 4.220–224, 237–246; 5.298–300, 371–379, 406–407, 433–438, 493–497; 6.107–113, 125–128, 324–327, 341–348, 395–399, 532–537, 611–612; 7.132–141, 257–261, 317–326, 330–338, 464–473, 486–492, 504–511, 569–577, 715–722; 8.40–45, 175–181, 268–271, 331–336, 372–375, 387–392, 405–407; 9.172–179, 364–370; 10.114–117, 242–245, 441–446; 11.74–78, 110–117, 146–151, 170–179, 207–215, 217–218, 383, 476, 483–485; 12.489–496, 530–534, 580–584; 13.44–49, 55–58, 68–70, 70–75, 104–108, 127–130, 133–141, 258–266; and 14.33–37, 89–92, 258–261, and 317–319.

[11] 2.103–106, 193–195, 208–211, 217–218, 220–227, 345–354, 379–387, 471–480, 533–534, 535–537; 3.63–66, 279–281, 293–295, 325–328, 375–381, 508–513, 577–581; 4.78–81, 248–249, 349–353, 423–431, 439–442, 518–521, 552–557; 5.131–133, 364–370, 386–390, 408–411, 461–462; 6.330–335, 377–382; 7.115–122, 229–231, 530–534, 545–552, 569–577, 586–593; 8.49–53, 59–67, 69–74, 89–92, 130–133, 167–170, 204–207, 222–227, 230–233, 278–283, 338–340, 361–365, 379–385,

that have myths or gods as their subject matter;[12] and I would then classify all other similes together.[13] *Posthomerica* 1 contains the highest number of similes (35 long similes, and 5 short similes). However, this is not the highest concentration in the poem. *Posthomerica* 7, which is 96 lines shorter than *Posthomerica* 1, has 18 long similes and 11 short similes, which, including the narrative text that introduces and concludes the similes, is 17.71% of the book, unlike book 1, which has 16.63%. Book 7 centres on the entry of Neoptolemus into the story. *Posthomerica* 8, with 22 long similes and 6 short, has 19.24% as simile text (the highest concentration), and *Posthomerica* 11 has 18.163% as simile text (27 similes, including 8 short similes).[14] The high concentration of similes in these books can be accounted for by their focus on battle narrative—book 8 involves the combat centrepieces between Eurypylus and Neoptolemus (the *Posthomerica* follows the *Iliad* in having most of its similes clustered around battle narrative).[15]

In Alexandria, Homeric similes are given their first extant critical exegesis.[16] The *scholia* to the Homeric poems, an amalgamation of critical notes and exegesis of the text, beginning in Alexandria and typified by Aristarchus, and ending in Byzantine times and summarised by Eustathius,[17] provide the modern reader with an insight into the ancient interpretation of the Homeric simile. It is difficult to ascertain with any precision the date and authorship of the *scholia*, and it seems that the influences of Late Antique

---

414–419; 9.70–72, 162–167, 235, 240–245, 270–273, 378–383, 451–458, 473–478; 10.66–72, 170–177, 248–251, 415–422; 11.122–126, 156–160, 228–234, 308–315, 377–378, 396–399, 401–405; 12.409–410, 428–434; 13.240–242, 309–316, 395–398, 480–487, 488–493; and 14.5–10, 63–67, 75–81, 175–178, 207–208, and 457–458.

  [12] Listed at note 70, this section.

  [13] 2.230–234; 3.63–66, 414–417; 5.380–385, 503–507; 7.530–534, 637–641; 8.278–283, 331–336; 9.162–167, 198–202; 10.277–282; 11.362–366; 13.535–543; and 14.263–269. Most of the similes of this last category bear least resemblance in their subject matter to Homeric similes.

  [14] The other books have the following concentration of similes: book 2 – 13.068% (24 similes, including 4 short similes); book 3 – 11.03% (26 similes, including 6 short similes); book 4 – 7.058% (14 similes, including 4 short similes); book 5 – 9.04% (18 similes, including 3 short similes); book 6 – 7.526% (18 similes, including 9 short similes); book 9 – 10.62% (17 similes, including 4 short similes); book 10 – 9.2% (16 similes, including 7 short similes); book 12 – 4.957% (11 similes, including 6 short similes); book 13 – 12.765% (15 similes, including 1 short simile); and book 14 – 9.878% (22 similes, including 8 short similes).

  [15] Cf. Moulton 1977.50.

  [16] Interpretation of the nature and function of similes begins with Aristotle (*Rhetoric* 3.11.11–13). He is the first to come up with definitions that resemble the modern idea of a poetic simile. He states that a simile (εἰκών) is a type of metaphor, where one thing is likened to another. See McCall 1969.24–56 for discussion of Aristotle on similes and comparison.

  [17] Nünlist 2009.220–285 provides the most up-to-date discussion of the *scholia*.

rhetorical schools and Imperial philosophies formed as accretions to the original writings of the Alexandrian scholars.[18] We can be sure that Quintus would have been immersed in this tradition of scholarly Homeric exegesis, just as Vergil was.[19] Often, the function allotted to Homeric similes by the *scholia* transfers to the Posthomeric similes that derive their intertextuality from the very same Homeric similes they discuss, and I will draw attention to this on occasion: an entirely separate study of this relationship between the *scholia* and the *Posthomerica* is required, however, to exploit this phenomenon fully (and is unfortunately outside the scope of this study). While the ancient material on similes is relatively scant, however, modern scholarship on epic similes is immense.[20] From among this mass of information, there is now a general consensus that each simile must be interrogated in terms of its specific narrative context and content, and that it is more difficult to classify the function of all Homeric similes under the same headings.[21] What has become clear is that Homeric similes can have multiple correspondences with their surrounding narrative,[22] that similes elicit an emotional response at the reader's level,[23] and among many other functions, prolong tension and draw specific emphasis upon a point in a narrative that would otherwise be un-highlighted.[24] The subject matter of the similes is generally drawn from the world of the poet, recognisable to the reader, and which thus momentarily "unites narrator and audience in *their* world, not that of the heroes."[25] This scholarship builds on what the ancient testimony on similes informs us (via Eustathius), namely that there were four functions for similes: αὔξησις, ἐνάργεια, σαφήνεια, and ποικιλία (Eustathius 176.20 ff.; 253.26 ff.; and 1065.29 ff. van der Valk).[26]

---

[18] Cf. Snipes 1988.209.

[19] Cf. Schlunk 1974.

[20] The best summary of this scholarship is perhaps Edwards 1991.24–41 (and for bibliography 1991.24n28). Of the many recent studies Scott 2009 deserves particular mention.

[21] Cf. Coffey 1957.132, Fränkel 1997.105, and Edwards 1991.38–39.

[22] See Edwards 1991.30–34 and Fränkel 1997.111–113. Contrast D.A. West 1969.40.

[23] This is something that Fränkel was the first to argue for at length—see Fränkel 1997.103–104. Contrast the now outdated views of Bowra 1930.116 and 127.

[24] Edwards 1991.39 summarises the function of the Homeric simile: "In sum, we can say that a simile produces a pause in the action, prolongs the tension, and draws the audience's attention to an important point. Like the expansion of a type-scene, it adds colour and a new dimension to whatever is the focus of attention." Much of this summary by Edwards echoes the comments in the *scholia*: cf. Snipes 1988.209–218.

[25] Edwards 1991.39; cf. Fränkel 1997.110.

[26] According to Snipes 1988.208–209, these terms can be translated (respectively) as "to supply details and to amplify the narrative", "to make it more vivid or actual", "to make it clear", and "to vary the monotony". Κόσμος was also included as a function of the Homeric

The above is only a very cursory summary of scholarship ancient and modern on the Homeric similes, and by no means does justice to the complexity of the subject. We cannot positively assign such interpretative views to Quintus, but it is useful to apply these theories on function to the similes of the *Posthomerica*, to ascertain just how closely he imitated the function of Homeric similes.[27] Reading of these similes was a matter of inheritance on the part of each new epic poet, and by the time Quintus wrote the *Posthomerica*, Homeric similes had been analysed and picked over by Alexandrian scholars, and manipulated allusively by Alexandrian scholar-poets.[28]

The first simile of the *Posthomerica* is unlike the other similes of book 1 in that it allows for accommodation of differing chronological perspectives in the main narrative. The simile is used at the very opening of the poem as a structurally unifying device: the narrative expands upon the fear oxen have of a lion (line 5—standing for the Trojans' fear of Achilles) by recalling Achilles' deeds, and by foreshadowing the destruction of Troy. This non-Homeric aspect of the simile (and especially the simile's narrative frame)— it is Janus-like in the way it looks back to the *Iliad* and forward to the end of the *Posthomerica*—foreshadows the non-Homeric patterns in the immediately succeeding similes.

> Εὖθ' ὑπὸ Πηλείωνι δάμη θεοείκελος Ἕκτωρ
> καί ἑ πυρῇ κατέδαψε καὶ ὀστέα γαῖα κεκεύθει,
> δὴ τότε Τρῶες ἔμιμνον ἀνὰ Πριάμοιο πόληα
> δειδιότες μένος ἠὺ θρασύφρονος Αἰακίδαο·
> 5 ἠΰτ' ἐνὶ ξυλόχοισι βόες βλοσυροῖο λέοντος
> ἐλθέμεν οὐκ ἐθέλουσιν ἐναντίαι, ἀλλὰ φέβονται
> ἰληδὸν πτώσσουσαι ἀνὰ ῥωπήια πυκνά·
> ὣς οἳ ἀνὰ πτολίεθρον ὑπέτρεσαν ὄβριμον ἄνδρα,
> μνησάμενοι προτέρων ὁπόσων ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἴαψε
> 10 θύων Ἰδαίοιο περὶ προχοῇσι Σκαμάνδρου,
> ἠδ' (ὁπ)όσους φεύγοντας ὑπὸ μέγα τεῖχος ὄλεσσεν,
> Ἕκτορά θ' ὡς ἐδάμασσε καὶ ἀμφείρυσσε πόληι,
> ἄλλους θ' οὓς ἐδάιξε δι' ἀκαμάτοιο θαλάσσης,
> ὁππότε δὴ τὰ πρῶτα φέρεν Τρώεσσιν ὄλεθρον.
> 15 τῶν οἵ γε μνησθέντες ἀνὰ πτολίεθρον ἔμιμνον·
> ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρά σφισι πένθος ἀνιηρὸν πεπότητο
> ὡς ἤδη στονόεντι καταιθομένης πυρὶ Τροίης.

---

simile, an adornment that tended to digression. Cf. also Edwards 1991.38 and especially Nünlist 2009.290–291 on these terms.

[27] "Similes are a narrative mode which Homer bequeathed to all subsequent epic poets" Hunter 1993.129.

[28] On this Alexandrian 'habit', see especially Effe 2001 on the example of Apollonius.

> After godlike Hector had been slain by the son of Peleus, and the pyre had consumed him and the earth covered his bones, then the Trojans stayed penned up in the city of Priam in fear of the noble might of the un-shirking grandson of Aeacus. *Just as cattle in a wood are unwilling to go and face a fearsome lion, but take fright, cowering altogether in dense thickets. So the Trojans in their city trembled in fear of the mighty man, remembering* that man's previous victims that he sacrificed by the banks of Idaean Scamandrus, and how many he killed of those trying to flee up to their great wall. And they remembered how he conquered Hector and dragged him about the city, and the others whom he slew while travelling on the untiring sea. The Trojans, remembering all of them, remained within their city; and bitter sorrow fell upon them as though Troy were already aflame with grievous fire.

The poem begins with a summary of the very end of the *Iliad*: the temporal adverbs specify that this action was recent (especially the first word εὖτε 1), and that straight afterwards (the correlative τότε 3) the Trojans remain within Troy in fear of Achilles (3–4). The simile, explaining the Trojans' fear of Achilles, motivates an analepsis of the events of the *Iliad* and prolepsis of the destruction of Troy, a fate that will be described in *Posthomerica* 12 and 13. The contrast between the prowess of Achilles and the stature of the Trojans is emphasised (βόες βλοσυροῖο λέοντος 5), as is the fact that the Trojans (cattle) huddle together in fear (7). The resumption of the main narrative after the simile picks up on the safety of the dense thickets (ἀνὰ πτολίεθρον 8 corresponds with ἀνὰ ῥωπήια πυκνά 7) and the fear the animals have of the lion (ὑπέτρεσαν ὄβριμον ἄνδρα 8 corresponds with φέβονται / ἰληδὸν πτώσσουσαι 6/7). This connection activates a movement chronologically back to the events of the *Iliad*, since μνησάμενοι (line 9) explains why the Trojans remain in Troy, like cattle, in fear of Achilles. This account of their fear, their recollection of Achilles' deeds, allows for a summary of the slaughter of the Trojans by Achilles (8–11),[29] how he slew Hector and dragged him round the city (12), and the killings he carried out by sea when he first came to Troy (13–14).[30] Lines 15–17 then close this summary of the *Iliad*, with repetition of a verb of recollection (μνησθέντες 15) in ring composition with

---

[29] According to Vian 1963.12n1 these lines summarise the events of *Iliad* 21, 22, and 24.

[30] The last two details mentioned do not specifically occur within the action of the *Iliad*: the *Iliad* does not describe Achilles dragging Hector's body around the walls of Troy (cf. Vian 1963.12n1—it is attested in Euripides *Andromache* 107–108, Vergil *Aeneid* 1.483, and again in the *Posthomerica* at 1.112 and 14.133); lines 13–14 refer "to the sacking of the twelve cities by sea, as recalled by Achilles in the *Iliad* (9.328–329), together with eleven cities sacked on the mainland near Troy" (James 2004.269).

μνησάμενοι (line 9).[31] The participles μνησάμενοι and μνησθέντες also symbol-
ise the reader's act of remembering. The simile's frame, with these two signal
words, mirrors the activity of the reader. The reader's focus is diverted to the
Iliad at the very beginning of this poem, as it will be throughout. Further-
more, as Silvio Bär shows,[32] δὴ τὰ πρῶτα (14) is the same formulation used at
Iliad 1.6, of the beginning of the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon.
The echo draws attention to one of the premises of the *Iliad*, and implic-
itly to the consequences of this initial wrath of Achilles, to the subsequent
actions after the death of Patroclus. There is signified a continuum in the
motives of the wrath of Achilles. There is also a structural closing of this
section through repetition of the fact that the Trojans remain within the
walls of Troy (Τρῶες ἔμιμνον ἀνὰ Πριάμοιο πόληα line 3): ἀνὰ πτολίεθρον ἔμι-
μνον (line 14).[33] We take up the story at the point of the resumption of battle,
promised by Achilles to Priam at *Iliad* 24.669–670, twelve days after their
meeting together.

The opening section of the poem ends with an emphasis on the grief of
the Trojans (*penthos* 16), as though their city were already in flames, sacked
by the Greeks (17). The concessive particle ὡς along with the temporal
adverb ἤδη (line 17—loosely translated as 'as though … *now*') foreground the
telos of the Trojan story, and in fact, of the *Posthomerica*: the destruction of
Troy is there right at the beginning of the poem, disguised in the primary
narrator's description of the intensity of the Trojans' grief.[34] One simile
and the surrounding narrative motivated by it encapsulate the Trojan story
within, and previous to, the *Posthomerica*. As discussed earlier, the absence
of a proem has traditionally been seen as Quintus' attempts to construct a
direct link with the end of the *Iliad*, and in effect, to establish himself as 'still'
Homer. The first simile of the poem, and its context, reinforce this idea of
linkage, by recapping the final events of the *Iliad*, and the *telos* of the Trojan
War.[35]

The narrative then moves immediately to the coming of Penthesileia
to Troy: καὶ τότε Θερμώδοντος ἀπ' εὐρυπόροιο ῥεέθρων / ἤλυθε Πενθεσίλεια
… (1.18–19). Her arrival and the hope it brings to the Trojans is given an

---

[31] See Bär 2007.34 for discussion of ring composition in the vocabulary of 1.1–15.
[32] Bär 2009.162.
[33] This clause in fact echoes the narrative both pre- and post-simile, since ἀνὰ πτολίεθρον
also occurs at line 8.
[34] On Troy's destruction as the *telos* of the war, cf. the words of the anonymous Greek
speakers at *Posthomerica* 14.117, after the destruction of Troy. Cf. Bär 2007.33.
[35] Quintus also includes a recapitulation of the events of the *Iliad* and the *Posthomerica*
at 14.121–142, in the (indirectly reported) words of an anonymous bard.

extended narration (18–137). More specifically, the hope Penthesileia's appearance gives the Trojans is related by a series of similes that are interconnected,[36] and which map out the poetological patterns evident in the poem's similes. The string of related similes creates individual impressions in their own right, but which together also enlarge upon or vary this picture of hope instilled by the arrival of the new warrior. The similes of the *Iliad* are also sometimes interconnected to create a cumulative overall impression, as, for example, in the clusters at *Iliad* 2.455–483, 11.68–72, and 17.737–759.[37] Take the series in book 11, for example. There we have Hector, standing in his shining armour, compared to a destructive star that shines out from the clouds (61–63), signifying, as line 44 makes clear, his pre-eminence among his fellow Trojan champions. This idea of light motivates a short comparison to Zeus' lightning (66). We then get a contrast between the heavens and the reapers (~ Trojans) who cut down crops (67–69), an image which translates to both the Trojans and the Achaeans engaging each other in battle, who are then compared to wolves. It is apparent how one simile motivates the next (the companion to wolves is somewhat out of place) but scholarly views on the overall purpose of such sequences in Homer vary:[38] the most extreme considers them "embellishments for their own sake", but it is evident that an overall effect is aimed at.[39] In the case of the series in *Iliad* 11, a contrast is designed between Hector and all other warriors, including the Greeks (the adverbial conjunction at 67 conveys this).

But while these Iliadic similes clearly exhibit linkage from one simile to the next, the succession evident between them is not as artificially mannered in their connection as is very evident, for example, in the series in *Posthomerica* 1. The following diagram illustrates that almost all of the similes in the first section of book 1 (extending from 1.18 to 1.81) are generated by preceding ones, and that they are related thematically.[40]

---

[36] On the function of these similes, contrast Combellack 1968.10: "Quintus devotes most of his first pages to literary adornment, and very little happens. The whole of the first book of the *Iliad* is without similes; Quintus gives us five similes in the first hundred lines."

[37] Moulton 1977.19 shows the importance of "verbal repetition of certain key motifs" functioning "to connect the members of the sequence".

[38] Moulton 1977 (esp. chapter 1) has the best discussion of these sequences in the Homeric poems; cf. also Lee 1964.14, and further 13–14 for his discussion of series of similes and examples.

[39] As Moulton 1977.27–33 shows. Cf. also Edwards 1991.31.

[40] More intricate diagrams on the macrostructure and analogical and antithetical correspondences can be found in Bär 2009.97–100 (he does not discuss the effects of the series, however).

5–9: **Trojans** hide in <u>Troy</u> in fear of *Achilles*, like **cattle** that cower in the <u>thickets</u> in fear of a *lion*

37–41: **Penthesileia**, in the presence of her *attendants*, is compared to the **moon** (goddess) conspicuous among the *stars*

48–53: Just as **Penthesileia** stands out from the other *Amazons* as she <u>comes to Troy</u>, so **Dawn** who <u>descends from Olympus</u> stands out from the fair-haired *Seasons*

63–72: The **Trojans**, despite <u>past sorrows</u>, *rejoice* at the sight of *Penthesileia*, just as **countrymen**, when they catch sight of a *rainbow* extending from the sea, *rejoice*, because it is a sign of *approaching rain* for their <u>parched lands</u>

76–83: **Priam's** grieving mind is <u>gladdened at the sight of</u> *Penthesileia*, just as a **blind man** has <u>his sight partially restored</u> either by a doctor or by a god, so that he can once more see *dawn*

153–156: **Penthesileia in her armour** shines like a **flash of lightning** shot forth from Olympus

175–176: **Trojans** <u>follow</u> *Penthesileia* like **sheep** <u>following</u> behind a *ram*

179–181: **Penthesileia** <u>marches into battle</u> like **Tritonis** who <u>went to face the giants</u>, or **Strife** that goes through the *army* stirring tumult – as such was Penthesileia among the *Trojans*

Diagram 2. Structure in similes, *Posthomerica* 1.5–81.

The diagram illustrates that the similes contained within lines 37–156 share similar themes, and that there is a progressive movement from one simile forward to the next, to the extent that each simile generates a short piece of narrative which in turn generates another simile similar to the preceding one. All of these similes share similarities, and are thus linked in the diagram by a second connecting line (labelled Sequence '1').[41] Sequence '2' reflects the relationship between the similes at *Posthomerica* 1.175–176 and 1.179–181—which emphasise the pre-eminence and leadership of Penthesileia—and the similes at the beginning of book 1 (1.37–41 and 1.48–53), which contain a similar emphasis. Sequence 2 rounds of, in ring composition, the narration of Penthesileia's arrival into Troy and the effect she has on those who see her.

---

[41] The simile at *Posthomerica* 1.153–156 is not connected to the simile at 1.76–83, but is related by theme to the other similes in Sequence 1 in the diagram.

The first extended simile of the series occurs at 1.37–41: this simile compares Penthesileia among her attendants to the pre-eminence of the moon among the stars.[42]

> ὡς δ’ ὅτ’ ἀν’ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἐν ἄστρασι δῖα σελήνη
> ἐκπρέπει ἐν πάντεσσιν ἀριζήλη γεγαυῖα,
> αἰθέρος ἀμφιραγέντος ὑπὸ νεφέων ἐριδούπων,
> 40 εὖτ’ ἀνέμων εὕδῃσι μένος μέγα λάβρον ἀέντων·
> ὣς ἥ γ’ ἐν πάσῃσι μετέπρεπεν ἐσσυμένῃσιν.

> As when in the broad expanse of heaven the brilliant moon among the stars stands out from among all of them, being more distinct, when the *aether* is torn apart by the loud-thundering clouds, and when the great might of the winds that bluster furiously has fallen asleep. So Penthesileia stood out from among all those speeding by her side.

There are two ideas implied in this simile: just as the moon is superior to the stars, so Penthesileia is superior to her followers.[43] Implicated in this idea is that the moon is the brightest, the most eye-catching in the heavens, compared to the stars around her. Penthesileia is compared to something elemental—a light that suddenly appears in all its brightness (ἀριζήλη γεγαυῖα 38).[44] We can infer that the contrast in the simile between the loud thunderclouds torn apart and the winds that have fallen asleep (39–40), and the moon that is suddenly pre-eminently bright in the sky (37–38), implies the previous gloomy status of the Trojans and the hope that the appearance of Penthesileia and her companions now bring to them. Penthesileia is a dazzling light, a symbol of hope. This *idea* is elaborated in the succeeding simile, with slight variation. It also compares Penthesileia to a deity / natural element, but this time we have a specific focus on the effect this appearance has on the Trojans.

> οἵη δ’ ἀκαμάτοιο κατέρχεται Οὐλύμποιο
> Ἠὼς μαρμαρέοισιν ἀγαλλομένη φρένας ἵπποις
> 50 Ὡράων μετ’ ἐυπλοκάμων, μετὰ δέ σφισι πάσαις
> ἐκπρέπει ἀγλαὸν εἶδος ἀμωμήτοις περ ἐούσαις·

---

[42] This is a Homeric intertext (Vian 1963.14n1 compares *Il.* 5.524–526, 8.555–559, and 16.300). I will not dwell on the function of the intertextuality of the similes in this series: that will be the focus in parts (ii) and (iii).

[43] Correspondence in the main narrative with this key idea in the simile occurs immediately after the simile (ὣς ἥ γ’ ἐν πάσῃσι μετέπρεπεν ἐσσυμένῃσιν 41), and occurs immediately before the simile as its motivation: ἀλλ’ ἄρα πασάων μέγ’ ὑπείρεχε Πενθεσίλεια (line 36).

[44] Just as the moon appears when the might of the blustering wind has died down (1.40), so too Penthesileia appears when the war has abated for a moment, as the Trojans wait in Troy.

τοίη Πενθεσίλεια μόλεν ποτὶ Τρώιον ἄστυ
ἔξοχος ἐν πάσῃσιν Ἀμαζόσιν. ἀμφὶ δὲ Τρῶες
πάντοθεν ἐσσύμενοι μέγ᾽ ἐθάμβεον, εὖτ᾽ ἐσίδοντο
55   Ἄρεος ἀκαμάτοιο βαθυκνήμιδα θύγατρα
εἰδομένην μακάρεσσιν.

As Dawn descends from immortal Olympus with her fair-haired Seasons, her mind delighting in her shining horses, and among all those with her she is the one with the most splendid appearance, even though they also are blameless in that respect. As such Penthesileia went to the city of Troy outstanding among all the Amazons. And the Trojans round about flocking from all sides marvelled greatly, when they looked upon the deep-grooved daughter of untiring Ares, who looked like one of the blessed ones.

It is of course appropriate that Penthesileia is compared to Dawn—her arrival is a new beginning and fresh hope for the Trojans.[45] Once again, pre-eminence from among companions is the central idea:[46] Dawn has beauty more outstanding than all those who accompany her, even though they too are beautiful (50–51); so Penthesileia is the most beautiful to look upon (53), as she goes to Troy (52).[47] The verbs in the simile and post-simile narrative emphasise movement: Dawn descends from Olympus (ἀκαμάτοιο κατέρχεται Οὐλύμποιο 48) and just so Penthesileia went to Troy (μόλεν ποτὶ Τρώιον ἄστυ 52). The vaguely descriptive aorist μόλεν (52) parallels the present tense κατέρχεται (48) that describes the habitual action of Dawn. Penthesileia's single action thus appears as the daily light of Dawn—a strong and exaggerated comparison. The perspective in the narrative switches to the viewing of the Trojans as they look upon Penthesileia (53–56) like one of the gods (56). This specific shift in narrative perspective to secondary focalizers implies that in the eyes of the Trojans themselves Penthesileia is dawn, heaven-sent help. Penthesileia among her Amazons has been compared to the Moon among the stars, Dawn among the Seasons, and for the first time, the perspective of on-lookers, Trojans, has been introduced.[48]

---

[45] On the mythology of this simile, cf. Vian 1963.14n3, who also states (ibid.) that 1.48–53 are a transposition of *Odyssey* 6.102–109, where Nausicaa is compared to Artemis.

[46] This focus on pre-eminence among followers is refocused onto the leadership of Penthesiliea later in book 1, at 175–181, where, first, the Trojans following Penthesileia into battle are compared to sheep following behind a ram (175–176), and then Penthesileia among the Trojans is compared to Tritonis or Strife that goes through the army stirring up tumult (179–181). See Sequence 2 in the diagram. The later similes reflect back on the earlier similes, and *vice-versa*.

[47] Cf. *Posthomerica* 5.130–133 for a simile suggesting the pre-eminence of Ajax among the Greeks, placed just before the contest for the Arms of Achilles.

[48] There is a traditional connection between Selene and Eos: cf. Hesiod *Th.* 371–374,

The next simile in the sequence (*Posthomerica* 1.63–72) builds on this last factor in particular: it describes the effect the sign of rain has on those longing for their parched crops.

> λαοὶ δ' ἀμφεγάνυντο καὶ ἀχνύμενοι τὸ πάροιθεν·
> ὡς δ' ὁπότ' ἀθρήσαντες ἀπ' οὔρεος ἀγροιῶται
> Ἶριν ἀνεγρομένην ἐξ εὐρυπόροιο θαλάσσης,
> 65 ὄμβρου ὅτ' ἰσχανόωσι θεουδέος, ὁππότ' ἀλωαὶ
> ἤδη ἀπαυαίνονται ἐελδόμεναι Διὸς ὕδωρ,
> ὀψὲ δ' ὑπηχλύνθη μέγας οὐρανός, οἳ δ' ἐσιδόντες
> ἐσθλὸν σῆμ' ἀνέμοιο καὶ ὑετοῦ ἐγγὺς ἐόντος
> χαίρουσι⟨ν⟩, τὸ πάροιθεν ἐπιστενάχοντες ἀρούραις·
> 70 ὣς ἄρα Τρώιοι υἷες, ὅτ' ἔδρακον ἔνδοθι πάτρης
> δεινὴν Πενθεσίλειαν ἐπὶ πτόλεμον μεμαυῖαν,
> γήθεον.

And the people, despite grieving over past events, rejoiced: as whenever rustics, espying from a mountain Iris the rainbow rising up from the expansive sea, when they yearn for god-sent rain, when their fields now dry up as they crave Zeus' water, and at last the great heavens are clouded over, and they, looking upon the promising sign of mind and coming rain, rejoice, although previously they groaned about their land. So then the Trojan sons, when they saw the terrible Penthesileia eager for war within their homeland, rejoiced.

This simile illustrates the effect the sight of Penthesileia has on the Trojans.[49] They are compared to countrymen who espy a rainbow, when their fields are dry for want of rain.[50] For the first time the Trojans are the subject of a simile with reference to the appearance of Penthesileia. This switch in emphasis is motivated by the previous simile, and especially its narrative context where, post-simile, the Trojans marvel at Penthesileia (1.53–56). It is no accident that, once again, Penthesileia is compared to a natural element that suggests an abundance of light. Emphasis has now shifted away from pre-eminence, and instead lies on the meaning the sight of a natural phenomenon like a rainbow has for those who catch sight of it. The rainbow portends water for dry crops and joy for rustics who have long hoped for rain (69);[51] so the Trojans look upon the iridescent appearance of

---

and *DNP s.v.* "Eos". Selene is also associated with Artemis, with whom Penthesileia is also compared at *Posthomerica* 1.663–668.

[49] For the intertextuality of this simile, see James 2004.269. This is the only rainbow simile, and in fact the only occurrence of a rainbow, in the *Posthomerica*.

[50] Note the most explicit correspondence between simile and narrative: λαοὶ δ' ἀμφεγά-νυντο καὶ ἀχνύμενοι τὸ πάροιθεν (62) is paralleled closely by χαίρουσι⟨ν⟩, τὸ πάροιθεν ἐπιστενά-χοντες ἀρούραις (69).

[51] Cf. Vian 1963.15n1 on the ancients' belief that a rainbow was a presage of rain.

Penthesileia as a sign of hope for success in battle (71–72). Thus, through a sequence of similes, our reading of Penthesileia's arrival has moved from an understanding of her pre-eminence among her followers, because of the brightness of her appearance (1.37–40), to the new hope this pre-eminent appearance brings (1.48–53), to the suffering of the Trojans and the relief they now have even in seeing her brilliant appearance (1.63–72).

The Trojans' perspective on Penthesileia's arrival is then narrowed down to the effect her coming has on one Trojan, Priam (*Posthomerica* 1.76–85), an effect which is compared to partial relief from blindness:

ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀνὴρ ἀλαοῖσιν ἐπ' ὄμμασι πολλὰ μογήσας
ἱμείρων ἰδέειν ἱερὸν φάος ἢ θανέεσθαι
ἢ πόνῳ ἰητῆρος ἀμύμονος ἠὲ θεοῖο
ὄμματ' ἀπαχλύσαντος ἴδῃ φάος ἠριγενείης,
80 οὐ μὲν ὅσον τὸ πάροιθεν, ὅμως δ' ἄρα βαιὸν ἰάνθη
πολλῆς ἐκ κακότητος, ἔχει δ' ἔτι πήματος ἄλγος
αἰνὸν ὑπὸ βλεφάροισι λελειμμένον· ὣς ἄρα δεινὴν
υἱὸς Λαομέδοντος ἐσέδρακε Πενθεσίλειαν·
παῦρον μὲν γήθησε, τὸ δὲ πλέον εἰσέτι παίδων
85 ἄχνυτ' ἀποκταμένων.

As when a man who has suffered much from blindness desires to see the holy light or else die, at last beholds the light of dawn, either by the skill of a blameless doctor, or because a god has lifted the mist from his eyes, though he sees not so much as before, but nevertheless is strongly cheered from his great bane, even though he yet has pangs of grievous pain left stinging under his eye lids. So then the son of Laomedon beheld terrible Penthesileia. He rejoiced slightly, but greater still was his grief for his sons that had been killed.

Quintus here plays on the running imagery of Penthesileia's appearance as something elemental and celestial that dazzles onlookers. Against the joy-inducing arrival emphasised in the use of similes, this time Priam, one of the Trojans who behold Penthesileia, has a more realistic reaction to her arrival:[52] the simile and post-simile narrative emphasise only partial restoration of sight / feelings of joy (lines 80–82, 83–84).[53] The blind man in the simile still feels the pain of his affliction: ἔχει δ' ἔτι πήματος ἄλγος, implying

---

[52] It is difficult to assign in the main narrative a correspondence for the doctor's skill or the god's lifting of the mist (1.78–79). Arguably, the arrival of Penthesileia can be transferred, in the simile, both into the remedy for blindness and into dawn, since it is her arrival that makes Priam rejoice despite so much previous grief (lines 74–75, and especially line 75: μέγ' ἀκηχεμένοιο περὶ φρεσὶ τυτθὸν ἰάνθη). Cf. Vian 1963.161 on the description of blindness here.

[53] The simile also functions as an illustration or proof of the validity of the gnome at 1.72–73, which speaks of the softening of grief through hope.

that Priam's grief is too great to be completely relieved by Penthesileia's arrival. She does not dispel all of Priam's grief,[54] just as the blind man in the simile is not able to see the light of the sun fully, in contrast to the effect the Moon, Dawn, and a rainbow have in the previous similes.

Thus, in terms of the running theme involved in the similes from 1.37 to 1.83 (Sequence 1 in Diagram 1), the Priam simile marks a *diminuendo* in the exaggerated comparisons that exalt Penthesileia to an all-relieving elemental force.[55] In this final simile in the sequence we again get a Trojan perspective, but we zoom in on one Trojan, and the personal feelings he has, unlike the general joy felt by the group as a whole. Compare the simile series at *Iliad* 2.455–483, which ends with a focus on Agamemnon (*Iliad* 2.480–483): "The entire movement, if compared to a series of views with a camera lens, clearly exhibits a contraction of the frame, until the audience is finally brought to concentrate on the supreme leader of the expedition."[56] This is a sequence Quintus imitates, but the Posthomeric sequence is more descriptive and exaggerated, and inter-motivating. We still get a focus on seeing, but this is only a limited sight after blindness, not dazzlement at a celestial sign, a private view of her arrival and the hope that it brings. We move from great expectations coupled with relief to realism and experience. Priam symbolises the grief felt at the death of Hector, and his more realistic acceptance of Penthesileia, portrayed in this last simile, is paralleled by Andromache's outcry at the Amazon's boasts: at 1.100–114 she explains that Penthesileia has no hope against Achilles, given that her own Hector fell by his spear, and "he was far better than you" (105).

By a series of related similes the impact of the arrival of Penthesileia narrows to a reminder of past conflict and disaster. The series also, however, unifies the narrative on account of its tightly controlled thematic progression. We do not get anything as measured or precise as this in the *Iliad*'s similes. The later similes in book 1 interact with the earlier expectations of success through Penthesileia's prowess, as related through simile-imagery,

---

[54] Cf. James 2004.269: "The simile of partial recovery from blindness is one of the few that seem to be original in subject matter. The condition described is probably glaucoma, with which Laokoon is inflicted at 12.400–412."

[55] There is one more simile I would add to what I term Sequence 1, illustrated in Diagram 1. It occurs at *Posthomerica* 1.153–156, where Penthesileia in her armour is compared to a flash of lightning shot by Zeus. Penthesileia's appearance is thus once again emphasised as something dazzling. Similes (long and short) involving lightning bolts are common in the *Posthomerica*, however: they occur at 1.677–681, 2.207, 2.379–387, 3.293–295, 6.197, 8.69–74, 8.222–227, 9.295, 10.479–482, 11.401–405, and 14.457–458.

[56] Moulton 1977. 33.

and both reverse them and create opposite reader-responses. I will focus on this interplay now by highlighting in particular Penthesileia's fate in book 1 at the hands of Achilles. (For a complete list of similes and their subject matter in book 1, see the table at the end of this section).

I begin with one pair that manipulates expectations of an untimely fate for Penthesileia. The parallel is between the simile at *Posthomerica* 1.179–181 and the simile at 1.515–521.

> ἣ δ' οἵη Τριτωνίς, ὅτ' ἤλυθεν ἄντα Γιγάντων,
> 180 ἠ Ἔρις ἐγρεκύδοιμος ἀνὰ στρατὸν ἀίσσουσα,
> τοίη ἐνὶ Τρώεσσι θοὴ πέλε Πενθεσίλεια.

Penthesileia was like Tritonis when she went against the Giants, or Strife who raises tumult rushing through the army—such among the Trojans was swift Penthesileia.   (*Posthomerica* 1.179–181)

> ~

> 515 Ἀργεῖοι δ' ἐχάρησαν, ἐπεὶ ἴδον ἄνδρε κραταιὼ
> εἰδομένω παίδεσσιν Ἀλωῆος μεγάλοιο,
> οἵ ποτ' ἐπ' εὐρὺν Ὄλυμπον ἔφαν θέμεν οὔρεα μακρά,
> Ὄσσαν ⟨τ'⟩ αἰπεινὴν καὶ Πήλιον ὑψικάρηνον,
> ὅππως δὴ μεμαῶτε καὶ οὐρανὸν εἰσαφίκωνται·
> 520 τοῖοι ἄρ' ἀντέστησαν ἀταρτηροῦ πολέμοιο
> Αἰακίδαι

The Argives rejoiced when they saw the stout men looking like the sons of mighty Aloeus, who once boasted that they would pile on top of broad Olympus the great mountains Ossa the sheer and Pelion the high-peaked, that they, in their eagerness, might arrive at heaven's limit. As such then the grandsons of Aeacus faced the fearsome war.   (*Posthomerica* 1.515–521)

The similarity of their entries into battle, and the natural oppositions suggested by the similes, puts the contest between Penthesileia and Achilles on a cosmic, gigantomachic scale.[57] In the first simile (1.179–181), Penthesileia going into battle is compared both to Tritonis going against the giants, and to Strife stirring up tumult. In the second simile (1.515–521), Achilles and Ajax going into battle are compared to the giants Otus and Ephialtes, who famously warred against the gods and captured Ares in a jar.[58] Both similes refer to the same gigantomachic event.[59] Penthesileia is the daughter of

---

[57] It is Achilles alone who eventually faces Penthesileia in battle (Ajax leaves him in battle at 1.570–572).

[58] Cf. Vian 1963.163 and James 2004.272.

[59] On gigantomachy in the *Posthomerica*, see the references at James 2004.270. On cosmology (in *Posthomerica* 14), see now Carvounis 2007.

Ares,[60] and is compared to Athene who fought against the giants.[61] Otus and Ephialtes, the giants, managed to capture Ares, the father of Penthesileia, in a jar.[62] By setting up battle-entries for Penthesileia on the one hand, and Achilles (and Ajax) on the other, against a background of a struggle that took place in another mythological world, the reader expects a similar super-human struggle between Penthesileia and Achilles. As the story goes, the sons of Aloeus eventually did not succeed in their struggle against the gods, and since Penthesileia is compared to Athene who successfully, along with the other gods, defeated the Giants,[63] the similes themselves seem to leave open the outcome of their eventual meeting. But this is a brief glimpse of hope, shading only slightly the strong foreshadowing of Penthesileia's death at the hands of Achilles, repeatedly forecast in book 1, which makes clear what the outcome of the contest will be.[64]

The reversal of fortune for Penthesileia in the latter part of book 1 contrasts with her rampant successes at the beginning of the poem. There are two similes that best illustrate this, at *Posthomerica* 1.488–493 and 1.625–629. *Posthomerica* 1.488–493 highlights the manner in which Penthesileia destroys the Greek troops who fight against her.[65]

> ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἐπιβρίσασα μέγα στονόεσσα θύελλα
> ἄλλα μὲν ἐκ ῥιζῶν χαμάδις βάλε δένδρεα μακρὰ
> 490 ἄνθεσι τηλεθόωντα, τὰ δ' ἐκ πρέμνοιο κέδασσεν
> ὑψόθεν, ἀλλήλοισι δ' ἐπὶ κλασθέντα κέχυ⟨ν⟩ται·
> ὣς Δαναῶν ⟨τότε⟩ κεῖτο πολὺς στρατὸς ἐν κονίῃσι
> Μοιράων ἰότητι καὶ ἔγχεϊ Πενθεσιλείης.

> As when a grievous gale, bearing down strongly, uproots and throws to the ground some tall trees that are in full bloom, destroys some parts from the trunk from above, and the broken parts end up piled on top of each other. So

---

[60] Cf. *Posthomerica* 1.55.

[61] See the note of James 2004.270.

[62] For the story of Otus and Ephialtes, see *OCD s.v.* "Aloedae". The comparison to giants does of course emphasise the size and strength of Achilles and Ajax.

[63] Another Trojan, Aeneas at *Posthomerica* 11.415–420, is compared to Zeus who fought against the giants.

[64] Penthesileia's death is foreshadowed at 1.93–97, 1.125–137, 1.172, 1.201–204, 1.357, 1.374–375, and 1.391–395. Cf. Duckworth 1936.73: "Again and again [Quintus] refers to Penthesileia's folly and to the death that awaits her ... on the whole the foreshadowing in this episode fails to be effective because Quintus inartistically uses too much repetition within the short space of one book." Penthesileia and Achilles (and Ajax) are elsewhere paralleled by simile subject matter. For example, fire imagery is used to characterise them at *Posthomerica* 1.209–210 (referring to the speed with which Penthesileia brings slaughter to the Trojans) and 1.534–537 (expressing an almost identical idea, but this time referring to Achilles and Ajax).

[65] For the intertextuality of this simile, see Vian 1963.31n1.

then the great army of the Greeks lay in the dust by the will of the *Moirai* and the spear of Penthesileia.

This simile is the last in the narrative which compares Penthesileia incurring battle successes. The simile illustrates the effect Penthesileia's participation in the battle has on the Greeks. The Greeks, compared to tall trees in blossom (489–490),[66] and therefore (by implication) men at their peak, lie in the dust (492) like uprooted and broken trees. The simile elicits a sympathetic reader-response in its details of full-bloom (490) and the manner in which the broken parts of the trees are piled up together (491). We attain a picture of youthful soldiers lying as broken corpses in a pile. The simile also demonstrates the battle prowess of Penthesileia, and the ease with which she slays the Greeks. The reader recalls the details and effects of this simile and its narrative context when he / she comes to read a simile where Penthesileia is the one compared to a pine tree that is broken by the North wind (*Posthomerica* 1.625–629):[67]

625   εὖτ' ἐλάτη κλασθεῖσα βίῃ κρυεροῦ Βορέαο,
        ἥν τέ που αἰπυτάτην ἀνά τ' ἄγκεα μακρὰ καὶ ὕλην,
        οἷ αὐτῇ μέγ' ἄγαλμα, τρέφει παρὰ πίδακι γαῖα·
        τοίη Πενθεσίλεια κατ' ὠκέος ἤριπεν ἵππου,
        θηητή περ ἐοῦσα· κατεκλάσθη δέ οἱ ἀλκή.

When a pine tree has been snapped by the force of the icy North Wind, which in fact is the highest in the great glens and wood, a great delight to the earth itself that nourishes it by a spring. Like such a pine tree Penthesileia fell down from her swift horse, though she was a marvel to behold: and the strength within her was broken.

Penthesileia has fallen from her horse, slain by the spear of Achilles (1.621–624). The primary idea behind the simile is not illustration of the way Penthesileia fell from her horse, but rather a focus on the dignified and awesome appearance of Penthesileia even as she falls from a horse: θηητή περ ἐοῦσα (line 629), corresponding with οἷ αὐτῇ μέγ' ἄγαλμα (627) in the simile, underscores the marvel that Penthesileia is even in death.[68] The tree in the simile is described as the highest (626), a delight to the earth that nourished it beside a spring (627). The poet, here too, strives to elicit

---

[66] Similes that describe trees occur in the *Posthomerica* (other than book 1) at 4.239–242, 4.248–249, 6.377–382, 8.130–133, 8.204–207, 9.162–167, 9.451–458, 11.122–126, and 13.395–398.

[67] See Vian 1963.163 on the intertextuality of this simile. He correctly identifies a parallel with *Posthomerica* 1.249, where Bremousa, slain by Idomeneus, falls like an ash tree.

[68] One other obvious parallel between simile and narrative exists between κατεκλάσθη δέ οἱ ἀλκή (629) and κλασθεῖσα βίῃ (625).

the reader's sympathy, this time in the death of Penthesileia. The echo
casts a differing emphasis on the previous simile. The reader's awareness
of the manner in which Penthesileia's death is described shifts the focus
away from the prowess of Penthesileia to her future death at the hands of
Achilles. Penthesileia is absorbed into the imagery that she caused by killing
Greeks. She is now made to appear like one of her own victims. Now Achilles
supplants Penthesileia in the narrative focus.[69]

Penthesileia is also paralleled towards the end of the *Posthomerica*. Only
two characters in the *Posthomerica* are compared to goddesses: Helen in
book 14 (discussed in detail in the next section) is compared to Aphrodite,
while Penthesileia in book 1, where she is compared to Artemis (1.663–
668):[70]

> τῆς δὲ καὶ ἐν κονίῃσι καὶ αἵματι πεπτηυίης
> 660 ἐξεφάνη ἐρατῇσιν ὑπ' ὀφρύσι καλὰ πρόσωπα
> καί περ ἀποκταμένης. οἳ δ', ὡς ἴδον, ἀμφιέποντες
> Ἀργεῖοι θάμβησαν, ἐπεὶ μακάρεσσιν ἐῴκει.
> κεῖτο γὰρ ἐν τεύχεσσι κατὰ χθονὸς ἠΰτ' ἀτειρὴς
> Ἄρτεμις ὑπνώουσα Διὸς τέκος, εὖτε κάμῃσι
> 665 γυῖα κατ' οὔρεα μακρὰ θοοὺς βάλλουσα λέοντας·
> αὐτὴ γάρ μιν ἔτευξε καὶ ἐν φθιμένοισιν ἀγητὴν
> Κύπρις ἐϋστέφανος κρατεροῦ παράκοιτις Ἄρηος,
> ὄφρά τι καὶ Πηλῆος ἀμύμονος υἷ' ἀκαχήσῃ.

> Although she had fallen in the blood-soaked dust her beautiful face shone out
> under her lovely eyebrows—even though she lay there slain. And the Argives,
> gathering round, marvelled when they saw her, because she looked like the
> blessed gods. For she lay there in her armour on the ground just like the
> indefatigable Artemis, the child of Zeus, asleep, after her limbs have grown
> weary from shooting swift lions in the great mountains. For lovely-crowned
> Aphrodite, the wife of mighty Ares, made her a marvel to look upon, even
> among the dead, so that she might somehow grieve the son of irreproachable
> Peleus.   (*Posthomerica* 1.659–668)

Achilles, after killing Penthesileia in combat and boasting over her corpse
(1.592–653), has removed her helmet (1.654–658), only to be struck by his
victim's overwhelming beauty (1.671–674—lines that follow on from the

---

[69] On reversal through similes in the *Iliad*, cf. e.g. Lonsdale 1990.85 and Moulton 1977.58–
62.

[70] The other similes where heroes are compared to actual gods occur at *Posthomerica*
3.419–421 (Achilles compared to Ares), 7.359–364 (Neoptolemus compared to Ares), 9.218–
222 (Neoptolemus again compared to Ares), 10.170–177 (Philoctetes compared to Ares), and
11.415–420 (Aeneas compared to Zeus who fought against the giants).

passage above). The comparison of Penthesileia to the sleeping Artemis here mirrors, in some of its vocabulary and content, the comparison of Helen to Aphrodite in book 14. On a superficial level, the parallels are clear: both women are compared to goddesses—Penthesileia as warrior queen is aptly compared to the goddess of hunting,[71] while Helen is aptly compared to the goddess of love; both situations involve Argives marvelling at the young women's beauty (1.662 and 14.61); and both women have been physically hidden from the Greeks—Penthesileia by her helmet (1.657), and Helen by absence within the Trojan walls, and are made marvellous to behold in the eyes of the Greeks by the agency of Aphrodite (1.666–667 and 14.69–70). More specifically, there are verbal links that foreshadow the description of Helen in book 14. When the Argives see Penthesileia they marvel because she looks like one of the gods: Ἀργεῖοι θάμβησαν, ἐπεὶ μακάρεσσιν ἐῴκει (1.662). This line is echoed by 14.58—θάμβεον ἀθρήσαντες, and by 14.61—ἀλλ᾽ ὡς θεὸν εἰσορόωντο. Marvelling at someone is a common occurrence in the *Posthomerica*, but it rarely occurs with regard to godlike women. The form of the simile is also the same as the form in book 14: both have an initial ἠΰτε before a digressive εὖτε (1.663–664 and 14.47–48).

The emphasis in both passages is on the disarming effect of the women's beauty, through the agency of Aphrodite.

1.
Ἀργεῖοι θάμβησαν, ἐπεὶ μακάρεσσιν ἐῴκει.
...
αὐτὴ γάρ μιν ἔτευξε καὶ ἐν φθιμένοισιν ἀγητὴν
Κύπρις ἐυστέφανος κρατεροῦ παράκοιτις Ἄρηος,
ὄφρά τι καὶ Πηλῆος ἀμύμονος υἷ᾽ ἀκαχήσῃ   (*Posthomerica* 1.662, and 666–668).

2.
                      ἀμφὶ δὲ λαοὶ
θάμβεον ἀθρήσαντες ἀμωμήτοιο γυναικὸς
ἀγλαΐην καὶ κάλλος ἐπήρατον· οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
60 κείνην οὔτε κρυφηδὸν ἐπεσβολίῃσι χαλέψαι
οὔτ᾽ οὖν ἀμφαδίην, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς θεὸν εἰσορόωντο
ἀσπασίως· πᾶσι⟨ν⟩ γὰρ ἐελδομένοισι φαάνθη
...
τοῖον γὰρ Κυθέρεια νόον ποιήσατο πάντων
70 ἦρα φέρουσ᾽ Ἑλένῃ ἑλικώπιδι καὶ Διὶ πατρί.

---

[71] Her comparison to Artemis also implies that Penthesileia is a young maiden at adolescence: cf. Larson 1997.255. That Achilles might find Penthesileia sexually desirable (implied by *Posthomerica* 1.718–721 and 1.726–728) is implied in the simile through the idea of Artemis' virginity as something "highly sexualized, just like that of the Greek maiden of marriageable age" Larson 1997.255; cf. Burkert 1985.150 on Artemis' virginity as an erotic ideal.

And the people on all sides marvelled as they looked upon the splendour and lovely beauty of the blameless woman. But no one dared openly or secretly to reproach her with insults, but they looked upon her gladly as though she were a god: for they had all been hoping to see her appear … For as such Aphrodite made the mind of all, bringing help to bright-eyed Helen and to her father Zeus.   (*Posthomerica* 14.57–61, and 69–70)

The excerpts quoted above have a similar structure. The Argives / *laoi* marvel when they see the woman, since she is like a god. It is Aphrodite who brings about this reaction, in the first example to cause Achilles to regret what he had done (a successful aim evident from 1.671–674), and in the second example to prevent the Greeks from harming Helen (also a successful aim).[72] The parallelism points to a poetological concern for ring composition (these strong similarities occur between passages that occur at opposite ends of the epic), but also to a contrast between the characters, as is evident from *Odyssey* 6.102–109, where Nausicaa and her maidservants are compared to Artemis among her nymphs.[73] Despite a lack of verbal echoes between the passages, the fact that both young maidens (that is, *parthenoi* of marrying age) are compared to Artemis stresses their virginity and youth.[74] There is a contrast between the happy state of Nausicaa and the death of Penthesileia, as well as a contrast between the martial and non-martial settings, perhaps emphasising the unusualness of Penthesileia's role as a woman in battle. Helen is compared to Aphrodite because it was her beauty that caused the war, whereas both Penthesileia and Nausicaa are compared to Artemis to stress their innocence and sexual purity in contrast to Helen's (although in Penthesileia's case her death has brought an end to such a status).[75] This emphasis contrasts strongly with the status of Helen in *Posthomerica* 14, and her comparison to Aphrodite caught *in flagrante*: there is nothing virginal about Helen. What is also different in both passages is

---

[72] Relevant here is Stesichorus *Fr.* 201 (which survives, summarised, in a *scholion* on Eur. *Or.* 1287), where it is stated that the Greeks, on the point of stoning Helen, drop their stones to the ground the moment they saw her face (I follow the text of D.A. Campbell 1991). On the parallel, cf. James 2004.341.

[73] Cf. James 2004.274. Note, also, that at Apollonius *Argonautica* 3.876–884 Medea and her companions are compared to Artemis among her nymphs. On this see Hunter 1989.193–194, and especially 194: Medea rides out to meet Jason for the first time, and since "Artemis was also closely connected with the crucial transitional stages of a woman's life … it is just such a transition that this ride represents for Medea".

[74] Cf. Burkert 1985.150 on Artemis: "The goddess among her nymphs is *hagne* in a very special sense as an inviolate and inviolable virgin."

[75] On Artemis' association with marriage and rites of passage, see Larson 1997.253.

that Helen, who caused the deaths of many Trojans, leaves Troy alive, while Penthesileia, who left Troy for her first and last time (*Posthomerica* 1.172 and 201–204 foreshadow her death), dies in battle, fighting for Troy.

We gain a further insight into Penthesileia's status as a *parthenos* at *Posthomerica* 1.52–61. What is striking here is the way Penthesileia's description foreshadows the portrayal of Helen in book 14:

> τοίη Πενθεσίλεια μόλεν ποτὶ Τρώιον ἄστυ
> ἔξοχος ἐν πάσῃσιν ᾿Αμαζόσιν. ᾿Αμφὶ δὲ Τρῶες
> πάντοθεν ἐσσύμενοι μέγ᾿ ἐθάμβεον, εὖτ᾿ ἐσίδοντο
> 55 ῎Αρεος ἀκαμάτοιο βαθυκνήμιδα θύγατρα
> εἰδομένην μακάρεσσιν, ἐπεί ῥά οἱ ἀμφὶ προσώπῳ
> ἄμφω σμερδαλέον τε καὶ ἀγλαὸν εἶδος ὀρώρει,
> μειδίαεν ⟨δ᾿⟩ ἐρατεινόν, ὑπ᾿ ὀφρύσι δ᾿ ἱμερόεντες
> ὀφθαλμοὶ μάρμαιρον ἀλίγκιον ἀκτίνεσσιν,
> 60 αἰδὼς δ᾿ ἀμφερύθηνε παρήια, τῶν δ᾿ ἐφύπερθε
> θεσπεσίη ἐπέκειτο χάρις καταειμένη ἀλκήν.

> As such, Penthesileia went to the Trojan city pre-eminent among the other Amazons. And the Trojans hastening from every direction marvelled greatly when they saw the daughter of immortal Ares with the long greaves, in appearance like the blessed ones. For the look in her face seemed at once both grievous and brilliant, and she smiled a lovely smile, and her eyes flashed full of desire from under her eyebrows—like the rays of the sun, and *aidos* reddened both her cheeks, and heaven-sent grace, clothed in courage, lay on top of them.   (*Posthomerica* 1.51–61)

Instead of a simile, this time we see Penthesileia, physically, for real.[76] It is useful to concentrate on this passage (although it is not a simile), as it exemplifies what effect the similes are trying to convey, or compare. She is described as having a lovely smile (58), eyes full of desire (58–59),[77] and *aidos* reddens her cheeks on top of which is the appearance of courage (60–61). I will focus on 1.58 and 1.60 in particular. First, 1.60: αἰδὼς δ᾿ ἀμφερύθηνε παρήια is echoed closely by καλὰς ἀμφερύθηνε παρηίδας in 14.41. The

---

[76] Some items of vocabulary, bearing similarity to those discussed above in relation to the previous passage on Penthesileia (1.657–674), appear in this passage. The Trojans marvel greatly when they see Penthesileia (μέγ᾿ ἐθάμβεον 1.54 ~ θάμβεον ἀθρήσαντες 14.58), she appears like a god to them (εὖτ᾿ ἐσίδοντο … εἰδομένην μακάρεσσιν 1.54 … 56 ~ ἀλλ᾿ ὡς θεὸν εἰσορόωντο 14.61), and her appearance is dazzling (ἀγλαὸν εἶδος ὀρώρει 1.57 ~ ἀγλαΐην καὶ κάλλος ἐπήρατον 14.59).

[77] Cf. D.L. Cairns 2005.132 on the eyes as an active force in *eros*—Penthesileia, despite being a warlike figure, displays Medea-like qualities in her appearance (cf. Eur. *Medea* 1146 with D.L. Cairns 2005.132).

matching verb ἀμφερυθαίνω, occurs only in these two places in the *Postho-merica*.[78] The objects of the verbs, 'cheeks', also closely align the two passages. The repetition of the rare verb, in particular, draws attention to the differing nature of the respective *aidos* of Penthesileia and Helen. I will discuss at length the nature of Helen's *aidos* in book 14 in terms of adultery in the next section. Penthesileia's *aidos*, however, has no such implications. Rather, her *aidos* is used here to emphasise her virginal beauty and innocence.[79] Once again, similarities in the verbal composition of the passages draw attention to the dissimilarities in content and atmosphere. *Aidos* reddens the cheeks of both women, but Helen's *aidos* is there for a very specific reason in relation to her past conduct.

Lines 58–59 are echoed by the description in the shield of Achilles of *Himeros* who hovers around Aphrodite (5.71–72): Κύπρις ἐυστέφανος, τὴν δ' Ἵμερος ἀμφεποτᾶτο / μειδιόων ἐρατεινὰ σὺν ἠυκόμοις Χαρίτεσσιν.[80] The expressions that draw 1.58 and 5.72 together are (from each line respectively) μειδίαεν ⟨δ'⟩ ἐρατεινόν and μειδιόων ἐρατεινά.[81] The personified subject at 5.71, *Himeros*, echoes the participle used of Penthesileia's eyes—ἱμερόεντες (58).[82] The ecphrastic description of Aphrodite *anadyomene* in book 5,[83] and in particular the emphasis on 'Desire' (5.71), which itself is a characteristic association of both Aphrodite the goddess and Aphrodite as metonymy for *eros*,[84] reflects back on the description of Penthesileia, because of the verbal parallels. The fact that Penthesileia's description is undoubtedly erotic in connotation underscores the validity of the parallel with Aphrodite.[85]

---

[78] The verb in fact occurs only in Quintus. Vian and Battegay 1984.*s.v.* ἀμφερυθαίνω translate as "faire rouger des deux côtés". Carvounis 2005.105n32 draws attention to the parallel. The verb without the prefix occurs at *Posthomerica* 4.156, 4.355, 8.229, 8.420, 9.147, 9.529, 9.177, and 14.319.

[79] Cf. D.L. Cairns 1993.123 on Nausicaa.

[80] James and Lee 2000.59 point out the parallel with Sappho 22.11–12.

[81] The verbs used in these expressions echo the adjective used of Aphrodite at *Od.* 8.362: φιλομμειδὴς Ἀφροδίτη.

[82] *Himeros* appears personified twice in Hesiod's *Theogony* (64 and 201), the latter appearance being particularly relevant since the personification is present, with *Eros*, at Aphrodite's birth—cf. James and Lee 2000.59.

[83] James and Lee 2000.58 find no literary model for this scene, and account for Quintus' "vivid pictorial detail" as due to "inspiration by Apelles' famous picture".

[84] Cf. *LIMC s.v.* "HIMEROS", "HIMEROI", 425: "Une des formes d'Eros, symbolisant la passion et le désir amoureux."

[85] Cf. Tzetzes *Posthomerica* 64–71, and his description of Penthesileia's shield. On it are depicted *Eros* and Ares on either side of Penthesileia. This late hexameter reception of Penthesileia follows Quintus in emphasising (symbolically) the duality of Penthesileia—she is at once a desirable godlike woman, and warrior princess.

Penthesileia's *eyes* are described as full of desire (ἱμερόεντες—ὑπ' ὀφρύσι δ' ἱμερόεντες / ὀφθαλμοὶ μάρμαιρον lines 58–59). Eyes were the seat of desire, and the gaze itself was regarded as something powerful and even destructive:[86] on the basis of this parallel, Penthesileia, just like Helen, appears as a desirable object, a godlike woman who stirs up erotic passions, whose beauty overwhelms on-lookers,[87] and overcomes antagonists. Aphrodite not only has a role in exaggerating the beauty of both women, but is connected by allusion in the case of Penthesileia and by simile in the case of Helen. It is also no accident that the only two extended descriptions of women, and their *aidos*, in the *Posthomerica* emphasise the effect their beauty has on the men who view them.[88] The extended parallels between the similes, and the thematic ring apparent between Penthesileia and Aphrodite (or *Himeros* / *Eros*) and Helen and Aphrodite bind the two female characters together in the narrative. The reader, at the end of the epic, is encouraged to look to the beginning.

Yet another parallel links Helen with Penthesileia, this time specifically between two similes—*Posthomerica* 1.633–639, and a simile that follows on closely from the Helen-Aphrodite simile—*Posthomerica* 14.63–68.[89] First let us consider the second simile of the Helen episode in book 14:

> ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀλω⟨ο⟩μένοισι δι' ἀκαμάτοιο θαλάσσης
> πατρὶς ἑὴ μετὰ δηρὸν ἐπευχομένοισι φανείη,
> 65 οἳ δὲ καὶ ἐκ πόντοιο καὶ ἐκ θανάτοιο φυγόντες
> πάτρῃ χεῖρ' ὀρέγουσι γεγηθότες ἄσπετα θυμῷ·
> ὣς Δαναοὶ περὶ πάντες ἐγήθεον· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' αὐτοῖς
> μνῆστις ἔην καμάτοιο δυσαλγέος οὐδὲ κυδοιμοῦ.

> As when, at last, their native land appeared to those who have prayed for it as they have wandered across the sea that does not tire. They, having escaped from the sea and therefore from death, stretch out their hands towards their homeland, rejoicing unspeakably in heart. Just so did the all the Greeks have immense joy—for they no longer had recollection of painful toil and battle.
>
> (*Posthomerica* 14.63–68)

---

[86] Cf. D.L. Cairns 2005.132–133. It is relevant here to compare Euripides *Tr.* 892–893, and the description of Helen as capturing men's eyes because of her beauty. Cf. also Ibycus 287.1–4, where Aphrodite's role is clearly connected.

[87] On the overpowering nature of their beauty, cf. the gnome at *Posthomerica* 13.401–402 spoken by the primary narrator: θεὴ Κύπρις, ἥ περ ἁπάντων / ἀθανάτων δάμνησι νόον θνητῶν τ' ἀνθρώπων.

[88] Much of book 10 is dedicated to narration of Oenone's rejection of Paris' pleas for help and then her death by his side on the funeral pyre (*Posthomerica* 10.411–489). However, we do not get a description of her appearance.

[89] Vian 1969.232 identifies this parallel, and also compares *Posthomerica* 2.103–105 and 7.455–460.

Helen appears to the Greeks, who had long hoped for her appearance before them which, concomitantly, would signal the end of their suffering.[90] By means of this simile, she becomes a symbol of their *nostos*, and the subject matter of the simile hints at the future troubled journey home for the Greeks.[91] This simile is motivated by an expression at 14.62: πᾶσι⟨ν⟩ γὰρ ἐελδομένοισι φαάνθη.[92] The simile is also a Homeric allusion, echoing *Odyssey* 23.233–240:[93]

> ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἀσπάσιος γῆ νηχομένοισι φανήῃ,
> ὧν τε Ποσειδάων εὐεργέα νῆ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ
> 235 ῥαίσῃ, ἐπειγομένην ἀνέμῳ καὶ κύματι πηγῷ·
> παῦροι δ' ἐξέφυγον πολιῆς ἁλὸς ἤπειρόνδε
> νηχόμενοι, πολλὴ δὲ περὶ χροῒ τέτροφεν ἅλμη,
> ἀσπάσιοι δ' ἐπέβαν γαίης, κακότητα φυγόντες·
> ὡς ἄρα τῇ ἀσπαστὸς ἔην πόσις εἰσοροώσῃ,
> 240 δειρῆς δ' οὔ πω πάμπαν ἀφίετο πήχεε λευκώ.

As whenever a welcome land appears to swimmers in the sea, whose well-made ship Poseidon shattered in the sea, weighed down by the wind and strong surge. And few escaped the grey sea by swimming to the mainland, and with their skin coated in copious sea salt, they gladly reached the land, having avoided an evil fate. So then Penelope was glad to see her husband, and not yet did she altogether release her white arms from around his neck.

Penelope's joy at being reunited with her husband, likened to sailors who at last espy land after being storm tossed in the sea,[94] and who swim ashore escaping evil, matches the climax in the Helen episode—her appearance is in many ways the encapsulation of the Trojan War, just as the reunion of Penelope and Odysseus is the *telos* of the *Odyssey*.[95] However, despite verbal

---

[90] The simile moves the narrative on, as is evident in the narrative resolution at 14.67–68, where, just as the sailors rejoiced in escaping the sea and death (65–66), so now the Trojans rejoiced, for they no longer had any recollection of toil and battle. Carvounis 2005.118 is correct to suggest that this sentiment of the Greeks echoes the Trojan *gerontes*' claim at *Il.* 3.156–157, that Helen's beauty justifies the suffering of the Trojans and Greeks.

[91] Cf. Carvounis 2005.103: "The Fall of Troy (*Ilioupersis*) and Helen's restitution signal the end of a journey and the beginning of another to the distant homes of the Achaeans (*Nostoi*), with this simile thus linking the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*."

[92] This is the principal correspondence in the main narrative, echoed by ἐπευχομένοισι φανείη (14.64).

[93] So Vian 1969.232; see, further, Carvounis 2005.102.

[94] On which see the discussion at Russo, Fernández-Galiano, and Heubeck 1992.338–339.

[95] The *scholia* on *Odyssey* 23.296 (H, M, V, and Q) state that Aristophanes and Aristarchus designated the line the *peras* or *telos* of the poem. Cf. Russo, Fernández-Galiano, and Heubeck 1992.313–314.

similarities between texts,[96] the contexts of the two similes are markedly dissimilar. The simile in *Odyssey* 23 reflects the coming together of husband and wife, whereas Helen the adulteress, who has already had a reunion of sorts with her husband, is 'reunited' with the Greeks—just as Odysseus is the joyous sight of land for Penelope, so Helen is the expectant sight for the Greeks. The allusion, which brings Penelope into the discussion, sets up a contrast of contexts: Penelope the faithful wife has joy in the return of Odysseus who himself has been unfaithful, whereas the Greeks joy in the retrieval of Helen who herself has been unfaithful.

The simile at *Posthomerica* 1.633–639, and its context, activates further meaning for the Helen episode:[97]

630 Τρῶες δ' ὡς ἐ⟨σ⟩ίδοντο δαϊκταμένην ἐνὶ χάρμῃ,
     πανσυδίῃ τρομέοντες ἐπὶ πτόλιν ἐσσεύοντο,
     ἄσπετ' ἀκηχέμενοι μεγάλῳ περὶ πένθεϊ θυμόν.
     ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀν' εὐρέα πόντον ἐπιβρίσαντος ἀήτεω
     ναῦται νῆ' ὀλέσαντες ὑπεκπροφύγωσιν ὄλεθρον,
635 παῦροι πολλὰ καμόντες ὀιζυρῆς ἁλὸς εἴσω,
     ὀψὲ δ' ἄρά σφισι γαῖα φάνη σχεδὸν ἠδὲ καὶ ἄστυ,
     τοὶ δὲ μόγῳ στονόεντι τετρυμένοι ἅψεα πάντα
     ἐξ ἁλὸς ἀίσσουσι μέγ' ἀχνύμενοι περὶ νηὸς
     ἠδ' ἑτάρων οὓς αἰνὸν ὑπὸ ζόφον ἤλασε κῦμα·
640 ὣς Τρῶες ποτὶ ἄστυ πεφυζότες ἐκ πολέμοιο
     κλαῖον πάντες Ἄρηος ἀμαιμακέτοιο θύγατρα
     καὶ λαοὺς οἳ δῆριν ἀνὰ στονόεσσαν ὄλοντο.

And when the Trojans saw that Penthesileia had been slain in battle they rushed with all speed to the city in tremulous fear, grieved unspeakably in heart with great sorrow, just as when sailors in the expansive sea, having lost their ship in a heavy storm, escape and flee death, a few left toiling away in the woeful sea, and then at the last moment a land appears to them nearby— and a city, and though worn out in every limb by grievous toil they propel themselves out of the sea, despite their great grief for their ship and the companions whom the swell drove down into the terrible dark depths. So the Trojans, having fled to their city from war, all wept for the daughter of irresistible Ares and for the people who had perished in grievous battle.

---

[96] Cf. Vian 1969.232. Cf. Apollonius *Arg.* 3.956 (so Carvounis 2005.117), of the appearance of Jason to Medea: ἐελδομένῃ ἐφαάνθη. Jason in the succeeding lines is then compared to Sirius, set up as a bringer of disastrous consequences for Medea.

[97] In my translation, I have attempted a literal rendering of ἀίσσουσι (638), following meanings in both LSJ and Vian and Battegay 1984.*s.v.* ἀίσσω. James 2004.ad loc. translates (incorrectly) as "they strain to quit [the sea]", imitating Way's rendering (1913.ad loc.). Here I read some indulgence in hyperbole on the poet's part for the sake of emphasising the effect the sight of land and a city has on them, despite their weariness (637–638). Vian 1963.37 gives the best translation: "se hâtent de sortir".

Achilles has just killed Penthesileia in battle, and as a result, the Trojans flee back to Troy now that their big hope of success has perished.[98] They are compared to sailors who are shipwrecked (that is, now that they are without Penthesileia) and toil in the sea to stay alive (1.635), and to whom just at the last minute a land, and even a city, appears (1.636).[99] Both similes describe sailors or men struggling in the sea to whom suddenly sight of land appears, giving them hope despite past or present sorrows. The similarities are outweighed by the contrasts the two similes represent structurally in the poem, and, in particular, between the status of the Trojans and the position of the story in *Posthomerica* 1, and the status of the Greeks and the position of the story in *Posthomerica* 14. For the Trojans on the one hand, the sight of land and a city in the simile in book 1 symbolises, in the main narrative, Troy as a temporary place of refuge from present troubles, now they have lost Penthesileia.[100] For the Greeks in book 14, on the other hand, the sight of land relates to the appearance of Helen, a departure *from* Troy and a permanent end to the toils of war for them. The simile in book 1 is preceded immediately by mourning (1.632), whereas the simile in book 14 ends with rejoicing (14.67). The Trojans in book 1 have just seen their great hope, Penthesileia, their female saviour who fought for them, slain in battle (1.630), symbolised in the simile by a shattered ship (1.634). The Greeks, however, view Helen, because of whom they fought, come out alive from Troy. The Trojans remember their comrades slain in battle (1.639 ~ 1.642), but the Greeks, because of the sight of Helen and their return home that she symbolises, have no recollection of the toil of battle (14.68).

The parallelism between the two similes therefore reflects structurally the contrast between the statuses of the Trojans and the Greeks, the stages of the war in book 1 and book 14, and the actions and effect of Penthesileia

---

[98] Obvious correspondences between simile and narrative include the parallel between the slain Penthesileia and the ship that has perished (630 ~ 634); the Trojans running in fear to the city and the sailors escaping death (631 and 640 ~ 634); and the grief they feel for Penthesileia and the others who have died in battle is paralleled by the grief the sailors feel for their ship and their comrades who have drowned (632).

[99] This simile too imitates the simile at *Odyssey* 23.233–240. Another simile at *Posthomerica* 1.62–72, which describes the joy the Trojans feel at the arrival of Penthesileia, shares similarities with the simile at 14.63–68 in particular, especially in relation to the joy the Trojans and Greeks feel respectively with the arrival of (respectively) Penthesileia and Helen. It marks a contrast with the simile at 1.630–642, since the Trojans there rejoiced in Troy as a haven but at the beginning of book 1 they rejoiced in Penthesileia as a saviour.

[100] This outcome brings the Trojans in a sense back to their position at the beginning of the *Posthomerica*, where they are described as remaining inside Troy in fear of Achilles (1.3–4).

and Helen respectively. The reader identifies the inversion of book 1 in book 14.[101] Quintus thus brings about some closure in the poem, and an emphasis on the success of the Greeks, and a sense of the injustice of war: Helen remains alive despite the battles fought because of her, whereas Penthesileia dies fighting in a battle to save Troy and the Trojans. This is of course not the end of the poem, nor even the end of the Trojan story. In terms of fighting between the Greeks and Trojans, the appearance of Helen in many ways reflects the end of hostilities.

Quintus uses similes to provide structure and unity to a poem that is made up of episodes. It is clear that in function the *Posthomerica*'s similes cooperate in a more complicated manner in the mechanics of the text than do Homeric similes. *Posthomerica* 1 is intricately linked by similes both individual and in series. Quintus has taken the basic form and function of Homeric similes and transformed them into something that is distinctively characteristic of a non-orally derived text, written in a tradition and era where the ability and cooperation of the reader, after Alexandria, became essential.[102]

Table 2. Similes in *Posthomerica* 1.

Line(s)	Subjects in Narrative	Subjects in Simile
5–9	Trojans, Achilles	Cattle, Lion
37–40	Penthesileia, her Attendants	Moon, Stars
48–53	Penthesileia, Amazons	Dawn, Seasons
63–72	Trojans, Penthesileia	Countrymen, Rainbow
76–83	Priam, Penthesileia	Blind man, Dawn
153–156	Penthesileia in her armour	Flash of Lightning from Olympus
175–176	Trojans, Penthesileia	Sheep, Ram
179–181	Penthesileia, Trojans	Tritonis, Giants, Strife
207–210^	Trojans, Penthesileia, Greeks	mountain beasts, Sheep, Fire, Bush
222#	Trojans, Greeks	Flesh-devouring Beasts
249–253	Bremousa	Ash Tree, Woodsmen
262–265	Amazons, Diomedes	Heifers, Strong man
277#	Son of Phyleus	Lion, Sheep
315–319	Penthesileia	Lioness, Cattle
320–324	Penthesileia, Greeks	Surging Sea, Speeding ships
345#	Greeks	Falling leaves, Drops of Rain
352#	Trojan Horses, Greeks	Threshed Grain

---

[101] Cf. the discussion of inversion and parallelism between *Iliad* 1 and 24, as examined cogently by MacLeod 1982.32–35, and cf. the more recent discussion by Murnaghan 1997.23–42.

[102] Fuller discussion and background on Alexandrian epic and the *Posthomerica* can be found in Maciver 2012.

Line(s)	Subjects in Narrative	Subjects in Simile
353–356	Trojans, Penthesileia	Sea Storm, Sun, Capricorn
395–402	Penthesileia	Heifer, Springtime, Dewy Grass
440–445	Trojan Women	Bees
479–481	Greeks, Penthesileia	Dying Goats, Panther
488–493	Penthesileia	Howling Gale, Uprooted Trees, Snapped Branches
513#	Achilles, Ajax	Ares
515–521	Achilles, Ajax	Sons of Aloeus
524–528	Achilles, Ajax, Trojans	Herd-destroying Lions, Shepherd-less sheep
534–537	Achilles, Ajax, Trojans	Fire, Racing Wind, Forest
538–544^	Penthesileia, Achilles, Ajax	Panther, Wild beasts, Hunters
572*#	Penthesileia, Achilles	Dove, Hawk
586–587*	Achilles, Penthesileia	Fawn, Herd-destroying Lions
613–621^	Achilles, Penthesileia, her Horse	Man, Innards over a Fire, Stag, Pine Tree
625–629	Penthesileia	Fir Tree, North Wind
633–642	Trojans, Troy	Shipwrecked Sailors, City
633–638	Penthesileia	Artemis
673–674	Penthesileia	Immortal Goddess
677–681	Ares	Zeus' Thunderbolt
696–702	Ares, Zeus	Rock from Cliff, Storm of Zeus

Key: * = Spoken by a secondary Narrator; ^ = Double Simile; # = Short Simile

ii. *Helen Received, Helen Judged*

There is only one simile in the *Posthomerica* that contains a gnome, at 14.47–54. In this simile, and its context, Helen is compared to Aphrodite caught with Ares in the snares of Hephaestus. I will now demonstrate that Quintus, through this simile, devises a corrective presentation of the Homeric story, where the morals not clearly apparent in the Homeric version, in the song of Demodocus in *Odyssey* 8, are supplied. He picks a Homeric passage that was a Homeric problem for ancient interpreters of Homer, and posits his own re-presentation of it in an emotionally climatic and tense moment at the end of the *Posthomerica*. We as readers are anxious to see how the Greeks treat Helen and how Helen is presented and how she herself reacts to the Greeks. Quintus threads this climax into the tradition of ancient commentary of Homer, by use of a simile, and by use of a gnome within that simile. The Helen of the *Posthomerica* is crafted carefully to follow her Homeric *persona*, but subtle differences, centred around this simile, describe a Helen who is not only received from her Homeric representation, but who is now in the *Posthomerica* judged (implicitly) for her conduct in the Trojan war.

Book 14 concludes the *Posthomerica* with the enslavement of the Trojan women, the sacrifice of Polyxena, the shipwreck of the Greek fleet as a result of the gods' punishment of Ajax, and, finally, the destruction of the wall of the Achaeans.[103] The book is one of climax, not only because it is the final book of the poem, but also because long-feared events finally take place, such as the enslavement of the Trojan women and their removal to the Greek ships (14.11–38).[104] It is in connection with this captivity that Helen finally appears before the Greeks outside the walls of Troy (14.39–62).

ἀλλ' οὐ μὰν Ἑλένην γόος ἄμπεχεν· ἀλλά οἱ αἰδὼς
40   ὄμμασι κυανέοισιν ἐφίζανε καί οἱ ὕπερθε
     καλὰς ἀμφερύθηνε παρηίδας. ἐν δέ οἱ ἦτορ
     ἄσπετα πορφύρεσκε κατὰ φρένα, μή ἑ κιοῦσαν
     κυανέας ἐπὶ νῆας ἀεικίσσωνται Ἀχαιοί·
     τοὔνεχ' ὑποτρομέουσα φίλῳ περιπάλλετο θυμῷ.
45   καί ῥα καλυψαμένη κεφαλὴν ἐφύπερθε καλύπτρῃ
     ἕσπετο νισομένοιο κατ' ἴχνιον ἀνδρὸς ἑοῖο
     αἰδοῖ πορφύρουσα παρήιον, ἠΰτε Κύπρις,
     εὖτέ μιν Οὐρανίωνες ἐν ἀγκοίνῃσιν Ἄρηος
     ἀμφαδὸν εἰσενόησαν ἑὸν λέχος αἰσχύνουσαν
50   δεσμοῖς ἐν θαμινοῖσι δαήμονος Ἡφαίστοιο,
     τοῖς ἔνι κεῖτ' ἀχέουσα ⟨περὶ⟩ φρεσὶν αἰδομένη τε
     ἰλαδὸν ἀγρομένων μακάρων γένος ἠδὲ καὶ αὐτὸν
     Ἥφαιστον· δεινὸν γὰρ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἀκοίτεω
     ἀμφαδὸν εἰσοράασθαι ἐπ' αἴσχεϊ θηλυτέρῃσι·
55   τῇ Ἑλένη εἰκυῖα δέμας καὶ ἀκήρατον αἰδῶ
     ἤιε σὺν Τρῳῇσι δορυκτήτοισι καὶ αὐτὴ
     νῆας ἐπ' Ἀργείων εὐρέας. ἀμφὶ δὲ λαοὶ
     θάμβεον ἀθρήσαντες ἀμωμήτοιο γυναικὸς
     ἀγλαΐην καὶ κάλλος ἐπήρατον· οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
60   κείνην οὔτε κρυφηδὸν ἐπεσβολίῃσι χαλέψαι
     οὔτ' οὖν ἀμφαδίην, ἀλλ' ὡς θεὸν εἰσορόωντο
     ἀσπασίως· πᾶσι⟨ν⟩ γὰρ ἐελδομένοισι φαάνθη.

Lamentation did not grip Helen, however. Instead, *aidos* sat on her dark-blue eyes and reddened her beautiful cheeks right through. Her heart brooded unspeakable things in her mind, that the Achaeans would outrage her as she went to the dark ships. Therefore she trembled with them in mind, her heart shaking utterly with fear. And so, with veil-covered head, she followed behind her husband—in his footsteps—colouring her cheeks with *aidos, just like Aphrodite, when the Heaven-dwellers gazed on her caught openly in the arms*

---

[103]   For the structure of book 14, see Vian 1969.155–156.
[104]   As a climax, of course, the enslavement of the Trojan women goes as far back in the literary story of Troy as the words of Andromache at *Il.* 24.731–732.

of Ares, shaming her husband's—cunning Hephaestus'—bed, in whose thick bonds she was caught. There among them Aphrodite lay, tortured in mind, and felt shame before the genos of great gods and Hephaestus himself, all standing there together; for it is a terrible thing for women to be caught in the shame of adultery openly in the eyes of a husband. Like her in body and undefiled aidos, Helen went with the Trojan women-captives herself to the well-oared ships of the Argives. And the people on all sides marvelled as they looked upon the splendour and lovely beauty of the blameless woman. But no one dared openly or secretly to reproach her with insults, but they looked upon her gladly as though she were a god: for they had all been hoping to see her appear.

Here Helen appears before the Achaean host for the first time, both within the scope of the *Posthomerica*, and within the timeframe of the myth of the Trojan War. Helen's appearance before the Achaeans occurs, therefore, at a moment of suspense. The poet does not relieve this tension, but focuses on how Helen feels in the presence of the Achaeans, which, as discussed briefly in the last section, is suggested by her *aidos* that we are told she feels, and which she displays in her physical gestures. The passage opens by setting up a polarity. Unlike the other Trojan women, lament does not grip Helen: *aidos* (39–40), an emotion that connotes restraint and self-awareness, has her as its object. This *aidos* sits on Helen's eyes (40) and causes her beautiful cheeks to blush (41).[105] *Aidos* here is practically personified:[106] it takes a verb (ἐφίζανε 40) that is used elsewhere only in the normal context of a mortal sitting down (*Posthomerica* 6.38).[107] This physical indication of *aidos* occurs again before she walks behind her husband (46): she covers her head with her veil (καλυψαμένη κεφαλὴν ἐφύπερθε καλύπτρῃ 45), and she colours her cheek with *aidos* (αἰδοῖ πορφύρουσα παρήιον 47).[108] At 42–44 we have

---

[105] Κυάνεος is used of eyes in the *Posthomerica* only here. Cf. Carvounis 2005.104–105 for discussion of the adjective in Homer.

[106] Cf. Vian 1969.177n5: "L'αἰδώς est plus ou moins personnifiée." Cf. D.L. Cairns 1993.224 for discussion of the personified *Aidos* at Sophocles *Oedipus Coloneus* 1267–1269. Αἰδώς occurs sixteen times in the *Posthomerica* (eight times in the sixth foot as here at 14.39): as "honte" 1.749, 7.554, 9.114, 9.281, 13.425, 14.19, 14.39, 14.47, and 14.55; as "pudeur" 1.60, 12.555, and 14.432; and as "sexe (de la femme)" 1.622 and 13.116 (so Vian and Battegay 1984.*s.v.* αἰδώς). The more specific implications of the term with respect to Helen and her other appearances in the *Posthomerica* are discussed below.

[107] This verb is used in the *Iliad* with ὕπνος as subject (*Il.* 10.26—the only time the verb is used), which does not sit on the eyes of Menelaus. Cf. Carvounis 2005.104, who also notes the use of ὕπνος with ἱζάνει at *Il.* 10.91–92. The rare verb in both poems, and the unusual use it is put to, draws the passages together in the reader's mind.

[108] Cf. D.L. Cairns 1993.6: "*Aidos* is most readily identified as an emotion by the fact that it is regularly described as having physical or psychological symptoms (typically blushing) and as involving characteristic behavioural responses (such as averting one's gaze, bowing or

the inward correspondents of these outward manifestations of *aidos*: she fears lest the Greeks do her outrage as she walks to the ships (42–43), and (therefore) trembles in heart (44).[109]

What exactly is the meaning of *aidos* in this passage? *Aidos*, which is traditionally translated as 'shame', according to Cairns operates in two specific ways: on the one hand, it operates with reference to self, and on the other hand, to one's own self image with reference to others—both uses being closely connected.[110] Helen has *aidos* because she is viewed, or knows that she will be viewed, by others.[111] Her gestures that physically exhibit her *aidos* are all in relation to an audience. It is, rather, the focus of the *simile* that adds a particular shade of meaning to Helen's *aidos* in relation to adultery and failure in marriage.[112]

The first thing that strikes the reader is the difference in presentation between this simile and the account of the story in Demodocus' song (*Odyssey* 8.266–369). The *Odyssey*'s presentation of the myth is overall comical and non-judgmental,[113] despite the serious shades of meaning that accompany the picture.[114] We do not get a description of the embarrassment of

---

veiling head, etc.)." More specifically on veiling as "part of the general complex of associations between *aidos* and the eyes", cf. D.L. Cairns 1993.292.

[109] For fear or pity accompanying *aidos* in Homer, see D.L. Cairns 1993.49. Menelaus himself feels both joy and *aidos* as he leads Helen out of Troy to the Greek camp (*Posthomerica* 14.19). Cf. Vian 1969.158: "Tout au plus est-il partagé entre la joie du triomphe et l'αἰδώς, la confusion que lui inspire la conduite passée d'Hélène." It is difficult to ascertain why exactly he feels this 'shame'. It seems plausible that his honour is directly affected by the conduct of Helen—cf. Llewellyn-Jones 2003.156: "A man's honour is intrinsically bound up in the sexual purity of the women of his family and it is for his reputation that women needed to be socially and sexually controlled."

[110] D.L. Cairns 1993.2–3. D.L. Cairns 1993.50 establishes "the fundamental connection in Homer between *aidos* and popular opinion", with specific reference to the words of Hector at *Il.* 22.105–107. One could argue that any self-reference is reference to one's image before others—otherwise self-reference becomes pointless.

[111] "It is clear that shame bears a frequent, and some would say an essential, reference to the concept of an audience" D.L. Cairns 1993.15.

[112] On Helen's *aidos* in Homer having specific reference to her role as a woman and her failure in marriage, cf. D.L. Cairns 1993.121. Vian 1969.178n3 argues, on the basis of 14.19, 39, 47, and 51, that here *aidos* "ne désigne plus la pudeur virginale, mais la honte de la femme adultère". Vian is correct to read this meaning for *aidos* here, but not in connection with lines 19, 39, and 47. *Aidos* can only be read this way for these lines in the light of the simile; they do not of themselves suggest this designation for *aidos*.

[113] On this, see, further, the brief but astute comments by Carvounis 2005.102.

[114] Cf. de Jong 2001.207: "What the latter [i.e. the gods] see as no more than a game (even though they may feel strong emotions at the time), is deadly serious for the former [i.e. the mortals]."

Aphrodite, but only the reaction of the (male) gods, who find the scene very amusing.[115] The presentation of the myth in the *Posthomerica* is markedly different in tone however—the humour of the story in the *Odyssey* is absent. The status and gender of the gods exacerbate the vulnerability of Aphrodite's position here (and in the main narrative, Helen's position before the Achaean male host). The narrator makes clear that Aphrodite was seen openly shaming the bed of her husband (ἀμφαδόν 49),[116] precisely the *duty* involved in a woman's *aidos* that she has failed to keep.[117] It is of course true that Aphrodite is a goddess, and that she, therefore, can with some impunity transgress the boundaries of *aidos* set for mortals.[118] However, it is made very clear that she is judged as an adulteress—she is caught *disgracing* her husband's bed.

To understand Helen and the specific force of her *aidos* in this passage requires appreciation, also, of her characterisation in the Homeric poems. Other studies have discussed thoroughly the *Iliad*'s Helen, and so I will restrict my analysis to key moments which have a direct impact on how we read the Posthomeric Helen.[119] Throughout the *Iliad*, Helen is referred to as the cause of the war,[120] but is herself rarely seen or heard. She draws atten-

---

[115] Cf. Heubeck, S. West, and Hainsworth 1988.368; the tone of Demodocus' story is of course comic (Garvie 1994.305), and 8.324–325, of the modesty of the goddesses, is, according to Garvie (*ib.*) "one of the most amusing touches in the story". Cf. D.L. Cairns 1993.123, on the *aidos* of the absent goddesses here, and my discussion below. *Odyssey* 8.334–343 exemplifies the light-hearted nature of the story.

[116] For αἰσχύνω as "disgrace" in a moral sense, see LSJ *s.v.* αἰσχύνω 2. See D.L. Cairns 1993.57 for the Homeric passages he cites to support the meaning "disgrace". Aphrodite is called the wife of Ares at 1.667, whereas the simile in book 14 and the song of Demodocus imply that she is the wife of Hephaestus. Both traditions existed in antiquity, though the Ares~Aphrodite myth was the stronger. Cf. Heubeck, S. West, and Hainsworth 1988.364 and James 2004.274.

[117] Cf. D.L. Cairns 1993.124 on the husband's bed receiving *aidos* "as a quasi-personified symbol of the marital relationship".

[118] For the lack of consequences of the gods' actions for themselves, and the perseverance of their divine status, see Griffin 1980.200–201, who also discusses the "mortification of Ares and Aphrodite" in the *Odyssey*, and the reassertion of the divinity of Aphrodite afterwards. This impunity for the gods in fact might explain the lack of the word '*aidos*' in relation to Aphrodite in the *Odyssey* passage. Its occurrence here in the *Posthomerica* in relation to the conduct of Aphrodite is also, to an extent, motivated by the narrative context, and the poet's attempts to implicate the simile firmly within the narrative, and to intertwine the conduct of Helen with the conduct of Aphrodite, and *vice-versa*.

[119] The key study is now Roisman 2006.

[120] Roisman 2006.1n1 cites the following passages to prove that Helen is "repeatedly referred to as the woman for whose sake the Trojan War was fought" (2006.1): *Iliad* 1.159–160 (vaguely relevant), 3.126–128, 3.156–157, 4.173–174, 6.344–358, 7.350–351, 9.339, 19.325, 22.114–116, and 24.762–774. She cites the following from the *Odyssey*: 4.235–289, 11.438, 14.68–69,

tion to her status as *casus belli* at *Iliad* 3.171–180.[121] The famous *teichoskopia* paints a cogent, subtle picture of a Helen aware of her surroundings.[122] The Trojan 'household', and the readers / listeners of the poem, have an opportunity to redress their view of Helen (except Priam, who seems to have an unwaveringly favourable opinion of her anyway—3.162, 164), based on her self-depiction.[123] She is a foreigner, and though protected by Priam and Hector, is the underlying cause of the Trojans' suffering.[124] Therefore, she has a reputation, an image constructed outside of her control, one that the Greeks and Trojans have alike of her, and one that even the readers / listeners of the *Iliad* may have.[125] She misses her home but still speaks in reverential terms to Priam (3.172). She speaks harshly of herself, and describes herself as dog-like, or 'bitch-face' (κυνώπιδος 3.180), an expression used only by her, of herself, in the *Iliad*.[126] She makes it clear that she would rather have died than follow Paris to Troy (173–174). Such negative self-reference evokes opposite reactions, and a more favourable view of her in the eyes of the Trojans.[127] So while on the surface it seems that Helen feels true regret over what has happened because of her, she is acutely aware of her situation as a foreigner on enemy territory, of her status as *casus belli*, and her need to portray herself as the unwilling victim.[128] On the basis of this example, that she manages to

---

17.118–119, 22.226–230, and 23.218–221. That Helen has caused the sufferings of the Greeks is suggested especially by *Iliad* 2.356—for which see Kirk 1985.153. For discussion of the culpability of Helen in the eyes of the Trojans, see Roisman 2006.7.

[121] See Roisman 2006 for a discussion of Helen in the whole *Iliad*. Note that I am concerned primarily with Helen's self-representation, and I do not dwell on the other features of her characterisation.

[122] For more detailed discussion of strategy in the words of Helen in book 3, see Roisman 2006.13–15.

[123] In fact she does not have to say anything, since her appearance seems to have a persuasively appeasing effect on the old men on the wall who see her approaching (3.156–158—on which see Roisman 2006.7). Despite this beauty, however, they state in the immediately succeeding lines (159–160) that even then she should leave in the ships with the Greeks.

[124] Cf. Roisman 2006.11.

[125] Cf. Roisman 2006.7, on the culpability of Helen in the eyes of the Trojans in particular. For Helen as the daughter of *Nemesis*, and thus by birth a destructive force, see Kahil 1955.28, Roisman 2006.13n23, and Collins 1988.46.

[126] On the expression cf. Kirk 1985.290, and Clader 1976.17: "Helen characterises herself as a 'bitch' four times in Homer [*Il*. 3.180, 6.344, 6.356, and *Od*. 145], always in contexts where she refers to the shame of her having brought about the War." She speaks of herself twice in this way in book 6 to Hector, at *Il*. 6.344 and 6.656. The example at 6.344 is particularly self-deprecatory: κυνὸς κακομηχάνου ὀκρυοέσσης.

[127] Such a favourable view is of course restricted to those who see and hear her: cf. Roisman 2006.8.

[128] Cf. Roisman 2006.8: "Essentially, the epic's treatment of Helen's culpability highlights

survive in Troy for the duration of the war is due to an extent on her ability to construct an identity that ensures her survival. Her fear of reprisal from the Achaeans matches her watchful attitude with the Trojans. Her response at 3.418–420 to the threats of Aphrodite in those respects underlines her commitment to save her own skin—she follows Aphrodite's bidding despite her initial unwillingness.

In *Odyssey* 4, Helen is also represented in a complex way. On the one hand she describes herself as having rejoiced in the chance at last to return to her homeland (4.259–264). Menelaus, however, in reply to this favourable self-representation his wife gives herself, points out how she imitated the voices of the wives of the Greek heroes as she went round the wooden horse with Deiphobus, in an attempt to get the men (whom she knew were inside—as Helen herself makes clear at *Odyssey* 4.256) to cry out (4.374–379).[129] Here we have two representations of Helen similar to those found in *Iliad* 3 discussed above. On the one hand, Helen portrays herself as pro-Greek, an unwilling victim in captivity, keen to return home: in the context of *Odyssey* 4, such statements suit the presence of Menelaus.[130] On the other hand, Menelaus' reply highlights a Helen keen to fit into her Trojan environment, and even suggests a Helen that is pro-Trojan and anti-Greek.[131]

Thus the picture of Helen in Homer is not straightforward. She is someone who is aware of herself and her surroundings, and someone who carefully constructs her speeches to suit her ends. Helen in Quintus actually figures personally as subject in the *Posthomerica* only five times: in book 6 (153–165), where Helen and Eurypylus exchange marvelling gazes; in book 9 (143)—only the Trojan women and the old men are left on the walls looking down on battle, but Helen stays away; in book 10 (389–405), where she 'laments' for Paris; and book 14—the passage under discussion here, and the

---

her isolation and vulnerability as an unwelcome stranger in a foreign land, unwelcome even among those who are kindly disposed to her." Helen herself, in her own words, does much to construct this characterisation.

[129] On Helen in the *Odyssey*, cf. Austin 1994.71–90, Felson-Rubin 1994 (as a contrast to Penelope), and the unfavourable portrayal by Ryan 1965.117. Contrast Groten 1968.35 (and 35n1). Note that Menelaus ascribes the actions of Helen here to the influence of a god wanting to give the Trojans warning (*Od.* 4.274–275).

[130] Cf. Heubeck, S. West, and Hainsworth 1988.208–209 on the speeches of Helen and Menelaus here: "The juxtaposition of these two complementary tales suggests the lability of Helen's character, and a rather coquettish pride in dangerous secrets." Cf. also Goldhill 1988.21 on Menelaus representing his wife as a "dangerous deceiver".

[131] This contrasts with Helen's claims at Euripides *Tr.* 962–964, where she states that Paris forced her to marry him, and that she suffered slavery in Troy.

reconciliation with her husband at 154–164.[132] As in the *Iliad*, she is often the subtext to much disagreement between Trojans in the poem.[133]

At *Posthomerica* 10 we gain the clearest insight into the mind of Helen as she speaks to herself. She behaves first in a way that is designed to please the Trojans after the death of Paris (*Posthomerica* 10.389–405):[134]

ἀλλ᾽ Ἑλένη μάλα πολλὰ διηνεκέως γοόωσα,
390 ἄλλα μὲν ἐν Τρώεσσιν ἄϋτεεν, ἄλλα δέ οἱ κῆρ
ἐν κραδίῃ μενέαινε· φίλον δ᾽ ἀνὰ θυμὸν ἔειπεν·
"Ἆνερ, ἐμοὶ καὶ Τρωσὶ καὶ αὐτῷ ⟨σ⟩οὶ μέγα πῆμα,
ὤλεο λευγαλέως· ἐμὲ δ᾽ ἐν στυγερῇ κακότητι
κάλλιπες ἐλπομένην ὀλοώτερα πήματ᾽ ἰδέσθαι.
395 ὡς ὄφελόν μ᾽ Ἅρπυιαι ἀνηρείψαντο πάροιθεν,
ὁππότε σοί ⟨γ᾽⟩ ἑπόμην ὀλοῇ ὑπὸ Δαίμονος Αἴσῃ.
νῦν δ᾽ ἄρα καὶ σοὶ πῆμα θεοὶ δόσαν ἠδ᾽ ἐμοὶ αὐτῇ
αἰνομόρῳ· πάντες δέ μ᾽ ἀάσπετον ἐρρίγασι,
πάντες δ᾽ ἐχθαίρουσιν ἐμὸν κέαρ, οὐδέ πῃ οἶδα
400 ἐκφυγέειν· εἰ γάρ κε φύγω Δαναῶν ἐς ὅμιλον,
αὐτίκ᾽ ἀεικίσσουσιν ἐμὸν δέμας· εἰ δέ κε μίμνω,
Τρωαὶ καὶ Τρῶές με περισταδὸν ἄλλοθεν ἄλλαι
αἶψα διαρραίσουσι· νέκυν δ᾽ οὐ γαῖα καλύψει,
ἀλλὰ κύνες δάψουσι καὶ οἰωνῶν θοὰ φῦλα.
405 ὡς ὄφελόν μ᾽ ἐδαμάσσαντο ....
405 ...., πάρος τάδε πήματ᾽ ἰδέσθαι."

But Helen lamenting profusely and unceasingly, uttered among the Trojans what was suitable for Trojan ears, but her inward desire purposed other things. These were the words of her dear heart: "Husband, a great blow is your mournful death to me, the Trojans, and you yourself. You left me behind in grievous ills, and now I expect to see even more destructive sorrows. Would that the Harpies beforehand had snatched me away, when I followed you under the compulsion of some destructive decree of a *Daimon*. Now the gods have truly brought disaster to you and to me, ill-fated one that I am. All shudder in unspeakable horror at me, all hate my heart, and I do not know where to escape to. For if I flee into the throng of the Greeks, immediately they will do outrage to my body; but if I remain, the Trojan women and men will stand around me and one after another rip me quickly to shreds. No earth will cover my body, but dogs and the swift flocks of birds will eat me. Would that ⟨the grievous Fates⟩ had destroyed me before I saw all these sorrows."

---

[132] Helen's name occurs 23 times in the *Posthomerica*: 2.54, 66, 97; 6.24, 152, 156, 157; 9.89, 143; 10.287, 324, 363, 389; 12.548; 13.356, 379, 412, 470, 519, 525; 14.39, 55, and 154.

[133] At 2.66, 97; 6.24; 12.548; 13.379, 470, and 519.

[134] In my translation at line 405 I translate Vian's conjecture for the hiatus in the text, given in his *apparatus criticus* (Vian 1969.32): στυγεραί ποτε Κῆρες.

The narrator's explanation (10.389–391) of the rationale behind Helen's words implies that her lamenting for Paris is not sincere (πολλὰ διηνεκέως γοόωσα 10.389), and that she laments audibly only for the sake of the Trojans (390–391). Even the other Trojan women lament secretly over their own kin (10.408–410), while grieving officially for Paris (ὡς κεῖνον στενάχοντο, μετὰ φρεσὶ δ' ἄλλα μενοίνων 408). Oenone alone has real grief for Paris (10.411–414). It is likely that Helen actually speaks in this passage completely truthfully, since she speaks these words only to herself, if in fact they are uttered and not simply thought. She focuses on her own plight and future now that Paris is dead and the end of the war likely.[135] One parallel within book 14 in particular creates considerable dramatic potential. At 10.400–401, Helen states that if she flees to the Greeks they will outrage her body (401). The word for 'outrage'—ἀεικίσσουσιν, is echoed at 14.43—ἀεικίσσωνται Ἀχαιοί. Both passages involve revelation of Helen's inward fears, here in book 10 in her own words, and there in book 14 reported by the primary narrator. Thus, suspense is created through intratext.[136] The subtle difference in syntax between the passages implies that Helen by book 14 is unsure whether the Greeks will do outrage to her body (the verb is in the subjunctive within a clause of fearing), whereas she more definitely states with the future tense in ἀεικίσσουσιν at 10.401 that the Greeks will harm her.[137]

Helen speaks one more time in the *Posthomerica*, but this time after the passage under discussion in book 14. In her reconciliation scene with Menelaus (14.149–178), she tells Menelaus that she left him unwillingly (156), that Paris and the Trojans abducted her by force, and that what kept her from killing herself was desire for him and their child (162).[138] This excuse to Menelaus echoes Agamemnon's vindication of Helen at *Posthomerica* 13.409–414, where he states that Helen is not to blame (οὐ γάρ τοι Ἑλένη πέλει αἰτίη, ὡς σύ γ' ἔολπας 412), but Paris and his violation of *xenia* (413–414)—as the visitation of a *daimon* against him proves (τῶ καί μιν ἐν ἄλγεσι τίσατο

---

[135]   This is emphasised by the pronouns referring to herself at 10.392, 395, 397, 398, 399, 401, 402, and 405.

[136]   James 2004.341 notes the parallel, without elaboration.

[137]   Helen's belief that all hate her (both Trojans and Greeks)—πάντες δ' ἐχθαίρουσιν ἐμὸν κέαρ (10.309), foreshadows the description of her fears before the Greeks at 14.44—τοὔνεχ' ὑποτρομέουσα φίλῳ περιπάλλετο θυμῷ. Helen's reconciliation with Menelaus does not occur until 14.149–178, after her appearance before the Greeks. The fact, however, that the reader has already seen the removal of Menelaus' anger against Helen, at *Posthomerica* 13.385–402, mollifies any tension that may exist.

[138]   Discussion of this speech is in Maciver 2011 with reference to an echo in it (156) of *Aen.* 6.460.

δαίμων 414).[139] Helen's attempted vindication of herself in the *Posthomerica* jars with the more ambiguous statement in her soliloquy at 10.396: ὁππότε σοί ⟨γ'⟩ ἑπόμην ὀλοῇ ὑπὸ Δαίμονος Αἴσῃ. Instead of placing an emphasis on force and seizure (as at 14.157–158), she talks there about following (ἑπόμην) Paris, under the compulsion of an unseen, destructive fate of a *daimon* (ὀλοῇ ὑπὸ Δαίμονος Αἴσῃ). *Aisa* is here personified (as reflected in the capitalisation Vian 1969 uses in his edition), and recalls the other appearances of the personified abstraction in the *Posthomerica*. It is similarly used with *Daimon* in six other places in the poem.[140] The use here and elsewhere implies that Helen's conduct in following Paris was out of her hands, but the uses in no way suggest that she was forced unwillingly.[141] Helen pleads innocence here, in her words to Menelaus, by laying the blame on the dead Paris (Ἀλεξάνδροιο βίη 157), and by stressing her unhappiness in Troy.[142] She heard Agamemnon tell Menelaus (13.413) that it was Paris to blame, not her (as a result of this, and Athene's intervention, Menelaus spares Helen), and reuses this successful *aitia* to appease Menelaus further.[143] This version Helen gives differs from her words in *Odyssey* 4.259–264, where she excuses her infatuation by laying the blame on another, this time Aphrodite (4.261–262)—she does not explicitly blame Paris in the Homeric poems.[144]

The *Posthomerica* strives to present a Helen that is cowed before others, restrained by *aidos*, and keen to represent herself as an unwilling victim, and always pro-Greek. However, Helen does not actively feign or control her own *aidos*. It is rather presented as something external (*aidos* is perhaps a

---

[139] On violation of *xenia* generally, see the brief comments of Griffin 1987.91. This statement by Helen contrasts with portrayal of her in Triphiodorus 463–490.

[140] At *Posthomerica* 1.104 (Andromache chides Penthesileia for her confidence for success in battle, and warns her that her allotted death is near); 3.374 (the primary narrator states that all those who died in battle were allotted their fate by the *Aisa* of a *daimon*); 5.594 (Odysseus states that Ajax was led astray by an *Aisa* of a *daimon*, even though he was a good man); 6.13 (Fate has destroyed many men in battle, so much so that Menelaus wishes he had died before he had gathered the warriors to Troy); 6.416 (Eurypylus taunts a weaker man he has just slain); and 9.502 (a discourse by Agamemnon on the role of Fate in life, spoken to Philoctetes). Personified *Aisa* occurs only once in the *Iliad*, at *Il.* 20.127, in a dissimilar situation.

[141] Note her words to Priam at *Iliad* 3.173–174: ὡς ὄφελεν θάνατός μοι ἀδεῖν κακὸς ὁππότε δεῦρο / υἱέϊ σῷ ἑπόμην, which *Posthomerica* 10.396 clearly echoes.

[142] Cf. Vian 1969.157: "Hélène fait retomber toute la responsabilité des événements sur Pâris et sur ses compatriotes … elle prétend n'avoir été qu'une victime et, pour prouver sa sincérité, elle assure qu'elle a tenté maintes fois de mettre fin à ses jours."

[143] Cf. Maciver 2011.695.

[144] *Iliad* 6.56 might be an exception (Helen mentions the infatuation Paris had for her), but there is no clear statement that Helen followed Paris unwillingly.

personification, as discussed above) that first grips her (14.39–41) when she finally comes to appear before the Greeks. Quintus depicts Helen with overt physical gestures (14.45–47) that reflect an inner turmoil (14.44). He closely connects the inner turmoil with the outward manifestation of *aidos* by echoing the metaphorical use of πορφύρω at 14.42 (πορφύρεσκε), the earlier Greek usage, with the colouring of her cheek at 14.47 (πορφύρουσα), which reflects later Greek usage of the verb.[145]

After a description of her inward fears (41–44), we have the first active gesture in the passage to symbolise the *aidos* that Helen feels—veiling: καί ῥα καλυψαμένη κεφαλὴν ἐφύπερθε καλύπτρῃ (45).[146] This gesture is societal and culturally generated,[147] and is an action by the subject of *aidos* in the presence of those before whom she feels *aidos*, and makes clear to them that she feels this *aidos*. It could even be argued that this gesture of veiling is connotative of Helen's seductiveness and the power of *eros*.[148] This becomes especially the case when the simile is taken into consideration, and the very fact that Helen is compared to Aphrodite, the Love goddess. The only Homeric passage relevant in connection with Helen's veiling here is *Iliad* 14.184, where Hera veils herself as she goes to seduce Zeus.[149] So on the one hand, Helen behaves as is expected of her, and exhibits her *aidos* to the onlookers, and on the other hand, her veiling can be understood as part of her overpowering beauty that pacified Menelaus earlier (13.385–394, and especially 391–394), and that here pacifies the on-looking soldiers (14.59–62).[150]

---

[145] For an early example of the metaphorical use of the verb, cf. *Il.* 21.551, and for another example that imitates this early usage, cf. *Posthomerica* 13.25, of Sinon's unfulfilled fears (so Vian 1969.177n6). For the later usage, cf. LSJ *s.v.* πορφύρω II: "After Hom[er], when the purple-fish (πορφύρα) and its dye became known, πορφύρω and πορφυρέος … were taken to denote positive colour, to grow purple or red." There are various Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic examples of this: cf. Carvounis 2005.110–111.

[146] Helen veiled, led out by Menelaus, is depicted on vases from archaic times onwards: cf. *LIMC* II *s.v.* "Hélène", and especially figure 291, where Helen's veil completely covers her head. See the commentary by Kahil *LIMC s.v.* "Hélène" 546–547, and cf. Kahil 1955.118 on Helen's veiling depicted on black figure vases: "il s'agit du geste ritual de la fiancée illustré par les *anakalypteria*."

[147] Cf. Llewellyn-Jones 2003.121 and 170.

[148] On veiling and eroticism, see Llewellyn-Jones 2003.283–314, who states at 2003.284 that "veiling and eroticism are fundamentally linked". Cf. the veiling of Medea at Apollonius *Argonautica* 3.681–682, 3.834, 3.891, and 3.963.

[149] Cf. Carvounis 2005.99: "Set against the Homeric intertext, Quintus' description of Helen's eyes and the donning of her veil point to a shameful yet seductive Helen." According to Janko 1992.178, who comments on this line in the *Iliad*, a κρήδεμνον leaves the face open, and "the rendering 'veil' is wrong."

[150] Note the role of Aphrodite in both these contexts: 13.389–392 and 14.69–70.

It is appropriate that Helen is compared to Aphrodite here. As the god-
dess of Love and the initiator of the Trojan War, since she herself promised
Helen to Paris, she appears in a simile compared to Helen just at the mo-
ment when Helen finally appears before the Greeks, recaptured by her
husband. On another level, however, Quintus has chosen to incorporate
into one of the most climatic parts of the text a simile drawn from a part
of the *Odyssey* that was famous not only for its dramatic context in that
epic, but also for the problems that it presented for ancient commenta-
tors concerned with interpretation of Homer. The second song of Demod-
ocus (*Odyssey* 8.266–369) has been subject to the attacks of moralising crit-
ics,[151] and has been defended by means of various allegorical interpretations.
Quintus inserts this 'Homeric problem' (of philosophy and ancient Home-
ric scholarship) in a simile in one of the climaxes of the whole narrative of
the war.[152] The Greeks have been waiting long for the appearance of Helen.
The Aphrodite-Ares adultery story is thus given an emphatic position in
the *Posthomerica*, and allows Quintus an altered version of Homer, to write
what was not explicitly stated (or censured) in Homer. Quintus' use of the
story, and the moralising tone in his version, alerts the reader to the exeget-
ical and literary reception of the myth. By toning down the more comic
elements of the story, and by concentrating on the anguish Aphrodite feels
in the presence of the male gods, Quintus in effect comments on Homer, by
changing a myth that was hitherto portrayed literarily only in the *Odyssey*.
The *Posthomerica* adjoins itself, therefore, to this tradition of commentary
on the Odyssean passage, and this simile of the *Posthomerica* can be read as
a 'critical caption' on the Homeric presentation of the story.

In the Posthomeric passage, there are two central aspects that construct
a difference in tone between this presentation by Quintus, and the pre-
sentation by Homer: an emphasis on the discomfort of Aphrodite in the
presence of the on-looking male gods (14.51–52), and the conclusion of the
simile by means of a gnome (14.53–54). In Homer, however, there is no refer-
ence to any discomfort felt by Aphrodite, and there is no comparable moral
statement such as that contained in the gnome at *Posthomerica* 14.53–54.[153]

---

[151] See Heubeck, S. West, and Hainsworth 1988.363 for the objections of ancient commen-
tators (including Xenophanes) of this passage in the *Odyssey*. Cf. Buffière 1962.74n1: "C'est en
effet le plus grand scandale de toute l'oeuvre homérique."

[152] The philosophers who attack the story are principally Xenophanes (*Fr.* 15) and Plato
(*Rep.* 390c)—cf. Burkert 1960.137n16, and Brown 1989.285n6.

[153] The closest the Homeric account gets to a moral tone are lines 329 and 332. Cf. Garvie
1994.307.

First, then, it is clearly stated that Aphrodite felt grief (51) and *aidos* (αἰδο-μένη τε line 51) in the presence of the gods who have assembled (52–53). Aphrodite's feeling of shame in the presence of the gods is reinforced by the primary narrator's statement that Aphrodite openly shamed the bed of her husband in the sight of the other gods (line 49). In the *Odyssey*, the gods also see Aphrodite openly, but there is no hint of how Aphrodite feels in their presence, and in fact the only reaction to their viewing of Aphrodite is implicit in Apollo's words to Hermes, and in Hermes' reply: Apollo asks Hermes whether he would sleep with Aphrodite even tied down by Hephaestus' bonds (8.335–337); Hermes replies that he certainly would sleep with Aphrodite, even with three times as many bonds and with the goddesses also present to see him (8.339–342). The gods obviously find Aphrodite physically desirable.

Quintus, in his presentation of the story, does not have the same scope as Homer, since he uses it as an excursus within a simile. The adverb εὖτε (line 48), after the initial ἠΰτε (line 47) that signals the beginning of the simile, draws on the narratological status of the song of Demodocus, in that the simile digresses with an inset tale in a simile, with a story from an inset tale, to specify the type of *aidos* that Aphrodite felt, and through correspondence, Helen.[154] Quintus, however, despite the short compass of the story here in the simile, puts emphasis on the *aidos* and wrong conduct of Aphrodite, by incorporating a gnome into the simile, and by weaving it into the fabric of the simile through verbal correspondence. There is nothing in the actual retelling of the story (especially given its brevity here) that suggests that we should read this account as an entire re-working. Rather, Quintus uses exactly the same story but emphasises elements left un-emphasised in the Homeric account.[155]

The primary narrator then states that it is a terrible thing for a woman to be caught in the act of adultery openly in the eyes of her husband (14.53–54). Although the gnome is almost disguised at the end of the digressive movement into the Odyssean tale of Aphrodite and Ares, it is, however, firmly imbedded in the simile. The expression ἀμφαδὸν εἰσοράασθαι (54) echoes ἀμφαδὸν εἰσενόησαν (49), verbally and in metrical position. Also, the

---

[154] On the Song of Demodocus as a para-narrative, cf. Alden 2002.2. On the obvious relevance of the tale for the dramatic interest of the main narrative of the *Odyssey*, see Rinon 2006.208–209 and his discussion of the song as *mise-en-abîme*.

[155] The fact, however, that Apollo asks Hermes if he would, given the chance, swap places with Ares, suggests that the act of 'adultery' is not viewed by the gods, or even by Hephaestus or Aphrodite, in the same way as the narrator of the gnome in the *Posthomerica*.

parallel between αἴσχεϊ (54) and αἰσχύνουσαν (49) draws the moralising force of the gnome upon the activities of Aphrodite detailed in line 49, and from there, to the original setting of the story and *Odyssey* 8. The parallelism between lines 49 and 54 is mannered, and thus the primary narrator ensures application of the gnome to Aphrodite. The generalising nature of gnomai, in the case of this gnome, has become non-generalising here due to the explicit verbal parallels—the primary narrator has cast moral judgement on the conduct of Aphrodite and thus accounts for her *aidos*—she feels the *aidos* of adultery, in contrast to any such specific application in the *Odyssey*.[156] Simile, by its very nature, functions on a narratological plain that shows seams, and highlights the guiding interpretation of the narrator, by the very fact that it is not main narrative.[157] On this level, the narrator has an opportunity (and a cover) to shed light on Helen through comparison to another. What is interesting here, however, is that instead of movement into typical subject matter for Homeric (or post-Homeric) similes, movement is instead made exclusively into the poetic-mythological world figured in *Odyssey* 8.[158]

Quintus writes in the wake and context of varying critical methods of Homeric exegesis, some of it concerned with charging Homer with improper portrayal of the gods, and some of it with defending Homer against such charges.[159] As noted above, the Ares-Aphrodite story in *Odyssey* 8 was a conduit for much of this pro- and anti-commentary.[160] The *scholia* carry most of the evidence of this tradition. *Scholion* H, for example, reports that some of

---

[156] The expression τὸ καὶ μοιχάγρι' ὀφέλλει (*Odyssey* 8.332) is spoken by an anonymous god, not by the primary narrator, and therefore does not have the same force as the gnome in the present passage.

[157] I disagree with Lyne 1989.68, that simile is still narrative, but simply in a different medium. A comparison by its very nature—not being the same thing as the thing compared—adds details not there in the main narrative, since a simile is not narrative.

[158] Cf. *Posthomerica* 3.419–421, where the slain Achilles is compared to Ares laid low by Athene's rock: this simile is in fact an echo of *Iliad* 21.403–408—cf. James 2004.285. Movement is similarly made into the intertextual world of the Homeric poems, and thus the status of the *Posthomerica* as post-Homeric, and Quintus as a Homeric reader, is underscored. Other mythological similes in the *Posthomerica* (that is, similes that have as their subject matter features of a myth, rather than a picture of the real world of the poet) occur at 1.512–521, 1.663–668, 1.673–674, 3.392–399, 5.484–485, 5.641–651 (two similes), 7.107–112, 7.359–365, 8.28–33, 9.218–222, 10.170–177, 10.479–482, 11.415–420, and 14.582–586.

[159] Clarke 1981.86–87 summarises the ancient reception of the *Odyssey*'s Aphrodite-Ares story.

[160] Cf. Hardie 1986.62: "The song was something of a test-case in antiquity for the moral worthiness of Homer." Cf. also Burkert 1960.137n16: "Das Domodokos-Lied wurde athetiert … oder von der austößigsten Stelle gereinigt … oder allegorisch gedendet."

the copies did not carry lines 333–342 of *Odyssey* 8 because of their impropriety.[161] Strictly speaking, it is only the early philosophers who condemn Homer outright for the portrayal of the gods in the story in *Odyssey* 8.[162] None of the *scholia* on the Aphrodite-Ares story in *Odyssey* 8 in fact attach adverse criticism to Homer the poet, but rather either (*scholia* P and V on *Odyssey* 8.267) explain that Homer intended to instruct the readers not to behave licentiously, since even the gods behave disgracefully (διὰ ταῦτα), or (*scholia* H, Q, and T on *Odyssey* 8.267) put the blame on Demodocus, since he, not Homer, constructs the story—therefore Homer is not to be reproached (οὐχ Ὁμήρου τὸ ἔγκλημα). Later critics were concerned rather to explain away the moral improprieties through recourse to allegory.[163] The Stoics, and critics influenced by Stoic methods of criticism, sought principally to locate universal truths in Homer through allegorical interpretation.[164] The Aphrodite-Ares story was explained allegorically in terms of the opposing Empedoclean principles of love and strife: Ares was explained as the principle of strife, and Aphrodite that of love, disharmonious elements that Homer had brought together.[165] Such a reading of the Odyssean story is of course possible in the Posthomeric account, especially in the potentially symbolic 14.48—ἐν ἀγκοίνῃσιν Ἄρηος. The potential symbolism can be argued for on the basis of the other allegorical interpretation of the Odyssean passages in ancient literary criticism.[166] Aphrodite in the arms of Ares possibly bespeaks harmony of disharmonious elements.

Quintus concentrates, instead, on presenting a re-writing of the Homeric account.[167] It is interesting to note that the temporal εὖτε (14.48) leads

---

[161] *Scholion* H, on *Odyssey* 8.333–342: ἐν ἐνίοις ἀντιγράφοις οἱ δέκα στίχοι οὐ φέρονται διὰ τὸ ἀπρέπειαν ἐμφαίνειν. νεωτερικὸν γὰρ τὸ φρόνημα.

[162] Philosophers such as Xenophanes and Plato, as stated above.

[163] Cf. Buffière 1956.168: "Les amours adultères d'Arès et d'Aphrodite sont un des scandals majeurs de l'épopée homérique: mais plus un mythe est attaqué, mieux il est défendu: pour celui-ci, l'apologétique des allégoristes n'est pas à court d'explications."

[164] On Homer as the biggest source for universal truth, cf. Buffière 1956.140, and on their tendency to read Homer allegorically, cf. *id*. 1956.140–141: "Les Stoïciens, il est important de le noter, n'apportent dans leur exégèse aucune préoccupation d'apologétique ou de morale. L'adventure d'Arès et d'Aphrodite, qui scandalisait si fort Platon, ne troublait sûrement pas Zénon, qui condamnait l'adultère pour ses seules conséquences sociales."

[165] See Buffière 1956.148 and 168–169 on this allegorical interpretation, which is found in *scholion* E to *Odyssey* 8.267, which itself is exactly replicated at *ps.*-Heraclitus 69.8–9.

[166] *Ps.*-Heraclitus 69.12–15 also proposes that Ares stands allegorically for iron, and Hephaestus for fire.

[167] Vian 1969.178n2 summarises the difference, without further elaboration: "Quintus altère profondément l'esprit du récit homérique en traitant sur un ton moralisateur." Cf.

the reader back to the occasion on which the myth took place (real but mythological time), and directs the reader to *Odyssey* 8.266–369 where Demodocus sings of the myth (literary time via intertextuality). But neither Aphrodite's shame and discomfort, nor a gnomic statement on adultery, are in the Odyssean passage: the 'when' at *Posthomerica* 14.48 leads the reader to Homer, but not to Homeric specifics. Just to incorporate the Aphrodite-Ares story within the *Posthomerica* acts as an interpretative index for the reader to all of the pre-Quintus criticism of the Homeric story. The explicit intrusion of moralistic elements, due to the emphases in the Posthomeric version, is of itself an exegetical comment on the Odyssean version, namely because the Odyssean version lacks these emphases: differences point to interpretation by Quintus.

The Aphrodite-Ares story from the *Odyssey* has been chosen with this judgemental flavour because the story provides the poet with a means of casting judgement upon Helen. Aphrodite caught in the act of adultery, and described as feeling shame and torment before the other gods, translates to Helen and her situation in the main narrative. What is unspecific in relation to the immediate narrative context is the idea of Helen as an adulteress. Line 55 makes clear that the point of the simile is elaboration of the appearance of Helen and her *aidos*. The simile, and its digressive inset tale on Aphrodite, in fact, refers more to the status of Helen within the Trojan tale as a whole, and not to her immediate situation, where she walks out to the ships behind her husband. This focus on her overall status is appropriate since the Greeks see her for the first time at the end of the Trojan War, a war that we are told repeatedly, in both the Homeric epics and the *Posthomerica*, was at least partly her fault.

Helen's portrayal in relation to the Aphrodite simile must also be read in relation to other comments made by the primary narrator about her. At *Posthomerica* 10.406–407, after Helen has 'lamented' for the dead Paris, the primary narrator states that Helen so lamented, not so much for her husband as she did remembering her own terrible *faute* (αἰνῆς / μύρετ᾽ ἀλι-τροσύνης μεμνημένη 406–407).[168] Wrong-doing is explicitly assigned to Helen, both with the noun used—ἀλιτροσύνη, and with the pejorative adjective—

Plutarch *Moralia* 2.19d–20a where the Aphrodite-Ares Homeric story are put under the category of 'vile themes'.

[168] "Faute": so Vian and Battegay 1984 *s.v.* ἀλιτροσύνη. It is difficult to give the correct translation for ἀλιτροσύνη. LSJ *s.v.* translate as "sinfulness, mischief", but neither of these meanings are suitable here: sinfulness has too much Christian connotation, while mischief (in modern English) is too weak.

αἰνή. Ἀλιτροσύνη is found only here in the *Posthomerica*, and is used first by Apollonius (in the plural), at *Argonautica* 4.699.[169] Whatever its true force,[170] it is clear that we are to read here that Helen did wrong, that this wrong was terrible, and that the statement is the primary narrator's, who compares Helen to Aphrodite the adulteress in book 14.

At *Posthomerica* 13.400, the primary narrator again focuses on the wrongs of Helen, by stating that Menelaus, through the agency of Aphrodite, forgets all the things Helen had done, when she committed wrongs in respect of the marriage bed (ὅσσά οἱ ἐν λεχέεσσιν ἐνήλιτε κουριδίοισι 13.400).[171] The verb here (ἐνήλιτε) is used again, in a speech of Athene, at *Posthomerica* 14.436, this time concerning Ajax the son of Oileus and his rape of Cassandra in the temple of Athene. This occurrence of the verb reflects back on it use at 13.400: Athene complains to Zeus about an act of Ajax that means disaster for the return of the Greeks, just as the primary narrator comments on conduct of Helen that caused the war at Troy. The adulterous behaviour of Helen is clearly judged.[172]

There is one adjective in that passage in book 14, however, that seem to contradict the characterisation I have argued for above: ἀκήρατον αἰδῶ (line 55).[173] For example, Katerina Carvounis, in her thesis,[174] argues that the adjective proves that Helen's moral sense is undamaged, whatever her physical conduct, and that in the eyes of the Achaeans it is maidenly *pudor* which shines from her eyes.[175] It is not clear, however, either that Helen's moral

---

[169] Vian and Délage 1981.101 translate the noun there as "scélératesse", which is much stronger in its moral register than Vian and Battegay's definition here.

[170] The word, after Apollonius, occurs only in later hexameter verse and Christian prose. Of these, Triphiodorus 491 is significant, in a context directly related to the conduct of Helen (discussed above), and connected to her adultery and her *atē* inflicted by Aphrodite (Triphiodorus 492). It is interesting to note that Hesychius provides the gloss ἁμαρτία (α 3072.1—in Latte 1953.108), which suggests a translation of 'improper action' here in respect to Helen's adultery.

[171] Vian and Battegay 1984.*s.v.* ἐναλιταίνω translate as "commettre une faute dans". The word is found only in Quintus.

[172] The primary narrator also makes clear that the Trojans lose the war because they started it by first doing wrong in respect of Helen, and by first breaking their oaths (see *Posthomerica* 13.378–384). This does not undermine the stress the narrator places on Helen's guilt, however.

[173] Ἀμώμητος is also used of Helen at 14.58. Its use is fairly widespread elsewhere: cf. similar usages at Hes. *Fr.* 185.13, *hHom. in Dioscuros* 3, Bacc. 5.147, and Musaeus 92.

[174] 2005.113.

[175] Ἀκήρατος is used twice in the *Posthomerica*, here, and at 12.555 by a *tis* speaker who reproaches Cassandra for her lack of maidenly and undefiled *aidos*. Vian and Battegay 1984.*s.v.* ἀκήρατος translate as "pur, vierge, chaste, sans mélange".

sense is undamaged, or that the Greeks view her *aidos* in this particular
sense. Helen's portrayal should be viewed in the light of the simile, and the
fact that she is compared to Aphrodite caught in adultery. The problem in
the passage in book 14 is that Aphrodite's *aidos* in the simile is clearly not
undefiled, and nor for that matter is Helen's. Its presence in this passage has
tempted some to emend it in the text to ἀπήρατον, but as Vian notes,[176] its use
with *aidos* previously at warrants its inclusion here, without emendation.[177]
The adjective does not occur with *aidos* in Homer or elsewhere, but is used
in significant contexts that affect our reading here in the *Posthomerica*. Of
particular interest is Apollonius *Argonautica* 4.1024–1025: Medea states, in
her plea for mercy to Arete, that her mitre remains at home for her unde-
filed, a statement where Medea emphasises her youthful chastity, despite
her errors.[178] The adjective is used here to draw attention to the nature of
the *aidos* found elsewhere, such as Penelope's in the *Odyssey*, and that the
adjective, in the context of the simile here, is used ironically: *aidos* by nature
should be undefiled, but Helen does not have this undefiled *aidos*, because
of her conduct.[179]

   Other literary presentations of Helen also add to the reading of her char-
acterisation in this passage. In Euripides' *Troades* 1025–1028, Hecuba tells
Helen how she ought to appear before the Greeks, abased and in 'sack-
cloth and ashes' (ταπεινὴν ἐν πέπλων ἐρειπίοις 1025), trembling with shiver-
inducing fear, with head shaved (φρίκῃ τρέμουσαν, κρᾶτ' ἀπεσκυθισμένην
1026), and her *sophron* full of shamefulness because of her previous wrong-
doings (τὸ σῶφρον τῆς ἀναιδείας πλέον / ἔχουσαν ἐπὶ τοῖς πρόσθεν ἡμαρτημέ-
νοις 1027–1028).[180] The portrayal in the *Posthomerica* exhibits gestures and

---

[176] Vian 1969.178n3, where he discusses the suggestion for emendation made by Platt 1910.208 on the grounds that the two women in the passage are adulteresses.

[177] Vian 1969.178n3: "Quintus s'est borné à transférer mécaniquement la formule dont il avait usé auparavant." Such a view, however, erroneously makes Quintus an oral poet—the *Posthomerica* is not an oral poem, and despite any imitation of Homeric use of stock epithets, in the *Posthomerica* none of these epithets are stock or 'dead', and must be interpreted as affecting, and carrying, meaning.

[178] Also relevant is Euripides *Tr*. 675, where Andromache equates her virginity with being undefiled: ἀκήρατον δέ μ'—which Kovacs 1999.83 translates as "[you received] me as a virgin".

[179] Note that the adjective is used with λέκτρον at *Argonautica* 2.502, and with λέχος at Euripides *Orestes* 575, contrasting with the *aidos* with respect to the marriage bed of Menelaus that Helen has failed to keep intact. See, further, the discussion by Carvounis 2005.112–113 on significant earlier uses of the word, and the association of the adjective with the notion of virginity.

[180] I use the edition of Diggle 1981, but alter the orthography. The words of Hecuba here should be set against a background of *Tr*. 969–1032, and Hecuba's desire for Menelaus to kill

feelings of Helen that come close to the expected behaviour that Hecuba outlines in Euripides. Helen trembles with fear (ὑποτρομέουσα φίλῳ περιπάλλετο θυμῷ 44), exhibits *aidos* by veiling (καί ῥα καλυψαμένη κεφαλὴν ἐφύπερθε καλύπτρῃ 45) and blushing (αἰδοῖ πορφύρουσα παρήιον 47), and it is made clear in lines 39–41 (*aidos* sat on her eyes and caused her cheeks to redden) that *aidos* is the primary emotion belonging to Helen that is concentrated on in this passage. The two texts are similar in their exertion to present Helen as a shameless (so Euripides) or shameful (so Quintus) adulteress. While Quintus shows a Helen feeling *aidos*, and not a shameless Helen as in Euripides (ἀναιδείας πλέον), he still depicts a Helen who is unequivocally an adulteress.[181]

The Aphrodite-Ares story brings into focus the intertextual relationship between Quintus and Homer, and on a meta-poetical level, the presentations of the story in each epic point to poets with differing literary and thematic aims. Quintus uses but corrects Homer by revising and adapting a myth that was one of the most controversial in the post-Homeric literary world. His moral censure of the story becomes moral censure of Helen the adulteress. Quintus disguises his re-presentation of the Homeric a-moral story within the strictures of narrative and simile. His is a simile, not an inset tale, his is a casting of Aphrodite, not explicitly Helen; and above all, the gnome, within the simile, is a universal truism, applicable to many situations. But the parallelism and intertextuality of the whole passage inevitably leads the reader to transfer blame beyond the initial stages as found in the passage. We read Quintus reading ethics into a Homeric situation, and presenting this situation in his newly censured Homeric story. Quintus not only joins the scholarship on this Homeric problem, but also redresses it as it *should have been.*

iii. *Like Father like Son: Comparing Neoptolemus*

While similes in their own right can contribute to characterisation, the intertextuality of the *Posthomerica*'s similes brings features to a character's

---

Helen. D.L. Cairns 1993.298 has brief but persuasive discussion of Hecuba's words here, and in particular the use of *anaideia*.
  [181] Carvounis 2005.103 argues that "unlike Euripides' Trojan tragedies, Helen is here seen as the *prize*, rather than as the *cause* of the war". I have already shown that Helen in the *Posthomerica*, as in the Homeric poems, is regarded, openly, and as sub-text, as the cause of the war.

personality inherited from earlier texts.[182] This interaction produces multi-dimensional and multi-directional functions for the *Posthomerica*'s similes and strands of earlier texts accumulate to build a more extensive picture than the immediate impression created by the poem. Neoptolemus, despite entering the epic as late as *Posthomerica* 7, has 23 long similes applied to him.[183] This pre-dominance of similes connected with him matches the emphasis put on his character as a second Achilles and his idealisation as *the* hero of the epic; it is also the case that his prominence in the narrative naturally means that he will be compared in similes more frequently than others. Only Ajax attains a higher simile tally (24 long similes),[184] despite the fact that he dies at the end of book 5. After the death of Achilles, Ajax has a prominent place in the narrative as the next best hero.[185] Similarly, Achilles, who features as a living hero in the *Posthomerica* only as far as book 3, is compared in 18 similes.[186] Quintus concentrates most similes in connection with the most prominent heroes.[187] I will focus now on the characterisation of Neoptolemus as reflected specifically in two similes (8.329–340 and 8.22–33). Both of these similes, to varying extents, amplify the construct of Neoptolemus as a second Achilles, or as the *very* embodiment of his father. Thus, Iliadic intertextuality in connection with Achilles becomes supremely important. The allusions, however, to the figure of Achilles embedded in the text symbolise the belated position of Quintus as a late reader of Homer. Not only is the re-enactment of Achilles in the conduct of his son interrogated within the inevitable (and carefully manufactured) relationship of Quintus in the shadow Homer; the function of these similes, especially in terms of concern for acute parallelism with the surrounding narrative of the similes, are indicative of a later, non-Homeric poetic behaviour.

---

[182] On characterisation through similes in the Homeric poems, see Moulton 1977.88–116.

[183] At *Posthomerica* 7.317–326, 330–338, 359–365, 455–463, 464–473, 569–577, 586–593, 637–641, 715–722; 8.28–33, 40–45, 89–92, 167–170, 175–181, 222–227, 230–233, 331–336, 338–340; 9.198–202, 218–222, 270–273; 11.228–234; and 13.240–242.

[184] 1.512–521, 524–528, 572; 3.221–227, 267–268, 270–274, 293–295; 4.220–224, 237–246, 248–249, 439–442; and 5.131–133, 364–370, 371–379, 380–385, 386–390, 406–407, 408–411, 433–438, 461–462, 484–485, 493–497, and 641–651 (a double simile).

[185] Cf. James 2004.245–247.

[186] 1.5–7, 512–521, 524–528, 596–597, 613–621 (a double simile); 2.208–211, 230–234; 3.63–66, 142–148, 170–174, 181–185, 201–205, 392–399, 414–417, 419–421, 508–513; and 4.423–431.

[187] Memnon, who features in *Posthomerica* 2, is compared in 9 long similes: 2.103–106, 248–251, 282–287, 298–300, 345–354, 371–378, 379–387, and 575–582. Eurypylus is compared in 10 long similes: 6.125–128, 377–382, 395–399; 7.107–109, 115–122, 530–534; and 8.130–133, 167–170, 175–181, and 204–207.

In book 8, Neoptolemus and Eurypylus come together to fight in the single combat that forms in what is in a sense the centrepiece of the poem, in imitation of the combat between Achilles and Hector.[188] Eurypylus is eventually killed by Neoptolemus, but then Ares joins the battle to help the Trojans (8.239–240), and by crying out in battle, gives strength to the Trojans, and put the Greeks to flight (8.326–328). Only Neoptolemus remains unafraid, and carries on his slaughter of the Trojans (8.329–330). His actions are explained in a double simile:

     ἀλλ' οὐχ υἷα φόβησεν Ἀχιλλέος· ἀλλ' ὅ γε μίμνων
330 μάρνατο θαρσαλέως, ἐπὶ δ' ἔκτανεν ἄλλον ἐπ' ἄλλῳ·
     ὡς δ' ὅτε τις μυίῃσι περὶ γλάγος ἐρχομένῃσι
     χεῖρα περιρρίψῃ κοῦρος νέος, αἳ δ' ὑπὸ πληγῇ
     τυτθῇ δαμνάμεναι σχεδὸν ἄγγεος ἄλλοθεν ἄλλαι
     θυμὸν ἀποπνείουσι, πάις δ' ἐπιτέρπεται ἔργῳ·
335 ὣς ἄρα φαίδιμος υἱὸς ἀμειλίκτου Ἀχιλῆος
     γήθεεν ἀμφὶ νέκυσσι. καὶ οὐκ ἀλέγιζεν Ἄρηος
     Τρωσὶν ἀμύνοντος, ἐτίνυτο δ' ἄλλοθεν ἄλλον
     λαοῦ ἐπαΐσσοντος, ὅπως ἀνέμοιο θυέλλας
     μίμνει ἐπεσσυμένας ὄρεος μεγάλοιο κολώνη·
340 ὣς ἄρα μίμνεν ἄτρεστος.

> But Ares did not put to flight the son of Achilles. Instead, Neoptolemus remained and fought bravely, and killed one Trojan after another. As when a young boy swishes his hand over flies that are swarming over milk, and stunned dead by his light swat lie expiring near the pail on both sides, and the boy takes delight in his game. So then the brilliant son of merciless Achilles exulted over the corpses. And he did not care for the defending Ares who moved among the Trojan ranks, but punished one after another of the army assailing him. Just as a peak of a great mountain withstands the buffeting gales of wind, so Neoptolemus remained firm, unafraid.

Each simile has mannered parallelism with the main narrative. In my discussion of correspondences between simile and surrounding narrative, I use 'explicit correspondence' to refer to a verbal parallel or balance between simile and narrative that is obvious, and 'implicit correspondence' to a parallel that is not verbal but thematic or that can be understood by the reader from the context.[189] The first simile involves explicit correspondences

---

[188] On this idea, discussed in the introduction, see Vian 1966.47–49 on the structure of books 6–9, and on the centrality of the combat between Neoptolemus and Eurypylus within the poem as a whole, cf. James 2004.311.

[189] Cf. D.A. West 1969, who, in my opinion, obfuscates with his terminology his otherwise excellent discussion of multiple correspondence similes in the *Aeneid*.

between the boy in the simile and Neoptolemus in the narrative. τις (331), κοῦρος νέος (332) and πάις (334) have as their narrative correspondences υἷα ... Ἀχιλλέος (329) and φαίδιμος υἱὸς ἀμειλίκτου Ἀχιλῆος (335). Implied by the youth of the boy in the simile (κοῦρος νέος 332) is the youthfulness of Neoptolemus. Other explicit correspondences include the main point of comparison with the main narrative—the fact that Neoptolemus kills Trojans one after another: ἄλλοθεν ἄλλαι / θυμὸν ἀποπνείουσι (333–334) has as its parallel in the narrative ἔκτανεν ἄλλον ἐπ' ἄλλῳ (330). The narrative resumes at 335–336 with another explicit correspondence, a detail which motivates the resumption of the narrative: πάις δ' ἐπιτέρπεται ἔργῳ (334) is echoed by γήθεεν ἀμφὶ νέκυσσι (336). It is possible, further, to characterise narrative details implicit in the simile. The flies (μυίῃσι 331) that swarm around the milk suggest the sheer number of the Trojans and their relentless assault.[190] The fact that they are swatted so easily by the boy in the simile (ὑπὸ πληγῇ / τυτθῇ δαμνάμεναι 332–333) implies the ease with which Neoptolemus fights and kills the Trojans—they bear no threat to him. Neoptolemus is also characterised as a brutal, merciless killer. There is something discomfiting in the juxtaposition of the simile's content and the surrounding narrative: the simile's homeliness and delicacy jars very much with the martial context.[191] The simile serves to emphasise that war to Neoptolemus is almost a game, an amusement. The Trojans (flies) are the playthings of Neoptolemus (πάις δ' ἐπιτέρπεται ἔργῳ 334).[192]

The first simile is motivated by the killing of the Trojans one after another (330). The narrative then resumes post-simile with the delight of Neoptolemus (335–336), motivated by the delight of the boy in the simile (334). The emphasis of the second simile is on winds buffeting a mountain peak, stimulated by line 338. This exertion of the Trojans reflects the swarming of the flies around the milk at line 331. The narrative contexts for both similes (and a detail in the first simile) also have an emphasis on the relentless killing by Neoptolemus: ἔκτανεν ἄλλον ἐπ' ἄλλῳ (330) is echoed by ἄλλοθεν ἄλλαι (333) in the first simile and by ἐτίνυτο δ' ἄλλοθεν ἄλλον (337) in the narrative before

---

[190] Cf. Rebelo Gonçalves 1987.65.

[191] On violent juxtaposition in the *Iliad*'s similes, cf. D.H. Porter 1972.11–21. A similar simile occurs at *Posthomerica* 10.114–117 (so Vian 1966.157n1), where wasps perish before they get to taste the grapes of the vineyard they have entered. The occurrence of ἀποπνείουσι in both similes (8.334 and 10.116) aligns them.

[192] The milk (γλάγος 331) and the milk-pail (ἄγγεος 333) fit more exclusively with the details of the simile than have relevance for the narrative, since what attracts the Trojans in the narrative is Neoptolemus himself.

the second simile.[193] The narrative resolution after the second simile (μίμνεν ἄτρεστος 340) picks up not only on the steadfastness of the mountain peak that withstands the buffeting of the gales (339), but also echoes the narrative that precedes the first simile—ἀλλ' ὅ γε μίμνων / μάρνατο θαρσαλέως (329–330). The second simile of the passage is also imbedded in the narrative through correspondence. The gales of wind (338) that buffet the mountain top echo the onslaught of the Trojans (λαοῦ ἐπαΐσσοντος 338). There is also an implicit correspondence between the peak of the *great* mountain (339) and the strength and stature of Neoptolemus, which thus serves as a contrast to the first simile, in which Neoptolemus is compared to a young boy. The two similes are delicately linked together, and the whole simile sequence is rounded off by ring composition. Quintus has a more mannered concern for structure and parallelism between simile and narrative, and between similes that occur successively, than is apparent in Homeric similes.[194] I do not suggest that Homeric similes do not have multiple correspondences with the narrative.[195] However, there is more of a general tendency in Homeric similes, than in similes in later epic, for digression beyond the initial point of comparison.[196] In Apollonius, by way of contrast, it has been argued that similes "show overt multiple correspondences with what they illustrate in a way which may seem non-Homeric".[197] This type of reception and reworking of Homer, as exemplified by Apollonius, is similarly evident in the mechanics of the *Posthomerica*'s similes. Mannered parallelism in the similes of Quintus reflects the nature of Late Antique poetics, as also evident, for example, in the similes of Oppian.[198] It is certainly apparent that Quintus leaves no detail redundant in similes, but arguably goes too far in some respects. The

---

[193] Neoptolemus' lack of fear of Ares is also narrated before each simile (ἀλλ' οὐχ υἷα φόβησεν Ἀχιλλῆος 329 and οὐκ ἀλέγιζεν Ἄρηος / Τρωσὶν ἀμύνοντος 336–337). According to Vian 1966.157n2, ἐτίνυτο is corrupt; he quotes (ibid.) M.L. West's conjecture ποτιδέγνυτο. I would prefer a verb whose meaning comes closer to the paralleled ἐπέκτανεν at 8.330.

[194] Cf. James 2004.xxvi and Moulton 1977.19. Cf. Paschal 1904.39 on Quintus' artificial striving for explicit correspondence between simile and narrative.

[195] Cf. Edwards 1991.30–41.

[196] Cf. Edwards 1991.31: "One often feels, especially with similes that begin with ὡς (δ') ὅτε … that the poet is drawing a general illustrative picture rather than making a direct comparison between one item and another."

[197] So Hunter 1993.129, who also states (ibid.) that "it may indeed be the use to which the simile is put, rather than the simile itself, which is most distinctive of the Hellenistic epic". Cf. Nimis 1987.108: "The increased use of spatial-temporal organization is an index of the increased focalization and schematization of phenomena which distinguishes the Hellenistic world from that of Homer."

[198] See, e.g., Hopkinson 1994b.189 on *Haleutica* 1.463–469.

emphasis on swatting flies that come relentless like the Trojans (330–333)
is easily inferred without the pointed verbal parallels. This insistence on
parallelism mirrors the practice throughout the poem. This again is poetry
showing its seams, exhibiting its blueprint. The Homeric *scholia* too have
an obsession for finding narrative-correspondences for similes, an exercise
which, one can presume, Quintus inherits and mimics to varying degrees.[199]

Despite their interconnection, both similes have differing functional em-
phases. The first brings out a strong emotional response in the reader.[200]
The pathetic picture of flies breathing out their last fatal gasps evokes sym-
pathy for the Trojans. The expression (8.334) θυμὸν ἀποπνείουσι personifies
the flies, as it resembles a similar combination used at 14.540, of the ship-
wrecked Achaeans gasping out their life. Other parallels in the main narra-
tive include Trojans dying in the sack of Troy (13.90) and an expression at
13.124, of babies dying, that combines 8.333 and 334: ἄλλοι δ᾽ ἀμφ᾽ ἄλλοισιν
ἀπέπνεον. As mentioned above, the simile also paints a picture of Neoptole-
mus as cruel and merciless, despite the peaceful and bucolic world depicted
in the simile.[201] We can feel disgusted with the belittling of the Trojans in
the simile, and impressed by the prowess of Neoptolemus. The simile also
illuminates details in the narrative—flies connote a multitude and inces-
sant activity, but also insignificance and worthlessness.[202] The Trojans are
grouped in combat against Neoptolemus, but Achilles' son easily swats them
dead.

The second simile of the sequence aims more at illuminating the narra-
tive than achieving an emotional reader-response.[203] The Trojans are com-
pared to gales of wind, while Neoptolemus is compared to a mountain peak.
Neither of these images reflects human ideas, but rather elemental forces
designed to emphasise the force of the Trojan attack, and the strength and
resistance of Neoptolemus. Both similes together achieve maximal force in
both illumination of the narrative—we have a better idea of the manner
in which Neoptolemus killed and withstood the Trojans, and the manner

---

[199] On this obsession in the *scholia*, cf. Nünlist 2009.288–297 and his discussion in partic-
ular of the *Vergleichspunkte*.

[200] Cf. Fränkel 1997.103 for this chief function.

[201] Cf. Spinoula 2000.108 on Neoptolemus finding "playfulness and delight precisely in
destruction".

[202] Of course, the Trojans are not *like* flies in the strongest sense of the word *like*. Cf. Hunter
1993.130: "every assertion of likeness implies also unlikeness, and this is what the epic simile
always struggles to control." There are two fly similes in Oppian, but in dissimilar contexts to
this one (*Haleutica* 2.446, 2.450). For these, cf. Spinoula 2000.105.

[203] The chief function for similes argued for by Bowra 1930.116.

in which the Trojans together attacked Neoptolemus, and in involvement of the reader's emotions—we as readers recognise the homely picture of a boy swatting flies as they swarm over milk, but feel shocked at the image's incongruity with the battle narrative and the pleasure and effortlessness with which the boy in the simile (corresponding to Neoptolemus) swats the flies (Trojans).

It is inter- (and intra-)textuality which brings most meaning to this pair of similes. At 3.263–265, Ajax compares the Trojans to flies that flit about the corpse of Achilles: μυίης οὐτιδανῇσιν ἐοικότες ἀίσσουσιν / ἀμφὶ νέκυν Ἀχιλῆος ἀμύμονος.[204] This passage is particularly relevant as it draws together the situations of Neoptolemus in book 8 and the (dead) Achilles in book 3, and alerts the reader to the differences. In both passages the Trojans are compared to flies, but in Neoptolemus' case, he, unlike his father who is the corpse (νέκυν Ἀχιλῆος 3.265), is alive and rejoices over the corpses around him (γήθεεν ἀμφὶ νέκυσσι 8.336). Son here emulates father, and the simile spoken by the primary narrator here in book 8 reflects back upon the simile in the words of Ajax in book 3. Whereas the corpse of Achilles is what attracts the Trojans in that situation, here in book 8 Neoptolemus easily dispatches those intent on bestowing a fate on him similar to that of his father.

The second simile of the pair echoes a similar passage at 8.167–170.[205] There, Eurypylus throws a rock against Neoptolemus' shield, but Neoptolemus stands firm like an immense headland on a great mountain (ἅτε πρὼν εἱστήκει ἀπείριτος οὔρεϊ μακρῷ 8.167) that withstands the force of rivers all coming together (τόν ῥα διιπετέων ποταμῶν μένος οὐδ' ἅμα πάντων / ἂψ ὦσαι δύναται, ὃ γὰρ ἔμπεδον ἐρρίζωται 8.168–169).[206] The most significant verbal parallel is the narrative resolution after the simile (8.170): ὣς μένεν ἄτρομος αἰὲν Ἀχιλλέος ὄβριμος υἱός. The first three words closely resemble ὣς ἄρα μίμνεν ἄτρεστος at 8.340. The parallel serves to replay the battle narrative where Neoptolemus successfully withstood the onslaught of the Trojans' great warrior, and to underscore the invincibility of Neoptolemus. Also, the adjective used of Neoptolemus at 8.340, ἄτρεστος, is a

---

[204] See the brief note by James 2004.284 on this passage.

[205] Vian 1966.151n1 makes the parallel, where he writes that the image is a recurrent one in the *Posthomerica* (he compares 2.522–523, 5.461–462, 8.197–198, and 12.365–366). He also lists some Homeric antecedents (*Il.* 15.618–621, 16.434–435, and 16.747–751). For the phraseology in the second simile, Vian 1966.218 compares *Il.* 12.132–134.

[206] This itself echoes *Posthomerica* 2.401–404, where Memnon throws a rock against Achilles' shield to no avail.

Quintean coinage used, in the *Posthomerica*, only of Neoptolemus,[207] further highlighting the unique fearlessness of the warrior.

   More importantly for our purposes, the first simile of the pair (to which I now restrict discussion) is remarkable for its conflation of these three Iliadic models: *Iliad* 2.469–473, 4.130–133, and 16.641–644.[208] The first model, *Iliad* 2.469–473, amplifies the reader's view of the flies and in particular their number in the Posthomeric simile.

> ἠΰτε μυιάων ἀδινάων ἔθνεα πολλά,
> 470 αἵ τε κατὰ σταθμὸν ποιμνήιον ἠλάσκουσιν
> ὥρῃ ἐν εἰαρινῇ ὅτε τε γλάγος ἄγγεα δεύει,
> τόσσοι ἐπὶ Τρώεσσι κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοί
> ἐν πεδίῳ ἵσταντο διαρραῖσαι μεμαῶτες.

> Just as the many swarms of flies buzz around, who flit about in a sheep pen in the springtime, when the pails spill milk. Just so many long-haired Achaeans stood on the plain opposite the Trojans, bent on destruction.

The simile occurs in *Iliad* 2, after a series of similes just before the catalogue of ships. The key point of comparison in the simile is the number of flies and the number of the Achaeans (469 and 472).[209] There are clear indicators of the presence of this intertext in the Posthomeric simile.[210] The Posthomeric simile contains a well-defined emphasis on the multitude already, but the pedigree of the motif is illustrated by the very similar description in the *Iliad*. What the echo of *Iliad* 2 really does is alter our view of the worthlessness of those 'Trojan flies'. The Achaean image is obviously positive in martial terms and lends the idea of the courage of the Trojans, since the Achaeans of the Iliadic simile are eager for battle: διαρραῖσαι μεμαῶτες (4.273). Thus, the status of the Trojans is lifted to something nobler and more worthy of the battlefield. It follows, therefore, that Neoptolemus' valour is made more glorious—he is not slaying valour-less 'things'.

   The second Iliadic passage, 4.127–134, brings a different dimension. Menelaus escapes the mortal danger of an arrow, when the daughter of Zeus diverts its course, as a mother lightly brushes a fly away from a sleeping child's skin.[211]

---

[207] The other occurrence is at *Posthomerica* 7.568, in another battle narrative.

[208] So Vian 1966.157, who also compares *Argonautica* 4.1453–1455.

[209] Cf. Moulton 1977.30, who writes that there is a clear "motif of multitudinousness". Cf. also Kirk 1985.165.

[210] Verbally, μυίῃσι (*Posthomerica* 8.331) echoes μυιάων (*Iliad* 4.469), γλάγος (8.331) echoes γλάγος (*Il.* 4.471), and ἄγγεα (8.333) echoes ἄγγεα (*Il.* 4.471).

[211] The *scholion* bT on this passage see manifold significances in the simile for the narra-

οὐδὲ σέθεν Μενέλαε θεοὶ μάκαρες λελάθοντο
ἀθάνατοι, πρώτη δὲ Διὸς θυγάτηρ ἀγελείη,
ἥ τοι πρόσθε στᾶσα βέλος ἐχεπευκὲς ἄμυνεν.
130 ἣ δὲ τόσον μὲν ἔεργεν ἀπὸ χροὸς ὡς ὅτε μήτηρ
παιδὸς ἐέργῃ μυῖαν ὅθ' ἡδέϊ λέξεται ὕπνῳ,
αὐτὴ δ' αὖτ' ἴθυνεν ὅθι ζωστῆρος ὀχῆες
χρύσειοι σύνεχον καὶ διπλόος ἤντετο θώρηξ.

Nor did the immortal gods forget you, Menelaus, but the first daughter of
Zeus—the forager—she, standing in front you, warded off the sharp-pointed
dart. So much did she keep away the arrow from his skin as when a mother
keeps a fly away from a child who lies in sweet slumber. Athene steered the
arrow to where the golden fastening of Menelaus' belt joined, and where his
double breastplate fitted together.

There are no echoes between text and imitated text other than the inclusion
of a fly or flies (*Posthomerica* 8.331 and *Iliad* 4.131), and the fact that both
similes involve a child (8.332 and *Iliad* 4.131). In the *Posthomerica*, the child
becomes the one swatting away the flies, and is thus bound up with the
mother (Athene) in the Iliadic passage. By association with the divine being
in the Iliadic model, Neoptolemus becomes an Athene-figure. Whereas
Athene in the Iliadic passage redirects an arrow (which becomes a fly in the
simile) in order to protect Menelaus, Neoptolemus protects himself with the
ease of a deity. Both figures (Athene and Menelaus) have been reduced to
one as Neoptolemus defends himself with all the ease shown by Athene. The
adaptation of the model illustrates the near-invincibility of Neoptolemus.[212]

The third Iliadic passage is another simile: *Iliad* 16.641–647. The simile
compares the swarm of warriors over the corpse of Sarpedon to flies that
swarm over the milk pail spilling over in springtime.

οἳ δ' αἰεὶ περὶ νεκρὸν ὁμίλεον, ὡς ὅτε μυῖαι
σταθμῷ ἔνι βρομέωσι περιγλαγέας κατὰ πέλλας
ὥρῃ ἐν εἰαρινῇ, ὅτε τε γλάγος ἄγγεα δεύει·
ὣς ἄρα τοὶ περὶ νεκρὸν ὁμίλεον, οὐδέ ποτε Ζεὺς
645 τρέψεν ἀπὸ κρατερῆς ὑσμίνης ὄσσε φαεινώ,
ἀλλὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς αἰὲν ὅρα καὶ φράζετο θυμῷ,
πολλὰ μάλ' ἀμφὶ φόνῳ Πατρόκλου μερμηρίζων.

And they milled unceasingly about his corpse, just as when flies roar in the
sheep-pen down on the milk-pails that are full of milk in springtime, when the

---

tive, and emphasises the favourable disposition of Athene towards Menelaus, since she is
compared, in the simile, to a mother (ἡ μήτηρ πρὸς τὸ εὔνουν); cf. Snipes 1988.220–221; cf. also
Moulton 1977.93n14.
    [212] The model, unavoidably, lends some of its meaning, content, and context via the
reader. Cf. Hutchinson 1988.116 on Apollonius.

pails spill over. Just so they milled about the corpse, and nor did Zeus turn his shining eyes from the fierce battle, but always he looked down on them and pondered in his heart, considering over and over how Patroclus should meet his death ....   (*Iliad* 16.641–647)

This passage is verbally very similar to *Iliad* 2.469–471.[213] However, there are emphases in this passage that have a differing impact upon our reading of the Posthomeric simile. The adjective περιγλαγέας (*Iliad* 16.642) is echoed at *Posthomerica* 8.331 by περὶ γλάγος. As with the simile in *Iliad* 2, there are also verbal echoes between γλάγος ἄγγεα (*Iliad* 16.643) and γλάγος (*Posthomerica* 8.331) and ἄγγεος (8.333). It is interesting to contrast the content and contexts of the similes. In the Iliadic passage, the soldiers swarm over the body of Sarpedon like flies. The implications of the simile are that flies are attracted to corpses (although in the simile it is actually milk that attracts them), just as the soldiers are to Sarpedon. The Greeks want to strip the corpse while the Trojans want to protect it, and in their activity (it is implied) they make much noise, since the flies in the simile roar (βρομέωσι *Iliad* 16.642).[214] In the Posthomeric passage, the Trojans are attracted to a live warrior, who exults over the corpses he makes, rather than, as in the Iliadic simile, a corpse that attracts the 'flies'. While in the context of a simile that describes flies swarming around milk the reader should expect a corpse attracting the soldiers in the main narrative (as in the *Iliad*), Neoptolemus himself stops the trend, due to his supreme heroism. Instead, he makes the 'flies' the corpses. The simile in *Iliad* 16 develops into embedded focalization, when, at 644–645, Zeus is described as watching the battle with his eyes (οὐδέ ποτε Ζεὺς / τρέψεν ἀπὸ κρατερῆς ὑσμίνης ὄσσε φαεινώ). It is possible to assume that to Zeus, the soldiers milling around the corpse of Sarpedon appear like flies, just as they are compared in the simile by the primary narrator. This reading is given added validity by the fact that Zeus' seeing is described immediately post-simile (644–645).[215] The eyes of Zeus on the battle imply that he sees them as such, from his viewing-point far off. On this basis, the reader can apply to Neoptolemus the same 'viewing' of the soldiers attacking him as flies, just as Zeus

---

[213] Note the identical lines *Il.* 2.471 and *Il.* 16.643.

[214] The simile emphasises the multitude and eagerness of the Greeks, according to Σ bT on *Iliad* 16.641–643.

[215] Cf. Edwards 1991.27 on a simile motivating the narrative, post-simile. For the embedding of focalization by the primary narrator through a character (secondary narrator) in the text, cf. de Jong 1997.313.

viewed. The Iliadic intertext exacerbates the invincibility and near-divinity of Neoptolemus, an idea emphasised throughout the *Posthomerica*.[216]

There is one other Iliadic simile that is worth discussing here. It occurs at *Iliad* 15.361–366, where Apollo destroying the wall of the Achaeans is compared to a child who demolishes a sandcastle he has made.

> ἔρειπε δὲ τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν
> ῥεῖα μάλ', ὡς ὅτε τις ψάμαθον πάϊς ἄγχι θαλάσσης,
> ὅς τ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ποιήσῃ ἀθύρματα νηπιέῃσιν
> ἂψ αὖτις συνέχευε ποσὶν καὶ χερσὶν ἀθύρων.
> 365 ὣς ῥα σὺ ἤϊε Φοῖβε πολὺν κάματον καὶ ὀϊζὺν
> σύγχεας Ἀργείων, αὐτοῖσι δὲ φύζαν ἐνῶρσας.

> And he overthrew the wall of the Achaeans easily, as when a boy in the sand by the seashore, who when he has made little towers in his childish play, in turn destroys them playfully with his feet and hands—so then you, Phoebus Apollo, went destroying the great labour and grief of the Achaeans, and stirred them up to flee.

The point of this simile is to emphasise both the ease with which Apollo destroys the Achaeans' wall, and also the pleasure he takes in doing so: the simile expands upon the adverb ῥεῖα (362) in particular.[217] The tone and focus of each simile is similar. Both emphasise a child taking delight in a simplistic activity, whereas the characters in the narrative, in both cases, involve destruction in battle: in the case of Apollo, he destroys a military bulwark and puts the Greeks to flight; in the case of Neoptolemus he slays Trojans who attack him. The supernatural ease with which Apollo accomplishes his task in demolishing the wall of the Achaeans is explicable on account of his divine status.[218] The ease and delight with which Neoptolemus slays the Trojans like flies is on a similar level to the ease and pleasure with which Apollo / the boy destroys the wall / sandcastle. The parallel with Apollo exalts Neoptolemus again to the level of a supernatural.

The simile in *Posthomerica* 8 is remarkable for the paradoxical picture represented when compared to its surrounding narrative, and enlarges our reading of the key character of the poem's second half. I have shown that Quintus strives for a more intricate and artificial linking between simile and narrative that belies the poem's date, despite the Homeric intertextuality

---

[216] Boyten 2007.308–319 discusses the tendency of the *Posthomerica* to portray Neoptolemus in a favourable light.

[217] See Janko 1992.267 on this simile, and for further scholarship.

[218] Cf. Moulton 1977.71: "One result of the comparison is surely to emphasise the terrible power of the gods when they intervene in human affairs."

of the similes. According to Paschal, Quintus' similes lack the directness of Homer.[219] In fact, Quintus' similes activate further meaning in their narrative context because of their Homeric intertextuality, and thus despite the new artificiality found in the careful parallelism between simile and narrative, it is still the presence of the Homeric poems that is fundamental for interpretation of the poem. I continue my discussion of Neoptolemus with close reading of a simile that, in itself, and, more especially, in its intertextuality, exalts him to the level of his father Achilles, and that provides foreshadowing of his actions in combat. The simile comes earlier in the narrative, before the combat with Eurypylus, and compares Neoptolemus both to Helios and to the star Sirius (*Posthomerica* 8.23–33). A very famous simile at *Iliad* 22.25–32, and a simile that earlier in the *Posthomerica* compares Achilles to Helios, help build a picture of this second Achilles.

Neoptolemus first makes his first appearance approximately half-way through the *Posthomerica*, at 7.140. From this first appearance onwards, he is compared with, mistaken for, or identified as, the re-embodiment of his father Achilles. When the Achaean expedition first see him practising in warlike exercises, they see how like Achilles he is (7.176–177), and then Odysseus in his speech to Neoptolemus reinforces this impression (7.185–186).[220] At *Posthomerica* 7.445–451, Neoptolemus, having arrived on the Trojan plain, dons the armour of Achilles. Emphasis is laid on the perfect fit (7.446–449), that it makes him look exactly like Achilles (οἱ φαίνετο πάμπαν ἀλίγκιος 446) and the fact that he lifts even the ashen spear easily (451)—the spear that no one but Achilles could lift (*Iliad* 16.140–144). The fact that he can lift it implies that he has taken the 'sword from the stone'—he is (the new) Achilles. Just as in the Arthurian myth, Neoptolemus takes what is rightfully his both by birth and because he is the only one that can yield the spear. He first enters battle at 7.474, and then in book 8, fights and defeats Eurypylus in single combat—an encounter that parallels his father's defeat of Hector. Eurypylus himself is set up as a worthy adversary of Neoptolemus: he is descended from Heracles (*Posthomerica* 6.120); Paris calls him the greatest warrior—Greek or Trojan—that he has ever seen (6.300–301);[221]

---

[219] 1904.39.

[220] Other key references include *Posthomerica* 7.177, 7.674, and 12.287–288. Boyten 2007. 308n7 implies that because Neoptolemus is called the 'son of Achilles' 61 times, the poet emphasises Neoptolemus' characterisation as 'like' Achilles (an unlikely interpretation).

[221] On the exploits of Eurypylus in the *Posthomerica*, cf. Vian 1966.63–64, 96–99 and 139–140.

and he is the son of Telephus who once fought against Achilles.[222] Neop-
tolemus is also presented as the ideal hero of the *Posthomerica*, in that
he is the embodiment of the poem's moralising. This is especially evident
at *Posthomerica* 14.185–222, where the deified Achilles speaks moralising
words to Neoptolemus on how he should conduct himself in life (discussed
in chapter II).

The simile I wish to focus on (*Posthomerica* 8.23–33) is inserted in the
narrative just after Neoptolemus puts on his father's armour. It is a moment
loaded with intertextuality, and the simile itself, because of *its* intertextu-
ality, maximises this focus on Neoptolemus' inheritance of Achilles' role.
Neoptolemus addresses the troops for the first time in the poem (8.15–22):

> ὣς εἰπὼν ὤμοισι πατρώια δύσετο τεύχη
> πάντοθε μαρμαίροντα· Θέτις δ' ἠγάλλετο θυμῷ
> 25 ἐξ ἁλὸς εἰσορόωσα μέγα σθένος υἱωνοῖο.
> καί ῥα θοῶς οἴμησε πρὸ τείχεος αἰπεινοῖο
> ἐμβεβαὼς ἵπποισιν ἑοῦ πατρὸς ἀθανάτοισιν.
> οἷος δ' ἐκ περάτων ἀν⟨α⟩φαίνεται Ὠκεανοῖο
> Ἠέλιος θνητὸν ἐπὶ χθόνα πῦρ ἀμαρύσσων,
> 30 πῦρ, ὅτε οἱ πώλοισι καὶ ἅρμασι συμφέρετ' ἀστὴρ
> Σείριος ὅς τε βροτοῖσι φέρει πολυκηδέα νοῦσον·
> τοῖος ἐπὶ Τρώων στρατὸν ἤιεν ὄβριμος ἥρως,
> υἱὸς Ἀχιλλῆος.

> After speaking these words Neoptolemus donned his father's armour that
> gleamed in all directions. Thetis rejoiced in heart at seeing from the sea the
> great strength of her grandson. He, riding on his father's immortal horses,
> went swiftly before the sheer wall. *As Helios, from the ends of Ocean, appears
> shooting forth his wondrous fire to earth—the sort of fire that appears when the
> star Sirius—which brings grievous disease to mortals—is carried by his horses
> and chariot; as such, the mighty warrior son of Achilles approached the army of
> the Trojans.*   (*Posthomerica* 8.23–33)

At line 24, the armour is described as flashing in all directions: πάντοθε
μαρμαίροντα.[223] This gleaming of armour is reflected in the words denot-
ing appearance and brightness in the simile: Neoptolemus is compared to
Helios (28–29) that shoots forth its wondrous fire (29), fire that appears just
at the time when the star Sirius is in the sky (30–31). The other emphasis in

---

[222] The defeat of Telephus by Achilles is recounted by Nestor in his *paean* of Achilles at
Posthomerica 4.152–153.

[223] Armour is described as flashing (same verb) at *Posthomerica* 1.150 (Penthesileia's
shield), 1.510 (armour of Achilles and Ajax), 1.657 (Penthesileia's helmet), 2.207 (armour of
Achilles), 5.4 (shield of Achilles), and 6.353 (of armour clashing).

the simile is on movement, echoing the simile's narrative frame. In the context Thetis from the sea watches Neoptolemus as he goes before the wall riding on his father's horses (24–25). In the resolution of the narrative at 32, Neoptolemus' movement is again emphasised (ἤιεν ὄβριμος ἥρως 32). Movement in the simile is suggested by the description of Helios' fire that flashes to the earth (29),[224] and by the chariot and horses of the star Sirius (30), just as Neoptolemus rides on his father's immortal horses (27, 33).

The use of Achilles' armour and horses and the brightness of his appearance are sufficient in itself to establish that Neoptolemus has taken Achilles' place in the poem.[225] There are details in the further narrative context of the simile that exacerbate this: at 8.21–22, he encourages the Achaeans to put on courage, so that the Trojans might think that Achilles were yet alive among the Argives (ὄφρα μὴ ἀμπνεύσῃ Τρώων στρατός, ἀλλ' Ἀχιλῆα / φαίη ἔτι ζώοντα μετέμμεναι Ἀργείοισιν). The horses themselves reflect upon the status of Neoptolemus, so to speak: at 8.36–38 they rejoice in one who looks so like Achilles, and deem in their heart that he is in fact no worse than Achilles himself (ἵπποι δ' αὖτ' ἐχάρησαν ἑὸν φορέοντες ἄνακτα / εἴκελον Αἰακίδῃ 37–38). The simile and its context establish Neoptolemus as a second Achilles.

Intertextuality refocuses the dynamic of the simile, and more especially, Neoptolemus' characterisation. Within the *Posthomerica* itself, there is a parallel passage in book 2 that not only resembles our simile in book 8, but re-emphasises its point, namely, to highlight Neoptolemus as a second Achilles. In it, Achilles himself, in his gleaming armour and riding on the same chariot with the same horses, is compared to Helios (*Posthomerica* 2.204–211). Achilles, with the Achaeans, arms and goes out to meet Memnon and the Trojan allies who have just streamed out of Troy (*Posthomerica* 2.190–214).

---

[224] Ἀμαρύσσω according to LSJ (ad loc.) can be translated as both "sparkle" and "shoot forth, dart". Cf. Boisacq 1950.*s.v.* ἀμαρύσσω. It seems that Quintus plays with the fact that the verb is a cognate of μαρμαίρω, which itself is placed at 8.24—cf. Frisk 1960. *s.v.* ἀμαρύσσω. This description of Helios shooting forth fire occurs identically at *hHom Merc.* 415.

[225] There is also a degree of foreshadowing in the simile: it is stated that the star Sirius brings disease to mortals (Σείριος ὅς τε βροτοῖσι φέρει πολυκηδέα νοῦσον 31). Ὅς τε (31) implies that this is a general characteristic of Sirius—cf. Monro 1891.232 (§ 263). This forebodes the slaughter Neoptolemus will wreak among the Trojans. The use of οἷος and τοῖος (8.28 and 8.32—see LSJ *s.v.* οἷος II) suggests that what is being emphasised is the *type* of person that Neoptolemus is.

ὃς δ' ἐνὶ μέσσοις
205 ἤιε Τιτήνεσσι πολυσθενέεσσιν ἐοικώς,
κυδιόων ἵπποισι καὶ ἅρμασι· τοῦ δ' ἄρα τεύχη
πάντῃ μαρμαίρεσκον ἀλίγκιον ἀστεροπῇσιν.
οἷος δ' ἐκ περάτων γαιηόχου Ὠκεανοῖο
ἔρχεται Ἠέλιος φαεσίμβροτος οὐρανὸν εἴσω
210 παμφανόων, τραφερὴ δὲ γελᾷ περὶ γαῖα καὶ αἰθήρ·
τοῖος ἐν Ἀργείοισι τότ' ἔσσυτο Πηλέος υἱός.

Achilles went in the middle of them like Titans who have great strength, glorying in his horses and chariot. His armour gleamed in all directions like lightning flashes. As Helios that brings light to mortals shining in the sky, rises from the bounds of earth-circling Ocean, and the nurtured earth and air all round laughs; as such the son of Peleus then hastened among the Argives.

He is compared first to a Titan (205),[226] and then to Helios who rises from the Ocean's bounds (207–210). Both similes function in similar ways. Achilles' movement, and primarily the appearance of his armour, are emphasised in the simile by comparison with the movement and brightness of Helios. In the context of both similes, Achilles and Neoptolemus ride the same immortal horses.[227] The two similes are also intricately linked verbally: the sparkling effect of the armour and the description of Helios rising from Ocean's limits are described in markedly similar terms.[228] Achilles, in book 2, is about to face Memnon for the first time in the poem, and subsequently defeat him in combat; similarly, Neoptolemus, in book 8, is about to face Eurypylus in battle.[229] The death of Memnon, which occurs after Achilles is described through this simile, foreshadows a similar fate for Eurypylus in book 8. Intertextuality between passages in the *Posthomerica* thus influences reading of the plot, and in this case, the interlinking of the poem's similes creates a dynamic of rereading and re-interpretation. The simile's

---

[226] On the comparison to a Titan, cf. the discussion in Carvounis 2007.253–255, on the simile where Locrian Ajax is compared to a Titan (*Posthomerica* 14.550). Titanic imagery is a recurrent theme in the *Posthomerica*: note, in particular, the long excursus by Nestor on the subjugation of the Titans by Zeus, in which he proves the gnome that Zeus is mightier than mortals (*Posthomerica* 8.459–470); and the helmet of Achilles adorned with the same theme (*Posthomerica* 5.102–109).

[227] 2.206 (the horses and chariot) is echoed by 8.27, 30.

[228] Πάντῃ μαρμαίρεσκον, of Achilles' armour (2.24), finds at echo at 8.24, with πάντοθε μαρμαίροντα. Both of these descriptions match the introductory lines to the description of the shield of Achilles at 5.3–4 (πάντῃ / δαίδαλα μαρμαίρεσκεν). Cf. also 1.152 of Penthesileia's armour, a line whose wording is echoed by 2.24. Note also the parallel between the similes in οἷος δ' ἐκ περάτων γαιηόχου Ὠκεανοῖο (2.208) and οἷος δ' ἐκ περάτων ἀν⟨α⟩φαίνεται Ὠκεανοῖο (8.28).

[229] Achilles meets and defeats Memnon in the narrative at 2.396–548.

intratextuality not only underscores Neoptolemus' status as a second Achilles, but even connotes similar outcomes in battle for him as we read earlier for Achilles himself.[230]

From the Posthomeric Achilles I move back to Achilles in *Iliad* 22. There, Achilles, in his shining armour, is compared to a star that brings destruction to mortals (*Iliad* 22.25–32). Its presence in the simile in *Posthomerica* 8 sets up further evaluation of the *Posthomerica*'s Homeric intertextuality, and again shifts the level of reading Neoptolemus' characterisation.[231] The narratology, contextual implications, and characterisation of Achilles in that Iliadic simile, all transfer to Neoptolemus.

25 τὸν δ' ὃ γέρων Πρίαμος πρῶτος ἴδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι
     παμφαίνονθ' ὥς τ' ἀστέρ' ἐπεσσύμενον πεδίοιο,
     ὅς ῥά τ' ὀπώρης εἶσιν, ἀρίζηλοι δέ οἱ αὐγαὶ
     φαίνονται πολλοῖσι μετ' ἀστράσι νυκτὸς ἀμολγῷ,
     ὅν τε κύν' Ὠρίωνος ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσι.
30 λαμπρότατος μὲν ὅ γ' ἐστί, κακὸν δέ τε σῆμα τέτυκται,
     καί τε φέρει πολλὸν πυρετὸν δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν·
     ὣς τοῦ χαλκὸς ἔλαμπε περὶ στήθεσσι θέοντος.

Priam the old man first saw Achilles with his eyes—Achilles rushing across the plain all-shining like a star which comes out in the autumn, whose brilliant rays shine out among the other stars in the darkness of the night, which men apparently call Orion's dog; it is certainly the brightest, and has become a sign of evil, which brings great fever to unfortunate mortals. So Achilles' bronze shone about his chest as he ran.   (*Iliad* 22.25–32)

Just as the details of the Iliadic simile reflect how Priam sees Achilles and realises the danger he poses, so details in the Posthomeric simile reflect Quintus' reading of the narratology of the Iliadic simile.[232] The *Iliad* simile is seen through the eyes of Priam—he sees Achilles in this way (as 22.25 suggests—Πρίαμος πρῶτος ἴδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι), and realises that his son is doomed (22.37–76).[233] In the Posthomeric passage, we do not get a viewing

---

[230] A further parallel between the similes and their contexts exists in the cheer that Achilles' / Neoptolemus' appearance gives the Greeks—cf. 2.210 with 8.39.

[231] For this simile, see N.J. Richardson 1993.108–109. Vian 1954.34 identifies the intertext. Cf. Vian 1966.145n3, who also compares *Il.* 5.4–7 (a simile that compares Diomedes) and *Il.* 11.62–64 (where Hector is compared). Cf. James 2004.312.

[232] Σείριος is not mentioned by name in the *Iliad*, but it is clear that this is what is described at *Il.* 22.29–31 (cf. N.J. Richardson 1993.109). The name first occurs in Hesiod (*Op.* 417, 587, 609, and *Sc.* 397), and at Alcaeus *Fr.* 347a.5, Archilochus *Fr.* 106.1, and Euripides *Hecuba* 1101.

[233] Cf. de Jong 2004.16: "The primary function of the simile is, of course, to illustrate Achilles' swift and dazzling appearance. Yet, its secondary function is to express Priam's feelings … at seeing Achilles running straight towards his son."

of Neoptolemus by one of the Trojans. Instead, the closest the text comes to secondary narrator focalization is the viewing of Thetis. She rejoices when she sees her grandson (8.24–25). Unlike the passage in *Iliad* 22, however, this passage begins a new sentence at 8.26 that introduces the simile. In the *Iliad*, the object of Priam's seeing—an accusative participle (παμφαίνοντα 22.26), continues in the simile as an accusative participle (ὥς τ' ἀστέρ' ἐπεσσύμενον πεδίοιο 22.26), elaborated by an explanatory relative clause (ὅς ῥά 22.27). Strictly speaking, the primary narrator in the *Iliad* reports what Priam sees—the discourse is indirect, and we are not led to believe that what is reported—the appearance of Achilles and what it is likened to—is not what Priam actually saw and thought. The sympathetic emotion produced at the level of the reader / audience by the simile in the *Iliad*, since it is a simile indirectly reported as the creation of an aged father beholding his son's (future) killer, is not replicated to the same extent in the simile that draws upon it in the *Posthomerica*. We do not read the simile through the eyes of a relation of Eurypylus, and we cannot claim to read the simile through the eyes of Thetis, due to the syntax.

Instead, *we* as readers, and Quintus as a reader, view Neoptolemus as Priam does Achilles in the Iliadic passage. Quintus appropriates Iliadic secondary narrator discourse (as identified by the reader) and puts it into the narrative in the primary narrator's voice in the *Posthomerica*. We as readers become direct recipients of the proleptic information in the simile, namely, that just as the star Sirius spells sickness for mortals, so Neoptolemus will bring death to his enemies. We also become recipients of analeptic indicators in the simile: the simile's Iliadic intertextuality replays, through our reading memory, the death of Hector at the hands of Achilles, which Priam, through his viewing of Achilles as the destructive star Sirius, foresees. Priam's fears are realised in the *Iliad* (22.326–361). As a result, the analepsis, through intertextuality, becomes prolepsis: the reader reads Neoptolemus as an Achilles who will bring certain death to his chief enemy.[234] Eurypylus is, subsequently, to be read as a Hector figure, ultimately doomed to die. The simile in *Iliad* 22 constructs our reading of the outcome of the battle between Eurypylus and Neoptolemus before it takes place. Furthermore, because of the focalization present in *Iliad* 22, Quintus need not objectively focalize the viewing of Neoptolemus, since the reader receives this poetic

---

[234] Cf. Duckworth 1936.64 on 8.28–33 as a means of foreshadowing the death of Eurypylus. Tension is created in the poem by a lack of substantial foreshadowing of the death of Eurypylus until 7.479–482, 7.522–525, and 8.10–12 (Duckworth 1936.83).

technique in the Iliadic passage. In the *Iliad*, Homer gives Priam an extended speech in which he describes his fears for Hector after he sees Achilles (*Il.* 22.38–76). The Homeric intertextuality allows Quintus to abbreviate his narrative.[235]

An earlier encounter between Eurypylus and the dying Machaon (*Posthomerica* 6.426–434), before Neoptolemus appears in the poem, makes problematic a simplistic identification of Neoptolemus as Achilles, and Eurypylus as Hector. Eurypylus exchanges words with Machaon whom he has just cut down in battle. The scene recalls two similar exchanges in the *Iliad*, that between Hector and the dying Patroclus (*Iliad* 16.852–854), and that between Achilles and the dying Hector (*Iliad* 22.355–367).[236] Through this intertextuality, Eurypylus is cast, on the one hand, through Machaon's words, as a Hector figure.

> "Εὐρύπυλ᾿, οὐδ᾿ ἄρα σοί γε πολὺν χρόνον αἴσιμόν ἐστι
> ζώειν, ἀλλὰ σοὶ ἄγχι παρίσταται οὐλομένη Κὴρ
> Τρώιον ἂμ πεδίον, τό⟨θι⟩ περ νῦν αἴσυλα ῥέζεις."

> "Eurypylus, it is not your fate though to live for much longer, but near to you stands destructive Fate on the Trojan plain, just where you now carry out your evil deeds."

Machaon's words echo *Iliad* 16.852–854, where the dying Patroclus foretells the death of Hector at the hands of Achilles:[237]

> "οὔ θην οὐδ᾿ αὐτὸς δηρὸν βέε᾿, ἀλλά τοι ἤδη
> ἄγχι παρέστηκεν θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταιή,
> χερσὶ δαμέντ᾿ Ἀχιλῆος ἀμύμονος Αἰακίδαο."

> "You will not live for very long, but already near to you stands *Death* and stout Fate—you will go down slain by the hands of Achilles the blameless son of Aeacus."

Both Machaon and Patroclus state that their killer has not long to live, and that their deathly Fate is standing beside them. This Iliadic allusion casts Eurypylus as a Hector figure doomed to perish at the hands of Neoptolemus,[238] and as the narrative progresses, this foreshadowing is not false. The

---

[235] Note that there is no 'Achilles-Hector' exchange when Neoptolemus slays Eurypylus (8.200–217).

[236] Vian 1966.84n2.

[237] Vian highlights this parallel (1966.84n2) in connection with Machaon's prophecy, but gives greater prominence in his notes to the Achilles-Hector exchange at *Il.* 22.355–367.

[238] Strictly speaking, Machaon does not mention the son of Achilles, but the simile in *Posthomerica* 8 under discussion suggests that Neoptolemus will be his killer.

reply that Eurypylus gives at 6.431–434 turns Eurypylus into an Achilles figure.[239] At *Iliad* 22.359–360, Hector (who corresponds to Machaon here) gives Achilles very specific information on who will kill him and where he will be killed.[240] Achilles replies (22.365–366):[241]

365 ‘τέθναθι· κῆρα δ’ ἐγὼ τότε δέξομαι ὁππότε κεν δὴ
      Ζεὺς ἐθέλῃ τελέσαι ἠδ’ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι.’

‘Die! But I shall receive my allotted death whenever it is that Zeus and the other immortal gods decree.’

Eurypylus’ reply to Machaon (*Posthomerica* 6.431–434) bears strong thematic resemblances:[242]

‘νῦν μὲν δὴ σύγε κεῖσο κατὰ χθονός· αὐτὰρ ἔγωγε
ὕστερον οὐκ ἀλέγω, εἰ καὶ παρὰ ποσσὶν ὄλεθρος
σήμερον ἡμετέροισι πέλει λυγρός· οὐ τι γὰρ ἄνδρες
ζώομεν ἤματα πάντα· πότμος δ’ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται.’

‘You, now lie there on the ground. But I, I do not care for what will come, even if baneful destruction lies at my feet this day: for men do not live forever—a fateful day is earmarked for all.’

Both say that they will accept death when it comes,[243] and that the future is not in their hands, unlike Hector at *Iliad* 16.859–861 who gets above himself by suggesting that Achilles could in fact die by *his* spear. Eurypylus’ reply, and in particular its intertextuality, boosts his status from a Hector figure bound to die at the hands of a superior hero, as cast through the words of Machaon, to an Achilles figure.[244] As if Eurypylus were aware of the intertextuality of his statement his reply shifts focus from one level of characterisation to a superior level. In a sense, the new Achilles must defeat a figure who also strives to be Achilles.[245] Eurypylus’ reply mirrors the

---

[239] See Vian 1966.84n2 for this exchange. See further James 2006.305, who states that the stabbing of Machaon’s dead body is similar to the treatment of Hector’s body (*Il.* 22.369–375).

[240] This is not replicated by Machaon in his words to Eurypylus, but the certainty of Eurypylus’ death may be assumed because of this intertext.

[241] On Achilles’ reply, see N.J. Richardson 1993.140.

[242] Cf. my discussion of this passage in chapter III.

[243] Eurypylus’ reply, echoing as it does that of Achilles to Hector, also foreshadows his own death, just as Hector correctly prophesised the death of Achilles at the hands of Apollo / Paris.

[244] Cf. Duckworth 1936.81–82: “[The dying Machaon’s] words are very vague, and the poet’s failure to give a definite forecast of the death of Eurypylus leaves with the reader a strong impression of the invincibility of the warrior.”

[245] The simile at *Posthomerica* 8.23–33 has additional Homeric intertexts feeding into it: *Iliad* 5.4–6, where the focus is on the shine of Diomedes’ armour, and *Iliad* 11.62–63, where Hector stands out among the Trojans.

chronological position of Quintus: the later poet echoes and emulates the proto-poet, just as Eurypylus, a post-Achilles figure in mythological time, and post-Iliadic figure literarily, echoes the words of the proto-hero.

The passage at Apollonius *Argonautica* 3.957–959 is also important. Note the similarities between *Argonautica* 3.957 (Σείριος Ὠκεανοῖο) and *Post-homerica* 8.28 (Ὠκεανοῖο) and 8.31 (Σείριος), between 3.958 (Jason is bright / beautiful to look upon), and 8.29–30—Neoptolemus is bright to look upon (this is certainly the impression, although not explicitly stated), and between 3.959 and 8.31. In Apollonius, it is implied that Jason appears as such to Medea as he approaches her. The Apollonian passage implies how something that outwardly is brilliant and dazzling can, on a symbolic level, portend something ill in the long term, beyond the initial appearance. Apollonius interprets the immediacy of Achilles' appearance and expands upon this idea for Jason's initial *good* effect on Medea.[246] Similarly, in this instance in book 8, it is Thetis (24–25) who rejoices in the sight of her grandson—it is she who receives the image primarily; but by nature, and intertext, the image portends far more serious consequences for Neoptolemus' eventual opponent. Compare also *Aeneid* 10.271–275. Aeneas, at that point in the Vergilian narrative, returns to battle after an absence, but this time he has new, shining armour specially made for him by Vulcan. The visual effect of his armour generates a simile in which Aeneas is compared to the star Sirius.

> ardet apex capiti cristisque a vertice flamma
> funditur et vastos umbo vomit aureus ignis:
> non secus ac liquida si quando nocte cometae
> sanguinei lugubre rubent, aut Sirius ardor
> ille sitim morbosque ferens mortalibus aegris
> 275 nascitur et laevo contristat lumine caelum.

> On the head of Aeneas there blazed a tongue of fire, baleful flames poured from the top of his crest and the golden boss of his shield belched streams of fire, like the gloomy, blood-red glow of a comet on a clear night, or the dismal blaze of Sirius the Dogstar shedding its sinister light across the sky and bringing disease and thirst to suffering mortals.[247]

The Vergilian simile evokes both the Homeric simile at *Iliad* 22, and the situation of Achilles at that point in the *Iliad*. Both heroes return to battle after

---

[246] See Hunter 1989.202 for the significance of this simile for the relationship between Jason and Medea and its eventual outcome. Cf. also *Argonautica* 3.1229–1230 (so Vian 1966.63n3)—a simile on the bright appearance of a helmet—see Hunter 1989.233 for the Homeric influences.

[247] Translation of D.A. West 1990.

an absence and, with new armour, strike fear into their enemies and bring great encouragement to their own side (this is evident at *Aeneid* 10.262–264).[248] This is a similar situation to the arrival of Neoptolemus in battle complete with his father's armour, as discussed above. The marked similarity between *Aeneid* 10.273–274 and *Posthomerica* 8.31 draws the reader's attention to Quintus' incorporation of Vergil within a Homeric setting and intertext.[249] The use that the Vergilian simile makes of *Iliad* 22.25–31 is similar to the use the simile in the *Posthomerica* makes of it. Aeneas becomes an Achilles figure: he has new armour and arrives late in battle after an absence (*Aeneid* 10.260–262), is compared to Sirius, and therefore, in this role, portends the death of Turnus.[250] Neoptolemus, as shown above, is clearly drawn as an Achilles figure: he has the armour of his father which caused the simile at *Iliad* 22 in Priam's eyes; he arrives in battle halfway through the text; and is compared to Sirius, portending the certain death of Eurypylus.[251]

Quintus strives to make Neoptolemus, the son of Achilles, Achilles. The simile in *Posthomerica* 8 exemplifies this characterisation. The Posthomeric intratext of the simile and actions of Achilles in *Posthomerica* 2 gives added potential to the future actions of Neoptolemus in *Posthomerica* 8, and in particular, parallels the death of Memnon at the hands of Achilles with the future death of Eurypylus at the hands of Neoptolemus. Homer, Apollonius, and Vergil also contribute to the characterisation of Neoptolemus. *Iliad* 22 makes Neoptolemus an Iliadic Achilles, with Iliadic aims and Iliadic results, and, in particular, aligns the death of Hector with the future death of Eurypylus. The Iliadic intertext reinvents the coming combat of Neoptolemus and Eurypylus into a combat between an Achilles figure and a Hector figure. Quintus reads Homer through Apollonius and Vergil in this

---

[248] Cf. Williams 1973.340: "The effect of Aeneas' return to the scene of battle is to bring as certain disaster on his enemies as Achilles' return did." Note that both this simile in the *Aeneid* and the simile in *Iliad* 22 make the brightness of the armour the main point of comparison.

[249] The intertext is noted only by Duckworth 1936.64n22. Gärtner 2005 (the most comprehensive treatment of the 'Vergil question') does not mention this passage for possible Vergilian influence. On the Vergil question, see also Keydell 1954 and Vian 1959.101. I do not enter the fray on the Quintus-Vergil subject, but cf. Maciver 2011, and Conte 1986.29.

[250] Cf. S.J. Harrison 1991.146–147 for brief notes on this simile.

[251] Similes in the *Posthomerica*, on the basis of subject matter alone, can portend narrative events: for example, at *Posthomerica* 14.282–288, Hecuba, mourning over her daughter, is compared to a bitch that whimpers because her puppies have been taken from her. At 14.348–351, Hecuba is in fact changed from human form into a dog, cast in stone.

case, and imitates their use of a Homeric intertext. We as modern readers at least, reread the Posthomeric simile with the refractions of the multiple epic interactions, and create a picture of Neoptolemus that is inherited just as much as it is freshly constructed by Quintus.

AFTERWORD

As reiterated in this study, the *Posthomerica* is a 'Homeric' poem. By 'Homeric' I mean that it has a Homeric language and style, a Homeric epic apparatus of poetics and plot construction, and a story that continues exactly on from the end of the *Iliad*. Thus, reading any part of the *Posthomerica* is an inevitable engagement with the Homeric texts. These original texts both as *code* and *exemplary* model help to construct the *Posthomerica*'s identity.

Despite, however, the poet's obvious exertions to construct a Homeric text, we read differences, because of this intertextual engagement with Homer. The *Posthomerica*'s date of composition and its position as a work of post-Homeric and post-Hellenistic literature are identifiable in many respects, but especially when the reader closely analyses the function of poetic devices. In my analysis of ecphrasis, gnomai, and similes, I have illustrated their overall Homeric inheritance. I have concentrated, in my study of ecphrasis, on the shield of Achilles in *Posthomerica* 5, and have discussed the complexities in reading one and the same 'artefact', made by Hephaestus, and presented and described in two different epics, the *Iliad* and the *Posthomerica*, by two different narrators, the Iliadic and Posthomeric primary narrators, with very different descriptions in each epic. I have emphasised that gnomai, despite their Homeric echoes and Homeric function, contain a non-Homeric, Stoically influenced meaning, and I have demonstrated how they interact and carry some of the key ethical themes of the poem—themes that are outwardly Homeric, but that in fact have further, post-Homeric significances. I have shown that the similes are un-Homeric in terms of their structure and placement, in their connection with the main narrative, and in the effect intertextuality has on characterisation through similes. Intertextuality is, of course, a multi-faceted idea. What I have given in this book is *my* reading of the *Posthomerica*, in dialogue with other earlier readings by other readers, and in dialogue with Quintus and his own literary and cultural context. I have viewed Homer through the poem, I have analysed Homeric features of the text and submitted my readings of Quintean originality against, and through, the widespread Homeric intertextuality. For example, the shield of Achilles is invented in the *Iliad*, it is thought up, planned, constructed, described during construction, completed, and given to Achilles. It is a *fait accompli*, an inherent part of the *Iliad*, and is Homer's masterpiece of ecphrasis. An ecphrasis is a natural, and almost expected,

part of an epic poem, yet there were many other shields Quintus could have chosen to describe, other than the shield of Achilles. Instead, Quintus' choice set up an emblem of his poetic aims and intertextual relationship with Homer.

Intertextual engagement of this kind has made apparent the *lateness* of the *Posthomerica*. It was never under doubt that the *Posthomerica* would betray such an identity, but against the overt Homeric nature of the poem, such a characterisation, with its accompanying traits, is always in relation to, and not distinct from, the Homeric poems. Thus the clear influence of Stoicism recurrent and sometimes symbolised in the *Posthomerica* often appears in the most Homeric of contexts, such as set scenes of consolation of a distinct Iliadic character, or in the mythological *paradeigmata* spoken both by the primary and secondary narrators such as Nestor or Odysseus. This philosophical content is planted in Homeric guise, and the interaction of the *old* and the *new* results in an admixture which produces a new type of 'Homeric' ethics and philosophy, which is a rewriting of the original Homeric content. The reader is meant to *read* the Homeric poems in this way, because according to Quintus in his continuation of the Homeric story, this is how it is in his *Iliad*. Quintus appropriates the *Iliad* as a Stoic epic.

One of the key aims of this book was to demonstrate that the *Posthomerica* is a learned text. This learning is evident not just in the breadth of texts which the *Posthomerica* contains in its literary texture, but also in *how* texts are used. In my discussion of similes and their effect on characterisation, I have illustrated how Homeric intertextuality can add a whole extra layer of meaning to the Posthomeric setting. I have highlighted, for example, how characterisation of Neoptolemus is vivified by reading the Homeric echoes in the similes that compare him. I have also shown how Posthomeric intertextuality can construct further meaning. Echoes and interactions between verbal and thematic parallels in the *Posthomerica* overlap and engage in discourse via the reader, as shown in the interaction between the similes of book 1 involving the arrival of Penthesileia. Quintus' similes, called hyper-Homeric in scholarship, create a sense of complete absorption of this Homeric feature, and attentiveness to all aspects of the function of the Homeric simile. On the other hand, the *Posthomerica*'s similes convey something that Homer could not—double, or manifold, points of engaging with the character or situation compared, because of their intertextuality. The rich indebtedness read in the similes leads the reader to Homer and to post-Homeric traditions for the similes' function, structure, and imbedding in the narrative, and to the *Posthomerica* itself, where echoes of other situations in the text unify the epic and extend the range of possible meanings.

This study of the *Posthomerica* has reflected my reading of Quintus, Quintus' reading of Homer, and my reading of Homer. But my interpretations and characterisation of the poem's poetics and strategies do not exhaust the potential of the *Posthomerica*. There are many paths which still lie relatively untrodden. Beside the many areas of the poem which are to be considered in themselves, from a complete analysis of the neo-formulaism to a fuller understanding of Quintus' relationship to the Epic Cycle for example, fruitful potential will come of casting the net further afield. A complete analysis of the poem's relationship with the *Dionysiaca* for example, both as a motivating factor in the so-called evolution of the Nonnian style, and as a vehicle for discussion of the aesthetics of later Greek Imperial poetry, is a strong *desideratum* of scholarship. Also fruitful would be consideration of the similarities in style and intertextual behaviour between the *Posthomerica* and Latin hexameter works such as those by Claudian, or even the works by earlier poets like Statius. And above all, a more complete understanding of the relationship between Alexandrian poetry and the *Posthomerica*, something I have tried to approach only in passing in this study, is vital for a fuller appreciation of the aesthetics of Quintus' creation.

These directions are a postscript to one of the essential aims of this work, to illustrate that Quintus' *Posthomerica* is a learned and engaging text, intrinsically of high poetic merit, and a poem that is worth studying in its own right. If I have achieved this aim, this study has reciprocated the pleasures which the *Posthomerica* bestows by rights.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Accorinti, D., and Chauvin, P. eds 2003. *Des Géants à Dionysos. Mélanges de mythologie et de poésie grecques offerts à F. Vian* Allesandria

Adkins, A.W.H. 1960. *Merit and Responsibility: A Study in Greek Values* Oxford

Ahrens, E. 1937. *Gnomen in Griechischer Dichtung* Halle

Alden, M. 2000. *Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the* Iliad Oxford

Allen, T.W. ed. 1912. *Homeri Opera recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Thomas W. Allen* Tomus V Oxford

Annas, J. ed. 2001. *Cicero On Moral Ends; edited by Julia Annas, translated by Raphael Woolf* Cambridge

Appel, W. 1987. "À propos de la réception de Quintus de Smyrne", *AC* 56, 250–253

—— 1994a. *Die homerischen hapax legomena in den* Posthomerica *des Quintus Smyrnaeus* Torún

—— 1994b. "Zur Frage der Interpretatio Homeri bei den späteren Dichtern", *ZPE* 101, 49–52

—— 1994c. "Grundsätzliche Bemerkungen zu den *Posthomerica* des Quintus Smyrnaeus", *Prometheus* 20, 1–13

Atchity, K.J. 1978. *Homer's* Iliad: *The Shield of Memory* Carbondale

Austin, N. 1966. "The Function of Digressions in the *Iliad*", *GRBS* 7, 295–312

—— 1975. *Archery at the Dark of the Moon* Berkeley

—— 1994. *Helen of Troy and her Shameless Phantom* Ithaca

Austin, R.G. ed. 1977. *P. Vergili Maronis* Aeneidos *Liber Sextus, with a Commentary by R.G. Austin* Oxford

Babbitt, F.C. ed. 1928. *Plutarch's* Moralia, *with an English Translation* Vol. II Cambridge MA

Bär, S. 2007. "Quintus Smyrnaeus und die Tradition des epischen Musenanrufs", in Baumbach and Bär 2007.29–64

—— 2009. *Quintus Smyrnaeus*, Posthomerica *1: die Wiedergeburt des Epos aus dem Geiste der Amazonomachie. Mit einem Kommentar zu den Versen 1–219.* Göttingen

—— 2010. "Quintus of Smyrna and the Second Sophistic", *HSPh* 105, 287–316

Barchiesi, A. 1997. "Virgilian Narrative: Ecphrasis", in Martindale 1997. 271–281

Barthes, R. 2001a. "From Work to Text", translated by Stephen Heath, in Leitch 2001.1470–1475

——. 2001b. "The Death of the Author", translated by Stephen Heath, in Leitch 2001.1466–1470

Bartley, A.N. 2003. *Stories from the Mountains, Stories from the Sea: The Digressions and Similes of Oppian's* Halieutica *and the* Cynegetica Göttingen

Bartsch, S. 1989. *Decoding the Ancient Novel: The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius* Princeton

Bartsch, S. and Elsner, J. 2007. "Introduction: Eight Ways of Looking at Ekphrasis", *CPh* 102.1, i–vii.

Basore, J.W. 1932. *Seneca in Ten Volumes: II Moral Essays, with an English Translation by John W. Basore, in three Volumes* Vol. II Cambridge MA

Bassett, S.E. 1925. "The Hill of Success", *CJ* 20, 414–418

Bates, W.N. 1931. "Quintus of Smyrna and the Siege of Troy", in Hadzsits, G.D. ed. 1931. *Classical Studies in Honor of John C. Rolfe* Philadelphia, 1–18

Baumbach, M. 2007. "Die Poetik der Schilde: Form und Funktion von Ekphraseis in den *Posthomerica* des Quintus Smyrnaeus", in Baumbach and Bär 2007.107–142

Baumbach, M., and Bär, S. 2007. "An Introduction to Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*", in Baumbach and Bär 2007.1–26

Baumbach, M., and Bär, S. eds 2007. *Quintus Smyrnaeus: Transforming Homer in Second Sophistic Epic* Berlin

Becker, A.S. 1990. "The Shield of Achilles and the Poetics of Homeric Description", *AJPh* 111,139–153

—— 1992. "Reading Poetry through a Distant Lens: Ecphrasis, Ancient Greek Rhetoricians and the Pseudo-Hesiodic 'Shield of Herakles'", *AJPh* 113, 5–24

—— 1995. *The Shield of Achilles and the Poetics of Ekphrasis* Maryland

Becker, M. 1939. *Helena: Ihr Wesen und ihre Wandlungen im klassischen Altertum* Strassburg

Becker, O. 1937. *Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellungen im frühgriechischen Denken* Berlin

Bekker, I. ed. 1816. *Ioannis Tzetzae* Antehomerica Homerica *et* Posthomerica *ex recensione Immanuelis Bekkeri* Berolini

Beye, C.R. 1982. *Epic and Romance in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius* Carbondale and Edwardsville

Blok, J.H. 1995. *The Early Amazons* Leiden

Boedekker, D.D. 1974. *Aphrodite's Entry into Greek Epic* Leiden

Boeke, H. 2007. *The Value of Victory in Pindar's Odes: Gnomai, Cosmology and the Role of the Poet.* Leiden.

Boisacq, É. 1950. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* Heidelberg

Bonnafé, A. 1983. "Quelques remarques à propos des comparaisons homériques de *l'Iliade*; critères de classification et étude statistique", *RPh* 67, 79–97

Bonner, S.F. 1949. *Roman Declamation* London

—— 1977. *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny* London

Bouvier, D. 2005. "Penthésilée ou l'absence de la muse au début des *Posthomériques* de Quintus de Smyrne", in Kolde, A., Lukinovich, A., and Rey, A.-L. eds 2005. χορυφαίῳ ἀνδρί. *Mélanges offerts à André Hurst* Geneva 41–52

Bowersock, G.W. 1990. *Hellenism in Late Antiquity* Cambridge

Bowie, E.L. 1989. "Greek Sophists and Greek Poetry in the Second Sophistic", *ANRW* II 33.1, 209–258

—— 1990. "Greek Poetry in the Antonine Age", in Russell 1990.53–90

Bowra, C.M. 1930. *Tradition and Design in the* Iliad Oxford

Boyten. B. 2007. "More 'Parfit Gentil Knyght' than 'Hyrcanian Beast': The Reception of Neoptolemus in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*", in Baumbach and Bär 2007.307–336

Braswell, B.K. 1982. "The Song of Ares and Aphrodite", *Hermes* 110, 129–137

Brown, C.G. 1989. "Ares, Aphrodite, and the Laughter of the Gods", *Phoenix* 43, 283–293

Brennan, T. 2005. *The Stoic Life: Emotions, Duties, and Fate* Oxford

Brinkmann, A. 1911. "Ein Denkmal des Neupythagoreismus", *RhM* 66, 616–625

Broeniman, C.S. 1992. *Thematic Patterns in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius Rhodius: A Study in the Imagery of Similes* Ann Arbor

Buffière, F. 1956. *Les Mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque* Paris

Buffière, F. ed. 1962. *Héraclite: Allégories d'Homère* Paris

Burgess, J.S. 2001. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* Baltimore

Burkert, W. 1960. "Das Lied von Ares und Aphrodite", *RhM* 103, 130–144

——— 1985. *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical, translated by John Raffan* Oxford

Byre, C.S. 1982. "Per Aspera (et Arborem) ad Astra: Ramifications of the Allegory of *Arete* in Quintus Smyrnaeus *Posthomerica* 5.49–68", *Hermes* 110, 184–195

——— 1992. "Narration, Description, and Theme in the Shield of Achilles", *CJ* 88, 33–42

Cairns, D.L. 1993. *Aidos: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature* Oxford

Cairns, D.L. ed. 2001. *Oxford Readings in Homer's* Iliad Oxford

Cairns, D.L. 2005. "Bullish Looks and Sidelong Glances: Social Interaction and the Eyes in Ancient Greek Culture", in Cairns, D.L. ed. 2005. *Body Language in the Greek and Roman Worlds* Swansea, 123–155

Cairns, F. 1979. "Self-imitation within a Generic Framework", in West and Woodman 1979.121–141

Calero Secall, I. 2000. "Paralelismos y contrastes en los personajes femeninos de Quinto de Esmirna", *ASNP* 5, 187–202

Cameron, A. 1970 *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda in the Court of Honorius* Oxford

——— 1995. *Callimachus and his Critics* Princeton

——— 2004. *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* Oxford

——— 2004b. "Poetry and Culture in Late Antiquity", in Swain and Edwards 2004.327–354

Campbell, D.A. 1982. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Greek Poetry* New Edition with Appendix Bristol

Campbell, D.A. ed. 1991. *Greek Lyric III: Stesichorus, Ibycus, Simonides, and Others, Edited and Translated by David A. Campbell* Cambridge MA

Campbell, M. 1981a. *A Commentary on Quintus Smyrnaeus* Posthomerica *XII* Leiden

——— 1981b. *Echoes and imitations of early epic in Apollonius Rhodius* Leiden

Cancik, H., and Schneider, H. eds 1996–2004. *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike. Altertum* (Band 1, 3, 6, 10, and 11) Stuttgart

Canter, J.H. 1925. *Rhetorical Elements in the Tragedies of Seneca* Urbana

Cantilena, M. 2001. "Cronologia e tecnica compositiva dei *Posthomerica* di Quinto Smirneo", in Montanari and Pittaluga 2001.51–70

Carlisle, M., and Levaniouk, O. eds 1999. *Nine Essays on Homer* Lanham

Carspecken, J.F. 1952. "Apollonius Rhodius and the Homeric Epic", *YClS* 13, 33–143

Carvounis, A.N. 2005. *Transformations of Epic: Reading Quintus of Smyrna*, Posthomerica *XIV* DPhil Dissertation, Oxford University

——— 2007. "Final Scenes in Quintus of Smyrna, *Posthomerica* 14", in Baumbach and Bär 2007.241–257

Carvounis, A.N. and Hunter, R.L. eds 2008. *Signs of Life? New Contexts for Later Greek Hexameter Poetry*, *Ramus* special number 37.

Chaintraine, P. 1958–1963. *Grammaire Homérique. Phonétique, Morphologie et Syntaxe* 2 Vols Paris

Chrysafis, G. 1985. "Pedantry and Elegance in Quintus Smyrnaeus *Posthomerica*", in *Corolla Londiniensis* 4, 17–42

Clack, J. 1973. "The Medea Similes of Apollonius Rhodius", *CJ* 68, 310–315

Clader, L.L. 1976. *Helen: The Evolution from Divine to Heroic in Greek Epic Tradition* Leiden

Clare, R.J. 2002. *The Path of the Argo: Language, Imagery, and Narrative in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius Rhodius* Cambridge

Clarke, M. 2004. "Manhood and Heroism", in R. Fowler 2004.74–90

Clausen, W. 1987. *Virgil's* Aeneid *and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry* Berkeley

Coffey, M. 1957. "The Function of the Homeric Simile", *AJPh* 78, 113–132

Cohoon, J.W. ed. 1932. *Dio Chrysostom, with an English Translation* Vol. 1 Cambridge MA

Collins, L. 1988. *Studies in Characterization in the* Iliad Frankfurt am Main

Combellack, F.M. 1968. *The War at Troy: What Homer Didn't Tell, by Quintus of Smyrna. Translated with Introduction and Notes* Oklahoma

Conte, G.B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation; Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets. Translated from the Italian. Edited and with a Foreword by Charles Segal* Ithaca

——— 1992. "Proems in the Middle", *YClS* 29, 147–159

——— 1994. *Genres and Readers. Translated by Glenn Most* Baltimore

Coulter, J.A. 1976. *The Literary Microcosm: Theories of Interpretation of the Later Neoplatonists* Leiden

Cropp, M.J. 1988. *Euripides* Electra, *with Translation and Commentary* Warminster

Cunliffe, J. 1924. *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect* London

Dällenbach, L. 1989. *The Mirror in the Text. Translated by Jeremy Whiteley, with Emma Hughes* Chicago

Davies, M. 1989. *The Epic Cycle* Bristol

Decleva Caizzi, F. ed. 1966. *Antisthenis* Fragmenta *collegit Fernanda Decleva Caizzi* Milan

DeForest, M.M. 1994. *Apollonius'* Argonautica: *A Callimachean Epic* Brill

de Jong, I.J.F. 1985. "Fokalisation und die Homerischen Gleichnisse", *Mnemosyne* 38, 257–270

——— 1987. "The Voice of Anonymity: *tis*-Speeches in the *Iliad*", *Eranos* 85, 69–84

——— 1997. "Homer and Narratology", in Morris and Powell 1997.305–201

de Jong, I.J.F. ed. 1999. *Homer: Critical Assessments*, Volume II: *The Homeric World* London

de Jong, I.J.F. 2001. *A Narratological Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey Cambridge

——— 2004. *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the* Iliad (2nd Edition) London

——— 2011. "The Shield of Achilles: From Metalepsis to *Mise-en-abyme*", *Ramus* 40.1, 1–14

de Jong, I.J.F., and Sullivan, J.P. eds 1994. *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature* Leiden

Delacy, P. 1948. "Stoic Views of Poetry", *AJPh* 69, 241–271

Denniston, J.D. ed. 1939. *Euripides* Electra: *Edited with Introduction and Commentary by J.D. Denniston* Oxford

Denniston, J.D. 1954. *The Greek Particles* (2nd Edition) Oxford

Depew, M. and Obbink, D. eds 2000. *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society* Cambridge MA

Dickie, M.W. 1978. "*Dike* as a Moral Term in Homer and Hesiod" *CPh* 73 (2) 91–101

Dietrich, B.C. 1962. "The Spinning of Fate in Homer", *Phoenix* 16, 86–101

——— 1965. *Death, Fate, and the Gods. The Development of a Religious Idea in Greek Popular Belief and in Homer* London

Diggle, J. ed. 1981. *Euripidis* Fabulae *edidit J. Diggle* Tomus II Oxford

Dilcher, R. 1995. *Studies in Heraclitus* Hildesheim

Dindorf, W. ed. 1850. *Scholia in Homeri* Odysseam Oxford

D'Ippolito, G. 1994. *Studi Nonniani: L'Epillio nello* Dionisiache Palermo

Dodds, E.R. 1951. *The Greeks and the Irrational* Berkeley

Drögemüller, H.-P. 1956. *Die Gleichnisse im Hellenistischen Epos*. Dissertation Hamburg

Duckworth, G.E. 1931. "Προαναφώνησις in the Scholia to Homer", *AJPh* 52, 320–338

——— 1936. "Foreshadowing and Suspense in the *Posthomerica* of Quintus of Smyrna", *AJPh* 57, 58–86

Duff, J.D. 1934. *Silius Iltalicus* Punica *with an English Translation* Cambridge MA

Easterling, P.E. and Knox, B.M.W. 1985. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: The Hellenistic Period and the Empire* Vol. 1. Cambridge

Ebbott, M. 1999. "The Wrath of Helen: Self-Blame and Nemesis in the *Iliad*", in Carlisle and Levaniouk 1999.3–20

Edwards, M.W. 1987. *Homer, Poet of the* Iliad Baltimore

——— 1991. *The* Iliad: *A Commentary*, Vol. 5 *Books 17–20* Cambridge

Effe, B. 1996. "Tradition und Innovation. Zur Funktion der Gleichnisse des Apollonios Rhodios", *Hermes* 124, 290–312

——— 2001. "The Similes of Apollonius Rhodius: Intertextuality and Epic Innovation", in Papanghelis and Rengakos 2001.147–169

Elderkin, G.W. 1906. *Aspects of the Speech in the Later Greek Epic* Baltimore

Elsner, J. 2004. "Late Antique Art: The Problem of the Concept and the Cumulative Aesthetic", in Swain and Edwards 2004.271–309.

Erbse, H. ed. 1969–1988. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri* Iliadem (*Scholia Vetera*). 7 Vols Berlin

Evelyn-White, H.G. 1914. *Hesiod*, The Homeric Hymns, and Homerica, *with an English Translation* Cambridge MA

Fantuzzi, M. 2007. "Ekphrasis", in Cancik and Schneider 1997.342–345

Fantuzzi, M., and Hunter, R.L. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* Cambridge

Farrell, J. 1997. "The Virgilian Intertext", in Martindale 1997.222–238

Feeney, D.C. 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition* Oxford

Felson-Rubin, N. 1994. *Regarding Penelope*: *From Character to Poetics* Princeton

Fitzgerald, J.T., and White, M.L. eds 1983. *The* Tabula *of Cebes* California

Finley, M.I. 1978. *The World of Odysseus* (2nd Edition) London

Fletcher, A. 1964. *Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode* Ithaca

Ford, A. 2002. *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece* Princeton NJ

Fordyce, C.J. ed. 1961. *Catullus: A Commentary by C.J. Fordyce* Oxford

Fowler, D. 2000a. *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin* Oxford

——— 2000b. "The Didactic Plot", in Depew and Obbink 2000.205–219

Fowler, R. ed. 2004. *The Cambridge Companion to Homer* Cambridge

Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace* Oxford

Fränkel, H. 1968. *Noten zu den* Argonautika *des Apollonius* Munich

——— 1975. *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy. Translated by Moses Hadas and James Willis* Oxford

——— 1977. *Die homerischen Gleichnisse, unveränderte Auflage, mit einem Nachwort und einem Literaturverzeichnis, herausgegeben von Ernst Heitsch* Göttingen

——— 1997. "Essence and Nature of the Homeric Similes", in Jones and Wright 1997.103–123

Frede, M. 1999. "On the Stoic Conception of the Good", in Ierodiakonou 1999.71–94

Friedländer, P. 1912. *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentarius: Kunstbeschreibungen Justinianischer Zeit* Leipzig

Friedrich, R. 1981. "On the Compositional Use of Similes in the *Odyssey*", *AJPh* 102, 120–137

Frisk, H. 1960. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* Heidelberg

Gagarin, M. 1973. "*Dike* in the *Works and Days*", *CPh* 68.2, 81–94

Gale, M. ed. 2004. *Latin Epic and Didactic Poetry: Genre, Tradition and Individuality* Swansea

Galinsky, G.K. 1972. *The Herakles Theme: The Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century* Oxford

García Romero, F.A. 1985. "El *destino* en los *Posthomerica* de Quinto de Esmirna", *Habis* 16, 101–106

——— 1990. "Aportaciones al estoicismo de Quinto de Esmirna: Un comentario a la figura de Anfitrite y a *Posthomerica* XI 106s", *Emerita* 58, 119–124

Gärtner, U. 2005. *Quintus Smyrnaeus und die Aeneis: zur Nachwirkung Vergils in der Griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit* Munich

——— 2007. "Zur Rolle der Personifikationen des Schicksals in den *Posthomerica* des Quintus Smyrnaeus", in Baumbach and Bär 2007.211–240

Garvie, A.F. ed. 1986. *Aeschylus* Choephori *with an Introduction and Commentary by A.F. Garvie* Oxford

Garvie, A.F. ed. 1994. *Homer* Odyssey *Books VI–VIII* Cambridge

Garvie, A.F. ed. 1998. *Sophocles* Ajax: *Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary by A.F. Garvie* Warminster

Georgiadou, A., and Larmour, D.H.J. 1998. *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel* True Histories. *Interpretation and Commentary by Aristoula Georgiadou and David H.J. Larmour* Leiden

Gerber, D.E. ed. 1999. *Greek Elegiac Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC. Edited and Translated by Douglas E. Gerber* Cambridge MA

Giagrande, G. 1974. "Sur un passage mal compris de Quintus de Smyrne", *REG* 87, 138–143

Gill, C. 2003. "The School in the Roman Imperial Period", in Inwood 2003.33–58

Gill, C. ed. 2005. *Virtue, Norms, and Objectivity: Issues in Ancient and Modern Ethics* Oxford

Goldhill, S. 1988. "Reading Differences. The *Odyssey* and Juxtaposition", *Ramus* 17, 1–31.

—— 1991. *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature* Cambridge

—— 1994. "The Naive and Knowing Eye: Ecphrasis and the Culture of Viewing in the Hellenistic World", in Goldhill, S., and Osborne, R. eds 1994. *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture* Cambridge 197–223

—— 2007. "What is Ekphrasis For?", *CPh* 102, 1–19

Gordon, R.L. 2001. "Selene", in Cancik and Scheider 2001.354

Goţia, A. 2007. "Light and Darkness in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica* 2", in Baumbach and Bär 2007.85–106

Gow, A.S.F., and Page, D.L. eds 1965. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams.* Vol. 2 *Commentary and Indexes* Cambridge

Gow, A.S.F., and Page, D.L. eds 1968. *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip* Cambridge

Graf. F. 1996. "Aisa", in Cancik and Schneider 1996.345

—— 1997. "Dike", in Cancik and Schneider 1997.570–571

Griffin, J. 1980. *Homer on Life and Death* Oxford

—— 1986. "Homeric Words and Speakers", *JHS* 106, 36–57

—— 1987. *Homer: The* Odyssey Cambridge

—— 2001. "The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer", in Cairns 2001.365–384

Groten, F.J. 1968. "Homer's Helen", *G&R* 15, 33–39

Grube, G.M.A. 1961. *A Greek Critic: Demetrius on Style* Toronto

Guez, J.-P. 1999. "Du rêve homérique au rêve posthomérique" *AC* 68, 81–98

Gutzwiller, K. 2002. "Art's Echo: The Tradition of Hellenistic Ecphrastic Epigram", in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker 2002. 85–112

Hadas, M. 1958. *The Stoic Philosophy of Seneca: Essays and Letters of Seneca translated with an Introduction* New York

Hahm, D.E. 1977. *The Origins of Stoic Cosmology* Columbus, Ohio

Hainsworth, J.B. 1991. *The Idea of Epic* Berkeley

Hall, J. 1981. *Lucian's Satire* New York

Halliwell, S. 1986. *Aristotle's Poetics* London

Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C. eds 2002. *Hellenistic Epigrams: Hellenistica Groningana 6* Leuven

Hardie, P.R. 1985. "Imago Mundi: Cosmological and Ideological Aspects of the Shield of Achilles", *JHS* 105, 11–31

—— 1986. *Virgil's* Aeneid: *Cosmos and Imperium* Oxford

—— 1993. *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition* Cambridge

Harmon, A.H. 1915. *Lucian, with an English Translation*, Vol. 2 Cambridge MA

Harrison, E.L. 1970. "Cleverness in Virgilian Imitation", *CPh* 65.4, 241–243

Harrison, J.E. 1922. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (3rd Edition) Cambridge

—— 1962. *Epilegomena to the Study of Greek Religion, and, Themis: A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion* (2nd Revised Joint Edition) New York

Harrison, S.J. ed. 1991. *Vergil* Aeneid *10. With Introduction, Translation, and Commentary by S.J. Harrison* Oxford

Harrison, S.J. ed. 2001. *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory, and Classical Literature* Oxford

Harrison, S.J. 2001a. "General Introduction: Working Together", in Harrison 2001.1–18

——— 2001b. "Picturing the Future: The Proleptic Ekphrasis from Homer to Vergil", in Harrison 2001.70–92

Heath, M. 2002. *Interpreting Classical Texts* London

Heffernan, J.A.W. 1993. *Museum of Words: The Poetics of Ecphrasis from Homer to Ashbury* Chicago

Hesk, J. 2006. "Homeric Flyting and How to Read It: Performance and Intratext in *Iliad* 20.83–109 and 20.178–258", *Ramus* 35, 4–28

Heubeck, A. and Hoekstra, A. 1990. *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey, Volume 2, *Introduction and Books XI–XVI* Oxford

Heubeck, A., West, S., and Hainsworth, J.B. 1988. *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey, Volume 1, *Introduction and Books I–VIII* Oxford

Hermann, G. 1840. In *Zeitschrift für die Altertumswissenschaft* 7.31–33, 257–275

Hershkowitz, D. 1998. *Valerius Flaccus'* Argonautica. *Abbreviated Voyages in Silver Latin Epic* Oxford

Hiller, E., and Crusius, O. eds 1907. *Anthologia Lyrica* Leipzig

Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* Cambridge

Hirsch-Luipold, R., Feldmeier, R., Hirsch, B., Koch L. and Nesselrath, H.-G. eds 2005. *Die Bildtafel des Kebes: Allegorie des Lebens. Eingeleitet, übersetzt und mit interpretierenden Essays versehen* Darmstadt

Hofinger, M. ed. 1978. *Lexicon Hesiodeum cum Indice Inverso* Leiden

Hommel, H. 1949–1950. "Per Ardua ad Astra", *WJA* 4, 157–165

Hopkinson, N. ed. 1988. *A Hellenistic Anthology* Cambridge

Hopkinson, N. ed. 1994a. *Studies in the* Dionysiaca *of Nonnus* Cambridge

Hopkinson, N. ed. 1994b. *Greek Poetry of the Imperial Period: An Anthology* Cambridge

Hopkinson, N. ed. 1994c. *Nonnos de Panopolis, Les* Dionysiaques. *Tome VIII: Chants XX–XXIV. Texte établi par Neil Hopkisnon et traduit par Francis Vian* Paris

Huart, P. 1973. *Gnome chez Thucydide et ses contemporains* Paris

Hunter, R.L. ed. 1989. *Apollonius of Rhodes*: Argonautica *Book III* Cambridge

Hunter, R.L. 1993. *Apollonius of Rhodes: Jason and the Golden Fleece* (*The* Argonautica) Oxford

——— 1993. *The* Argonautica *of Apollonius. Literary Studies* Cambridge

——— 2001. "The Poetics of Narrative in the *Argonautica*", in Papanghelis and Rengakos 2001.93–105

——— 2005. "Aspects of Technique and Style in Dionysius' *Periegesis*", in Accorinti and Chuvin 2005.343–356

——— 2006. *The Shadow of Callimachus*: *Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome* Cambridge

Hutchinson, G.O. 1988. *Hellenistic Poetry* Oxford

Ierodiakonou, K. ed. 1999. *Topics in Stoic Philosophy* Oxford

Inwood, B. 1999. "Kleanthes", in Cancik and Schneider 1999.499–500

Inwood, B. ed. 2003. *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics* Cambridge

Irwin, E. 1974. *Colour Terms in Greek Poetry* Toronto

Irwin, W. 2004. "Against Intertextuality", *Philosophy and Literature* 28, 227–242

James, A.W. 2004. *The Trojan Epic*: Posthomerica / *Quintus of Smyrna. Translated and Edited by Alan James* Baltimore

——— 2006. Review of Gärtner 2005, *CR* 56, 328–329.

——— 2007. "Quintus of Smyrna and Virgil—A Matter of Prejudice", in Baumbach and Bär 2007.145–157

James, A.W., and Lee, K. eds 2000. *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna* Posthomerica *V* Leiden

Janko, R. 1992. *The* Iliad, *A Commentary* Vol. 4, *Books 13–16* Cambridge

Jebb, R.C. ed. 1896. *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments with Critical Notes, Commentary, and Translation in English Prose*, Part VII: The Ajax Cambridge

Jebb, R.C. ed. 1898. *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments with Critical Notes, Commentary, and Translation in English Prose*, Part IV: The Philoctetes (2nd Edition) Cambridge

Jones, C.P. 1986. *Culture and Society in Lucian* Cambridge MA

Jones, J.W. Jr. 1965. "Trojan Legend: Who is Sinon?", *CJ* 61, 122–128

Jones, P.V. 1996. "The Independent Heroes of the *Iliad*", *JHS* 116, 108–118

Jones, P.V., and Wright, G.M. eds 1997. *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation* Oxford

Kahil, L. 1955. *Les enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène dans les texts et les documents figurés* Paris

Kakridis, J.T. 1971. *Homer Revisited* Lund

Kakridis, Ph.I. 1962. *Κόιντος Σμυρναῖος. Γενικὴ μελέτη τῶν Μεθ᾿ Ὅμηρον καὶ τοῦ ποιητῇ τους* Athens

Kehmptzow, F. 1891. *De Quinti Smyrnaei Fontibus ac Mythopoeia* Kiel

Kelly, G. 2008. *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian* Cambridge

Kennedy, G.A. 1983. *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors* Princeton

Kennedy, G.A. ed. 1989. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*; Volume 1: *Classical Criticism* Cambridge

Keydell, R. 1935. "Die Dichter mit Namen Peisandros", *Hermes* 70, 301–311

——— 1949–1950. "Seneca und Cicero bei Quintus von Smyrna" *WJA* 4, 81–88

——— 1954. "Quintus von Smyrna und Vergil", *Hermes* 82, 254–256

——— 1963. "Quintus von Smyrna", *RE* 47, 1271–1296

Kidd, D. ed. 1997. *Aratus* Phaenomena. *Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary by Douglas Kidd* Cambridge

King, K. 1987. *Achilles: Paradigms of the War Hero from Homer to the Middle Ages* London

Kirk, G.S. 1985. *The* Iliad: *A Commentary*. Vol. I. *Books 1–4* Cambridge

——— 1990. *The* Iliad: *A Commentary*. Vol. II. *Books 5–8* Cambridge

Kneebone, E. 2007. "Fish in Battle? Quintus of Smyrna and the *Haleutica* of Oppian", in Baumbach and Bär 2007.285–305

Knight, V. 1995. *The Renewal of Epic: Responses to Homer in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius* Leiden

Köchly, A. ed. 1850. *Quinti Smyrnaei* Posthomericum *XIV recensuit prolegomenis et adnotatione critica instruxit* Leiden

Korenjak, M. 2003. "Homer und die sophistische Rhetorik der Kaizerzeit: ein komparatistischer Versuch", *MH* 60, 129–145

Kovacs, D. ed. 1999. *Euripides*: Trojan Women, Iphigenia among the Taurians, Ion. *Edited and Translated by David Kovacs* Cambridge MA

Kouremenos, T. 1996. "Herakles, Jason and 'Programmatic' Similes in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*", *RhM* 139, 233–250

Krieger, M. 1992. *Ekphrasis: The Illusion of the Natural Sign* Baltimore

Kristeva, J. 1969. *Séméiotiké: Recherces pour une sémanalyse* Paris

Laird, A. 1993. "Sounding out Ecphrasis: Art and Text in Catullus 64", *JRS* 83, 18–30

——— 2002. "Authority and Ontology of the Muses in Epic Reception", in Spentzou and Fowler 2002.117–140

Laird, A. ed. 2006. *Oxford Readings in Ancient Literary Criticism* Oxford

Lamberton, R. 1986. *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Readings and the Growth of the Epic Tradition* California

——— 1992a. "Introduction", in Lamberton and Keaney 1992.vii–xxiv

——— 1992b. "The Neoplatonists and the Spiritualization of Homer", in Lamberton and Keaney 1992.115–133

Lamberton R., and Keaney, J.J. eds 1992. *Homer's Ancient Readers: The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes* Princeton

Lardinois, A. 1997. "Modern Paroemiology and the Use of Gnomai in Homer's *Iliad*", *CPh* 92.3, 213–233

——— 2000. "Characterization through Gnomai in Homer's *Iliad*", *Mnemosyne* 53, 641–661

Larson, J. 1997. "Handmaidens of Artemis?", *CJ* 92, 249–257

Latte, K. ed. 1953. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon* Vol. I Haunia

Lattimore, R. 1951. *The* Iliad *of Homer: Translated and with an Introduction by Richmond Lattimore* Chicago

Leaf, W., and Bayfield, M.A. eds 1895. *The* Iliad *of Homer: Edited with General and Grammatical Introductions, Notes, and Appendices* Vol. I (*Books I–XII*) London

Lee, D.J.N. 1964. *The Similes of the* Iliad *and* Odyssey *Compared* Sydney

Leitch, V.B. 2001. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism* New York

Levet, J-P. 2005. "L'expression du *vrai* et de la *vérité* dans les *Posthomerica* de Quintus de Smyrne", in Accorinti and Chuvin 2005.357–384

Liddell, H.G., Scott, R., and Jones, H.S. eds 1968. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. (9th Edition, with Supplement) Oxford

Lindsay, J. 1974. *Helen of Troy: Woman and Goddess* London

Lloyd, M. 1984. "The Helen Scene in Euripides *Troades*", *CQ* 34, 303–313

Lloyd-Jones, H. 1969. Review of Combellack 1968, *CR* 19, 101

——— 1983. *The Justice of Zeus* (2nd Edition) Berkeley

Long, A.A. 1974. *Hellenistic Philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics* London

——— 1992. "Stoic Readings of Homer", in Lamberton and Keaney 1992.41–66

——— 1996. *Stoic Studies* Cambridge

Lonsdale, S.H. 1990. *Creatures of Speech: Lion, Hunting, and Herding Similes in the* Iliad Stuttgart

Lucarini, C.M. 2001. "De tribus Quinti Smyrnaei locis Homero pendentibus", *Eranos* 99, 31–33

Lyne, R.O.A.M. 1987. *Further Voices in Vergil's* Aeneid Oxford

——— 1989. *Words and the Poet: Characteristic Techniques of Style in Vergil's* Aeneid Oxford

Lynn-George, M. 1988. *Epos: Word, Narrative, and the* Iliad London

Maciver, C.A. 2007. "Returning to the Mountain of *Arete*: Reading Ecphrasis, Constructing Ethics in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*", in Baumbach and Bär 2007.259–284

——— 2009. Review of Gärtner 2005, for *Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft*, 149–151

——— 2011. "Reading Helen's Excuses in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*", *CQ* 62.1, 690–703

——— 2012. "Representative Bees in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*", *Classical Philology* 107.1 (2012), 53–69

——— *forthcoming*. "Flyte of Odysseus: Allusion and the *Hoplon Krisis* in Quintus Smyrnaeus, *Posthomerica* 5"

Mackie, H.S. 1996. *Talking Trojan: Speech and Community in the* Iliad London

MacLeod, C. ed. 1982. *Homer* Iliad *Book XXIV* Cambridge

MacQueen, J. 1970. *Allegory* London

Mair, A.W., and Mair, G.R. 1921. *Callimachus and Lycophron with an English Translation, Aratus with an English Translation* Cambridge MA

Manakidou, F. 1993. *Beschreibung von Kunstwerken in der hellenistischen Dichtung* Stuttgart

Mansur, M.W. 1940. *The Treatment of Homeric Characters by Quintus of Smyrna* New York

Marg, W. 1971. *Homer über die Dichtung* Münster

Martin, R.P. 1989. *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the* Iliad Ithaca

Martin, M., and Devallet, G. eds 1992. *Silius Italicus*: La Guerre Punique, Tome IV: *Livres XIV–XVII. Texte établi et traduit par Michel Martin* (*livres XIV–XV*) *et Georges Devallet* (*livres XVI–XVII*) Paris

Martindale, C. 1993. *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception* Cambridge

Martindale, C. ed. 1997. *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* Cambridge

Matsen, R.P., Rollinsen, P., and Sousa, M. eds 1990. *Readings in Classical Rhetoric* Illinois

McCall, M.H. 1969. *Ancient Rhetorical Theories of Simile and Comparison* Cambridge MA

Means, T. 1951. "Incidental Observations on the *Argonautica* and the *Posthomerica*", *CJ* 46, 335–340

Michna, T. 1994. *ἀρετή im mythologischen Epos: Eind bedeutungs- und gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung von Homer bis Nonnos* Frankfurt am Main

Miguelez Cavero, L. 2008. *Poems in Context: Greek Poetry in the Egyptian Thebaid 200–600AD* Berlin

Monro, D.B., and Allen, T.W. eds 1920. *Homeri Opera recognoverunt brevique adnotatione critica instruxerunt David B. Munro et Thomas W. Allen*. Tomus I, Iliadis *libros I–XII continens*, Tomus II, Iliadis *libros XIII–XIV continens*, (editio tertia) Oxford

Montanari, F., and Pittaluga, S. eds 2001. *Posthomerica III: Tradizione omerica dall'
    antichità al Rinascimento* Genova

Morales, H. 2004. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius'* Leucippe and Clitophon
    Cambridge

Morris, I., and Powell, B. eds 1997. *A New Companion to Homer* Leiden

Moulton, C. 1977. *Similes in the Homeric Poems* Göttingen

Muellner, L. 2005. *The Anger of Achilles* Ithaca

Murnaghan, S. 1997. "Equal Honor and Future Glory: The Plan of Zeus in the *Iliad*",
    in Roberts, Dunn, and Fowler 1997.23–42

Newbold, R.F. 1981. "Space and Scenery in Quintus of Smyrna, Claudian and Non-
    nus", *Ramus* 10, 53–68

Niemeyer, K.A.E. 1883–1884. *Über die Gleichnisse bei Quintus Smyrnaeus* Zwickau

Nimis, S.A. 1987. *Narrative Semiotics in the Epic Tradition: The Simile* Indianapolis

Nisbet, R.G.M., and Hubbard, M. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace* Odes, *Book 1* Oxford

Nussbaum, G. 1960. "Labour and Status in the *Works and Days*", *CQ* 10, 213–220

Obbink, D. 1999. "The Stoic Sage in the Cosmic City", in Ierodiakonou 1999.178–195

O'Brien, M.J. 1964. "Orestes and the Gorgon: Euripides' *Electra*", *AJPh* 85, 13–39

Oldfather, W.A. 1925. *Epictetus: The* Discourses *as Reported by Arrian, the* Manual,
    and Fragments, *with an English Translation* Vol. 1. Cambridge MA

Olson, S.D. 1989. "*Odyssey* 8: Guile, Force, and the Subversive Poetics of Desire",
    Arethusa 22, 135–145

Onians, C.T. eds 1969. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology. Edited by C.T. Oni-
    ans, with the assistance of G.W.S. Friedrichsen and R.W. Burchfield* Oxford

Page, D.L. ed. 1975. *Epigrammata Graeca* Oxford

Paley, F.A. 1876. *Quintus Smyrnaeus and the 'Homer' of the Tragic Poets* London

Papanghelis, Th.D., and Rengakos, A. eds 2001. *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*
    Leiden

Papathomopoulos, M. 2002. *Concordantia in Quinti Smyrnaei* Posthomerica. 2 Vols.
    Hildesheim

Paschal, G.W. 1904. *A Study of Quintus of Smyrna* Chicago

Platt, A. 1910. Review of Zimmermann, A. 1908. *Neue Beiträge zu den* Posthomerica
    des Quintus Smyrnaeus Leipzig, *Journal of Philology* 31, 287–298

Pompella, G. ed. 1981. *Index in Quintum Smyrnaeum* Hildesheim

Pompella, G. ed. 2002. *Quinti Smyrnaei* Posthomerica *recognovit Giuseppe Pompella*
    Hildesheim

Porter, D.H. 1972. "Violent Juxtaposition in the Similes of the *Iliad*", *CJ* 68, 11–21

Porter, J.I. 1992. "Hermeneutic Lines and Circles: Aristarchus and Crates on the
    Exegesis of Homer", in Lamberton and Keaney 1992.67–113

Preminger, A., and Brogan, T.V.F. eds 1993. *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry
    and Poetics* Princeton

Prendergast, G.L. 1962. *A Complete Concordance to the* Iliad *of Homer. New Edition
    Completely Revised and Enlarged by Benedetto Marzullo* Darmstadt

Pucci, J. 1998. *The Full-Knowing Reader. Allusion and the Power of the Reader in the
    Western Literary Tradition* London

Putnam, M.C.G. 1998. *Virgil's Epic Designs: Ekphrasis in the* Aeneid New Haven

Quinn, K. ed. 1980. *Horace*, The Odes. *Edited with Introduction, Revised Text, and
    Commentary* London

Race, W.H. 1992. "How Greek Poems Begin", *YClS* 29, 13–38

Rackham, H. ed. 1931. *Cicero*: de Finibus Bonorum et Malorum. *With an English Translation by H. Rackham* (2nd Edition) Cambridge MA

Rebelo Gonçalves, M.I. 1987. "As imagens animais em Quinto de Esmirna", *Euphrosyne* 15, 31–69

Reitz, C. 1996. *Zur Gleichnistechnik des Apollonios von Rhodos* Frankfurt

Rengakos, A. 2001. "Apollonius Rhodius as a Homeric Scholar", in Papanghelis and Rengakos 2001.193–206

Richardson, N.J. 1980. "Literary Criticism in the Exegetical Scholia to the *Iliad*: A Sketch", *CQ* 30, 265–287

——— 1993. *The* Iliad, *A Commentary*, Volume VI *Books 21–24* Cambridge

Richardson, S. 1990. *The Homeric Narrator* Nashville

Rinon, Y. 2006. "*Mise en abyme* and Tragic Signification in the *Odyssey*: The Three Songs of Demodocus", *Mnemosyne* 59, 208–225

Risch, E. 1974. *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache* (2nd Edition) Berlin

Rist, J.M. 1978. "The Stoic Concept of Detachment", in Rist 1978.259–272

Rist, J.M. ed. 1978. *The Stoics* Berkeley

Roberts, D.H., Dunn, F.M., and Fowler, D. eds 1997. *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature* Princeton NJ

Roberts, M. 1989. *The Jewelled Style. Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity* Ithaca

Robertson, D.S. 1943. "Quintus Smyrnaeus iii.267–277", *CR* 57, 6–7

Robinson, T.M. ed. 1987. *Heraclitus* Fragments. *A Text and Translation with a Commentary by T.M. Robinson* Toronto

Roisman, H.M. 2006. "Helen in the *Iliad*. *Causa Belli* and Victim of War: From Silent Weaver to Public Speaker", *AJPh* 127, 1–36

Rollinson, P. 1981. *Classical Theories of Allegory and Christian Culture* Pittsburgh

Russell, D.A. 1979. "*De Imitatione*", in West and Woodman 1979.1–16

——— 1981. *Criticism in Antiquity* London

Russell, D.A. ed. 1990. *Antonine Literature* Oxford

Russo, J., Fernández-Galiano, M., and Heubeck, A. 1992. *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey, Vol. III *Books XVII–XXIV* Oxford

Ryan, G.J. 1965. "Helen in Homer", *CJ* 61, 115–117

Saïd, S., and Trédé, M. 1999. *A Short History of Greek Literature* London

Sainte-Beuve, C.-A. 1857. *Étude sur Virgile suivie d'une étude sur Quintus de Smyrne* Paris

Sale, W. 1966. "The Popularity of Aratus", *CJ* 61, 160–164

Sandbach, F.H. 1975. *The Stoics* London

Schenk, P. 1997. "Handlungsstruktur und Komposition in den *Posthomerica* des Quintus Smyrnaeus", *RhM* 140, 363–385

Schlunk, R.R. 1974. *The Homeric Scholia and the* Aeneid: *A Study of the Influence of Ancient Homeric Literary Criticism on Vergil* Ann Arbor

Schmidt, E.G. 1999. "Quintus von Smyrna—der schlechteste Dichter des Altertums?", *Phasis* 1, 139–150

Schmiel, R. 1986. "The Amazon Queen. Quintus of Smyrna Book 1", *Phoenix* 40, 185–194

Schmitz, T. 1997. *Bildung und Macht. Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit* (Zetemata 97), München

——— 1999. "I hate all common things: The Reader's Role in Callimachus' *Aetia* Prologue", *HSPh* 99, 151–178

Schmitz, T.A. 2007. "The Use of Analepses and Prolepses in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*", in Baumbach and Bär 2007.65–84

Schubert, P. 1996. "Thersite et Penthésilée dans la Suite d'Homère de Quintus de Smyrne" *Phoenix* 50, 111–117

——— 2007. "From the Epics to the Second Sophistic, from Hecuba to Aethra, and finally from Troy to Athens: Defining the Position of Quintus Smyrnaeus in his *Posthomerica*", in Baumbach and Bär 2007.339–355

Scott, W.C. 2009. *The Artistry of the Homeric Simile* Dartmouth

Scully, S. 2003. "Reading the Shield of Achilles: Terror, Anger, Delight", *HSPh* 101, 29–47

Sellars, J. 2006. *Stoicism* Chesham

Severyns, A. 1928. *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque* Liège

Shannon, R.S. 1975. *The Arms of Achilles and the Homeric Compositional Technique* Leiden

Sharples, R.W. ed. 1991. *Plato* Meno. *Edited with Introduction and Notes* (3rd Revised Impression) Warminster

Sharrock, A., and Morales, H. eds 2000. *Intratextuality* Oxford

Sherman, N. 2005. *Stoic Warriors: The Ancient Philosophy behind the Military Mind* Oxford

Shorey, P. 1922. "The Logic of the Homeric Simile", *CPh* 17, 240–249

Shorrock, R. 2001. *The Challenge of Epic: Allusive Engagement in the* Dionysiaca *of Nonnus* Leiden

Silk, M. 1974. *Interaction in Poetic Imagery* Cambridge

Sinclair, T.A. ed. 1966. *Hesiod* Works and Days Hildesheim (Reprint of Macmillan Edition: London 1932)

Skutsch, O. 1987. "Helen, her Name and Nature", *JHS* 107, 188–193

Snipes, K. 1988. "Literary Interpretation in the Homeric Scholia: The Similes of the *Iliad*", *AJPh* 109, 196–222

Spentzou, E., and Fowler, D. 2002. *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature* Oxford

Spinoula, B. 2000. *Animal Similes and Creativity in the* Posthomerica *of Quintus of Smyrna* PhD Dissertation: University of St. Andrews

Solmsen, F., Merkelbach, R., and West, M.L. eds 1990. *Hesiodi* Theogonia. Opera et Dies, Scutum *edidit Friedrich Solmsen*. Fragmenta selecta *ediderunt R. Merkelbach et M.L. West* (3rd Edition) Oxford

Stanford, W.B. 1954. *The Ulysses Theme. A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero* Oxford

Stanley, K. 1993. *The Shield of Homer: Narrative Structure in the* Iliad Princeton NJ

Stafford, E., and Herrin, J. eds 2005. *Personification in the Greek World from Antiquity to Byzantium* London

Stenger, J. 2004. *Poetische Argumentation. Die Funktion der Gnomik in den Epinikien des Bakchylides* Berlin

Stickney, T. 1903. *Les sentences dans la poésie grecque d'Homère à Euripide* Paris

Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50–250* Oxford

Swain, S., and Edwards, M. eds 2004. *Approaching Late Antiquity: The Transformation from Early to Late Empire* Oxford

Taplin, O. 1992. *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of the* Iliad Oxford

——— 2001. "The Shield of Achilles within the *Iliad*", in D.L. Cairns 2001.342–364

Tarrant, R.J. ed. 1985. *Seneca's* Thyestes. *Edited with an Introduction and Commentary* Georgia

Todorov, T. 1982. *Theories of the Symbol. Translated by Catherine Porter* Oxford

Toohey, P. 1996. *Epic lessons. An Introduction to Ancient Didactic Poetry* London

Trypanis, C.A. 1947. "The Character of Alexandrian Poetry", *G&R* 46, 1–7

Trypanis, C.A., Gelzer, T., and Whitman, C. eds 1975. *Callimachus*: Aetia, Iambi, Hecale, *and Other Fragments. Text, Translation and Notes by C.A. Trypanis; Musaeus*: Hero and Leander. *Introduction, Text and Notes by Thomas Gelzer with an English Translation by Cedric Whitman* Cambridge MA

Turner, P. 1961. *Lucian: Satirical Sketches. Translated with an Introduction* Harmondsworth

van der Valk, M. ed. 1971. *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis* Commentarii *ad Homeri* Iliadem *Pertinentes* Leiden

van Erp Taalman Kip, A.M. 1994. "Intertextuality and Theocritus 13", in de Jong and Sullivan 1994.153–169

van Proosdij, B.A. ed. 1968. *P. Ovidii Nasonis* Metamorphoseon *Libri I–XV* Leiden

van Tress, H. 2004. *Poetic Memory: Allusion in the Poetry of Callimachus and the* Metamorphoses *of Ovid* Leiden

Vian, F. 1954. "Les comparaisons de Quintus de Smyrne", *RPh* 28, 30–51; 235–243

——— 1959. *Recherches sur les* Posthomerica *de Quintus de Smyrne* Paris

Vian, F. ed. 1963–1969. *Quintus de Smyrne, La suite d'Homère. Texte établi et traduit par Francis Vian* 3 Vols Paris

Vian, F. 2001. "Echoes and Imitations of Apollonius Rhodius in Late Greek Epic", in Papanghelis and Rengakos 2001.285–308

Vian, F., and Battegay, E. eds 1984. *Lexique de Quintus de Smyrne* Paris

Vian, F., and Delage, É. eds 1981. *Apollonios de Rhodes*: Argonautiques Tome III, *Chant IV* Paris

von Arnim, I. ed. 1903. *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* (Vols 2 and 3) Leipzig

von der Muehll, P. ed. 1962. *Homeri* Odyssea *recognovit P. von der Muehll* (3rd Edition) Stuttgart

von Möllendorff, P. 2000a. *Auf der Suche nach der verlogenen Wahrheit. Lukians* Wahre Geschichten Tübingen

——— 2000b. *Lukian*. Hermotimos, *oder: Lohnt es sich, Philosophie zu studieren? Herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert von Peter von Möllendorff* Darmstadt

von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, U. 1905. *Die griechische Literatur des Altertums* Berlin

Waites, M.C. 1912. "Some Features of the Allegorical Debate in Greek Literature", *HSPh* 23, 1–46

Way, A.S. 1913. *Quintus Smyrnaeus: The Fall of Troy. Translated with an Introduction by A.S. Way* Cambridge MA

Wendel, C. 1958. *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium Vetera, recensuit Carolus Wendel* (2nd Edition) Berlin

Wenglinsky, M.H. 1999. "Response to the Philological Criticism of the Portrayal of the Gods: The *Posthomerica* of Quintus of Smyrna", *Ancient Philosophy* 19, 77–86

——— 2002. *The Representation of the Divine in the* Posthomerica *of Quintus of Smyrna* PhD Dissertation Columbia University New York

West, D.A. 1969. "Multiple Correspondence Similes in the *Aeneid*", *JRS* 59, 40–49

——— 1990. *Virgil: The Aeneid. A New Prose Translation* Harmondsworth

West, D.A., and Woodman, T. eds 1979. *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* Cambridge

West, M.L. 1963. "On Nicander, Oppian, and Quintus of Smyrna", *CQ* 13, 57–62

——— 1969. "Echoes and Imitations of the Hesiodic Poems", *Philologus* 113, 1–9

West, M.L. ed. 1978. *Hesiod*: Works and Days Oxford

West, M.L. 1986. "Last Notes on Quintus of Smyrna", *Philologus* 130, 145–149

——— 1988. *Hesiod*: Theogony *and* Works and Days. *Translated with an Introduction* Oxford

West, M.L. ed. 1998. *Homeri* Ilias *recensuit / testimonia congessit Martin L. West*. Volumen prius *rhapsodias I–XII continens* Stuttgart

West, M.L. ed. 2000. *Homeri* Ilias *recensuit / testimonia congessit Martin L. West*: Volumen alterum, *rhapsodias XIII–XXIV et indicem nominum continens* Stuttgart and Leipzig

West, M.L. ed. 2003. *Greek Epic Fragments from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC. Edited and Translated* Cambridge MA

Wheeler, S.M. 1995. "*Imago Mundi*: Another View of the Creation in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*", *AJPh* 116, 95–121

Whitby, M. 1994. "From Moschus to Nonnus: The Evolution of the Nonnian Style", in Hopkinson 1994b.99–155

Whitman, J. ed. 2000. *Interpretation and Allegory: Antiquity to the Modern Period* Leiden

Whitmarsh, T. 2001. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation* Oxford

——— 2005. *The Second Sophistic* Oxford

Wifstrand, A. 1933. *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos: metrisch-stilistische Untersuchungen zur späteren griechischen Epik und zu verwandten Gedichtgattungen* Lund

Willcock, M.M. ed. 1978. *Homer* Iliad *I–XII. Edited with Introduction and Commentary* London

Willcock, M.M. ed. 1984. *The* Iliad *of Homer, Books XIII–XXIV. Edited with Introduction and Commentary* London

Willcock, M.M. 2001. "Mythological *Paradeigma* in the *Iliad*", in D.L. Cairns 2001.435–455

Williams, G. 1978. *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire* Berkeley

Williams, R.D. ed. 1972. *Virgil* Aeneid *I–VI. Edited with Introduction and Notes* London

Williams, R.D. ed. 1973. *Virgil* Aeneid *VII–XII: Edited with Introduction and Notes* London

Willis, W.H. 1941. "Athletic Contests in the Epic", *TAPhA* 72, 392–417

Wilson, D.L. ed. 1989. *Jefferson's Literary Commonplaces: The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* (*Second Series*) Princeton

Wyss, U. 1954. *Die Wörter auf -σύνη in ihrer historischen Entwicklung* Dissertation, University of Zürich

Yamagata, N. 1994. *Homeric Morality* Leiden

Zanker, G. 1994. *The Heart of Achilles: Characterization and Personal Ethics in the Iliad* Michigan

——— 2004. *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art* Wisconsin

Zeiner, N.K. 2005. *Nothing ordinary here: Statius as creator of distinction in the* Silvae. London

Ziegler, K. 1966. *Das Hellenistische Epos* (2nd Edition) Leipzig

GENERAL INDEX

INDEX LOCORUM