

University College London
Department of Greek and Latin

**Epic Journeys:
Studies in the Reception of the Hero and Heroism
in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica***

A thesis submitted to University College London
For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by

Bellini Boyten

September 2010

Declaration

I, Bellini Boyten confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

Thesis Abstract

Quintus scholarship has experienced something of a renaissance over the last decade. However, it is now seventy years since the last monograph that focused on the Homeric heroes of his epic (Mansur, 1940). It is time for a reappraisal and this thesis, which utilizes modern theoretical techniques and methodologies, seeks to meet this need. My study is predominantly concerned with the reception of the hero in Quintus' *Posthomerica*, but I also use these receptions to explore Quintus' epic poetics. Unlike Mansur, I explore not only Homer's heroes but also heroes that did not feature in the *Iliad*, including the narrator himself. In my *Introduction*, I consider central questions relating to Quintus and his poem; for instance, who was he? when was he working? did he have access to the *Epic Cycle*? and did he engage with Latin literature? A brief summary of my thesis chapters is also included.

The five chapters are sequenced in such a way as to suggest thematic developments in my study, and Quintus' work. Each chapter begins with a character study of the eponymous hero, I then view the characters as signifiers – embodiments of centrally important ideas, regarding epic and beyond. Chapter I: *Penthesileia* - after exploring Penthesileia's *aristeia*, I consider wider issues of women, gender and epic anomaly. Chapter II: *Achilleus* - I view Achilleus in action, as the model for *other* heroes and in reminiscence. Chapter III: *Nestor* – Nestor (with other *gerontes*, like Priam) becomes a paradigm for multiple meanings of 'diminishment', and traditional inter-generational degeneration is inverted. Chapter IV: *Neoptolemos* – Achilleus' son challenges the negative portrayals which dominated the tradition and shows himself to be more than a worthy heir both to Quintus' and to Homer's Achilleus. Chapter V: *Primary Narrator* - Quintus' Narrator reveals himself as poet-hero throughout. I explore his language, learnedness and character, as Neoptolemos' heir.

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor Chris Carey. Had I even '*eleven* tongues and *eleven* mouths', I would not be able to express my gratitude for the wonderful support that Professor Carey has given. This ranges from innumerable readings of drafts, to help with giving papers and publication. All of the way, I have been extremely fortunate to work with Professor Carey, who has been a patient inspiration. Should my thesis fly, this is largely due his epic support in supplying the wings.

Next, I would like to thank my friend, Adrian, for putting me up all those years ago, when my journey began from Brighton to Malet Street, and then Gower Street. His generosity was legendary, and Alcinous would be shamed by his hospitality.

I would like to thank my wife, Katrine, for all of the positive support that she has given me over the years. She has never lacked faith in me. To my young son, Isaac, I would like to apologize for being aloft in the loft sometimes too often. But, equally, I thank him for bringing me down to earth with the things that really matter.

Finally, it is with sadness that I note my one regret that my mother could not be here for this time. She showed great interest in my desire to learn and my studies, and realized, many years back, how Homer touched my heart. To her especially I dedicate my work.

Table of Contents

General Introduction: <i>Beginning the Journey</i>	7
Chapter I <i>Penthesileia: Death and the Maiden</i>	31
Part 1 - <i>Women at War: Engagement</i>	32
Part 2 - <i>A Woman's Place</i>	55
Part 3 - <i>Gender-Specific Lamentations</i>	67
Chapter II <i>Achilleus: The Epic Journeys of Achilleus</i>	81
Part 1 - <i>Achilleus' Death</i>	82
Part 2 - <i>Achilleus: the 'Driving' Force</i>	115
Part 3 - <i>Reconstructing Achilleus: Remembrance of Things Past</i>	127
Chapter III <i>Nestor: Dreams of Gerontius</i>	139
Part 1 - <i>The Gerenian Horseman</i>	140
Part 2 - <i>Gerontes: Decline and Fall</i>	150
Part 3 - <i>The 'Golden Age' of Heroes</i>	170
Chapter IV <i>Neoptolemos: On the Shoulders of Giants</i>	183
Part 1 - <i>More 'Parfit Gentil Knyght' than 'Hyrceanian Beast'</i>	184
Part 2 - <i>The Budding Hero</i>	205
Part 3 - <i>Superhero: His Father's Son?</i>	223
Chapter V <i>The Primary Narrator: Poet-Hero</i>	238
Part 1 - <i>Contact</i>	239
Part 2 - <i>Hearing Voices</i>	248
Part 3 - <i>Taking Centre Stage</i>	276
Conclusion: <i>Nostos</i>	285
Bibliography	290

Tables

1. Deaths of Patroklos and Hektor (<i>Iliad</i>)	85
2. Deaths of Penthesileia, Memnon and Eurypylos (<i>Posthomerica</i>)	85
3. Death of Achilleus (<i>Posthomerica</i>)	85-6
4. First Assault on Thebes	175
5. Interactional Particles	254-55

To my family, in all guises

General Introduction:

Beginning the Journey

The focus for my thesis is Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*. An important aim of my project is to explore Quintus' receptions of the hero. In four of my five chapters I begin with Quintus' characterization of key figures, and the models which he invokes by, and for, the construction of character(s). Thus, I explore Quintus' intertextual engagement with previous authors as well, especially Homer. The heroes are: Penthesileia, Achilleus, Nestor and Neoptolemos. The scope of my study, however, goes beyond the delineation of character. I also view the selected heroes as 'signifiers'¹ of wider phenomena, both intra- and meta-textual. For instance, I explore Penthesileia's character construction, and her portrayal as emblematic of Quintus' treatment of women and gender more generally. In this way I show how Quintus also makes use of the conventions of epic on a metapoetic level. This reading strategy is perhaps most apparent in my final chapter on the Primary Narrator, whom I (like Quintus) treat as a hero of sorts.

*Quintus' Reception*²

Quintus, like his heroes, has had a chequered past. Excluding references to the *Vision of Dorotheos*,³ no other ancient references to him survive. Eustathius and Tzetzes name him in the twelfth century, and in a thirteenth century scholium of the Geneva manuscript, he is cited as *Kointos ho poietes*, author of *Ta meth' Homerou*.⁴ Baumbach and Bär note that, "the text of the *Posthomerica* as such came down to us in some twenty manuscripts of which three put it between the Homeric epics."⁵ So, its Middle Age transmission - being

¹ For use of this term, see Saussure (2006), 74: "To signify means both to provide a sign with an idea and to provide an idea with a sign".

² For Quintus' reception, I make particular use of Baumbach and Bär (2007), 15-25.

³ See below, *Quintus in Context(s)*.

⁴ Schol. Gen. II. 2.119: 'You must know, then, that Achilleus finishes him [= Thersites] off, as Quintus the poet (my translation) reports in his *Posthomerica*', noted in Baumbach and Bär (2007), 15n.70. See *The Historical Author*, below.

⁵ Baumbach and Bär (2007), 16; see too their footnotes, 16ns.71 and 72, relating to transmission.

sandwiched between the Homeric epics - may indicate its status.⁶ From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment, the poem enjoyed positive attention. Equally, it is telling that Quintus' poem survived and flourished "through late antiquity to the Byzantine Middle Ages", surviving as "the only full-scale poetic narrative in Greek of the war's main events" (James, 2005, 364).⁷ The fifteenth-century Byzantine scholar Constantine Lascaris describes Quintus as consummately *Homerikotatos*: Quintus "was a very good poet and aimed to imitate Homer on a large scale by taking over everything from him, (...) which makes him look like a *perfect poet (teleion poieten)*. As he was so much like Homer (*Homerikotatos*), he wanted to do in a Homer-like way what had been left over by Homer from the *Iliad*."⁸ In the Renaissance world, such comments were not negative. Rather, they communicated Quintus' abilities as a worthy Homeric heir.⁹ Later, in the nineteenth century, Quintus was equally well received. For instance, Gottfried Hermann states that "Quintus' epic poem is the best after Homer's."¹⁰

Quintus' more recent reception was less positive. In the twentieth-century, Lloyd-Jones comments: "Among the late Greek epic poets Quintus is by far the worst,"¹¹ and that "the anaemic pastiche served up by Quintus is utterly devoid of life" (1969, 101; review of Combellack's translation). There have even been articles that overtly address his poetic merits, or lack of them, such as Schmidt's, 'Quintus von Smyrna – der schlechteste Dichter des Altertums?' (1999). Quintus' artistry has also been called into question. Keydell comments that Quintus shows "lack of imagination", and that his "style is determined by deficiency in linguistic creativity".¹²

⁶ Or, perhaps, its functional, rather than literary, qualities.

⁷ See *Quintus and the Epic Cycle*, below.

⁸ Baumbach and Bär (2007), 16 and 16n.74.

⁹ Quintus also alludes to his own ability to buck the epic trend of inter-generational degeneration, see Ch.III. Throughout my study, 'Ch'. refers to the Chapter; Parts *within that Chapter*, simply the number. So: Ch.I.1 = Chapter I, Part 1, etc.; just '1' = Part 1 of the Chapter, etc.

¹⁰ Hermann (1840), 257, cited in Baumbach and Bär (2007), 24; also positive comments of Paley (1876), 7, in Baumbach and Bär (2007), 24-25.

¹¹ As in Baumbach and Bär (2007), 23.

¹² Keydell (1963), 1293, as Baumbach and Bär, *ibid.* For further twentieth-century critiques, including Vian's, see Baumbach and Bär (2007), 24.

Recently, however, there seems to have been a positive shift in the way that Quintus is being received. An international conference on Quintus was held in Zurich in 2006,¹³ and its proceedings published the following year (Baumbach and Bär, 2007). Such attention is a rarity indeed, as the budding Quintus scholar will know – cast your eye through the *Index* of many texts of classical literary scholarship, and you will find a conspicuous gap between ‘Propertius’ and ‘Sallust’; if occupied by any ‘Qs’, it is far more likely to be Quintilian than Quintus; the same can be said for the learned shelves of classical libraries, where little more than half a dozen books on Quintus (including Vian’s set,¹⁴ and three or four translations), are sandwiched between the more accepted ‘heavyweights’. Thus Baumbach and Bär’s *Quintus Smyrnaeus: Transforming Homer in Second Sophistic Epic* (2007), is a welcome and much needed literary addition – as the ‘gap’ between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* needed filling, so too modern scholarship on Quintus. James and Lee published a commentary on *Posthomerica* V (2000); James published a new English translation (2004); Gärtner’s monograph on Quintus and Virgil (2005). In 2008, Carvounis completed her commentary on *Posthomerica* XIV, and, most recently, Bär published part of his thesis on *Posthomerica* I (2009).¹⁵ Thus Quintus is again experiencing something of a renaissance. This thesis locates itself firmly within the contemporary re-evaluation of Quintus, while offering a complementary line of research which focuses firmly on the hero.

Quintus in Context(s)

i) *The Historical Author*

Quintus is famously located in Smyrna (modern Izmir) on the West coast of Asia Minor on the basis of the autobiographical passage (*Post.* XII.306-13).¹⁶ The locale has poetic

¹³ In the Classical Association Annual Conference (Liverpool, 2008), Bär, Boyten, Carvounis and Maciver [panel organizer], focused on Quintus: ‘Quintus of Smyrna with and without Homer’.

¹⁴ His parallel texts (1963/2003; x3), *Recherchés* and *Manuscrite* (both 1959), and (with Battagay) *Lexique* (1984).

¹⁵ Also, Gärtner, Jahn and König (all 2009); Carvounis, Sánchez Hernández, and Maciver’s completed thesis on intertextual engagement in Quintus (all 2008).

¹⁶ This, and other aspects of *Quintus in Context(s)*, are discussed in Ch.V.

associations as one of the possible places of Homer's origin in the tradition;¹⁷ thus, reference to it aligns Quintus closely with Homer. However, it has also been plausibly suggested that reference to Smyrna may well be more than literary. James argues that the comment on topographical details serves little purpose beyond that of factual record, and that "they are at least compatible with the territory of Smyrna between the river Hermos and Mount Sipylus".¹⁸ However, on a metapoetic level, Quintus' claim that he was inspired 'on a hill that is not particularly high or low' (XII.13), has been interpreted as comment on his writing style, which "avoids extremes".¹⁹ Such a reading may well suit other metapoetic aspects from this passage, where similar Hesiodic (*Theo.* 22ff.) and Callimachean (*Ait.* 1.2) (as well as Homeric) passages are evoked.

Though stepping out of his narrative in this autobiographical passage, Quintus, as is traditional in ancient heroic poetry, withholds his name. "The manuscripts"²⁰ of the poem simply give its author's name as "Quintus," without further information."²¹ Two scholars from Constantinople in the twelfth century make the earliest datable references to 'Κόντρος': Eustathius in his commentaries on Homer (*Iliad* and *Odyssey*) contains six references,²² and Tzetzes in a variety of works, including his own *Posthomerica*, "a prosaic coverage of Quintus' subject matter in 780 faulty hexameters", twelve references.²³ In these, 'Quintus' is sometimes qualified by 'the poet' or 'of Smyrna'; the poet of the *Posthomerica* was also incorrectly referred to as 'Quintus of Calabria'. Also, the Latinized form for the Greek communicates the cultural climate in which 'Quintus' lived, but perhaps it also conveys a subtle allusion to his thoughts on that (cultural) time.²⁴

¹⁷ E.g. *The Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, 566-67 in Evelyn-White (2000); See Graziosi (2007), ch. 2, e.g. 76 n.77 and 83-5.

¹⁸ James (2004), xviii.

¹⁹ Hopkinson (1994), 106.

²⁰ See above, *Quintus' Reception*.

²¹ James (2004), xviii. The following points are also based on James' comments.

²² Eustathius, introduction to *Iliad*, A468 (136.4), B814 (352.2), 9501 (1608.1), λ546 (1698.48), λ592 (1702.11). See James & Lee (2000), 3-4.

²³ James and Lee (2000), 4; Tzetzes, *Post.* 10, 13, 282, 522, 584, 587; *Prooem in Iliadem* 482; schol. To Lycophron, *Alex.* 61, 1048; *Exeg. in Iliadem* p. 772.20 (Bachmann); *Chiliad.* 2.489f.; schol. To Tzetzes, *Post.* 282.

²⁴ See Hesiod (*Works*, 169c-78), on his unfortunate and declining iron (fifth) generation of men.

Quintus' date is significant because it has direct bearing on the poetic purpose. Two passages in the poem stand out as possible evidence.²⁵ In *Posthomerica* VI.532-36, reference is made to the use of wild beasts in the arena for public executions. Next, in XIII.336-41 it is noted that Aeneas is destined to go to the Tiber, and found a great city and empire. Both examples locate Quintus' work within Roman times. The latter reference may well indicate a *terminus ante quem* because the centre of power shifted to Constantinople in 330 AD. A work that Quintus could well have influenced, Triphiodoros' *Alois Iliou*, is dated no later than the mid-fourth century AD because of a papyrus fragment.²⁶ A *terminus post quem* of 180AD seems likely because Quintus appears indebted to Oppian's didactic *Halieutika* in two fishing similes (VII.569-75 and IX.172-77), and in a digression on a fisherman killed in battle (XI.56-5). The *Halieutika* is dated between 176-180 AD by its dedication to Marcus Aurelius and Commodus.

A papyrus codex that was published in 1984 could also help with Quintus' date.²⁷ In it is contained a Greek hexameter poem of approximately 630 lines. The piece is entitled *The Visions of Dorotheos*, and it claims to be an autobiographical record of a Christian's vision in 'the house of god'. Its story of persecution and punishment may be reference to persecutions in the early church. Its language is mainly Greek epic, with many words and phrases recalling Homer. However, at l.300 the author calls himself *Dorotheos Kuntiades*, 'Dorotheos, son of Quintus';²⁸ the Greek for Quintus is Kointos, thus Kuntiades is the Greek equivalent of the Latin Quintiades, 'son of Quintus' (presumably, 'Quintus' would have been a common name under the Empire, but these other factors noted above and following, though not necessarily conclusive, suggest a fairly persuasive argument for origin). This patronymic style is epic in nature, and perhaps alludes to the *Posthomerica* poet's focus. Furthermore, the following colophon occurs at the poem's end: 'the end of the vision of Dorotheos son of the poet Quintus'.

²⁵ See James (2004), xvii-xx.

²⁶ The *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 2946*, vol. 41 (1972), 9-10, James (2004), xxxvii n.7.

²⁷ *Bodmer Papyrus 29, Vision de Dorotheos* (1984), ed. Hurst, Reverdin, and Rudhart (James, 2004, xxxvii n.10.)

²⁸ Perhaps a 'gift', indeed, considering the lack of evidence.

Although the editors of the text note similarities between its poetic diction and that of the *Posthomerica* (this could be attributed to imitation of a number of works), there is a marked similarity between Dorotheos' statement, ἐν στήθεσσιν ἀοιδῆν/ παντοίην ἐνέηκε, 'he filled my breast with poetry' (340-41), and Quintus' 'autobiographical' passage: ἕμεϊς γὰρ πᾶσάν μοι ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θήκατ' ἀοιδῆν, 'you were the ones who filled my breast with poetry' (*Post.* XII.308).²⁹ A Dorotheos is mentioned a number of times in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* (VII.32.2-4, VIII.1.4, 6.1-5). He became priest in Antioch c. 290 AD, was learned in Greek and Hebrew, and found imperial favour until Diocletian's persecutions (303-11: he was tortured to death). So we can conclude with some confidence that this is probably 'our' Quintus.³⁰

Quintus' poem is entitled τὰ μετ' Ὅμηρον or τὰ μετὰ τὸν Ὅμηρον, 'the things after Homer' (more commonly now simply, *Posthomerica*). Eustathius (c. twelfth-century AD) notes that this title is used in a scholium to the *Iliad*.³¹ Moreover the title reflects the copyists' practice of placing the text between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.³² As with the poet's name, then, we do not have a definitive title, rather the poem became known as the above. This is not to say, that Quintus had not, in fact, entitled his poem thus; simply, that we do not know.³³ An actual title would have helped clarify Quintus' intention, perhaps. Yet, the assumed title does show that it was seen as a piece that naturally continued on from Homer.³⁴

ii) *Ambition*

In outline, Quintus' narrative covers the story of the Fall of Troy - beginning where the *Iliad* ends (Hektor's funeral), and ending where the *Odyssey* begins (Odysseus' Trojan departure). It is filled with many of the same characters (e.g. Achilles) and themes (the

²⁹ On possible Hesiodic allusion (*Theogony*, 22, and 31-32), see James and Lee (2000), 8-9.

³⁰ More firmly James concludes, "Accordingly the activity of Quintus can be securely dated in the second half of the third century A.D." (2004), xxi.

³¹ See Vian (2003), Vol. I, vii-viii; on Quintus' title, see too Köchly (1850) 1, and Appel (1994c) 2-4, as noted in Baumbach and Bär (2007), 1.

³² James (2005), 364-65; (2000), 1.

³³ However, the tacit limitation of 'Homer' to the *Iliad* in the received title makes one hesitate.

³⁴ See esp. Ch.V1.1-2, for the exceptionally close relationship between the *Iliad*'s end/*Posthomerica*'s beginning, and *Posthomerica*'s end/*Odyssey*'s beginning.

Trojan War, role of the gods, and pursuit of glory, etc.). The poem thus appears a natural and purposeful link between the two Homeric works. This, in itself, is extremely important. In form, the poem sits comfortably alongside Homer, and one could think of it almost as the third Homeric epic, because it bridges the gap between both Homeric works. Although it covers the chronological divide between the Homeric epics, to think of the *Posthomeric* as a mere ‘filler’ would be to overlook a simple but crucial fact. Even in a cultured age, composing thousands of hexameters is an arduous task. Had Quintus simply wanted to cover the *story* linking the end of the *Iliad* with the beginning of the *Odyssey*, he could have chosen a more compressed form, such as that used by Ovid in his *Metamorphoses*, or Apollodorus/ Pseudo-Apollodorus’ mythographic *Library*. While there is an unmistakable episodic structure to the *Posthomeric*,³⁵ Quintus’ choice of subject and genre (like Virgil, but more so)³⁶ and (for all the differences) the monumental scale of the composition align him extremely closely with Homer. This is a large and bold project. In addition, Quintus also makes abundant use of Homeric compositional techniques, from epic hexameter and Homeric characterization, to type-scenes (such as arming, and individual and group laments). So, Quintus’ ‘Homeric’ narrative coverage and manner of coverage overtly reveal his self-conscious effort to align himself with Homer, the ‘Poet’. Thus perceived, the poem communicates Quintus’ ambition to do more than add some interim narrative information. In a sense, it exploits Homer himself as a signifier, not only of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, their characters, narratives and themes, but also as the paradigm of literary excellence. Such alignment also impacts on the later poet himself.³⁷

However, although Homer is the dominant influence through whom Quintus conveys his heroes and narratives, the different genres through which his characters and themes were filtered in the centuries which intervened between Homer and Quintus, mean that other intermediary texts inevitably impact on his presentation of character and context. Again this is more than just an issue of narrative content. The poetic tradition came to Quintus

³⁵ See *The Epic Cycle and Quintus* below.

³⁶ Although written in epic hexameter, with many Trojan War heroes and similar heroic themes, the *Aeneid* was composed in Latin, and its central focus is Aeneas, his adventures *post* Trojan War and Rome.

³⁷ In this regard, it is also helpful to bear in mind Virgil and his *Aeneid*.

mediated by the major figures from the Hellenistic period. In Quintus' overt learnedness (e.g. allusion to other literatures, and, indeed, his own composition) and tone (e.g. predominance of indirect speech in epic, and gnomic asides),³⁸ he strongly evokes Hellenistic writers like Callimachus and Apollonius and their approaches to literature. In this way, Quintus is writing an 'Homeric' epic for a modern, highly literate/educated audience. Again, this has implications for our perception of the author, who can himself be understood to be a hybrid of sorts – Homeric, and *beyond*. 'Beyond' implies not only literary legacy, but is also to be understood in a qualitative sense³⁹ (although quantitative aspects also apply).⁴⁰

Quintus sometimes wears his learning lightly, not only in his relatively high (compared to Homer) frequency of gnomic utterances, but also in the manner of his narrative which seems to be episodic. His narrative sequence may echo the *Cycle*,⁴¹ but the apparent 'self-containedness' of each book means that they can be read as mini-stories in themselves. In this Quintus perhaps aligns himself with the Hellenistic considerations of Callimachus.⁴² While dismissing the *Cycle* (*Ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν*, 'I hate the cyclic poem' [*Epi.* XXX.1]),⁴³ Callimachus still champions a narrative manner which allows the big poem (*mega biblion mega kakon* oversimplifies his views) but builds it by a series of finely honed incidents united by theme (e.g. *Ait.* I). His highly allusive, learned and protean style, epitomized, in many ways, the multifariousness of Hellenistic literature (see the *Iambi*). Something of Callimachus' approach to composition, which defies simple categorization, is apparent throughout the *Posthomerica*; for instance also in the numerous 'voices' of Quintus' narrator.⁴⁴

³⁸ See, esp. Ch.V.

³⁹ This sense of progression is a central concern in each of my studies.

⁴⁰ On Quintus' penchant for excess, see, esp. 'Ch.II.1.

⁴¹ See *The Epic Cycle and Quintus* below.

⁴² On Callimachus, see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), esp. chs. 2 and 5; also Hunter (2006); Hutchinson (1997), ch. 2; Cameron (1995); *OCD* (2003), 276-77.

⁴³ For Callimachus' *Hymns* and *Epigrams*, I follow the translation and numbering of A. Mair (1955); for the *Aitia*, Trypanis (1989)

⁴⁴ See esp. Ch.V.

But, as I argue in Chapter II, the *Posthomerica* is not without its own form of cohesion. Unity is attributed to the *Iliad* because of the unifying theme of Achilles' *menis*.⁴⁵ Yet, Quintus' Achilles also acts as a cohesive force, dominating the first five books, and then re-emerging especially as Neoptolemos (as I discuss in Chapter IV), and a host of other heroes throughout. Thus, like Callimachus, Quintus 'plays' with epic forms and genres, and in true Hellenistic style, offers novel renderings of established forms. I also show that assumptions are made on Quintus' part, with reference to the learnedness of his readers (a Hellenistic trait). This is apparent from the high degree of allusivity throughout. Yet the text can be appreciated on a more superficial level, too, as, simply, the "the only full-scale poetic narrative in Greek of the war's main events"⁴⁶ (this in itself, also marks their importance) - that is, from the end of the *Iliad* to the beginning of the *Odyssey*.

Above I have discussed aspects of Quintus' ambition, regarding Homer and later writers, and noted the narrative coverage associated with Homer. However, in view of the narrative content one cannot ignore the importance of the *Epic Cycle* in Quintus' project.

The Epic Cycle and Quintus

Quintus covers the narrative of the *Trojan Cycle*,⁴⁷ the Trojan War 'stories' that constitute part of the so-called *Epic Cycle*. The *Trojan Cycle* consisted of eight poems including the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.⁴⁸ Much of the story covered in the *Cypria* (from Zeus conferring with Themis about the Trojan War, and Peleus and Thetis' ill-starred wedding, to the seduction of Helen and Greek expedition to Troy) deals with events leading up to the *Iliad*. The poems which cover the narrative following on from the end of the *Iliad* to just before the beginning of the *Odyssey* are as follows (number of books based on Proklos'

⁴⁵ See Aristotle, *Poet.* 1459a-b, and 1451a.

⁴⁶ James (2005), 364.

⁴⁷ On Quintus and the *Epic Cycle*, see James (2004), xvii-xxi. On the *Epic Cycle*, Burgess (2005; 2001); West (2003), 2-4; *OCD* (2003), 531; Davies (2001), 1-10. Also helpful are Griffin (1977), and Willcock (1997).

⁴⁸ In sequence: *Cypria*, *Iliad*, *Aithiopsis*, *Ilias Mikra*, *Iliou Persis*, *Nostoi*, *Odyssey*, *Telegony*. See the *OCD* (2003), 531.

summaries are in brackets):⁴⁹ *Aithiopsis* (5); *Ilias Mikra*, ‘Little Iliad’ (4); *Iliou Persis*, ‘Sack of Ilion’ (2); *Nostoi*, ‘Returns’ (5).

Subdivisions of individual Cyclic books are as follows (with *Posthomeric* coverage). I make use of West’s numberings for the *Cycle*,⁵⁰ and these numberings reflect cyclic sequence.⁵¹

i) *Aithiopsis* (five books): Penthesileia’s arrival, *aristeia*; and death at the hands of Achilles (*Aith.* Arg.1; *Post.* I); the same for Memnon (*Aith.* Arg.2; *Post.* II); Achilles’ death (*Aith.* Arg.3; *Post.* III); Funeral Games for Achilles (*Aith.* Arg.4; *Post.* IV) and the beginning of the *Hoplōn Krisis* (*Aith.* Arg.4; *Post.* V);

ii) *Ilias Mikra* (four books): awarding of arms, and Aias’ suicide (*Il. M.* Arg.1; *Post.* V); recruitment of Neoptolemos (from Skyros)/ arrival and *aristeia* of Neoptolemos (*Il. M.* Arg.3; *Post.* VII)/ death of Eurypylos (by Neoptolemos) (*Il. M.* Arg.3; *Post.* VIII); the Wooden Horse (*Il. M.* Arg.5; *Post.* XII);

iii) *Iliou Persis* (two books): Sack of Troy (*Il. P.* Arg.2; *Post.* XIII) – including deaths of Priam (by Neoptolemos); sacrifice of Polyxena (*Il. P.* Arg.4; *Post.* XIV);

iv) *Nostoi* (five books): departure of the Greeks (*Il. P.* Arg.3; *Nost.* 3)/ destruction of Greek Wall (and many Greeks because of the lesser Aias’ sacrilege [rape of Cassandra at Athene’s altar])/ scattering of surviving Greeks (including Odysseus) (*Il. P.* Arg. 2; *Post.* XIV).

Closer analysis reveals further elements that ‘match’ Quintus’ (such as the recruitment of Philoktetes, and appearance of Achilles’ ghost). But this is not the point. The episodes, self-contained mini-narratives, generally dictate those covered by Quintus, in terms of

⁴⁹ Proklos notes the number of *Trojan Cycle* books (and authors). See West (2003): *Aith.*, pp. 110-11; *Ilias Mikra*, pp. 120-21; *Iliou Persis*, pp. 142-43; *Nostoi*, pp.154-55.

⁵⁰ West (2003).

⁵¹ The *Cypria* is also relevant but for *epanalepsis*: West *Cyp.* Args.1-12.

chronology and subject. This would suggest engagement with the *Cycle* in some form on Quintus' part; and, therefore, that, as a narrative (and possibly more)⁵² Quintus considered them significant.

Aligning Quintus with the *Cycle* on specific areas is fraught with difficulties, however, precisely because so little is known of the details of the cyclic narratives. It has been argued that by the Hellenistic period (third-century BC) artists referring to the *Cycle* were probably already using summaries.⁵³ Yet there is reason to believe that at least some writers working in the second-century AD had access to the poems; e.g. Pausanias (*fl. c.* 160 AD):

‘That Palamedes was drowned on a fishing expedition, and that Diomedes was the one who killed him with Odysseus, I know from reading it in the epic *Cypria* (*ἐπιλεξάμενος ἐν ἔπεσιν οἶδα τοῖς Κυπρίοις*).’ (Pausanias, X.31.2)⁵⁴

The third-century AD may have great significance as far as Quintus is concerned. It has been argued that it is at approximately this time that the *Cycle* disappeared.⁵⁵ Furthermore, it was during this period that the Library in Alexandria was destroyed (272 AD). If the *Cycle* was no longer available, this might have contributed to a sense of the need for preservation, or, perhaps more accurately, re-creation – particularly as an indication of Greek cultural presence during the Empire.

The extreme scarcity of Cyclic papyri suggests that the *Cycle* was not in wide circulation by the Roman period. This reflects a comparative (re-)evaluation of Homer and the *Cycle* which begins at least as early as the fourth-century BC. In his fourth-century BC *Poetics*, Aristotle challenges the literary merits of episodic narratives:

⁵² I return to this point below.

⁵³ So West (2003), 4.

⁵⁴ Tr. West (2003), *Cyp.* fr.27.

⁵⁵ James (2004), xix-xx.

‘So in this respect, too, compared with all other poets Homer may seem ... divinely inspired, in that even with the Trojan war, which has a beginning and an end, he did not endeavour to dramatize it as a whole ... As it is, he takes one part of the story only and uses many incidents from other parts ... the others, on the contrary, all write about a single hero or about a single period or about a single action with a great many parts, the authors, for example, of the *Cypria* and the *Little Iliad*.’ (*Poetics*, 1459a-b)⁵⁶

Hellenistic writers, like Callimachus,⁵⁷ also express criticisms of the episodic narratives. Thus, it can be seen that many years before Quintus, limitation and rejection of cyclic narratives were voiced. This is relevant, because it indicates some reason for their diminished circulation and scarcity, some six hundred or so years later, in the third-century AD.

But, it is evident that, in *some* form, Quintus had access to Cyclic material; it is the precise form(s) of the Cyclic material that is the enigma, though, not only for Quintus scholarship (of course, this need not necessarily be restricted to text, as other art forms, such as iconography, conveyed Cyclic episodes, and it had been thoroughly covered in tragedy).⁵⁸ Baumbach and Bär note, in reference to Quintus and the *Epic Cycle* that, “we do not know with certainty whether these texts were still accessible or already (partially) lost in the third century A.D.”⁵⁹ The poem did not need to have disappeared completely; it might simply be that the long-term lack of demand (evidenced in the lack of papyrus fragments) had resulted in limited availability of texts. Then again, it may simply be that the *Epic Cycle* could be found but was no longer read, thus offering Quintus an opportunity - and an adventure, if he was addressing a narrative sequence he knew not to be popular.

⁵⁶ Unless otherwise stated, I use Fyfe’s translation for the *Poetics* (1953).

⁵⁷ See *Ambition*, above,

⁵⁸ See Gantz (1996), esp. chs. 16 and 17; on the visual arts, Scherer (1964); Woodford (1998); Carpenter (1996), esp. ch. 9.

⁵⁹ Baumbach and Bär (2007), 1.

In order to get a clearer idea of Quintus' project, it is worth revisiting once more the question of date. If, as now commonly believed, Quintus worked in the third century AD, he is not 'merely'⁶⁰ bridging the gaps between the Homeric poems, he is also substituting the 'missing' (if not literally, then metaphorically) corpus – the *Cycle*. There are further reasons for such composition during this period. Epic genre represents an ancient Greek voice under the Roman Empire. So, in this sense, renewed interest in the Cycle indicates a cultural presence, and reaffirmation of Greek primacy.⁶¹ Unlike Homer, Quintus shows a certain partisanship for the Greeks, as Virgil had for the Trojans; for instance, Quintus' 'hapless' (*dusammoron*) Sinon appears the victim to barbaric Trojans (*Post.* XII.360-73; cf. *Aen.* II.73ff.), and his Neoptolemos is far less 'degenerate' with Priam than Virgil's Pyrrhus (*Post.* XIII.213-50; *Aen.* II.526-58).⁶²

Epic Journeys

Quintus' characters come to him with a long history, and are mainly recognizable in that they bear many similarities to their Homeric counterparts. Quintus most often conveys their essences through recourse to the Homeric prototypes; for example, defining characteristics (Achilleus as 'angry'; Odysseus as 'wily'; Nestor as old), type-scenes (duels; laments), and motifs (arming), strongly suggests certain heroes. Of course (as with inscription in vase-painting), 'labelling' (= naming) is the key identifier. The poem is saturated with such examples, dealing with (as Homer) the Trojan War, and its heroes. However, Quintus also tampers with these configurations, not only with regard to characters who echo 'themselves' (e.g. earlier representations of that same hero), but also of those where a hero evokes a *different* hero (e.g. Quintus' Penthesileia recalling Homer's Hektor).⁶³

In its simplest form, taking Achilleus as an example, Quintus' Achilleus can recall his Homeric counterpart (as expected, most usually (though not exclusively) this applies to the Iliadic Achilleus). Name initially marks both 'Achilleuses' as the 'same' hero; yet similar

⁶⁰ See *Ambition*, above.

⁶¹ See 'Second Sophistic' below.

⁶² For detailed discussion, see Ch.IV.1.3-5.

⁶³ See Ch.I.1.1.

action, speech and description further reinforce their oneness. Though we know this is not Homer's Achilles, it is still Achilles; the close similarities between these models create the illusion that this is the same Achilles (and indeed, Homer's Achilles, at times). This has important implications for the text and poet, too. Quintus' Achilles may also evoke *other* Homeric heroes, and, indeed, other literatures, and figures in literature, and so on.⁶⁴ In principle, this can also be applied to groups; for instance a type-scene, such as group laments, that could evoke the same in Homer (the *Iliad*), though the context (and characters) may well be very different. In Chapter I, I show this to be the case, with recourse not only to Homeric laments, but also to laments from the Greek tragedians. Such reconfigurations, not only of Homer, but also of intervening post-Homeric models, are central to Quintus' poetic technique. It is the complex interplay between these various models (characters) and texts (narratives) that give the *Posthomerica* its high degree of allusivity.

Finally, it is also worth considering that marked similarity between works is not the only way that authors can engage with other texts. Equally effective can be a deviation from a model to show engagement; for instance, in an arming-scene involving Penthesileia,⁶⁵ Quintus' deviation from the Homeric norm (substituting the double-sided axe for the more conventional spear) is not suggestive of ignorance on the receiver's part. Rather, it conveys his familiarity with the earlier model. In this I am not suggesting that in each different version there is necessarily a connexion or knowledge. Instead, each case should be judged individually.⁶⁶

This is perhaps an appropriate moment to add a word of caution. Quintus was writing almost a millennium after the monumental composition of the Homeric poems, and he lived in a rhetorical age. In this context it is over-simplistic to begin from questions of

⁶⁴ E.g. as I discuss in Ch.II.1: after his killing by Apollo, Achilles is lamented, like the Iliadic Patroklos, for his 'gentleness'; so too, his ghostly demand for Polyxena echoes Euripides' *Hekabe*; and his ghostly warning to Neoptolemos recalls Herakles' warning to Neoptolemos in Sophocles' *Philoktetes*; see Ch.IV.1.3.

⁶⁵ See Ch.I.1.4ii.

⁶⁶ See James (2007). See below, *Quintus and Rome*.

representational realism and psychological insight.⁶⁷ When I explore Quintus' heroes, I view them on the terms that make sense of his work: Quintus, as I hope to show, is predominantly interested with the *effects* of the reception of his heroes, for instance, in evoking earlier texts and models, and communicating ideas; so, how 'realistic'/'believable' his characters are is of secondary importance. I am more interested, accordingly, in exploring the reception of the hero and heroism in Quintus on these grounds, as signifiers, not those of 'realism'.⁶⁸

Quintus and Rome

For anyone composing Trojan War epic under the Empire Homer's was not the only shadow; there was another, Virgil. James comments: "It seems to have been unusual, in spite of widespread bilingualism and overwhelming influence of Greek literature on Latin, for a Greek to make creative use of Latin poetry." This, and Quintus' perceived merits (or lack of them),⁶⁹ are the key reasons why it has often been considered that Quintus would *not* have engaged with Latin literature.

Vian (1959;⁷⁰ 1963, 1966, 1969) argued that Virgil and Quintus made use of 'hypothetical lost sources'.⁷¹ Thus, any similarities were not based upon Quintus making use of Virgil directly. In his commentary on *Posthomerica* XII (the 'Wooden Horse' episode), M. Campbell (1981) follows Heinze⁷² and Vian, concerning engagement with Latin sources. Gärtner's monograph on the use of Virgil in the Greek literature under the Empire (2005), explores possible engagement (similarities, for instance in Priam's death-scene); she notes that her findings are inconclusive – it is not clear whether Quintus made use of Latin sources. Keydell (1931),⁷³ argued that Quintus *was* directly influenced by Virgil; for instance Quintus' use of the *testudo* (*Post.* XI.359-64) recalling the same in Virgil (*Aen.*

⁶⁷ Cf. Homer's Achilles; on which, see Zanker (1997), esp. chs 3 and 4; also, Nethercut (1976), which inspired my title.

⁶⁸ On characterization, Pelling (1990); Gill (1998), on Platonic and Aristotelian views, 99-107.

⁶⁹ The author does not agree with this. See *Quintus' Reception*.

⁷⁰ Vian (1959), 17-109.

⁷¹ Erbse (1971), 567-68, quoted by James (2007), 148.

⁷² Heinze (1915), 63-91, as noted in James (2007), 146.

⁷³ James (2007), 147.

IX.505-18). There is convincing logic in Erbse's review of Vian's 1969 Bude edition of the *Posthomeric*: "The burden of proof rests with anyone who argues that Virgil could have been ignored by an epic poet of Quintus' time who treated the fall of Troy."⁷⁴ Regarding Quintus' engagement with Rome,⁷⁵ I consider possible correspondences in my studies on Penthesileia (Ch.I), Neoptolemos (Ch.IV), and the Primary narrator (Ch.V); for instance, the manner and response evoked by Penthesileia's/Camilla's initial battle charge: *women* marvel (*thaumazon*,⁷⁶ *Post.* I.404; *miratur*, *Aen.* VII.813). Both ride their horses into battle (*Post.* I.171; *Aen.* VII.804), and are killed on them (*Post.* I.612; *Aen.* XI.827); function to activate warring responses from other women (thus explore gender boundaries; *Post.* I.403-48; *Aen.* XI.891-95).⁷⁷ Similarly, both are faulted in their over-estimation of their fighting abilities – they both promise to face the mightiest opponents (Achilleus and Aeneas) alone (*hupescheto*, **mega phroneous*', *Post.* I.93ff.; **audeo* ...⁷⁸ *promitto* ... *solaque* ... *contra*, *Aen.* XI.502-04). The prominence of an unusual weapon in Penthesileia's arming scene is also noteworthy. Quintus follows the Homeric arming motifs closely in terms of objects and sequence: greaves, breastplate, sword, shield, helmet.⁷⁹ However, whereas Homer caps each of the four arming scenes with the spear(s), Quintus gives Penthesileia an *amphitupon bouplega*, a 'double-sided axe' (*Post.* I.159); this exotic weapon has meanings within the text as it conveys Penthesileia's 'otherness' (foreign, woman, female warrior, etc.).⁸⁰ Such an unusual weapon, given such profile marks the object and its wielder: double-sided axe + battling female = Amazon Queen (Penthesileia). The equation maps easily onto Virgil: double-sided axe + battling female = Volscian Queen (Camilla), where Camilla's weapon is a *bipennem* (*Aen.* XI.651). In the *Aeneid*, Virgil also tells us, ironically, that Camilla is modeled on the Amazons (*Aen.*

⁷⁴ James (2007, 148), quotes Erbse (1971), 567-68.

⁷⁵ See James for Quintus and Virgil (2007), 149-57; James and Lee for Quintus and Ovid (2000), esp. 80-82, 91-93.

⁷⁶ There is a possible pun here: *thaumazon*/ Amazon; this is given significance through context on a number of levels: on the page, *gunaikes* immediately precedes *thaumazon*, and, in the story, the women are 'amazed' by the Amazon.

⁷⁷ War = men's work/ wool and distaff = women's work is used in connexion with both (*Post.* I.445-46; *Aen.* VII.805-07), although this has an obvious precedent in Hektor's famous lines to Andromache (*Il.* VI.490-94).

⁷⁸ *mega phroneous*' 'too much desire' and *audeo* 'I dare' are also particularly noteworthy, and they convey the idea of pride.

⁷⁹ *Iliad* III.330ff., XI.17ff., XVI.131ff. and XIX.369ff.

⁸⁰ See Cartledge (1993), esp., chs. 1-5.

XI.648-63). In this context, the irony is that Penthesileia passes through a Latin intermediary to become, again, her Greek self.

Priam's death-scene is another case in point (*Post.* XII.213-50). Priam's meeting with Neoptolemos, in this episode, clearly evokes that between Priam and Achilles from *Iliad* XXIV. Virgil's engagement with the same Iliadic scene further complicates the allusion (*Aen.* II.). However, various aspects link the versions: recourse to Priam's ill-fate (*kakon*, *Post.* XIII.250; *fatorum, sorte*, *Aen.* II.554, 555); reference to seeing the burning of Troy (*Post.* XIII.232-33; *Aen.* II.554-55); Priam's fall from greatness – 'once lord of so many tribes and lands, the Monarch of Asia'⁸¹ (*Aen.* II.556-57)/ '(Priam's) wealth and lineage and his numerous offspring'⁸² (*Post.* XIII.246). A strong contrast is drawn between Priam's present state (dead), and that of the prosperity of his past. In this there are further similarities. Both episodes note Priam's decapitation (*Post.* XIII.241-45; *Aen.* II.558); although Virgil does not include description of the actual decapitation itself.

I make a similar case for Roman influence in the Primary Narrator (Ch.V), including reference to the Empire (*Post.* XIII.336-41; cf. *Aen.* I.286-88), the *testudo* passage (*Post.* XI.359-64; *Aen.* II.438-68, IX.505-18) and the Games (VI.531-36). For these and the above reasons, I consider Quintus to be directly engaging with Virgil, Latin literature, and Rome in some form.

Methods, Approaches and Aims

As noted, Quintus has had his fair share of criticism. And, while there seems to be a very healthy interest now in Second Sophistic in general,⁸³ and also in Quintus' work,⁸⁴ there has not been a substantial study of Quintus' characters since M. Mansur (1940). These

⁸¹ Unless otherwise stated, I follow Fairclough's translation of the *Aeneid* (1920 and 1960).

⁸² Unless otherwise stated, I follow James' translation of the *Posthomerica* (2004).

⁸³ The so-called 'Second Sophistic' (c. 50AD-250AD) marked a resurgence in expressing Greek cultural identity. On the Second Sophistic and being Greek under the Empire, see, Whitmarsh (2008), ch. 7, (2008); Goldhill (2001); Swain (1996); *OCD* (2003), 1377. On Quintus and the Second Sophistic, see Baumbach and Bär (2007), *Introduction*, especially 8-15; also, in the same volume, Schubert, 339-55; Hadjittofi, 357-78; Shorrock, 379-91; Usener, 393-409.

⁸⁴ See *Quintus' Reception* above.

character studies, however, are very brief, and Mansur focuses on Homeric characters only. Vian considers Quintus' reception of heroes, especially in his *Recherchés sur les Posthomeric de Quintus de Smyrne* (Paris, 1959) and his three volume edition of the poem, *Quintus de Smyrne, La suite d'Homere* (Paris, respectively 1963, 1966, 1969; repr. 2003). Again, the character studies are very brief, and Vian concentrates more on possible Quellenforschung.

My research differs from the above in important ways. I extend the scope of Mansur, by exploring characters that do not feature in Homer or appear only indirectly or in passing (namely, Penthesileia and Neoptolemos; I also analyze Quintus' use of the Primary Narrator), and expanding the depth of analysis. I further extend the scope of Mansur's work, by applying more modern theoretical approaches.⁸⁵ Unlike Vian, I am more interested in the *dynamics* of reception than in the identification of possible sources; although this does not mean that I necessarily preclude the consideration of sources, if I believe such analysis beneficial to my studies.

Within the focus of heroism in Quintus, two overriding themes unite my research: how heroes are appropriated, and the impact of this reception. The former entails consideration of the methods that Quintus uses to evoke such characters; and the latter, what the effects of these receptions are, and possible reasons why? Here, I challenge the way that Quintus himself has been largely received, arguing that (as many other more 'acceptable' classical authors) his work is highly allusive, and, as such, benefits from, and indeed requires, consideration of these factors to be better appreciated.

In each chapter I take the reception of a specific hero as the initial focus, and then consider themes associated with them. In this way, I am exploring each hero as 'signifier', a representation of a hero, but also much more. So, for instance, in my chapter on Quintus' reception of Penthesileia, initially I explore *how* (models and methods made use of in her reception) and to *what effect* (dynamics produced by such receptions) she is characterized.

⁸⁵ Such as narratology, and intertextual readings. On modern literary theory and ancient texts, see Schmitz (2007a).

As a female warrior, a key consideration of Penthesileia's characterization is the question of gender within (and without) epic. Next, I extend this scope by exploring women more generally in the *Posthomerica*. As traditional modifiers of heroism, they should reinforce gender stereotypes (e.g. women *should* stay at home, and not fight), and therefore the actual convention of epic, yet Quintus uses them to challenge these very conventions. I then explore the implications of Quintus' treatment of women for the presentation of men in the *Posthomerica* also: in this sense, Quintus' exploration of gender in epic embodies a highly allusive approach to epic itself, and, indeed, the art of its construction. Through this method, I hope to show how close readings of characters in Quintus convey his approach to (and challenge of) epic, and poetics. This is why I view it as helpful to explore the characters as signifiers – the specific conveys the general. I examine models, to consider Quintus' exploration of models. In this respect, too, my research expands significantly on previous studies of character in Quintus.

Though my theme is not narrative as such, I make extensive use of narratological methods in my research. I use this methodology because it is through analysis of the manner of Quintus' telling, that his characters, and therefore interests, can better be appreciated. In this context, I make use especially of S. Richardson's (1990), and de Jong's (1987, 1997a, 2004a)⁸⁶ narratological studies on Homer, and Hunter's study on Apollonius Rhodius (2004). I apply such readings throughout, for instance in exploring Quintus' approach to narration, e.g. his use of focalization (Ch.I, Andromache's concern for Penthesileia), internal and external analepses and prolepses (Ch.II, Achilles' 'biography'), and the poet's voice (Ch.V, the Primary Narrator's dominant voice).

I also explore Quintus' engagement with tropes of the epic genre, for instance arming scenes (Ch.I, Penthesileia, which strongly evokes such scenes in the *Iliad*), laments (Ch.I, male and female laments, evoking Iliadic and tragic laments), and duels (Ch.I: Achilles and Penthesileia, strongly reminiscent of the Iliadic duel between Achilles and Hektor; and, similarly, Ch.II, Achilles and Memnon). Furthermore, I make use of inter-

⁸⁶ And, therefore, Genette (1983).

/intratextual readings throughout my studies.⁸⁷ This is a fundamental aspect of my approach, and, although (as noted above) my focus is not on literary source, I show that evocation of certain models, texts and authors (including those actually *in* the *Posthomeric*, too) has a profound impact on the characterization of the heroes in the *Posthomeric*.

Summary

Chapter I: *Penthesileia*

Initially, I look at Penthesileia, Amazon Queen and Hektor's replacement. Quintus uses the heroine to explore issues of gender. Traditionally, war is the male preserve, so her presence can be understood to have multiple meanings in the text. Based on Homer's Hektor in many ways, Penthesileia is also striking as the *femme fatale*. Her presence threatens not only Achilles' masculine heroism, but also the social structure through her impact on women *en masse*. I explore Penthesileia's characterization (especially through her battle with Achilles). Then, I consider further facets of her characterization, such as her arming-scene, where this type-scene recalls Homer, but with important differences. This can be understood to represent her 'otherness'. I then extend my study to view gender issues more widely; for instance the Tisiphone/Theano episode (*Post.* I.404-76), arguing that the anomaly, Penthesileia, impacts upon the text in a broader sense, as Quintus uses her presence to explore gender issues. This study is further extended as I show a continuation of this trend through analysis of, this time, the male in Quintus, and, specifically, his tendency for lament where previously, e.g. *Iliad*, this sphere was largely occupied by the female. Thus, I argue, Penthesileia's presence and its consequences can be understood in a wider context as exploration not only of, *and challenge to*, gender, but also with regards to other forms of convention, including genre itself.

Chapter II: *Achilleus*

Achilleus poses different problems for Quintus. This huge Homeric figure threatens to dominate any text in which he figures, as he does the battlefield. Quintus conveys the

⁸⁷ See Sharrock (2000), ch.1; Hinds (1998); Pucci (1995); Martindale (1993).

magnitude of his heroic reputation through extremes in his characterization; for instance, much reference is made to Achilles' gigantic size. Such amplification extends to his unusually protracted and violent death-scene - Achilles continues to kill even whilst dying. Achilles' 'end' takes on further meaning, as it is something that not even Homer achieves.⁸⁸ Achilles' impact is great indeed, as Quintus chooses to focus on his Homeric ferocity as his essential characteristic; this is brought to the fore through amplifying the trait. Quintus' Achilles thus loses his Iliadic complexity, although his 'essence' is entirely recognizable. Having established his Achilles, I show how Quintus' Achilles impacts on other pre-eminent heroes in the *Posthomeric* (e.g. Memnon, Neoptolemos, Aias). It becomes clear that Quintus' received model is internalized, and then employed as a type of heroic archetype to characterize his other heroes. Thus, Quintus reconfigures *the* Homeric hero, and signifier of Homer and the *Iliad*, again engaging with and challenging the earlier model. Through such reconfiguring, it can be understood that Quintus himself explicitly engages with early epic in the most overt of ways, firmly locating himself within the genre via the most pointed marker of Homeric 'epic-ness'. This also applies in Ch.V, where I show that Quintus stakes further claim to Achilles in his portrayal of a substantial amount of his heroic biography. Quintus achieves this in numerous ways, namely through secondary characters' songs of Achilles' heroic biography, and the primary narrator's reminiscences of his deeds through reference to his war booty. The illusion of Achilles' full biography is thus created using allusion to events both within and beyond the *Posthomeric*'s timeframe. Consequently, Quintus makes Achilles very much his own, as he aligns himself with the most Homeric of heroes. This can also be understood as Quintus 'writing' himself into epic.

Chapter III: *Nestor*

Ch.III shares much with Ch.I. I begin with a character and explore associated ideas. I then extend this approach to explore more widely related issues. Nestor is my initial focus, and Quintus' approach to 'age' the theme. I choose Nestor because he is *the* embodiment of old age (as Achilles is *the* hero), link with the past, memory, etc. Through analysis of the *geron*, I show how Quintus explores representations of the past – this can be seen to have

⁸⁸ The metapoetic implications are also explored; see Ch.II.1.2ii.

meaning for his approach to epic; e.g. Nestor speaks far less in the *Posthomeric*. This can be understood as comment on Nestor's great agedness. Yet, it also indicates a diminishing of other sorts – the impact of the past at a meta-literary level. Further studies reinforce this premise, as I explore *gerontes* like Priam and Phoenix, and, finally, the 'Golden Age' of heroes. Regarding the latter, the attribution of preternatural size and power to Quintus' heroes like Achilles, Memnon, Aias and Neoptolemos, and significant reduction in exempla (where previously recourse to a glorious past and glorious heroes had featured in Homer), can be understood to both diminish the impact of the heroic past (the previous generations of heroes), and consequently elevate the heroic present (the heroes of Troy): put simply, this means that the Trojan War heroes are shown to at least match the deeds of the previous generation of heroes. This, I argue, has implications also at the level of text – a severance of reliance on previous heroes/heroic epochs for inspiration, can be read as meta-literary comment: i.e. the poem (*Posthomeric*) and poet (Quintus) are a literary 'match' for previous poems and poets (especially the *Iliad*/Homer). This much anticipates my next chapter.

Chapter IV: *Neoptolemos*

Neoptolemos, like Penthesileia, allows Quintus a different kind of scope to that of Iliadic heroes like Achilles. As Penthesileia, Neoptolemos is an epic figure in outline, whom Quintus 'fleshes out'. I show that Neoptolemos 'carries the banner' for Quintus. He is the new warrior, but exhibits innate brilliance. At multiple levels, Neoptolemos' 'completeness' is shown; e.g. in his mature prowess whilst practising war on Skyros, and in the numerous recognition scenes that remind the reader that he really is heir to Achilles. Quintus takes him further, though. It is made clear that the young warrior is the perfect substitute for Achilles and more. Not only is he a match for his father physically, conveyed through exceptional prowess and size (e.g. the 'ease' at which he wears Achilles arms), but he also has a level of sophistication and temperance which is at odds with Achilles – Posthomeric *and* Iliadic. This also has more profound meaning: Quintus' hero (and poet) *par excellence* matches, and perhaps, surpasses the best that Homer can produce. However, the charge directed at Quintus that he tends to idealize his heroes is most apparent in Neoptolemos, whose more traditional negative portrayal is greatly

diminished. This is especially evident in Priam's death-scene. Here I compare Quintus' version with Virgil's: in Quintus, as Virgil, Neoptolemos kills Priam, but Priam's desire to die in the *Posthomerica*, and other factors, such as the Greek's (rather than the more usual Neoptolemos') killing of Astyanax significantly reduce Neoptolemos' more common unsavoury portrayals. Quintus also omits allusion to Neoptolemos' negative post-Troy biography; e.g. his subsequent murder for killing Priam at Zeus' altar. The effect, as with Achilles, amplifies the essential features of Quintus' hero. Consequently, the portrayal can also be read metapoetically as comment on the text, its poet, and its (Neoptolemos') multi-dimensional sophistication.

Chapter V: *The Primary Narrator*

This idea is extended in Ch.V. Though anachronistic, the 'renaissance' qualities that Neoptolemos exhibits are echoed in part in the 'character' of the primary narrator, where a strikingly post-Homeric figure emerges. I show that Quintus' narrator is markedly different from the Homeric narrator; e.g. the Posthomeric narrator is *the* dominant voice in the epic, as opposed to Homer's loquacious heroes. Quintus also blurs the boundaries between narrator and character (in a sense like Penthesileia: male/female), as distinct Homeric character/narrator-text merge. Furthermore, the relatively high proportion and tone of *gnomai* visibly deviate from Homeric patterns, where Homer's narrator leaves the aphorisms to his heroes. My test-case analysis of Quintus' use of interactional particles (e.g. *pou*) highlights this feature and shows affinity with Hellenistic narrators, such as Apollonius). Overt allusion to non-mythic phenomena, like the gladiatorial games and Roman Empire, also contribute to this markedly different epic narrator. I explore the noteworthy beginning and ending of the *Posthomerica*, the highly unusual delayed invocation to the Muse, and Quintus' famous 'biography' passage in Book XII. Here the narrator all but steps out from behind his epic anonymity, revealing himself to be also a reader of Hesiod, Herodotus and Callimachus. It is perhaps in this final, and rather unusual, character study, that Quintus' approach is most striking.⁸⁹

⁸⁹ Although 'gentle' Neoptolemos, gives him a run for his money. See Ch.IV.

Pre-Script

Superficially, the ‘character’ of Quintus’ epic seems to be a fusion of Homeric characterizations mapped onto Cyclic narratives. However, such broad outline grossly underestimates Quintus’ project. Taking on the *Cycle* and Homer is no small task, and these factors (whether or not and in what form the *Cycle* ‘remained’), reveal great ambition on the part of the poet; perhaps more so when also considering the time at which he worked (during the Imperial Period).

At the level of detail I show that through engagement with Homeric heroes, and over a thousand years of other literatures, set within the general story frame of the *Trojan Cycle*, Quintus is actually doing something far more creative than simply uniting *epeisodia* with *ethos*. Through close focus on the hero(-ine), I hope that my study of Quintus will reveal less an “anaemic pastiche ... utterly devoid of life,” but more of his art. And that, in his own way, Quintus was ‘divinely inspired’, too.

Chapter I: *Penthesileia*
Death and the Maiden

‘But go to the house and busy yourself with your own tasks, the loom and the distaff,
 and tell your handmaids to ply their work: and war will be the concern for men ...’

(*Il.* VI.490-92)⁹⁰

Introduction

In this chapter I examine Quintus’ reception of Penthesileia.⁹¹ She is unusual in her place as a woman *amongst* men. Nothing similar occurs in the *Iliad*.⁹² I will show that she represents a larger engagement by Quintus with the issues of gender and more generally with the nature of epic and conventions, in a broader sense. For these reasons, Penthesileia is extremely important: she embodies Quintus’ most striking expression of tradition and change, and is therefore a key character in understanding considerations that are central to Quintus.

Initially, I will explore the representation of Penthesileia in the *Posthomerica*, and the way Quintus creates this literary hybrid. I will take as my main focus her confrontation with Achilles. Secondly, I will move on to analyse significant expressions of heroism relating specifically to gender portrayals largely occurring in Book I. Finally, I will explore more general gender representations throughout the *Posthomerica*, through examining the theme of expressions of lament and Quintus’ reshaping of the relationship between mourning and gender.

⁹⁰ Hektor instructing Andromache. Unless otherwise stated, I follow Wyatt’s translation of the *Iliad* (1999 and 2001); and Dimock’s for the *Odyssey* (2002 and 2004).

⁹¹ On Quintus’ Penthesileia, see Vian (1959), 18-25, and Vol. I (2003), *Introduction* and *Notice*; Schmiel (1986); Sánchez Barragán (2001); (and with Thersites) Schubert (1996); See Gantz (1996), 621-22. On ‘Amazons’, see Dowden (1997); Hardwick (1990); Lindblom (1999).

⁹² The goddesses are literally another story; cf. too Helen as *cause terrible*. However, perhaps, at least, one should bear in mind Virgil’s Camilla; see following, 1.3.

Part 1 – *Women at War: Engagement*

1.1 *Hektor*

The “story” of Penthesileia forms part of the *Epic Cycle*,⁹³ where she was prominent in the *Aithiopsis*. Only fragments remain of Proklos’ late (second/fifth-century AD?) summary of the *Cycle*.

Ἀμαζῶν Πενθεσίλεια παραγίνεται Τρωσὶ συμμαχήσουσα, Ἄρεως μὲν θυγάτηρ, Θραῖσση δὲ τὸ γένος, καὶ κτείνει αὐτὴν ἀριστεύουσαν Ἀχιλλεύς, οἱ δὲ Τρῶες αὐτὴν δάπτουσι. καὶ Ἀχιλλεύς Θερσίτην ἀναιρεῖ λοιδόρηθεις πρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ὄνειδισθεῖς τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ Πενθεσιλείᾳ λεγόμενον ἔρωτα. καὶ ἐκ τούτου στάσις γίνεται τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς περὶ τοῦ Θερσίτου φόνου.

‘The Amazon Penthesileia arrives to fight with the Trojans, a daughter of the War god, of Thracian stock. She dominates the battlefield, but Achilles kill her and the Trojans bury her. And Achilles kills Thersites after being abused by him and insulted over his alleged love of Penthesileia. This results in a dispute among the Achaeans about the killing of Thersites.’ (*Aith.* Arg.1)

Although brief,⁹⁴ much of what figures in Proklos features in the story of Quintus’ Penthesileia: Penthesileia fights for the Trojans; is noted as the daughter of Ares; excels in battle; is killed by Achilles; buried by the Trojans; Achilles kills Thersites following the latter’s ridiculing of Achilles ‘love’ for her; consequently, an argument ensues between the Greeks.

Significantly, a scholium to the last line of the *Iliad* shows an attempt at linking the end of the *Iliad* with the beginning of the *Aithiopsis*:

ὡς οἱ γ’ ἀμφίεπον τάφον Ἑκτορος· ἦλθε δ’ Ἀμαζῶν,
Ἄρηος θυγάτηρ μεγαλήτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο.

‘So they busied themselves with Hektor’s funeral; and an Amazon came, a daughter of Ares the great-hearted, the slayer of men.’ (Schol.(T)*Il.*24.804a)⁹⁵

⁹³ On the *Epic Cycle*, etc. see West (2003), 2-37, with select bibliography; Burgess (2005) and (2001), esp; General Introduction: *The Epic Cycle and Quintus*.

⁹⁴ This summary is all we have. For the contentious question of Quintus’ ‘source(s)’ see General Introduction: *The Epic Cycle and Quintus* and *Quintus and Rome*.

⁹⁵ West (2003) notes papyrus giving the variant “and an Amazon came, the daughter of Otrera, the fair Penthesileia”, P. Lit. Lond. 6 xxxii 43, (2003), 114-15.

In this (virtual) amalgamated epic narrative, the focus shifts from its Iliadic base, Achilles' wrath, to the narrative of the Trojan War. Penthesileia's coming functions as a narrative transition: Hektor's funeral and departure (= end of the *Iliad*); Penthesileia's arrival (= following Trojan War episode(s)). It appears the *Posthomerica's* opening echoes key elements of the scholium's transitional passage:⁹⁶

Εὐθ' ὑπὸ Πηλείωνι δάμνη θεοείκελος Ἔκτωρ
καὶ ἐ πυρῇ κατέδαψε καὶ ὀστέα γαῖα κεκεύθει ...
καὶ τότε Θερμώδοντος ἀπ' εὐρυπόροιο ῥέεθρων
ἦλυθε Πενθεσίλεια θεῶν ἐπιειμένη εἶδος,

'Hektor the equal of gods had been killed by the son of Peleus, consumed by the funeral pyre, his bones were under the ground ... (*Post.*I.1-2)
Just then from the river Thermodon's broad-flowing waters came Penthesileia clothed in godlike beauty.' (18-19)

The narrative proximity of Penthesileia with Hektor in the text cited in the scholium suggests that she will occupy the role of successor to Hektor as the Trojan champion. This is largely the case in the *Posthomerica*, where Quintus' first major representation of the hero (or, as in this case the heroine), Penthesileia, has much in common with the Iliadic Hektor. Hektor is mentioned immediately (*Post.* I. ff.); Penthesileia's "arrival" begins from line 18ff. Hektor is named again at 12 and Penthesileia directly at 19. Thus, merely seven lines separate the two Trojan warriors. Indeed, there is much to suggest that Quintus' Penthesileia is the 'new' Hektor.

Like Hektor, Penthesileia aims to be Troy's salvation,⁹⁷ subdue Achilles' fire,⁹⁸ and ravage the Argives and their ships (*Post.* I.94-5; *Il.*XV.596ff., IX.237-43). And, as the Iliadic Hektor, Penthesileia too misjudges her opponent and herself.⁹⁹ These errors culminate in their deaths. In both cases, the hero's/ heroine's capabilities are challenged:

⁹⁶ See Ch.V.1.1, for the *Posthomerica's* beginning.

⁹⁷ *Post.* I.92-95; cf. the *Iliad* on Hektor as Troy' protection (VI. 404).

⁹⁸ *Post.* 94; cf. *Il.* XVI.860-61, XXII.108-10, 286-88.

⁹⁹ So Patroklos (*Il.* XVI).

Hektor on numerous occasions, but most significantly, by Andromache (*Il.* VI).¹⁰⁰ In her Iliadic appeal, Andromache had warned Hektor that his might (*menos*) will be his doom (*Il.* VI.407ff.). Immediately following Penthesileia's 'promise' (see below, 1.2-3), Andromache's appearance is telling (*Post.* I.100-14).¹⁰¹

Quintus' Andromache refers to Hektor's death at Achilles' hand, his supremacy (over Penthesileia), and that Penthesileia's over-confidence (*mega phroneous*', *Post.* I.100), as opposed to Hektor's 'might' (*menos*, *Il.* VI.407),¹⁰² will be her undoing: paraphrased, 'Achilleus was better than Hektor, so is *far better* (*pollon huperteros*, *Post.* I.105) than you (Penthesileia)'. However, in Quintus, Andromache's concern is focalized but (unusually for an extensive and detailed reflection) not vocalized:¹⁰³ thus, Penthesileia is not privy to this information. This adds to the drama of Penthesileia. Like Andromache, we know that she is doomed, but she does not. In this sense, too, Penthesileia is out of place: she doesn't fit into the epic schema, unlike the attentive reader and Andromache, who know what has gone before.

If Andromache's Posthomeric concern for Penthesileia echoes her Iliadic warning to Hektor, what does this make Penthesileia in relation to Andromache? If a shadowy Hektor, then this amplifies Hektor's reverberations in Penthesileia, and further masculinizes the heroine. There is a further bond between Hektor and Penthesileia, this time implicit, created by the subtle intertextual relationship between *Iliad* VI (Homer) and *Posthomeric* I (Quintus). The primary narrator's reference to 'Eetion' (*Post.* I.115) reminds us of another feature of the *Iliadic scene* – Andromache reminds Hektor that Achilles had killed Eetion (*Il.* VI.407); the allusion, evident to the reader, is, again, lost on Penthesileia, and further enhances the element of dramatic irony in the exchange.

¹⁰⁰ Patroklos by Achilles, *Il.*XVI.83-96.

¹⁰¹ See Calero Secall (2000), 195-96.

¹⁰² Although note, *memenas* is used by Andromache, in the Posthomeric passage (*Post.* I.103). This indeed links Penthesileia with Hektor.

¹⁰³ See de Jong, (1997a; 2004a). On 'voice' in Quintus, see Ch.V.

Like Hektor (and Patroklos), Penthesileia is ominously unaffected by others' warnings. Consequently, she, like Hektor, is slain by the superior Achilles (*Post.* I.594ff.; *Il.* XXII.326ff).¹⁰⁴ It seems, then, that the over zealous warriors, in Homer and Quintus, are blinded by their desire for glory, and, lacking restraint, 'foolishly' pursues their end. In terms of critical errors in their battling judgment, *nepios* is applied to Patroklos (*Il.* XVI.46, 833), Hektor (*Il.* XXII.333), and Penthesileia (*Post.* I.96, 134, 374); significantly, she is termed *nepios* more than any other character in the *Posthomeric*.

Penthesileia's opening physical assault echoes that of Hektor, too. Her spear, like Hektor's, 'glanced from' (*apeplagchthe*) Achilles' shield, causing him no harm (*Post.* I.549; *Il.* XXII.291;). *Apeplagchthe* is used in exactly the same form (only here, in Homer) and metrical position in the verse,¹⁰⁵ and in exactly the same context, describing the missile's deviation from its target: Achilles. The responses to the failed assaults on Achilles, further link the two: they feel their attacks are 'fruitless' (*etosion*, *Il.* XXII.292; *etosia*, *Post.* I.573), and both are right.

When this fated end approaches, Penthesileia, like Homer's Hektor, expresses a dilemma. Hektor considers the best options before confronting Achilles (*Il.* XXII.98-130). His thoughts can be divided into five main parts: i) flee and be rebuked, 98-107; ii) fight Achilles, 108-110; iii) negotiate with Achilles the return of Helen and her booty, 111-21; iv) self-awareness of dilemma and predicament (note self-awareness of danger of supplication/feminization, 123-28), 122-28; v) conclusion to fight, 129-30.

Penthesileia's dilemma, however, is less complex. Already wounded by Achilles she considers, i) drawing her sword and fighting, (*Post.* I.600-02), and ii) begging for mercy with ransom, for she longs to escape (*eeldomene per aluzai*, 609). This contrasts sharply with her earlier (over-)confident state, and therefore heightens her demise. Further, the verbal echo creates great pathos and dramatic irony as Penthesileia came longing for war (*eeldomene polemoio*, *Post.* I.20); that she also 'longed' to reinstate her honour and rid her

¹⁰⁴ Similarly, Patroklos is killed by Hektor, *Il.* XIV.818ff.

¹⁰⁵ Beginning on the first foot, on the second short syllable.

‘grief’ (*penthos*, 23)¹⁰⁶ for accidentally killing her sister Hippolyte (I.20-5), adds to Penthesileia’s tragedy: her exit (like Camilla’s, see below, 1.3), as her entrance, is tarnished by failure.

Hektor can also be seen in Penthesileia’s end. Unusually ‘pity’ (*oikteirantes*, *Post.* I.782) compels the Atreidai to return their enemy’s corpse to Priam, as it did Achilles (*oikteiron*, *Il.* XXIV.516). Furthermore, the verb *katedapse* (‘consume’) is both applied to Hektor at the *Posthomerica*’s opening (I.2), when his body is consumed by the funeral pyre and, in the same context, to Penthesileia at her Posthomerian departure (I.793). There is a sense of completeness – she begins and ends with, and like, Hektor. Even the ‘wine’ used to ‘quell’ the Iliadic Hektor’s ‘pyre’ extinguishes the Posthomerian Penthesileia’s pyre – the telling elements being *pyrkaien*, *sbesan* and *oino* (*Il.* XXIV.791; *Post.* I.795).¹⁰⁷

1.2 - Hektor ‘Plus’

However, Quintus’ heroine appears far more aggressive than Homer’s Hektor. And, this is where important deviations from Homer’s text can be seen. For example, Penthesileia purposefully seeks out Achilles (and Aias) (*amphoteron hormese katantion*, *Post.* I.540), initiating the attack (547ff.). Penthesileia is compared to a leopard (*pordalis*, 541);¹⁰⁸ and a lioness (*leaina*, *Post.* I.315) – ‘lion-like’ being the ultimate simile for the male *promachos*.¹⁰⁹ It is also a simile whose connotations of wildness are activated twice later – in Paris’ comments on the wild reception Achilles’ corpse will receive from the Troades (*Post.* III.202), and in Cassandra’s raving (*Post.* XII.530).¹¹⁰ The effect is to emphasize the unusual degree of aggression. With reference to Penthesileia, the term *hupeireche*, ‘surpass’, is also noteworthy. It is first used to convey how she ‘surpasses’ all of her Amazons (*Post.* I.36); then applied to Posthomerian Achilles (I.167), Memnon (II.298),

¹⁰⁶ Quintus takes the opportunity to pun on Penthesileia’s name. See too ‘Ilioneos’ in Ch.III.2.2 and Ch.IV.1.5; ‘Neoptolemos’, Ch.V.2.2; ‘Aglaia’, Ch.V.2.3i.

¹⁰⁷ The ritual is similar, also (*Post.* I.794-99; *Il.* XXIV.791-96). This also applies to Patroklos (*Il.* XXIV.791-96 = *Il.* XXIII.237-44), as noted by James (2004), 275n.794-9.

¹⁰⁸ So too *Post.* I.480.

¹⁰⁹ See Moulton (1977), esp. ch. 3.D. On unusual lion similes in Quintus, see Chs.II.1.1v, III.1.1 and IV.3.1

¹¹⁰ On the ‘double-headed axe’ of Penthesileia and Cassandra see following, 1.4ii.

Aias (V.130), and Neoptolemos (VII.368) – *the* preeminent warriors. This again conveys something of the threat she possess to the males and their dominance of the battlefield.

As Achilles in his Iliadic duel with Hektor, Penthesileia initiates the attacks: verbal (*Post.* I.553-62; *Il.*XXII.261-72); physical (*Post.* I.547ff.; cf. Achilles attacking, *Il.* XXII.273ff.).¹¹¹ Yet, part of Penthesileia’s vaunt is strikingly similar to the Iliadic Hektor’s:

ἀλλ’ οἷώ τάχα τῶδε μένος καὶ θυμὸν δλέσσειν
 ὑμέων ἀμφοτέρων, οἳ τ’ ἄλκιμοι εὐχετάασθε
 ἔμμεναι ἐν Δαναοῖσιν· ἐλαφρότερη δ’ μόθοιο
 ἔσσεται ἵπποδάμοισι μετὰ Τρώεσσιν ὀϊζύς.

‘But I think with this one (spear) I shall soon destroy the strength and courage of you both, although you boast to be the mighty men among the Danaans. Then the pain of the press of battle that lies upon the Trojan chariot-lords shall be lighter.’ (*Post.* I.554-57)¹¹²

Hektor tells Achilles:

ὣς δὴ μιν σῶ ἐν χροῖ’ πᾶν κομίσαιο.
 καὶ κεν ἐλαφρότερος πόλεμος Τρώεσσι γένοιτο
 σείῳ καταφθιμένοιῳ·

‘I wish that you would take all of it in your flesh!¹¹³ So would the war be lighter for the Trojans, if you were dead.’ (*Il.* XXII.286-88)

However, Quintus’ syntax makes his Amazon queen seem far more confident: whilst Hektor ‘wishes’ (ὣς plus the optative, 286) that Achilles would die,¹¹⁴ Penthesileia ‘believes’/ ‘thinks’ (οἷώ, 554) that she will (δλέσσειν, future infinitive) accomplish her heroic task. Such self-belief is marked not only in the syntactical difference from Hektor, but also by the fact that she is taking on *both* Achilles *and* Aias. Nothing similar occurs

¹¹¹ That Penthesileia is a “female counterpart to Achilles”, is also played out by their names, both meaning pain to the people: *penthos*; *achos*. See Dowden (1997), 99.

¹¹² My translation.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁴ Similarly, even in the euphoria of his *aristeia* (victory over Patroklos/‘Achilles’ (virtue of the arms), Hektor only toys with the idea that he can defeat Achilles: ‘Who knows but perhaps (τίς δ’ οἶδ’ εἴ ...) Achilles ... may first be struck (φθῆν) by my spear and lose his life?’ (XVI.860-61). Hektor’s use of the interrogative *tis*, and the subjunctive, show that he is expressing uncertainty, or, at best, entertaining a possibility.

in the *Iliad*; confronting one preeminent hero is always more than enough.¹¹⁵ Penthesileia's overconfidence has been gathering momentum. This duel is the climax, but ominous foreshadowings from Andromache, Priam and the primary narrator, have already made clear her doom, and they run parallel to, and counter, her over-confidence.

Furthermore, Penthesileia is *supremely* confident of her superior prowess. From the outset we learn of this ill-founded over-confidence: ἡ δ' ἄρ' ὑπέσχετο ἔργον ὃ οὐ ποτε θνητὸς ἐώλπει, / δηώσειν Ἀχιλλῆα καὶ εὐρέα λαὸν ὀλέσσειν / Ἀργείων, νῆας δὲ πυρὸς καθύπερθε βαλέσθαι, 'Her promise was a deed for which no mortal had hoped – to kill Achilles, destroy the mighty host of Argos and toss their ships upon a fire' (*Post.* I.93-5). Yet, as with Hektor, these themes (female warrior's over-confidence and (false) promise), have parallels elsewhere (see Camilla below, 1.3).

Penthesileia also contrasts sharply with the Posthomeric Memnon in *Posthomeric* II, who feels that it is not appropriate whilst feasting to make great claims and promises; and, he humbly concludes (in direct contrast to Penthesileia) that his prowess shall be tested (*Post.* II.148-52). The occurrence of these lines, so soon after Penthesileia's death, has the effects of emphasizing the extreme nature of her character; the similarities of Penthesileia's and Memnon's arrival/ welcome, function as Troy's potential salvation (and substitute for Hektor), and primary defense against, especially, Achilles, emphasize the fundamental differences in their characters.¹¹⁶

We are, however, also made aware of the naïveté of Penthesileia's optimism by the primary narrator: Penthesileia is 'foolish' (νηπιρία, *Post.* I.96; cf. 374-5).¹¹⁷ Similarly, the secondary narrators reinforce this (Andromache, 100ff.; Priam, 200-02; Achilles, 575ff.,

¹¹⁵Note Poseidon's warning to Aeneas in his confrontation with Achilles, *Il.* XX.332-36.

¹¹⁶ However, the third imported Trojan ally, Eurypylos, appears more Penthesileia-like in his ill-founded optimism. In response to Trojan expression to subdue the Greeks, he promises that all shall fulfilled (*Post.* VI.184). Yet, even Eurypylos appears to acknowledge that he may be fallible when he swears, just before embarking for battle, that he will never turn from the fight except in victory *or death* (VI.313-14).

¹¹⁷ See *nepios* at *Il.* XVI.46ff.; XVIII.311; XXII.333. These apply to Patroklos, the Trojans for their false hope in Hektor, and to Hektor himself, respectively; *Il.* XVIII.311 corresponds closely to *Post.* I.374-5 in that the mass is foolishly inspired by the Trojan defense (Hektor and Penthesileia). Again, this emphasizes their relationship.

etc.); unfortunately, for Penthesileia, she is the last one to see this truth – the drama of her ‘fall’ is heightened when, after being mortally wounded by Achilles, she realizes her limitations and contemplates begging for mercy.

The gap between Penthesileia and Hektor is reinforced by a telling silence. When Hektor is finally subdued, he utters a death-prophecy (*Il.* XXII.358-60).¹¹⁸ Hektor (like Patroklos) prophesies that his vanquisher’s death is close at hand, and names that new vanquisher (Achilleus-Apollo/ Paris).¹¹⁹ Such death-prophecy in *Posthomerica* would make sense – Achilles, both Hektor’s and Penthesileia’s killer, will die soon after killing Penthesileia. Thus, Penthesileia’s death (coming after Hektor’s) also symbolizes that Achilles is that much closer to his own death. The omission of a prophecy, then, is marked. In part, it distances Penthesileia from Hektor, yet, as with Quintus’ opening,¹²⁰ it also blurs the boundaries between the two texts and their authors: Hektor’s Iliadic prophecy still stands, and Penthesileia is part of this process. In these ways, the omission speaks volumes.

1.3 - *Camilla*

Penthesileia clearly challenges the traditional portrayal - a female should *not* be present on the battle-field, the males’ “sphere of existence”.¹²¹ This role was dictated by an epic tradition which went back beyond Homer, namely the oral myths that eventually formed the *Cycle*. Such myths found written expression in the posthomeric *Aithiopsis*. There is however another possible intertext intermediate between the *Cycle* and Quintus.

Virgil’s earlier *Camilla* certainly shares something of Penthesileia’s characterization.¹²² R. Williams notes that *Camilla* was, “Virgil’s own creation, not heard of before him or again after him” (1999b, 226n.803f.). In a sense this is true, as *she* features in no other text. However, Virgil’s *Camilla* had a model in earlier epic. Virgil knew Penthesileia (*Aen.* I.490ff.), and her story either from the *Aithiopsis* or from intermediate sources. But in

¹¹⁸ So too Patroklos (*Il.* XVI.851-54).

¹¹⁹ So too Hektor-Achilleus, in Patroklos’ death-prophecy (*Il.* XVI.851-54).

¹²⁰ See Ch.V.1.1.

¹²¹ See below, 2-2.1.

¹²² See General Introduction: *Quintus and Rome*.

conceptualizing the role of the woman in war he will also have been influenced by the way the Amazons were envisaged in post-Homeric, particularly Athenian, contexts.

As the foreign heroine, the Amazons were used by earlier writers to represent a challenge to male supremacy and Athens,¹²³ so too Camilla the Volscian princess, with reference to Rome.¹²⁴ (Again, Achilles' subjugation of Penthesileia, as the Trojan for Camilla, is also loaded with social and cultural meanings: Achilles = male and Greece; Penthesileia = female and barbarian; Arruns (Trojan ally) = male and Rome; Camilla = female and barbarian.)¹²⁵

Apart from the superficial similarities, i.e. battling foreign females, in epic, there are a number of more significant parallels which could certainly point to Quintus' engagement with Virgil, and therefore, Latin literature. Penthesileia, like Camilla, was exiled from her homeland (*Post.* I.21ff.; cf. *Aen.* XI.542). And, although Penthesileia comes for battle fleeing reproach because she accidentally killed her sister, Hippolyte (*Post.* I.20-5), both maidens have ventured afield to win glory through warring; though through battle Penthesileia seeks to 'cleanse' (καθηραμένη, 28) herself of this deed and, by-so-doing, rid herself of the Erinyes (26-31).¹²⁶

Further, Camilla, the *bellatrix* ('warrior-maid', *Aen.* VII.805; cf. Penthesileia, *daiphrona*, *Post.* I.594, II.17), had 'never trained her woman's hands to Minerva's distaff (*colo*, 805) or basket of wool (*calathisve*, VII.805)'. Instead, she was, 'hardy to bear the battle-brunt' (805-07). This obviously echoes *Iliad* VI, when Hektor clearly articulates *the* gender divide as he speaks to his wife, Andromache:

¹²³ Examples of earlier Greek writers include Homer – Bellerophon's subduing of the Amazons in Lycia (*Il.* VI.186); Herodotus, who notes the battle between Greeks and Amazons, and the latter's Scythian name, *Oeropata*, 'killers of men' (*Hist.* 4.110ff.); and, especially, Plutarch, who cites the sixth-century *Theseid* on Theseus' defence of Athens from the Amazons (*Thes.* 26-28).

¹²⁴ See Oliensis (2000).

¹²⁵ On Quintus, see Schubert (2007); the Trojan War, Rossi (2002), and Erskine (2003).

¹²⁶ Compare the Iliadic Patroklos (XXIII.85ff.) who flees his homelands, too, because of murdering a man. Thus, the intertextual link with the Iliadic Patroklos is already made. This is crystallized in *Posthomeric* I.718-21. Similarly, Phoenix flees his homeland and the Erinyes' curse (*Il.* IX.448ff.).

ἀλλ' εἰς οἶκον ἰοῦσα τὰ σ' αὐτῆς ἔργα κόμιζε,
 ἰστόν τ' ἡλακάτην τε ...
 πόλεμος δ' ἀνδρεσσι μελήσει ...

‘But go to the house and busy yourself with your own tasks, the loom and the distaff ... and war will be the concern for men’ (*Il.* VI.490-92)

Such musings also find expression in the gender-specific comments of Quintus’ Theano, and especially Tisiphone,¹²⁷ who argues that women have their place; *but* female warriors defy this convention because they are trained in the art of war (*Post.* I.456-57).

Camilla is also Amazon-like physically. She appears Amazonian in battle, “one” breast¹²⁸ bared for the fight (*Aen.* XI.648-49),¹²⁹ and clear reference is made to the Amazons (of Thrace), and Hippolyte and Penthesileia (*Aen.* XI.659-62). Like Penthesileia, too, Camilla is important in the Book in which she appears, performing deeds of great prowess, and occupying much of the text (*Aen.* XI.432ff.). And, as Thersites’ rebuke of Achilleus,¹³⁰ Tarchon’s reprimand of the Tyrrhenian warriors concentrates on similar points (732ff.), implying that they have been feminized (*dolituri*, *Aen.* XI.732; *ignavia*, 733) by their *response* to this woman (*Aen.* XI.734).¹³¹

As instigators of female action, through female action, both have close parallels, too. In this context, Quintus’ *kore* replaces Virgil’s *mater* – both terms are used to define the gender of group responding to the heroines (*Post.* I.403; *Aen.* XI.891). And, inspiration comes for: the Troades (with help from Tisiphone) seeing Penthesileia’s *aristeia* (*Post.* I.403-04, 436-39); the Italian women seeing Camilla’s death (*Aen.* XI.891-95). In both cases, the heroines inspire ‘love’: *eros* (*Post.* I.436); *amor* (*Aen.* XI.892). And it is these

¹²⁷ See below, 2.1.

¹²⁸ Cf. *a-mazon*, ‘without breast’; see S. Blundell (1999), 59. Blundell notes that Strabo II.5.I (64BC?-24AD) and Didorus Siculus 2.45.3 and 3.53.3 (c.60 and 30BC) (203n.2, ‘Amazons’, in Blundell), comment on the removal of the Amazon breast (Blundell, 59). However, as she continues, the myth for this phenomenon probably crystallized fairly late as in many 5th-century BC visual representations, Amazons always appeared “with the normal two”. Thus, interpreting *a-mazon* so, may have offered (“fanciful”) credence to this theory (*ibid.*).

¹²⁹ It is in the similarities in this passage, Camilla’s entrance to battle (*Aen.* XI.648-55), the same for Penthesileia (*Post.* I.335-41), that James sees the most striking evidence of intertext (2007, 153n.29).

¹³⁰ See below, 1.5.

¹³¹ Cf. Sarpedon, too, at *Il.* XII.310ff., and XVI.422ff.

feelings that activate their response, and fuel their desire to defend their *astu* (city), and *patria* (father-/homeland) (*Post.* I.439; *Aen.* XI.892).

Furthermore, their deaths (*Post.* I.594-629; *Aen.* XI.801-31) share many similarities: both are killed by a spear; hit by the breast (*mazoio*, *Post.* I.594; *papillam*, *Aen.* XI.803);¹³² killed whilst fighting on horseback;¹³³ drop their weapons; their beauty is noted (*Post.*I., *theeter* (629), *kala prosopa* (660), *ageten* (666); *Aen.* XI., *lumina* (819)), they do not die straight away, but gain their senses sufficiently to think/ speak; there is a gracefulness (*eustalios*, *Post.* I.622; *fluens*, *Aen.* XI.828) to their falls.¹³⁴

Moreover, the similarities between the ‘promises’ of Penthesileia and Camilla are especially noteworthy. In Quintus, Penthesileia promises Priam:

‘Her promise (*hupeschetō*) was a deed for which no mortal hoped – to kill Achilleus, destroy the mighty host of Argos and toss their ships upon a fire.’ (*Post.* I.93-5)

Virgil’s Camilla tells Turnus,

‘I dare and promise (*promitto*) to face Aeneas’ cavalry, and singly ride to meet the Tyrrhene horse.’ (*Aen.* XI. 503-04)

Particularly suggestive as an intertext, are the elements: the promise; that it is ill-founded. Like Penthesileia, such bravado is misplaced, so appears particularly marked when the boastful maiden is subdued.¹³⁵ Even here, Penthesileia seems more arrogant because Camilla appears less certain. This is conveyed by her use of *si*, ‘if’ (-she may trust in her prowess, *Aen.* XI.502). Though the conditional clause is a rhetorical trope, formally it

¹³² Both terms for ‘breast’ are significant. As female associated, they reinforce the gender of the combatants. Quintus’ choice of *mazos* clearly engages with Penthesileia’s *ethnos*: Amazon. It is also worth noting that Penthesileia is hit by the right breast (*dexiteroio*, 595). This differs from traditions where the right breast is cauterized so as not to impede spear throwing; e.g. Apollod. II. V.9; Strabo, XI. V.1; *OCD* (2003), 69. *Mazos* is used by Homer, for wounds to the male’s chest (e.g. *Il.* IV.480), but the word and the wound take on additional force when used of a woman.

¹³³ This mode of combat is significant in itself, as discussed below, 1.4ii.

¹³⁴ See Vian (Vol. I, 2003, 35.4).

¹³⁵ *Aen.* XI.535-37; cf. *Post.* I.95; note too Camilla’s *infelix*, 563, and Penthesileia’s *σχετλιε*, 733. Virgil’s audience, as Quintus’, is also privy to this knowledge soon after the vaunt, as the goddess Diana foreshadows Camilla’s doom. This possible intertext, and the use of cavalry in warfare are discussed in detail below, 1.4ii.

opens up an area of doubt which is absent from Penthesileia. However, the content of the over-confident claim further suggests an intertext: taking on the enemy i) *en masse*, and ii) *alone*.

Although one cannot prove that Virgil is the intermediary, the similarities are highly suggestive. Furthermore, Virgil was an established classic in the Roman world long before Quintus.¹³⁶ Finally, the likelihood that the *Cycle* was not much read in Quintus' day¹³⁷ makes it likely that for both Quintus and his audience the most obvious intertext was the *Aeneid*. If so, Penthesileia migrated from archaic epic to Quintus via Roman epic and brought with her associations acquired *en route*.

However, it can be seen that Quintus' Penthesileia is in fact a more striking model and presence in the *Posthomeric*, than Camilla is in the *Aeneid*. The action is more noticeably centred around Penthesileia. Also, her impact on the characters is far more marked; for instance, she has a major impact on the women¹³⁸ and Achilles.¹³⁹ Furthermore, she affects the tone of text at a profound level: namely, in that as Penthesileia communicates the idea of a challenge to the convention of ancient epic, one can also understand something of the concerns that are central to Quintus and his poem.

1.4 - A Man's Place

Quintus' approach to Penthesileia is also evident in the ways he makes use of gendered stock episodes and motifs.

i) A Hero's Reception

S. Reece (1996), in his study of the stranger's welcome in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, has divided the epic welcome into twenty-five parts. These range from the "Arrival" (II), "Reception" (VII) and "Feast" (IX), to "Identification" (XI), "Bed" (XVII) and "Departure

¹³⁶ On Virgil's reception, see especially Tarrant (2000); on Virgil and Quintus, James (2007), and Gärtner (2005).

¹³⁷ See General Introduction: *The Epic Cycle and Quintus*.

¹³⁸ See following discussion on Theano and Tisiphone below, 2.1.

¹³⁹ See following discussions on Achilles' response to Penthesileia's death, and Thersites' critique of Achilles' response, where Quintus highlights ideas of sexual 'love'; both below, 1.5.

omen and interpretation” (XXIV).¹⁴⁰ The welcome of Quintus’ Penthesileia bears close resemblance to many of the divisions noted by Reece, for instance, I) Arrival at the destination (*Post.* I.18ff.), and VIIa) Reception (host(s) catches sight of the visitor(s) *Post.* I.53ff.; 62ff.; 70ff.; 74ff.);

These aspects of Penthesileia’s arrival constitute a challenge to epic conventions, where the arrivals/ welcomes, etc. are male-dominated.¹⁴¹ Yet, her reception scenes serve a further purpose. Penthesileia is masculinized through her proximity with Hektor, Trojan defence for much of the *Iliad*. An aspect of Penthesileia’s relationship to Hektor is formalized at lines 85-7, as Priam leads her to his halls,¹⁴² as though a daughter: ‘He conducted the queen to his palace, eagerly he pressed her with honours, like a daughter back home from distant land after twenty years’, Ἄγε δ’ εἰς ἐὰ δώματ’ ἄνασσαν,/ καί μιν προφρονέως τίεν ἔμπεδον, εὔτε θυγατρα/ τηλόθδε νοστήσασαν ἐεικοστῷ λυκάβαντι (*Post.* I.85-7); as daughter-surrogate she fills the space vacated by Hektor:¹⁴³ the hero(-ine) has returned.

ii) *Arms and the Woman*

This effect is further emphasized by another epic convention, the arming-scene. There are four main Iliadic arming scenes:¹⁴⁴ Paris (*Il.* III.328-38); Agamemnon (XI.15-55); Patroklos (XVI.130-54); Achilles (XIX.364-424).¹⁴⁵ The sequence of arming, “which confirms the supposition that we are dealing with generic formula”,¹⁴⁶ is as follows: i) greaves; ii) breastplate; iii) sword; iv) shield; v) helmet; vi) spear(s). Quintus’ arming of Penthesileia follows Homer’s pattern closely (object and sequence): (*Post.* I.: greaves (142-43); breastplate (144); sword (145); shield (147); helmet (148); spear (158)).

¹⁴⁰ The Latin numerals throughout this discussion of the hero’s welcome refer to Reece’s divisions, e.g. see *Odysseus and the Phaeacians*, in Reece, 212-14.

¹⁴¹ Other Posthomeric arrival/ welcome scenes include: Memnon (II.100ff.); Eurypylos (VI.119ff.); Neoptolemos (VII.431ff.); Philoktetes (IX.445ff.).

¹⁴² Cf. Memnon, whose arrival at the halls is omitted – he arrives in Troy, then the feast begins (II.113ff.); Eurypylos, led by *Paris* (VI.143ff.).

¹⁴³ The *nostos* motif, especially by noting ‘twenty years’, also evokes Odysseus (tens years Trojan War + ten years of *nostoi*), ‘the’ returner; e.g. see Odysseus with his father Laertes (*Od.* XXIV.345-50). Also, cf. Eurypylos, welcomed as Hektor by Paris (*Post.* VI.133).

¹⁴⁴ See Armstrong 1958.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 341.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

However, there are striking differences in Penthesileia's arming scene, and these are of great significance.

Firstly, Penthesileia's arms include an item not found in the similar Iliadic arming scenes.¹⁴⁷ Penthesileia's βουπλήγ' ἀμφίτυπον, 'double-sided pole-axe' (*Post.* I.159) is an exceptional weapon (note, too, Camilla's *bipennem*, 'double-sided battle-axe', *Aen.* XI.651). In the *Iliad*, we find *bouplex* only once (*Il.* VI.135). Diomedes informs Glaukos, in their *xenia* exchange, that mighty Lykurgos wielded the 'pole-axe'.¹⁴⁸ (The brutal double-headed battle axe (in the form of the *sagaris*) is strongly associated with being foreign and the Scythians, in our Greek sources; for instance, Herodotus (*Hist.* 1.215, 4.5, 70, 7.64.). Originating from the wild Thracian land, like Penthesileia, there is much mythology documenting the god-challenging hero who, ultimately, met a savage death himself; in the Iliadic account, Lykurgos is first blinded by Zeus, following his terrorizing of Dionysus and his entourage, and dies swiftly afterwards (*Il.* VI.130-40).¹⁴⁹ Thus, like Penthesileia, Lykurgos' savagery and 'otherness', epitomized by his weaponry,¹⁵⁰ brought about his own fall. Also, like Penthesileia, Lykurgos' wrath was ill-directed, and hubristic, angering those clearly his superior.

The *bouplex* occurs more frequently in the *Posthomerica* than in Homer, but never again in the context of the arming-scene.¹⁵¹ There is, however, a striking similarity in its form at *Post.* XII.571, with Cassandra's frenzied (*maimoos*'s, 570) attempt to destroy the Horse (ἀμφίτυπον βουπλήγα).¹⁵² So: this weapon represents anomaly – the 'madness' of women, and the danger and wildness of 'other' – this includes not only women, but also foreigners, and opposites, such as nature and culture, and man and beast. Here, the *bouplex amphitupon* can also represent deviation from traditional epic.

¹⁴⁷ See Griffin (1983), ch. I.

¹⁴⁸ Cunliffe defines the *bouplex* as, "an ox-whip or –goad; perh., a pole-axe" (1963), 73.

¹⁴⁹ See too Schol. (D) *Il.* VI.131 ((27) in West (2003), 244-47); Virgil (*Aen.* III.14ff.); Hyginus (*Fab.* 132); Apollodorus (*Lib.* III.V.I).

¹⁵⁰ On "significant objects" as indicators of character, see Griffin (1983), ch. I.

¹⁵¹ *Post.* X.218, XI.190.

¹⁵² See Calero Secall, (2000), esp. 191-93.

In full *aristeia*, Penthesileia destroys swathes of men with the weapon, and is likened to the irresistible force of Fate (*Post.* I.335ff.). Significantly, only in Penthesileia's subjugation by Achilles does the axe lose its power, and she drops it. Now it becomes a *pelekun* albeit *megan*, the some-time axe of war (I.597).¹⁵³ Thus, as her life passes, so too does the potency of her most fierce and exotic weapon. In this way, Penthesileia is inseparable from her arms. She can be defined by their characteristics, and they by hers.¹⁵⁴

Penthesileia's arming scene is significant in other ways, too. Achilles' second set of armour features in his Iliadic arming scenes. It is *the* supreme weaponry, a gift from the god Hephaistos (*Il.* XIX.368).¹⁵⁵ Quintus' Penthesileia can make similar claims, receiving her arms from her father, Ares (*Post.* I.141; 159-60); there is a further echo, here, as it is the Iliadic Thetis, Achilles' parent and the divine mediator, who gives Achilles his arms. Similarly, *daidaleos* is applied to both Achilles' and Penthesileia's arms (*Il.* XIX.380; *Post.* I.141); 'curiously wrought' indeed, as one would expect from armour divinely forged (and its application singles out the warriors who wear such arms, thus simultaneously separating Achilles and Penthesileia from the "norm", whilst uniting the two as "outsiders"). Also, both are compelled to fight through guilt: Penthesileia for Hippolyte; Achilles for Patroklos.

Penthesileia's otherness is further expressed through another important deviation from the Iliadic norm – she fights on horseback. Mounted horse-attack is most unusual in Greek epic warfare; indeed apart from chariot taxiing, horses are seldom found in the fighting of ancient epic; certainly not in the *Iliad*. Homer's *promachoi* fight on foot. Excluding Penthesileia, Quintus' *leading warriors* (ranging from 'old' Homeric heroes – Achilles, Aias, etc., to Quintus' Trojan debutees (Memnon, Neoptolemos, etc.), also do not use this mode of attack. Unlike Homer, other cavalry escapades do occur in Quintus,¹⁵⁶ even *hippees* 'cavalry' against *hippees* (*Post.* IX.127-28), i.e. *en masse*. As noted, Virgil's Camilla rides (and is killed on) the horse in a battle context too (*Aen.* VII.804). Also,

¹⁵³ On *πέλεκυς* references in Quintus, see Vian and Battegay (1984), 377; Homer, Cunliffe (1963), 321.

¹⁵⁴ Again, see Griffin (1983), ch. II.

¹⁵⁵ On Achilles' divine armour, see Ch.II.2.3.

¹⁵⁶ E.g. Fatally, Amides takes on Neoptolemos on horseback (*Post.* IX.186-91).

horse battles (*equitatus*) *en masse*, occur in the *Aeneid*.¹⁵⁷ Again, this possibly indicates a filter through which Penthesileia passed.

Quintus clearly presents her as associated with horse-attack in battle context, not just during her duel with Achilles. She *rode* (ἔξετο, 166, ἐξομένη, *Post.* I.170)¹⁵⁸ to encounter her (infantrymen) enemies.¹⁵⁹ So, we are to understand Penthesileia's *aristeia* in terms of cavalry attack; e.g. implied at *Post.* I.227-29, as she subdues Molion, Persinous and Eilissos, *et al.*, and at I.335ff. where she crashes through ranks upon ranks of Argives. As with her *bouplex*, this mode of combat reinforces Penthesileia's otherness as an Amazon, and all that this represents.

As well as being an anachronism in the context of ancient Greek epic, Penthesileia and horse have broader cultural implications, too. At *Post.* I.166-69 we learn Penthesileia's steed was from Thrace. The area has wild connotations, being on the 'fringe' of the civilized world. In some accounts, the Amazons originate from Thrace (as in the Cyclic fragment quoted above), but Quintus has his Amazons originate from Thermodon (*Post.* I.18-9). In her horse attack, Quintus could also be alluding to the Parthians, who made use of mailed cavalry and horse archers.¹⁶⁰ And, we can assume familiarity with genres such as history.¹⁶¹

iii) *Undressing for the Occasion*

Typically in epic battle-scenes, the fallen hero, is further vanquished by his subjugator, as he is 'stripped' (συλλάω, ἀπαυράω, etc.) of his battle-gear.¹⁶² (Quintus' Memnon also receives such treatment).¹⁶³ Penthesileia is, however, again a notable exception.

¹⁵⁷ *Aen.* XI.598, 610, 619, etc.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. *Post.* IV.547-48.

¹⁵⁹ Note too the Trojan Amides, who takes on Neoptolemos, ὅς ῥά οἱ ἵππῳ ἐξόμενος συνέκυρσε καὶ οὐκ ἀπόνηγ' ἐρατεινὸς ἵππασίης· - like Penthesileia, even mounted he proves no match for one of the Aeacus-line, *Post.* IX.186-88.

¹⁶⁰ *OCD* (2003), 1117-118; Colledge (1986); Ghirshman (1978).

¹⁶¹ E.g. Diodorus Siculus (Greek, first century BC), notes cavalry in the battle of Paraetacene (*Bib.* 19.27-31), as B. Campbell (2004), 103; also, especially "Greek", 3, 5; "Roman", 8, 10; and 'Index', 228.

¹⁶² E.g. *Il.* IV.466; XVII.125; XXII.368, etc. (for further references to occurrences of *συλλάω* in the *Iliad*, see Cunliffe (1963), 368); cf. Diomedes and Glaukos (*Il.* VI.232-36) as "a reflection of stripping the armour from

Unlike Hektor and the other fallen heroes of the *Iliad*, no attempt is made to *totally* strip Penthesileia of her armour (the contrast with Penthesileia in this context is heightened as Quintus' Greeks continue to strip the arms of the Trojans in Iliadic fashion (*Post.* I.716-18). However, a stripping of sorts does occur as Achilles removes an item of armour from Penthesileia's corpse.

'From her head he removed her helmet, the brilliance of which equalled the rays of the sun of the lightning of Zeus.' (*Post.* I.657-58)

This scene, dealing with the vanquished Penthesileia's arms, is important for two main reasons. As noted, the stripping of corpses' armour by the enemy is usual in epic. Thus, that Penthesileia is left virtually untouched is highly significant – though a warrior, Penthesileia is *female*: it would be 'improper' for *her* to be stripped. This preserves her modesty, and the effect of her presence in the epic. We can compare the death of Euripides' Polyxena.¹⁶⁴ She too appears most 'feminine' after her 'elegant' (*εὐσχήμων*, *Hek.*569; cf. *ἤσχυλεν*, *Post.* I.623) fall,¹⁶⁵ significantly '*concealing* (*κρύπτουσ'*) what should be *concealed* (*κρύπτειν*) from men's eyes' (*Hek.*570); a reversal of the warriors' revealing, through stripping. Quintus flirts with modes of etiquette that protect the modesty of the female, while, at the same time, giving an erotically charged narrative in preparation for what follows.

The helmet reminds us specifically of the Iliadic Hektor because it is central to his main epithet - *κορυθαίολος Ἴεκτωρ*.¹⁶⁶ And, its removal is especially evocative of *Iliad* VI. Here (*Iliad* VI), its removal signifies some sort of crossing of boundaries.¹⁶⁷ Astyanax starts with fright at his father in battle-garb *at home*: 'immediately glorious Hektor took the helmet from his head and laid it gleaming on the ground', *αὐτίκ' ἀπὸ κρατὸς κόρουθ' εἴλετο φαίδιμος Ἴεκτωρ, / καὶ τὴν μὲν κατέθηκεν ἐπὶ χθονὶ παμφανόωσαν*. (*Il.* VI.472-73). The

the corpse of a defeated enemy" (M. Edwards, 1990, 80). See too Fenik (1968); Griffin (1983). See Ch.V for genre 'voices'.

¹⁶³ *Post.* II.547; cf. the Achaean treatment of the slaughtered Trojans at *Post.* III.382.

¹⁶⁴ *Hek.*568-70.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. *εὐσταλέως ἐριποῦσα*, *Post.* 622.

¹⁶⁶ *Il.* VI. 359, 440; XXII. 232, etc.

¹⁶⁷ See Griffin (1983), ch. I, esp. 7.

flashing helmet so closely associated with Hektor further links him with Penthesileia (cf. *κόρυν... μαρμαίρουσαν*, *Post.* I.657). Although exactly the same language is not employed, the elements (*κρατὸς κόρυθ' εἴλετο ... παμφανόωσαν*, *Il.* VI.; *κρατὸς κόρυν εἴλετο μαρμαίρουσαν*, *Post.* I) and context are strikingly similar.¹⁶⁸ Furthermore, Quintus' choice of verb for the removal of the Penthesileia's helmet (*εἴλετο*),¹⁶⁹ exactly matches that used for the scene between Hektor and Andromache.¹⁷⁰

Here the stripping away of one "barrier" (here symbolized by the helmet) serves a multi-dimensional purpose. Its removal by Achilleus, after a close connexion between Penthesileia and the Iliadic Hektor has clearly been established, opens the way for a radical change of context.¹⁷¹ Yet, this scene simultaneously distances Penthesileia from Hektor (in so many ways her Iliadic counterpart), as a further theme, unusual in the context of battle in traditional epic, is introduced by Quintus.

1.5 - *Amor and the Man: Misplaced 'Love'*¹⁷²

When first looking upon the fallen Penthesileia, the Argives are 'amazed' by her beauty (*theesanto*, *Post.* I.661-62). Yet, although the Iliadic Achaeans gaze on the godlike stature of Hektor's body with similar *amazement*, they immediately defile his corpse (*thambesan*, *Il.* XXII.369-75).¹⁷³ (Both responses are focalized by the primary narrator.) In contrast, the *kala prosopa* (*Post.* I.660) of Penthesileia produces most unwarlike responses: the Greek warriors think of their wives reclining in their beds (*Post.* I.670),¹⁷⁴ whilst Achilleus is profoundly moved.

¹⁶⁸ On Quintus' Homeric *imitatio cum variatione*, see Chrysafis (1985).

¹⁶⁹ *Post.* I.657; *Il.* VI.472.

¹⁷⁰ *Esula* is used for Achilleus' 'stripping' of Hektor (*Il.* XXII.368); on which, see N. Richardson (2000), 144n.368-9; *apeura* for Hektor and Patroklos (*Il.* XVII.125); see M. Edwards (1991), 74n.123-39.

¹⁷¹ See Propertius, III. XI.14-16: Achilleus is smitten by Penthesileia when removing her helmet.

¹⁷² On *Eros* in: Apollonius, Hunter (2004), ch. 3 (this includes a useful note on Homer's Calypso and Nausicaa, 46); Virgil, Oliensis (2000). See Hinds (2000); Pavlock (1990).

¹⁷³ See N. Richardson (2000), 144n.370-1.

¹⁷⁴ Compare Hektor's return to Troy, which activates the Troades' thoughts for their men, *Il.* VI.237-40.

‘Even Achilles’ heart felt unremitting remorse for killing her instead of bringing her as his bride to Phthia the land of horses, because in height and beauty she was as flawless as an immortal goddess.’ (*Post.* I.671-74)

The ‘Cyprian’ (Aphrodite), so frequently associated with romance in epic, and the destructive power of lust,¹⁷⁵ in Quintus is *the* cause of Achilles’ sorrow (*Post.* I.666-68); as wife of Ares (Penthesileia’s father; a fact noted *here*), the cause is implicit, and explicit:

‘This (Penthesileia’s) beauty even among the dead was the personal work of the fair-crowned Kyprian goddess, the mighty war-gods’ spouse, to inflict some suffering also on noble Peleus’ son.’ (*Post.* I.666-68)

When describing Achilles response to Penthesileia’s death, Quintus’ choice of *ἐρατὸν* (‘beautiful’, *Post.* I.719) evokes multiple meanings (Achilles’ response to Penthesileia’s death in the *Posthomeric* is far more sexually charged than the same for Virgil’s Camilla, thus indicating important differences in the functions of these heroines).¹⁷⁶ Whilst sexualizing this episode, it also echoes Iliadic uses, where it is associated with war ‘lust’, and indeed, sexual desire in a non-violent context.¹⁷⁷ Furthermore, Achilles’ *mega achnuto*, ‘great pain’ (*Post.* I.718) at his enemy’s (Penthesileia’s) death recalls personal sufferings from his previous Iliadic existence of an entirely different order;¹⁷⁸ namely, the Iliadic Achilles’ responses to the death of Patroklos, his closest companion (e.g., *Il.* XVIII.22ff., 80-93, 98ff.). The narrator’s reference to Patroklos at *Post.* I.721, cements

¹⁷⁵ For instance, Aphrodite’s involvement in Paris and Helen’s biography, and, therefore that of the Trojan War (e.g., *Il.* XXIV.28-30; *Cyp.* 1, 2, 4); on the *Iliad* passage, see N. Richardson (2000), 276-79. Equally, Venus is central to Dido’s and Aeneas’ *amor* (e.g., *Aen.* I.657-60). See Aphrodite’s *eros* plan, in Euripides’ *Hippolytus*; e.g. 1-57. See too, Pavlock (1990), on *eros* in epic, esp. chs. 1 and 2.

¹⁷⁶ See above, 1.3.

¹⁷⁷ Agamemnon is called a lover of war (*Il.* IX.64), and Achilles reminds his Myrmidons of their love for battle (XVI.208); whilst both Paris and Zeus feel ‘love’ (*eramai*) toward Helen and Hera (respectively, *Il.* III.446 = XIV.328).

¹⁷⁸ Consider also Achilles’ response to Thersites’ rebukes. The offender (Thersites) is on the end of Achilles’ wrath. Thus, Thersites acts as a catalyst to Achilles’ rage, as he, like Hektor, triggers this anger through his (Thersites’) involvement with one who has touched Achilles’ heart (*Iliad*: Hektor for Patroklos; *Posthomeric*: Thersites for Penthesileia); so too Agamemnon for Briseis, though with different results. Achilles does not kill Agamemnon in anger.

their (Penthesileia's and Patroklos') connexion, and the connexion between both Achilleus' (Iliadic and Posthomeric) responses.¹⁷⁹

There is at least some connexion, too, in Achilleus' response to Penthesileia and his feelings for the Iliadic Briseis. According to Briseis, Achilleus would make her his wife, and they would live in Phthia (*Il.* XIX.297-99). Therefore, this Posthomeric fusion of two distinct Iliadic themes, Achilleus' responses to: a) a 'loved' one's death; b) desire to wed/live with *alochos* in Phthia, binds Quintus' Penthesileia with a) Patroklos, and b) Briseis.¹⁸⁰ In this way, Penthesileia is also used to create great(-er) pathos, and, through these allusions, activate memories on a dual level, both for Achilleus (of his 'beloved' – Patroklos and Briseis), and the reader (of the Iliadic Achilleus and his relationships with Patroklos and Briseis). Penthesileia lives up to her (*penthos*)¹⁸¹ name, and through the 'pain' that she causes Quintus imports Homer and more.

Certainly, the seemingly separate spheres of 'love' and war are clearly presented as having some sort of mutual connexion in the *Aithiopsis*. As noted with reference to the *Aithiopsis*,¹⁸² it is *rumoured* (*λεγόμενον*) that Achilleus loves (*ἔρωτα*) Penthesileia; the difference being, in the *Posthomeric*, Quintus goes at least one step further, again expanding a theme, as his Achilleus has *actually* fallen in love.¹⁸³ Quintus exploits the Aithiopic Achilleus' (rumoured) 'love' for Penthesileia, and fuses it with his representation of events and character, one of whom, Penthesileia, is based so closely upon the Iliadic Hektor.

In Quintus' epic, however, the hero is more inextricably linked with the feminine in a different way. Women are key, in the *Iliad* – Helen is the cause of war (*Il.* XXIV.28-30),

¹⁷⁹ See Ch.II.1.3i.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Ovid, *Heroides* III. Note too Achilleus' Iliadic feelings for Briseis, bearing great similarity to those for and Patroklos. Both are 'dear/close' to his heart (*Il.* IX.336, XI.608).

¹⁸¹ As perhaps does Achilleus here: *achnuto*, as noted above.

¹⁸² Above, 1.1.

¹⁸³ See Ch.II.1.3i. See Vian, Vol. I (2003), 6-7.

and Chryseis and Briseis are the cause of the two central quarrels (*Il.* I.121ff.).¹⁸⁴ Yet, in the *Posthomeric*, male and female involvement and gender concerns are expressed in an entirely different way in the climactic battle between the sexes, when Penthesileia and Achilles literally clash. It is also noteworthy that the more typical hero's aspirations for battling renown are somewhat inverted in the case of Penthesileia, who aims for glory through her violent engagement with the opposite sex, namely Achilles: usually *man* fights man to win *kleos*.¹⁸⁵

Numerous references to her beauty, though, serve to 'glorify' Penthesileia in a different, gendered way. And, indeed, noteworthy females are evoked by Penthesileia: the simile applied to Penthesileia's entrance, likening her outstanding beauty to that of Dawn over the Seasons, evokes the same for Nausicaa, with reference to Artemis and her nymphs (*Post.* I.48-51: *Od.* VI.102-09);¹⁸⁶ and her comparison to 'the blessed immortals' is also said of Helen (*Post.* I.662: *Il.* III.158).¹⁸⁷ Penthesileia is also compared to Athene battling the Giants (*Post.* I.179), which is significant because such similes usually apply to heroes, in a male-dominated context; for instance, Achilles and Memnon are compared to Giants and Titans (*Post.* II.518).¹⁸⁸

A quite different slant on heroism, with particular reference to gender representation, in the *Posthomeric* is provided by Thersites, as he rebukes the love-torn Achilles.¹⁸⁹ Perhaps we can debate whether Achilles, the wrathful killer of the *Iliad* (and beyond),¹⁹⁰ is himself feminized by his response to Penthesileia.¹⁹¹ Nowhere does Achilles himself verbalize his feelings. Yet this point is communicated by the primary narrator (*Post.* I.671-

¹⁸⁴ Hekabe and Andromache are important as well, as are the Troades *en masse*, in their laments and prayers. See below, 3.1-2.

¹⁸⁵ Here, then, *kleos* can be won by the female, more typically the 'stumbling block' for the hero, as she can divert his attentions. E.g. again note the potential threat to the hero's *kleos*, with particular reference to Hektor and the women of *Iliad* Book VI.: Hekabe (258ff.; see too, XXII.79-92) Helen (354ff.), Andromache (407ff.) – all of whom try to dissuade Hektor from fighting.

¹⁸⁶ As noted by James (2004), 269n.48-51. See *Post.* I.663-35 and *Od.* VI.102-09 for further evocation of Nausicaa, as James, 274n.663-5.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.* 274n.662.

¹⁸⁸ E.g. Ch.II.2.1i and Ch.II.1.4

¹⁸⁹ See Schmiel (1986); Schubert (1996).

¹⁹⁰ E.g. cf. Achilles in Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Aulis*.

¹⁹¹ See Thersites' critique, Ch.II.1.3i.

74, 718-21).¹⁹² But, Thersites does interpret Achilles' response to mean something specific: Achilles has fallen in love, and been feminized (*Post.* I.723-40). This extends the theme that the primary narrator introduced. In this way, then, Thersites acts as a type of a focalizer. However, being *within* the narrative (the text), Thersites functions as an interpretive vehicle for Quintus: an epic voice (Thersites) articulates an un-epic phenomenon (feminization of Achilles *at Troy*)¹⁹³.

Albeit an unattractive voice, Quintus' Thersites again¹⁹⁴ makes astute comments. Achilles, Thersites notes, is *gunaimanes*, 'woman-mad' (*Post.* I.726), his heart turned (*ἐπιτέρπειαι ἤτορ*, 730) merely by the sight of woman (732). *Gunaimanes* is a key term that is also used for Paris in the *Iliad*, when he is twice rebuked by Hektor (*Il.* III.39; VI.389). Thus it is highly offensive; Paris operates in spheres that challenge the *ethos* and *locus* of the hero.¹⁹⁵

The Posthomeric Thersites asks a poignant question, 'Surely you know how great has been the cost to Troy of lust for women (*gunaimaneousi*)?' *οὐδέ τι οἶσθα/ ὅσον ἄχος Τρώεσσι γυναιμανέουσι τέτυκαι*; (I.734-35). Woman is the enemy to the hero's plight, and *arete*, *kudos* and *kleos* are threatened by any engagement with her; consider, for instance, Hektor's responses to Hekabe's and Helen's hospitable offerings, and Andromache's pleas.¹⁹⁶ Here the Iliadic hero is threatened by the female and the comforts of domesticity (the *oikos*).¹⁹⁷ However, as war is not the females' preserve, by concentrating on

¹⁹² On Homeric narratology, per se, see S. Richardson (1990); de Jong (1997a), 305-12. On embedded focalization, de Jong (2004; 1997a).

¹⁹³ Cf. Achilles' feminization in Statius *at Skyros* (e.g. *Ach.* I.259ff.); also K. King (1987), 180-83.

¹⁹⁴ See Thersites' critique of Agamemnon, *Il.* II.225-42.

¹⁹⁵ Also in the *Iliad*, Thersites criticizes the Greek army for becoming, 'Αχαιίδες, οὐκέτ' Ἀχαιοί, 'women of Achaea, no longer Achaean men' (II.235); the implication being that the Greeks have been feminized by Agamemnon's lust (for treasures or women; 229, 232; the Iliadic Thersites also manages a late jibe at Achilles whom, he believes, has become 'complacent' (*μεθήμεων*, 241). It is this Iliadic complacency that Quintus exploits and amplifies in the *Posthomeric*, as the hero and the feminine are bound more closely through the battle-field interaction between male and female.

¹⁹⁶ *Il.* VI.264-65, 360-62, 441-46, respectively. Note classical Athenian perceptions of women as contaminators and threats; e.g. see Apollodorus/Demosthenes(?), *Against Neaera*.

¹⁹⁷ Similarly, compare the Iliadic Paris, who appears utterly at home *at home* in spite of the war (*Il.* III.380ff.; VI.321-38). Note especially *θαλάμῳ εὐώδει* 'his fragrant bedchamber', III.383, *θαλάμῳ...ἔποντα* 'working in

Penthesileia's activity *and* Achilleus' response, Quintus introduces an anomaly to the epic. Not only do the Posthomerian Penthesileia/ Aphrodite 'pollute' Achilleus. They also contaminate epic per se, as Quintus' (and Achilleus') focus on the heroine and the erotic, threatens to dominate the text.

This is a striking example of Quintus' exploration of convention: Penthesileia = Woman + War. The impact of this climactic battle of the sexes on the text is profound, as can be seen in the effects on the embodiment of heroism and ancient epic. Thersites interprets the collateral damage - *now*, Achilleus = War + *Eros*: here, men are from Venus; women from Mars.

Penthesileia performs multiple functions in the *Posthomerica*. From the earliest point epic motifs are echoed in her reception. Quintus makes intertextual reference to generic epic arrival/ welcome, scenes more typically associated with the male. He also takes the opportunity to establish, almost immediately, the close relationship between Hektor and Penthesileia. These show the text's reliance on its intertextual background but with the addition of gender providing a metapoetic dimension. As the Hellenistic scholium to the *Iliad* and the epitome to the *Aithiopsis* suggest, she substitutes for Hektor, Homer's Iliadic conclusion. Thus her entrance signifies new narrative (a move away from Homer), yet potent evocations of early epic (a strong glance back to Homer). In this way, she functions as a dynamic cohesive force, linking characters, texts, and authors. Penthesileia does not stop here, though. She establishes herself quickly as a formidable presence in the text. Showing exceptional *aristeia*, she also outperforms most men. In the process, she activates change. She will be *the* factor that disrupts convention, initially in herself, then her Amazons, then other women. She is the cancerous anomaly, and her deviant influence spreads quickly to other women.

Penthesileia is a fusion of what has gone before, but with an epic twist: the package is female. Female, foreign (in dress, battle mode, and etiquette), and ferocious, she is the

his bedchamber' (polishing his arms), VI.321, and the sorrow he was about to give himself over to ἐν θαλάμῳ, VI.335).

embodiment of danger to man and tradition. For these reasons, there is a ‘gender-bending’ poignancy that *she* is the preeminent vehicle used to challenge convention. It is not so much that gender is of central concern to Quintus. Rather that *through* exploring gender, issues of convention and anomalies (in wider contexts) are being brought to the fore: Penthesileia and gender are markers of change, and these novel frictions help smooth the way for Quintus.

Part 2 - A Woman’s Place

Such explorations of gender, through Penthesileia, also provide Quintus with the opportunity to explore different aspects of heroism.¹⁹⁸ Typically in Greek epic, a woman’s place is in the *oikos*; a man’s on the battle-field. This spatial and activity-based gender division is most clearly defined in Hektor’s address to Andromache (*Iliad* VI.490-93).¹⁹⁹

In this encounter between Hektor and Andromache more conventional ‘spheres’ of existence are challenged.²⁰⁰ However, it is Hektor who threatens to transgress initially; he is the warrior *at home*, physically absent from battle, the ‘place’ where he should be. Although the narrative justifies Hektor’s return to the city of Troy and his home (*Il.* VI.85ff.), his absence challenges Hektor’s function in war. Therefore, Homer conveys possible divergences within more typical roles; the suggestion that Hektor is ‘out of place’ here is also conveyed through Astyanax’ response – he is scared by his father’s helmet (*Il.* VI.466-70).

Hekabe asks Hektor why he has left battle and come ‘home’ (*Il.* VI.254).²⁰¹ The gender-specific role of the warrior is further shown to be under threat, as she requests that Hektor stays and drinks wine (258ff.); Hektor rejects this offer, ‘lest you cripple me, and I be forgetful of my force and valour (*ἀπογυιώσης*, 264-65). The epic, however, is not disrupted,

¹⁹⁸ On female heroism, see Lefkowitz (1981); women in general in Quintus, Calero Secall (1992a).

¹⁹⁹ See opening quote, and 1.3 on Camilla.

²⁰⁰ On gender “spheres” in *Iliad* VI, Hammond (1987), xxvii-xxx; Arthur (1981). On women in Homer, Beye (1974); Farron (1979); S. Blundell (1999), I. 4.

²⁰¹ ‘Home’ is implied as Hektor is being addressed at Priam’s house.

as resolution is achieved through the narrative. Consider too the *locus* of Andromache in *Iliad* VI. Andromache was not ἐν μεγάροισιν (VI.371), but had gone to stand on the wall (373).²⁰² Thus, as Hektor, Andromache's presence here challenges gender-specificity. She is outside, and on the wall (/on the verge); the "wall" (of Troy) signifying the divide between the warrior's place (*ektos*, outside, and the woman's (*entos*, inside).²⁰³

When Hektor does not find Andromache, he too occupies a liminal space, on the 'threshold', *oudos* (375). It is significant too that, when they meet, Andromache retards Hektor's progress. He had been passing through the city of Troy, and was on the verge of passing through the Scaean Gates back to war (393). It is at this precise point (the Scaean Gates - symbol of transition), that Hektor would "transform" - from son, 'brother', father and husband (i.e. 'everyman'), to warrior - that Andromache intercepts him. By doing so she preserves his domestic status (husband, etc.) for that much longer; therefore, she preserves their relationship, and delays his doom (407ff.). So, although Homer explores tensions between these literal and metaphorical boundaries, they are not crossed: women work at home, on the loom, etc.; men work outside, at war.²⁰⁴

When Quintus alludes to this scene, however, we have *already* witnessed, in Penthesileia, the anomaly. Thus, with reference to gender boundaries, the "threshold" has already been crossed. It is through the utterances of the Troades, Theano and Tisiphone,²⁰⁵ that Quintus recalls this Iliadic scene that defines the "place" of women and men so clearly. Their comments act as particularly good examples of contrasting representations of gender more generally in the *Posthomerica*,²⁰⁶ and as points of reference for Quintus with Homer, and therefore, epic convention.

²⁰² Interestingly, these are examples of spheres within spheres: here Hektor is physically at home, though still *in* the War; Andromache is outside her home, though *within* the Trojan Wall (/City)

²⁰³ Note too *Il.* III.146ff. – the *gerontes* with Helen on the Wall.

²⁰⁴ See following on *ergon* 'work'; also, Ch.V.2.3ii.

²⁰⁵ See Calero Secall (2000), esp. 196-98, *Teano e Hipodamia* (Tisiphone), and *physis*, 197ff.; *Troyanas y Amazonas*, 194-95.

²⁰⁶ That their speeches also act to provide "symmetry" to Book I, as these narrative interludes from battle (delaying tactics?), see Schmiel: "it *(the interlude) foreshadows the reversal from Penthesileia's *aristeia* to her defeat" (1986), 188 and following; *my addition in parenthesis.

2.1 - Tisiphone and Theano²⁰⁷

In the Troades ‘marveling’ at Penthesileia’s *aristeia* (*Post.* I.404), their response is striking.²⁰⁸ Here, the women are receptive to battling females, and are neither repulsed nor bewildered. Tisiphone, more so than the others, is seized by ἔρως (‘passion’) for war (*Post.* I.404, 436).²⁰⁹ Thus, Penthesileia acts as a catalyst.

Parts of Tisiphone’s rhetoric echo typical aspects of the epic male’s war-cries.²¹⁰ For example, Tisiphone’s rallying cry to the Troades dramatically recalls that of the Iliadic Achilles to his Myrmidons: ‘Friends, let the hearts within your breasts be brave, no less than those of our husbands ...’, ὦ φίλοι, ἄλκιμον ἦτορ ἐνὶ στέροισι βαλοῦσαι/ ἀνδράσιν ἡμετέροισιν ὁμοίον ... (*Post.* I.409ff.);²¹¹ similarly Achilles: ‘Therefore, let it be with valiant hearts (ἄλκιμον ἦτορ) that each man (*tis*) fights with the Trojans’ (*Il.* XVI.209). Whilst ἄλκιμον ἦτορ (*Post.* 409; *Il.* 209) verbally link the scenes, the context of address, mustering the troops for attack, further cements their bonds.

The main thrust of Tisiphone’s rhetoric, which covers a considerable number of lines for a minor female figure (*Post.* I.409-35), is that the Troades should fight as men. Tisiphone’s reference to the way that men fight for (the fatherland) their *children and the Troades* (“us”) (410-11), bears a close resemblance to the rhetoric of a particular Iliadic female; although, interestingly, these are the utterances of the Iliadic *Theano*, who has the opposite view of women/ their “place”. In the *Iliad*, Theano prays to Athene that the Troades will offer sacrifice, ‘if you will take pity on the city and the *Trojans’ wives and their little ones*,’ (VI.309-10). Thus, in a way, Tisiphone and Theano have already begun their dialogue; one’s comments in the *Iliad* are picked up and engaged with by the other in the

²⁰⁷ See Bär (2004).

²⁰⁸ Cf. Achilles’ gendered response (and the Greeks *en masse*).

²⁰⁹ There is debate over the name, ‘Tisiphone’ or ‘Hippodameia’. ‘Tisiphone’ seems more likely; in Virgil, Tisiphone is a Fury who incites war (*Aen.* X.761); see Apollodoros (*Library*, I.I.4). See Vian, Vol. I (2003), 28n.2 and 28n.404-06.

²¹⁰ On speech as an indicator of personality, see Friedrich and Redfield (1978); Achilles is their focus.

²¹¹ *Sternon*, rather than *mazos* indicates masculinization, too. Also, cf. Sarpedon who at *Iliad* XVI.422ff. chides his Lykians for their lack of shame.

Posthomeric. Yet, rather than wanting Iliadic pity, Tisiphone and her Troades want the fight.

Tisiphone continues, women are very similar to men in *form* and *need*. Here Tisiphone's rhetoric conveys her sense of the 'equality of the sexes'.²¹² So, Penthesileia liberates the women, *en masse*, from their epic confines: she, and they, are now 'modern women'.

Οὐ γὰρ ἀπόπροθεν εἴμεν ἐυσθενέων αἰζηῶν,
ἀλλ' οἷον κείνοισι πέλει μένος, ἔστι καὶ ἡμῶν·
ἴσοι δ' ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ γούνατα, πάντα δ' ὁμοῖα,
ξυγὸν δ' αὖ πάντεσσι φάος καὶ νήχυτος ἀήρ,
φορβὴ δ' οὐχ ἑτέρη. τί δ' ἐπ' ἀνδράσι λώιον ἄλλο
θῆκε θεός; τῷ μὴ τι φεβώμεθα δηιοτῆτος.

'We are not far removed from the strength of men. The vigour that there is in them is also in us. Eyes and knees are the same, and everything is alike. The light and the liquid are common to us all. Our food is the same. So what advantage is given to men by heaven? Let us not shrink from battle.'²¹³ (*Post.* I.414-19)

So, on a physiological level, according to Tisiphone, little, if anything, separates men from women. Women can be brave, like men, as they are basically the same physically, having similar body parts, senses and requirements. This rhetoric is unusual in epic. More typically, traditional ('conservative') females are portrayed as inferior in some way (physically, mentally, and/or socially), either by themselves or others.²¹⁴

Tisiphone continues that Penthesileia far excels men in the battle, because her soul is fired for war. The implication is, if Penthesileia can do this, why can't the Trojan women?

²¹² See especially, Dillon (1995).

²¹³ Dillon's translation (1995), 33, with minor alterations in punctuation.

²¹⁴ In tragedy, Euripides' Medea clearly articulates women's general limitation: 'Of all the creatures that have life and consciousness, we women are the most wretched' (*Med.* 230-31). Dillon argues that here Hippodameia's (= Tisiphone) rhetoric bears close similarities to that of the fourth argument (on physiology) of the fourth-century A.D. Neoplatonist philosopher, Theodorus of Asine (33-35): 'If the organs out of which male and female are put together were constructed for the same purpose in each sex – the eyes for seeing, the ears for hearing, the brain for perception, the legs for walking ... how can it be otherwise than that the parts of the soul be in common, and exist in both for the same purposes?' *Ibid.*, 32.

(II.420-24)²¹⁵ – thus, Penthesileia, the individual, is used by Tisiphone to represent the general, all women. As will be seen in Theano’s counter argument, there is a flaw in this logic. Penthesileia, however, does represent *these* (i.e. the Troades) women at one level, as has been suggested by Schmiel (1986).

However, ironically, Tisiphone’s conclusion fuses aspects of male warrior-vaunts with those of more conventional female utterances:

*Τῷ μὴ τις ἔτ’ ἀμβολίῃ πολέμοιο
 εἶη τειρομένῃσιν· ἔοικε γὰρ ἐν δαῖ μάλλον
 τεθνάμεν ἢ μετόπισθεν ὑπ’ ἀλλοδαποῖσιν ἄγεσθαι
 νηπιάρχους ἅμα παισὶν ἀνιερῆ ὑπ’ ἀνάγκῃ,
 ἄστεος αἰδομένοιο καὶ ἀνδρῶν οὐκέτ’ ἐόντων.*

‘Our affliction is such that we can delay no longer the joining of battle. Better by far to die in fighting than afterwards be led with our helpless children by foreign masters under painful compulsion, our city in flames and our men no longer living.’ (*Post.* I.431-35)

This rhetoric neatly blends masculine and feminine concerns. Echoes of masculine rhetorical traits include: do not flinch from war, even if fatal. Whilst the latter points apply to the female: avoid captivity with children; leave homeland; lose husbands. In this way, again, perhaps we are reminded of the *Iliad*, especially Book VI, where Hektor provides the masculine lines (441-65); Andromache the feminine (407-39). This scene particularly would have provided Quintus with a strong model of the traditional epic stance on gender positions, and its main theme is worth closer analysis.

The Iliadic Hektor notes he may not shirk his war duties (*Il.* VI.441-43), and, while acknowledging Andromache’s (*gunai*, 441 and following) concerns, he is also aware that he will probably die in battle (see 407ff.). Such ethics (do not flinch from war; it is better to die in battle), are commonly voiced by glory-driven heroes throughout the *Iliad*. In his famous comments on *noblesse oblige* (to Glaukos), Sarpedon too notes aspects of the

²¹⁵ This rhetoric again corresponds to that of Theodorus (his fourth argument (physiology), and second (anthropology)): women are no different from men physically, and they are the same gender as this woman (who excels on the battle-field); Dillon, 33-34. On Amazons and violence, see Lindblom (1999).

warrior's "code": '...now we must take our stand against the foremost Lykians and confront blazing battle...' (XII.315-16). He continues, like Quintus' Tisiphone, that 'if once escaped from this battle we were for ever to be ageless and immortal, neither should I fight among the foremost...' (322-24). Later in the *Iliad*, Sarpedon echoes these lines as he chides the Lykians for running from Patroklos, thus bringing shame (*aidos*) upon themselves as they attempt to avoid war (XVI.422). Achilles also expresses these aspects of the hero's world: 'if I remain here and fight... then lost is my return home, but my renown (*kleos*, 413) will be imperishable,' (*Il.* IX.412-13).

Tisiphone's more "feminine" concerns (avoid captivity with children; leave homeland; lose husbands), have been clearly set out by the Iliadic Andromache: Hektor's death will leave her vulnerable (therefore *further* feminized through her helplessness) as a 'widow' (*chere*, *Il.* IV.408-09, 432). *After* Hektor's death, Andromache again makes reference to being a widow (*Il.* XXIV.725), and, like Quintus' Tisiphone, notes that wives and children (*alochous; nepia tekna*) will be taken to alien lands as slaves (*Il.* XXIV.730-34).²¹⁶

Tisiphone further challenges the place of women in a war-torn society. She comments that the Troades are in the 'midst' (*parai*, *Post.* I.425) of trauma (425ff.). They mourn for the loss of sons (*phila tekna*), husbands (*aneres*), parents (*tokeas*), brothers (*adelphieion*) and kinsmen (*peon*) (426-29). Thus, she covers all facets of man, and they are *all* dead: war has *come to them* (women), so it is their time to act.

Tisiphone has conveyed the male and female positions and states that the Trojan male is no more (*ἀνδρῶν οὐκέτ' ἔόντων*, *Post.* I.435). This emphasizes the importance of Penthesileia as the Trojan hope, and the need for the Troades' action. Penthesileia acts as a subversive model for the women: the female who can fight. Therefore, the Trojan women have an actual example of a female anomaly, and must reject their more typical position in Troy, as those separate from war. By rejecting this gender convention, they also challenge epic portrayals of the female: the anomaly of Penthesileia spreads.

²¹⁶ Much subject matter from Tisiphone's speech is also echoed in tragedy. Consider *Andromache* (1ff.; 98ff.), *Hekabe* (59ff.) and *Troades* (98ff.) for days of doom and bondage for captive women and children.

Furthermore, and as a by-product of this rejection, the Troades are to turn from the largely female dominated activity of lament, to war.²¹⁷ In *Iliad* VI, when the Trojan warriors were under extreme pressure from the Greeks, the Troades lament and pray (*Il.* VI.237-41, 297-310) – their ‘action’ is rhetoric and gesture. Ominously, they also lament for Hektor, while he is still living (VI.495-502), and following his death (XXIV.722ff.) (which symbolizes Troy’s fall, XXIV.728-30): it is also interesting to note here, that while Hektor triggers ‘female’ response from the women, Penthesileia has the opposite effect. In principle, though, this is another marked parallel between the two: they are catalysts for the Troades. But, in Tisiphone’s rhetoric, one can see a call for the woman to cast off her epic regalia, and clothe herself in battle, the epic male’s domain.

The response to Tisiphone’s rallying is immediate, as the Troades overtly challenge Hektor’s (Iliadic) gender categorizations: ‘They cast aside their wool and baskets, putting their hands to instruments of pain’, ἀπόπροσι δ’ ἔριρα θέντο/ καὶ ταλάρους, ἀλεγεινὰ δ’ ἐπ’ ἔντευα χεῖρας ἴαλλον (*Post.* I.445-46; as well as recalling Homer, this may well indicate engagement with Virgil. On seeing Camilla, the Italian women adapt normal objects for warring (*Aen.* XI.887-9). Thus, the context and elements are highly suggestive). The act of repudiation of these objects, and the objects themselves, are very significant.²¹⁸ They are objects of the female,²¹⁹ and also imply domesticity, and therefore the internal place that the female *should* occupy.²²⁰ Thus, in the Troades’ rejection of these “symbols” of gender, one sees their metaphorical rejection of their more typical spheres of operation. Gender specificity is further challenged with their reaching for the weapons, the male’s “work tools”. In these actions, i) the rejection of female associated objects, ii) the attempted acceptance of male associated objects, the Troades occupy a similar liminal state to that of the Iliadic characters aforementioned: Hektor on the threshold; Andromache on the City Wall. Yet, in Homer, the boundary is never crossed. Quintus’ Penthesileia has already made the transition; therefore the threat of further epic disruption is very real.

²¹⁷ See below, 3.1-2.

²¹⁸ On “significant objects”, and “gendered weapons”, see, respectively, Griffin (1983), ch. I, and Lateiner (2001), ch. XI; and on nonverbal behaviour in general, again, Lateiner (2001).

²¹⁹ See again the words of Hektor to Andromache (*Il.* VI).

²²⁰ Cf. Amazon’s objects *designed* for war, making them even less ‘feminine’. See Lindblom (1999), 87.

The Troades are about to go forth, *beyond* Troy’s wall (*pro teicheos*, *Post.* I.437; *asteos ektos*, 447). And, this transgression would have had fatal consequences, the primary narrator informs, had their movements not been checked by ‘prudent’ (*phroneousa*) Theano, (447-50). It is at precisely this point – the Troades’ restraint – Schmiel argues (1986, esp. 188-89) that Penthesileia’s *peripeteia* also occurs. Thus her battle, like the hypothetical one of the Troades, will change. Like the Troades, Penthesileia is not up to the task: as she represents deviation, the feminine and battling ‘equality’, so the women represent tradition, Penthesileia and her limitations.

However, Theano has a much more conservative outlook than Tisiphone. Referring to the Troades dismissively (*σχέτλιαι*, *Post.* I.451), Theano recalls the traditional gender categorizations and uses them to counter Tisiphone’s claims, and, therefore, what they represent. The Troades, Theano argues, have never ‘toiled’ (*ponos*) in conflict (452; *ergon*, 453);²²¹ “Normal” (untrained) women will never have the strength of men (454-55). However, the Amazons are the exception as they are versed in the fight, make use of horses,²²² and undertake ‘the work of men’, *aneres erga* (457; 456-57). As with Tisiphone, Theano’s conclusion echoes *Iliad* VI. Here, however, the speech is particularly reminiscent of Hektor’s to Andromache (see above) because Theano, like Hektor, underlines the male and female *locus operandi*, and, similarly, the “proper” activity for both within these spheres:

τοῦνεκα δημοτήτος ἀποσχόμεναι κελαδεινῆς
 ἰστόν ἐπεντύνεσθε ἑὼν ἐντοσθε μελάθρων.
 ἀνδράσι δ’ ἡμετέροισι περὶ πτολέμοιο μελήσει

‘Therefore stay away from the noisy battle and busy yourselves with the looms inside your homes. War shall be the business of our menfolk.’ (*Post.* I.467-69; cf. *Il.* VI.490-93)

Theano is asserting that war is ultimately for men *alone*, thus excluding herself and all other women from it. Quintus knows Homer well, as Theano, a minor figure in the *Iliad*,

²²¹ Cf. Virgil’s Camilla, ‘never having trained her woman’s hands to Minerva’s distaff or basket of wool’, *Aen.* VII.805-06.

²²² See Penthesileia and horse above, 1.4ii.

prays to the goddess to break Diomedes' spear and save the Troades and their children (*Il.* VI.305-10). So, war is not entirely new to her. Nor, in a way, is she out of place textually, as her *particular* presence in *Iliad* VI and here, in *Posthomerica* I, further binds the episodes.

These two spokespeople for women in the context of war, present opposite views on the woman's place. Through both, Quintus refers back to the *Iliad*, and the gender-roles of ancient epic. At one level, Theano restores the norm, with regard to gender portrayals. The Troades are persuaded by her logic, and concede to her, not Tisiphone. The women accept their typical role in epic as non-combatants at home; the men are fighters outside. However, the accuracy of Theano's perception can be called into question as she concludes that the tide of battle is changing: the *Achaean*s are failing, quickly; the Trojans' (male) might grows. *Ergo*: 'there is no desperate need for women to join in fighting' (*Post.* I.473-74). This is *not* the case, because the Trojan heroes are not containing (and cannot contain) the Greeks. So, the issues raised by the gender subversion (Tisiphone: 'women can fight', etc.), seemingly addressed (Theano: a) 'women cannot fight'; 'women do not need to fight'), are not entirely resolved (primary narrator/ narrative: 'women need to fight'; and, in fact, they will fight). This throws a different light onto the resolution of Theano. Furthermore, it presents *Quintus* in an interesting way. Regarding gender representations, Quintus seems to i) initially challenge epic convention, ii) then to conform, and iii) finally to reject those norms. Of course, there is something of an irony here, too: much of his innovation is based upon engagement with the epic model.

2.2 - Further Expressions of Gender

i) Gendering Battle

The Posthomeric Neoptolemos articulates the traditional male approach to war when he challenges the heroic legitimacy of Odysseus' Horse-ploy:²²³ 'Kalchas, strong men stand and face their foes when they fight ...' (*Post.* XII.67ff.); only Neoptolemos and Philoktetes feel uneasy about this battle tactic (*Post.* XII.84-6). Similar spatio-gender considerations have already been expressed when, again, Philoktetes moralizes:

'Aeneas, do you imagine that you are the bravest, when all your work is from the towers the place where feeble women fight their foes. If you are a man, come outside from the wall with your arms' (*Post.* XI.491-94)²²⁴

Philoktetes' observation also closely echoes that of the Posthomeric Theano, and the Iliadic Hektor, although the context differs - this interlude is *not* between allies. It smacks of extreme ridicule, and constitutes the greatest insult to the hero: you fight like a *woman*.

However, even this stereotype is no longer applicable in the same way. We have seen Penthesileia and her Amazons fight. Also, the possibility of further disruption, with reference to the place of women in the epic (Tisiphone, *et al.*), has now been realized, and cannot be entirely undone (although, it is to be remembered that Penthesileia and her Amazons are ultimately subdued). Therefore, a type of disruption has already occurred. Furthermore, the Troades' active involvement in battle towards the end of the *Posthomeric* (and Troy's resistance) is the fulfilment of the gender deviation initially implied in Book I. In these senses, women, in Quintus, no longer entirely conform to their epic gender stereotypes.

²²³ On Neoptolemos' ethics, see Ch.IV.1.3.

²²⁴ Minor adaptations of James. Both Posthomeric critiques of spatio-gender cowardice evoke Diomedes' criticism of Paris, for shooting him from behind a rock (*Il.* XI.385ff.). See Thucydides on the civil war in Corcyra: women hurl tiles from rooftops, showing unnatural bravery. (*Hist.* 3.74). Wiedemann (1983) comments that when Thucydides records the women's "active intervention" in the events, he suggests that the event is "odd" – "that it lies outside the 'norms' of his subject-matter", 163. In their attack on Plataea (431B.C.), the women scream, and hurl missiles from the roof (2.4.2), 169. Also (Wiedemann), in Corcyra, Thucydides says their behaviour is *παρὰ φύσιν*. So, when women appear in Thucydides, except in a passive role, they highlight the "non-rational factors".

ii) *Paris: Heros to Eros*

In the *Iliad*, there are two key instances of the male occupying a space, which challenges his more usual sphere of existence within ancient epic. Paris is twice found in the City, when he should be on the battlefield (*Il.* III and VI). But, even more significant than this is his particular place in the City: the ‘bedchamber’ (*en thalamo: Il.* III.391; VI.321): in *Iliad* III, Paris is whisked away by Aphrodite to save him from being killed in his duel with Menelaos, and, so Aphrodite seductively tells Helen, he appears more like the dancer than the defender (III.390-94); in Book VI, as Troy suffers particularly from Diomedes’ onslaught, Paris busies himself with his beautiful arms (*perikallea teuche heponta, Il.* VI.321). Here, Paris’ alignment with Helen and her handmaids is especially telling – *simultaneously*, they busy themselves with their beautiful handiwork (*perikluta erga*) (*Il.* VI.321-224). On both occasions, the anomaly of Paris’ absence from battle/ presence at home is confirmed by Iliadic characters (rebuke by Helen, III.428-36; Hektor, VI.326-31). Thus, Paris’ extremely inappropriate presence is polarized, and he is used to express where man should *not* be in war. Like Homer, Quintus uses Paris to represent deviation, but this expression also communicates much more.

In *Posthomerica* X, Paris is mortally wounded in the groin (*boubonos*) by Philoktetes (240ff.).²²⁵ The traditional epic passivity of the female is inverted, however, as the dying Paris supplicates Oenone, the only one who can save him:²²⁶ *pesen para possi gynaiikos* (*Post.* X.272).²²⁷ Here, the *gyne* is empowered. This passage also evokes traditional (male) battle scenes, where the vanquished hero begs for mercy.²²⁸ Thus, war and love are comingled overtly. Parallels can also be drawn with the Penthesileia/ Achilles interlude in Book I, where romance seeps into battle, and epic. Although Oenone does not kill Paris, as Achilles does Penthesileia, neither does she save him. It is also noteworthy that Paris begins, *O gynai* (*Post.* X.284), as Achilles had to Penthesileia (*Post.* I.575), although the tone of the rhetoric is very different – respectively, lover’s appeal; enemy’s reprimand.

²²⁵ See Hopkinson (1994), 105-20.

²²⁶ See Calero Secall (2000), 198-202. On this Paris/ Oenone myth, see Parthenius 4, and Gantz (1996), 637; cf. Ovid, *Heroides* V. See too P. Knox (2000), 140-70.

²²⁷ Expressed thus, Paris’ alliteration (‘p’) is noteworthy

²²⁸ E.g. Lykaon, *Il.* XXI.65.

The extreme duration of Paris' death scene, prominence of 'romance' and centrality of this episode in Book X invites comparison with the Achilles-Penthesileia climactic interlude of Book I.²²⁹

The scene is further gendered in Paris' supplication. Instead of the traditional hero appeal to hero (the offer of ransom, etc. = concrete *time*), Paris cites his inescapable destiny (*Keres*, 286) as the cause of his affair with Helen (*Post.* X.284ff.). Significantly, in his recourse to their 'bed' (*lecheon*) and 'wedded love' (*kouridies philotetos*, 290), as reason (emotional ransom?) for her mercy (*epion*, 291), Paris substitutes the *erotic* for the *heroic*. This also has significance in a wider context – at the level of genre. *Eros* is, at this date (third century AD), more at home in the novel than in epic.²³⁰

Quintus does make use of Homer in this scene; for instance, Paris' wish to have died before becoming involved with Helen (*Post.* X.287-88), and the comment that he left Oenone at home against his will (*ouk ethelon*, 287), recall Helen's self-reproach in *Iliad* VI (344ff.). Also, Oenone's wish to *devour* Paris (*Post.* X.315-16), recalls Achilles' words to Hektor (*Il.* XXII.346-47).²³¹ But, the 'masculine' lines are voiced by the female, and the 'feminine' by the male: these represent gender inversions. Through the marrying of these, and numerous other elements, expressed in Paris, Quintus, reconfigures the heroic. In these senses, this Paris/Oenone episode (as Penthesileia/Achilleus) is used to 'gender epic'. Furthermore, that Paris' (a man) salvation depends upon Oenone (a woman), conveys an epic rarity;²³² this factor makes Penthesileia, a 'light to the Trojans' (i.e. women and *men en masse*),²³³ even more marked.

²²⁹ I explore a further similarity, the unusual length of Achilles' and Paris' death-scenes, in Ch.II.2.4.

²³⁰ Regarding the Greek Novel, E. Bowie notes: "It is uncertain what features should be seen as characterizing the genre," (1999), 124. Bowie explores the extant Chariton, Xenophon of Ephesus, Longus, Achilles and Heliodorus (1999, ch.6). However, he continues, "the plot is one element of unity." This incorporates: boy and girl of aristocratic background falling in love; being separated shortly before/ after marriage; subjected to melodramatic adventure; travel; reunited. All of these elements feature in this protracted episode (*Post.* X.270-331; 411-89), which, just as Penthesileia with Achilleus, locate the Eros theme as far more central to epic than was traditional. As well as Bowie, see Schmeling (1996); Swain (1999). On "gender" and "genre", see Hinds (2000).

²³¹ And Hekabe's wish regarding Achilleus (*Il.* XXIV.212-13).

²³² Cf.: Homer's Odysseus and Calypso (*Od.* V); Apollonius' Jason and Medea (*Argon.* III). Oenone's potion (*pharmak'*, *Post.* X.292) required to save Paris, may recall Medea's *pharmakon* required to help Jason

So, there are examples of transgressions in Homer. And, this is what they are – examples of anomalies, made more marked by their peculiarity and rarity. However, in these Homeric instances, it is the *individual*, as opposed to the collective (men and women *en masse*) who challenges, here, gender boundaries.²³⁴ As shown, this is not the case in Quintus, where traditional categorization is far less distinct. Such ‘un-epic’ expressions communicate novel approaches to epic that also reflect Quintus’ engagement with Hellenistic writers like Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes.²³⁵

Part 3 - Gender-Specific Lamentations

In this section, I wish to examine lamentations in the *Posthomerica*. Again, this will be shown to be highly significant to, and representative of, Quintus’ approach to ancient epic. Predominantly in the *Iliad*, lamentation is gendered: women lament most frequently.²³⁶ It is their *modus operandi*, as fighting is for males: (women) “contrast male power with human weakness, κλέος with ἄχος and πένθος and, finally, the battlefield with the οἶκος”, (Tsagalis (2004), 68). As with patterns of conflict in the *Posthomerica*, Quintus challenges such gender-based activity: in Quintus, men, individually and *en masse*, lament far more and with greater intensity than their Homeric counter-parts; and women lament less.

Initially, I will focus on the *Posthomerica*’s intertextual relationship with Homer’s epics, especially the *Iliad*. I will begin with analysis of verbal expressions of lament in Homer, such as the rarely occurring *threnos*, and more frequent *goos* (both terms mean ‘shrill cry’, Alexiou (1974), 102).²³⁷ Here I will explore the structural similarities that Quintus engages with; for instance who laments, and what is said. Following this, I will consider the non-verbal expressions of epic grief (the physical “how” of lamentation). In the final

complete Aietes’ deadly task (*Argon.* III.1014). See Hunter (2004), esp. ch. 3.iii; Virgil’s Aeneas and Dido (*Aen.* I-IV); W. Camps (1989), ch. IV.

²³³ See above, *Post.* I.93-5, 554-57.

²³⁴ Cf. Nestor, the old man who still fights; Ch.III.1.1.

²³⁵ On Hellenistic poetry, see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), Hopkinson (1990), Hutchinson (1997), Bulloch (1993), ch. 1.

²³⁶ See Tsagalis (2004), ch. 3.4. Alexiou (1974), 10; Van Wees (1998).

²³⁷ See Alexiou (1974), 11-13, and ch. 6; Tsagalis (2004), ch. 1.2.

part of my exploration of lamentation, I will consider tragic laments, because they seem to act as a type of intermediary between the gender-specificity of laments in early (Homer) and late (Quintus) epic.

3.1 - *Threnos, Goos and Homeric Soundings*

Threnos and *goos* are often words most closely associated with expressions of lamentation in ancient literature. In her study of ritual laments in ancient and modern Greece, Alexiou (1974, 210n.68) notes, that *goos* is the term most frequently used in Homer for the laments given in full, and these have two common features: “they are improvisations inspired by the grief of the occasion, and ... they are sung by all the dead man’s relations or close friends” (13).²³⁸ The most formal manifestation of verbal lamentation is expressed through the *threnos*. The antiphonal structure of these laments in the *Iliad*, expressed by women, follows these patterns: female (often captive) singers begin with musical *threnos*; refrain of cries answers; finally lament taken up by next of kin who sings verse in turn; pattern repeats (12). The Iliadic lament for Hektor, involving the “kinswomen” Andromache, Hekabe and Helen (one could classify Helen as either captive or kinswomen, but considering her role in this ritual lament, as a leader in the wailing, here she clearly expresses lament as a relative (a sister-in-law, *Il.* XXIV.720-23, as cited above), provides excellent example of antiphony, and I shall come back to this later.

However, there are only two instances of the use of *threnos* in Homer. One occurs in the *Odyssey*.²³⁹ The other, which is of particular interest for my study of lament in Quintus, is found in *Iliad* XXIV.721 and 722:

παρὰ δ' εἶσαν ἀοιδούς
 θρήνων ἐξάρχους, οἳ τε σπονόεσσαν ἀοιδὴν
 οἱ μὲν ἄρ' ἐθρήνεον, ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναῖκες.
 τῆσιν δ' Ἀνδρομάχη λευκώλενος ἦρχε γόοιο

²³⁸ Alexiou cites the following examples: *Il.* VI.499-500, XVIII.51, XXIV. 723, etc.

²³⁹ Alexiou cites (11-12), this is by the nine Muses who sang *threnos* (*Od.* XXIV.61) for the dead Achilles (as reported by Agamemnon, *Od.* XXIV. 36-97); note too the summary of this lament in the *Aithiopsis*, and the use of *threnei* (*Aith.* Arg.4), in West (2003).

‘and by his side (the others) set singers, leaders of the dirge, who led the song of lamentation – they chanted the dirge, and to it the women added their laments. And among these white-armed Andromache led the wailing ...’ (*Iliad* XXIV.720-23)²⁴⁰

Alexiou notes that the distinction between the *threnos* and the *goos* is most clearly defined in Homer: “the *threnos* of the professional mourners ... was a proper song, and the *goos* of the kinswomen ... was merely wailed”, (12).

Quintus inherited a mass of literature, yet, it is in the epic female *threnos* “(ritual) dirge” and *goos* “lament” of Homer that we can see the outline for the model of *male* lamentation he uses in the *Posthomerica*. This is not to say that the male lament was non-existent, but it was certainly neither typical nor prevalent in ancient *epic*. Although males grieve in Homer, the developed *threnos* is a female affair. However, as will be discussed, gender-specific utterances filtered through other genres, such as tragedy, found expression in less conventional ways. Homer does provide noteworthy examples of male lamentation, but they are rare: Achilles for Patroklos (*Il.* XVIII.22-27); Priam for Hektor (*Il.* XXII.416-28); their shared lamentations (*Il.* XXIV.507ff.); Agamemnon for Menelaos (*Il.* IV.155-82).²⁴¹

The term *threnos* is used nowhere in the *Posthomerica*. Also, surprisingly, for a work in which major heroes die with such frequency, there is relatively little particular focus on extended coverage of funerals and formalized lament (e.g. for Penthesileia (*Post.* I), Memnon (*Post.* II) and Eurypylos (*Post.* VIII)); in contrast, Hektor’s funeral and laments dominate the last hundred or so lines of the *Iliad* (*Il.* XXIV.707-804). However, although there is not a *threnos*, and thus no antiphonal lament as such, Quintus makes great use of the *threnos*-like structure, and *goos* and physical manifestation of lamentation in ways that engage with Homer. In the *Iliad*, the major lament (both in terms of coverage and organized structure) is for Trojan Hektor.²⁴² In the *Posthomerica*, however, the main

²⁴⁰ Noteworthy, however, is the very similar structural role Achilles’ plays in the lament for Patroklos: ‘So he (Achilleus) spoke, and they raised their voice of wailing all together, and Achilleus led’ (*Il.* XXIII.12).

²⁴¹ On Agamemnon’s (“pseudo-*γόος*”) lament, see Tsagalis (2004), 112ff.

²⁴² Though laments for Patroklos also provide key examples of epic grief.

lament is for the Greek Achilleus (*Post.* III.401-630 – this exceptional length²⁴³ is striking, as it is for Achilleus’ death-scene),²⁴⁴ followed by that for his comrade Aias (*Post.* V.492-558). And, although the tight-knit structure of the Homeric *threnos* is not strictly adhered to in Quintus, there are many similarities: the key difference being, in these major Posthomeric laments, comparable to those for the Iliadic Hektor, it is the *men*, *not* the *women*, who are the chief mourners.

The structure of the Iliadic *threnos*, “professional singers begin with a musical *threnos*, answered by a refrain of cries, and then the lament is taken up by the next of kin...”,²⁴⁵ is also evident in Quintus, but with important differences. For example, following the death of Achilleus, the Achaeans lament (γόον, *Post.* III.400; γόου, 408) and then the Myrmidons (422ff.): no dirge is being *sung*, nor is there any response *specifically* to the initial (Achaean) lament, although the Myrmidon cries *περι* ‘around’ the body of Achilleus (422-23) are not dissimilar from laments of the women *παρὰ*, ‘by’ Hektor (*Il.* XXIV.720).

These collective laments in *Posthomeric* III, are followed by those of individual Greeks: Aias (*Post.* III.435-58), Phoenix (463-89) and Agamemnon (493-503). With reference to these Posthomeric lamentations for *Achilleus*, one notes that Aias picks up on the opening group laments of the Greeks. Echoing the Iliadic Achilleus with Priam, Aias *στενάχων* (427) *ὀλοφύρατο* “bemoans” (434) the fact that he (Achilleus) will never see his old father, Peleus, again (427-58); Quintus’ inclusion of Phoenix’ lament further links Achilleus’ Iliadic lament in Book XXIV with this Posthomeric episode. Thus Quintus’ Phoenix acts as a surrogate father, once again to Achilleus, but this time on an intertextual level (*Post.* III.463-89). Quintus extends this reference again, as Nestor weeps, reminded of the death of his son, Antilochos.²⁴⁶ Structurally, then, these Posthomeric male laments for Achilleus bear close similarities to the female dominated Iliadic laments (*threnoi*, to be precise) for Hektor: lament initiated by the group; then “taken up” by individuals (as Andromache *ἦρχε γόοιο* (*Il.* XXIV.723), so Aias *πρώτοισι... στενάχων* [*Post.* III. 427]).

²⁴³ ‘Textual space’ = number of lines.

²⁴⁴ See Ch.II.1.1.

²⁴⁵ Alexiou, 12.

²⁴⁶ *Post.* III.514-17; cf. Achilleus weeping for Peleus, reminded by old Priam of his father (*Il.* XXIV.507ff).

Noteworthy too, is the phrase *γόν δ' ἀλίσστων*. The Achaeans' 'ceaseless grieving' (*Post.* III.400) for Achilles' death and their fears (400ff.), acts as another type of textual link between the laments for Hektor in *Iliad* XXIV, and the Posthomeric laments for Achilles. In response to Hekabe's wailing for Hektor, the Trojans grieve ceaselessly (*γόν δ' ἀλίσστων*, *Il.* XXIV.760). So, use of this phrase in this context is marked, as its Iliadic placing (lament for Hektor) was *female dominated*. In the *Iliad*, the Trojans (e.g. male and female), grieve. In the *Posthomeric* the males *alone* grieve. Thus its presence in the text at this point is telling. *Γόν δ' ἀλίσστων* is part of the Iliadic *threnos* scene. So, its use in the Posthomeric lament for Achilles recalls this scene, and creates a closer bond between the female lamenters of the *Iliad*, and the male lamenters of the *Posthomeric*.

The same patterns of echo and reversal can be seen elsewhere. With reference to the Greek males (the army), the primary narrator focalizes their response following Achilles' death. Every Greek is devastated, and recalls their: parents (*tokeon*), wives (*gynaikon*), and children (*nepiachois*) (*Post.* III.403ff.). Parallel concern is expressed by the *Troades* in Homer. When Hektor returns from battle, they smother him, asking about their: sons (*paidas*); brothers (*kasignetous*); friends (*etas*); and husbands (*posias*) (*Il.* VI.238-40). These are, in fact, inversions: all categories of Greek heroes (son, husband, etc.) recalls all categories of non-heroes (parent, wife, etc.); whilst all categories of Trojan women (mother, sister, etc.) recall all categories of Trojan heroes (sons, brothers, etc.).

Quintus' heroes express similar concern to Homer's women. Furthermore, the frequency of such occurrences in this context, the lament for Achilles, the major lament in the *Posthomeric*, as was Hektor's in the *Iliad*, is, therefore, highly suggestive. (In such a work, one would also expect a play on '*penthos*', with regard to Penthesileia. Quintus does not disappoint: soon after her death (*Post.* I.629), it is noted that Ares felt '*penthos*' for his daughter (*Post.* I.675); *immediately* after her death, the primary narrator states that the *Troes* (Trojan males) were overwhelmed with *penthos* (I.632). Here, the latter is especially relevant as it shows men, *en masse*, lamenting for a woman.²⁴⁷)

²⁴⁷ Cf. The *Troades* for Hektor (*Il.* XXIV.722), and the handmaids for Patroklos (*Il.* XVIII.28-31).

Other Posthomeric laments follow, in fact many more than for the Iliadic Hektor (e.g. the captive maids, *Post.* III.544ff.; Briseis, III.560-73; the Argives, III.784; and the Nereids and Thetis, III.582-630).²⁴⁸ And, although the subject of the lamentation has changed (the Iliadic Hektor becomes the Posthomeric Achilles), as has the gender of the three individual mourners in *this* context, there are striking resemblances between the Iliadic *threnos* for Hektor and the Posthomeric *goos* for Achilles; as Hektor has ‘become’ Achilles, so too Quintus’ Aias, Phoenix and Agamemnon equate to Homer’s Andromache, Hekabe and Helen. Even the length of their lamentations is not greatly dissimilar (cf. the Iliadic Andromache, 725-45; Hekabe, 748-59; Helen, 762-75; = 44 verses compared to Quintus’ 59). Thus, these *broad* structural similarities are evident even before considering the content of the laments; the important differences being here the two groups of mourners, Homer’s professional *female singers* and *kinswomen*, are replaced by Quintus’ *Greek soldiers* and *heroes*.²⁴⁹

3.2 - *The Content and Internal Structure of the Iliadic and Posthomeric Laments*

The content and internal structure²⁵⁰ of the three kinswomen’s (Andromache, Hekabe, Helen) laments for Hektor, can be summarized as follows:²⁵¹ The mourner addresses the dead; remembers the past/ imagines the future “in a predominantly narrative section”; concludes by echoing opening address/lament. This is example of the “ternary” form, *ABA*. For example:

Andromache (Il. XXIV.725-45)

A 725-30: Direct address, ἀνερ/ reproach to Hektor for dying so young, ἀνερ, ἀπ’ αἰῶνος νέος ὄλλεο ...

²⁴⁸ But the intertextual atmosphere alters slightly as the narrative shifts to include a simile of Danaan despair (*Post.* III.508-11), and the stoicism of Nestor (518-24).

²⁴⁹ Similarly, the Trojan *men* weep for Penthesileia’s loss (*Post.* I.800-01). This is especially ironic, as usually the women cry *collectively* for the hero’s death in battle; see, for example, the female captives at Patroklos’ death (*Il.* XVIII.28-31); the Troades (led by Andromache) at the death of Hektor (*Il.* XXII.515); the *threnos* of *Iliad* XXIV. And, furthermore, the *πάργω*, ‘funeral rites’ in Homer are the preserve of the hero; see *Il.* VII.85, XVI.456, 674; similarly, note *Post.* I.820, VII.165, IX.43 (see Vian and Battegay, for further Posthomeric examples (1984), 435).

²⁵⁰ I use “internal” to differentiate between the broad structure of the laments (e.g. who speaks and when), and the specifics *within* those laments (e.g. what is said).

²⁵¹ The following summary is based upon Alexiou’s model of analysis for the Iliadic Hektor (1974, 133).

- B* 731-9: Narrative where son's future is envisaged
A 740-5: Renewed address/ reproach to Hektor leaving such grief, ἄρρητον ... γόον
καὶ πένθος ἔθηκας,/ Ἴκτορ.

Using the Posthomerian lament by Aias for Achilles as a test-case, one can see Homeric internal structural echoes:

- Aias* (*Post.* III. 435-58)
A 435-45: Direct address, ὦ Ἀχιλλεῦ
B 446-57: Narrative where Greeks' and father's future is envisaged
C 450-58: Conclusion as to general sorry state of man

More specifically too, there are certain linguistic characteristics in the lament of the Iliadic female which figure prominently in Quintus.

As Alexiou notes, often the lamenter expresses anxiety through the use of questions: Hekabe asks, 'Ah, child! I am wretched – why should I live on in misery and suffering now that you are dead?' (*Il.* XXII.431-32).²⁵² The mourner often reinforces the appeal through contrasting past with present:²⁵³ after an introductory address (often containing questions), the mourner reflects on role of the dead in his lifetime, and what he is *now*; the hopes therein contrasted with present (now) despair; the journey to Hades/ desolation of those left. Alexiou gives Briseis' speech in the *Iliad* in response to Patroklos' death as example:

Πάτροκλέ μοι δειλῆ πλεῖστον κεχαρισμένε θυμῷ,
ζῶν μὲν σε ἔλειπον ἐγὼ κλισίηθεν ἰοῦσα,
νῦν δέ σε τεθνηῶτα κιχάνομαι, ὄρχαμε λαῶν,
ἄψ ἀνιοῦσ' ὡς μοι δέχεται κακὸν ἐκ κακοῦ αἰεί.

²⁵² *Ibid.*, 162.

²⁵³ Alexiou (1974), 165.

‘Patroklos, my soul’s delight! Woe is me! I left you alive when I went out of the hut, and now I come back to find you dead, leader of my people. My life has brought one grief after another.’ (*Il.* XIX.287-90)²⁵⁴

The formula most commonly employed to emphasize past and present opposing states was introduced by one clause containing *before* or *when*, followed by a second clause introduced by *now*²⁵⁵ (in Briseis’ words above, the first part of this formula is satisfied by ἔλειπον; the second with νῦν). Quintus uses such formula, although the context is markedly different as it is *also* the male who laments in this manner.

In Phoenix’ Posthomeric lament for Achilles, we can see aspects of the *before/when* and *now* formula:

ἐπεὶ ἦ νύ μοι ἦτορ ἑώλπει
θρέψειν κηδεμονῆα βίου καὶ γήραος ἄλκαρ.
καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐλπομένῳ βαιὸν χρόνον ἔπλετο πάντα·
νῦν <δὲ> δὴ οἴχη ἄιστος ὑπὸ ζόφον· ἀμφὶ δ’ ἐμὸν κῆρ
ἄχνητ’ οἰζυρῶς, ἐπεὶ ἦ νύ με <πέν>θος ἰάπτει
λευγαλέον·

‘since, full of heart’s delight, I thought I was rearing one who would care for me and support me in old age. All that I had hoped for lasted only a short time. Now you have vanished into the darkness, leaving my heart to sorrow and suffer the pangs of terrible loss.’²⁵⁶ (*Post.* III.477-82)

The use of the formulaic structure, *I* and *you*, was also, like the *before/ now* formula, a significant element of the ancient lament. As Alexiou comments, the use of the second person pronoun, “in all cases, with verbs, relatives and participles, was a universal mode of ritual address in praise of god, hero or man, to be found in the *hymnos* (hymn), *enkomion* (high praise), *epitaphios* (funeral oration) and *threnos* alike.”²⁵⁷

However, while the dead man’s fate, introduced by σὺ, ‘you’, was juxtaposed with the lamenter’s present or future state, introduced by ἐγώ, ‘I’, ritual address in all but the

²⁵⁴ Alexiou’s translation (165).

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁵⁶ Minor adaptations of James.

²⁵⁷ Alexiou, 171 (parenthesis additions mine); see too 133ff.

threnos focussed on the attributes of the hero (or god). Again, Quintus' heroes follow this Homeric trait for female lamentation (formulaic use in the *threnos*). Andromache's Iliadic lamentation for Hektor includes: ὄλεο, καὶ δὲ μέ γήρηγν/ λείπεις ἐν μεγάροισι, '(you are) perished, and you leave me a widow in your halls' (XXIV.725-26). Following this pattern for Iliadic female lament in the *threnos*, the Posthomeric Phoenix wails for Achilles: ὄλεό μοι, φίλε τέκνον, ἐμοὶ δ' ἄχος αἰὲν ἄφυκτον/ κάλλιπες: 'You are dead, my child, and inescapable pain is left' (III.463-64); similarly, in his lament for Achilles, which mirrors that of the "three-part"²⁵⁸ *threnos* for the Iliadic Hektor, Quintus' Agamemnon cries, ὄλεο, Πηλείδην, Δαναῶν μέγα φέρτατε πάντων, ὄλεο, καὶ στρατὸν εὐρὺν ἀνερκέα θήκας Ἀχαιῶν, 'Son of Peleus, best of the Danaans, you are dead. Your death has left the whole of the Achaean host defenceless' (493-94).

One further element of the ancient lament relevant to my study of Quintus is noted by Alexiou. The expression of an unfulfilled *wish* played a traditional part in the mourner's lament. The mourner wished that: she/ they had died (together) or never been born. This type of wish is particularly common in the female lamentations in Homer. Andromache laments: ἦς μὴ ὄφελλε τεκέσθαι, 'How I wish he had never begotten me' (*Il.* XXII.481). Similarly, Helen laments: ἦς πρὶν ὄφελλον ὀλέσθαι, 'I wish I had died before then!' (*Il.* XXIV.764).²⁵⁹ Once more, with reference to the Posthomeric lamentation of Phoenix, one can see Quintus' again "borrowing" another (the "wish") element from Homer. This time, however, the gender(female)-specific utterance is reapplied as these Iliadic expressions of feminine lamentation (the *γούωσα*, 'feminine lament'),²⁶⁰ find new voice through Quintus' *heroes*.

²⁵⁸ Three-part in that three successive Posthomeric laments for Achilles (Aias, Phoenix and Agamemnon), echo those of the three successive laments for the Iliadic Hektor (Andromache, Hekabe and Helen); see above, 3.1-2.

²⁵⁹ Both references supplied by Alexiou, 238n.46; as Alexiou notes, the "wish" is also common in tragedy. But, there are further elements expressed: secondly, that the death had occurred at a different time/place, or in an alternative manner; thirdly, that enemy might suffer similarly (a "curse", 178; e.g. Aes. *Pers.*915-17; Soph. *Ai.*1192-8; Eur. *Andr.*523-5, etc., in Alexiou, 238n.46).

²⁶⁰ *Il.* XXII.476; see Andromache above; and the *threnos*, see Helen above.

Phoenix cries, ὡς ὄφελόν με χυτὴ κατὰ γαῖα κεκεύθει/ πρὶν σέο πότμον ἰδέσθαι ἀμείλιχον. ‘If only the piled up earth had covered me before I saw your (Achilleus’) cruel doom’ (*Post.* III.464-65). Such a formula also reverberates intratextually. Andromache, both warning Penthesileia and bemoaning her predicament, informs Penthesileia, ὡς εἴ με χυτὴ κατὰ γαῖα κεκεύθει/ πρὶν σφε δὲ ἀνθρεῶνος ὑπ’ ἔγχρῃ θυμὸν ὀλέσσαι, ‘I wish that the earth had heaped on me before the spear thrust through his throat cost him his life’ (I.109-10). Thus Quintus’ Phoenix follows the pattern of female lament which he (Quintus) has established early on within his own epic.²⁶¹

3.3 - *Classic Laments*

In this section, I wish to briefly consider Quintus’ engagement with the non-epic genre of tragedy. As will become evident, Quintus seems to have extended the range of epic lament through reference to the tragedians of classical Athens. The gender-specificity of Homeric laments had been challenged and remoulded through the medium of tragedy:²⁶² the near dominance of the female as mourner had been called into question by the tragedians. In the preceding discussions of gender-specificity, with reference to lament, I had examined the structure and content of epic laments, looking at a variety of examples. Here, as my focus is tragedy as an intermediary, I will concentrate on a Teukros as a specific character test-case.

Following the death of Aias, Quintus’ Teukros articulates the mourner’s anxiety questions originating in Homeric female lament:²⁶³ ‘Aias strong in spirit, what disturbed your reason to make you inflict such disastrous death on yourself?’ (*Post.* V.509-10). However, another Greek model would have been available to Quintus. Sophocles’ Teukros in *Aias*

²⁶¹ See too Teukros, *et al.* for Aias (*Post.* V.515-16). For the purposes of concision, I have omitted discussion on non-verbal expressions of grief, but the pattern is the same as with the verbal laments – Quintus intensifies the frequency of male expressions of grief. Key Posthomeric examples include: Aias and Achilleus ‘lying’ (κέχλυτο, I.378) by Patroklos’ tomb; following Achilleus’ death, Aias throws himself to the ground, pouring sand over his head (*Post.* III.433); also the Achaean men (III.408-12). At Aias’ death the Danaans fling themselves upon the dead, throwing dust over their heads (V.490-91). Teukros would have attempted suicide, and he throws himself upon Aias (500-02); so too Podaleirios’ at Machaon’s death (VII.21-34); see Ch.II.2.2. On non-verbal expressions of grief, see Lateiner (2001), esp. 33-37.

²⁶² Cf. Easterling (1984); Rutherford (1982).

²⁶³ The address is noteworthy too; cf. Hekabe to Hektor above, *Il.* XXII.431-32. See too Sophocles’ *Ai.* 879-86; Euripides’ *Tr.* 110-11, *Hek.* 154-64, etc. cited by Alexiou (235n.6).

expresses this structure and content of lamentation, as he mourns the dead Aias, asking a number of questions, such as where he can go (*Ai.* 1005-06); how he will be shamed (by his father, Telamon) (1012ff.); and what can he do (1024). Like the Iliadic Andromache, he highlights his present grief (*nun*, 995), and then imagines the suffering that will be as a result of the death: ‘In the end I *shall* be rejected and cast out from the land, denounced as a slave ... that is what *will* happen at home; and at Troy I have many enemies and little to help me’ (1019-22; he also imagines Telamon’s terrible reaction (1024-27).

In his response to the Posthomeric Aias’ death, Teukros laments as the Posthomeric Phoenix had for Achilles (see above):

οὐδ’ ἔτ’ ἐμοὶ νόστοιο τέλος σέο δεῦρο θανόντος
ἀνδάνει, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς οἴομαι ἐνθάδ’ ὀλέσθαι,
ὄφρα με σὺν σοὶ γαῖα φερέσβιος ἀμφικαλύπτῃ·

‘And I no longer have a desire to return home now that you are dead, but I also long to die here, so that the earth may cover me and you together.’ (*Post.* V.515-17).²⁶⁴

The Sophoclean Teukros neither wishes to die, nor be enveloped by dust, but in his lament there are various references to the laments of Iliadic females, especially Andromache (*Il.* VI.407ff.; XXIV.725-45); e.g. loss of status, and exile. This example, the “tragic” male echoing the Homeric mode of expression for the lament, shows how gender-specific lamentation had come to be received in classical writings.²⁶⁵ This point is very important for my study of Quintus, and shows how the Epic Tradition could be cross-fertilized with other genres. Also, with reference to the *before/then*, and *now* formula, Alexiou notes that, “in the archaising laments of Quintus and Psellos, the Homeric and Hellenistic forms are

²⁶⁴ See James and Lee (2000), 134-39, esp. 137n.509-20 - 138n.515. Cf. Sophocles’ Teukros (*Aias* 992-1039).

²⁶⁵ In tragedy, the classical writers used *threnos* and *goos* and other terms of lament almost interchangeably; Alexiou, 11 and 113; e.g. see *Aias* (*goos*, 629; *threnos*, 631). Their proximity and context are interesting: the Salamian male chorus anticipates Aias’ mother’s response to his death. See too *threnos* at and *Ai.*852 and 924.

preserved without any further development.”²⁶⁶ Alexiou cites as evidence Quintus I.108-11, Andromache’s plea to Penthesileia.²⁶⁷

This (Andromache/ Penthesileia) Posthomeric interlude is closely modelled upon the Iliadic scene between Andromache and Hektor (*Il.* VI.500). Therefore it is interesting to note Alexiou’s point that weeping for the living was a bad omen (as she does with reference to the Iliadic scene). Andromache does not weep for Penthesileia, but her warning for Penthesileia in this context recalls the Iliadic scene. Consider the intertextual links between these episodes: Andromache’s foreshadowing (= the “bad omen”) applies to both Hektor *and* Penthesileia. Thus, again, Penthesileia (briefly) “becomes” the Iliadic Hektor.²⁶⁸ Here, then, we see a type of three-way textual interplay. The epic lament, expressed by Andromache in her premature weeping for Hektor, contrasting time frames (*then/now*), finds voice in tragic utterances. However, now the male too bemoans similarly. Thirdly, the Iliadic scene is recalled in Quintus, but the now the gender of the ill-omened character is female.

Conclusion

Putting Women in their Place: Achilleus

Though part of the *Epic Cycle*, Quintus makes Penthesileia a hugely significant character - arguably the central character - in his opening book. She is exceptionally successful in battle, with a character based mainly on the Iliadic Hektor’s. In this way, Penthesileia provides an ideal choice to suggest the natural continuation from the end of the *Iliad*, to the beginning of Quintus’ new epic. But Quintus also exploits Penthesileia in other important ways.

As Achilleus faces the battle-hungry Amazon, he says:

Ἦ γύναι, ὡς ἀλίισιν ἀγαλλομένη ἐπέεσσιν

²⁶⁶ Alexiou (1974), 166.

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 236n.23.

²⁶⁸ See 1.1.

ἡμέων ἤλυθες ἄντα λιλαιομένη πολεμίζειν,
οἳ μέγα φέρτατοί εἰμεν ἐπιχθονίων ἡρώων·

‘Woman, empty words indeed are your delight. You have come to meet us eager for a fight, when we are far the greatest warriors in the world.’
(*Post.* I.575-77)

Achilleus is discussed in detail in Chapter II, but let us reconsider who, or more precisely what, this ‘woman’ is whose mere presence challenges earlier concepts of gender, heroism and “Homer”?²⁶⁹

The confrontation between Achilleus and Penthesileia is significant in numerous ways. The anomaly (the battling female, here Penthesileia) disrupts the more usual conventions of traditional epic. Penthesileia, through her presence in the context of battle *and* the epic itself, challenges both spheres. Thus through the presence and characterization of Penthesileia, Quintus’ voice can be heard. As Penthesileia challenges epic convention, so too Quintus through her. So, it may not be inappropriate to see a reflection in Penthesileia of Quintus’ own challenge to the Homeric ethos and traditional narrative. Thus, when Achilleus, *the* established epic hero, inseparable from the *Iliad*, and therefore Homer, confronts Penthesileia, we may understand his reproach in a metapoetic sense as the voice of ancient epic (Homer) asserting its pre-eminence; and their confrontation as a battle between the old order, and the new.²⁷⁰

In his first verbal exchange with the Amazon queen, Achilleus’ address, *gynai*, is loaded (*Post.* I.575ff.). It reinforces the inappropriateness of her presence, in that it announces her deviant gender. Furthermore, it undermines her *kleos*; she, unlike the *promachoi* of Homer and Quintus, is nameless when it matters most – in battle, where glory is won.²⁷¹ In his second exchange, following Penthesileia’s speedy death, Achilleus recalls the gender categorization from Homer’s Hektor, to Quintus’ Tisiphone when he tells Penthesileia that

²⁶⁹ On the reception of Homer in antiquity, see Graziosi (2002).

²⁷⁰ Similarly, note other ancient authors and the way they challenge epic convention. E.g. Callimachus on epic versus episodic (e.g. *Ait.*I.1ff.). See General Introduction, *Ambition*. Also, see Cameron (1995), etc.; Apollonius’ Jason as “anti-hero”, etc., Beye (1982), Hunter (2004).

²⁷¹ Note the omission of Cleopatra’s name in the description of Aeneas’ shield – *Aegyptia coniunx* (*Aen.* VIII.688).

she must have been goaded by the Fates to ‘abandon women’s work (*gunaikon erga*) and go to war (*polemon*)’ (*Post.* I.652-53). Penthesileia’s death realigns the anomaly of the battling woman. And, consequently, traditional ancient epic is reinstated: it is a ‘man’s world’, almost.²⁷²

Through such disruptions in the narrative of the more typical ancient epic conventions, Quintus’ heroes also challenge gender more universally in Book I. For instance, as we have seen with reference to the rhetoric of Theano and Tisiphone, and the responses of the Troades, and Achilles to Penthesileia’s death, spheres of existence become blurred. This impacts upon the text in general, as the reverberations are not dependent upon the representation of Penthesileia alone, nor solely of Book I. Quintus also disrupts the gender-specificity of the typical epic lament, as the more usual lamentations dominated by the epic female spill over into the male narrative throughout the *Posthomeric*. Particular lament structures, such as the rare Homeric *threnos*, find voice in Quintus, not as literal echoes, but through types of content-based and structural imitation. Whilst fused with the lamentations of tragedy (already where more traditional gender-specific expressions had been challenged and reconfigured), Quintus takes us back to the earliest narratives through his choice of the most ancient of genres: epic.

Therefore Penthesileia is striking for the early and sustained impact that she makes in Book I, and *throughout* the *Posthomeric*. Her early and bold entrance draws the readers’ attention to distinctiveness of the *Posthomeric*, not merely a Homeric sequel, but something novel and highly rhetorical. Achilles notes that Penthesileia should not be there, but she is. And, from her initial appearance, she challenges the heroes to rethink heroic convention. In a sense, even when she is subdued by Achilles, she will not go away – he (according to Thersites), has already fallen in love with her; the Troades have been inspired to the call to arms; and men will cry - like women. For these reasons, Penthesileia can be seen as something of a champion for Quintus and his poem.

²⁷² Cf. above, on women fighting, and men lamenting. See Hinds (2005); Papaioannou (2007).

Chapter II: Achilleus
The Epic Journeys of Achilleus

‘He was the tallest and the strongest man that I ever slew:’ (*Il.* VII.155)²⁷³

Introduction

As discussed in my General Introduction,²⁷⁴ the broad structure of the *Posthomerica* follows the major events of the *Cycle*. For this reason, the Posthomeric books seem to be self-contained narratives, *epeisodia*. This kind of narrative structure, already criticized by Aristotle (*Poetics*, 1459a-b), receives one of its most famous critiques in the Hellenistic writings of Callimachus, who notes that he ‘hates’ *poiema to kuklikon* (*Epigram XXX*).²⁷⁵ However, though lacking the *Iliad*’s unifying theme (Achilleus’ ‘anger’, *menis*, *Il.* I.1ff.), Quintus avoids the ‘well-trodden, common path’²⁷⁶ of cyclic epic through his *use* of Achilleus; though Quintus appears to follow much of the structure of *Cycle*, in fact manifestations of Achilleus’ character saturate the poem, bind the narrative and provide cohesion. Therefore, Achilleus is an extremely important figure in Quintus’ poem, not only as the Greeks’ greatest hero, but also as the signifier of heroism, epic and Homer.

Firstly, I will explore Quintus’ characterization of Achilleus and show how he engages with previous models of Achilleus. Often Quintus amplifies Achilleus’ most Iliadic characteristics, although Achilleus’ narrative is extended beyond that of the *Iliad*. In part, this creates the effect that Homer’s Achilleus’ is imported into this new text. Metaphorically, Achilleus bears the burden of the *Iliad*²⁷⁷ on his *extremely*²⁷⁸ broad shoulders; at least initially.²⁷⁹ However, facets from other heroes are also woven into

²⁷³ Nestor speaking of his battle against Ereuthalion.

²⁷⁴ Under: *The Epic Cycle and Quintus*.

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*: *Ambition*.

²⁷⁶ Callimachus, *Epigr.* XXX.

²⁷⁷ By burden, I mean the challenge of ‘worthy’ epic post Homer.

²⁷⁸ As will be shown, Quintus enjoys hyperbole, especially with reference to Achilleus.

²⁷⁹ See 2, on Achilleus’ impact on others’ characterization, e.g. Aias (2.3) and, especially, Neoptolemos (Ch.IV.2-3).

Achilleus' Posthomeric construction. These act to extend Achilleus' range beyond that of a gargantuan blusterer, and also open channels for more complex allusions on Quintus' part.

Then, I will explore the ways that Quintus engages with Achilleus to develop the characterization of *other* heroes in the *Posthomeric*. This is important because it shows how central Achilleus is to Quintus' epic. Often behind the most heroic acts of other heroes stands the Iliadic Achilleus, although Quintus does have recourse to other models for Achilleus, too. So, it is important to explore these characters who collectively can reveal more about Achilleus, and, therefore, the way that Quintus engages with this hero and much associated with him.

Finally, I will discuss how Achilleus himself is remembered and reconfigured after his death in the *Posthomeric*. As with the way that Quintus engages with Achilleus the character and Achilleus' characteristics, this section explores how, to what effect and why Quintus characterizes Achilleus the way that he does. However, the fundamental difference is that Achilleus now dead, is present merely as an echo of his Posthomeric self. I explore the way that this echo reverberates, through reminiscences, including song, other verbal and non-verbal recollections, and objects particularly associated with him. By examining these phenomena, I will show how Quintus extends the scope of Achilleus, and his relationship with epic.

Part 1 - *Achilleus' Death*²⁸⁰

1.1 *Dying to End a Good Story*

Superficially, the broad structure of Achilleus' death corresponds with that of other prominent Iliadic and Posthomeric heroes: Sarpedon, Patroklos and Hektor (*Iliad*), and Penthesileia, Memnon, and Achilleus (*Posthomeric*), are fatally overpowered following brilliant *aristeiai* and verbal exchanges with their assailants.

²⁸⁰ See Vian (2003), vol. I, *Livre III, Notice*, esp. 98-102, 169-70; also Burgess (2009), esp. chs. 2 and 5.

From the fatal blow's initial impact, to that of death itself, the account of a hero's death assumes a fairly uniform length, approximately thirty-five lines: Patroklos (*Il.* XVI.821-57) and Hektor (*Il.* XXII.327-63); Sarpedon is approximately a third less (*Il.* XVI.481-503, = twenty-three lines). Patroklos' and Hektor's deaths are particularly noteworthy for their striking similarities: number of lines (thirty-seven, each); content; structure and formulae.²⁸¹ Like these Homeric heroes, Penthesileia's demise is covered in almost exactly the same number of lines (*Post.* I.594-629, = thirty-six lines); although Memnon's demise is noticeably brief (*Post.* II.542-44), as opposed to his lengthy battle with Achilles,²⁸² the pattern so far is that Quintus, as Homer, attributes less than forty lines to the hero's death (including fatal wounding) in battle.

Regarding Achilles, there are fundamental differences in Quintus' representation of his dying process and actual moment of death. Up to and including *Posthomerica* III, Quintus' Achilles proves to be a dramatic exception to the general pattern of textual space allotted to such death-scenes.²⁸³ From the fatal impact of Apollo's shaft, to the actual moment of death, the account occupies over one hundred lines (*Post.* III. 62-176, = one hundred and sixteen lines; to line 179 (one hundred and eighteen lines) if including the Fall²⁸⁴), approximately three times the textual space of the Iiadic Patroklos and Hektor (more than five times longer than Sarpedon's), and Quintus' own Penthesileia. Thus, the duration of Achilles' death and dying scene is hugely extended.²⁸⁵

The scale of this death-narrative is highly unusual in Greek epic; especially when considering the possible upper word limit such narrative could have occupied in the *Aithiopsis*. The *Aithiopsis* constituted five books,²⁸⁶ and covered the deaths of Penthesileia, Antilochos, Memnon and Achilles; the burials of Antilochos and Achilles (and his

²⁸¹ See Willcock (1984), 244n.830-67, 296n.330-67; Janko (1999), 415-20; N. Richardson (2000), 139-43.

²⁸² See below, 1.3i, and 2.1i.

²⁸³ Cf. Paris' Posthomerian death/dying, below, 2.4.

²⁸⁴ See following on conventional order of events.

²⁸⁵ On 'duration', see S. Richardson (1990); Genette (1983), 86.

²⁸⁶ For summaries of the contents of the *Epic Cycle*, see West (2003), 14-19.

funeral games); and the quarrel between Odysseus and Aias over Achilles' divine armour. The longest Iliadic book is no more than nine hundred lines;²⁸⁷ therefore, it is unlikely that the *Aithiopsis* would have exceeded four thousand lines in total. In an epic of this length with so much to cover, it is probable that Achilles' death would have occupied far fewer lines than it does in Quintus.

We could ask ourselves, why is Achilles portrayed in such a way? And what is the effect of such a portrayal? In the first instance, Quintus is breaking away from the norm. For the reader attuned to epic conventions, such 'misdirection'²⁸⁸ is marked: we could expect a death-scene like that of Patroklos or Hektor, for a major hero. Then, such intertextual 'misdirection' creates tension between 'our' (the reader/ receiver) expectation and the actual episodes. Therefore, Quintus creates a 'space' to inject something into a hero who has been so comprehensively explored. Equally, by 'borrowing' overwhelming character motifs from the Iliadic Achilles (i.e. rage and battling brilliance), Quintus' Achilles is as unmistakably Achillean in representation as in name (*the* marker of character).

That Quintus' Achilles rages so could also be due to the finality of the episode – *the* 'final performance': in a biographic (and narrative) sense, Achilles' time is fast coming to an end. This is his (and Quintus'), last opportunity to make a significant impression worthy of such a character, and his illustrious Homeric lineage. So, Achilles' dying is proportionate to his status in the epic tradition: 'great' in numerous senses; whilst at a narrative level, both engaging with, and rejecting, the Iliadic models. Put simply, Quintus' handling of Achilles' death shows how he intends to spotlight this scene, and is a strong indicator of his reception of the greatest Trojan War hero and epic.²⁸⁹

It is worth briefly looking at the most significant warrior deaths in the *Iliad* and the *Posthomerica* to appreciate how Quintus extends this narrative episode.

²⁸⁷ 897 lines, *Iliad* XXIII; cf. the *Posthomerica* (830 lines, Book I).

²⁸⁸ See Morrison (1995).

²⁸⁹ Whether or not the *Aithiopsis* was extant/available to Quintus, the point holds: Quintus spotlights Achilles' death. On the *Cycle*'s circulation, see General Introduction: *The Epic Cycle and Quintus*.

Deaths of Patroklos and Hektor (Iliad):

Content (1)	Patroklos (<i>Il.</i> XVI.821-57):	Hektor (<i>Il.</i> XXII.327-63):
Mortally Wounded	(821)	(327)
Falls	(822)	(330)
Simile	(823-26)	-
Victor's Rhetoric ²⁹⁰	(830-42)	[a] 331-36; b) 345-54]
Answer ²⁹¹	(844-54)	[a] 338-43; b) 356-60]
Death	(855-57)	(361-63)

Here we can see how Homer 'fills' (i.e. textual space = number of lines allotted to the whole death-scene and each element) the narrative of the death-scene. Major differences become apparent when considering the main elements in Achilles' death in the *Posthomerica*. The pattern in the *Posthomerica* is similar:

Deaths of Penthesileia, Memnon and Eurypylos (Posthomerica):

Content (2)	Penthesileia (<i>Post.</i> I.612-24):	Memnon (<i>Post.</i> II.542-46):	Eurypylos (<i>Post.</i> VIII.200-05)
MW ²⁹²	(612)	(542)	(200-01)
Falls	(622)	(545-46)	(204-05)
Simile	(625-27)	-	(204-06)
VR ²⁹³	- ²⁹⁴	-	-
Answer	-	-	-
Death	(624)	(544)	(202-03)

Death of Achilles (Posthomerica):

(The schema for the death of Achilles however is as follows (the underlined headings below indicate addition of the element in Quintus, i.e. they are absent in the Iliadic examples above.)

²⁹⁰ Pre-killing.

²⁹¹ See ii) *Victim's Rhetoric*, below.

²⁹² Mortally Wounded.

²⁹³ Victor's Rhetoric. Again, see 'Victim's Rhetoric', under *Death of Achilles*, below.

²⁹⁴ Here, the equivalent of the 'Victor's Rhetoric' occurs after the death (*Post.* I.644-53).

Content (3)	Achilleus (<i>Post.</i> III.62-179)
Mortally Wounded	(62)
Falls (i)	(63-6)
Simile ²⁹⁵ (i)	(63-6)
<u>Victim's Rhetoric</u> ²⁹⁶ (i)	(68-82) ²⁹⁷
<u>Removal of weapon</u>	(83-4)
Dying (i)	(85-7)
 <i>Narrative Shift</i> ²⁹⁸	
<u>Gods on Olympos</u>	(87-138)
 <i>Narrative Return</i>	
<u>Fighting thoughts</u> (i)	(138-40)
<u>Simile</u> (ii)	(142-46)
<u>Fighting thoughts</u> (ii)	(147-48)
<u>Aristeia</u>	(149-63)
Dying (ii)	(164-65)
<u>Victim's Rhetoric</u> (ii)	(167-69)
<u>Simile</u> (iii)	(170-72)
Death	(175-79)
<u>Falls</u> (ii)	(177)
<u>Simile</u> (iv)	(177)
<u>Falls</u> (iii)	(179)

²⁹⁵ On the similes in this episode, see 1.1v.

²⁹⁶ This differs from the 'Answer' above as the headings suggest: 'Answer' is a response to the 'Victor's Rhetoric'; whereas, 'Victim's Rhetoric' is more akin to the tone of 'Victor's Rhetoric'/ rhetoric of hero during *aristeia*, e.g. Achilleus (mortally wounded) vaunts like the battling, not subdued, hero.

²⁹⁷ NB. the significant omission at this point (following the victim's 'Fall') of the 'Victor's Rhetoric'.

²⁹⁸ 'Narrative', in this context, means the *focus* of the telling, the *subject* of what is being told; see Genette (1983), 161ff., 'Mood', and Lowe (2000), esp. chs.1 and 2, and his *Glossary*. See too S. Richardson on 'narrative time' and 'story time' (9ff.). The narrative focus moves from Achilleus to the gods on Olympos. By introducing a shift of focus, Quintus is introducing simultaneity into this death-scene which is not present in the similar Homer scenes. This extends Achilleus' dying, and the scale of the scene. Regarding this episode, consider especially Hera's reproach of the anti-Achillean Apollo (*Post.* III.98-127), echoing that of *Il.* XXIV.55-63 (and Hera with Zeus, *Il.* IV. 49-55); see James (2004), 282n.96-127.

It is clear that the Posthomeric episode is packed with many more elements than the *Iliad*.²⁹⁹ Also, the structure of the Iliadic (and *other* Posthomeric) episodes (six parts),³⁰⁰ appears relatively simple in comparison to that of Quintus' eighteen for Achilles, where the chronology of the Homeric prototype has been tampered with.³⁰¹ As with Penthesileia's arming scene,³⁰² Quintus has made significant changes to generic scenes, which appear all the more marked for this engagement with, then rejection of, the norm. Each of the elements in Achilles' death-scene is worth close analysis. However, with particular reference to the textual space allotted to this scene, certain elements specifically stand out.

i) *Repetition and Doubling*

Quintus expands Achilles' death by revisiting elements already covered in this episode. Achilles 'falls' in a death stupor not once but three times; has fighting thoughts twice (likewise his battling rhetoric); and we are told that he is dying twice. With the exception of Achilles and Hektor,³⁰³ where they are engaged in a brief verbal exchange, repetition of death-scene elements is uncommon. Such 'doublings' play an important part in Achilles' death-scene as they account for over one third of the textual space allotted (just over forty lines). They are a key factor in extending the duration of the scene. One can also view them as a continuation of theme, a type of narrative 'trick'. So, for example, though Achilles' first falls at *Post.* III.63-6, he is still falling over one hundred lines later (179). This repetition can create the effect of magnitude and continuity, although he does pick himself up in the interval (e.g. *anorouse*, 149): 'what a fall, a rise, and fall again!' Furthermore, the multiple 'falls', punctuated by Achilles' continued onslaughts emphasize how truly exceptional he is – he just will not die, and, in-so-doing, briefly defies Apollo, and epic convention.

²⁹⁹ For example, Quintus adds the 'victim's rhetoric', 'removal of weapon', 'dying', 'gods on Olympos', 'fighting thoughts', and '*aristeia*', though 'victor's rhetoric' and 'answer' do not figure; therefore, two out of the six Homeric elements differ.

³⁰⁰ Seven, if considering the double 'Victor's Rhetoric' and 'Answer' in 'Hektor'.

³⁰¹ Quintus has 'shuffled the pack', and added a few of his own 'cards' (sometimes more than once).

³⁰² See Ch.I.1.4ii.

³⁰³ See *Death of Hektor*, 'Victor's Rhetoric' and 'Answer' above.

ii) *Victim's Rhetoric*

Although both Patroklos and Hektor are involved in verbal exchanges with their subduers, they do not instigate their rhetoric like Quintus' Achilles does. Much of what the Iliadic pair says is in response to their subduers' battling vaunts. Here Achilles differs. He spends fourteen lines (*Post.* III.68-82) in a monologue which is more in response to the *mode* of attack, than directed at a specific attacker. Certainly a key part of this is that, unlike Patroklos and Hektor, Achilles does not face his foe, Apollo:

'Who was it shot a dreadful arrow at me by stealth? Let him have the courage to face me openly, to have his black³⁰⁴ blood and all his bowels gushing out around my spear, to send him off to sorrowful Hades ... ' (*Post.* III.68-71)

(Achilleus' threat, to send his enemy to Hades (*Post.* III.71) perhaps echoes the opening of the *Iliad*, where his *menis* is most pronounced, *Il.* I.1-3; and his angry response at stealth, having been hit in the ankle, may invite comparison with Diomedes' critique of Paris, following Diomedes' wounding in the foot, *Il.* XI.375-95.³⁰⁵) Compare Lucan's Scaeva, who is fatally attacked but continues to kill (*Civil War*, VI.192-206). I am not arguing here that Quintus was necessarily influenced by Lucan (though the similarity is suggestive). Rather, that Quintus chooses to embellish his poem in melodramatic ways that bear similarity to Roman literature, and the effects in the Achilles' death-scene seem to owe something to the penchant for the grotesque dating from Roman Imperial times.³⁰⁶

Achilleus continues in bellicose fashion, more suited to battle rhetoric than the dying hero's last words. This includes moralizing on how *not* to conduct oneself on the battlefield (*Post.* III.76), and musings over Thetis' prophecy (78ff.). Thus, even in death's clutches, Achilles is most unusually loquacious; his rhetoric far outstripping that of the

³⁰⁴ My translation.

³⁰⁵ For neoanalytic readings of this and other Iliadic episodes, see Willcock (1997), esp. 188. Burgess provides a useful definition: "In more general terms neoanalysis can be described as a willingness to explore the influence of pre-Homeric material on the Homeric poems" (2001), 62; also 61-4. On neoanalysis, see too, Kakridis (1949), Pestalozzi (1945), Kullmann (1960, 1981), Clark (1986).

³⁰⁶ Also, Seneca's gory handling of Hippolytus' death (*Phaedra*, 1093ff.; cf. Euripides' less severe *Hipp.* 1236-39). Dihle's comments on Lucan's work seem applicable to Quintus: "Lucan's contemporaries evidently loved art that was bizarre, shocking, or exaggerated, seeing this as the best way to escape the compulsion to produce and consume progressively refined imitations of canonized models" (1994), 118-19.

‘Victims’ in the equivalent Iliadic scenes. Nearly one hundred lines later, Achilles still berates the Trojans. In fact, in his second monologue (167-69), Achilles outdoes personal death-prophecies of the Iliadic Patroklos and Hektor, when foreshadowing that ‘all’ (*pantes*, 168) shall pay the price for his death (168-9).

iii) *Narrative Shift*

The narrative shift at *Post.* III.87ff. is another anomaly. In the Iliadic death-scene, the focus does not move from the location of the battle-field, and the duelling figures under the spotlight, *once fatally wounded*.³⁰⁷ Yet Quintus’ Apollo seems to act as the vehicle for the focus shift; transporting ‘us’ to Olympos, the dying hero is left for over fifty lines (87-138). Thus, Quintus creates room to heighten this drama. The narrative device, the ‘delaying tactic’/‘retardation’, is not uncommon in Homer.³⁰⁸ More specifically, these types of narrative shifts occur in similar battling contexts with Sarpedon, Patroklos and Hektor. In Sarpedon’s case, we ‘cut’ to Olympos just *before* he is fatally wounded (*Il.* XIV.413ff.), Hera and Zeus discussing his fate. Regarding Patroklos, we learn that the gods desert him (XIV.794ff).³⁰⁹ With reference to Hektor, in a scene highly reminiscent of that with Sarpedon, Zeus plus another immortal (here Athene; with Sarpedon, Hera), argues the merits of Hektor’s case (i.e. should he live or die?). This begins well before Hektor is mortally wounded (XXII. 166ff.); there is a further narrative shift, again before the mortal wounding, when the focus briefly moves from the battle to Zeus and his ‘golden scales’ (209-13). In all of these Iliadic scenes, the narrative shift occurs *prior* to the actual wounding. This narrative shift, occurring where it does (unusually *after* the wounding), enables Quintus to extend Achilles’ dying way beyond the textual point that such an episode typically occupies, with the overall effect that he is indeed taking longer to die.³¹⁰

³⁰⁷ The Sarpedon shift from battle plain to Olympos, occurs before he is mortally wounded (*Il.* XVI.426ff).

³⁰⁸ On such digressions, see de Jong (2004), 22-3, who cites the story of Odysseus’ scar (*Od.* XIV.393-466). As de Jong shows, the digression can relieve or contribute to the tension.

³⁰⁹ Perhaps this is not exactly the same in principle, as the narrative shift does not take us to Olympos explicitly, however, mention of the gods disrupts the presentation of events as purely earth-based.

³¹⁰ Quintus also takes the opportunity to recall various myths relating to Achilles (the Wedding of Peleus and Thetis, *Post.* III.99ff.), and others (Laomedon, 109-13), whilst foreshadowing Neoptolemos’ coming (119-22).

iv) *Fighting Thoughts and Aristeia*³¹¹

Fighting thoughts following serious wounding are not entirely foreign to Quintus. As noted, Penthesileia considers continuing fighting.³¹² However, she decides against this; Achilleus does not. Quintus' Achilleus will not be anyone's suppliant. Quintus shows us that even in the throes of death, Achilleus' fighting spirit cannot be tempered. In fact, he is as bent on killing as the most battle-hungry Iliadic Achilleus (e.g. *Il.* XX.455ff.; XXI.116ff.), his 'dark blood *longing* (*ἐέλδομένοιο*) to fight' (*Post.* III.140), where Penthesileia *longed* (*ἐέλδομένη*) to live (I.609). The 'rage' inflaming Achilleus' heart (*cholos*, *Post.* III.147; and previously for Antilochos' death, *choloumenos*, III.10), is not an original touch, as this is a trademark attribute of Achilleus (Homer and beyond),³¹³ so too battling resolve in his very 'blood' (*ezeen aima*, 140, 163). Yet such anger and blood-lust are highly unusual for a *dying* hero. Similarly, Achilleus' *aristeia* and the attention to gory detail (a brain being penetrated (153-54), an eyeball falling from its socket (156), a severed tongue (159)) are not exceptional until one considers that these elements are all part of a death-scene where it is the one who is *actually dying* who continues to inflict these fatal blows.

v) *Similes*:³¹⁴ *As Numerous as Leaves (and the Generations of Men)*

In the death-scene similes occur four times. This aspect of the death-scene is noteworthy not only for the simile's frequency and duration.³¹⁵ The simile is also one of the most effective ways for the narrator to indicate his presence within the text.³¹⁶ Although not as overt as a direct address, e.g. to the unknowing secondary narratee (the character *within* the text), or 'educated' primary narratee (the reader/ audience *outside* the text³¹⁷),³¹⁸ such embellishment of an episode subtly reminds us of the narrator's presence. Thus the

³¹¹ On Achilleus in battle, see 1.3i and 2.1i.

³¹² See Ch.I.1.1.

³¹³ See K. King (1987), under 'anger', 324; also on *menis*, Considine (1986).

³¹⁴ On similes in Quintus, see James and Lee (2000), 19-20.

³¹⁵ It occupies more than ten lines as opposed to the relative few (four) in Patroklos' death, and it is entirely absent in Hektor's death (see 'Content (1)' above).

³¹⁶ On further indications of presence, the primary narrator, see Ch.V.

³¹⁷ Of which there are many more instances in Quintus (equally heir of the bookish Hellenistic world, as that of ancient (oral) epic) than in Homer. See Ch.V; also, General Introduction: *Ambition*.

³¹⁸ See de Jong (2004a), ch.1; (1997a), 311-12.

repetitive use of similes particularly, in an unusually long passage where the narrator's 'mark' is already evident through other repetitions, helps Quintus bring something new to the culturally burdened super hero, and *he* (the primary narrator) is inextricably involved in Achilles' death; he 'writes' himself into the narrative and character, and, therefore, epic.

Following the fatal strike Achilles is gripped with pain and he 'falls' (*anetrápet'*, *Post.* III.63; *eklithe*, 66). The fall is 'like a tower that from the force of a subterranean vortex collapses on top of the deeply shaken earth', *ὁ δ' ἀνετράπετ' ἥύτε πύργος, / ὃν τε βίη τυφῶνος ὑποχρονίη στροφάλιγγι / ῥήξει ὑπὲρ δαπέδοιο κραδαιομένης βαδὺ γαίης* (63-5).³¹⁹ This is a striking variation on the more usual epic simile describing a fall: (Sarpedon) 'fell as an oak falls, or a poplar, or a tall pine ...' (*Il.* XVI.482ff.). Quintus uses such a tree simile with Penthesilea (I.625-27, which in turn, is based on that of *Iliad* XVII.53-8), and Eurypylos (slain by Neoptolemos, *Post.* VIII.204-06).³²⁰ Though, in the simile Achilles is the 'tower', its relationship with the 'subterranean vortex' (an 'earthquake'), communicates extreme elemental force (Achilleus), and is developed here, and later in the simile applied to Achilles' second fall, when *Achilleus* causes the earth to shake (see below). The subterranean force also echoes the simile applied to Achilles' battle with Memnon, where *they* are the great force (I. 230-02).³²¹

Eute purgos is also significant as it recalls the simile applied to Aias' shield, '*sakos eute purgon*' (*Il.* VII.219).³²² The term *purgos*, 'tower', also connotes *great size* – whilst it applies to Aias' shield, it is applied to Achilles. Nowhere else in numerous occurrences in the *Posthomerica* is it applied to a hero,³²³ always to fortifications, and most usually, then, to the Trojan stronghold: so, Achilles, the attacker, is as exceptional, powerful and huge, etc., as *the* defence in Troy. However, he does finally fall, like the Trojan

³¹⁹ So too *Post.* II.230-32, On the use of similes in Homer, see M. Edwards (1990), ch. 12; Moulton (1977); Coffey (1957).

³²⁰ As noted by James (2004), 273n. 625-27. See too James on the simile of an earthquake causing buildings to collapse (277n.230-32).

³²¹ James (2004), notes that the reference to a subterranean vortex, caused by earthquakes, is found in Aristotle (*Meteorologika*, 2.7-8), 277n.230-2. On such 'learnedness', see Ch.V.2.3.

³²² Also, *Il.* XI.485, XVII.128. See Kirk (2000), 263-64ns.219-23, 219.

³²³ See Vian and Battegay (1984), 411-12; cf. Cunliffe (1963), 353.

fortification. In this, we can see an allusive foreshadowing of Troy's fall (e.g. *Post.* XII.509-10) – Achilles and Troy are inextricably linked, and more: Achilles in epic and epic in Achilles.

The aligning of Quintus' Achilles with Iliadic Aias, especially his (Aias') largeness, is further emphasized by the frequency of *pelorios* ('of uncommon size/strength') is application to Posthomeric Achilles (x7);³²⁴ of its eighteen Posthomeric occurrences, it is applied to Achilles most: *pelorios*, Aias (x3);³²⁵ Neoptolemos (x4);³²⁶ Penthesileia/Memnon (x1).³²⁷ But as in the case of the application primarily to Aias in the *Iliad* (x4), the adjective is now firmly Achillean. This shows how Quintus internalizes a Homeric quality and reconfigures it as his own. Thus, Achilles *is* very large.³²⁸

Quintus picks up theme of falling again at *Post.* III.177: 'He fell among the dead like a lofty mountain.'³²⁹ The earth resounded with the mighty crash of armour at the fall of Peleus' peerless son', *ἤριπεν ἀμφὶ νέκυσσιν ἀλίγκιος οὐρεῖ μακρῶ·/ γαῖα δ' ὑπεπλατάγησε καὶ ἄσπετον ἔβραχε τεύχη/ Πηλεΐδαο πεσόντος ἀμύμονος* (177-79). Again Achilles' 'lofty mountain' replaces the standard '(lofty/ tall) tree' and conveys something of the 'essence' of the character or subject being described. Through associating Achilles with a great mountain (as opposed to the less imposing, though more common, tree imagery), Quintus communicates his physical enormity. Thus, the engagement with these earlier phenomena creates the effect of amplifying such qualities.

The frequency of the 'fall' is relevant, too (Achilleus x3). Normally, the dying hero falls once: Iliadic Sarpedon (*eripe*, *Il.* XVI.482), Patroklos (*peson*, *Il.* XVI.822) and Hektor (*eripe*, *Il.* XXII.330); Posthomeric Penthesileia (*eripousa*, I.622), Memnon (*kappese*, *Post.* II.545), Aias (*pesontos*, *Post.* V.486) and Eurypylos (*eripe*, *Post.* VIII.204). However,

³²⁴ *Post.* III.719, 740, IV.163, V.113, VII.448, 538, IX.237.

³²⁵ *Post.* IV.264, V.385, 576.

³²⁶ *Post.* VII.538, 554, IX.237, 313.

³²⁷ Respectively, *Post.* I.160, II.109; cf. II.148.

³²⁸ And other central heroes are very large *as* Achilles. See below, 2.

³²⁹ My translation.

Achilleus' continuation to fight even after the initial fall emphasizes his mental desire and physical ability not to succumb as quickly as other preeminent heroes. This highlights numerous qualities that set him apart from even great Trojan War heroes. For the most part the standard epic terms, *eripe* (*eripen*, *Post.* III.177) and *peson* (*pesontos*, 179), are used. *Eklithē* (66), however, is less common and an interesting choice of verb. It was applied to Achilleus when he 'sinks down' (*klinthē*) wearied following Patroklos' cremation (*Il.* XXIII.232). The term, applied to Achilleus, thus evokes the earlier model. This gives a twist to the death-scene, whilst conveying an aspect of the far more complex Achilleus. So, in the 'fall' we see a fusion of past epic deaths, and Achilleus in his grief.

The second simile, occurring at *Post.* III, is more in keeping with our epic expectations, as the Trojans

ἀλλ' ἀπάνευθεν ἀφέστασαν, εὔτε λέοντος
ἀγρόται ἐν ξυλόχοισι τεθρηπότες, ὃν τε βάλῃσι
θηρτήρ, ὃ δ' ἄρ' οὔ τι πεπαρμένος ἦτορ ἄκοντι
λήθεται ἠγορέης, ἀλλὰ στρέφετ' ἄγριον ὄμμα
σμερδαλέον βλοσυρῆσιν ὑπαὶ γενύεσσι βεβρυχώς·

'stood well back, as from a lion rustics in a wood draw back afraid when a hunter has struck it; though a shaft has pieced its heart, it remembers still its courage; as it rolls its glaring eyes it utters a terrible roar from its savage jaws.' (*Post.* III.142-46)

Achilleus is frequently associated with a lion,³³⁰ and although this simile echoes that of Achilleus charging Aeneas at *Il.* XX.164-73,³³¹ there is a major difference. In Quintus, the unusual fact is that the lion is dying and killing, which reflects Achilleus, and is as unusual of the lion-simile as Achilleus' behaviour is of the epic hero. Quintus has taken elements from the *aristeia*-fuelled Iliadic model, and applied them to his dying hero. Achilleus, then, becomes unmistakable. He is also compared to a lion, where the Trojans shudder at his vaunt, as fawns to a roaring lion (*Post.* III.170-72). These references to a 'roaring' lion (*bebruchos*, 146; *epibruchoio*, 171) are noteworthy, also: "For vigorous and lifelike as it is,

³³⁰ See Moulton on lion similes applied to the Iliadic Achilleus (1977, 100).

³³¹ See James (2004), 283n.142-46.

one thing is lacking to the Homeric lion: it is never heard to roar” (Dunbabin).³³² See especially the ‘roar’ of Sarpedon (*bebruchos*, *Il.* XVI.486), when mortally wounded by Patroklos – as a bull wounded by a lion (*Il.* XVI.485-89); also Asius (*Il.* XIII.393). (Neoptolemos’ ‘roar’ is described in exactly the same way: *Post.* III.146=VII. 471.)³³³ Through the lion’s roar of the dying Achilles, Quintus again takes the opportunity to amplify a facet of his Achilles, and extend Homeric techniques.

1.2 *The Death of Achilles*

The actual moment of Patroklos and Hektor’s deaths are formulaic, described in exactly the same way:

Ὡς ἄρα μιν εἰπόντα τέλος θανάτοιο κάλυψε·
 ψυχὴ δ’ ἐκ ῥεθέων πταμένη Ἴδίοσδε βεβήκει,
 ὃν πότμον γούωσα, λιποῦσ’ ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἦβην

‘Just as he spoke these words the end of death enfolded him; and his soul fleeing from his limbs was gone to Hades, bewailing its fate, leaving manliness and youth.’ (*Il.* XVI.855-57, XXII.361-63)³³⁴

In contrast, it is harder to pin down the precise moment of Achilles’ death. Likewise, there appears to be a closer connexion between *process* of his dying and the *event* of his death, i.e. the division between his dying and his death is less distinct than that in Homer, where the solitary fall (the beginning of the dying; almost a self-contained episode) indicates the dying, and the formulaic ‘as he spoke ... leaving manliness and youth’ clearly marks the moment of death; there is no ‘cross-over’ as in Quintus, where the process of dying and the moment of death spill into each other. Rather, the dying and death are inseparable processes, unlike the Iliadic, where they are more sharply defined events. The former amplifies the death through elaboration.

³³² Dunbabin (1957), 46, as Hainsworth (2000), 200.

³³³ On Neoptolemos as ‘second’ Achilles, see Ch.IV.2-3.

³³⁴ Partly, the moment of Sarpedon’s death is narrated similarly (*Il.* XIV.502): See Janko (1999), 381n.502-5; “The same distinctive verse, 502, ends the last words and the lives of the poem’s three major casualties (*Sarpedon, Patroklos, Hektor*) = 16.855, 22.361).”

At *Post.* III.164-65, when Achilles' 'limbs grew cold and his spirit ebbed away, he stopped to lean on his spear', Ἀλλ' ὅτε οἱ ψύχοντο μέλη καὶ ἀπήιε θυμός,/ ἔστη ἐρεισάμενος μελίη ἔπι. This should indicate finality, but does not - Achilles will not be dead until 177 (though the simile of his death fall ends at 179). In his final death-act, we learn that the 'earth resounded with the mighty crash of armour', γαῖα δ' ὑπεπλατάγησε καὶ ἄσπετον ἔβραχε τεύχε (178). This is in keeping with the baroque tone set – the implication being that Achilles is *so* large, that his fall causes the earth to shake.³³⁵ In contrast, the noise at death in *Iliad* is usually the rattle of the armour. In *Iliad* XXI.387, 'the wide earth rang' (*brache d' eureia chthon*), under the elemental force of divinities clashing. Quintus may have this passage in mind to evoke the intensity of cosmic force in his Achilles and his death.

i) *Problems with Achilles' Heel*³³⁶

Of course, the preceding results from the fatal shaft to Achilles' 'ankle' (*sphuron*, *Post.* III.62). Quintus' relationship with Achilles' ankle/'heel' (*pterna*;³³⁷ = his invulnerability), is not easy to locate. Homer makes no mention of Achilles' invulnerability or heel,³³⁸ nor does Proklos (*Aithiopsis*).³³⁹ However, Gantz notes that the artistic sources which "may anticipate details of the literary tradition" consist of a number of vases; e.g. a lekythos (c. 670BC). There are no names, but a battle scene, with an archer who is about to hit a warrior in the shin. Also, an (now lost) amphora (c. 540BC), includes named characters: Achilles lies dead, with an arrow through his ankle (and one in his back).³⁴⁰ Regarding literary sources, the heel is explicitly attested much later (during the Imperial Period) in Hyginus (*Fab.*, 107), and Apollodoros (*Epit.* V.3-4).³⁴¹ These may

³³⁵ This is also recalls the Posthomeric death of Memnon, in so many ways Achilles' double (*Post.* II.545-46. See 2.1i.

³³⁶ On Achilles' heel, see Burgess (1995).

³³⁷ I will use the term 'heel' to include 'ankle', too.

³³⁸ It is tempting, though, to 'read' in Diomedes' wounding by Paris (*Iliad* XI.377), a foreshadowing of the same for Achilles; the elements of arrow, ankle/foot, and Paris as bowman, being particularly suggestive. See Hainsworth (2000), 267n.369-83. Again, for neoanalytic readings, see Willcock (1997), esp. 188.

³³⁹ Cf. Apollodoros in West (2003), 112-13.

³⁴⁰ Gantz (1996), 626.

³⁴¹ On possible allusions to the heel, and Achilles' invulnerability (or lack of it), see Gantz (1996), 625-28.

indicate that Quintus favours the later tradition that the heel/ankle is *the* (if not the only) vulnerable spot.

Quintus has already shown that his Achilles is not invulnerable (earlier Memnon grazes his arm, during their duel (*Post.* II.409-10), in similar fashion to Asteropaios, *Il.* XXI.166-67).³⁴² James (2004, 278n.409-10) notes that this is interesting because it is “incompatible with the late tradition that his mother has made him invulnerable except in the left heel”. Quintus does not refer to this (vulnerable heel) tradition overtly. However, that injury to the heel causes Achilles’ death certainly evokes the heel motif. But why should Quintus wish to evoke the heel as Achilles’ weak-spot? In a sense, this is a marked anachronism: Quintus’ Achilles exhibits, to a significant degree, his Homeric rage; yet, the famous Achillean heel locates him much later. If one takes the *literary* allusions as Quintus’ starting point, then it could be argued that his Achilles is somewhat problematic. The later addition of the heel as his weak spot jars with Homer, who does not acknowledge invulnerability of any sort; in fact, quite the opposite - Achilles needs armour, and this ‘immortal armour’ (*ambrota teuchea*, *Il.* XVII.174, 202; *Post.* V.2), rather than merely elevating the wearer, also draws attention to the wearer’s *mortality*.³⁴³

Perhaps some of the answer is that the heel acts as an allusive trigger. By locating the heel as somehow central to Achilles’ demise, Quintus evokes not only the more explicit versions of *this* myth, but many other versions, too, such as those of Achilles’ invulnerability,³⁴⁴ his death, and those involved in his death.³⁴⁵ In this way, reference to the heel encourages his audience to recall much more of Achilles, his heroic biography and other texts.

³⁴² See Memnon and the Asteropaios, below, 1.3i.

³⁴³ Papaioannou (2007), 65.

³⁴⁴ E.g. Thetis, almost, immortalizing Achilles in ambrosial flame (Apollonius, *Argon.* IV.869-79); waters of the Styx (Statius, *Ach.* 1.268-70).

³⁴⁵ See below.

ii) *Grand Designs: Achilleus' Killer*

That Apollo alone is responsible for fatally shooting Achilleus in the heel is significant, too (*Post.* III.60-2). The version of myth that Quintus chooses for Achilleus' death also communicates the centrality of Achilleus (and Quintus) to epic, and his personal qualities; such 'centrality' also applies regarding the narrative sequence of Achilleus' death in relation to Antilochos' death. As I discuss below,³⁴⁶ these two deaths are clearly demarcated, thus, again, elevating Achilleus and his textual impact.

The *Iliad* foreshadows Achilleus' death at the hands of Paris and Apollo (*Il.* XXII.359-60);³⁴⁷ so too the summary of the *Aithiopsis* (*Aith.* Arg.3): 'Achilleus puts the Trojans to flight and chases them into the city, but is killed by Paris and Apollo',³⁴⁸ *τρεψάμενος δ' Ἀχιλλεύς Τρωῶας καὶ εἰς τὴν πόλιν συνεισπεσῶν ὑπὸ Πάριδος ἀναιρεῖται καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος.* Quintus' Achilleus is killed by Apollo alone (*Post.* III.60ff.). This further elevates Quintus' Achilleus, whose death (and *kleos*) is glorified by the divine status of the slayer.³⁴⁹ Paris, often central to Achilleus' death, either as the lone archer, or archer helped by Apollo, with all of his negative baggage, is far less illustrious.³⁵⁰

Fearing death from Skamandros, the Iliadic Achilleus recollects that Thetis had prophesied his death by Apollo. So, Achilleus feels Thetis' Apollo-prophecy was a fiction (*pseudessin*, *Il.* XXI.275-78). This passage is evoked but inverted in *Post.* III.80-2, where Achilleus acknowledges the *accuracy* of Thetis' prophecy: Apollo *will* kill him. Achilleus' following remarks in the *Iliad* are telling: 'I wish that Hektor had slain me, *the best of men* (*aristos*) bred here; then would a good man (*agathos*) have been the slayer, and a good man (*agathon*) would have been slain' (*Il.* XXI.279-80); cf. Ovid's Achilleus, shot by Paris: 'If in a 'woman's fight' (*femineo ... Marte*) you had to fall, you would have preferred the Amazon's double axe' (*Met.* XII.610-11). Quintus' Achilleus avoids Paris

³⁴⁶ See 1.4.

³⁴⁷ See *Il.* XXI.113, and XIX.416-17, as noted by N. Richardson (2000), 143n.359-60.

³⁴⁸ West (2003), 112.

³⁴⁹ Similarly, Patroklos reprimands Hektor, who would not have killed him, he claims, without the help of Euphorbos and Apollo (*Il.* XVI.844-54).

³⁵⁰ Coward (*Il.* XI.368-95), and dandy (*Il.* VI.321-31).

(and the ‘Amazon’ = Penthesileia), and therefore a form of feminizing. This is extremely important, because the Apollo version, used by Quintus, elevates Achilles through his killer: a formidable god, as opposed to a ‘good-for-nothing, woman-crazed lover’.³⁵¹ This is still slightly problematic as the ‘far-shooter’ does just that: Quintus’ Achilles, like the Iliadic Diomedes (when shot by Paris, see above), is unambiguous about such war tactics, and, if ‘stealth’ (*kruphedon*, *krubden*) is a coward’s way (respectfully, *Post.* III.68 and 76), Achilles is still susceptible to ‘feminizing’ influences; Achilles has evaded such emasculation by Penthesileia (and Thersites) and Memnon, but here he has really met his match.

Though experiencing the ‘anger’ (*menis*) of a god,³⁵² the locale of the *Iliadic* Achilles is clearly demarcated, as even he acknowledges the gods’ supremacy: in the *Iliad*, on learning that he had been foiled by Apollo, Achilles berates him, ‘I would certainly avenge myself on you, had I but the power’, (*Il.* XXII.19-20).³⁵³ This does, however, indicate intent. Quintus extends this theme, as Achilles appears to reject his place in epic, through evoking this Iliadic episode, and the ones involving Diomedes and Patroklos: the Iliadic Apollo warns/threatens Diomedes (*Tydeide ... chazeo*, *Il.* V.443), and Patroklos (*chazeo ... Patroklees*, *Il.* XVI.707). So too the Posthomeric Apollo: *Chazeo, Peleide*, ‘Back off, Peleus-son!’ (*Post.* III.40). These divine imperatives indicate mortal limitation. But, while the Iliadic heroes concede to Apollo, the Posthomeric Achilles does not. Instead, Achilles returns the Iliadic and Posthomeric ripostes, as *he* threatens Apollo: ‘Back off (*anachazeo*) now, far away, and join the rest of the gods at home, or I will strike you, immortal though you are!’ (*Post.* III.51-2). Achilles acknowledges the divide

³⁵¹ I.e. Paris, *Iliad* III.39-57; cf. Thersites’ critique of Achilles (over Penthesileia), 1.3i.

³⁵² *Μῆνις* features twelve times in the *Iliad*: Achilles (x4): I.1, IX.513, XIX.35, 75; Gods (x8): I.75, V.34, 178, 444, XVI.711, XIII.624, XV.122, XXI.523: “The noun is thus only used of the gods and Achilles,” Considine (1986), 54. In Quintus, *μῆνις* occurs only four times, but they are *not* peculiar to Achilles and the gods, thus further indicating how Iliadic Achillean motifs are redistributed, and his characteristics exaggerated: dead IX.37, Helenos X.346, gods XII.488, Achilles (in song) XIV.132. For Posthomeric ‘recollections’ of Achilles’ anger (namely, *menis*, XIV.132, and *choomai*, XIV.215), see below, 1.3i-ii, and 1.5. On Quintus’ tendency to exaggerate, see Ch.III.3.

³⁵³ Patroklos and Diomedes also concede to Apollo, respectively, *Iliad*, XVI.698-711 and V.431-44 (though Diomedes is reluctant to quit, and pushes things as far as he can); cf. *Il.* XX.441-47. On this marked similarity, see Kirk (2000), 106-07ns.436-39,-440-02.

between gods and man,³⁵⁴ but subverts the norm by incorporating this in his threat: God, know your place (Olympos, *and as inferior to me*), or else! By rejecting the conventional confines in which heroes normally operate (challenge men, but not gods),³⁵⁵ Quintus' Achilleus challenges epic and extends his own boundaries, much in the same way that his Posthomeric self has shown himself to be the superlative bellicose Achillean model. Quintus' Achilleus is like a superconductor here, as his hubristic response is an amalgam of receptions from the Iliadic Apollo, Diomedes, Patroklos and Achilleus.

However, on one level, epic is reinstated by the more conservative 'far-shooter', who swiftly dispatches the fatal dart; here, Achilleus ultimately conforms – as specified in the *Iliad*, there *is* a divide between man and gods, and those who overstep the mark are punished.³⁵⁶ This is reinforced when Apollo (just before shooting) notes that Achilleus 'has taken leave of his mind', and that not even Zeus, 'or anyone else can tolerate such insane defiance of the gods' (*Post.* III.57-9). Thus, the epic model of Troy's greatest hero is deviating dangerously from established epic norms. All, including Achilleus, the gods, and Quintus are challenging the Homeric models.

So, Quintus' focus on Achilleus' actual death (as much as in his dying) is on a type of inflated Iliadic model. Excluding superficial structural deviations in his death-scene (i.e. compare the elements of Achilleus' death with those of particularly Patroklos and Hektor above, 1.1), Achilleus blusters uncontrollably (physically and verbally), when he should be dying. When he finally dies, he is presented as an object far more gigantic than anything Iliadic; a tree ('normal' hero) is dwarfed by a mountain (Achilleus). In this, and other contexts regarding Quintus' characterization of Achilleus, 'size does matter': *magnus*, rather than *magnanimity*, defines Quintus' model.³⁵⁷

³⁵⁴ Previously, Apollo warned Diomedes of the immortal/ mortal divide (*Il.* V.440-43).

³⁵⁵ Cf. Achilleus' *apparent* rejection of the heroic code, e.g. *Il.* IX.308.

³⁵⁶ Consider Patroklos' punishment by Apollo (*Il.* XVI.698ff.), he chose *not* to heed Achilleus' warning to stop at the ships, 83ff.

³⁵⁷ For the extremes of Quintus' Achilleus, see K. King (1987), 133-38; similarly, on Statius' Achilleus, Dilke (1963); cf. the *Iliad*'s Achilleus, Zanker (1997), ch. 5.

Yet, Achilleus' death also has important implications in other ways. As noted, Quintus' choice of Apollo (a major deity) as Achilleus' killer confers further greatness on the greatest of the heroes of Troy. So, Achilleus' death can be seen to have extra meaning, when considering its place in, and centrality to, the *Posthomeric*. Quintus does what Homer merely alluded to: he kills Achilleus, and in this, like Apollo, he claims a mighty scalp.³⁵⁸

1.3 *The Quintessential Achilleus?*

i) *In Battle*

In full flight, on the battlefield, Achilleus reveals his most Achillean traits: superhuman rage and magnificence: *aristeia*. In the *Posthomeric*'s first line, we are reminded of Achilleus killing Hektor; then his ominous destructiveness is 'recalled' (*mnesthentes*, *Post.* I.15). By *Posthomeric* II, Achilleus is already engaged in his *second* 'major'³⁵⁹ duel - this time with Memnon.³⁶⁰ Homer's audience have to wait for twenty books (over 80% of the epic) to 'see' Achilleus fight.³⁶¹ And, arguably, his central duel is against Hektor (*Iliad* XXII.273ff.).³⁶² Although Quintus is bound by the cyclic narratives, this does have the effect of cutting to the chase so that we see Achilleus, in all his battling glory, very early on: *belligerence* is central to Achilleus' presence, and presentation, in the *Posthomeric*; in contrast, in the *Iliad*, the absence of Achilleus' violent action allows for a different type of character development, as martial prowess is a characteristic only on display for a small part of the *Iliad*.³⁶³

³⁵⁸ Although, in another sense, Quintus has brought Achilleus back to life, and immortalized him. See apotheosis below, 1.4

³⁵⁹ Major in the sense that Achilleus is fighting *the* Trojan defence, and 'best' warrior; doubles for Hektor, then, become apparent: Penthesileia; Memnon. See Ch.I.1.1 on evocation of the Iliadic Hektor and Hektor/Achilleus duels.

³⁶⁰ On Achilleus' first duel (with Penthesileia), see Ch.I.1.1

³⁶¹ Prior to this, they have only 'heard' about the great man's great deeds from the secondary narrators (e.g. *Il.* I. 162-66, VI.414-24, IX.328-32). The 'seeing' for the audience/ reader comes from the primary narrator.

³⁶² Cf. Achilleus with Aeneas (*Il.* XX.259ff); Asteropaios (*Il.* XXI.161ff.); and Hektor (*Il.* XX.438ff.).

³⁶³ (Achilleus), the, "greatest of the heroes becomes the most obdurate anti-hero; but the heroic life provides no practice in opting out of wars, and by opting out of this war, Achilles exposes himself to contradictory feelings, which he expresses by contradictory actions" (Silk, 1999, 91); see too G. Zanker on Achilleus' characterization and personal ethics, especially ch. 5, Achilleus' 'Magnanimity' (1997).

The Iliadic Achilles seeks out Hektor specifically for killing Patroklos. In the *Posthomeric*, Achilles directs a specific assault against Penthesileia (*Post.* I.545), but a personal assault against Memnon (II.398ff.).³⁶⁴ The scene with Penthesileia shares many similarities with that between Achilles and Hektor in the *Iliad*, but a major difference is that Penthesileia, unlike the Iliadic Hektor, has not caused Achilles personal grief, so Achilles' violent anger can no longer be attributed to the *achos* caused by Patroklos' killing: against Penthesileia we learn, 'Those two warriors were likewise ready for Penthesileia' (*Post.* I.545); whereas, at *Iliad* XVIII.90-3, Achilles articulates his compulsion to act out revenge on Hektor for Patroklos' death). In the *Iliad* we see Achilles kill not only Hektor, but also other Trojans (including sacrifice),³⁶⁵ *only after* Patroklos' death; thus his *Iliadic* battling is as a direct result of Patroklos' death: this *raison d'être* is fundamentally tied to Patroklos and the multifarious complexities of Achilles' character that Patroklos' death activates. This is important, because the Posthomeric Achilles and his battle actions become particularly callous *now*, i.e. in Quintus, as Achilles' motivation lacks substance. This has a profound effect on his characterization. Achilles chides Penthesileia briefly (575ff.), and injures her promptly (594ff.); delivering the fatal second blow impales Penthesileia and her horse (612ff.). As the Iliadic scene with Hektor, Achilles also continues to rebuke his slain foe in cruel fashion: 'Now lie there in the dust, food for dogs and fowl, wretched one' (644-45; cf. *Il.* XXII.335-56, 354).

Here, Quintus has focused on all of Achilles' most violent Iliadic traits; the violence seems all the more hyperbolic because the narrative does not justify such personally directed vitriol: unlike Hektor, Penthesileia has not killed Achilles' closest friend (or even his second closest friend).³⁶⁶ Thus, a more 'savage' Achilles emerges. Quintus' Achilles is more just a killing-machine, significantly separated from his profound Iliadic

³⁶⁴ As below, Achilles' motivation for fighting Memnon (who killed Antilochos) is modeled, in part, on the Iliadic Achilles' assault on Hektor (for Patroklos). See Ch.IV.3.2 on Neoptolemos' duel with Eurypylos (= Achilles/Memnon) for parallels.

³⁶⁵ I.e. Achilles' mass slaughter of the Trojans in the river Xanthos (*Il.* XXI.17ff.), and his unmerciful treatment of Lykaon (XXI.97ff.) and the twelve Trojans (XXIII.175-76); also XVIII.336-37 and XXI.26-32, as noted in N. Richardson (2000), 56n.26-32.

³⁶⁶ Cf. Memnon and Antilochos following.

achos. Here it is tempting to observe meaning in a *nomen omen*.³⁶⁷ Quintus' 'Achi/ lleus' becomes half the 'man' he was, i.e. in Homer; Quintus nods to Achilles' Iliadic grief as he is initially found lamenting at Patroklos' grave (with Aias; *Post.* I.378-79), but such sensitivity is wholly unconvincing, as he lacks humanity throughout the *Posthomeric*.

Quintus' exploration of Achilles' battle with Memnon³⁶⁸ is most illuminating for understanding Achilles' reception in the *Posthomeric*. With reference to the duel, I take as the starting point the first attack, and the end point, the hero's death. Achilles' encounter with Memnon occupies a significant part of *Posthomeric* II (*Post.* II.452-546; so nearly a sixth of the Book, which is 666 verses). The nature and duration of this battle is unusually long in Achilles' epic biography.³⁶⁹ The primary narrator's recourse to the battle's 'very long time' (*pollē ... mekuneto*, 490; *pollon ... chronon*, 526),³⁷⁰ plus the extended textual space (number of lines) produces the effect of inflating this duel beyond the Homeric norm.

Typically, even the *promachoi* facing Achilles are dispatched quickly, with little significant resistance or whisked away by a protective god who realizes that Achilles' is about to kill them.³⁷¹ The only reason that the Iliadic Hektor lasts as long as he does is because Achilles misses him, initially, with his attack (spear); Penthesileia appears to have a good innings, but much of this is rhetoric between the two. Actual contact time is kept to a minimum, and when Achilles' spear or sword is true, death follows almost immediately. In contrast, Memnon is struck *repeatedly*.³⁷² Through chronicling this episode in the grandiose manner in which he does, Quintus takes full advantage of the

³⁶⁷ *Achos + laos* = Achilles? See Nagy (1979), 69-83. Cf. Homer, too: when Patroklos is injured, he causes 'grief to the army of the Achaians', *ekache laon Achaion* (*Il.*XVI.822).

³⁶⁸ See Burgess (2009), ch. 2; Gantz (1996), 622-24.

³⁶⁹ As Achilles' 'dying' noted above.

³⁷⁰ Cf. Ovid for Cycnus and Achilles, *multo rem ... dierum* (*Met.* XII.146).

³⁷¹ See Hektor (*Il.* XXII.273-363) and Penthesileia (*Post.* I.547-629). Cf. Achilles with Aeneas (*Il.* XX.259-91); Asteropaios (*Il.* XXI.161-82); and Hektor (*Il.* XX.438-44).

³⁷² Below, 2.1i,

opportunity to present Achilles in his full battling glory, although, ironically, he does not dominate this fighting in his Iliadic fashion we had come to expect.³⁷³

Though godlike, at points, Achilles is still mortally vulnerable. Quintus uses other methods to evoke the Iliadic Achilles in this scene, too. At *Post.* II.509ff., Zeus dispatches two different Fates (one for each hero). This textual reference to the Iliadic duel between Hektor and Achilles is crystallized at *Post.* II.541, where ‘the fatal scales of war’ clearly recall Zeus’ ‘golden scales’ (*Il.* XXII.209ff.). The ‘two fates’, noted earlier in Quintus, figure in the Iliadic scene, and, as the *Iliad*, the ‘balance’ tips, to the detriment of Achilles’ foes. This episode evokes the Iliadic battle with Hektor.³⁷⁴ The Iliadic Achilles is also recalled through reference to the superficial wound from his Asteropaios fight: ‘and with the other (spear) he (Asteropaios) struck the right forearm of him (Achilleus) a grazing blow, and the black blood gushed out’, τῷ δ’ ἐτέρῳ (δουρὶ, 164) μιν πῆχυν ἐπιγράβδην βάλε χειρὸς/ δεξιτερῆς, σύτο δ’ αἷμα κελαινεφές (*Il.* XXI.166-67); ‘(Memnon) hit Aiakos’ grandson on the arm with his spear and shed some blood’, τύψε δ’ ἄρ’ Αἰακίδαο βραχίονα δουρὶ κραταιῷ/ τοῦ δ’ ἐχύθη φίλον αἷμα (*Post.* II.409-10).

Achilles’ opening words to Memnon echo those spoken to Aeneas in his Iliadic confrontation:³⁷⁵ ‘Aeneas, what god is it that urges you in blindness of heart in this way to face in fight the high-hearted son of Peleus, who is a better man than you ...’ Αἰνεΐα, τίς σ’ ὦδε θεῶν ἀτέοντα κελεύει/ ἀντία Πηλεΐωνος ὑπερθύμοιο μάχεσθαι,/ ὅς σεῦ ἅμα κρείσσων ... (*Il.* XX.332ff.). This sense of disbelief, implying that it is suicide to face Achilles, is also expressed to Memnon in the *Posthomeric*: ‘Memnon, bad³⁷⁶ reason must have emboldened you to come and pit yourself against me now in battle’, ὦ Μέμνον, πῆ νῦν σε κακαὶ φρένες ἐξορόθυναν/ ἐλθέμεν ἀντί’ ἐμεῖο καὶ ἐς μῶθον ἰσοφαρίζειν (*Post.* II.431-32); there is an intratextual echo too, when Achilles mocks (κερτομέων, 574) Penthesileia: ‘Woman, ...

³⁷³ Mainly through Memnon’s remarkable resemblance with Achilles; see 2.1i.

³⁷⁴ On neoanalytic readings of Achilles’ battles with Memnon/ Hektor, see Burgess (2001), 64; also “Neither Patroklos nor Hector seem to be figures particularly well embedded in the epic tradition,” Dowden (1996, 53, as in Burgess (2001), 214n.53.

³⁷⁵ See following discussion for Quintus’ use of the Iliadic Aeneas for (rhetorical) aspects of his Achilles.

³⁷⁶ My translation.

it is utter madness in you, your monstrous nerve in threatening both of us with death today ... the gods have robbed you of your wits and sense', Ὡ γύναϊ .../ σὺ δ' ἐν φρεσὶ πάγχυ μέρμηνας,/ ἢ μέγ' ἔτλης καὶ νῶϊν ἐπηπειλήσας ὄλεθρον/ σήμερον.../ ἢ σευ πευδομένης μάκαρες φρένας ἐξείλοντο/ καὶ νόον ... (Post. I.575-91).³⁷⁷

Such is the contempt for Penthesileia, that Achilles and Aias, laugh (*egelassan*, Post. I.563). Achilles gloats (*kertomeon*, 575) that he and Aias are *mega phertatoi* ... *epichthonion heroon*, 'by far the best of the earthborn heroes' (577);³⁷⁸ this develops 'best of the Achaeans', *ariston Achaion* (Il. I.244), noted by Nestor. The Posthomeric Achilles' arrogance is highlighted in his challenging Apollo (III.45ff.); he is also compared to the arrogant (*huperphialos*) Titan, Tityos (III.395). It is later claimed that the dead Achilles was 'never arrogant nor cruel',³⁷⁹ *ou ... huperphialos ... oud' oloophron* (III.425). This is inappropriate, as is reference to Achilles' 'gentle(-ness)' (*epiou*, III.424) to *all*. This is neither the case in the *Iliad*, nor (especially), the *Posthomeric*. Furthermore, reference to the 'earthborn heroes' amplifies this arrogance because it invites consideration of even greater comparisons, i.e. with the gods.

In the whole build up to their confrontation, Achilles and Memnon seem to be perfectly matched (not only with reference to their immortal mothers). Memnon is a 'giant king' (*basilea pelorion*, Post. II.109; cf. *basilees ... apeiriton*, when the 'kings' carry Achilles' 'boundless' corpse, Post. III.385). And, we are left in no doubt as to Memnon's 'worth': he is the son of the goddess Dawn and immortal Tithonos, and he tells his *klea andron* to Priam (115ff.); who notes his resemblance to an 'invincible god' (*makaressin ateiresi*), more than to any 'earthly hero' (*epichthonion heroon*) whom he surpasses (131-32). 'Looks' (artifice, not essence), however, prove to be deceptive, as Quintus implies; for instance, Quintus' Penthesileia also looked like a god(-dess), and the Iliadic Patroklos (and

³⁷⁷ Regarding Achilles, such arrogance is surpassed in Ovid, when he notes Cycnus is honoured to die at his hand (*Met.* XII.80ff.), as Papaioannou (2007), 54-5.

³⁷⁸ My translation.

³⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

Hektor), in Achilleus' armour appeared Achillean. Ultimately, both were inadequate.³⁸⁰ The sheer frequency of such hyperbole applied to Achilleus communicates the most quintessential characteristics of the hero in his full splendour. This is especially so in his battle with Memnon.

More in keeping with the dominant model in the *Posthomeric*, is Achilleus' response to Thersites' challenge to his masculinity (*Post.* I.723-40) and, therefore heroism, and epic status: Achilleus' heart is overwhelmed with anger (*perichosato thumo*), and he immediately smashes Thersites' jaw and teeth in (742ff.); he even reprimands his dead 'colleague', as he would an enemy on the battlefield: *keiso nun en koniesi ...* (757ff.). This reminds us of Achilleus' anger, and 'who' he is in epic: it is acceptable for Achilleus to have *cholos*, and even *menis*, but a heart that is *gunaimanes* ('women mad') is abhorrent. Furthermore, even the enraged Iliadic Achilleus stops short of killing a fellow Greek (Agamemnon, Book I). This restraint, and the 'quarrel' (*neikos*) is evoked when Achilleus nearly comes to blows with Diomedes (*Post.* I. 767-81). Finally, the unusual *pity* and *respect* shown to an *enemy*, and his (her) corpse, returning it *unstripped* for cremation, finds expression in the *Posthomeric* through Atreus' sons (782ff.). This evokes the same for the Iliadic Achilleus with regard to, respectively, Priam (*oiktos*, *Il.* XXIV.516), and Eetion (*sebassato*, VI.416-19), and is a far cry from Thersites' critique, with its implied accusation of necrophilia,³⁸¹ and rape.³⁸²

Quintus, however, takes the opportunity to communicate something of the greater complexity of the Iliadic Achilleus in the events immediately following Penthesileia's death. He feels 'unremitting remorse in his heart', *aliaston heo eneteireto thumo* (*Post.* I.571); this echoes his conciliatory words to Priam, 'do not grieve ever ceaselessly in your

³⁸⁰ Reference to Achilleus' trademark divine armour (*Post.* I.550) and Cheiron's spear (*Post.* I.593; *Il.* XVI. 143-44; noted by James (2004), 273n.593.), in his Penthesileia battle, and his duelling supremacy, clearly locate Achilleus in his literary epic past – the *Iliad*. These 'concrete' Achillean expressions reverberate with other heroes that overtly 'fill the gap' left following Achilleus' Posthomeric death. See below Aias, 2.3; Neoptolemos, Ch.IV.2.2. The arms act, for Achilleus *between* epics (*Iliad* to *Posthomeric*), and his heirs, as super-charged signifiers of character; heroic batons, so to speak.

³⁸¹ James (2004), 274n. 723-40, notes Eustathios on *Il.* II.200.

³⁸² On Achilleus' 'rape' of Deidameia, see Schol. (D) *Il.* XIX.326, *Cyp.* fr. 19 in West (2003), 98-9; also, Statius (*Ach.* I.639ff.), and Ovid (*Met.* XI.264ff.), as noted in Dilke (2005), 126n.642.

heart', *med' aliaston odureo son kata thumo* (*Il.* XXIV.549). Yet, here (*Posthomeric*), Achilles' grief is for the loss of a potential *akoitis* (672); this also evokes Achilles' response to the loss of Briseis, his 'heart's love' (*thumarea*), and *alochos* ('wife', *Il.* IX.335). Achilles is also 'greatly grieved' (*mega achnuto*, *Post.* I.718) to see vanquished Penthesileia. Quintus completes the circuit, by making the ultimate logical allusion: if one wants to communicate Achilles and his greatest suffering, his Iliadic pain for *Patroklos* is the prototype. So: 'No less deadly pangs of grief consumed his heart than previously for the killing of Patrklos his friend' (720-21). But, this cannot be truly convincing. Even with the help of Aphrodite, who beautifies Penthesileia to make Achilles suffer (*Post.* I.667-68), such *achos* cannot really have the same profound *gravitas*. Patroklos was Achilles' closest friend, and companion from childhood; Penthesileia, his most recent *enemy*.

ii) 'Lament' for Antilochos

Quintus' report of Antilochos' death to Achilles is poignant, for it is the Iliadic Antilochos who had brought Achilles news of Patroklos' death (*Il.* XVIII.2ff.). In the later epic, Nestor informs Achilles (*Post.* II.391-94).³⁸³ The allusion to the Iliadic Achilles is crystallized when Achilles tells Memnon, 'As Hektor for Patroklos so you for Antilochos I'll punish, because no weakling's comrade have you killed', *Ἐκτορα γὰρ Πατρόκλοιο, σὲ δ' Ἀντιλόχοιο χολωθεῖς/ τίσομαι· οὐ γὰρ ὄλεσσας ἀνάλκιδος ἀνδρὸς ἑταῖρον* (*Post.* II.447-48).³⁸⁴ The avenging Iliadic Achilles chides Hektor, 'Hektor, you thought, I suppose, while you were stripping Patroklos, that you would be safe, and had no thought of me while I was away, you fool', *Ἐκτορ, ἀτὰρ που ἔφης Πατροκλή' ἐξαναρίζων/ σῶς ἔσσεσθ', ἐμὲ δ' οὐδὲν ὀπίξο νόσφιν ἔοντα,/ νήπιε* (*Il.* XXII.331-32). Here Quintus constructs his Achilles through indirect means: it is Achilles' association with the Iliadic Patroklos, or, more specifically, allusion to the Iliadic Patroklos, that recalls the Iliadic Achilles.

³⁸³ On the neo-analytical position, see Willcock (1997), especially 181-82: "it is obvious that Homer is preparing for future events by establishing a relationship between these two (Antilochos and Achilles)* which will be the background to the later story of Antilochus, and the fights with Memnon." *My parenthesis addition.

³⁸⁴ Note *cholotheis tisomai*, which reinforces the Iliadic allusion.

Achilleus' response to both sets of bad news is also significant. In these renditions, we can see something of the 'essence' of the respective Achilleuses - Iliadic and Posthomeric. At news of Patroklos' death, Achilleus is enfolded in a 'black cloud of grief' (*Il.* XVIII.22 and following), he pours dust over his head, defiles his face (mutilation of the living), and lies in the dust, 'huge and hugely fallen' (26); he also continues by tearing his hair, and groaning. Such response to the death-news, though intense, is not localized. The Iliadic Achilleus expresses sadness over Patroklos' death on a *number* of occasions, and over a protracted textual space: *Iliad* XVIII (first hears of Patroklos' death), *Iliad* XXIV (reconciliation with Priam); = a significant amount of the poem, especially when considering the number of books in which Achilleus is actually present; again pain (*achos*) is a major part of the *Iliadic* Achilleus, as is the exceptional 'gentleness' (*eka*) and 'pity' (*oiktros*) shown in his meeting with Priam in *Iliad* XXIV.

Conversely, Achilleus' Posthomeric lament is brief: 'When hearing (Nestor), his (Achilleus') heart was filled with grief' (*Post.* II.395). There is no residue of sorrow which now characterizes Achilleus. We *are* also told that he felt 'anger' (*choloumenos*) for the death of Antilochos (and other's slain; 400-01), and notes to Memnon that as he avenged Hektor for Patroklos, so he will avenge Memnon for Antilochos (as noted above). But, apart from name and allusion to a significant Iliadic scene, Quintus' Achilleus bears little similarity to that of the far more complex Iliadic model. Arguably, the *Cycle* would have given greater precedent, and textual space, to this episode.³⁸⁵

Excluding Antilochos, three major deaths occur in the five Aithiopic books – Penthesileia, Memnon, and Achilleus himself. Considering the textual space that Quintus dedicates to these heroes, his coverage of Antilochos is rather scant. This fact seems especially marked when considering neoanalytic 'readings' that suggest a pre-Patroklean death episode, placing Antilochos at its centre (and thus acts as a precursor to the Patroklos/ Achilleus Iliadic episode).³⁸⁶

³⁸⁵ Proklos' late fragmentary summary merely notes, Ἀντίλοχος ὑπὸ Μέμνονος ἀναιρεῖται, ἔπειτα Ἀχιλλεὺς Μέμνονα κτείνει (*Aith.* Arg.2).

³⁸⁶ E.g. Willcock (1997), *ibid.*

Also, in an epic so saturated by laments (*gooi*),³⁸⁷ Quintus' choice to convey minimal sadness for his closest Posthomeric friend's death (rather than being surprising) is actually in keeping with this Achilles: ever the violent warrior. The impact on Achilles is significant – in the *Posthomeric*, where others lament *more*, he laments *less* (the pattern of Achilles' characterization is inverted, although this ties in with his reduced complexity). This juxtaposition makes Achilles seem even more violent. Contrastingly, Homer's Achilles is not predominantly characterized by his physicality (battling or otherwise) alone. Instead, the Iliadic Achilles is also highly perceptive/sensitive. These characteristics are evident in the Iliadic scenes with Thetis (I.348ff., XVIII.70ff.), and the embassy (e.g. IX.308ff.), and the sense of development of his character is conveyed in the highly emotive episode with Priam (XXIV.507ff.), where Achilles exhibits great gentleness (*eka*, 508), pity (*oikteiron*, 516) and compassion – 'magnanimous' indeed.³⁸⁸

Telling, too, is the immediacy of and nature of Achilles' response to news of Antilochos' death. At *Post.* II.395, Achilles is distraught; by 396 he is looking to kill Memnon. In the *Iliad*, Achilles requires four books to avenge Patroklos' death; here only a hundred or so lines (this communicates another meaning of his 'swift-footedness', as he propels the story, whilst appearing more anger-driven). The intensity of feelings and dramatic techniques that Homer employs to enliven the Iliadic Achilles are almost absent from Quintus' Achilles here.

Partly, Achilles' swift response *is* in keeping with Iliadic and Odyssean heroism. The Iliadic Achilles is renowned for intense emotions which drive his actions; e.g. if not for divine intervention, he might have avenged Agamemnon's insults (I.188ff.); to news of Patroklos' death, his *emotional* response is intense and immediate (Achilles is overwhelmed with grief, casting dust over himself, and lying 'huge and hugely fallen' in the dust; XVIII.22ff.). So, when hearing that Memnon has killed Antilochos, such response is understandable, as Antilochos is second only to Patroklos (*Od.* XXIV.78-9). Quintus' Achilles seeks out Memnon (Antilochos' killer) in hybrid fashion, combining

³⁸⁷ See Ch.I.3.

³⁸⁸ On Achilles 'pity' and 'magnanimity', see, respectively, Kim (2000), and Zanker (1997), esp. ch. 5.

elements from Homer's hero (he is angry and vengeful, *Iliad*; he is very close to Antilochos, *Odyssey*).

A key difference, though, is that in the *Posthomeric* Achilles' rage utterly overwhelms his sorrow (though the Iliadic Achilles is consumed by rage up to a significant point, his character reveals many more depths: he laments uncontrollably at Patroklos' death; his great humanity emerges through mourning with Priam). This emphasises that anger is the Posthomeric Achilles' overriding characteristic. Concentration on this anger conforms with much post-Homeric literature, where anger and violence are Achilles' defining characteristics (e.g. *Hek.*93-5; *Aen.* I.453-87; *Met.* XII.73-165, note 162-63).³⁸⁹ Although the context is exactly the same as that of the *Iliad*, the Trojan War, Achilles is fundamentally different in Quintus' portrayal as, although he echoes key character traits of the Iliadic model, extreme amplification of such traits makes Achilles at the same time both unmistakable and alien.

1.4 *Transportation of the Corpse*

In Proklos' summary of the *Aithiopsis* fighting over Achilles' corpse follows his death:

(2) 'When they encounter (each other), Antilochos is killed by Memnon, then Achilles kills Memnon ...'. (3) '(Achilleus) is killed by Paris and Apollo. A fierce battle develops over his body in which Aias takes it up and carries towards the ships, with Odysseus fighting the Trojans off.' (4) 'Then they bury Antilochos, and lay out the body of Achilles. Thetis comes with the Muses and her sisters, and laments her son. And presently Thetis snatches her son from the pyre and conveys him to the White Island. When the Achaeans have raised the grave mound, they organize an athletic contest ...'
(*Aith.*, Args.2-4)

Quintus disrupts the sequence of events after Achilles' death by choosing to have Antilochos buried (*Post.* III.4ff.; = *Aith.* Arg.4) well *before* Achilles (*Post.* III.736ff.; = *Aith.* 4); in fact, Achilles continues to fight *after* Antilochos' burial. Thus, on a metapoetic level, Achilles is given more (textual) space; narrative-wise *he* is 'bigger'.

³⁸⁹ For further primary bibliography, see Achilles: *-anger of, -brutality of, -prowess of, -as vengeful*, in K. King's *Character and Place Name Index* (1987), 323-25.

Significantly, unlike the *Iliad* (where Patroklos' funeral and games form the beginnings of Achilles' reintegration into human society after his rage), Antilochos' funeral does not interrupt the killing.

At *Post.* III.385, Greek 'kings' (βασιλῆες) carry Achilles' 'huge' (ἀπειριτον) corpse to safety. In the *Aithiopsis* Aias famously takes the burden *alone*.³⁹⁰ Quintus' choice is more in keeping with the *Odyssey* (XXIV.38ff.), where Agamemnon tells Achilles that the 'best' (ἀριστοι) of the sons of the Trojans and Greeks fought all day for his corpse, and were victorious, when 'we (= the best of the Greeks' sons) bore (ἐνείκαμεν, 43) you' to the Greek ships (as with Achilles' killer/killing, the status of those involved with him elevates his status: 'concrete' expressions of *time*?). However, Quintus also chooses, for the tug-of-war over Achilles' body, to borrow from the Iliadic scuffle for Patroklos (*Il.* XVII.3ff.). On both occasions Telamonian Aias is a dominant defensive presence (*Post.* III.217ff.; *Il.* XVII.128ff., 715ff.).

Regarding earlier models for treatment of Achilles' corpse, the following deviations are noteworthy: Patroklos' Iliadic bones are distinct from those of his funerary offerings (sacrificed Trojans, etc.) because they are placed apart on the pyre (*Il.* XXIII.240). Conversely, Achilles' bones are essentially different: they 'stood out conspicuously, being different from the rest, like those of an invincible giant (*Gigantos ateireos*)' (*Post.* III.723-25),³⁹¹ which, in fact, is what Achilles has become in Quintus' epic.³⁹² This ties in with the Posthomeric Achilles throughout, where great size is a consistent and central quality of his characterization. James notes that, "there is evidence for a popular belief that Greek heroes were distinguished in this³⁹³ way" (e.g. Herodotus, I.68.3 and Pausanias, VIII.29.3).³⁹⁴ But they are not usually so viewed in their own lifetime, only by later ages

³⁹⁰ Cf. Ovid, *Met.* XIII.284-85; Sophocles, *Phil.* 373.

³⁹¹ On Achilles' alignment with mythological giants in the *Posthomeric*, see below, 2.1i.

³⁹² Cf. Ovid's Achilles, *magnus*, 'huge' to *parvus*, 'small', *Met.* XII. 615-16).

³⁹³ I.e. gigantic.

³⁹⁴ James (2004), 287n.723-35.

as a distinguishing feature between a greater past and the (lesser) present;³⁹⁵ here Achilles is already superhuman among his own generation.³⁹⁶

Allusion to Achilles' afterlife also significantly departs from what we may expect from the Homeric poems. Homer's Achilles leaves us in no doubt regarding the finality of death: (to Odysseus) 'a man's spirit should come back when once it has passed the barrier of his teeth, neither pillage avails nor winning' (*Il.* IX.408-10). If not, then *time* and *kleos* would not drive hero.³⁹⁷ In the Underworld, too, Achilles' spirit bemoans the tragedy of loss of existence (*Od.* XI.488ff.). The Posthomeric narrator notes that Achilles (like Peleus and Neoptolemos) is to be whisked away to the Elysian Plain, *makaron epi gaian*, 'the land of the blessed ones' (762). Furthermore, Quintus' Achilles will not be subject to the darkness which fills all the Homeric and Posthomeric laments,³⁹⁸ as Poseidon consoles Thetis, for, 'he won't be dwelling with the dead but with the gods, like Dionysus and Herakles. He won't be kept in darkness either by fearful Fate or by Hades, but soon shall rise to Zeus' light' (*Post.* III.771-74). Significantly, Achilles shall be deified: (Poseidon) 'And I will present him with an island fit for a god, in the Euxine Sea, where your son shall be a god forever. The tribes that live around shall greatly glorify him and with desirable sacrifices honour him no less than me' (775-79).³⁹⁹ This apotheosis not only exceeds the Homeric view of mortality; it also goes beyond the *Cycle*. Removal to Leuke may involve immortality, but it does not bring Achilles among the gods; he is not elsewhere like Dionysus or Herakles.⁴⁰⁰

Quintus' choice of Achilles' apotheosis reflects a marked deviation from the theology of the Homeric world. However, this episode of Achilles' biography in the *Posthomeric* clearly owes much to the cyclic version: 'And presently Thetis snatches her son from the

³⁹⁵ See Ch.III, esp. part 3.

³⁹⁶ On which, see Achilles' *klea andron* below, 3.2-3.

³⁹⁷ See Sarpedon on *noblesse oblige* (*Il.* XII.310-28), and the rest of Achilles' full reply to Odysseus (*Il.* IX.308-429); on which, Hainsworth (2000), 99-119.

³⁹⁸ See Ch.I.3.

³⁹⁹ Such deification ties in with Farnell's comments on the cults of the heroes: "Now the chief and earliest attested centre of Achilles-worship was the Black Sea, in the island of Leuke ..." (1921, 286); and 285-89 for Achilles' cult.

⁴⁰⁰ See Burgess (2009), ch. 7. See too Neoptolemos' apotheosis, Ch.IV.1.8

pyre and conveys him to the White Island' (*Aith.* Arg.4). Essentially, Quintus' Achilles has been predominantly Iliadic in his characterization, albeit through accentuated portrayal (greater anger, etc.), and, in his burial, we see intertextual engagement with the Homeric poems, too. So, through choosing to then refer to the cyclic account of his apotheosis, Quintus again introduces an element of surprise into the narrative. Furthermore, we can understand Achilles' deification and immortalization also as metapoetic comment on Quintus' poem.⁴⁰¹

1.5 *Shadow of Former Selves: 'Gentle' Achilles*

At the end of *Posthomerica* III there is no doubt about the (un-Homeric) afterlife awaiting Achilles. In Book XIV we are reminded of this and much more when Achilles makes his final appearance, but this time in ghostly form.⁴⁰² As often the case, the scene clearly borrows from the Homeric poems, where the *characters* echo their *Homeric predecessors*, and the *narrative* follows the *outline* of the *Cycle*. Here, the appearance of Achilles' shade to Neoptolemos, recalls Patroklos' ghostly visitation to Achilles (*Il.* XXIII.62ff.); though the narrative is a fusion of cyclic accounts:

'And Odysseus fetches Neoptolemos from Skyros and gives him his father's armour; and Achilles appears to him.' (*Ilias Mikra*, Arg.3)⁴⁰³

In the *Ilias Mikra* (Arg.4), the wooden horse is built, and in (Arg.5), the horse is taken into Troy, by the Trojans; thus, Quintus has deviated from this chronology, as Achilles' ghost appears *after* Troy has been breached by the wooden horse. Why? By positioning Achilles after the Fall, he is able to associate Greek departure more closely with sacrifice to Achilles, the 'god' and thus emphasize his heroic status.

The following cyclic accounts further show elements that Quintus fuses:

'Then they (the Greeks)⁴⁰⁴ set fire to the city, and slaughter Polyxena at Achilles' tomb.' (*Iliou Persis*, Arg.4)

⁴⁰¹ See too, Neoptolemos, Ch.IV., *Conclusion*.

⁴⁰² On this episode, see also Ch.IV.2.2.

⁴⁰³ See following for Achilles' deification and demands.

⁴⁰⁴ My addition in parenthesis.

‘When Agamemnon’s party is preparing to sail, Achilles’ ghost appears and tries to prevent them by foretelling what will happen.’ (*Nostoi*, Arg.3)⁴⁰⁵

On the whole, Achilles’ ghost differs greatly from the living model previously seen, *sophrosyne* and gentleness being central characteristics of the *imago*. Immediately before his speech, even his affectionate kissing (*kusse ... aspasios*) of Neoptolemos (*Post.* XIV.183-84),⁴⁰⁶ appears out of character from his earlier Posthomeric self. Achilles recalls his apotheosis and advises on particular qualities: e.g. being foremost (*promos*, 189), good sense (*euphrona*, 191) nobility (*amumonas*, 192), goodness (*agatha, agathon* 194), so too will be your deeds (*ergon*, 194). Core aspects of this speech recall Phoenix’ words to Achilles in *Iliad* IX: ‘(Peleus) sent me to instruct you in all these things, to be both a speaker of words and doer of deeds’ (IX.442-43).

Posthomeric XIV.201-09 proceeds in similar vein to lines 185-94. The emphasis is on attaining glory (*kudimos*, 201), and exercising restraint (201-03): Achilles continues, ‘So cover yourself with glory and have sufficient wisdom to neither to tear your spirit with grief because of misfortune nor to be too happy with luck’ (201-03). In part, this (and lines 185-88) evokes Achilles’ consolation to Priam (do not grieve ceaselessly, *Il.* XXIV.549). ‘Gentleness’ figures highly in Achilles’ thoughts, too, as he advises his son to be *gentle* with friends (*epios*, *Post.* XIV.203; *meilichos*, 209), and mortals in general. Recourse to gentleness recalls Quintus’ earlier Achilles (see *Post.* III.424-26). This appears similarly incongruous as violence characterizes Achilles thus far. However, we have seen striking examples of Achilles’ exceptional compassion only elsewhere: (as above) *eka* (*Il.* XXIV.508); *oikteiron*, (*Il.* XXIV.516). This incongruity is dramatically heightened with Achilles’ final Posthomeric request.

Achilles’ instruction to Neoptolemos has occupied his speech so far, and cannot prepare us for his following request even if we consider the *Iliou Persis* (4) and Euripides’ *Hek.* 93-5: ‘Now tell this to the Argives, especially (*malist*)’ to Atreus’ son Agamemnon: if truly they remember all my work round Priam’s walls and all that I plundered before we reached

⁴⁰⁵ Quintus could also have referred to Euripides’ Achilles (e.g. *Hek.* 37-43).

⁴⁰⁶ See Ch.IV.1.2.

the land of Troy, Now let them (the Greeks) meet my desire by bringing to my tomb, out of Priam's treasure, well-dressed Polyxena to sacrifice her at once, because my anger (*choomai*) with them is even greater (*mallon*) than earlier over Briseis' (*Post.* XIV.209-216). This counters the claim of the Iliadic Achilles, following Patroklos' death, that the 'girl' (Briseis) was not worth his anger (XIX.56ff.). As James notes (2004, 342n.215-16), "Its obvious precedent is Achilles' undertaking at *Iliad* 18.336-7 to satisfy his anger over the killing of Patroklos by sacrificing twelve Trojan captives on the latter's pyre". There is more to this speech, however, because it also evokes Achilles' quarrel with Agamemnon (*Il.* I.1ff.), including Achilles' sense of being exploited by Agamemnon, winning much for the king, but ultimately losing out himself. Consequently, Achilles appears even *more angry* than his Iliadic self, and even more unfair than the Iliadic Agamemnon. Death intensifies these elements: Achilles killed even when dying;⁴⁰⁷ now he continues to kill even though dead. Nothing, it seems, can stop his wrath. Achilles threatens numerous storms, and that the Greeks will remain marooned in Troy until they make sacrifice, *and* 'pour libations to honour me' (*Post.* XIV.216ff.). Demand for libations again marks Achilles as different from Homer's - the deification of the hero is now complete. Such presentation is more in keeping with the cyclic, than the Homeric epics.

This speech really conveys a super-compressed character and narrative, with numerous aspects evoking the complexities of the *Iliadic hero*. In terms of the *Posthomeric*, this Achilles can be understood as a shadow of his former (Posthomeric and Iliadic) self. Here, he is a phantom, an anomaly. His rhetoric contrasts with his earlier portrayal (in the *Posthomeric*): conversely, that living self bears little relation to his past (Iliadic) self.⁴⁰⁸ However, if we really want to 'see'⁴⁰⁹ examples of, for instance, 'Achillean' gentleness and pity, we need to look beyond Quintus' Achilles to other Posthomeric heroes who express such qualities, ironically, by strongly evoking the *Iliadic* Achilles. So too, we need to look beyond Quintus' Achilles to these characters, to gain a sense of something of

⁴⁰⁷ See above, 1.1iv.

⁴⁰⁸ E.g. in his 'lament' for Antilochos, 1.3ii.

⁴⁰⁹ Primary narrative, as opposed to secondary narrative (being *told*). On the latter, see Achilles 'remembered', 3.

the complexity of the Iliadic hero. In this way, as will be shown, a more ‘complete’ Achilleus emerges through other heroes.

Part 2 - *Achilleus: the ‘Driving’ Force*

In this section on Quintus’ Achilleus, I will explore the ways Quintus uses Achillean model(s) to ‘drive’ other heroic characterizations (I use the term ‘drive’ to mean inform, inspire, serve as model for) to suggest the centrality and prominence of Achillean motifs, such as ‘anger’, in the configuration of other heroes. I will show how aspects of Achillean characterizations are embedded within the text, and used to create other heroes. Thus, Quintus dissects (deconstructs) Achilleus, employing his fragmentary remains (reconstructed) to create an air of ancient epic.⁴¹⁰ Related to this is another central consideration, regarding Quintus’ reception of Achilleus. Achilleus, either the Iliadic or Posthomeric, frequently acts as the model on which other heroes are constructed: Quintus internalizes the Iliadic Achilleus, and his (Quintus’/ the ‘new’ Achilleus’) reconfiguration drives the major heroes of the *Posthomeric*. This, in turn, has metapoetic implications, as Achilleus (*the* epic, Homeric and Trojan War signifier) represents more than himself.

I will now consider five Posthomeric heroes, who exhibit unmistakable Achillean characteristics: Memnon, Aias and Neoptolemos; and Podaleirios and Paris.

2.1 *Memnon*⁴¹¹

i) *A Battle Made in Heaven*

No hero offers Achilleus as much battling resistance in epic as Quintus’ Memnon.⁴¹² On close inspection, the reasons for this become clear: Quintus has largely based Memnon on Achilleus. This is shown particularly in his battle with Achilleus, and his engagement with Nestor.

⁴¹⁰ For Achillean de-/reconstructions, see Papaioannou (2007).

⁴¹¹ Also, see above on the *Quintessential Achilleus*, 1.3.

⁴¹² Cf. Achilleus’ battle with the apparently invulnerable Cycnus: in Ovid (Ovid, *Met.* XII.84ff.).

Following the “brilliance” of Achilles applied in the simile as Achilles moves among the Argives with Titan-like the strength (*Post.* II.204-05), we learn Memnon proceeds in *similar* (ὄς) illustrious manner among the Trojans as Ares (*Post.* II.212). In fact, for the duration of their *aristeiai*, also *before* they meet, Quintus’ heroes seemed to be engaged in similar battling; each attaining similar attention for similar deeds, performed at similar times. At 228ff., Quintus focuses on Achilles’ *aristeia*, as he subdues Thalios and ‘noble’ Mentos; many others follow; the devastation Achilles brings is likened to that caused by an earthquake (230-32).⁴¹³ ὄς ... ἀΰτως (235 and following), Memnon wreaks havoc on the Argives. Again this use of ὄς intratextually links the manner and time of Memnon’s *aristeia* with that of Achilles’, and its place in the text, immediately following on from Achilles’ rampage, implies a further closeness, or parallel of characterization; they do things in the same way, simultaneously.

Both Memnon and Achilles share immortal ancestry, and these heroes are well matched physically. Memnon strikes first with a boulder, which crashes down onto Achilles’ shield (*Post.* II.401ff.).⁴¹⁴ The stone hits its mark, ‘godlike’ Achilles; although the blow causes little damage to him. Achilles quickly responds, striking Memnon with his spear, but, unusually, Achilles’ attack is not decisive,⁴¹⁵ and his goddess-sprung adversary continues the assault. In fact, it is Memnon who draws first blood; Memnon grazes his arm through spear-attack, and Achilles bleeds (*Post.* II.409-10). Regarding Achilles, such wounding is something of a rarity, and also indicates that he is not invulnerable.⁴¹⁶

A Memnon owing much to Achilles can also be seen in their second onslaught: ‘That said, he (Achilles) grasped his huge sword, and Memnon did the same.’ (*Post.* II.452-53). Such similarities are numerous throughout this episode, so their proximity to each other (in this narrative), and the battling context evokes particularly strongly Achillean

⁴¹³ James notes that this earthquake simile may well be original (2004), 277n.230-32; see too *Post.* III.63-5.

⁴¹⁴ The boulder, or, more precisely, a boundary stone, is not hurled for the first time here. Homer’s Athene hits Ares with such a rock in *Iliad* XXI.403-06, whilst Virgil’s Turnus’ attempt against Aeneas, falls pathetically short (*Aen.* XII.896-907); see James (2004), 278n.401-04.

⁴¹⁵ Compare, e.g., Hektor’s injury (*Il.* XXII.326ff.), and Penthesileia’s (*Post.* I.592ff.), at Achilles’ ‘man-slaying’ hands.

⁴¹⁶ See 1.2i.

characteristics. This proximity (physical and metaphorical) is highlighted as the plumes of their helmets brush against each other (456-57);⁴¹⁷ Zeus favours *both*, increasing their strength (458), endurance and size, and makes them seem godlike (459-60); also, in their battle strategies, there is an echo of Achilles' attack on Hektor: '... so shone a gleam from the sharp spear that Achilles brandished ... as he devised evil for noble Hektor ... but there was an opening where the collarbones part the neck and shoulders, the throat' (*Il.* XXII. 319-25); 'In eager fury these swiftly thrust out the spear to reach the throat between shield and crested-helmet' (*Post.* II. 460-62).

They 'repeatedly' (*amoton*) strike each other and each other's shields (*Post.* II.454ff.).⁴¹⁸ Significantly, these shields were both forged by Hephaistos. 'Divinely-crafted' armour was one of the hall-marks of the Iliadic Achilles (*Il.* XVIIIff.) and its exceptional craftsmanship implies much about its wearer.⁴¹⁹ This unmistakable Achillean motif, now applied to Memnon, is mentioned on two occasions during Achilles' battle with Memnon (*Post.* II.455 and 466). Thus, as heroes can be characterized through what they wear,⁴²⁰ so such use of arms for characterization can also recall previous (intertext) and present (intratext) models.

Indeed, it seems as if Memnon will also be impervious to fatal attack as the 'immortal armour' (*Post.* II.466ff.) deflects assault after assault. Memnon, too, is compared to a tireless Giants and powerful Titan (518-19). So, the i) super-human and ii) superhuman qualities usually associated with the battling i) Iliadic and ii) Posthomeric Achilles, are, in this instance, seemingly shared. Regardless of being struck, neither concedes (520-21). And, it appears, Quintus' Achilles has met his match, as both adversaries resist decisive injury.

⁴¹⁷ As in *Il.* XIII.131-33, when the Aiantes fight in *unison*; so James (2004), 279n.456-57.

⁴¹⁸ Cf. the Iliadic Hektor and Penthesileia noted above, who offer little resistance.

⁴¹⁹ See Griffin (1983) on 'Significant Objects', ch. 1, esp. 36-7 for Achilles' armour.

⁴²⁰ Note Patroklos wears Achilles' armour, but cannot wield his spear (*Il.* XVI.139-44); Penthesileia arms as the Iliadic hero, but wields a *double-edged axe* (*Post.* I.159). On Penthesileia's arming, see Ch.I.4ii.

Achilleus' and Memnon's closeness is also implied in the similar battle fears of their respective mothers, Thetis and Dawn (and their cohorts, *Post.* II.497-502);⁴²¹ and also in the responses of Thetis and Dawn when both sons *are dead*: they are comforted by their sons' *apotheoses* (Dawn, II.651-53; Thetis, III.770-83; however, the primary narrator leaves some doubt (*pou*) about Memnon's afterlife).⁴²² Dawn herself draws the parallel overtly when she states: 'I am no less honoured than Nereus' daughter ... I am off to darkness.'⁴²³ Zeus can bring Thetis to Olympos from the sea, in order to shine for gods and men' (II.616-20) – in this, we are also reminded of Thetis' closeness with Zeus in the *Iliad*, when he grants her/ Achilleus' wish for the Greeks to suffer for Achilleus' dishonouring by Agamemnon.

Of course, other factors come into play, such as a form of misdirection. We (the reader) know that Achilleus will defeat Memnon (Achilleus and Memnon are bound by tradition/text), but Quintus maximizes the drama, by toying with their characterizations. He presents them as closely matched. However, unlike Achilleus, Memnon dies *swiftly* after the mortal wound (*Post.* II.542-44);⁴²⁴ Memnon's reputation for 'staying' (*Μέμνον* = *μένω*) power, here coming from his ability to (almost) last the course with Achilleus). However, his death-fall anticipates that of Achilleus, and further connects the two: 'As he fell in a pool of dark blood his armour loudly clashed, the ground resounded'⁴²⁵ *κάππεσε δ' ἔς μέλαν αἶμα, βράχεν δέ οἱ ἄσπετα τεύχη· γαῖα δ' ὑπεσμαραγήσε* (II.545-56); whilst, with regard to Achilleus: 'The earth resounded with the mighty crash of armour at the fall of Peleus' peerless son', *γαῖα δ' ὑπεπλατάγησε, καὶ ἄσπετον ἔβραχε τεύχη Πηλεΐδαο πεσόντος ἀμύμονος* (III.178-79). This very much ties in with the characterization of both as giant-like, hence

⁴²¹ Plutarch notes that Aeschylus' lost *Memnon* trilogy dealt with the concerns of Thetis and Dawn for Achilleus' and Memnon's souls: the *Psychostasia* (*Mor.* 17a), as noted by Gantz (1996), 623. For earlier visual evidence of the weighing of their souls, see Gantz (1996), 624; also Gantz (1980), 146-48.

⁴²² Cf. *Aith.* (2), West, where immortality *is* conferred.

⁴²³ In the 'darkness' we can see allusion to Memnon's 'blackness'. (There are numerous references to darkness in this book, for instance, the dust from Memnon and Achilleus' battle blots out the sun.) And it is perhaps an ironic touch that the darkness that Dawn's absence will bring, because of sadness for Memnon's death, will replace the darkness absent in Memnon. On day/night and darkness/light in Quintus, see Grotia (2007); James (1978).

⁴²⁴ The fatal 'scales' (*talanta*, *Post.* II.540) and Memnon's fatal wounding (*sternoio themethla*, 542), evoke Hektor, respectively (*talanta*, II. XXII.209; *auchenos*, 327).

⁴²⁵ Minor adaptation of James (2004).

the great noise and earth resounding under their (to be understood) massive armour containing their massive frames.⁴²⁶

ii) *Memnon's Encounter with Nestor*⁴²⁷

As Priam (*Iliad* XXII.408), Nestor saw his son die before him (*Post.* II.260-64). There is further intertextual engagement that evokes the highly emotive scene between Priam and Achilleus (*Il.* XXIV),⁴²⁸ therefore, making Memnon something of an Iliadic Achilleus. Memnon, like Achilleus, is reminded of his father (*pater*, *Post.* II. 308; *Il.*XXIV.511) by this old (*geron*) adversary. Most unusually in epic, this stirs feelings of respect for one's enemy (*Post.* II.308ff; cf. *Il.*XXIV.485-551). *This* context also activates memories of the complex and unusual Iliadic Achilleus: *cholos* ('anger'), *achos* ('pain'), *oiktros* ('pity'), and *eka* ('gentle(ness)').

The primary narrator comments that,

'(Nestor) would have fallen beside that son and like him would have been counted among the dead, if valiant (*obrimothumos*) Memnon had not addressed him as he attacked, out of respect (*aidestheis*) for a man as old as his father (*patros heoio*)' (*Post.* II.305-08)⁴²⁹

Priam beseeches Achilleus,

'Remember your father (*μνησαί πατρός σοῖο*), godlike Achilleus ...'
(*Il.* XXIV.486ff.)

Following Priam's Iliadic plea, the primary narrator observes

'So he spoke, and in him (Achilleus) he (Priam) roused desire to weep for his father (*patros*); and he took the old man (*geronta*) by the hand, and gently (*eka*) pushed him away from him.'
(*Il.* XXIV.507-08)

⁴²⁶ See above on Achilleus' 'giant' bones (1.4).

⁴²⁷ On which, see too Ch.III.1.1.

⁴²⁸ See Zanker (1997), ch. 4. See, too, Macleod (1982), and N. Richardson (2000), 320-47.

⁴²⁹ This also evokes Nestor's near death on the battlefield at the hands of Hektor: he is saved from imminent death by Diomedes (*Il.* VIII.90-1)

The echoes of ‘father’ and ‘old man’ in such a context (young warrior facing the father of the man he has killed in a duel) intensify the intertext. However, again as in the Iliadic scene between Achilles and Priam, Memnon warns Nestor not to challenge him for his son’s (Antilochos’ body) or he will face the young warrior’s wrath: ‘Draw back in case I have to strike you against my will’, *χάξεο, μή σε βάλοιμι καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλων περ ἀνάκη* (*Post. II.315*); Achilles warns Priam, who rejects his offer of *xenia*, preferring Hektor’s corpse: ‘Do not provoke me further, old man; I intend myself to give Hektor back to you ... So now stir my heart no more among my sorrows, lest, old man, I spare not even you inside the huts ...’, *μηκέτι νῦν μ’ ἐρέθιζε, γέρον· νοέω δὲ καὶ αὐτός/ Ἐκτορά τοι λῦσαι .../ τῷ νῦν μή μοι μάλλον ἐν ἄλγεσι θυμὸν ὀρίνης,/ μή σε, γέρον, οὐδ’ αὐτὸν ἐνὶ κλισίῃσιν ἐάσω ...* (*Il. XXIV.560-69*).⁴³⁰ Both *gerontes* require their sons’ corpses, but their approaches, and the contexts differ.

This threat of violence, and the warning, works to divide and unite these episodes. Here, the scenes converge: Achilles is supplicated by Priam in his tent (non-battleground); Memnon is challenged by Nestor on the battlefield. Noteworthy, too, are the responses of both young heroes to the sight of their old adversaries: Memnon, ‘I thought at first it was a young man’ (*Post. II.311*); ‘Achilles was struck with wonder at the sight of godlike Priam’ (*Il. XXIV.483*). Both young warriors are taken with the impressive physicality of the old men.

James comments (2004, 278n.309-18), “Memnon’s chivalrous attitude toward Nestor is likely to be either an original touch or derived from a source reflecting an ethos different from that of early Greek epic.” However, there is much to suggest here that Quintus’ Memnon, and the scene, is fuelled by Homer’s account of Achilles’ meeting with Priam in the *Iliad*, although Quintus does appear to adapt the context: *geron* sees son’s killing, and confronts son’s killer on battlefield.⁴³¹ In this sense, Memnon’s chivalry is more marked. Again we are reminded of the Iliadic Achilles, although this time Quintus

⁴³⁰ The nature of the old men’s challenges, as the response to the heroes’ threats, is very different. For *gerontes*, Ch.IV.2-3.

⁴³¹ Cf. Mezentius, Lausus and Aeneas for: son dying near father (*Aen. X.794ff.*); ‘chivalry’ (811-12); father confronting son’s killer (861ff.).

evokes his exceptional compassion, and thus invites us to reconsider the striking Iliadic model; and, perhaps, other renderings of this episode. There were two tragedies derived from this scene: Aeschylus' Achilles play *Phryges*,⁴³² and Sophocles' lost *Priamos* or *Phryges*.⁴³³ Thus, this did have a significant impact, and arguably the compassion was recognized as a *marked feature of Achilles*, though generated, initially, by Homer.

2.2 Shared Lament:⁴³⁴ Podaleirios

Regarding the centrality of Iliadic Achilles to Memnon's characterization, one notices that Quintus used numerous methods; e.g. evocation through recollection and manipulation of 'heroic' scenes peculiar to Achilles, such as shows of super-human prowess in the duel, and engagement between hero and *geron*. Now I will extend this approach to briefly survey other Posthomeric heroes who prove to be something of Achillean heirs.

Though for different reasons, both Achilles and Podaleirios are removed from battle (Achilles is on 'strike'; Podaleirios is tending the injured), and by their ships (*neos*, *Il.* XVIII.3; *Post.* VI.456) when learning of these deaths. Whereas Hektor killed Patroklos (*Il.* XVI.818ff.), Eurypylos killed Machaon (*Post.* VI.429). This is significant because the context is evoked: leading Trojan hero killing Greek; expanded lament scene follows; also, both victims (Patroklos and Machaon) pronounce death-prophecies, stating that their vanquishers do not have long to live, and that death/ fate stand close by (*Il.* XVI.851-54; *Post.* VI.426-28); so the episode is also suggestive of Hektor.

Whilst Podaleirios is Machaon's brother, Achilles and Patroklos are *as* brothers, being brought up together as children by Peleus (*Il.* XXIII.84-90). Thus, the brother-like closeness of the Iliadic pair is *formalized* in Quintus' Podaleirios/Machaon. However, whereas the Iliadic Achilles is consumed with grief immediately, the Posthomeric Podaleirios immediately seeks revenge for the killing (*Post.* VI.458ff.); in fact, the swift

⁴³² The third of his lost Achilles trilogy, the first two being *Myrmidons* and *Nereides*.

⁴³³ Both playwrights noted in Gantz (1996), 617-18. On Aeschylus' *Phryges*, see Sommerstein (1996), esp. 344-47

⁴³⁴ On Laments, see Ch.I.3.

response is more in keeping with the *Posthomerica* Achilleus, who, as discussed above, is driven more by anger than grief.⁴³⁵

Many aspects of the Posthomerica Podaleirios' lament for his dead brother (*Post.* VII.21ff.), Machaon, recall those of the Iliadic Achilleus for Patroklos (*Il.* XVIII.22ff.).⁴³⁶ This is not surprising as Quintus frequently employs striking Homeric motifs, although (re-)applying them differently. Like the Iliadic Achilleus for Patroklos, Quintus' Podaleirios refuses to eat (*Il.* XIX.209-10, 305-08, 319-20; *Post.* VII.21); Podaleirios' rejection of *edetus* 'food' in this context recalls the same for Achilleus (*Il.* XIX.320). The actual lament is displaced in the *Posthomerica*, as Podaleirios joins the battle *first*. However, expression of the lament is similar to that of Achilleus for Patroklos, and it is spotlighted: Podaleirios lies in the dust, moaning aloud (*Post.* VII.21-2; so Achilleus: rolling in dust (*Il.* XVIII.26-7); moaning aloud (*Il.* XVIII.35)).

Podaleirios also refuses to leave Machaon's grave: 'He would not leave the graveside (*sema*) of his brother' (*Post.* VII.22-3). Whilst the refusal to leave the side of his dead beloved may evoke the Iliadic Achilleus, 'and the whole night long swift Achilleus ... wetted the ground (where Patroklos was cremated), calling ever on the spirit of unhappy Patroklos' (*Il.* XXIII.218-21), it also bears a close similarity to the Posthomerica Achilleus, who lies prostrate at Patroklos' grave: 'Both (Achilleus and Aias) lay prostrate at the grave (*sema*) of Menoitios' son; recalling their comrade, one groaned on this side, one on that' (*Post.* I.378-79).

Elements that further evoke Achilleus and his grief include Podaleirios' thoughts of suicide, (*Post.* VII.23-4; *Il.* XVIII.32-4); other expressions include restlessness, inability to sleep, and continued weeping (*Post.* VII.31ff.; cf. *Il.* XXIV.2ff). Also, Nestor's intervention, with regard to Podaleirios' potential suicide, recalls the same function that Antilochos performs in hindering Achilleus' suicide. Podaleirios' lament to Nestor also evokes Achilleus' to Thetis: both note that they no longer have the will to live because of

⁴³⁵ I.e. for Antilochos.

⁴³⁶ See Laments, Ch.I.3.

their losses (*Il.*XVIII.90-3; *Post.*VII.64-5). The Posthomeric scene also invites comparison with that between Achilles and Priam in *Iliad* XXIV. As Nestor consoles Podaleirios with recourse to the good and evil fortunes (*Post.* VII.70ff.), we are reminded of Achilles' consolation to Priam, regarding Zeus' good and evil urns (*Il.* XXIV.525ff.).⁴³⁷ For Podaleirios, as Achilles, this lament shared with a *geron* who has experienced a recent loss proves cathartic.

2.3 *Brothers in Arms: Aias*

Following Achilles' death, another Achillean character emerges. Quintus finds, in Aias, the most suitable replacement for the Greeks. Here Quintus draws on the tradition which makes Aias second only to Achilles.⁴³⁸ As Neoptolemos later,⁴³⁹ Aias almost immediately replaces Achilles in the text: 'Achilleus, though, was not abandoned by godlike Aias, who 'swiftly' (*thoos* = Achilles' *oka*) 'bestrode' (*peribe*) him and with his 'very long lance' (*dourati macro* = Achilles' Pelian spear) drove them all away from him' (*Post.* III.217-19). A density of allusion here aligns the heroes, as Aias briefly fills Achilles' heroic shoes. The evocation, however, is not wholly new. Such allusion to Achilles has, in fact, been gaining momentum as Achilles' death draws closer. In *Posthomeric* I, Aias and Achilles lament Patroklos, (briefly) face Penthesileia with Achilles, and Achilles claim that he *and* Aias are by far the greatest. While protecting and 'bestriding' (*peribas*) a fallen hero evoke Menelaus for Patroklos (*Il.* XVII.80), the mention of swiftness and the very long spear, combined with the growing parallels between Aias and Achilles, suggest great closeness between the two (Achilles and Aias), especially, as Aias takes centre stage.

The duel-scene, with Aias, also follows quickly on. So far, in the *Posthomeric*, the only duels have involved Achilles. This is further clear example of Aias' substitution for Achilles. Against Glaukos, Aias asks (as the Iliadic Achilles had regarding Lykaon and Hektor, and the Posthomeric Achilles had with Penthesileia) if he is aware how much

⁴³⁷ See too discussion on *gnomai*, Ch.V.2.3i.

⁴³⁸ E.g. *Il.* II.768-70 and *Od.* XI.550-58, as Kirk (2001), 241n.768-70; so too Nagy (1981), 31. Also *Ai.*418-26, and *Met.* XIII.11-12.

⁴³⁹ See Ch.IV.2.1

greater (*pherteros*) Hektor was than he (Glaukos, III.253-54). Here Aias refers to his Iliadic battle with Hektor, who was outmatched (*Il.* VII.244-72). And close reference is made to the famous *xenia* scene between Diomedes and Glaukos (*Post.* III.258-60; *Il.* VI.119-236), yet also the Iliadic Achilles is recalled through Aias' rhetoric as he comments that Glaukos shall not escape (*fuges*, *Post.* III.261) for a *second* time from a Greek warrior. These points echo those of the Iliadic Achilles with Lykaon (again) (escape, *Il.* XXI.57; gifts/ransom, *Il.* XXI. 99). Evocation of Achilles' most frenzied Iliadic *aristeia* is cemented with the simile comparing Aias, like Achilles earlier, to a '(whale or) mighty dolphin' and the Trojans to terrified 'fish' (*ichthues ... keteos ... delphinos ... megaloio*, *Post.* III.271-72; *delphinos megaketeos ichthues*, *Il.* XXI.22).

In places, Quintus is more explicit. In Achilles' Funeral Games, Thetis, herself 'doubling' for Achilles as overseer and prize-giver of the contests (*Post.* IV.115-17; *Il.* XXIII.262ff.), is struck by Aias' similarity to Achilles: 'The sight of Aias reminded her (Thetis) of her beloved son' (*Post.* IV.498-99). Again, if a character is reminded of (here) Achilles, so are we. Thus, a mother's recognition serves a particularly powerful intertextual function.⁴⁴⁰ Also, Thetis spoke to Aias 'away from the other Danaans' (*nosphi allon Danaon*, *Post.* IV.96), and told him that the games would be held in Achilles' honour. Excluding Achilles, Aias is the only other hero who speaks to Thetis *alone* (before Neoptolemos' arrival), and Aias' comment that they were separate from the other Greeks recalls the intimate Iliadic scenes involving Achilles and Thetis at the sea's edge (*hetaron ... nosphi*, *Il.* I.70ff.; XVIII.348ff.). These indicate the special relationship Aias also has with her.

Aias' prize of Memnon's 'immortal armour', at the Funeral Games for Achilles also implies that Aias possesses Achillean attributes. These arms, like the Iliadic Achilles' are both given by Thetis and crafted by Hephaistos. Aias (until Neoptolemos later), like the Iliadic Achilles, is the only hero *me gas* and powerful enough to wear them (457ff.). The size association between these two is not new, as Achilles, awaiting Hephaistos'

⁴⁴⁰ So does a father's; see Ch.IV.2.4.

armour,⁴⁴¹ comments: ‘No other man do I know whose glorious armour I might put on, except for the shield of Aias’ (*Il.* XVIII.192-93).⁴⁴² The Iliadic Achilles is not *supersized*, though. However, that the Posthomeric Achilles is, reinforces this close link between these two, and Aias’ hugeness: Aias tells Odysseus in Quintus’ *Hoplou Krisis*,⁴⁴³ ‘You haven’t even the strength to wear this⁴⁴⁴ solid armour of the warrior grandson of Aiakos or hands that can wield his spear. For me they are all a perfect fit, so that it’s fitting for me to wear such splendid armour ...’ (*Post.* V.224-27).⁴⁴⁵

Papaioannou, in her study of Ovid’s Achilles (*Metamorphoses* XII), notes that Aias’ post *Armorum Iudicium* ravings evoke Achilles’ ‘anger’ in his ‘quarrel’ with Agamemnon in *Iliad* I.⁴⁴⁶ (Here, as Achilles’ lingering *menis* from the grave (*Post.* XIV.132), Aias’ anger is inappropriate.) The same can be argued for Quintus’ Aias, whose anger at the Greeks (*choloumenos*, *Post.* V.352; because he is not granted Achilles’ arms), recalls Achilles’ Iliadic anger with Agamemnon/the Greeks in the *Iliad*’s opening; Aias’ violent dilemma and divine deflection from killing Odysseus further evokes the same, where Athene hinders Achilles killing Agamemnon (*Post.* V.355-60; *Il.* I.188-221).⁴⁴⁷

Dead Aias is also compared to giants Orion (*Post.* V.404), and Typhon (485), recalling Achilles’ description as Tityos-like in death.⁴⁴⁸ With Achilles Aias is compared to the raging Otos and Ephialtes (*Post.* I.516-19).⁴⁴⁹ Even Odysseus’ response evokes the Iliadic Achilles: following Aias’ *Hoplou Krisis* defeat and suicide, Quintus’ Odysseus laments the danger of excessive (Aias’) rage ‘*cholos*’ over the arms (*Post.* V.574-77), this recalls Achilles reconciliation with Agamemnon at (*Il.* XVIII.107-11).⁴⁵⁰

⁴⁴¹ Hektor having taken Achilles’ from dead Patroklos.

⁴⁴² As K. King (1987), 134.

⁴⁴³ See James and Lee (2000).

⁴⁴⁴ Achilles’ immortal arms; understand the *second* arms, forged by Hephaistos.

⁴⁴⁵ Perhaps the last line is also a further clue as to why Quintus omits Paris from Achilles’ killing.

⁴⁴⁶ Papaioannou (2007), ch.5, esp. 166-69.

⁴⁴⁷ Also, *Ai.*42ff.

⁴⁴⁸ Noted above.

⁴⁴⁹ As K. King (1987), 135.

⁴⁵⁰ As James (2004), 300n.574-77.

Regarding Aias' and Achilleus' endgames, both heroes are illustriously honoured by being carried by the *basilees* (respectively, *Post.* V.612; III.385). The enormity of both carried corpses further links these two: Aias is *megan* (V.614); Achilleus, *apeiriton* (III.386).⁴⁵¹ The construction of Aias' bier echoes Achilleus', too (respectively, V.655-56; III.739-42):⁴⁵² Achilleus' cremated remains inhabit a *sema pelorion* ('huge tomb, III.740), Aias' mound is *apeiresien* ('boundless, V.656); Aias' *apeiresien* also recalls *apeiriton* for Achilleus' corpse (III.385). Allusion to apotheosis features too, linking Aias with Achilleus and with Herakles: 'Or as his living limbs were consigned to consuming fire by Herakles under the torment of Nessos' trick ... his spirit passed into the air to be numbered with the gods' (V.643-48).

2.4 Paris' Death and Neoptolemos' Birth

Like Achilleus' death in the *Posthomeric*,⁴⁵³ the duration of Paris' death is marked for its exceptional length (*Post.* X.240-363).⁴⁵⁴ Paris' death is protracted, as, like Achilleus, he does not die straight away; and also, a 'narrative shift' and narrative return' occur (see below). That these two alone share such unusually long deaths evokes their relationship on multiple levels: Achilleus as slayer of men; Paris/ 'Alex/andros' as 'protector of men'. Also, although Paris does not neutralize Achilleus in the *Posthomeric*, he proves a match for *the hero* through the epic space he occupies when dying.⁴⁵⁵

Furthermore, Oenone's wish to devour Paris (*Post.* X.315-16) recalls both Hekabe for Achilleus (*Il.* XXIV.212-13),⁴⁵⁶ and Achilleus for Hektor (*Il.* XXII.346-47). In Paris' death, the embassy to Achilleus in *Iliad IX* is also evoked: Paris' plea to Oenone for mercy recalls Aias' to Achilleus (*Post.* X.291; *Il.* IX.639), and Oenone's response to Paris,

⁴⁵¹ See above, 1.3i.

⁴⁵² As James notes (2004), 301n.655-56.

⁴⁵³ See, 1.1-2.

⁴⁵⁴ See Hopkinson (1994), 108-15.

⁴⁵⁵ See, 1.1. Quintus has used such 'displacement' in other parts of his epic; for instance, in the Diomedes/Ilioneos killing scene, which is brutal in a way we would expect (but do not receive) in the Neoptolemos/Priam killing scene; see Ch.IV.1.3.

⁴⁵⁶ As James notes (2004), 312n.315-16.

regarding Helen, echoes Achilles' response about Agamemnon and Briseis (*Post.* X.310-11; *Il.* IX.336-37).⁴⁵⁷

The most extreme example of Achilles' character as the basis for other heroes (excluding, of course, the Posthomeric Achilles with reference to the Iliadic Achilles), can be seen in the characterization of Neoptolemos, which I explore in detail in a Chapter IV. Neoptolemos is first mentioned in *Posthomeric* III.760, only half a book after Achilles dies. Though Achilles continues to dominate the text overtly (he is the focus through eulogy, song and arms, etc.) until the end of Book V, Neoptolemos, following Aias' death, most markedly picks up Achilles' mantle: e.g. his striking physical resemblance, and battling prowess, etc. As noted, Aias becomes the 'second' Achilles, until just before Neoptolemos' entrance into the poem. In this way, the Achillean line remains virtually intact.

In each of these instances, ironically, Quintus' reconstruction of Achilles does not necessarily need to rely solely upon the Homeric texts, nor the Homeric archetype for the illusion of his Iliadic characterization.

Part 3 - *Reconstructing Achilles: Remembrance of Things Past*

Next, I am going to explore Achilles as a 'recalled' figure; the 'remembrance' of the hero and his heroic deeds by both the primary and secondary narrators.⁴⁵⁸ Here, Achilles is reconstructed through narratives (words) about him, rather than what he does (deeds) in the text. The narrators' construction of Achilles is also very significant as their constructs express an 'ideal'. Further, this ideal epic model of the epic hero communicates the centrality of Achilles to epic and epic heroism. In these recollections, Achilles again represents more than himself: Achilles *is* epic. Thus, his narrators (from secondary

⁴⁵⁷ Hopkins (1994), 112-13.

⁴⁵⁸ On Homer and narratology, see especially de Jong (2004a, 1997a).

narrators like Nestor *et al.* who have shared relations,⁴⁵⁹ to the primary narrator/ Quintus) are also his creators, and epic heirs.

Throughout these narratives, Quintus makes use of two very Homeric techniques; external and internal *analepses* (therefore, intertextual and intratextual engagements will also be considered).⁴⁶⁰ This analysis contrasts with my two previous studies of Achilles, where the focus has been on the characterization of an Achilles who is actually *present* in the primary narrative⁴⁶¹ - even if this is by ‘default’; i.e. through manifestations of his character that drive others’ characterizations. Importantly, the secondary narratives, even if delivered by the primary narrator, often as eulogy, recall an Achilles who has already died.⁴⁶² Therefore, we are privy to another method in Achilles’ Posthomerian characterization. Also, these remembrances of Achilles take the hero beyond the narrative-frame in which the *Posthomerica* is set and, in so doing, import episodes from his mythic past. This creates the effect of an Achilles with a ‘history’; a biography. By considering such ‘secondary’ memories, *and* narratives stretching beyond the narrative scope of the *Posthomerica*, I will further show how Quintus reconstructs Achilles, and the type of hero that emerges.

3.1 Heroic Recollections: Old Memories

In *Posthomerica* IV, dominated by the funeral games for Achilles, Nestor begins his song (*hymnos*, 129; 128-70). He sings of Thetis, her wedding to Peleus, etc. and events pre-Achilles (therefore, pre-*Iliad* and pre-*Posthomerica*). This narrative, as that regarding parts of Achilles’ heroic eulogy, is example of external *analepsis*. At 146, in the ‘midst of the assembly’, the focus shifts to the main subject of his song (*melpe*, 147), Achilles

⁴⁵⁹ Cf. Neoptolemos, who activates memories of Achilles; e.g. Ch.IV.2.2.

⁴⁶⁰ See de Jong (1997a), 309ff. See following for discussion of *analepsis* (flashbacks) and *prolepsis* (foreshadowing); on which, see S. Richardson (1990), especially, ch. 4, ‘Order’, including *Events Retold*, pp. 95-9 and *Retrospection*, pp. 100-08; and *Foreknowledge*, pp. 132-39. On *prolepsis* and *analepsis* in Quintus, see too Chs.III.3.3; also, Schmitz (2007b). On ‘foreshadowing’ in Quintus, see Duckworth (1936).

⁴⁶¹ By ‘primary narrative’ I mean the running commentary on events as they occur *within* the text; alternatively, ‘secondary narrative’ implies the recollection of events which have already occurred in the text, and/ or previously, e.g., external and/ or internal *analepsis*.

⁴⁶² The primary narrator’s descriptions of the dead Achilles, and the appearance of his ghost, are important exceptions to this rule.

and his heroic deeds; I note the context (assembly's midst), as not only does this context echo Homeric precedents (e.g. Phemios, *Od.* I.154, and, especially, Demodocus, *Od.* VIII.43ff.), it also locates Achilles' 'song' (recollection of heroic deeds) as worthy of an (important and vast) audience,⁴⁶³ and of the most brilliant singers - Nestor, at one level, Quintus, at another. Furthermore, there is a significant interpretative point that Achilles himself, who once delighted his heart and 'sang of the glories of men (heroes)' (*aeide ... klea andron*, *Il.* IX.189.), is now the subject of such song - he is the hero other heroes sing of, in the epic in which he was present (compare the *klea andron* of *Od.* VIII.73, where Demodocus recalls a dead Achilles from beyond the parameters of the poem = external *analepses*). Achilles has now, actually *in* Quintus' epic, won *kleos aphthiton*, 'immortal glory' (*Il.* IX.413). As Agamemnon tells Achilles in the Underworld in *Odyssey* XXIV, 'You were very dear to the gods. So, even now you have died, you have not lost your name (*su ... oude thanon onom' olesas*, *Od.* XXIV.93),⁴⁶⁴ but always among all men your fame shall be great (*aiei ... ep' anthropous kleos essetai esthlon*, 94-5), Achilles' (92-5).⁴⁶⁵

Before considering the material covered in Achilles' eulogy, it is worth noting its mode. Nestor's 'song' is not really his. *Melpe* 'he sang', the primary narrator informs, then he (the primary narrator) proceeds to *tell* of his (Nestor's) song. This reported/indirect method of narrating, echoes Homer, where, the singing of Demodocus (*Od.* VIII.73ff.) and Phemios (*Od.* I.154-55), is recounted by the primary narrator.⁴⁶⁶ In form, Odysseus' fairly detailed recollections to Penelope (*Od.* XXIII.310-41; Odysseus précised *each* of his deeds), bare similarity to those of Quintus' Nestor. Except, at points, Nestor's song stretches *beyond* the narrative frame of the text in which it figures (external *analepsis*).

The Posthomeric narrator permits his characters far less expression in general, as he frequently intercepts their secondary narratives, with *his* précised accounts. Nestor's song, as the bard's (see following), recounts Achilles' heroic past (both internal and external

⁴⁶³ Ranging from the 'most kingly' (*basileutatos*; *Post.* IV.126) Agamemnon, to the Greek army (*laos*, 147).

⁴⁶⁴ Cf. Odysseus' living 'Nobody', *Od.* IX.366.

⁴⁶⁵ Translation based on Lattimore (1975).

⁴⁶⁶ See, Ch.V, on the primary narrator; also, de Jong (1997a), 310.

analepsis), as reported speech. And, while the context (funeral games honouring Achilles), clearly echoes the same for Iliadic Patroklos (*Il.* XXIII), the narrative form of the recollections (*klea andron*) and the mode (indirect speech) recall those of the *Odyssey*. Furthermore, while these contexts and modes of expression appear Homeric hybrids, the subject matter within the songs themselves fuses Iliadic narratives with those of the *Cycle*, and the *Posthomerica*, as Quintus includes Achillean narratives also figuring *in* his own text.

Nestor's *klea andron* covers the following Achillean episodes,⁴⁶⁷ which draw their primary and secondary inter-/intratextual narratives mainly from the *Iliad*, the *Epic Cycle*, and the *Posthomerica*: sackings of cities (*Post.* IV.150-51);⁴⁶⁸ vanquishing of Telephos and Eetion (*Post.* IV.152-53);⁴⁶⁹ the killing of Cycnus, (*Post.* IV.153)⁴⁷⁰ Polydoros (*Post.* IV.154),⁴⁷¹ Troilos (*Post.* IV.155) and Asteropaios (*Post.* III.609-10);⁴⁷² bloodying the river Xanthos with numerous corpses (*Post.* IV.156-58);⁴⁷³ the killing of Lykaon (*Post.* IV.158-59),⁴⁷⁴ Hektor and Penthesileia, and Memnon (respectively, *Post.* IV.160; *Post.* IV.161).⁴⁷⁵ Though presented largely in summary form (as the *Cycle*, episodic), the reported nature of the narratives and breadth of narrative covered creates the impression that much of Achilles' heroic past is conveyed; and, through this, that the Achilles we now have comes with footnotes and full *curriculum vitae*. The primary narrator also creates this effect with his recollections of Achilles' heroic deeds, except that Quintus uses the story for each of the arms (won by Achilles),⁴⁷⁶ given as prizes for the winners of the funeral games, to drive the narratives.

⁴⁶⁷ On Achilles' heroic biography, see Gantz (1996), 230-31; Vol. II (1996), 576-659.

⁴⁶⁸ See *Il.* I.163-68, VI.414ff.; *Cyp.* (Args. 7, 9, 11, 12); *Post.* I.13-4, III.544-46.

⁴⁶⁹ For Telephos (though cf. *Post.* IV.172ff., where Achilles *heals* Telephos), cf. *Cyp.* (Arg.7); for Eetion, *Il.* VI.414-20; *Post.* III.544-46.

⁴⁷⁰ See *Cyp.* (Arg.10).

⁴⁷¹ See *Il.* XX.407ff.

⁴⁷² For Troilos, cf. *Il.* XXIV.257, and *Cyp.* (Arg.11); for Asteropaios, *Il.* XXI.139ff..

⁴⁷³ See *Il.* XXI.1ff.; *Post.* I.10ff.

⁴⁷⁴ *Il.* XXI.34ff.

⁴⁷⁵ For Hektor, see *Il.* XXII.326-63, *Post.* I.1ff., etc.; for Penthesileia, *Aith.* (Arg.1), *Post.* I.569ff.; for Memnon, *Aith.* (Arg.2); *Post.* II.396ff.

⁴⁷⁶ See 3.4.

3.2 *Songs My Fathers Taught Me*

Many of the aspects of Nestor's song feature in the bard's 'song' (*aeide*, *Post.* XIV.125; 121-42). The song, as Nestor's, is also reported. Furthermore, much of the subject matter, like Nestor's, deals with Achilles' legendary past (127ff.), such as his sacking of cities (128-29); his deeds against Telephos and Eetion (130); his subduing of Cycnus (131; cf. above); the dragging of Hektor (133), and vanquishing of Penthesileia (134), and Memnon (Tithonos' son, 135). Thus, through the secondary narratives, aspects of Achilles' heroic past are again recalled; sometimes, as in Nestor's song, the narratives are external *analepses* (sackings, etc.); sometimes, once again as in Nestor's song, internal *analepses* (e.g. Penthesileia, Memnon).

So, in terms of the content of Nestor's song, there are many parallels. However, the bard omits certain features present in Nestor's eulogy, such as Achilles' killing of Troilos and Asteropaios, and he includes narrative *summaries* that had been absent. Of these one is hugely significant for the reconstructing of Achilles. The 'anger of Achilles' (*menin Achilleos*) is recalled in the bard's song at *Post.* XIV.131-32. For all his ravings in the *Posthomerica*, nowhere else is *menis* applied to Achilles.⁴⁷⁷ This overtly recalls the opening of the *Iliad*, the Iliadic Achilles (and, consequently Homer). As noted, Achilles' anger is the central unifying theme in the *Iliad*, so, recourse to it is extremely loaded. While, as noted, Quintus' poem lacks the cohesive theme of the *Iliad*, Achilles, evoked in numerous ways, provides the cohesion, making the epic more than series of episodes. In a sense, the entire *Iliad* is contained in this one term (*menis*), so Quintus' fleeting 'quote' both reduces the *Iliad* and Achilles to their bare minimum, while also signifying the complete Iliadic story, and the complete (and complex) Achilles. Viewed so, it can be seen that the 'real' Achilles, i.e. most true to his Iliadic self, is more apparent as a *memory* than he actually was as a hero *present* in the *Posthomerica*.

The bard, however, fails to include an Achillean narrative so comprehensively covered by the primary narrator: Achilles' death. It has been noted that Quintus often presents an

⁴⁷⁷ *Cholos* is the preferred term. See 1.

‘idealized’ Achilleus, and one based on hyperbole:⁴⁷⁸ he is Achilleus ‘plus’; more violent; more indestructible (Apollo alone kills him); more ‘romantic’ (Penthesileia); more philosophical (as in his ghostly form). As primary narrative the episode was so well documented, Achilleus taking hundreds of lines to die, that it appears strange that this is omitted from the secondary narratives, except if we consider that perhaps Quintus was saving the ‘best’ lines for himself, and that mention of Achilleus’ death in *secondary* songs of his heroic deeds somehow detracts from them: the essence of heroic songs (for secondary narrators, too) is the glory of success, not failure. Also, perhaps a précised account shatters the illusion that we are witnessing Achilleus’ ‘epic’ biography: being so long and stylized, a ‘report’ is inappropriate.

3.3 *Epic Tales*

Key episodes that do not figure in either Nestor’s or the bard’s songs are woven into Quintus’ text in other ways, thus further creating the impression that, in the *Posthomeric*, we are privy to Achilleus’ full heroic life. All of the following are secondary narratives: Thetis recalls her ill-starred relationship with Peleus (*Post.* III.613ff.).⁴⁷⁹ Whilst her laments echo those for Patroklos in *Iliad* XVIII.429ff., and the *Cycle* (*Aith.* Arg.4), these recollections also create the effect that another episode in Achilleus’ biography (albeit technically pre-Achilleus), features; as is the case in the *Iliad* too. Heroic recountings continue with Phoenix’ lament, when he recalls his involvement in young Achilleus’ childhood (*Post.* III.463ff.; e.g. *nepieesin ... stethea ... chitonas*, 475-76). Again this echoes Phoenix’ speech in the *Iliad* (IX.434ff.; *stethessi chitona ... nepiee*, 490-91);⁴⁸⁰ itself going beyond the narrative time-frame of its text (external *analepsis*); Phoenix tells a similar tale to the young Neoptolemos much later (*Post.* VII.642-66).

⁴⁷⁸ See Mansur (1940).

⁴⁷⁹ See *Il.* I.5 scholia in West (2003), *Cyp.* (fr.1), and *Il.* XVIII.434ff; also, Apollonius. *Argon.* IV.865-79.

⁴⁸⁰ Cf. *Il.* XI.830-32, where Cheiron taught Achilleus; like the *Cycle*, Quintus makes no such reference in this context); further on Cheiron/Achilleus, see Gantz (1996), 231; e.g. Hesiod, *Precepts of Cheiron*, and art (e.g., neck amphora of Protoattic period; Berlin, CHA9).

Achilleus' youthful time in Skyros, so well documented by Statius in his first-century AD *Achilleid*, acts as further narrative 'filler' of Achilleus' mythic past;⁴⁸¹ this part of Achilleus' mythic biography receives only fleeting reference in the *Iliad*. Though Neoptolemos is named as Achilleus' son (*Il.* XIX.326-27), there is no mention of Deidameia.⁴⁸² Achilleus notes that Neoptolemos is in Skyros, (*Il.* XIX.331-33; Schol. (D) *Il.* XIX.326⁴⁸³ = Peleus hides Achilleus (disguised as a girl) on Skyros; Odysseus, Phoenix and Nestor are sent to find him, and both Deidameia and Neoptolemos are mentioned; in the *Ilias Mikra*, Odysseus fetches Neoptolemos from Skyros ... (Arg.3). However, little is recalled with regard to this episode. No mention is made of Achilleus 'raping' Deidameia (cf. *ephtheire*, in the Schol. (D); Statius, *Ach.* I.639ff.; Ovid, *Met.* XI.264ff.). This omission, as his choice to include Apollo as Achilleus' killer, serves to present the hero in a more positive light. Equally, a further addition to this list could have included Penthesileia.⁴⁸⁴ In the Skyros episode (*Post.* VII.169ff.), Odysseus' and Diomedes' presence catalyse Deidameia's⁴⁸⁵ memories of young Achilleus; these are also focalized by the primary narrator (242ff.). And, her time with Achilleus is recalled, as she foreshadows her son's doom (268ff.).

Returning from Skyros, Achilleus' heroism is recalled as the recruiting Greeks 'delighting' (*terpeskon*) him (Neoptolemos) 'telling' (*enepontes*) 'stories' (*muthoisin*) of his father's deeds' (*erg'*, *Post.* VII.378).⁴⁸⁶ The secondary narrator's narrative covers Achilleus' accomplishments on his long voyage (380), in the land of Telephos (381), and in his assaults on Troy (Priam's citadel, 382). So, as with the songs (also indirect speech) of the secondary narrators, Nestor and the bard, the secondary narratives of the Greeks surpass the narrative frame of the *Posthomerica*, whilst including events within Quintus' text. This recalls more of Achilleus than literally figures in the text, and gives a grand sweep of the Trojan War. At a text-internal level too, such narratives serve an interesting purpose. The

⁴⁸¹ On Statius' *Achilleid*, see Dilke (2005), esp. *Introduction*; also Ch.IV, esp. 2.1.

⁴⁸² Nor in the *Odyssey*, but Odysseus tells Achilleus he recruited Neoptolemos from Skyros (XI.505ff.)

⁴⁸³ *Cyp.* (fr.19).

⁴⁸⁴ However, regarding Penthesileia, for necrophile allusions see above, 1.3i.

⁴⁸⁵ And the readers'.

⁴⁸⁶ My translation.

Greeks, like Odysseus and Phoenix, reconstruct the absent *father* for Neoptolemos. This is important as it presents another Achillean aspect (as parent), that is all but missing from the *Iliad*.⁴⁸⁷

3.4 Concrete Expressions of Abstract Constructs: Presence in Presents

Immediately following on from his song in honour of Achilles and his heroic deeds (*Post.* IV.171ff.), Nestor is first to receive a prize for his accomplishment (brilliant singing). The prize, Telephos' steeds (172ff.), also marks the beginnings of the primary narrator's recollections of Achilles' heroic past, which so closely matches that of Nestor's secondary narratives in content. The narratives, recalling Achilles' deeds, range from the early sackings of cities, where Achilles captured many women (Briseis included), to Memnon's slaughter. As Nestor's song, the primary narrator provides coverage of Achilles' narratives involving: Eetion; Cycnus; Polydoros; Troilos and Asteropaios; and Lykaon. Furthermore, Nestor's song (and the bard's) creates the effect that we see more of Achilles than is so.

The booty, given as prizes for victory in these games, activates Achillean narratives. To a lesser extent this is so in *Iliad* XXIII, where brief reminiscences (e.g. Achilles' announcement that Eumelos shall receive Asteropaios' bronze corselet), recall his heroic deeds stretching beyond the *Iliad*'s time-frame (558-62). Two major differences here (in the *Iliad*) are that much more of the narrative is spoken by the secondary narrators, and many prizes have no 'story' whatsoever; e.g. for the charioteers, Achilles sets out a woman, a tripod, and a mare, etc. (*Il.* XXIII.262ff.); for the boxing, a mule (XXIII.653ff.), etc. Narratives are *occasionally* connected with the games' prizes (silver mixing bowls for 'fleetness of foot', given by Euneos to Patroklos as ransom for Lykaon, XXIII.740ff.): of the eight contests (Quintus has ten, excluding Nestor's), only four of the many prizes (and two of these are for the wrestling alone, XXIII.798-810) recall previous narratives.

⁴⁸⁷ See Ch.IV.2.2.

With the exception of the uncontested prize ('won' by Aias for the game of 'fists and feet', *Post.* IV.479ff.),⁴⁸⁸ each gift presented to the victorious competitors has an Achillean tale of conquest attached that the primary narrator recalls; particularly noteworthy is that associated with Herakles, the huge lump of metal (*solon perimekea*, 436 and following). The iron recalls the contest at *Iliad* XXIII.826-49, but whereas the Theban Eetion had used the iron for training, the Posthomeric metal has a far greater 'history'. The giant Antaios exercised with the mass, until subdued by the greatest hero Herakles. This, subsequently, he gave to Peleus, and Peleus to Achilleus. Such transmission confers something further on Achilleus (and Aias), here closely associated with Herakles; in fact, in a way, heirs through objects. The massy iron is hurled furthest by the greater Aias, who receives the armour which Achilleus took from Memnon after subduing him. The primary narrative, then, recalls Achilleus' heroic deed, and adds further information which elevates his heroic stature (that the sight of Aias reminds Thetis of Achilleus, and moves her so is also significant (*Post.* IV.498-99)).⁴⁸⁹

The primary narrator also manipulates the actual contents of the narratives, triggered by the histories of the prizes. Achillean deeds are recalled through primary reference to arms/booty for numerous vanquished heroes (Cycnus, *Post.* IV.468ff.; Polydoros, 586; Memnon, 458, etc.). However, the arms (or anything else for that matter) of Hektor and Penthesileia, are not recalled by the primary narrator. Possibly because, in the *Iliad*, Achilleus brought Hektor back to camp after subduing him, and Penthesileia was returned to the Trojans (presumably 'clothed', i.e. for the sake of (feminine) modesty, still wearing her battle gear (*Post.* I.784ff.)).⁴⁹⁰ Similarly, the primary narrator omits reference to Achilleus' deeds involving the river Xanthos (IV.156-58 in Nestor's song), except if we consider his reference to Lykaon on Lemnos as cryptic reference (384).

⁴⁸⁸ See *Iliad*, XXIII.884-94: Achilleus gives Agamemnon an embossed cauldron for uncontested supremacy in spear-throwing and power.

⁴⁸⁹ See 2.3.

⁴⁹⁰ See Ch.I.

As in Achilles' death-scene,⁴⁹¹ this narrative is dramatically extended. The primary narrator's Achillean narratives, stretch over four hundred lines - many times more than those of Nestor or the bard. Although the narratives of these funeral games, as for those for Achilles' death-scene, change focus (they cover the events of the games themselves), the actual narratives specifically *about* Achilles are much more detailed in many places; e.g. all we learn of the Achilles/Cycnus 'story' from Nestor and the bard is, respectively, 'how he killed Cycnus the son of Poseidon with his spear' (IV.153-54); 'how he killed proud Cycnus' (XIV.131). In contrast, the primary narrator notes that, 'He (Agapenor) was given the *beautiful armour*⁴⁹² of Cycnus by Thetis. After killing Protesilaos Cycnus had taken the lives of many before being killed by Achilles. That first loss of the champion shrouded the Trojans in sorrow' (IV.468-71); four lines of primary narrative relating to Achilles' heroic deed, as opposed to one and a half of Nestor, and one for the bard.

The Achillean narrative involving Troilos is even more marked. Nestor tells only that, 'handsome Troilos' (*Post.* IV.155) had been killed by Achilles' spear; Troilos does not figure in the bard's narratives of Achilles' heroic deeds. In the primary narrator's account, however, we learn that, 'To him (Teukros) the spouse of Peleus presented the beautiful armour of godlike Troilos, far the best of the bachelor sons of Hekabe in holy Troy, but from his beauty he had no benefit, because the deadly strength behind the spear of Achilles robbed him of his life ...' (IV.418-220). The narrative continues, however, with an extended simile of a poppy or blade of grass cut short (423-29),⁴⁹³ including more mention of Achilles at 431; the Troilos narrative ends at 435.

Like the secondary narratives discussed above, Achilles' reconstruction is very comprehensive in the *Posthomeric*.⁴⁹⁴ For instance, the primary narrator glosses over

⁴⁹¹ See above, 1.1.

⁴⁹² See Ovid, *Met.* XII., on Cycnus' 'ornamental armour'; cf. Achilles' and its functions – wearer 'special' distinct, but also vulnerable.

⁴⁹³ This recalls *Il.* VIII.306-07. See James (2004), 292n.423-9.

⁴⁹⁴ If, sometimes incongruous and artificial; e.g. remembered as 'gentle', though especially violent; his demand for Polyxena sacrifice and advice to Neoptolemos.

many of his *pre*-Posthomeric narratives right from the beginning of the text. In the first fifteen lines, the narrator recalls Achilles' heroic deeds: subjugation of Hektor (*Post.* I.1); numerous Trojan killings in the Skamander (9-10), and around Troy's walls (11); again Hektor, dragged round the city (12); slayings on the sea (13); Achilles' first Trojan killings (14). The primary narrator focalizes all of these 'memories' *mnesthentes* (15); the first four deeds relate back to events actually in the *Iliad*, whilst the sackings, though noted by Achilles at *Iliad* IX.328-29, fall beyond its narrative scope, as does Achilles' first killing at Troy (according to the *Cycle*, *Cycnus*, *Cypria* [Arg.10]), which is not recounted in Homer.

Conclusion

At one level, Quintus' Achilles is far more simplistic than his Homeric counterpart; he is a blusterer, extremely violent, and rage-fuelled. However, through numerous allusions, the overall picture of Achilles is actually far more complex. As the hero present within the text, we see an Achilles who is predominantly bellicose – an observation that can reasonably be made about the Iliadic model. In fact, most of Achilles' violent traits evoke Homer's hero. He can be cruel verbally, too, again, as Homer's Achilles. Yet, for all the parallels that can be made, Homeric Achilles shows a level of depth, and, there is a true sense that he 'develops' in a way that Quintus' Achilles does not. The Posthomeric Achilles weeps for Patroklos (and Antilochos), he is sad for Penthesileia (as Briseis, and Patroklos). So, central aspects of his character find voice in the later model. Character traits even make recourse to 'gentleness', and the ability to forgive.

Further aspects of the Homeric Achilles are manifested in different ways. Striking episodes and characteristics are evoked also in other heroes, in their words and deeds. Memnon's encounter with Nestor recalls arguably the most emotive scene in the *Iliad* – Priam/Achilles (courtesy to the enemy is most peculiar in the violent world of epic). Achilles' pre-eminence is particularly suggested in Aias and Neoptolemos. As a 'memory' in the poem, a more diverse heroic biography is implied: ironically, the idea of Achilles is more compelling than the real thing. Absence, so the cliché goes, makes the

heart grow fonder. And the selective process in the memorizing of numerous characters eulogizes the man. In this respect, there is a convergence, as the primary narrator euhemerizes Achilleus; so too the heroes themselves.

Little of Achilleus is left unexplored, but one must piece him together rather like a shattered statue. In outline, we recognize the image, although fragmentary. This is the key difference between Homer's and Quintus' Achilleus. Yet this does not mean that Achilleus' reception is necessarily 'unsuccessful'. Through the deconstructions and reconstructions Quintus makes Achilleus into an epic journey. By presenting Achilleus in the ways that he does, Quintus invites his audience to re-explore the hero, too. Whilst his excessive physicality in the *Posthomerica* produces the effect of a more primitive hero, it is through Achilleus that Quintus paves the way for more sophisticated renderings of heroism and epic. As *the* Trojan War hero, Achilleus is the signifier of epic and much more.

Though Achilleus dominates the first three books, Apollo kills him in *Posthomerica* III. Major laments, funeral games in his honour, and allusion to Achilleus' great deeds occupy the remainder of Book III, *and* Books IV and V. Yet Achilleus, although absent early on, arguably dominates the text; and Neoptolemos, especially, picks up his mantle from *Post.*VI.⁴⁹⁵ Achilleus' shadow looms ominously in the *Iliad* even after he has removed himself from battle; so too Quintus' Achilleus continues as *the* dominant force, for numerous 'Achillean' qualities are manifested through other heroes. Here, Achilleus, to a striking degree, is not only embedded in Quintus' text, but also *represents* ancient epic and is *the* 'model' hero. Therefore, Achilleus represents far more than himself. In embedding his Achilleus so firmly in the text, though differently from Homer, Quintus shows himself an astute Homeric reader. Also, he signals his proximity to Achilleus, and his capacity to vary this model. Finally, in using the Homeric Achilleus in so many ways in a poem which is cyclic in content, Quintus tacitly claims to unite the divided epic tradition to create a new synergy. So, Quintus' Achilleus is hugely significant.

⁴⁹⁵ For Neoptolemos, see Ch. IV.

Chapter III: Nestor
Dreams of Gerontius

‘We declare ourselves to be better men by far than our fathers ...
So do not ever place our fathers in the same honour with us.’ (*Il.* IV.405-10)⁴⁹⁶

Introduction

For my third chapter, I explore heroic representations of age; for instance, age in relation to the hero (e.g. the *aged* (= old) hero), and age in relation to the heroic age (e.g. the *heroic age before* the Trojan War). I consider the characteristics of age, both positive and negative; but also their larger narrative roles as links to the (heroic) past.

Firstly, I consider the portrayal and function of old age initially through analysis of Nestor, the archetypal old man of epic, who bridges the gap between three generations (*Il.* I.250-52). As the dominant model of great age in Homer, Nestor embodies, often to an extreme, much that is associated with the *geron* (e.g. his exceptional loquacity, numerous reminiscences, and link with the past). Thus, analysis of Quintus’ Nestor is an ideal place in which to begin such a study in the *Posthomerica*.

Next, I extend this study to consider Quintus’ reception of further *gerontes*. I view Priam, with particular reference to two other epic models: *Iliad* XXIV, supplicating Achilleus; *Aeneid* II, confronting Neoptolemos. In Homer, both old men (Nestor and Priam) are caught up in the brutality of war, but whilst exemplars and stratagems typify one, the pathos of a father and king under siege convey the other. I also consider Phoenix, Achilleus’ surrogate father, and the *gerontes* more broadly (e.g. their portrayal *en masse*). Finally, in this section, I consider Quintus’ portrayals of the opposite extreme: babies/very young (*nepiachoi/nepia tekna*).

⁴⁹⁶ Sthenelus reprimands Agamemnon.

For my third focus, I explore representations of the Heroic Age itself. Traditionally, in Homeric epic, the previous heroic age is held up as a paradigm or exemplum that heroes should aspire to; often a greater past is recalled to inspire/shame the present heroes into acts of greatness. In numerous ways, heroes (and mythological creatures, like Giants and Titans) from previous ages, are usually remembered as bigger, stronger, faster and more heroic. Regarding the heroic age, this chapter also takes into account not only the importance of aspirations to the heroic ideal, but also ideas about the importance of memory.

Through this focus, I hope to show how, in Quintus' exploration of age, he engages with the epic past, and his place within it: Quintus' approach to 'age' entails not only exploration of *gerontes* and themes associated with them, but also the past in terms of previous literatures and their authors. Thus, his representations of age are used to convey the supremacy of the *Posthomeric*'s heroic *present*,⁴⁹⁷ which, in turn, can be understood to impact upon Quintus and his text.

Part 1 – *The Gerenian Horseman*

1.1 *Nestor and Memnon: Age-related Disorders or Chronologically Challenged*

In *Posthomeric* II, in full *aristeia*, Memnon makes for old Nestor.⁴⁹⁸ This onslaught is briefly checked by the intervention of his son, Antilochos. Antilochos' defence, however, proves fatal, as Memnon, instead, dispatches him:

‘The death of Antilochos brought sorrow to all the Danaans, but greatest was the grief (*malista ... penthos*) that beset the heart of his father Nestor, to have his own son killed before his eyes (*παιδὸς ἐοῖο παρ’ ὀφθαλμοῖσι δαμέντος*). Truly no worse sorrow comes to mortal man than when a son is killed with his

⁴⁹⁷ I.e. the mythic time in which Quintus' narrative is set – the period of the Trojan War, after the death of Hektor (= post Iliadic), to Troy's Fall and Greek departure (= pre-Odyssean). On the *Posthomeric*'s 'beginning' and 'ending', see Ch.V.1.1-2.

⁴⁹⁸ On which, see too, Ch.II.2.1ii.

father looking on (οὐ γὰρ δὴ μερόπεσσι κακώτερον ἄλγος ἔπεισιν ἢ ὅτε παῖδες ὄλωνται ἐοῦ πατρὸς εἰσορόωντος). And so, for all the sternness of his spirit, his soul was pained at the cruel fate of his son's death.' (*Post.* II.260-66)⁴⁹⁹

Quintus' *gnome*,⁵⁰⁰ illustrated by this episode, highlights this tragedy: fathers should die *before* their sons (and sons should not be killed in front of their fathers). However, war ruptures societal order. A similar scene occurs in Homer as Priam views Hektor facing Achilleus (*Il.* XXII.25ff.), and his dragging around Troy, having been killed (XXII.405-28). Yet, there is a fundamental difference in the locale, the old parent's sphere of existence. In Homer, Priam watches from the Troy; in Quintus, Nestor views the event on the battlefield. This radically alters the tone, as the context turns the *geron* from onlooker to warrior.

The "problematic of old age" discussed in Falkner's chapter on old age in Homer⁵⁰¹ is, partly, resolved in Homer, but more so in Quintus. The "problem" concerns the tension caused by the old man in the heroes' world: how can the *geron*⁵⁰² be accommodated in a world where status is largely gained through battling prowess?⁵⁰³ The active *aged* hero is a rarity in the Homeric epics,⁵⁰⁴ Nestor being the main exception.⁵⁰⁵ He features on the battle-field on numerous occasions, though to little effect: at *Il.* VIII.102ff.,⁵⁰⁶ Diomedes saves the stranded Nestor, noting: 'Old man (*geron*), clearly young warriors (*neoi ... machetai*) are wearing you down; but your might is broken and grievous old age (*chalepon geras*)⁵⁰⁷ attends you ... But come, mount my chariot'

⁴⁹⁹ Slightly modified version of James (2004); see too *Post.* III.515-17, and VII.38ff. For Nestor's consolation of Podaleirios, see Ch.II.2.2.

⁵⁰⁰ On *gnomai* in Quintus, see Ch.V.2.3i.

⁵⁰¹ Falkner (1989), ch. 1.

⁵⁰² And its cognates: *γεραιός, ἀρχαῖος, παλαιός, πρέσβυς*.

⁵⁰³ See Van Wees (1992).

⁵⁰⁴ As opposed to merely the *geron*, e.g. an old character/non-combatant in the epic. Though, cf. following note.

⁵⁰⁵ Cf. Falkner on Odyssean Laertes (1989), 38-53.

⁵⁰⁶ See too *Il.* XI. 511-20; though cf. XIV.1ff. Slightly modified version of Wyatt's translation (1999).

⁵⁰⁷ On this formula, see too Achilleus to Nestor (*Iliad* XXIII.623; Falkner, 31), and Antikleia to Odysseus, regarding Laertes (*Od.* XI.195-96; Falkner, 40).

In the *Posthomeric*, Nestor considers joining the fight against Memnon, although, the primary narrator informs us, such action is beyond his abilities, and he *would* have fallen:

‘He even thought of joining the fight himself on his chariot, since the loss that he felt for the son that was slain was drawing him into a fight beyond his strength.’ (*Post.* II.302-05, and following)

However, in a ‘chivalrous’ act that echoes that of the Iliadic Achilles with Priam (*Iliad* XXIV.504ff.), ‘great-hearted’ (*obrimothumos*) Memnon checks his aged adversary, ‘Out of respect for a man as old as his father’, *αἰδέσθεις ἀνὰ θυμὸν ὁμήλικα πατρός ἐοῖο* (*Post.* II.308). This in itself is significant, as Quintus ‘borrows’ the tone of the Iliadic scene, where the hero shows reverence for the *geron*, an age-mate of his father’s: (Priam beseeches Achilles) ‘But respect the gods, Achilles, and take pity on me, remembering your own father’, *ἀλλ’ αἰδεῖο θεούς, Ἀχιλεῦ, αὐτόν τ’ ἐλέησον, / μνησάμενος σοῦ πατρός* (*Il.* XXIV.503-04).⁵⁰⁸ Yet, the context marks the fundamental differences between both the scene, and the heroes meeting: in *Iliad* XXIV, Achilles and Priam are literally removed from war’s stage (the battlefield). Also, their status as enemies is briefly forgotten, as their shared suffering unites them.⁵⁰⁹ Priam’s supplication of Achilles triggers an entirely different mood from that of Quintus’ Nestor and Memnon.

Memnon highlights these differences when he states,

*ᾤω γέρον, οὐ μοι ἔοικε καταντία σεῖο μάχεσθαι
πρεσβυτέροιο γεγῶτος, ἐπεὶ γε μὲν οἶδα νοῆσαι·
ἢ γὰρ ἔγωγ’ ἐφάμην σε νέον καὶ ἀρήγιον ἄνδρα
ἀντιάαν δηίοισι ...*

‘Old man, it is not fitting for me to fight against you who are so much older, as I can now see. I thought at first it was a young man, fit for fighting, who faced the foe’ (*Post.* II.309ff.)

⁵⁰⁸ The language of *aidos* is also used in *Il.*24.208 in Hekabe’s (false) prediction of Achilles’ savage response, and in Apollo’s condemnation of his treatment of Hektor’s corpse (24.44)

⁵⁰⁹ See Macleod (1982), esp. 8-35. Cf. however, Agamemnon’s attitude to Chyses, when he insults and threatens the priest (*Il.* I.26ff.).

This statement expresses reverence for the *geron*, whilst also emphasising the gerontological dilemma: how to be a hero, when too old to be heroic (i.e. win glory through fighting). Memnon's further warning also echoes Achilles' concern that he will kill Priam in anger: 'Draw back, in case I have to strike you against my will', *χάζεο, μή σε βάλοιμι καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλων περ ἀνάγκη* (*Post.* II.315); 'Do not provoke me further, old man ... So now stir my heart no more among my sorrows, lest, old man, I spare not even you inside the huts ... ', *μηκέτι νῦν μ' ἐρέθιζε, γέρον ... τῶ νῦν μή μοι μᾶλλον ἐν ἄλγεσι θυμὸν ὀρίνης, / μή σε, γέρον, οὐδ' αὐτὸν ἐνὶ κλισίῃσιν ἐάσω ...* (*Il.* XXIV.560ff.).⁵¹⁰ Memnon's warning is marked, though, as the two meet as potential combatants on the battlefield. Thus, the context suggests legitimized physical confrontation – yet Memnon declines.

Although Nestor heeds this warning (like Priam), he is not intimidated by his adversary,⁵¹¹ but rather by *age itself*. Priam's response had been to obey because of fear of Achilles' wrath. Nestor, instead, chastises Memnon, and returns the warning, commenting that had Memnon come up against him when his strength was intact (*empedos*, *Post.* II.324),⁵¹² and he was in his 'prime' (*heboonti*, 328),⁵¹³ he (Nestor) would have killed him (323ff.).⁵¹⁴ The *hos* clause, with *nun*, also recalls the language of lament:⁵¹⁵ in both instances, the speaker bemoans some form of loss (preferring the previous state to the present); in Nestor's case, his loss is not a person, but a quality: youth.⁵¹⁶

In this clash between Youth and Age, Nestor's rhetoric (words), rather than what he does (deeds), is central to understanding Quintus' approach to age in the *Posthomeric*. Nestor uses a lion simile to express his condition, but the *geron* gives the traditional simile a novel twist.

⁵¹⁰ Slightly modified version of Wyatt's translation (1999).

⁵¹¹ As Achilles for Apollo; see Ch.II.1.2ii.

⁵¹² So too at *Iliad*, XXIII.629; also, cf. *empedos* in Nestor's song below, 1.2.

⁵¹³ So too at *Iliad*, XXIII.629 (*heboomi*).

⁵¹⁴ There is a touch of irony, when Nestor chides *Memnon* for excessive boasting, which is, he claims, attributable to youth (*neou*).

⁵¹⁵ See Laments, Ch.I.3.

⁵¹⁶ Such longings for youthful prowess recall Nestor (*Il.* XXIII.629ff.).

νῦν δ' ὡς τίς τε λέων ὑπὸ γήραος ἄχθομαι αἰνοῦ,
 ὄν τε κύων σταδμοῖο πολυρρήνοιο δίηται
 θαρσαλέως, ὃ δ' ἄρ' οὐ τι λιλαιόμενος περ ἀμύνει
 οἱ αὐτῶ, οὐ γάρ οἱ ἔτ' ἔμπεδοί εἰσιν ὀδόντες
 οὐδὲ βίη, κρατερόν δὲ χρόνον ἀμαδύνεται ἦτορ.
 ὡς ἐμοὶ οὐκέτι κάρτος ἐνὶ στήθεσσι νῦν ὄρωρεν
 οἷόν περ τὸ πάροιθεν· ὁμῶς δ' ἔτι φέρτερός εἰμι
 πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων, παύροισι δὲ γήρας ὑπέικει.

'But now I feel the grievous weight of age,⁵¹⁷ like a lion which even a dog is bold enough to chase from a fold full of sheep; the lion, in spite of its longing, cannot hold its own, because its teeth are no longer sound; its strength is gone and time has broken its sturdy spirit. Likewise the strength within my breast no longer stirs as it did before. However, I am still stronger than many men⁵¹⁸ and even in age I yield to few.' (*Post.II.330-37*)

The imagery is striking in a number of ways; the repetition of the idea of 'age' as an affliction or disease, and the decrepitude associated with it. However, especially noteworthy is the unusual use of the lion simile.⁵¹⁹ Typically, the lion simile is employed to convey the ferocious essence of the battling hero at his best (or worst: e.g. Achilles, *Il.* XX.164-73, XXII.262ff.; Odysseus, *Od.* XXII.401-06).⁵²⁰ The lion is king of beasts, endowed with the greatest, not least, power. In this sense, the traditional lion is ageless, the embodiment of youth, strength, and possibility. Yet Quintus' lion is made impotent by time, physically (its (killing) teeth no longer lethal), and psychologically, as the passion (for war) has diminished (the body *and* mind have withered).⁵²¹ The evocation is fitting, though, because the imagery does recall Nestor's earlier prowess: he *was* a traditional hero, a 'lion' once; but now he is a shadow of his former self, a memory.

⁵¹⁷ Cf. *chalepon geras* above, and below, 1.2.

⁵¹⁸ Cf. the Iliadic Nestor's ability to lift his huge cup, below, 1.2.

⁵¹⁹ See Ch.II.1.1v, for the unusual lion-simile applied to the dying Achilles.

⁵²⁰ See Moulton (1977): on lion similes in general, 139-41; on Achilles and lion similes, 100, 105-06, 112-14. D. Lee (1964), esp. p. 65 for a list of lion similes in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; also 21-24.

⁵²¹ On *Il.* 330-34, James notes, "The simile of a lion weakened by old age has no precedent among the many Homeric lion similes" (2004), 278. The lion in *Od.* 6.130-36 (applied to Odysseus, as he emerges before Nausikaa) is bedraggled and weather beaten, not the straightforwardly majestic hunter of the Homeric similes. It is also invoked in context in which the hero will not attack. So we have a readiness in the *Odyssey* to treat lions in a different way from the *Iliad*, which, to some degree, anticipates what Quintus does. Thus, Quintus is on occasion more *Odyssean* in his use of the motif.

However, as Nestor retires, immediately following his speech, the primary narrator justifies his withdrawal: ‘With these words he drew back a little ... because no more was there all the strength that there was before in his once supple limbs,⁵²² so heavily age with all its suffering⁵²³ weighed him down’, Ὡς εἰπὼν ἀπὸ βαιὸν ἐχάσσατο ... / ἐπεὶ νύ οἱ οὐκέτι πάμπαν/ γναμπτοῖς ἐν μελέεσσι πέλε σθένος ὡς τὸ πάροιθε· / γήραϊ γὰρ καδύπερθε πολυτλήτῳ βεβάρητο (*Post.* II.338-41). This is important because the primary narrator closely echoes Nestor’s speech, therefore reinforcing his claim and the central message communicated by, and through, Nestor: time erodes. Yet, the ‘wearied old lion’ still has some heroic ability, as, rather surprisingly, he dispatches Meneklos (*Post.* II.368).⁵²⁴ This is significant, even if appearing incongruous with the portrayal of the aged *geron* of the *Posthomeric* so far, because the less frail Iliadic Nestor (though involved in battle mainly as a charioteer), does not kill. Here Quintus’ Nestor, though more frail (and less loquacious), relieves the tension inherent in the problematic of old age, more so than Homer had in his battle epic, the *Iliad*.

1.2 Sweet-talking Heroes

Age-related loquacity is applicable to no-one more than the Iliadic Nestor, with his lengthy digressions (e.g. *Il.* I.254ff., XI.670ff., XXIII.629ff.).⁵²⁵ Furthermore, a key difference between Iliadic and Posthomeric Nestor’s reminiscences of his youthful prime, is that Homer’s Nestor usually recalls the heroic exploits of his youth *as well as* that youth itself. For instance, in attempting to goad Patroklos to fight, Homer’s Nestor bemoans his lost vital ‘strength’ (*bie*), and ‘youth’ (*heboimi*) when battling the Eleans (*Il.* XI.668ff.). Nestor’s goading is also significant in Quintus. He encourages Achilles to seek revenge for Antilochos’ death;⁵²⁶ Nestor’s plea is a fusion of the Iliadic Antilochos bringing news of Patroklos’ death to Achilles and, in his reference to a ‘true friend’ not forgetting a slain colleague, to Patroklos’ ghost. Nestor’s involvement in inciting a hero to involve himself

⁵²² Cf. *Il.* XI.669.

⁵²³ On *polutletos*, ‘much suffering’, see Priam following, 2.2.

⁵²⁴ Achilles notes that Nestor’s fighting days are behind him (*Il.* XXIII.621-23).

⁵²⁵ On Nestor’s reminiscences of the ‘(good) old (heroic) days’, see below, 3.3; also see Phoenix’ Meleagros exemplum (*Il.* IX.524-605).

⁵²⁶ See Ch.II.1.3ii.

in battle also recalls the part he plays in *Iliad* XI, when he coaxes Patroklos into both encouraging Achilles back to battle (Nestor reminds Patroklos of Menoitios' advice to 'counsel' him (Achilleus); *Il.* XI.786ff.), and to battle (in Achilles' armour) himself (798ff.): though too old to fight, mellifluous Nestor can manipulate and incite others.

Posthomerica IV's Games (181ff.) echo those of *Iliad* XXIII.262ff. In Quintus' boxing contest, none challenge Idomeneus in respect for his older years (*geraiteros*, *Post.* IV.287),⁵²⁷ and following Phoenix' invitation to the younger men (*neoi andres*, 297), still none respond. The silence that follows is broken by Nestor, who reprimands the heroes that skilled fighters should not avoid fame-winning contests (IV.303-05). These thoughts are echoed by Nestor again at the end of his speech when he notes that young men (*neo andri*) should win glory (*kudos*) in contests (IV.320-22). Such thoughts are punctuated, as with Memnon, by Nestor's wish (*hos eith'* ...) that his limbs were as strong as in his glorious past (IV.306-07ff.). This closely recalls Iliadic Nestor (*Il.* XXIII.629ff.).⁵²⁸ Similarly, Nestor bemoans the onset of grievous old age (*geras epeisi ... algea*, *Post.* IV.320; again as in *Iliad* XXIII). Once more Nestor reminds his youthful audience of his great deeds and youthful abilities - which he now lacks. Furthermore, as with Memnon,⁵²⁹ such reminiscences are used to shame the youthful listener into action – they act as exemplar: the psychology seems to work, as Epeios, then Akamas, take the bait. In tone this is not dissimilar from the reprimand of Sarpedon to his Lykians (*Il.* XVI.421ff.); nor is it dissimilar to the manipulations of the Iliadic Nestor who, as noted above, goads Patroklos into battle.

Such goading is evident in *Posthomerica* XII, but with variation. As the Greeks are on the verge of boarding the Horse, Nestor recalls his old exploits, prowess, and old age, and great Argonautica expedition (*Post.* XII.266ff.). However here he intends to fight (at least he *claims* this) – a nod to the future, rather than the past. Nestor begins his rhetoric of reminiscence in typical fashion, 'I only wish my body still had such great strength as at the

⁵²⁷ Also Idomeneus' honour-gift, in respect for his years (*progenesteron*, *Post.* IV.296).

⁵²⁸ For *hos eith'*, see above.

⁵²⁹ Memnon's *aidos* precedes anything Nestor says.

time when ... ', Ως ὄφελον μέγα κάρτος ἐμοῖς ἔτι γούνασι κείτο, / οἶον ὅτ' ... (XII.266-67). Nestor then, again (see above) bemoans the 'burden of age' which now afflicts him (νῦν δέ με γῆρας ἔπεισι πολύστονον, *Post.* XII.271). However, Quintus' Nestor here takes a different course as he concludes:

'But even so, as though in the prime of my youth (*hos neon heboon*), I'll go on to board the horse with courage (*tharasaleos*). A god will give me both strength (*chartos*) and honour (*kudos*).'
(*Post.* XII.271-74)⁵³⁰

Nestor's stock phrases ('in the prime of my youth') and heroic vocabulary ('strength', 'courage', 'honour', etc.) are here used in a different way which differs both from their Iliadic, and, previous, Posthomeric usage. Thus Quintus turns the established model of Nestor on its head, as Nestor now says the unexpected. Consequently, he threatens to challenge the Homeric convention of the non-combatant *geron*:⁵³¹ in Quintus, Nestor claims he *will* fight, although old, and he uses the simile of his youth as the exempla. This does, though, stress the hyperbolic frailty of the *geron* in Quintus, as is articulated in Neoptolemos' response.

'Nestor, for intelligence you are the greatest of all men. But merciless old age has you in its grip (*σε γῆρας ἀμείλιχον ἀμφιμέμαρφεν*), nor is your strength (*bie*) sufficient (*empedos*) for the work you desire. So you must withdraw to the shores of Tenedos. As for the ambush, we the young men (*neoi andres*), hungry for battle, will enter it eager to do your bidding, old sire (*geraie*).'
(*Post.* XII.275-80)

The liminality is marked by Neoptolemos' admission that Nestor is too old to fight: it is not his place to battle, and Nestor should remove himself to Tenedos – a distant geographical locale. Yet, as with the Iliadic Nestor with Patroklos, and the Posthomeric Nestor with the young heroes at Achilles' Funeral Games, one is left with the impression that his rhetoric has the power to galvanise the warrior Greeks. This is indeed the case,

⁵³⁰ Slightly modified version of James' (2004) translation.

⁵³¹ Nestor has 'broken the mould' already in the *Posthomeric* by squaring up to Memnon, and by killing Meneklos (see above), but his break with rhetorical convention is significant here.

and the scene takes on something of a comic tone if the audience sees the astute psychology of the wily Nestor: in his allusion to his Argonautic story, Nestor's involvement was checked, apparently against his will – though he was young. Yet, now, though old, he will fight. His present claim, however, seems to replicate his Argonautic one, with Neoptolemos' timely comments that he should not fight because of his age. In both instances Nestor does not fight, but his story manipulates others to do just that.

The Iliadic model is more loquacious, although loquacity is still a key feature of Quintus' Nestor. Also, the Iliadic context (above) is different from that of the Posthomerian scene. Nestor's Iliadic speech is spoken from his hut, away from the battle itself, and addressed to a colleague, Patroklos, as opposed to the enemy, on the battlefield; this Iliadic episode also includes the famous scene, narrated by the primary narrator, of old Nestor *easily* (*amogeti*, *Il.* XI.637) lifting his beautiful cup – another man could barely lift it (632-37). I note this as Nestor's Iliadic strength, here still more than another man's, contrasts with his Posthomerian frailty, which curbs his action.⁵³²

As documented in Chapter II,⁵³³ Nestor sings in honour of the dead Achilles. However, before the narrative begins, we are again reminded of his aged state, *and* his age-related qualities:

'First of all the son of Neleus stood up in their midst, not from any desire to exert himself in the boxing or in the exhausting wrestling, because long since his limbs and joints (*guia kai apsea*) had been worn out by grievous age (*lugron katedamnato geras*).⁵³⁴ But firm (*empedos*) still in his breast remained his spirit and mind. No other Achaean could contend with him

⁵³² Cf. the *Odyssey*: old Laertes joins his son (Odysseus) and grandson (Telemachos) in battle. With Athene's help, Laertes seems to turn back the heroic clock, and actually kills Eupheithes – father of the slain suitor Antinous (*Od.* XXIV.521-25). The nature of Homer's epics is different, though: the *Iliad* centres on *menis* and *polemos*; the *Odyssey*, *nostos*. Odysseus' 'return' involves a reinstating of identity, so Laertes – the old hero, *now* rejuvenated through battle. Thus, Quintus' Nestor represents an alternative reading of the *geron*, and a fusion of Homer's poems.

⁵³³ Ch.II.3.1.

⁵³⁴ Cf. *chalepon* ... *geras*, above.

when it came to competing with speeches in an assembly. Even the famous son of Laertes yielded to him for speaking in assembly, as did the kingliest man of all Argives, Agamemnon of the ashwood spear.’ (*Post.* IV.118-27)⁵³⁵

This passage recalls that of *Iliad* XXIII, but in Homer, the audience (both primary and secondary narratees) are reminded of Nestor’s aged state by Achilles:

‘Take this (the two handled urn) now, old man, and let it be a treasure for you ... I give you this prize unwon (*autos*): for not in boxing will you contend, nor in wrestling, nor will you enter the javelin contest, nor run on your feet; for now grievous old age (*chalepon ... geras*) weighs heavy on you.’ (*Il.* XXIII.618-23)

As N. Richardson notes, the “crucial word *αὐτως* (‘just like that’, i.e. without a contest) is emphatically placed, and then explained.”⁵³⁶ Thus, the ‘honour gift’ (*geras*) celebrates Nestor’s status and previous reputation as first-class hero. Although now no longer able to compete, this chivalrous gesture reinforces Nestor’s place amongst heroes.

This is also the case for Nestor’s songs themselves, in Quintus.⁵³⁷ Nestor covers a vast amount of narrative (from praise of Thetis and the gods, to Achilles’ *aphthita ergon* (‘immortal deeds’), pre-Troy to Memnon). Nestor’s dominance of this scene is telling. Though very old, the greatest speaker gets the greatest stage to tell the greatest story. Age, then (more than a millennium has passed since Nestor’s last epic gift of honour at funeral games), has not diminished Nestor’s importance, or rhetorical skills. Yet now in Quintus, the primary narrator never relinquishes centre stage, as the whole of Nestor’s rhetoric is conveyed through indirect speech.⁵³⁸ Time and challenge to conventional modes of epic seem to have robbed Nestor of his voice.

⁵³⁵ Slightly modified version of James’ (2004) translation.

⁵³⁶ N. Richardson (2000), 236n.621.

⁵³⁷ Further the song’s contents, see Ch.II.3.1.

⁵³⁸ On the primary narrator speaking, see Ch.V.

Part 2 – *Gerontes: Decline and Fall*

Now I will consider further portrayals of *gerontes*. Whilst Quintus' Nestor strikes a more diminished figure through marked reduction in his rhetoric, and remembrances of the past, other *gerontes*, such as Phoenix, Priam, and the old Trojans *en masse*, convey a further kind of diminishment. In the extreme, many of these figures die. Thus we can understand severances with the past, and what these represent; for instance, the replacement of old heroes with new ones. As Sarpedon famously tells Glaukos, the generations of men are as leaves (*Il.*VI.146-49). Yet the hero is immortalized through his great deeds: this equally applies to the epic poet trying to establish his own (in Achilles' words) *kleos aphthiton* (*Il.* IX.413).⁵³⁹

2.1 *Phoenix Rising*

In Quintus old Phoenix is also important as a signifier of the past. Here, I will show he functions on a dual level: he is a link with Achilles, and he is, therefore, a link with the *Iliad*. The significance of the Iliadic Phoenix is established in the embassy to Achilles, in Book IX. He reminds Achilles of his father in terms of what Peleus asked Phoenix to do – make Achilles a speaker of words and doer of deeds (*Il.* IX.443); and *he* reminds Achilles of his father as a type of 'surrogate' in Peleus' absence, noting how he (Phoenix) helped wean Achilles as a baby (485-91), and that he could not bear life without him near (434-38, 444), and through offering his own advice; Phoenix also attempts to motivate (in the rambling way associated with the *geron*) with the Meleagros fable (529ff.), and his recollection of his (Phoenix') past youth (444ff.).

Although Phoenix also features in several other Iliadic books (*Il.* XVI.196, as the fourth leader of Achilles' Myrmidons; Book XVII.555-61, as a 'checking' device to make Menelaos defend Patroklos' corpse; *Il.* XIX.311-13, to console Achilles for Patroklos' death; Book XXIII.360, to umpire the horse-race in the funeral games for Patroklos), it is in Book IX that he performs his most significant function, as Achilles' 'surrogate'

⁵³⁹ Which is exactly what Achilles does in the *Posthomeric*. On Achilles becoming a legend in his own lifetime, see below 3.2-3, and Ch.II.3.1-2.

father.⁵⁴⁰ The nature of Phoenix' appeal to Achilles, his 'surrogate' qualities and his Meleagros-exemplar tale affect the tone of the Book and Achilles in profound ways – heroism comes to the fore, as do further dimensions to Achilles: child, son, protector. Whilst other accounts centre on Cheiron as young Achilles' mentor,⁵⁴¹ the effect would be altogether different in the *Iliad* had Homer followed this line.⁵⁴² “Kheiron would have been unacceptable to Homer ... Kheiron was a centaur ... whom Homer banishes to the sidelines of the *Iliad*” (Hainsworth, 2000, 121n.442). Thus Phoenix' primary (entire?) function is his relationship to Achilles.

As Homer's Phoenix, Quintus' features in a number of books (*Post.* III, IV, VII, IX). The Iliadic Phoenix' direct speech lasts for nearly two hundred lines (*Il.* IX.434-605), and is confined to only one book, whilst in Quintus he receives just over seventy lines (*Post.* III.463-89; IV.294-299; VII.642-66). Phoenix speaks less, like Nestor, and this could be viewed as diminishing his role in the epic. However, he is actually more significant in Quintus overall as a narrative device. Or, viewed slightly differently, what Phoenix represents is more central to Quintus' epic: age = vulnerability = pathos.

As noted, the Phoenix of *Iliad* IX serves a number of narrative functions, most of which are associated with his age in some form; e.g. link with Achilles' past, including evocation of Peleus. Quintus achieves similar effects, often clearly engaging with the Homeric model; although the increased frequency of the scenes in which he is significant alone makes Phoenix seem different. This has an impact on the representation of age as portrayed through him.

⁵⁴⁰ See Hainsworth, who notes that Phoenix occupies a central role in *Iliad* IX (2000), 57, 85-86n.182, 119.

⁵⁴¹ See Gantz (1996), 96, 231; on *Phoenix* by Sophocles, Euripides and Ion, 618; also, Hesiod's *Precepts of Cheiron*, Pindar *Nem.* III.43-53.

⁵⁴² Homer mentions Cheiron four times: *Il.* IV.219; XI.832; XVI.143; XIX.390, but it is only in Book XI that any reference is made to his tutoring of Achilles. Hainsworth notes on *Il.* XI.831-32 (2000, p.310), that “the poet alludes without further explanation to a well-known corpus of ‘knowledge’ ... the saga of Achilles, beginning with his birth education.”

In his Posthomerian lament for Achilles (*Post.* III.463-89),⁵⁴³ and his emotional meeting with Neoptolemos (*Post.* VII.630ff.), Phoenix re-calls much from his single Iliadic speech; e.g. Phoenix notes leaving his parents in exile, and being welcomed by Peleus (*Post.* III.467ff.)⁵⁴⁴. Posthomerian Phoenix also hoped for protection from Achilles in later (= old age) life through nurturing the child-hero (*Post.* III.477-78; so too *Il.* IX.495). Phoenix' conclusion that it would be far better to die than live defenceless, without Achilles, for both himself and Peleus (*Post.* III.488-89), expresses both the vulnerability of the *geron* without youthful support, and, indeed, vulnerability itself. Extreme vulnerability is here expressed through closely locating loss (Achilles) with extreme danger *en masse* - *apaneuthen aosseteros* ('absent defence', *Post.* III.489) applying to an Achilles-less Greek army, too (as well as the embodiment of vulnerability – the *geron*).

Old age is very much part of Phoenix' rhetoric. In the *Iliad*, he had also referred to the age of Peleus (*Il.* IX.438): 'the old horseman' (*geron hippelata*). Now *his* old age (*geraos*) is the focus (*Post.* III.478). Yet, in the *Posthomerica*, Phoenix grimly anticipates the news that Achilles' death will have on his father (*Post.* III.482ff.). The shared grief unmistakably connects the two old men: 'Most pitiful will be the pain for both of us your father and myself, for now that you are dead our great sorrow will quickly take us under the ground', οἴκτιστον γὰρ νῶϊν ὑπὲρ σέθεν ἔσσεται ἄλλος, / πατρί τε σῶ καὶ ἐμοί, τοί περ μέγα σεῖο θανάτου / ἀχνύμενοι τάχα γαῖαν ὑπὲρ (*Post.* III.485-88).⁵⁴⁵ The pain of an old father caused by concern for his son recalls a number of earlier epic models: namely (again) the Iliadic Peleus (conspicuous in his absence),⁵⁴⁶ and Priam, and the Odyssean Laertes⁵⁴⁷.

Quintus develops further the role of Phoenix as surrogate father, extending it beyond Achilles. The meeting of Phoenix and Neoptolemos in *Posthomerica* IX contains

⁵⁴³ For the *actual* grieving part of the lament (i.e. 'If only the piled-up earth had covered me before I saw your cruel doom ...', etc. [464ff.]), see Ch.I.3; the same 'wish' is expressed to Neoptolemos (*Post.* VII.656-57).

⁵⁴⁴ As *Il.* IX.448-78; 478-84. Reference to cradling Achilles, and his wetting Phoenix' tunic is especially evocative (*Post.* III.471-76; *Il.* IX.488-91). Phoenix also notes that he nursed Achilles when speaking to Neoptolemos (*Post.* VII.642ff.)

⁵⁴⁵ Slightly modified version of James' (2004) translation.

⁵⁴⁶ *Il.* XXIV.486ff.

⁵⁴⁷ *Od.* XV353-55

elements of the Iliadic scene between Achilles and Priam – the old man ‘amazed’ by the younger hero.⁵⁴⁸ However, in the case of Neoptolemos, Phoenix is amazed by his likeness to his great father. Again the father motif is powerful, but in a multi-dimensional way. As Iliadic Phoenix had been a substitute for absent Peleus, so Posthomeric Phoenix ‘represents’ Achilles. Here, Phoenix ‘locates’⁵⁴⁹ Neoptolemos, through *recalling* his father, whom Neoptolemos had never known: ‘In prowess he was ... like a blessed god in build and strength’ (*Post.* VII.651-52). Thus Phoenix acts as a mnemonic device. This is true also in the *Iliad*, but in Quintus Phoenix’ recollections of Achilles’ qualities have direct significance for Neoptolemos, who is to be his replacement. In this sense, Neoptolemos will become the concrete expression of memories about Achilles, and no one has better memories of Achilles from cradle to grave than Phoenix.

The old man substitutes for the absent father, reminding the young hero of his duty, and the father himself, is further evoked as Phoenix tells Neoptolemos, ‘But come,⁵⁵⁰ you must help the Myrmidons and Achaean horsemen in their extremity, turning against our foe the fury you feel for your fine father. Great glory shall be yours ...’, Ἄλλ’ ἄγε, Μυρμιδόνεσσι καὶ ἵπποδάμοισιν Ἀχαιοῖς/ τειρομένοις ἐπάμυνε μέγ’ ἀμφ’ ἀγαθοῦ τοκῆος/ χωόμενος δηίοισι· κλέος δέ τοι ἔσσεται ... (*Post.* VII.661-63). So, Phoenix, who was like a father, and recalled the absent father, to both the Iliadic and Posthomeric Achilles, now performs the same function with Neoptolemos (in each scene, Phoenix refers to the hero (Achilles, or Neoptolemos) as *teknos* (*teknon tekos*); *Il.* IX.444; *Post.* III.463, VII.659). But here Phoenix takes on the educational role of the dead father.

However, the suffering associated with the *geron* is never far away. In Phoenix’ embrace of Neoptolemos, we are reminded of Odysseus’ reunion with Laertes (*Post.* VII.637-39; *Od.* XXIV.345ff.). In Phoenix’ précised lament for Achilles, he notes his ‘wretched old age’ (*lugro ... gerai*, *Post.* VII.655).⁵⁵¹ Also, Phoenix advises Neoptolemos not to distress himself with mourning, *unlike* himself (*achnumeos*, VII.659). Thus, the *geron* embodies

⁵⁴⁸ See Ch.IV.2.2.

⁵⁴⁹ By ‘locates’ I mean that Neoptolemos is given a sense of his (great) lineage, and that, therefore, he has much to live up to, *and* he is made to appear Achillean.

⁵⁵⁰ My translation.

⁵⁵¹ Of which, also see discussion above.

and reflects suffering, but this suffering is a consequence of past memories. Furthermore, Phoenix' roles are greatly diminished in *Posthomerica* IV and IX, where he, respectively, notes the honour-gift to Idomeneus for wrestling, and, finally, in his accompaniment of Neoptolemos and the Myrmidons, following the visit to Achilles' tomb. Still, in each episode, age is noted: for Idomeneus, the honour-gift for the 'older' man (*progenesteron*, IV.296); for Neoptolemos, the 'aged' (*geron*, VII.64) Phoenix. In these Posthomerian instances, Phoenix' importance is heightened. Bestowing Idomeneus with the *geras* communicates Phoenix' place of honour, too. Like Achilles in the Iliadic funeral games for Patroklos, Phoenix now occupies the role of overseer (albeit brief). And, like the highly regarded *geron* Nestor, Phoenix attempts to provoke action through inspiring *kleos*. Similarly, Phoenix is significant in *Posthomerica* IX as a signifier of Achilles' past and, now, Neoptolemos. Only he, Neoptolemos and a dozen Myrmidons visit Achilles' tomb – so all are markers of Achilles. Yet Phoenix is the one 'groaning bitterly' (*lugron anastenachon*, IX.64-65). This is further example of the suffering associated with memory of the past. As the Posthomerian Priam, old Phoenix' lament recalls his Iliadic self, but that earlier model had not yet experienced the son-like loss that *now* characterizes his sorry state.

The Posthomerian Phoenix is clearly a hybrid, fusing, particularly, earlier epic models of the *geron*: namely, the Iliadic Phoenix of Book IX, Peleus, and Priam. By engaging with these models, Quintus accentuates Phoenix' agedness. It is not shown whether Phoenix fights in the *Iliad* (although he leads the Myrmidons, *Il*.XVI.196), and Quintus' Phoenix never fights (this contrasts with Nestor, who fights in Quintus).⁵⁵² This amplifies Phoenix' association with Achilles, as this is his primary *raison d'être*. Though actually having far fewer lines than his Iliadic self (where he functioned largely as surrogate father to Achilles, a substitute for old Peleus), Phoenix seems to have a more significant role, overall, in the *Posthomerica*, always closely associated with Achilles. Quintus' Phoenix challenges his Iliadic portrayal, not in his crossing of physical boundaries, as had the Posthomerian Nestor, and the Iliadic Priam, but in the more significant role he plays (indicated by his direct speech), in a *number* of scenes.

⁵⁵² See above, 1.1.

2.2 Priam

The aged Priam cuts a far more pathetic figure in Quintus than in Homer.⁵⁵³ The overwhelming suffering caused by Hektor's death (*Il.* XXII and XXIV), is perhaps never matched by Quintus' Priam, but, in frequency of devastation, and resignation, the earlier model is surpassed.

Early in Quintus, we are made aware of these traits. In *Posthomerica* I, whilst the mood of the Trojans changes from grief to joy, at Penthesileia's arrival (I.62ff.), we learn that Priam's pain is only briefly abated:

‘So even Priam, whose mind had many a cause to groan (*noos polea stenachontos*), whose heart was greatly distressed (*μέγ’ ἀκηχεμένοιο περι φρεσι*), rejoiced a little⁵⁵⁴ (*tutthon ianthe*). As a man who has suffered much (*polla mogesas*) because of blindness and longs for death (*himeiron ... thaneesthai*) if he cannot see the blessed light, either through some good doctor's work or because a god has removed the mist from his eyes, now sees the light of day,⁵⁵⁵ not as well as before, so as before, but he's comforted a little (*baion ianthe*) after all his suffering (*polles ek kakotetes*), though pangs of dread pain (*pematos alegos ainon*) linger beneath his eyelids; such was the sight of dreaded Penthesileia to Laomedon's son. He felt a little joy (*pauron men gethese*), though still overweighed by grief for the deaths of his sons. (*πλέον εἰσέτι παίδων ἄχλυτ’ ἀποκταμένων*).’ (*Post.* I.74-85)⁵⁵⁶

For most of the *Iliad*, Priam has hope, because he has Hektor. However, with Hektor's death (and in events immediately preceding this – for instance, when Priam begs Hektor not to face Achilles, *Il.* XXII.25ff.), Priam becomes a broken man. Priam's world is shattered in *Iliad* XXII, when he sees Hektor's corpse being dragged behind Achilles' chariot (*Il.* XXII.395-408); this has further significance, too, because Hektor represents Troy's defence (*Il.* XXIV.499-501). Thus, his demise signals Troy's endgame. And, although Priam is compelled to brave incredible dangers to retrieve his son's corpse, the man is spent when the best (and most beloved) of his sons dies.⁵⁵⁷ This is the base on

⁵⁵³ See too Priam, Ch.IV.1.3-4.

⁵⁵⁴ My translation.

⁵⁵⁵ See Lament, Ch.I.3; e.g. longing for death, no longer seeing light, and language of 'pain', such as *achnuto*; on this glaucoma simile, see Ch.V.2.4.

⁵⁵⁶ Slightly modified version of James' (2004) translation.

⁵⁵⁷ See *Il.* XXII.424-28; XXIV.224-27, 253-62.

which Quintus builds. His Priam receives the torch from his Iliadic self, yet it must burn less brightly because his beginning is the Iliadic Priam's end.

In his gestures, words and thoughts, Priam's pathetic Posthomerian state is made absolutely clear: in prayer for Penthesileia's martial success, Priam raises much-suffering hands (*Post.* I.181-82); he prays for her safe return, asking Zeus to consider all the evil he has suffered, losing his children, and devastation to Troy, ending by begging for some respite for the city and Trojans (I.192-97). Sight of a screeching eagle holding a dove dying in its talons, however, convinces him of Penthesileia's and (by implication) Troy's doom; Priam's heart is struck by fear at this omen (*thumo tarbese*), and he thinks to himself that he shall not see Penthesileia alive again (I.198-202).⁵⁵⁸ Thus, he is left in no doubt that Penthesileia's fate will be as Hektor's. The tone clearly recalls the Priam of *Iliad* XXII, who shall never see Hektor alive again; though, as James notes, "Priam's unsuccessful prayer to Zeus for victory is an adaptation of the successful one made by him, on Hekabe's advice, for safe return from the Greek camp at *Iliad* 24.287-321."⁵⁵⁹ The end of this scene is also telling, as the primary narrator notes, 'Such in truth was the work to be done that very day by Fates unseen, which *broke his grieving heart*' (*achnuto thumon eagos*, *Post.* I.203-04).⁵⁶⁰

This tension is briefly resolved with news of Memnon's arrival. In answer to 'old' Thymoites' concerns (he recommends fleeing Troy, *Post.* II.10-25), Priam appears strangely optimistic (*Post.* II.27ff.): Memnon *will* come, Priam tells, in answer to his request for help expressing 'the great anguish of my heart' (*meg achnumenos peri thumo*, II.35ff.). As opposed to the ill-omen which prompts his thoughts on Penthesileia's doom, Priam believes that Memnon will 'accomplish all I asked' (*panta telessai*, II.37)⁵⁶¹ – this, in effect, will serve to heighten Priam's tragedy, as his hopes are dashed in Memnon's fall.

⁵⁵⁸ On the eagle as an ill-omen, see *Il.* XII.200-07.

⁵⁵⁹ James (2004), 270n.182-204.

⁵⁶⁰ Slightly modified version of James' (2004) translation.

⁵⁶¹ Cf. Memnon's humility, when he arrives; see Ch.I.1.2.

Priam's final words here, echo, in part, those of younger warriors: 'Far better it is to perish bravely in battle than to escape and live a life of shame among foreign people',⁵⁶² *ἐπεὶ πολὺ λωϊόν ἐστι/ θαρσαλέως ἀπολέσθαι ἀνὰ κλόνον ἢ ἐφυγόντας/ ζῶειν ἀλλοδαποῖσι παρ' ἀνδράσιν αἴσχε' ἔχοντας* (*Post.* II.38-40). The first half of this aphorism⁵⁶³ recalls utterances by the Iliadic heroes, such as Sarpedon's famous speech on *noblesse oblige* (*Il.* XII.310-28), and Hektor's words to Andromache, and himself just before facing Achilles (respectively, *Il.* VI.441-46, XXII.104-30); whilst the second half (a life amongst foreigners), recalls the 'female' concerns of Hektor and Andromache (respectively, *Il.* VI.450-65, XXIV.725ff.).⁵⁶⁴ Although the Trojans are overjoyed by Memnon's arrival (*Post.* II.102ff.), it is Priam who experiences the greatest happiness (II.105-06); we are reminded of Priam's long suffering when Priam converses with Memnon: 'Priam told of the Danaan champions and all the suffering they had brought him', *ὅς μὲν ἀριστῆσας Δαναῶν καὶ ὅσ' ἄλλε' ἀνέτλη/ ἐξενέπων* (114-15). Such reminiscences of the Trojan War, presented in heavily précised reported speech, again recall the Posthomeric Nestor (IV).⁵⁶⁵ This once again shows the mnemonic value of the *geron*: they link not only generations, but also narratives. We are further privy to a more positive portrayal of old Priam as, during Memnon's telling of his great deeds, Priam's 'heart was filled with joy' (*terpeto thumos*, *Post.* II.125); at 156, we are told that the aged king (*geraios*), was enchanted (*agassamenos*) by his words; this differs from the previous rhetoric to describe Priam's mental and physical state. He is optimistic in his speech to Memnon (II.127-35), and his raising, and toasting with a 'hugely capacious' (*poluchandes*) golden cup (*Post.* II.136ff.), recalls Nestor's famous cup (*Iliad* XI. 632-37) – too heavy for a normal man to lift. Here the implication, through intertext, is that Priam still possesses exceptional physical qualities – thus we are reminded of his old prowess. However, there is a fundamental difference in that Priam shoulders an even greater burden. His predicament is alluded to,

⁵⁶² Italic my translation.

⁵⁶³ On *gnomai*, see Ch.V.2.3i.

⁵⁶⁴ The *geron's* (*Post.* II.41) battling advice, however, does not please Polydamas, whose judgement, thus far, has proved most reliable. See especially his advice to Hektor and the Trojans to hold back (*Il.* XII.211-29, and XVIII.249-309). Such advice, then, though the Trojans revere Priam too much to reject his advice in place of Polydamas' (II.64-6), show Priam to be rather impetuous, as Nestor had been in daring to consider taking on Memnon, and in his wish to be part of the Horse ruse.

⁵⁶⁵ For the use of the *geron* to recount events, and, thus, provide a link with the (heroic) past, 1-2, and 3.1 and 3, following; e.g. Nestor, Priam, Phoenix.

as the primary narrator notes that, '(Priam) would have given it to his son next', but this will *not* happen (II.144-45).⁵⁶⁶

The decline of Priam is particularly marked in the third of these recruited warrior's arrival scenes. Priam is conspicuous by his absence, at Eurypylos' arrival. Paris instead plays the epic host (*Post.* VI.133ff.); it is Paris too who praises the visiting warrior's brilliance, and anticipates such effectiveness in battle (*Post.* VI.298ff.). It is clear that Priam's role is diminished further, as the primary narrator notes that, 'Priam *and the other sons of Troy*' (*Priamos te kai alloi Troioi huies*) took turns to beseech Eurypylos to cause mass destruction to the Argives (VI.182-85): Eurypylos' 'promise' (to cause mass destruction) evokes the earlier scenes between Priam and Penthesileia (I) and Memnon (II). But this contrasts markedly with the Priam of Books I and II, because Priam alone commanded the warriors' attention, made the war request, and sought to safe-guard the 'promise' (*hupescheto*). This type of usurpation is significant, because it shows Priam's diminishing role in the epic. This too conveys his growing resignation. Once Troy's *primus*, Priam's last appearance will be as king of 'suffering'.

Quintus' Hekabe is actually called the wife of 'much-suffering' (*polutletoio*) Priam when she finds out that Paris is dead (*Post.* X.369).⁵⁶⁷ Contrastingly, Priam is oblivious to *this* son's death because he continued to weep (as Achilles for Patroklos) around the tomb of Hektor, whom he held in the highest regard (X.386-87). Yet, both characters' laments spill over into the *Posthomerica*: Achilles is found still lamenting Patroklos at the beginning of the *Posthomerica*, and Priam still laments Hektor approaching the *Posthomerica*'s close. This shows how Quintus makes use of Iliadic pathos, which is central to his epic.⁵⁶⁸ With this in mind, it is worth looking at Quintus' use of *polutletos* ('much-suffering'). This adjective features thirteen times in Quintus.⁵⁶⁹ In Homer, it features only once. On his trip to Hades, Odysseus witnesses many poor souls. One

⁵⁶⁶ The shared admiration (Priam's, *Post.* II.131-32; Memnon's, II.146-47) in this *xenia* scene, between old man and young warrior, also recalls that of the Iliadic Priam's meeting with Achilles, II.XXIV.628-32.

⁵⁶⁷ As is used of the spirits of the *gerontes* in the underworld (*Odyssey*, XI.38).

⁵⁶⁸ For Laments, Ch.I.1.

⁵⁶⁹ *Post.* I.135, 182; II.341; V.45, 361; VIII.411; X.369; XI.25; XIII.319, 477, 544; XIV.267, 557.

unfortunate group are termed *polutletoi*. Significantly, they are *gerontes* (*Od.* XI.37). In Quintus' hands, *polutletos* becomes something of a gerontological epithet.⁵⁷⁰ In general terms, it is applied to the suffering of men.⁵⁷¹ It is also applied, specifically, to old Nestor (*Post.* II.341) and Anchises (*Post.* XIII.319) – these are noteworthy, recalling the great suffering of Homer's old men in the *Odyssey*. The majority of its applications, though, are applied to Priam (x5).⁵⁷² Quintus' narrative associates old men especially with being much-suffering, and, Priam in particular.

Equally, *poludakrutos* ('much-weeping') is marked in its application to Priam. This time, however, the term features more frequently in Homer: *Od.* (x3).⁵⁷³ It features only once in the *Iliad* (XXIV.620) (as in the *Posthomerica*), and as in the *Posthomerica* (XIV.348) it is applied to Priam. Its use in Homer (*Iliad*) appears particularly poignant because it is used by Achilles to characterize the profound degree of suffering that he anticipates Priam will experience when he takes Hektor back to Ilios. This is indeed the case, but it has special significance to the reader of the *Posthomerica*, as this great suffering becomes the essence of Priam's characterization. As noted above: where Homer's Priam ends, Quintus' Priam begins.

As the meeting between Achilles and Priam in *Iliad* XXIV is the climax of the poem, so, in many ways, is the confrontation between Neoptolemos and Priam in *Posthomerica* XIII, with particular reference to Priam's decrepit characterization: Priam no longer wishes to live, and is utterly resigned, in fact welcoming death – the end to his woes. Recourse to the latter stages of the *Iliad* highlight how Quintus has imbued his Priam with very different characteristics. When the Iliadic Priam learns of Hektor's death he immediately attempts to leave the confines of the city to ransom Hektor's body from Achilles (*Il.* XXII.412ff). In the *Iliad*, Priam actually utters something akin to warrior's rhetoric when he wishes Achilles were as loved by the gods as by him, then unburied, he

⁵⁷⁰ On epithets in Quintus (and compared to Homer), see Mansur (1940), 73-78.

⁵⁷¹ *Post.* I.135; V.45; XIII.477; XIV.557; cf. XI.25.

⁵⁷² *Post.* I.182; VIII.411; X.369; XIII.544; XIV.267.

⁵⁷³ Each time, applying to Penelope: *Od.* XIX.213, 251; XXI.57.

would be devoured by dogs and vultures (XXII.41-3).⁵⁷⁴ Thus the heroic image of the Iliadic Priam is enhanced, though we are never allowed to forget his tragic status (having suffered much, losing many sons, XXII.416-28), and his age (*geron*, *polias*, XXII. 77; *geraios*, XXIV.162, *gerontos*, 164, etc.). His crossing of the liminal boundary, separating (young) hero from old man, in the form of his journey from (*inside*) Troy's fortifications to (*outside*) Achilles' camp further enhances this image, as does the actual meeting with the 'awe-struck' Achilleus (XXIV.483ff.)

The Priam whom Achilles' son meets, is altogether different; as is the motive for the meeting. Here Priam feels no fear because he is resigned to, or rather willing, his Fate: 'Priam recognized at once the son of Achilleus but felt no fear, because his spirit yearned to die at the side of his own sons (*θυμός ἐέλδετο παισὶν ἐπὶ σφετέροισιν ὀλέσθαι*). So he expressed to him his eagerness to die (*προσέειπε λιλαιόμενος θανέεσθαι*)' (*Post.* XIII.222-25). This is highly evocative of *Iliad* XXIV.224-27: (Priam) 'And if it is my fate to lie dead by the ships of the bronze-clad Achaeans, I am ready; immediately let Achilleus slay me, when once I have clasped my son in my arms, and have put from me the desire for lamentation', *εἰ δέ μοι αἴσα/ τεθνάμεναι παρὰ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων,/ βούλομαι αὐτίκα γάρ με κατακτείνειεν Ἀχιλλεύς/ ἀγκὰς ἐλόντ' ἐμὸν υἱόν, ἐπήν γόου ἔξ ἔρον εἶην*.

The attitude of Quintus' Priam also contrasts with the Virgilian version of this scene,⁵⁷⁵ who offers full, though pathetic, resistance (*Aen.* II.518ff.); whilst there is a psychological disparity between both Priams (Virgil's and Quintus'), their age-related physical limitations and characteristics converge, *unlike* Homer's: Virgil's Priam offers pathetic resistance, as he hurls a spear in vain (*Aen.* II.544ff.); is dragged trembling (*tremementem*) through Polites' blood, and dispatched – decapitated as Quintus' Priam. We are further reminded of his aged state, when Quintus notes that Neoptolemos 'easily' (*rheidios*, *Post.* XIII.242) cut off the old man's gray-haired head (*polioio gerontos*, 241).⁵⁷⁶ The pathos is

⁵⁷⁴ As Achilleus anticipates for Hektor (XXII.352-54).

⁵⁷⁵ See too Ch.IV.1.4.

⁵⁷⁶ Which recalls the Homeric formula of *Iliad* XXII above; and Priam's (prophetic) *words* to Hektor, also at *Iliad* XXII (74-6): 'But when the dogs work shame on the gray head and gray beard and on the nakedness of a slain old man, that is the most piteous thing that falls to wretched mortals'.

heightened further, for Priam continues to groan (*mega muzousa*, 244) even in death, as his head rolls away.

There is also similarity in the primary narrators' (Virgil's and Quintus') summary of Priam's final scene.

Virgil:

'Such was the close of Priam's fortunes; such the doom that befell him – to see Troy in flames and Pergamus laid low, he once lord of so many tribes and lands, the monarch of Asia. He lies a huge (*ingens*)⁵⁷⁷ trunk upon the shore, the head severed from the shoulders, a nameless corpse.' (*Aen.* II.554-58)

Quintus:

'With a loud moan his head went rolling over the ground, far away from the limbs that enable a man to move. In his black blood he lay among the rest of the slain (*lacuna*) ... for his wealth and lineage and his numerous offspring. The glory of man is never undiminished for long and disgrace can quickly catch one unawares. So Priam was caught by his doom and forgot his many troubles.' (*Post.* XIII.244-50)

Both narrators take the opportunity to recall Priam's former glory, that contrasts with his present 'tragic' fall,⁵⁷⁸ once so powerful, and prosperous interestingly reinforced in Quintus by his lying among the slain - just one of a mass; the part the fates/ destiny play in man's 'life'; and the separation of the head from the body. However, it is significant that whilst Virgil attributes great size to Priam's corpse, nothing similar is mentioned by Quintus;⁵⁷⁹ adding to the physical dissimilarity, and therefore, particular decrepitude of his Priam. Also, while Virgil's focuses on Priam's lack of identity (virtue of the decapitation), Quintus concludes that Priam has, at last, respite from his troubles. (One could draw the parallel that both convey some form of relinquishing.)

⁵⁷⁷ That Virgil uses such an adjective and Quintus does not, is telling, as, whilst Virgil's Priam is emboldened, Quintus' appears the more pathetic.

⁵⁷⁸ The 'classical' definition is apt here: one having fallen from a position of great prominence.

⁵⁷⁹ Here Virgil's Priam anticipates Quintus' Achilles (see Ch.II.1.4), as the greatness of the character is represented by size even in death; as noted above, however, Quintus exploits this technique (further characterization after death), by noting the great (cf. Quintus' *mega*, with Virgil's *ingens*) moaning of the headless corpse.

In Homer, following his reproach of his sons (just after Hektor's death), Priam comments:

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ γε
πρὶν ἀλαπαζομένην τε πόλιν κεραιζομένην τε
ὄφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδεῖν, βαίην δόμον Ἴδου εἶσω.

‘But as for me, before my eyes look on the city sacked and laid waste, may I go down into the house of Hades.’ (*Il.* XXIV.244-46)

Quintus seems to have this in mind – for heightened drama – when his Priam notes:

Ὡς ὄφελόν με
σεῖο πατὴρ κατέπεφνε, πρὶν αἰδομένην εἰσιδέσθαι
Ἴλιον

‘If only your father had killed me before I had to see the burning of Iliion.’ (*Post.* XIII.231-33)

To Neoptolemos:

ἀλλὰ που ἤδη
φθεῖσθαι ὁμῶς τεκέεσσι καὶ ἐκλελαθέσθαι ἀνίης
λευγαλέης ὁμάδου τε δυσηχέος.

‘My one wish now is to perish with my children and so to forget my grievous pain and the ugly din of war.’ (*Post.* XIII.229-31)

As the primary narrator's recourse to *lesato* (*Post.* XIII.250), Priam's choice of *eklelathesthai* (*Post.* XIII.230) and *lelathom'* (*Post.* XIII.236) are also significant. Whereas a key aspect of the *Iliad* is *kleos*, and by association immortality through being remembered (in this sense, Nestor is his own biographer, as he is the only one old enough to recall actual heroic exploits of which he was involved), Quintus' Priam articulates the opposite. He does not wish to remember, but to forget. In this sense, we can see that old Priam, and his death, are very meaningful. They are significant expressions of the decline and fall not only of a man, but also the worlds that that man's longevity bound. In Priam's death, then, we also see a marked expression of the loss of the past. It is interesting that in the parallel scene in the *Iliad* (Achilleus and Priam), Priam asks Achilleus to ‘remember’ (*memnemai*) his father (*Il.* XXIV.486, 504, 509). Here, then, we can see a sharp contrast

between the Iliadic tendency to encourage memory, and the Posthomeric one to forget. This tendency has wider significance, as I discuss below.⁵⁸⁰

Representations of the futility which the *geron* embodies reach their climax as the epic draws to a close which (as regards Trojan defence, this is Book XIII). Here Priam is subdued, and so is Ilioneos ('Child of Ilion'),⁵⁸¹ the *demogeronti* (*Post.* XIII.181).⁵⁸² As I discuss in Chapter IV, Ilioneos' name is also highly significant: as 'child of Troy', as well as being so closely located to Priam's death,⁵⁸³ Ilioneos' death represents Troy's doom. Diomedes comes across Ilioneos during his *aristeia* in Troy; he draws his sword to dispatch Ilioneos, the 'aged' man (*geraleou*), who then collapses to the ground (*Post.* XIII.181-82).⁵⁸⁴ Ilioneos' supplication is briefly successful, as he reminds Diomedes that although there is great renown (*kudos*) for killing a young (*neon*) man, there is no glory (*alkes*) for killing an old man (*geronta*).⁵⁸⁵ Here we see that the 'problematic of old age' also has implications for the (young) hero, and heroism *per se*. Regardless of Ilioneos' attempt to persuade Diomedes through recourse to the divide between youth and age in relation to the hero and glory, his wish (unlike Priam's) is not granted; though the outcome, for the helpless *geron*, is the same.

2.3 *Gerontes: Trojans en Masse*

We saw in the case of Penthesileia that the presentation of the individual heroine was mirrored and amplified by the women of Troy. An analogous phenomenon occurs in the case of old age. As shown with reference to Quintus' Priam and Phoenix, particularly, the Posthomeric *geron* represents pathos. This applies to the *gerontes en masse*, too. With the imminence of Troy's Fall fast approaching, the Trojans (already in Homer a symbol of weakness), emphasize the tragedy of war.

⁵⁸⁰ See 3.

⁵⁸¹ On Ilioneos, see Ch.IV.1.5.

⁵⁸² The term echoing Homer's at *Il.* III.149, as above.

⁵⁸³ Priam's death scene follows immediately afterwards (*Post.* XIII.220ff.).

⁵⁸⁴ *Γηραλέου* also features in Aeschylus (*Pers.* 171); Xenophon (I.18); Pindar (*Pyth.* IV.121); Theocritus (XIV.69). For further discussion, see Liddell and Scott (1996), 348.

⁵⁸⁵ Ironically, one may see aspects of the beaten warrior in Ilioneos' supplication, e.g. grasping the knees, reaching out to the hero's sword with the other hand, pleading for respect, and mercy (185ff.); see, for instance, Lykaon's unsuccessful attempt with Achilles at *Il.* XXI.68ff

In war-torn society, Homer expresses the inherent otherness of the *geron*, through demarcating their specific locale: in *Iliad* III, the Trojans elders watching from the battlements; *Iliad* XVIII, the shield of Achilleus, where the Trojan elders (with the equally vulnerable women and young children)⁵⁸⁶ guard the wall. Like the women and children, the old should be physically separate from war.

In *Iliad* III, the Trojan elders,

‘men of prudence both, sat as elders of the people at the Skaean Gates.
Because of old age they had now ceased from battle, but they were good
speakers (γῆραι δὲ πολέμοιο πεπαυμένοι, ἀλλ’ ἀγορηταὶ ἑσθλοί), like cicadas that
 in a forest sit on a tree and pour out their lily-like voice: such were the leaders
 of the Trojans who were sitting on the wall.’ (*Il.* III.148-53)

Key characteristics of the old in epic are expressed here: wisdom; positions of political responsibility; withdrawal from battle; eloquence; separateness. Although they are under siege, because they are old, they are (like women and children) no longer able to act. These expressions of old age are only *observers* of action and givers of speeches. As such, they fulfil only half of the prerequisites of the hero who should be a speaker of words and doer of deeds.⁵⁸⁷

A mirror scene occurs in Quintus, in Book IX. But the key difference involves a dramatic change of tone. In the Iliadic example, the elders appear merely spectators, preparing to view the duel between Paris and Menelaos. Here, they also take the time to resolve the problem of Helen: she is beautiful, but send her back.⁵⁸⁸ Quintus’ *gerontes* find themselves in a very different world. With Hektor gone, and his heirs (Penthesileia, Memnon, Eurypylos), there is increasing pressure on Trojan defences. This is expressed

⁵⁸⁶ See ‘the young’, below.

⁵⁸⁷ As *Il.* IX.443.

⁵⁸⁸ *Il.* III.156-60.

through the concern of the *gerontes* (and, closely associated in terms of helplessness, the women):

‘The women of Troy were watching from the walls the ghastly struggle of their menfolk, all their bodies trembling as they uttered prayers for husbands, fathers, sons and brothers. At their sides sat gray-haired elders watching with them, their spirits gripped by anguish for cherished children.’
(*Post.* IX.138-43)

Now, in Quintus, the old Trojans are beginning to be drawn into the war more directly. Their psychological state is focalised by the primary narrator. This is compounded with comment on their key physical characteristics. As a result, greater pathos is added to the scene.

The Trojans’ dire straits are also highlighted by the response of the *gerontes* to the mounting pressure of the Greeks: the ‘aged father’ (*geraios*) helps his hero son arm (*Post.* IX.120-21), encourages him to yield to no one (IX.122-23), and show his old war-wounds, ‘signs’ (*semat’*) of ‘old battles’ (*palaies deiotetos*) (IX.123-24) – a type of exemplum, a physical expression of a Nestorian reminiscence, designed to inspire. This shows a marked deviation from the collective old Trojans of the *Iliad*, who are not so directly involved in the war. In the assistance with arms, the old Trojans are more closely locating themselves again in the world of the hero, but this also reflects the imminent danger – i.e. as with the women, their active involvement is a sign of breakdown.⁵⁸⁹

Quintus extends this theme this when his Aeneas advises warrior, child, and old fathers (*geraroi paterressi*) to fight together in Troy’s defence (*Post.* X.39-40).⁵⁹⁰ This necessity is justified by their predicament – Troy is under exceptional threat (*Post.* X.35ff.). Thus, the rise of the *gerontes* communicates the extreme danger: again, the old are not supposed to fight. When they deviate from their traditional roles it is for exceptional reasons. And,

⁵⁸⁹ For women in war, Ch.I.2-2.1, and young children, below.

⁵⁹⁰ Cf. the *geras*, guardians of the wall, on Achilles’ shield (*Iliad* XVIII.515), and, similarly, *Aeneid* XII.131-33, where *invalidi(que) senes* (and mothers and the unarmed) take their battle positions – though physical boundaries are still evident, as the ‘new’ recruits go to towers, roof-tops, and gates. Also, for roof-top escapades for the untypical combatants, see Thucydides’ women (III.74).

these reasons appear more dramatic for the *geron* is not really equipped for the task. Rather, as shown with Priam, Peleus and even Nestor, conventionally, it is the *geron* who requires help, not of whom help is required.

Quintus' choice of narrative coverage permits the Greeks to breach Troy, in the Trojan War the old man's locale. So a form of transgression has occurred; rather than the *geron* himself challenging his physical locale (as with the Iliadic Priam, and Posthomeric Nestor who 'function' differently from the 'normal' *geron*), the actual locale of the *geron* is penetrated, forcing the world of the hero on to that of the old man.

Quintus' old Trojans never entirely deviate from the epic norm. However, although they reinforce, at one level, the 'place' of the *geron*, at another Quintus challenges the convention. The aged Trojans are bound by Troy's walls, in the narrative, and through epic norms. Yet as the Trojan War approaches its end, a shift occurs in their place in conventional epic, as they involve themselves more fully in battle; even if, initially, it is only through offering advice, and helping the young warriors' arm; Aeneas' words intensify the need for the Posthomeric *geron* to respond to change. As the narrative takes the Greeks inside the Trojan fortress, the place of the Trojan *geron* again appears challenged, as he is made to confront the young hero's world.

2.4 *The Young: Children of Troy*

At the opposite end of the age spectrum, Quintus employs 'young children' (*nepiachos*, etc.) to communicate great pathos. As noted, like the old men and women, young children have represented vulnerability from Homer onwards. In the *Iliad*, Agamemnon's ruthlessness (the ruthlessness of any powerful aggressor-king?) is expressed through his desire to kill even the unborn child (*gasteri mater kouron ... pheroi*, *Il.* VI.57-60).⁵⁹¹ Such rhetoric even goes beyond the killing of the young child; although neither the slaying of the unborn or born child actually occurs in Homer, this communicates extreme hatred in this war.

⁵⁹¹ See Kirk (2000), 161n.7-60; also *Exodus* I.16, 22.

The idea of infanticide is further expressed in Homer in Andromache's lament (*Il.* XXIV.734-39.). Consequently (and because Astyanax is the son of the hero who killed so many Greeks), Andromache concludes, Astyanax' death will follow. Later, Andromache offers graphic detail of Astyanax' doom (*Il.* XXIV.734-35). This passage is strongly evoked by Quintus when Astyanax is hurled from a tower, because of Greek anger at Hektor's prowess (*Post.* XIII.251-55), where Quintus builds on the repugnant idea of infanticide in the single act of Astyanax' death.

The accompanying simile (*Post.* XIII.258-63), comparing Astyanax to a calf cut off from its mother's 'milky udder', and driven over a cliff by wolves, communicates cruelty, vulnerability, and therefore, pathos in the extreme. As James notes,⁵⁹² the simile of a cow lamenting the loss of its calf to wolves recalls Deidameia's response to Neoptolemos' departure (*Post.* VII.257-59). Deidameia's Posthomeric response itself evokes the lion looking for its cub at *Iliad* XVIII.318-22 – Achilles' response to the loss of Patroklos.

The proximity of the killings of Astyanax and Priam is also striking. Astyanax' death follows on immediately after Priam's (*Post.* XIII.251ff.). This in itself, with the death also of Ilioneos, is very significant, too: here Priam and Ilioneos particularly represent 'old' Troy and its past glories; similarly, Astyanax ('lord of the city')⁵⁹³ was to be Troy's future. We know this because, as the *geron* represents the past, the *nepios* represents the future: Hektor articulated this in the *Iliad* when he wished for Astyanax' pre-eminence even over him (*Il.* VI.476-80). The same symbolism is clearly conveyed in Virgil, when Aeneas carries his father, and leads his son (*Aen.* II.721-24); and, there appears a close parallel in Quintus where Aeneas does the same (*Post.* XIII.317-24). One can also see a connexion between Astyanax and Priam in the defensive void that Hektor leaves when he dies: the defence gone, past and future are obliterated.

Astyanax' death is also significant in that his (and other Trojan children's) doom is anticipated in Homer, but realized in Quintus. Although the narrative, geared towards

⁵⁹² James (2004), 336n.258-63; 308n.257-59.

⁵⁹³ *Il.* VI.402-03. Also see *Il.* XXII.506ff. See Kirk (2000), 212-13n.402-03.

Troy's 'Fall', would suggest this, Quintus exploits the great vulnerability expressed by young children in key moments that highlight the extreme tragedy of the poem. Like the Troades and *gerontes*, the children are drawn into the war more directly. In Book IX, the young children (*νήπιοι υἱῆς*) gather arms for their fathers preparing for war (*Post.* IX.115-16). In *Posthomerica* X, Aeneas tells Polydamas that to avoid destruction they (the heroes) must fight with their children (*tekeessi*, 38) and old fathers (*gerarois pateressi*, 39).

The frequency of these associations (children suffering, fighting and dying) accelerates as the *Posthomerica* and imminence of the 'Fall' progresses. At Paris' death, Hekabe anticipates the captivity that awaits the Troades and their children (*Post.* X.383-84). But, it is in the last two books of the poem that the greatest tragedy of the child is most powerfully conveyed.

In *Posthomerica* XIII, during Troy's sacking, the Troades' (mothers')

'wails woke children (*atalaphronas*) from their sleep, children (*nepiachous*) whose tender spirits had never yet known cares (*οὐπω ἐπίστατο κήδεα θυμός*). Crowded together they breathed their last, some lying sprawled who'd only seen their death in their dreams.' (*Post.* XIII.122-25)

It can be seen here that the Fall of Troy is directly related to the children – their mothers' response to the sacking of Troy disturbs them from their slumber; then they die. Furthermore, the children's restful state and innocence, contrasts sharply with cause of their waking and subsequent death – here, the 'sleep of the innocent' takes on grotesque meaning. Noteworthy, too, is Quintus' choice of *atalaphron* (Cunliffe gives, 'of a child, with the mind just budding').⁵⁹⁴ This Homeric *hapax* features in *Iliad* VI, and is applied to Astyanax in the highly emotive reunion between Hektor, Andromache and Astyanax (*Il.* VI.400); as Kirk notes on this Homeric scene, *atalaphrona* contributes to the "touching" mood created through recourse to Astyanax.⁵⁹⁵ Thus, Quintus imports a word that has unique associations in Homer.⁵⁹⁶ Here, in the *Posthomerica*, the presence of *atalaphron*

⁵⁹⁴ Cunliffe (1963), 59.

⁵⁹⁵ Kirk (2000), 212-13ns.400-13.

⁵⁹⁶ The same applies for *meilichos*; see Ch.IV.1.7.

evokes the vulnerability of Astyanax alone, most doomed and marked of all of Troy's children. Yet, in Quintus, it is applied to the *collective* group of the Trojan young. This intensifies the pathos because it recalls the Iliadic Astyanax from Books VI and XXIV. The Iliadic Astyanax' foreshadowed vulnerability and doom now looms over *all* Trojan young.

Though one can see Astyanax' death, like Priam's, as the climax of the tragedy for which group they are represent (e.g. children; the old), Astyanax' death does not mark the end of Quintus' focus on the suffering of young children. Like the Jews under siege by the Romans at Masada,⁵⁹⁷ the Trojans take the life of their own children rather than have the enemy kill them (*Post.* XIII.443-44); the barbarity of such an act is famously expressed in Euripides's *Medea* as well, when Medea commits infanticide (*Med.* 1279-92);⁵⁹⁸ infanticide (*ekthesis, expositio*, 'putting outside'/'exposing') features in other myths, like Oedipus, Cyrus and Romulus and Remus, and, in historiography, Polybius (36.17).⁵⁹⁹ Also, the chaos of war is further conveyed as the Troades' frantically rush back to save children, still in their beds, that they had deserted in their panic: both mothers and children are crushed to death under falling, Trojan, rubble (*Post.* XIII.453-56).

In the *Posthomerica*'s last book, *following* Troy's Fall, there is still no let up for the Trojan children. Trojan mothers lament for their young as they both begin their exile (*Post.* XIV.32ff.) - the accompanying simile compares the wailing of their mothers with squealing of white-tusked sows and their tiny piglets, when they are moved from their pen.⁶⁰⁰ During this exile, again closely associated with their mothers, the primary narrator informs that grief-stricken mothers clasped their children, who were too young to comprehend their bondage and this disaster, and were more concerned with their mothers' breasts (= being fed). Quintus takes this opportunity to attach a suitable *gnome*: the primary narrator states that the young child's heart is carefree (*Post.* XIV.386-89). Finally,

⁵⁹⁷ See Josephus, *BJ.* VII.275-406.

⁵⁹⁸ The motivation is different, but the barbarity and act are similarly shocking. For further famous infanticides, see Page (1952) on the *Medea* passage (and Ino), 172n.1284.

⁵⁹⁹ As noted in *OCD* (2003), 757; on infanticide see too Sallares (1991), and Boswell (1998).

⁶⁰⁰ See James (2004), 341n.33-36.

echoing the ‘mercy killings’ of Book XIII, Trojan mothers rejoice in their deaths as the Greek fleets are destroyed, embracing their children as they sink to their doom (*Post.* XIV.541-43).

A cursory glance at children’s terms such as *nepiachos* (‘young child(ren)’) suggests a similar pattern. The term features fifteen times in Quintus,⁶⁰¹ but only three times in Homer (all in the *Iliad*).⁶⁰² Whereas the idea of the very young was used to inspire the warrior to protect his home and family (both in the *Iliad* and *Posthomerica*), in Quintus these children become far more prominent and active in a real sense, as Troy’s doom approaches and the narrative progresses. Not only do young children suffer and die, they also activate the maternal instincts in women: these range from inspiring martial resistance, to (literally) smothering with love. Thus, Quintus makes his children work harder to bring out the greater tragedy in his epic.

Part 3 - *The ‘Golden Age’ of Heroes*⁶⁰³

3.1 *The Power of Now*

‘But listen to me ... For I once joined with warriors who are better (*ἀρείοσιν*, 260) men than you ... Such warriors have I never since seen, or shall see, as Peirithous ... and Theseus, son of Aegeos, peer of the immortals. Mightiest (*κάρτιστοι*, 266) were these of all men reared on the earth; mightiest (*κάρτιστοι*, 267) were they, and with the mightiest (*κάρτιστοισις*, 267) did they fight, ... but with them no man of all mortals that are now (*νῦν*, 272) on the earth could fight. And they listened to my advice and heeded my words.’ (*Il.* I.259-73).

So the Iliadic Nestor reminds Achilles and Agamemnon, hoping to shame them into reconciliation; if better, and the mightiest *ever*, warriors listened to me, so should you, i.e., though mighty, *lesser* men. This is the definitive articulation, in either Homeric poem, of

⁶⁰¹ See Vian & Battegay (1984), 323.

⁶⁰² See Cunliffe (1963), 279.

⁶⁰³ Technically, this term applies to the first generation of mortals, when Kronos ruled (Hes. *Works*, 109). However, I use it in the more modern sense, i.e. the ‘glorious’ past. For Hesiod’s definition of the ‘fourth’ generation (the Theban and Trojan age), see *Works*, 156ff.; on which, see West (1996), 178-93.

the *superiority* of the previous heroic age (i.e. the heroic age *before* the Trojan War), and *its* heroes; so too Nestor at *Iliad* VII on his youthful confrontation with Ereuthalion, whom none of his peers had the courage to face: ‘He was the tallest (*μήκιστον*) and the strongest (*κάρτιστος*) man that I ever slew’ (155).⁶⁰⁴ The point behind Phoenix’ recollection is also similar, when he recalls Idas (in his Meleagros story), ‘who was the mightiest (*κάρτιστος*) of men who was then on the face of the earth and who took up his bow against the king Phoebos Apollo ... ’ (*Il.* IX.558-60).⁶⁰⁵ In these instances, the ‘function’ of recourse to past heroes is to act as a type of exemplar.

In Hesiod’s *Works* (109ff.), there is also a sense that, with each new generation, the race of man is degenerating; though the heroic age (the fourth generation, in which the Theban Wars and Trojan War are located) is something of an anomaly, its men (*heros*, 159) being ‘nobler’ (*dikaioteron*) and ‘better’ (*areion*) than the bronze (third) age (156ff.), the pattern of decline is re-established for the fifth (present, and iron) age (169c).⁶⁰⁶ Thus, each heroic age, in general, views its predecessor(s) in a more positive light; as the Trojan War in relation to the previous heroic age (see Nestor above), so too the present age in relation to that Trojan era. For instance, we learn that Diomedes lifts a stone that none could lift ‘now’ (*nun*, i.e. in the narrator’s time, and, therefore, *after* the events *recalled*) (*Il.* V.302-04); this comparative (and formulaic) comment is echoed in a number of places, reinforcing the premise.⁶⁰⁷ Commenting on one of these other instances (*Il.* XII.445-49), Hainsworth makes a point which has important implications for Quintus’ take on epic and the heroic age: “The hurling of large rocks is one of the rare breaches of realism in the *Iliad* and one of the few indications that the heroes were thought to possess preternatural strength. There is no indication at all that they were thought to be of preternatural size.”⁶⁰⁸ This is *not* so in Quintus, where his pre-eminent heroes buck the trend, outperforming their ancestors.⁶⁰⁹

⁶⁰⁴ See Kirk (2000), 255.

⁶⁰⁵ On this, the Meleagros ‘fable’, and the genealogies of the kings of Pleuron and Kalydon, see Hainsworth (2000), 130ff.

⁶⁰⁶ Line references apply to Evelyn-White (2000).

⁶⁰⁷ *Il.* XII.445-49; XX.285-87; and, similarly at XII.381-83

⁶⁰⁸ Hainsworth (2000), 364n.449.

⁶⁰⁹ Cf. Carvounis (2007).

Achilleus is the prominent model to prove the point that the present age of heroes is in no way inferior to their heroic predecessors,⁶¹⁰ although he is not the only exception in the *Posthomeric*. Nestor sings of Achilleus' great size, and that none could contend with him (IV.163ff.). This is the language for the heroic past, and recalls Iliadic descriptions of heroes from the previous age (see Iliadic comments above from Nestor and Phoenix). His giant corpse (*nekun ... apeiriton*) is compared to that of the huge Giant, Tityos (III.386ff.; see Aias following),⁶¹¹ who features well before the 'present' (Trojan War) period.⁶¹² Similarly, following his cremation, Achilleus' bones 'stood out conspicuously, being different from the rest, like those of an invincible giant' (*Gigantos ateiros*; III.723ff). *Preternatural* size, as opposed to merely being larger/ greater, is anomalous for the Homeric *hero*.⁶¹³ It is redolent of post-Homeric excess, and of the un-Homeric (or, more specifically, un-Iliadic) fantastic, far more in keeping with the world of the *Epic Cycle*.⁶¹⁴

However, in the *Posthomeric*, great size is also associated with other Trojan War heroes: in the Games for Achilleus, Diomedes leaps up 'eager to contend with huge Aias' (*Post*. IV.264; so too, V.385, 576).⁶¹⁵ Aias is the only one, now, large enough to wear the huge armour of Memnon given to him as prize in those Games (*Post*. IV.457ff.; so too Achilleus' arms (V.224-27); on Memnon's (and further examples of Achilleus') enormity, see below). Although, following his cremation, no mention is made of the size of Aias' bones (cf. Achilleus above), his immense size is implied by the boundless (*apeiresien*) mound of earth used to cover it (*Post*. V.655-56), and like Achilleus, by the many kings (*basilees ... polloi*) carrying his huge (*megan*) corpse (612-15).

⁶¹⁰ On Achilleus, see Ch.II; also on the preternaturally large Aias, Memnon and Neoptolemos, Ch.II.2 (and below). For Neoptolemos especially, see Ch.IV.

⁶¹¹ Odysseus notes Tityos is over nine 'roods' (*ennea ... pelethra*, *Od*. XI.576-77); in the *Iliad*, the primary narrator notes Ares stretched over seven plethra (*hepta ... pelethra*) in his fall (XXI.407). While Murray (*Odyssey*) comments "Renderings of *πέλεθρα* can only be tentative" (1953), 427n.1, Wyatt (*Iliad*) notes that this measure equates to "Roughly, either 70,000 square feet in extent (something over an acre and a half) or 700 feet in length" (2001), 435n.2

⁶¹² See Apollodoros, *Lib*.I.IV.

⁶¹³ As Hainsworth above.

⁶¹⁴ See Griffin (1977). On the size of the corpse indicating that people were much taller in the *past*, see Herodotus, I.68 (Orestes); Pausanias, I.35.3 and V.I3.1-7 (Aias, and Pelops' shoulder, respectively), I.35.5 (Asterios); Plutarch, *Thes*. 36 (Theseus). For these and further references, see Hainsworth (2000), 364n.449. However these writers are looking at the Homeric world from the perspective of the post-heroic world.

⁶¹⁵ Slightly modified version of James' (2004) translation.

Against Neoptolemos Eurypylos hopes that his killing of so many would, ‘exhaust the strength of that huge (*pelorion*) figure’s arm’ (*Post.* VII.554-55).⁶¹⁶ As with Aias, Neoptolemos’ abnormal size is indicated by him being the only one (now Aias is dead) large (and strong) enough to wear the arms of preternaturally huge Achilles (*Post.* VII.445ff.). Allusion is also made to Neoptolemos’ great size at *Post.* VII.538, and IX.313; in both instances, Achilles is the bench-mark noted. Quintus’ general penchant for extremes, here in relation to size, becomes more apparent when considering that both Patroklos and Hektor wore the original arms of the Iliadic Achilles’; neither of whom was attributed with super-human stature. Excess, then, here with regard to size, is the hallmark of Quintus’ Trojan War heroes, as it was of Nestor’s pre-Trojan heroes.

The imagery of *immense* size features with reference to Trojan allies too. In their duel, the physical representation of Memnon and Achilles is virtually indistinguishable: Achilles draws his *polumeketon* ‘very long’ sword, so too Memnon (*Post.* II.452ff.); Zeus gave both great strength size until, they resembled gods (458ff.);⁶¹⁷ and both appear as Giants (*Gigantas*) or Titans (*Titenas*) in combat (518-19); so too Aias in his death-fall, compared to the Titan-related monster, Typhon (V.485-86); and the giant, Orion, twice (368 and 404).

There are a number of other references to Giants and Titans in the *Posthomerica*, and, though not always used to characterize heroes specifically, as those above, recourse to them, and their frequency are telling. Τίτην, in its various forms, occurs in nine instances,⁶¹⁸ as opposed to once in Homer;⁶¹⁹ Γίγας features in Quintus on five occasions,⁶²⁰ but only three times in the Homeric poems, and all of these are in the *Odyssey*.⁶²¹ Quintus uses the collective terms ‘Giants’ and ‘Titans’ themselves on many more occasions than they feature in the Homeric poems.

⁶¹⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶¹⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶¹⁸ *Post.* I.714; II.205, 519; V.105; VI.271; VIII.461; X.163; XII.180; XIV.550.

⁶¹⁹ *Il.* XIV.279.

⁶²⁰ *Post.* I.179; II.518; III.725; XI.416; XIV.584.

⁶²¹ *Od.* VII.59, 206; X.260. Tityos, as noted, features once in Quintus, and twice in the *Odyssey* (VII.324; XI.576), though not in the *Iliad*. Orion, the giant, is mentioned three times in Quintus (see above), including

However, when Quintus refers to the Giants and/or Titans, collectively or individually, on the majority of occasions, unlike Homer, it is to enhance the portrayal of his heroes, and, within this, most usually in relation to their preternatural physicality (size, strength and prowess); thus, the primary focus, of which the narrative is also a key part, is rarely allowed to deviate from the heroes of the Trojan War period, the Trojan War period itself, and, specifically, his rendering of those heroes in that heroic age. Whilst the Homeric giants, etc., and their narratives, stand separate, preserved in a distant and separate past within the Homeric poems, Quintus' giants pervade the text as similes, subordinate to, and subsumed by, the characters that they enhance. Thus in Quintus when recourse is made to the past, via the preternaturally endowed Giants/ Titans, it is used not to "shame" the present age of heroes (unlike the *Iliad*), but rather to enhance their characterizations.

I will now extend the above approach, taking into account a significant pre-Trojan War episode as a test-case: the first Theban assault (Seven Against Thebes). Below are lists of the heroes (and the places) who are associated with these two major epic episodes, showing the frequency that their names occur in the *Iliad*⁶²² and the *Posthomerica*.⁶²³

once as the constellation (i.e., not as a giant, VII.304), his appearance in the *Iliad* follows this latter use only (as a name for the star-cluster; XVIII.486, 488; XXII.29.), while in the *Odyssey* his presence is both more frequent and versatile (Orion is the constellation once, then twice as a giant, and finally, as a mortal hunter). V.121 (mortal hunter), 274 (constellation); XI.310 (giant, on which it is noted that Otus and Ephialtes are the tallest (*mekistos*) after Orion), 572 (*pelorion*). Typhon (also known as Typhoeos) features twice in Quintus (as 'Typhon', see above, and XII.452), he is absent in the *Odyssey*, but features twice in the *Iliad* (as Typhoeos, II.782, 783). The Titan, Atlas, is mentioned once in Quintus (XI.419), not all in the *Iliad*, and twice in the *Odyssey* (I.52; VII.245).

⁶²² I have included Odyssean occurrences in the footnotes.

⁶²³ Shared names are clarified in parentheses, as are, in the case of the *Epigonoï*, characters' ancestry.

<u>First Assault on Thebes (The ‘Seven’):</u> ⁶²⁴	<i>Iliad</i>	<i>Posthomeric</i>	
Thebe(s) (Boeotian) ⁶²⁵	6	0	
Adrastos (of Sicyon) ⁶²⁶	3	1	
Amphiaraos ⁶²⁷	0	1	
Kapaneus ⁶²⁸	7	3	
Mekisteos (son of Talaus) ⁶²⁹	3	0	
Parthenopaeos	0	0	
Polynices ⁶³⁰	1	0	
Tydeus ⁶³¹	110	37	
<u>Total</u>	130	42	(= 3.3:1)

These statistics show that Quintus makes far less reference to heroes from the previous heroic age than Homer does in the *Iliad*. When taking into account the differing lengths of both epics (verses: *Iliad*, 15,000; *Posthomeric*, 9,000), the findings are still marked; e.g. Total references to heroes in the Theban Assault: 130 (*Iliad*)/ 42 (*Posthomeric*). At this rate, even if the *Posthomeric* were three times longer (27,000 = nearly twice the length of the *Iliad*), the occurrence of heroes from the previous heroic age would still be more in the *Iliad* (*Il.*, 130/ *Post.*, 126). Also, the number of names cited by Homer and Quintus differs greatly too: of the eight names (Thebes-Tydeus), all but two feature, compared to Quintus’ reference to only four. Even if the names are not noted by these authors in a specific context, the anomistic allusion is activated, although less so in Quintus’ case.

⁶²⁴ The ‘seven’ sometimes varies; e.g. Hippomedon (as in Aeschylus) and Eteocles (son of Iphis). See Gantz on the *Seven Against Thebes* (1996), 510-19; Aeschylus (*Septem*); Apollodorus (*Epit.* III.vi.3); Statius (*Thebaid*); on the *Theban Cycle*, West (2003), 4-9.

⁶²⁵ *Il.* IV.378, V.804, VI.223, X.286, XIV.114, XXIII.679; *Od.* XV.247. Boeotian Thebes is also noted at *Il.* IX.383, XIV.323, XIX.99, and *Od.* XI.363, 365, 275, X.492, 565, XI. 90, 165, XII.267, XXIII.323, but not in relation to either expedition.

⁶²⁶ *Il.* II.572, XIV.121, XXIII.347. *Post.* IV.572.

⁶²⁷ *Od.* XV.244, 253. Son of (= Amphilokos), *Post.* XIV.366.

⁶²⁸ *Il.* II.564, IV.403, V.319. Son of (= Sthenelos), IV.367, V.108, 109, 241. *Post.* X.481. Son of (= Sthenelos), IV.566, XI.338.

⁶²⁹ *Il.* II.566, XXIII.678. Son of (= Euryalos), VI.28.

⁶³⁰ *Il.* IV.377.

⁶³¹ *Iliad* ‘Tydeus’ x41, ‘son of Tydeus’ x69; under which see *Index Nominum*, in Monro and Allen, Vol. II (1986). *Od.* III.167. Son of (= Diomedes), III.181, IV.280. *Post.* I.773. ‘Son of-’, ‘child of-’, etc. ‘Tydeus’ x36; under which, see Vian and Battagay (1984).

Why should this be so? By reducing the reference to key heroes and episodes associated with their legendary exploits, Quintus creates a world that, in a sense, reduces indebtedness. This may appear peculiar when considering the epic tradition of recourse to past, greater heroes and ages. However, this relative silence produces the effect of a set of heroes, and an age, which is by no means inferior to their past. Exemplary reference to previous heroes/ ages that had been so popular with the old heroes of the Homeric poems, who bridged the gap between the two (or more in the case of Nestor) ages, is largely omitted by Quintus, as his heroes are the benchmark, and legends in their *own* lifetime.⁶³²

3.2 *Heros Theos*⁶³³

In Quintus, the *frequency* of recourse to both apotheosis and the afterlife shows a number of Trojan War heroes at least on a par with the greatest heroes from the previous heroic ages (this can be understood to have implications for Quintus and his text in relation to Homer as well).⁶³⁴ Poseidon consoles Thetis that, like Dionysus and Herakles, Achilles shall dwell with the gods. Furthermore, he shall live as a god on an island in the Euxine Sea, and be worshipped as a god (*Post.* III.771-79); at *Post.* XIV.186ff., Achilles' apotheosis has already been effected, and he returns to the Elysian Plain shortly after (XIV.224-26).⁶³⁵

As noted,⁶³⁶ reference to the afterlife is more in keeping with the cyclic handling of Achilles.⁶³⁷ James comments on *Posthomeric* III, that "771-4 reflects the post-Homeric tradition of Achilles' apotheosis",⁶³⁸ and it sharply contrasts with the bleak outlook of the *mortal* Achilles in the Odyssean Underworld (*Od.* XI). It also serves to reduce, rather than increase, the impression that the present is inferior to the past. Again, however,

⁶³² See Achilles (Ch.II.); Neoptolemos (Ch.IV.).

⁶³³ So Pindar refers to Herakles (*Nem.*III.22). With special reference to Herakles, see Burkert on heroes crossing the Chthonic-Olympian boundary (2004), 208ff.

⁶³⁴ See below.

⁶³⁵ On the 'Achilles-cult', see Farnell (1921), 285-89.

⁶³⁶ See Ch.II.1.4.

⁶³⁷ *Aith.* Arg.4; *Ilias Mikra*, Arg.3; *Nostoi*, Arg.3. Though, the emergence of Patroklos' ghost (*Il.* XXIII.65ff.) raises interesting questions, especially if we view his appearance as a 'real' event, as opposed to the product of Achilles' subconscious; on Achilles' musings of the afterlife, see the same at 103ff., and N. Richardson's comments on these lines (2000), 177-79.

⁶³⁸ James (2004), 288.

Achilleus is not exceptional in this respect, and therefore, neither is Herakles. Quintus' Neoptolemos is bound for the Elysian Plain, also (*Post.* III.760-62); and, in an interesting moment of narratological uncertainty,⁶³⁹ so too (perhaps) Memnon: 'He meanwhile in the house of Hades, or perhaps (ἤέ που) among the Blessed Ones (μακάρεσσι) on the Elysian Plain, rejoices' (*Post.* II.650-52).⁶⁴⁰ A type of afterlife hierarchy emerges here, with Herakles and Achilleus at the top, receiving divine status (the apotheosis being exceptional in Achilleus' case in Quintus). Thus, in contrast to the *Iliad*, the heroes' afterlife seems far more common in Quintus' epic,⁶⁴¹ where the hero is, literally, elevated to the highest degree.

The sharp divide between the Trojan Age and previous Age of Heroes, so prominent in the *Iliad*, continues to blur, as Quintus can again be seen to merge the attributes of the greatest heroes of each period (Herakles = previous Heroic Age; Achilleus = present Heroic Age), this time through their arms. Achilleus' arms, and their *ekphrasis*, dominate the text for a substantial part of the narrative in *Posthomerica* V (2-120).⁶⁴² However, it is not simply the textual space that indicates their importance. They are *ambrota teuche* ('Immortal arms', 2), which, as the same armour in the *Iliad* (XVIII.478-613), are alive with narrative. Rather than just a microcosm (the shield seems to incorporate everything: the heavens; earth; universe; strife and peace; the helmet is huge (*mega*); as are the greaves; and the spear, as long as a pine), there are countless (*muria*, *Post.* 97) other scenes, too – unlike Homer's shield. Regarding this armour, Odysseus' comments to Neoptolemos are telling: 'They are not like the arms of mortal men, but as good as those of the god of war ... A marvel even for immortals. No mortal man on earth has ever before this seen or borne such arms apart from your father ...' (*Post.* VII.194ff.). So they cannot be bettered, but,

⁶³⁹See Ch.V.2.1ii, on the primary narrator's 'doubt'.

⁶⁴⁰*Aith.* Arg.2, confers similar immortality (*athanasian didosi*).

⁶⁴¹Like the *Cycle*, and the *Odyssey*, where Menelaos is destined for the Elysian Plain (*Od.* IV.561-70). On which (and for useful discussion of the afterlife in general), see Heubeck, *et al.* (Vol. I), (1990), 227. Conversely, it is worth considering Herakles' own claim to immortality (and his apotheosis), granted in the *Odyssey* (*Od.* XI.601ff.), but *not* in the *Iliad* (*Il.*XVIII.117-18). Such fantastical handling of character and narrative is distinct from the *Iliad* in general, though not dissimilar from the *Cycle*, or Quintus. For discussion of stylistic features in, and engagement between, the Homeric poems and the *Cycle*, see Griffin (1977).

⁶⁴²See Maciver (2007), 259-84.

more significantly, in this utterance, Quintus' Odysseus challenges the Iliadic tenet that the past was supreme: recourse to *prosthén* ('past', 205), and that no man had seen their like, echoes references of the supremacy of the previous heroic age (e.g. by the Iliadic Nestor and Phoenix).⁶⁴³ Yet here the rhetoric is clearly applied to, and evocative of, the *recent* past, of which, technically, they are *still* part.

3.3 *Old Narratives and Narratives of the Old*

The old (especially Nestor) are key figures linking previous ages with the present. Nestor recalls the heroic past (always associated with his youth)⁶⁴⁴ in a number of places in the *Iliad* (I.259ff.; VII.133ff.; XI.670ff.; XXIII.627ff.). The heroic age before the Trojan War, is evoked with reference to great men and stories (Nestor himself always features in the action): Theseus, *et al.* and battles with the Centaurs (*Il.* I.266ff.); Ereuthalion, and Pylian battles (VII.133ff.); Pylian battles, and Herakles (XI.682ff.); Pylian Games in honour of Amarynkeos (XXIII.629ff.).

As noted above, Nestor's rhetoric in the *Posthomerica* retains a number of these essential features (lament for his lost youth, great deeds that he performed, etc.), although they are far shorter. For the purposes of discussion here, however, it is the reference (and indeed, lack of reference) to other figures and events from the heroic past that is significant.

Against Memnon, Nestor laments his lost youth, and battling prowess. But, surprisingly does not name-drop, as he had in the *Iliad*. In fact, we learn little of the heroic past here, where, perhaps, we would expect a more Homeric Nestor to recount various exploits he was involved in. His stock phrase, 'I only wish I had my strength intact ...' (*Post.* II.323-24), a key feature of his Iliadic rhetoric, is, unusually, *not* followed with specific battles and heroes' names; similarly, at 328-29, when Nestor recalls his (lost) prime, we would expect something along the Iliadic lines of 'such were the men I fought ...'. Yet, these heroes are never mentioned. Here the heroic past is given less attention than usual, creating the effect that the 'present' of Quintus' heroes is more central, and, therefore,

⁶⁴³ See above.

⁶⁴⁴ See above, 1.1-2.

‘great’; if the heroes’ *raison d’être* is *kleos* (as in Achilles’ ‘song’ of *Iliad* IX), such relative silence, regarding previous exploits and heroes, surely speaks volumes.

In part, the more typical Iliadic pattern is established later, in *Posthomerica* XII, when Nestor bemoans his aged state – he is now too frail for war (here, the Horse ruse); he recalls a previous heroic age, referring to the Argonauts’ expedition: ‘Aison’s son’ (267); ‘his speedy ship from Argo’ (268); ‘Pelias’ (270). In Quintus’ account, Nestor was to be part of the Argonaut’s expedition, yet is stopped from going by Pelias (his uncle), the usurper of Aison’s (and therefore Jason’s) throne; presumably, here, Pelias blocks Nestor’s progress to protect his nephew from the dangerous voyage.⁶⁴⁵ Association of the youthful Nestor with the Argonauts is exceedingly rare (no mention is made of this in Homer, the *Epic Cycle*, Pindar, Apollonius of Rhodes, Ovid or Apollodoros, though a number of these chronicle the Argonauts),⁶⁴⁶ and rarer still is his actual inclusion in the expedition as in Valerius Flaccus’ first century A.D. *Argonautica* (I.434-35). Whilst the crew (and indeed times and reasons for the expedition) of the *Argonautica*, as most myth, is not fixed,⁶⁴⁷ there is a common body usually associated, of which Nestor is not part. Such toying with this important epic episode offers an alternative to the more typical heroic biography of Nestor (e.g. as in Homer).⁶⁴⁸ The deviation is short-lived, however, as Nestor quickly extricates himself (Pelias’ objection). Reference to, and the link with, the heroic past is made, although allusion to such exploits is kept to a minimum. Again, this contrasts with the much more detailed accounts of the heroic age recalled through the Iliadic Nestor.

Previous heroic exploits are recalled, to a greater degree, in *Posthomerica* IV (Nestor’s eulogy for Achilles; see Book XIV also). However, the focus of such reminiscences may be hugely significant for understanding the part played by the heroic past and its heroes. Though the narrative time-frame extends beyond the *Posthomerica* (external analepsis), in places, recourse, taking Achilles as its subject, is mainly to the *very recent past*. As such, the generational time lapse required for the distant heroic past, a requisite of greatness, and

⁶⁴⁵ If the story is true, or manufactured by Nestor as another exemplum.

⁶⁴⁶ On which, see Gantz (1996), 341ff.

⁶⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴⁸ See the Homeric references above.

byword for comparatives (*ἀρείοισιν*) and superlatives (*κάρτιστοι*), has been compressed (note Phoenix who comments, ‘... we have heard the glorious deeds of men of old (*prosthēn*) who were warriors ... I recall this deed (Meleagros) of the olden days (*palai*) and not of recent ones (*neon*)’, *Il.* IX.524ff.).⁶⁴⁹ Unlike Homer, in Quintus ‘past’ does not necessarily mean ‘best’. In fact, much suggests that the opposite is often the case.

Κάρτιστοι is employed only once in the *Posthomeric*, and this is in a completely different context from that of the *Iliad*. Kalchas notes,

‘Necessity has inspired the Trojans with courage, which rouses even a worthless man to war. The time that men are strongest (*kartistoi*) in action is when they hazard their lives in recklessness of utter destruction, as now the sons of Troy are fighting dauntlessly to defend their city’ (*Post.* XII.60-5)

Thus it is not used as an exemplum contrasting the superiority of the *previous* age, as is the method of the Iliadic Nestor and Phoenix.⁶⁵⁰ Rather, it is used in a more gnomic fashion.⁶⁵¹

Quintus uses *ἀρείων* on four occasions,⁶⁵² but again in a different way from Homer. Rather than eulogizing the past, Phoenix tells Neoptolemos: ‘You are and shall be as much *superior* to him (Eurypylos), as your father was *mightier* (respectively, *ὑπέρτερός* and *ἀρείων*, 665) than his miserable parent (Telephus),’⁶⁵³ (VII.665-66).⁶⁵⁴ Although one could argue that the comparison is used to inspire the young warrior to acts of brilliance, and of course the utterance by a *geron* provides the link with the past, the emphasis is fundamentally on superiority in the present and future, as opposed to the more traditional (Homeric) past; *ἀρείων* is also used in a gnomic context at *Post.* VII.86, when old Nestor

⁶⁴⁹ Slightly modified version of Wyatt’s (1999) translation.

⁶⁵⁰ See above.

⁶⁵¹ See Ch.V.2.3i.

⁶⁵² *Post.* III.540, V.235, VII.86, 665.

⁶⁵³ With reference to the success of the *Epigono*i, cf. Sthenelus’ words at *Iliad* IV.405ff.: ἡμεῖς τοι πατέρων μέγ’ ἀμείνονες εὐχόμεθ’ εἶναι ...

⁶⁵⁴ Slightly modified version of James’ (2004) translation.

tries to console the grieving Podaleirios: ‘Always hope for better things (*ἀρείονα*), rather than dwelling on painful thoughts ...’;⁶⁵⁵ *μήκιστον* does not feature at all in Quintus.

Conclusion

Quintus makes use of age in multiple ways. At one level, *gerontes* link not only epochs, but also epics, as old men like Nestor and Priam recall their earlier models. Yet, changes in their portrayals affect both the mood of the text (i.e. Priam’s great pathos), and its mode of expression (i.e. Nestor’s reduced direct speech). Babes, like their opposites (the old) represent extremes and the tragic circumstances in which they find themselves amplify the tragedy of war, and their new roles in new narratives. The amplification of the pre-eminent heroes’ prowess, and diminished centrality of previous heroic ages, impacts further, as Quintus ‘writes himself’ into the ancient canon. Rather than a lyre-playing Achilles singing about the *klea andron* of an heroic past, Quintus writes a poem that communicates a glorious ‘present’, in which *his* hand ushers in superior change.

Largely through Nestor, a tenet that pervades the *Iliad* is that the previous generation were superior to those of the present. The glorious past is referred to on a number of occasions, often to shame the Iliadic heroes into action (see Nestor to Achilles and Agamemnon, and Phoenix to Achilles above). This is not the case in the *Posthomeric*, where Quintus’ heroes are more than a match for their epic predecessors. Extremes in characteristics, where Posthomeric heroes are gigantic in stature, superhuman in battling feats, and deified in death, further emphasize the fact that traditional degeneration does not apply.

When the past is recalled, it is often used to enhance the heroes of the present – simile taking precedent over exemplum. On occasions where brilliant exploits of a previous generation dominate, as in the case of Herakles and the ekphrasis of his shield, the focus is as much on the ability of the artist to ornament his cadenza, as on the subject of that piece. Furthermore, the tendency of Quintus to refer far less to major exploits of the previous

⁶⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

heroic generations also indicates a relative diminishing not of the qualities in the present, but the significance of the past – this is also substantiated by the singing of the glorious deeds of the present generation (Achilleus, Aias, the Fall of Troy, etc.), while there is a noticeable omission of an *Iliad*-like scene, where Achilleus sings of the glorious deeds of the *past*. Quintus' pre-eminent heroes are more than a match for those of the previous generations; they are not shamed by the past; and, therefore, there is not the same sense that they are deteriorating.

It can be understood in a *metapoetic* sense that Quintus' *text* becomes a sort of paradigm.⁶⁵⁶ Through his heroes, who show themselves to excel even their namesakes, and previous heroes, and through others, the old men of epic, Nestor and his chronologically challenged peers, Quintus creates an epic microcosm. Paradoxically much contained within itself, the *Posthomerica* also engages with established models, of characters both literary and real. But, whilst Homer's old make recourse to past conquests for paradigmatic purposes, Quintus glorifies his mythic present; and although the legendary past of Homer's Trojan heroes shines brilliantly, it is ultimately overshadowed by *his* giant, Neoptolemos,⁶⁵⁷ who towers over Homer's giant, Achilleus. In this, the 'past' represents not only myth (conveyed and recalled through, and by, Nestor *et al.*, the Trojan War and heroes), but also genre and poet (Homer, epic and beyond). Thus, Quintus makes his *text* the exemplar.

*cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Grai.
nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade.
(Propertius, Elegies, II. XXXIV.65-66)⁶⁵⁸*

⁶⁵⁶ On mythological paradeigma, see Willcock (1964).

⁶⁵⁷ The subject of Ch.IV.

⁶⁵⁸ So Propertius praises Virgil's *Aeneid*.

Chapter IV: Neoptolemos
On the Shoulders of Giants

‘For this reason he sent me to instruct you in all these things,
be both a speaker of words and a doer of deeds.’ (*Il.* IX.442-43)⁶⁵⁹

Introduction

The son of Achilles is far more amiable in Quintus than previous mythological accounts would lead us to expect.⁶⁶⁰ In fact, the prevalent tendency in the *Posthomerica* is for Neoptolemos to be portrayed against type in a positive light.⁶⁶¹ Quintus manipulates the narrative and the characterization of Neoptolemos, and those involved with him to achieve this effect. In Part 1, I will consider this tendency in the *Posthomerica* in general. Then, I will focus on a specific instance which highlights this point; the killing of Priam.⁶⁶² Finally, to avoid oversimplifying Quintus’ treatment of the young hero, I will consider the rather more ambiguous portrayal, the Polyxena sacrifice episode, followed by a brief biography of Neoptolemos’ post-Troy narrative. Through making extensive use of intertextual readings, I aim to illustrate how Quintus portrays a Neoptolemos who differs markedly from more traditional representations.

In Parts 2 and 3 of my discussion on Quintus’ Neoptolemos, I will explore the sense to which Neoptolemos is something of a ‘legacy’. He shows himself to be fully prepared for war before his arrival in Troy, and the recognition scenes of characters he meets, and the primary narrator serve to reinforce this. Locale shifts (Skyros to Troy), make little difference to Neoptolemos’ innate maturity, but the constant reaffirmations can be seen to communicate that Neoptolemos is both already fully prepared for war, and unequivocally Achilles’ ‘son’.⁶⁶³ The overall reading that emerges, through consideration of various

⁶⁵⁹ Phoenix reminds Achilles of the requisites of the ‘ideal’ hero.

⁶⁶⁰ On Neoptolemos’ positive portrayal, see Boyten (2007). On Neoptolemos in general, Gantz (1996), 581-82, 615, 622, 636-37, 639-41, 649-59, 687-94, 713; as a cult figure, Farnell (1921), 311-21.

⁶⁶¹ See especially Calero Secall (1998).

⁶⁶² See especially Gärtner (2005).

⁶⁶³ I use inverted commas to draw attention to the multiple meanings implied by a progeny, as I note in this paragraph.

episodes that address these themes (e.g. Quintus' portrayal of Neoptolemos' war-practice on Skyros; significant recognition scenes, involving characters and locales central to the Iliadic Achilleus, from Phoenix and Briseis, to Achilleus' 'camp' and Achilleus himself), is that Neoptolemos represents more than reception at the level of character. Quintus also uses Neoptolemos to assert his (Quintus') place in the epic tradition: thus Quintus' exploration of Neoptolemos' exceptional qualities communicates his (Quintus') own challenge to epic, and what has gone before. The significance of the 'Achillean heir', with its strong association with Homer and the *Iliad*, then, takes on meta-poetic meaning. Such a reading forms an important part of his chapter.

Part 1 - *More 'Parfit Gentil Knyght'⁶⁶⁴ than 'Hyrceanian Beast'⁶⁶⁵*

1.1 *Getting to the Point Quickly⁶⁶⁶*

At the point, half-way through the *Posthomerica* (VII), in which Neoptolemos makes his debut, he is not the typical of the major hero we would have expected in Quintus' epic; where excessive physicality (often in the form of extreme violence), is central to the characterization.⁶⁶⁷ Nor, indeed, is Quintus' Neoptolemos what we would have expected based on his previous negative mythologies. Though associated with Achilleus (as frequent use of his patronymic indicates),⁶⁶⁸ and equally adroit in battle, Neoptolemos is more complex than his Posthomerian father. The young hero also expresses an awareness of others, sensitivity and wisdom that sets him apart from his Posthomerian peers, Homeric heroes, and his own traditional portrayal in ancient Greek and Roman epic. In fact, to some extent, Neoptolemos shares these unusual features with Virgil's Aeneas.⁶⁶⁹

⁶⁶⁴ Chaucer, *General Prologue*, 72. On the Knight's qualities, see Hodson (1969), 75.

⁶⁶⁵ Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, II. II.446. For "Hyrceanian", read "wild"/"savage". See Jenkins (1990), 263n.446.

⁶⁶⁶ This section was prompted by suggestions made by Dr M. Cuypers and Professor A. James at the Zurich Quintus Conference, 2006, for which I would like to thank both.

⁶⁶⁷ I.e. see Ch.II where extreme size/violence are central to Achilleus.

⁶⁶⁸ In the *Posthomerica*, Neoptolemos is so named seventeen times; however, he is 'son of Achilleus' sixty-one times; this contrasts with the Iliadic Achilleus, where the pattern is reversed: Achilleus is so named three-hundred and one times, as opposed to his patronymic, 'son of Peleus' (one-hundred and ten). This is but one example of the great impact Achilleus has on Neoptolemos' characterization in the *Posthomerica*. See 2-3 below.

⁶⁶⁹ Aeneas is referred to in numerous instances following, that draw attention to his 'sophisticated' heroic qualities (i.e. as more egalitarian than the usual Homeric hero), and his meta-literary use (i.e. as

The Iliadic Achilles proves himself to be a speaker of words and a doer of deeds (*Iliad*, IX.438-43). Not so Quintus' Achilles, whose amplified bellicosity is countered by his diminished rhetoric and the aggressive nature of his speech.⁶⁷⁰ In contrast, Quintus' Neoptolemos is more like his *Iliadic* father; greatly skilled in both areas.⁶⁷¹ It is apparent, however, that Neoptolemos' speech exhibits restraint in manner and length.⁶⁷² The brevity of Neoptolemos' speech is marked, even in an epic which reduces rhetoric to approximately half that of its Homeric predecessor.⁶⁷³ And, this factor gives further clues as to the type of hero Quintus wants his Neoptolemos to be.

It is immediately evident that Neoptolemos *already* possesses the rhetoric of a hero. In his Posthomeric debut, Neoptolemos welcomes the Greeks sent to recruit him (led by Odysseus and Diomedes) with the confidence Telemachos shows at his best moments (*Post.* VII.179-81; cf. *Od.* I.123-24).⁶⁷⁴ In many of Telemachos' speeches, however, it is evident that he is not yet entirely prepared for the role thrust upon him – to be the young hero. This does not apply to Neoptolemos, whose preparedness is communicated by his short speeches. Neoptolemos never bursts into tears of frustration.⁶⁷⁵ Furthermore, Neoptolemos does not ask for or need advice;⁶⁷⁶ nor is he shown to speak inappropriately.⁶⁷⁷ This is not to say, however, that Neoptolemos' speech is reduced to such an extent that he appears, like his Posthomeric father, more just a doer of (violent) deeds. Instead, Neoptolemos' speech is measured: he speaks when he needs to speak, and

communicating the 'worthiness' of Virgil and Rome, as, respectively, heirs of Homer and Greece). On Aeneas as a paradigm, see Nisbet (1990); as a 'stoic' ideal, see Bowra (1990); also, on Aeneas, G. Williams (1983), esp. ch. 1.1; on the 'purpose' of the *Aeneid*, see R. Williams (1990), and Virgil's relationship with Homer, Knauer (1990). Also, for ideas on cultural assertions, see Whitmarsh (2008), esp. Part One.1 ('Second Sophistic') and 2; Erskine (2003).

⁶⁷⁰ See Ch.II, on Achilles.

⁶⁷¹ E.g. Achilles' responses to the embassy (*Il.* IX); his diplomacy in Patroklos' Games (*Il.* XXIII).

⁶⁷² On Aeneas' 'taciturnity', see Feeney (1990), ch.8. See Friedrich and Redfield (1999), on speech as a personality symbol, with reference to Achilles especially, on 'poetic directness': "Sometimes this reduces to a simplicity, as in his response to his dream of Patroclus (XXIII.103-7). But this same simplicity becomes a strength when it enables him to go straight to the hard facts," 243.

⁶⁷³ See James and Lee (2000), 16; Character-text: *Posthomeric* (24 per cent), *Iliad* (44 per cent), *Odyssey* (56 per cent). On character/ narrator-text, see Ch.V.

⁶⁷⁴ Further on the Telemachos-Neoptolemos relationship, see 1.2, and Parts 2 and 3.

⁶⁷⁵ Cf. Telemachos, *Od.* II.81.

⁶⁷⁶ Cf. Telemachos, *Od.* I.252-305. See Achilles' advice/instruction to Neoptolemos, 1.7 and 2.3.

⁶⁷⁷ Compare Telemachos who makes foolish claims about what is and what is not possible (*Od.* III.225-38); and Odysseus' bragging to Polyphemos (*Od.* IX.492-536).

in that, says what he needs to say. After a grandiose welcome by Phoenix (*Post.* VII.642-66), wherein Neoptolemos is likened to Achilles, his reply is noticeably brief and modest:

‘Old fellow, the judges of my prowess in battle will be almighty Fate and powerful Ares.’ (*Post.* VII.668-69)⁶⁷⁸

Such a rare show of heroic humility follows similar eulogy from Agamemnon. Neoptolemos’ response is, again, very brief:

‘Agamemnon, I wish I had found him still alive, so that he could see for himself the son he loved bringing no shame on his mighty father, as I trust will happen if I am preserved by the carefree gods in heaven.’ (*Post.* VII.701-04)

The primary narrator’s comment which immediately follows reinforces the emerging impression of *this* Neoptolemos:

‘So he spoke in wisdom (*pinutesin*),⁶⁷⁹ expressing the restraint in his heart.⁶⁸⁰ The people round him marvelled at his noble manhood.’ (*Post.* VII.705-06)⁶⁸¹

Neoptolemos’ interchange with Nestor, regarding his (the *geron*’s) involvement in the Horse ruse follows suit; the old man noting Neoptolemos’ ‘wise words’ (*euphroni mutho*, *Post.* XII.287) (as his prowess) matching Achilles’. And, again, Neoptolemos’ reply takes into account their ultimate subservience to the gods and fate, noting, philosophically, *Ei δ’ ἐτέρως ἐθέλουσι θεοί, καὶ τοῦτο τετύχθω*, ‘But if the gods choose otherwise, so be it also’ (*Post.* XII.300). The tone of such rhetoric recalls Virgil’s Aeneas at a number of points, where the hero exhibits great humility; for instance, when he tells the Latin envoy that he did not want conflict and will allow them time to bury their dead (*Aen.* XI.116-18⁶⁸²).⁶⁸³

⁶⁷⁸ Partly my translation. Such humility also recalls Memnon at *Post.* II.148-55; though, cf. Penthesileia (*Post.* I.93ff.).

⁶⁷⁹ Compare *pinutesin* frequently applied to the ‘wise’ Telemachos, just before he is about to speak; e.g. *Od.* I.213, 367, 388, etc.

⁶⁸⁰ My translation.

⁶⁸¹ It is true that Telemachos’ speech is admired similarly, even by the suitors (*Od.* I.381-82), but, as mentioned, Neoptolemos’ rhetoric, much more brief, is never mocked.

⁶⁸² As noted in G. Williams (1983), 8.

⁶⁸³ Granting burial to an enemy also recalls Achilles with Priam (*Il.* XXIV.668-70).

Neoptolemos is what his speech indicates: the complete hero, *also* with an air of sophistication and humility. Furthermore, the brevity of his rhetoric represents his temperance. He is restrained, fully in control of himself, as of his words; compare the longer rantings of Athene-maddened Aias (*Post.* V.451ff.), and the overly bellicose Achilles in his death-scene with Apollo: *ouk alegize theou* (*Post.* III.45ff.).⁶⁸⁴ By appropriate speech (in terms of content and context), Neoptolemos can proceed with battle, and, as his foes shall find, get to his point, quickly.

1.2 *What's in a Kiss?*⁶⁸⁵

It is significant that Nestor kisses Neoptolemos (*Post.* XII.282; both his hands and head), following Neoptolemos' well chosen words, including his volunteering to enter the Horse⁶⁸⁶ (*Post.* XII.275-80). Kissing (*kuneo*, *phileo*; here, *ekusse*, and its other forms, including *amphikusas*)⁶⁸⁷ is more frequently associated with Neoptolemos than any other character in the *Posthomeric*, and gives us another clue as to the type of hero Quintus wants him to be.

Neoptolemos is kissed on five occasions (this figure includes Deidameia,⁶⁸⁸ who lavishes Neoptolemos' spear, and any other of his possessions, with kisses, *phileeske*; *Post.* VII.342); and kisses twice (Deidameia, VII.328, and Achilles' tomb-stone, IX.47). Those kissing Neoptolemos, also include Nestor (XII.282), Phoenix (VII.640), Lykomedes (his grandfather, and Deidameia's father; VII.312), and Achilles (in the form of a ghost; XIV.183). The list, with the exception of Nestor, really constitutes Neoptolemos' family – Phoenix being 'surrogate' father (again).⁶⁸⁹ His kissing of Deidameia is especially marked. He kisses her *mala muria* ('innumerably', *Post.* VII.328); the infinite, or the excessive, in Quintus is more usually associated with the hero's killing or size (for

⁶⁸⁴ See Ch.II.1.2ii, on Achilles.

⁶⁸⁵ I would like to thank Dr. C. Maciver for asking the significance of this question (Zurich, 2006).

⁶⁸⁶ Neoptolemos is, in fact, true to his word, and more, as he is *first* to enter the Horse (314-15). This 'pole position' further enhances Neoptolemos' positive characterization. The number of Greeks, order in which they enter, and names of those involved is by no means set. See Gantz (1996), 649.

⁶⁸⁷ See below for *amphikusas*, *Post.* VII.328. See Vian and Battagay (1984), 281 for all *kuneo* references.

⁶⁸⁸ Further on Deidameia's, Achilles' and Phoenix' relationships with Neoptolemos, see 2 and 3.

⁶⁸⁹ As he had been to Achilles (*Iliad* IX.437ff.); on discussion of Quintus' Phoenix and Neoptolemos see following 2.2; and Quintus' Phoenix and Achilles, Chs.II.3.3 and III.2.1.

instance, the number of men Neoptolemos kills is beyond counting, *muria*, VIII.230),⁶⁹⁰ than with affection shown toward or by him. In this way, Quintus applies hyperbole again, but here it emphasises gentleness as opposed to brutality.⁶⁹¹

In the Homeric epics, kissing (*kuneo*) occurs eighteen times in the *Odyssey*, and on three occasions only in the *Iliad*;⁶⁹² this frequency, and the nature of the scenes in which kissing occurs, is an important factor, and (though the context of the *Posthomeric* is superficially closer to the Iliadic world (conflict) than that of the *Odyssey* (reunion)) somewhat reduces the centrality of the *Iliad* as source for Neoptolemos' epic characterization. Of its Odyssean instances, it applies to Telemachos four times,⁶⁹³ and Odysseus thirteen times. With reference to Telemachos, he is kissed on each of these occasions. He never kisses. This is significant as it helps to portray the Telemachos as a less mature, more passive and vulnerable figure (at least at certain points) in the epic, as opposed to Quintus' Neoptolemos, who, as above, occasionally returns the favour. However, there are obvious similarities in the high association of kissing with the hero's (Odysseus' or Achilles') young son where great affection is evoked.

Eumaios' kissing Telemachos (*Od.* XVI.15-21), somewhat anticipates the kissing of Quintus' Neoptolemos by Phoenix (*Post.* VII.640), where he is kissed on his head and chest, and that of Nestor with Neoptolemos (*Post.* XII. 282; both hands and head). Here (Eumaios/ Phoenix), the intertext is especially marked as the *geron* shows affection to the son of the absent father he so adored, and was instrumental in his upbringing. Quintus' Achilles kisses Neoptolemos' neck and sparkling '*phaea*' (eyes, *Post.* XIV.183).⁶⁹⁴ This more emotive welcome recalls Penelope's for Telemachos (*Od.* XVII.39), as she too kisses his *sparkling* eyes, and head;⁶⁹⁵ again, the mother's engagement with the hero evokes his

⁶⁹⁰ Also, Achilles' corpse is gigantic (*Gigantos*, III.725).

⁶⁹¹ For further instances of hyperbole in Quintus, see discussions of laments (Ch.I.3); Achilles' death (Ch.II.1.1); the presentation of *gerontes* (Ch.III.1-2). See below for *meilichos*, 1.7.

⁶⁹² See Cunliffe (1963), 241-42.

⁶⁹³ *Od.* XVI.15, 21, 190; XVII.39.

⁶⁹⁴ Cf. the more restrained reunion between Odysseus and Telemachos (*Odyssey* XVI.190); and for the Neoptolemos/ Achilles reunion, 2.3

⁶⁹⁵ Telemachos' fifth kiss is from Odysseus' maids (*Od.* XVII.33-5; head and shoulders).

gentler side.⁶⁹⁶ On each of these occasions in the *Odyssey*, the characters kiss the young man because they are delighted at his return. Similar expressions of delight at Neoptolemos' arrival ('debut' rather than 'return') therefore invite comparison with the epic antecedent. (Deidameia's kissing, however, instead forms part of her lament at Neoptolemos' departure;⁶⁹⁷ although, this still conveys the same: affection for the young hero.)

The use of *kuneo* is marked in the *Iliad*, when Hektor kisses his small son, Astyanax (*Il.* VI.474), following the young child's tears at the sight of his father in his helmet; again, the scene is a tender one, between familiars, often involving father/ surrogate father-figures. Neoptolemos' association with these actions, then, recall emotive representations from Homer, and distance him slightly from the brutal world of battle, and, especially, his particularly brutal previous characterizations and narratives.

1.3 *Degeneration?*

Traditionally, Neoptolemos' biography is most violent:⁶⁹⁸ having killed Eurypylos (and, presumably, many Trojans) he kills Priam, who had fled to Zeus' altar for safety;⁶⁹⁹ himself decides to dispatch Astyanax; sacrifices Polyxena; and is killed, for his *hubris* (killing Priam at Zeus' altar) on his return at Delphi.⁷⁰⁰ Thus, Quintus had certain pre-mapped mythic parameters in which to work. However, myth was always in Greek literature a malleable medium and within the prescribed limits Quintus was very creative in the way he manoeuvred Neoptolemos so as to depict him in the most positive light.

⁶⁹⁶ As Thetis with Achilleus (*Il.* I.357ff. and XVIII.70ff.).

⁶⁹⁷ Deidameia's lament for the living hero perhaps recalls the ominous foreshadowing of Andromache for Hektor (*Il.* VI). However, in Deidameia's case, this is unfounded. See Deidameia's concerns, 2.1.

⁶⁹⁸ See discussion following. On the sources and alternative versions for those killed by Neoptolemos see Gantz (1996), 640-41, 650-59; for his Trojan War 'afterlife' (including his being killed), see Gantz 687-94; Cancik and Schneider (2000) 830-31.

⁶⁹⁹ This sacrilegious act is often cited as reason for Neoptolemos' eventual murder; see following.

⁷⁰⁰ On the killings of Astyanax and Polyxena, see below, respectively 1.5, 1.6-7; on Neoptolemos' 'afterlife', 1.8.

With reference to Neoptolemos' dispatch of Priam,⁷⁰¹ the young hero had a particularly nasty reputation.⁷⁰² Pausanias notes of Lesches' *Ilias Mikra*: 'Lescheos says he (Priam) was not killed at at the hearth altar (*ἐπὶ τῆι ἐσχάρα*) of Zeus of the Courtyard, but was pulled away from the altar (*ἀποσπασθέντα ἀπὸ τοῦ βωμοῦ*) and dealt with in passing by Neoptolemos at the doors of the house'.⁷⁰³ In Proklos' summary of Arctinus' *Iliou Persis*, Priam is killed on the altar (*epi ton ... bomon*,⁷⁰⁴ which became the later tradition); Lesches' milder version has him killed not on the altar but even so in a causal way (*πάρεργον*) as he fled to Zeus' altar. The sacrilege of killing Priam at Zeus' altar has terrible consequences for Neoptolemos.⁷⁰⁵

As Gantz notes, the death of Priam is linked again and again with the death of a child usually taken to be Astyanax;⁷⁰⁶ for instance, on a 6th century BC Black-Figure lekythos, where Neoptolemos holds the child over a corpse prostrated on an altar, threatening him with a sword (Syracuse 21894).⁷⁰⁷ The scene becomes more grotesque, and Neoptolemos' characterization more violent, as in Lydos' (c.550) painting: "the pose found there (child brandished above head like a club) is now combined with the old man on the altar, so that Neoptolemos appears to be dashing the child down upon the body of Priam (Louvre F29; so too Berlin: CH F3988, a tripod kothon)."⁷⁰⁸

Virgil's first-century BC portrayal of the episode is equally unambiguous as to the savagery of Neoptolemos' treatment of Priam.⁷⁰⁹ The pathos of the scene is heightened by emphasizing Priam's vulnerability, and Neoptolemos' (/Pyrrhus')⁷¹⁰ mockery and brutality

⁷⁰¹ For discussion of this scene with slightly different focus, see Ch.III.2.2.

⁷⁰² See Gantz (1996), 650ff.

⁷⁰³ Fr. 25, West (2003), 138-39.

⁷⁰⁴ Arg.2, West (2003), 144-45.

⁷⁰⁵ See below.

⁷⁰⁶ Gantz (1996), 655ff.

⁷⁰⁷ As Gantz 656.

⁷⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰⁹ On Priam's Virgilian death, see Austin (1980), 196-215. On Priam's death (Virgil's and Quintus'), see especially Gärtner (2005), 236-41; and 241-43 for Astyanax' killing.

⁷¹⁰ On the names – Neoptolemos/Pyrrhus - see 2.2

(violent words and deeds). Neoptolemos slaughters Priam's son, Polites, before him.⁷¹¹ Priam offers pathetic physical resistance, and chides Neoptolemos for his wickedness (*Aen.* II.535ff.; cf. a similar scene in Quintus, where Memnon kills Antilochos in front of his father, Nestor, *Post.* II.243ff.⁷¹²).⁷¹³ For witnessing this murder, Priam invokes the curse that foreshadows the traditional fate of Neoptolemos – punishment by the gods for such terrible deeds. Priam's juxtaposition of Achilles' integrity when they met (*Aen.* II.540-43),⁷¹⁴ is itself juxtaposed with the few positive portrayals of his (Achilleus') son, as in Sophocles, and Quintus.⁷¹⁵ Similarly, the crimes (*tristia facta*, 548)⁷¹⁶ of Virgil's Neoptolemos' make him almost unrecognizable as Achilles' son, as Priam previously articulated.⁷¹⁷

Neoptolemos' reply incorporates particularly vindictive rhetoric, as he announces that old Priam shall bear such news to his dead father (Achilleus), and, *illi mea tristia facta/degeneremque Neoptoleum narrare memento/; nunc morere*, 'tell him, be sure of my sorry deeds and his degenerate Neoptolemos. Now die' (*Aen.* II.547-550). Finally, Neoptolemos drags the trembling (*tremementem*, 550, and following) Priam through Polites' blood, making his way specifically to the altar (*altaria*, 550) to kill the old man, this will be the traditional cause of his undoing in his post-Troy biography. Furthermore, Neoptolemos' dispatch of Virgil's Priam is noticeably tactile, as he winds the old man's hair around his hand (*Aen.* II.552) just before decapitating him at the altar. As will be seen, Neoptolemos' killing of Priam in Quintus, seems much less personal; for instance, the rhetoric of Quintus' Neoptolemos makes it clear that he is treating Priam as *any* (i.e. Priam is not distinguished from other foes) enemy.⁷¹⁸ In fact, Quintus' Neoptolemos *and*

⁷¹¹ James (2004, 335n.214) notes that this is the only record of Polities being killed by Neoptolemos immediately before Priam.

⁷¹² See Chs.II.1.3ii and III.1.1 for fuller discussion of Antilochos' death.

⁷¹³ Perhaps Aeneas' killing of Lausus in front of Mezentius is also evoked (*Aen.* X.846ff.).

⁷¹⁴ And for the archetype, the famous Iliadic meeting between the two (XXIV.472ff.). On which especially, Macleod (1982), and N. Richardson (2000), 320-47.

⁷¹⁵ See below.

⁷¹⁶ These are Neoptolemos' mocking words.

⁷¹⁷ Again, see Neoptolemos in Sophocles, and Quintus, following.

⁷¹⁸ Having said this, decapitation does mark the killing as slightly unusual; less so though in this episode (as Virgil). See Servius *ad Aen.* II.506. See Austin (1980), 196n.506-58.

Priam do not engage in any vitriolic rhetoric directed against each other. And, physical contact is kept to the bare minimum.

Virgil's portrayal, with the focus on Neoptolemos' moral degeneration (and Priam's vulnerability), contrasts markedly with Quintus' characterization of Neoptolemos in Book XII, when he opposes the Horse ruse suggested by Odysseus. As James notes, such opposition, from Neoptolemos and Philoktetes, is not attested elsewhere.⁷¹⁹ So, Quintus has again taken the opportunity to idealize the young hero. Neoptolemos tells Kalchas that strong men face their enemies, and do not employ trickery (*Post.* XII.67-72). This echoes Neoptolemos' illustrious father who, having just been mortally wounded by Apollo's arrow, demands that his assailant faces him (*Post.* III.68-77). Moral conviction of this type also clearly recalls that of allusion to Achilles in Sophocles' *Philoktetes*. Neoptolemos tells Odysseus that it is against his 'nature' (*phusis*; as Achilles'), to succeed through duplicitous means (*Phil.* 86-95).⁷²⁰ Quintus' Neoptolemos, like Sophocles', is morally opposed to deceit, especially Odyssean wiles. In this one looks back a little further and recalls Achilles' famous rejoinder in the *Iliad*; ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κείνος ὁμῶς Ἀΐδαο πύλησιν/ ὅς χ' ἕτερον μὲν κεύθη ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἄλλο δέ εἴπη, 'For hateful in my eyes as the gates of Hades is that man who hides one thing in his mind and says another' (*Il.* IX.312-13).

Quintus attempts to resolve the tension of this apparent stalemate without discrediting Neoptolemos.⁷²¹ Neoptolemos (and Philoktetes), though still uncomfortable with the Horse stratagem, continues to muster his troops for overt offensive, which, the primary narrator notes, would have been decisive (*Post.* XII.93ff.). However, Zeus' displeasure at Neoptolemos' initial rejection of Kalchas (expressed with earth tremors and the hurling of thunderbolts, *Post.* XII.94ff.),⁷²² checks Neoptolemos' defiance of the stratagem. Thus,

⁷¹⁹ James (2004), 329n.84-7.

⁷²⁰ See especially Bezantakos (1992); and on Neoptolemos' *phusis* (nature), M. Blundell (1988).

⁷²¹ This also applies to Neoptolemos' sacrifice of Polyxena. See following, 1.6-7.

⁷²² See James (2004), who notes Iliadic echoes where Zeus' thunderbolts deter Nestor and Diomedes (*Il.* VIII.132-36), 329n.94-9.

the compliance of the young hero is fully justified,⁷²³ and, *unlike* his Posthomerian father with Apollo,⁷²⁴ he reverently bows to the will of the gods.⁷²⁵

It is also worth noting that even Sophocles' more noble Neoptolemos does not emerge entirely untainted; at least, the divine Herakles' cryptic foreshadowing implies this when he tells Neoptolemos to show 'reverence' (*eusebein*, *Phil.* 1441) to the gods when he conquers Troy (*Phil.* 1440-41). This alludes to his dispatch of Priam at Zeus' altar, and Neoptolemos' consequent punishment; on which, see Pindar (*Pae.* VI. 104-120).⁷²⁶ However, this is marked because the implication for divine retribution for sacrilege at Troy also applies to the lesser Aias, who raped Cassandra at Athene's temple; in response the gods raise a storm, killing many returning Greeks.⁷²⁷ In other words, Neoptolemos' degeneration (as Aias') is implied in *Philoktetes*, even though his portrayal is more positive than the epic and subsequent tradition. Quintus appears to borrow from these positive aspects of Sophocles' Neoptolemos. Yet, although Aias' traditional degeneration is highlighted by his subsequent punishment (*Post.* XIV.435ff.), Neoptolemos' degeneration is not.

1.4 *Euthanatos*

Tradition dictates that Neoptolemos must kill Priam (*Ilias Mikra*, fr.25; *Iliou Persis*, Arg.2).⁷²⁸ But, in Quintus' handling of Priam's killing by Neoptolemos (*Post.* XIII.220-50) the mood is very different from more typical versions: in these, the young hero's negative portrayal had been far more marked. As in the early accounts of this episode, mention is made of Priam's physical relation to Zeus' altar ('*Ερκείου ποτὶ βωμόν*; *Post.* XIII.222); in Quintus' version, the action centres around the altar, although Priam has

⁷²³ Similarly, Aeneas' departure from Troy is fully legitimized: e.g., Hector (*Aen.* II.289-95), Venus (594-620) and Creusa (776-89) tell Aeneas to leave (and not fight), and the meteor shower (693-704) indicates the same.

⁷²⁴ *Post.* III.40ff.

⁷²⁵ Still, Apollo comes dangerously close to dispatching Neoptolemos just as he did his father (*Post.* IX.304-14).

⁷²⁶ See Ussher (2001), 162n.1440-1441; so too Webster (1970), 158n.1441; and Blundell (1988), 146.

⁷²⁷ In fact, Seneca's *Hecuba* notes that she saw Neoptolemos' killing of Priam at the altar. She also notes that this crime was worse than Ajax'. On Aias' crime, see Webster (1970), 158n.1441.

⁷²⁸ On Priam's death (where Neoptolemos is usually implicated), see Gantz (1996), 650-57.

neither *fled* to or from it; nor, in a hubristic act that will cause him trouble post-Troy, has Neoptolemos leapt onto the altar to kill Priam.⁷²⁹ These are significant. Furthermore, Priam offers no resistance to Neoptolemos, as he had in Virgil.⁷³⁰ Also, it is not explicit, as in Virgil, that Priam actually witnesses Polites' killing (the most tragic sight for any father);⁷³¹ neither is Neoptolemos involved in the killing of Priam's grandchild, Astyanax; and the killing, when it does come in Quintus, is much lower profile (*Post.* XIII.241).

Priam is portrayed particularly as a resigned figure throughout most of the *Posthomerica*, having suffered much.⁷³² This prominent aspect of his character, which has been building as the narrative unfolds,⁷³³ reaches its climax in this scene where he *now* actually wishes to die. Immediately he tells this to Neoptolemos (*Post.* XIII.227ff.); this echoes focalization of the same just preceding Priam's direct speech (223-24). In fact, Priam's resignation, as opposed to his Virgilian defiance, is frequently referred to by Priam throughout the scene:

κτεῖνον μῆδ' ἐλέαιρε δυσάμμορον· οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε
τοῖα παθῶν καὶ τόσσα λιλαίομαι εἰσοράασθαι
ἠελίοιο φάος πανδερκέος, ἀλλὰ που ἤδη
φθεισθαι ὁμῶς τεκέεσσι καὶ ἐκλελαθέσθαι ἀνίης
λευγαλέης ομάδου τε δυσηχέος. Ὡς ὄφελόν με
σεῖο πατὴρ κατέπεφνε, πρὶν αἰθομένην εἰσιδέσθαι
Ἴλιον, ...

Ἄλλὰ τὸ μὲν που

Κῆρες ἐπεκλώσαντο·

'Kill me without mercy in my misfortune⁷³⁴ ... After all that I've suffered, (I) have no desire to see the light of the ... sun⁷³⁵ ... My one wish now is to perish with my children and so forget my grievous pain and the ugly din of war⁷³⁶ ... if only your father had killed me before I had to see the burning of Ilion⁷³⁷ ... But such is the thread the Fates have spun for me.' (*Post.* XIII.227-35)

⁷²⁹ The locale is still a haven, though – or, at least, should be – although it is a motif that receives less attention than usual.

⁷³⁰ See James (2004), 336n.220-50.

⁷³¹ *Aen.* II.531ff. See above on fathers witnessing sons' deaths.

⁷³² E.g. *πολύτλητος* ('much-enduring'), is applied to Priam more than any other character in the *Posthomerica*; so too, the hapax *πολυδακρύτοιο* ('much-weeping'), *Post.* XIV.348 See Priam, Ch.III.2.2.

⁷³³ As his hopes have been dashed: e.g., with the deaths of Penthesileia (I), Memnon (II), Eurypylos (VIII).

⁷³⁴ *Post.* XIII.227.

⁷³⁵ *Post.* XIII.228-39.

⁷³⁶ *Post.* XIII.229-30.

⁷³⁷ *Post.* XIII.231-33; had Neoptolemos' father been the Posthomic Achilles in their meeting, Priam's wish probably would have been granted.

Priam's final words reiterate the above as he says, 'So glut your mighty sword by shedding my blood and letting me forget my anguish', *σὺ δ' ἡμετέροιο φόνοιο ἄασον ὄβριμον ἄορ, ὅπως λελάθωμι ὀδυνάων* (*Post.* XIII.235-36). The common features of Priam's rhetoric are that he: is broken by his suffering; wishes to die; wishes to 'forget' (*ἐκλελαθέσθαι*, 230; *λελάθωμι*', 236; and the primary narrator's *λήσατο*, 250).⁷³⁸ The repetition of *λανθάνομαι*, is most telling, though, and the subjunctive at the end of Priam's speech takes us back to its beginning: Priam initially *demanded* death (*κτεῖνον*, 227), and finally *requests* that he may be allowed to forget. Neoptolemos' action, then, is legitimized by Priam, too; perhaps, even more, almost merciful? – at least in effect, if not intent.⁷³⁹ This impacts on the characterization of Neoptolemos. He is no longer the hero overpowering the old king against his will; no frantic movement is suggested (fleeing to or from Zeus' altar); and physical contact (including also the *χεῖρ ἐπὶ καρπῶ* 'hand on the wrist'),⁷⁴⁰ indicative of force, is kept to a minimum.

Furthermore, Quintus' Neoptolemos exhibits none of the mocking diatribe of his Virgilian self. Neoptolemos merely notes,

'Old man (*geron*), you are bidding one who is only too eager. As you're my foe (*echthron*) I shall not leave you among the living,⁷⁴¹ for nothing else is dearer to mortal men than life.' (*Post.* XIII.238-40)

Even in the act of despatching Priam, Quintus emphasizes his lack of resistance – therefore reducing Neoptolemos' negative portrayal; Priam's head is cut off, 'as easily (*rhedios*) as one reaps an ear of grain ...' (*Post.* XIII.241ff.).⁷⁴² This simile highlights the absence of struggle. So, Quintus exploits the opportunity to heighten the pathos whilst not focusing on Neoptolemos' depravity. With mention of Priam's decapitation, and,

⁷³⁸ *λελάθωμι*' (followed immediately by *ὀδυνάων*, 'pain') recalls the rhetoric at *Iliad* XV.60, where Apollo will make Hektor forget his pain (*λελάθη δ' ὀδυνάων*).

⁷³⁹ See below, 1.7.

⁷⁴⁰ Compare Polyxena, below, 1.6.

⁷⁴¹ Compare the 'courteous' Memnon with time-honoured Nestor (*Post.* II.309ff.); see Nestor in Ch.III.1.1.

⁷⁴² Similar features occur earlier in the *Posthomeric*, and in the *Iliad*: a Greek decapitates Pyrasos – the head rolls far away, still eager to speak (*Post.* XI.56-9); Diomedes decapitates Dolon, whilst he is speaking (*Il.* X.457). See James (2004), 336ns.241-45, 242-43 and 323n.56-9.

especially, his “tragic” fall,⁷⁴³ one is reminded of the same in Virgil. Yet, the final image is a defining one – for Neoptolemos as much as Priam. As the earlier Priam lies a huge trunk (*ingens ... truncus*, 557),⁷⁴⁴ we are told that Quintus’ Neoptolemos makes Priam forget his many woes: *κακῶν δ’ ὅ γε λήσατο πολλῶν* (*Post.* XIII.250).

1.5 Resolution

However, Quintus does not disappoint his audience as aspects of Neoptolemos’ more traditional biography are refracted throughout the text and other characters. The theme of the doomed *geron* not wishing to die is fulfilled in the scene immediately preceding Neoptolemos’ killing of Priam, when Diomedes encounters old Ilioneos (*Post.* XIII.181-207);⁷⁴⁵ James notes that Ilioneos may be a variation of Eioneos, killed by Neoptolemos in the *Ilias Mikra* (fr.15).⁷⁴⁶ If this is so, again Quintus’ Neoptolemos evades such negative portrayal. As Virgil’s Priam, Ilioneos is killed against his will.

In contrast to the Neoptolemos/Priam scene, Ilioneos supplicates his would-be killer, asking for mercy, rather than death, and appealing to his heroic sense of shame (*αἰδώς*, *Post.* XIII.192); holding Diomedes’ sword and knees (185), in much the same fashion as Lykaon supplicates to Achilles (grasping his knees and spear, *Il.* XXI.70-2).⁷⁴⁷ The intertext is also encouraged by the supplicants’ openings: *γοννοῦμαί ...* (‘I beg’, *Post.* XIII.191; *Il.* XXI.74). But, while Lykaon begs for pity as a former suppliant, Ilioneos appeals to Diomedes’ sense of pity for the *geron* (*Post.* XIII.191-97).

Diomedes’ reply anticipates that of Neoptolemos, though the tone of the scene differs for the reasons noted above (Priam wants to die; Ilioneos does not):

⁷⁴³ E.g. loss of wealth, lineage, and numerous offspring, *Post.* XIII.247; cf. *Aen.* II.556-57. See Aristotle on such tragic characters, *Poetics*, XIII.5.

⁷⁴⁴ In keeping with the positive heroic portrayal of Priam, e.g. arming himself and attempting physical resistance.

⁷⁴⁵ Ilioneos’ ‘biography’ is a matter of interest. An Ilioneos is killed in *Il.* XIV.489-92. Thus, the character could well be Quintus’ creation to fulfill the narrative expectation of the Neoptolemos/ Priam scene; cf. Ilioneus, Aeneas’ old emissary (*Aen.* I.521ff.). See Ilioneos, Ch.III.2.2 (and discussion of his name); and Vian (2003), Vol. III, 135n.181.

⁷⁴⁶ James (2004), 335n181.

⁷⁴⁷ For other *aidos* appeals, see Achilles, Ch.II.2.1ii.

‘Old man (*geron*), I certainly hope to reach old age. But while my strength is undiminished I shall not spare an enemy (*echthron*) of my person; I’ll hurl them all to Hades. It is the brave man’s mark to avenge himself on his foes (*deeion*).’ (*Post.* XIII.199-202)

As Neoptolemos, Diomedes dispatches the old man straight after his (the younger hero’s) heroic announcement. Less is made of Ilioneos’ actual death (he is mortally wounded in the throat, so no melodramatic groaning, rolling head, nor reference to tragic fall; nor even a flourish of typical Posthomeric similes), and it is dealt with in fewer lines (Priam gets ten lines, *Post.* XIII.241-50; Ilioneos only five, *Post.* XIII.203-07). Diomedes’ characterization is marked in the episode: *he* is referred to as *δεινὸς ἀνὴρ* (‘terrible man’, 204) by the primary narrator; so too Ilioneos (unlike Priam) portrayed as terrified at numerous points.⁷⁴⁸ These factors impact upon the scene between Neoptolemos and Priam that *immediately* follows, making Neoptolemos seem less barbaric, and, unlike Neoptolemos with Priam in Quintus,⁷⁴⁹ there is more a sense of the killer’s cruelty, as Diomedes’ openly rejects his victim’s plea: no such plea is made to Neoptolemos, and therefore, no rejection.

Significant, too, is Quintus’ preference for Diomedes as killer of Koroibos. This act is often associated with Neoptolemos.⁷⁵⁰ It is also noteworthy that Quintus will still include the defiling of a holy altar, but not by Neoptolemos. Instead, Quintus follows tradition, *here*, with the famous outrage (the rape of Cassandra) committed by Lokrian Aias at Athene’s image (the goddess, to emphasize the degeneracy of the rape act, weeps; *Post.* XIII.420ff.).⁷⁵¹ The point here is that this highlights Quintus’ approach to Neoptolemos.

With reference to the killing of Astyanax as part of Neoptolemos’ brutal biography, Quintus again manipulates the traditional strands.⁷⁵² From Pausanias we learn that in

⁷⁴⁸ Ilioneos collapses to the ground (*κλάσθησαν*, *Post.* XIII.183; cf. Hekabe when led to captivity by Odysseus, XIV.23), and trembles all over (*περιτρομέων*, XIII.184). Also, Ilioneos’ *gonu*-supplication (185-86), emphasizes his fear.

⁷⁴⁹ Though cf. the same episode in Virgil.

⁷⁵⁰ Cf. Pausanias on Lesches (X.27.1), who does *not* choose the ‘majority version’, *ὡς μὲν ὁ πλείων λόγος*, but favours Diomedes over Neoptolemos. See Gantz, too, (1996) 650.

⁷⁵¹ E.g., see *Iliou Persis* (Arg. 3); Pausanias (X.26.3); Lykophron (357-64) etc., as James notes (2004), 338n. 420-29.

⁷⁵² See Gärtner (2005), 241-43. See above for discussion of the artistic portrayals of the famous scene involving Neoptolemos’ killing of Astyanax; and Gantz on the literature, 650.

Lesches' *Ilias Mikra* Astyanax' 'end came when he was thrown from the fortifications, not by a decision of the Greeks but from a private desire of Neoptolemos to be his slayer ...' (ἀλλ' ἰδία Νεοπτόλεμον αὐτόχειρα ἐθελῆσαι γενέσθαι).⁷⁵³ This is extremely important, and fully implicates Neoptolemos as mastermind and executioner in the infanticide⁷⁵⁴ – nothing could be further from Quintus' version, and this also shows that other accounts were still in circulation.⁷⁵⁵ Similarly, in Tzetzes' commentary on Lykophron, we learn that Neoptolemos flings Astyanax from the battlement. Quintus, however, avoids associating the hero with the act: no mention is made of Neoptolemos, and the Greeks *en masse* perform the infanticide (*Post.* XIII.251ff.); as Andromache had feared – Astyanax is hurled from the battlements because of Hektor's prowess (*Il.* XXIV.734ff.).

It is also worth considering that Quintus deviates from the more traditional narrative sequence (as Sophocles),⁷⁵⁶ where Neoptolemos is summoned from Skyros only *after* Philoktetes has been recruited (*Ilias Mikra*: Philoktetes recruited (2); Neoptolemos summoned (3)). Yet Quintus differs from Sophocles in *not* using Neoptolemos as a recruit. Thus Quintus offers a substitute episode (the Horse ruse), in which Neoptolemos can express these specific moral qualities: repugnance of deceit; nobility of Achilles.⁷⁵⁷

Of the three significant killings of *Posthomerica* XIII, one directly following the other, Neoptolemos is implicated only once – with Priam. Therefore, Quintus' Neoptolemos emerges less besmirched with gore than is typical. Polyxena's sacrifice, however, is not so clear cut.

⁷⁵³ Pausanias, X.25.2; West (2003) 137.18. So too Tzetz. In. Lyk. 1268, West, pp. 138-41, *Ilias Mikra* fr. 29; cf. *Iliou Persis* 4, where the act is attributed to Odysseus.

⁷⁵⁴ Cf. the Polyxena episode below, 1.6.

⁷⁵⁵ On Quintus and the *Epic Cycle*, see General Introduction.

⁷⁵⁶ See below, for further discussion of Quintus manipulating Neoptolemos' narrative sequence for dramatic effect, 2.1 and 3.2.

⁷⁵⁷ Though, ironically, in both instances, Neoptolemos ultimately goes along with the plan.

1.6 *Making a Sacrifice*

On a Tyrrhenian amphora (570BC), Neoptolemos slits Polyxena's throat; her blood drips onto a tomb.⁷⁵⁸ Traditionally, Neoptolemos is often associated with her sacrifice.⁷⁵⁹ Sophocles' lost *Polyxena* features a ghost, a sacrifice (to placate Athene), and dark foreshadowings for the Greeks, but again no cause is given. The reason for sacrifice is provided in Euripides' extant *Hekabe*. Achilles' ghost has appeared above his tomb, demanding her sacrifice for the Greek's departure (*Hek.*35-44).

In the *Posthomeric*, although choosing both to incorporate Polyxena's sacrifice, and having Neoptolemos as the executioner, Quintus again reduces many negative aspects of his portrayal in this unsavoury episode. The ghostly Achilles demands (*ἠνώγει*, *Post.* XIV.239) Polyxena in sacrifice (*δέξωσιν*, 215; 242) at his tomb (*τύμβον*, 213-14; 241) to show that the Greeks 'remember' all his labour (i.e., plundering, etc.; *μέμνηνθ' ... ἐμόγησα*, 211); *and*, also, to appease his anger (215-16).⁷⁶⁰ So, Neoptolemos is not responsible. Rather, he is doing Achilles' bidding, as he hopes to avoid Achilles' wrath in the form of a terrible storm (as Achilles threatens, 216-220).⁷⁶¹

But, like Odysseus in *Iliad* IX,⁷⁶² Neoptolemos does choose to omit facets of the original speech that could have negative connotations; e.g. Achilles' specific address for Agamemnon, followed closely by reference to his *anger* which will be even greater (*choomai ... mallon*) than it was over Briseis (*Post.* XIV.210-16).⁷⁶³ Neoptolemos recounts that Achilles 'ordered'⁷⁶⁴ Polyxena's sacrifice, as opposed to Achilles' actual words,

⁷⁵⁸ On Polyxena's sacrifice, see Gantz (1996), 658-59.

⁷⁵⁹ Proklos recounts that Polyxena is sacrificed at Achilles' tomb (*Iliou Persis*, Arg. 4). It is not clear who is responsible, or indeed, who is involved in the sacrifice. In the *Cypria* fr.34 (*PEG*) there are multiple accounts: Schol. Eur. *Hek.* = Neoptolemos (Ibykos follows this version); also Glaukos favours Neoptolemos; but another account notes that she dies from her wounds when Odysseus and Diomedes sack Troy.

⁷⁶⁰ For other aspects of this scene, see 2.3; for Achilles' portrayal in this episode, see Ch.II.1.5.

⁷⁶¹ Cf., too, Astyanax episode above, 1.5.

⁷⁶² Odysseus quotes Agamemnon's offers (*Il.* IX.122-57 = IX.265-99), but omits that Achilles *must yield to him*.

⁷⁶³ It is noteworthy, too, that nowhere does Neoptolemos express anger directed against his *own* comrades, as Achilles had at Agamemnon and the Greeks, (e.g., *Il.* I.1ff.; IX.312ff.); only in *Post.*XII is there clear conflict (see the Horse ruse, above), but this is quickly resolved.

⁷⁶⁴ See *ἠνώγει* above.

which *begin* with a conditional *εἰ* (210). So, the Greeks *must* sacrifice Polyxena, but, as a means to an end - speedy return. Such urgency is also communicated through Neoptolemos' editing: he virtually halves Achilles' request (*Post.* XIV. 209-222 = 238-45). Neoptolemos is also a diplomat, then, who wants quick results.⁷⁶⁵

However, both the episode and Polyxena's characterization are marked (*Post.* XIV.256-328); these affect the portrayal of Neoptolemos.⁷⁶⁶ Polyxena does *not* go willingly to death as her Euripidean self (*ἐκοῦσα θνήσκω*, *Hek.* 548).⁷⁶⁷ Instead, 'like a heifer'⁷⁶⁸ for sacrifice to a god, torn by herdsmen from its mother in the woods, which in its heart's distress calls loudly and pitifully' (*Post.* XIV.258-60);⁷⁶⁹ and she is 'dragged',⁷⁷⁰ as under a weighty millstone the fruit of an olive tree pours out much oil, while men strain at the ropes (263-66).⁷⁷¹ Yet in her lament, Hekabe recalls that Achilles is *the* causal agent (298-99), so distancing Neoptolemos from the deed (although he does pin Polyxena down with his hand, 306).⁷⁷²

Though we are told that Polyxena greatly loved life (*πολυήρατος*, *Post.* XIV.314), her death is immediate as is her return to the Trojans (*αἶψα*, 314, 320). There is no confusion over the return,⁷⁷³ or defilement of her corpse;⁷⁷⁴ no lingering lament as in Euripides; Quintus (and Neoptolemos) has achieved 'closure'; and the narrative passes quickly to a new episode, equally concerned with speed (*θοῶς*, 329; *αἶψα*, 331; *ἤδη*, 340): *because of*

⁷⁶⁵ See discussion above on the nature and brevity of Neoptolemos' rhetoric, 1.1.

⁷⁶⁶ I would like to thank Professor P. Schubert for his helpful comments regarding this episode.

⁷⁶⁷ Though this is Talthybios' version to Hekabe (i.e. he wants to reduce her suffering), Polyxena herself makes her acquiescence clear (*Hek.* 346-47).

⁷⁶⁸ So Polyxena in *Hekabe*, 205-08; James (2004), 343n.258-60.

⁷⁶⁹ Cf. *Post.* VII.255-58, where Deidameia weeps as a cow searching for her calf. I thank Dr. A. Carvounis for drawing my attention to this simile.

⁷⁷⁰ *Post.* XIV.267-68. On Priam's daughters being 'dragged' (*ἐλκέω*), see too *Iliad*, XXII.62.

⁷⁷¹ See James (2004), 343n.236-66, who notes that this olive oil-like weeping of Polyxena, may echo that of the tears of the daughters of the sun god at *Argon.* IV.625-26.

⁷⁷² Like Aeneas dispatching Turnus (*Aen.* XII.938-52), the necessity of the brutal act is fully substantiated: both deaths mean that the wars are over; something 'good' results from necessary 'evils'.

⁷⁷³ Cf. *Hek.* 611ff.; cf. 671ff., 726ff.

⁷⁷⁴ In this sense, her death is 'clean'; compare Euripides, where even necrophilia may be implied (*Hek.* 605-08); on which, see Gregory (1999), 119n.606. Such 'decent' treatment of the slaughtered female (also by the Greek's *promachos*), may also recall Achilles' unusual response to Penthesileia's death (see Ch.II.1.3i); although, there is a whiff of necrophilia.

Neoptolemos, the Greeks can now leave Troy. Therefore, though Quintus exploits the drama of Polyxena's sacrifice, and its build-up, Neoptolemos' depravity is greatly reduced, even if inescapable because of the role he *does* play; and Quintus does much to resolve the tension between excessive *idealization* and excessive *pathos*.⁷⁷⁵ One could also read the episode as variation on the largely idealized Neoptolemos, so avoiding monotony. Regardless, Neoptolemos' legitimization comes in the form of a number of characters, including Achilles, the Greeks, and the primary narrator, as will be further shown next.

1.7 Killing with 'Kindness'?

In a scene which centres around reunion between father and son, and instruction, Achilles' advice to Neoptolemos to be 'gentle' (*μείλιχος*) is significant.⁷⁷⁶ This may recall Andromache's concerns for Astyanax' (*ἀμειλίχου*, 'violent') future, following Hektor's death (*Il.* XXIV.734).⁷⁷⁷ If viewed as a warning, though, as much as fatherly advice, Achilles' divine suggestion to be 'gentle' could be as allusively ominous in the *Posthomeric*, as Herakles' tip to his 'piety' (*eusebein*) in *Philoktetes*. Furthermore, it could emphasize the contrast between multi-talented son and violent father (*ἀμειλίκτου*, *Post.* XIV.268). However, Quintus' particular choice of *μείλιχος* is hugely suggestive in another way.

In *Iliad* XVII, Menelaos notes that Patroklos was always 'gentle' (*meilichos*, 671); so too Briseis, on hearing of Patroklos' death (XIX.300). M. Edwards comments, "(Patroklos) is the only person to whom *μείλιχος* is applied Patroklos' gentleness is unique in the language of the poem ... ".⁷⁷⁸ Furthermore, in a sense the reference to *μείλιχος* in this context also frames this narrative, and impacts on Neoptolemos' characterization regarding Polyxena's sacrifice. After executing Achilles' request (Polyxena's sacrifice), Achilles fulfils his promise. Nestor tells the Greeks that Achilles' spirit has been appeased, the

⁷⁷⁵ See Laments, Ch.I.3.

⁷⁷⁶ I would like to thank Dr. Carvounis for providing me with her unpublished commentary, and paper on *Post.* XIV (2005).

⁷⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, n.209.

⁷⁷⁸ M. Edwards (1991), 127n.669-73; cf. *meilichos*' use with a negative at *Il.* XXIV.739 (127n.669-73); see too 270n.300.

waters stilled, and that the sailing winds are gentle (*meilichoi*, *Post.* XIV.344). Thus, it is time for the Greeks' 'return' (*nostos*, 345) home (340-45).

Neoptolemos is, then, not only to *be* gentle; he also serves the function of bringing calm. This directly affects the Greeks' prospects of return in a positive way.⁷⁷⁹ His sacrificing of Polyxena, immediately bears fruit for the Greeks; "the greatest good for the greatest number" – even if that 'good' necessarily involves some 'bad' (this also recalls Sophocles' Neoptolemos in *Philoctetes*).⁷⁸⁰ Of the four times that this very rare Homeric word features in Quintus,⁷⁸¹ then, *μείλιχος* is very closely associated with Neoptolemos twice.⁷⁸²

Perhaps one could add that, while in *Philoctetes* we are left with the ominous allusion to Neoptolemos' demise,⁷⁸³ the last act which marks Neoptolemos in the *Posthomerica* is one that secures the well-being of his army: more an act of necessity that requires brutal violence;⁷⁸⁴ rather evolution, than degeneration. Regarding Neoptolemos' Trojan existence, then, it can be seen that Quintus' omissions are very significant, creating the effect of a hero far less barbaric, and in fact much 'better' (the latter point with reference not only to previous narratives of Neoptolemos, but also with regard to other heroes in the *Posthomerica* and beyond). As will be discussed, this has meta-literary implications, too.

1.8 *Post Script: Neoptolemos' Afterlife*

Traditionally Neoptolemos' post-Troy afterlife is also distinguished by its many negative associations. Though Neoptolemos' post-Troy biographies differ, he meets his death soon after leaving Troy.⁷⁸⁵ Elements range from Pindar's VIth *Paeon*, where Apollo kills

⁷⁷⁹ The storm that *does* follow is as a result of the lesser Aias' sacrilege (*Post.* XIV.435ff.).

⁷⁸⁰ On Sophocles' Neoptolemos', see Bellinger (1939), 6.

⁷⁸¹ *Post.* III.564; VII.90; XIV.209 and 344.

⁷⁸² Achilles is described by Thetis as *μείλιχος αἰὼν* (*Post.* III.564); cf. the primary narrator's eulogy for Achilles (*Post.* III.424-25), especially *ἡπίου* ('gentle', 424), which recalls the aforementioned eulogies for the Iliadic Patroklos, with the key difference that *μείλιχος* is avoided; on which, see Ch.II.1.5. Finally, at *Post.* VII. 21ff./ 90, again the context is also suggestive of the Iliadic Patroklos: Podaleirios' extreme lament for Machaon (*Post.* VII.21ff.) = Achilles for Patroklos (*Iliad*, XVIII.22ff.); see Chs.II.2.2.

⁷⁸³ See above.

⁷⁸⁴ See M. Blundell on *Philoctetes* (1988), 146n.1440-443.

⁷⁸⁵ See Gantz (1996), 690-94.

Neoptolemos at Delphi as punishment for killing Priam, and Sophocles' lost *Hermione*,⁷⁸⁶ where Neoptolemos is killed, again at Delphi, by Machaireus, to Euripides' *Andromache*, where Neoptolemos, having despoiled the shrine at Delphi, is killed by the Delphinians – at the instigation of Orestes, and Pacuvius' *Hermiona*, where Neoptolemos confronts Orestes in Delphi, and, as the *Andromache*, is killed by the locals.

One has to look hard and imaginatively to find any suggestion of Neoptolemos' negative afterlife in Quintus. Lykomedes' (Neoptolemos' grandfather) vague warnings at *Posthomerica* VII.294-311, concerning sea-travel, with reference to the shooter of arrows (*βαλῶν ... βελέμωνων*, 301), and the Archer (*Τοξευτήν*, 302), may be cryptically suggestive of Apollo and his involvement in Neoptolemos' post-Troy legendary life (death); and mention of Neoptolemos' prize, Andromache (XIV.21), could also foreshadow his darker future.⁷⁸⁷ And, Achilles' ghostly advice to Neoptolemos to be 'gentle' could be loaded in the same way as Herakles' warning to the same character in Sophocles' *Philoktetes*;⁷⁸⁸ a key difference being, that in the *Posthomerica* Neoptolemos has *already* killed Priam. The comment, though, may resonate, and evoke the more traditional model. Yet, no explicit indication is given of the unsavoury end that awaits the young hero.

Rather, overt reference to Neoptolemos' post-death state is marked as his apotheosis is foreshadowed (*Post.* III.760-62). In this, not only does Quintus deviate from traditional handlings of Neoptolemos' biography,⁷⁸⁹ but Neoptolemos' elevated post-death status has extremely *positive* connotations. Neoptolemos will join illustrious company in deed: in this poem: Dionysus and Herakles (III.772), Achilles (774-79)⁷⁹⁰ and 'perhaps',⁷⁹¹ Memnon (II.650-51). Such immortality is also conferred on Memnon (*Aith.* Arg.2) and Achilles (*Aith.* Arg.4) in the *Cycle*; and Aeneas (*Aen.* I.259-60 and XII.794-95).⁷⁹² As

⁷⁸⁶ The plot is preserved in the *Odyssey* scholia, and Eustathius (Gantz, 690).

⁷⁸⁷ Who unwittingly causes him so many troubles with Hermione; e.g., Eur. *Andromache*.

⁷⁸⁸ See discussion above.

⁷⁸⁹ (Though, cf. Pindar's VIIth *Paeon*) and epic theology; Quintus makes use of the same as regards Achilles too, *Post.* III.771-74; see James (2004) 288n.771-74.

⁷⁹⁰ For Achilles' apotheosis, see Chs.II.1.4 and III.3.2.

⁷⁹¹ For discussion of interactional particles, see Ch.V.2.1ii.

⁷⁹² As noted in the *OCD* (2003), 23.

will be discussed below, that Quintus' representation of Neoptolemos goes way beyond his traditional negative reception, actually writing his apotheosis into his mythic life, communicates striking meta-poetic implications for Neoptolemos, the poem and the poet.

Of other *major* heroes from Troy,⁷⁹³ who have marked futures, Quintus is not silent.⁷⁹⁴ Whilst the primary narrator's reference to Agamemnon's leading away of Cassandra (*Post.* XIV.20) may only be suggestive of his terrible fate at Argos,⁷⁹⁵ the imprecation of the mad Aias has far stronger connotations: he curses the Greeks, but especially Agamemnon (*Post.* V.472-75),⁷⁹⁶ and Odysseus (*Post.* V.470-72). The latter's damning is further evoked at the *Posthomerica*'s end, as Athene rejoices in Lokrian Aias' punishment, but also laments Odysseus' sufferings (*Post.* XIV.628-31).⁷⁹⁷ Although Odysseus eventually overcomes his problems, there are no such heavily pointed dark forebodings in the case of Neoptolemos. Thus one could conclude that omission of reference to Neoptolemos post-Troy, 'good' or 'bad', is fairly exceptional and highly significant.

Quintus' overriding tendency in the *Posthomerica* is to portray Neoptolemos in a positive fashion. This tendency is marked not only in his dealings with his fellow Greeks, such as Nestor, but also even in his engagement, or noticeable absence of it, in relation to the Trojans, too. Quintus renders his Neoptolemos different from his more traditional self, by excluding him from certain negative portrayals completely, such as the killing of Astyanax, and by diminishing his part in less favourable narratives; for instance, his killing of Priam, in which the old king's demands for death fundamentally impact upon the characterization of the young hero. A further key tendency of Quintus', to exaggerate pathos in order to add greater drama to his narrative, creates tension at points, particularly with reference to Neoptolemos. The hero cannot, at the same time, be characterized

⁷⁹³ Note Antiphos, saved from Eurypylos, only for the Cyclops, after Troy (*Post.* VIII.124-27); as in *Od.* II.17-20, noted by James (2004), 312n.124-7.

⁷⁹⁴ On foreshadowing and flashback, see Chs.II.3 and III.3.3; also Schmitz (2007b), 65-84, and Duckworth (1936).

⁷⁹⁵ See *Agamemnon*, 1431-447.

⁷⁹⁶ This curse also recalls the same in *Aias*, 841-42; on which, see James (2004), 299n.65-81. See too James and Lee (2000), 131n.474-75.

⁷⁹⁷ See *Od.* I.11ff., which, as the end of the *Iliad* to Quintus' opening, is anticipated in the *Posthomerica*'s close. See Ch.V.1.1-2, on the *Posthomerica*'s beginning and ending.

positively, when the role he performs in the narrative suggests otherwise. Quintus' handling of Polyxena's sacrifice and Neoptolemos' involvement in it is perhaps one of the most pertinent cases in point, where this problematic is notably marked. Even here, though, Quintus does much to reduce Neoptolemos' negativity, albeit less successful than in other episodes; and, perhaps the key to Neoptolemos' involvement is that he is responsible for bringing about the Greeks' *nostos*, in effect, the end of the War. Diminished involvement in certain narratives, sometimes extending to complete omission, is also matched by Quintus' silence on Neoptolemos' post-Troy afterlife. So universally negative are the traditions of Neoptolemos' afterlife that mere mention of them could cause Quintus' parfit knyght to buckle under the strain, and the old beast leap forth. In this section, I have intended to show that while Quintus' Neoptolemos is not characterized in a purely positive way (which the weight of tradition renders difficult), his more traditional negative depiction is greatly reduced. As my title on this discussion indicates: *more parfit gentil knyght, than Hyrcanian beast*.

Part 2 - *The Budding Hero*

2.1 *Skyros and Beyond*

The Posthomerian Neoptolemos is first encountered not in Troy, but in Skyros: initially, he is mentioned just after Achilles' death⁷⁹⁸ by the primary narrator (*Post.* III.754, where Skyros is noted); then by Kalchas (VI.65-7; again Skyros is noted); finally Neoptolemos features at Skyros (VI.169-70). Introduction in this locale is significant for various reasons. Skyros plays a part in Achilles' pre-Troy biography (*Il.* IX.666-68, XIX.326-333; *Od.* XI.506-09), although Homer does not wish to draw too much attention to it, unlike Statius (e.g., *Ach.* 5).⁷⁹⁹ So, whilst the narrative focuses on Neoptolemos, mention of the locale also evokes Achilles, and therefore the close link between the two – going beyond the fact that they share a father/ son relationship.

⁷⁹⁸ For the structural significance of Neoptolemos being mentioned so soon after Achilles' death, see below, 3.2.

⁷⁹⁹ See too Schol. (D) *Il.* XIX.326; *Cyp.* Arg.7; *Ilias Mikra* Arg.3. On Achilles' 'youth', see Ch.II.3.3; Achilles was educated by Phoenix (*Il.* IX.438ff.), not Cheiron; though cf. *Il.* XI.832.

With reference to Neoptolemos and the Skyros, a further significant point to consider is that the locale is Neoptolemos' home, and the only place he has known. Again, the significance goes beyond the superficial. For Neoptolemos, Skyros also signifies the divide between youth and adulthood. For the young hero, this is incredibly important, as, traditionally, maturation is hampered by the things of one's youth; this includes home. Telemachos is perhaps the best epic example of this point, as his heroic development is hindered by remaining on his *patria*, Ithaka. He *must* leave to develop, to fulfil his heroic potential; *and* to find out about his absent father. In part, Neoptolemos shares this heroic necessity, and Quintus evokes Telemachos at points. However, there is a fundamental difference between the two: whilst Telemachos needs to leave home to practise being a hero, it is made clear that Neoptolemos *already* possesses these skills, i.e. *at* home. A key part of Neoptolemos' characterization, then, is not so much the process of acquisition, as the process of revelation. As will be discussed, this is important because Quintus uses Neoptolemos' revelatory process to communicate ideas about his epic.⁸⁰⁰

Quintus, however, toys with issues raised in previous texts, concerning the epic journey of the young hero. Heroic maturation is threatened by women, the mothers: like Thetis in Statius (*Ach.* I.31ff.),⁸⁰¹ Deidameia wishes to protect her son from Troy (*Post.* VII.254ff.); though, in the *Posthomeric*, Thetis (with Neoptolemos and the other Nereids) is overjoyed (*kecharonto*, 353) by the prospect of her grandson leaving Skyros for Troy. Furthermore, maternal tears for the young hero, which, of course can also be used to divert the child from his heroic path, feature in Neoptolemos' Skyros, and Telemachos' Ithaka (*Od.* II.372-76). Like Telemachos, Neoptolemos shrewdly wishes to keep news of his departure from his mother (*Post.* VII.235-37).

Deidameia and Penelope are afraid that they will lose their child, as well as the child's father (regarding the fathers, these fears are legitimized because they have already been realized) (*Post.* VII.242-52; cf. *Od.* IV.724-34). A difference, though, is that while Telemachos does not tell his mother that he will leave his home, Neoptolemos does.

⁸⁰⁰ See below, and 3.

⁸⁰¹ See Dilke (2005).

Quintus shows the concerns of the young hero to be well founded. On discovering that Neoptolemos is to leave, Deidameia, weeping, begs him to stay (*Post.* VII.254ff.).⁸⁰²

Quintus also expresses Neoptolemos' maturity in a novel way:

'He (Neoptolemos) was already intent on war the cause of tears though still a boy (*paidnos*), still beardless (*achnoos*)⁸⁰³ It was his courage and strength that spurred him on. He hurried from his homeland (*patres*)... .' (*Post.* VII.356-58ff.)

Neoptolemos bucks the usual relational trend between youth (*paidnos*, *achnoos*, *Post.* VII. 357) and martial prowess (*polemoio*, 356; *alke*, 357; *menos*, 358); the beardlessness normally a symbol of immaturity (as it was of Statius' Achilles), though, as Neoptolemos, the juxtaposition between youth and heroic maturity is heightened to show just how brilliant the young hero is. The idea has also found expression in Homer's *Odyssey*, where Telemachos' maturity (in more than just a physical sense) is equated with facial hair (*geneiesanta*, *Od.* XVIII.176, 269). It needs to be considered, though, that Telemachos' new found 'maturity' is not apparent from his *first* appearance. Rather, his more mature state takes a time to evolve, the above references to his 'beard' coming many books after his debut, a debut in which there is a huge disparity between being young and being prepared. Telemachos needs to get a beard to be a 'man'. Neoptolemos does not. Again, this indicates that Neoptolemos is already endowed with qualities far beyond his youth and experiences. It is further marked in that these words are the primary narrator's. This reference also impacts on a meta-literary level, when, in the much awaited epic invocation, the primary narrator alludes to his poetic prowess *before* he had a beard (*prin ... ioulon*, *Post.* XII.309).⁸⁰⁴ I discuss the 'character' of primary narrator in Chapter V, but it is worth considering this particular similarity which strongly suggests the affinity Quintus' narrator shares with his super-hero, Neoptolemos. As Aeneas in Virgil's *Aeneid*, Neoptolemos' marked pre-eminence in the *Posthomerica*, communicates more than just the brilliance of

⁸⁰² This invites comparison with Andromache's pleas to Hektor: (*Post.* VII.289-91; cf. *Il.* VI.487-89), as noted by James (2004), 308n.289-91.

⁸⁰³ My italics. Compare Statius' Achilles, 'Nor yet is his first youth changing with new down' (*Ach.* I.163), and Pindar's child-hero Achilles (*Nem.* III.43ff.).

⁸⁰⁴ Further on Neoptolemos'/primary narrator's 'beardlessness', see Ch.V.3.1, *Age*.

the hero. It also suggests a poetic assertion: previous heroes had certain qualities; *my* heroes match and surpass these. Thus, I (narrator/ poet) am a worthy heir (e.g., to Homer).

Neoptolemos is also shown as unusually mature in other ways. Not only was he already practising the art of war when the Greeks arrived at Skyros, he was doing this *in spite* of the grief he felt for his father's death (*Post.* VII.170ff.). Thus he practices *sophrosyne* (restraint), both way beyond his tender years, and absent from many more 'mature' heroes; such as the Iliadic Achilles.⁸⁰⁵ This intellectual maturity is also evident in the weighty burden Neoptolemos accepts, regarding the desperate need the Greeks have for him (*Post.* VII.220ff); again, this can be sharply contrasted with the Iliadic Achilles, who abandons the Greeks to their own doom, in fact worse – *he* is the destructive catalyst (*Il.* I.1ff.). Furthermore, whereas lesser⁸⁰⁶ heroes, like Telemachos,⁸⁰⁷ frequently doubt (sometimes to the great annoyance of the gods) that they are up to the task,⁸⁰⁸ these vacillations do not feature in Neoptolemos' psyche; his heroism is sound. Taking these factors into account, this begs the question, if Neoptolemos already seems to be an unusually mature young hero, unlike say Homer's Telemachos, who is his recognition really for?

Whilst the *Odyssey* focused on the return (*nostos*) of the father, Quintus now concentrates on the 'return' of the son; though the return here is fundamentally different, as it is more a *debut*. As discussed above, Neoptolemos' maturity is already evident when arriving at Troy; he has the skills of a great hero, but, up to this point (Troy), merely lacks the stage on which to exhibit them. Regarding his father, as Telemachos, Neoptolemos' learning shall be a longer and more protracted process. Key differences, though, are that Telemachos needs Odysseus not only as a father, but also as a hero to safeguard his home, Ithaka. In contrast, Neoptolemos cannot literally find his father, as he is dead, and, he already possesses the heroic attributes to accomplish what is required in battle context.

⁸⁰⁵ Cf. *Iliad* I.193-98: Athene stops Achilles killing Agamemnon

⁸⁰⁶ In terms of being less prepared/ less able to act independently.

⁸⁰⁷ And Apollonius' Jason, e.g. *Argon.* I.460-71. On Jason's heroism, see Hunter (2004), 15-25.

⁸⁰⁸ E.g. *Od.* III.226-28 = Telemachos' doubt; III.230ff., = Athene's critique of these doubts.

Having left Skyros and now approaching Troy, the contingent, of whom Neoptolemos is part, witness the dire straits that the Argives are in – Eurypylos is pressing their fortifications hard. This sequence differs from that in Proklos’ summary of the *Ilias Mikra* (Arg.3), where Neoptolemos’ arrival *precedes* that of Eurypylos. By using an alternative sequence, Quintus heightens the drama (rather as Achilles with Hektor in the *Iliad*, the absence of the preeminent Greek means the Trojan forces, and their greatest hero, begins to encroach on the Greek territory). The hero’s Troy-debut, however, is eagerly awaited by all (including the reader and audience, as well as the characters of the story), who could legitimately ask whether Neoptolemos will be ‘up to the task’. The delay itself maximizes the impact of Neoptolemos’ entrance, but its narrative positioning also demarcates its centrality. Furthermore, early allusions to Achilles, and therefore the *Iliad*, in Neoptolemos’ portrayal, plus the sense of debut on numerous levels (e.g. Neoptolemos’ arrival in Troy, ‘first’ battle, and test as Achilles’ progeny) add to the anticipation and prominence of Quintus’ (super-)hero.⁸⁰⁹

Significantly, Neoptolemos’ journey from Skyros helps establish his lineage. As a narrative device, Quintus uses this to communicate the development of his hero – Achilles’ son, who, by journeying from his *patria*, will move into his *pater*’s most illustrious territory. This ‘journey’ can be understood literally and metaphorically, as Troy is the signifier of Achilles and the *Iliad*. Neoptolemos has much baggage, then, and weighty tasks as he accepts the epic challenge. Not only will he show himself to be his father’s son, but he is also Quintus’ supreme challenge to epic as he (Quintus) attempts to live up to his poetic ‘ancestor’, Homer.

Famous ‘fathers’ (literal and metaphorical), however, can be hugely problematic for their children, especially male heirs.⁸¹⁰ Deidameia tells Neoptolemos that, ‘Not even your father could escape the doom of death but was destroyed in action, *who was better*

⁸⁰⁹ On Neoptolemos as Quintus’ ‘super-hero’, see 3.

⁸¹⁰ As discussed below, especially regarding Neoptolemos as Quintus challenge to Homer; e.g. 3.3.

(*prophereske*, *Post.* VII.274) than you ... ’ (272ff.).⁸¹¹ Though not accurate in the sense that Neoptolemos is *not* inferior to Achilles in the *Posthomerica*, Deidameia’s concern incorporates significant implications. In a sense, this is a (perhaps ‘the’) defining point for Neoptolemos. Deidameia’s claim expresses fundamental issues regarding Neoptolemos. At the level of text, ‘we’ (the readers) know that he is Achilles’ son. Yet, ‘we’ do *not* know whether Neoptolemos is up to the task of fulfilling the role left absent by his dead father in this fictional world, and, therefore by implication, whether Quintus’ construct can hold the narrative together. Since Homer’s *Iliad*, the narrative of ancient epic had been galvanized through the centrality of particular heroes: the *Iliad* had Achilles; the *Odyssey*, Odysseus (and Telemachos in his absence in the narrative); the *Argonautica*, Jason; the *Aeneid*, Aeneas. So, when Deidameia articulates concern for Neoptolemos, one is also made aware of the problematic facing the epic lacking a dominant model through which to propel the narrative.

Deidameia’s claim, that Neoptolemos will not measure up to Achilles, not only adds to the dramatic immediate tension *in the Posthomerica*; that of a mother’s sadness for losing her son (echoing that of Thetis for Achilles in the *Iliad*, and in Statius), and the issue raised of whether Neoptolemos will (can) emulate his father. It also invites the reader to recall, and engage with, other of Neoptolemos’ narratives. Neoptolemos’ ‘idealization’ (or, at least, the negative in his portrayal being reduced), has been discussed in Part 1. But, it is worth recalling this traditional negative biography. In one sense, Quintus’ Deidameia is an astute critic of Neoptolemos’ character; *but not the Posthomerica one*. Thus, an intertextual reading of Deidameia’s claim also reminds us that Neoptolemos had not been an adequate substitute for Achilles. In fact, far from it; he had been degenerate, *much* less than his father.⁸¹²

⁸¹¹ Not being able to escape death echoes Achilles’ words regarding himself and Herakles (*Il.* XVIII.117-18), and himself and Patroklos (to Lykaon, XXI.107-13); the latter also communicates the idea, as Deidameia, that Patroklos was ‘better’. Cf. Andromache’s concerns for Penthesileia, which, unlike Deidameia for Neoptolemos, prove to be well-founded (*Post.* I.100-114). See Ch.I.1.1.

⁸¹² See 1 for précis of Neoptolemos’ traditional negative portrayal.

The importance of living up to a father is central in early epic, as indicated, for instance, by Achilles in the *Iliad*, and Telemachos in the *Odyssey*. Amongst other things,⁸¹³ Quintus underlines this point when Neoptolemos tells Agamemnon that, god-willing, he hopes not to shame Achilles' reputation (*Post.* VII.701-04). Furthermore, the 'marveled' (*ethambeon*) response to his reply communicates how impressed the characters are with Neoptolemos (*anera dion*, *Post.* VII.706), whilst the primary narrator's comment is telling, too, and further substantiates his credentials: ὡς ἄρ' ἔφη πινυτῆσιν ἀρηρέμενος φρεσὶ θυμόν (*Post.* VII.705).⁸¹⁴ Such characteristics are noteworthy, not only for their qualities, but also because Neoptolemos lacks the guidance of a father. Because Achilles *is* dead, Neoptolemos does not have the opportunity that Telemachos does. On facing the enraged relatives of the suitors, Odysseus tells Telemachos that this is his chance to not to disgrace his father (*Od.* XXIV.506ff.). Telemachos agrees (*Od.* XXIV.511-2). This causes old Laertes to rejoice that his son and grandchild are competing over who is the bravest (*Od.* XXIV.514-15). Neoptolemos cannot engage in the traditional inter-generational competition, but his 'worthiness', as his father's son is expressed in other ways. Again these can be understood on a meta-poetic level, as Quintus asserting his own position in epic.

2.2 Getting the Recognition Neoptolemos Deserves

Though memory and *kleos* play a vital part in the hero's world,⁸¹⁵ reminiscences mean that Neoptolemos' experience of his father is still only indirect. Through the promise of gifts (concrete *time, dor'*; *Post.* VII.193) from the Achaeans, and Achilles' trademark immortal arms (*Post.* VII.194ff.),⁸¹⁶ for Neoptolemos' services, Odysseus acts as a catalyst, introducing Neoptolemos to the heroic world which he has not known. Odysseus provides a précised *ekphrasis* of the arms (*Post.* VII.194-205),⁸¹⁷ of which he notes Neoptolemos will be thrilled. Odysseus' foreshadowing of Neoptolemos' response recalls that of Achilles for the same arms in the *Iliad*; they act as catalyst for Achilles' extreme

⁸¹³ Such as the importance of father/ son reunion. See Achilles' visit too Neoptolemos following.

⁸¹⁴ Compare Telemachos' epithet, *pepnumenos* ('wise'), e.g. *Od.* I.213, 367, 388, etc.

⁸¹⁵ See, for instance, Achilles' *klea andron* (*Il.* IX.189). See Goldhill (1999), esp. ch. 2

⁸¹⁶ On these arms, see Ch.II.2.3. See too Maciver (2007), 259-84.

⁸¹⁷ Which recalls *Posthomerica* V.2-120.

heroism, revealing his true supernatural nature (*Il.* XIX.15-18). One needs to bear in mind, that whilst Achilles had spent nearly ten years at Troy, Neoptolemos has just arrived.⁸¹⁸

Prior to the symbolic locale shift from his home on Skyros to the battle fields of Troy, Neoptolemos' talents are immediately apparent; this, however, will be reinforced to an even greater extent, as Neoptolemos' narrative shifts stage to Troy. In this way, the character is inseparable from the narrative, and vice versa. Thus to completely fulfil his major role in epic, Neoptolemos must be recognized through his *Trojan* presence.

Unlike Telemachos, at a similar life-changing point (both must prove their maturity and heroic worth), Neoptolemos does not appear to require supervision. This is evident from his first appearance. The primary narrator's focalization of what they (the men sent to recruit him) see, and through what Odysseus says, qualify Neoptolemos' heroic maturity. When the Greeks (at Skyros) first see Neoptolemos they are struck by how like his Achilles he is, physically and in his behaviour (*Post.* VII.170-77). Therefore, Neoptolemos' 'stock' is both unmistakeable and unquestionable. The primary narrator notes 'Achilleus' son' (*Post.* VII.170)⁸¹⁹ is found shooting arrows and spears, and exercising his horses; thus, already behaving as a hero.⁸²⁰

When Odysseus tells Neoptolemos they are friends of Achilles, *euptolemos*, '(the) skilled warrior' (*Post.* VII.183), the father's *nature* is recalled, and more. Connexion between who the father was, and who Neoptolemos is (could be), is evident in Odysseus' announcing that they are friends of 'mighty Achilles': *euptolemos* (/ = Neoptolemos), the pun being significant. However, Odysseus touches a raw (heroic) nerve as he challenges Neoptolemos' identity: 'Whose son men say you are ...' (184). But, such 'fighting talk'

⁸¹⁸ Cf. Evander's lament on Pallas killed in his battling debut (*Aen.* XI.152-81).

⁸¹⁹ Important in itself because his lineage is recalled.

⁸²⁰ Here Neoptolemos more appropriately fits Pindar's 'natural', than does Telemachos; 'inborn valour' (*συγγενεῖ ... εὐδοξία*), as opposed to nurture, marks the true hero (*Nem.* III.40ff.). Pindar is also useful here, in providing a brief account of Achilles' early brilliance. A *child* (*pais*, 44) in Philyra's (Cheiron's mother) home, he performed *mighty deeds* (*megala erga*, 44); like Quintus' Neoptolemos.

would appear to be in line with other Odyssean manipulations.⁸²¹ The opportunity to confirm his identity quickly presents itself as Odysseus asks Neoptolemos to have pity on them, and rescue the Argives by coming to Troy (*Post.* VII.191-92): in short, to fulfil the function of Achilleus (see Odysseus' appeal to Achilleus, *Il.* IX.225ff.).

These striking similarities between heroic father and inexperienced son, again have Odyssean antecedents, namely, in the form of Telemachos.⁸²² Neoptolemos' innate abilities and heroic maturity are emphasized by closely associating him with Achilleus. It is the recognition by others (secondary characters directly, and focalized recognition by the primary narrator), that creates this effect, and Quintus frequently employs this method throughout the *Posthomerica*.⁸²³

Odysseus also fulfils this function (together with other heroes), telling Neoptolemos heroic tales of Achilleus as they sail for Troy. These educational tales cover his father's heroic biography from sailing to Troy, to his battle with Memnon (*Post.* VII.377-81); one notes a similar function being performed in the tales Telemachos hears of his father, Odysseus.⁸²⁴ (Furthermore, perhaps there is a significant echo in the telling of great heroism beginning with Achilleus' lengthy voyage, whilst Neoptolemos too sails to Troy.) This obviously has the desired effect, as the primary narrator notes, by inspiring Neoptolemos to greatness like Achilleus (*Post.* VII.382-83). But it is with the arrival in his new world, Troy, and facing new challenges and characters that Neoptolemos really begins to demonstrate who he is.

Neoptolemos receives a hero's welcome after his first battle at Troy (*Post.* VII.679ff.).⁸²⁵ As with Achilleus in his *return* to the fighting, in *Iliad* XIX.243-48,⁸²⁶ Neoptolemos is showered with gifts. Neoptolemos' response to these recall his Skyros reaction having

⁸²¹ E.g. see *Il.* IX.225ff.; *Phil.* 54ff.; Stanford (1992), esp. chs.II and V; Detienne and Vernant (1978); Murnaghan (1987).

⁸²² Helen recognises Telemachos almost immediately (*Od.*IV.138ff.). Cf. Nestor (*Od.* III.122-23), and Menelaos (*Od.* IV.60-4), who initially are not sure who their visitor is. Quintus' Neoptolemos is fundamentally different as there is no doubt of his ancestry.

⁸²³ See following.

⁸²⁴ E.g., Nestor (*Od.* III.120ff.), and Menelaos (*Od.* IV.106ff.).

⁸²⁵ For arrival/reception of other heroes in Quintus, see 1.4i.

⁸²⁶ On which, see James (2004), 311n.679-83.

heard tales of his father:⁸²⁷ ‘At these the heart of Neoptolemos glowed with joy’ (*Post.* VII.684). However, this is a step further in his development. The gifts, though in a sense as ‘up front’ payment for his heroic services, are no longer merely promises of honours (as Odysseus in Skyros) that he will receive.⁸²⁸ The young warrior has now realized some of his potential in his initial onslaught at Troy (474ff.); his abilities, and their maturity, were never in doubt, but now they find expression in their appropriate context – war itself.

This can be shown virtually every time he figures in the text – as a character in his own right or as acknowledged by another. As the Greeks, the Trojans note his heroic appearance (mistaking him for Achilles). However, this illusion is maintained far longer than in the *Iliad*, where Patroklos is initially mistaken for Achilleus at *Iliad* XVI.278-82. Yet, this identity is questioned by Sarpedon at XVI.423-24, and known by Glaukos at XVI.543. Neoptolemos is first mistaken for Achilleus in *Post.* VII.537-39,⁸²⁹ and the confusion over his identity still continues into Book IX, where Trojan Antenor prays that ‘Achilleus’ (or one looking very much like him), is turned from Troy (*Post.* IX.9-13). The idea that perhaps Achilleus did not die has meta-literary implications, in that Neoptolemos all but ‘becomes’ him as the figure that Quintus stresses is certainly a worthy substitute and (as Quintus for Homer) heir.⁸³⁰

Phoenix’ focalized recognition of Neoptolemos and his speech in *Posthomerica* VII serves the function of characterizing Neoptolemos for the reader too. This scene recalls the exceptionally close relationship between Phoenix and Achilleus in the *Iliad*. Embracing Neoptolemos ‘as a father would a son’, reminds the reader of Phoenix’ ‘surrogate’ role, standing in for Achilleus’ absent father, Peleus. Furthermore, Phoenix’ closeness to Neoptolemos is also implied in Cyclic accounts of Phoenix calling him ‘Neoptolemos’ (because Achilleus was ‘young’, *neos*, when ‘warring’, *polemein*), as opposed to

⁸²⁷ See above.

⁸²⁸ On objects as register of worth, see below, 2.3.

⁸²⁹ A distinction needs to be made between being mistaken for Achilleus (as in the Trojan case), and being just like him (e.g. as noted by Odysseus, Briseis, Phoenix, etc.). In the former, Neoptolemos’ true identity is not known; in the latter, it is.

⁸³⁰ See also, 3.

Lycomedes' 'Pyrrhus', as noted in Pausanias (X.26.4).⁸³¹ But, it also recalls Telemachos for Odysseus, as the quote continues: '... who, after suffering for a long time, by the god's will comes back home to his father's great delight' (*Post.* VII.638-39). Quintus' Phoenix recalls their (Phoenix' and Achilles') 'father/ son' relationship. But Phoenix goes further by telling Neoptolemos of his remarkable physical likeness to his father; his father's brilliance; and of the suffering his father's death has brought him (Phoenix). This super compact potted-history from one so close performs the function of further establishing who Neoptolemos is for the young hero himself, and the reader. Phoenix educates Neoptolemos further, through instructing him that he must help the Greeks, by asserting his supremacy over Eurypylos, as Achilles did over his father Telephos.

Also in this episode, Phoenix advises Neoptolemos to redirect anger at Achilles' death against his enemies (*Post.* VII.661-66). This conveys restraint, but also a type of transmission: Neoptolemos, like Quintus, internalizes and then reconfigures Achilles. Thus, the past (Achilles), merges into the future (Achilles), in the sense of an *epigonos* who resembles, in nature and abilities, the father (again, this can be understood in a metapoetic sense: Quintus, like Neoptolemos, heir apparent, e.g. to Homer, and the epic tradition). The young hero, new to war, is advised of the heroic course he is to take, and also reminded of his father's great deed (here against Telephos). As in many, if not all of the recognition scenes involving Neoptolemos and the characters noted above, this evokes similar scenes in the *Odyssey*, where Telemachos learns who his father is (was?), and who he needs to be.⁸³²

2.3 Material Worlds: *Locus Operandi*

The 'objects' (armour and captive women) evident when Neoptolemos makes his way to his father's quarters also have added meaning, as they are (with Skyros and Troy) material signifiers of the father. Yet since of the two (Achilles and Neoptolemos), it is now only Neoptolemos who can enter the locale, powerful senses of transfer and replacement are

⁸³¹ Homer only uses 'Neoptolemos', *Il.* XIX.326 (see M. Edwards (1991), 273n.326-27), and *Od.* XI.506. On Neoptolemos' name, including 'Pyrrhus' (*Πύρρος*, 'fiery-haired'), see too Austin (1980), 123n.263 and 185-86n.469. Phoenix is also associated with Neoptolemos' recruitment (Schol. (D) *Il.* XIX.326; fr. 19).

⁸³² See footnote above, on Telemachos with Nestor, Menelaos and Helen.

conveyed: the dead king cannot return, but his son can. Neoptolemos finds armour from foes Achilles had vanquished, and he is surrounded by captive women, making the quarters ready as if Achilles was returning (*Post.* VII.710ff.), which, in a sense, he is; it has already been established that Neoptolemos will have the same value for the Greeks that Achilles' had, and that he possesses equal qualities.

Intimate occasions such as this also trigger the greatest response from Neoptolemos;⁸³³ here, sorrow. The teething process, even for heroes, is a painful one, and the pain also serves a function of binding the father and son more closely, emotionally. As he witnesses his father's quarters, the armour of Achilles' slaughtered foes and the presence of the captive women preparing the quarters as if Achilles were still alive, make Neoptolemos groan with longing for Achilles (*ἔρος δέ μιν εἶλε τοκῆος*, *Post.* VII.714). Thus Neoptolemos is physically immersed in his father's world, but a world in which that father is absent – so, as the following simile indicates, the son takes his physical place, though the psychological aspect is revealing in another way. On seeing Neoptolemos, those responding and their response are telling. The primary narrator notes:

δμῳαὶ δέ μιν ἀμφογάσαντο·
 καὶ δ' αὐτὴ Βρισησίς, ὅτ' ἔδρακεν υἱὸν Ἀχιλλῆος,
 ἄλλοτε μὲν θυμῷ μέγ' ἐγρήθευεν, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
 ἄχρυτ' Ἀχιλλῆος μεμνημένη· ἐν δέ οἱ ἦτορ
 ἀμφοσίη βεβόλητο κατὰ φρένας, ὡς ἑτέον περ
 αὐτοῦ ἔτι ζώντος ἀπαρβέος Αἰακίδαο.

'Round him the servants were filled with wonder. Among them Briseis, as she looked on the son of Achilles, now was thrilled with joy in her heart, now wrung with grief at the memory of Achilles. Her heart within her was struck with speechless wonder, for it was as if Aiakos' dauntless grandson himself was still alive.' (*Post.* VII.722-27)

The episode is very evocative, and fuses various texts and episodes: Neoptolemos' lamenting recalls that of *Iliad* XVIII.318-22, for Patroklos, as the simile (discussed following) confirms. The presence and lament of the captive women and Briseis, however, echo *Iliad* XIX.287-301. Furthermore, the same (presence and lament of Achilles'

⁸³³ On Neoptolemos' visit to Achilles' tomb, see below.

captive women and Briseis) also recalls *Posthomerica* III.544ff., where the dead, and death of, Achilles was initially bemoaned. Thus, a Posthomeric episode engages with a previous Posthomeric episode, which had itself exploited another text. This fusion of inter/intra-texts shows how Quintus internalizes and then reconfigures models, to present them as his own.⁸³⁴

This also has interesting implications, as Briseis, like Neoptolemos' mother Deidameia, was Achilles' lover. So (as Deidameia), Briseis' response is especially important, and, perhaps, raises interesting questions regarding the absence of Neoptolemos' parents; Briseis appears a type of surrogate parent to Neoptolemos that Phoenix was to Achilles, and is now to Neoptolemos. In this way, Neoptolemos has a type of quasi-family at Troy. Also, what is the nature of Neoptolemos' relationship with his father's captive women, including, particularly, Briseis? And are there any sexual implications? If so, is there something of the 'Oedipus' here? Neoptolemos does not literally kill his father; although he renders him unnecessary. Still, he moves onto his patch, and takes his woman.⁸³⁵

The arms serve the function of an early and significant material prompt at Troy as to who Neoptolemos is. Concerning the arms, accounts vary as to who ultimately receives them. In the *Odyssey*, though Odysseus informs Achilles of Neoptolemos' brilliance, no mention is made of him giving the arms to Neoptolemos, only that Odysseus wins them (*Od.* XI.545-46). In part, this seems to agree with *Philoktetes*, where Odysseus appears to keep them (*Phil.* 62ff., 362ff.).⁸³⁶ On the other hand, the *Ilias Mikra* had Odysseus pass them to Neoptolemos (Arg.3; and Apollodoros notes that Odysseus gives them to Neoptolemos 'willingly', *hekontos*, *Epit.* v.11). Quintus' version of the ownership of arms says a great deal about Neoptolemos and his incontestable status as his father's heir and equal.

⁸³⁴ See, esp., Achilles, Ch.II.2.

⁸³⁵ See following, 'The 'Neoptolemos' Complex', 3.3.

⁸³⁶ On which, see Webster (1970, 73n.62), who cites a red-figure cup (c. 490 BC), which, on the inside, has Odysseus handing the arms to Neoptolemos.

The ease with which Neoptolemos receives the arms is as effortless as the manner in which he proves his mettle: again, his transition from youth on Skyros, to hero on Troy, is virtually seamless. Almost immediately Neoptolemos is decked in Achilles' armour, which, the primary narrator notes, makes him look exactly like Achilles (*Post.* VII.445ff.); it fits perfectly, another indication of proximity with his (at this stage literally unknown by its new wearer) father. This invites comparison with the same in the *Iliad*, where Patroklos wears Achilles' arms (*Il.* XVI.130ff.), and is mistaken for Achilles himself by the Trojans (*Il.* XVI.278-83). However, noteworthy differences are Patroklos' inability to wield Achilles' mammoth spear (*Il.* XVI.140-144); Neoptolemos not only wields this (presumably the same Pelian-ash spear), but he also does it with *ease* (*rhedios*, *Post.* VII.451); '*rhedios*' reverberates later with Priam,⁸³⁷ perhaps aligning the ease with which Neoptolemos 'becomes' Achilles, with his ability to kill. The spear is also a paternal legacy: from Peleus to Achilles (*Il.* XIX.387); Achilles (by proxy), to Neoptolemos. Also, this is Achilles' second set of arms, not that lost in Patroklos' battle with Hektor, but its supernatural replacement, forged specifically for Achilles by Hephaistos (*Il.* XVIII.457-61; *Post.* VII.446-50). Furthermore, Neoptolemos (unlike Patroklos in *Iliad* XVI),⁸³⁸ is no substitute leader, and he takes the initiative *independently*, leading the Greeks into battle,⁸³⁹ to defend their wall (*Post.* VII.474ff.). In this sense, too, he behaves more like a seasoned warrior than someone 'new to war'.⁸⁴⁰

Further examples help crystallize the importance of physical signifiers of character: namely, Neoptolemos' visiting of his father's quarters (*Post.* VII.708ff.); his 'tomb' (*tumbos*, *Post.* IX.46ff.); and, then the climactic visitation by Achilles' himself (*Post.* XIV.180ff.). The visit by the son to locales and markers extremely closely associated with the deceased father has important implications for Neoptolemos. The place serves the function of bringing Neoptolemos symbolically closer to dead Achilles, the parent he can

⁸³⁷ See Priam's death, 1.4.

⁸³⁸ Achilles musters the army, initially (*Il.* XVI.198ff.), as is always apparent as the Myrmidon leader, giving commands, even when not fighting. This is not to say, however, that Patroklos does not lead (cf. *Il.* XVI.268-74), rather that he is never 'the' leader.

⁸³⁹ Cf. Aeneas, *Aen.* X.310ff.

⁸⁴⁰ In defiance of his name.

no longer meet. Although Troy is the grand backdrop for this, these smaller locales are more personal, thus intensifying the shadowy reunion to maximum effect. Important antecedents include Orestes' visit to Agamemnon's tomb⁸⁴¹ and Aeneas to Anchises (*Aen.* V.76). Though not father-son visits to tombs, similar emotiveness is evoked with Achilles' visit to Patroklos' tomb (*sema*, *Il.*XXIV.16),⁸⁴² and even Quintus' own Achilles and Aias for Patroklos (*sema*, *Post.* I.378; which recalls *Il.* XXIV). Proklos' account is unclear regarding who visits Achilles' tomb (*taphon*; *Iliou Persis* (Arg.4 – see above).⁸⁴³

In *Posthomerica* IX, after a truce is called so that the Greeks and Trojans can bury their dead, Neoptolemos takes the opportunity to pay his own respects to his dead father, by visiting his tomb. Neoptolemos' rhetoric, emotions (and actions), either focalized or primary, dominate the scene. This intensifies the drama, and makes the scene that much more personal; it also anticipates the climactic encounter of *Posthomerica* XIV, when the son and father are literally reunited;⁸⁴⁴ although Achilles is unable to touch his friend, and here, Neoptolemos can only kiss his father's grave marker (*Post.* XIV.47). At this point, this is the closest Neoptolemos can get to his father.

Neoptolemos greets his absent father: *χαῖρε, πάτερ* (*Post.* IX.50; cf. Aeneas' *salve, sancte parens*, *Aen.* V.80); this welcome is very important, though Neoptolemos must wait for five books for his father's reply. He also notes that he shall not forget Achilles, even in death (*Post.* IX. 50-1); the father, in fact, that he has only 'met', to date, in fragmentary form (through associated locales, other's rhetoric, his innate abilities). Furthermore, he imagines the heroic deeds they would have performed together at Troy (*Post.* IX.52-4); so too Achilles for Patroklos (*Iliad* XVI.97-100; which heightens the pathos, communicates great closeness between the two (although they have never met), and offers an alternative

⁸⁴¹ E.g. Aeschylus, *Choph.* 1ff.; Sophocles, *Elektra*, 51ff.; Euripides, *Elektra*, 90ff.

⁸⁴² On Patroklos' 'tomb', see N. Richardson (2000), 275n.14-18, and references.

⁸⁴³ On Polyxena's sacrifice, see 1.6-7.

⁸⁴⁴ See following.

gentler ‘reading’ to Neoptolemos).⁸⁴⁵ In contrast, Telemachos actually joins forces with Odysseus firstly in his scheming,⁸⁴⁶ and then in battle.⁸⁴⁷

However, Neoptolemos has obviously internalized the degree to which he resembles his father, and, thus, is fulfilling his potential. When visiting his Achilles’ tomb, Neoptolemos acknowledges:

‘But even with you far away among the dead your spear and your son in the fray are filling the foe with terror, while the Danaans rejoice in the sight of one who is like (*enalignkion*) you in body (*demas*) and spirit (*phuen*) and deeds (*erga*).’ (*Post.* IX.57-60)

As with the lion simile at *Post.* VII.715-20,⁸⁴⁸ *Post.* IX echoes Homer, but makes Neoptolemos the focus of the piece. Reference to Achilles’ spear (*son doru*, 58) is pointed, too, as *the* peculiar Achillean instrument of war. In Hades, Odysseus informs Achilles of his son’s brilliance at Troy, and notes the father’s proud response on being told of his prowess (*Od.* XI.506-40). This is an inversion of the son wishing to learn of the father, but no such report is necessary in Quintus, as the father and son *actually* meet. Not only is there father-son reunion, but also Achilles tells Neoptolemos the type of hero that he should be.⁸⁴⁹ Furthermore, that Neoptolemos is firmly located within the epic himself, is indicated and reinforced by the single and peculiar presence here of a Myrmidon contingent, and Phoenix; always directly linked to Achilles in the *Iliad*; and *Posthomerica* (*Post.* IX.63-5).⁸⁵⁰ Quintus will provide, however, further unmistakable indicators of Neoptolemos’ place in the Trojan epic.

⁸⁴⁵ On ‘gentle’ Neoptolemos and his more positive portrayal, see 1.

⁸⁴⁶ E.g., *Od.* XVI.235ff., etc.

⁸⁴⁷ *Od.* XXII.91ff., and *Od.* XXIV.506ff.

⁸⁴⁸ See below, 3.1.

⁸⁴⁹ So too the *dead* Anchises with Aeneas (*Aen.* VI.896-92).

⁸⁵⁰ See discussion of Phoenix above, 2.2.

The last, and perhaps climactic, substantiation for Neoptolemos occurs in *Posthomerica* XIV, as Neoptolemos' identity is acknowledged by the highest authority:⁸⁵¹ the father himself, Achilleus. Again, this can be understood in a meta-poetic sense: *the* signifier of Homer identifies his progeny, and his rights of inheritance: thus through Achilleus, *this* (i.e. Quintus') Neoptolemos, and therefore Quintus, are unequivocally acknowledged as legitimate heirs.

Now the scene is utterly personal, as Quintus' Neoptolemos is the only one to see the apparition.⁸⁵² This creates the effect of intensifying the focus on the characters, and the atmosphere of the scene. At last, the child meets the elusive father; and an aspect of Neoptolemos' identity and his relationship with Achilleus are finally established in Achilleus' first words: *χαῖρε, τέκος* (*Post.* XIV.185):⁸⁵³ the circuit is now complete. It is also a significant part of the portrayal of Neoptolemos that he *alone* is witness to Achilleus' phantom. Proklos notes that Achilleus appears to Neoptolemos, but gives no more information, i.e. on whether he appears to others, too (*Il. Mik.*, Arg.3). And in his summary of another lost Cyclic work, he comments that Achilleus' ghost appears to Agamemnon's *party* when preparing to sail away (*Nostoi*, Arg.3). Achilleus' appearance to Neoptolemos alone, not only has the effect of resolving the tension implied by the absent father for the young hero,⁸⁵⁴ but it also locates Neoptolemos as the figurehead for the Greeks' departure, thus elevating his heroic status further,⁸⁵⁵ and providing even more justification for the sacrificial act.⁸⁵⁶

As noted previously,⁸⁵⁷ Neoptolemos bears much more in common with Homer's Iliadic Achilleus, than with Quintus' Posthomerica one. But, even here, Quintus seems to have

⁸⁵¹ After, of course, the primary narrator; Achilleus, as secondary narrator within the narrative, adds maximum emotiveness. For discussion of narratology in Quintus, see Ch.V.

⁸⁵² Other versions do not always have Achilleus' ghost appearing to Neoptolemos *alone*: *Nostoi*, Arg.3; Eur., *Hek.*37-8, 109-15; Longinus *Sublime* on Sophocles' lost *Polyxena*, XV.7; cf. *Il. Mik.*, Arg.3, where he is alone.

⁸⁵³ As noted, see Neoptolemos' similar greeting at *Post.* IX.50.

⁸⁵⁴ As early as Book III.

⁸⁵⁵ As James notes (2004, 343n.230-33), in hindering the Greeks' departure, Neoptolemos performs the function of Euripides' Achilleus in *Hekabe* (37-9).

⁸⁵⁶ On which, see 1.6-7.

⁸⁵⁷ E.g. 1.1.

Neoptolemos ‘surpass’ his father, not in character drawing,⁸⁵⁸ but in terms of the comprehensiveness of his attributes. In this sense, the ghostly instruction of Achilles in Book XIV has perhaps come too late (we could say, at least, that the instruction was not *really* required, i.e. for Neoptolemos himself);⁸⁵⁹ for, from the first appearance of Neoptolemos, we have seen their fulfilment. For instance, Achilles tells Neoptolemos to keep his sorrow in check, and be inspired (literally) by him (*Post.* XIV.185-88). However, on Neoptolemos’ debut in Skyros, seven books *earlier*, we learn that the Greeks found him practising war, *despite* grieving for Achilles (*Post.* VII.170-75). *Teiromenos ker* (‘distressing the heart’) at *Post.* XIV.187 evokes the same at *Post.* VII.174; the difference being Achilles continues *amph’ emethen*, whilst, in Book VII, *amphi patros ktamenoio* immediately follows. This shows Neoptolemos’ maturity before Achilles’ instruction, but also the how these heroes evoke each other.

Perhaps, then, we could read Achilles’ instruction to Neoptolemos as a type of summary of the young hero’s conduct to this point; similar, in a way, to Nestor’s recap of Achilles’ heroic exploits in his song (*Post.* IV.146-68), and the bard’s song of the Trojan War (*Posthomeric* XIV.125-42).⁸⁶⁰ The nature of the rhetoric is significant, though. Rather than a retrospective account (although, in fact, this is what it mainly is), the rhetoric concentrates our attention on the reunion of father and son; the paternal guidance which Neoptolemos had literally been missed. This, I believe, is Quintus’ focus here. In this sense, then, what Achilles says is less significant, perhaps, than to whom he is speaking.

In a sense, then, it is *Neoptolemos* who is constructing an unknown (and increasingly unrealistic) father, and relationship with him. Neoptolemos states: ‘But as it was you never set eyes on your son, nor did I see you alive as I longed to do’ (*Post.* IX.55-6). The imagined deeds they would have performed together allow Neoptolemos the fantasy of

⁸⁵⁸ One could reasonably ask, ‘who has?’

⁸⁵⁹ This raises the question, then, ‘why have this scene/ the instruction?’. It seems, the answer is the dramatic and literary, rather than practical (i.e. in the sense that Neoptolemos does not ‘need’ it) function it serves: it reunites the son with missing father; impacts upon the characterization of Achilles and Neoptolemos; provides Quintus the opportunity to moralize.

⁸⁶⁰ On both songs, see Ch.II.3.1-2.

their relationship, and also stand to elevate his heroic status: he is talking like a hero. But, more is also happening here. Through the reconstruction of Achilles, as it applies to Neoptolemos (e.g. in unmistakable recognition by others, and the primary narrator's portrayal), Neoptolemos also represents Quintus' most concentrated efforts at aligning himself with Homer, as Achilles' progeny metaphorically extends the link between Homer ('father') and Quintus ('son'). And, all that this could represent, i.e. that Neoptolemos is *the* worthy heir, and more.

Part 3 – *Superhero: His Father's Son?*

3.1 *Lion-like Neoptolemos: Similar through Simile*

As discussed, the occupation (not only at the level of text, but also in a meta-literary sense) of places particularly connected with Achilles activates especially poignant associations. M. Edwards notes, "the greatest hero of a tale is likely to be compared to the most dangerous predator".⁸⁶¹ This comment applies to the Iliadic Achilles. Of the forty occurrences of lion similes in the *Iliad*,⁸⁶² five apply to Achilles;⁸⁶³ of the thirty five occurrences of lion similes in the *Posthomerica* (thirty eight if we include lioness similes), four apply to Neoptolemos.⁸⁶⁴ It is, however, not so much the quantity⁸⁶⁵ as the qualities of the similes that are particularly noteworthy; Quintus' lions are less predictable than Homer's, though they will bite (if they still have teeth).⁸⁶⁶ The idea of the lion's cub (*skumnos*) is also important. With the meaning of 'lion's cub',⁸⁶⁷ *skumnos* features only once in the *Iliad* (nowhere in the *Odyssey*), where it is applied to Patroklos (*Iliad* XVIII.319); the same features twice in the *Posthomerica* (VII.468, 717), one of which applies to Neoptolemos (717).

⁸⁶¹ M. Edwards (1991), 184n.318-22.

⁸⁶² Lion similes only occur seven times in the *Odyssey*. For a list of both, see D. Lee (1964), 65.

⁸⁶³ *Iliad* XVIII.318; XX.164; XXII.262; XXIV.41, 572. For a useful discussion of all of these similes, see Moulton (1977), 105-14.

⁸⁶⁴ *Post.* VII.464; VIII.238; IX.241, 253.

⁸⁶⁵ Achilles is matched by Hektor in the *Iliad*; Neoptolemos is surpassed by Aias and Achilles in the *Posthomerica*.

⁸⁶⁶ See especially my discussion on Achilles' 'roaring' lion (Ch.II.1.1v), and Nestor's 'old' lion (Ch.III.1.1).

⁸⁶⁷ It is also used to mean the young of an animal, i.e. not necessarily a *lion's* cub; *Post.* VII.507.

Two of these lion similes, both extended, are especially significant for understanding Quintus' reception of Neoptolemos. In *Posthomerica* VII, Neoptolemos goes to Achilles' quarters. At the sight of the armour and servants, Neoptolemos is overwhelmed with longing for Achilles,

ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀνὰ δρυμὰ πυκνὰ καὶ ἄγχεα ῥωπήεντα
 σμερδαλέοιο λέοντος ὑπ' ἀγρευτῆσι δαμέντος
 σκύμνος ἐς ἄντρον ἴκηται εὐσκίον, ἀμφὶ δὲ πάντη
 ταρφέα παπταίνει κενεὸν σπέος, ἀθρόα δ' αὐτοῦ
 ὄστέα δερχόμενος κταμένων πάρος οὐκ ὀλίγων περ
 ἵππων ἠδὲ βοῶν μεγάλ' ἄχνηται ἀμφὶ τοκῆος·

'As when in forest thickets and tangled glens, after the killing of a ferocious lion by hunters, the lion's cub comes to its shady cave and keeps on peering all round the emptiness of the den; the sight of the heaped up bones of many creature killed on former occasions, horses and cattle, makes it grieve for its parent intensely.' (*Post.* VII.715-20)

The lion clearly applies to Achilles, and, here, its cub, Neoptolemos. This simile strongly invites comparison with that at *Iliad* XVIII, where Achilles leads the lament for the recently returned corpse of Patroklos. Achilles groans,

ᾧ ῥά θ' ὑπὸ σμύμνονος ἐλαφθηβόλος ἀρπάσῃ ἀνήρ
 ὕλης ἐκ πυκινῆς· ὁ δὲ τ' ἄχνηται ὕστερος ἐλθῶν,
 πολλὰ δὲ τ' ἄγχε' ἐπῆλθε μετ' ἀνέρος ἴχνι' ἐρευνῶν,
 εἴ ποθεν ἐξεύροι· μάλα γὰρ δριμύς χόλος αἰρεῖ.

'Like a bearded lion whose cubs some hunter of stags has snatched away out of the thick wood; and the lion coming back later grieves, and through many a glen he ranges on the track of the footsteps of the man, in the hope that he may find him somewhere; for anger exceeding bitter lays hold of him.' (*Il.* XVIII 319-22).

In both instances, reference is made to the lion's locale (though more specifically in the first example). However, in Quintus it is the 'cub' (*skumnos*) that survives its lion parent (*tokeus*), returning to its (the lion's) haunt, only to be faced with its absence. Quintus, then, as the narrative would suggest, has inverted the roles: the lion grieving for its young becomes the cub grieving for its parent. This image reinforces Neoptolemos' relationship with Achilles (the lion); he is his natural heir (cub), in terms of locale and, though immature, (bestial) nature. Furthermore, it is another way that Quintus can reinforce the

relationship between the son and absent father, for reunion, at this stage, is impossible. The scene, then, also serves the function of showing how Neoptolemos can further learn about his father. The sense of legacy, conveyed through Neoptolemos' portrayal here, can also be seen to have significance for the *Posthomerica* poet: he is revisiting hallowed ground, reveals many characteristics of his metaphorical 'parent' (Homer, as *Iliad* poet), but is shown to be a worthy successor.

Quintus' use of *skumnos* is also highly significant. In Homer it is a *hapax legomenon*, and, like *meilichos*, applies to Patroklos.⁸⁶⁸ The subject of the lament in Homer, and the verbal echo of such a rare word, indicate very strongly that Quintus is also trying to evoke Patroklos, in part, in his version of Neoptolemos. This has the effect also of presenting a gentler model, and, thus, distancing him from his more traditional negative construct.⁸⁶⁹

I now turn to the second of the extended lion similes. Neoptolemos is literally just about to make his battling debut in Troy:

ὄσσε δέ οἱ μάρμαιρον ἀναιδέος εὖτε λέοντος,
 ὅς τε κατ' οὐρεα μακρὰ μέγ' ἀσχαλόων ἐνὶ θυμῷ
 ἔσσυται ἀγρευτῆσιν ἐναντίον, οἳ τέ οἱ ἤδη
 ἄνθρωποι ἐπεμβαίνουσιν ἐρύσσασθαι μεμαῶτες
 σκύμνους οἰωθέντας ἔων ἀπὸ τῆλε τοκῆων
 βῆσση ἐνὶ σκιερῇ, ὃ δ' ἄρ' ὑψόθεν ἔκ τινος ἄκρης
 ἀδρήσας ὀλοοῖσιν ἐπέσσυται ἀγρευτῆσι
 σμερδαλέον βλοσυρῆσιν ὑπαὶ γενύεσσι βεβρυχώς

'His eyes were flashing like those of a lion without restraint; high in the mountains with its spirit severely provoked, it rushes down to attack some hunters, who are just about to enter its cave intent on dragging out its cubs while they are separated from their parents in a shady valley; from a height the lion spots and charges upon the murderous hunters with a terrible roar from its savage jaws.' (*Post.* VII.464-72)

In this simile, which precedes that from the *Posthomerica* above, it is *Neoptolemos* who takes on the role of the lion, and the Greeks the vulnerable *skumnoi*. James notes that the lion's attempt to hinder any effort to steal its cub is a variation on that of the frantic 'beast'

⁸⁶⁸ For *meilichos*, see 1.7.

⁸⁶⁹ See 1.

(*ther*) over the loss of its young in *Posthomerica* V.371-78.⁸⁷⁰ Here, the beast simile (though *not* lion), applies to the maddened greater Aias, following the *Hoplon Krisis*; this again recalls that at *Iliad* XVIII.318-22,⁸⁷¹ a circuitous root back to the raging Iliadic Achilles. Furthermore, the highly unusual ‘roar’ and ‘wild eyes’, referring to Neoptolemos in the above extract, also closely recall that of the dying Achilles (*Post.* III.142-46).⁸⁷²

Both extended Posthomeric lion similes evoke particular aspects from *Iliad* XVIII. Even superficially the lion-cub reference is marked, although, as noted, Quintus’ Neoptolemos fulfils both roles at different points, and to different effect. This does indicate, however, the importance Quintus attached to the hallmark lion simile of the Iliadic Achilles, in terms of Neoptolemos’ characterization.

Neoptolemos’ qualities are recognized by those (like Odysseus and Diomedes) who knew his father particularly well: Agamemnon (*Post.* VII.689-99); Briseis (and the captives 722-27); Nestor (XII.287-96); Priam (XIII.222ff.); Achilles’ immortal horses (VIII.36-8). The recognition scenes, involving all of the characters listed above, share certain features. The characters, who had particularly close ties with Achilles, also often tell Neoptolemos not only of his striking similarity with his father, but also what now is *his* task. The heroic deeds of the father, and his biography, are recalled, thus filling part of Neoptolemos’ ‘lost’ youth. This ‘background’ information gives *Neoptolemos* a context while, at the same time evoking the heroic spirit which will inspire Neoptolemos to great deeds himself. Or, paraphrased: ‘What an illustrious father you had; show us that you are his illustrious son!’ This sense of ‘lineage’ substantiates Neoptolemos for the reader too, and its meta-literary significance pervades Neoptolemos throughout.

⁸⁷⁰ James (2004), 310n.464-71.

⁸⁷¹ See James (2004), 299n.371-78.

⁸⁷² See James (2004), 283n.142-46. On Achilles’ lion’s ‘roar’ in Quintus, see Ch.II.1.1v.

3.2 *That's My Boy*

Telemachos tells Athene: 'My mother says that I am his child; but I do not know this, for never yet did any man know his parentage of his own knowledge', μήτηρ μὲν τέ φησι τοῦ ἔμμεναι, ἀπ' αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ γε/ οὐκ οἶδ'. οὐ γάρ πώ τις ἐὼν γόνον αὐτὸς ἀνέγνω (*Od.* I.215-16). In contrast, Neoptolemos tells Eurypylos: 'I *am* the son of stalwart-hearted Achilleus', υἱὸς Ἀχιλλῆος κρατερόφρονος (*Post.* VIII.150).

Achilleus, especially the Iliadic model, has a profound influence on Neoptolemos' characterization. While the Posthomeric father blusters, belligerently laying waste to virtually everything in his path,⁸⁷³ the complexity of the Iliadic parent filters into Quintus' model of his son, making Neoptolemos a far more multi-faceted (and interesting?) individual. Part of the reason for this could certainly be the narrative space available for a character far less documented than his illustrious father; Achilleus had been so heavily rendered from Homer onwards, it would be more difficult to say anything new of him,⁸⁷⁴ unlike Neoptolemos, who offered many more possibilities.

Although Homer's Achilleus is a key feature in Quintus' characterization of Neoptolemos, Quintus' Achilleus is also evoked to convey familial excess. For instance, Neoptolemos' fight with Eurypylos (*Post.* VIII), echoes that between Achilleus and Memnon (*Post.* II).⁸⁷⁵ This is communicated through the unusually long duration (textual space, i.e. number of lines) of their fight (*Post.* VIII.162-201; Memnon and Achilleus, *Post.* II.401-544), compared to the line or so it takes to dispatch most other heroes, and this also conveys that both sets of combatants are almost equally matched. They are also *diogenes*, in the sense of coming from godly stock. Furthermore, like Achilleus with Memnon, both Neoptolemos and Eurypylos wear immortal armour - Neoptolemos wears that very armour of Achilleus; and Eurypylos, Herakles' armour.⁸⁷⁶

⁸⁷³ See Ch.II.1.

⁸⁷⁴ See Ch.II.

⁸⁷⁵ See Ch.II.1.3i and II.2.1i.

⁸⁷⁶ The immortal qualities of both arms figuring in their individual *ekphrases*: Achilleus' (Neoptolemos') arms, *Post.* V.6-109; Herakles' (Eurypylos') arms, VI.198-293.

Neoptolemos' duel with Eurypylos also recalls that in the *Iliad* between Achilles and Hektor (*Il.* XXII.273ff.). (Perhaps one is also invited to consider Patroklos' wearing of Achilles' arms in *Iliad* XVI; the wearer, as with Neoptolemos in Quintus, appearing to be Achilles himself. Key differences, though, are that these (the ones Patroklos wears) are not *the* immortal arms,⁸⁷⁷ and that Patroklos is unsuccessful against his foe, Hektor, while wearing them. But, perhaps, these are the points. Or, put simply, allusion to this Iliadic scene reinforces just how adequate a replacement Neoptolemos is.) These instances locate Neoptolemos as not just a second Achilles, but also an adequate substitute; possibly more. Certainly, the relative brevity of the second duel in the *Posthomerica* (Neoptolemos and Eurypylos) could imply this; for instance, Neoptolemos takes far less textual space to dispatch Eurypylos, than Achilles does Memnon.

Quintus also raises Neoptolemos' profile through structural manipulating. As noted, Neoptolemos is first mentioned in the *Posthomerica* when Thetis, in particular, is mourning the loss of Achilles. The primary narrator informs us that Achilles' immortal steeds will delay their return to their divine home to await the arrival of 'Achilleus' fleet-foot son' (*Post.* III.753-54). He features again, almost immediately, when his apotheosis, as his father's (noteworthy in itself), is anticipated (*Post.* III.760ff.).⁸⁷⁸ Thus, in terms of narrative place, Neoptolemos follows swiftly on in the footsteps of his father, where focal and narrative transition between father and son is virtually seamless.

Yet, in a sense, Neoptolemos is 'new' to the reader in Quintus, coming *after* the Posthomeric father in the narrative: Achilles dominates *Posthomerica* I-IV; even in death he looms large, as in the laments of Book IV; cf. Neoptolemos, *Post.* VII-XIV. (Here, the *Odyssey* makes an interesting comparison, where the epic is *initially* dominated by the son, Telemachos (*Telemacheia*, *Od.* I-IV); from *Odyssey* V, however, Odysseus becomes central.) Viewed thus, however, it can be seen that Neoptolemos has the lion's share of the text overall. In another way, Neoptolemos is also new as a secondary figure, always in the

⁸⁷⁷ See above, 2.2-3.

⁸⁷⁸ See 1.8.

shadow of Achilles in classical literature in general, and, most significantly for Quintus, as a hero far less documented.

However, in a number of instances the literal⁸⁷⁹ place of Neoptolemos' emergence also amplifies the importance of the young hero. Achilles' death brings great strain for the Greeks. This is exacerbated by the death of Aias, and, particularly, the arrival of Eurypylos, who shall enjoy such success, whilst the Greeks lack adequate defence. Eurypylos arrives in *Posthomerica* VI – (a book) before Neoptolemos.⁸⁸⁰ This contrasts with the *Ilias Mikra*, where Neoptolemos arrives first.⁸⁸¹ Quintus' choice of sequence creates greater drama because this highlights the present deficiency and vulnerability of the Greeks, and, therefore, the need for a super-Greek - formally expressed by Kalchas later to be Neoptolemos (*Post.* VI.64-6). Thus, Neoptolemos' grand entrance is set, but his delayed arrival and Eurypylos' devastating *aristeia* (for one book) further intensifies the magnitude of the impact he has. Furthermore, the respective brilliance of both Neoptolemos and Eurypylos suggest a climactic confrontation between the two, as the supreme heroes from each side gravitate towards each other. This feature also echoes that of the Iliadic Achilles and Hektor (XX, XXII), and the Posthomeric Achilles with, first, Penthesileia (*Post.* I) and then Memnon (*Post.* II).

Quintus' choice to cut from the main narrative of Trojan plain to Skyros (*Post.* VII) also directs the attention away from Achilles to Neoptolemos, as the locale most commonly associated with him shifts. It serves further functions too, as the reader is introduced to his domestic environment. Here the budding hero appears as a more naïve⁸⁸² version of the self which will emerge in Troy; he is not literally fighting, and connexion with his mother, Deidameia, delays his heroism; in contrast, the Trojan champions, *at Troy*, are delayed by their Trojan welcomes.⁸⁸³ Neoptolemos fights *first* (*Post.* VII.474ff.) and *then* receives his

⁸⁷⁹ I.e. he is physically present in the episode, as opposed to merely being spoken of.

⁸⁸⁰ As in Dictys, IV.14-15.

⁸⁸¹ Arg.3.

⁸⁸² Although perhaps only naïve in terms of not having proved himself *at Troy* – all is evident *already* at Skyros.

⁸⁸³ For Penthesileia, Memnon and Eurypylos, see Ch.I.1.4i.

welcome (*Post.* VII.674ff.). However, he is already filling the narrative void left with the physical departure of his father. The drama is heightened with the anticipation of his arrival, literal and metaphorical.

3.3 *The 'Neoptolemos Complex': How to Subdue a Dead Father*

Where the previous section stresses Neoptolemos' resemblance to Achilles and the qualities he possesses which both replicate and go beyond his father, this section explores his capacity to replace him.

For Neoptolemos to emerge as a hero *in his own right*, he must at least show that his is an adequate substitute.⁸⁸⁴ This point can be understood at a number of levels. Superficially, Neoptolemos, as all heroes, must prove his worth; especially that he is worthy of his father (and that he does not disgrace him). Classical antiquity is rife with examples, such as Phoenix' reminder to Achilles of Peleus' advice, to be a speaker of words, and doer of deeds (*Il.* IX.443). Perhaps more poignantly, one recalls Achilles' questioning regarding the heroic deeds of Neoptolemos' heroic deeds, and his joyous response (*Od.* XI.492-93; 538-40). At a different level, Neoptolemos must match his father for the textual space that he going to occupy, and also in the centrality of the position he is going to dominate - Neoptolemos must measure up to Achilles at the level of character, *and* as a narrative device. This conveys more, however, on a metapoetic level, where it can be understood that Quintus himself must substantiate his qualities as a poet, and heir to Homer.

Marked examples of Neoptolemos being 'equal' to Achilles are as follows:

Following his battle debut, Agamemnon tells Neoptolemos,

'Truly you are the son of Aiakos' dauntless grandson, my child; you have his outstanding strength, appearance, and size, as well as his courage and inward qualities of mind (*ὦ τέκος, οὐνεκά οἱ κρατερόν μένος ἤδη καὶ εἶδος καὶ μέγεθος καὶ δάρσος ἰδὲ φρένας ἔνδον ἕοικας*). You give my heart a glow of comfort. I have high hopes that by your hands and the spear they wield we shall destroy the

⁸⁸⁴ Note Deidameia's concerns, 2.1.

hostile hordes and famous city of Priam, because you are like (*eoikas*) your father' (*Post.* VII.689-95).

Agamemnon's response, including that he has high hopes that Troy will fall (*Post.* VII.692ff.), contrasts markedly with that earlier, when he was inconsolable over Achilles' death: 'I cannot think that this war's goal will be attained with Achilles dead' (*Post.* III.502-03). Such internal engagement, on the part of the text (intratext), implies how Neoptolemos resolves Achilles' absence (also, *menos* (*Post.* VII.690), has especial significance when uttered by Agamemnon, as recourse to the cause of Achilles' Iliadic anger shows (*Il.* I.1); and reference to *the* spear evokes this model, too (*egchei*, *Post.* VII.693). This is done again, when, in *Posthomeric* I, the primary narrator states that Achilles is 'matchless' (*hypertatos*, 97) in war (*Post.* I.96-7). This is 'answered' below, six books later, in Neoptolemos' fearless response. The primary narrator notes the Greeks' response to Diomedes' war cry, compared to that of Neoptolemos'. Whilst the *laoi* are terrified (*tromos*, *Post.* VII.432), Neoptolemos is fearless (*thrasuphronos*, *Post.* VII.433), as (*eoikei*, *Post.* VII.433-34) Achilles.

Furthermore, Phoenix' words to Neoptolemos, that he shall be as *superior* (*hypertatos*, *Post.* VII.665-66) to Eurypylos as Achilles was to Telephos (Eurypylos' father) affirms Neoptolemos' attributes and his exceptional link with Achilles (the echo of *hypertatos* from *Post.* I, further reinforces this). The gods too, reaffirm Neoptolemos' credentials. Hera notes that the 'Trojans' labour will *not* be 'lighter', even though Achilles is dead, because Neoptolemos will *quickly* (*thoos*, 120) show himself to be Achilles' equal (*Post.* III.118-22). *Troessin elaphroteron* evokes Penthesileia's boast to Achilles (*Post.* I.556-57), which, in turn, strikingly evokes the same by Hektor to Achilles (*Il.* XXII.287). Quintus' choice of diction, and context is significant too, as Hera's foreshadowing *immediately* follows Achilles' death; as, in fact, will Neoptolemos, as 'ideal'⁸⁸⁵ replacement. Finally, Achilles' own horses are happy to carry Neoptolemos, so similar in appearance and qualities to Achilles (*Post.* VIII.36-8).

⁸⁸⁵ Ideal in multiple senses: he is Achilles' son; he shows great qualities (e.g., physical, psychological and moral; see discussion in I); and he serves Quintus' purpose of communicating his own place as Homeric heir.

Quintus also creates the effects that Neoptolemos is an adequate replacement for Achilles through other means; for instance, when he focalizes the emotional response Neoptolemos evokes in others, with reference to *joy for Neoptolemos matching sadness for Achilles*. The joy (*terpet'*, 183) Thetis experiences at the sight of Neoptolemos slaughtering Trojans equals (*hoson*, 183) her sadness (*achnuto*, 183) at Achilles' death (*Post.* IX.181-83). Something similar occurs in Book VII, when Phoenix is overcome with joy (*charma*, 632, 634) and sorrow (*algos*, 632, 633): 'Sorrow because he was reminded of fleet-foot Achilles and joy at the sight of a sturdy son' (*Post.* VII.632-34); so too Briseis (*egetheen*, 724; *achnut'*, 725). Considerations of the manner in which Neoptolemos is welcomed (*as* Achilles, VII.674ff.), and the fear he evokes in the Trojans, forcing them to remain in Troy's walls (IX.6ff.; as Achilles had, I.3ff.), are just two more of numerous examples that merely prove this point further. However, there is much to suggest that Neoptolemos is shown to be superior to Achilles; at least, the *Posthomeric* one. Quintus reconfigures the heroes to convey the overwhelming certainty that the progeny is worthy: thus the limitations of his Achilles and brilliance of his Neoptolemos, also redress the divide between Homer and Quintus.

Posthomeric Achilles is characterized as a raging killer. So much so (e.g. even when dying),⁸⁸⁶ that when he is presented differently, the portrayal appears incongruous. The primary narrator's reference to Achilles' being 'gentle', 'never cruel or arrogant', and surpassing all in 'forbearance as in strength' (*Post.* III.424-26), is problematic when applied even to the Iliadic Achilles; to the Posthomeric one, it is almost completely incomprehensible. Equally, this applies to the ghost rhetoric of Achilles (*Post.* XIV.185-222). Where has the Posthomeric Achilles exhibited emotional restraint or concession to elders? And where has he indicated concern for a reputation of good sense, the importance of honouring 'constant' men and that being 'gentle' is paramount? Agamemnon's comment that Neoptolemos is truly Achilles' son, with all of his physical and mental qualities (*Post.* VII.689-91) takes on an entirely different meaning: *Phrenas* is a wide-ranging term, but if we consider it to imply 'discretion'/'wisdom', then it is reasonable to

⁸⁸⁶ See Ch.II.1.1iv.

challenge its application to Quintus' Achilles.⁸⁸⁷ Agamemnon's praise really applies more to Quintus' Neoptolemos than Achilles.⁸⁸⁸ Only in his demand for Polyxena's sacrifice, do we recognize *Quintus' Achilles*.

In *Posthomeric* VII, the primary narrator informs that Neoptolemos' 'strength was equal to that of a river that never fails, which the onset of an enormous fire can't put to flight ...' (*Post.* VII.586ff.). This recalls the Iliadic Achilles/ Skamandros confrontation (XXI.136ff.; 212ff), and Hephaistos saves Achilles. In Quintus, Neoptolemos' strength matches the river's. Metaphorically, he *becomes* the river. And, is so powerful, unlike in the Iliadic episode, that not even the 'fire god's strength' (*Post.* VII.589) can subdue him (Neoptolemos' 'river'); an example of the traditional father-son-degeneration trend that Quintus' Neoptolemos *rejects*.⁸⁸⁹

To this one should also consider the scars of battle which indicate heroic action,⁸⁹⁰ and vulnerability. Achilles is physically injured three times in Homer and Quintus; first against Asteropaios in the *Iliad*, Achilles' right forearm is grazed, the 'black blood' gushing out (*Il.* XXI.166-67). This injury is strongly evoked when Achilles meets Memnon (*Post.* II.409-10).⁸⁹¹ Finally, he receives the mortal wound from Apollo (*Post.* II.62).⁸⁹² However, in his battle with Eurypylos (*Post.* VIII), which closely recalls that between Achilles and Memnon (where Achilles received a flesh wound),⁸⁹³ Neoptolemos emerges *completely unscathed*. In Book VII, the primary narrator notes that Neoptolemos, though in the thick of fighting, receives no wound (*Post.* VII.595-97). This also confirms Odysseus's report to Achilles in the underworld (*Od.* XI.535-37).

⁸⁸⁷ See Ch.II.1, for Achilles' Posthomeric limitations.

⁸⁸⁸ Brief summary of Achilles' instruction exhibits this. Advice was *not* required by Neoptolemos at any stage; e.g. Neoptolemos has *already* shown himself to be *the* indomitable Greek from the moment he landed in Troy (*Post.* XIV.189; *Post.* VII); wise (*Post.* XIV.190-91; *Post.* VII.705), and restrained (*Post.* XIV.201-03; *Post.* VII.174-75).

⁸⁸⁹ For Quintus' exploration of 'age', see Ch.III.

⁸⁹⁰ And act as mnemonic devices, e.g. the old Trojan's battle-wounds (*Post.* IX.120-24; on which, see Ch.III.2.3; also Odysseus' 'scar' (*Od.* XIX.388ff.).

⁸⁹¹ See II.1.3i.

⁸⁹² See II.1.2ii.

⁸⁹³ See above, 3.2.

It is important to raise these points because they highlight the incongruity in Quintus' Achilleus, and impact upon his Neoptolemos, who, if we take *Quintus'* Achilleus as 'father', appears not so clearly Achilleus' son; or, at least, the son of Quintus' Achilleus.⁸⁹⁴ So, in a sense, when Quintus has his characters recognize Achilleus in Neoptolemos, we could also challenge the accuracy of their observations;⁸⁹⁵ although, as character indicators, they do reinforce Neoptolemos' status.

In certain respects, though, Neoptolemos does show himself to be the son of Quintus' Achilleus. When the news of Patroklos' death reaches Achilleus (*Iliad* XVIII.22ff.), he is overwhelmed with grief, and does not return to battle until Book XX. Although awaiting the immortal arms, Achilleus spends much time lamenting his beloved friend. Like the *Posthomeric* Achilleus in response to Antilochos' death,⁸⁹⁶ Neoptolemos does *not* hang around, taking the battle field almost the moment he steps onto Troy. Neoptolemos, as his *Posthomeric* father, is not overwhelmed by grief. However, it is important to bear in mind, as noted previously, that Neoptolemos restrains the grief he feels for his father; shown, for instance, in war-practice on Skyros, regardless. This temperance, however, also distances Neoptolemos from the *Posthomeric* Achilleus, who, it seems, cannot be contained, and is not sophisticated enough to practice restraint. The effect of such a response, rather than diminishing the pain he feels for the loss of his father, instead heightens Neoptolemos' *sophrosyne*.

However, Neoptolemos can destroy, like Achilleus (Homeric and *Posthomeric*), but not so indiscriminately. Achilleus slaughters relentlessly when returning to war, in revenge for Patroklos: he is merciless with Lykaon (*Il.* XXI.97ff.), and exceptional in his sacrifice of twelve Trojans (*Il.* XXIII.175-76). But he will not stop until he exacts revenge on Patroklos' killer, Hektor. Neoptolemos has mythic limitations: he cannot be reunited with

⁸⁹⁴ See Bellinger (1939, 11), on Neoptolemos in Sophocles' *Philoktetes*, and Euripides' Achilleus from *Iphigeneia in Aulis*: "I think we may safely conclude that, artistically, Achilles is descended from Achilles' son." For us, we could consider, that Neoptolemos is not entirely the son of Neoptolemos' father.

⁸⁹⁵ Read thus, Deidameia's critique that Neoptolemos is less than Achilleus could be understood as an elusive compliment; see 2.1.

⁸⁹⁶ On Achilleus' response to Antilochos' death, see Ch.II. 1.3ii.

his father, and is not allowed the luxury of an apprenticeship (as Telemachos). Equally, Neoptolemos cannot avenge the slaughter of a loved one because Achilles' killer (Apollo), unlike Patroklos' killer (Hektor), is inaccessible. This does not mean, however, that Neoptolemos' hands are tied.

Both the rage Achilles experienced and the revenge he exacted on Hektor for Patroklos are recalled by Quintus:

‘His spirit could never have enough of deadly conflict and he was intent on avenging his father’s lamented death.’ (*Post.* VII.602-04)

Technically, Neoptolemos cannot be satisfied, because there is no culprit on which to vent his sadness and frustration; again, no ‘Hektor’. However, Eurypylos fulfils this function, as Neoptolemos seeks him out, like Achilles had Hektor. Here Quintus imparts something of the personal. Though, they are bound to meet by tradition (they fight in the *Cycle*), an extra significance is given to this meeting when Neoptolemos delivers the death blow which recalls the same for Hektor in the *Iliad*: ‘At last the great long Pelian spear cut through the throat of Eurypylos after all that toil’ (*Post.* VII.199-201). As James notes, “Neoptolemos drives his spear through Eurypylos’ throat much as Achilles drives the same spear through Hektor’s throat at *Iliad* 22.326-7.”⁸⁹⁷ Eurypylos doubles for a Hektor who cannot be found; it is not only Neoptolemos who proves himself a worthy substitute. In this way, Quintus satisfies Neoptolemos *and* his readers.

Conclusion

Neoptolemos can perform the super deeds of the exaggerated Posthomerich Achilles; yet, also has the ‘best’, non-violent characteristics of the Iliadic Achilles, such as the ability to speak well, empathize, and show consideration for others. But, it is the unusual combination of these two Achilleuses, with Quintus’ general tendency to exaggerate key characteristics, that takes Neoptolemos beyond either model: thus, the hybrid Neoptolemos matches his Iliadic father in nature (*phusis*), but his Posthomerich father in bellicosity

⁸⁹⁷ James (2004), 313n.199-201.

(*aristeia*). In both, we see Quintus' penchant for excess, as he (Quintus) recalls the Achillean models (inter/intra-textually) by amplifying their key character traits. Neoptolemos, however, becomes more than the sum of his parts. When Quintus wants to portray *other* aspects of his Neoptolemos, he uses further models who embody specific characteristics: namely, 'fatherless', young Telemachos; and 'gentle', inadequate Patroklos.

At the level of narrative, too, Quintus elevates his Neoptolemos. His model is mentioned almost immediately after Achilles' death; he follows Eurypylos (thus emphasising the great need for him); and he is first into the Horse (*Post.* XII.314-15); he is immortalized through song whilst *living* (*Post.* XIV.137);⁸⁹⁸ and, he executes Polyxena's sacrifice, required for the Greeks' Trojan return – a highly significant act, with the Horse ruse, which shows that Neoptolemos is key to bringing about the end of Troy, as a nation and a narrative, and, something that Achilles cannot achieve. Also, Neoptolemos is the only hero who does not disappoint: Achilles and Aias die, and the Trojan contingent (Penthesileia, Memnon and Eurypylos) are no match in their duels.

Quintus makes it clear that Neoptolemos is absolutely central. Whilst Achilles' *menis* bound the *Iliad*, Neoptolemos' emergence is the *Posthomerica*'s cohesive force following Achilles' death. In terms of Neoptolemos' reception of Achilles, this has great significance. Neoptolemos not only surpasses the Achillean models of the *Iliad* and the *Posthomerica* (the former in deeds; the latter in words), he also accomplishes this naturally, i.e. without being trained. Thus, the function Achilles serves, for Neoptolemos, is redundant; the son has outgrown the father.

In these senses, Neoptolemos is the hybrid supreme, the *Posthomerica*'s super-hero. And, through Neoptolemos' numerous proofs of heroism, we can understand Quintus' most striking articulation to be, himself, a worthy successor to Homer – both progenies, literal and metaphorical. Quintus makes Neoptolemos an extremely useful ally. However, the

⁸⁹⁸ Something that not even Achilles can claim; see Ch.II.3.1 – Achilles receives *kleos aphthiton* just after his death.

alliance is mutually beneficial. Through finding so central a place for such a comprehensively developed hero, Quintus ultimately communicates his own pursuit of epic glory and heroic ambition.

Chapter V: *The Primary Narrator*

Poet-Hero

‘and him they found delightng his mind with a clear-toned lyre ... With it he was delighting his heart, and he sang of the glorious deeds of warriors;’ (*Il.IX.186-89*)⁸⁹⁹

Introduction

In the previous four chapters, I have focussed on specific heroes within the *Posthomeric*. Each has been explored as signifiers, embodiments of engagements with particular aspects of epic. Now I turn to the more unusual figure of the primary narrator himself. As with the heroes within the narrative, Quintus’ primary narrator evokes Homer, but also like Quintus’ heroes, the reception of the Posthomeric narrator communicates far more, revealing numerous other influences and meta-literary considerations. In fact, it is the character of the primary narrator who poses the greatest challenge to Homeric convention.

This Chapter views the primary narrator through three discussions: I begin with the ‘beginning’ and ‘end’ of the poem. These are very significant because they are the extreme points of narrative convergence. The external analepses (for the beginning) and external prolepses (for the ending) show marked but complex engagement with Homer.⁹⁰⁰ In the next section, I will explore the character of the poet under a number of headings that help convey the sense of his multiplicity. The ‘Homeric’ voice (the anonymous narrator of heroic myth) is only one aspect of the complex persona created by the poem. I end this study with two further instances that spotlight Quintus’ narrator, but in very different ways. Firstly, I look at the primary narrator’s ‘star’ moment in *Posthomeric* XII – his autobiographical passage. This is important because of the unusual overttness of the heroic epic narrator, and the character of that poet. Finally, I consider the meaning of the

⁸⁹⁹ The embassy to Achilleus find him singing of heroic deeds.

⁹⁰⁰ On *analepses* and *prolepses* in Quintus, see Chs.II.3.1 and.III.3.3; also Schmitz (2007b); Duckworth (1933). In Homer, de Jong (1997a), ch. 13 and (2004b), 81-90; S. Richardson (1990), *Retrospection*, 100-08 and *Foreknowledge*, 132-39.

narrator's super allusivity in the heroic songs of Nestor and the bards. Although less marked than his autobiography, the narrator's précised cantos have profound significance.

In Homer, the voice of the primary narrator stands largely silent *behind* his narratives, and only very rarely are we made *overtly* aware of his presence.⁹⁰¹ The relatively high degree of *character-text* (45% for the *Iliad* and 67% for the *Odyssey*),⁹⁰² means that the narrative is coloured by the characters (heroes) *themselves*. In this sense, the narrative is embedded in the heroes⁹⁰³ – by what they say (character-text).

On Homer's approach to epic, Aristotle comments:

‘The poet (*ton poieten*) should speak as seldom (*elachista legein*) as possible in his own character (*auton*), since he is not representing (*mimesis*) the story in that sense.’ (*Poetics*, 1460a)

In contrast, Quintus' primary narrator dominates the narrative. As with Apollonius, the narrator-text in Quintus is far greater than that in the Homeric poems. Narrator-text in the *Posthomerica* accounts for 76%⁹⁰⁴ of the epic; the *Argonautica*, slightly less at 71%.⁹⁰⁵ So, Quintus' primary narrator is far more a 'character' in the poem. Significantly, we can also say more about the *type* of character he is, by virtue of the fact that he says more. However, it is the *nature* of his speech that is most telling.

Part 1 - *Contact*

1.1 *Beginnings: First Impressions*

The opening of any work of art is a key moment. And for an ancient audience familiar with the conventions of heroic epic narrative the first words of the *Posthomerica* must have come as a striking surprise, for Quintus does not open his epic with the traditional and

⁹⁰¹ See de Jong (2004a).

⁹⁰² And 47% of the *Aeneid*. Figures from Hunter (2004), 138. The (primary) *narrator-text* equates as follows: *Iliad*, 55% and *Odyssey*, 33%; *Aeneid*, 53%.

⁹⁰³ We could say that character = plot.

⁹⁰⁴ Based on James' figures of 24% for character-text in the *Posthomerica*, (2004), *Introduction*, XXV. My own findings are similar: approx. 25% character-text for Books I-III.

⁹⁰⁵ Hunter (2004, 138), notes 29% character-text for the *Argonautica*.

expected invocation of the Muse.⁹⁰⁶ In fact, unlike in Homer (*Iliad*, I.1ff; *Odyssey*, I.1ff), Apollonius (*Argon.* I.1ff) and Virgil (*Aen.* I.1ff.), there is no proper proem (invocation of Muse and statement of poet's theme) at all. We are simply plunged *in medias res*.⁹⁰⁷

Εὖθ' ὑπὸ Πηλείωνι δάμνη θεοείκελος Ἴκτωρ
καὶ ἐπυρὴ κατέδαψε καὶ ὄστέα γαῖα κεκέρθει,
δὴ τότε Τρῶες ἔμιμνον ἀνὰ Πριάμοιο πόλιν
δειδιότες μένος ἢ θρασύφρονος Αἰακίδαο·

'When godlike Hektor was killed by the son of Peleus, and the pyre had consumed him and the earth covered his bones, then the Trojans stayed inside Priam's city, fearing the anger of Aeacus' dauntless grandson.' (*Post.* I.1-4)⁹⁰⁸

The conjunction, *euth'* ('when'), the very first word of the *Posthomeric*, strongly indicates that *this* epic is a natural continuation of the *Iliad*. The nearest parallel for this comes in fact not from poetry but from historiography. As a marker of continuity with a pre-existing narrative, *euth'* recalls the *meta de tauta* with which Xenophon opens his history (*Hellenica*, I.1); just as Xenophon's opening assumes the link with the end of Thucydides' *Historiai*, so Quintus' opening ties his text explicitly to the end of the *Iliad*.⁹⁰⁹ The 'join' could not be more seamless.

Quintus does eventually gesture to tradition and invoke the Muse, but not until very near the end of the poem (*Post.* XII.306-13).⁹¹⁰ This has a significant impact upon the 'voice' of the poem. Traditionally divine inspiration brings much with it; omniscience, omnipresence, authority, to name a few of the 'special' qualities.⁹¹¹ Thus, by repressing the Muse, it could be understood that Quintus' primary narrator lacks these qualities, or, indeed, that the narrator's authority comes from elsewhere. However, absence of divine assistance does mean that the primary narrator is more noticeably central to his poem. *He* becomes the voice.

⁹⁰⁶ See Bär (2007).

⁹⁰⁷ Kirk's definition (2001), 51. See Redfield (2001), ch.16; de Jong (2004), ch. 1.

⁹⁰⁸ My translation.

⁹⁰⁹ On the Xenophon-Thucydides continuation, see Gray (2004), 131 and her footnote 10. For Quintus and historiography see below, 2.2.

⁹¹⁰ See below, 3.1.

⁹¹¹ On the Homeric narrator's 'special abilities', See S. Richardson (1990), ch. 5.

This is not of course the first appearance of the Muses in the poem. They are mentioned earlier, but in a different context. Trying to console Thetis for Achilles' death, Kalliope comments:

‘Poets (*aoidoi*) shall always sing (*aien ... aeisousin*) of his glory (*kleos*) and his proWess (*menos*) to people upon the earth, inspired (*ioteti*) by me and other Pierian (Muses) (*Pieridon*).’ (*Post.* III.645-47)

Reference to being ‘inspired by me and *other* (*allōn*) Pierian Muses’ is significant, because (as *euth*’ discussed above) it does imply alignment. But alignment to whom? Kalliope’s comment links the primary narrator’s inspiration closely with her and other Muses, therefore indicating that he, too, is Muse-inspired. Yet, her recourse to poets (*aoidoi*) reminds the audience of the disjuncture in the narrative. However, we must also be aware that it is, in fact, the primary narrator’s narrative in which Kalliope is actually speaking. Pierian Muses, too, is interesting, evoking Hesiod (e.g. *Works*, 1; *Theogony*, 53; *Herakles’ Shield*, 206).

Kalliope’s Poet/Muse comment is also important because it reminds us of the power of the poet’s song: this song (of Achilles) will act as a remedy for the pain that Thetis is suffering (but inspiration from the Muses is required, too; in *Il.* IX.185-89, *Od.* VIII.367-68 and Theocritus, *Id.* XI, the heroes’ pains are soothed through song). Though the heroes perform the heroic deeds, worthy of song, and therefore remembrance, it is the poets, through their songs, who immortalize the heroes. Thus the poet empowers the hero. And, subsequently, it is also true that the poets are immortalized through their songs of the heroes. This is a mutually beneficial relationship, though, as each requires the other. De Jong (2004a, 24), notes that Homer’s primary narrator often compares Odysseus to a singer, e.g. Odysseus’ bow-stringing = singer’s (i.e. poet’s) lyre-stringing (*Od.* XXI.406-409). The heroes’ goal, ‘imperishable glory’ (*kleos aphthiton*, *Il.* IX.413), is the ultimate prize for all poets, too.⁹¹²

⁹¹² On the poet/hero relationship, see Goldhill (1999), ch. 1.

Yet we can still reasonably ask why Quintus omits the actual Muse invocation for such a considerable extent of his poem? If the *Posthomerica* is a continuation of the *Iliad*, as implied by its opening, then perhaps the Muse has not abandoned the poet, but is immersed in the text and the narrative. For instance, we can ‘read’ the opening of the *Posthomerica* not as the ‘beginning’ of a new poem, but, instead, as the continuation of another (older) poem (the *Iliad*). Read this way, the Posthomeric narrator assumes something of the Homeric narrator’s mantle.

The care which Quintus has taken to interlock his narrative inseparably with the *Iliad* can be seen from the subtle *epanalepsis* which opens the poem. For what looks at first sight like a mechanical continuation of Homer’s story is in fact a sleight of hand. The *Posthomerica* begins with recourse to Hektor’s death, cremation and burial (I.1-2). In the *Iliad*, Hektor has been cremated, his bones collected and buried under a mound (*Iliad* XXIV.787ff.). So, there is a sense of Quintus going over the same ground. Therefore, Quintus’ beginning is not quite so entirely sequential. Further disjunctions are evident in the opening verses of the *Posthomerica*. The primary narrator notes that the Trojans remembered (*mnesamenoī*) Achilles’ mass slaughters. These focalized reminiscences of the Trojans function as a ‘way in’ for the primary narrator’s narrative flashback (compare the *mnesomai* of Apollonius’ primary narrator, *Argon.* I.2).

In the following *narrative sequence*, Roman numerals (‘i’, etc.), apply to the *Posthomerica*; Arabic numerals (‘1’, etc., *outside* the parentheses), apply to the *Iliad*.

Narrative Sequence: *Posthomerica*

This includes (in the order recounted in *Posthomerica* I) those: i) Hektor killed and his funeral (1-2); ii) Trojans killed before (*proteron*) around the Skamandros river (9-10); iii) fleeing below Troy’s (lofty) walls (11); iv) Hektor killed and dragged around Troy (12); v) those killed by Achilles at sea (13); vi) his first (*prota*) slaughter in Troy (14).

Narrative Sequence: *Iliad*

Something of a ‘concertina’ effect is achieved here. The order should read: 1 (not v), those killed by Achilles at sea; 2 (not vi), his first slaughter in Troy; 3 (not ii), Trojan slaughter around the Skamandros river/ fleeing below Troy’s walls; 4, Hektor killed and dragged around Troy.

Quintus tampers with the narrative sequence,⁹¹³ but also expands and contracts the narrative to give a broader sweep to an opening that seems, at first merely consecutive. Broadly, some of these mini-narratives recall Iliadic events; some fall outside; for instance (in the chronological order in the *Iliad*), the (in-)famous Skamandros slaughter/ fleeing (*Iliad* XXI), Hektor’s slaughter (*Iliad* XXII), yet, his ‘dragging’ is not a single event, as it is spread over two Iliadic Books (XXII and XXIV; Achilles defiles Hektor in Book XXIII, but not by dragging him). The deaths at sea, and first slaughter at Troy fall outside of the narrative covered within the *Iliad*. They refer, respectively, to Achilles’ sea-raids pre-Troy (referred to in the *Cypria*, and *Iliad*, I.366-69, etc.), and Achilles’ killing of Cycnus (covered in the *Cypria*; though reference to ‘first’, ‘killing’ and ‘Troy’, could also evoke the Greek, Protesilaos, the very first (*protos* + *laos*) killed at Troy = the very beginning of the Trojan War).⁹¹⁴ As Redfield shows in his article on the proem of the *Iliad* (2001), such dense manipulation of sequence, including allusion to events that precede the beginning of the narrative (external analepses), has been used before, by Homer.

Rather than just picking up from the very end of the *Iliad* (‘in this way they held the funeral for horse-taming Hektor’, *Il.* XXIV.804), Quintus disrupts the seamless of the narrative with this retrospective disjuncture: in a sense, Quintus is superimposing himself onto a pre-existing narrative. Although the events to which Quintus alludes have already taken place, i.e. in the *Iliad*, the Posthomeric narrator presents them in a different sequence. In this new sequence, the primary narrator greatly compresses these events/ narratives, but their new chronology is almost unnoticeable. One could view this as Quintus importing (albeit condensed) the end of the *Iliad* into and onto his poem. Yet,

⁹¹³ Also on manipulation of sequence, see Ch.IV.1.5 and 2.1.

⁹¹⁴ On Protesilaos’ killing, see *Il.*II.698-702, noted by S. Richardson (1990), 103-04.

whichever way(s) this ‘suture’ is viewed, there is a significant ripple, however minimal it first appears. The merging and manipulation of sequence and material creates the illusion of continuity, but also it communicates authorial presence and the act of creating. In fact, the same could be said of the ending of the *Posthomeric*, too.⁹¹⁵

Such attempts at plot/ author alignment (but of a much simpler kind) are also evident in the Hellenistic writers who tried to join the end of the *Iliad* (and therefore Homer) with the following epic story from the *Cycle*’s *Aithiopsis*. In place of the final line in the *Iliad* (XXIV.804), the following was added to link the stories:

ὄς οἱ γ’ ἀμφίεπον τάφον Ἑκτορος· ἦλθε δ’ Ἀμαζών,
Ἄρης θυγάτηρ μεγαλήτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο.

‘So they busied themselves with Hektor’s funeral; and an Amazon came, a daughter of Ares the great-hearted, the slayer of men.’
(Schol. (T) *Il.*24.804a)⁹¹⁶

The insertion of *elthe d’Amazon*, approximately half way through the verse begun with Hektor’s funeral (= departure; Schol. (T)*Il.*24.804a), creates a striking cohesive effect, which links the end of the *Iliad* with the opening of the *Epic Cycle*’s *Aithiopsis* (of Arctinus). Proklos’ fragment summary of the Arctinus’ *Aithiopsis* opens:

‘The Amazon Penthesileia arrives to fight with the Trojans, a daughter of the War god’ (*Aith.* Arg.1)

Penthesileia does not *begin* Quintus’ narrative. But she does follow on very swiftly from the opening references to Hektor’s death, cremation and burial: Hektor is last mentioned by name at *Post.* I.12; Penthesileia is first named seven verses later (*Post.* I. 19). There is, then, a narratological reason for having the one follow on so quickly from the other – they represent story and poem transition. While Quintus divides his narratives by seven

⁹¹⁵ See *Endings*, following.

⁹¹⁶ On the alternative ending, see N. Richardson (2000), 361n.804. On Penthesileia as narrative link, see Ch.I.1.1.

verses, these post-Homeric authors merely split hairs: in this case, verse 804a (Hektor departs, the narrative and text) with 804b (Penthesileia arrives in the narrative and text).⁹¹⁷

The presence of Quintus' primary narrator is also felt through the delayed opening speeches of his characters. Not only do the primary narrators of Homer, Apollonius and Virgil bow to the authority of the Muses from the off. With the exception of Apollonius, the heroes' direct speech is swiftly introduced into the epic: *Iliad*, Chryses (I.17); *Odyssey*, Zeus (I.32); *Aeneid*, Juno (I.37). Apollonius' characters do not speak until line 242 of Book I, when *laoi* marvel at the Argonauts. In this respect, Quintus is more in keeping with the Hellenistic poet.

There are three possible points at which we could say Quintus' characters first speak. All the following references are to *Posthomerica* I. Firstly, Priam offers up prayer to Zeus (186). The preceding 185 lines had been occupied with the primary narrator's setting the tone with his external analepses (as noted), and references to Hektor and Achilleus, immediately followed by the splendid arrival of Penthesileia. However, whilst setting the heroic scene, the primary narrator has silenced the heroes themselves. In this way, Quintus has appropriated them as signifiers (i.e. of the *Iliad* and Homer), but silenced them to spotlight himself. This early pattern is consistent throughout the whole of the poem.

Secondly, one could view Andromache's rhetoric, with regard to Penthesileia, as the initial character-text (*Post.* I.100). Yet, the speech is focalized by the primary narrator. In fact, Andromache 'says' nothing, except in the sense of 'speaking to her heart' (99 and 115). The speech, then, is internal monologue, given 'wings' by the primary narrator's 'special abilities'⁹¹⁸ – he can read, or better hear, thoughts.

⁹¹⁷ On Penthesileia/Hektor parallels, see Ch.I.1.1-2. For Quintus' access to the *Cycle*, see General Introduction: *The Epic Cycle and Quintus*.

⁹¹⁸ See S. Richardson (1990), ch. 5.

Yet, the linguistic divide between the narrator-text and character-text is, in many places, blurred.⁹¹⁹ There are also instances where Quintus' primary narrator's diction is similar to a hero's, and not like the traditional epic narrator.⁹²⁰ This, allied with the absence of the invocation to the epic Muse, and the striking percentage of narrator-text (76%) to character-text (24%) (compare Homer, 45/55;⁹²¹ Apollonius, 71/29; Virgil 53/47) suggests something very interesting, and returns us to the original consideration of at which point we could say Quintus' characters first speak. Perhaps, instead of seeing the absence of the apostrophe as an indicator of delayed character-text, we could view this in a different way. Then, it is not so much that the primary narrator withholds the speech of his heroes for an unusually long time. Rather, we could view a character as speaking immediately; in fact, well before Homer's and Virgil's. Instead, the fundamental difference is the nature of that character: the primary (Homeric?) narrator who is embedded within the narrative itself.

1.2 *Endings: the Last word*

The end of the *Posthomerica* shares a number of features with its beginning. Neither merges entirely seamlessly into its Homeric counterpart (the end of the *Iliad* with the *Posthomerica*'s beginning, and the beginning of the *Odyssey* with the *Posthomerica*'s end). But points of convergence are still striking, indicating close meshing of Quintus' text with that of Homer.

Whilst invocation to the Muse begins the *Odyssey* (*Od.* I.1), the last two verses of the *Posthomerica* read:

ἄλλη δ' ἄλλος ἴκανεν, ὅπη θεὸς ἦγεν ἕκαστον,
ὅσσοι ὑπὲρ πόντοιο λυγρὰς ὑπάλυξαν ἀέλλας

'They⁹²² landed in different places, where heaven guided each one, as many as had escaped the disastrous storm at sea.' (*Post.* XIV.657-58)

⁹¹⁹ See following 2.1-3.

⁹²⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹²¹ Of which, *Iliad* 55/45; *Odyssey*, 33/67.

⁹²² Greeks.

This, in fact, closely anticipates the Greeks' *nostos*, involving particularly surviving the sea. As will be seen, the diction varies, but key elements feature, such as safe return, and the dangers of the sea, in the same context:

ἐνθ' ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες, ὅσοι φύγον αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον,
οἴκοι ἔσαν, πόλεμόν τε πεφευγότες ἠδὲ θαλασσαν·

'Now all the rest, as many as had escaped sheer destruction, were at home, safe from both war and sea.' (*Od.* I.11-12)

Another similarity is that reference is made to Odysseus' suffering, instigated by Poseidon:

αὐτὰρ Ἀθήνη
ἄλλοτε μὲν <θυμῶ> μέγ' ἐγήθεεν, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
ἄχνητ' Ὀδυσσῆος πινυτόφρονος, οὐνεκ' ἔμελλε
πάσχειν ἄλγεα πολλὰ Ποσειδάωνος ὀμοκλήῃ·

'Athene, however, was torn between great joy in her heart and apprehension on account of prudent Odysseus, because he was destined to suffer many woes through Poseidon's hostility.' (*Post.* XIV.628-31)

In the *Odyssey*, the same is noted at I.19-21, where, again, divine pity, Odysseus' suffering, and Poseidon's enmity are central features in the same context:

θεοὶ δ' ἐλέαιρον ἅπαντες
νόσφι Ποσειδάωνος· ὁ δ' ἀσπερχές μενέαινε
ἀντιθέω Ὀδυσῆι πάρος ἦν γαῖαν ἰκέσθαι.

'And all the gods pitied him except Poseidon; he continued to rage unceasingly against godlike Odysseus until at length he reached his own land.' (*Od.* I.19-21)

As the 'beginnings' above, it is apparent that the last lines of the 'real' text (here *Posthomeric*; cf. *Iliad* above) that precedes the mythic plot of the following text (here *Odyssey*; cf. *Posthomeric* above), converge at very early various points within a very short textual space (first twenty or so verses). Thus, Quintus' manner of alignment to Homeric beginnings and endings appears consistent.

By 'staggering' moments of convergence (for instance *Post.* XIV.657-58 = *Od.* I.11-12; *Post.* XIV.628-31 = *Od.* I.19-21), Quintus diminishes the distinctive Odyssean entrée.

And, although historically Homer's *Odyssey* predates Quintus' *Posthomerica*, in the imaginary mythic world of epic, Quintus' poem (story) precedes Homer's. Thus Quintus' primary narrator appears to anticipate, rather than echo, the story of which the *Odyssey* is concerned, and, therefore, the *Odyssey* itself. On a metaliterary level, Quintus' primary narrator actually assumes the guise of Homeric precursor, thus writing himself into the epic tradition from the earliest point. Of course this narrative tension can be seen to work both ways, meaning that Quintus' clear continuation of the *Iliad* (as opposed to just the continuation of the *Epic Cycle* following the *Iliad*) equally suggests his role as authorial heir.

Through such means, Quintus is making a strong statement about aligning himself not just with the characters of Homer, but also with his narratives. Furthermore, it is Quintus' primary narrator that has 'the last word', with reference to Troy; e.g.⁹²³ *he*, metaphorically, dispatches Achilleus (*Post.* III. 60-179),⁹²⁴ builds the Horse (XII.121-56), sacks the citadel (XIII.61ff.),⁹²⁵ kills Priam (XIII.220-50),⁹²⁶ sends the Greeks home (XIV.370ff.) and destroys their wall (XIV.632-66).⁹²⁷ In short, he does what Homer did not do. And, if the poet is judged by the deeds of his heroes and events of his narrative, then Quintus' primary narrator is most heroic, indeed.

Part 2 – *Hearing Voices*

2.1 *Scholar*

Now I consider a less Homeric phenomenon, which I refer to as the 'Scholar'. I use the term 'Scholar' for the following discussion in order to mark the prominence and self-consciously learned nature of the narrator. Such 'learnedness' evokes Hellenistic writers

⁹²³ See General Introduction: *Ambition*.

⁹²⁴ See Ch.II.1.2ii.

⁹²⁵ As does Virgil (*Aen.* II). See Erskine (2001).

⁹²⁶ See Chs.III.2.2 and IV.1.3-5.

⁹²⁷ Which 'completes' *Il.* VII.445-63; see James (2004), 346-47n.632-55.

such as Apollonius, Callimachus and Aratus – the latter two, especially, being associated with the ‘scholar-poet’.⁹²⁸

i) *Myth into History: Epic Anachronisms*

I begin with the issues of narrator-time and narrative divide. The exact mythic time(s) of which Homer’s narrator sings is difficult to detect; so too the narrative divide (the contrast between the time of the telling and the time of the tale). This effect is achieved through avoidance of time-specific phenomena that would firmly locate (and confine) any elements of the epics. Such examples include the primary narrator’s reference to Diomedes’ impressive feat to lift a stone that two men would not be able to lift ‘now’ (*nun*, 304; *Il.* V.302-304).⁹²⁹ Such vague allusion to ‘then’ and ‘now’ means that the time at which events occur in these epics could be *anytime*: that Diomedes lifts a stone heavier than two men could manage ‘now’ is non-specific, in that the ‘now’ is not located in any particular time. Thus, in a sense, this passage means the same to ‘our’ generation as it did to Homer’s: men *were* stronger than they are *now*, but this ‘now’ could be anytime – the point being simply that men were stronger in the epic past (which is elusive). Thus, we can say that the Homeric poems are “omnitemporal”⁹³⁰ – divisions between narrative-time, and narrative divides are not explicit.

Quintus’ primary narrator makes use of such techniques, too (e.g. *kai nun*, *Post.* II.646; *eti nun*, X.131, *nu*, 133). But, he also makes references to specific phenomena that overtly locate his epic. These epic anachronisms shatter the illusion of the epic past, and are marked because their inclusion draws attention to the distinction between the time of the *imagined* world (the tale), and that of ‘real’ time (the telling). Consequently, this draws attention to the artificiality of the narrative, and the persona of the primary narrator. In *Posthomerica* VI, the Atreidai are surrounded by Trojans. As James notes, “The encirclement of Agamemnon and Menelaos by the enemy is reminiscent of that of

⁹²⁸ See Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004), on Apollonius and Callimachus; Aratus’ *Phainomena*, 224-45. For Callimachus as ‘scholar-poet’, see Harder (2004). This learned nature of the primary narrator could also be reason for the absence of the Muse. See Muse, 3.1.

⁹²⁹ So too *Il.* XII.445-49 and XX.285-87. See M. Edwards (1991), 324n.283-87.

⁹³⁰ On Homeric omnitemporality, de Jong (2004a), 14.

Odysseus at *Iliad* XI.401-20”, where the hero is “likened to a boar surrounded by hunters and hounds”.⁹³¹ However, the primary narrator’s simile that is used to convey the scene also evokes the Roman Games:⁹³²

‘Those two were in the middle turning this way and that like boars or lions in an enclosure, on a day when rulers gather people together and cruelly shut them in to meet a dreadful death from savage beasts that are penned in there with them to tear apart any slave who happens to come to close.’
(*Post.* VI.531-36)

Elements such as rulers gathering people in enclosures, and death from savage beasts strongly evokes the Roman Games, a phenomenon that postdates Troy’s mythic past by a thousand or so years. Such a time discrepancy highlights not only this temporal disjuncture, but also draws attention to the divide between myth and reality (so too compare Virgil’s equestrian display of young nobles (= *ludus Troiae*), *Aen.* V.545-603).⁹³³ Furthermore, that this statement is in the form of a simile enhances these divergences because this mode of narrative telegraphs authorial intervention.⁹³⁴ The allusion to the Homeric simile also alerts the reader to the artificiality of the primary narrator’s construct – Quintus’ well-read narrator is inspired by Homer’s narrator. Something similar can be said of Apollonius’ engagement with the simile, and hence Quintus’ evocation too of Apollonius and his (Apollonius’) relationship with Homeric epic.⁹³⁵

In *Posthomerica* XI, Odysseus’ men,

‘arranged their shields for the war god’s business, placing them above their heads to overlap with each other, all joined with a single movement. You would have thought it was the protecting roof of a hall, solid enough to stop the mighty blast of a wet wind coming through or a deluge of rain from Zeus.’
(*Post.* XI.359-64)

⁹³¹ James (2004), 305n.527-37.

⁹³² See Vian, Vol. II (2003), 88-89n.3; James (2004), xix. On animal/man confrontations in the Roman Games, see Kyle (2001), ch. 3, especially *Gladiators and beast-fighters*, 79-90; *Noxii*, 91-95.

⁹³³ See Suet. *Aug.* 43, as noted in R. Williams (1999a), 433n.545f. On Virgil’s time-specific comments, see G. Williams (1983), 186ff.

⁹³⁴ On the effect of Homeric similes in this context, S. Richardson (1990), 64-69.

⁹³⁵ On Apollonius’ similes, see Hunter (2004), 129-38. On Quintus’ engagement with Apollonius’ similes, see Vian (2001), 287-88.

Again, the image is an epic hybrid that also stands out for its anachronistic inclusion. The Homeric simile at *Iliad* XVI.212-14 expresses the compactness of the Greek ranks, ‘like the wall of a high house’ to avoid winds. At *Argonautica* II.1072-88, the Argonauts protect themselves from the aerial attack of the birds of Ares’ Island. The interlocking of their shields is compared to close-fit roof-tiles compactly positioned to protect a house from rain.⁹³⁶ However, Quintus’ contraption (the close-knit shields) bears a close resemblance to the Roman military manoeuvre known as the *testudo* (‘tortoise’): “a screen or penthouse formed by shields held above their heads and overlapping by soldiers advancing to the attack of a fortress”.⁹³⁷ James notes that “there is no earlier mention of it in extant Greek poetry”, although the *Argonautica* passage seems to have influenced Quintus.⁹³⁸ He presents a strong case for Roman (and Virgilian) allusion when he argues: “The subsequent course of action, however, with the Trojan defenders first pelting the *testudo* with stones and other missiles and achieving nothing, and later Aeneas breaking it up with a huge rock and more stones, is so closely parallel to the narrative at *Aeneid* 9.505-18 of how Trojan defenders first fail and finally succeed against a Volscian *testudo* that it is impossible to deny direct influence of that passage”.⁹³⁹ The *testudo* features also in a variety of historical writings on warfare, e.g. Frontinus (*Stratagems* 2.3.15, 23);⁹⁴⁰ Arrian (*Tactica* 11);⁹⁴¹ Cassius Dio (*Roman History* 75.7).⁹⁴²

The last overt anachronism that I will explore concerns the prophecy for Aeneas. Here it is one of the secondary narrators, the Greek seer Kalchas, who speaks:

‘It is destined by the glorious will of the gods that he shall go from the Xanthos (Trojan river = myth/fantasy)⁹⁴³ to the broad-flowing Tiber (*eurureethron*, 337; Roman river = history/reality), to found a sacred city, an object of awe to future generations, and be the king of a widely scattered

⁹³⁶ See Vian, Vol. III (2003), 63n.1.

⁹³⁷ *Cassells’ English Dictionary*, 1165.

⁹³⁸ James (2004), 326n.358-407.

⁹³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁹⁴⁰ B. Campbell (2004), source 150, p. 121.

⁹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, source 167, p. 131.

⁹⁴² *Ibid.*, source 193, p. 142. On Greek and Roman warfare, also see Montagu (2006).

⁹⁴³ My parenthetical additions to highlight the signifiers of myth/fantasy and history/ reality.

people. The rule of the line descended from him shall later extend to the rising sun and its external setting.’ (*Post.* XIII.336-41)⁹⁴⁴

This further presses the boundaries dividing the mythic world of archaic epic from reality. The foreshadowing is obviously reference to the Roman Empire. This method, historical allusion couched in myth, taken with the subject (the foundation of the ‘awe-inspiring’ Roman Empire), has been employed before. Virgil’s *Aeneid* is saturated with such references.

The following Virgilian passage is marked for its allusion to historical reality, and also its focus on the magnitude of Rome’s Empire. This may strongly suggest Quintus’ engagement with Roman literature, and especially Virgil.

‘From this noble line shall be born the Trojan Caesar, who shall limit his empire with ocean, his glory with the stars, a Julius, name descended from great Iulus.’ (*Aen.* I.286-88)⁹⁴⁵

Such non-traditional convergence (myth becoming history) contrasts with Homer’s handling of Aeneas’ ‘destiny’. Of Aeneas’ fate Poseidon comments:

‘it is fated for him to escape so that the race of Dardanus may not perish without seed and be seen no more .../and now surely will the mighty Aeneas be king among the Trojans, and his sons’ sons who will be born in days to come.’ (*Il.* XX.302-04/ 307-08)⁹⁴⁶

The *prolepses* of both Virgil’s and Quintus’ accounts of Aeneas’ destiny differ markedly from Homer, since in the detail of their foreshadowings, they actually refer to a historical reality, the Roman Empire. The Empire had not been established by ‘Homer’s’ time. The mythical founding date is 753BC⁹⁴⁷ (early enough for Homer) but it is no more than that; and Homer may be referring to a clan in the Troad which claimed descent from Aeneas. Even if we accept a reference to an historical dynasty, the external *prolepsis* of the Homeric passage remains unfixed in time and space. Thus, it the general omnitemporality

⁹⁴⁴ See Vian, Vol. III (2003), 228-29ns. 4-5.

⁹⁴⁵ Similarly, *Aen.* I.267-79; VI.794-97. See James (2004), 337n.336-41.

⁹⁴⁶ See M. Edwards (1991), 326-27n.307-8.

⁹⁴⁷ On Rome’s founding, *OCD* (2003), 1322.

of the Homeric epic that distinguishes him from the epics of Quintus and Virgil. Their mythical allusion to the Roman Empire anticipates events *post*-dating the Troy myth. So, the narrators teleport ‘us’ (i.e. the audience) to a later reality, not an earlier fiction. This shatters both the traditional illusions of epic past and impersonality, as the descriptions are couched in contemporary reference. Therefore, the text, like its primary narrator, takes on a decidedly ‘self-conscious’ character, more in line with Hellenistic poetics (and Virgil), than Homer. With reference to this technique in Virgil’s *Aeneid*, G. Williams notes that, “The poet has so composed the *Aeneid* that a reader, aware that he is set among events that took place within a few years in the latter part of the twelfth century B.C., is nevertheless always conscious of the historical Rome ... ”.⁹⁴⁸ Like Virgil, this can be said of Quintus, but not Homer.

ii) *Interactional Particles*

I will now explore interactional particles in Quintus, to further highlight the learned nature of the Posthomeric narrator; I make use of Cuypers’ (2005) study of interactional particles in Apollonius and Homer, with minor emendations. Unless otherwise stated, my Posthomeric findings are based on the *TLG*. Cuypers defines *interactional* particles as particles that, “address the intentions, beliefs attitudes, emotions, expectations, commitment or knowledge (general and contextual) of the speaker and/ or his addressee (in epic: the narrator and the narratees) with respect to the message exchanged, and so modify the communication between them.”⁹⁴⁹

⁹⁴⁸ G. Williams (1983), 132; ch. 6, of which this citation forms part, is especially useful.

⁹⁴⁹ Cuypers (2005), 35.

Interactional Particles: Table:

Text	Narrator-text ⁹⁵⁰	Character-text	Total N : C
$\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ <i>Post.</i>	283	206	489 1.37 : 1
<i>Argon.</i>	128	101	229 1.27 : 1
<i>Il.</i>	251	514	765 0.48 : 1
<i>Od.</i>	83	574	657 0.14 : 1
$\gamma\epsilon$ <i>Post.</i>	52	26	78 2.00 : 1
<i>Argon.</i>	185	78	263 2.37 : 1
<i>Il.</i>	220	334	554 0.66 : 1
<i>Od.</i>	87	407	494 0.21 : 1
$\delta\eta$ <i>Post.</i>	16	12	28 ⁹⁵¹ 1.33:1
<i>Argon.</i>	124	67	191 1.85 : 1
<i>Il.</i>	166	312	478 0.53 : 1
<i>Od.</i>	95	401	496 0.24 : 1
$\delta\eta\theta\epsilon\nu$ <i>Post.</i>	0	0	0 -
<i>Argon.</i>	3	5	8 0.6 : 1
<i>Il.</i>	0	0	0 -
<i>Od.</i>	0	0	0 -
η <i>Post.</i>	17	23	40 0.74 : 1
<i>Argon.</i>	15	35	50 0.43 : 1
<i>Il.</i>	6	186	192 0.03 : 1
<i>Od.</i>	2	136	138 0.01 : 1
$\nu\nu$ <i>Post.</i>	33	66	99 0.50 : 1
<i>Argon.</i>	19	23	42 0.83 : 1
<i>Il.</i>	20	73	93 0.27 : 1
<i>Od.</i>	6	55	61 0.11 : 1
$\pi\omicron\nu$ <i>Post.</i>	55	24	79 2.29 : 1
<i>Argon.</i>	18	10	28 1.80 : 1

⁹⁵⁰ Terms:

i. 'Narrator-text' = primary narrator's speech;

ii. 'Character-text' = characters' speech;

iii. 'N : C' = ratio of 'Narrator-text' to 'Character-text'; thus *pou*: 'Narrator-text' (55) divided by 'Character-text' (24) = 2.291 : 1.

⁹⁵¹ Figures based on Vian and Battagay (1984).

	<i>Il.</i>	7	60	67	0.17 : 1
	<i>Od</i>	4	91	95	0.04 : 1
<i>ποθι</i>	<i>Post.</i>	0	1	1	0.00 : 1
	<i>Argon.</i>	2	4	6	0.50 : 1
	<i>Il.</i>	1	7	8	0.25 : 1
	<i>Od</i>	0	13	13	0.00 : 1

As is immediately apparent from my findings in this representative study, there is a marked difference between the ratios for each interactional particle. The pattern that emerges is that Quintus frequently *inverts* the pattern established in the Homeric poems: in numerous cases, Quintus' primary narrator uses these particles more than his secondary characters, often to a considerable degree. In this tendency, Quintus is more in keeping with Apollonius than Homer. Yet, even here, Quintus' inversion is often greater. That the Homeric poems are longer than the *Posthomerica*⁹⁵² (*Iliad*, 15,000 lines; *Odyssey*, 12,000 lines; *Posthomerica*, 9,000 lines) further highlights these differences.

Pou

Quoting Sicking (1993, 59), Cuypers notes: "with *pou* a speaker presents his statement as a surmise whose accuracy he does not vouch for ("perhaps", "I suppose") so that disputing it need not impair the basis for an understanding between the two partners in the conversation."⁹⁵³ This explains the near total absence of *που* in the narrator-text of the Homeric poems: "In the overarching communicative fiction of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the narrator does not compose the narrative on his own authority, but 'relays' what the Muses have told him. This fiction requires that he does not argue but state, and not surmise but know."⁹⁵⁴

Που occurs eighteen times in Apollonius. In four instances, it is used in a similar way to Homer, "in the vehicle of a simile."⁹⁵⁵ The remaining fourteen occurrences (Cuypers

⁹⁵² And the *Argonautica* (6,000 lines).

⁹⁵³ Cuypers (2005), 41.

⁹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 42.

includes *ποθι* once) are more noteworthy, “even disturbing.”⁹⁵⁶ On eight occasions, *που* features in narrator-text on “motivation, feelings or thoughts of characters.” Such focalization, which expresses uncertainty, challenges the traditional omniscience of the epic narrator (and, as Cuypers notes, is more in keeping with the historian).⁹⁵⁷

For instance, hypothesizing on a speech, Apollonius’ primary narrator muses,

‘And I suppose (*pou*) one Argonaut said to another in delight, through wetted lips’: ...’ (*Argon.* IV.1457)⁹⁵⁸

A second example from Apollonius shows a further use of *που* in the narrator-text: an “assumed story detail” is conveyed:

‘For I guess (*pou*) these terrible monsters, too, had been kept by Zeus’s wife Hera as a labour for Herakles.’ (*Argon.* I.996-97)⁹⁵⁹

Such uncertainty is very much part of Quintus’ primary narrator too.

Που in Q.

The frequency of *που* in the narrator-text in Quintus is striking, far outstripping its frequency for the same in Homer, and even in Apollonius (see table above).

The following are noteworthy examples:

- i. When Thrasymedes (Antilochos’ brother) and Phereos attack Memnon (Antilochos’ killer),

‘Their tips were turned aside from his flesh, no doubt (*pou*) deflected by the goddess Dawn.’ (*Post.* II.289-90)⁹⁶⁰

The primary narrator’s uncertainty alerts the reader to issues of authorial omniscience. Traditionally, the primary narrator knows what his characters cannot. A similar scene in

⁹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 43. The following points on *pou* in Apollonius are based on Cuypers, 43ff.

⁹⁵⁷ On *pou* (and *kou*) in the historians Herodotus and Thucydides, see Sicking (1993, 57-9). On Herodotus/Historian, see below.

⁹⁵⁸ Cuypers (2005), 44; and 42n.14, for translators used.

⁹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 44.

⁹⁶⁰ See too *Post.* IV.200, and James’ note (2004), 290-91n.200-05.

the *Iliad* shows this. In *Iliad* XXII.276-77 *Athene* retrieves *Achilleus*' spear (he had hurled it at *Hektor*, and missed). The primary narrator conveys this information, and that this has gone unnoticed by *Hektor* (277). This shows that the primary narrator is distinct from the characters of his story. He can see what they cannot; unlike the mortals (even semi-divine) he has the ability to 'see' the gods.⁹⁶¹ Therefore, the expressed doubt of *Quintus*' primary narrator, as *Apollonius*', tells 'us' that he is different. It also reminds the reader that there is a disjuncture between *the* event, and the *telling* of that event. This is also connected to *Quintus*' suspension of the traditional epic invocation to the Muse(s)⁹⁶² - the Muse which guarantees accurate and comprehensive coverage.

ii. When *Memnon* has died, the primary narrator raises the issues about his afterlife:⁹⁶³

'He meanwhile in the house of *Hades*, or perhaps⁹⁶⁴ (*pou*) among the blessed ones on the *Elysian Plain*, rejoices.' (*Post.* II.650-52)

The use of *pou* in this instance could have a slightly different effect. Its use conveys doubt or (as the previous example), it *could* confer something else. The noted doubt, which previously highlighted the primary narrator's limitation, may now imply his strength. The difference in this example, is that an alternative has been noted: i) *Hades* or ii) *Elysian Plain*. Thus, this can also be read as drawing attention to the 'learnedness' of the primary narrator. In this sense, the primary narrator shows characteristics that link him with the Hellenistic writers as well as *Homer*.

iii. Following the destruction of the Greek Wall (itself anticipated in *Iliad* VII.445-63), the primary narrator notes:

'That no doubt (*pou*) resulted from the gods' resentment.' (*Post.* XIV.654-55)

Quintus' primary narrator's statement is somewhat unexpected – but perhaps this is the point. In *Iliad* VII (cited above), there is no doubt that the Greek Wall will fall – *Zeus*

⁹⁶¹ *Achilleus* is a rare exception: he *alone* sees *Athene* (*Il.* I.197-98).

⁹⁶² See above, *Beginnings.* 1.1.

⁹⁶³ Also see Ch.II.2.1i.

⁹⁶⁴ My translation.

reassures Poseidon (who is responsible for the Wall's destruction in Quintus, *Post.* XIV.646ff.). Yet, Quintus' primary narrator is unsure of the reason for/ cause of the Wall's destruction. Quintus knows his Homer very well, as do his audience: the manner of the destruction and language in Quintus closely recalls that of Homer. Zeus (in the *Iliad*) tells Poseidon that when the Greeks have left Troy, he should: i) burst apart the Wall (*teichos anarrexas*, 461), ii) sweep it into the sea (*hala ... katacheuai*, 461), iii) cover it with sand (*psamathoisi kalupsai*, 462). These three aspects feature in Quintus, although the very same diction is avoided: 'sand' (*psamathos*, 652), 'wall' (*herkos*, 651) 'cover with sea' (*hypobruchion ... ekaluphe*, 650). Therefore, the introduction of narratorial doubt, rather than merely spotlighting the primary narrator's limitations (uncertainty), actually invites multiple readings. *Within the text*, Quintus' narrator appears to lack the omniscience/ authority of Homer's narrator. Yet, in an *extra-textual* sense, it shows a poet well versed in Homer, and other writers (e.g. Apollonius and Herodotus). Thus, an *authorial* 'omniscience' is revealed through literary allusion.

Further Considerations of Pou: Myth into Mystery

The high percentage of narrator-text (76%) in Quintus points to a different approach to epic (as noted, this is closer to Apollonius than Homer). The 'telling', rather than 'showing', evokes historiography. The unusually frequent use of *pou*, in particular, locates the epic voice, at numerous points, with that of the historian. 'Doubt' is cast over the authenticity of the account for this very reason: it is an account, *not* Muse-inspired, primary narrative.

Aitia passages show this, too. The burning rock of Korykos and its palm trees which cause mortals to marvel has something of the aitiological and topographical about it - further characteristics of Hellenistic writers⁹⁶⁵ (and, indeed, writers from other periods, too). The physical objects (the burning rock of Korykos and its palm trees) *are* evidence for *future generations*. Thus, the fact of the *aitia* (cause) and its topography are beyond doubt. Yet, the *intention* of the gods is presented as a matter for speculation.

⁹⁶⁵ E.g. Callimachus' *Aitia*, and Apollonius (*Argon.* IV.1765-1772), as Hunter (2004), 105.

‘The immortals seem (*pou*) to have made it as a sight for future ages.’
(*Post.* XI.97-8)

What is supposed: the agency (e.g. was it the *immortals* that caused the rock, etc., to burn), or their motivation (e.g. did the immortals cause the rock to burn *for* future generations)? Reference to Hephaistos’ rock at line 93 suggests agency, although it does not overtly make the link. Then again, that Hephaistos is referred to as the ‘clever god’ (93), could also encourage the other reading: a ‘clever god’ would do something that ‘causes mortals to marvel’ (93-4; ... in future times, 98), so, the immortals remain immortalized (*continually* revered).

The gods are also evoked with reference to the destruction of Apollo/ Poseidon’s famous wall (*Post.* XIV.654-55) and in Dawn’s deflecting of missiles from Memnon (*Post.* II.290). *Pou* features in both instances. The use of *pou* is interesting in this context. Again, attention is drawn to the limitation of the primary narrator: he does not have access to the inner workings of the immortals; their motives. He is not omniscient. The function of *pou* and the implication of divinities (supernatural causes) as possible agents and/ or their motivations (in both instances, *aitia* are accounted for) strongly evokes Herodotus.

On earthquakes, Herodotus comments:⁹⁶⁶

‘The Delians declared that after his⁹⁶⁷ departure the island was shaken by an earthquake – the first and the last shock ever experienced there up to my time. It may well be (*kou*) that the shock was an act of God to warn men of the troubles that were on the way.’ (*Hist.* 6. 98.1)⁹⁶⁸

Under the sub-heading of ‘*Pou*’, Sicking (1993, 57-8) comments on Herodotus’ use of *kou*: “In some places *kou* conveys that we are dealing with an unverifiable surmise on the part of Herodotus, as at 5.1.3 ... and at 7.214.2 ... An arguably similar context is 6.98.1 ...

⁹⁶⁶ On ‘supernatural events’ (earthquakes, etc., including the following Herodotean passage), see T. Harrison (2000), ch. 3, esp. 95-7.

⁹⁶⁷ Datis the Persian general.

⁹⁶⁸ Tr. de Selincourt (1996).

(where)⁹⁶⁹ kou betrays a certain ambivalence: the putative earthquake at this holy spot ‘cannot but’ be a sign from Apollo, but whether it has really occurred is uncertain”.

This also raises interesting metapoetic questions for Quintus’ primary narrator, regarding sources, methods and motivations: in aligning himself with writers such as Herodotus and Apollonius in his use of *pou*, the narrator reveals the learnedness of a scholar. Flagged ambiguity of interpretation highlights the well-read poet and/or historical researcher, and also raises the profile of its educated commentator. The nature of the narrator is evident, then, not only in *his* tendency to speak (e.g. narrator-text, 76%), but further in his tendency to interpret. Through these means, he controls the narrative and its reception.

ἦ

A cursory glance at the data for another interactional particle further suggests this. In Homer ἦ is predominantly character-text (8/322;⁹⁷⁰ Apollonius 15/35);⁹⁷¹ in Quintus 17/23 (narrator/ character). As Cuypers (2005, 50): “A felicitous label for ἦ is ‘subjectivity marker’. It expresses a *personal* commitment of the speaker to the validity of the utterance. This contribution that can be made explicit with paraphrases such as “I assure you”, “in my opinion”, and “if you ask me”. So, this strongly indicates the un-Homeric manner of the primary narrator in Quintus, who is far more overtly subjective.

Cuypers’ observation of ἦ in Homer is also useful: “Of the eight instances of ἦ in narrator-text that do occur, five appear in *Iliad* 16-17, the events around Patroclus, where scholars have also found the narrative more ‘emotional’ than elsewhere” (Cuypers, 2005, 51).⁹⁷²

This emotive use of ἦ intensifies the claim of the primary narrator, and, therefore, his presence. Thus, the following data emphasises the different characteristics of the primary narrator in the *Posthomeric*: 17/23; as opposed to the same in Homer, 8/322 (*Iliad*, 6/186;

⁹⁶⁹ My addition in parenthesis.

⁹⁷⁰ *Iliad* 6/186; *Odyssey* 2/136.

⁹⁷¹ Data for Homer and Apollonius is based on Cuypers (2005), 39.

⁹⁷² I.e.: *Iliad*, XIII.354, XVI.46-7, 362, 685-88, XVII.234-36, 429-30; *Odyssey*, IV.228-32, XXII.31-3. See Cuypers (2005), 51 and 52, respectively.

Odyssey, 2/136); Apollonius, 15/35. Again, it is worth recalling that the Homeric epics are far longer than Quintus' work – approximately 30,000 verses to Quintus' 9,000; also, the discrepancy of its uses – ἦ is clearly a speech-word in Homer (perhaps the less frequent use in the *Odyssey* reflects its greater character-text). Even compared to Apollonius, a far less traditional epicist, Quintus' primary narrator stands out: ἦ features more in narrator-text in Quintus, but less in character-text than in Apollonius; there is a greater discrepancy between its uses within each poem. Thus, the pattern of use is even more unconventional.

2.2 *The Hero: Subjectively Speaking*

Recourse to Quintus' use of a couple of further terms equally reveals his tendency to blur rhetorical boundaries, which, in turn, have an impact on the character of the primary narrator. Here I look at *nepios* and *phaies*.

Νήπιος

*Νήπιος*⁹⁷³ 'foolish (one)',⁹⁷⁴ and its cognates (*νήπιε* and *νηπίη*) are predominantly speech words in Homer.⁹⁷⁵ However, Quintus' primary narrator uses them far more frequently: (the first number refers to *narrator-text*, the second to *character-text*) *νήπιος* - Homer (7/24),⁹⁷⁶ Quintus (4/1), Apollonius (1/0); *νήπιε* - Homer (0/4),⁹⁷⁷ Quintus (0/1), Apollonius (0); *νηπίη* - Homer 2/1,⁹⁷⁸ Quintus 3/0, Apollonius (0).

Overall, Homer uses the above forms of *νήπιος* x38; Quintus only x9: Homer (9/29); Quintus (7/2). This indicates: i) the *relative* prominence and subjectivism of Quintus' primary narrator compared to his characters, and Homer's primary narrator – thus, Quintus' primary narrator predominantly characterizes his heroes, whilst Homer's heroes characterize each other; ii) that Homer's primary narrator uses these forms more than Quintus', but, proportionately (compared to his character-text), far less; iii) the idea of the

⁹⁷³ Data is based on the *TLG*.

⁹⁷⁴ *Nepios* can also mean 'child', and, therefore, that no value judgment/opinion is necessarily intended.

⁹⁷⁵ Similarly, *αἰδώς* ('shame') is almost entirely a speech word in Homer (1/24). See Hunter (2004), 109-10; Griffin (1986), 43.

The trend is reversed (though not to the same degree) in Quintus (8/3) (and Apollonius, 10/2).

⁹⁷⁶ *Iliad* 7/9; *Odyssey* 0/15.

⁹⁷⁷ *Iliad* 0/4; *Odyssey* 0.

⁹⁷⁸ *Iliad* 2/1; *Odyssey* 0.

‘fool’ features far less in Quintus. Perhaps this adds weight to the opinion that Quintus has a tendency to idealize his heroes.⁹⁷⁹ Although, it is ironic that Quintus’ heroes are less ‘foolish’, though more silent (*νη-, ἔπος*).⁹⁸⁰

On Homer’s use of *νήπιος*, Griffin notes: “A character may address another in the vocative, *νήπιε*; for himself the narrator sticks to the nominative and the third person. The distinction cannot be primarily metrical, as other possibilities did exist in the epic. It is a matter of stylistic and emotional level and tone” (1986, 40). So, Quintus’ inversion of this pattern, as with the other words noted, not only blurs the boundary between narrator and character, but in fact locates the primary narrator as *the* central character. He rejects the largely objective and anonymous primary narrating, traditional in Homer, and, in its place saturates the text with subjective rhetoric more in keeping with the heroes. He also amplifies narrator-text peculiarities that occasionally mark the primary narrator’s presence in the Homeric poems; and, as is shown, extends the unorthodox trends of Apollonius.

Regarding *νηπίη*, this form occurs in epic only in Homer (*Iliad*) and Quintus. On each occasion in Quintus, *νηπίη* is addressed to a doomed woman (Penthesileia x2;⁹⁸¹ Oenone x1⁹⁸²). It is tempting to draw parallels here with Homer’s use of the vocative *νήπιε*, where it is the *heroes* who announce the doom of the unfortunates who meet them (Hektor;⁹⁸³ Achilles x2⁹⁸⁴) – the vanquished heroes showed misguided judgment (foolishness) in facing their superior foes. As is shown, in Quintus, the primary narrator notes Penthesileia is a fool twice, whilst, in Homer, Achilles uses the word twice. In this sense, Quintus’ primary narrator can be said to sometimes take the words out of Homer’s heroes’ mouths.

Φαίης

Φαίης ‘you would say’ (second singular optative), uttered by the primary narrator, shatters the illusion of the separateness of the heroic world from our own. Here myth and reality

⁹⁷⁹ See James (2000), 13-14, and especially Mansur (1940), as noted in James.

⁹⁸⁰ As discussion throughout, Quintus’ tendency is to silence his heroes, but *not* his narrator.

⁹⁸¹ *Post.* I.96, 134.

⁹⁸² *Post.* X.329.

⁹⁸³ *Il.* XVI.833 = mocks fatally wounded Patroklos; cf. Hektor’s reproach of Poulydamas, *Il.* XVIII.295.

⁹⁸⁴ *Il.* XXI.99 = reproach of doomed Lykaon; XXII.333 = reproach of doomed Hektor.

merge into one. The term acts as a kind of half-way-house where we (the audience/reader) move closer to the primary narrator, and he closer to us (in film, the term corresponds to the actor's address (visual or verbal) to the camera).

The convergence has multiple meanings. At one level it pulls us into the world of the narrator, which is not entirely the world of the heroes. Yet, on another level the term reminds us of the distinction between the epic events, the *telling* of those events (the primary narrator recounts, usually, but does not comment, usually), and the reception of the narrative, or: myth, narrator, audience. The implication is, we would say, *if* we were there. This also reminds us, then, paradoxically, that we were not there. And, that the primary narrator's account will have to do.

For the following statistics,⁹⁸⁵ as above, the first figure is for narrator-text, the second character-text: Homer 3/3;⁹⁸⁶ Apollonius 4/2; Quintus 9/1.⁹⁸⁷ Although these are not huge frequencies, Quintus outstrips his epic predecessors, and the figures indicate differences in his primary narrator. Of the three instances in Homer (the *Iliad*) each is founded in reality (IV.429, silent multitudes; XV.697, tireless in fight; XVII.366, destruction of the sun and moon).⁹⁸⁸ This contrasts with Quintus, whose primary narrator's address to the narratee ('us') sometimes assumes that we would locate the events in a supernatural sphere (in part, this is similar in tone to Herodotus' speculation about supernatural causation⁹⁸⁹). However, the key factor here is that Quintus' narrator anticipates our response to a far greater extent than Homer had. In this way, the Posthomeric narrator is not only the dominant voice of the actors, but also of the audience – he filters all.

For instance, with reference to the nature of Achilles' battle with Memnon, the primary narrator comments:⁹⁹⁰

⁹⁸⁵ Data is based on the *TLG*.

⁹⁸⁶ *Iliad* 3/2; *Odyssey* 0/1.

⁹⁸⁷ *Post.* II.517, 565, III.556, V.13, IX.544, X.134, XI.199, 362, XIV.473.

⁹⁸⁸ On *phaies* in Homer, see S. Richardson (1990), 76-77.

⁹⁸⁹ See esp., Herodotus, above in *Scholar*.

⁹⁹⁰ On this battle, see Chs.II.1.3i and II.2.1i.

‘You would say (*phaies*) that on the day of desperate strife either tireless Giants or mighty Titans were fighting.’ (*Post.* II.517-19)⁹⁹¹

Similarly, of the scenes on Achilles’ immortal arms (shield),

‘You would say (*phaies*) they were alive and moving with the winds.’ (*Post.* V.13)⁹⁹²

In these instances, *phaies* can be interpreted to act in a double-edged way: we become more immersed in the world of the primary narrator’s focus, because he imposes mythic interpretations onto us; also, as noted, the poem’s artificiality is flagged and we become aware of the artifice and its author. ‘We’ become part of the fabric of the narrator’s tale, as he assumes our responses. In this sense, Quintus’ primary narrator acts as a conduit for our thoughts, as he does for the (relatively silent) heroes *in* his story. In other words, we become the narratees; and our speech reported (indirect). What does this all point to? The primary narrator controls not only the speech of his heroes, but also that of his audience. Thus, he takes on a very prominent and dominant role, unusual in traditional heroic poetry, conveyed through appropriating a traditional element in different ways.

However, it is worth noting here, that although Quintus’ primary narrator uses terms more closely associated with character-text (this is pattern is also evident in his use of *gnomai* below), he avoids the more pronounced emotional engagement of the narrator of the *Aeneid*. Virgil’s primary narrator makes explicitly partisan comments in the *Aeneid* about Aeneas and Rome’s ‘great destiny’ (see references above). Furthermore, the Virgilian primary narrator in places intervenes to share the experiences of his characters, for example, in his direct address to Dido, when she witnesses the Trojans’ preparation for departure, *quis tibi tum Dido ...* (*Aen.* IV.407-15), and in his comment on her ‘miserable’ doom (*Aen.* IV.696-97); so too the authorial eulogy for Nisus and Euryalus, *Fortunati ambo! ...* (*Aen.* IX.446-49).⁹⁹³ Thus, Quintus’ primary narrator comes somewhere between

⁹⁹¹ My adapted version of James’ translation (2004).

⁹⁹² *Ibid.*

⁹⁹³ On authorial comment in the *Aeneid*, see Fowler (2000); G. Williams (1983), 201-203.

the emotive extremes of the relatively 'objective' Homer and markedly subjective Virgil.⁹⁹⁴

In this, as indicated by his 'learned' approach (see discussion on the 'Scholar' above) to epic, the Posthomeric narrator achieves distinct voices that shift in tone. The effect, like the narrators in Callimachus' Hellenistic writings,⁹⁹⁵ is that of a well-read poet.⁹⁹⁶ And, in a manner which has its roots in archaic and classical views of the poet, the dictum is not only to entertain, but also instruct.⁹⁹⁷ It is to this area that I now turn.

2.3 *Teacher*

As Scholar-poet, Quintus' narrator displays his learning, but as 'Teacher' he imparts his wisdom. This facet of the narrator is particularly evident in the frequency and use of the Posthomeric *gnome* and allusive *Mountain of Virtue*.

i) *Gnomai*

The *OCD* defines a *gnome* (pl. *gnomai*) as, "a maxim or aphorism ... articulated as a succinct general truth or instruction".⁹⁹⁸ Accounts vary as to the actual number of *gnomai* in the *Posthomeric*. In my readings, I have made the figure approximately 100.⁹⁹⁹ Of these, 34 are narrator-text (the primary narrator); thus, approximately one third of the total. This contrasts markedly with that in the *Iliad*, where of the 150 *gnomai*,¹⁰⁰⁰ only three are spoken by the primary narrator.¹⁰⁰¹ As Maciver (2007) notes, and as is evident with regards to other aspects of Quintus,¹⁰⁰² this figure is all the more remarkable when

⁹⁹⁴ 'Objective' here is a comment on style, not effect or intent. On Homer, see de Jong (2004), esp. chs. 1 and 2 and S. Richardson (1990), esp. 165-66; for Virgil, G. Williams (1983), ch. 7.

⁹⁹⁵ On Callimachus' 'voices', see Hunter (2004), 115ff.

⁹⁹⁶ See Bing (1988).

⁹⁹⁷ See Aristophanes (*Frogs*, 1500-1502).

⁹⁹⁸ *OCD* (2003), 640.

⁹⁹⁹ Cf. 90 in James (2004), xxviii, and James and Lee (2000), 12 (who cite Kakridis (1962, 178-81) for the same); 132 in Maciver (2007), 269.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Again, the figures vary: 81 in Ahrens (1937), 12-38; 154 in Lardinois (1997), 215; 150 in Maciver (2007), 269, who cites, and challenges both earlier studies.

¹⁰⁰¹ Maciver (2007), 47; Maciver also notes that the primary narrator utters *gnomai* twice in the *Odyssey*.

¹⁰⁰² These 'other aspects' are central to my study, and can be briefly termed as Quintus' engagement with, and manipulation of, earlier models and motifs.

considering the length of the *Posthomerica* (9,000 lines) compared to that of the *Iliad* (15,000 lines).

Immediately, then, this presents us with a primary narrator far more prominent in the epic than his Homeric predecessor. The nature of these *gnomai* further conveys the departure of Quintus from Homer's primary narrator. Maciver notes that, "all three *gnomai* spoken by the primary narrator in the *Iliad* have a single theme, that of man's inferiority to the gods".¹⁰⁰³

Quintus' primary narrator does make such gnomic utterances,¹⁰⁰⁴ but he also has much to say on other areas, too; such as: Fate(s);¹⁰⁰⁵ *ponos/ ergon* (hard work);¹⁰⁰⁶ gentleness;¹⁰⁰⁷ prowess;¹⁰⁰⁸ honour/ glory;¹⁰⁰⁹ mortality;¹⁰¹⁰ necessity (elevating a man beyond his normal ability);¹⁰¹¹ wisdom/ restraint;¹⁰¹² hierarchy (usually in the form of, 'a man of lower standing should defer to his 'better'');¹⁰¹³ virtue;¹⁰¹⁴ beauty (a superficial quality, that can contrast with prowess);¹⁰¹⁵ man's tragic fall (from the position of grace);¹⁰¹⁶ and suffering.¹⁰¹⁷ One could also add to these the (detrimental) effects of drink,¹⁰¹⁸ hunger,¹⁰¹⁹

¹⁰⁰³ Maciver (2007), 270n.51: *Il.* XVI.688-90 (applied to Patroklos); XX.265-66 (applied to Aeneas); XXI.264 (applied to Achilleus); and, *Odyssey* V.79-80; XVI.161 (Lardinois, 1997, 230 and 232).

¹⁰⁰⁴ *Post.* IV.205-07; VII.9-10.

¹⁰⁰⁵ *Post.* I.31-2; VII.9-10; IX.415-22; XI.11, 272-77 (x2); XIII.495, 559-60; XIV.99-100. On 'Fate', see also, III.756-57; VII.67-92; IX.499-508, as noted in James (2004), 325n.272-77.

¹⁰⁰⁶ *Post.* IV.63-4; XII.342-43. On 'Work's' moral benefits, see also, V.49-56 'The Tree of Virtue' (and James' note on this passage, 2004, pp. 295-96); I.738; II.76-7; IV.87; VI.451; IX.104-05; XII.71-2, 292-96, as in James (2004), 274-75n.738.

¹⁰⁰⁷ *Post.* IV.379. On 'Gentleness', see also, VII.89-90; IX.522; XIII.348-49; XIV.203-09, as James (2004), 285n.424.

¹⁰⁰⁸ *Post.* IV.434-35; VI.205-07; VII.565-66; XI.282.

¹⁰⁰⁹ *Post.* V.636; VII.565-66; XIII.248-49, 269-70, 287-90; XIV.112-14.

¹⁰¹⁰ *Post.* VI.4-5; X.41-2.

¹⁰¹¹ *Post.* XII.388. On 'Necessity' inspiring courage, see also, II.275-76; XII.60-3; XIII.121-22; XIV.564, as noted in James (2004), 275n.275-76.

¹⁰¹² *Post.* III.8-9; IV.379; XIV.112-14.

¹⁰¹³ *Post.* XIII.269-70.

¹⁰¹⁴ *Post.* I.116-16.

¹⁰¹⁵ *Post.* VII.9-10.

¹⁰¹⁶ *Post.* XIII.248-49.

¹⁰¹⁷ *Post.* I.71-2, 116-16; II.263-64; III.8-9; IV.401-02; VII.635-36; IX.416-22.

¹⁰¹⁸ *Post.* XIII.12-3.

¹⁰¹⁹ *Post.* IV.66-9; VI.95.

jealousy,¹⁰²⁰ moral decline (including adultery),¹⁰²¹ and the quickest way to death,¹⁰²² the importance of sleep/ rest,¹⁰²³ not passing judgment on the dead,¹⁰²⁴ the Seasons/ Time,¹⁰²⁵ hope,¹⁰²⁶ and the ignorance of children.¹⁰²⁷ It is also to be noted, that these *gnomai* are not necessarily self-contained subject units. For instance, multiple subjects can feature, such as in Book III (8-9), where the primary narrator notes that the *wise man* suffers *courageously*. Here, then, the subjects of the *gnome* are wisdom *and* courage.

The dense presence of generalizing maxims voiced by the primary narrator creates a decidedly didactic tone that is unlike Homeric epic. In fact, as will be discussed below,¹⁰²⁸ the moralizing of the primary narrator is more in keeping with the Hesiodic narrator.¹⁰²⁹ This is not to say that Homer is not evoked, but it is the *type* of narrator that differs. Sometimes, elements of *non-gnomic* character-text from Homer are reworked, and become *gnomai* in the mouth of Quintus' primary narrator; or, put another way, Quintus takes a character's comment that has specific application and turns it into the primary narrator's universal truth. This phenomenon is striking, and indicates a marked departure from the traditional primary narrator of Homeric epic. This gives Quintus' narrator a distinct voice.

Noteworthy examples of the reworking mentioned above are as follows:

‘only the cruel Fates, which can't be avoided by any who walk on the earth (had caused Philoktetes' suffering).¹⁰³⁰ Ever unseen, they haunt the hapless race of men every single day, at one time breaking the strength of mortals by their merciless will and at another suddenly giving them glory. For all the fortunes of mortals, the painful as well as the pleasant, are contrived by them according to their pleasure.’¹⁰³¹ (*Post.* IX.415-22)¹⁰³²

¹⁰²⁰ *Post.* VI.32; IX.347-49.

¹⁰²¹ *Post.* II.83-5; XIV.53-4.

¹⁰²² *Post.* IX.193-94; XIII.204-05.

¹⁰²³ *Post.* IV.63-4.

¹⁰²⁴ *Post.* I.809-10.

¹⁰²⁵ *Post.* II.504-06; X.41-2.

¹⁰²⁶ *Post.* I.72-3.

¹⁰²⁷ *Post.* XIV.389.

¹⁰²⁸ See following discussion on the ‘Mountain of Virtue’, also.

¹⁰²⁹ For the Hesiodic narrator, see Nunlist (2004a). On Hesiodic wisdom literature, see West (1996), 3-25.

¹⁰³⁰ My parenthetical addition.

¹⁰³¹ On Hesiod's ‘ephemeral’ man, see below.

This *gnome* (technically *gnomai* as there are plural maxims here) actually begins the indirect speech of Diomedes and Odysseus as they try to console the deserted Philoktetes. But the indirect speech and the detached tone quickly becomes that of the primary narrator generalising. This is example of a *gnome* that reaches beyond a self-contained subject unit (see above), as it touches upon Fate, mortality, glory and suffering.¹⁰³³

The *gnome* recalls the character-text of *Iliad* XXIV.525-30. Trying to console Priam, Achilleus notes:

‘For so have the gods spun the thread for wretched mortals, that they should live among sorrows; and they themselves are without care. For two urns are set on Zeus’ floor of gifts that he gives, the one of ills, the other of blessings. To whomever Zeus, who hurls the thunderbolt, gives a mixed lot, that man meets now with evil, now with good.’

Quintus’ *gnomai*, like his character drawing and frequency of similes, have been heavily criticised.¹⁰³⁴ Yet, there is nothing random about his usage. The majority of the *gnomai* have apparent contextual links with the specific scenes in which they are uttered. This can be viewed in terms of the scene giving concrete expression to the *gnome*; or, vice versa – the *gnome* draws out a principle from the previously ‘witnessed’ scene. The mixture of ‘showing’ (scene content = internal narrative) and ‘telling’ (primary narrator comment = external narrative) enhances the inter-relationship between the two. (Thus, the narrator becomes his story. This point is also suggested by the extreme narrator-text in the *Posthomeric* – 76%; as compared with about 45 % for the Homeric poems (55%, *Iliad*; 33%, *Odyssey*), where the heroes do the talking. This reinforces the point – dominant voice = story.)

¹⁰³² Quintus’ episode does also recall his own at *Post.* VII.67-92, when Nestor consoles Podaleirios for the loss of his brother Machaon. On which, see Ch.II.2.2; also, James (2004, 306n.67-92), notes *Iliad* XXIV, and Plato’s *Republic*, X.

¹⁰³³ See above for references for each of these gnomonic themes.

¹⁰³⁴ See Köchly (1850), and Paschal (1904), noted by James and Lee (2000), 12.

An example of this concerns Priam's killing (by Neoptolemos).

'The glory (*kudos*) of man is never undiminished for long and disgrace (*oneidos*) can quickly catch one unawares.' (*Post.* XIII.248-49)

The subject of this gnomic theme is man's tragic fall. The lines immediately preceding the *gnome* focus on Priam's decapitation, and of the juxtaposition between his (once) great prosperity (wealth, lineage, and numerous offspring, 247). In this sense, then, Quintus' *gnome* here caps the scenes. The episode *shows* exactly what the *gnome conveys* – ideas (words) become things (deeds); and the *kudos* that Priam (man = universal 'men') achieved is fleeting.

Hesiod also considers the ephemeral nature of man, and his vulnerability to external forces. It is the didactic tone of Hesiodic narrator, in the following, that can be detected in the Posthomeric musings of the primary narrator cited above:

'For easily he (Zeus) makes strong, and easily he brings the strong man low; easily he humbles the proud' ¹⁰³⁵ (*Works*, 5ff.)

As discussed, ¹⁰³⁶ Quintus' focus, the fragility of man, also evokes the Virgilian episode (*Aen.* II.554-59): 'Such was the close of Priam's fortunes; such was the doom that by fate (*fata*) befell him ... he once the lord of so many lands, the monarch of Asia. He lies a trunk upon the shore ... '. Yet, unlike Quintus' primary narrator, Virgil's hero Aeneas narrates (= character-text). Also, Aeneas' comment does *not* take on a universal tone, although the implication may well be there. ¹⁰³⁷ Instead, Aeneas speaks of Priam *specifically*. Equally, Quintus' *gnome* could remind the reader of the epitome of the tragic fall; Oedipus. ¹⁰³⁸ In the *exodus* to *OT*, the Chorus begin with specific reference to Oedipus (1524-527), but close with a universalizing truth on man(kind) (*OT*.1528-30).

¹⁰³⁵ On which, see West (1996), 139-40; cf. *Il.* XX.242ff., as cited by West (139n.5ff.).

¹⁰³⁶ See Chs. III.2.2 and IV.1.3-4.

¹⁰³⁷ See Austin (1980), 213n.554: *hic exitus* = Hannibal; Pompey: "and any Roman reader would recognize in Virgil's lines the ethos of history in an epic guise".

¹⁰³⁸ See Aristotle, *Poetics* 1453a.

In my next example Quintus uses the death of the beautiful Nireus to generalize on the juxtaposition of beauty and prowess:

‘The gods don’t grant perfection (*teleousin*) to human beings in all things, for Fate decrees that evil (*kakon*) must accompany good (*esthlo*).’
(*Post.* VII.9-10)

This recalls the narration, and character-text in *Posthomeric* VI; although the *gnome* is set up, it is not formalized by the *primary* narrator until the next Book (VII). In *Posthomeric* VI, we are told that Nireus rivals the gods (in beauty, 372). This anticipates *Post.* VII.7. The primary narrator also notes that Nireus’ beautiful body (*aglaie erateine*, 383) lay on the earth (VI.382-83).¹⁰³⁹ To emphasize this point, the voice shifts to Eurypylos (Nireus’ killer). Eurypylos articulates that Nireus’ marvellous beauty could not save him (VI.385-86). Eurypylos ends with the *gnome* that, in battle, beauty (*kallos*) is no match for strength (*kartei*, VI.389; this is also an interesting inversion from the *Iliad*, where it is the primary narrator who notes that Amphimachus’ golden decoration could not save him from battle-death, *Il.* II.872-73).

This closely anticipates the primary narrator’s comment at *Post.* VII.11-12, that Nireus’ beauty and weakness are linked (*aglaie erateine*, VII.11; *alapadnosune*, 12), and the primary narrator’s repetition of *aglaie erateine* frames the episodes. Thus, the registers shift, from narrator-text to character-text to narrator-text, and (within these) from specifics to universals (*gnomai*). The two episodes are clearly connected, Nireus, the subject matter and verbal echoes being the overt links. And, these echoes reinforce the point.¹⁰⁴⁰

In an epic that focuses on violence, we may be forgiven for noting the incongruity of the following *gnome* on ‘gentleness’. In the Games for Achilleus, Epeios has just floored Akamas, and it seems the boxing match may get out of hand. The Greeks are concerned about the outcome, but it is the primary narrator who expresses the maxim:

¹⁰³⁹ For the pun on Nireus’ mother, Aglaia, see James (2004), 304n.372.

¹⁰⁴⁰ E.g. the *gnome* triggered by Priam’s death (*Post.* XII.248-49) anticipates the *gnome* for Andromache: ‘for royal persons death in battle is better than serving their inferiors’ (*Post.* XIII.269-70). The fall from a very prosperous position links the two.

‘Wise men’s (*pinutoisi*) minds are ever inclined to gentleness (*epios*).’
(*Post.* IV.379)¹⁰⁴¹

Gentleness (*epios, meilichos*)¹⁰⁴² is mentioned elsewhere in the *Posthomerica* and the *Iliad*,¹⁰⁴³ but nowhere else does it feature in the narrator-text as a *gnome*. In the Games context, this may recall especially Achilles’ function as mediator in the wrestling between Aias and Odysseus (*Il.* XXIII.733-39).¹⁰⁴⁴ Yet, this can only be inferred, and the mode is character-text. Quintus’ narrator is explicit. For my purposes this is significant because it is another example of the way Quintus’ primary narrator differs markedly from that of Homer’s.

ii) *The Mountain of Virtue*¹⁰⁴⁵

I mentioned above that Quintus’ preference for *gnomai* gives his text a Hesiodic aspect. This dimension of the narrator is enhanced by a striking passage in *Posthomerica* V, the Mountain of Virtue, which, though not a *gnome*, is clearly didactic in nature. In *Posthomerica* V, the primary narrator gives a detailed description (ekphrasis) of Achilles’ immortal arms (*Post.* V.3ff.; cf. *Il.* XVIII.478ff.¹⁰⁴⁶). The noteworthy ‘Mountain of Virtue (Arete)’ forms part of this description (*Post.* V.49-56); and from this concrete image, the primary narrator’s focalization (interpretation) conveys the moral commonplace. In the immediate backdrop to the Mountain of Virtue, the primary narrator notes that ‘much-enduring men’ (*polutleton anthropon*, 45) were living in beautiful cities, overseen by ‘Justice’ (*Dike*, 46). The men are ‘working on various tasks’ (*epi erga cheras pheron*, 47). The morally edifying nature of hard work, then, has been set up just before the metapoetic narrative which is about to follow.

‘Shown also on that god’s creation was the steep and rugged mountain of holy Virtue (*zathees Aretes oros*), with Virtue herself standing with her feet on the

¹⁰⁴¹ Here, perhaps, one can detect a certain playfulness in Quintus’ choice of words, *epios* (‘gentleness’) for (Akamas and) ‘Epeios’; also Aglaia above; Ilioneos, Chs.III.2.2.

¹⁰⁴² Further on *meilichos*, see esp. Ch.IV.1.7.

¹⁰⁴³ See James (2004), 285n.424, and related notes for *Post.* III.424, VII.89-90, IX.522, XIII.348-49 and XIV.203-09. James notes its use in the *Iliad* at XIX.300, XXIV.771-75.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Perhaps, too, Nestor, trying to reconcile Achilles and Agamemnon (*Il.* I.259-84).

¹⁰⁴⁵ See especially Maciver (2007).

¹⁰⁴⁶ On Achilles’ Iliadic shield, see M. Edwards (1991), 200-33.

top of a palm tree, so high that she touched the sky above. On every side pathways interrupted by crowding bramble bushes impeded the approach of human feet, for many there were who turned back overawed by the steep ascent and few persisted, sweating up the sacred way.’ (*Post.* V.49-56)

On the Mountain of Virtue in Quintus, James notes, “Its first literary antecedent is Hesiod’s contrast between the difficult road to virtue and the easy one to evil (*Works and Days*, 287-92)”.¹⁰⁴⁷

‘Badness (*kakoteta*) can be got easily (*rhedios*) and in shoals: the road to her is smooth, and she lives very near us. But between us and Goodness (*aretas*) the gods have placed the sweat of our brows (*hidrota... proparoithen*): long and steep is the path that leads to her, and it is rough at the first; but when a man has reached the top, then is she easy to reach, though before that she was hard.’ (Hesiod, *Works*, 287-92)

Quintus’ Mountain also anticipates the *gnome* uttered by Nestor, which again recalls Hesiod in *Posthomerica* XII.290-96.¹⁰⁴⁸ Nestor congratulates Neoptolemos on his prudence: ‘toil’ (*kamatoio*, 290) will be rewarded with great glory (*mega kleos*, 290), after much painful war-work (*ponesamenoisi*, 291); good things are distant and require work (*ponon*, 293); the road to ruin is easy (*rheidie*, 294),¹⁰⁴⁹ to glory hard, and requires work (294-96; *ponon*, 296).¹⁰⁵⁰ (The challenge to Xenophon’s Herakles – the difficult path to virtue, or easy path to evil - could also be evoked by this scene (*Mem.* II.21-34).)¹⁰⁵¹ Quintus, then, aligns his narrative persona with wisdom literature; this alignment, implicit in the case of the *gnomai*, is presented in this case in an exceptionally explicit manner.¹⁰⁵² Furthermore, the alignment is more striking for its form; Quintus uses a device famously associated with Homer, the ekphrasis of a work of art (yet not just any work of art, but the arms of Achilleus), to create a singularly un-Homeric effect.

¹⁰⁴⁷ James (2004), 295-96n.49-56. For detailed commentary on this passage, see James and Lee (2000), 52n.49-56 to 55n.56. See Vian (2003), II.203-05. On the Hesiodic passage, see West (1996), 229-30, and ch.II on ‘Wisdom Literature’.

¹⁰⁴⁸ See M. Campbell (1981) 97n.290-99n.296; See Vian (2003), II.203-05.

¹⁰⁴⁹ Note the ‘ease’ of *rhedios* in the Hesiodic passage.

¹⁰⁵⁰ See James (2004), 330n.292-96.

¹⁰⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 295/296n.49-56.

¹⁰⁵² On Hesiod/Wisdom literature, see West (1996), 3-25.

Quintus' Mountain passage differs from the more usual gnomic passages because the moralizing is couched in an ekphrasis, as opposed to the *gnome* capping a character's action. However, the description is focalized by the primary narrator, and the significance is that value judgments are woven into the narrator's description. Thus, the unusual context (ekphrasis) and tone (wisdom literature) especially mark the episode (if, indeed, one can term it so), *and* the primary narrator's voice.

The character of this voice is designedly distinct and different from Homer, although, as noted, the form (ekphrasis) recalls Achilles' arms in the *Iliad*. These marking qualities (prominence and nature) of the primary narrator, have a great impact upon the character of the epic poem also, and create the effect that the narrative is, relatively speaking, far *more* concerned with *gnomai* than is the case in the Homeric narratives.

2.4 *The Physician*¹⁰⁵³

The Posthomeric primary narrator's exploration of medical matters is also used to contribute to the dominant impression of learnedness; it also reinforces the impression that he is far more 'modern' in the breadth and nature of his learning.

Regarding the mental demise of Aias (following the *Hoplōn Krisis*), the primary narrator shows himself to be an astute physiologist.

'Aias' noble strength was frozen stiff, as suddenly pain and confusion overwhelmed him. All through his body his crimson blood was boiling and bitter bile came flooding over into his liver. Dreadful anguish gripped his heart, and through the base of his brain sharp pain came shooting up and totally enveloped the membranes, making his mind confused. He fixed his eyes on the ground and stood there as though he could not move.'
(*Post.* V.322-29)

This passage is discussed in detail in James' and Lees' commentary on *Posthomeric V* (2000, 107-08n.322-29). The passage is marked for its elaborate attention to a

¹⁰⁵³ For medical matters in Quintus, see especially Ozbek (2007). On ancient Greek and Roman medicine (including glaucoma, the nervous system, madness, the four humours, etc.), see Nutton (2006); psychology in Quintus, García Romero (1986).

physiological state, including being frozen (*pachnothe*, 322), mental blindness (*ate*, 323); with physical symptoms following – heating of the blood, etc. (322-28). James and Lee note this reflects the Hippocratic theory of four humours (determining temperament); and investigation of the nervous system by the Alexandrian doctors Herophilus and Erastistratus.¹⁰⁵⁴ In this context – *Hoplou Krisis* - Aias' madness,¹⁰⁵⁵ is noted in the *Little Iliad* (1), Sophocles (*Ai*.51ff.) and Ovid (*Met.* XIII.382ff.), but in none of the extended medical detail that Quintus makes use of. This clearly produces a different effect and indicates a further focus.

However, Apollonius' love-struck Medea exhibits similar occipital symptoms, as she anticipates Jason's task of yoking Aietes' bulls:¹⁰⁵⁶

‘And the tear of pity flowed from her eyes, and ever with anguish tortured her frame, and about her fine nerves (*araias inas*, 762-63) and deep down beneath the nape of the neck where the pain enters keenest, whenever the unwearied Loves direct against the heart their shafts of agony.’ (*Argon*.III.761-65)

Perhaps one could add the mad-induced Turnus (*Aen.* VII.458-59) and love-sick Dido to this epic list. On discovering that Aeneas is leaving, the primary narrator informs us that the doomed lover, Dido is:

‘(But Dido,) trembling and frenzied with her awful purpose, rolling her bloodshot eyes, her quivering cheeks flecked with burning spots, and pale at the coming of death.’ (*Aen.* IV.642-44)

Similarly, Quintus' primary narrator exhibits great medical knowledge in his detailed comments on the famous blinding (and suffering) of Laocoon, who has just warned the Trojans of the danger of the Horse (Athene is the angered goddess):

‘At once he was seized by terror and trembling shattered the strength of the proud man's limbs. Around his head was spread the blackness of night. A horrible pain shot through his eyelids and disordered the eyes beneath his shaggy brows. Stabbed with piercing pangs up from their roots, his pupils

¹⁰⁵⁴ For further on these less well-known ancients, see *OCD* (2003), 699 and 552-53, respectively.

¹⁰⁵⁵ On epic madness, see Hershkowitz (1998), esp. 17-24.

¹⁰⁵⁶ See Hunter (1998), 179-80n.762-63.

grew confused. His eyeballs started rolling with deep affliction, and agonizing pain penetrated the membranes at the base of the brain.¹⁰⁵⁷ His eyes appeared alternately bloodshot and, in contrast, covered with sickly glaze. From that came a frequent discharge, just like water sprinkled with snow which flows from a rugged rock in the hills. He seemed to be demented, seeing everything in double and uttering dreadful groans. But still he exhorted the Trojans, disregarding his misery. Robbed of their blessed light by the goddess, his eyes grew fixed and white beneath their lids after the fatal bleeding.’ (*Post.* XII.399-415)

As James notes, “400-15 provides remarkably detailed and accurate description of an accelerated attack of congestive glaucoma, with inflammation of the cornea followed by white, opaque condition”.¹⁰⁵⁸ As well as medical references, the passage evokes a host of writers, ranging from Homer (8th century BC) to Oppian (late 2nd century AD).¹⁰⁵⁹ Thus, here, Quintus’ primary narrator presents the persona of a very well-read medical man. On *Post.* V.322-29, Aias’ ‘madness’, James also comments that, “anatomical precision is already a feature of the *Iliad*, but with his (Quintus’) incorporation of medical knowledge and exclusion of supernatural elements Q. goes considerably further than A. R. in modernising H.”¹⁰⁶⁰ Also, as with Aias’ ‘madness’ noted above, one can draw parallels with earlier texts. Similarly, in Virgil’s account of Laocoon’s demise, virtually no attention is given to his physical and mental demise – he merely tries to help his son, strains for his own release, and cries to heaven (*Aen.* II.220-24).

In Book I, the primary narrator applies a medical simile to Priam, a long-suffering man, who is relieved by Penthesileia’s arrival,

‘As a man who has suffered much because of blindness and longs for death if he cannot see the blessed light, either through some good doctor’s work or because a god has removed the mist from his eyes, now sees the light of day; not as well as before, but he’s comforted a little after all his suffering, though pangs of smarting pain linger beneath his eyelids;’ (*Post.* I.76-82)

¹⁰⁵⁷ The same term is applied to evoke Aias’ madness (*Post.* V.325-28); Vian, Vol. III (2003), 219n.4 (to page 104).

¹⁰⁵⁸ James (2004), 331.n.400-15. See Vian, Vol. III (2003), 105-06n.1; M. Campbell (1981), 139-45.

¹⁰⁵⁹ E.g. *tromos* and *guia* (399); *odunesin* (403), Oppian, *Cyn.* III.426. *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶⁰ James (2000), 108n.322-29. Further medical references are as follows: *Post.* IV.211-14, 396-404, 538-40; V.322-28; IX.428.29; X.277-81; XI.321-12, as in James (2004), 269n.76-82.

The conditions described here seem to be those of glaucoma. The apparent interest in medical detail (including the psychological state) is unusual in traditional epic. In this (the Priam one) simile, Quintus' exploitation of medical knowledge reveals a rather different primary narrator: 'up' on the latest (medical) learning of his day, we see further evidence of another string to his multi-faceted kithara.¹⁰⁶¹

In the context of epic, recourse to physiology is not wholly original. However, it is the more detailed elaboration that distances Quintus' primary narrator from his epic predecessor, Homer. In this area, too, Quintus aligns himself more closely with the learned Hellenism of epicists such as Apollonius, and the later Virgil. Yet, even here, Quintus' degree of medical focus is unusual. This primary narrator shows himself to be even *more* learned than his well-read predecessors. In this, then, the primary narrator's great medical knowledge in the *Posthomerica* can be understood metapoetically as comment on his great poetic abilities.

Part 3 - *Taking Centre Stage*

3.1 *Autobiography*

In this famous passage,¹⁰⁶² the primary narrator overtly steps out from the traditional epic shadow:

Τούς μοι νῦν καθ' ἕκαστον ἀνειρομέμερ σάφα, Μοῦσαι,
 ἔσπεθ' ὅσοι κατέβησαν ἔσω πολυχανδέος ἵππου·
 ὑμεῖς γάρ πᾶσάν μοι ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θήκατ' αἰοιδήν,
 πρὶν μοι <ἔτ' > ἀμφὶ παρειὰ κατασκίδνασθαι ἴουλον,
 Σμύρνης ἐν δαπέδοισι περικλυτὰ μῆλα νέμοντι
 τρίς τόσον Ἑρμοῦ ἄπωθεν ὅσον βοόωντος ἀκοῦσαι,
 Ἄρτεμιδος περὶ νηὸν Ἐλευθερίῳ ἐνὶ κήπῳ,
 οὔρεϊ οὔτε λίην χθαμαλῶ οὔθ' ὑψόθι πολλῶ.

'Muses, I ask you to tell me precisely, one by one, the names of all who went inside the capacious horse. You were the ones who filled my mind with

¹⁰⁶¹ Cf. *Od.* V.394-98, where relief from an affliction is used in a simile. Quintus is far more interested in medical detail.

¹⁰⁶² See Vian, Vol. III (2003), 101n.1, and Vol. I (2003), IX-XIII. For dense lexical commentary on these lines, see M. Campbell (1981), 101-03.

poetry, even before the dawn was spread across my cheeks, when I was tending my noble sheep in the land of Smyrna, three times as far as shouting distance from the Hermos, Near Artemis' temple, in the garden of Liberty, on a hill that is not particularly high or low.' (*Post.* XII.306-13)

The passage marks itself out as an epic invocation to the Muse. It is worth drawing attention to the severely delayed traditional invocation, which, in Quintus, comes twelve Books 'late'; at least compared to the usual epic manner, as in Homer (*Iliad*, I.1, and *Odyssey*, I.1), and even Apollonius (*Argon.* I.1; III.1; IV.1), and Virgil (*Aen.* I.8). Yet such suspension appears differently when questioning issues over 'beginnings'; for instance, that the *Posthomerica* is 'framed' by the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, etc.¹⁰⁶³

Skills

The context, of what will become autobiographical, is the Catalogue of Greek heroes entering the (Trojan) Horse. This recalls the primary narrator's invocation to the Muses in the *Iliad*, for the 'Catalogue' (of Ships; *Il.* II.484-93). In Homer, the primary narrator needs the assistance of the Muses to help him convey the multitude of Greeks, without which, he could not hope to achieve this task (even if he had ten tongues and mouths, and a tireless voice; 489-90). Further, where Homer's primary narrator invokes the Muses because they are (omni-) present (*pareste*, 485), and know all things (omniscient; *iste ... panta*, 485), no such comment features in Quintus' invocation. In this instance, the silence is explicit, and loaded. Not only is recourse to the Muses delayed for an unusually long time (textual space), but also when they are summoned, their 'special' attributes are glossed over. Consequently, Zeus' scales dip in favour of the narrator, whose centrality is elevated.

However, in one sense, Quintus' Catalogue allusion serves a similar function to the Catalogue in Homer. In his discussion, of which the Iliadic Catalogue forms a part, Silk talks of an "unexpected structural technique, which might be called *illusionist*".¹⁰⁶⁴ The Catalogue (and mobilisation), "would most naturally arise in the first year of the war, not

¹⁰⁶³ See *Beginnings/Endings* above., 1.1-2. On 'framing' epic, see Hunter (2004), 119.

¹⁰⁶⁴ Silk (1997), 41.

in the tenth”.¹⁰⁶⁵ Yet, it is woven into the narrative in such a way that its structural inappropriateness is greatly reduced (hence ‘illusion’). So, there are functional similarity between the Catalogues of Homer and Quintus: both serve to locate their poems. In Homer, the Catalogue evokes the beginning of the Trojan War; in Quintus, the Catalogue evokes Homer; and other poets/ persona, as the invocation proceeds.

Age

Reference to the poet’s early inspiration (his mind was filled with song, *aioden*; *Post.* XII.308), apparently before he needed to shave; *prin ... ioulon*, 309), also aligns himself with the star and super-star of Quintus’ epic (respectively, Achilles and Neoptolemos).¹⁰⁶⁶ These two (super-)heroes showed outstanding abilities whilst ‘beardless’ (*achmoos*, *Post.* IV.431 and VII.357). (Furthermore, whereas *klea andron* distinguishes the hero (*Il.* IX.189), the poet is immortalized through *his* poem (here ‘words’ equating to the hero’s ‘deeds’; also see below on the primary narrator singing his own song)). Reference to such early flowering (with other factors discussed below, e.g. Smyrna) further implies a connexion with Homer. For instance, the poet’s/ primary narrator’s self-assertion, that his mind was filled with poetry *even before* he had facial hair, also implies that the he is *now* no longer beardless. Thus, he is mature physically (as well as psychologically = ‘poetically’, i.e. his poetic skills). This temporal progression can also be taken to locate Quintus (very) closely with ‘earlier’ epic poets, especially Homer – the temporal shift, like Shakespeare’s ‘Seven Ages of Man’, has wider implication: sequentially, the earlier flowering could allude to Homer through his *Iliad*. Also, recourse to a Muse, invocation for a Catalogue, and the theme of the *Posthomerica* (Troy’s Fall = picking up from Homer’s Iliadic end), and reference to shepherding (see below) locates Quintus very closely on numerous levels with his illustrious predecessors, Homer and Hesiod (and Callimachus): the ‘real’ poets *and* their literary persona.

¹⁰⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶⁶ For Achilles, see Ch.II.; Neoptolemos, Ch.IV.

Occupation

Reference to ‘shepherding’ is equally loaded, for instance evoking Hesiod (*Theog.*23). By association, Callimachus (*Ait.*, I.2) is also alluded to, as he offers commentary on Hesiod’s meeting with the Muses; the locale allusively referred to as the ‘foot-print of the fiery horse’ (Pegasus) = the fountain Hippocrene on Mt. Helicon.¹⁰⁶⁷ Regarding Hesiod, direct verbal echo is avoided, while both he and Quintus ‘tend’ to their sheep: Quintus, *nemonti* (310); Hesiod, *poimainonth* (23). Quintus also alters the formula, as his sheep (*perikluta mela*, 310)¹⁰⁶⁸ far outshine those of Hesiod (simply *arnas*, 23); again one can detect, in Quintus’ communication of superiority, comment on his own work in relation to others. Quintus’ ‘famed’ sheep have been taken to be (possibly) his pupils (making Quintus a school teacher).¹⁰⁶⁹ For instance, in the idea of tending ‘famed sheep’ in Smyrna,¹⁰⁷⁰ Quintus’ narrator assumes the multiple personality of a Homeric/ Hesiodic narrator, with Hellenistic (i.e. Callimachus) allusivity: in this amalgam, care of the sheep may convey writing for a select (i.e. educated = *perikluta*) audience. And, perhaps, in the invocation to the ‘Muses’, we can see Quintus nodding not just to the tradition of epic invocation, but also to Homer, Hesiod and Callimachus’ in their own right, as ‘inspirers’ *themselves*.

(Home) Address

Geographical reference to Smyrna¹⁰⁷¹ evokes a locale associated particularly with Homer:

‘But as for Homer, you might say that every city with its inhabitants claims him as her son. Foremost are the men of Smyrna who say that he was the Son of Meles, the river of their town, by a nymph Cretheis ...’
(*Homerica, Peri Homerou*, 313)¹⁰⁷²

The Posthomeric narrator’s biographical comment, then, implies further connexion with ‘the’ epic poet. It has been suggested that perhaps reference is made to Homer’s home in

¹⁰⁶⁷ Tr. Trypanis (Cambridge, 1989); ‘foot-print’ noted *Ait.* 2, Trypanis, pp. 8-9.2a. For further discussion on allusion through locale/geography, see below.

¹⁰⁶⁸ Cf. Polyphemos’ sheep at *Od.* IX.308 (*kluta mela*).

¹⁰⁶⁹ See James and Lee (2000), 4.

¹⁰⁷⁰ See below.

¹⁰⁷¹ Cf. Virgil’s cryptic Mantua (*Aen.* X.198-201), as noted in G. Williams (1983), 186-87.

¹⁰⁷² Tr. Evelyn-White (2000), 566-67. On the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, see Evelyn-White, xxxix-xlii. On Homer’s origins, see ‘Homer’ (p. 718) and ‘Smyrna’ (p. 1417), in *OCD* (2003). On Homer’s homeland, see Graziosi (2002), ch. 2.

Iliad IX.5 (east side of the Aegean); and that thorough knowledge of the area near Miletus (*Il.* II.461) and Troy (*Il.* XII.10-33).¹⁰⁷³ All of these references are in the primary narrator's voice, but none are so explicit, stating in the first person that the poet actually lived there. Hesiod, however, does make a similar geographical claim, naming his home; Helicon.¹⁰⁷⁴ And, like Quintus, this has significances attached. '(Holy) Helicon' (*Helikonos ... zatheoio*, 23), in SW Boeotia was associated with the Muses (*Theog.* 25). Unlike Hesiod, though, Quintus does not give a name to his poet; even if, by his noting Smyrna, a cryptic link is made. (The *Homeric Hymn to Artemis* achieves a similar effect through reference to Smyrna. Subsequently, Quintus' reference to Artemis' temple, as well as to Smyrna, both reinforces his links with Homer and that early post-Homeric literature that itself attempted to convey its affinity with the 'poet'. In this allusive sense, the anonymous poet of the *Homeric Hymns* evokes a similar persona in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, with his hope that he shall be remembered as the 'blind man' from 'Chios' (= Homer; 172).¹⁰⁷⁵ We should not take Quintus' Smyrna literally; rather it is a signifier of his cultural inheritance and assertion.

Interests

Finally, the 'hill', neither too high (*oute lien chthamalo*) nor too low (*outh' rhupsothi pollo*; *Post.* XII.313), lends itself to metaphorical comment on Quintus' poem. This 'middle ground' can certainly be read as implying that the style is not too exclusive. And, therefore, unlike (the 'Tree of Virtue',¹⁰⁷⁶ or even), Callimachus and Apollonius,¹⁰⁷⁷ this epic is accessible to many. N. Hopkinson offers useful insight into the programmatic nature of this final line: "(implying) that the poem is written in a middle style that avoids extremes (*χαμαλός* = *humilis*, *ὑψόθι* = *sublimis*). Neither sublime nor pedestrian, Quintus bases his style on that of Homer ... (but)¹⁰⁷⁸ His narrative, like that of other Imperial poets, is punctuated by gnomic asides and authorial generalizations ... He parades some, but not

¹⁰⁷³ *OCD* (2003), 718.

¹⁰⁷⁴ See Callimachus above, *Occupation*.

¹⁰⁷⁵ For Homer's 'blindness', see Graziosi (2002), ch. 4. On Chios as Homer's home, see *OCD* (2003), 'Homer' (p.718), 'Homeridae' (p. 720).

¹⁰⁷⁶ See above.

¹⁰⁷⁷ See Hunter's comments for the primary narrator's 'heroic' voyage in Apollonius (2004), chs. 2 & 5.

¹⁰⁷⁸ My addition in parenthesis.

excessive learning ... In these as in other respects his motto is *μηδὲν ἄγαν*.¹⁰⁷⁹ As Hopkinson continues, this “middle ground” could also refer to the subject-matter which Quintus covers, bridging the gap between the end of the *Iliad* and the beginning of the *Odyssey*.¹⁰⁸⁰

There is a certain irony that *the* biographical episode of the *Posthomerica* (far more overt than anything in Homer, and other ancient heroic epic), should make recourse to a number of registers of renowned poets; the poet’s voice, at its loudest, sings to others’ tunes.

3.2 *Song of Songs: the Primary Narrator’s Apotheosis*¹⁰⁸¹

In my final study, I examine the primary narrator’s *obliqua oratio* of two key songs from and about the poem. Thus, I hope to further convey a sense of the Posthomerian narrator as poet-commentator in and of his poem, and beyond.

There are two striking songs *in* the *Posthomerica*. In subject matter they are very similar. In Book IV, Nestor recounts Thetis’ divinity and wedding to Peleus, to Achilles’ great heroic deeds (128-70).¹⁰⁸² The second song features in Book XIV.¹⁰⁸³ Bards sing, again, of Achilles’ great heroic deeds (126-42). These songs are noteworthy for a number of reasons. Both recount deeds occurring *before* the narrative of the *Posthomerica*, for instance, Achilles’ fight with Telephos (IV.151-52; XIV.130), and Achilles’ treatment of Hektor (IV.160; XIV.132-33). Achilles’ *menis* is also mentioned (XIV.132). This closely evokes the beginning of the *Iliad* (I.1ff). Thus, in these opening sections, the songs function to import narratives that pre-date (external analepses), mythologically *and* textually speaking, the narrative covered in the *Posthomerica*.

Yet, the content of these songs then moves to events *within* (internal analepses) the *Posthomerica*, such as Achilles’ subjugation of Penthesileia (IV.160; XIV.134). The

¹⁰⁷⁹ Hopkinson (1994), 106-07.

¹⁰⁸⁰ See *Beginnings/Endings*, 1.1-2.

¹⁰⁸¹ For Achilles’ *et al.* apotheoses, see Ch.IV.1.8.

¹⁰⁸² See Ch.II.3.1.

¹⁰⁸³ See Ch.II.3.2.

audience, both internal (listening characters) and external (readers) are now given an overview of the key heroic battles and events: in the case of the earlier song (Book IV), the narrative sweep takes us up to Achilles' last great deed – the killing of Memnon (161); whilst the latter songs cover and surpass this narrative, taking us to the mythic present, i.e., the actual fall of Troy (including the Horse), celebrations, including the actual singing of these songs (XIV.135-42). Also contained within these songs is the great deed of Neoptolemos, Eurypylos' killing (XIV.136-37).

Quintus, however, again locates his primary narrator centrally, as it is *he* who reports the songs. We do not hear secondary narratives from the secondary heroes. Instead, the narrative is distanced further from its mythic setting through the intercession of this narrator. Thus, the story of Achilles and Troy, becomes *a song of a song*. This reminds us of its artificiality, but also of the prominence and nature of the primary narrator. A further point to consider is that, through merging mythic time (external and internal analepses), and real texts (intertext, i.e., recourse to Iliadic events, such as Achilles' duel with Hektor, and intratext, i.e. the Posthomeric Achilles' killing of Memnon), the narrator also elevates the content of his poem. The primary narrator aligns his story with the narrative of Homer, but, through singing of his *own* songs, he locates himself as part of the epic canon. *Kleos aphthiton*, the traditional goal of the epic hero, is now also the achievement of the epic poet.¹⁰⁸⁴

In a sense, this is the primary narrator's supreme manifestation, though, perhaps not as obvious as, say, his autobiography in *Posthomeric* XII. Even in the *Iliad*, its greatest hero, the self-aware Achilles, sings only of previous heroes (*Il.* IX.189);¹⁰⁸⁵ Odysseus hears songs about his great exploits in Troy (e.g., *Od.* VIII.73-82), but the temporal sphere locates these stories as past events that fall *outside* of the narrative of the poem. In contrast, the Posthomeric narrator brings us and the narrative up to his mythic present, and, in this, his text, voices and persona become 'primary'.¹⁰⁸⁶

¹⁰⁸⁴ See above, 1.1

¹⁰⁸⁵ Cf. Helen and Trojan War tapestry (*Il.* III.125-28).

¹⁰⁸⁶ On the pre-eminence of the Posthomeric 'present', see Ch.III.3.1.

Thus Quintus' narrator has become Homer's ideal hero:

μύθων τε ῥητῆρ' ἔμεναι προηκτῆρά τε ἔργων. (*Il.* IX.443)

Conclusion

For the high drama and magnificent deeds of the *Posthomerica* and all its greatest heroes, it is its primary narrator that dominates the text. As a story, the narrator neatly frames the *Posthomerica* between the end of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*'s beginning. Absence of the traditional Muse (though perhaps presence of the 'Callimachean spirit')¹⁰⁸⁷ and proem mark departure from conventional epic, yet they also confer Homeric continuity, as one story, text and poet merge into another. This is an indicator of patterns to follow. Yet, the narrator shows himself to be far more than simply a Homeric echo.

As Scholar, Teacher and Physician, the primary narrator clearly exploits Homeric elements; for instance, in recalling the heroes of old and their super-natural capabilities. However, it is he, ultimately, who shows himself to be pre-eminent: with every Homeric touch, we see re-classification – where the hero knows, the narrator 'doubts', and where the poet sees, the narrator comments. Language motifs switch from character to narrator, and vice-versa, as do aphorisms. Even medical comments cut through the epic narrative, and force the reader to reassess what, and *who*, he is reading.

A narrator for all genres surpasses even the abilities of the more earthly Neoptolemos, who is equipped merely with Achilles' shield, looks and abilities. In contrast, Quintus' narrator has tradition on his side – not convention, which can limit, but knowledge of the literary past. In this sense, like Kalchas, but as poet, he knows what is, will be, and was (*ede, essomena, pro*).¹⁰⁸⁸

Something of the narrator's epic postcode receives its stamp in his autobiography in Book XII, and he explicitly name drops: Smyrna becomes his signifier, but the Smyrna of whom

¹⁰⁸⁷ Hunter (2004), 115ff., on Callimachus' multiple voices.

¹⁰⁸⁸ *Il.* I.69-70.

– Homer, Hesiod, Callimachus? And, this inclusion is as striking as the Muse exclusion. Although criticized as a second-rate Homer,¹⁰⁸⁹ making crude use of excess (from battle scenes to similes), actually more open reading shows that Quintus and his narrator will not allow themselves to be pinned down as they elude through allusion: nothing is as it seems – texts, genres and meanings shift.

In the final reckoning, the narrator cannot resist the ultimate compliment – imitation (*mimesis*). Throughout Quintus has shown his narrator to refer to *other* writers, texts and genres. These all reinforce his learnedness, and show that his poem, like his heroes, is a hybrid amalgam. The pivotal shift occurs, though, when he cites *his own* work. Then he truly writes himself, like *his* Achilles and Neoptolemos, into the epic pantheon.

¹⁰⁸⁹ See General Introduction: *Quintus' Reception*.

Conclusion:

Nostos

Post-Script

As noted in my *Introduction*, the last monograph character study for Quintus was Mansur in 1940. By using more modern theoretical tools, such as narratology and reception theory, I have both updated and extended the scope of studies on heroes in the *Posthomerica*. Mansur's focus is only the heroes in Homer that Quintus appropriates, such as Achilles. These, including Achilles and Nestor, I have explored, and in far greater detail than Mansur. However, I have also explored characters that feature in Quintus but not in the Homeric poems (or only in passing), such as Penthesileia, Memnon, and Neoptolemos; and the Primary Narrator, as 'poet-hero'.

Consideration of these 'non-Homeric' heroes has to be a major concern in trying to appreciate Quintus more fully. Their centrality in the poem is evident from the key positions that they occupy – Book I is arguably dominated by Penthesileia (as a focus, if not an unstoppable heroine); similarly, Memnon's *aristeia* and battle with Achilles is a central aspect of Book II. Regarding Neoptolemos, this pattern is even more marked, as he is first mentioned just lines after Achilles' death, in Book III, but arrives in his (and his father's) full splendour by Book VII; after which, he is an extremely prevalent force in the poem. As is the Primary Narrator, the most un-Homeric of heroes, and my focus for Chapter V.

Yet, as I show, they, and the other heroes that form the focus of my thesis, perform multiple functions. This is where my interest really lies. Here I show that Quintus' reception of the heroes (and heroine) is far more than a just an amalgam of earlier literary models. Although the latter is important, it is consideration of how Quintus configures the characters and the effects of these configurations that highlight Quintus' central concerns. For instance, in Penthesileia's female challenge to the male Greek army, we also see

Quintus' challenge to Homeric epic. Achilles' ultra-supremacy conveys Quintus' overt allusion to Homer, but in reference to Achilles' heroic biography (including his pre-Trojan life) we can also detect Quintus' self-conscious exploration of literary techniques, such as external *analepsis*. Manipulation of such temporal devices, however, creates an effect of epic 'self-sufficiency' (the text alluding to so much mythic matter, that it creates the illusion of incorporating far more than it actually does), that further impacts on Quintus' work: the poem, like Achilles, can stake its own literary claims. In Chapter III on Nestor, I also engage with Quintus' use of time. Here, however, I show that, through his exploration of 'age' (ranging from Nestor and old men in general, to the heroic past), the poem can ultimately be read as comment on Quintus' pre-eminence as poet: Quintus, like the heroes of his epic, shows himself to be a worthy successor to the 'heroes' who have gone before – namely, Homer. Quintus explores this to a striking degree, with reference to Neoptolemos, who is the focus for my fourth study. Here, Achilles' son shows himself to have all of his father's attributes, and more. In Quintus' Neoptolemos, one can detect all of the finest qualities of the epic hero – bravery, battling brilliance, and physical prowess. Yet, Quintus takes his Neoptolemos further, as, in a sense, he becomes *the* heroic expression of key issues that are clearly of central concern at the level of text and theory (see Primary Narrator following). Thus, Neoptolemos' genius (his youthful abilities begin where the mature Achilles' end), expressed through traditional heroic prowess (and striking similarity with Achilles), is further complemented by less conventional heroic qualities, such as brilliant (but succinct) speech, great humility and sophistication. Quintus conveys Neoptolemos as a hero for the 'modern' age; and through this, himself as poet. My focus on these key themes of heroism, reception and poetics reaches its climax in my final study, that of the Primary Narrator. To this point, each hero has been the initial point of contact. This chapter differs, as I more closely study the fabric of the text and its construction, and the poet's thought on this construction through the person of the Primary Narrator. Traditionally, this 'character' is sharply delineated from the heroes 'within' the epic – secondary narrators, to use de Jong's narratological terminology. Quintus' Primary Narrator, however, blurs the boundary between 'hero' and 'narrator'. He sometimes speaks like a hero, usually dominates the text, and avoids epic

convention in marked episodes, such as his omission of the proem. Therefore, he demands the readers' attention as the greatest challenge to Homeric convention, and is a fitting conclusion to my study of the reception of the hero. I have found studying the heroes as signifiers an extremely beneficial approach in my thesis. But I do not neglect the importance of the heroes also as epic characters in their own right. Main focus on the heroes themselves, as Mansur, is where my approach differs from most other (even recent) studies of Quintus; this can be seen with reference to Baumbach and Bär's recent Quintus monograph (2007), where the heroes are secondary to poetic considerations. In a genre dominated by heroes and the heroic a focus on the characters is extremely important.

I have also shown how and why Homer is the overriding model through which Quintus filters his heroes and narrative. Yet, consideration of the *Epic Cycle* is also an ongoing and important part of my study. This hugely complex area is a thesis in itself, with questions over its survival, in what form, and its accessibility. I have never been entirely satisfied with the claim that Quintus' poem is 'episodic' in nature. Although there are close parallels with cyclic material, the *Posthomerica* has an overall cohesion that the *Cycle* both as a whole and in its individual parts seems to lack (even based on fragments of summaries). But it is a great deal more than simple 'padding out' of story. Also, with its unified focus on the final stage of the Trojan war the *Posthomerica* is entirely different from a work such as Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and very different in tone from a compendary mythographic work such as ps-Apollodoros' *Library*. Obvious attempts have been made to enliven the narrative with not only explicit and complex engagement with Homer, but also with numerous other authors, texts and genres. In this, we see Quintus' extremely ambitious attempts at a super-text – a complex amalgam of not only the epic tradition, but also comment on this and other traditions. In this, as with his Achilles and Neoptolemos, he can be seen to reach for the heavens. Regarding cohesion, again Quintus' Achilles is the obvious narrative device to point to, as he dominates, either through himself or Neoptolemos. So here, one can claim a unifying theme (like his *menis*, from the *Iliad*) through character. In fact, we can say far more, as his Iliadic cohesion extends

beyond authors, texts and a millennium, be it through evocation of character or theme - an astounding leap of which any hero would be immensely proud.

My study has also been important in highlighting further literary models - genres as well as characters – with which Quintus engages. These range from Hesiod, Herodotus, the Greek tragedians and the Hellenistic writers, to the less commonly accepted Greek engagement with Latinists, like Virgil and Ovid.¹⁰⁹⁰ The influence of Latin literature on Quintus and Greek literature of the Imperial period more generally is and will remain contentious. But a good case can be made for *Quintus*' openness to influence from Latin sources. This would be consistent with his recognition of Rome's greatness (the *prolepsis* about its founding) and his readiness to draw Roman cultural phenomena, such as the shield *testudo* and the games, into his epic frame.

For the above mentioned reasons, I hope that I have brought to attention the complex nature of the *Posthomerica*: the sophistication of his narrative in a rhetorical age; a re-evaluation of his poetic qualities; and his considerable ambition, in taking on Homer, the *Cycle* and the Empire, with a host of heroes as allies.

Afterlife

So, where now? Having been occupied with Quintus' reception, perhaps it is appropriate to end with a note on legacy itself. As indicated above, a study dedicated to Quintus and the *Epic Cycle* could be exceptionally useful. I think that the exploration of certain phenomena, such as portrayal of the city¹⁰⁹¹ could be fruitful, e.g. in relation to further ideas about gender, and as a 'character' in its own right; so too an exploration of the 'meaning' of the Trojan War in the *Posthomerica*, for instance, as a conveyer of Greek cultural re-surgence;¹⁰⁹² and, perhaps, more detailed exploration of Quintus' interaction with tragedy,¹⁰⁹³ and *his* reception from antiquity to the modern era.¹⁰⁹⁴ Concerning

¹⁰⁹⁰ See Introduction, *Quintus and Rome*.

¹⁰⁹¹ Cf. Scully (1990).

¹⁰⁹² 'Second Sophistic' readings could be helpful here, such as Schubert (2007), Whitmarsh (2008), Swain (1996), combined with Erskine (2001).

¹⁰⁹³ See Paley (1876).

further studies of the reception of the hero and heroism in Quintus, Aeneas¹⁰⁹⁵ has particular appeal – another ‘way in’ to assess engagement with Latin literature (and the Empire), and surely, for this reason, a great ‘signifier’; equally, Paris may be an attractive prospect in symbolising the journey from epic to romance.¹⁰⁹⁶ I also think applying modern theoretical approaches to extended character studies of key women, like Helen, Andromache and Hekabe would be worthwhile, to explore the reception of such important figures in the Trojan War and beyond.¹⁰⁹⁷ Detailed analysis of Memnon, too, offers much, for example, as a multi-cultural bridge from Europe and Asia, to Africa.¹⁰⁹⁸ But, as a narrative link to the *Odyssey*, and still a major hero, study of the wily Odysseus (like Quintus), may pay dividends with *close* attention. Finally, I hope that the resurgence of interest in his work (of which this thesis forms a part) makes Quintus, like his Achilleus, harder to kill off; and that others are encouraged to continue the epic journey.

¹⁰⁹⁴ See Baumbach and Bär (2007), 15-17.

¹⁰⁹⁵ See Gärtner (2005).

¹⁰⁹⁶ See Pavlock (1990); Ker (1957).

¹⁰⁹⁷ See Calero Secall (1992a).

¹⁰⁹⁸ See Snowden (1970).

Bibliography

The following abbreviations are used:

- *AFLN* *Annali della Facoltà Di Lettere E Filosofia, Napoli*
- *AJP* *American Journal of Philology*
- *AMal* *Analecta Malacitana*
- *ASNP* *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*
- *BICS* *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*
- *BL* *Bulletin Supplement*
- *Cl. Ant.* *Classical Antiquity*
- *CJ* *Classical Journal*
- *CL* *Corolla Londiniensis*
- *CQ* *Classical Quarterly*
- *CR* *Classical Review*
- *CW* *The Classical World*
- *DNP* *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopaedie der Antike. Altertum*
- *EGF* *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*
- *ExcPhilol* *Excerpta Philologica*
- *FNT* *Filología Neotestamentaria*
- *G&R* *Greece and Rome*
- *JHS* *Journal of Hellenic Studies*
- *LIMC* *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*
- *MPhL* *Museum Philologum Londiniese*
- *OCD* *Oxford Classical Dictionary*
- *PEG* *Poetae Epici Graeci: Testimonia et Fragmenta, Pars I*
- *RE* *Real Encyclopadie der Classischen Altertums - Wissenschaft*
- *RPh* *Revue de Philologie*
- *RhM* *Rheinisches Museum*
- *TAPA* *Transactions of the American Philological Association*
- *TLG* *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*
- *WS* *Wiener Studien*
- *YCP* *Yale Classical Studies*

I. Editions, Translations, Commentaries and Lexicon:

- Aland, K. *et al.* (ed.), *The Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart, 166; repr. 1983).
- Austin, R. (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis. Aeneidos, Liber Secundus* (Oxford, 1964; repr. 1980).
- Babbitt, F. C. *Plutarch. Moralia* (1a-86a). Vol. I, (Cambridge, 1927; repr. 1986).
- Bailey, Shackleton, D. (ed.), *Statius. Achilleid* (Cambridge, 2003).
- Bär, S. *Frauen, Rhetorik und Geschlechterrollen. Kommentar und Interpretation zu einem Frauenredenaar in den Posthomerica des Quintus Smyrnaeus [1.403-76]* (MPhil thesis Universität Zürich, 2004).
- Bär, S. *Quintus Smyrnaeus, Posthomerica I: die Wiedergeburt des Epos aus dem Geiste der Amazonomachie. Mit Einem Kommentar Zu Den Versen 1-219* (Göttingen, 2009).
- Bernabe, A. (ed.), *Poetae Epici Graeci: Testimonia et Fragmenta, Pars I* (Leipzig, 1996).
- Bowra, C. (ed.), *Pindari Carmina* (Oxford, 1935; repr. 1954).
- Braund, S. *Lucan. Civil War* (Oxford, 1992; repr. 1999).
- Butler, H. *Propertius. Elegies* (Cambridge, 1912; repr. 1929).
- Campbell, B. *Greek and Roman Military Writers: Selected Readings* (London, 2004).
- Campbell, D. A. *Alcaeus*, in *Greek Lyric*. Vol. I. (Cambridge, 1982).
- Campbell, M. *A Commentary on Quintus Smyrnaeus Posthomerica XII* (Leiden, 1981).
- Carey, C. (ed.), *Lysias. Selected Speeches* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Carvounis, A. *Transformations of Epic: Reading Quintus of Smyrna*, Posthomerica XIV (D. Phil., Oxford, 2005).
- Combellack, F. *Quintus Smyrnaeus. The War at Troy: What Homer Didn't Tell* (Norman, 1968; repr. New York, 1996).
- Constans, L. (ed.), *Benoit de Sainte-Maure. Le Roman de Troie*. VI. Vols. (Paris, 1904-12).
- Cunliffe, R. *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect* (London, 1924; repr. Norman, 1963).
- Davies, M. (ed.), *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen, 1988).
- Davies, M. *The Greek Epic Cycle* (London, 1989; repr. 2001).
- Dilke, O. (ed.), with New Introduction by Cowan, R. *Statius. Achilleid* (Cambridge, 1954; repr. Exeter, 2005).

- Dimock, G. E. *Homer. Odyssey*. II Vols. (I: Cambridge, 1919; repr. 2002) (II: Cambridge, 1919; repr. 2004).
- Duff, J. D. *Lucan. The Civil War: Books I-X* (London, 1928).
- Easterling, P. (ed.), *Sophocles. Trachiniae* (Cambridge, 1982).
- Edwards, C. *Suetonius. Lives of the Caesars* (Oxford, 2000).
- Edwards, M. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. V: books 17-20 (Cambridge, 1991).
- Evelyn-White, H. *Hesiod, Homeric Hymns, Epic Cycle, Homerica* (I: Cambridge, 1914; repr. 2000).
- Fagles, R. *Oedipus at Colonus*, in *Sophocles. Three Theban Plays* (London, 1984).
- Fairclough, H. R. *Virgil. Aeneid*. II Vols. (I: London, 1916; repr. 1920) (II: Cambridge, 1918; repr. 1960).
- Fitch, J. *Seneca. Hercules, Trojan Women, Phoenician Women, Medea, Phaedra* (Cambridge, 2002).
- Fränkel, H. (ed.), *Apollonii Rhodii. Argonautica* (Oxford, 1961; repr. 1988).
- Frazer, J. *Apollodorus. The Library*. II Vols. (I: Cambridge, 1921; repr., 2001) (II: Cambridge, 1921; repr. 1996).
- Frazer, R. *The Trojan War: The Chronicles of Dictys of Crete and Dares the Phrygian* (London, 1966).
- Freeman, K. *Demosthenes. Against Neaera*, 59, in Lefkowitz, M. and Fant, M. (eds.), *Women's Life in Greece & Rome: A Sourcebook in Translation* (London, 1999).
- Fyfe, W. *Aristotle. The Poetics*, in *Aristotle, Longinus, Demetrius* (Cambridge, 1927; repr. 1953).
- Gaselee, S. *The Love Romances of Parthenius and other Fragments* (Cambridge, 1916; repr. 1989).
- Gerlaud, B. (ed.), *Tryphiodore. La Prise D'Ilion* (Paris, 1982; repr. 2003).
- Green, P. *Alexander of Macedon 356-323 B.C.: A Historical Biography* (Harmondsworth, 1970; repr. 1974).
- Gregory, J. *Euripides. Hecuba. Introduction, Text, and Commentary* (Atlanta, 1999).
- Hainsworth, B. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. III: books 9-12 (Cambridge, 1993; repr. 2000).

- Hammond, M. *Homer. The Iliad* (London, 1987).
- Hard, R. *Apollodorus. The Library of Greek Mythology* (Oxford, 1997; repr. 1998).
- Hemmingway, E. *The Old man and the Sea* (1952; repr. London, 1993).
- Henderson, J. (ed.), *Aristophanes. Lysistrata* (Oxford, 1987).
- Heubeck, A., West, S., and Hainsworth, J. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Vol. I: Introduction and Books I-VIII* (Oxford, 1988; repr. 1990).
- Hodson, P. (ed.), *Chaucer. The General Prologue to the Canterbury Tales* (London, 1969).
- Hopkinson, N. (ed.), *A Hellenistic Anthology* (Cambridge, 1988; repr. 1990).
- Hopkinson, N. (ed.), *Greek Poetry of the Imperial Period: An Anthology* (Cambridge, 1994).
- Hopkinson, N. (ed.), *Ovid: Metamorphoses Book XIII* (Cambridge, 2000).
- Hude, C. (ed.), *Herodoti. Historiae. Vol. II. Libri V-IX.* (Oxford, 1908 ; repr. 1962).
- Hunter, R. (ed.), *Apollonius of Rhodes. Argonautica III* (Cambridge, 1989; repr. 1998a).
- Hunter, R. *Apollonius of Rhodes. Jason and the Golden Fleece* (Oxford, 1993; repr. 1998b).
- James, A and Lee, K. *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna, Posthomerica V* (Leiden, 2000).
- James, A. (ed.), *Quintus of Smyrna. The Trojan Epic: Posthomerica* (Baltimore, 2004).
- Janko, R. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. IV: books 13-16* (Cambridge, 1994; repr. 1999).
- Jebb, R. *Sophocles: Plays. Philoctetes* (Cambridge, 1898; repr. London, 2004).
- Jebb, R. *Sophocles: Plays. Oedipus Coloneus* (Cambridge, 1900; repr. London, 2004).
- Jenkins, H. (ed.), *The Arden Shakespeare. Hamlet* (London, 1982; repr. 1990).
- Jones, H. *Thucydides. Historiae. Libri I-IV.* (Oxford, 1898).
- Jones, H. L. *Strabo. Geography (Books 10-12). Vol. V* (Cambridge, 1928).
- Jones, P. *Homer's Odyssey: A Commentary Based on the English Translation of Richmond Lattimore* (London, 1992; repr. 2000).
- Kirk, G. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. I: books 1-4* (Cambridge, 1985; repr. 2001).

- Kirk, G. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. II: books 5-8 (Cambridge, 1990; repr. 2000).
- Knight, W. *Virgil. The Aeneid* (Harmondsworth, 1956; repr. 1988).
- Knox, P. (ed.), *Ovid: Heroides* (Cambridge, 2000).
- Köchly, A. *Quinti Smyrnaei Postomeritorum Libri XIV ... Prolegomenis et Adnotatione Critica* (Leipzig, 1850; repr. Amsterdam, 1968).
- Lamb, W. *Lysias* (Cambridge, 1930; repr. 2000).
- Lattimore, R. *The Odyssey of Homer* (New York, 1975; repr. 1991).
- Lee, D. *Plato. The Republic* (Harmondsworth, 1955; repr. 1974).
- Lee, D. *Plato. Timaeus and Critias* (Harmondsworth, 1965; repr. 1971).
- Lefkowitz, M. and Fant, M. (eds.), *Women's Life in Greece & Rome: A Sourcebook in Translation* (London, 1982; repr. 1999).
- Levi, P. *Pausanias. Guide to Greece, Central Greece* (Harmondsworth, 1971; repr. 1979).
- Levi, P. *Pausanias. Guide to Greece, Central Greece* (London, 1971; repr. 1979).
- Day Lewis, C. *Virgil. The Aeneid* (Oxford, 1952; repr. 1998).
- Liddell, H and Scott, R. *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford, 1843; repr. 1996).
- Liddell, H and R. Scott, *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford, 1889; repr. 2003).
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (ed.), *Sophocles. Ajax, Electra, Oedipus Tyrranus*. Vol. I. (Cambridge, 1994; repr. 2001).
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (ed.), *Sophocles. Antigone, Women of Trachis, Philoctetes, Oedipus at Colonus*. Vol. II. (Cambridge, 1994; repr. 2002).
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (ed.), *Sophocles. Fragments*. Vol. III. (Cambridge, 1996).
- Macleod, C. *Homer. Iliad Book XXIV* (Cambridge, 1982).
- Mailer, N. *The Fight* (London, 1975; repr. 1991).
- Mair, A. W. *Callimachus, Lycophron* (Cambridge, 1921; repr. 1955).
- Mair, A. W. *Oppian, Colluthus, Tryphiodorus* (Cambridge, 1928; repr. 2002).
- Mair, G. R. *Aratus* (Cambridge, 1921; repr. 1955).

- Marchant, E. and Todd, O. *Xenophon. Memorabilia, Oeconomicus, Symposium, Apology*. Vol. IV. (Cambridge, 1923; repr. 1979).
- Marshall, P. K. *Hyginus. Fabulae* (Michigan, 1998).
- Melville, A. *Ovid. Metamorphoses* (Oxford, 1986; repr. 1987).
- Miller, F. *Ovid. Metamorphoses*. II Vols. (I: Cambridge, 1916; repr. 1951) (II: Cambridge, 1916; repr. 1951).
- Monro, D. and Allen, T. *Homeri Opera. Ilias*. II Vols. (I: Oxford, 1902; repr. 1920) (II: Oxford, 1902; repr. 1986).
- Murray, A. *Homer. The Odyssey*. II Vols. (I: Cambridge, 1919; repr. 1953) (II: Cambridge, 1919; repr. 1946).
- Nauck, A. (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1889).
- Nisetich, F. *Pindar's Victory Songs* (Baltimore, 1980; repr. 1990).
- North, T. *Plutarch. The Lifers of the Noble Grecians and Romans* (Ware, 1998).
- Oldfather, C. *Diodorus Siculus*. Vol. II. Books II.35-IV.58 (Cambridge, 1935).
- Page, D. *Aristophanes. Peace, Birds, Frogs* (London, 1930).
- Page, D. *The Plays of Euripides: Medea* (London, 1938; repr. 1952).
- Peck, A. L. *Aristotle. Generation of Animals* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Rawson, C (ed.), *Jonathan Swift. Gulliver's Travels* (Oxford, 1986; repr. 2005).
- Rhodes, P. *Thucydides. History III* (Warminster, 1994).
- Richardson, N. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. VI: books 21-24 (Cambridge, 1993; repr. 2000).
- Rouse, W. *Nonnus. Dionysiaca*. III Vols. (I: Cambridge; 1940 repr. 1984) (III: Cambridge, 1940; repr. 1955).
- Sandys, J. *The Odes of Pindar: Including Principal Greek Fragments* (Cambridge, 1915; repr. 1957).
- Saunders, T. J. *Plato. The Laws*. (Harmondsworth, 1970; repr. 1980).
- Scott-Kilvert, I. *Plutarch. The Rise and Fall of Athens* (Harmondsworth, 1960; repr. 1985).
- Seaton, R. *Apollonius Rhodius. Argonautica* (Cambridge, 1912; repr. 1999).

- Selincourt, de-, A. *Herodotus. The Histories* (Harmondsworth, 1954; repr. 1996).
- Selincourt, de-, A. *Arrian. The Campaigns of Alexander* (Harmondsworth, 1958; repr, 1971).
- Slavitt, D. *Staius. The Achilleid of Publius Papinius Staius* (Philadelphia, 1997).
- Slavitt, D. *The Voyage of Argo: The Argonautica of Valerius Flaccus* (Baltimore, 1999).
- Smyth, H. *Aeschylus. Agamemnon, Libation-Bearers, Eumenides, Fragments*. Vol. I. (Cambridge, 1926; repr. 1999).
- Smyth, H. *Aeschylus. Suppliant Maidens, Persians, Prometheus, Seven Against Thebes*. Vol. II. (Cambridge, 1922; repr. 1973).
- Sommerstein, A. *Aristophanes. Lysistrata, The Acharnians, the Clouds* (Harmondsworth, 1973).
- Stanford, W. (ed.), *Homer. Odyssey*. II Vols. (I: London, 1947; repr. 2001) (II: London, 1948; repr. 2000).
- Stanford, W. *Sophocles. Ajax*. (London, 1963; repr. 2002).
- Swift, J. *Gulliver's Travels* (Oxford, 1986; repr. 2005).
- Thornley, G. *Daphnis and Chloe by Longus* (Cambridge, 1916; repr. 1989).
- Tredennick, H. *Plato. The Last Days of Socrates: Euthyphro; The Apology; Crito; Phaedo* (Harmondsworth, 1954; repr. 1971).
- Trypanis, C. *Callimachus. Aetia, Iambi, Hecale and Other Fragments* (Cambridge, 1958; repr. 1989).
- Ussher, R. *Sophocles. Philoctetes* (Warminster, 1990; repr. 2001).
- Vian, F. (ed.), *Quintus de Smyrne, la Suite d'Homere*. Vol. I, Livres I-IV (Paris, 1963; repr. Paris, 2003); Vol. II, Livres V-IX (Paris, 1966; repr. 2003); Vol. III, Livres X-XIV (Paris, 1969; repr. 2003).
- Vian, F. and Battegay, E. *Lexique de Quintus de Smyrne* (Paris, 1984).
- Warmington, E. (ed.), *Remains of Old Latin: Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Pacuvius, Accius* (Cambridge, 1936; repr. Cambridge, 2001).
- Warner, R. *Thucydides. The Peloponnesian War* (Harmondsworth, 1954; repr. 1975).
- Way, A. *Euripides. Iphigeneia in Aulis, Rhesus, Hecuba, Daughters of Troy, Helen*. Vol. I (Cambridge, 1912; repr. 1978).

- Way, A. *Euripides. Electra, Orestes, Iphigeneia in Taurica, Andromache, Cyclops*. Vol. II (Cambridge, 1912; repr. 1965).
- Way, A. *Euripides. Bacchanals, Madness of Hercules, Phoenician Maidens, Suppliants*. Vol. III (Cambridge, 1912; 1962).
- Way, A. *Euripides. Ion, Hippolytus, Medea, Alcestis*. Vol. IV (Cambridge, 1912; repr. 1958).
- Way, A. *Quintus Smyrnaeus. The Fall of Troy*. (Cambridge, 1913; repr. 2000).
- Webster, T. (ed.), *Sophocles. Philoctetes* (Cambridge, 1970).
- West, M. (ed.), *Hesiod. Works and Days*. Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary (Oxford, 1978; repr. 1996).
- West, M. (ed.), *Greek Epic Fragments: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC* (Cambridge, 2003).
- Willcock, M. (ed.), *The Iliad of Homer*. II Vols. (I: London, 1978; repr. 2002) (II: London, 1984).
- Williams, R. (ed.), *Virgil. Aeneid*. II Vols. (I: London, 1972; repr. 1999a) (II: London, 1973; repr. 1999b).
- Williams, R. *The Aeneid of Virgil: A Commentary Based on the Translation of C. Day Lewis, with Introduction and Glossary* (London, 1985; repr. 1999c).
- Williamson, G. *Josephus: The Jewish War* (London, 1959; repr. 1981).
- Wyatt, W. *Homer. Iliad*. II Vols. (I: Cambridge, 1924; repr. 1999) (II: Cambridge, 1925; repr. 2001).

II. Modern Works:

- Accorinti, D. and Chuvin, P. (eds.), *Des Geants a Dionysos: Melanges de Mythologie et de Poesie Grecques Offerts a Francis Vian* (Alexandria, 2003).
- Adrados, F. and Diez, A. (eds.), *Actas del IX Congreso Espanol de Estudios Clasicos (Madrid, 27-30 de Septiembre de 1995)* (Madrid, 1998).
- Agocs, P. 'Memory and Forgetting in Pindar's Seventh Isthmian', in Dolezalova (2009), ch. 3.
- Alexiou, M. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Cambridge, 1974).
- Anderson, M. *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art* (Oxford, 1997).
- Appel, W. 'Grundsatzliche Bemerkungen zu den *Posthomerica* und Quintus Smyrnaeus', *Prometheus* 20 (1994), 1-13.
- Appel, W. 'Die Homerischen Hapax Legomena bei Quintus Smyrnaeus: Adverbien', *Glotta* 71 (1993), 178-88.
- Armstrong, J. 'The Arming Motif in the *Iliad*', *AJP* 79 (1958), 337-54.
- Arthur, M. 'The Divided World of *Iliad* VI', in Foley (1981), 19-44.
- Auerbach, E. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (Berne, 1946; repr. Princeton, 1974), Princeton repr. tr. by W. Trask..
- Bär, S. 'Quintus Smyrnaeus und die Tradition des epischen Musenanurfs', in Baumbach and Bär (2007), 29-64.
- Bär, S. *Quintus Smyrnaeus, Posthomerica I: Die Wiedergeburt des Epos aus dem Geiste der Amazonomachie. Mit einem Kommentar zu den Versen 1-219* (PhD Thesis, Unpublished) (Zurich, 2008).
- Baumbach, M. and Bär, S. (eds.), *Quintus Smyrnaeus: Transforming Homer in the Second Sophistic* (Berlin, 2007).
- Baumbach, M. and Bär, S. 'An Introduction to Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*', in Baumbach and Bär (2007), 1-26.
- Bellinger, A. 'Achilles' Son and Achilles', *YCP* 6 (1939), 3-13.
- Beye, C. 'Male and Female in the Homeric Poems', *Ramus* 3 (1974), 87-101.
- Beye, C. *Epic and Romance in the Argonautica of Apollonius* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1982).

- Bezantakos, N. 'Le *Philoctete* de Sophocle et Neoptoleme dans les *Posthomerica* de Quintus de Smyrne', *Parnassos* 34 (1992), 151-57.
- Bing, P. *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets* (Gottingen, 1988).
- Blundell, M. 'The *Physis* of Neoptolemus in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *G&R* 35 (1988), 137-48.
- Blundell, M. *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies: A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics* (Cambridge, 1989; repr. 1991).
- Blundell, S. *Women in Ancient Greece* (London, 1995; repr. 1999).
- Boardman, J. *Athenian Black Figure Vases* (London 1974; repr. 1997).
- Boswell, J. *The Kindness of Strangers: Abandonment of Children in Western Europe from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance* (New York, 1988; repr. Chicago, 1998).
- Bowie, E. 'The Greek Novel', in Easterling (1999), ch. 6.
- Bowra, C. *Heroic Poetry* (London, 1952; repr. 1978).
- Bowra, C. 'Aeneas and the Stoic Ideal', in S. Harrison (1990), ch. 19.
- Boyten, B. *The Afterlife of Achilles: Adaptations of the Iliadic Achilles as "Lover" in Ancient Greek and Roman Literature* (MA Dissertation, Unpublished) (London, 2002).
- Boyten, B. 'More 'Parfit Gentil Knyght' than 'Hyrceanian Beast': The Reception of Neoptolemos in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*', in Baumbach and Bär (2007), 307-36.
- Braund, S. and Most, G. (eds.), *Ancient Anger* (Cambridge, 2003; repr. 2007).
- Bremer, J. 'Pindar's Paradoxical $\epsilon\gamma\omega$ ', in Slings (1990), 41-58.
- Bulloch, A. 'Hellenistic Poetry', in Easterling and Knox (1993), ch. 1.
- Burgess, J. 'Achilles' Heel: The Death of Achilles in Ancient Myth,' *Cl. Ant* 14 (1995), 2:217-43.
- Burgess, J. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* (London, 2001).
- Burgess, J. 'The Epic Cycle and Fragments', in J. Foley (2005), ch. 24.
- Burgess, J. *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles* (Baltimore, 2009).
- Burkert, W. 'Oriental Myth and Literature in the *Iliad*', in Hagg (1983), 51-56.

- Burkert, W. *Greek Religion* (Stuttgart, 1977; repr. Oxford, 2004).
- Byre, C. 'Per Aspera (et Arborem) ad Astra: Ramifications of the Allegory of Arete in Quintus Smyrnaeus 'Posthomerica' 5, 49-68', *Hermes* 110 (1982), 184-95.
- Byre, C. 'Narration, Description, and Theme in the Shield of Achilles', *CJ* 88 (1992-93), 33-42.
- Cairns, D. (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad* (Oxford, 2001).
- Calero Secall, I. 'La Mujer en las *Posthomericas* de Quinto de Esmirna', in Zaragoza and Gonzales (1992a), 163-68.
- Calero Secall, I. 'Los Epitetos Femeninos en las *Posthoméricas* de Quinto de Esmirna', *AMal* 15 (1992b), 43-53.
- Calero Secall, I. 'Los Epitetos de Divinidades en las *Posthomericas* de Quinto de Esmirna', *Habis* 24 (1993), 133-46.
- Calero Secall, I. 'Deidamía en la epopeya de Quinto de Esmirna', in M. Sánchez. (1995a), 35-51.
- Calero Secall, I. 'El Tema la Llegada y Reception de los Heroes en la Epopeya de Quinto de Esmirna', *Faventia* 17/2 (1995b), 45-58.
- Calero Secall, I. 'La Figura de Neoptolemo en la Epopeya de Quinto de Esmirna', in Adrados and Diez (1998), 101-06.
- Calero Secall, I. 'Paralelismos y Contrastes en los Personajes Femeninos de Quinto de Esmirna', *ASNP* 5 (2000), 187-202.
- Cameron, A. *Callimachus and His Critics* (Princeton, 1995).
- Campbell, J. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (Princeton, 1949; repr. London, 1993).
- Camps, W. *An Introduction to Virgil's Aeneid* (Oxford, 1969; repr. 1989).
- Cancik, H. and Schneider, H (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopadie der Antike*, Vol. VIII (Stuttgart, 2000).
- Carey, C. 'Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 637', *JHS* 113 (1993), 148-49.
- Carey, C. *Trials from Classical Athens* (London, 1997).
- Cartledge, P. *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others* (Oxford, 1993).
- Carpenter, T. *Art and Myth in Ancient Greece: A Handbook* (London, 1991; repr. 1996).

- Carson, A. 'Putting Her in Her Place: Woman, Dirt, and Desire', in Halperin *et al.*, (1990), ch. 5.
- Cartledge, P. *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others* (Oxford, 1993).
- Carvounis, A. 'Final Scenes in Quintus of Smyrna, *Posthomerica* 14', in Baumbach and Bär (2007), 241-57.
- Carvounis, A. 'Transforming the Homeric Models: Quintus' Battle among the Gods in the *Posthomerica*,' in Carvounis & Hunter (eds.), *Signs of Life? Studies in Later Greek Poetry = Ramus* 37.1-2, (2008), 60-78.
- Carvounis, A. and Hunter, R. (eds.), *Signs of Life? Studies in Later Greek Poetry = Ramus* 37.1-2, (2008).
- Casanova-Robin, 'D'Homere a Ovide: Le Discours d'Ulysse dans l'armorum iudicium (*Metamorphoses*, XIII) Rhetorique et Specularite', *Gaia* 7 (2003), 411-23.
- Chrysafis, G. 'Pedantry and Elegance in Quintus Smyrnaeus, *Posthomerica*', *CL* 4 (1985), 17-42.
- Clark, M. 'Neoanalysis: A Bibliographical Review', *CW* 79 (1986), 379-94.
- Clarke, H. *The Art of the Odyssey* (1967; repr. London, 2004).
- Clarke, W. 'Achilles and Patroclus in Love', *Hermes* 106 (1978), 381-96.
- Coffey, M. 'The Function of the Homeric Simile', *AJP* 78 (1957), 113-32.
- Colledge, M. A. R. *The Parthian Period* (Leiden, 1986).
- Considine, P. 'The Etymology of ΜΗΝΙΣ', in *Studies in Honour of T. B. L. Webster*, Vol. 1 (Bristol, 1986), 53-64.
- Cramer, O. 'Speech and Silence in the *Iliad*', *CJ* 71 (1975-76), 300-04.
- Crotty, K. *The Poetics of Supplication: Homer's Iliad and Odyssey* (Ithaca, 1994).
- Cuypers, M. 'Interactional Particles and Narrative Voice in Apollonius and Homer', in Harder and Cuypers (2005), 35-69.
- Davidson, J. *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens* (New York, 1997).
- Denniston, J. *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1934; repr. London, 1996).
- Depew, M. and Obbink, D. (eds.), *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons and Society* (London, 2000).

- Detienne, M. and Vernant, J-P. *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society* (Paris, 1973; repr. Atlantic Highlands, 1978).
- Dickson, K. *Nestor: Poetic Memory in Greek Epic* (New York, 1995).
- Dihle, A. *Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire: Augustus to Justinian* (Munich, 1989; repr. London, 1994), London repr. tr. by M. Malzahn.
- Dilke, O. “‘Magnus Achilles’ and Station Baroque’, *Latomus* 22 (1963), 498-503.
- Dillon, J. ‘The Equality of the Sexes – Variations on a Rhetorical Theme in the Fourth Century AD’, *Hermathena* 158 (1995), 27-35.
- Dolezalova, L. (ed.), *Strategies of Remembrance: From Pindar to Heolderlin* (Cambridge, 2009).
- Dowden, K. *The Uses of Greek Mythology* (London, 1992; repr. 1998).
- Dowden, K. ‘Homer’s Sense of Text,’ *JHS* 116 (1996), 47-61.
- Dowden, K. ‘The Amazons: Development and Functions’, *RhM* 140 (1997), 97-128.
- Duckworth, G. ‘Foreshadowing and Suspense in the *Posthomerica* of Quintus of Smyrna’, *AJP* 57 (1936), 58-86.
- Duckworth, G. ‘Five Centuries of Latin Hexameter Poetry: Silver Age and Late Empire’, *TAPA* 98 (1967), 77-150 (see ‘Appendix’, 139-41, 145 for Quintus Smyrnaeus particularly).
- Dunbabin, T. J. *The Greeks and their Eastern Neighbours* (London, 1957).
- Eagleton, T. *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Oxford, 1983; repr. 1986).
- Easterling, P. ‘The Tragic Homer’, *BICS* 31 (1984), 1-8.
- Easterling, P. ‘Constructing Character in Greek Tragedy’, in Pelling (1990), ch. 4.
- Easterling, P. and Knox, B. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: The Hellenistic Period and the Empire* (Vol. I Part IV) (Cambridge, 1989; repr. 1993).
- Edwards, M. *Homer: Poet of the Iliad* (London, 1987; repr. 1990).
- Erbse, H. Review of Vian (1969), in *Gnomon* 43 (1971), 563-68.
- Erskine, A. *Troy Between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power* (Oxford, 2001; repr. 2003).
- Faber, R. ‘Vergil’s ‘Shield of Aeneas’ (*Aeneid* 8.617-731) and the *Shield of Heracles*’, *Mnemosyne* 53 (2000), 49-57.

- Falkner, T. 'Ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῶν: Homeric Heroism, Old Age and the End of the *Odyssey*', in Falkner and de Luce (1989), ch.1.
- Falkner, T. and de Luce, J. (eds.), *Old Age in Greek and Latin Literature* (New York, 1989).
- Falkner, T. *The Poetics of Old Age in Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy* (London, 1995).
- Fantham, E. 'Staius' Achilles and His Trojan Model', *CQ* 29 (1979), 457-62.
- Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge, 2004).
- Farnell, L. *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality* (Oxford, 1921).
- Farron, S. 'The Portrayal of Women in the *Iliad*', *AC* 22 (1979), 15-31.
- Feeney, D., 'The Taciturnity of Aeneas', in S. Harrison (1990), ch. 8.
- Fenik, B. *Typical Battle Scenes in the "Iliad": Studies in the Narrative Techniques of Homeric Battle Descriptions. Hermes Einzelschriften* 21 (Wiesbaden, 1968).
- Fernández Contreras, M. 'El Silencio Expresivo de Homero a Quinto de Esmirna', *ExcPhilol* 4/5 (1994/95), 31-40.
- Fernández Contreras, M. 'Contemplacion y Alegría en los *Posthomerica* de Quinto de Esmirna', *Habis* 27 (1996), 171-87.
- Fernández Contreras, M. 'La Animacion del Entorno Natural en los *Posthomerica* de Quinto de Esmirna', *Habis* 29 (1998), 233-47.
- Finley, M. *The World of Odysseus* (Harmondsworth, 1954; repr. 1979).
- Foley, H. *Reflections of Women in Antiquity* (New York, 1981).
- Foley, H. *Female Acts in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton, 2001; repr. 2003).
- Foley, J (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epic* (Oxford, 2005).
- Fornaro, S. 'Quintus. [3] Q. (Κόιντος) von Smyrna', in *DNP* 10 (2001), 722-24.
- Foucault, M. *The History of Sexuality. Vol. II: The Use of Pleasure* (Paris, 1984; repr. Harmondsworth, 1992), Harmondsworth repr. translated by R. Hurley.
- Fowler, D. 'Virgilian Narrative', in Martindale (2000), ch. 17a.
- Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. (eds.), *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power and Identity in Classical Antiquity* (London, 1998).

- Fränkel, H. 'Essence and Nature in the Homeric Similes', in P. Jones (ed.), (Gottingen, 1921; repr. Oxford, 1997), 103-23, Oxford repr. tr. by G. Wright and P. Jones.
- Friedrich, P. and Redfield, J. 'Speech as a Personality Symbol: The Case of Achilles', in de Jong (ed.), (London, 1999), Vol. IV, ch. 87 (Source: *Language*, Vol. 54 (1978), 23-88).
- Friedrich, W.-H. *Wounding and Death in the Iliad: Homeric Techniques of Description* (London, 2003), London repr. tr. by G. Wright and P. Jones.
- Galinsky, G. *The Herakles Theme: The Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century* (Oxford, 1972).
- Gall, D. and Wolkenhauer, A. (eds.), *Laokoon in Literatur und Kunst: Schriften des Symposions "Laokoon in Literatur und Kunst" vom 30.11.2006, Universität Bonn* (Berlin, 2009) (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 254).
- Gantz, T. 'The Aischylean Tetralogy: Attested and Conjectured Groups', *AJP* 101 (1980), 133-64.
- Gantz, T. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. II Vol. Initially pub. in one Vol. (London, 1993); (I: repr. London, 1996) (II: repr. London, 1996).
- García Romero, F. 'El *Destino* en los *Posthomérica* de Quinto de Esmirna', *Habis* 16 (1985), 101-06.
- García Romero, F. 'La "Intervencion Psiquica" en los *Posthoemrica* de Quinto de Esmirna', *Habis* 17 (1986), 109-16.
- García Romero, F. 'El Nuevo Testamento y los Post Homérica de Quinto de Esmirna', *FNT* 1, (1988), 103-07.
- García Romero, F. 'Algunas Figuras Mitológicas en Quinto de Esmirna', *Emerita* 57 (1989), 95-102.
- García Romero, F. 'Los Glosas Homéricas en Quinto de Esmirna. Unas Notas Sobre Calamaco y Quinto a Proposito de $\epsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\omicron\nu$ $\text{Κητ}\omega\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha$ (QS XII 314)', *Habis* 20 (1989), 33-6.
- García Romero, F. 'Aportaciones al Estoicismo de Quinto de Esmirna. Un Comentario a la Figura de Anftrite y a *Posthomeirca* XI 106 s', *Emerita* 58 (1990), 119-24.
- Garnsey, P. *Food and Society in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1999).

- Gärtner, U. *Quintus Smyrnaeus und die Aeneis: Zur Nachwirkung Vergils in der Griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit* (Munich, 2005).
- Gärtner, U. 'Laokoon bei Quintus Smyrnaeus,' in Gall and Wolkenhauer (2009), 128-45.
- Genette, G. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Tr. J. Lewin (New York, 1980; repr. 1983).
- Ghirshman, R. *Iran* (Paris, 1951; repr. New York, 1978).
- Gill, C. 'The Character-Personality Distinction', in Pelling (1990), ch. 1.
- Gill, C. *Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy and Philosophy: The Self in Dialogue* (Oxford, 1996; repr. 1998).
- Glover, T. *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century* (Cambridge, 1901).
- Goldhill, S. *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature* (Cambridge, 1991; repr. 1999).
- Goldhill, S. (ed.), *Being Greek Under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire* (Cambridge, 2001).
- Grotia, A. 'Light and Darkness in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica* 2', in Baumbach and Bär (2007), 85-106.
- Gray, V. 'Xenophon', in De Jong, Nunlist and Bowie (2004), ch. 9.
- Graziosi, B. *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic* (Cambridge, 2002; repr. 2007).
- Griffin, J. 'The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer', *JHS* 97 (1977), 39-53.
- Griffin, J. *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford, 1980; repr. 1983).
- Griffin, J. 'Homeric Words and Speakers', *JHS* 106 (1986), 36-57.
- Hadjittofi, F. 'Res Romanae: Cultural Politics in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica* and Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*', in Baumbach and Bär (2007), 357-78.
- Hagg, R. (ed.), *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century B.C.: Tradition and Innovation* (Stockholm, 1983).
- Halliwell, S. 'Traditional Greek Conceptions of Character', in Pelling (1990), ch. 2.
- Halperin, D., Winkler, J., Zeitlin, F. (eds.), *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World* (Princeton, 1990).
- Harder, M. 'Callimachus', in de Jong, Nunlist and Bowie (2004), ch. 5.

- Harder, A. and Cuypers, M. (eds.), *Beginning from Apollo: Studies in Apollonius Rhodius and the Argonautic Tradition* (Leuven, 2005).
- Hardwick, L. 'Ancient Amazons – Heroes, Outsiders or Women?,' *G&R* 37 (1990), 14-36.
- Harrison, S. (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford, 1990).
- Harrison, T. *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (Oxford, 2000).
- Havel, I. M. 'What Kind of Episodes are Stored in Episodic Memory? On the Concept of Memory in Cognitive Science', in Dolezalova (2009), ch. 2
- Hershkowitz, D. *The Madness of Epic: Reading Insanity from Homer to Statius* (Oxford, 1998).
- Hinds, S. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge, 1998).
- Hinds, S. 'Essential Epic: Genre and Gender from Macer to Statius', in Depew and Obbink (2000), ch. 12.
- Holst-Warhaft, G. *Dangerous Voices: Women's Laments and Greek Literature* (New York, 1992).
- Hornblower, S, and Spawforth, A. (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 2003).
- Howatson, M. (ed.), *The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature* (Oxford, 1989; repr. 1997).
- Hunter, R. *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies* (Cambridge, 1993; repr. 2004).
- Hunter, R. *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Hutchinson, G. *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford, 1988; repr. 1997).
- Huxley, G. *Greek Epic Poetry: From Eumelos to Panyassis* (Cambridge, 1969).
- Jacobson, H. *Ovid's Heroides* (Princeton, 1974).
- Jahn, S. 'Die Darstellung der Troer und Griechen in den Kampfszenen der *Posthomerica* des Quintus von Smyrna', *WS* 122 (2009), 87-108.

- James, A. 'Night and Day in Epic Narrative from Homer to Quintus of Smyrna', *MPhL* 3 (1978), 153-83.
- James, A. 'Quintus of Smyrna', in J. Foley (2005), ch. 26.
- James, A. 'Quintus of Smyrna and Virgil - A Matter of Prejudice', in Baumbach and Bär (2007), 145-57.
- Janko, R. *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction* (Cambridge, 1982).
- Jones, P. (ed.), *German Scholarship in Translation* (Oxford, 1997).
- Jong, de-, I. *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam, 1987; repr. London, 2004).
- Jong, de-, I. 'Homer and Narratology', in Morris and Powell (1997a), ch. 13.
- Jong, de-, I. 'Γάρ Introducing Embedded Narratives', in Rijksbaron (1997b), 175-85.
- Jong, de-, I. (ed.), *Homer: Critical Assessments*. Vol. IV (London, 1999).
- Jong, de-, I. 'Three Off-Stage Characters in Euripides', in Mossman (2003), ch. 17.
- Jong, de-, I. 'Homer: The Primary Narrator', in de Jong, Nunlist and Bowie (2004a), ch. 1.
- Jong, de-, I. 'Herodotus', in de Jong, Nunlist and Bowie (2004b), ch. 7.
- Jong, de-, I., Nunlist, R. and Bowie, A. (eds.), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature: Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*. Vol. I (Leiden, 2004c).
- Just, R. *Women in Athenian Law and Life* (London, 1989; repr. 1991).
- Kakridis, P. *Κόιντος Σμυρναῖος: Γενική μελέτη τῶν Μεθ' Ὀμηρον καὶ τοῦ ποιητῆ τους* (Athens, 1962)
- Kakridis, T. *Homeric Researches* (Lund, 1949).
- Kearns, E. *The Heroes of Attica, BL 57* (London, 1989).
- Kennedy, G. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric* (An Extensive Revision and Abridgement of: *The Art of Persuasion in Ancient Greece; The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World; Greek Rhetoric in the Roman World* [With Additional Discussion of Late Latin Rhetoric]) (Princeton, 1994).
- Ker, W. *Epic and Romance: Essays on Medieval Literature* (London, 1908; repr. 1957).
- Keydell, R. 'Quintus von Smyrna und Vergil', *Hermes* 82 (1954), 254-56.

- Keydell, R. 'Quintus von Smyrna', *RE* 47 (1963), 1271-296.
- Kim, J. *The Pity of Achilles: Oral Style and the Unity of the Iliad* (Oxford, 2000).
- King, K. *Achilles: Paradigms of the War Hero from Homer to the Middle Ages* (London, 1987).
- Kirk, G. (ed.), *Language and Background of Homer* (Cambridge, 1964).
- Kirk, G. *Homer and the Epic: A Shortened Version of The Songs of Homer* (Cambridge, 1965; repr. 1999).
- Knauer, 'Vergil's *Aeneid* and Homer', in S. Harrison (1990), ch. 21.
- Knox, B. *The Heroic Temper: Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy* (Berkeley, 1964; repr. 1992).
- König, J. *Greek Literature in the Roman Empire* (London, 2009).
- Koon, C. *Discourse Particles in Latin: A Study of Nam, Enim, Autem, Vero and At* (Amsterdam, 1995).
- Kopff, E. 'The Structure of the Amazonia (*Aethiopsis*)', in Hagg (1983), 57-62.
- Kullmann, W. *Die Quellen der Ilias. Hermes* 14 (Wiesbaden, 1960).
- Kullmann, W. 'Zur Methode der Neoanalyse in der Homerforschung', *WS* 15 (1981), 5-42.
- Kyle, D. *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome* (London, 1998; repr. London, 2001).
- Lateiner, D. *Sardonic Smile: Nonverbal Behaviour in Homeric Epic* (Michigan, 1995; repr. 2001).
- Lee, D. *The Similes of the Iliad and the Odyssey Compared* (London, 1964).
- Lefkowitz, M. 'L'heroisme de la femme', *Bulletin Bude* (1981), 284-92.
- Lefkowitz, M. *Women in Greek Myth* (London, 1986; repr. 1995).
- Lesky, A. *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (Bern, 1957/58).
- Levene, D. and Nelis, N. (eds.), *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Tradition of Ancient Historiography* (Leiden, 2002).
- Levet, J.-P. 'L'expression du *Vrai* et de la *Verite* dans les *Posthomerica* de Quintus de Smyrne', in Accorinti and Chuvin (Alexandria, 2003), 357-84.
- Lindblom, A. 'The Amazons: Representative of Male or Female Violence?', *Arctos* 33 (1999), 67-91.

- Lloyd-Jones, H. Review of Combellack (1968), *CR* 19 (1969), 101.
- Long, A. *Stoic Studies* (Cambridge, 1996; repr. London, 2001).
- Loraux, N. *Tragic Ways of Killing a Woman* (Hachette, 1985; repr. London, 1991), London repr. tr. by A. Forster.
- Loraux, N. 'Herakles: The Super-Male and the Feminine', in Halperin *et al.*, (1990), ch. 1 (this article originally appeared in *Revue française de psychanalyse* 46 (1982), 697-729).
- Loraux, N. *Mothers in Mourning* (Seuil, 1990; repr. Ithaca, 1998), Ithaca repr. tr. by C. Pache.
- Lowe, N. *The Classical Plot and the Invention of Western Narrative* (Cambridge, 2000).
- Maciver, C. 'Returning to the Mountain of Arete: Reading Ecphrasis, Constructing Ethics in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomeric*', in Baumbach and Bär (2007), 259-84.
- Mackay, E. (ed.), *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World (Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 7)* (2008).
- Mackie, H. *Talking Trojan: Speech and Community in the Iliad* (New York, 1996).
- Mansur, M. *The Treatment of Homeric Characters by Quintus of Smyrna* (Dissertation) (New York, 1940).
- March, J. *Cassell Dictionary of Classical Mythology* (London, 1999; repr. 2000).
- Martin, R. 'Wrapping Homer Up: Cohesion, Discourse, and Deviation in the *Iliad*', in Sharrock and Morales (2000), ch. 3.
- Martindale, C. *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Martindale, C. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge, 1997; repr. 2000).
- Michelakis, P. *Achilles in Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge, 2002).
- Montagu, J. D. *Greek and Roman Warfare: Battle, Tactics and Trickery* (London, 2006).
- Morgan, T. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge, 1998).
- Morris, I. and Powell, B. (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden, 1997).
- Morrison, J. *Homeric Misdirection: False Predictions in the Iliad* (Michigan, 1992; repr. 1995).

- Mossman, J. (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Euripides* (Oxford, 2003).
- Most, G. 'Anger and Pity in Homer's *Iliad*', in Braund and Most (2007), ch. 5.
- Moulton, C. *Similes in the Homeric Poems* (Gottingen, 1977).
- Muellner, L. *The Anger of Achilles: Menis in Greek Epic* (London, 1996).
- Murnaghan, S. *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey* (Princeton, 1987).
- Murray, G. *The Rise of the Greek Epic* (Oxford, 1907).
- Myres, J. 'Hesiod's 'Shield of Herakles': Its Structure and Workmanship', *JHS* 61 (1941), 17-30.
- Nagy, G. *Homeric Questions* (Austin, 1996; repr. Austin, 2002).
- Nagy, G. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (London, 1979; repr. 1981).
- Nethercut, W. 'The Epic Journey of Achilles', *Ramus* 5 (1976), 1-17.
- Newbold, R. 'Space and Scenery in Quintus of Smyrna, Claudian and Nonnus', *Ramus* 10 (1981), 53-68.
- Nisbet, R. 'Aeneas Imperator: Roman Generalship in an Epic Context', in S. Harrison (1990), ch. 20.
- Nunlist, R. 'Hesiod', in de Jong, Nunlist and Bowie (2004a), ch. 2.
- Nunlist, R. 'The Homeric hymns', in de Jong, Nunlist and Bowie (2004b), ch. 3.
- Nutton, V. *Ancient Medicine* (Oxford, 2004; repr. New York, 2006).
- Oliensis, E., 'Sons and Lovers: Sexuality and Gender in Virgil's Poetry', in Martindale (2000), ch. 19.
- Ozbek, L. 'Ripresa della Tradizione e Innovazione Compositiva: la Medicina nei *Posthomeric* di Quinto Smirneo', in Baumbach and Bär (2007), 159-83.
- Paley, F. *On Quintus Smyrnaeus and the "Homer" of the Tragic Poets* (London, 1876).
- Papaioannou, S. *Redesigning Achilles: Recycling the Epic Cycle in the Little Iliad (Ovid, Metamorphoses 12.1-13.622)*, (Berlin, 2007).
- Papanghelis, T. and Rengakos, A. (eds.), *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius* (Leiden, 2001).
- Parry, A. 'The Language of Achilles', in Kirk (1964), ch. III (*TAPA* 87 (1956), 1-7).

- Parry, A. (ed.), *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry* (Oxford, 1971; repr. 1987).
- Paschal, G. *A Study of Quintus of Smyrna* (Chicago, 1904).
- Paschalis, M. *Virgil's Aeneid: Semantic Relations and Proper Names* (Oxford, 1997).
- Pavlock, B. *Eros, Imitation, and the Epic Tradition* (London, 1990).
- Pelling, C. (ed.), *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature* (Oxford, 1990).
- Pestalozzi, H. *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias* (Zurich, 1945).
- Pfeijffer, I. 'Pindar and Bacchylides', in de Jong, Nunlist and Bowie (2004), ch. 15.
- Pompella, G. *Quinto Smirneo, Le Posthomeriche, libri III-VIII* (Cassino, 1987).
- Pompella, G. 'Coniectanea in Quintum Smyrnaeum', in Accorinti and Chuvin (2003), 385-91.
- Pucci, P. *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad* (Ithaca, 1987; repr. 1995).
- Redfield, J. 'The Proem of the *Iliad*: Homer's Art', in Cairns (2001), ch. 16.
- Reece, S. *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene* (Michigan, 1993; repr. 1996).
- Reeve, M. 'The Language of Achilles', *CQ* 23 (1973), 193-95.
- Reynolds, L. and Wilson, N. *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford, 1968; repr. 1978).
- Richardson, B. *Old Age Among the Ancient Greeks: The Portrayal of Old Age in Literature, Art, and Inscriptions* (Baltimore, 1933; repr. New York, 1969).
- Richardson, S. *The Homeric Narrator* (Nashville, 1990).
- Rijksbaron, A. (ed.), *New Approaches to Greek Particles* (Amsterdam, 1997).
- Road, T. 'Thucydides', in de Jong, Nunlist and Bowie (2004), ch. 8.
- Robertson, D. 'Quintus Smyrnaeus, iii. 267-77', *CR* 57 (1943), 6-7.
- Roisman, H. *Sophocles: Philoctetes* (London, 2005).
- Rood, T. 'Thucydides', in de Jong, Nunlist and Bowie (2004), ch. 8.
- Rosenmeyer, P. *The Poetics of Imitation: Anacreon and the Anacreontic Tradition* (Cambridge, 1992).

- Rossi, A. 'The Fall of Troy: Between Tradition and Genre', in Leven and Nelis (2002), ch. 12.
- Rutherford, R. 'Tragic Form and Feeling in the *Iliad*', *JHS* 102 (1982), 145-60.
- Sainte-Beuve, C. *Quintus de Smyrne et son Epopée* (written 1856, Paris, 1870).
- Sallares, J. *The Ecology of the Ancient Greek World* (London, 1991).
- Sánchez Barragán, E. 'Pentesilea: Héroe y Mujer. El Rostro de la Amazona Arcaica', *Nova Tellus* 19.2 (2001), 69-107.
- Sánchez Hernández, J. 'Dos notas a Quinto de Esmirna', *Habis* 39 (2008), 267-74.
- Sánchez, M. (ed.), *Comportamientos Antagónicos de las Mujeres en el Mundo Antiguo*, (Málaga, 1995).
- Saussure, F. de, *Writing in General Linguistics* (1916; repr. Oxford, 2006).
- Schein, S. 'On Achilles' Speech to Odysseus, *Iliad* 9.308-429', *Eranos* 78 (1980), 125-31.
- Schenk, P. 'Handlungsstruktur und Komposition in den *Posthomerica* des Quintus Smyrnaeus', *RhM* 140 (1997), 363-85.
- Scherer, M. *The Legends of Troy in Art and Literature* (London, 1963; repr. 1964).
- Schmeling, G. (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World* (New York, 1996).
- Schmidt, E. 'Quintus von Smyrna – der Schlechteste Dichter des Altertums?', *Phasis* 1 (1999), 139-50.
- Schmiel, R. 'The Amazon Queen: Quintus of Smyrna, Book 1', *Phoenix* 40 (1986), 185-94.
- Schmitz, T. *Modern Literary Theory and Ancient Texts: An Introduction* (Darmstadt, 2002; repr. Oxford, 2007a).
- Schmitz, T. 'The Use of Analepses and Prolepses in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*', in Baumbach and Bär (2007b), 65-84.
- Schubert, P. 'Thersite et Penthésilée dans la *Suite d'Homere* de Quintus de Smyrne', *Phoenix* 50 (1996), 111-75.
- Schubert, P. '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), 339-55.

- Scott, W. *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile* (Leiden, 1974).
- Scully, S. *Homer and the Sacred City* (Ithaca, 1990; repr. Ithaca, 1994).
- Segal, C. *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the Odyssey* (London, 1994).
- Selden, R. and Widdowson, P. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory* (Lexington, 1993).
- Shapiro, H. 'Jason's Cloak', *TAPA* 110 (1980), 263-86.
- Sharples, R. "'But Why Has My Spirit Spoken With Me Thus": Homeric Decision-Making', *G&R* 30 (1983), 1-7.
- Sharrock, A. 'Intratextuality: Texts, Parts, and (W)holes in Theory', in Sharrock and Morales (2000), ch. 1.
- Sharrock, A. and Morales, H. (eds.), *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations* (Oxford, 2000).
- Shorrock, R. 'Nonnus, Quintus and the Sack of Troy', in Baumbach and Bär (2007), 379-91.
- Sicking, C. 'Devices for text Articulation in Lysias I and XII', in Sicking and Ophuijsen (1993), Part One.
- Sicking, C. and J. Ophuijsen, J. (eds.), *Two Studies in Attic Particles Usage: Lysias and Plato* (Leiden, 1993).
- Silk, M. *Homer: The Iliad* (Cambridge, 1987; repr. 1999).
- Sinos, D. *Achilles, Patroklos and the Meaning of Philos* (Innsbruck, 1980).
- Sistakou, E. *Reconstructing the Epic: Cross-Readings of the Trojan Myth in Hellenistic Poetry* (Leuven, 2008).
- Slatkin, L. *The Power of Thetis: Allusion and Interpretation in the Iliad* (Berkeley, 1991; repr. 1995).
- Slings, S. 'The I in Personal Archaic Lyric: An Introduction', in Slings (1990a), 1-30.
- Slings, S. (ed.), *The Poet's I in Archaic Greek Lyric* (Amsterdam, 1990b).
- Snowden, F. *Blacks in Antiquity: Ethiopians in the Greco-Roman Experience* (London, 1970).
- Sodano, A. 'La Saga Peleo-Teti Nell'epos Arcaico e i Suoi Riflessi Nei τῶν μεθ' Ὀμηρον λόγοι Di Quinto Smirneo', *AFLN* (1953), 81-104.

- Sommerstein, A. *Aeschylean Tragedy* (Bari, 1996).
- Stanford, W. B. *The Ulysses Theme: A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero* (Oxford, 1954; repr. Dallas, 1992).
- Swain, S. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism and Power in the Greek World, AD 50-250* (Oxford, 1996).
- Swain, S. (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel* (Oxford, 1999).
- Taplin, O. (ed.), *Literature in the Greek World* (Oxford, 2000; repr. 2001a).
- Taplin, O. (ed.), *Literature in the Roman World* (Oxford, 2000; repr. 2001b).
- Tarrant, R. 'Aspects of Virgil's Reception in Antiquity', in Martindale (2000), ch. 4.
- Toohey, P. *Reading Epic: An Introduction to the Ancient Narratives* (London, 1992).
- Toohey, P. 'Epic and Rhetoric', in Worthington (1994), ch. 8.
- Trout, D. 'Latin Christian Epics of Late Antiquity', in Foley (2005), ch. 40.
- Tsagalis, C. *Epic Grief: Personal Laments in Homer's Iliad* (New York, 2004).
- Tsomis, G. P. 'Vorbild und *aemulatio*: An der Kreuzung von intertextuellen Bezügen in den Totenklagen dreier Frauen in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*: Briseis, Tekmessa und Oinone', in Baumbach and Bär (2007), 185-207.
- Usener, K. 'Wege und Formen, Umwege und Umformungen: Quintus Smyrnaeus und die Rezeption der Trojasage in Kaiserzeit und Spätantike', in Baumbach and Bär (2007), 393-409.
- Van Wees, H. *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History* (Amsterdam, 1992).
- Van Wees, H. 'A Brief History of Tears: Gender Differentiation in Archaic Greece', in Foxhall and Salmon (1998), ch. 1.
- Vermeule, E. *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry* (London, 1979; repr. Berkeley, 1981).
- Vian, F. 'Les Comparaisons de Quintus de Smyrne', *RPh* 28 (1954), 30-51.
- Vian, F. 'Les Comparaisons de Quintus de Smyrne (fin)', *RPh* 28 (1954), 235-43.
- Vian, F. *Histoire de la Tradition Manuscrite de Quintus de Smyrne* (Paris, 1959).
- Vian, F. *Recherches sur les Posthomerica de Quintus de Smyrne* (Paris, 1959).

- Vian, F. 'Echoes and Imitations of Apollonius Rhodius in Late Greek Epic', in Papanghelis and Rengakos (2001), 285-308.
- Visi, Y. 'Memory and Immortality', in Dolezalova (2009), ch. 1.
- Walder, D. (ed), *Literature in the Modern World: Critical Essays and Documents* (Oxford, 1990)
- West, M. L. 'Echoes and Imitations of the Hesiodic Poems', *Philologus* 113 (1969), 1-9.
- West, M. L. 'Last Notes on Quintus of Smyrna', *Philologus* 130 (1986), 145-49.
- Whitby, M. 'Telemachus Transformed? The Origins of Neoptolemus in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *G&R* 43 (1996), 31-42.
- White, H. *Studies in Late Greek Epic Poetry* (Amsterdam, 1987).
- Wiedemann, T. 'ἐλάχιστον ... ἐν τοῖς ἄρσεσι κλέος : Thucydides, Women, and the Limits of Rational Analysis', *G&R* 30 (1983), 163-70.
- Whitmarsh, T. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation* (Oxford, 2001; repr. 2008).
- Whitmarsh, T. "'Greece is the World': Exile and Identity in the Second Sophistic", in Goldhill (2001), ch. 7.
- Whitmarsh, T. *The Second Sophistic* (Oxford, 2009).
- Willcock, M. 'Mythological Paradeigma in the *Iliad*', *CQ* 14 (1964), 141-154.
- Willcock, M. 'Neoanalysis', in Morris and Powell (1997), ch. 7.
- Williams, G. *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid* (London, 1983).
- Williams, R. 'The Purpose of the *Aeneid*', in S. Harrison (1990), ch. 2.
- Wilson, D. *Ransom, Revenge, and Heroic Identity in the Iliad* (Cambridge, 2002).
- Woodford, S. *The Trojan War in Ancient Art* (London, 1993; repr. 1998).
- Worthington, I. (ed.), *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action* (London, 1994).
- Zaragoza, J. and A. Gonzalez (eds.), *Homenatge a Josep Alsina. Actes del X simposi de la Seccio catalana de la SEEC* (Tarragona, 1992).
- Zanker, G. *The Heart of Achilles: Characterization and Personal Ethics in the Iliad* (Michigan, 1994; repr. 1997).
- Zeitlin, F. *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature* (Chicago, 1996).