

Primacy and Subsumption in Greco-Roman Epic Literature

By

E. Perot Bissell V

B.A., University of Michigan, 2010

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in the Department of Classics at Brown University

PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

MAY 2019

© Copyright 2019 by E. Perot Bissell V

This dissertation by Elliston Perot Bissell V is accepted in its present form
by the Department of Classics as satisfying the
dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Curriculum Vitae

E. Perot Bissell V was born in 1989 in New York City, NY. He earned a B.A. from the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor in 2010, with a thesis entitled “Cato in Lucan’s Poetic Conception of History,” which received highest departmental honors. Upon graduation, he was awarded the Copley Prize, for the top graduating student in Latin. He was a three-time winner of the Phillips Prize for sight translation of Latin, and one-time winner of the same prize for sight translation of Greek. While at Brown, Perot presented at the 2013 meeting of the American Oriental Society, and was a Fulbright Research Scholar at the University of Vienna for the 2013-14 academic year. He also studied at the American School for Classical Studies at Athens and the American Institute for Indian Studies in Pune. Concurrently with his studies at Brown, Perot attended the Yale Law School, where he was an editor of the *Yale Law Journal*. His co-authored comment entitled “Exceptional Judgments: Revising the Terrorism Exception to the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act,” and his note “Monuments to the Confederacy and the Right to Destroy in Cultural Property Law” have been published in the *Yale Law Journal*. He will receive his J.D. in May 2019. Following graduation, he will serve as a law clerk to Chief Judge Diane P. Wood of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to the many people who have helped me through the process of writing this dissertation. Special thanks to Jay Reed for all of his help and feedback through the development of this project, and without whose guidance and encouragement this dissertation would never have been completed. I owe a great debt to Pura Nieto Hernández for her help on this project, and for many years of stimulating instruction in Homeric studies. I am very grateful to Joseph Pucci for his help through the years of the program, and for generously agreeing to join the committee at the last moment.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the many graduate students whose conversations and criticisms greatly improved the project. In particular, I would like to thank the members of the Dissertation Writers' Group, Darrel Janzen, Dominic Machado, and Rachel Philbrick.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1: SUBSUMPTION AND PRIMACY, LITERACY AND ORALITY IN THE POEMS OF HOMER.....	7
CHAPTER 2: ENNIUS' <i>ANNALES</i>: PRIMACY, SUBSUMPTION, AND THE FOUNDING OF A LATIN EPIC TRADITION.....	42
CHAPTER 3: PRIMACY, BELATEDNESS, AND SUBSUMPTION IN STATIUS' <i>THEBAID</i>.....	66
CHAPTER 4: CULMINATING A TRADITION AND STARTING ANEW IN NONNUS OF PANOPOLIS' <i>DIONYSIACA</i>.....	115
CONCLUSION.....	136
BIBLIOGRAPHY:	138

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation analyzes the strategies of primacy and subsumption, and their interactions, in epic poetry across four authors in the Greco-Roman epic tradition. I argue that these strategies are central to Greek epic as far back as we have evidence of such a tradition, and that they continue to define and shape the tradition as it progress. I proceed in four chapters, each of which treats one of four authors: Homer, Ennius, Statius, and Nonnus.

Chapter 1 treats the Homeric poems. Relying upon the oral theories first expounded in the works of Lord and Perry,¹ I argue that Homer, a poet operating on the boundary between orality and literacy,² employs a series of strategies to make the poems, though limited in narrative scope, appear to be subsumptive or totalizing. Homer, by bringing in material from other points in the Epic Cycle, looks outwards, beyond the narrative confines of his own poem to the vast mass of mythological stories that were available to him. He looks both backwards, to material that occurred before the beginning of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and forward to material that happens afterwards.³ I further argue that Homer demonstrates his expansive capabilities through the use of similes that recall other mythological episodes, through the refashioning of stories from elsewhere in the Cycle for the context of his stories,⁴ and through the use of lengthy catalogues.⁵

¹ Lord (1960).

² See, e.g. Nieto Hernández (2007) 30; Bakker (2005) 39-42.

³ Crucial works on the Cycle, with which the chapter engages, include Burgess (2001) and West (2013).

⁴ That Homer employs this technique is a central observation of Neoanalysis. From a large bibliography, see Rutherford 1985, Slatkin 1991, Danek 1998, Schmitz 2001, Scodel 2002, de Jong 2004, and Burgess 2006. For more, see Chapter 1, ns. 12-18.

⁵ For catalogues as a feature of oral-derived poetry, see Minchin (2011).

I next argue that this subsumptive self-presentation can be seen in Homer's presentations of bardic figures in the *Odyssey*. Homer uses the figures of the bards Demodocus and Phemius in the *Odyssey* to make programmatic implications about his own poetry. In particular, Demodocus and Phemius are presented throughout as having a particular form of omniscience, a capacity to tell any story that might be asked of them. The argument builds upon Scodel's observation that a key difference between bards and other characters who tell stories in Homeric poetry (*Odyssues* in particular) is their ability to narrate activity which they themselves did not witness, such as the actions of the gods.⁶

Chapter 1 concludes with a discussion of how the *Odyssey* seems to contest the *Iliad*. This segment relies upon the observations of Pucci, who argues that the *Odyssey* can be seen to compete with the *Iliad* through the studious silence it maintains on the subject of that poem.⁷ In this, I argue, we see the seeds of what would come to be the theme of poetic primacy, which is a claim made by numerous Latin poets, epic and otherwise, and which is important in the poetry of Nonnus as well. Chapter 1 also includes a few comparative remarks on the Sanskrit *Mahābhārata*, in which, I argue, some similarities can be discerned in the way the poem frames itself as a subsumptive epic and as the "entire thought" of an omniscient bard.⁸

Chapter 2 treats the poetry of Ennius. Ennius employs both the strategies of primacy and subsumption to create a space for himself in the epic tradition. Ennius presents himself as a new beginning, in order to contend with two epic traditions that preceded him – a well-developed

⁶ Scodel (1998).

⁷ Pucci (1987) 17-18.

⁸ *MBh* 1.1.23c-d: *pravakṣyāmi mataṃ kṛtsnaṃ vyāsasyāmitatejasaḥ* ("I speak forth the entire thought of Vyāsa, of limitless splendor.")

Greek epic tradition, and a nascent tradition of Latin literary epic.⁹ Ennius presents himself as the founder of a new epic tradition through several strategies. He presents himself as the reincarnation of Homer in the Latin tradition, and he introduces the hexameter into the Latin language. In doing so, he minimizes the works of his predecessors, Livius Andronicus and Naevius each of whom had composed earlier Latin epics, but had done so in the native Italic Saturnian meter. In Ennius' self-presentation, he is the first properly to write Latin epic poetry.¹⁰

The theme of subsumption is clearly visible in the fragments of Ennius as we have them as well. Ennius' poem covered the whole expanse of time from the fall of Troy all the way through his present. In other words, the poem told the whole story of Rome, from its earliest founding through to the present. Elliott has observed that Ennius' poem should be connected with the rise of universal history in the early second century BCE and that the poem is likely missing fragmentary material that would have set its story of the rise of Rome in a cosmic framework beginning with the origins of the universe, narrated in summary form by Homer.¹¹ As such, Ennius' poem exhibits the subsumptive goals of telling the whole story, and claiming that poetic terrain as his own. Ennius' protective stance towards being the authoritative poet of Roman history can be seen in his decision to expand the poem by three books after its initial publication, to bring the story down to the events of his own time.¹²

⁹ Early Latin literature, and Ennius in particular, have been the subject of significant recent scholarly interest. Important works on Early Latin literature include Hinds (1998) and Feeney (2016). Recent works on Ennius in particular include Elliott (2013), who treats both the traditional text criticism of Ennius and reevaluates the literary qualities of his poem in light of development in Roman political history; Goldschmidt (2013), who treats the influence Ennius exerted upon Virgil; and Fisher (2014), who furnishes a linguistic argument for the influence of native Italic oral traditions on the poetry on Ennius.

¹⁰ For a classic discussion, see Hinds (1998) 52-74.

¹¹ Elliott (2013) 233-294.

¹² See Skutsch ad loc.

In chapter 3, I move to the works of Statius. By Statius' time, the field of Latin literary epic had become far more crowded, with the *Aeneid* having attained near canonical status. I argue that Statius employs a new set of strategies to create an illusion of primacy for himself and to present his poem as subsumptive, both vis-à-vis his predecessors, and his contemporaries.¹³ Statius creates an illusion of primacy for himself by setting his poem deep in the recesses of mythological history. In so doing, he sets his poem at a time before the events of the *Aeneid*, the *Annales*, the *Iliad*, or the *Odyssey*.¹⁴ In so doing, he creates the impression that episodes in later poets, on which he models episodes in his poems, are in fact the models for the episodes he imitates. Thus, the characters of the *Aeneid* become pale imitations of predecessors in Statius' *Thebaid*.

Statius also employs the rhetoric of subsumption to give the impression of a new beginning in Latin literature.¹⁵ Statius refers repeatedly to his poem as part of a *longo retro series* ("long series of events")¹⁶ that must be cabined within particular boundaries. As in the case of the Homeric poems, the poem spills out over its edges and must delimited by boundaries (*limes*).¹⁷

In chapter 4, I move to Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*, the latest and longest of the Greek hexametrical epics of antiquity. In Nonnus, I argue, we can see a sort of culmination of the

¹³ For the *Thebaid*'s competition with its predecessors as well as its contemporaries, see generally Lovatt (2005), who analyzes the poem's games through its intertextual relationship to Homer, Virgil, Valerius Flaccus, and Silius Italicus.

¹⁴ Mythological epic came into Roman literature later than might be expected, and the vast majority of our attested early epics are on historical themes. Reed (2011) 21-22: "Mythological epic – after Andronicus' translation of the *Odyssey* – seems to come into Latin late, and is especially Augustan (though precedents are the translations of the *Iliad* and the *Argonautica* by Matius and Varro of Atax ...).

¹⁵ For subsumption in Statius' games, see Lovatt (2005) 106: "The discus, through its sacred shape becomes the world, and, through its destructiveness, threatens it."

¹⁶ *Theb.* 1.7.

¹⁷ *Theb.* 1.16.

themes that are evident in the earlier epicists. Nonnus takes the themes of primacy and subsumption to extremes, in the course of his repeated, stated ambition to surpass Homer.¹⁸ Like Statius, Nonnus attempts to create an illusion of primacy for himself by retrojecting his narrative back into the earliest realms of mythological antiquity. He presses even further back by starting with cosmological and Gigantomachic themes. In fact, Dionysus is not even born until the seventh book of his poem. His poem reorients the entire mythological history of the world around the lead up to the birth and exploits of Dionysus.

Nonnus, as has been written “takes to an extreme the generic tendency of epic to the expansive and the comprehensive.”¹⁹ Faced with an enormous tradition of Greek literature, Nonnus presents his poem as a culmination of the tradition, and a new beginning in order to carve a place for himself within that tradition. Nonnus’ poem is a sort of encyclopedia of previous literature, subsuming everything that came before in the service of creating a new, totalizing epic poem.

In conclusion, primacy and subsumption are critical tools employed by Greek and Latin epic poets in carving out space for themselves in a tradition. These themes are present from the very beginning in the oral-derived poetry of Homer. They are critical in the self-presentation of Ennius, who presents himself as doing something completely new, even as he relies upon and takes in strands of both a Greek and a Latin epic tradition. Statius creates an illusion of primacy for himself by situating his poem in narrative time earlier than most of the remainder of the Latin tradition, and employs intertextuality to emphasize his own priority both in time and in quality. And in Nonnus, the themes become central to a poetics of culmination and re-beginning: By

¹⁸ Hopkins (1994a).

¹⁹ Bannert and Kröll (2016) 483.

including everything that came before him, and reconfiguring it into something new, Nonnus invents a potential fresh start in epic poetry.

CHAPTER 1: SUBSUMPTION AND PRIMACY, LITERACY AND ORALITY IN THE POEMS OF HOMER

The Homeric poems are, on the conventional view, the oldest surviving poems of Greece.²⁰ The themes of primacy and subsumption are discernible in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The position of the poems, on the boundary between literacy and orality, accounts for the presence of these two themes in the poems. The poems respond to the other Cyclic poems, as well as to each other by attempting to subsume and encompass them within their own ambits.

The Homeric poems are crystallizations of particular stories from a vast body of Epic and Cyclic literature. The poems themselves, however, only represent a small fraction of the stories of the Greek mythological tradition.²¹ The poems, in fact, only narrate a portion of the story of the Trojan War: The *Iliad* occupies only a period of fifty days in the ninth year of the Trojan War, while the *Odyssey* tells the story of the homecoming of Odysseus with only references to the homecomings of the other heroes who survived the war.²²

The Greek tradition provides evidence for the existence of a number of other poems that went under the broad heading of “Cyclic Epics.”²³ These epics, assembled together, would have told a “more or less continuous account of mythical history from the beginning of the world to the end of the Heroic Age.”²⁴ The poems reflect the vast scope of the underlying oral tradition from which the Homeric poems derive – a huge quantity of epic stories that are not included within the ambit of the narratives of the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*.

²⁰ For linguistic arguments placing Hesiod in the first half of the seventh century, see Janko (1982). See Köiv (2011) for bibliography on the dating of Hesiod.

²¹ Finkelberg (2002).

²² Nieto Hernández (2007) 38: “[T]he actions of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are only minor episodes in the whole picture of the Trojan War and its aftermath. And yet, although they are much more limited and specific in their plots, they are at the same time far more ambitious in their scope and their temporal dimension.”

²³ For text and commentary, see West (2013).

²⁴ West (2013) 1.

Unfortunately, these epics have survived only in a highly fragmentary form. The only description of them is derived from Photius, summarizing the work of Proclus, who in turn had written summaries of the Cyclic poems.²⁵ Proclus' own descriptions of the epics concerning the Trojan War are preserved in some manuscripts of the *Iliad*, but his descriptions of the other poems only have survived through Photius.²⁶ Indeed, the poems outside of the Trojan Cycle are so poorly attested that we do not even know exactly how many there were.²⁷ We can confidently say that there existed at least a *Theogony* and a *Titanomachy* concerning the early mythological history of the Olympians. There are also citations to a Cyclic *Thebaid*, that included at least an *Oidipodeia*, a *Thebaid*, and an *Epigonoï*.²⁸

Better attested are the six poems constituting the so-called Trojan Cycle. "Detailed plot summaries" of each of these poems have survived.²⁹ The poems filled out the story of the Trojan War, starting from the very beginning with Zeus' plan to reduce the world's population. It included such well-known stories as the Judgment of Paris and the death of Achilles, the Trojan Horse, and the ill-fated homecomings of the other Greek heroes including Agamemnon and Ajax. The Cyclic poems provided a great deal of the subject matter for later Greek literature, including the tragedians.

The relationship between the Cyclic Epics and the Homeric poems has been a topic of keen scholarly interest for many decades. As early as 1849, Welcker had noted parallels between episode in the *Iliad* and episodes in the *Aethiopis* as described by Proclus.³⁰ A particularly

²⁵ *Id.* 1-2.

²⁶ *Id.* 2.

²⁷ *Id.*

²⁸ *Id.*

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ Welcker (1849) 189-91. See also, West (2003) 2.

vibrant strand of scholarship has been the work of the Neoanalysts, beginning with J.T. Kakridis in the 1940s.³¹ These scholars used oral theory to suggest that many of the inconsistencies in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, which had previously been used by the Analysts as evidence for multiple authorship of the Homeric poems, are the result of borrowing from other segments of the Cycle and importation into the context of the Homeric poems.

The Neoanalysts found many episodes in the *Iliad* which they believed originated in other parts of the epic cycle and were adapted with small modifications to fit into the plot of the *Iliad*.³² Some of these parallels are more persuasive than others, but some have become established as convincing.³³ The work of the Neoanalysts has revealed that Homer borrows episodes from elsewhere within the epic cycle and adapts them to his own Iliadic context.³⁴ For example, at *Iliad* 8.80-121, Nestor becomes trapped on the front lines of the battle after Paris kills his horse with an arrow. As Hector makes his way towards the old horseman, Diomedes sees him and rides to the front to rescue him. Nestor leaps on Diomedes' chariot and avoids the death that would surely have come to him. This episode shares many similarities with an episode from the *Aithiopis*, in the summarized form in which it has come down to us from Proclus. In the episode from the *Aithiopis*, and partially reconstructed from a retelling in Pindar's sixth Pythian,³⁵ Nestor's son Antilochus saves Nestor after his horse was wounded. In doing so,

³¹ Kakridis (1949). The subject of the deployment of such stories remains a fruitful topic of scholarly investigation. From a large bibliography, see Rutherford 1985, Slatkin 1991, Danek 1998, Schmitz 2001, Scodel 2002, de Jong 2004, and Burgess 2006.

³² See, Burgess (2001) 62.

³³ For persuasive examples of Neoanalytical analysis, see Willcock (1973), Janko (1992).

³⁴ The following example is derived from Schadewaldt (1951), a highly influential work among the early productions of the Neoanalysts. See also, West (2003) 5, noting that "the extensive parallelism between *Iliad* 16-23 and the *Aethiopis* cannot be fortuitous, and it is not to be explained away as the consequence of two poets drawing independently on stock motifs."

³⁵ *Pyth.* 6.28-42.

Antilochus loses his life.³⁶ The close relation of the episodes seems to suggest that Homer drew the story of Nestor being isolated on the front lines and his rescue by Antilochus and modified it only slightly to fit the context of the *Iliad*.³⁷ Whether the story was drawn from the *Aithiopis* described by Proclus or simply from some earlier or different version of the cyclic stories remains a difficult question, but the episode does seem sure to have been taken from the other story.

The process by which the Homeric poems became texts is unknown to us, though theories abound.³⁸ That the poems are oral formulaic compositions is unassailable.³⁹ That the Homeric poems are orally-dictated texts was originally demonstrated by Lord.⁴⁰ As Parry and Lord discovered, oral poetry is composed during performance from a repertoire of stories, type scenes, and linguistic formulae at the narrowest level. To perform an orally recited poem is to compose it anew, and the composition will never be identical in the way that a reproduced text will be. The composition changes each time. As the Homeric poems are surely orally composed poems, the idea that they were composed concomitantly with their being written down as texts is no radical assumption, no matter whether they were copied down in the eighth century and are

³⁶ Schadewaldt (1951) 155.

³⁷ See also, West (2003).

³⁸ One theory holds that the poems were taken down from one master poet by dictation. See Lord (1960), Janko (1990), Powell (1997). Some have doubted whether this would be possible, given the length of the poems and the incipient state of writing in Greece (eg. West 2001). Few since the introduction of the oral theory have argued that Homer wrote the poems down himself, with the result that the argument must be for some kind of patronage for the dictation process. Another model, advocated by Nagy (1996) and followers has the first recension of the text produced at Athens through an assemblage of oral poets during the Panatheneia during the reign of Pisistratus, producing the so-called Pisistratean Recension.

³⁹ For discussion of the oral formulaic composition of the Homer poems, see Hoekstra (1965), Hainsworth (1968) and Finkelberg (2004).

⁴⁰ Lord (1960), Foley (1990).

the works of a single hand or whether they were copied from the versions of many rhapsodes during the Panathenaia in the sixth century, a process associated with Pisistratus.⁴¹

Lord and Parry observed that the composition-in-performance of oral poetry responds to the caprice of the audience.⁴² In many cases, the performer may be faced with an audience that is only partially paying attention, or coming and going.⁴³ The performer must customize his telling of the story in order to tailor it to the audience at hand: For a docile and attentive audience, he will tell a more extensive, elaborate version of the story,⁴⁴ while for a restless audience, he is more likely to accelerate the story to move more quickly to the high-points of the narrative action.⁴⁵

Lord and Parry also observed certain features of oral poets' responses to their attempts to record and transcribe their songs.⁴⁶ In particular, they noted that oral bards, when given the

⁴¹ The question of the so-called Pisistratean recension, including whether or not such a thing ever actually happened, has been the subject of a great deal of scholarly activity. The sources for this event -- an alleged conclave of rhapsodes that took place during the Panathenaia sometime in the late sixth century to collect the Homeric poems -- vary in how they describe it and as to what exactly it was. Our earliest sources for this idea are drawn from the fourth century, more than a century after the reign of the historical Pisistratus. The earliest testimony comes from the *Hipparchus* of Pseudo-Plato, who writes that Pisistratus was the first to bring the Homeric poems to Attica, and that he caused the rhapsodes to perform them at the Panathenaia. Scattered references, usually vague are found in Lycurgus, Josephus, Cicero, and Pausanias. The general view among these authors is that the work of Homer was somehow divided or confused, and that Pisistratus, by assembling a large group of rhapsodes, "arranged" or "reconstructed" the poems. Some have rejected the theory entirely (see Davison 1955, who believes that the Pisistratean recension was an invention propagated by the Pergamene School of Homeric scholars to undermine the authority of Aristarchus of Samothrace, who "held Homer to be an Athenian from the time of the Ionian migration," Anderson, *Pisistratean Recension* in Finkelberg (2011)). Some have given more credence to the idea of the Pisistratean recension, or at least to the idea that the Homeric poems underwent some revision at Athens at the time of the Pisistratos or his sons, on the basis of the superficial Atticization found throughout the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Janko (1992) has argued that the earliest versions of the *Iliad* were written in East Ionic script and then brought to Athens, lending support to some truth lying behind the Pisistratean recension.

⁴² Lord (1960) 13-29.

⁴³ *Id.* at 14-15.

⁴⁴ Lord notes that particularly elaborate and slow-moving songs were sung among Yugoslav Muslims during the festival of Ramadan. As Lord notes, "[h]ere is a perfect circumstance for the singing of one song during the entire night." *Id.* at 15-16

⁴⁵ *Id.* at 14-15

⁴⁶ Lord (1960) 124-138.

opportunity to have their poems recorded by dictation, tend to tell highly expansive and adorned versions of their poems:

“From the point of view of verse-making, dictation carries no great advantage to the singer, but from that of song-making it may be instrumental in producing the finest and longest of songs. For it extends almost indefinitely the time limit of performance. And with a little urging, under the stimulus of great accomplishment for a worthy audience, the singer of talent will apply every resource of his craft to adorn and enrich his song. The important element is that of time; there is nothing in the dictating process itself that brings this richness to bear. The collector who tells a singer that he can sing his song from day to day taking as many days, as much time, as he wants, can elicit the same results in such performance... It should be stressed also that the additional time is of use only to the exceptional singer of great talent in a tradition rich in traditional themes and songs. The “ordinary” singer in a mediocre tradition will not have enough material at his command nor the imagination to avail himself of it. The extraordinary singer will enjoy the opportunity to the full.”⁴⁷

This description of the practice of oral bards when called upon to produce versions of their poems for transcription squares with the observations of the Neoanalysts. The expansive version of the *Iliad* that we have is filled out with stories and episodes modelled on or drawn from elsewhere in the Epic Cycle. This is the natural and probable result of producing a transcribed version of an oral-derived poem.

Further, this description of the process of the transcription of oral-derived epic poetry provides support for the concept of a subsumptive urge in the Homeric poems. In producing a written version of an oral derived poem, the poet would feel the urge to pull in as much material from outside the temporal bounds of the poem as possible. These efforts give a sense of the poet’s virtuosity, as well as presenting a rich layering of other stories – references to other stories that might have been included or expanded, but were not.

⁴⁷ *Id.* at 128.

The frequent gestures to material outside of the main narrative of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* point to the oral poet's comprehensive knowledge of the material that formed the remainder of the Cycle, thus subsuming the Cycle in to the text of the Homeric Epics. This subsumptive urge manifests itself in at least five ways, which will be discussed in the following pages. First, Homer employs mythological excursus, both in his own voice and in the retellings of other characters, to include other mythological stories. Second, Homer uses prolepsis to refer or allude to other stories that lie in the future, beyond the end of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, outside of the poems' scope. Third, Homer uses his similes to recall other Cyclic episodes. Fourth, as the Neoanalysts have observed, Homer refashions stories from elsewhere in the Epic Cycle with modest modifications, so that the stories can be included within the frame of his own, time-bounded stories. Finally, Homer's use of catalogues points to his own poetic virtuosity and to his omniscience with respect to the events of mythological history.

The first narrative technique Homer uses to give voice to the subsumptive urge is the mythological excursus or reference. The Homeric poems take place in front of an immense backdrop of other narrative and mythology.⁴⁸ Homer makes frequent reference to events from elsewhere in the broader Cycle of mythological poetry throughout the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. These references and excursus call to the listener's mind stories from outside the poem's immediate frame. As such, they make these stories part of the poem's, subsuming them to the confines of the poem.

⁴⁸ Nieto Hernández (2007): "[T]he Homeric poems are much more than their basic storylines. The main actions of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are, in fact, set against the background of a much larger mass of stories involving the human and divine characters that figure in the poems. In fact, one of the surprising features of this poetry for a first-time reader is the richness and density of its contents, the fact that one needs to read and re-read the texts to appreciate all that is going on within their lines and to reconstruct all the information that is either assumed or indirectly alluded to."

A simple form of this narrative technique is the reminiscence. Homer includes many stories ranging from the form of brief pieces of information about a particular hero to full scale reminiscences of various heroes about events from the past. The most famous narrator of his reminiscences in the *Iliad* is Nestor, who tells four major stories about his own prowess in his youth over the course of the *Iliad*.⁴⁹ Nestor often tells stories from his past experience, including the story of how he fought against the Centaurs, and of various cattle raids he participated in in his youth.⁵⁰ Though some have argued that these stories parallel the events of the *Iliad* so closely that they are likely to be the fictional inventions of Homer,⁵¹ such a model does not align with the practices of oral bards as we are aware of them.⁵² Oral poets do not invent stories out of thin air, but they do present their material strategically to meet the needs of their audience. Nestor's stories point to a great amount of mythological material that is available to Homer, but that predates the events of his story. Nestor, the character strategically tells his stories to provide suggestions for the heroes at Troy on how they ought to behave, but Homer uses the stories strategically himself to indicate that there is another generation worth of stories available to him. Nestor's stories can be quite extensive and elaborate, such as the story of the battle he fought at Pylos which he tells to Patroklos in book 11.⁵³ As Ebbott writes: "it is easily conceivable that the

⁴⁹ For Nestor's stories as paradigms for the action of the poem, see Alden (2000) 74-111. For discussion of Nestor, see Minchin (2005). For the argument that the character of Nestor himself has Indo-European roots, see Frame (2009).

⁵⁰ *Il.* 1.260-73; *Il.* 11.670-762; *Il.* 23.629-43.

⁵¹ See Alden (2000) 74-111. Though Alden's position seems untenable, the Homeric poets do certainly adapt traditional materials into stories well-suited for the moment, sometimes called "mirror stories" in the scholarship. Examination of such materials was a major focus of the Neoanalysts, who searched through the Homeric stories for material drawn from elsewhere in the epic cycle. The subject of the deployment of such stories remains a fruitful topic of scholarly investigation. From a large bibliography, see Rutherford 1985, Slatkin 1991, Danek 1998, Schmitz 2001, Scodel 2002, de Jong 2004, and Burgess 2006.

⁵² See Lord (1960) 4-29.

⁵³ *Il.* 11.668-761

poets see the parallels in events within their traditional repertoire and therefore tell an appropriate story about the past in a way fitting for the current situation. From this perspective, Nestor's reminiscences are interwoven within a larger tradition and can thus create richer meaning."⁵⁴ Homer's inclusion of these stories embeds the *Iliad* within a larger framework of mythology that also gives the sense of an Iliadic subsumption of other mythological material.⁵⁵

Homer's references to the broader Cycle can take the form of quite brief references, quite unlike Nestor's lengthy excursus.⁵⁶ One example is his references to the mythology associated with Thebes, of which, as has been noted, Homer "exhibit[s] extensive knowledge."⁵⁷ The Thebans are referred to throughout the *Iliad* as the Καδμείοι, the descendants of Cadmus, a reference to the founding myth of the city of Thebes. More specifically there is a reference to the funeral games of Oedipus during the boxing match at the funeral games of Patroklos. Euryalus is introduced as a potential fighter with an anecdote about an earlier exploit:

ὅς ποτε Θήβας δ' ἦλθε δεδουπότος Οἰδιπόδαο
ἐς τάφον. ἔνθα δὲ πάντας ἐνίκα Καδμείωνας.

...who at the funeral games for Oedipus, in Thebes, defeated every Cadmeian opponent. (*Il.* 23.679-80)

⁵⁴ Ebbott (2011).

⁵⁵ See also, Christensen & Barker (2011) 11: "[W]hile each unit is extremely versatile and can be put to use in any number of different ways according to the demands or aims of the present *individual* poem or bard, their long-established existence may activate prior associations with the broader tradition for poet and audience alike." Foley (1991) 7: "Traditional referentiality ... entails the invoking of a context that is enormously larger and more echoic than the text or work itself, that brings the lifeblood of generations of poems and performance to the individual performance or text." Alden (2000) 1 takes a similar, but slightly different view, arguing that what she calls the "secondary narratives" of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* serve primarily as "subtle guides" to the interpretation of the plot.

⁵⁶ See, e.g., Danek (2002) 5.

⁵⁷ Scully (2011). See also, Kullmann (1960); Davies (1989); Torres-Guerra (1995). For a close reading, arriving at similar conclusions, of Agamemnon's Theban Tale in *Iliad* 4, see Christensen & Barker (2011).

The note brings us briefly out of the world of the “Trojan Cycle” and into the world of the “Theban Cycle.”⁵⁸ Though we do not know anything of a story about a funeral games of Oedipus, the story again points out to a body of mythology that we know to have been memorialized in oral epic form, and which would have been familiar to Homer’s audience. The reference, like the reference to Typhon above, reminds the reader of the vast world of mythology outside of the scope of the *Iliad* itself, and by extension Homer’s ability to tell that story as well as the story here. The alignment of the funeral games of Patroclus with those of Oedipus makes the reader aware that Homer is capable of telling the story of those funeral games as well, and of the occasion where Euryalus triumphed – an occasion which contrasts strongly with this one, in which Euryalus is brutally beaten by the stronger Epeius.

At other points, Homer makes reference to other mythological stories specifically as being songs. In the *Odyssey*, for instance, Homer indicates that the story of Jason and the Argonauts was already in wide circulation. When Circe directs Odysseus how to travel through the straits of Scylla and Charybdis, she mentions that in an earlier age, Jason and the Argonauts traveled through those straits:

οἷη δὴ κείνῃ γε παρέπλω ποντοπόρος νηὺς
Ἀργὼ πᾶσι μέλουσα, παρ’ Αἰήταο πλέουσα.
καὶ νῦν κε τὴν ἔνθ’ ὄκα βάλεν μεγάλας ποτὶ πέτρας,
ἀλλ’ Ἥρῃ παρέπεμψεν, ἐπεὶ φίλος ἦεν Ἰήσων.

That way the only seagoing ship to get through was Argo,
who is in all men's minds, on her way home from Aietes;
and even she would have been driven on the great rocks that time,
but Hera saw her through, out of her great love for Jason. (*Od.* 12.69-72)

⁵⁸ On the tradition of the Theban Cycle in Homer, see Torres-Guerra (1995, esp. 27-49, 65-74.

This passage has been interpreted as evidence that there were already epics in circulation telling the story of Jason and the Argonauts.⁵⁹ The evidence suggests to many “that some of Odysseus’ adventures owe something to a pre-existing narrative about Jason and the Argonauts.”⁶⁰ Indeed, the suggestion that the Argo was “in all men’s minds,” seems to suggest a good deal of currency for the story of the Argo already at the time of Homer’s composition.⁶¹ But these lines also indicate that Homer could break off and narrate that story here, in a digression or as a separate epic, if so called upon. By reference, Homer incorporates these existing Argonautic stories into his own.

And further, in accordance with the suggestions of Neoanalysis, scholars have suggested that the *Odyssey* brought in several stories from the already circulating *Argonautica*. The evidence suggests that this *Argonautica* only ever circulated orally, or alternatively that “if it was ever fixed in writing, it disappeared before the Hellenistic age.”⁶² As West has shown, numerous of the episodes connected in Odysseus’ wanderings in books 9-12 of the *Odyssey* show evidence of influence from the Argonautic myth.⁶³ As he writes, “the Laestrygonians; Circe; the entry into Oceanus; the Cimmerians, and perhaps other features of the approach to Hades; the Sirens; the Clashing Rocks; perhaps the Cattle of the Sun” all demonstrably have Argonautic elements.⁶⁴ This encompassing of the stories of Jason and the Argonauts to the story of Odysseus subsumes the *Argonautica*, both by referring outwards to it, and by bringing its elements inward. In this

⁵⁹ For a treatment of the story of Jason and the Argonauts in early Greek literature, see Dräger (1993) 12-18.

⁶⁰ West (2005) 39. For a response to West, see Allan (2005).

⁶¹ *Id.* See also, Kirchhoff (1869) 84-6, who first advanced the argument. Danek (1998) 197-201.

⁶² West (2005) 40.

⁶³ *Id.*, *passim*.

⁶⁴ *Id.* 58.

way, the *Odyssey* looks out beyond its textual confines to the broader repertoire of the oral bard.⁶⁵

Another Homeric technique for expanding the frame of his poems beyond their immediate compass is the use of foreshadowing or prolepsis.⁶⁶ Homer alludes to events that are yet to come in the Epic Cycle, outside of the compass of his poems. Sometimes, these allusions come in the form of prophecies or other references to future events; at other times, they are mere bits of foreshadowing or brief hints of events that the Homeric audience would have known took place in the characters' futures.⁶⁷

Homer uses small allusions and foreshadowing to project events that will happen after the conclusion of his poems. As Franko has shown, Homer alludes to the Trojan Horse slyly three times near the conclusion of the *Iliad*.⁶⁸ First, Epeios, who builds the Trojan Horse according to the *Little Iliad*, appears in a boxing match and knocks out his opponent with a sucker punch.⁶⁹ Second, Priam, in his final speech of the poem, encourages the Trojans to bring wood into the city, and not to fear any potential ambush of the Greeks (μη δε τι θυμῷ/δείσῃτ' Ἀργείων πυκινὸν

⁶⁵ See also Mackie (2013) 3, who writes that the many allusions outside of the immediate narrative “look back to the earlier life of Troy before the war began,” while others “seem to assume a detailed knowledge of the fall of Troy, and so take us forward to its imminent doom at the hands of the Greeks.”

⁶⁶ Duckworth (1933) is the foundational study of foreshadowing in Homer. Morrison (1992) examines misleading foreshadowing in the poems. Narratological interpretations of Homer have made many interesting observations about the role of Homer's various indications of future events in creating “simultaneous foreknowledge and suspense.” Scodel (2011). See also, Bal (1985) 63-66. See also, Nieto Hernández (2007) 44: “One point in which the two poems behave very differently and which is not stressed enough in current scholarship is their treatment of the future. The *Iliad* often refers, through prophecies and anticipations, to events that postdate the end of the poem, above all to the death of Achilles and the fall of Troy and its immediate aftermath. There are also anticipations of the future in the *Odyssey*, but all events that are predicted in the *Odyssey*, unlike the *Iliad*, come to full realization within the temporal framework of the poem. Projections of the future that go beyond the time covered by its own narrative are practically limited to the prediction of Odysseus's death, which has some bearing but whose importance cannot be compared with the weight attached to the predictions of Achilles's death in the *Iliad*.”

⁶⁷ Scodel (2011).

⁶⁸ Franko (2005) 121-123.

⁶⁹ *Id. Il.* 23.689-91.

λόχον “do not fear in your heart any packed ambush of the Greeks.” *Il.* 24.788-89).⁷⁰ These words are an obvious allusion to the ultimate fate of the city, when a wooden ambush of the Greeks will bring about the city’s fall. And finally, as Franko notes, the final word of the poem, ἵπποδάμοιο (*Il.* 24.804), “leaves the audience with the ironic foreshadowing of the inability of the Trojans without Hector to master that most fatal horse.”⁷¹ These references gesture out beyond the end of the poem – they bring the material subsequent to the written poem’s conclusion into the reader’s mind, reinforcing the notion that the *Iliad*, while bounded, reaches and encompasses Cyclic material.⁷²

Mackie has persuasively argued that references both to material before the beginning of the *Iliad* and to material after its end are particularly frequent as the poem reaches its conclusion.⁷³ According to Mackie, this proliferation of explicit references to material outside of the narrative frame of the poem should be understood as part of Homer’s poetic program: “It is Homer’s way of closing his epic. The reference to the Judgment ... should not really be read in isolation from its immediate context, any more than should Helen’s reflection on her twenty years away from Sparta, or Andromache’s anxiety about the death of her son, or Cassandra’s sudden appearance on Pergamus. They are all part of the same coherent creative process, not random allusion to other mythical episodes.”⁷⁴ Mackie’s hypothesis supports the notion that Homer’s compositional process attempts to subsume the Cycle: As the poem approaches it

⁷⁰ *Id.*

⁷¹ *Id.* 123.

⁷² Mackie (2013) discusses an explicit reference in *Iliad* 24 to the Judgment of Paris, arguing that Book 24 of the *Iliad* shows a particular interest in the

⁷³ Mackie (2013) *passim*, esp. 10 & 13, where Mackie catalogues such references.

⁷⁴ *Id.* 15.

conclusion, he includes ever more references to events beyond, in an attempt to co-opt them as material for the *Iliad*.

Other uses of this strategy in the *Iliad* are more developed and explicit. The Death of Achilles, for instance, is foreshadowed at several different points throughout the poem. Thetis first remarks on the probability of Achilles' early death in the first book of the *Iliad*: αἶθε ὄφελες παρὰ νηυσὶν ἀδάκρυτος καὶ ἀπῆμων/ῆσθαι, ἐπεὶ νύ τοι αἶσα μίνυνθά περ, οὐ τι μάλα δῆν/νῦν δ' ἄμα τ' ὠκύμορος καὶ οἰζυρὸς περὶ πάντων/ἔπλεο ("If only it had been your lot to stay by your ships without tears and without grief, since your span of life is brief and will not last long; but now you are doomed to a speedy death and are unfortunate above all men.").⁷⁵ Achilles himself shows awareness of the prospective brevity of his own life in *Iliad* 9, when the embassy comes to persuade him to return to the fight:

μήτηρ γάρ τέ με φησι θεὰ Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα
διχθαδίας κῆρας φερέμεν θανάτοιο τέ
εἰ μὲν κ' αὖθι μένων Τρώων πόλιν ἀμφιμάχωμαι,
ᾧλετο μὲν μοι νόστος, ἀτὰρ κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται.
εἰ δέ κεν οἴκαδ' ἵκωμι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,
ᾧλετό μοι κλέος ἐσθλόν, ἐπὶ δὴρὸν δέ μοι αἰὼν
ἔσσεται, οὐδέ κε μ' ὄκα τέλος θανάτοιο κιχεῖη.

For my mother the goddess, silver-footed Thetis, tells me that twofold fates are bearing me toward the doom of death: if I remain here and fight about the city of the Trojans, then lost is my return home, but my renown will be imperishable; but if I return home to my dear native land, lost then is my glorious renown, yet will my life long endure, and the doom of death will not come soon on me. (*Il.* 9.410-416).⁷⁶

⁷⁵ *Il.* 1.415-17. For the difficulty of the exact construction of αἶσα with μίνυνθά περ, οὐ τι μάλα δῆν, see Kirk, ad loc.

⁷⁶ κλέος ἄφθιτον is a phrase with Indo-European roots and an equivalent reflex in Vedic Sanskrit. See Kirk, ad loc. with references. See also, Jameson (1994) for an analysis of various *Iliadic* episodes from an "Indic" perspective.

Achilles's death is also invoked in his second conversation with Thetis in Book 18,⁷⁷ his horse Xanthus prophesies it to him,⁷⁸ and finally Achilles himself invokes it in his final words to the dying Hector: τέθναθι. κῆρα δ' ἐγὼ τότε δεξομαι, ὁππότε κεν δῆ/Ζεὺς ἐθέλῃ τελέσαι ἧδ' ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι ("Lie dead; my fate will I accept when Zeus is minded to bring it to pass and the other immortal gods.").⁷⁹

These numerous references to Achilles' death look forward to the events of the *Aethiopis*. The evidence for the *Aethiopis* indicates that Thetis continued to predict Achilles' imminent death.⁸⁰ The references in the *Iliad* predict what would happen to Achilles in the *Aethiopis* with some precision – two of the references mention that his death would come at the hands of Apollo and Paris.⁸¹

These frequent allusions to the events after the poem complicate the boundedness of the text and contribute to the Homeric sense of subsumption. The story spills out over the temporal bounds of the poem, reaching out and pulling in other Cyclic material. Every reference to the alternative material is an opening; an opening for the listener to consider the material, and for the poet to begin down that path, should the listener so choose. Even through short references, allusions and premonitions, the reader is reminded that, even if Homer should not tell the story in full on any particular occasion, it remains within the oral poet's power to do so. In doing so, the outside material becomes part of the song through subsumption.

⁷⁷ *Il.* 18.94-96.

⁷⁸ *Il.* 19.408-417.

⁷⁹ *Il.* 22.365-366.

⁸⁰ See Proclus, arg. 2b in West (2013) 145: καὶ θέτις τῷ παιδὶ κατὰ τὸν Μέμνονα προλέγει ("And Thetis predicts to her son the things [that would happen] with respect to Memnon."). Early Neoanalysts argued that Thetis' prediction to Achilles in the *Aethiopis* was primary and that Thetis' interventions in the *Iliad* drew upon them. Schadewaldt (196), Kullmann (1922) 38. West (2013) 145 forcefully adopts the contrary view.

⁸¹ *Il.* 21.277; 22.359.

Readers in antiquity apparently felt this sense of unease with boundaries and endings with respect to the Homeric Cycle, as evidenced by the alternative final line of the *Iliad*. The T scholia (1st century CE)⁸² report that some manuscripts of the *Iliad* replaced the final line ὥς οἱ γ' ἀμφίεπον τάφον Ἑκτορος ἵπποδάμοιο (“Thus, they held the funeral of Hector, breaker of horses”)⁸³ with the alternative: ὥς οἱ γ' ἀμφίεπον τάφον Ἑκτορος. ἦλθε δ' Ἀμαζών (“Thus, they held the funeral of Hector. Then came an Amazon...”).⁸⁴ This line allowed for a seamless combination of the *Iliad* with the *Aethiopis*, thus eliminating the boundary between the two.⁸⁵

Homer employs the strategy of prolepsis of events past the ending of the poem in the *Odyssey* as well. In a notable example, Homer has Tiresias “predict” some of the events of the *Telegony* during Odysseus’ trip to the Underworld. After predicting the later events of the *Odyssey*, including the slaying of the Cattle of the Sun and the death of the suitors, Tiresias instructs Odysseus to go to the mainland with an oar, and to go until he finds men who know nothing of the sea: ἔρζεσθαι δὴ ἔπειτα λαβὼν ἐνήρες ἐρετμόν/εἰς ὃ κε τοὺς ἀφίκηαι οἱ οὐκ ἴσασιν θάλασσαν/ἄνδρες (Then go abroad, taking a shapely oar, until you come to men that know nothing of the sea) (*Od.* 11.121-23). He tells him to continue until he finds men who do not

⁸² Kirk (1993) ad loc.

⁸³ *Il.* 24.804.

⁸⁴ T-Schol. at *Il.* 24.804. Fick (1886) argued that 24.804 never belonged to the *Iliad* until it was inserted later in the manuscript tradition, observing that ὥς typically introduces new material in Homer. See Burgess (2001) 141, citing Leaf (1886-88). Burgess (2001) 141-42 views this assessment as possible, but necessarily uncertain. West (2010) 428-430 argues that the alternative version was original, and that the *Iliad* originally ended with *Il.* 24.803. He suggests that “someone faced with separating the two poems took the backward-looking sentence [ie, *Il.* 24.804] ... as belonging to the *Iliad*, and filled out the verse with ἵπποδάμοιο.” West (2013) 136.

⁸⁵ On the other hand, Burgess (2001) 142-43 suggests that there may have been some significant overlap between the subject matter of the *Odyssey* with the subject matter of the Cyclic poems. In particular, he indicates that the *Telegony* seems to overlap with the *Odyssey*: “The Cyclic poem opens with the burial of the suitors. But a burial of the suitors occurs in book 24 of the Homeric poem. It is possible that the *Telegony*’s opening told of the climactic finish of the suitors, and so was cut when the Cyclic poem was placed next to the *Odyssey* in the Epic Cycle. The beginning of the book used to begin the Epic Cycle’s excerpt of the *Telegony* must have included the burial of the suitors, but this duplication of the Homeric material would have been left in because book divisions, and not sense divisions, seemed to have been used in the manufacture of the Epic Cycle.”

recognize the oar as a oar, instead taking it for a winnowing shovel.⁸⁶ Finally, he is to stick the oar in the earth and sacrifice to Poseidon, at which point Poseidon will finally forgive him.⁸⁷ According to Proclus' summary of the *Telegony*, as well as Apollodorus' summary, Odysseus completed all of this in that poem.⁸⁸ The prophecy of Tiresias thus serves to subsume events later than the *Odyssey* within the poem's scope.⁸⁹

A third technique used by Homer for subsuming outside material is allusion through simile.⁹⁰ Homeric similes sometimes bring together the current context of the poem with a reference to some other point in mythological lore. In the Catalogue of Ships, for example, the Greeks are described moving across the Trojan plain thus:

Γαῖα δ' ὑπεστενάχισε Διὶ ὧς τερπικεράνῳ
Χωομένῳ ὅτε τ' ἄμφι Τυφωέϊ γαῖαν ἰμάσση
Εἰν Ἀρίμοις, ὅθι φασὶ Τυφωέος ἔμμεναι εὐνάς.

And the ground shook beneath them, as when Zeus the Thunderer in anger lashes the land of the Arimi, where they say Typhoeus has his bed. (*Il.* 2.781-3)

This simile brings us, for a brief moment, out of the world of heroes at Troy and into the mythological world of the exploits of Zeus. The simile not only provides an effective comparandum for the power of the Achaian host; it also informs the reader that Homer has knowledge of the mythology associated with Zeus that is outside the scope of the poem, in a different location with a different set of concerns. The simile also refers to a mythological event

⁸⁶ *Od.* 11.124-26.

⁸⁷ *Od.* 11.127-31.

⁸⁸ Proclus, 1c. ἔπειτα εἰς Ἰθάκην καταπλεύσας τὰς ὑπὸ Τειρεσίου ρηθείσας τελεῖ θυσίας, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰς θεσπρωτοὺς ἀφικνεῖται ("Then having sailed to Ithaca, he completed the sacrifices commanded by Tiresias. And after these things, he went to Thesprotia.") Quoted in West (2013) 295.

⁸⁹ For the *Odyssey* as completing or subsuming the *Iliad*, see below XXX-XXX.

⁹⁰ The Homeric simile has attracted a great deal of scholarly attention. Foundational studies include Fränkel (1921); Podlecki (1971); Moulton (1974); Moulton (1977).

which we know had a hexametrical oral tradition associated with it: the Theogonic legend of the establishment of the Olympian gods and the rule of Zeus, which we have represented in the *Theogony* of Hesiod.⁹¹ Homer here points out to another story within his repertoire, indicating that the song is within his poetic control, but simply is not the song that he has chosen to sing on this particular occasion.

Another example of a simile referring to a mythological event comes, perhaps more pointedly, in Homer's description of the Shield of Achilles.⁹² This scene is the *Ursprung* for all later ecphrases of art and architecture that come in later Greek and Latin literature.⁹³ The Shield has attracted interest since antiquity, both because of the difficulty of visualizing its exact dimensions,⁹⁴ and because of the elaborate, extensive description of numerous scenes unconnected with warfare which appear on the Shield.⁹⁵ As scholarly literature on ecphrasis has shown, such passages often provide self-reflexive commentary upon the poet's own art. The passage of the Shield provides a look out onto the world beyond the poem, and the poem's subject, describing a number of scenes of domestic peace and tranquility.

⁹¹ *Theogony* 453-868.

⁹² *Il.* 18.478-608.

⁹³ Hardie (1985) 11. See also, Becker (1990) 139, who states that the shield stands "at the head of a long tradition of ecphrasis, the description of a work of visual art in a literary text."

⁹⁴ For the impossibility of squaring Homer's description of the shield with what is known about Greek shields of the archaic period, see Schadewaldt (1965) 357: "Der Schild des Achilleus ist nicht in einer wirklichen Werkstatt, sondern in der Gedankenwelt Homers entstanden."

⁹⁵ See, e.g., Scully (2003) 29: "While vocabulary and theme in [the] vignettes [features on the Shield] resonate with key scenes in the poem proper, as critics have observed, it has proved more difficult to define the particular relevance, if any, of the god's work of art for the heroes of the *Iliad* and most particularly for the hero who is to bear that shield." Bibliography on the Shield is collected in the footnotes to the same page.

The description of the Shield invites consideration of the larger poem.⁹⁶ Within the description of the Shield, Homer embeds a simile, describing a dancing floor:⁹⁷

ἐν δὲ χορὸν ποίκιλλε περικλυτὸς ἀμφιγυῆεις,
τῷ ἴκελον οἶόν ποτ' ἐνὶ Κνωσῷ εὐρείῃ
Δαίδαλος ἤσκησεν καλλιπλοκάμῳ Ἀριάδνῃ.

On it furthermore the famed god of the two lame legs cunningly inlaid a dancing floor like the one which in wide Knosus Daedalus fashioned of old for fair-tressed Ariadne. (*Il.* 18.590-592).

The simile has the effect of doubly distancing the reader from the events of the *Iliad*.⁹⁸ Already far into the description of the Shield, Homer draws away from the Shield itself to recall the story of Daedalus and Ariadne. Through this move, Homer draws in material from far outside the confines of his immediate story, subsuming it into his own narrative.

A fourth Homeric technique for subsumption is the refashioning of other Cyclic stories for the context of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.⁹⁹ As discussed above, the Neoanalysts have identified places in the *Iliad* where stories from elsewhere in the Cycle have been adapted to the context of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* with small modifications. These stories fill out and expand the narrative. This hypothesis aligns well with the descriptions of the methods of oral bards when they are asked to perform their songs for recording. Without the counterweight of the audience, the bards extend their poetry to a great extent. The versions that are elicited by people who

⁹⁶ Scully (2003) 29.

⁹⁷ The exact contours of this story are somewhat obscure. See Edwards (1991) ad loc. “The conception of Daidalos’ making a dancing-floor in Knossos for Ariadne, followed immediately by the description of a dance of young men and women, must be associated with the familiar tale of the Minotaur, the labyrinth, and the yearly tribute of young men and maidens ... Tablets from Knossos mention a Daidaleion and a Mistress of the Labyrinth ... and three circular platforms dating from soon after 1400 have been identified as dancing floors.”

⁹⁸ See, e.g., Edwards (1991) ad loc: “The simile compares the scene of daily life to the heroic past, an appealing reversal or the normal illustration of a heroic action by a familiar action of ordinary experience.”

⁹⁹ See above, XXX-XXX.

record the songs are longer, more leisurely and more drawn out. But there are only a finite number of episodes associated with an individual epic story, such as the wrath of Achilles, and it would seem that the bard has included other stories from outside of the immediate story being told in order to flesh it out and extend his tale. With the small modification of Diomedes successfully saving Nestor rather than Antilochus sacrificing himself to save his father's life, the poet can include material from elsewhere in the story, integrating it into his own story, simultaneously expanding his poem to its full extent and demonstrating his knowledge of stories from elsewhere in the cycle.

A related technique is the way in which Homer looks out to other homecomings in the *Odyssey*. The *Odyssey* is properly the story of the homecoming of Odysseus, but the poem regularly looks out to the homecomings of the various other Greek heroes, many of which would have been recounted in the Cyclic *Nostoi*.¹⁰⁰ The effect is to create the impression that the story is only one of many that could be told, and points out to the vast number of other stories that could have been told by "Homer," had he not chosen the story of Odysseus in particular.

The most prominent of other homecoming narratives which receives attention in the *Odyssey* is the story of Agamemnon. The poem is framed by the doomed king's story, where it is told at the poem's outset, and again in the final book of the epic. The *Odyssey* begins, once the proem and other preliminaries have been dispensed with, with a council of the gods, discussing the lugubrious fate of Agamemnon, and the death particularly of Aegisthus. Zeus tells the story,

¹⁰⁰ West (2013) 245: "[I]t appears that the return of the two Atreidai formed the framework of the whole epic: it began with the dispute that separated them, and ended with Menelaos' belated arrival home following Orestes' killing of Clytaemestra and Aegisthus. The murder and avenging of Agamemnon was the main heroic subject matter of the narrative."

presenting it as an example of how mortals blame the gods when they are justly punished for their own crimes:¹⁰¹

ὦ πόποι, οἷον δὴ νῦν θεοὺς βροτοὶ αἰτιόωνται.
ἐξ ἡμέων γάρ φασι κάκ' ἔμμεναι, οἱ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ
σφῆσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὑπὲρ μόνον ἄλγε' ἔχουσιν...

It's astonishing how ready mortals are to blame the gods. It is from us, they say, that evils come, but they even by themselves, through their own blind folly, have sorrows beyond that which is ordained. (*Od.* 1.32-34).

Scholars have rightly pointed to the way this introduction creates a sense of anxiety in the reader for the homecoming of Odysseus, and causes one to wonder if Odysseus' own household will have turned against him.¹⁰² The episode also points out to the broader world of Greek myth, and to the repertoire of stories available to the oral bard, but not here to be told. Agamemnon's story could easily be the starting point for another bardic song, or indeed the poet could expand upon this story if his audience desired. Here, the story is merely alluded to, giving an indication of a possible starting point for another epic, one which will not be told here. The suggestion of the story of Orestes and Aegisthus indicates the vastness of the oral bard's repertoire, as he points to another possible epic at the outset of his lengthy song.

Homer brings the *Odyssey* to a close with another look outward to the world of the homecomings of other Greek heroes. After Odysseus has killed the suitors, we see them once more descending to the underworld at the outset of book 24. There, they encounter Agamemnon, and tell him how they came to come down to the underworld. Agamemnon responds by imagining the process whereby past events become songs, and how Clytaemnestra will be

¹⁰¹ *Od.* 1.32-43.

¹⁰² See, e.g. D'Arms & Hulley (1946); Olson (1990) 57: "[I]t has become a modern critical commonplace that the tale serves there as a foil for the larger story of Odysseus and his family." See also, Nieto Hernández (2007) 34.

remembered by comparison with Penelope. After invidiously remarking on the good fortune of Odysseus in having found such a virtuous wife, Agamemnon says:

...τῷ οἱ κλέος οὔ ποτ' ὀλεῖται
ἧς ἀρετῆς, τεύξουσιν δ' ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἀοιδὴν
ἀθάνατοι χαρίεσσαν ἐχέφρονι Πηνελοπείῃ,
οὐχ ὥς Τυνδαρέου κόρυς κακὰ μήσατο ἔργα,
κουρίδιον κτείνασα πόσιν, στυγερὴ δέ τ' ἀοιδὴ
ἔσσει ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, χαλεπὴν δέ τε φῆμιν ὀπάσσει
θηλυτέρῃσι γυναιξί, καὶ ἥ κ' εὐεργὸς ἔησιν.

...Thereby the fame of [Penelope's] virtue shall never die away, but the immortals will make for the people of earth a thing of grace in the song for prudent Penelope. Not so did the daughter of Tyndareos fashion her evil deeds, when she killed her wedded lord, and a song of loathing will be hers among men, to make evil the reputation of womankind, even for one whose acts are virtuous. (*Od.* 24.196-202)

Agamemnon imagines the future recollection in song of Penelope and Clytaemnestra, and their contrasting actions regarding their absent husbands. Homer, in including this, indicates other stories within his repertoire. He has just related in full the "graceful song" of Penelope. By contrasting it with the "baleful song" of Clytaemnestra, Homer suggests that the song is within his repertoire as well.

A fifth and final Homeric technique of subsumption comes in the use of catalogues.¹⁰³

The catalogues that Homer employs during the poem gives the listener a sense of Homer's encyclopedic knowledge, or even omniscience, with respect to mythological history. The catalogues also furnish particularly suitable moments for the poet to refer to or tell briefly other events from prior to the war, in accordance with the first technique of subsumption referred to above.

¹⁰³ Catalogues appears to be features of oral-derived poetry more generally. Minchin (2011); see also, below XXX-XXX.

The most famous example is surely the catalogue of ships in Book 2, which occupies most of the second half of the book. That catalogue names the leaders and the number of men who came from every part of Greece to take part in the Trojan expedition. The Catalogue of Ships claims to be a complete enumeration of the ships which came to Troy, listing all of the ships and leaders and leaving none out:

ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι...
οἳ τινες ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι ἦσαν.
πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἄν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω,
οὐδ' εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ' εἶεν,
φωνὴ δ' ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δὲ μοι ἦτορ ἐνείη,
εἰ μὴ Ὀλυμπιάδες Μοῦσαι, Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο
θυγατέρες, μνησαίαθ' ὅσοι ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθον.

Tell me now, you Muses who have dwellings on Olympus ... who were the leaders and lords of the Danaans. But the multitude I could not tell or name, not even if ten tongues were mine and ten mouths and a voice unwearying, and the heart within me were of bronze, unless the Muses of Olympus, daughters of Zeus who bears the aegis, call to my mind all those who came beneath Ilios. (*Il.* 2.484-492)

Homer begins his catalogue with an appeal to the omniscience of the Muses. He notes that he cannot name all of the soldiers who came to Troy, not for lack of knowledge, but because his physical capabilities will not allow for it.¹⁰⁴ The entire list of names is accessible to him, and perhaps even part of a still more expansive version of the poem that he alludes to.

Homer makes a similar claim in his Catalogue of Nymphs, near the end of Book 18.

Here, Homer enumerates all of the nymphs who gathered to lament the death of Patroclus. The

¹⁰⁴ Homer's refusal to name all the members of the Greek multitude has occasioned divergent readings. Ford (1992) 86 suggests a measure of elitism in the lines; only the leaders were worthy of being remembered, while the commoners did not deserve a spot in the epic. See also, Nagy (1979) 17, who reads the lines similarly. Heiden (2008) 132 takes the opposite view, observing that "far from implying that the common soldiers did not merit commemoration in epic, because their deeds were unworthy of memory, the poet states that only the sheer *numbers* of the common soldiers prevented him from reciting their names. Thus he insinuated that the performance tradition that preserved the fame of the heroes in epic also left out other names that were worthy of memory, indeed that it left out many such names."

list includes the names of numerous nymphs, but Homer does not claim that the list itself is comprehensive; rather, after finishing the list, Homer rounds it off with:

ἄλλαι θ' αἱ κατὰ βένθοις ἄλ' οἱ Νηρηίδες ἦσαν

...and other Nereids that were in the deep of the sea. (*Il.* 18.49)

Here, Homer rounds out his list without making a claim to totality or the completeness of his catalogue. The catalogue still produces the effect of indicating the expansiveness of Homer's poetic knowledge by including so many names.

A similar effect is produced in the famous catalogue of dead women during the *Nekyia* of book 11. Here, Homer, speaking through Odysseus, produces a long catalogue of mythological heroines who appear to Odysseus in Hades after he has questioned Tiresias about how to attain his homecoming. The first woman he encounters is Tyro. Tyro tells her whole story: how she fell in love with the river god Enipeus, how after making love the river revealed that he was actually Poseidon, and how she bore Pelias and Neleus (*Od.* 12.235-259). After Tyro's fuller story, Odysseus lists off a great number of famous mythological women, and tells each of their stories in a brief synopsis of a couple of lines. As the catalogue continues, some women are named only as names: Phaidra and Prokris (11.321), Maira and Klymene (11.326). The catalogue provides a sense of the great number of women Odysseus encountered in the underworld, and his own ability to remember and retell each of their stories, but this feat redounds to the greater exaltation of Homer himself. The poet here points to a great number of mythological tales, each of which could make for a suitable theme for an epic poem. Indeed, many of the mythological heroines whom he mentions were probably included in the scope of other cyclic and oral epic poems current in Archaic Greece. Tyro, being the grandmother of Achilles, would have figured into the stories of the generation preceding the war at Troy,

including the famous marriage of Peleus and Thetis. Antiope, mother of Amphion and Zethos, who according to Homer founded Thebes would have figured prominently in the myths regarding Thebes.¹⁰⁵ Alkmene, mother of Heracles appears, whose son was almost certainly the subject of many songs and stories already at the time of Homer. Indeed, practically all of the heroines whom Homer names took part in stories which remained popular and current throughout Greek literary history. Odysseus ends with a remark which refers to his own experience in the underworld and to his own narration thereof, but which also pointedly refers to Homer's expansive capabilities:

πάσας δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω,
ὅσσας ἡρώων ἀλόχους ἶδον ἠδὲ θύγατρας.
πρὶν γάρ κεν καὶ νύξ φθῖτ' ἄμβροτος.

But I could not tell over the whole number of them nor name all
the women I saw who were the wives and daughters of heroes,
for before that the divine night would give out. (*Od.* 11.328-30)

The stories of the women of the underworld have the capacity to go on for the entire evening. Odysseus, and by extension, Homer, could tell each one of these stories in a fully fleshed out version which would expand the story beyond the boundaries appropriate for his story and for his audience.

Comparative evidence for the desire to subsume narrative in oral-derived epics can be drawn from the Sanskrit *Mahābhārata*. The *Mahābhārata* makes explicit certain themes that in the Homeric poems are implicit. For example, the *Mahābhārata* makes express and programmatic its desire to subsume everything. It states:

¹⁰⁵ *Od.* 11.260-264. "According to widespread legend, Antiope had to expose her newborn babies, was later imprisoned in Thebes by Dirke, and eventually released by her sons... The story of Antiope's sufferings was popular both in poetry and art. Euripides wrote a tragedy *Antiope*." Finkelberg (2011).

yad ihāsti tad anyatra yan nehāsti na tat kva cit

What is here is elsewhere, and what is not here is nowhere. (MBh 1.56.33c-d)

The poem claims to include everything, and to be the final word in knowledge. Anything that exists outside of the scope of the poem also must be included within the poem itself.

Further the poem makes its narrator expressly omniscient. The Sanskrit *Mahābhārata* presents itself as the oral composition of Vyāsa. Vyāsa serves two major functions in the *Mahābhārata*: First, he is the grandfather of the two key groups of warring cousins who are the stories pro- and antagonists. In this role, he is an important character in the poem's main action, even if he intervenes in relatively few moments throughout the plot. At the same time, he is the poem's author, who narrates the first version of the story to Vaiśampāyana. As such, he is both author and actor. Vyāsa is also expressly noted in the poem as being omniscient.¹⁰⁶ And the poem, further, is presents itself throughout as the product of Vyāsa's fertile mind. One of the ways in which the *Mahābhārata* regularly characterizes itself is as the "thought entire" of Vyāsa. Ugraśravas refers to the story he recites as such early, in the poem's twenty-third stanza:

Pravakṣyāmi mataṃ kṛtsnaṃ vyāsasyāmitatejaśaḥ

I speak forth the entire thought of Vyāsa, of limitless splendor. (MBh 1.1.23c-d)

This line is repeated twice when another self-description of the *Mahābhārata* is offered at 1.55.2c and 1.56.12c. The poem suggests, here, that it includes everything that was in Vyāsa's mind. At its most basic level, the assertion makes the case that nothing of Vyāsa's original story

¹⁰⁶ MBh 1.23

has been left out or forgotten. On a broader level, however, the poem claims to include everything that was within Vyāsa's mind, a far more expansive claim, given Vyāsa's position as an omniscient seer.

The *Mahābhārata* employs the framing device of expansion and contraction, despite its position as a written epic. In doing so, it replicates some of the features of oral performance as described by Parry and Lord, and causes the poem to appear as an oral poem, despite its reality in written form. As mentioned above, scholars of oral formulaic epic poetry starting with Parry and Lord have noted that oral bards have the ability to expand or contract episodes in accordance with the desires of the audience. For an audience which is not paying attention, the bard will tell a short version of each particular episode or story; for an attentive audience, he will expand.¹⁰⁷ The *Mahābhārata* is always placed in the mouth of various bardic figures, and as result there is always an narrator and an addressee within the text itself. The poem employs a literary version of the situation in which an audience wishes for an expanded version of a particular episode in order to narrate much of the poem. A common mode of narration in the poem is for the narrator to tell a very short version of the events that are about to be told. Then, the addressee will ask the narrator to retell the events in a fully fleshed out version, *vistarena*. Typical is the opening of the Mausala Parvan, the sixteenth book of the epic in which Kṛṣṇa's clan, the Vṛṣṇis, exterminate

¹⁰⁷ Lord (1960) describes this process in explaining how young singers are brought up in oral traditions: "Here, then, for the first time the audience begins to play a role in the poet's art. Up to this point the form of his song has depended on his illiteracy and on the need to compose rapidly in the traditional rhythmic pattern. The singers he has heard have given him the necessary traditional material to make it possible for him to sing, but the length of his songs and the degree to which he will ornament and expand them will depend on the demands of the audience. His audience is gradually changing from an attitude of condescension toward the youngster to one of accepting him as a singer." A great deal has been written on the relationship between Lord's theories and Homer. For an update on the state of the field since the initial publication of *The Singer of Tales*, see Foley (1988) and Lord (1995). The oral theory has come under the greatest attack from those who see it as taking the agency of creation away from the bard completely, subsuming him to his tradition. See the famous colloquy between Calhoun (1935) and Parry (1937), over whether the expression ἔπεα πτερόεντα "winged words" was used by the bard expressly for particular situations, or was simply the metrical expression that happened to fit best in the context.

themselves under the influence of a curse. Vaiśampāyana, who narrates the section, has this exchange with King Janamejaya:

vaiśampāyana uvāca
ṣaṭtrimśe 'tha tato varṣe vṛṣṇīṇām anayo mahān
anyonyam musalais te tu nijaghnuh kālacoditāḥ
janamejaya uvāca
kenānuśaptās te vīrāḥ kṣayam vṛṣṇyandhakā yayuh
bhojās ca dvijavarya tvaṁ vistareṇa vadasva me

Vaiśampāyana said: “In the thirty-sixth year there was great misfortune for the Vṛṣṇis. They killed one other with clubs under the influence of fate.”

Janamejaya said: “Cursed by whom did those heroes, the Vṛṣṇis and the Andhakas, and the Bhojas go to destruction? Excellent Brahman, tell me with expansion (*vistarena*)” (MBh 16.2.2-3)

Vaisampayana goes on to tell a much extended version of the story, occupying the entirety of the sixteenth book of the *Mahabharata*. Thus, the *Mahābhārata* presents itself as an expanding text, in which each of its many component parts can be expanded outwards, with short versions of tales ever replaceable with longer, filled out versions. In this, we see an approximation of the actual dynamics of oral poetry as shown by Lord and Parry.

Homer’s presentation of bardic figures in the course of the *Odyssey* also is suggestive of a subsumptive ambition. As scholars have long recognized, the bardic figures encountered in the *Odyssey* are used to reflect Homer’s own poetic program.¹⁰⁸ These bardic figures are used to indicate the vastness of the Homeric repertoire, which extends out broadly beyond the confines of the poems. Indeed, as Scodel observes, one of the key differences between bardic narrative

¹⁰⁸ Thomas (2014) 89; Scodel (1998). But see, Pucci (1987) 218, who argues that the author of the *Odyssey* sets up Demodocus in contrast to himself: “The *Odyssey*’s general downgrading of *kleos* and its relative neglect of the theme of the Muses’ inspiration contrast with the strong evocation of both themes in Demodocus’ song (*Od.* 8.72-73) and leaves no doubt that Demodocus sings in the wake of the heroic Iliadic tradition of the *klea andrōn*, that is, in the wake of a different thematic tradition than the *Odyssey*.”

and other narrative in the Homeric poems is the ability to report events not derived from personal experience, particularly the actions of the gods.¹⁰⁹

In the first book of the poem, for example, the bard Phemios sings for the suitors at Odysseus' house. He sings the stories of the homecomings of the Greeks from Troy. Penelope, distressed by the song, emerges from her bedroom to rebuke him for singing of those events. Her rebuke carries with it the suggestion that Phemios has many other options of suitable subject matter to sing of:

Φήμιε, πολλὰ γὰρ ἄλλα βροτῶν θελκτήρια οἶδας
ἔργ' ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, τά τε κλείουσιν ἀοιδοί.
τῶν ἐν γέ σφιν ἄειδε παρήμενος, οἱ δὲ σιωπῇ
οἶνον πινόντων. ταύτης δ' ἀποπαύε' ἀοιδῆς
λυγρῆς, ἣ τέ μοι αἰὲν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλον κῆρ
τείρει...

Phemios, since you know many other actions of mortals and gods, which can charm men's hearts and which the singers celebrate, sit beside them and sing one of these, and let them in silence go on drinking their wine, but leave off singing this sad song, which always afflicts the dear heart deep inside me... (*Od.* 1.337-341)

The *Nostoi* of the Greeks is only one of many stories available to the bard Phemios to sing. Penelope's rebuke points out to Homer's own craft and his choice of subject, as he himself is singing one particular *nostos*, that of Odysseus. According to Penelope, bards know of “many other actions of mortals and gods,” any one of which the bard could summon at any moment. Penelope's statement casts the *Odyssey* itself as only one of many potential oral bardic stories that could be told at any time. The written version of the *Odyssey* necessarily cuts out much

¹⁰⁹ Scodel (1998) 172: “There are two important differences between bardic and other narratives. First, in the world depicted in the epic, “ordinary” narrative derives its authority either from personal experience or from human report, whereas epic performers are informed by the Muse, and do not depend on ordinary sources. This divine source for bardic knowledge results in only one significant practical difference between bardic narratives and those of less authoritative characters: the bard’s freedom to report the doings of the gods... Second, narrative outside the frame of epic performance normally either answers a request for information or serves an explicit paradigmatic function.”

material that is available to a bard to sing, but the bard himself still possesses those songs, and still could sing them, were the need to arise.

Phemius' performance in the first book of the *Odyssey* can further be read as a metapoetical indication of the fact of the vast poetic repertoire that lurks in the background of the *Odyssey*. In a 2014 article, Thomas has pointed out that the scene in which Phemius sings in the first book provides an example of "backgrounding" which is vanishingly rare in the Homeric corpus.¹¹⁰ Homer's typical practice in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, noted as early as the late nineteenth century, is to present simultaneous events as sequential, a fact so commonly established that it is occasionally referred to in the scholarship as "Zielinski's Law," after the scholar who first noted it.¹¹¹ While the exact dynamics of Zielinski's Law continue to be debated, Phemius' song is one of only two unambiguous examples in the Homeric corpus of a foregrounded action taking place while a simultaneous background action also happens.¹¹² At *Od.* 1.155, Phemius begins singing, but rather than moving to an introduction of the bard's theme, Homer shifts the focus to Athena and Telemachus, who sequester themselves away from the singer and the suitors in order to have a private conversation. Phemius is narratologically forgotten for the next 175 lines while Athena and Telemachus converse and Athena sets Telemachus off to the mainland to attempt to get tidings of Odysseus. After the departure of Athena, the reader returns to the still singing Phemius (*Od.* 1.324), whose theme, "the wretched return of the Achaeans from Troy," (*Od.* 1.326-7) is only at last announced.

¹¹⁰ Thomas (2014) 89-91

¹¹¹ See Richardson (1990) 91. For a recent critical assessment of Zielinski's Law, see Scodel (2008).

¹¹² Thomas (2014) 91

Thomas rightly inquires: "How are the latter stages of Athena's discussion with Telemachus to be related to Phemius' simultaneous *Nostoi*?"¹¹³ . I suggest that Phemius' backgrounded song has the effect of emphasizing the "background" of the Homeric story itself. While Homer, a bard, sings one bardic tale, he places another bardic figure within his story, telling other stories at the same time as he himself narrates. In this way, Homer once again indicates his capability of moving from out of the narrative of the *Odyssey* into the world of one of the many other epic stories, particularly the *nostoi*, that he is not telling at this particular moment.

Phemios has many songs available to him, just as does the second bardic figure encountered in the *Odyssey*, Demodocus. We encounter Demodocus in the eighth book of the *Odyssey*, when Odysseus has arrived at the house of the Phaiacians. Demodocus first sings the obscure tale of the quarrel between Odysseus and Achilles, a story unknown from elsewhere in the archaic Greek tradition.¹¹⁴ The story induces Odysseus to cry, which Alcinoos notices, and causes him to propose athletic games as a pause. A second time around, Demodocus sings a mythological story, the love of Ares and Aphrodite. The scope of the tales available to bards once again comes to the fore. Demodocus can sing the stories of the Trojan heroes just as easily as he can sing of the mythological tales of the gods and goddesses. Homer suggests a vast repertoire of stories available to the Phaiacian bard. At a metapoetical level, Homer suggests his own virtuosity and the enormity of his own repertoire.

¹¹³ Thomas (2014) 91

¹¹⁴ *Od.* 8.75-82. Purves (2011) 538 links this quarrel to the footrace between Odysseus and Achilles in Book 23 of the *Iliad*: "[H]ow should we understand Odysseus' words in relation to the end of the *Iliad*, where he not only won the running race but where Antilochus afterward claimed that only Achilles could challenge Odysseus in the speed of his feet? Was Antilochus only being conciliatory there, or can we detect behind his words hints of a rivalry between Achilles and Odysseus?"

Both of the stories, the quarrel of Odysseus and Achilles and the love of Ares and Aphrodite, are woven into his own narrative. Speaking through the voice of another bard, who is a literary fiction, Homer suggests that he himself has within his grasp that bard's full repository of epic song. Homer's bardic repertoire includes all that is within the bardic repertoires of Phemios and Demodocus. Homer includes the full story of Aphrodite and Ares within his story, despite its lack of direct connection with his narrative, suggesting that his power of story-telling expands beyond the direct story of the *Odyssey*. The quarrel of Odysseus and Achilles, being a very obscure, indeed otherwise unknown, story, suggests that the author of the *Odyssey* possesses a repertoire of stories including many that are not commonly known. Through his bardic figures, Homer looks out to other stories available to him as subjects for literary epic compositions, and suggests the limitlessness of his repository of epic tales. The *Odyssey* as a written composition may be limited to what is on the page, but the author's capacity for narratorial expansion spreads far beyond its confines.

So far, this chapter has focused on the subsumptive strategies employed in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. In the concluding pages, I will discuss the way in which the *Odyssey* engages with the *Iliad*. In these interactions, we can see early specimens of the theme of primacy, which will be important in the following discussions of other epic authors in the subsequent three chapters.¹¹⁵

As scholars have observed, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* interact with one another. One of the primary ways in which they interact is by ignoring one another. As first observed by

¹¹⁵ West (2011) 389 believes that there was an original tradition that gave the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* different authors. He argues "for the view that in origin Homer was not the name of a historical poet, but was generated from an ancient word for what the Welsh call an eisteddfod, an assembly of the people with poetic contests."

Munro,¹¹⁶ the *Odyssey* maintains a nearly complete silence on the events of the *Iliad*.¹¹⁷ As Pucci writes, this fact indicates that “the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* presume each other, border and limit each other, to such an extent that one, as it were, writes the other.”¹¹⁸

This relationship indicates a certain contestation between the two poems.¹¹⁹ Pucci calls this relationship a “decidedly polemic [and] controversial” one.¹²⁰ The epic texts ignore each other in the service of claiming a sort of poetic primacy for themselves.¹²¹ The *Odyssey*’s independence as an epic text is formulated against the existence of the *Iliad* through ignorance.

One nexus for the *Odyssey*’s contestation with the *Iliad* is the song of the quarrel between Odysseus and Achilles, mentioned above. Marg has suggested that Demodocus’ story of the Trojan War suggests both the beginning of the war and the end.¹²² He explains the absence of the *Iliad* from the story as part of the *Odyssey*’s focus on Odysseus himself. Because Odysseus, while a participant in the *Iliad*, was not its principal figure, the *Odyssey* is making programmatic statements about the importance of the events of the *Iliad* to its own narrative.¹²³ The *Odyssey* thus centers the focus of the Epic Cycle on Odysseus, transferring it away from Achilles.¹²⁴

¹¹⁶ Munro (1901) 325.

¹¹⁷ Pucci (1987) 17-18: “The most significant indication of the *Odyssey*’s ambivalent economy is its silence about the *Iliad*. At several points the *Odyssey* indicates, blatantly, that it is ignoring the *Iliad* and its tradition”

¹¹⁸ *Id.* at 18.

¹¹⁹ *Id.*: “This thorough complementarity ... does not mean the two poems constitute one consistent and harmonious unity.”

¹²⁰ *Id.* See also, Marks (2005) 14: “[T]he *Iliad* and *Odyssey* respond to each other regardless of which, if either, began first to be performed or was first to achieve the form in which we know it. By my interpretation, intertextual “reverberation” and “specularity” likewise reflect a state of mutual awareness between Iliadic and non-Homeric traditions at a time before the fixation of either, whether in performance or as a written text.”

¹²¹ Pucci (1987) 18 links this contestation to a competition for which poetic hero is the greater, Achilles or Odysseus.

¹²² Marg (1956) 14.

¹²³ *Id.*

¹²⁴ According to Pucci, this extends to a programmatic denial of *Iliadic* values in the *Odyssey*, *kleos* particularly. Pucci (1987) 217: “[T]he *Odyssey* is almost explicit in denying *kleos* – that is, the specifically epic fame and renown

The *Odyssey* also may programmatically attempt to “overtake” the *Iliad*. In a 2011 article, Purves argues for a contestation of the *Iliad* in the *Odyssey* through the theme of running.¹²⁵ According to Purves, “various manifestations of overtaking ... are initiated by the figure of Odysseus in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.”¹²⁶ Embedded in the concept of catching up and overtaking are the “power dynamics embedded in the meaning of being “first” or “last.””¹²⁷ The way of running in the *Odyssey* is to be ever the overtaker.¹²⁸ In this, we may see a programmatic effort by the poet of the *Odyssey* to overtake the *Iliad*, where it was initially the last, to become the first.¹²⁹

The *Odyssey*’s strategy of contesting the *Iliad* by silencing its events will be seen to reappear in the epics covered later. In the following chapter, we will see that Ennius attempts to write his predecessor Naevius out of literary history, minimizing his poem by asserting the unimportance of its subject matter and moving past it.¹³⁰

In conclusion, the themes of primacy and subsumption are visible in the Homeric poems. Homer exhibits a drive towards subsumption through various strategies of bringing in material from outside the boundaries of his poem in order to give a sense of his poetic virtuosity. Homer finds ways to bring in a great deal of material from both before and after the conclusion of his poems, sometimes at a great remove from the time of the action of his poems themselves. This subsumptive urge correlates with the findings of the oral theorists, as well as comparative

– to Odysseus’ return and revenge.... The contrast is striking: Odysseus’ *kleos* is debased to a generic reputation for his share and merits in Penelope’s domestic virutes.”

¹²⁵ Purves (2011).

¹²⁶ *Id.* at 524.

¹²⁷ *Id.*

¹²⁸ *Id.* at 548.

¹²⁹ *Id.*

¹³⁰ See below, XXX-XXX.

evidence from the Sanskrit epics. Homer's self-presentation through the various bards in the *Odyssey* similarly points towards a poet who is capable of singing any number of songs outside of the song being sung. And the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*'s self-conscious silence with respect to one another points towards epic being a site of contestation for prime status already from the earliest strata of Greek epic.

CHAPTER 2: ENNIUS' *ANNALES*: PRIMACY, SUBSUMPTION, AND THE FOUNDING OF A LATIN EPIC TRADITION

In the previous chapter, we saw how poetic self-construction of primacy and subsumption figured into the poems of Homer. In this chapter, I move to the *Annales* of Ennius, to examine how these two themes manifest themselves in his work. I argue that Ennius self-consciously constructs his primacy against two strands of literary tradition – a well-developed tradition of Greek hexametrical epic, and an incipient tradition at Rome of narrative poetry in native Italic meters. I suggest that Ennius' primary strategy for constructing his primacy is his self-assimilation to the figure of Homer, presenting himself as a new Homer for the Latin tradition. In addition, I argue that Ennius attempts to suggest that his *Annales* are an all-encompassing, subsumptive poem. His efforts to do so take place both on the level of narrative themes, and on the level of taking in earlier epic poetry, subsuming existing epic to his own poetic project. In doing so, Ennius presents his poem simultaneously as a culmination of earlier literature, and as a new beginning for the epic genre.

Literary Latin epic was a relatively new innovation at Rome at the time when Ennius wrote. According to the sources, Latin literature began in September 240 BCE, when Livius Andronicus produced a scripted play translated from Greek originals.¹³¹ Recent scholarship has emphasized the fact of Rome's uniqueness in creating a vernacular literature among Hellenized Mediterranean societies. Feeney, for instance, has called it "one of the most remarkable events in ancient history."¹³² This new literary form of a literature in Latin opened up the possibility for

¹³¹ Livy, 7.2.8.

¹³² Feeney (2005) 229. See also, *id.* 230: "It is worth reminding ourselves that, on the available evidence, no society in the ancient world other than the Romans took over the prototypical forms of the institution of Greek literature as the basis for a corresponding institution in their own vernacular."

new experiments and new, inventive efforts at bringing the great wealth of the Greek literary tradition into the Latin literary language.

Ennius had at least two predecessors in the burgeoning field of Latin epic: Livius Andronicus and Naevius. Livius' translation and abridgement of Homer's *Odyssey* into Latin Saturnians was the first example of an epic poem of any kind composed at Rome. Although little can be said about the literary qualities of Livius' work, given the pitiful state of his transmission, the few surviving fragments demonstrate his "self-consciousness about the novelty and power of his operation."¹³³ Stephen Hinds famously demonstrated that the first line of the poem contains a sophisticated, bi-lingual pun.¹³⁴ Livius translates the *πολύτροπον* of *Odyssey* 1.1 as *uersutum*, capturing both the sense of "twisting" or "turning" of the Greek word, and the meaning "translated."¹³⁵ Further, in the twenty-seven meagre fragments that have come down to us, we have two instances of Livius demonstrating knowledge of Hellenistic commentators and critics.¹³⁶ Thus, despite the traditional label of "archaic" which has attached to Livius, in the small remains of his poem a degree of sophistication is apparent.¹³⁷

Ennius' second predecessor in the Latin tradition was Naevius, who composed a *Bellum Poenicum* on the First Punic War.¹³⁸ Naevius' epic, also composed in Saturnians, represents our

¹³³ Feeney (2016) 53.

¹³⁴ Hinds (1998) 61.

¹³⁵ Hinds (1998): "*Vertere* is the technical term *par excellence* for "translation" in early Latin literature (as in *Plautus vortit barbare*); and, here in this programmatically loaded context our poet introduces a Ulysses whom the very linguistic switch to which he owes his textual existence has been made part of his proverbial versatility, has been troped into his *πολυτροπία*." 61-62. See also McElduff (2013) 53; Feeney (2016) 53-55.

¹³⁶ Mariotti (1952) ad loc.

¹³⁷ See Feeney (2005), who takes a critical view of the term "archaic" as applied to Latin literature.

¹³⁸ Some have argued that Naevius' poem acknowledges the "firstness" of the *Odusseia*. According to Feeney, the publication of Naevius' poem fixes Livius as the "first" epic poet in the Roman tradition: "Livius' version of Homer now [ie, after the publication of the *Bellum Poenicum*] becomes the "first" epic retrospectively, not just because it has a follower, but because it is indeed now the first in a tradition, the equivalent of the "original" Homer as the first

first Roman epic of which we have any knowledge on an original, Roman theme.¹³⁹ The poem told the events of Rome from the escape of Aeneas and Anchises from Troy down to the events of the First Punic War, events roughly contemporaneous with Naevius' own life. The poem was thus the first literary epic composed in Latin on an original theme. In a move prefiguring Ennius, Naevius also includes a great deal of Homerizing in the few transmitted fragments.¹⁴⁰ He develops epithets for gods and heroes on the model of the Homeric forms, in contrast to the “simple patronymics” that are transmitted in the text of Livius Andronicus.¹⁴¹ And as Elliott notes, “[t]he very act of narrating the war with Carthage over the course of a long poem represented it as comparable to the Trojan War[.]”¹⁴² Naevius was thus an important precursor to Ennius, in so far as he was the first to compose a Latin epic on an original theme, and one that placed Rome at the center.¹⁴³

A vexing and enduring question has been the extent to which early Latin literature was influenced by native Italic traditions of heroic song. This question remains highly controversial. It finds its origins in a passage of Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations*, reporting a passage of Cato's *Origines* that has not survived:

...gravissimus auctor in Originibus dixit Cato morem apud maiores hunc epularum fuisse, ut deinceps qui accubarent canerent ad tibiam clarorum virorum laudes atque virtutes: ex quo perspicuum est et cantus tum fuisse descriptos vocum sonis et carmina.

poet in Greek.” Feeney (2016) 165. The poor preservation of both Livius and Naevius, however, makes the direct comparison that could illuminate how Naevius used Livian material impossible.

¹³⁹ Elliott (2013) 269: “Naevius’ achievement in the *Bellum Punicum* was above all to establish a story of the recent Roman past as a worthy subject for epic.”

¹⁴⁰ Elliott (2013) 269-272.

¹⁴¹ Elliott (2013) 270. See also, Feeney (1991) 128.

¹⁴² Elliott (2013) 271.

¹⁴³ Elliott (2013) 271.

Cato, a writer of great authority, has stated in his *Origines* that at banquets it was the custom of our ancestors for the guests at table to sing one after the other to the accompaniment of the flute in praise of the merits of illustrious men. And from this it is clear that, in addition to poems, songs set to music were already at that date written down to guide the voice of the singer. (*Cic. T.D.* 4.3)

Drawing upon this passage, as well as a short mention in Varro,¹⁴⁴ some scholars suggest that the *carmina convivalia* that Cicero refers to here constituted a genre of oral heroic lays.¹⁴⁵ A more modest position, presented in Fisher's 2014 book, is that Ennius draws on a great deal of formulaic language drawn from Roman cultural practices, in particular ritual.¹⁴⁶ Many scholars remain deeply suspicious of the reliability of Cicero's testimony here, however, and have questioned how much, if any, influence any pre-literary tradition of Italic song had upon the literary period following the innovations of Livius Andronicus.¹⁴⁷

Such was the nascent scene of epic poetry at Rome at the time when Ennius composed his *Annales*. Although Ennius had predecessors in this tradition of Latin epic, he presents himself as doing something entirely new.¹⁴⁸ Ennius adopts a polemic attitude towards the poet's

¹⁴⁴ *carmina antiqua, in quibus laudes erant maiorum, et assa uoce et cum tibicine*. Varro fr. 394 Salvatore = Non. 77-4-5.

¹⁴⁵ This idea, first proposed and expounded in the early nineteenth century by Niebuhr, who believed that aspects of the earlier Latin oral tradition could still be located within the texts of the surviving Latin historians, had fallen almost completely out of the academic mainstream by the late 1980s, but has made a dramatic comeback in recent years. Critical works in this revival of scholarly enthusiasm for the *carmina conuiualia* include Zorzetti (1991), Habinek (1998), and Wiseman (2004).

¹⁴⁶ Fisher (2014) 3.

¹⁴⁷ Feeney (2005) 234 criticizes the model that sees a great deal of continuity between the alleged *carmina convivalia* and the early Latin poets. Feeney suspects that Cicero and Varro's remarks are dubious parallels drawn to assimilate Latin culture to the Greek culture of the symposium: "Once one has remarked that the testimony of Cato, Cicero, and Varro makes pre-literary Roman culture look awfully like the music culture of archaic Greece, one can either accept the equation and flesh it out by analogy, or one can countenance the alternative interpretation advanced by Dahlmann and Horsfall, namely, that later Romans' accounts of their early 'literary' history and fundamentally calqued upon Greek accounts of theirs. The later Roman authors, on this hypothesis, had no independent knowledge of conditions which had, even for Cato, disappeared *multis saeculis ante suam aetatem* (*Cic., Brut.* 75). See also, West (2007) 33, Feeney (2016) 213-15; Lowrie (2009) 48-52.

¹⁴⁸ Most scholarship acknowledges that Ennius presented himself as making a break with the pre-existing Latin tradition. Scholars take conflicting views, however, on whether continuity or disjunction should be emphasized with respect to Ennius' relationship to Greek literature. Compare Aicher (1989) 230: "The Pythagorean theory helps to create a linguistic environment in which the liberties that Ennius takes in modelling Latin on Greek will appear not

predecessors. Ennius self-consciously attempts to assert for his *Annales* a place of primacy on the historical axis of Roman poetry. While re-writing and expanding upon the material treated in Naevius' poem, Ennius attempts to supplant the *Bellum Poenicum*, by continuing the story to the present, and by introducing the hexameter into Latin epic. In doing so, Ennius stakes a claim for himself as founding a new epic poetic tradition – one which excludes Livius and Naevius, and in which he will stand as the figure of Homer. Ennius thus boldly writes his own position within literary history into his own poem.

Ennius' construction of his own primacy is closely bound up with his self-assimilation to the figure of Homer.¹⁴⁹ Ennius links himself and the fortunes of his poem to Homer in at least four ways. First, in an autobiographical episode, he explicitly states that he himself is the reincarnation of Homer. Second, through the use of the hexameter, he claims primacy within a new Latin tradition, thus writing his predecessors, who used the Saturnian, out of literary history. Third, even in the scant fragments that have survived, Ennius can be seen to translate and adapt Homeric content, bringing it and refashioning it to make it part of the story of Rome. Fourth, Ennius looks ahead prospectively to a literary future in which his poem is widely read and influential, and in which he stands at the head of the tradition.

Ennius staked his first claim to primacy in the opening lines of his poem. He began his poem with an autobiographical episode.¹⁵⁰ This form of opening is unique in all of Greek and

so much to violate a Latin tradition as to continue an older one," with Elliott (2013) 272: "The effect that Ennius was able to produce by re-casting the Homeric gods, replaced in their hexametric setting, as the major and minor divinities of Rome, supervising the full panorama of Roman history, now playing itself out, startlingly, under the aspect of known Iliadic episodes, must have been wholly arresting."

¹⁴⁹ For a contrary view, see Goldschmidt (2013) 13-14, who argues that Ennius' claim to be the Roman Homer is a failure and that scholars have "overstated" the potential comparisons between the *Annales* and the *Iliad*: "Whatever we might be missing in terms of lost narrative parallels with Homer in the *Annales*, Ennius does not come close to this. In Bloom's terms, there is no great *agon*."

¹⁵⁰ Aicher (1989) 229 suggests that the role of the dream was "to render the innovative and experimental qualities of Ennius' style more immediately acceptable and plausible to his Roman audience."

Roman epic literature. After the typical invocation to the Muses, Ennius describes a dream that he himself had. After falling asleep, *somno leni placidoque reuinctus*, the figure of Homer appeared to him:

uisus Homerus adesse poeta
The poet Homer seemed to be present. (*Ann.* 3)¹⁵¹

Despite the lack of actual text from the scene, several pieces of ancient testimony allow for it to be reconstructed with some certainty.¹⁵² It seems that the opening of the *Annales* described how Homer came to Ennius in a dream, and told the Roman poet that he was his reincarnation.¹⁵³ In addition, Ennius discovered that he had previously been reincarnated as a peacock at some point in the interval between his own life and Homer's: *memini me fieri pauom*.¹⁵⁴

The *Commentum Cornuti*, a collection of scholiastic remarks on Persius, offers a particularly detailed description of the scene, which explains the details of what is alleged to have happened:

Ennius... in Annalium suorum principio... dicit se vidisse in somnis Homerum dicentem fuisse quondam pavonem et ex eo translatam in se animam esse secundum Pythagorae philosophi definitionem.

Ennius... in the beginning of his *Annales*... says that he saw Homer in his dreams, saying that he was formerly a peacock and that from that his soul was transferred into himself, according to the precept of Pythagorean philosophy. (*ad* 6.9-11)¹⁵⁵

¹⁵¹ Skutsch attributes six Ennian fragments to this scene, though Elliott (2014) has cast doubt upon three of them.

¹⁵² Skutsch (1985); Elliott (2014) 249-51.

¹⁵³ For the potential influence of Pythagorean ideas of reincarnation upon Ennius, see Skutsch *ad loc.* For a critical view of the survival of such ideas in Southern Italy at the time of Ennius' youth, see Burkert (1961) 241.

¹⁵⁴ Ennius fr. 11. The relevance or symbolism of the peacock is obscure. Skutsch notes that Tertullian found the peacock perplexing, and suggests that "Ennius may have known a south-Italian story in which the soul of Euphorbus passed into a peacock and thence into Pythagoras." Skutsch *ad loc.*

¹⁵⁵ The scholia on Persius are collected in Clausen & Zetzel (2004).

Lucretius also (*DRN* 1.117-26) tells of how Ennius related how Homer revealed the nature of things to him:¹⁵⁶

*unde sibi exortam semper florentis Homeri
commemorat speciem lacrimas effundere salsas
coepisse et rerum naturam expandere dictis*

Whence he avers that the likeness of ever deathless Homer issued forth, and began to shed salt tears and to unfold the nature of things. (*DRN* 1.124-6)¹⁵⁷

Lucretius here is interested in Ennius' claim to knowledge received through Homer, and also indicates his disagreement with the accuracy of some of what Homer related to Ennius.¹⁵⁸

Prophyrio's Commentaries on Homer, too, sketch the basis outlines of the scene: *in principio Annalium suorum somnio se scripsit admonitum, quod secundum Pythagorae dogma anima Homeri in suum corpus venisset* "[Ennius] wrote at the beginning of his *Annals* that he was advised in a dream that, according to the doctrine of Pythagoras, Homer's soul had come into his body." (Porph. ad Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.51).

Ennius' self-presentation as Homer represents a programmatic claim to primacy. The exact contours of the reception of Homer in third century literature are difficult to define given the thin textual record from the period. However, there is evidence for wide popularity and stature of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* for a long period in Italy.¹⁵⁹ Tombs in Italy feature scenes from the Trojan War and from the *Odyssey* as early as the late fourth century.¹⁶⁰ The Etruscans,

¹⁵⁶ Elliott (2013) 254-55 views Lucretius' reference to the *rerum naturam* as critical here, and suggests the importance of the *Annales*' "cosmic setting."

¹⁵⁷ Translation of W.H.D. Rouse (1924).

¹⁵⁸ Garani (2007) 25-28, for example, emphasizes that Lucretius invokes Ennius' claim to be the reincarnation of Homer in a passage denying the existence of reincarnation. In Hardie's (1986) 18, memorable phrasing: "Lucretius is an efficient predator, who digests those parts of his victim which are beneficial to his system and ostentatiously rejects the indigestible."

¹⁵⁹ For a summary of the artistic evidence, see Farrell (2004) 255-63.

¹⁶⁰ Farrell (2004) 257.

as well as the Romans show an interest in representing Homeric episode and narrative in artistic productions consistently.¹⁶¹ As Farrell has argued, Homer was “an important element of elite Roman ideology,” and “defined a world of aristocratic epistemology and stood as the paradigm against which to measure one’s own experience.”¹⁶² The stature of the Homeric poems appears to be unmatched in the literary scene of Italy in the later third century. Against this backdrop, Ennius’ claim to be the Roman Homer positions himself as a foundational text.

Ennius’ claim to be a Latin Homer is thus an assertion of poetic primacy. Ennius will be a Roman Homer, and his poem will map Roman history onto the frame of the Homeric poems. The subject will be entirely new – the history of the city as the history of the world; and the form of epic poetry will be born anew in the Latin tongue, just as Ennius was Homer reborn.

In addition, Ennius’ self-presentation as Homer effectively nullifies Livius Andronicus’ and Naevius’ claims to occupy a Homer-like position in Latin literary history. Livius and Naevius each would have had credible claims for being the “Homer” of Latin epic. Livius Andronicus had inaugurated the tradition of epic by translating the one of the Homeric poems itself into Latin.¹⁶³ Naevius, too, would have had a claim to being the originator of a Latin tradition, in so far as he was the first to compose an original Latin epic on an original theme. In Naevius, as in Ennius, the effort to map Roman history onto the poetic landscape of the Homeric poems is already present.¹⁶⁴ Further, some evidence suggests that Naevius may have been at least

¹⁶¹ Farrell (2004) 259.

¹⁶² Farrell (2004) 263.

¹⁶³ Feeney (2016) 165 argues that Naevius recognizes Livius Andronicus as the first Latin epic: “Livius’ version of Homer now [ie, after the publication of the *Bellum Poenicum*] becomes the “first” epic retrospectively, not just because it has a follower, but because it is indeed now the first in a tradition, the equivalent of the “original” Homer as the first poet in Greek.”

¹⁶⁴ That Naevius included a scene of the fall of Troy is confirmed by a fragment preserved by Servius: *amborum uxores/noctu Troiad exhibant capitibus opertis/flentes ambae, abeuntes lacrimis cum multis* “The wives of both men

partially successful in his claim to being the first Roman epic poet during the second century BCE.¹⁶⁵ Ennius' presentation of himself as the reincarnation and Latin successor of Homer effectively denies these claims; in claiming the position of a new Homer, he eliminates Naevius and Livius Andronicus from Latin literary history, claiming a position of primacy for himself.

The self-presentation as Homer also represents a break from the Alexandrian tradition. As Skutsch notes, the suggestion that Ennius himself is Homer frees him from the Alexandrian ban on imitation of Homer.¹⁶⁶ Although Ennius, as discussed below, uses Greek sophistication as a tool to distinguish himself from the preceding Latin tradition, he simultaneously announces a separation from it by claiming the status of Roman Homer.

Ennius' assimilation of himself to Homer extends to his own position within history. Numerological considerations enhance Ennius' claim to representing a new start in the epic tradition. Ennius probably took the initial fifteen books of his poem down from the end of the Trojan War through to the year 189, a period that would span exactly 1000 years. His theme thus covers a period whose significance is numerologically significant vis a vis Homer's. The poem picks up where Homer left off, at the fall of Troy, and carries the story on up to the rise of Rome and 189. The period of 1000 years lends a weight to Ennius' claim to be the new Homer, and to be telling a more complete version of the story of the rise of Rome than did Naevius.¹⁶⁷

departed from Troy by night, both crying with their heads covered, leaving with many tears." Morel fr. 4. For commentary, see Barchiesi (1962) 349-58, Putnam (2007) 197-99.

¹⁶⁶ Skutsch (1968) 6-9.

¹⁶⁷ This idea was originally suggested by F. Munari. Skutsch takes a highly dismissive view of his opinion, stating that: "I [cannot] believe that, reading οἷοι νῦν βροτοί εἰσιν in Homer again and again, he could, like the silly author of the *Vita Herodotea*, have failed to see that Homer must have lived long after the Trojan War." Commentary ad Frg. 11. Although Skutsch's comment does indicate that Ennius would not have positioned himself as having been reincarnated 1000 years after Homer, the significance of ending his poem 1000 years after the Trojan War could still have numerological significance.

Ennius' second, related claim to poetic primacy is his development of the Latin hexameter, which he was the first to use in Latin.¹⁶⁸ The use of hexameters was a bold and doubtless laborious innovation for Ennius, and would have represented a stark disjunction from the poems of Naevius and Livius Andronicus.¹⁶⁹ With respect to this innovation, Ennius' composition would turn out to be determinative: we have only the scantest evidence for any narrative poetry composed in Saturnians after the publication of the *Annales*.¹⁷⁰ The use of the hexameter provides additional support for Ennius' claim to be a new Homer, inventing a new epic tradition.

Ennius uses the hexameter explicitly to differentiate himself from the poems of his predecessors, Naevius in particular. In a famous fragment, Ennius Ennius announces his rejection of previous Roman narrative poets when he says that he will pass over the events of the First Punic War, in one of the most quoted fragments of the *Annales*:

*scripsere alii rem
uorsibus quos olim Faunei uatesque canebant.*

Others have written that affair in the verses which of old the Fauns and prophets sang.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁸ The identification between the hexameter and epic would become definitive by the time of Augustus, though it had been definitive in the case of the Greeks for centuries by that point. See, e.g., Knapp (1908).

¹⁶⁹ See Aicher (1989) 227: "The greatest surprise for the reader [of Ennius] will of course have been the new meter, hexameter in place of saturnians. Although the novelty of this change should not be over-emphasized – Latin had already been molded to Greek metrical schemes before the *Annales*, beginning with Livius' dramas – each of the ancient genres had something of an independent linguistic character, and Ennius' substitution of quantitative hexameter for the shorter, two-cola and possible accentual Saturnian line constituted a clear break with the Latin epic tradition."

¹⁷⁰ We know of only a single example of extended narrative poetry composed in Saturnians after the time of Ennius. A single line of a poem entitled the *Carmen Priami* is transmitted in Varro's *De Lingua Latina* 7.28. See above, XXX, for discussion of the *Carmen Priami*.

¹⁷¹ Skutsch (1985) frg. 206: "In a proem the poet explains why he does not propose to write the history of the First Punic War: it was described by Naevius, albeit in uncultured verse." See also, Wiseman (2006) 514: "The reference is to Gnaeus Naevius. Although Ennius thinks of him as a fellow *writer*, it seems that Naevius doesn't count as a proper "literary author" because he used a meter appropriate to the pre-literary world."

Ennius will skip over the subject matter which was covered by the earlier poets, specifically the subject matter that Naevius himself treated. Ennius draws attention to his sophisticated use of a Greek meter in opposition to the rustic and backwards Saturnian employed by Naevius, whose *Bellum Punicum* is the particular object of Ennius' barb here.¹⁷² Ennius dismisses the Saturnian narrative poems as being the products of a rustic Italic past, because they are unconnected with the Hellenistic epic tradition to which he assimilates himself. Poets such as Naevius and Livius are the antique products of a rustic period, and do not count as epic poems as a result. The lines call Ennius' innovative use of the hexameter to the reader's attention. Further, they furnish an example of Ennius once again self-consciously writing his own literary history. Within his poem itself, he fashions the place for the poem in literary history, where he plans for the poem to stand.

Ennius' rejection of Naevius and Livius is emphasized by his use of the term *uates*, as has been noted.¹⁷³ The term makes the two poets into archaic poets, not to be counted in the literary tradition, and further bolsters Ennius' claim to primacy. Ennius elsewhere makes dismissive remarks about such figures:

satin uates uerant aetate in agunda
 Do seers, in all their life's course, tell much of truth? (*Ann.* 374).

¹⁷² See, e.g., Skutsch (1985) ad loc.

¹⁷³ Goldschmidt (2013) 56: "In linking Naevius and Livius with the *Fauni* and *uates* of the past, chanting their *carmina* in a primitive metre before the arrival of real poems (Greek *poemata*) and a real poet (*poeta*) to sing them, Ennius consigned his precursors to the realm of pre-civilized verse."

Lack of context makes it uncertain that Ennius himself disparaged such *uates* here,¹⁷⁴ but the line is at least suggestive.¹⁷⁵

Ennius similarly points to his foundation of a new tradition within the Latin language by reference to himself as devoted to learning, and claims that before him, there was no such poet:

*cum neque Musarum scopulos...
nec dicti studiosus quisquam erat ante hunc*

“When neither the mountain of the Muses... nor was anyone devoted to learning before the present author.”¹⁷⁶

This boast clearly refers to his predecessor, Naevius.¹⁷⁷ The epithet, translating the Greek φιλόλογος, points to the learned Alexandrian body of literature on which Ennius draws,¹⁷⁸ and bolsters his claim that his poetic lineage does not include Livius and Naevius.¹⁷⁹ Indeed, these fragments are drawn from a passage of Cicero, in which he asserts that Ennius’ claim was accurate with respect to his predecessors: *sic enim sese res habet. nam et Odyssia Latina est sic [in] tamquam opus aliquod Daedali et Livianae fabulae non satis dignae quae iterum legantur* “For that’s the fact of the matter. For the Latin *Odyssey* is for its part like some sort of product of

¹⁷⁴ But see, Skutsch, ad loc.: “The word is here clearly disparaging in sense.” See Goldschmidt (2013) 56 n.74 for bibliography on the “generally negative connotation of *uates* in a republican context.” See also, *id*: “Ennius’ scorn of primitive *uates* also influences a proemial link between the *uates* and ‘primitive’ superstition by Lucretius in the prologue to *De rerum natura* when he sums up the dangers of his philosophical rivals.”

¹⁷⁵ See Goldschmidt (2013) 50-60 for Virgil’s use to the same technique to characterize Ennius as an “obsolete primitive poet.”

¹⁷⁶ Skutsch (1985) Frg. 209. For discussion of Ennius’ self-promotion in these lines, see Conte (1984) 128-29; Hinds (1998) 52-74; Elliott (2013) 181.

¹⁷⁷ Feeney (2016) 159.

¹⁷⁸ There is some controversy on this point. Skutsch, following the sources from which the fragment is drawn, interprets *dicti studiosus* specifically as a translation of the Alexandrian φιλόλογος. Skutsch (1968) 6-7. Goldberg (1995) 91 argues for caution, stating that it “is by no means certain that was in fact an Alexandrian catchword in Ennius’ day.” Goldschmidt (2013) 41 n.15 cites Goldberg approvingly, and indicates that he “is probably right to be sceptical.”

¹⁷⁹ Feeney (2016) 159: “The Latin phrase... sets the bar high for the readers of Ennius’ epic, and for his oeuvre as a whole.” See also, Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012) 208-10.

Daedalus', and Livius' dramas are not worth reading a second time."¹⁸⁰ Ennius thus uses his hexameters as a way to claim his primacy over his predecessors. For him, the works of Naevius and Livius are not relevant to the Latin literary tradition because of their inferior meter.

A third strategy used by Ennius in constructing his primacy is the use of strong Homeric style in the Roman context.¹⁸¹ Several among the longer fragments allow us to discern Ennius adapting or translating full passages of Homer in a new context.¹⁸² This strategy is of course closely linked to Ennius' claim to being the new Roman Homer. By importing Homeric passages into Latin and by imbuing them with new significance by connecting them to the rise of Rome, outside of their original Greek context, Ennius emphasizes his primacy in the Latin epic tradition.

Ennius' Homerising is also connected to his claim to "first-ness" on the basis of his higher degree of sophistication over Livius and Naevius. The scant evidence from Livius and Naevius makes comparisons difficult, but it does appear that based upon the fragments we have, Ennius made considerably greater use of full passages from Homer than did Naevius and Livius. Livius seems to have "offer[ed] little that is comparable to Naevius' reproduction of Homerising epithets,"¹⁸³ employing instead simple patronymics and epithets in the fragments we have.¹⁸⁴ The fragments of Naevius suggest a more developed "practice of setting Roman cult-titles amid patently Homerising descriptive terms."¹⁸⁵ However, while the few fragments of Naevius do not

¹⁸⁰ *Cic. Brut.* 71.

¹⁸¹ Homerization in Ennius has been of interest since the 19th century. Foundational studies include Kunz (1980); Kameke (1926); Röser (1939).

¹⁸² The nature of the fragments of course means that in many cases we do not know the precise context, as in the case of the *Annales* fragment that follows.

¹⁸³ Elliott (2013) 270.

¹⁸⁴ *Id.* See, e.g., *patrem suum supremum optimum adpellat* ("she addresses her father, the highest and best.").

¹⁸⁵ *Id.*

allow certainty, it appears that the *Bellum Poenicum* was significantly less adaptive of Homer than the *Annales*.¹⁸⁶

One example of Ennius' adaption of Homer to his new context is the following:

*incedunt arbusta per alta, securibus caedunt,
percellunt magnas quercus, exciditur ilex,
fraxinus frangitur atque abies consternitur alta,
pinus proceras pervortunt: omne sonabat
arbustum fremitus silvai frondosai.*

Then strode they through tall timber-trees and hewed
With hatchets; mighty oaks they overset;
Down crashed the holm and shivered ash outhacked;
Felled was the lofty fir; they wrenched right down
Tall towering pines; and every woody tree
In frondent forest rang and roared and rustled. (*Ann.* 175-9)¹⁸⁷

This passage is modelled on a well-known passage from Homer, in which the Greeks cut down trees for the funeral pyre of Patroclus in *Iliad* 23:

οἱ δ' ἴσαν ὑλοτόμους πελέκεας ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες
σειράς τ' εὐπλέκτους. πρὸ δ' ἄρ' οὐρῆες κίον αὐτῶν.
πολλὰ δ' ἄναντα κάταντα πάραντά τε δόχμιά τ' ἦλθον.
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ κνημοὺς προσέβαν πολυπίδακος Ἴδης
αὐτίκ' ἄρα δρῦς ὑψικόμους ταναήκει χαλκῷ
τάμνον ἐπειγόμενοι. ταῖ δὲ μέγала κτυπέουσαι
πῖπτον. (*Il.* 23.114-120)

And they went out holding in their hands axes for the cutting of wood and well-woven ropes, and before them went the mules: and ever upward, downward, sideward, and aslant they went. But when they had come to the spurs of many-fountained Ida, at once they began to fell high-crested oaks with the long-edged bronze eagerly, and with a mighty crash the trees kept falling.

¹⁸⁶ Elliott (2013) 269-272.

¹⁸⁷ The context of these lines is irrecoverable. Skutsch ad loc. offers suggestions, arguing that it probably was in the context of a funeral: "In Ennius' model ... as well as in the imitation of his rendering by Virgil, ... and in later poets, the felling of timber is described as a preparation for a funeral. It is therefore difficult to assume, with Columella and Merula, that E. employed the motif as an introduction to the building of a fleet." Macrobius, who provides the quote, tells us that it came in the sixth book of the *Annales*. Macrobius 6.2.27.

This passage reveals that Ennius closely adapted Homer at least in certain scenes of the poem.¹⁸⁸

Commentators have long noticed that Ennius imitates both the substance and the feel of the Homeric passage, imbuing it with a solemn tone and a tragic ethos.¹⁸⁹

Elliott has compellingly argued that Ennius' use of Homer is linked to giving cosmological significance to the story of Rome.¹⁹⁰ She points to a long list of Ennius' fragments which set the story in a cosmic setting.¹⁹¹ As she notes: "[r]eminders of either reciprocity fill the narrative. The Homerising and quasi-formulaic language of the text is studded with lines that repeat the gesture of the proem by pointing to the story's ultimate setting."¹⁹² The Homerising thus becomes part of the poetic program of being the first to bring epic poetry to Rome, and to elevating that poetry both to the level of sophistication, and to elevating the subject matter, the history of Rome to cosmological or universalizing significance.

Fourth and finally, Ennius asserts his primacy by forecasting his position in a future Latin tradition. Ennius predicts the future success of his poem as the primary Roman epic text. Ennius' self-conscious writing of himself into literary history includes another fragment from book 1:

Latos <per> populos res atque poemata nostra... clara> cluebunt ("For my subject and my

¹⁸⁸ Elliott (2013) 289: "While it would be natural to assume that Ennius took his inspiration in magnifying individuals more directly from Homer, nothing precludes the possibility that the historiographical fetishisation of individuals after the Homeric manner represents a parallel influence. Above all, the claim Ennius made by endowing the figures of Roman history with epic stature and representing them as 'types' of heroism was similar to the claim made by universal historians that the figures they lionised were representative of their nation and age and properly dominated history's trajectory."

¹⁸⁹ Aicher (1990) 218-219: ". See also, Williams (1968) 263: "Each tree has its own special verb to describe its felling, sometimes with alliteration and always with some effects of assonance. The effect is to personalize the fate of each type of tree, to express in the exuberance of verbal effects the destruction of a great wood as something to be felt, emotionally perceived by the reader."

¹⁹⁰ Elliott (2013) 254-255.

¹⁹¹ *Id.* 255.

¹⁹² *Id.*

poem shall have renown among the peoples of Italy.”).¹⁹³ Here Ennius makes the type of claim of poetic immortality familiar from surviving Latin poets of the later period. His poem will attain a permanence among the peoples of Italy. Further, in making this proleptic claim to poetic immortality, he asserts that he will have a position similar to that of Homer in the Greek tradition. He will be remembered by the Italians.¹⁹⁴ In addition to his poem, his subject will be remembered, much as the Trojan War is remembered throughout the world on account of Homer's telling of those events. Ennius sets himself up in the position of the Homer of a Latin tradition that does not yet exist, but of which he will sit at the head. Ennius' subject is the story of Rome's rise to dominance of the Mediterranean, and as such will be remembered in the future history of Rome, much more than was the story of the First Punic War, an assertion that seems uncannily prophetic. His subject will have renown, but Naevius' subject merits only a brief mention in that same story.

Ennius' claims to primacy may have influenced his reception, which from an early date attributed the title of “first” to him. In the early lines of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*, the poet identifies Ennius as the first to write poetry in Rome:

*Ennius ut noster cecinit, qui primus amoeno
Detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam
Per gentis Italas hominum quae clara clueret*

¹⁹³ Skutsch (1985) Frg. 12. See also, Sciarrino (2006) 463: “Ennius took care to define his poetic craft as *poemata* ...; as such, during the performance of his script, he would have also encouraged his audience to conceive of his poetry as a self-standing (i.e., written) object of verbal design capable of speaking by itself.”; Sheets (1982): “The phrase [ie, *res atque poemata nostra*] suggests an interdependence and equality of importance among these three elements, which will mutually share the fame of which Ennius boasts.” Elliott (2014) 523 suggests that this fragment may not be authentic.

¹⁹⁴ Sciarrino (2006) 452: “Poetry in the context of late third and early second century B.C.E. Rome was doubly “performative”: it was not only a cultural invention based on the reprocessing of cultural expressions belonging to non-Romans, it was also the means whereby its non-elite and alien inventors made a living in their new home. In other words, the poets engaged in much more than purely aesthetic acts of translation, and the civic celebrations that hosted poetic performances soon became institutional contexts wherein the cultural heritage of the Greeks was acknowledged in a way that defended and upheld the growing hegemony of the Roman ruling elite.”

As our own Ennius sang, who first brought down from pleasant Helicon a chaplet
of evergreen leafage to win a glorious name through the nations of Italian men.
(*DRN* 1.117-9)

These lines allude to Ennius' own prophecy of his poetic success.¹⁹⁵ Lucretius acknowledges that, although Ennius' ideas about reincarnation were misguided, Ennius was still the "first" to bring the hexameter into Latin, and constitutes Lucretius' own primary literary model.¹⁹⁶ The lines thus show that Ennius' claims to poetical primacy were taken seriously from an early date.¹⁹⁷

I have argued in the previous pages that Ennius presents his *Annales* as doing something new in the epic tradition. But Ennius simultaneously presents his poem as a culmination of what came before, subsuming the earlier epic tradition in the creation of a new beginning.¹⁹⁸ Subsumption in Ennius takes place on at least two levels. First, Ennius presents his poem as complete or totalizing on the basis of narrative theme. His story includes the complete history of Rome from its mythological origins, to the present day. Second, Ennius presents himself as having subsumed much of earlier poetry, bringing it a great deal of what had come before in the service of creating a new and complete work.

¹⁹⁵ Feeney (2005) 236.

¹⁹⁶ See, e.g., Brown (1984) ad loc.

¹⁹⁷ Other such references in Latin literary criticism continue. See, e.g., the 4th/5th century CE critic Diomedes, who writes:

Epos Latinum primus digne scripsit is, qui res Romanorum decem et octo complexus est libris qui et annales inscribuntur.

He first wrote a worthwhile Latin epic, who encompassed in eighteen books the deeds of the Romans, which are called the *Annales*. (*GL* 1.484)

¹⁹⁸ Elliott (2013) 254-55 connects this theme in Ennius to the metempsychosis of Homer: "If Ennius began his narrative with a cosmology placed just ahead of his narrative of the Roman past, he thereby created an implicit parallelism between the origins of the cosmos and the origins of the Roman race ... The proem with its *rerum natura* on this reading sets up a double reciprocity, first between Homer and Ennius (or the *Iliad* and the *Annales*) on the one hand, as dramatized in the metempsychosis narrative, but then also between the history of the cosmos given by 'Homer' and the history of Rome given in the poem's main narrative voice on the other."

Ennius' first subsumptive strategy is to construct a universalizing narrative that stretches back to the fall of Troy and the founding of Rome, through to the present. In so doing, the poet makes a claim to have covered the entire field of new poetic terrain. His work takes the story of Rome all the way back to its beginnings – indeed, he picks up where Homer left off with the fall of Troy, and may have even taken the story back to its cosmological and theogonic origins.¹⁹⁹

Ennius' *Annales* appear to have been the first to have covered all of Roman history in the detail. The evidence is fragmentary, but it seems that Naevius wrote his epic in accordance with the so-called “hourglass style” of history, in which the contemporary events were narrated in detail, along with an account of the city's foundation.²⁰⁰ Ennius, on the other hand, apparently wrote in a more measured style, telling the whole history of Rome from its founding to the present with the speed of the narrative decelerating as it approached the present.²⁰¹

Elliott has persuasively linked the narrative style of Ennius' *Annales* to the growing tradition of universal epic at Rome.²⁰² She argues that the *Annales* are genuinely new, in so far as they present Rome as “the hub of space and time, the primary focus of the cosmos in all its aspects.”²⁰³ She argues that Ennius lived at precisely the correct historical moment for forming “a new type of narrative about Rome, one that made the City the central node linking together

¹⁹⁹ This is the opinion of Elliott, who suggests that the Dream of Homer with which the poem began may have included a cosmogony, on the basis of Lucretius' remark, cited above, that Homer in the dream began to recount the *rerum natura* to Ennius. Elliott (2013) 253-255.

²⁰⁰ See Badian (1966) 3-11, who describes this form of narration in the early histories of Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus. See Elliott (2013) 269-272 for evidence of Ennius' innovations in the area of narrative with respect to Naevius.

²⁰¹ Elliott (2013) 233-39. See also, Skutsch (1985) 5-6. As noted above, Elliott objects to much of what she perceives as the positivism of Skutsch's placement of the fragments of Ennius within the poem. Elliott (2013) 75-134. However, she seems to agree with Skutsch's basic outlines of the contours of each of the eighteen books of the poem.

²⁰² Elliott (2013) 233-294.

²⁰³ *Id.* 234.

the rest of the known world.”²⁰⁴ She connects Ennius to such authors as Polybius, who tell versions of Roman history that are in fact histories of the world, centered upon the rise of Rome.²⁰⁵

The original version of the poem probably culminated with Nobilior’s Aetolian campaign, and his rededication of the temple of the Muses (Skutsch 1985).²⁰⁶ Goldberg suggests that “[the] rededication of the Muses’ temple gave the entire project a sense of closure by uniting its main artistic and political preoccupations... the new temple, with its portico of the Greek Muses and *aedicula* of the Camenae, represented the very amalgamation of poetic traditions, imported and native, that Ennius’s own poem had so successfully forged.”²⁰⁷ Thus, the poem would have formed a satisfying ring composition – beginning with Homer and ending with the importation of the Muses to a new temple in Rome.

Such a poetic program may be further suggested by the poem’s first fragment:

Musae, quae pedibus magnum pulsates Olympum

Muses, who strike great Olympus with your feet. (*Ann.* frg. 1)

²⁰⁴ *Id.* 240.

²⁰⁵ See, e.g., Feeney (2016) 122-51. “If we focus on the Romans’ reform of their *Ludi* in 240, it is important to note that Syracuse in particular represented a showpiece to the Roman officer class of how an up-and-coming Hellenistic power stages itself to an international audience – just at the time when the Romans found themselves precisely in the position of becoming such a great Hellenistic power. The conquest of Sicily, after all, put Rome in a leading position on the world stage in a distinctively new way. The *Ludi Romani* of 240 marked this moment for an international audience, for they were, in effect, the Victory Games to celebrate the end of the generation-long war.”

²⁰⁶ Skutsch (1985) 6, argues that it is “overwhelmingly probable” that the *Annals* “were begun some little while after the poet’s return from Greece, say in 184 BC,” and that Ennius “from the start planned to bring the poem to a close with the Aetolian campaign, the triumph of Fulvius and, probably, the founding of the temple *Herculis Musarum*.”

²⁰⁷ Goldberg (2006) 437.

Musae, as has been noted, stands in opposition to the earlier Latin *Camēnae* who Livius Andronicus and Naevius asked for inspiration for their poems.²⁰⁸ The poem thus began with the Muses and ended with the introduction of their cult into Rome.²⁰⁹ This introduction was performed by Ennius' patron, M. Fulvius Nobilior, who introduced the cult, either in 187 BCE, the year of his triumph over the Aetolians, or in 179 BCE, the year of his censorship.²¹⁰

That Ennius concerned himself with having his epic tell the complete story of Rome (indeed, that he placed a higher premium on completeness of narrative than on literary unity or numerological significance) is evidenced by his choice to expand his poem after it had already been published. This fact is evidence by the testimony of Pliny the Elder:

Q. Ennius T. Caecilium Teucrum fratremque eius praecipue miratus propter eos sextum decium adiecit Annalem.

²⁰⁸ Skutsch (1985) ad loc.: "[T]he poet invokes the Muses instead of the *Camēnae*, to whom Livius Andronicus in his translation of the *Odyssey* and apparently Naevius in the *Carmen Belli Punici* had addressed themselves... As the *Camēnae*, who may owe their connection with poetry to an etymology linking their name with *carmen*, are replaced by the Muses, so *carmen* is replaced by *poema*, *uates* by *poeta*, and the Saturnian line by the hexameter." See also Goldschmidt (2013) 40. Frg. 1 is among the very few Ennius fragments quoted from Varro whose placement according to modern conjectures Elliott finds persuasive. Elliott (2013) 137 n.5.

²⁰⁹ Skutsch ad loc.

²¹⁰ *Id.* See also, the testimony of Cicero, in which he indicates that Nobilior was criticized for bringing Ennius to Aetolia:

sero igitur a nostris poetae vel cogniti vel recepti. Quamquam est in Originibus solitos esse in epulis canere convivas ad tibicinem de clarorum hominum virtutibus, honorem tamen huic generi non fuisse declarant oratio Catonis, in qua obiecit ut probrum M. Nobiliori, quod is in provinciam poetas duxisset; duxerat autem consul ille in Aetoliam, ut scimus, Ennium. Quo minus igitur honoris erat poetis, eo minora studia fuerunt, nec tamen, si qui magnis ingeniis in eo genere extiterunt, non satis Graecorum gloriae responderunt.

At a late date then were poets either known or welcomed by our countrymen: Though it is stated in the *Origines* that guests were in the habit of singing at banquets in honor of the virtues of famous men to the playing of a piper, yet a speech of Cato's shows that this kind of talent was not held in respect, for in it he censured M. Nobilior for having, as he declares, taken poets in his suite to his province. It is, as we know, matter of fact that Nobilior when consul had taken Ennius to Aetolia. The lighter then the esteem in which poetry was held, the less was the devotion paid to it, and yet such writers as have by virtue of great natural endowments proved themselves poets, have not failed to be a worthy match for the glory of the Greeks.

Ennius especially admired Titus Caecilius Teucer and his brother and because of them added the sixteenth book of his *Annals*. (*Pliny N.H.* 7.101)

Skutsch believes that this statement must be derived from the proem to Book 16 of the *Annales*, but is skeptical of whether this was the real reason, as the identities of the Caecilii Teucuri are unknown.²¹¹

In adding these books, Ennius sacrificed the time scope of a millennium and a satisfying ring composition concluding with the dedication of the Temple of the Muses in order to extend his poem onwards.²¹² The *Annales* were originally published as a fifteen-book poem, which covered the period down through the Aetolian War, which ended in 189 BCE. Years after the poem's initial publication, however, Ennius expanded the poem to include Roman history down to 170, detailing the events of the Istrian and Macedonian Wars. He composed three additional books, bringing the total number to eighteen.

The decision to expand demonstrates that Ennius was concerned with having his poem be a comprehensive narrative of the Roman story. The authority of the *Annales* as the complete Roman epic was at risk if it did not cover the entire history of Rome. Without continuing the story down to the present, the *Annales* were at risk of becoming victim to the same move that Ennius performed vis-à-vis Naevius' *Bellum Poenicum*. A new poet could come and claim the mantle of the subsumptive narrator of Rome's story if developments in history render unimportant the events that seemed to Ennius and his contemporaries to be the most important in the Roman story. Ennius preempts such a move, at least for the time he remained alive, by

²¹¹ Skutsch (1985) ad loc., cites Badian favorable for the proposition that "the valor of the Caecilius brothers was no more than the ostensible reason for the resumption of the epic by Ennius, and that the true reason was that Ennius wished, or was asked, to give an account as favorable as possible of the conduct of the Istrian war by A. Manlius Vulso, consul 178 BC, brother of Cn. Manlius Vulso, who was a close friend and political ally of Ennius' patron Fulvius Nobilior."

²¹² See Skutsch (1985) ad Frg. 401.

expanding his story to cover the full history of Rome up to his own point in life, though this may have come at the expense of literary unity.

Ennius' second strategy of subsumption is to subsume earlier poetry. From the available fragments, it seems that this strategy primarily was applied to Homer, whose language Ennius translated and adapted.

As discussed above there are ample examples of Ennius translating and adapting Homeric passages for the new context of the *Annales*. In addition to frgs. 175-79, discussed above, other examples of Homeric adaptation are visible in the *Annales*. Macrobius provides a longer fragment from Book 15 with its Homeric analogue (*Sat.* 6.3.2-4):

Αἴας δ' οὐκέτ' ἔμιμνε. βιάζετο γὰρ βελέεσσι.
δάμνα μιν Ζηνός τε νόος καὶ Τρῶες ἀγαυοὶ
βάλλοντες, δεινὴν δὲ περὶ κροτάφοισι φαεινὴ
πήληξ βαλλομένη καναχὴν ἔχε. βάλλετο δ' αἰεὶ
κάπ φάλαρ' εὐποίηθ'. ὁ δ' ἀριστερόν ὦμον ἔκαμνεν
ἔμπεδον αἰὲν ἔχων σάκος αἰόλον, οὐδ' ἐδύναντο
ἀμφ' αὐτῷ πελεμίζαι ἐρείδοντες βελέεσσιν,
αἰεὶ δ' ἀργαλέῳ ἔχετ' ἄσθματι, καὶ δε οἱ ἰδρῶς
πάντοθεν ἐκ μελέων ῥέεν ἄσπετος οὐδέ πη εἶχεν
ἀμπνεῦσαι, πάντα δὲ κακὸν κακῷ ἐστήρικτο. (*Il.* 16-102-11)
hunc locum Ennius in quinto decimo ad pugnam Caelii tribuni his versibus transfert:
unique conveniunt velut imber tela tribuno:
configunt parmam, tinnit hastilibus umbo,
aerato sonitu galeae, sed nec pote quisquam
undique nitendo corpus discernere ferro.
semper abundantes hastas frangitque quatitque.
totum sudor habet corpus, multumque laborat,
nec respirandi fit copia: praepete ferro
Histri tela manu iacentes sollicitabant. (*Ann.* 391-8)

Ajax no longer stood his ground; he was forced back by their missiles. Zeus' plan and the lordly Trojans with their spear-casts were breaking him, and the shining helmet rang terribly about his temples under the blows: the well-constructed cheek-pieces were their constant target. His left shoulder grew weary holding his gleaming shield constantly steady, though they were not able to make him quail as they set upon him with their weapons; but all the same shortness of breath wracked him painfully, and sweat ran plentifully everywhere down his limbs, and

he had no chance to catch his breath, for on all sides trouble was heaped on trouble.

Ennius adopts this passage in his fifteenth book for the fight of the tribune, in the following verses:

From all sides weapons converge on the tribune like a rain-storm. They pierce his shield, the boss rings with spear-strikes to the brazen clanging of his helmet, but no one is able, strive as they might from all sides, to dismember his person with their weapon-blows. Ceaselessly he shatters and shakes of their ever-increasing spear-casts. Sweat covers his entire body; his efforts are many, but he has no chance to catch his breath: with the winged iron and strong-armed weapon-casts, the Istrians bore hard on him.

This passage once again shows how Ennius translated full-scale Homeric episodes and repurposed them in the Roman context. Subsumption becomes for Ennius a tool in repurposing Greek materials for the new Latin context. Ennius' poem is thus a culmination of what came before, and a new beginning: It reveals a meaning of history that could not be apparent to Homer (or Livius or Naevius) and repurposes the language and the scenes of those poems towards the development of a new kind of epic poetry. Ennius subsumes character, language, and scene to use Homeric poetry for a new poetry of historical, Roman epic.

If Elliott is correct that Homer described the origins of the Earth to Ennius in the course of the proem to the *Annales*, then Ennius performs a doubly subsumptive move in the early lines of the poem.²¹³ Ennius would then subsume earlier mythological history prior to the foundation of Rome, by having it quickly summarized in the mouth of the critical poet of those events himself. Homer's own work is subsumed into the poem as a lead up to the new story, culminating in the triumph of Rome.

In conclusion, the themes of primacy and subsumption which we saw in evidence in the Homeric poems in Chapter 1 continue in Ennius. Ennius, self-conscious founder of a new

²¹³ Elliott (2013) 253-255.

tradition of Latin hexametrical epic poetry employs a number of strategies, enumerated above to assert his position of primacy in the tradition that he claims to inaugurate. Most prominently, he adopts the position of Homer, in order to make the claim that he stands at the head of a prospective literary tradition. He asserts his primacy, also through the introduction of the new meter, the hexameter, into Latin. Along the way, he writes his predecessors out of the Latin tradition. Additionally, Ennius employs the technique of subsumption. He attempts to tell the entire story of Rome, from its earliest mythological history to the present time, perhaps even including cosmological time as well. And, even in the limited fragments that survive, he can be seen adapting passages from his poetic predecessors, Homer in particular, to subsume their works into his own.

CHAPTER 3: PRIMACY, BELATEDNESS, AND SUBSUMPTION IN STATIUS' *THEBAID*

In the previous chapter, I examined how the early Roman epic authors – Livius Andronicus, Naevius, and Ennius – self-consciously attempted to position themselves as the progenitors of a future Latin epic tradition. In this chapter, I move to the Flavian period, by which time the tradition of Latin epic was firmly established at Rome, leaving fewer opportunities for epic poets to cast themselves as the first in the tradition. The intervening centuries had produced a great deal of epic poetry, critically in the Augustan period, which saw the genre transformed by such entries as Vergil's *Aeneid*. Despite the crowding of the Latin tradition by the Flavian period, authors continued to produce new works in the genre at a high rate.²¹⁴

Despite the changes in the landscape of existing epic poetry, the desire to create an illusion of primacy and to subsume the poetry that came before remained an animating concern among the poets of the Flavian period. Statius, along with his contemporaries Valerius Flaccus and Silius Italicus, had to develop new strategies for accomplishing this intention, however. These poets did not have available to them some of the strategies employed by the poets of the early Latin period for formulating their originality. The early poets had attempted to efface the Latin tradition that predated it and to begin a new tradition on the model of the Greek tradition.²¹⁵ This option was unavailable to the Flavian poets; instead, the Flavians constructed their originality against the tradition that stood behind them. The poets of the Flavian period formulate dynamically an illusion of primacy in relationship to the enormous body of already

²¹⁴ The Flavian period produced more surviving epics than any other period in Greco-Roman literary history. It is generally accepted that Statius composed the *Thebaid* after the death of Valerius Flaccus and the publication of his unfinished *Argonautica*, and that Silius Italicus was Statius' contemporary. Lovatt (2015) 408-9. It is also widely accepted that the *Punica* and the *Thebaid* exerted reciprocal influence on one another. Ripoll (2015).

²¹⁵ See Chapter 2.

existing Greek and Latin epic.²¹⁶ As Hardie writes: “Imperial Latin epic takes to an extreme the innate tendency of the genre to the expansive and the comprehensive.”²¹⁷

In this chapter, I argue that the attempt to create an illusion of primacy – a theme that, as argued in the previous two chapters, has its origins in poems on the boundary between literacy and orality and that continues as epic becomes a purely textual genre – remains a motivation in the poets of the Flavian period. I describe several strategies that the Flavian poets use for primacy assertion. First, I examine how, by narrating events from early in mythological history, Statius presents himself as prior to the stories of the earlier Roman epic authors, particularly Vergil, whose subject matter, straddling line the line between historical and mythological material, took place later than that of the *Thebaid*. I discuss how, by narrating early themes and modelling episodes on stories in Vergil or Homer, the Flavian poets imagine that their versions of stories are the ones being imitated, rather than the imitating ones.²¹⁸ I identify several strategies that arise in this context, including amplification or exaggeration of elements of the model episode, and correction, making the earlier version appear to be a degenerate version of the later one. I next turn to places in Statius and Silius Italicus where the authors include earlier canonical epic poets in their poems, either through direct address or by making them characters within the poem’s narrative. Finally, I examine how Statius and Valerius Flaccus compete with one another in their proems for primacy of theme. I focus my treatment on Statius’s *Thebaid*,

²¹⁶ See, e.g. Micozzi (2015) 325 (“[Statius] pushes to an extreme the innate tendency of epic towards both the expansive and the comprehensive, attempting to conflate within his own grand poetic design the entire culture of epic, and fully exploring its critical issues in an encyclopedia form that touches all genres. If it is normally the tradition that contains the author, Statius reverses this axiom: it is the poem that incorporates the tradition.”)

²¹⁷ Hardie (1993) 11.

²¹⁸ Barchiesi (1993) discusses this strategy, calling it the “future reflexive” and discussing references by characters within a poem to events that have not yet happened in the narrative, but that are known to the reader through the earlier literary tradition.

because of its completeness and its greater degree of literary success. However, there will be occasion to discuss Valerius Flaccus, Silius Italicus, and Statius' *Achilleid* as they exhibit some of the same strategies.

Statius' *Thebaid*, far more than Ennius' *Annales* is haunted by the belatedness of the author's position.²¹⁹ As Feeney has observed, Statius was the "heir to an oppressively rich inheritance."²²⁰ Statius composed his epic under Domitian, by which time the tradition of Roman hexametrical epic had grown crowded, and had become particularly dominated by the *Aeneid* of Vergil, a poem which had already attained canonical status as the pinnacle of Roman epic by the time Statius composed his magnum opus.²²¹ Where Ennius could stake a claim to originality by asserting, truthfully, that he was the first to compose hexametrical epic in Latin, Statius could not make a claim to originality on the basis of language or meter. Statius competed with his predecessors, including Homer, Lucan, and Ovid, but most of all Vergil, by attempting to create an illusion of primacy for himself, and by subsuming and recasting much of the tradition that came before him.²²²

The particular importance of the influence of Virgil on Statius has been noted.²²³ Statius directly addresses the poem in the *Thebaid* and discusses its influence on the poem in the

²¹⁹ Numerous studies have addressed Statius' ambitions with regards to particular authors. Book length studies include Ganiban (2007), which treats the relationship between Statius and Vergil, McNelis (2007), which addresses Statius' use of the poetry of Callimachus, and Lovatt (2005), which treats Statius' funeral games in book 6 with reference to depictions of funeral games in Homer, Vergil, Valerius Flaccus, and Silius Italicus.

²²⁰ Feeney (1991) 340.

²²¹ The fact of Vergil's canonical status is attested to by Statius himself in his own *sphragis* of the *Thebaid*. See below. For an appraisal of Vergil's status as it related to the composition of Statius' *Thebaid*, see Vessey (1973) 1-5 esp. and throughout.

²²² I will limit my discussion here to Homer and Virgil. For Statius' attempts to one-up Ovid and Lucan, with bibliography, see Lovatt (2005) 204-7.

²²³ See generally Ganniban (2007).

Silvae.²²⁴ However, the *Thebaid* does not simply imitate or worshipfully follow the *Aeneid*. The poem engages with the *Aeneid* dynamically, attempting to usurp its position as the primary Roman epic. On one level, the *Thebaid* can be read as a “political critique” of the *Aeneid*, that destabilizes the optimistic readings of that poem by presenting the political world as a realm governed by *nefas*.²²⁵ Another set of readings see the poem as an “adaptation of Virgilian *pietas* to a Flavian world, where *humanitas* is the defining ideal.”²²⁶ While the exact nature of the poem’s response to the *Aeneid* is difficult to resolve, the *Thebaid* clearly engages with the *Aeneid* and responds to it polemically.

Writing a century after Vergil, whose *Aeneid* had by that time attained canonical status as the most perfect of the epics, Statius was compelled to construct his originality “upon his dependence on tradition and his massive indebtedness” to his predecessor.²²⁷ But by explicitly acknowledging his own belatedness, and indeed thematizing it through his own poem, Statius finds a way to “revitalize and reinvent” the epic tradition.²²⁸ Statius seeks to include the *Aeneid* within his poem, by choosing as a narrative theme a story prior to the events of the *Aeneid*, and by writing episodes modelled on those of the *Aeneid*, which then have the surface appearance of predating the *Aeneid*. These same techniques are seen, though perhaps to a lesser extent, in the poems of Silius Italicus and Valerius Flaccus.

²²⁴ For more discussion, see below XXX-XXX.

²²⁵ Ganniban (2007) 6.

²²⁶ Ganniban (2007) 5. This view of the *Thebaid* is associated with a line of French scholars, including Ripoll (1998), d’Espèrey (1999) and Delarue (2000).

²²⁷ Micozzi (2015) 325.

²²⁸ Id. at 329.

Statius bolsters his illusion of primacy through the use of a theme from quite early in mythological lore. By choosing to relate the story of the Seven Against Thebes, Statius selects a story that predates all of the material of the *Aeneid* and the Homeric poems. He draws his subject matter, instead, from the body of Theban mythology that treated the events of the generation preceding the generation that fought in the Trojan War. Instead of composing a Roman epic on the story of the history of Rome, Statius tells a story drawn from antique, pre-Homeric Greek mythology.²²⁹

The effect of telling a mythological narrative while modelling many of the episodes on episodes from Vergil and Homer is to cause the *Thebaid* to seem to be the model for that poetry within narrative time. The characters in Statius' narrative, by virtue of their priority in narrative time, become the figures imitated in Vergil and Homer.²³⁰ Statius can thus employ a variety of tools to attempt to outdo the episodes of the canonical epic authors.

A first technique Statius employs is writing his heroes as performing greater feats than those in Homer and in Vergil. When imitating scenes from earlier epic, Statius routinely intensifies aspects of the episode that he is imitating. In doing so, Statius plays into the classical trope of degeneration – that each subsequent generation is worse than the previous. The effect of employing the concept of generational decline in this way is to enforce the notion of primacy. Statius amplifies and exaggerates the characteristics of scenes from earlier poets, and at the same time, corrects them. In this way, Statius points to his own fictional primacy. The episodes that he imitates become the weaker, incorrect, and later versions.

²²⁹ One oft noted curiosity of Roman literary history is the late development of mythological epic at Rome, despite the fact of Rome's importation of Greek literary models. Putting aside Livius' *Odusseia*, we have no examples of purely mythological epic at Rome until Varro of Atax's translation of Apollonius of Rhodes' *Argonautica* during the Augustan period.

²³⁰ Nonnus also employs this strategy extensively; see Chapter 4.

One example of an episode in which Statius engages with Homer and Vergil in an attempt to create an illusion of primacy is Tydeus' fight with the fifty assassins of Eteocles in book 2 of the *Thebaid*.²³¹ The illusion of primacy in this episode functions on at least two levels. First, Statius amplifies the exploits of Tydeus while modelling the episode on the exploits of his son Diomedes in the *Iliad*. Second, this move has a metapoetical resonance. While Statius occupies the position of the poetical “son” to Homer and Vergil’s “father,” the episode reversed the valences. Statius becomes the poetical “father” superior to his inferior “sons.”

In the episode, Polynices sends Tydeus to Thebes as an emissary to tell Eteocles that his year as king has elapsed, and that he must relinquish the throne or war will commence (*Th.* 2.363-409). Eteocles refuses to stand down, and rudely dispatches Tydeus (*Th.* 2.410-81). When Tydeus leaves, Eteocles orders fifty men to stand in ambush for Tydeus and to assassinate him (2.482-526). When Tydeus encounters the Thebans in the night ambush, however, he fights them single handedly and kills all of them but one, whom he sends back to Thebes to tell Eteocles what happened (527-681). Statius establishes his telling of this so-called *monomachy* against the models of Homer and Virgil. Salient models include the *aristeia* of Diomedes in book 5 of the *Iliad*, and the night raid of Nisus and Euryalus in book 9 of the *Aeneid*, itself constructed in imitation of the Doloneia of *Iliad* 10, yet another salient model for Tydeus' exploits in book 2 of

²³¹ The *monomachy* of Tydeus in book 2 of the *Thebaid* has received limited scholarly attention. Mulder (1954) offers a few intertextual remarks, while Parkes (2010) and (2014) discusses some Virgilian, Ovidian, and Valerian allusions, but does not engage with Homer. Gervais (2015) marks a major step forward in understanding the scene. Roche (2015) 396 points out that Tydeus can also be seen to be one-upping Lucan’s Scaeva in this scene, as well as during his final *aristeia* in Book 8.

the *Thebaid*.²³² Statius is particularly interested, however, in having his Tydeus engage with the model of his son Diomedes as portrayed by Homer in the *Iliad*.²³³

Statius connects his telling of Tydeus' destruction of Eteocles' assassins with the *aristeia* of Diomedes in book 5 of the *Iliad*.²³⁴ Both through his telling of Tydeus' exploits and through engagement with Homer, Statius indicates the superiority of his own version of Tydeus to the Homeric Diomedes.²³⁵ In doing so, Statius creates a two-pronged argument for the superiority of his poem over Homer's: through the primacy of his tale, being one told before that of Homer, and through the greater prowess of his hero, Tydeus, over Homer's hero, Tydeus's son Diomedes. As we shall see below, Statius also employs Homer's own words to make his Tydeus appear greater than Homer's Diomedes by comparison.

Diomedes is the son of Tydeus in the *Iliad*, and several references are made to Tydeus and his exploits.²³⁶ Of particular note is an episode in book 4, when Agamemnon travels around the Greek camp encouraging the various Greek heroes and preparing them for battle. Among the heroes Agamemnon encounters is Diomedes. Agamemnon rebukes him and encourages him to fight by comparing him unfavorably with his father, Tydeus:

“ὦ μοι, Τυδέος υἱὲ δαΐφρονος ἵπποδάμοιο,
τί πτώσσεις, τί δ’ ὀπιπεύεις πολέμοιο γεφύρας;
οὐ μὲν Τυδέι γ’ ὥδε φίλον πτωσκαζέμεν ἦεν,

²³² For the poetic models for the *monomachy*, see Gervais (2015) 56-62.

²³³ Gervais (2015) is more interested in Tydeus' relationship to mythological heroes in general, in particular to Hercules, and whether or not Tydeus represents a "successful" or "unsuccessful" imitator of the great demi-god.

²³⁴ Throughout the *Thebaid*, Tydeus is regularly portrayed as the most "Iliadic" of the characters in the poem. Lovatt (2005) 194.

²³⁵ Diomedes will be a major character in Statius' second, unfinished epic, the *Achilleid*. Much of the plot of that poem in its surviving state is concerned with Diomedes and Ulysses attempting to recover Achilles from his hiding spot on Scyros. For extensive discussion of his character there, see Chinn (2015).

²³⁶ Other references outside of this scene in the *Iliad* are 5.115-20, 10.284-90, and 14.113-27.

ἀλλὰ πολὺ πρὸ φίλων ἐτάρων δηίοισι μάχεσθαι,
ὥς φάσαν οἱ μιν ἴδοντο πονεύμενον· οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε
ἦντις· οὐδὲ ἴδον· περὶ δ' ἄλλων φασὶ γενέσθαι.

Ah me, son of battle-minded Tydeus, tamer of horses, why do you cower, why do you gaze at the lines of battle? It was surely not Tydeus' habit to cower in this way, but far in advance of his comrades to fight against the foe, as they tell who saw him amid the toil of war; for I never met him or saw him; but men say that he was preeminent over all. (*Il.* 4.370-5)

Homer has Agamemnon present Diomedes as weaker than his father Tydeus in order to provoke him. As an example of Tydeus' prowess, Agamemnon next relates an anecdote illustrating Tydeus' excellence; an anecdote which is, in fact, the same story that Statius relates in the second book of the *Thebaid*. Agamemnon relates how Tydeus came to the house of Eteocles and defeated all of the Cadmeians (as Homer calls them) in feats of strength (this detail is missing in the *Thebaid*, where Tydeus comes to Thebes not for the demonstration of feats of strength, but to sue for peace).²³⁷ Then, the angered Cadmeians send out an ambush to attack Tydeus:

οἱ δὲ χολωσάμενοι Καδμεῖοι, κέντορες ἵππων,
ἄψ ἄρ' ἀνερχομένῳ πυκινὸν λόχον εἶσαν ἄγοντες,
κούρους πεντήκοντα· δύο δ' ἡγήτορες ἦσαν
Μαίων Αἰμονίδης, ἐπιείκελος ἀθανάτοισιν,
υἱὸς τ' Αὐτοφόνιοι, μενεπτόλεμος Πολυφόντης.
Τυδεὺς μὲν καὶ τοῖσιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐφῆκε·
πάντας ἔπεφν', ἓνα δ' οἶον ἵει οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι·
Μαίον' ἄρα προέηκε, θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήσας.
τοῖος ἔην Τυδεὺς Αἰτωλῖος· ἀλλὰ τὸν υἱὸν
γεῖνατο εἶο χέρεια μάχῃ, ἀγορῇ δέ τ' ἀμείνω.”

But the Cadmeians, goaders of horses, grew angry, and as he traveled back, brought out and set a strong ambush, fifty youths, and two there were as leaders, Maeon, son of Haemon, peer of the immortals, and Autophonus' son, Polyphontes, firm in the fight. But Tydeus on these let loose a hideous fate: he slew them all and only one man did he send to return home; Maeon he sent on in obedience to the portents of the gods. Such a man was Tydeus of Aetolia; but the

²³⁷ The story is almost certainly drawn from a longer oral poem about the stories of Thebes, possibly from the Theban Cycle. See Kirk ad loc.

son he begot is worse than he in battle, though in the place of the assembly he is better. (*Il.* 4.391-400)

According to Agamemnon in Homer, Tydeus was a greater man than his son Diomedes when it comes to battle.²³⁸ Diomedes stands up poorly in comparison with his father, as demonstrated by what Tydeus accomplished fighting against the Cadmeians. Diomedes does not immediately respond, but his companion Sthenelaus, son of Capaneus, angrily replies that he and Diomedes are better men than their fathers (ἡμεῖς τοι πατέρων μέγ' ἀμείνονες εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι "we declare the we are better men than our fathers by far." *Il.* 4.05). For this assertion, Diomedes irately rebukes him and commands him to remain in silence. Homer includes a reprise of this rebuke in Book 5, when it is the goddess Athena herself who accuses Diomedes of inferiority to his father, and she once again tells the story of how Tydeus overcame the Cadmeian youths in Thebes.²³⁹ She adds, however, that she gave the hero help, a fact that Agamemnon does not include in his version of the events.

By relating his own version of this story, Statius calls to mind Agamemnon's rebuke of Diomedes and the version of the story that he told. By calling to mind Homer's own words discussing how Tydeus was a greater hero than his son Diomedes, Statius stakes a claim for the superiority of his hero and, by extension, his poem. Tydeus is a model for what Diomedes should strive to be and fails to achieve within Homer's own text. Statius appropriates this dynamic for himself and for the relationship between his poem and the *Iliad*.²⁴⁰ Rather than tell the tale of the

²³⁸ Kirk ad loc. "Sons are often held to be inferior to their fathers; this stirring claim to the contrary is based on the specific and unusual case of the successive attacks on Thebes."

²³⁹ *Il.* 5.800-13

²⁴⁰ Lovatt (2005) treats Tydeus as a representation of Statius' antagonistic relationship with tradition in the context of the wrestling match in the games of book 6. "For the match offers itself as a textual and intertextual metaphor: the bodies of the competitors can be read as the bodies of poetic texts; the theme of paternal inheritance is a poetic anxiety as much as a heroic one; but above all the clear allusions to wrestling matches in Ovid and Lucan, and

son who fell short of the father, Statius tells the story of the father himself.²⁴¹ Statius alludes to Homer's Diomedes several times in the course of the night ambush scene, each time providing evidence for Agamemnon's statement in the *Iliad* that Tydeus was a greater warrior than Diomedes.²⁴² The priority of Statius' story relative to that of Homer's makes his characters the models for Homer's inferior versions. Statius uses Homer's own words to indicate that his heroes are greater than the heroes of Homer's poem.

In order to frame his comparison of Tydeus and Diomedes, and to make his hero appear the greater, Statius has his Tydeus perform feats that Diomedes performs in the *Iliad*. In each instance, Statius' Tydeus performs the feat in a more impressive way than his Homeric son had. In a famous passage during the *aristeia* of Diomedes, the hero picks up a stone and hurls it at Aeneas. Homer interjects parenthetically that the stone was so great that men such as they are now would not have been able to lift it:

ὁ δὲ χερμάδιον λάβε χειρὶ
 Τυδεΐδης μέγα ἔργον ὃ οὐ δύο γ' ἄνδρε φέροιεν,
 οἷοι νῦν βροτοὶ εἰς· ὃ δέ μιν ῥέα πάλλε καὶ οἷος.
 τῷ βάλεν Αἰνείας κατ' ἰσχίον ἔνθά τε μηρὸς
 ἰσχίῳ ἐνστρέφεται, κοτύλην δέ τέ μιν καλέουσι·

But Tydeus' son in his hand caught
 up a stone, a huge thing which no two men could carry
 such as men are now, but by himself he lightly hefted it.
 He threw, and caught Aineias in the hip, in the place where the hip-bone
 turns inside the thigh, the place men call the cup-socket. (*Il.* 5.302-6)

through them back to a tradition which includes Virgil, Apollonius and Homer, create an ever more complex process of reading the match, in which Statius is truly wrestling tradition." Lovatt (2005) 194

²⁴¹ For a similar poetic tactic, see Nonnus' explicit statement of poetic superiority to Homer on the basis of theme below, XXX.

²⁴² Ripoll (1998) 314-20 has argued that for Tydeus, *virtus* as exemplified by the accomplishment of heroic deeds is the only end in itself of Tydeus' behavior, thus rendering it void of moral value.

This passage is one of a very few references in the *Iliad* to Homer's present.²⁴³ The section attests to the Archaic Greek opinion that human kind had degenerated from the way men were during the mythological time.²⁴⁴ Homer asserts here that the men of the mythological period were of greater size and strength than the men of his time, who cannot achieve the kind of feats that Homer's heroes could. This widespread archaic Greek idea is reproduced in Statius' recounting of the deeds of Diomedes' father Tydeus. Statius expresses this relationship to Homer through the exploits of Tydeus in book 2 of the *Thebaid*.²⁴⁵

The first act of violence accomplished by Tydeus is the hurling of a great rock, much as Diomedes had done in the *Iliad*. Tydeus, realizing that there are a great number of soldiers there to ambush him, climbs to the top of a tower and looks down on the men below him. He then grabs a rock, which he pulls up from the cliff. Statius describes the episode in language evoking Homer's mention of the rock that men today could not lift:

*saxum ingens, quod vix plena cervice gementes
vertere humo et muris valeant inferre iuveni,
rupibus avelli;*

From the rocks he plucks a huge boulder, which groaning steers with full strength of neck could scarce tear from the ground and bring within walls. (*Th.* 2.559-61)

The language evokes the parenthetical statement of Homer, but Statius exaggerates it. Where

²⁴³ Kirk (1990) ad loc. notes that the expression is surprising "in a tradition where the singer's own *persona* is so carefully suppressed."

²⁴⁴ See, for instance, the second book of the *Odyssey*, in which Athena tells Telemachus that sons are rarely as good as their fathers, and Hesiod's description of the Ages of Man in the *Works and Days* (109-201), in which he describes a slow decline in mankind's strength, both moral and physical, over time.

²⁴⁵ Though the epic and didactic trope is that sons are rarely as good as their fathers, the superiority of sons to their fathers in praise poetry should be compared, even within Statius' own corpus. Bernstein (2015) 141: "Many of the *Silvae* employ the encomiastic *topos* that young men either replicate the fame of their ancestors or (more often) surpass it."

Diomedes could lift a stone that two men of Homer's day could not have lifted, his father lifts a stone that a team of horses could not have moved, much less have lifted overhead. While Homer's Diomedes simply lifts a large stone, Statius' Tydeus rips the stone out of the side of the cliff, a feat requiring far more strength than picking a stone off the ground. Through this competitive imitation of Homer's Diomedes, Statius' Tydeus emerges as a superior hero in "imitating" the exploit of his son, who threw a stone far smaller than his father. By presenting the story in this way, Statius provides evidence for Homer's own statement that men were stronger in earlier generations, and for Agamemnon's argument that Diomedes was a weaker man than his father Tydeus. Statius presents evidence for the notion of a degeneration through time of heroes, in which the earlier generation is generally superior to the younger. In doing so, he makes an argument for the greater importance of his own narrative; the heroes, being of an earlier generation are stronger and greater than the heroes of the Homeric epic. Tydeus, just as Agamemnon said his rebuke of Diomedes, was the greater hero, and capable of greater exploits, exploits which Statius now narrates.²⁴⁶

Statius' description of Tydeus lifting the rock also recalls Vergil's imitation of the Homeric scene, during the climactic duel between Aeneas and Turnus. During that conflict, Vergil describes Aeneas lifting a large rock to hurl at his Latin adversary:

*saxum circumspicit ingens,
saxum antiquum ingens, campo quod forte iacebat,
limes agro positus litem ut discerneret arvis.
vix illud lecti bis sex cervice subirent,
qualia nunc hominum producit corpora tellus;*

He glances round and sees a huge stone, an ancient stone and huge which by chance lay upon the plain, set for a landmark to keep dispute from the fields. Twice six chosen men could scarce lift it on their shoulders, men of such frames

²⁴⁶ For a similar argument regarding Statius' relationship to Senecan drama, see Augustakis (2015).

as the earth now produces. (*Aen.* 12.896-900)

Statius' description imitates and surpasses Vergil's description. Aeneas lifts a rock which would require twelve men of Vergil's age to lift. Vergil's description, like Homer's, indicates a degeneracy of the strength of heroes through time. Statius' hero, who is the father of Homer's hero, and lives further back in mythological time than Vergil's Aeneas, surpasses them both. Statius makes his hero stronger than Aeneas by describing him lifting a rock that horses could barely move, and in doing so makes him the model for Aeneas's strength. While Aeneas surpasses the men of Vergil's time, Statius' hero is still stronger, and thus surpasses Aeneas, in a move where analogously, Statius surpasses Vergil as a poet on the basis of theme.

Statius returns to the issue of fathers and sons with reference to Tydeus in the sixth book during the games, in which Tydeus competes in the wrestling.²⁴⁷ There he fights Agylleus, the son of Heracles. Statius writes of Agylleus that he did not match up to his father: *sed non ille rigor patriumque in corpore robur* "but he does not have the stiffness and strength of his father in his body." (*Th.* 6.840). Tydeus defeats him by lifting him off the ground. This detail is calculated to evoke an exploit from Heracles' history, the wrestling match with Antaeus. In that episode, memorably recounted by Lucan in Book 4 of the *Bellum Civile* (4.581-824), Heracles did battle with Antaeus, who was the son of the Earth. Antaeus had previously beaten all

²⁴⁷ For fathers and sons in the works of Statius generally, see Bernstein (2014). Compare *Achilleid* 1.650-1, in which Achilles suggests to his rape-victim Deidamia that he is "almost" a son of Zeus:

ille ego – quid treipdas? – genitum quem caerulea mater

paene Ioui

I am the man – what are you afraid of? – whom my seablue mother almost bore to Jupiter.

This sentiment, like that expressed by Statius regarding the relationship between Tydeus and Diomedes, suggests that the further the generations get away from Jupiter, the more attenuated the connection between the descendant and the god becomes.

challengers by remaining in contact with his mother, who provided him with strength so long as they remained touching. Heracles defeated Antaeus by lifting him off of the Earth and crushing him to death. Here in Statius, the son of Heracles takes the role of the vanquished foe of the great hero, and Tydeus takes the place of Heracles. Statius thus emphasizes the degeneracy of sons compared to their fathers, and elevates Tydeus to the position of Heracles. Vessey has argued that when Tydeus lifts Antaeus off the ground, the reader should recognize a connection to Tydeus' *aristeia* in book 2, when he lifts the stone.²⁴⁸ Such a reading would further emphasize the connection between Tydeus as a "father", and thus an earlier and superior hero to his Homeric son Diomedes.

Statius relegates Homer's heroes to the position of sons of their greater mythological fathers.²⁴⁹ As Boyd writes, speaking of the relationship between fathers and sons in Ovid's version of the Diomedes episode, the "comparison of father and son is premised on the idea of degeneracy, and Diomedes' respectful ... response both acknowledges this idea and implies a determination to prove Agamemnon wrong."²⁵⁰ Where Ovid, according to Boyd, presents himself in the role of Diomedes, Statius aligns himself with Tydeus, thus inverting the roles of poetic father and poetic son.

Homeric theomachy was an important influence on the Flavian poets. As Chaudhuri has noted, the Flavian epic poets are the only extant poets we have who imitate his scene of the

²⁴⁸ Vessey (1973) 437

²⁴⁹ For Diomedes and Tydeus as poetical father and son in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, see Boyd (2017) 44-45 and 64-73.

²⁵⁰ Boyd (2017) 66.

struggle between the mortal and a river god.²⁵¹ Further, in keeping with the reading offered here of the Tydeus episode, Chaudhuri has noted that in these scene of *machē paratamios*, while “Homer... goes to great lengths to emphasize the divine or near-divine qualities of Achilles in his struggle against the river Scamander...the two Flavian epicists downplay the divine qualities of their theomachs while at the same time showing them in crucial ways to be more powerful than their Iliadic predecessor.”²⁵² The relationship between Silius’, Statius’, and Homer’s versions of these episodes “exemplifies a metapoetic competitiveness typical of Flavian epic.”²⁵³

Statius connects his stone-throwing episode with the war of the gods and the giants, further emphasizing the anteriority of his own hero. By assimilating Tydeus to earlier, gigantomachic themes,²⁵⁴ Statius gives the sense of his hero as a primordial force, one greater than his son and the other heroes of the *Iliad*. In a simile, Statius compares Tydeus fighting against his attackers to the Lapiths and Centaurs:

*dein toto sanguine nixus
sustinet, immanem quaerens librare ruinam
qualis in adversos Lapithas erexit inanem
magnanimus cratera Pholus*

Then striving with all his might, he raises and seeks to balance the monstrous bulk, like great-hearted Pholus hoisting an empty mixing bowl against his Lapith adversaries. (*Th.* 2.562-4)

By comparing Tydeus to a combatant in the war of the Lapiths and Centaurs, Statius associates

²⁵¹ Chaudhuri (2014) 196.

²⁵² *Id.* at 196-97.

²⁵³ *Id.* at 197.

²⁵⁴ On Gigantomachy in the *Thebaid*, see Lovatt (2005) 114-39. See also, Chaudhuri (2014) 195-230, for discussion of Gigantomachy both in Statius and in Silius Italicus. For more general discussion of gigantomachy in the Flavians, see Hardie (1993) 80.

this battle with primordial mythological antiquity.²⁵⁵ The simile reminds the reader that Tydeus is a sort of primordial force, more like to a god than to a man, a hero with more in common with Centaurs than with his less mighty son. Homer never employs the Gigantomachy as a comparandum in a simile. Statius compares Tydeus to a specific, and relatively obscure Centaur, Pholus who appears twice in the Vergilian corpus. He is mentioned in the *Aeneid* at the beginning of the Hercules and Cacus story, where Evander prays to Hercules in thanks for having slain Cacus. In his opening litany of exploits of Hercules, he lists the defeat of Pholus:

*tu, nubigenas, invicte, bimembris
Hylaeumque Pholumque manu.... mactas*

You, unconquerable one, you slew the cloud-born Centaurs, bi-formed Hylaeus and Pholus with your hand. (*Aen.* 8.293-4)

The verbal similarity is not so close here, and Pholus is undifferentiated as a victim of Hercules, but the passage does connect Tydeus with Hercules. The reference also reinforces the generational decline of heroes: Hercules belongs to an earlier generation than the seven against Thebes, and here we have Tydeus compared to an obscure Centaur who, according to Vergil, was killed by Hercules. Though Statius refers the Pholus as a great-hearted Centaur, he is nonetheless no match for Hercules, a member of the generation prior to that of Tydeus.

A closer verbal parallel to this simile comes in the second book of the *Georgics*, Vergil's so-called vituperation of the vine.²⁵⁶ Here, Vergil indicates that the vine is an inferior plant because of the extensive cultivation required to produce its fruits:

²⁵⁵ For the way in which Statius alludes to Ovid's version of the battles of the Lapiths and Centaurs here, see Parkes (2014).

²⁵⁶ Some earlier editors condemned this section on the grounds that it violated the perceived ideology of book 2 of the *Georgics*, that is the affirmation of the tenets of *labor*. This view is no longer widely held. See Thomas (1988) ad loc.

*Bacchus et ad culpam causas dedit; ille furentis
Centauros leto domuit, Rhoecumque Pholumque
et magno Hylaeum Lapithis cratera minantem*

Bacchus has even given occasion of offence. It was he who quelled in death the maddened Centaurs, Rhoetus, and Pholus, and Hylaeus, as he aimed his massive flagon at the Lapiths. (*Georg.* 2.455-7)

The parallelism of this scene with Statius' simile is quite close, as both feature Pholus, and a centaur aiming a wine flask at a Lapith.²⁵⁷ The connection to the vituperation of Bacchus adds to the scene a note of elemental madness, and adds the idea of primordial fury to Tydeus' attack on the fifty ambushing Cadmeians. The simile retrojects Tydeus into the world of myth, and still more amplifies his position as a force from an earlier age. This produces the effect of further indicating Tydeus' position as a hero of myth as opposed to his son, a hero of a heroic period.

Statius includes other references to Homeric heroes during the monomachy of Tydeus in order to suggest the superiority of Tydeus to those heroes. As the Cadmeians rush on to attempt to kill him, Statius describes him awaiting his attackers, undaunted by their onslaught:

*manet ille ruentes
angustus telis et inexpugnabilis obstat.*

He awaits the attackers, presenting a slim target to the spears, impregnable. (*Th.* 2.593-4)

This line recalls a moment from the sixteenth book of the *Iliad*.²⁵⁸ At that point in the narrative, the Greeks are being put to flight by the Trojans, who have gained the upper hand in the conflict.

Homer describes Ajax fleeing:

²⁵⁷ Pholus has a somewhat more prominent role in the *Metamorphoses*, where he fights in the battle of the Lapiths and Centaurs. Apollodorus relates a more elaborate version of his story, in which Heracles was staying with him on his way to recover the Erymanthian boar, and upon opening a bottle of wine, the Centaurs, smelling it, came and started a fight. In that fight, the inept Pholus meets his end by shooting an arrow into his own foot. *Apollodorus* 2.5.4.

²⁵⁸ Mulder (1954) ad loc.

‘Αἴας δ’ οὐκ ἔτ’ ἔμιμνε: βιάζετο γὰρ βελέεσσι:
 δάμνα μιν Ζηνός τε νόος καὶ Τρῶες ἀγαυοὶ
 βάλλοντες: δεινὴν δὲ περὶ κροτάφοισι φαεινὴ
 πῆληξ βαλλομένη καναχὴν ἔχε, βάλλετο δ’ αἰεὶ
 καπ φάλαρ’ εὐποίηθ’· ὃ δ’ ἀριστερόν ὦμον ἔκαμνε
 ἔμπεδον αἰὲν ἔχων σάκος αἰόλον: οὐδὲ δύναντο
 ἀμφ’ αὐτῷ πελεμίζαι ἐρείδοντες βελέεσσιν.

But Ajax no longer held his ground, for he was hard pressed with missiles; the mind of Zeus was subduing him as were the lordly Trojans with their missiles; and terribly did the bright helmet about his temples ring continually as it was struck, for it was constantly struck on the well-made cheekpieces, and his left shoulder grew weary as he ever firmly held his flashing shield; nor could they beat it back about him, though they pressed him hard with missiles. (*Il.* 16.102-108)

Statius evokes the Homeric moment, but where Ajax was fleeing, beaten down by the Trojan spears, Tydeus remains firm despite the many spears being hurled around him. Once again Statius shows the superiority of his hero to the Homeric models.

Statius presents Tydeus as a great and violent hero in Book 2 of the *Thebaid* and closely connects him with and compares him against Diomedes, Tydeus' own son, as presented in the full flower of his glory in Book 5 of the *Iliad*. Statius' subtle indications of Tydeus' superiority over Diomedes make a claim for the superiority of his own poem over Homer's. By portraying Tydeus in this way, Statius stakes a claim to being the poetic "father" of Homer, the proverbial "father of poetry". Statius' Tydeus provides a model for Homer's Diomedes, picking up on the statements of Agamemnon in the *Iliad*, suggesting Diomedes' inferiority to his father. In comparing the two episodes side-by-side, Tydeus emerges as the greater hero, and Statius emerges as the poetic progenitor of the events in the *Iliad*, which now appear to be a degraded imitation of the events Statius narrates in the *Thebaid*.

The Tydeus episode connects to the tendency of post-Virgilian epic towards extravagance and hyperbole.²⁵⁹ In Lucan, hyperbole had become a tool, by which Lucan strained “to express conceptually and grammatically the outrage” of the Civil War.²⁶⁰ By the Flavian period, this aspect of Lucan’s style had become *de rigour* in epic poetry, though less in the service of a poetics of outrage, and more in the service of a violent and pessimistic outlook.

The Flavian tendency to amplify and exaggerate often manifests itself through the motif of twinning or tripling.²⁶¹ One such example comes at the beginning of the war in Statius’ *Thebaid*. Statius closely follows and exaggerates the event which causes the war between the Trojan and Latins to break out in the *Aeneid*.²⁶² In the *Aeneid*, the war is instigated by Allecto. The fury finds Ascanius while he is hunting, and puts his hounds onto the scent of a stag, who, as it turns out, was domesticated and beloved of the household of Latinus.²⁶³ The slaying of the deer causes great anger among the partisans of Latinus, and the event results in the outbreak of the war. This event occurs in the seventh book of the *Aeneid*, just past the midpoint, and begins the war books of the poem.

²⁵⁹ For this tendency in Lucan, see Martindale (1976) 48; Masters (1992) 11-42.

²⁶⁰ Bartsch (2005) 496. As Bartsch further notes “[t]he poem is marked by a constant usage of paradox, catachresis, subject-object reversal, the inversion of ethical terminology, and the use of negatives to confound epic expectation.”

²⁶¹ Helen Lovatt has discussed this phenomenon in the games of both Silius Italicus and Statius, suggesting that Statius has re-doubled the games already once multiplied from Virgil to Silius Italicus: “Silius’ race resembles a straightforward race between the lead drivers of the four colors... Statius’ race is perhaps more like the sort of race in which each color ran two chariots, one of whom would act as pacemaker and strategic running mate for the other. Statius has doubled Silius’ version, and the language of doubling runs through the race... Virgil’s race is one continuum; Silius’ race comes in two parts; Statius multiplies his race into many races within the race.” Lovatt (2009) 172-73. See also Lovatt (2005) 23-39 on doubling in Statius’ games.

²⁶² Hershkowitz (1995) 61. Hershkowitz observes that in Book 7 of the *Thebaid*, Jupiter has lost control. Though he sends Mars to instigate the war, it is Tisiphone’s stirring up of the tigers that actually, finally sets the battle in motion. See also Simms (2004) 174-75.

²⁶³ *Aen.* 7.493ff. For interpretation see Hardie (2011) 103-104.

Statius closely imitates this scene, also situating it in the seventh book of his poem, but attempts to surpass it by using a more violent animal and a more engaged fury. Statius pointedly imitates Virgil's opening line of the episode. In introducing his stag, Virgil writes *errabat silvis rursusque ad limina nota* ("The stag used to wander in the woods, and back to its familiar door.") (*Aen.* 7.491) Statius has the slaying of a domestic animal also result in the breaking out of war, but instead of a stag, he uses a pair of tigers: *errabant geminae Dircaea ad flumina tigres* ("Twin tigresses were wandering by the waters of Dirce.") (*Th.* 7.564) Statius pointedly doubles a feature of Virgil's poetry: where there was only one stag, Statius' *Thebaid* will have two tigers. This doubling is emphasized by Statius' use of language. He starts the line with *errabant*, recalling Vergil's *errabat*, but giving emphasis to the changed plural nature of the phenomenon he is to describe. Next, he employs *geminae* to refer to the tigers; they are a doubling, or a twinning, of a feature of Virgil's work. In addition, the use of tigers rather than a stag adds an element of wildness and increases the stakes of the conflict. If we are to imagine the events of the *Thebaid* taking place before the events of the *Aeneid*, the *Aeneid*'s instigating event of the war seems to be a watered down imitation of the events of the *Thebaid*.

Statius' story of the tiger tracks Virgil's description of the stag closely.²⁶⁴ Virgil describes how the stag had been taken from its mother at birth and had been nurtured in the royal hunting grounds. The children of the groundskeeper of the royal hunting grounds had taken care of it and his daughter combed and bathed it. Statius' tigers similarly had come in from the wilds. Instead of being nurtured from birth by human hands, however, Statius' tigers had been rendered tame by Bacchus after his exploits in the east. Statius inverts the role of the divine intervention from Vergil. In Vergil, the fury had caused Ascanius' dogs to go wild at the scent of the stag. In

²⁶⁴ *Aen.* 7.475-539.

Statius, the wild and ferocious tigers are instead rendered tame by Bacchus. The problems begin when Tisiphone returns the tigers to their earlier state, causing them to become wild beasts once again. The tigers are cared for by the priest of Bacchus, who adorns them with vines and fillets. They wander from town to town and people and animals are not afraid of them. Where in Virgil, Allecto inspires the hounds of Ascanius to go after the beloved stag, in the *Thebaid*, Tisiphone inspires the tigers themselves. She restores them to their earlier, wilder state and causes them to attack Amphiaraus. Where Ascanius had attacked the stag in the *Aeneid*, in the *Thebaid*, it is the animals themselves that attack the human figure. In Statius, Aconteus, an accomplished hunter, saves Amphiaraus and kills the newly wild tigers. The denizens of the town let the tigers back into the city, where once again they act as domesticated tigers. Statius exaggerates the suffering of the town-dwellers to a fever pitch:

*templa putes urbemque rapi facibusque nefandis
 Sidonios ardere lares, sic clamor apertis
 exoritur muris; mallent cunabula magni
 Herculis aut Semeles thalamum aut penetrale ruisse
 Harmoniae.*

You might think that temples and city were being sacked and Sidonian homes aflame with wicked torches, such clamour rises from the opened walls. They had rather the cradle of great Hercules or Semele's bower of Harmonia's inner chamber had collapsed. (*Th*, 7.599-603)

The pathos evoked on behalf of the tigers significantly outstrips the level of misery that the Latins had suffered on behalf of the stag.²⁶⁵ Statius once again amplifies the events of the *Aeneid* in order to make the *Aeneid* seem a lesser version of the events of the *Thebaid*. The insistence on the greater degree of the events of the *Thebaid* coupled with their earlier position in time allows Statius to claim a primacy for his poem, despite the fact that in reality he is

²⁶⁵ For hyperbole and exaggeration in Statius, as well as Lucan, see Hardie (1993) 8-9, 95-96.

following on and imitating Vergil's poem rather than the other way around. Statius' version of the story of the wounded animal that instigates the war becomes a greater mythological model for the killing of the stag in *Aeneid* 7. The use of tigers instead of a stag further assimilates Statius' poem to mythological antiquity, by employing an animal who requires possession by a god in order to render her docile. The tigers tamed by Bacchus adds an additional level of antiquity to Statius' poem, distancing it from the *Aeneid* in time.

Numerical one-upmanship is also a feature of the Flavian poets. One example is the “ten tongues” motif, which goes back to Homer and is regularly amplified by Roman epic poets.²⁶⁶ Homer is the first recorded poet to use this trope, in the second book of the *Iliad*, when he writes that he could not enumerate all of the men who came to Troy, even if he had ten tongues, were it not for the help of the Muses.²⁶⁷ The Roman epic authors picked up this trope enthusiastically, and consistently increased the number of tongues. Ennius brought Homer's line into Latin, writing in the *Annales* while presumably introducing a catalogue, that he would not be able to

²⁶⁶ See Hinds (1998) 35-47.

²⁶⁷ *Il.* 2.488-90.

exhaust the subject, even if he had ten tongues.²⁶⁸ In his *Bellum Histricum*, Hostius amplified this number to 100.²⁶⁹ Vergil, following Hostius, kept the number at 100.²⁷⁰

Valerius Flaccus amplified the number yet again, increasing it from one hundred to one thousand:

*Verum ego nec numero memorem nec nomine cunctos
Mille vel ora movens*

Truly neither by number nor by name could I tell them all, had I even a thousand mouths. (*Argonautica* 6.36-7)

Valerius expands the number still further, offering the highest number in Latin epic with one thousand mouths.²⁷¹ Interestingly, Silius and Statius do not follow his lead by increasing the number further. Those two poets returned to one hundred. No poet of whom we are aware ever returned the number to ten. The ever increasing number is part of a general strategy of drawing “attention to the (relative) deficiencies of his epic predecessors.”²⁷²

A similar trope of one-upping occurs in the repeated use among the Flavians of the trope of slain twins. The slain twins motif is found in all three of the extant Flavian epic poems. Each

²⁶⁸ Skutsch (1985) fg. 561. *Non si lingua loqui saperet quibus, ora decem sint/in me, tum ferro cor sit pectusque reuinctum* (“Not if I had ten mouths with which my tongue could have sense to speak, and my heart and breast were encased in iron.”). The context of the fragment is uncertain. Skutsch, ad loc., writes: “The fragment clearly introduces a major section of the poem. Timpanaro tentatively advanced the idea that, connected as its Homeric model with an invocation of the Muse(s), it introduced, again as its Homeric model, a catalogue of warriors.” As Courtney (2003) writes, however, “in Homer and Val. Fl. This introduces a catalogue of warriors, but it could also lead up to a heroic exploit defying description, as at Sil. It. 4.525ff.” 53.

²⁶⁹ Courtney (2003) 53, Hostius fg. 3. *Non si mihi linguae/centum atque ora sient totidem uocesque liquatae* (“Not if I had one hundred tongues, and as many mouths, and voices clear.”). The context of this fragment is again unclear.

²⁷⁰ *Non, mihi linguae centum sint oraque centum/ferrea vox, omnis scelerum comprehendere formas/omnia poenarum percurrere nomina possim* (“Not if I had a hundred tongues and a hundred mouths, and a voice of iron could I cover all of the forms of evil deeds and go through all the names of the punishments.”). *Aeneid* 6.625-27.

²⁷¹ See Fucecchi (2004) 90-94; Demeretz (2014) 67-68.

²⁷² Demeretz (2014) 68.

scene recalls the slain twins episode of *Aeneid* 10, while simultaneously meditating on poetic immortality for dead warriors, a concept whose most important articulation comes with the deaths of Nisus and Euryalus in *Aeneid* 8. The slain twins motif undergoes numerical amplifications in all three of the Flavian epic poets, from Valerius to Silius to Statius.

The original scene portraying the deaths of twins at the same time comes in the tenth book of the *Aeneid*. The scene is relatively short, occupying only seven lines, and comes in the middle of extensive battle description. No thoughts about poetic fame are included, unlike, as we shall see, they are in all three of the Flavian poets:

*Vos etiam, Gemini, Rutulis ceditistis in arvis,
Daucia, Laride Thymerque, simillima proles,
Indiscrete suis gratusque parentibus error;
At nunc dura dedit vobis discrimina Pallas.
Nam tibi, Thymbre, caput Evandrius abstulit ensis;
Te decisa suum, Laride, dextera quaerit
Seminanimesque micant digiti ferrumque retractant.*

You twin brothers, too, fell on Rutulian plains, Larides and Thymber, sons of Daucus, most like in semblance, indistinguishable to kindred, and to their own parents a sweet perplexity. But now Pallas has made a grim difference between you. For your head, Thymber, Evander's sword swept off; while your severed hand, Larides, seeks its master, and the dying fingers twitch and clutch again at the sword.

Vergil's scene is pathetic and violent, reminding the reader of the relationship between the two warriors and their parents (a long standing epic trope going back to Homer), and emphasizing the gruesome violence of the scene. These features will be amplified by later poets, who imitate the scene.

For Statius, the theme of slain twins has an added significance, as the simultaneous fratricide of Polynices and Eteocles will ultimately form the climax of his poem. The theme thus stands in the backdrop of the central theme of the poem. As Braund writes, "what Thebes offers

above all is a chance to ponder origins-in-fratricide, by aligning the story of the conflict between Romulus and Remus with Theban fraternal conflict.”²⁷³ Statius presents the reader with sets of slain twins multiple times in the *Thebaid*. That the subject of his poem will be, at the very least, battles fought among family members is announced already in the first two words of the poem, *fraternas acies* “brotherly battle lines” (*Thebaid* 1.1).²⁷⁴ The first example comes towards the end of book 2, when Eteocles sends a fifty-man ambush to kill Tydeus after his ambassadorial mission to Thebes. Two brother, the sons of Thespius die at Tydeus’ hand during the violence that follows the ambush. Statius introduces the passage in the language of poetic fame that recalls the deaths of Nisus and Euryalus:

*Vos quoque, Thespiadae, cur infitatus honora
arcuerim fama?*

You too, sons of Thespius, why should I deny and keep you from honorable fame? (*Thebaid* 2.629-30)

This introduction connects Statius’ presentation of the dead set of brothers to the already established epic trope. His meditation on the fame of the dead brothers recall the dead lovers Nisus and Euryalus.²⁷⁵ Meanwhile, Statius amplifies the piteousness of the trope by emphasizing the fact that the two twins were impaled upon the same spear, a detail not included in the Virgilian version of the episode. This point is further emphasized in Statius’ aftermath of the battle. Book 3 of the *Thebaid* begins with the inhabitants of Thebes finding their loved ones dead on the rocky declivity where Tydeus killed them all. The mother of the twins, Ide, (now

²⁷³ Braund (2006) 267.

²⁷⁴ For the poem’s proem, see, for instance, Ganiban (2007) 44-46.

²⁷⁵ On the Nisus and Euryalus episode, see Reed (2007) 16-43.

described as *magna parens iuvenum, gemini nunc funeris, Ide* “Ide, great mother of sons, now of twin corpses, (*Thebaid* 3.134)”), finds her dead children and delivers a speech full of pathetic emotion. She concludes with a reference to the fact that the two children will not receive their due measure of fame on account of their battle having been fought at night, and laments the loss of both of them:

*...sed nec bellorum in luce patenti
Conspicui fatis aeternaque gentibus ausi
Quaesistis miserae vulnus memorabile matri
Sed mortem obscuram numerandaque funera passi,
Heu quantus furto cruor et sine laude iacetis!
Quin ego non dextras miseris complexibus ausim
Dividere et tanti consortia rumpere leti:
Ite diu fratres indiscretique supremis
Ignibus et caros urna confundite manes.*

But not in the open light of battle, conspicuous in your fate and daring deeds to live in the memory of nations, did you seek a wound for a grieving mother to tell of; you suffered a fameless end, a death for numbering, lying, alas, in so much blood stealthily, with none to praise. Nay, I dare not separate your hands locked in pitiful embrace and break the union of such a passing. Go, long be brothers, unsevered in the final pyre, and mingle your fond ashes in the urn. (*Thebaid* 3.160-168)

Statius’ rendition of the speech here amplifies the pathos of Vergil’s slain twins scene. Vergil represents the twins as distinguishable now in death as a result of the difference in their wounds. For Statius, the twins remain indistinguishable. Impaled on the same spear, the two twins are as identical in their fatal injuries as they are in their appearances. Further, the words of the twins mother seem to contradict the words of Statius’ authorial voice, which previously had requested a lasting reputation for the subjects of his verse. Ide insists that the twins have lost their measure of potential fame by losing their lives at night, rather than fighting their fight in the open light of day. Finally, the indistinguishable twins are forecast to be mingled in the urn, remaining indistinguishable even after the cremation of their bodies. Through these various

techniques, Statius amplifies the horror and the pathos of Vergil's slain twins episode.²⁷⁶ In doing so, he attempts to supplant Vergil's version of this epic trope, creating a version that is superior on account of its greater violence and more significant emotional impact. Statius' version surpasses his model through the amplification and exaggeration of the pathos of the scene.

Silius Italicus amplifies the trope of the slain twins still further, in perhaps the most obvious way: by inventing the death of a set of triplets. The fourth book of the *Punica*, in which this event takes place, narrates the battle of Ticinus. In the midst of the battle, we are introduced to a set of triplets, the children of a Spartan father and a Carthaginian mother. They are introduced as dreaming of the glory of an earlier generation of Spartans who captured Regulus and to visit Sparta, which they themselves have never seen. As in Vergil and Statius, the ambition for fame is strongly thematized in the episode of slain twins. We learn a few verses on that their names are Eumachus, Critias and Xanthippus. But, in a pathetic note typical of such dead siblings scenes, Silius notes that this visit was not to be:

*sed Spartam penetrare deus fratresque negarunt
Ausonii, totidem numero... (Punica 4.365-366)*

But the gods and Ausonian brothers of the same number denied them an entrance into Sparta.

They join battle with the three Romans, Virbius, Capys, and Albanus. In a bloody scene, Critias kills Albanus and Eumachus kills Capys, leaving Virbius alone against the three Greek triplets. He kills Xanthippus with his sword and Eumachus with his spear. Finally, Virbius and Critias drive their spears through one another at the same moment, concluding the battle, and leaving

²⁷⁶ For further discussion of the significance of the both the repetition of the names and of the names of the minor characters of these scenes more generally, see Hulls (2006).

both sets of triplets dead on the field. The version performs a double amplification of the dead twin motif. It increases the number of siblings from twins to triplets, and it performs a second doubling by involving two sets of triplets, rather than the single set of slain twins that we saw in Vergil and in Statius. Silius' version thus attempts to surpass Statius' and Vergil's in both these ways.

Silius apostrophizes the six dead men with a speech strongly reminiscent of the motif as we have seen it elsewhere:

*felices leti, pietas quos addidit umbris!
optabunt similes venientia saecula fratres,
aeternumque decus memori celebrabitur aevo,
si modo ferre diem serosque videre nepotes
carmina nostra valent, nec famam invidit Apollo.*

Fortunate in death were they, whom love of kin and country sent down to join the dead! Coming ages will pray for brethren like them, and their undying fame shall be forever remembered, if only my verse has power to endure and see a distant posterity, and if Apollo has not begrudged me fame. (*Punica* 4.396-400)

Silius has amplified the trope to its next logical step. Instead of the dead twins whom we find in Statius and Valerius Flaccus, Silius gives us sets of triplets doing battle against one another, and ultimately killing each other, all six meeting their untimely end. Here, the effort seems to be directed purely at surpassing a literary example. The only effect of this expansion of twins to triplets is to one-up the dead twin scenes of Statius and Valerius, and also the Nisus and Euryalus scenes of *Aeneid* 8. The section also could have been a vague reminiscence of the early Roman myth of the Horatii and the Curii. However, Silius' retelling diverges from that story in the important detail that no one of the triplets survives victorious. The episode is simply an amplification of the carnage found in earlier poets.

The one-upmanship of the Flavian poets can be connected to the illusion of primacy. By retrojecting their stories into the mythological past, and imitating scenes from earlier poets, the scenes in the earlier poets appear to be inferior or lesser versions of the episodes in the newer poets. Rather than seeming to be the amplified versions of earlier poets, the episodes in the Flavian poets become the originals for later copies. In doing so, Statius and the other Flavians claim superiority through primacy on the axis of narrative time.

Another technique suggesting the inferiority of earlier poets is the way in which Statius “corrects” earlier poets through the scholia. Statius does this in a number of places – here I will only treat one example for the purpose of conserving space. Because the events of Statius’ poem come earlier than those in the Homeric poems, his primacy along the axis of narrative time makes his episodes a model for the Homeric versions, which become muddled through their later position and their accentuated inconsistencies of narrative.

One example of this strategy comes during Statius's adaptation of the Teichoscopeia of *Iliad* 3. The Teichoscopeia is one of the best-known scenes of the *Iliad*. The episode comes as the two opposing armies prepare to do battle for the first time in the narrative of the *Iliad*. After the Greek and Trojan forces have arrayed on the plain in preparation for battle, an event which makes up much of the second book of the poem, the beginning of the third book of the *Iliad* concerns the events which inspire Menelaus and Paris to fight in single combat for Helen and to bring the war to a peaceful conclusion. After this fight is set in motion, the scene shifts to Troy, where Iris inspires Helen to step out onto the Trojan walls. On the wall, Helen sits down with Priam, who asks her about a particular Greek hero on the plain:

ὅς τις ὅδ’ ἐστὶν Ἀχαιοὺς ἀνὴρ ἧῶς τε μέγας τε.
ἦτοι μὲν κεφαλῇ καὶ μείζονες ἄλλοι ἔασι,
καλὸν δ’ οὕτω ἐγὼν οὐ πω ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσιν,

οὐδ' οὕτω γεραρόν: βασιλῆϊ γὰρ ἀνδρὶ ἔοικε.

Tell me who that great warrior is, that tall and powerful Achaean. There are others taller, true, but I have never seen so handsome or so regal a man, every inch a king. (*Il.*167-70)

Helen informs him that the hero is Agamemnon. Priam then proceeds to ask about other various heroes, while Helen answers who each one of them is.

This scene has caused scholarly consternation since antiquity, as readers are often perplexed as to why Priam is ignorant of the names and appearances of the Greek heroes. After ten years of fighting, one could reasonably assume that Priam would know the names and faces of the Greek principals. The A-scholiast reasonably inquires on line 166:

ἐζήτῃται πῶς ὁ Πρίαμος τῷ δεκάτῳ ἔτει;
Why does Priam ask in the tenth year?

Why, if Priam has been observing the events of the Trojan War for the last nine years, does he need to ask Helen who the Greek heroes are? At this point, the Trojan king should know who all of the Greek kings and warriors are. There has been a great deal of scholarly discussion, both ancient and modern, on this point.²⁷⁷

Both the T- and A-scholiasts offer the rather feeble explanation that Priam cannot recognize the Greek heroes because they are dressed in their armor, but that Helen, knowing the armor of the Greeks, can. One would assume that by the tenth year Priam would be able to recognize the major figures of the Greek side by armor as well as by visage.²⁷⁸ This weak explanation is still further undermined by the fact that there are few references to the armor of

²⁷⁷ See Kirk (1985) ad loc. Also Schönberger (1960), Reckford (1964), Lendle (1968), Clader (1976), Tsargarakis (1982), Postlethwaite (1985). For an effort to explain the episode through the Indo-European comparative method with reference to Indic texts, see Jamison (1994).

²⁷⁸ Bowra (1952) 313: "The appropriate time for this was certainly before the general slaughter began at the start, when it would have saved much trouble to have the issue settled by the two men for whom the war was fought."

the Greek heroes in the course of the Teichoscopeia, and one even directly contradicts this explanation. Priam asks about a man whom Helen reveals to be Odysseus:

Τεύχεα μὲν οἱ κεῖται ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ
Αὐτὸς δὲ κτίλος ὥς ἐπιπωλεῖται στίχας ἀνδρῶν

His battle gear lies upon the bounteous earth, but himself he ranges like the bell-weather of a herd through the ranks of the warriors. (*Il.* 3.195-6)

Odysseus is not wearing his armor here, so surely the explanation of the T- and A-scholiasts is insufficient. Priam would be able to see him, and indeed says so explicitly. Whatever truly prompted Homer to include the scene of the Teichoscopia, it is not readily apparent from the text of the poem, nor are the explanations offered by the scholiasts especially appealing. The reader of the scholiasts is left unsatisfied by the solutions presented by the scholiasts in explanation of Homer's apparent error.

Statius, in imitating the scene of the Teichoscopia, corrects Homer's apparent mistake. In the seventh book of the *Thebaid*, as the war between Polynices and Eteocles is about to begin, Statius has Antigone and Phorbas, her *paedagogus*, climb to the top of a Theban tower to look over the assembled troops. The roles of the young woman and the old man are in this case reversed: the young Antigone asks the old *paedagogus*, who once was Laius' armor-bearer (...*quo Laius ibat armigero* "with whom Laius used to go as armor-bearer") to tell her who the assembled heroes on the Argive side are.²⁷⁹

Dic, o precor, extera regum
Agmina;
Tell me, I pray, of the foreign kings and their troops. (*Th.* 7.249-50)

²⁷⁹ *Th.* 7.245-6

By indicating that the *paedagogus* was at one time Laius' armor-bearer, Statius provides a rationale for Phorbas' knowledge of the warriors on the opposing side. In addition, by switching the roles of the Priam figure and the Helen figure, Statius establishes a situation in which one character asks the other out of genuine ignorance. The episode is a flipped Homeric episode, but one whose flipped nature produces a more sensible version of the story than the original. Upon completion of her speech, Statius explicitly indicates that Antigone asks Phorbas about the Argive heroes out of ignorance.

Sic rudis Antigone, senior cui talia Phorbas
So ignorant Antigone, to whom thus old Phorbas replies: (*Th.* 7.253)

Unlike Homer, Statius presents the reader with a clear reason for the enumeration of the heroes to be given by a character on the wall: Antigone does not know who the people on the plain are, in contrast to Priam, who properly should have, if the narrative is to make sense.

Statius continues to have Phorbas enumerate who each of the primary combatants on the plain are. Further, he indicates who many of them are on the basis of the appearance of their armor. This move seems to be in direct response to the comments of the scholiasts, who indicate that Helen knows who the Greek heroes are on the basis of their armor. Where this explanation does not fully satisfy for a reading of the *Iliad*, in the case of the *Thebaid*, Statius makes clear that the characters, and the groups that follow them, can be identified by their various accoutrements. The following is his description of Dryas, the first of the heroes whose appearance he describes:

Hic, cui nivea arma tridentem
Atque auro rude fulmen habent, Orionis alti
Non falsus virtute nepos:

His [Dryas'] snow-white shield bears a trident and a rude thunderbolt in gold. He is the grandson (and his valour attests it) of tall Orion. (*Th.* 7.255-257)

Dryas is recognizable by his weapons, as is next Eurymedon with his pastoral arms and his horsehair crest. Next we hear of a group from Schoenos who brandish ashen pikes, then of "they whose young harvest Haliartos grudges," who carry rude tree trunks and wear the faces of lions as helments and use treefolds as shields. These are led by Amphion, who, as Statius, through Phorbas, tells us, is easy to recognize thanks to his arms:

*Hos regis egenos
Amphion en noster agit (cognoscere pronum,
Virgo), lyra galeam tauroque insignis avito.*

As they lack a king, see, our Amphion leads them (he is easy to recognize, maiden), his helm conspicuous with lyre and ancestral bull. (*Th.* 7.277-279)

Here, Statius almost seems to playfully mock the controversy of Homer's Teichoscopeia. Statius has his Phorbas note as an aside that Amphion is "easy to recognize". This line perhaps digs at Homer for his indications that Priam could not recognize the men of the Greek side.

Statius' Teichoscopia thus corrects the perceived error of Homer's Teichoscopia, in which Homer fails to indicate why, in the tenth year of the war, Priam would ask Helen who the Greek heroes are. Statius makes clear why Phorbas is explaining who the assembled warriors on the plain are to Antigone: she does not know who they are. Statius also picks up on the scholiasts suggestion about Homer's Teichoscopia, that Priam asks who the heroes are, because he does not recognize them armed. In Statius' version, he makes armor the identifying token of who each of the heroes are, thus making explicit a notion that scholars had used to save Homer from the criticism of composing a ridiculous passage.

Flavian poets also contest primacy with their predecessors by invoking them directly, either as addressees or as characters within the narratives of their poems. Flavian epic poetry includes direct invocations of previous epic poets in the poems. Earlier Latin poets, such as Lucretius and Ennius, had discussed earlier poets by name in their poems, and Vergil, too, had features Musaeus and Orpheus in his depiction of the Underworld. In the Flavian poets, earlier epic poets become characters or addresses within the narrative of the poem. Silius Italicus brings Ennius on the battlefield in the *Punica*, while Statius concludes the *Thebaid* with an address to his poem, encouraging it not to try to surpass the *Aeneid*. This strategy has important implications for the dynamics of the illusion of primacy in the Roman epic tradition. Silius Italicus, by aligning himself with Ennius and Homer, attempts to assert for himself a similar position of primacy to that held by those two authors. Statius, on the other hand, calls attention to the anteriority of his subject relative to the subject of the *Aeneid*. Both authors, through their ostensible praise of their poetic predecessors, attempt to contest their position within the literary tradition.

Silius Italicus, whose *Punica* recounts the events of the Second Punic War, makes Ennius and Homer characters within his own poem.²⁸⁰ In the thirteenth book of the *Punica*, Scipio descends to the underworld, where he sees the ghost of Homer, followed by a crowd of shades (*laeto clamore frequentant*).²⁸¹ Scipio asks his guide who this soul is, noting that he would seem to be a god, were he not in Hades: *si Stygia non esset in umbra/dixissem facile esse deum* (“were

²⁸⁰ For the influence of Ennius on Silius Italicus, see Matier (2014). For discussion of these two episodes, see Tipping (2010) 195-197. Silius’ *Punica* has long been the subject of derision from scholars and critics. For a revaluation, see Tipping (2010) 1: “Silius Italicus’ *Punica* should be *the* example of Roman epic, glorifying hard-won victory over an external enemy at the height of the republic, between the legendary beginnings that Virgil traces in the *Aeneid* and the decline into civil war that Lucan laments in the *De bello civili*.”

²⁸¹ *Punica* 13.783. For Silius and Homer generally, see Juhnke (1972), Ripoll (2001), and Klaassen (2009).

he not in the darkness of Hades, I should have said confidently that he was a god.”).²⁸² His guide responds that the ghost was the rival of the Muses and of Apollo.²⁸³ She concludes by noting that Homer raised Troy’s fame to the stars – and that thus proleptically he raised the fame of Rome: *ac vestram tulit usque ad sidera Troiam* (“and he raised your [city] Troy to the stars”).²⁸⁴

The prolepsis here aligns Silius Italicus with Homer. The idea that Homer raised the glory of Rome to the stars because he told the story of the fall of Troy is a highly attenuated claim. It would require later poets, such as Silius himself, to establish Roman fame. In fact, the language recalls the opening line of Silius’ poem: *ordior arma, quibus caelo se gloria tollit/Aeneadum* (“I arrange the arms, by which the glory of the descendants of Aeneas lifted itself to the sky.”).²⁸⁵ In this line, Silius is casting himself in the same position in which he cast his Homer in the later journey to the underworld – as the celebrator of Roman accomplishments.

Indeed, after learning that he is looking at the ghost of Homer, Scipio regrets that Homer did not have the chance to tell of Roman achievements, rather than merely Greek ones:

*Si nunc fata darent, ut Romula facta per orbem
Hic caneret vates, quanto maiora futuros
Facta eadem intrarent hoc,” inquit, “teste nepotes!
Felix Aeacide, cui tali contigit ore
Gentibus ostendi! Crevit tua carmine virtus*

If Fate would suffer this poet now to sing of Roman achievements, for all the world to hear, how much deeper an impression the same deeds would make upon posterity, if Homer testified to them! How fortunate was Achilles, when such a poet displayed him to the world! The hero was made greater by the poet’s verse. (*Punica* 13.793-797).

²⁸² *Punica* 13.784-85.

²⁸³ *Punica* 13.789.

²⁸⁴ *Punica* 13.791.

²⁸⁵ *Punica* 1.1.

Scipio's lament recalls Alexander the Great's famous complaint that he had no Homer to celebrate his exploits.²⁸⁶ However, the sentiment also has an ironical valence in a poem that claims to raise Roman exploits to the stars. It is possible that Silius intends a genuine self-deprecation in this moment, suggesting that his poem would be better had it been written by Homer. Silius also, however, means to cast himself in the role of the Homer that Scipio does not have.

Silius' remark here also contrasts himself with Ennius, as Ennius too had traversed this subject matter. In fact, Ennius had covered the Second Punic War twice, treating it both in the *Annales*, as well as his *Scipio*, a panegyric poem celebrating the achievements of Scipio Africanus. By having Scipio remark that he had no Homer, Silius also intends a barb toward Ennius, who had celebrated Scipio's achievements twice, and during his own lifetime. In fact, Silius had already invoked Ennius by name in the *Punica*, giving Scipio's statement here added heft. Earlier in the poem, Silius had written Ennius himself into the poem as a character, presenting him as a fighter in the war. Scipio's remark thus calls attention to Silius' attempt to replace Ennius as the canonical epic poem for the events of the Second Punic War.²⁸⁷

Silius's Ennius episode occurs in the twelfth book of the *Punica*, during Silius' description of the war in Sardinia.²⁸⁸ Beginning by noting that he could not find the words to describe the battle, Silius asks Calliope for the ability to pass the fame of Ennius down through the ages:

²⁸⁶ For more on Homer in Silius' *nekyia*, see Manuwald (2007) 82-87.

²⁸⁷ For discussion of a similar dynamic between Petrarch and Ennius in Petrarch's composition of his *Africa*, see generally Suerbaum (1972).

²⁸⁸ *Punica* 12.342-419.

*Sed vos, Calliope, nostro donate labori,
Nota parum magni longo traduntur ut aevo
Facta viri, et meritum vati sacremus honorem.*

But grant me this, Calliope, in reward of my pains – that I may hand down to long ages the noble deeds, too little known, of a great man, and crown the poet’s brow with the wreath he deserves. (*Punica* 12.390-392).

While Silius’ stated posture here is reverential towards Ennius, the poet also seems to suggest that Ennius has now been forgotten. Both Ennius’ deeds in the Second Punic War and his poem have been forgotten, and now the man is “too little known.” The reference thus seems to suggest that Silius now has a chance to become the definitive poem on the Second Punic War, because the *Annales* have been forgotten by time.

In his Ennius episode, Silius also refers to Ennius as the first Roman epic poet. In Silius’ telling, one Hostus attempts to kill Ennius with the cast of a spear.²⁸⁹ Apollo prevents the spear from striking Ennius, and addresses Hostus.²⁹⁰ He states that the spear cannot strike Ennius, because Ennius is destined to become a great poet celebrating these events. Silius’ Apollo indicates specifically that Ennius will be the first: *hic canet inlustri primus bella Itala uersu* (“This man first will sing of Italian wars in distinguished verse.”).²⁹¹ Silius thus picks up upon Ennius’ claim in the *Annales* to have been the first among the Roman poets. At the same time, however, his later remark discussed above indicating that Ennius has been forgotten creates a new dynamic space for Silius to carve out a place for originality for himself.

²⁸⁹ *Punica* 12.404-405.

²⁹⁰ *Punica* 12.407-413.

²⁹¹ *Punica* 12.410.

The episode points to Silius as a new, third beginning.²⁹² By invoking Ennius, the reincarnation of Homer, and then by presenting the ghost of Homer during Scipio's *katabasis*, Silius positions himself in the line of reincarnated epic poets. By suggesting that the *Annales* have been forgotten, Silius indicates that the space is open for a new epic on the subject. By positioning himself as a new Ennius, Silius seeks, in turn, to take from Ennius the mantle of the Roman Homer that Ennius had notably claimed for himself. As Manuwald has written of Silius' interaction with Vergil, Ennius, and Homer, Silius "accepts [the] existence [of his predecessors] by casting them in the role of founders, who have a position in their own right."²⁹³ By subsuming the poets into his poem as actors in the action of his poem, Silius can stake a claim to doing something new and subsumptive.

Like Silius, Statius directly invokes Latin predecessors over the course of his poem. While Silius aligned himself with Homer and Ennius, respective founders of their traditions, Statius invokes Vergil as his model. Over the course of the *Thebaid*, in addition to dozens of allusions, Statius cites Vergil's poem twice explicitly. In the *Thebaid*, however, Statius takes a dramatically different world-view from the surface reading of the *Aeneid*. The *Thebaid* presents a dark and grim world governed by tyrants and where *pietas*, the primary moral value in the *Aeneid*, is inoperative and leads to negative consequences. The *Thebaid* picks up Lucan's bitter critique of the *Aeneid* and retrojects it back into the world of Greek mythology, telling a story that predates Vergil's, and sets up his own characters as models for the characters in the *Aeneid*.²⁹⁴ Statius' world, however, is far darker and more sinister than the world of the *Aeneid*.

²⁹² See Hinds (1998) 63-74. See also Tipping (2010) 195-197, who points to the exemplary valences of the episode.

²⁹³ Manuwald (2007) 89.

²⁹⁴ Heslin (2015) 519-20: "[Statius] creates a world every bit as cruel and indifferent to human suffering as Lucan's; it could never be considered a return to Vergilian certainty. Yet at the same time it is a world, like that of Lucan's

The poem amplifies negative Vergilian themes, such as civil war, violence, and anger, and makes itself the model for the more subdued world of the *Aeneid*. Statius consistently rewrites Vergilian scenes to make them darker, more cynical, and more horrifying. This process makes Statius' poem into a Vergilian overlay, constantly darkening the tone of Vergil's *Aeneid*. The *Thebaid* reinterprets the *Aeneid*, and presents itself as a companion to the poem that changes the originals meaning.²⁹⁵

Vergil provides Statius with his most explicit model for his *Thebaid*. At the conclusion of the epic, Statius addresses his poem and encourages it to always remain in awe of Vergil's poem:

*Vive, precor; nec tu diuinam Aeneida tempta,
Sed longe sequere et uestigia semper adora.*

Live on, I pray, and do not compete with the divine *Aeneid*. Rather follow at a distance and always revere its footprints. (*Th.* 816-7)

These lines have inspired a great deal of commentary.²⁹⁶ On their face, they seem to represent a modest confession of the *Thebaid*'s inferiority, and the unimpeachable merit of the *Aeneid*.²⁹⁷

More recent assessments have interpreted the lines as commentary on belatedness, or as ironic. I suggest here that Statius intends here to inextricably link his poem with the *Aeneid*, and vice-

Cato, in which human choices are not futile; where the same mistakes are not destined to be repeated eternally. Statius does this, moreover, in a way that makes clear that this darker vision was always part of the *Aeneid*."

²⁹⁵ See the work of Ganiban (2007), who argues that the failure of *pietas* in the *Thebaid* is the prime message of the poem vis-à-vis the *Aeneid*.

²⁹⁶ See Micozzi (2015) 341 n.61 for bibliography on Statius' epilogue. As she correctly writes (341): "Comparing a literary work with works by previous authors encourages the view of the epic tradition as a continuum from which the poet would never exclude himself: in the epilogue Statius takes up position (*sic*) with pride on the place occupied by the *Thebaid* in that *lignée*. He mentions Vergil's *Aeneid* and declares that his *Thebaid* is to follow its path reverently. This apparent admission of modesty, this "to follow" Vergil, attests to his determined wish to ratify his own inclusion among the classics,"

²⁹⁷ See Bernstein (2015) 143: "Statius' postures as bereaved son and apprehensive father, calculated contrasts to the traditional discourse of literary kinship, call attention to the challenge that the poet faces in taking up his belated position in the epic canon."

versa. Where the *Aeneid* goes, the *Thebaid* will follow as a sort of companion piece that will always color the interpretation of the *Aeneid*. Though as a work of literature, the *Thebaid* has the *Aeneid* as its model, the *Aeneid*, since its events take place later than those of the *Thebaid*, becomes modeled on the *Thebaid*, and its episodes take on new meanings when compared with the similar episodes in the *Thebaid*. Despite the apparent modesty of the concluding lines of the *Thebaid*, Statius' words usher his poem into the pantheon of the greatest works of literature, and bestow upon his own poem the poetic immortality frequently hoped for by Latin poets for their works.

Statius' self-deprecation in these final lines is further complicated by his statement about the *Thebaid* in the *Silvae*. Eulogizing his father, Statius writes:

*Te nostra magistro
Thebais urgebat priscorum exordia uatum.*

Under your guidance my *Thebaid* pressed hard upon the works of the ancient poets. (*Silv.* 5.3.233-4)

Rather than the picture of the subordinate *Thebaid* holding off at a distance from the *Aeneid*, here we see it pressing on the *Aeneid*'s heels, striving to step ahead of it and surpass it.²⁹⁸ Though Statius offers apparent modesty in the final lines of the *Thebaid*, his statements elsewhere complicate what he says about Vergil.

The context of the concluding lines of the *Thebaid* assimilate the *Thebaid* to the *Aeneid*. Statius states that he had toiled on his work for twelve years (*o mihi bisseos multum uigilata per annos Thebai?* "my *Thebaid*, on whom I have toiled through the night for twelve years?" *Th.* 12.811-2), the same number of years for which Virgil allegedly worked on the *Aeneid*. Statius

²⁹⁸ Nugent (1996) 70 calls this "perhaps the most explicit intertextual reference in Latin epic."

also configures his epic as having a relationship to the *princeps* in a form identical to that of Virgil: *iam te magnanimus dignatur noscere Caesar* “already great-hearted Caesar deigns to know you” (*Th.* 12.814). Further, the *Thebaid* follows in the *Aeneid*’s footsteps in a number of structural ways that are clear to the reader having just finished the poem. The *Thebaid* has the same number of books as the *Aeneid*, falling roughly into “Odyssean” and “Iliadic” halves: The first half of the poem consists of various journeys and “delays” which precede the war, while the second half consists of the climactic battle.²⁹⁹

While the *Thebaid* models itself closely on its Virgilian predecessor, Statius’ poem presents a far bleaker view of the world than does the *Aeneid*, one in which the moral virtues of the *Aeneid* are shown to be inadequate. In particular, the *pietas* of Aeneas, his prime moral characteristic in the poem, is subverted at every turn in the *Thebaid*.³⁰⁰ It is the contention of this section that the *Thebaid* overcomes its belatedness in relation to the *Aeneid* by subverting the poem and presenting itself as a sort of shadow-poem, a ghost that will haunt the *Aeneid* and its readers. With the *Thebaid* always following the *Aeneid* as its eternal companion piece, readers will never be able to take the *Aeneid* at its face value again. The *Thebaid*, with its close structural imitation of the *Aeneid*, provides an overlay for the *Aeneid*, which is layered over the top of the poem and is inextricable from the poem, once produced and read. New layers of meaning are introduced to the *Aeneid* through the *Thebaid*, and each become incomprehensible without the other.

²⁹⁹ For Book I-VI as various forms of delay that prevent the reader from reaching the battle, see Lovatt (2005) 1-23.

³⁰⁰ Ganiban (2007), who argues that the inoperability of the *pietas* of the *Aeneid* forms the central theme of the *Thebaid*.

Statius makes this point during episodes of the *Thebaid* modeled on episodes from Vergil. One explicit example comes from his Hopleur and Dymas episode, which is closely modelled on the Nisus and Euryalus episode from book 9 of the *Aeneid*. In that famous episode, the friends Nisus and Euryalus go out from the blockaded Trojan camp in order to try to bring Aeneas back. The Rutulians capture them and kill Euryalus. Nisus chooses to attempt to exact revenge for his comrade's death rather than escape, which results in his death as well. Rounding off the scene, Vergil yokes the future fame of this pair to the future of the Roman principate:

*Fortunati ambo! Si quid mea carmina possunt,
Nulla dies umquam memori vos eximet aevo
Dum domus Aeneae Capitoli immobile saxum
Accolet imperiumque pater Romanus habebit.*

Happy pair! If my poetry has the power, while the House of Aeneas lives beside the Capitol's immobile stone, and a Roman leader rules the Empire, no day will raze you from time's memory. (*Aen.* 9.446-9)

Nisus and Euryalus will remain famous as long as the power of the Roman state endures. Vergil joins the fame of his own poetry, the memory of Nisus and Euryalus, and the power of the Roman Empire together into a single unified entity.

Statius' adaptation of the episode follows Vergil's version closely. Hopleur and Dymas venture out at night in an attempt to recover the bodies of the leaders Tydeus and Parthenopaeus, both killed in the previous day's fighting. They manage to get the bodies, but are intercepted by the Thebans on their way back to the Argive camp. The Thebans kill Hopleur on the spot, but Dymas resists until the Thebans cut off his hand. They then offer Dymas a deal: he can keep his

life if he betrays the Argives. Dymas refuses and kills himself.³⁰¹ Statius finishes with a four-line coda that closely imitates Vergil's four-line coda to the Nisus and Euryalus episode:

*Vos quoque sacrati, quamvis mea carmina surgant
Inferiore lyra, memores superabitis annos.
Forsitan et comites non aspernabitur umbras
Euryalus Phrygiique admittet gloria Nisi.*

You too will be revered and outlive the years that remember, although my poems rise from an inferior lyre. And perhaps Euryalus will not scorn your shades as comrades, and the glory of Phrygian Nisus will welcome you. (*Theb.* 10.445-8)

As if the reader had not already recognized the similarities between the stories of Hopleus and Dymas and Nisus and Euryalus, Statius explicitly names the two Vergilian characters.³⁰² Statius once again here seems to offer a self-deprecating assessment of his own work,³⁰³ but simultaneously yokes his poem to Vergil's: so closely connected are their poems that the characters about whom they write will mingle together in the underworld as companions. Hopleus and Dymas will associate with Nisus and Euryalus, in such a way that the two stories become melded, a narrative alloy in which neither can be detached from the other. Just as Nisus and Euryalus will associate with Hopleus and Dymas in the underworld, so too will Statius' poem associate with Vergil's. The words invite us to associate Statius' other characters with Vergils, to evaluate them against one another, and to read new meanings from Statius poem into the characters presented in Vergil's *magnum opus*.

³⁰¹ Hardie (1993) 97 discusses how "Statius 'improves' on Virgil" in "appropriating" the Nisus and Euryalus episode here.

³⁰² See Ahl (2015) 247: "In *Thebaid* 10.447-8, Statius expresses the surprising and puzzling hope that Vergil's Nisus and Euryalus will not spurn his warriors Hopleus and Dymas.... In evoking Nisus and Euryalus, Statius invites us to look beneath the surface of his narrative."

³⁰³ See Parkes (2015) 476: "Statius presents himself as an epigonal poet... this is clear from such sections [as] the address to Hopleus and Dymas at 10.445-8, which looks to the Nisus and Euryalus episode of *Aeneid* 9."

Statius' Hoplaus and Dymas episode, and its relationship to the Nisus and Euryalus story, also serves to further Statius' ambition of creating an illusion of primacy for his poem. Statius' version of the story takes place before the version of the story offered by Vergil. Thus, though Statius composes his poem after Vergil's, and though his version of the story is clearly modeled on Vergil's, in narrative time, the Hoplaus and Dymas story becomes the model for the Nisus and Euryalus story. Statius calls attention to this temporal disjunction in his address to the deceased pair, quoted above, in which he suggests that now Hoplaus and Dymas will join Nisus and Euryalus. But Hoplaus and Dymas' sad ends antedate those of Nisus and Euryalus by a great expanse of time. While Statius models his own poem on Virgil's, he simultaneously claims a temporal primacy over the *Aeneid* by setting his poem in a much earlier time than the *Aeneid*. In this way, the episodes Statius models on the *Aeneid* remind the reader of his own primacy and make the *Aeneid* into the belated work of literature. The episode thus metapoetically challenges the primacy and authoritative position of the *Aeneid* by retrojecting the narrative earlier than that of the *Aeneid*, and self-consciously calling attention to that fact.

Statius and Valerius Flaccus were both part of the rush to mythological themes that occurred in Roman epic poetry during the Flavian period. There is some controversy regarding the chronology of the two authors, but the best evidence suggests that the *Thebaid* and the *Argonautica* were composed contemporaneously.³⁰⁴ Further, the poems seem to have exerted reciprocal influence on the other, owing to a literary culture of performance of works in progress. The *Thebaid* and the *Argonautica* seem to compete with each other on a variety of axes,³⁰⁵ and

³⁰⁴ Parkes (2014); Lovatt (2015).

³⁰⁵ Parkes (2014); Lovatt (2015).

primacy is one of them. The respective proems of the *Thebaid* and the *Argonautica* exhibit some of the strategies for creating an illusion of primacy characteristic of the Flavian period.

Valerius' proem reflects his concern with primacy. The first word of his poem is *prima*, immediately making "first-ness" a programmatic element of his poem.³⁰⁶ The use of *prima* in the first line of Valerius' poem is unusual: *prima deum magnis canimus freta pervia natis/fatidicamque ratem* "we sing the straits first made accessible to the great children of the gods, and the prophetic ship."³⁰⁷ The use of *prima* to modify *pervia* is original. Valerius "expand[s] the limits of predicatively used *primus*. In all other instances the word thus used still denotes the first person or thing to do or undergo something."³⁰⁸ The use of the word *prima*, in addition to its actual semantic meaning introduces a "linguistic novelty."³⁰⁹ Novelty forms a central theme of Valerius' poem, as the work recounts the story of the Argo, the first ship.³¹⁰ "First-ness" is thematized through the subject matter of the poem, as well as through the use of "first" as the first word of the poem, announcing primacy as a thematic concern.³¹¹

Valerius' emphasis on the Argo as the first ship and on primacy as programmatic in his poem situates his narrative as inaugurating a new epoch. Stover has argued that Valerius'

³⁰⁶ *Argonautica* 1.1. For discussion, see Kleywegt (2005) ad loc., Zissos (2010) ad loc., Blum (2015) 27 ("[Valerius'] replacement of Vergil's programmatic *arma virumque* with *prima* extends this prioritization."). For recent bibliography on Valerius' use of Apollonius, see Seal (2015).

³⁰⁷ *Argonautica* 1.1-2.

³⁰⁸ Kleywegt (2005) ad loc.

³⁰⁹ Kleywegt (2005) ad loc.

³¹⁰ For the notion of the Argo as the first ship, with bibliography, see Polt (2013).

³¹¹ Kleywegt (2005) ad loc. emphasizes the translation of Greek ἀρχόμενος (*Ap. Rhod.* 1.1.) as the central motivation for opening with the word *prima*. Barchiesi sees references to the *Aeneid* and to Catullus 64. In my opinion, these readings undervalue the extent to which Valerius asserts a position of "first-ness" through the first word. See also Blum (2015) 27-28 (emphasizing the significant differences between Apollonius' proem and Valerius').

Argonautic poetics represent an attempt to reinaugurate the epic tradition in the wake of Lucan.³¹² According to Stover, Valerius presents his poem as a rebirth of Roman epic aligned with Vespasian's refoundation of Rome.³¹³ According to Stover: "The destructive, iconoclastic impulse that characterizes Lucan's hopeless Neronian narrative yields to Valerius' poetics of rebirth and reconstitution.... The collapse of the Julio-Claudian dynasty triggered by the civil war and the death of the world narrated in Lucan's *Civil War*... are the preconditions necessary for new beginnings."³¹⁴ On this reading, Valerius presents his poem as a refounding of Latin epic, with the *Argonautica* as the new prime epic of the city.

This account of Valerius' poetic ambitions links him with the early Roman poets discussed in the previous chapter. As discussed there, the Roman habit of continuing history down to contemporary events allowed Roman epic authors to claim a position of primacy for themselves by being the first both to treat new events and to compose poems that uncovered the full significance of developments in the course of Roman history.³¹⁵ In the *Aeneid*, Vergil adopted this strategy as well, but modified it by putting the events that took place near to his time in prophecies and in Aeneas' vision of the Roman future during his katabasis.

In the first book of the *Argonautica*, Valerius' Jupiter delivers a prophecy on the model of Jupiter's prophecy in Book 1 of the *Aeneid*.³¹⁶ Jupiter states that the rise of Rome and the decline of the East was foreordained from the beginning of time: *vetera haec nobis et condita*

³¹² Stover (2012) 27-78.

³¹³ Stover (2012) 77.

³¹⁴ Stover (2012) 77.

³¹⁵ See above XXX-XXX.

³¹⁶ Stover (2012) 28.

pergunt/ordine cuncta suo rerumque a principe cursu/fixa manent (“These things all, having been established by us of old, go forward and remain fixed in their place from the beginning of things.”).³¹⁷ Jupiter announces that Asia is now moving towards its downfall, and that he will soon test other nations to determine which will have dominion: *quaenam populis longissimi cunctis/regna velim linquamque datas ubi certus habenas* (“...which kingdom I shall elect to let rule longest over all peoples, and in whose hands I can without fear leave the reins of power once bestowed.”).³¹⁸ Through this prophecy, Valerius indicates that Roman history begins with the Argo, rather than with the fall of Troy as was conventional in earlier Roman epics.³¹⁹

Valerius Flaccus thus claims primacy for his poem through several strategies. First, he retrojects the beginning of the Roman story backwards. Where Vergil – as Ennius and Naevius before him – presented the fall of Troy and the departure of Aeneas and Anchises as the beginning of the Roman story, Valerius Flaccus subsumes earlier mythological events to the Roman story. The building of the first ship and the journey of the Greek Argonauts replaces the fall of Troy as the origin of Rome, thus situating the beginning of the story generation earlier in mythological history. Second, by representing the rise of Vespasian as the culmination of the Argonautic project, Valerius extends his narrative down to the present, revealing as significant events in Roman history that had not yet occurred at the time of Vergil or of Lucan.³²⁰

³¹⁷ *Argonautica* 1.531-33.

³¹⁸ *Argonautica* 1.559-60.

³¹⁹ See above XXX-XXX. See also Stover (2012) 47 (“This feature of Valerius’ poem implicates his narrative in the discourse of Vespasianic Rome, while simultaneously redirecting the epic genre away from Lucan’s claustrophobic and centripetal poetic enterprise. Valerius, in fact, imbues his expansionist material with a Vespasianic colouring in the poem’s dedicatory proem, where he describes Vespasian as a latter-day Argonaut whose naval activity in Britain has opened up the Caledonian Ocean.”). But see Blum (2015) 28 n.82 (challenging Stover’s “optimistic interpretation” and arguing that it fails to capture “the tragic atmosphere with which Valerius overlays the expedition.”).

³²⁰ Stover (2012) 46-50.

Statius uses several techniques to create an illusion of primacy for himself in his proem.³²¹ The main narrative of the *Thebaid* takes place after that of the *Argonautica*, so Statius' poem would inevitably come after Valerius' on the axis of narrative time. Statius, however, begins his poem by indicating that the story extends back into the ancient mists of time. He begins by asking: *unde iubetis ire, deae?* ("Where do you bid me to begin, goddess").³²² He then invokes the rape of Europa and the search of Cadmus, leading to the founding of Thebes: *gentisne canam primordia dirae, Sidonios raptus et inexorabile pactum legis Agenoreae scrutantemque aequora Cadmum* ("Shall I sing the origins of the fateful clan, the Sidonian rape, and the inexorable covenant of Agenor's law, and Cadmus searching the waters?").³²³ The use of *primordia*, like the *prima* of Valerius' proem, suggests a return to the earliest beginnings, and a subsumption of that narrative to Statius' poem. Statius next refers to the *longo retro series* ("the long series [of events] going back")³²⁴ that he would need to narrate in order to tell the whole story. After listing a great many of the important mythological events in Thebes, he delimits the scope of his poem: *limes mihi carminis esto/Oedipodae confusa domus* ("let the limit of my song be the troubled house of Oedipus").³²⁵ Statius thus sets his poem up as something akin to the Epic Cycle – one component part of a story stretching back in a long continuous series of events.

³²¹ For discussion of the proem of the *Thebaid*, see Ganiban (2007) 45-47 (arguing that *fraternas acies* amplifies the *cognatas acies* of Lucan's proem, and that the proem sets up Statius in harsh opposition to the poetics of the *Aeneid*).

³²² *Theb.* 1.4.

³²³ *Theb.* 1.4-6.

³²⁴ *Theb.* 1.7.

³²⁵ *Theb.* 1.16-17.

Second, Statius aligns himself with Homer in his proem, recalling the *Iliad* where Valerius had recalled Apollonius' *Argonautica*. His request to the goddess to tell him where to begin recalls the eighth line of Homer: τίς τ' ἄρ σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι ("which of the gods was it that sets those two together in strife, such that they fought?").³²⁶ Bessone has shown in a recent essay how Statius presents himself as an archaic bardic figure both in the *Silvae* and the *Thebaid*.³²⁷ Statius' self-alignment with Homer casts him as the earlier bard as opposed to the Apollonian Valerius.

In conclusion, the use of the themes of primacy and subsumption continue in the works of Statius. Statius competes both with his contemporaries and his predecessors.³²⁸ Statius asserts his primacy by using a theme from deep in mythological history, and making episodes that appear in earlier authors seem to be the later episodes. Statius attempts to wrest the title of the Homer of the Latin tradition from Vergil, and to claim a place for himself and the prime and subsumptive poet of the tradition.

³²⁶ *Il.* 1.8.

³²⁷ Bessone (2014) 230-31. Bessone also discusses how this self-presentation operates in tension with the manner in which Statius sometimes calls attention to the laboriousness of his craft.

³²⁸ See Lovatt (2005), especially 2.

CHAPTER 4: CULMINATING A TRADITION AND STARTING ANEW IN NONNUS OF PANOPOLIS' *DIONYSIACA*

This chapter examines the end of the Greek tradition of hexametrical epic. I will discuss the *Dionysiaca*, the longer surviving work of classical antiquity, and its relationship to a crowded field of Greek literary classics and epic in particular.³²⁹ The *Dionysiaca* makes an excellent final case study for the themes of subsumption and primacy that we have been tracking through the Greco-Roman epic tradition. In the *Dionysiaca*, the themes of primacy and subsumption combine to create the impression of a culminating work, a work which subsumes all that came before it in the process of creating a new beginning in epic literature. The poem is both a culmination and a new beginning, created by reprocessing what had come before into something encyclopedic but simultaneously innovative.

Indeed, Nonnus' stated ambition in the *Dionysiaca* is to surpass Homer. He attempts to do so using methods that have been discussed in previous chapters: by retrojecting its narrative into a mythological antiquity prior to that of its primary models and by trying to establish itself as all-encompassing or encyclopedic.³³⁰ Bannert and Kröll capture the experience of reading the *Dionysiaca* correctly when they write: "Nonnus... takes to an extreme the generic tendency of epic to the expansive and the comprehensive."³³¹ In this chapter, I will demonstrate how Nonnus' use of subsumption and primacy responds to pressures in the tradition.

³²⁹ The *Dionysiaca* is the longest work of antique hexametrical poetry, as measured both by number of books (48) and by number of lines (21,286). It is possible that the lost *Ἡρωικαὶ θεογαμίαι* of Pisander of Laranda was longer, and our testimony refers to 60 books. Unfortunately, the pitiful state of our knowledge of Pisander leaves us unaware of much about his poem, including how it might have informed Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*. See Shorrock (2001).

³³⁰ Many readers have been struck by the encyclopedic character of the *Dionysiaca*. See especially Hernández de la Fuente, D. (2008) and Gigli Piccardi, D. (2003).

³³¹ Bannert and Kröll (2016) 483.

Greek epic poets had felt the weight of their tradition quite early.³³² Already in the *Odyssey*'s rigid silence about the events of the *Iliad* we can see contestation between epic poems for importance of subject matter and the creation of boundaries.³³³ The *Odyssey* appears to contest the *Iliad*, by completing the story and by shifting the focus of the Trojan War away from the wrath of Achilles to the homecoming of *Odysseus*.³³⁴

The generic trend toward subsumption in epic can also be seen early on the Greek tradition. For example, while much is unknown about the Epic Cycle,³³⁵ it is clear that the Trojan Cycle was originally considered a set of individual poems,³³⁶ and "only later is there an awareness that these poems constituted an 'Epic Cycle'."³³⁷ Only over a long period of time, quite probably lasting centuries, were the poems fashioned into a continuous narrative, connecting to the beginnings and the endings of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* to form one complete story of the Trojan War.³³⁸ This process suggests an early pull towards completeness, or even encyclopediasm early in the Greek tradition.

³³² Though little of the Greek epic tradition from Homer through the fifth century survives, we have a panoply of names and authors of epic poems stretching from the seventh century onwards. For the Epic Cycle, the non-Homeric archaic hexametrical epics, see, inter alios, Burgess (2001), West (2013) and Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (2015)

³³³ For discussion, see Chapter 1, XXX-XXX.

³³⁴ See generally, Pucci (1987).

³³⁵ The reconstruction of the Epic Cycle and the Trojan Cycle remains controversial. Burgess (2015) 43 describes two possible approaches: "Indeed the Epic Cycle's useful contextualization of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* has led to the common conception of it as something secondary to "Homer," both in chronology and value. For hermeneutic purposes I will call this the "Homer-centric" model, which has been dominant from antiquity onward. In its starkest form, this model posits that a series of poems were composed on the basis of the Homeric poems, though falling far short of their poetics, in order to surround them with prequels and sequels. A different model, which I will label 'Systemic,' would link the Epic Cycle broadly with various material about the Trojan War in ancient literary and artistic traditions."

³³⁶ Burgess (2001) 8: "The earliest ancient information about the Cyclic poems cites individual poems, and only later is there an awareness that these poems constituted an "Epic Cycle."

³³⁷ Burgess (2001) 8.

³³⁸ *Id.*: "Testimony about individual Cyclic poems often differs from the summary of the Epic Cycle that we possess, indicating that the process of manufacturing the Epic Cycle involved editorial manipulation of the Cyclic poems. Although I argue that the Epic Cycle was established during the Hellenistic period, I also stress that many different

The Epic Cycle was an important source for Nonnus' poem, and his engagement with both the Trojan and Theban Cycles is, as will be discussed below, important for his poetic program.³³⁹ This presents something of a paradox, because scholars are nearly certain that Nonnus did not have access to the Epic Cycle in its original form.³⁴⁰ However, Nonnus is sure to have had second-hand knowledge of the Cycle through such texts as Proclus' summary.³⁴¹

Our first example of a Greek epic poet explicitly discussing his feelings of belatedness comes in a fragment from the fifth century BCE poet Choerilus of Samos. In his poorly preserved *Persica*, Choerilus laments the fact that no mythological themes remain for him to treat:

ᾗ μάκαρ, ὅστις ἔην κείνον χρόνον ἴδρις ἀοιδῆς,
 Μουσάων θεράπων, ὅτ' ἀκήρατος ἦν ἔτι λειμών.
 νῦν δ' ὅτε πάντα δέδασται, ἔχουσι δὲ πείρατα τέχναι,
 ὕστατοι ὥστε δρόμου καταλειπόμεθ', οὐδέ πη ἔστι
 πάντῃ παπταίνοντα νεοζυγὲς ἄρμα πελάσσαι.

Ah, blessed was he who was skilled in song, a servant of the Muses, at that time when the field was still undefiled. Now everything has been divided up, the arts hold their limits, with the result that we are left behind, last in the race, nor is possible for us, though looking in every direction, to bring up a newly-yoked chariot. (*SH* 317)

There are various readings of the exact meaning of these verses, but most persuasive and pervasive is the suggestion that Choerilus announces a sense of belatedness at the outset of his poem.³⁴² For an epic poet, all of the good themes have already been taken. He has come too late

stages of the material in the Epic Cycle preceded this occurrence, and many different forms of the Epic Cycle followed it."

³³⁹ For the Cycle as a source for imperial Greek epic, see Bär and Baumbach (2015). See also, Cameron (2004) 60; West (2013) 21-26. See generally, Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (2015).

³⁴⁰ See, e.g., Bär and Baumbach (2015) 604: "On the whole, it is generally assumed that the Cycle (or at least larger parts of it) may still have been available to Quintus and Triphiodorus, but is more likely to have been entirely lost at the times of Nonnus and Colluthus (but still formed part of their epic memory)."

³⁴¹ Bär and Baumbach (2015) 618.

³⁴² This is the reading of Huxley (1969) 16, Stehle (1996) 222 and Hollis (2000) 14. MacFarlane (2009) sets up something of a straw man in writing that these arguments suggest that Choerilus "informed his audience, at the

to the race, so that there is no place left for him to stand. No mythological themes remain untreated by the previous throng of epic poets. Important for us is the image of the field, which indicates a finite amount of space. The field of epic poetry, that is, the total category of acceptable epic themes is finite for Choerilus, and they have all been used up, all the way up to the boundaries.

Choerilus finds his answer to this conundrum by boldly expanding the field of epic to new thematic material,³⁴³ thematic material which was to become critical for Roman epic.³⁴⁴ He composed his poem on the subject of the Persian Wars thus leaving the field of epic for new pastures and breaking out of the previously set boundaries of epic.³⁴⁵ Despite the apparent popularity of Choerilus' poem,³⁴⁶ the genre of historical epic never caught on in the Greek speaking world, with mythological epic continuing as the dominant form, at least in terms of attested publications, finding new strategies to cast itself as authoritative as time went on.

The period preceding Nonnus saw the continued publication of Greek epics. The evidence from these epics reveals a trend towards monumental, encyclopedic epics. The little we know about Nestor of Laranda's *Metamorphoses*, Pisander of Laranda's (Nestor's son) *Ἡρωικαὶ θεογαμίαι*, and Scoeprianus' *Gigantia* all suggest that these were works of monumental scope

outset of his new poem which he then proceeded to sing at length, that this poem was not worth hearing and just left it at that." 222

³⁴³ Choerilus seems to have been the first epic poet in Greece to have produced a poem of contemporary events, although dramatic poets had covered such material before. MacFarlane (2009) 230: "Choerilus was not, of course, the first poet to narrate historical events in poetry nor was he the first poet to sing of the Persian Wars. He was, however, the first poet to give an epic treatment of contemporary events in general and the Persian Wars in particular, and he may have gone beyond his predecessors in the scope of his work."

³⁴⁴ For historical epic in Rome, see Chapter 2, especially XXX-XXX.

³⁴⁵ The exact limits of Choerilus' poem continue to be debated, but the assumption that the poem treated only the war with Xerxes seems unlikely. Huxley (1969) suggests "the Marathon episode, the Ionian revolt, and even the Skythian campaign of Dareios could all have found a place in a *Persika* widely defined as the coming of war to Europe." 15. MacFarlane (2006) has also argued for an expansive *Persica*.

³⁴⁶ The *Suda* reports that the Athenians voted to have Choerilus' poem recited with the poems of Homer. See also, MacFarlane (2009) 219 n.2.

and comprehensive ambition.³⁴⁷ In addition, Quintus of Smyrna's *Posthomerica* had traversed the same narrative terrain as the *Aethiopis*, *Ilias Parva*, and the *Iliou Persis*.³⁴⁸

Nonnus, the poet of the enormous *Dionysiaca*, thus had a difficult task before him when confronting the tremendous amount of material in the Greek tradition. He composed the work probably between 450 and 470 CE,³⁴⁹ more than 1000 years after the composition of the Homeric poems, and almost 1000 years later than Choerilus had lamented the lack of remaining suitable subjects for hexametrical treatment.³⁵⁰ Nonetheless, Nonnus employed the poetic strategies of primacy and subsumption to carve out a space for his epic within a crowded tradition, and to present his poem as a culmination, rather than as a latecomer to the field.

³⁴⁷ Bär and Baumbach (2015) 604 n.1.

³⁴⁸ *Id.* at 605. Bär and Baumbach discuss the *Posthomerica*'s self-conscious self-styling as a "Homeric" text: "[T]he narrator of the *Posthomerica* indirectly, but clearly, stages himself as Homer – so much so that we can actually perceive Homer as the work's implied author. Consequently, the question as to whether or not Quintus may have had access to the poems of the Epic Cycle, and, if so, to what extent he may have used (and followed) them, is important not only in view of the fact that the topics of the *Posthomerica* are so ostentatiously "Cyclic," but also because of the narrator's programmatic staging as a second Homer – which may be seen as a reference not only to the author of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, but also to the widespread notion of Homer as the author of some of the Cyclic poems."

³⁴⁹ See Vian (1976) IX-XVIII; Accorinti (2016) for biographical discussion of Nonnus. Biographical details are exceedingly sparse. The *Suda* contains no entry for Nonnus, but one manuscript includes a marginal gloss, that indicates that Nonnus was "a man of Panopolis, in Egypt, a very learned man; he is the one who paraphrased the chaste Theologian in epic verse." Accorinti (2016) 19. The "striking" aspect of this brief biographical notice is that it makes no mention of the *Dionysiaca*. *Id.* at 20. Summarizing what we can say confidently about Nonnus' Accorinti observes that he was Egyptian, probably from Panopolis, and that he wrote the *Dionysiaca* probably in Alexandria. *Id.* at 23. The same author considers it more likely than not that Nonnus "belonged to a Christian family from Asia Minor." *Id.* at 24. Some believe that Nonnus is to be identified with the bishop of Edessa, who had the same name and participated in the Council of Chalcedon in 451 CE. Livrea (1987) 97-123; Fornaro (2006).

³⁵⁰ For much of the twentieth century, the primary question discussed in scholarship on Nonnus was the so-called "Nonnian question". As a hexametrical paraphrase of the Gospel of John has also come down to us under Nonnus' name, scholars of a previous generation wondered whether Nonnus was a Pagan or a Christian. Rohde (1914) 507, Geffcken (1920) and Golega (1930) among earlier scholars made the case that religious faith need not be directly tied to subject matter. Further, some have made the claim that the Paraphrase is clearly the weaker of the two poems, and that, as such, was probably composed earlier, undercutting the theory that Nonnus was originally a pagan, but converted to Christianity (see Bernabe 2016 with bibliography). Livrea (1987, 2003) has made the case that Nonnus should be identified with the 5th century bishop of Edessa, a theory which has gained acceptance from some (Shorrock 2011), but has been forcefully rejected by others (Cameron 2000). Sherry (1991, 1996) has tried to suggest that the two poems were written by separate authors, an idea which has not gained widespread acceptance.

Nonnus frames his primacy consistently throughout the *Dionysiaca* in relationship to Homer.³⁵¹ Nonnus measures himself against Homer often, and claims for himself a temporal primacy in relation to earlier Greek literature through a variety of strategies.³⁵² In the first two books of the *Dionysiaca*, Nonnus treats the rape of Europa, Cadmus' search for her and the battle between Zeus and Typhon. Nonnus employs a variety of methods in relating these myths for creating an illusion of primacy for himself vis a vis other earlier Greek poets.

In relation to Homer, Nonnus subsumes and reprocesses the Homeric poems in search of creating his own illusion of primacy. Nonnus' poem is heavily interlaced with Homeric language and stories, and he repeatedly addresses Homer directly, asking him for his help in composing his own epic.³⁵³ On the other hand, Nonnus attempts to surpass Homer through a variety of poetic strategies.³⁵⁴ The most transparent of these is the choice to write a forty-eight book epic, encompassing the length of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* combined. This move seems calculated to give the sense that Nonnus' poem supersedes or replaces the Homeric corpus at the top of a literary pantheon.

Another important strategy to surpass Homer is the choice of a theme that predates those narrated in the *Iliad*, thus rendering the events of the *Iliad* secondary, by presenting them as

³⁵¹ For the argument that Nonnus' relationship to Homer is a particularly anxious one, see Shorrock (2001) 119: "The *Dionysiaca* is not the story of a successful epic poet, but the story of his *attempt* to become a successful poet. It is the story of Nonnus' on-going relationship with Homer, his own anxious endeavor to break free from the powerful influence of his father."

³⁵² For episodes in the Indian War sections of Nonnus that draw their inspiration from Homer, see Frangoulis (1995, 1999), Agosti (2004), and Vian (1976) xlv.

³⁵³ Shorrock (2001): "It hardly needs to be said that the *Dionysiaca* is saturated with allusions to the epic poems of Homer: there is hardly a line in the whole poem that does not contain some Homeric reminiscence - in terms of vocabulary or imagery." 25.

³⁵⁴ Hopkinson (1994b): "Armed with such distinctively Alexandrian weapons as literary allusion, digression, eroticism, grotesquerie, and scientific and mythological learning, Nonnus approaches Homer not with the disingenuous self-deprecation affected by Hellenistic poets, but face to face and without fear. Although his poem is influenced by many forms of writing, it is chiefly moved by the desire to refashion Homer, and by the ambition, openly professed, to surpass him." 9

late.³⁵⁵ Indeed, in one of his several addresses to Homer, Nonnus asserts that his poem will surpass the poems of Homer on account of their more august theme, but implores Homer to inspire him with his beautiful language.³⁵⁶ As Bannert and Kröll (2016) write: "It is Nonnus' concern not only to imitate or to rival Homer, but to subsume, adopt, and ultimately surpass his poetic ancestor and to become the 'Homer' of his time."³⁵⁷ This strategy closely resembles the strategy which Statius employs with respect to Vergil, discussed in the previous chapter.

Nonnus' agonistic relationship to Homer is stated explicitly and repeatedly during the poem. Nonnus invokes Homer no less than six separate times during the poem to express his poetic program with respect to him. From these invocations, Nonnus' relationship to Homer as at once "a guide and a rival" emerges.³⁵⁸ He first invokes Homer in the course of the proem. In the proem, Nonnus presents himself as a Dionysiac priest and describes his poetic ambitions.³⁵⁹ During this address, he makes a direct reference to his poetry in relation to Homer's:

βυθίη δὲ παρ'Εἰδοθέῃ καὶ Ὀμήρῳ
 φωκάων βαρὺ δέρμα φυλασσέσθω Μενελάῳ.

and let the rank skin of seals for Menelaus be kept for deep Eidothea and Homer.
 (*Dionysiaca* 1.37-8)

Nonnus subtly suggests here that the rank sealskins are still available as a selectable topic for him.³⁶⁰ In other words, in Nonnus' imagination of his own poem, the Homeric poems have not

³⁵⁵ For discussion of the poetics of "overtaking" in the Homeric poems, see Purves (2011).

³⁵⁶ There is an ample bibliography on Nonnus and Homer stretching back to the 19th century, though much remains to be said on the topic. On the subject, see Wild (1886), D'Ippolito (1964) esp. 37-41, Vian (1991) as well as the many notes sprinkled through his comprehensive Budé commentary on the *Dionysiaca*, Lamberton and Keaney (1992), Hopkinson (1994a), De Stefani (2011), Frangoulis (2011), Mazza (2012) 228-240, and Fincher (2015).

³⁵⁷ Bannert and Kröll (2016) 481.

³⁵⁸ Bannert and Kröll (2016) 484.

³⁵⁹ *Dionysiaca* 1.17-36.

³⁶⁰ Harries (1994) 78-9, and Shorrock (2001) 118, interpret the passage in a different way. Shorrock "The poet of Dionysus has no need for the trickery employed by Homer/Menelaus, since wine furnished him with a new and

yet been composed. Nonnus imagines himself here as a Dionysiac priest before the time of Homer. He has a full panoply of options available to him, including the subjects of the Homeric poem. He will choose instead the Dionysiac topics, rejecting the inferior theme that Homer will choose. The poem performs a move almost directly inverse to that of Choerilus of Samos, who suggested that no good mythological themes were left to him, and as a result he would expand the subject matter of Greek epic to include historical themes. Nonnus, instead, willfully denies Homer's poem his place as a poem temporally anterior to his own, by suggesting that he has the choice of untouched themes, and that he will leave the theme chosen by Homer for him, as a better one is available to him.

At the same time as Nonnus criticizes Homer on the basis of his inferior theme, he asks the poet to inspire him as a Muse at various points. Toward the beginning of Book 13, Nonnus employs a trope familiar from the previous chapter:

οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ τόσα φῦλα δέκα γλώσσησιν ἀείσω
οὐδὲ δέκα στομάτεσσι χέων χαλκόθορον ἤχώ,
ὀππόσα Βάκχος ἄγειρε δορυσσόος, ἀλλὰ λιγαίνων
ἡγεμόνας καὶ Ὅμηρον ἀοσσητῆρα καλέσσω
εὐεπίης ὅλον ὄρμον, ἐπεὶ πλωτῆρες ἀλῆται
πλαγκτοσύνης καλέουσιν ἀρηγόνα κυανοχαίτην.

For I could not tell so many peoples with ten tongues, nor if I had ten mouths pouring a voice of brass, all those which Bacchos gathered for his spearchasing. Yet I will loudly name their leaders, and I will call to my aid Homer, the one great harbor of language undefiled, since mariners lost astray call on Seabluehair to save them from their wandering ways. (*Dionysiaca* 13.47-52)

Nonnus deploys the “ten tongues” theme directly before a catalogue, just as Homer had in the second book of the *Iliad*. But where Homer had called upon the Muse, Nonnus

more effective means of entrapment. Nonnus shows emphatically that imitation is not enough. He will do things differently, and will prove himself to be superior in the very act of imitation."

calls upon Homer himself to help with his catalogue. Additionally, where Homer had called on the Muse for knowledge, Nonnus calls on Homer instead for his language, in accordance with his earlier request at the beginning of the poem. Nonnus calls separately upon his Dionysiac Muses to help him with the content of the catalogue:

Ἀλλὰ πολυσπερέων προμάχων ἥρωίδα φύτλην
καὶ λασίων Σατύρων, Κενταυρίδος αἷμα γενέθλης,
Σειληγῶν τε φάλαγγα δασυκνήμοιο γεραιοῦ
καὶ στίχα Βασσαρίδων Κορυβαντίδες εἶπατε Μοῦσαι

But the heroic breed of farscattered champions, the hairy Satyrs, the blood of the Centaur tribe, the bushy-knee ancient and his phalanx of Seilenoi, the regiment of Bassarids – do you sing me these, O Corybantic Muses! (*Dionysiaca* 13.43-46)

Once again, Nonnus links himself to Homeric style, but separates himself on the basis of theme.³⁶¹

In a second proem at the beginning of Book 25, Nonnus invokes Homer again. The placement of the second proem, at the beginning of the second half of the epic, is of course programmatic. Nonnus announces that here will begin the “war” portion of his epic, the second half of his Homeric work:

Μοῦσα, πάλιν πολέμιζε σοφὸν μόθον ἔμφροني θύρσῳ
οὗ πω γὰρ γόνυ δοῦλον ὑποκλίνων Διονύσῳ
φύλοπιν ἑπταέτηρον Ἑώιος εὐνασεν Ἄρης.
ἀλλὰ δρακοντείοιο τεθηπότες ἄκρα γενείου
Ἰνδῶης πλατάνοιο πάλιν κλάζουσι νεοσσοί,
Βακχείου πολέμοιο προμάντιες. οὐ μὲν αἰείσω
πρώτους ἐξ λυκάβαντας, ὅτε στρατὸς ἔνδοθι πύργων
Ἰνδὸς ἔην. τελέσας δὲ τύπον μιμηλὸν Ὀμήρου
ὑστατον ὑμνήσω πολέμων ἔτος, ἐβδομάτης δὲ
ὑσμίνην ισάριθμον ἐμῆς στρουθοῖο χαράξω.

O Muse, once more fight the poet’s war with your thyrsus-wand of the mind: for not yet has Eastern Ares bent a servile knee and calmed the seven-year conflict.

³⁶¹ Bannert and Kröll (2016) 49-50 note the close verbal similarities between the Nonnian passage and Homer’s passage in *Iliad* 2, as well as the continued connection between Homer and Nonnus’ Dionysiac Muses in the *Dionysiaca*.

The nestlings of the Indian planetree are shrinking again in horror at the dragon's jaw-point, and thus they foretell war with Bacchos. I will not sing the first six lichtgangs, while the Indian army remained behind walls; I will make my pattern like Homer's and sing the last year of warfare, I will describe that which has the number of my seventh sparrow. (*Dionysiaca* 25.1-10)

Here we see Nonnus mapping his poem onto the Homeric frame. Nonnus will tell the story of Dionysus, but will use the structure of the *Iliad* to do so.³⁶² Nonnus thus frames his poem throughout as Homeric in language, but superior to Homer on the basis of theme.

Coming late in the Greek tradition, Nonnus attempts to create primacy for himself in a few ways. He employs two key strategies in crafting the opening of his epic and creating an illusion of primacy or originality for his work from the outset. First, on the level of narrative, he combines two initiating stories of Greek mythology into a single tale, by merging the battle of Zeus and Typhon, the final battle of the Gigantomachy and ultimate fight establishing the reign of Zeus and the Olympians with the story of Cadmus, the inaugural story of the Theban Cycle, and the beginning of the human events narrated in the epic cycle. By combining the story of Cadmus with the primordial tale of Typhon, Nonnus unifies two strands of Greek mythological history and retrojects the story of Cadmus into a primordial past in which he takes part in events prior to any events in which he would have taken part in the epic cycle, or indeed in any prior telling of his own story. Second, this same merging of the two stories creates a synthesis of "Homer" and Hesiod, by appealing to the authority of the two most ancient of Greek hexametrical poets, and suggesting that the two authors have been subsumed into Nonnus' own

³⁶² This invocation is followed soon after by a description of the Shield of Dionysus, another obviously Homeric episode, which consumes almost the entirety of Book 25. Chuvin (2014) 5 sees this Book as the key to the poem, which reveals it "hidden consistency." Faber (2016) 459 sees the shield as programmatic: "Building upon the Homeric tradition of the metaliterary function of epic ekphrasis, Nonnus' description of the shield of Dionysus may be read as a highly self-conscious and self-reflexive work of art which draws the reader's attention to the artful contruction [sic] of the *Dionysiaca* itself. As an analogue for the poem, the ekphrasis invites the reader to visualize the larger artifact of the *Dionysiaca* as whole, and thus to reflect on the ways in which imaginary visual representation negotiates a close relationship with literary, poetic representation."

new, but at the same time anterior, poem. This proliferation of strategies for affirming originality and primordality contributes to Nonnus' illusion of primacy, and by subsuming and mixing the opening elements of so many poems, gives the sense that everything can be found in Nonnus. Though Nonnus' poem stands late in the Greek epic tradition, he finds ways to affirm that his poem is original and that it has a primacy that places it above the earlier poems and those of Homer in particular.

Let us turn first to the story of Typhon. The story of Typhon represents a key beginning in Greek mythology as early as the *Theogony* of Hesiod,³⁶³ the conflict which brings to an end the battles which marked the conflict over the reign of the universe.³⁶⁴ Typhon represents the final major threat to the establishment of Zeus' rule on Olympus.³⁶⁵ In the *Theogony*, Typhon is born after Zeus defeats the Titans. Earth gives birth to him in an attempt to exact revenge on Zeus after Zeus hurls the Titans into Tartarus. Zeus and Typhon do battle, and Zeus defeats him and casts him into Tartarus. There is no mention of the episode in which Typhon steals Zeus' weapons, and the episode is relatively unadorned compared with the more fleshed out depiction of the Titanomachy which precedes it, a fact which led earlier text critics to frequently condemn the passage.³⁶⁶

³⁶³ Nonnus has one explicit reference to Hesiod, during the marshalling of the troops for the Indian expedition. As he catalogues the troops and from where they came he reports that a troop came from Ascrea, Hesiod's stated birthplace in the *Works and Days* and writes:

καὶ οἱ δυσπέμφελον Ἄσκριον,
πατρίδα δαφνήεσσαν ἀσιγήτοιο νομῆος.

And those of inclement Ascrea, the laureate home of the farmer whose name is on every tongue.
(*Dion.* 13.75-76)

³⁶⁴ 820-868.

³⁶⁵ Though Typhon is the last major threat to Zeus' establishment, he is not the last obstacle in absolute terms. Zeus still needs to address the threat of a female giving birth to another son who will oust him, just as he ousted his own father.

³⁶⁶ West (1969) 379 – 385.

Nonnus models his version of the battle with Typhon closely on Hesiod, but not on Hesiod's account of the fight between Zeus and Typhon, but rather on the entire Hesiodic telling of the Titanomachy. The Hesiodic Titanomachy unfolds in two parts, the first telling of Zeus' defeat of the Titans, the second of Zeus' battle with Typhon. In the Nonnian version, the entire battle is fought between Zeus and Typhon, but the structure is similarly bipartite. Further, Nonnus mingles the Titanomachy and Gigantomachy, two events which were separate in archaic Greek versions of the cosmogonic story, but which had already become thoroughly confused by the Classical period,³⁶⁷ and which in Nonnus are mingled in such a way so as to be indistinguishable.³⁶⁸

There are numerous correspondences between the versions of the fight between Zeus and Typhon in the *Theogony* and in the second book of the *Dionysiaca*.³⁶⁹ The sections which Nonnus adapts for his version are characterized by amplification, and direct competition with Hesiod, in making his own Typhon more horrifying than Hesiod's. Hesiod begins with a description of Typhon and his many heads:

φωναὶ δ' ἐν πάσῃσιν ἔσαν δεινῆς κεφαλῇσι,
 παντοίην ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι ἀθέσφατον· ἄλλοτε μὲν γὰρ
 φθέγγονθ' ὥς τε θεοῖσι συνιέμεν, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
 ταύρου ἐριβρύχῳ μένος ἀσχέτου ὅσσαν ἀγαύρου,
 ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε λέοντος ἀναιδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντος,
 ἄλλοτε δ' αὖ σκυλάκεσσιν ἐοικότα, θαύματ' ἀκοῦσαι,
 ἄλλοτε δ' αὖ ροίζεσχ', ὑπὸ δ' ἤχεεν οὔρεα μακρά.

And there were voices in all his dreadful heads, which uttered every kind of sound unspeakable; for at one time they made sounds such that the gods understood, but at another, the noise of a bull bellowing aloud in proud ungovernable fury; and at another, the sounds of a lion, relentless of heart; and at another, sounds like whelps, wonderful to

³⁶⁷ See Stamatopoulou (2017) 197, who suggests that Euripides was the first author to show complete confusion between the two.

³⁶⁸ Verhelst (2016) 160-161.

³⁶⁹ Many of these correspondences have been noticed, but not elaborated upon, by Schmiel (1992) n. 10.

hear; and again, at another, he would hiss, so that the high mountains re-echoed.
(*Theogony* 829 – 835)

In Hesiod's version, each one of Typhon's heads makes a sound, but, as it seems, only one at a time, as indicated by the repeated use of the word ἄλλοτε. This description of Typhon in Hesiod also cannot help but recall the reader to Nonnus' programmatic statements in the voice of the Dionysiac priest, where he indicated that as Proteus went through his various transformations, the poet would sing subjects that matched the form he took. His words seem to echo the scenario presented here, where Typhon utters the sounds that many different animals produce. Included among those animals are several of those which Nonnus enumerated in his list of possible transformations for Proteus.

In Nonnus' version of Hesiod's description of the monster, Typhon makes a far greater variety of sounds, and all at the same time:

ἡελίου δὲ φανέντος ὁμογλώσσων ἀπὸ λαιμῶν
εἰς ἐνοπὴν πολύπηχυν ἐπεβρυχᾶτο Τυφωεύς
Ζῆνα μέγαν καλέων· βλοσυρὴ δέ οἱ ἵκετο φωνή,
ρίζοπαγῆς ὅθι πέζα παλίμπορος Ὠκεανοῖο
τέτραχα τεμνομένην περιβάλλεται ἄντυγα κόσμου,
ζωσαμένη στεφανηδὸν ὅλην χθόνα κυκλάδι μήτρῃ·
φθεγγομένου δὲ Γίγαντος ἀμειβομένη στίχα φωνῆς
παντοίῃ σμαράγησε καὶ οὐ μία σύνθροος ἡχώ·
τοῦ δὲ κορυσσομένοιο φυῆς πολυειδέι μορφῇ
ὠρυγὴ κελάδησε λύκων, βρύχημα λεόντων,
ἄσθμα συῶν, μύκημα βοῶν, σύριγμα δρακόντων,
πορδαλίων θρασὺ χάσμα, κορυσσομένων γένυς ἄρκτων,
λύσσα κυνῶν· μεσάτῃ δὲ Γίγας βροτοειδέι μορφῇ

The sun appeared, and many-armed Typhoeus roared for the fray with all the tongues of all his throats, challenging mighty Zeus. That sonorous voice reached where the root-fixt bed of refluent Oceanos surrounds the circle of the world and its four divided parts, girdling the whole earth coronet-wise with encircling band; as the monster spoke, that which answered the army of his voices, was not one concordant echo, but a babel of screaming sounds: when the monster arrayed him with all his manifold shapes, out rang the yowling of wolves, the roaring of lions, the grunting of boars, the lowing of cattle, the hissing of serpents, the bold yap of leopards, the jaws of rearing bears, the fury of dogs.

Then with his midmost man-shaped head the Giant yelled out threats against Zeus.
(*Dionysiaca* 2.244 – 256)

Nonnus assigns to Typhon a far greater variety of bestial cries than does Hesiod, and amplifies his depiction by indicating that Typhon makes all of the cries simultaneously. Hesiod's Typhon caused the high mountains to re-echo (ὕπὸ δ' ἤχεεν οὐρεα μακρά), while Nonnus' causes not one single echo, but an incredible cacophony of horrible sounds. Nonnus has exaggerated Typhon from being a primordial monster to a creature who offers a full chaos of sounds. Indeed, in the battle that follows, Typhon will throw the entire universe into a complete chaos, complete with a collapse of the order of, among other things, the seasons and the motion of the stars and planets, until he is stopped by Zeus. Nonnus closely imitates Hesiod, while attempting to one up him wherever he can.

Nonnus' appropriation of Hesiodic chaos lends further support for his claim to primacy. Chaos in Hesiod has an additional cosmogonic function prior to its role in the fight with Typhon. Chaos is the original material out of which the world comes to be:

ἦτοι μὲν πρώτιστα Χάος γέντε'. αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
ἀθανάτων...

In truth, first of all Chaos³⁷⁰ came to be, and then broad breasted Earth, the ever immovable seat of all the immortals... (*Theogony* 116-118)

The entire world is thus born out of Chaos. This gives additional resonance to a cosmogonic sense in Nonnus, which creates the sense of primacy in his poem.³⁷¹

³⁷⁰ The Loeb translates Χάος as 'chasm.'

³⁷¹ There may be a connection here as well to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, which similarly traces the origins of the world back to Chaos:

*Ante mare et terras et quod tegit omnia caelum
unus erat toto naturae vultus in orbe,
quem dixere chaos: rudis indigestaque moles*

Nonnus similarly amplifies when describing Zeus' defeat of Typhon.³⁷² In Hesiods' version, Zeus' defeat of Typhon proper takes place in the course of a single sentence:

Ζεὺς δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν κόρθυνεν ἔδον μένος, εἴλετο δ' ὄπλα
βροντὴν τε στεροπὴν τε καὶ αἰθαλόεντα κεραυνόν,
πλήξεν ἀπ' Οὐλύμποιο ἐπάλμενος.

So when Zeus had raised up his might and seized his arms, thunder and lightning and lurid thunderbolt, he leaped from Olympus and struck him, and burned all the marvelous heads of the monster about him. (*Theogony* 853-855)

Nonnus expands this conflict into a battle of global proportions involving all of the winds and other forces of nature, where Typhon continues to fight even after being struck with Zeus' thunderbolt.

Ζεὺς δὲ πατὴρ πολέμιζε· κατ' ἀντιβίοιο δὲ πέμπων
ἡθάδα πυρσὸν ἴαλλεν, ἀκοντιστῆρα Γιγάντων,
βάλλων ποικιλόφωνον ἀμετρήτων στίχα λαιμῶν (510)

*nec quicquam nisi pondus iners congestaque eodem
non bene iunctarum discordia semina rerum.*

Before the sea was, and the lands, and the sky that hangs over all, the face of Nature showed alike in her whole round, which state have men called chaos: a rough, unordered mass of things, nothing at all save lifeless bulk and warring seeds of ill-matched elements heaped in one. (*Met.* 1.5-9)

Nonnus' knowledge of Ovid, and Latin literature generally has vexed scholars for generations. Historically, debate has focused on the close parallels between the two authors' version of the Phaeton myth. Compare *Met.* 1.747-2.398 with *Dion.* 38.105-434. In the nineteenth century, Knaack (1886) proposed the controversial theory that both versions were modelled on an otherwise unknown Hellenistic epyllion. This view was forcefully disputed by Braune (1935), who argued, based on an analysis of the four episodes that are recounted in both works (Phaeton, Cadmus, Actaeon, and Daphne) that Nonnus modelled his episodes directly on the Ovidian versions in the *Metamorphoses*. The leading scholar of Nonnus of the day was persuaded by Braune's theory, at least with respect to Phaeton, and that Nonnus had knowledge of Ovid became the *communis opinio* for a time. Keydell (1935); see also Cameron (1982) 233: "Nonnus' debt to Ovid has been put beyond reasonable doubt." However, the theory that Nonnus did not know the works of Ovid has come back forcefully in recent decades. From recent literature, see Herter (1981), who purports to demonstrate that Nonnus' flood scene in Book 6 is independent of Ovid's version in the *Metamorphoses*; Knox (1988), who argues that "[a] number of common sources for Ovid and Nonnus do survive, at least in part, and accordingly Knaack's assumption of a lost source is not improbable in principle, although its content and character must remain undetermined ... The onus of proof continues to lie with those who maintain that Nonnus had a[n] ... interest in Ovid."; Shorrock (2005) 380: "The *Dionysiaca* represents both a mythological and a literary cosmos. In this respect Nonnus' epic finds an obvious analogue in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, a text whose universalizing ambitions have been clearly documented. Although this similarity would seem to support the idea that Nonnus was conversant with Latin literature, it is by no means apparent that this was the case."

³⁷² Chuvin (2016) has a discussion of how Nonnus amplifies and separates Dionysus from the Homeric heroes. See esp. 119, where he discusses the culmination of Nonnus' "Catalogue of Ships", which concludes with a description of Dionysus, half-naked and armed only with his thyrsus.

οὐρανίῳ πρηστῆρι· Διοβλήτου δὲ βελέμνου
 ἔν σέλας ἔφλεγε χεῖρας ἀπείρονας, ἔν σέλας ὤμους
 νηρίθμους ἀμάθυνε καὶ αἰόλα φῦλα δρακόντων,
 καὶ κεφαλὰς ἐδάιξαν ἀτέρμονας αἰθέρος αἰχμαί,
 καὶ πλοκάμους Τυφῶνος ἔλιξ ἀμάθυνε κομήτης
 ἀντιπόρῳ σπινθῆρι δασύτριχα πυρσὸν ἰάλλων.
 καὶ κεφαλαὶ σελάγιζον, ἀναπτομένων δὲ κομῶων
 βόστρυχα συρίζοντα κατεσφρηγίσσατο σιγῇ
 οὐρανίῳ σπινθῆρι, μαραιομένων δὲ δρακόντων
 ἰοβόλοι ραθάμιγγες ἑτερσαίνοντο γενείων. (520)
 μαρναμένου δὲ Γίγαντος ἑτεφρώθησαν ὀπωπαὶ
 καπνῷ λιγνυόεντι, νιφοβλήτων δὲ προσώπων
 χιονέαις λιβάδεσσιν ἐλευκαίνοντο παρειαί.
 καὶ πυσύρων ἀνέμων τετράζυγον εἶχεν ἀνάγκην·
 εἰ γὰρ ἐς ἀντολίην σφαλερὰς ἐλέλιζεν ὀπωπὰς, (525)
 ὕσμίνην φλογόεσσαν ἐδέχνυτο γείτονος Εὐρου·
 εἰς κλίσιν εἰ σκοπίαζε δυσήνεμον Ἀρκάδος Ἄρκτου,
 χειμερίου πρηστῆρος ἀθαλπεί βάλλετο πάχνη·
 φεύγων ψυχρὸν ἄημα νιφοβλήτοιο Βορῆος
 καὶ διερῷ δεδόνητο καὶ αἰθαλόεντι βελέμνῳ· (530)
 καὶ δύσιν εἰσορόων βλοσυρῆς ἀντώπιον Ἡοῦς
 ἐσπερίην ἔφριξε θυελλήεσσαν ἐννῶ,
 εἰαρινῆς αἰὼν Ζεφυρηίδος ἦχον ἰμάσθλης·
 καὶ Νότος ἀμφὶ τένοντα μεσημβρινὸν Αἰγοκερῆος
 ἄντυγας ἠερίας ἐπεμάστιε, θερμὸς ἀήτης, (535)
 φλογμὸν ἄγων Τυφῶνι πυραυγεί καύματος ἀτμῷ.
 εἰ πάλιν ὄμβρον ἔχευε κατάρρυτον ὑέτιος Ζεύς,
 λυσιπόνους λιβάδεσσιν ὅλον χροά λοῦσε Τυφωεὺς
 θερμὰ καταψύχων κεκαφηότα γυῖα κεραυνῷ.

Zeus the father fought on: raise and hurled his familiar fire against his adversary, piercing his lions, and sending a fiery whirlwind from heaven to strike the battalion of his innumerable necks with their babel of tongues. Zeus cast his bolt, and one blaze burnt the monster's endless hands, one blaze consumed his numberless shoulders and the speckled tribes of his serpents; heaven's blades cut off those countless heads; a writhing comet met him front to front discharging a thick bush of sparks, and consumed the monster's hair. Typhon's heads were ablaze, the hair caught fire; with heaven's sparks silence sealed the hissing tresses, the serpents shriveled up, and in their throats the poison-spitting drops were dried. The Giant fought on: his eyes were burnt to ashes in the murky smoke, his cheeks were whitened with hoar-frost, his faces beaten with showers of snow. He suffered the fourfold compulsion of the four winds. For if he turned flickering eyes to the sunrise, he received the fiery battle of neighboring Euros. If he gazed towards the stormy clime of the Arcadian Bear, he was beaten by the chilly frost of wintry whirlwinds. If he shunned the cold blast of snow-beaten Boreas, he was shaken by the volleys of wet and hot together. If he looked to the sunset, opposite to the dawn of the grim east, he shivered before Enyo and the western tempests when he heard the noise of Zephyros cracking his

spring-time lash; and Notos, that hot wind, round about the southern foot of Capricorn flogged the aerial vaults, leading against Typhon a glowing blaze with steamy heat. If again Rainy Zeus poured down a watery torrent, Typhoeus bathed all his body in the trouble-soothing showers, and refreshed his benumbed limbs after the stifling thunderbolts. (*Dionysiaca* 2.508-539)

Nonnus' description of Typhon and the fight with Zeus thus imitates and recalls Hesiod's version, while simultaneously attempting to best it through amplification of the various characteristics of the monster and the battle. By structuring his Typhon narrative around the Titanomachy of the Hesiodic *Theogony*, Nonnus assimilates his story to that narrative. In doing so, he creates the sense that his poem includes the Gigantomachy and begins with it. By representing the battle with Typhon as a Gigantomachy, Nonnus inaugurates his story with the battle which establishes Zeus' reign as chief of the Olympians. This beginning takes his story back to the farthest reaches of early mythological time. The choice of the story emphasizes the primordial earliness back into which Nonnus presses his narrative. In doing so, he brings his story much farther back than the history of the Trojan War, and in doing so creates an illusion of primacy for himself relative to Homer. By including these Hesiodic events, he looks back to more primordial subjects and presents himself as the poet of an earlier age than the author of the *Iliad*.

Nonnus also potently deploys the tools of subsumption in his poem. Nonnus' poem gives the sense of having drawn in everything that came before it, both on the level of narrative, with the poem's massive scope, and even on the level of language: As Hopkinson notes, nearly every time the sands of Egypt yield a new papyrus fragment, we find a plausible reference to it in Nonnus.³⁷³ As Shorrock aptly writes, Nonnus adapts the material of the Epic and Cycle and

³⁷³ Hopkinson (1994a).

Homer so that the entire tradition of Greek mythological epic is reframed to support the story of Dionysus.³⁷⁴

One method employed by Nonnus for subsuming earlier narrative is modelling framing his epic on the model of the Epic Cycle. Though it seems unlikely that Nonnus would have had access to the epic cycle, he surely would have been aware of it and its contents.³⁷⁵ Nonnus duplicates the structure of the cycle, both its Trojan and its Theban components in order to subsume the cycle to his new Dionysiac cycle.

Shorrock has already noted a component of this fact, when he argues persuasively that beginning in book 13, Nonnus grafts his epic onto the structure of the Trojan Cycle of epic poems, with the events of book 13 through 24 duplicating the *Cypria*, and the *Iliad* beginning in book 25. Shorrock neglects, however, Nonnus' subsumption of the Theban cycle, beginning at the very start of the poem. Shorrock emphasizes Nonnus' choice of placing Thebes at the beginning of the story as a way of introducing elements connected with the story of Dionysus immediately at the start of the poem, which surely is a component of Nonnus' program. However, Nonnus' choice also brings the poems of the Theban Cycle into relevance at the outset of his poem. The Theban Cycle, predating the Trojan Cycle in epic time, began with an *Oidipodeia* telling the story of Cadmus' foundation of Thebes down to the death of Oedipus.³⁷⁶

³⁷⁴ See Bär and Baumbach (2015), quoting Shorrock (2001) 380: Nonnus “recasts material that Homer had artfully compressed into the narrative of the final year of the war ... and fashions a linear narrative by restoring Homeric analepses and prolepses to their “true” chronological sequence, so much so that the traditional cycle of Greek mythology ... is adapted ... to form a broad and overarching framework to support the specific narrative of the hero Dionysus.”

³⁷⁵ Shorrock (2001) 28-31 makes a forceful case that Nonnus would not have had access to the actual text of the cyclic epic poems. Vian (1959) has well demonstrated that Quintus of Smyrna, writing two centuries before Nonnus and covering the same material as the cyclic poems taking place after the *Iliad* also almost certainly did not have access to the cyclic epics.

³⁷⁶ West (2013) 2: “We cannot say how many other poems were included in the Cycle between the initial theogony and the *Cypria*.... [W]e may assume that the Cycle included the series of Theban epics, *Oidipodeia*, *Thebaid*, *Epigoni*, and perhaps *Alcmeonis*.”

The story of Cadmus and Europa would have represented the beginning of that poem, and thus would have provided the starting point for the cycle of epics on the Theban theme. By starting with Cadmus, Nonnus suggests that his poem includes the beginning of the Theban cycle, which will ultimately lead into the Epic Cycle to be introduced later in the *Dionysiaca* and similarly grafted onto the Dionysiac narrative.³⁷⁷ Shorrock's demonstration of Nonnus' use of the events of the Trojan Cycle is persuasive, and here Nonnus' relationship to the Theban Cycle is still more clear, as he is telling the events that actually occur in those poems, rather than assimilating the events of a set of poems to the events in his narrative.

Nonnus, indeed, marks Cadmus as the subject of what is to follow, rather than Europa or Typhon, by following his proem with the following words, introducing the main narrative of his poem.

Ἀλλὰ θεά μαστῆρος ἀλήμονος ἄρχεο Κάδμου
 Then come now, Goddess, begin with the long search and travels of Cadmus. (*Dionysiaca* 1.45)

The lines align Nonnus' first subject with the first subject of the *Oidipodeia*.³⁷⁸ Despite the fact that Nonnus launches into the story of the abduction of Europa in the following line, a story which continues for over 100 lines before Cadmus is even mentioned for the first time, Cadmus is the subject invoked as the subject of the episode to follow. The words themselves seem to recall the openings of the various cyclic poems, which were typically introduced with an

³⁷⁷ As Shorrock (2001) 52-67 has shown, Nonnus uses this move with the Trojan Cycle later in the *Dionysiaca*, by recapitulating the structure and events of the *Cypria*, the first poem of the Trojan Cycle, starting in Book 13.

³⁷⁸ Unavoidable, also, is comparison with Odysseus, as Cadmus' status as a wanderer is here emphasized. Shorrock (2001) 45.

invocation to the Muse, as Nonnus' here, significantly less adorned than the more complex proems to the Homeric poems.³⁷⁹

By beginning his poem with a subsumption of the Theban Cycle, Nonnus makes a claim to poetical totalizing. Nonnus includes the Theban Cycle, just as he will include a story modeled on the Trojan Cycle, including the *Cypria* and other Cyclic epics, in addition to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. In doing so, Nonnus can claim to have subsumed the entire Homeric narrative, plus the other poems of the cycle to his Dionysiac work.

In Nonnus' subsumptive claims here, we can see something like the *Odyssey*'s claim to culminate the events of the *Iliad*. In Chapter 1, we saw how the *Odyssey* presents itself as the culmination of the *Iliad*, by bringing to a close the events that began with the conflict of Achilles and Agamemnon at the beginning of the *Iliad*, and by subsuming all of the other homecomings of the heroes into its narrative. Here, Nonnus subsumes Homer by adopting the narrative frame of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; but by subsuming those narratives and using them in the service of a theme which he claims is greater and of a more important cosmological significance, he presents himself as the culmination of the epic tradition that goes back to Homer.

In conclusion, Nonnus employs the tools of primacy and subsumption to do something new and innovative in his *Dionysiaca*. By subsuming and including vast quantities of Greek literature within the ambit of his poem, he creates an encyclopedic effect, giving the sense that all that has come before him is included in his poem. But by creating such an expansive and subsumptive poem, Nonnus also creates the feeling of a "culmination" of Greek literature, or a new beginning. And through his emphasis on his own primacy through the use of a theme from

³⁷⁹ For example, the opening line of the *Epigoni*:

Νῦν αὖθ' ὀπλοτέρων ἀνδρῶν ἀρχώμεθα, Μοῦσα

But now, Muses, let us begin with the younger men. (*Epigoni* fr. 1)

deep in mythological history, and by giving his narrative cosmological proportions, Nonnus gives the sense that his poem constitutes a new beginning in Greek literature.

Conclusion

The themes of primacy and subsumption are critical to the Greco-Roman tradition of epic. From the Homeric poems to Statius, from Ennius to Nonnus, these themes occur and reoccur as epic poets attempt programmatically to carve out a position for themselves in a crowded genre.

In Chapter 1, we saw how Homer gave voice to a subsumptive impulse by regularly allowing the narrative of his poem to spill out of the confines of boundaries set for his story. In addition, we saw how in the *Odyssey*, Homer used bardic figures to present himself as a comprehensive repository of poetic knowledge, and how already in the *Odyssey* a poetics of contestation of the *Iliad* had arisen. In Chapter 2, we moved to Rome and examined how Ennius asserted primacy for himself by introducing the hexameter into Latin and by claiming the mantle of Homer. In addition, Ennius' poem subsumed the entirety of Roman history up to the point of his own lifetime, giving his poem totalizing and (possibly) cosmological significance.

In Chapter 3, Statius' *Thebaid* was examined as a poem attempt to subsume earlier poetry and to create an illusion of primacy for itself in a crowded field of Latin epic. And in Chapter 4, we saw how Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* attempted to create primacy for itself through the very act of subsumption. By appropriating all that had come before in the Greek tradition and creating a mix of encyclopedia and mélange, the poem announces itself as a culmination of everything that had come before, and an opportunity for a new beginning.

The number of poets covered in this dissertation could easily have been increased. There has been a good deal of work on Virgil, especially, as an encyclopedic epic author and one who

attempts to start a Latin tradition anew.³⁸⁰ Ovid, too, a poet whose “universalizing ambitions have been clearly documented,” would have provided another superb case study.³⁸¹ The great epics of India, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* take to an even greater degree the intrinsic epic drive towards expansion and all-inclusiveness, and deserve more than the slim attention afforded them in Chapter 1. Doubtless, the themes examined here could have been profitably explored in later epics of the Renaissance and Early Modern Period. But limitations of space, time, and capacity necessarily have limited the scope to these authors.

³⁸⁰ See, e.g., Hardie (1986).

³⁸¹ Shorrock (2005) 380.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Accorinti, D. (ed.) 2016. *Brill's Companion to Nonnus of Panopolis*. Leiden.
- 2016. "The Poet from Panopolis: An Obscure Biography and a Controversial Figure," in Accorinti (ed.) 2016.
- Accorinti, D. and Chuvin, P. (eds.) 2003. *Des Géants à Dionysos: Mélanges de mythologie et de poésie grecques offerts à Francis Vian*. Alexandria.
- Acosta-Hughes, B., Cusset, C., Durbec Y., and Pralon, D. (eds.) 2011. *Homère revisité: Parodie et humour dans les réécritures homériques. Actes du colloque international, Aix-en-Provence 30-31 octobre 2008*. Besançon.
- Acosta-Hughes, B. & S.A. Stephens. 2012. *Callimachus in Context: From Plato to the Augustan Poets*. Cambridge.
- Acosta-Hughes, B. 2016. "Composing the Masters: An Essay on Nonnus and Hellenistic Poetry," in Accorinti (ed.) 507-28.
- Adkins, A.W.H. 1969. "Threatening, Abusing, and Feeling Angry in the Homeric Poems." *JHS* 89: 7-21.
- Agosti, G. 2004. *Nonno di Panopoli. Le Dionisiache*. Milan.
- 2012. "Greek Poetry," in Johnson (2012) 361-404.
- Ahl, Frederick and Roisman, Hanna. 1996. *The Odyssey Re-Formed*. Ithaca.
- Ahl, F. 2015. "Transgressing Boundaries of the Unthinkable: Sophocles, Ovid, Vergil, Seneca, and Homer Refracted in Statius' *Thebaid*," in Dominik, Newlands, and Gervais (eds.) 240-65.
- Aicher, P. 1989. "Ennius' Dream of Homer," *AJP* 110.2: 227-232.
- 1990. "Ennian Artistry: Annals 175-179 and 78-83 (Sk.)," *CJ* 85.3: 218-224.
- Alden, M. 2000. *Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the Iliad*. Oxford.
- Allan, W. 2005. "Arms and the man: Euphorbus, Hector, and the death of Patroclus," *CQ* 55: 1-16.
- Anderson, Ø and Haud, D. (eds.) 2011. *Relative Chronology of Greek Epic Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Asso, P. (ed.) 2011. *Brill's Companion to Lucan*. Leiden.
- Augustakis, A. (ed.) 2009. *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*. Leiden.
- . (ed.) 2014. *Flavian Poetry and Its Greek Past*. Leiden.
- . 2015. "Statius and Senecan Drama," in Dominik, Newlands, and Gervais (eds.) 377-92.
- Austin, N. 1966. "The Function of Digressions in the *Iliad*," *GRBS* 7: 295-312.
- Bannert, H. and Kröll, N. 2016. "Nonnus and the Homeric Poems," in Accorinti (ed.) 481-506.
- Barchiesi, M. 1962. *Nevio Epico*. Padua.
- . 2001. "Genealogie letterarie nell'epica imperiale: fondamentalismo e ironia," in Schmidt (2001) 315-54.
- Bär, S. & Baumbach, M. "The Epic Cycle and imperial Greek epic," in Fantuzzi & Tsagalis (eds.) 2015.
- Baumbach, M. 2013. "Proteus and Protean Epic: From Homer to Nonnos," in Gildenhard and Zissos. 153-162.
- Berlincourt, V. 2015. "Early Modern *Thebaid*: The Latin Commentary Tradition," in Dominik, Newlands, and Gervais (eds.) 543-61.
- Bernabé, A. and García-Gasco, R. 2016. "Nonnus and Dionysiac-Orphic Religion," in Accorinti (ed.) 91-110.

- Bernstein, N. 2015. "Family and Kinship in the Works of Statius," in Dominik, Newlands, and Gervais (eds.) 139-56.
- Bessone, F. 2014. "Polis, Court, Empire: Greek Culture, Roman Society, and the System of Genres in Statius' Poetry," in Augoustakis (ed.) 215-234.
- Betts, J.H, Hooker, J.T. and Green, J.R. (eds.) 1986. *Studies in Honour of T.B.L. Webster, Volume 1*. Bristol.
- Bigger, A. "The Normative Redaction of the *Mahābhārata*: Possibilities and Limitations of a Working Hypothesis," in Brockington (ed.) 17-33.
- 1998. *Balarāma im Mahābhārata: Seine Darstellung im Rahmen des Textes und seiner Entwicklung*. Wiesbaden.
- Biggs, T. 2017. "Primus Romanorum: Origin Stories, Fictions of Primacy, and the First Punic War," *CP* 112: 350-67.
- Blänsdorf, J. (ed.). 1995. *Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum*. Berlin.
- Blum, Jessica. 2015. *The Language of Uncertainty: Genre, Tradition, and Literary Imagines in the Argonautica of Valerius Flaccus*. Ph.D. diss. Yale University.
- Bowra, C. 1952. *Heroic Poetry*. London.
- Braund, S. and Most, G. 2004. *Ancient Anger. Perspectives from Homer to Galen*. Cambridge.
- Braune, J. 1935. *Nonnos und Ovid*. Greifswald.
- Brink, C.O. 1972. "Ennius and the Hellenistic worship of Homer," *AJP* 93: 547-67.
- Brockington, J. 1998. *The Sanskrit Epics*. Leiden.
- Brockington, M. 1998. *Stages and Transitions: Temporal and Historical Frameworks in Epic and Purāṇic Literature*. Zagreb.
- Burde, P. 1974. *Untersuchungen zur antiken Universalgeschichtsschreibung*. Diss. Nürnberg 1972. München.
- Burgess, Jonathan S. 2001. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Baltimore.
- 2006. "Neoanalysis, Orality, and Intertextuality: An Examination of Homeric Motif Transference." *OT* 21: 148-189.
- 2011. "Intertextuality without Text in Early Greek Epic," in Andersen and Haug (eds.) 2011.
- 2015. "Coming adrift: The limits of reconstruction of the cyclic poems," in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (eds.) 2015.
- Cairns, D.L. 2003. "Ethics, Ethology, Terminology: Iliadic Anger and the Cross-Cultural Study of Emotion," in Braund and Most (eds.) 11-49.
- Calhoun, G.M. 1935. "The Art of Formula in Homer - ἔπεα πτερόεντα." *CP* 30:215-27.
- Cameron, A. 2000. 'The Poet, the Bishop, and the Harlot', *GRBS* 41, 175-188.
- Carvounis, K. and Hunter, R.L. (eds.) 2008. *Signs of Life? New Contexts for Later Greek Hexameter Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Chinn, C. 2015. "Intertext, Metapoetry, and Visuality in the *Achilleid*," in Dominik, Newlands, and Gervais (eds.) 173-88.
- Christensen, J.P. & Barker, E.T.E. 2011. "On not remembering Tydeus: Agamemnon, Diomedes and the contest for Thebes," *MD* 66: 9-43.
- Chuvin, P. 2016. 'The Poet of Dionysus: Birth of the Last among the Gods', in Accorinti (ed.) 111-124.
- Clader, L. 1976. *Helen: The Evolution from Divine to Heroic in Greek Epic Tradition*. Leiden.
- Clausen, W.V. & Zetzel, J.E.G. 2004. *Commentum Cornuti in Persium recogn. et adnot. crit. instrux*. Saur.

- Clay, J. *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey*. Princeton.
- Cohen, B. (ed.) 1995. *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey*. Oxford.
- Cole, S. 2006. "Cicero, Ennius, and the Concept of Apotheosis at Rome," *Arethusa* 39.3, 531-548.
- Considine, P. 1966. "Some Homeric Terms for Anger," *AClass* 9: 15-25.
- 1986. "The Etymology of *Mēnis*, in J.H. Betts et al. (eds.) 53-64.
- Conte, G.B. 1999. *Latin Literature: A History*. Translated by Joseph B. Solodow, Revised by Don. P Fowler and Glenn W. Most. Baltimore.
- Courtney, E. 2003. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford.
- Dandekdar, Ramchandra Narayan. (ed.) 1990. *The Mahābhārata Revisited*. New Delhi.
- Danek, G. 1996. "Intertextualität in der Ilias, Intertextualität in der Odyssee." *Wiener Humanistische Blätter* 38: 22-36.
- 1998. *Epos und Zitat: Studien zu den Quellen der Odyssee*. Vienna.
- 2002. "Traditional Referentiality and Homeric Intertextuality." In Montanari 2002: 3-19.
- D'Arms, E.F. & Hulley, K.K. 1946 "The Oresteia-Story in the *Odyssey*," *TAPA* 77: 207-213.
- Davis, M.A. 1989. "Ratis audax: Valerius Flaccus' Bold Ship," *Ramus* 18: 46-73.
- Davison, J.A. 1955. "Peisistratus and Homer." *TAPA* 86: 1-21.
- De Jong, I.J.F. 1987. (reprinted 2004) *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. London.
- I.J.F. (ed.) 1999. *Homer: The Creation of the Poems*. London and New York.
- I.J.F. 2006. "The Homeric Narrator and His Own kleos." *Mnemosyne* 59.2: 188-207.
- De Stefani, C. 2011. "Homeric Parody in Nonnus," in Acosta-Hughes, Cusset, Durbec and Pralon (eds.) 65-79.
- Deremetz, A. 2014. "Authorial Poetics in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*," in Heerink & Manuwald (eds.) 2014, 49-71.
- D'Ippolito, G. 1964. *Studi Nonniani: L'epillio nelle Dionisiache*. Palermo.
- Dominik, W.J., Newlands, C.E., and Gervais, K. (eds.) 2015. *Brill's Companion to Statius*. Leiden.
- Dräger, P. 1993. *Argo Pasimelousa: der Argonautenmythos in der griechischen und römischer Literatur*. Stuttgart.
- Duckworth, G. 1933. *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Virgil*. Princeton.
- Elliott, J. 2014. *Ennius and the Architecture of the Annales*. Cambridge.
- Esposito, J. 2016. "Who Kills Turnus? "Pallas" and What Aeneas Sees, Says and Does in *Aeneid* 12.939-52," *CJ* 111.4: 463-81.
- Fantham, E. 2006. "'Dic si quid potes de Sexto Annali': The Literary Legacy of Ennius' Pyrrhic War," *Arethusa* 39.3, 549-568.
- Fantuzzi, M. and Tsagalis, C. (eds.) 2015. *The Greek Epic Cycle and Its Ancient Reception: A Companion*. Cambridge.
- Farrell, J. 2004. "Roman Homer," in Fowler (ed.) 254-71.
- Feeney, D. 1991. *The Gods in Epic*. Oxford.
- . 2005. "The Beginnings of a Literature in Latin," *JRS* 95, 226-240.
- . 2016. *Beyond Greek: The Beginnings of Latin Literature*. Cambridge.
- Fincher, J. 2015. *Nonnus' Dionysiaca and the Redefinition of Epic Poetry and the Heroic Code*. Ph.D. diss. Yale University.

- Finkelberg, Margalit. 2004. "Oral Theory and the Limits of Formulaic Diction." *Oral Tradition* 19.2: 236-52.
- (ed.) 2011. *The Homer Encyclopedia*. Hoboken.
- Fisher, J. 2014. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius and the Italic Tradition*. Baltimore.
- Fitzgerald, James. 1983. "The Great Epic of India as Religious Rhetoric: A Fresh Look at the *Mahābhārata*." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* LI.4: 611-630.
- 1985. "India's Fifth Veda: The *Mahābhārata*'s Presentation of Itself." *Journal of South Asian Literature*, XX.1: 125-40.
- 2003. "The Many Voices of the *Mahābhārata*." In *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 123.4: 803-818.
- 2009. "A Preliminary Study of the 681 Triṣṭubh Passages of the *Mahābhārata*," In Goldman and Tokunaga 2009: 95-117.
- 2012. "Mahābhārata," in *Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism*, Edited by: Knut A. Jacobsen, Helene Basu, Angelika Malinar, Vasudha Narayanan.
- 2013. "History and Primordium in Ancient Indian Historical Writing: *Itihāsa* and *Purāṇa* in the *Mahābhārata* and Beyond," in Raaflaub (ed.) 41-60.
- 2014. "Old, Older, and Oldest Dharmaśāstra: The Manuscript Tradition of the Manu Śāstra, the Original Text of the Manu Śāstra, and the First Dharmasūtras," *JAOS* 134.3: 481-503.
- Foley, John M. 1988. *The Theory of Oral Composition*. Bloomington.
- 1990. *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic*. Bloomington.
- (ed.) 2005. *A Companion to Ancient Epic*. Malden MA and Oxford.
- Ford, A. 1992. *Homer: The Poetry of the Past*. Ithaca.
- Fornara, C. 1983. *The Nature of History in Greece and Rome*. Berkeley.
- Fowler, R. (ed.) 2004. *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Cambridge.
- Frame, Douglas. 2009. *Hippota Nestor*. Washington, D.C.
- Frangoulis, H. 1995. "Nonnos transposant Homère: Étude du chant 37 des *Dionysiaques* de Nonnos de Panopolis," *RPh* 69, 145-68.
- 1999. *Nonnos de Panopolis. Les Dionysiaques*, XIII: *Chant XXXVII*. Paris.
- 2011. "Réécritures parodiques et humoristiques d'Homère chez Nonnos de Panopolis," in Acosta-Hughes, Cusset, Durbec, and Pralon (eds.) 95-106.
- Franko, G.F. 2005. "The Trojan Horse at the Close of the *Iliad*," *CJ* 101.2: 121-123.
- Fränkel, H. 1921. *Die homerischen Gleichnisse*. Göttingen.
- Fränkel, E. 1932. "Griechische Bildung in altrömischen Epen," *Hermes* 67, 598-607.
- Frisk, H. 1946. "Mênis: Zur Geschichte eines Begriffes," *Eranos* 44: 28-40.
- Ganiban, R. 2007. *Statius and Virgil: The Thebaid and the Reinterpretation of the Aeneid*. Cambridge.
- Garani, M. 2007. *Empedocles Redivivus: Poetry and Analogy in Lucretius*. New York & London.
- Gaskin, R. 1994. "Aeneas Ultor and the Problem of *Pietas*," *Eirene* 30: 70-96.
- Geffcken, J. 1920. *Der Ausgang der griechisch-römischen Heidentums*. Heidelberg.
- Gervais, Kyle. 2015. "Tydeus the Hero? Intertextual Confusion in Statius, *Thebaid* 2," *Phoenix* 69.1/2: 56-78.
- Gigli Piccardi, D. 1985. *Metafora e poetica in Nonno di Panopoli*. Florence.
- 2003. *Nonno di Panopoli. Le Dionysiache. Introduzione, traduzione e commento, volume primo*. Milan.
- 2016. "Nonnus' Poetics," in Accorinti (ed.) 422-42.

- Gildenhard, I. and Zissos A. (eds.) 2013. *Transformative Change in Western Thought: A History of Metamorphosis from Homer to Hollywood*. London.
- Giraudet, V. 2005. "Les *Dionysiaques* de Nonnos de Panopolis: Un poème sous le signe de Protée," *BAGB* 2, 75-98.
- Goldberg, S. 1995. *Epic in Republican Rome*. Oxford.
- 2006. "Ennius After the Banquet," *Arethusa* 39.3, 427-447.
- Goldhill, Simon. 1991. *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*. Cambridge.
- (ed.) 2001. *Greek Identity in the Second Sophistic*. Cambridge.
- Goldman, Robert and Tokunaga, Muneo (eds.). 2009. *Epic Undertakings: Proceedings of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference*. Delhi.
- Golega, J. 1930. *Studien über die Evangeliendichtung des Nonnos von Panopolis: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Bibeldichtung im Altertum*. Breslau.
- Gould, J. 1983. "Homeric Epic and the Tragic Moment," in Winniffrith T., Murray P., Grandsen K.W. (eds.).
- Grintser, P. 1974. *Drevneindijski epos, genezis i tipologiya*. Moscow.
- Habinek, T. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton.
- 2006. "The Wisdom of Ennius," *Arethusa* 39.3, 471-488.
- Hadjittofi, F. 2016. "Major Themes and Motifs in the *Dionysiaca*," in Accorinti (ed.) 125-151.
- Hainsworth, J.B. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume 3. Books IX-XII*. Cambridge.
- Hardie, Philip. 1986. *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford.
- . 1993. *The Epic Successors of Virgil*. Cambridge.
- 2005. "Nonnus' Typhon: The Musical Giant," in M. Paschalis (ed.) 117-129.
- Haslam, M. 1997. "Homeric Papyri and Transmission of the Text," in Morris and Powell (eds.) 1997: 55-100.
- 2011. "Text and Transmission." In Finkelberg (ed.).
- Häussler, R. 1976. *Das historische Epos der Griechen und Römer bis Vergil*. Heidelberg.
- Heerink, M. and Manuwald G. (eds.) 2014. *Brill's Companion to Valerius Flaccus*. Leiden.
- Heiden, B. 2008. "Common People and Leaders in 'Iliad' Book 2: The Invocation of the Muses and the Catalogue of Ships," *TAPA* 138.1: 127-154.
- Heinze, R. 1915. *Virgils epische Technik*. Leipzig.
- Hernández de la Fuente, D. 2008. *Bakkhos Anax': Un estudio sobre Nono de Panópolis*. Madrid.
- Herter, H. 1981. "Ovidianum Quintum: Das Diluvium bei Ovid und Nonnos," *ICS* 6: 318-355.
- Heslin, P. 2005. *The Transvestite Achilles: Gender and Genre in Statius' Achilleid*. Cambridge.
- 2015. "Statius in Dante's *Commedia*," in in Dominik, Newlands, and Gervais (eds.) 512-26.
- Hiltebeitel, A. 2001. *Rethinking the Mahābhārata: A Reader's Guide to the Education of the Dharma King*. Chicago.
- 2005. "Weighting Orality and Writing in the Sanskrit Epics." In Koskikallio 2005: 81-111.
- Hinds, Stephen. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Hopkins, E. W. 1901. *The Great Epic of India: Its Character and Origin*. New York.
- Hopkinson, N. 1994a. "Nonnus and Homer," in Hopkinson (ed.) 9-42.
- (ed.) 1994b. *Studies in the Dionysiaca of Nonnus*. Cambridge.
- Horsfall, N. 1989. *Cornelius Nepos: A Selection, including the Lives of Cato and Atticus*. Oxford.

- Ingalls, W.B. 1982. "Linguistic and Formular Innovation in the Mythological Digressions in the *Iliad*." *Phoenix* 36: 201-208.
- Jamison, S. 1994. "Draupadī on the Walls of Troy: *Iliad* 3 from an Indic Perspective," *Classical Antiquity* 13.1: 5-16.
- Janko, Richard. 1982. *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*. Cambridge.
- 1990. "The *Iliad* and its Editors: Dictation and Redaction." *Classical Antiquity* 9: 326-334.
- (ed.) 1992. *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. 4: Books XIII-XVI*. Cambridge.
- Johnson, R. 1965. "Aeneas and the Ironies of *Pietas*," *CJ* 60: 360-64.
- Johnson, S.F. (ed.) 2012. *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity*. Oxford and New York.
- Juhnke, Herbert. 1972. *Homerisches in römischer Epik flavischer Zeit: Untersuchungen zu Szenennachbildungen und Strukturentsprechungen in Statius' Thebais und Achilleis und in Silius' Punica*. Munich.
- Kakridis, J.T. 1949. *Homeric Researches*. Lund.
- 1971. *Homer Revisited*. Lund.
- von Kameke, H. 1926. *Ennius und Homer: Versuch einer Analyse der Annalenfragmente*. Weida in Thüringen.
- Katre S. M. and Gode P. K. (eds.) 1939. *A Volume of Eastern and Indian Studies, presented to Professor F.W. Thomas*. Bombay.
- Keydell, R. 1935. *Gnomon* 11: 597-605.
- 1936. "Nonnos (15)," *RE* 17.1 904-920.
- 1959. *Nonni Panopolitani Dionysiaca*, 2 vols. Berlin.
- Klaassen, E.K. 2009. "Imitation and the Hero," in Augoustakis (ed.) 99-126.
- Kleywegt, A. 2005. *Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica, Book I: A Commentary*. Leiden.
- Kirk, G. S. 1985. *The Iliad, a commentary*. Cambridge.
- Knaack, G. 1886. *Quaestiones Phaethontaeae*. Berlin.
- Knauer, G. 1964. *Die Aeneis und Homer*. Göttingen.
- Knapp, C. 1908. "The Originality of Latin Literature," *The Classical Journal* 3.7: 251-60.
- Knox, P. 1988. "Phaeton in Ovid and Nonnus," *CQ* 38: 536-551.
- Kōiv, M. 2011. "A Note on the Dating of Hesiod," *CQ* 61.2: 355-377.
- Koskikallio, P. (ed.) 2005. *Epics, Khilas and Purāṇas: Continuities and Ruptures. Proceedings, 3rd Dubrovnik International Conference on the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas*. Zagreb.
- Krostenko, B.A. 2013. "The poetics of Naevius' 'epitaph' and the history of Latin poetry." *Journal of Roman Studies* 103, 46-64.
- Kullman, W. 1960. *Die Quellen der Ilias (Troischer Sagenkreis)*. Weisbaden.
- 1999. "The Homeric Question," in de Jong (ed.) 145-156.
- Kunz, F. 1890. *Die älteste römische Epik in ihren Verhältnis zu Homer*. Wien.
- Lamberton R. and Keaney, J.J. (eds.) 1992. *Homer's Ancient Readers: The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes*. Princeton.
- Lee, O. 1979. *Fathers and Sons in the Aeneid*. Albany.
- Leigh, M. 2010. "Early Roman epic and the maritime moment." *Classical Philology* 105, 265-80.
- Lendle, O. 1968. "Paris, Helena und Aphrodite: Zur Interpretation des 3. Gesanges der Ilias," *A&A* 14: 68.
- Lesky, A. 1971. *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. Bern.

- Livrea, E. 1987. "Il poeta e il vescovo. La questione nonniana e la storia," *Prometheus* 13, 97-123.
- 2003. "The Nonnus Question Revisited," in Accorinti and Chuvin (ed.) 447-455.
- Lord, Alfred. 1953. "Homer's Originality: Oral Dictated Texts," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 84: 124-134.
- 1960. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge and London.
- 1995. *The Singer Resumes the Tale*. Ithaca and London.
- Lovatt, H. 2005. *Statius and Epic Games. Sport, Politics and Poetics in the Thebaid*. Cambridge.
- 2015. "Following after Valerius: Argonautic Imagery in the *Thebaid*," in Domink, Newlands, and Gervais (eds.) 408-24.
- Mackie, C.J. (ed.) 2004. *Oral Performance and its Context*. Leiden.
- Marg, W. 1956. *Der erste Lied des Demodokos*. Leiden.
- Mariotti, S. (1952) *Livio Andronico e la traduzione artistica. Saggio critico ed edizione dei frammenti*. Urbino.
- Martin, Richard. 1989. *The Language of Heroes*. Ithaca.
- 2000. "Wrapping Homer Up: Cohesion, Discourse, and Deviation in the *Iliad*," in Sharrock and Morales (2000), 43-65.
- 2005. "Epic as Genre." In Foley 2005: 9-19.
- Maciver, C. 2016. "Nonnus and Imperial Greek Poetry," in Accorinti (ed.) 529-48.
- Matier, K.O. 2014. "The Influence of Ennius on Silius Italicus," *Akroterion* 36: 153-158.
- Mazza, D. 2012. *La fortuna della poesia ellenistica nelle Dionisiache di Nonno di Panopoli (H επιρροή της ελληνιστικής ποίησης στα Διονυσιακά το Νόννου Πανοπολίτη)*, Ph.D. diss., Sapienza University of Rome, in cooperation with the Aristoteles University of Thessaloniki.
- McElduff, S. 2013. *Roman Theories of Translation: Surpassing the Source*. New York.
- McNelis, C. *Statius' Thebaid and the Poetics of Civil War*. Cambridge, 2007.
- Mehta, M. 1990. "Dvaipāyana, poet of being and becoming." In Dandekar 1990: 101-11.
- Meister, K. 1921. *Die Homerische Kunstsprache*. Leipzig.
- Micozzi, L. 2015. "Statius' Epic Poetry: A Challenge to the Literary Past," in Dominik, Newlands, and Gervais (eds.) 325-342.
- Miguélez Caverio, L. 2008. *Poems in Context: Greek Poetry in the Egyptian Thebaid, 200-600 AD*. Berlin and New York.
- Minchin, Elizabeth. 2005. "Homer on Autobiographical Memory: The Case of Nestor," in Rabel 55-72.
- Moatti, C. 1997. *La Raison de Rome: Naissance de l'esprit critique à la fin de la République (IIer-Ier siècle avant Jésus-Christ)*. Paris.
- Montanari, F. (ed.) 2002. *Omero tremila anni dopo. Atti del congresso di Genova 6-8 Luglio 2000*. Rome.
- Morris, I. and Powell, B. 1997. *A New Companion to Homer*. Brill.
- Morrison, J. 1992. *Homeric Misdirection: False Predictions in the Iliad*. Ann Arbor.
- Moulton, C. 1974. "Similes in the *Iliad*," *Hermes* 102: 381-397.
- . 1977. *Similes in the Homeric Poems*. Göttingen.
- Mulder, H. M. 1954. *Publii Papinii Statii Thebaidos liber secundus*. Groningen.
- Müller, Dietrich. 1916. *Die Ilias und ihre Quellen*. Berlin.
- Munro, D. 1901. *Homer's Odyssey, Books XIII-XXIV*. Oxford.
- Murnaghan, S. 1995. "The Plan of Athena," in Cohen (ed.) 1995: 61-80.

- Nagy, G. 1992. "Homeric Questions." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 122: 17-60.
- . 2008. *Homer the Classic*. Washington D.C.
- Nieto Hernández, P. 2007. "Reading Homer in the 21st Century," *College Literature* 34.2: 29-54.
- Newbold, R.F. 2003. "The Power of Sound in Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*," in Accorinti and Chuvín (eds.) 457-468.
- Nizzola, P. 2012. *Testo e macrotesto nelle Dionisiache di Nonno di Panopoli*. Reggio Calabria.
- Nugent, S.G. 1996. "Statius' Hypsipyle: Following in the Footsteps of the *Aeneid*," *Scholia* 5: 46-71.
- O'Hara, J. J. 1996. *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Ann Arbor.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1885. "Das altindische Ākhyāna," *ZDMG* 37: 54-86.
- 1922. *Das Mahabharata: seine Entstehung, sein Inhalt, seine Form*. Göttingen.
- Olson, S.D. 1990. "The Stories of Agamemnon in Homer's *Odyssey*," *TAPA* 120: 57-71.
- Pagán, V. E. 2015. "Georgics 2.497 and Thebaid 1.19-20: Allusion and Inspiration," in Dominik, Newlands & Gervais (eds.) 362-376.
- Page, D. 1955. *The Homeric Odyssey*. Oxford.
- Parkes, R. 2010 "Dealing with Ghosts: Literary Assertion in Statius' *Thebaid*." *Maia* 39: 14-23.
- 2014. "The Epics of Statius and Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*," in Heerink and Manuwald (eds.) 326-39.
- Paschalis, M. (ed.) 2005. *Roman and Greek Imperial Epic*. Herakleion.
- 2014. "Ovidian Metamorphosis and Nonnian *poikilon eidos*," in Spanoudakis (ed.) 97-122.
- Podlecki, A.J. 1971. "Some Odyssean Similes," *G&R* 18: 81-90.
- Polt, Christopher B. 2013. "Allusive Translation and Chronological Paradox in Varro of Atax's *Argonautae*," *American Journal of Philology* 134: 603-636.
- Porter, J. 2004. "Homer: The History of an Idea," in Fowler (ed.) 324-43.
- Possanza, D.M. 2004. *Translating the Heavens: Aratus, Germanicus, and the Poetics of Latin Translation*. New York.
- Postlethwaite, N. 1985. "The Duel of Paris and Menelaos and the Teichoskopia in *Iliad* 3," *Antichthon* 19: 1-6.
- Putnam, M. 1995. *Vergil's Aeneid: Interpretation and Influence*. Chapel Hill.
- . 2007. "Troy in Latin Literature," *New England Classical Journal* 34.3: 195-205.
- Raaflaub, K. (ed.) 2013. *Thinking, Recording, and Writing History in the Ancient World*. Hoboken.
- Reckford, K. 1964. "Helen in the *Iliad*," *GRBS* 5: 8-17.
- Reed, J. 2007. *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the Aeneid*. Princeton.
- 2011. "The *Bellum Civile* as a Roman Epic," in Asso (ed.) 21-31.
- Renaud, J.M. 1993. *Le Mythe de Méléagre: Essais d'interprétation*. Liège.
- Renou, L. 1939. "L'Hymne aux Ásvin de l'Ādiparvan." In Katre and Gode 1939: 177-87.
- Richardson, Scott. 1990. *The Homeric Narrator*. Nashville.
- Ripoll, F. 1998. *La morale héroïque dans les épopées latines d'époque flavienne: Tradition et innovation*. Leuven.
- . 2001. "Le monde homérique dans les *Punica* de Silius Italicus," *Latomus* 60: 87-107.
- Roche, P. 2015. "Lucan's *De Bello Civili* in the *Thebaid*," in Dominik, Newlands, and Gervais (eds.) 393-408.

- Rochette, B. 1995. "Du grec au latin et du latin au grec: Les problemes de la traduction dans l'antiquité gréco-latine." *Latomus* 54, 245-61.
- Rossi, A. and Breed, B. 2006. "Introduction: Ennius and the Traditions of Epic," *Arethusa* 39.3, 397-425.
- Röser, W. 1939. *Ennius, Euripides, und Homer*. Würzburg-Aumühle.
- Rutherford, R.B. 1985. "At Home and Abroad: Aspects of the Structure of the *Odyssey*." *PCPS* 211: 133-49.
- Schadewaldt, W. 1956. "Hektor in der Ilias." *Wiener Studien* 69: 5-25.
- Schlunk, R. 1967. "Vergil and the Homeric Scholia," *AJP* 88.1: 33-44.
- . 1974. *The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid. A Study of the Influence of Ancient Homeric Literary Criticism on Virgil*. Ann Arbor.
- Schmidt, E. A. (ed.). 2001. *L'histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine*. Vandoeuvres.
- Schmit-Neuerburg, T. 1999. *Vergils Aeneis und die antike Homerexegese, Untersuchungen zum Einfluss ethischer und kritischer Homerrezeption auf imitatio und aemulatio Vergils*. Berlin and New York.
- Schmitz, C. 2001. "'Denn auch Niobe...' die Bedeutung der Erzählung in Achills Rede (Ω 599-602)." *Hermes* 129: 145-157.
- Schöll, F. 1885. "Zu Ennius und Quintilian." *RMP* 40: 320-24.
- Schönberger, O. 1960. "Zu Iliad 3, 146-180," *Gymnasium* 67: 197-201.
- Sciarrino, E. 2006. "The Introduction of Epic in Rome: Cultural Thefts and Social Contests," *Arethusa* 39.3, 449-469.
- Scodel, R. 1998. "Bardic Performance and Oral Tradition in Homer, *AJP* 119.2: 171-194.
- 2002. *Listening to Homer: Tradition, Narrative and Audience*. Ann Arbor.
- 2004. "The Modesty of Homer," in Mackie, C.J. (ed.) 2004.
- Scully, S. 2003. "Reading the Shield of Achilles: Terror, Anger, Delight," *HSCP* 101: 29-47.
- Seal, C. 2014. "Civil War and the Apolloninan Model in Valerius' *Argonautica*," in Augoustakis (2014) 113-136.
- Sharrock, A. and Morales, H. (eds.) 2000. *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*. Oxford.
- Sherry, L.F. 1991. *The Hexameter Paraphrase of St. John attributed to Nonnus of Panopolis: Prolegomenon and Translation*, Ph.D. diss, Columbia University.
- Shorrock, R. 2001. *The Challenge of Epic: Allusive Engagement in the Dionysiaca of Nonnus*. Leiden.
- 2005. "Nonnus," in Foley (ed.) 374-385.
- 2008. "The Politics of Poetics: Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* and the World of Late Antiquity," in Carvounis and Hunter (eds.) 99-113.
- 2011. *The Myth of Paganism: Nonnus, Dionysus and the World of Late Antiquity*. London.
- Skutsch, O. (ed.) 1985. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*. Oxford.
- Slatkin, L. 1991. *The Power of Thetis: Allusion and Interpretation in the Iliad*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Smith, Mary Carroll. 1992. *The Warrior Code of India's Sacred Song*. New York.
- Stegemann, V. 1930. *Astrologie und Universalgeschichte: Studien und Interpretationen zu den Dionysiaka des Nonnos von Panopolis*. Leipzig and Berlin.
- Spanoudakis, K. (ed.) 2014. *Nonnus of Panopolis in Context: Poetry and Cultural Milieu in Late Antiquity with a Section on Nonnus and the Modern World*. Berlin and Boston.

- Stamatopoulou, Z. 2017. *Hesiod and Classical Greek Poetry: Reception and Transformation in the Fifth Century BCE*. Cambridge.
- Stover, Tim. 2012. *Epic and Empire in Vespasianic Rome: A New Reading of Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica*. Oxford, New York.
- Suerbaum, W. 1968. *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter: Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius*. Hildesheim.
- . 2001. *Handbuch der Lateinischen Literatur der Antike. Erster Band: Die Archaische Literatur. Von den Anfängen bis zu Sullas Tod. Die Vorliterarische Periode und die Zeit von 240 bis 78 v. Chr.* Munich.
- Sukthankar, V. S. 1933. *Prolegomena (to the critical edition of the Ādiparvan of the Mahābhārata)*. Poona.
- Sullivan, Bruce. 1990. *Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa and the Mahābhārata: A New Interpretation*. Leiden.
- Thomas, Oliver. 2014. "Phemius Suite." *JHS*, 134: 89-102.
- Tipping, B. 2010. *Exemplary Epic: Silius Italicus' Punica*. Oxford.
- Tolkien, J. 1900. *Homer und die römische Poesie*. Leipzig.
- Torres-Guerra, José B. 1995. *La "Tebaida" homérica como Fuente de "Ilíada y Odisea"*. Madrid.
- Tsagarakis, O. 1982. "The Teichoskopia Cannot Belong in the Beginning of the Trojan War," *QUCC* 41: 61-72.
- van Buitenen, J. A. B. 1975. *The Mahābhārata, Volume 2*. Chicago.
- Vassilkov, Y. 1995. "The Mahābhārata's Typological Definition Reconsidered," *Indo-Iranian Journal* 38.3: 249-55.
- Vessey, D. W. T. 1973. *Statius and the Thebaid*. Cambridge.
- Vian, F. 1976. *Nonnos de Panopolis. Les Dionysiaques, I: Chants I-II*. Paris.
- 1991. "Nonno ed Omero," *Koinonia* 15, 5-18.
- 1998. "Les cultes païens dans les Dionysiaques de Nonnos de Panopolis," *Prometheus* 19, 39-52.
- 2003. *Nonnos de Panopolis. Les Dionysiaques, XVII: Chant XLVIII*. Paris.
- Watkins, C. 1977. "À propos de mēnis," *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 72: 193-9.
- Welker, Friedrich Gottlob. 1894. *Der epische Cyclus II*. Bonn.
- West, M.L. 1999. "The invention of Homer," *CQ* 49: 364-82.
- 2001. *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*. Munich and Leipzig.
- 2003. "Iliad and Aethiopsis," *CQ* 53.1: 1-14.
- 2005. "Odyssey and Argonautica," *CQ* 55.1: 39-64.
- 2011. "The Homeric Question Today," *PAPS* 155.4: 383-393.
- 2013. *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics*. Oxford.
- Wilamowitz, Ulrich von. 1884. *Homerische Untersuchungen*. Berlin.
- Wild, G. 1886. *Die Vergleiche bei Nonnos*. Regensburg.
- Williams, G. *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*. Oxford.
- Winkler, J.J. 1974. *In Pursuit of Nymphs: Comedy and Sex in Nonnos' Tales of Dionysus*, Ph.D. diss., University of Texas, Austin.
- Winniffrith, T., Murray, P., and Grandsen K.W. (eds.). 1983. *Aspects of the Epic*. London.
- Winternitz, M. 1908. *Geschichte der Indischen Literatur*. Leipzig.
- Wiseman, T.P. 2004. *The Myths of Rome*. Exeter.
- 2006. "Fauns, Prophets, and Ennius' Annales," *Arethusa* 39.3, 513-529.

- Zeitlin, F. 2001. "Visions and Revisions of Homer in the Second Sophistic," in Goldhill (ed.) 195-266.
- Zissos, A. 2010. *Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica, Book 1: A Commentary*. Oxford.
- Zorzetti, N. 1991. "Poetry and ancient city: the case of Rome," *CJ* 86, 311-329.