



King's Research Portal

DOI:
[10.1353/apa.2019.0005](https://doi.org/10.1353/apa.2019.0005)

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Avlami, P. (2019). Contextualizing Quintus: The Fall of Troy and the Cultural Uses of the Paradoxical Cityscape in *Posthomerica* 13. *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 149(1), 149-208.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/apa.2019.0005>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Contextualizing Quintus: The fall of Troy and the cultural uses of the paradoxical cityscape in *Posthomerica* 13*

Abstract: The article argues for a reader-oriented approach to the way Quintus of Smyrna (and other Imperial Greek poetry) can be placed in their synchronic literary context. The argument has a second, more specific goal: to show how such a reorientation can offer us a sense of the cultural work performed by the text, especially in terms of the ways in which one particular episode, the fall of Troy in book 13 of the *PH*, models ideas about past and present, as well as Greek and Roman identity. (91 words)

Introduction: contextualizing Quintus

Among the poets who composed in Greek under the Roman Empire, Quintus of Smyrna is by no means a neglected author. Besides a longer tradition of scholarship on Quintus's sources and on textual criticism, a new wave of studies has been steadily putting Quintus, as well as Greek Imperial poetry, on our radar when discussing the cultural history of the Greek-speaking Empire. While critics have shown that Quintus's poetics and artistry come alive with more sophisticated literary approaches, the new interest in Quintus and other epic poets of the Empire is not exhausted in showing that these are the great poets that no one ever suspected they were – a usual strategy in resuscitating the forlorn poets of yesteryear. Instead, there is a growing interest in the cultural context within which Greek poets of the Roman Empire functioned and in Quintus's place in the cultural history of the period.¹ There is a growing consensus for Quintus's date to be placed sometime in the 3rd c. C.E., which puts the work squarely within Imperial Greek literature in terms of chronology, and the new wave of criticism on Quintus is beginning to flesh out this synchronic story.² And yet the way in which Quintus could be placed within his Imperial context has been explored only in a limited way. Among other reasons for this,³ I would like in the following introductory

remarks to highlight two: 1) the cultural and chronological context in which Quintus has been placed has been the more narrowly rhetorical context of the “Second Sophistic” rather than the more complex and broadly encompassing “Imperial Greek literature” and 2) the ways in which the *Posthomerica* (hereon: *PH*) as a text interacts with and is shaped by its literary context has been largely based on an intentionalist and author-focused view of intertextuality, rather than a reader-oriented intertextual model. It will be necessary in what follows to deconstruct to a certain degree recent arguments that place Quintus in his cultural context, as this process will help clarify my approach. I should flag at the outset that I agree in various respects with the scholars discussed below and that my opening remarks are intended as a way of building on and extending their work rather than in a spirit of polemics.

As I argue in this article, it is especially by changing our intertextual lenses and focusing instead on a reader-oriented view of Quintus’s poem in its synchrony that we can appreciate Quintus’s presence in Imperial Greek literature. The strategies of reading Quintus offered here can be applied equally to other Imperial poets (and indeed some other poets are discussed below) and contribute to a better integration of the considerable Greek poetic output of the Empire in our approaches to the period’s textual production. The argument has a second, more specific goal: to show how such an approach to intertextuality can offer us a sense of the cultural work performed by the text through its readers, especially in terms of the ways in which one particular episode, the fall of Troy in book 13 of the *PH*, models ideas about the Empire, community, past and present, as well as Greek and Roman identity.

As far as the cultural and chronological context of Quintus is concerned, the fact that the poet is beginning to leave the isolation of “late Greek epic” and to be placed in its broader literary and cultural context is part of a broader reorientation in the study of Imperial Greek literature. It is necessary to emphasise this broader scholarly reorientation, because in

Quintean scholarship the question of the chronological and cultural context within which we should be placing Quintus has not been systematically defined mainly because the larger context in which Quintus has been placed is the “Second Sophistic” rather the more capacious and purely chronological umbrella of “Imperial Greek literature.” As Whitmarsh has suggested, the “Second Sophistic” is a slippery term that elides one socially and culturally determined aspect of literary culture (the importance of a rhetorically focused education and the centrality of epideictic oratory as elite social performance) with the totality of the period’s cultural dynamics.⁴ A new wave of studies on various aspects of Imperial Greek literature has shown that we are moving beyond the now traditional narrower focus on the ancient novel or focused studies tracing elements of rhetorical training and school culture in the literature of the “Second Sophistic.”⁵ Instead, we are gradually becoming more attentive to the variety of Greek literary production and consumption under the Roman Empire. The gradual acknowledgement of variety and plurality within Imperial Greek literature has also meshed with the growing recognition in cultural historical studies that texts are sites of negotiation, rather than mirrors of a stable cultural system. Texts have social and cultural agency, they both contest and reinforce dominant cultural trends, and they contain a plurality of voices.⁶ In this shift, the work of Whitmarsh has been instrumental in reminding us that the dominant structures and paradigms of Imperial Greek culture in our sources—especially the consolidation of elite identity around Atticism, elitism, Hellenocentrism, cultural nostalgia, and epigonal identity, as well as the centrality of rhetorical *paideia*—⁷ do not constitute a monolithic totality or unopposed dogma. Imperial Greek literature contains and consists of other voices and trends that do not fit neatly into the aforementioned tendencies of and grand narratives about Imperial Greek culture, but rather rewrite, negotiate, probe, and/or upset these dominant paradigms.⁸ There is certainly space for epic to exist side

by side with prose of all kinds (including declamation) within this broader context of Imperial Greek literature—and Imperial audiences were certainly exposed to both—but such developments in the study of a now multiform and multivocal Imperial Greek literature have not had much of an impact yet on the way Quintus has been contextualised.

The debate instead has tried to situate the poem through the relationship between “epic” and “Second Sophistic,” phrased in a rather artificial manner as a polarity. Whereas earlier publications on Quintus approached the question of his cultural context mainly by tracing clues in the text about the poem’s date,⁹ Baumbach and Bär re-opened the question in its own right regarding Quintus’s cultural context within Greek literature of the Empire with their edited collection *Quintus Smyrnaeus: Transforming Homer in Second Sophistic Epic* (2007a), in which the issue of Quintus’s relationship to the Second Sophistic was addressed explicitly in the editors’ introduction.¹⁰ The editors fruitfully suggested that, although strictly speaking Quintus does not conform to certain characteristics of the Second Sophistic such as Atticism (Quintus’s language being Homeric), there are reasons to take it for granted that elements of the period’s rhetorical culture had affected the practice of writing poetry by the 3rd c. C.E., an assumption that allows them to put experimentally “Quintus’ epic in dialogue with the Second Sophistic and to contextualise the *Posthomerica* within the cultural and literary tendencies which were well established in that period.”¹¹ Bär followed up with a dedicated article on the same issue arguing that Quintus is responding in a self-conscious manner to Second Sophistic Homeric revisionism in prose (works like Dio Chrysostom’s *Trojan Oration*, Lucian’s *Verae Historiae*, Philostratus’s *Heroicus*) by offering a traditionalist response of Homeric rewriting from within the epic genre, while we can also trace in Quintus’s speeches elements of contemporary epideictic and forensic rhetoric in the contest between Odysseus and Ajax over Achilles’ armor (*PH* 5), adapted to the poetics and

metapoetics of the *PH*.¹² Bär's article gave rise to a response by Maciver, who emphasised the essentially traditional epic character of this particular episode and argued against an understanding of Quintus's epic as part of the Second Sophistic, prioritizing instead the Homeric intertext as the key to interpretation: "[...] Quintus keeps to form by ensuring that the fundamental hue and integral intertextuality of the contest is Homeric. The *Posthomerica* as a whole cannot be a Second Sophistic epic by rights of what the Second Sophistic entails."¹³

In this debate the question of Quintus's cultural context has been defined from the start by the narrower rhetorical and cultural phenomenon of the Second Sophistic rather than by recognising the plurality and variety of Greek literature in the Imperial period. To a certain degree this narrower focus is due to the fact that these critics were attempting to open up Quintus to a discipline that was still at the time largely (though not exclusively) focused on sophistic literature as the defining trend within Imperial Greek culture. Looking at the question from within the confines of this narrower contextual framework, I essentially agree with Baumbach and Bär in their assertion that the overall centrality of Homer in the period's literary culture is a good starting point for considering the consonance between Quintus's project and the rhetorical culture of the Second Sophistic.¹⁴ For how could Homericising epic, its production, and consumption be somehow outside the domain of Imperial *paideia* and its markers of elite status? Homeric poetry not only continued to enjoy a central presence in high Greek culture under the Empire but also had an instrumental role in the reading lists, training, allusions, quotations, and identity politics of Imperial sophists.¹⁵ But when the connection between Quintus and the Second Sophistic becomes principally defined by a hunt for traces of the influence of declamation in the composition of the *PH*, as is the case in part of Bär's article, responses like that of Maciver are at once justified (where is the appreciation

of epic diachrony and Homeric poetics?) and also unrealistically binary (why do we need to choose between Homeric and sophistic poetics as the only interpretive key? Is the interpreter that we envision, when focusing solely on such a privileged intertext, a realistic view of Imperial readers and their habits?).¹⁶ Although I value the insights of Maciver's triangulation between Quintus, Homer, and Imperial context, I am less convinced by the narrower view (partly borrowed from those he critiques) of what "contemporary context" can mean: by and large, demonstrable traces of declamatory practice found in Quintus.¹⁷ This is to equate the context of Imperial literature with the narrower definition of the Second Sophistic and within this narrower context to privilege only one aspect of sophistic culture.

The limitations of the debate, though, as it has been pitched are more clear if we also consider that the relationship between Imperial epic and its contemporary cultural milieu remains focused on authorial intentions and production rather than audiences' intertextual links. Baumbach and Bär set out to read the relationship between Quintus and Second Sophistic literature from the perspective of reader response and the Jaussian horizon of expectation,¹⁸ but the focus on response is quickly substituted by authorial intention, as the discussion focuses instead on what Quintus's agenda might have been.¹⁹ Bär's 2010 approach is more nuanced and goes further: it acknowledges readers' expectations and is careful in the way it phrases the possible connections that can be made between Quintus's epic project and the contemporary wave of Homeric revisionism in sophistic prose.²⁰ But ultimately the analysis insists that Quintus is a traditionalist who offers "a 'traditional response' to [Homeric revisionism] and similar 'innovative tendencies'" without advancing a more fully worked out model of intertextuality and reader response in Quintus's reception. At the same time, the larger part of the argument returns to the author and the self-consciousness of Quintus's creative process: the marked use of declamation and its terminology in *PH 5*,

argues Bär, allows Quintus to mould the character of Odysseus into an embedded author figure beckoning to us like Hitchcock in his films.²¹ The issue of reader response brings out more clearly the problems arising from the limited synchronic comparanda. The reception of Homer in the Imperial period is attested and was characterized by a very broad range of uses, reactions, rewritings, and adaptations that were not limited to the “innovative tendencies” of the smaller canon of prose works that playfully refute the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (“Homeric revisionism”).²² Readers’ experience of Homeric epic could be populated by a vast range of potential comparanda that filtered perception of Homer: from memories of Homeric school exercises to Homeric scholia, biographies, *hypotheseis* and philological treatises to public performances by Imperial rhapsodes and private performances at leisure or banquet to texts with more complex engagements with Homeric authority that are not easily reducible to binary contrasts between nostalgia/traditionalism and modernism/innovation: in this last, complex category, we can think of, say, the meta-ekphrastic preoccupations of Philostratus in *Imagines* 1.1 on the Homeric Scamander between vision and text, or the influence of the *Odyssey* on the *nostos* story-pattern for Imperial texts like the sophistic novels.²³ It is rather unrealistic to think that we gain a representative image of the range of receptions that Quintus’s poem would have, considering the *PH* only through its juxtaposition to Dio’s *Trojan Oration* or Philostratus’s *Heroicus*.

Seen from this angle, Maciver’s argument for an essential incompatibility between Quintean epic and Second Sophistic literature relies solely on arguments about the production of the text, such as the fact that sophists seem not to have composed full-scale epic or the difference between the Atticism of sophistic prose and the Homeric language of Quintus.²⁴ Perhaps the individuals who wrote epic and those who composed in rhetorical genres were not the same, but why should we not pay any attention to how texts interacted with each other

in the eyes of Imperial readers instead, who read and listened to literature beyond such boundaries? Didn't Imperial audiences of *pepaideumenoí* roam broadly in their reading of canonical and classical but also of contemporary, Imperial texts? We get a glimpse of such readers in action in the omnivorous reading habits of Imperial epic poets from the 3rd c. C.E. onwards who exhibit clear influences from a variety of literary genres they consumed that go beyond a dichotomy of prose and poetry.²⁵ I am thinking of these poets as readers here and we find support for the larger presence of such an omnivorous intertextuality if we consider the similarly fluid way in which prose texts, like Athenaeus's *Deipnosophists* (possibly written within Quintus's lifetime), put literary texts into dialogue. As Jacob and Paulas have suggested, the *Deipnosophists* in its use of quotation-clusters and discussions of particular words or themes showcases the kinds of associations between texts that one author-reader, Athenaeus, made and recorded. But the text also invites its readers to make their own associations across quotations, texts, genres, and periods, while at the same time reflects on the various kinds of intertextual connections that actual, contemporary readers would make.²⁶ Quotations from prose and poetry are casually intermingled and the *Deipnosophists* gives us a sense of the breadth of learned reading habits in this period. It also shows clearly how linguistic purism, Atticism, and emulation of classical prose models is only one part of readerly habits within a range of types of cultural consumption and production that confer status upon the *pepaideumenos*. Archaism, cultural nostalgia, and the negotiation of past and present was filtered through a variety of texts, genres, and linguistic registers; reading poetry of various kinds was consonant with rather than competitive to sophistic Atticism.²⁷ The aspirational intellectuals of Imperial Oxyrhynchus, as discussed by Johnson, spent considerable time and effort studying and corresponding about dramatic works that had become niche and obscure text in this period, but also Pindar, Stesichorus, Alcaeus, Alcman,

Bacchylides, and Simonides.²⁸ This activity meshed with their overall self-positioning and status as elite members of their community. In terms of elite positioning, these readers occupy a place in the same continuum as Aelius Aristides, himself a sophist, who evidently read Homeric and other non-Attic poetry avidly besides his study of Attic models and densely interspersed his work with poetic quotation, a practice that did not change the fact that later generations viewed him as a model of Atticism in his own right.²⁹ Why should we forget the broad dialogue of texts that were in existence in the Imperial period and which was put into motion largely by all those other readers, those who did not necessarily write either prose or poetry themselves, but read widely, made sense of texts, negotiated their meaning, and were the agents of the intertextual webs that linked texts, themes, motifs, and literary techniques regardless of formalist and generic classifications?

By insisting on a reader-oriented view of intertextuality, I am not arguing against author-focused readings in general; an author-oriented approach is often inescapable and it underlies part of my own exploration of the programmatic aspects of *PH* 13.³⁰ Nevertheless, this approach will be contextualised by an equally important focus on how Quintus and other Imperial authors share narrative and aesthetic tropes that engage with the image of a city, as well as metaphorical ways of thinking about ideas of community and the relationship between past and present through the literary representation of the fall of Troy. Looking at the relationship between the *PH* and its synchronic context in this way means (to put it starkly) that the *PH* is *inescapably* an Imperial text, not because its author deploys a range of sophistic techniques or the author consciously refutes or affirms other contemporary texts and trends, but because the techniques, themes, and fictions of the totality of texts that are available to Imperial readers educate them to read in particular ways. It is readers that make contexts and readers cannot escape their synchrony. For the purposes of this discussion of

Quintus, this Imperial synchrony includes texts that were composed possibly within the same century as Quintus and composed earlier in the Imperial period, but also all the earlier texts (and responses to these texts) that continued circulating and whose accumulation formed the ever-expanding literary archive of *paideia*. So I am referring not simply to what is produced under the Empire but also to the internal dynamics of the ever-increasing body of texts available in the period.³¹

Reading Quintus outside the framework of the epic tradition he belongs to and side by side with a broad range of texts across several genres is to re-enact the varieties of intertextual and cultural work that the *PH* would have performed in its Imperial context and ancient reception. In this sense, my goal here, alongside a reorientation of how we should read intertextuality in Quintus, is to show how the description of the fall of Troy in the *PH* models for its Imperial audience their own relationship with an emblematic image of city and community (with the city of Troy as metaphor for an Imperial synchronic view of community). This relationship is a ‘remembering’ of the mythological moment of the *halôsis*, which is of foundational emblematic value for both ‘Greek’ and ‘Roman’ aspects of their identity (Troy as past, memory, and *aition* of the Empire). As I argue, the central elements of Quintus’s descriptive approach to the city and its destruction create a particular type of *historical fiction*, both of Troy and of a historical moment that is foundational for Greek and Roman cultures. The literary texture and the intertextual baggage of this type of historical fiction condition the image of Troy that Quintus invokes. By conditioning this image, they also condition the historical *relationship* between Imperial Greek culture and the mythical foundations of both Greek and Roman identities, while they also reinforce ideas about what it means to be Greek and Roman in the Imperial present.³² In this sense, a move towards a reader-oriented approach can provide a more secure footing towards retracing the ways in

which the language and themes of the *PH* not only opened a dialogue with Homer and other texts under the Empire, but also reinforced, probed, and reshaped broader cultural preoccupations of Greek-speaking Imperial readers. In the discussion that follows I engage with some non-literary context, especially Roman-era tourism in the Troad (in section IV and in my conclusion). I hope that the approach presented here—with its focus on synchronic negotiations of meaning and on how intertexts enable and encourage ways of reading and seeing—can provide a secure footing in terms of literary approach with a view to further work that will engage more systematically with the evidence of further non-literary texts and social practices.³³

As the approach presented here requires a thick description of how other texts shape the *PH*, the argument is long and synthesizes a variety of intertextual perspectives.³⁴ A roadmap will be useful here. My thematic focus is on the 13th book of the *PH*, in which Quintus narrates the destruction of Troy, after the Wooden Horse has been brought into the city, and as the Trojans celebrate and fall asleep drunk from the festivities. The Greeks come out of the horse and a bloody battle follows, described at length and in gruesome detail, a battle that leads to the Greeks' final victory. My argument will unpack the implications of the theme of the paradoxical fusion of banquet and battle in Quintus's portrayal of Troy ("Section I: Drunk battle"). The argument here is that the theme of banquet and inebriation become dominant themes in the book, by informing the poetics of the description more generally, while also blurring the dimensions of Greek and Trojan with repercussions for its Imperial readers. Section II ("The reader's couch: life and death at the banquet") extends the argument of Section I, arguing that Quintus's thematic contrast of battle and banquet is shaped by the earlier exploration of the theme in the *Odyssey*. The blend of banquet and battle collapses the worlds of audience and epic action, while at the same time it stages an

easily recognisable occasion of the act of reading within Quintus's narrative. Through this thematic interplay between life-banquet and death-battle, the foundational moment of the fall of Troy balances a sense of presence and reanimation against a sense of loss and rupture. In Section III ("Synecdoche and cityscape") I establish how literary context encourages Imperial readers to approach descriptions of destruction, remnants, and fragmentation through synecdoche; the ekphrastic strategies of other kinds of Imperial Greek literature can help us recover ways in which ancient readers would make sense of Quintus's description in *PH* 13. Finally, in Section IV ("Destruction and fragmentation") I draw the threads of all sections together to discuss how Quintus's Trojan cityscape creates a vision of the Roman Greeks' origin as both relatable and other, and of the Imperial Greek reader as both participant in this story of cultural identity and as distant viewer. This results in a capacious picture of Greek and Roman cultural identity that allows nostalgia for archaic origins to blend and merge freely with the sense that the mythical roots of Troy are a spectacle, an image of a once-upon-a-time community to be read and re-read as a shifting mirror of the Graeco-Roman Imperial present.³⁵

Section I: Drunk battle

One striking feature of Quintus's description of the sack of Troy is his elaboration on the festivities and the inebriation of the Trojans, an element of the story which was traditional in the epic tradition and other accounts of the sack of Troy, but which in Quintus becomes part of the programmatic opening of book 13 and resurfaces at regular intervals as an insistent motif. Proclus indicates that the *Little Iliad* (Arg. 5b West 2013=Proclus, *Chrest.* 233-6 Severyns) featured the celebrations of the Trojans as the opening of its final act and that Arctinus's *Iliou Persis* (Arg. 1b West 2013=Proclus, *Chrest.* 246-7 Severyns) similarly opened with the Trojan celebrations foregrounded. Several authors make it clear that by

Quintus's time it was one of the mythic facts of the story that the Trojans celebrated before their destruction.³⁶ That celebrations became part of the core facts of the storyline has to do with the creative dialogue between the Trojans' oblivious joy and their impending doom, but since Proclus's summary is sparse on details it is unclear to what extent the *Little Iliad* or the *Iliou Persis* dwelled on this contrast. Euripides inherited this contrast in some form from the Epic Cycle and expanded on it creatively, turning this contrast into a moment of reflection on past and present, as well as a metatheatrical moment of interplay between the narrative world of myth and the stagecraft of choral performance.³⁷

Whereas Euripides exploits dance as that aspect of Trojan festivities that gives poetic and dramatic depth to his treatment, Quintus dwells instead on the Trojans' inebriation as the central aesthetic element and narrative ploy, from the very opening of *PH* 13, which will define the poetics at work in the rest of the book (*PH* 13.1-24 Vian).³⁸

Οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἀνὰ πτολίεθρον ἐδόρπεον· ἐν δ' ἄρα τοῖσιν

αὐλοὶ ὁμῶς σύριγξι μέγ' ἦπυον· ἀμφὶ δὲ πάντη

μολπὴ ἐπ' ὀρχηθμοῖσι καὶ ἄκριτος ἔσκεν αὐτὴ

δαινυμένων, οἷ<η> τε πέλει παρὰ δαιτὶ καὶ οἴνω.

Ἦδε δέ τις χεῖρεσσι λαβῶν ἔμπλειον ἄλειςον (5)

πῖνεν ἀκηδέστως· βαρύθοντο δέ οἱ φρένες ἔνδον,

ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὀφθαλμοὶ στρεφεδίνεον· ἄλλο δ' ἐπ' ἄλλω

ἐκ στόματος προῖεσκεν ἔπος κεκολουμένα βάζων·

καὶ ῥά οἱ ἐν μεγάροις κειμήλια καὶ δόμος αὐτὸς

φαίνετο κινυμένοισιν ἐοικότα· πάντα δ' ἐώλπει (10)

ἀμφιπεριστρωφᾶσθαι ἀνὰ πτόλιν· ὅσσε δ' <ᾶρ' > ἀχλὺς

ἄμπεχεν· ἀκρήτω γὰρ ἀμαλδύνονται ὀπωπαι

καὶ νόος αἰζηῶν, ὀπότη' ἐς φρένα χανδὸν ἴκηται·

καὶ ῥα καρηβαρέων τοῖον ποτὶ μῦθον ἔειπεν·

«ἼΗ ῥ' ἄλιον Δαναοὶ στρατὸν ἐνθάδε πουλὺν ἄγειραν, (15)

σχέτλιοι, οὐδ' ἐτέλεσαν ὅσα φρεσὶ μηχανόωντο,

ἀλλ' αὕτως ἀπόρουσαν ἀπ' ἄστεος ἡμετέροιο

νηπιάχοις παίδεσσιν ἐοικότες ἢ ἐ γυναιξίν.»

ἽΩς ᾶρ' ἔφη Τρώων τις ἐεργόμενος φρένα οἴνω,

νήπιος· οὐδ' ᾶρ' ἐφράσσατ' ἐπὶ προθύροισιν Ὀλεθρον. (20)

Εὔτε γὰρ ὕπνος ἔρυκεν ἀνὰ πτόλιν ἄλλοθεν ἄλλον

οἴνω ἐνιπλήθοντα ἀπειρεσίῳ καὶ ἐδωδῆ,

δὴ τότε ᾶρ' αἰθαλόεντα Σίνων ἀνὰ πυρσὸν ἄειρε

δεικνὺς Ἀργείοισι πυρὸς σέλας [...]

The Trojans were feasting throughout the city amid the mingled

and strident sounds of oboes and panpipes. In every direction

There was singing and dancing and a confusion

of diners' voices, such as goes with food and wine.

And someone with brimming goblet uplifted in his hands

5

drank without a care. And so his wits grew heavy

and his eyes began to roll. In rapid succession

a babble of broken words came pouring from his lips.

The furniture in his home and the building itself

appeared to be in motion. He had the impression 10

the whole of the city was spinning round and his eyes were veiled

in mist. The eyesight and the intelligence of men

are harmed when undiluted wine is swallowed in gulps.

Such words as these he spoke with heavy head:

“In vain the Danaans gathered their great army here. 15

The wretches never accomplished what they planned to do.

They have decamped from our city just like that,

no better than foolish children or weak women.”

So spoke a Trojan with his mind impaired by wine,

the poor fool: he could not see destruction at their doors. 20

As soon as sleep had stopped them everywhere in the city,

sated as they were with food and copious wine,

Sinon held aloft a blazing torch,

a bright fire signal for the Argives.

The first line (οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἀνὰ πτολίεθρον ἔδόρπεον, 13.1) sets the tone of the paradoxical fighting that will follow. The banquet will define the tone of the book not because the inebriated Trojans will simply be at a disadvantage, but because inebriation and symposium become the defining mode of both Quintus's description and of the way in which the text calls for its own reading. The banqueting scene programmatically draws into the sphere of inebriation and confusion both speech and vision. We are initially told that voices in this part of the action have become indistinguishable, like voices at a banquet (ἄκριτος

ἔσκειν αὐτὴ /δαιθυμένων, οἷ<η> τε πέλει παρὰ δαιτὶ καὶ οἴνω, 13.3-4). Then, both word and vision are drawn into question. It is the eyes of the Trojans that are affected, we are told, and yet the Trojans' vision becomes our vision too³⁹ as Quintus begins to put a dystopian twist on the spinning Trojan cityscape and to parade striking contrasts, paratactically and paradoxically heaped. Word, meaning, and vision are bound together and inflicted with inebriation in a paradigm familiar to Imperial audiences from rhetorical theories of ekphrasis: “ekphrasis is descriptive language that relays vividly before the eyes that which is expressed” (ἔκφρασις ἐστὶ λόγος περιηγηματικὸς ἐναργῶς ὑπ’ ὄψιν ἄγων τὸ δηλούμενον, Theon, *Prog.* 118 Spengel).⁴⁰ Accordingly, in Quintus vision, speech, and the signified spin wildly all together. The eyes roll (ἀμφὶ δ’ ἄρ’ ὀφθαλμοὶ στρεφεδίνεον, 13.7) and so does each house and Troy as a whole (καὶ ῥά οἱ ἐν μεγάροις κειμήλια καὶ δόμος αὐτὸς / φαίετο κινυμένοισιν εὐοικότα· πάντα δ’ ἐώλπει / ἀμφιπεριστροφᾶσθαι ἀνὰ πτόλιν, 13.9-11). The words of the Trojans pile one on top of another: ἄλλο δ’ ἐπ’ ἄλλω / ἐκ στόματος προΐεσκεν ἔπος κεκολουμένα βάζων (13.7-8)—are they to be distinguished from the verses (ἔπη) of Quintus? Vision and meaning are confounded (ἀκρήτῳ γὰρ ἀμαλδύνονται ὀπωπαι / καὶ νόος αἰζηῶν, ὅπότε ἐξ φρένα χανδὸν ἴκηται, 13.11-12), as ‘the eyes are covered by mist’ (ὄσσε δ’ <ἄρ’> ἀχλὺς / ἄμπεχεν, 13.12-13).

The emphasis on word, subject matter, and visualization that is foregrounded in the descriptive language of *PH* 13 is not simply about Quintus working with a rhetorical cookie cutter from school theory and training to poetic practice and application. A preoccupation with this paradigm of mind, meaning, and vision can be seen beyond rhetorical handbooks in a wide variety of manifestations within Imperial literary culture that ranges from fictional

writing in verse and prose to scholiastic discourse. The noun νοῦς is used regularly in scholarship to mean ‘the meaning of a passage/author’ in both treatises and the way scholarship informs scholiastic discourse and, by extension, reader habits beyond the school context.⁴¹ A similar preoccupation with the visual presence (ὄψις) of poetry trickles down from philosophical and rhetorical schools to the Homeric scholia, a paraliterary area even more relevant to reader habits in the epic tradition in which Quintus stands. So the scholiast on *Il.* 1.317 (κνίση δ’ οὐρανὸν ἴκεν ἐλισσομένη περι καπνῶ [West]) comments on the visual qualities of the description by using the language of ekphrasis: the poet has brought before our eyes in the imagination the whiteness of the fat mixing with the blackness of smoke (ὕπ’ ὄψιν ἤγαγεν ἅμα τῷ μέλανι τοῦ καπνοῦ συναναμισγομένην τὴν λευκότητα τῆς πιμελῆς φανταστικῶς, schol. bT *Il.* 1.317a ex. Erbse).⁴² But discussions of visuality (ὄψις) and meaning (νοῦς) are by no means exclusive to technical writing but part of a multifaceted Imperial intellectual discourse.⁴³ In this sense, Quintus’s programmatics and metapoetics in this opening scene of book 13 work also in terms of reception by virtue of an ekphrastic culture shaping Imperial reading habits.

Looking at the opening then from the perspective of Imperial audiences whose reading habits have been partly shaped by ekphrastic language, we can also notice that the trope of inebriated vision taps into a recurrent problematic that is raised in ekphrasis more generally in Hellenistic and Imperial literature: ekphrasis tends to foreground the subjective nature of meaning and reading by staging competing interpretations or by pointing in other ways to the gap between vision and meaning or between language and effect.⁴⁴ The opening scene of *PH* 13 dwells on a comparable gap in its description of the Trojan landscape: each house (δόμος), its furniture (κειμήλια), everything in the city (πάντα... ἀνὰ πτόλιμ)—

appears to be moving, when it is not. The repeated vocabulary of similitude (φάινετο... ἐοικότα... ἐώλπει, 13.10) foregrounds the descriptive dimension of the passage in a way that is typical of ekphrasis and similes alike. Typically of ekphrastic passages, the vocabulary of semblance foregrounds the uncertain subjectivity that interprets what is described.⁴⁵ The unnamed, “everyman” Trojan who provides the focal viewpoint of 13.5-20 (τις, 5; Τρώων τις, 19) reinforces the limitations of ekphrastic language through Quintus’s emphasis on inebriation as impairment (13.11-12). The ways in which the Trojan’s inebriation partly recalls Laocoon’s godgiven madness and blindness at the close of the previous book of the *PH* works in the same direction, presenting the Trojan’s vision as the afflicted foil to the reader’s clarity and interpretive control.⁴⁶ As Goldhill has discussed, a central function of ekphrasis in Hellenistic and Imperial Greek literature is that it participates in the formation of elite viewing subjects in Greek culture; partial, naïve, or wrong interpretations of visual scenes are staged or commented on by authors who seek to create a hierarchy of knowledge and to position themselves and their readers in the cultural politics of postclassical Greek elitism.⁴⁷ And indeed one reading of the opening of *PH* 13 is to read it alongside the blindness of Laocoon at the end of *PH* 12 and the ominous celebrations of the Greeks in *PH* 14, who do not realize the suffering that awaits them on the journey back home (14.101-120): this paradigm of blindness works against the superior knowledge of the learned reader.

However, what is striking in book 13 of the *PH* is that although drunkenness stages just such an impaired vision, this impairment becomes an *enabling* trope for the aesthetics of book 13. Blurred vision is a poetic opportunity rather than moral opprobrium.⁴⁸ The language of inebriation is indistinguishable from the language of poetic effect. When we are told that in the eyes of the drunken Trojan his house and furniture look like they are moving (καί ῥά

οί ... κειμήλια καὶ δόμος ... / φαίνεται κινυμένοισιν ἐοικότα, 13.9-10), Quintus is using the particular language that we find in that subset of ekphrasis that has to do with descriptions of works of art,⁴⁹ such as the description of the plowed field in the Iliadic Shield of Achilles (ἦ δὲ μελαίνετ' ὄπισθεν, ἀρηρομένη δὲ ἔώκει, / χρυσεῖη περ ἐοῦσα· τὸ δὴ περὶ θαῦμα τέτυκτο, Hom. *Il.* 18.548-9).⁵⁰ Quintus himself uses this language in his own “Shield of Achilles” in *PH* 5 when the narrator comments on the lifelikeness of its depiction of battle (ζωοῖσιν ἐοικότα κινυμένοισι, *PH* 5.42), while he also has Odysseus reiterate this language in the way he re-describes the Shield to Neoptolemus in book 7 (ἀπειρεσίω τ' ἐνὶ κύκλῳ / ζῶα πέριξ ἤσκηται ἐοικότα κινυμένοισι, *PH* 7.202-3).⁵¹ If we think of ekphrasis in the narrow non-ancient sense of descriptions of works of art, the fact that the spinning house and furniture of the anonymous Trojan are described on the same terms as the language of wonder for an object of art is strange. House and furniture are not static objects set in lifelike motion by art; if something animates them in this description it is the poetics of inebriation which are cast in meta-ekphrastic terms. Indeed, if we consider the more diverse subject-matter of ekphrasis that we find in its ancient theorization, we can see a shared language of interpretation between the wondrous lifelikeness of Achilles’ Shield and the paradoxical scenes of *PH* 13.⁵² The proximity between Quintus’s descriptive language and rhetorical terminology is typical of Imperial literature, while, as Squire has shown, reflection on the visual and textual aspects of Achilles’ Shield looms large in this tradition.⁵³

In Quintus’s treatment of the banquet turned battle the paradox inheres in the way inanimate matter assumes agency in the action of *PH* 13 and the way objects of everyday life become unnatural. As the Greeks swarm into Troy, the descriptions that follow dwell on paradoxical clashes between swords, wine jars, and dangerous kebabs (*PH* 13.125-50):

[...] ἀμφὶ δὲ λυγραιὶ (125)

Κῆρες ὀϊζυρῶς ἐπεγήθεον ὄλλυμένοισιν.

Οἱ δ' ὥς τ' ἀφνειοῖο σύες κατὰ δώματ' ἄνακτος

εἰλαπίνην λαοῖσιν ἀπείριτον ἐντύνοντος

μυρίοι ἐκτείνοντο, λυγρῶ δ' ἀνεμίσγετο λύθρω

οἶνος ἔτ' ἐν κρητῆρσι λελειμμένος. Οὐδέ τις ἦεν (130)

ὅς κεν ἄνευθε φόνιοιο φέρε στονόεντα σίδηρον,

οὐδ' εἶ τις μάλ' ἄναλκῆς ἔην. Ὀλέκοντο δὲ Τρῶες·

ὥς δ' ὑπὸ θώεσι μῆλα δαΐζεται ἢ ἐλύκοισι,

καύματος ἐσσυμένοιο δυσσαέος ἦματι μέσσω

ποιμένος οὐ παρεόντος, ὅτε σκιερῶ ἐνὶ χώρῳ (135)

ἰλαδὸν ἀλλήλοισιν ὁμῶς συναρηρότα πάντα

μίμνωσι<ν>, κείνοιο γλάγος ποτὶ δῶμα φέροντος,

..... (137)

νηδυά πλησάμενοι πολυχανδέα, πάντ' ἐπιόντες

αἶμα μέλαν πίνουσιν, ἅπαν δ' ὀλέκουσι μένοντες

πῶυ, κακῆν δ' ἄρα δαΐτα λυγρῶ τεύχουσι νομῆι· (140)

ὥς Δαναοὶ Πριάμοιο κατὰ πτόλιν ἄλλον ἐπ' ἄλλω

κτεῖνον ἐπεσσύμενοι πυμάτην ἀνὰ δηιοτήτα·

οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔην Τρώων τις ἀνούτατος, ἀλλ' ἄρα πάντων

γναμπτὰ μέλη πεπάλακτο μελαινόμεν' αἶματι πολλῶ.

Οὐδὲ μὲν Ἀργείοισιν ἀνούτητος πέλε δῆρις. (145)

Ἄλλ' οἷ μὲν δεπάεσσι τετυμμένοι, οἷ δὲ τραπέζαις,

οἷ δ' ἔτι καιομένοισιν ὑπ' ἐσχαρεῶσι τυπέντες

δαλοῖς, οἷ δ' ὀβελοῖσι πεπαρμένοι ἐκπνεῖσκον

οἷς ἔτι που καὶ σπλάγχνα συῶν περὶ θερμὰ λέλειπτο

Ἥφαιστου μαλεροῖο περιζείοντος ἀυτμῆ. (150)

Surrounding them

125

the dismal Fates delighted in their miserable deaths.

Just like pigs in the palace of a wealthy prince

when he prepares an abundant banquet for his people,

they were killed in their thousands and with their grisly gore was mingled

the wine that was left in the mixing bowls. No one at all 130

could then have carried his steel unstained by bloodshed,

however feeble a fighter. The Trojans were simply slaughtered.

as sheep are destroyed by jackals or by wolves

at the time of the onset of stifling midday heat,

when the shepherd is absent, and in a shady spot 135

they are crowded together in a compact mass,

waiting while the shepherd carries their milk to the farm

...

They fill their capacious bellies, as they attack them all

and lap up their dark blood, persisting until they've destroyed

the whole flock, a sorry feast for the wretched herdsman; 140

like that the Danaans killed one after another in Priam's
city in the onslaught of that final battle.

Not one Trojan was left unwounded, but all whose limbs
still moved were darkly dashed with copious blood.

For the Argives also the fighting was not free from wounds. 145

Some of them were struck by goblets, some by tables;
others were hit beside the hearths by brands still burning.

Yet others expired there after being run through by spits
on which the innards of pigs remained, still warm

and sizzling from the fire god's blazing breath. 150

The paradoxical poetics of festivity and death spill over from the opening of book 13 to the description of the main battle. The simile of the wealthy king in 13.126-9 hammers the point home by connecting the banquet of the simile (εἰλαπίνην, 13.128) with the banquet of the opening lines (...ἔδ' ὄρπεον... δαίτη... οἴνω, 13.1-14) and explaining the sudden imagery of Trojan blood and wine mixing: μυρῖοι ἐκτείνοντο, λυγρῷ δ' ἀνεμίσγετο λύθρω / οἴνος ἔτ' ἐν κρητῆρσι λελειμμένος (13.129-30), where the ἔτι signals the flashback to the opening of book 13. But the paradox also carries meaning. When the Greeks come out from the Wooden Horse and let their comrades into the city (13.21-77), the battle resumes and we are suddenly looking at the world of Troy very much through the drunken eyes of Quintus's confused, unreliable, and programmatic Trojan of 13.14-20. The heaped lists, the stammering rhythm of the polysyndeton, the meaningless and bewildering incongruities of images, the elaboration

of twisted and fragmented bodies (13.146-50) – these are all part and parcel of the conceit of a reader’s inebriated vision of the battle.

One of the reasons for this particular trope being used in the description of battle in book 13 is the influence of rhetorical training on Quintus’s poetics as well as on his (probably) near contemporary Triphiodorus, as has been pointed out by Miguélez-Cavero.⁵⁴ Rhetorical handbooks like repeating a particular twist in the classification of ekphrasis: in certain cases an ekphrasis can belong to a mix of types. The example they all point to is the description of a night-battle (νυκτομαχία) which is an ekphrasis simultaneously of time (night) and occasion (battle) and this is precisely the situation in *PH* 13.⁵⁵ But the direct influence of rhetorical training on Quintus can only take us so far. What is equally striking is that both Triphiodorus and Quintus develop the theme of Trojan inebriation, which has little to do with rhetorical influence.⁵⁶ Triphiodorus’s *Iliou Halosis* is also a product of the 3rd c. C.E., but the precise chronological relationship between the two poets is debated and unclear and we cannot tell whether this is a case of borrowing in either direction, of a common source, or an independent development.⁵⁷ But the poetics are similar and of interest in giving a synchronic perspective to Quintus’s treatment of this theme (Triph. 573-86 Gerlaud):

πάντα δ’ ὄμοῦ κεκύκητο, φόνος δέ τις ἄκριτος ἦεν·
τοὺς μὲν γὰρ φεύγοντας ἐπὶ Σκαιῆσι πύλησι
κτεῖνον ἐφεστηῶτες, ὃ δ’ ἐξ εὐνῆς ἀνορούσας (575)
τεύχεα μαστεύων δνοφερῆ περικάππεσεν αἰχμῆ.
καί τις ὑπὸ σκίοεντι δόμῳ κεκρυμμένος ἀνήρ,
ξεῖνος ἔών, ἐκάλεσεν οἰόμενος φίλον εἶναι·
νήπιος, οὐ μὲν ἔμελλεν ἐνηεῖ φωτὶ μιγῆναι,

ξείνια δ' ἔχθρα κόμισσεν· ὑπὲρ τέγεος δέ τις ἄλλος (580)

μήπω παπταίνων τι θοῶ διέπιπτεν οἰστῶ.

καί τινες ἀλγεινῶ κραδίην βεβαρηότες οἴνω,

ἐκπλαγέες ποτὶ δοῦπον, ἐπειγόμενοι καταβῆναι,

κλίμακος ἐξελάθοντο καθ' ὑψηλῶν τε μελάθρων

ἔκπεσον ἀγνώσσοντες, ἐπαυχενίους δὲ λυθέντες (585)

ἀστραγάλους ἐάγησαν, ὁμοῦ δ' ἐξήρυγον οἶνον.

Everything was in a state of confusion and there was indiscriminate slaughter. Standing by the Scaean gates, they [*sc.* Greeks] killed some as they fled. One leapt from his bed and, looking for his arms, fell upon a spear in the dark. Another hiding in the shadows of his house invited in a man he thought was a friend. Fool. He wasn't to meet a gentle friend, but received hateful gifts for his hospitality. Another, before he could have a look over his roof, fell by a swift arrow. And some, their hearts weighed down with dreaded wine, shaken by the noise and hurrying to come down, forgot the ladder and fell in confusion from their lofty houses and broke their necks, as they threw up their wine. [transl. A. W. Mair, Loeb adapted]

Triphiodorus shares with Quintus the fusion between theme and technique: his heaped list of anonymous dying Trojans (574-82) mixes drunken characters with a symposiastic setting (572-76) and characterises the situation as confused in the language of the mixing of liquids (πάντα δ' ὁμοῦ κεκύκητο, φόνος δέ τις ἄκριτος ἦεν, 573).⁵⁸ Quintus, on the other hand, takes the level of drunk poetics further. He also invokes the idea of blending blood and wine (λυγρῶ δ' ἀνεμίσγετο λύθρω / οἶνος ἔτ' ἐν κρητῆρσι λελειμμένος, *PH* 13.129-30).

But, whereas Triphiodorus maintains a regimented, panoptic view of battle (e.g. his list in 574-82), Quintus extends the liquidity of symposiastic mixing into a disorienting fluidity that is evident in the long, complex simile of *PH* 13.127-142 (quoted above). In this passage, there is an accretion of two similes: a short (*PH* 13.127-30) and a long one (*PH* 13.132/3-142). The confluence of similes creates a conflict of imagery that ‘acts out’ the incongruous blending of the craters described (13.129-30) but also of the Greek and Trojan sides in battle. The first simile plays on a contrast: the Trojans have spent the night feasting but they have now become the main course in a wealthy king’s banquet for his people. What follows seems at first to be an extension of this thought. If we read or listen to the text disregarding punctuation in the ancient manner of reading from line 132 to 133 (ὀλέκοντο δὲ Τρῶες / ὡς δ’ ὑπὸ θώεσι μῆλα δαΐζεται ἢ ἐλύκοισι...) the second simile begins as if the subject of the comparison is the Trojans and its “vehicle” is the sheep (μῆλα, which are foregrounded as the subject of the verb δαΐζεται, itself seemingly linked to the earlier passive verb ὀλέκοντο). But something drastic happens in the lacuna after 13.137, for suddenly there is a new nominative subject (πλησάμενοι... ἐπιόντες... πίνουσιν, 138-9): the wolves. This reversal does not make sense until ll. 141-2, where the marker ‘ὡς Δαναοὶ...’ makes it clear that the simile, after all, refers to the Greeks, not the Trojans (hence my reference to the simile as 13.132/3-142). We cannot know what lies behind the lacuna, but the distance between the apparent tenor (Trojans) and the actual tenor (Danaans) of the simile and the syntax of the passage allow the long narrative of the vehicle in between to create misdirection and confusion. The sustained simile with its initial focus on the sheep, which then shifts to the wolves and jackals may have contributed to the scribal error but the complex syntax of the epic simile itself (regardless of the lacuna) would have drawn readers to these poetics of

blending in the original and full text.⁵⁹ The incongruous, inebriated style works here between the levels of description: the inebriation of the Trojans spills over into the imagery of the simile and into the characterization of the Greeks as wolves and jackals drunk on blood themselves. Narrative and simile intermingle, as do the categories of Greek and Trojan. While it is the Trojans who are drunk and have been caught mid-banquet, the simile turns the Danaans into drinkers of black blood (αἶμα μέλαν πίνουσιν, 13.139) in an ‘evil banquet’ (κακὴν δ’ ἄρα δαῖτα... τεύχουσι, 13.140). It is suddenly the Greeks who are inebriated.

The thematic focus on the confusion of battle is not the only reason that Greeks and Trojans are merged. Both similes in the quoted passage provide a third character in the background: the king feeding the pigs/Trojans to his people in 13.130, and the shepherd affected by the evil banquet (13.140). The actions of both Trojans and Greeks seem to relate to this third figure, who is assumed to be in a position of control and power. The reader who seeks an overarching interpretation of the similes could find a very prominent moral or theological reading for this looming figure in the following book of the *PH*. In 14.101-120, Quintus will revisit the same productive tensions between celebration and impending doom: the Greeks drink wine to celebrate their victory and pray to Zeus to grant them return. Immediately Quintus will tell us that Zeus grants return for some but not for others, a scene recalling the pivotal prayer of Achilles to Zeus in *Iliad* 16. The deluded vision of the Greeks in Quintus’s book 14 is the flip-side of the drunken Trojan’s false expectations at the beginning of book 13. Both camps commit moral outrage and both submit to divine wrath.

The theme of inebriation allows the categories of Greek and Trojan to mix and merge in other senses too, and the rhetoric of blending works at the level of inter- and intra-textuality too. The Greeks’ attack is described through the simile of the flock set upon by wild animals while the shepherd is away (13.133-42), a simile that aligns the Greeks’

slaughter of the Trojans with a series of similes of Greek valor in the *PH*. In *PH* 1 Ajax and Achilles attack the army of Amazons and Trojans like lions prey on a flock without its shepherd (*PH* 1.524-8). The Greeks also exit the Wooden Horse, a few lines before our passage, and attack the Trojans described by the same simile (*PH* 13.72-77). The use of this simile in the *PH* is in turn based on the Homeric simile of Odysseus and Diomedes attacking the Thracians in *Iliad* 10.485-8,⁶⁰ an intertext that gives an Iliadic pedigree to the theme of night battle that is shared between the *Doloneia* and Quintus's *halôsis*.⁶¹ But the Greeks' murderous glut (νηδύα πλησάμενοι πολυχανδέα, *PH* 13.138) is not without its problems for Greek eyes, partly because the image recalls Polyphemus's monstrous meal in the *Odyssey* (ἐπεὶ Κύκλωψ μεγάλην ἐμπλήσατο νηδύν / ἀνδρόμεα κρέ' ἔδων, *Od.* 9.296-7 Van Thiel)⁶² and partly because the imagery of the simile reflects the drunken recklessness of the anonymous Trojan of the opening of book 13: the phrase νηδύα... πολυχανδέα (13.138) recalls the greedy drinking of ἀκρήτω γὰρ ἀμαλδύνονται ὀπωπαι / καὶ νόος αἰζηῶν, ὁπότε' ἐς φρένα χανδὸν ἴκηται (13.12-13), while the Greeks' indiscriminate slaughter (ἄλλον ἐπ' ἄλλω / κτεῖνον, 13.141-2) recalls the Trojan's indistinct babble (ἄλλο δ' ἐπ' ἄλλω / ἐκ στόματος προῖεσκεν ἔπος κεκολουμένα βάζων, 13.7-8). In this instance too the programmatic opening of book 13 can "seep" through and the consequences of this "ekphrastic contagion" (to use Whitmarsh's turn of phrase) can affect the rest of the book. The contagion of the scene of Trojan inebriation works at the level discussed by Whitmarsh in his exploration of "ekphrastic contagion" in the *Aethiopica* of Heliodorus: scenes of embedded ekphrasis in a narrative dramatize the process of interpretation, its attempts, pitfalls, and uncertainties; as such they impose on the reader a heightened self-awareness about the truth value and factuality of the themes that the narrative negotiates more

generally.⁶³ In this reading drunk vision can become a way of casting the scene of *halôsis* at a critical distance and such an ambivalence in Quintus's Trojan epic can also reverberate with the way the prose tradition of Homeric revisionism had taught Imperial readers to dwell on the tensions between historicity and poetic fiction in Homer.⁶⁴ But critical self-awareness is not the only way in which ekphrasis seeps. The Trojan's drunk vision is also a mode of fiction that enables the fusion of Greek and Trojan excess which in turn allows the paradoxical melding of images of symposium, sensory exuberance, and death—thematic concerns that are central to Quintus's Imperial readers to which I now turn.

Section II: The reader's couch: life and death at the banquet

I began unpacking the case for a positive reading of banquet and drunk poetics in *PH* 13 by looking at the ways in which they enable the aesthetics of paradox and confusion to take centre stage, one aspect of which is the blurring between the categories of Greek and Trojan. But the theme of mixing banquet and battle also embeds the Imperial reader into the text, as I will argue in this section. This particular theme stages within the fiction of the *PH* a particularly prominent Imperial occasion for the performance and consumption of literature, the banquet, and blends it with the martial action of the epic narrative. This presence of the reader in the text is particularly elaborated in the way *PH* 13 densely echoes the disrupted banquets of the *Odyssey* (especially the murder of Agamemnon and the *mnêstêrophonia*) and the ways in which the Homeric poem engages with and collapses the temporalities of heroic action and bardic song.

I begin with the prominent intertext of the *Odyssey* in the simile of the wealthy lord laying out a banquet for his people (*PH* 13.127-130), a connection left out of my earlier discussion. Quintus's simile is manifestly based upon Agamemnon's description of his own slaughter at Aegisthus's hands in *Od.* 11 in terms of the simile's vehicle (the wealthy king),

in close verbal echoes, and in the thematic contrast of banquet and death (*Od.* 11.412-20 Van Thiel):⁶⁵

ὥς θάνον οἰκτίστῳ θανάτῳ· περὶ δ' ἄλλοι ἑταῖροι
νωλεμέως κτείνοντο σύες ὥς ἀργιόδοντες,
οἳ ῥά τ' ἐν ἀφνειοῦ ἀνδρὸς μέγα δυναμένοιο
ἦ γάμῳ ἦ ἐράνῳ ἦ εἰλαπίνῃ τεθαλυίῃ. (415)

ἤδη μὲν πολέων φόνῳ ἀνδρῶν ἀντεβόλησας,
μουνάξ κτεινομένων καὶ ἐνὶ κρατερῇ ὕσμίνῃ·
ἀλλὰ κε κείνα μάλιστα ἰδὼν ὀλοφύραο θυμῷ,
ὥς ἀμφὶ κρητῆρα τραπέζας τε πληθούσας
κείμεθ' ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ, δάπεδον δ' ἅπαν αἶματι θῦεν. (420)

So I died by a most pitiful death, and round about me the rest of my comrades were slain relentlessly like white-tusked swine, which are slaughtered in the house of a rich and powerful man at a marriage feast, or a joint meal, or a gay drinking bout. Before now you have been present at the slaying of many men, killed in single combat or in the press of the fight, but in heart you would have felt most pity had you seen that sight, how about the mixing bowl and the laden tables we lay in the hall, and the floor all swam with blood. (transl. A. T. Murray, Loeb)

Quintus follows very closely the Homeric simile. A wealthy king (ἀφνειοῦ ... ἄνακτος, *PH* 13.127=ἀφνειοῦ ἀνδρὸς μέγα δυναμένοιο, *Od.* 11.414) holds a banquet (εἰλαπίνην, *PH* 13.128=εἰλαπίνῃ, *Od.* 11.415). Many die (μυρίοι ἐκτείνοντο, *PH*

13.129=κτείνοντο...πολέων... ἀνδρῶν, *Od.* 11.413, 416) like swine (ὤς... σύες, *PH* 13.127=σύες ὤς, *Od.* 11.413). All this happens in a domestic setting, but what is part of the tenor of the simile in Homer, the house of Aegisthus (ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ, *Od.* 11.420), in Quintus becomes the vehicle of the simile, the house of the wealthy king (κατὰ δώματ', *PH* 13.127). The simile paints the public, city-wide slaughter in Troy with the colors of domestic Odyssean bloodshed.

Quintus does not draw only on Agamemnon's narrative in book 11 but also introduces elements from the killing of the suitors in book 22 of the *Odyssey*. The image of blood mixing with wine and the paraphernalia of the banquet (λυγρῷ δ' ἀνεμίσγεται λύθρῳ / οἶνος ἔτ' ἐν κρητῆρσι λελειμμένος, *PH* 13.129-30) draw in part on the image of Aegisthus's floor seething with blood (δάπεδον δ' ἅπαν αἵματι θῦεν, *Od.* 11.420) but this half-line is repeated in the narrator's description of Odysseus's house during the killing of the suitors (*Od.* 22.309) and again when the soul of the dead suitor Amphimedon brings report of the events in Odysseus's palace to Agamemnon in the second *Nekyia* (*Od.* 24.185). The *PH* opens a particular dialogue with the imagery of mixing blood and drink/food from book 22 in the killing of Eurymachus (*Od.* 22.83-8) but more emphatically with the death of Antinous (*Od.* 22.8-21):

ἦ, καὶ ἐπ' Ἀντινόῳ ἰθύνητο πικρὸν οἶστόν.

ἦτοι ὁ καλὸν ἄλειςον_ἀναιρήσεσθαι ἔμελλε,

χρῦσεον ἄμφωτον, καὶ δὴ μετὰ χερσὶν ἐνώμα, (10)

ὄφρα πίοι οἶνοιο· φόνος δέ οἱ οὐκ ἐνὶ θυμῷ

μέμβλετο. τίς κ' οἶοιτο μετ' ἀνδράσι δαιτυμόνεσσι

μοῦνον ἐνὶ πλεόνεσσι, καὶ εἰ μάλα καρτερός εἴη,

οἷ τεύξειν θάνατόν τε κακὸν καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν;

τὸν δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς κατὰ λαιμὸν ἐπισχόμενος βάλεν ἰῶ· (15)

ἀντικρὺ δ' ἀπαλοῖο δι' ἀυχένος ἤλυθ' ἀκωκή.

ἐκλίνθη δ' ἐτέρωσε, δέπας δέ οἱ ἔκπεσε χειρὸς

βλημένου, αὐτίκα δ' αὐλὸς ἀνὰ ρίνας παχὺς ἤλθεν

αἵματος ἀνδρομέοιο· θοῶς δ' ἀπὸ εἴο τράπεζαν

ῶσε ποδὶ πλήξας, ἀπὸ δ' εἶδατα χεῦεν ἔραζε· (20)

σῆτός τε κρέα τ' ὀπτὰ φορύνετο...

He spoke, and aimed a bitter arrow at Antinous. Now he, you must know, was on the point of raising to his lips a handsome goblet, a two-eared cup of gold, and was even now handling it, that he might take a drink of the wine, and death was not in his thoughts. For who among men at a banquet could think that one man among many, however strong he might be, would bring upon himself evil death and black fate? But Odysseus took aim, and struck him with an arrow in the throat, and clean out through the tender neck passed the point; he sank to one side, and the cup fell from his hand as he was struck, and at once up through his nostrils there came a thick jet of the blood of man; and quickly he thrust the table from him with a kick of his foot, and spilled all the food on the floor, and the bread and roast meat were befouled. (transl. A. T. Murray, *LCL*)

The images of the cup tumbling off Antinous's hand, the stream of thick blood, and the collapsing of table and food converge on the concluding image of the food being befouled

on the very floor that will soon be seething with blood. Death comes unexpectedly and the opening scene of book 22 plays with the notion that Antinous is still feasting as he dies, a paradox explored through the contrast of food and death in Agamemnon's death scene through the contrast of the dead bodies being surrounded by full tables (*Od.* 11.419-20) and in similar terms again in the eerie scene of Theoclymenus's prophecy to the suitors (20.345-57), where the bloody meat that the suitors eat (20.348) matches their own blood on the palace walls in the seer's vision (20.354). Quintus's descriptions of fighting conducted with the paraphernalia of the banquet (δεπάεσσι... τραπέζαις... ὑπ' ἔσχαρεῶσι... δαλοῖς... ὀβελοῖσι, *PH* 13.146-50) elaborates on these very aesthetics of paradox found in both Agamemnon and Antinous's deaths in the *Odyssey*.

The first eponymous Trojan to be killed in *PH* 13, Coroebus, dies at the hands of Diomedes in a manner that signals precisely the unexpected disruption of life that is described in Antinous's death in the *Odyssey* in the image of the arrow piercing the suitor's neck as he is about to (ἔμελλε, 22.9) lift his cup to drink. Diomedes runs Coroebus's stomach through with his spear "where the rushing pathways of food and drink are found" (ἦχι θοαὶ πόσιός τε καὶ εἶδατός εἰσι κέλευθοι, *PH* 13.171). Given Quintus's attention to the contrast between death and a banquet setting, the particular physical details of the killing make sense as the image of death interrupting Coroebus mid-digestion.

The Odyssean intertext also puts in perspective Quintus's reference to the grisly gore of the slain Trojans being mixed with wine in the crater (λυγρῶ... λύθρω, *PH*. 13.129; cf. σῆτος τε κρέα τ' ὀπτὰ φορύνετο *Od.* 22.21) as well as the description of the blood-spattered limbs of the Trojans (γναμπτὰ μέλη πεπόλακτο μελαινόμεν' αἵματι πολλῶ, *PH* 13.144). In the *Odyssey* the word λύθρον (gore) occurs twice: when Telemachus summons Eurycleia

after all the suitors have been killed and she encounters the gruesome spectacle of blood-spattered Odysseus (εὔρεν.../ αἶματι καὶ λύθρῳ πεπαλαγμένον, 22.401-2), while the line is repeated in 23.48 where Eurycleia reports what she saw to Penelope.⁶⁶

There is significance in the fact that Quintus combines freely elements from Agamemnon's slaughter in *Odyssey* 11 and the killing of the suitors in *Odyssey* 22. Within the *Odyssey* the story of the return of Agamemnon plays a larger paradigmatic role for the house of Odysseus, opening up potential alternative outcomes for Odysseus, Penelope, Telemachus, and for the narrative which are finally thwarted in books 22-24.⁶⁷ But in Quintus we can see that the two *nostoi* are conflated as the sack of Troy recalls at once both the death of Agamemnon at Aegisthus's hands (a wrongful act) and the killing of the suitors (largely though not unambiguously in the *Odyssey* a rightful act). On a general level the dense Odyssean echoes provide broadbrush closural gestures in the concluding books of the *PH* as well as foreshadowing aspects of the next narrative stage of the Trojan cycle (the *Odyssey* and the *Nostoi*). The fusion of *Odyssey* 11 and 22 in Quintus erases their paradigmatic juxtaposition of Ithaca and Mycenae and instead deploys the Odyssean *nostoi* en bloc to foreshadow the range of difficulties of return that awaits everyone in the Greek camp, difficulties that begin with the rape of Cassandra by Locrian Ajax in this book (13.420-29) and which will become foregrounded in the next and final book of the *PH*.⁶⁸

But if we press harder to extend the moral and paradigmatic functions of the Odyssean plot onto the *PH* we cannot get very far. The way the sack of Troy is modelled on both these starkly juxtaposed Odyssean *nostoi* (Agamemnon's and Odysseus's) in *PH* 13 creates a polyprismatic view of Greeks and Trojans. As we saw above, both Greeks and Trojans are represented as inebriated and they both die "banqueting" deaths, in such a way that the models of Odysseus, the suitors, Agamemnon, and Aegisthus/Clytaemnestra come

into play and shape the representation of Greeks or Trojans at different times in different ways in an inconclusive state of flux. For instance, the long complex of similes I discussed earlier (*PH* 13.127-42) can be read as equating the Trojans with the paradigm of Agamemnon's murder in *Od.* 11 or with the killing of Antinous in *Od.* 22 to opposite effect, while the κακή δαίς (*PH* 13.140) that the Greeks serve up to the shepherd-figure of the simile carries overtones of Polyphemus (νηδύα πλησάμενοι πολυχανδέα, *PH* 13.138=ἐπεὶ κύκλωψ μεγάλην ἐμπλήσατο νηδὺν / ἀνδρόμεα κρέ' ἔδω, *Od.* 9.296-7) who is in turn paradigmatic for the suitors in the *Odyssey*.⁶⁹ The crimes of Locrian Ajax in the context of a *halôsis* depicted as a banquet invites connections with the suitors' perversely godless sacrificial banquets.⁷⁰ Does the reader choose to read the Trojans as Agamemnon the paradigmatic victim and the Greeks as the suitors heading for their destruction? Or are both Trojans and Greeks like the suitors? Similarly, both the suitors and Agamemnon can model the celebrations of the unsuspecting Trojan (*PH* 13.1-24): is his obliviousness as sympathetic as the Odyssean Agamemnon's or is the mist that covers his eyes (*PH* 13.11-12) like the mist that shrouds the maddened suitors in *Od.* 20.357? Similar considerations apply to Coroebus's death (*PH* 13.168-77) which echoes the deaths of both Agamemnon and Antinous. More generally, is there a clear-cut narrative of culpability in the *PH* that the Odyssean intertext gives depth to here? For readers swayed by the dense Odyssean intertextuality to read Quintus's final two books (13 and 14) through a broader Odyssean template, the fact that the language of ἀτασθαλίη, so significant for reading blame and culpability in the *Odyssey*,⁷¹ characterizes the Greeks reveals perhaps the deadly banquet of book 13 as a condemnation of the Greeks, partly modelled on Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra and partly modelled on an Odysseus confronted with (and perhaps acknowledging⁷²) accusations of his own ἀτασθαλίη

by the end of the poem.⁷³ But this same reader would become disoriented, because the narrator also uses the term when he explicitly states that the Trojans deserved their destruction on account of the abduction of Helen (13.374-84). At the same time, the *Odyssey* itself allows a plurality of voices in the apportioning of blame and does not provide a unitary model for reading ἀτασθαλίη.⁷⁴ The intertextual lenses invoke models and partial readings but do not spell out a complete and consistent scheme.

And yet if we look for poetics rather than moral reasoning in the Odyssean intertext, we can see that the Odyssean theme of death-and-banquet models for the *PH* an immediacy and presence of narrated action, an illusion that the fourth wall has become permeable. This effect is partly due to the way the *Odyssey* stages the relationship between epic song and heroic action in books 21 and 22. It is also partly due to the cultural connotations of the banquet itself and its connections to occasions of reading.

First, the relationship between epic song and heroic action: as Segal discusses, in the *Odyssey* a key point in the poetics of the *mnêstêrophonia* comes in the conclusion of the competition of the bow in the previous book with the simile of Odysseus stringing the bow like a lyre (*Od.* 21.406-11). The simile signals the restitution of social order as bardic performance resumes its appropriate function in the house of Odysseus, affirming order while audiences listen to the song attentively. The paradigmatic model for this proper function of epic song are the Phaeacians, while the anti-type is the suitors' inability to understand song.⁷⁵ At least the near contemporary of Quintus Athenaeus read in this way both the correlation between the Phaeacians and the suitors (*Deipn.* 5.177b and 5.192c-e) and the proper function of bardic performance in the *Odyssey* (*Deipn.* 1.14a-d).⁷⁶ But it also signals a change in the characterization of Odysseus as well as a reconfiguration of the levels of fiction within the poem. As Odysseus reveals himself to the suitors in the immediately following opening scene

of *Od.* 22, he also reveals to Homer’s audience an aspect of his Iliadic martial prowess that so far has been filtered through song and report; from this point onwards, the bow will subsume the lyre and perform the *actions* of heroic *kleos* by staging this very *kleos* for the *Odyssey*’s audience.⁷⁷ The simile of the bow and the lyre signals not only a comeback⁷⁸ of an Iliadic Odysseus, but also a collapse in temporalities: the martial world that ought to be past, distant, and memorialized in song comes crashing into action and into the present world of the suitors and of the Odyssean audience alike.⁷⁹ In the larger economy of the *Odyssey* this simile is not an isolated moment; it is part of a persistent preoccupation in the poem with embedded bards and storytelling that presents song as contemporary with and parallel to the action that it memorializes: “the *Odyssey* retrojects itself into [the heroic] world, so that performance is no longer a late thing, after the event, but one involved with it and in part preceding it.”⁸⁰ Within this economy of “immediacy,” the concluding simile of book 21 and the action of book 22 in the *Odyssey* go one step further and elaborate the fiction that, even though the audience continues listening to a performance, Odysseus’s heroic action interrupts and supersedes epic narration.⁸¹ The fact that Quintus’s era could be sensitive precisely to the presence of narrated action heralded by the *Odyssey*’s bow/lyre simile can be seen in the way the anonymous poet of *Anacreontea* 2 creates a fiction of performance in a peaceful and well-ordered symposium by asking for a Homeric lyre without “that murderous string” that could bring war metaleptically into the banquet (δότε μοι λύρην Ὀμήρου φονίης ἄνευθε χορδῆς, *Anacreontea* 2.1 West; cf. χορδὴν *Od.* 21.407).⁸²

This presence can also be seen in the way ancient sources negotiate the wondrous element in the killing of the suitors. In *Odyssey* 22 the suitors are not listeners of storytelling (like the Phaeacians) anymore but witnesses of action, their own punishment. And yet they remain an embedded audience in book 22 whose helpless surprise at the unexpected turn that

their banquet has taken models emotional response of real-life audiences of the *Odyssey*.⁸³ Indeed, in the post-archaic reception of the *Odyssey* the killing of the suitors is consistently identified with the emotional apex of the poem, but the ways in which this given emotional impact is valorised, displaced, probed, or rationalized varies. It is identified with the emotional response (ἔκπληξις) of the audience in Plato's *Ion* (535b) where the killing of the suitors is the first example that Socrates identifies when he is looking for an example of a “stunning” Homeric passage for performance (ὅταν... ἐκπλήξης..., 535b2).⁸⁴ In another reading, overwhelming emotion is displaced onto Odysseus himself: Philodemus suggests that overwhelming emotion (exemplified in Eurycleia's joy) is what Odysseus resists in book 22 and shows himself a wise ruler with self-control (Phld. *Hom.* col. 36 Dorandi).⁸⁵ Another group of readings belongs to the familiar trope of critiquing both Homer and especially the *Odyssey* as poetic lies, a well-established way of reading Homer against the grain under the Empire.⁸⁶ Here the emotional impact of the *mnēstērophonia* is marginalized: when [Longinus] discusses the *Odyssey* he is poised between a full-blown Lucianic critique of the poem and qualified admiration.⁸⁷ On the one hand, he discredits τὰ ... περὶ τὴν μνηστηροφονίαν ἀπίθανα (*Subl.* 9.14) as the product of an aging Homer, great though he still might be (γῆρας διηγοῦμαι, γῆρας δ' ὁμῶς Ὀμήρου, 9.14); the problem for [Longinus] is that the fantastic element in the Odyssean adventures overwhelms verisimilitude (πλὴν ἐν ἅπασιν τοῦτοις ἐξῆς τοῦ πρακτικοῦ κρατεῖ τὸ μυθικόν, 9.14), resulting in the babbling style of a Homer composing in his old age. But judgements of this kind are conflicted in [Longinus's] treatise: the killing of the suitors can be described as unconvincing (ἀπίθανα) and yet in the opening of *On the Sublime* we are also told that convincing verisimilitude will always be inferior to wonder and amazement (πάντη δὲ γε σὺν ἐκπλήξει τοῦ πιθανοῦ καὶ

τοῦ πρὸς χάριν ἀεὶ κρατεῖ τὸ θαυμάσιον, 1.4). [Longinus], as Goldhill argues, does not put forward a pure description of critical concepts, but mainly a rhetoric of elite aesthetics, in which critical terms shift according to the needs of polemics and self-positioning.⁸⁸ If he marginalizes the wonder of ancient audiences at the killing of the suitors, it is because he is constructing for himself and his addressee a regimented and rationalist elite identity (γράφω δὲ πρὸς σέ, φίλτατε, τὸν παιδείας ἐπιστήμονα, 1.3). We can see how [Longinus's] marginalization of the *mnêstêrophonia* takes its place as one tactic of self-making within a broader discursive engagement with the fantastical element in the *Odyssey* under the Empire, if we turn to the Homeric scholia (schol. D *Od.* 1.262b, Ernst 2006) and Porphyry's (234 to ca. 305 C.E.) *Homeric Questions on the Odyssey* (on *Od.* 1.262): both sources see in the story that Athena tells Telemachus about Odysseus seeking poison for his arrows (*Od.* 1.262) a technique of verisimilitude and anticipation which explains how the suitors in book 22 die although shot with a single arrow each.⁸⁹ In these readings of *Odyssey* 22, [Longinus's] conflicted recognition of the power of wonder and amazement over verisimilitude in poetry becomes an approbation of the wonder and amazement of *Odyssey* 22 precisely because the action can be seen as realistic. Emotional impact is the common denominator also for Heliodorus (3rd or 4th c C.E.),⁹⁰ for whom the Odyssean scene held particular significance to use it as a model for parts of his opening description that dwells on the paradox of banquet-turned-battle.⁹¹ Among the Ithacan episodes of the *Odyssey*, the *mnêstêrophonia* is the most prominent scene in art, alongside the encounter with Penelope and the recognition with Euryclea in *Od.* 19 and it continues to appear up to the 3rd c C.E.⁹² There is a tradition in all these readings of accepting, redirecting, or resisting the given emotional impact of the *mnêstêrophonia* that takes us from the 4th c BCE all the way to Quintus's era.

Given this context, the deaths of the Trojans in the *PH* and of Antinous in the *Odyssey* mid-banquet are apostrophes to the audience that reflect on the sudden impact of the narrated violence on them. But these scenes also reflect on death and life more broadly: “he... was on the point of raising to his lips a handsome goblet... that he might take a drink of the wine, and death was not in his thoughts.” The D scholia on this Odyssean scene, which were available to Imperial readers and shaped their understanding of the Homeric poem, are revealing. Homer’s focus on Antinous’s goblet is related by the scholiast to a proverb current in the Imperial period and elsewhere attested by Aulus Gellius (*NA* 13.18; 2nd c C.E.): πολλά μεταξύ πέλει κύλικος καὶ χεῖλος (D schol. *Od.* 22.9-12 Ernst 2006: 381; “it’s a long way from the goblet to one’s lips”). The scholia explain the story by suggesting that the grammarian Dionysius Thrax (fl. ca. 100 B.C.E.) made the claim that the Odyssean scene was the origin of this particular proverb. Then (contradicting Dionysius but expanding on the proverb) the scholia add that Aristotle explained the proverb otherwise: Ancaeus the son of Poseidon and Astypalaia asked his slave for a drink. The slave responded that Ancaeus would not be able to have that drink, but Ancaeus insisted, while the slave responded with the proverbial words. At that moment news arrived of a wild boar destroying Ancaeus’s crops. Ancaeus put down the goblet, ran to confront the boar, and was killed. The explanation is aetiological and links the Homeric text (as origin) with the present usage of the proverb, triangulated through Aristotle’s alternative *aition*. But at the same time, the exegetical nature of the scholion links the death of Antinous to the universalizing and presentist dimension of a proverb, a proverb that reflects on the mutability of fate, the fragility of life, and the unexpected nature of death. The connotations that the scholion reveals and reinforces show that in the moment of restitution and revenge the otherwise unlikeable Antinous can become

the object of the reader's sympathy and identification—and this sympathy can extend to the Trojans of Quintus's poem, dying in the midst of their banquet.

Although the behavior of the suitors is consistently marked as transgressive within the *Odyssey* and their banqueting as corrupt,⁹³ their feasts still modelled—even in a negative sense—one of the typical occasions for epic performance. As discussed earlier, the *Odyssey* repeatedly stages scenes of epic performance that take place within the context of banquets and that configure the reception of the poem itself by its audience through the fiction of a banquet. The extent to which the performative fiction within the epic matches archaic performance realities outside the epic is debated,⁹⁴ but what is more relevant for my argument here is that the readerly fiction of the Homeric banquet could and did translate into later audiences' conceptions surrounding the reading and recitation of literature within symposiastic and dinner contexts, spaces that defined the social production and consumption of literature within small circles of elite audiences. Davidson has paid attention to Athenaeus's *Deipnosophists*, another third-century CE work, as a text drawing on the symposium as an institution and narrative theme that is centrally concerned with death, loss, absence, and—in the historical perspective of the Second Sophistic—with the historical distance between Athenaeus and the world of his classical sources.⁹⁵ What is true of the symposium is also true of Imperial Greeks and their past: for Davidson, Athenaeus's banquet of words (λογόδειπνον) is configured on the one hand as the place of readers and writers reanimating encyclopaedically—piece by piece—the *realia* of a past world, bringing them to life within the context of a banquet, an institution which is in itself an affirmation of life, the *good life*. And at the same time, it is a work preoccupied with death and absence on various levels. Not only does the work conclude significantly with the death of the host, Ulpian, but also the continuous act of recollecting that this literary banquet stages foregrounds a sense of

rupture and loss. If anything, the encyclopaedic and pedantic approach to this cultural reanimation keeps the ancient life of the classical period at a carefully controlled and regimented distance.

Quintus's banquet, of course, is of a different order. There are no scholars discussing at table; it is the depicted world of Troy that is an inebriated banquet. But the example of Athenaeus's description of *pepaideumenoí* discussing literature at the table should alert us to the fact that the banquet is something that belongs to the real-life world of the reader too, and it is a place charged with readerly cultural connotations. From this perspective Quintus's hybrid between banquet and battle is not only a general trope that allows various kinds of blurred vision, but also a trope that puts onto the stage of Troy one of the more prominent social spaces and occasions of social, communal reading in the Empire: social events of drinking and commensality. The banquet was not only an occasion in which Imperial readers regularly discussed, read, performed, and consumed literature in real life,⁹⁶ it was also a setting associated in the Imperial cultural imaginary, as can be seen in the proliferation of sympotic literature, with forging identities and communities of readers through an archival exploration of Greek past and present.⁹⁷ This connection between banquet and reader could be thus reinforced for Quintus's audience through cultural practice, ideology, and other literature (sympotic miscellanies).⁹⁸ The banquet embeds the audience in the fiction, in the same way that a bed in children's fiction or a living-room sofa center-stage in a sitcom bridge narrative and reading situation. And as in Davidon's Athenaeus, the thematic implications of Quintus's craters mixing wine and blood signify both a reanimation and presence of the fictive world of Troy in the eyes of its audience and a reminder of its loss and distance—all served up in their real or imagined cup of wine. I will return to these twinned dynamics of presence and loss below.

Section III: Synecdoche and cityscape

The violence visited upon the bodies of the Trojans and the physical features of the city in the *PH* is described at length through elaborate descriptions of mutilation and fragmentation, which I will be linking in the last section (IV) of this article to these tensions between the presence and distance of Troy. But before I turn to the *PH*, it is necessary for my argument to establish that in the Imperial context reading habits had been honed in such a way by various literary modes and traditions that individual objects and body parts of the paradoxical banquet were liable and expected to be individually scrutinised as synecdoches for something beyond the text, as parts of a puzzle that belongs to a reader's vision. This tradition also affected the reading of Quintus's description of violence and fragmentation.

This kind of intense focus on fragments and single or partial objects has been associated in scholarship on "late" poetry with the aesthetics of Late Antiquity, owing to the classic treatment of the subject in Roberts's *The Jeweled Style* (1989). The metaphor of the "jeweled style" makes the claim that, partly under rhetorical influence,⁹⁹ in Late Antique poetics the referential function of literary language "lost some of its preeminence"¹⁰⁰ by foregrounding words, phrases, or vignettes in intense focus and showcasing language and manner over content, an aesthetic paralleled in art, e.g. in the way Late Antique mosaics had sparser arrangements of their *tesserae* to showcase each one in its individual beauty and material detail.¹⁰¹ Roberts recognises that the tendencies he describes have a prehistory; what is peculiar to Late Antiquity is the degree to which they dominate.¹⁰² I would resist positing here an inflexible model of periodization for this trope.¹⁰³ Indeed the way Imperial audiences in Quintus's time read intense focus on physical parts and details had been in the making for a very long time in both verse and prose, both within and outside rhetorical influence; this

tendency needs to be understood, as I will discuss, in the *longue durée* of postclassical poetics of the Hellenistic period, the Early and High Empire, and Late Antiquity.

In the 3rd c. C.E. Philostratus the Elder gives a good sense of how the theme of battle and banquet could be read in an ekphrastic mode. *Imagines* 2.10 purports to describe an image of Agamemnon and Cassandra's murder at the hands of Clytemnestra and offers a dense commentary on the relationship between imitation and model, as well as speech and vision. The description opens with a dishevelled list of bodies, banqueting objects, and acts of violence; the opening words are (*Im.* 2.10.1 Kalinka-Schönberger): "The men who lie here and there in the men's great hall, the blood commingled with the wine (τὸ ἀναμιξ τῷ οἴνω αἷμα)...". The paraphernalia of the banquet mix with death, as in Quintus (and Homer and Athenaeus) and the emphasis is on capturing the moment of rupture (hence the durative quality of the present tense employed throughout), when the life-affirming qualities of commensality still linger on while death is already upon the banqueters (*Im.* 2.10.2-3):

And cups, most of them defiled with gore (κύλικες... πλήρεις αἱ πολλαὶ λύθρου), fall from their hands; nor have the dying men any power to defend themselves, for they are drunken. As for the state of those that have fallen, one has had his throat cut as he is partaking of food or of drink (ὁ μὲν ἐκτέμνηται τὴν φάρυγγα σίτου τι ἢ ποτοῦ ἔλκουσαν), another as he bent over the mixing-bowl has had his head cut off, another has had his hand lopped off as it carried a beaker (ὁ δὲ ἀπήρακται τὴν χεῖρα φέρουσαν ἔκπωμα), another [...] Nor is any one of the fallen pallid of hue, since when men die in their cups the flush does not immediately leave their faces (ὠχρὸς δὲ οὐδεὶς τῶν κειμένων, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς ἐν οἴνω ἀποθνήσκοντας οὐκ εὐθύς ἀπολείπει τὸ ἄνθος). [transl. A. Fairbanks, *LCL*, adapted]

Drinking cups are caught at the moment of falling and yet they are already full of blood; a throat is cut while food and drink are still going down; a head falls off while still stooping into the mixing bowl; a hand is severed while still drawing a cupful. Everyone is dead but still flushed with the fire of wine. The reading that these fragments, body-parts, and objects invite goes beyond the subject of Cassandra's murder and beyond the particular themes and discourse of the ekphrastic genre, in as much as it is a literary trope that also straddles a variety of genres and covers, in a more universal vein, a broad range of reactions and reflections on life and death, on rupture and continuity, as well as on the continuum and implications that inhere between that cupful drawn by the severed hand of a banqueter in Philostratus's description (ὁ δὲ ἀπήρακται τὴν χεῖρα φέρουσαν ἔκπωμα) and the cup in the Imperial reader's hand and mind.

In the middle of the description, Philostratus reflects on his own poetics by having his narrator address the young boy who is the embedded addressee throughout the work (*Im.* 2.10.1-2):

If we examine this scene as a drama (εἰ μὲν ὡς δράμα ἐξετάζομεν), my boy, a great tragedy has been enacted in a brief space of time (τετραγώδηται μεγάλα ἐν μικρῷ), but if as a painting, you will see more in it than a drama. Look! (εἰ δ' ὡς γραφήν, πλείω ἐν αὐτοῖς ὄψει. σκόπει γάρ) Here are torches to provide light (λαμπτήρες οὗτοι χορηγοὶ φωτός)—evidently these events take place at night—and there are mixing-bowls to provide drink, bowls of gold brighter than the torches' flame (κρατῆρες δ' ἐκεῖνοι χορηγοὶ ποτοῦ φανότεροι τοῦ πυρὸς οἱ χρυσοῖ), and there are tables laden with food, the food on which hero kings were feasting; but all these things are in disorder.

As Elsner points out, Philostratus turns the description into a quest for meaning and reader-response in a self-reflexive mode.¹⁰⁴ Philostratus makes it clear that the image invites two kinds of reading. The first is simple and is based on knowledge of tragic intertexts of Agamemnon's murder and their Odyssean background (τετραγώδηται μεγάλα ἐν μικρῷ). The other reading is double, since it is based on γραφή, a polysemous word that encapsulates both pictorial representation (the supposed painting of *Im.* 2.10) but also writing (the text of *Im.* 2.10). So when Philostratus suggests to his disciple that *Im.* 2.10 yields more if read as γραφή he flags the ways in which his own rewriting can outdo his tragic models (as “writing”), but also the ways in which his description as both vision and text offers a surplus of meaning (πλείω ἐν αὐτοῖς ὄψει. σκόπει γάρ). But what is this surplus of meaning that Philostratus gestures towards? For Elsner, πλείω is vague enough to invite the reader to go into interpretive overdrive and to ponder the variety of ways in which rhetorical ekphrasis differs from and competes with both literary model and the imaginary picture it translates.¹⁰⁵ But γραφή is also richer because it also includes the viewer/reader's reactions to it and the readerly intertextuality that engages with Philostratus's tragic models (Aeschylus's *Oresteia*, the *Electra* plays of Sophocles and Euripides) as well as with the *Odyssey* and the description of Agamemnon's death in *Od.* 11.405-34. And yet, at the same time, the injunction to see “more” ultimately calls attention to the impossibility of the task and the differences in genre between Philostratus and his tragic and epic models, while it also lifts the curtain on the layers of mimesis involved in this piece.¹⁰⁶

Such dynamics and this kind of reading are characteristic of rhetorical ekphrasis; indeed I have discussed above how Imperial readers who would arrive at Quintus's text having trained their eyes to see “more” in this double Philostratean sense could at once rush

headlong to embrace the illusion of drunk vision in *PH* 13 (illusive immersion) all the while recognising the fiction at work (realisation of reader's own involvement in the fiction). But for my purposes here, I would like to dwell on the agency of objects and body parts in the illusive immersion of such descriptions. This is the part of Elsner's argument that the *Imagines* "is an extraordinary and sympathetic celebration of the wonders, techniques, and effects of naturalism."¹⁰⁷ My point is that even a reading of the banquet-turned-battle that does not question absorption into the fiction of naturalism can also have its own considered nuances and effects. There is a striking contrast in *Im.* 2.10 between the narrator's promise that the boy will find "more" if he reads what is before him as a γραφή and the rather flat follow up in which there is no explicit explanation but rather a focus on the naturalism of detail. Heralding this section detailed description of particulars and immediately following the injunction "look!", we find the narrator focusing on the torches and shining mixing-bowls in the painting by calling these "choregic"; the term implies both the world of theatrical production (looking back to the tragic pedigree of this episode) and the metaphorical, vernacular sense of "providers of" light and drink (λαμπτήρες οὔτοι χορηγοὶ φωτός... κρατῆρες δ' ἐκεῖνοι χορηγοὶ ποτοῦ). I would like to suggest that the material objects and bodies strewn across this description are given a dramatic agency and occupy the aesthetic core of the scene, as they stage-manage the fiction. As shown above, the visual aspects of this ekphrastic theme (objects of commensality and the physicality of death) can be seen to have evoked for ancient readers a complex contemplation on life and death, which in turn was also linked in the Imperial context to questions of cultural rupture (death) and a celebration of the here-and-now of the empire (banquet) as well as of reanimation of the classical past through

the nostalgic and retrospective performance of identity (e.g. Athenaeus). In all these readings the focus is firmly on the symbolic agency of objects and bodies brought to the foreground.

Besides rhetorical influence and critical distance, we need to see the agency and effect of the objects in focus and through their thematic specificity: Philostratus's deadly banquet in *Im.* 2.10 exhibits similar concerns with the celebrated opening of Heliodorus's *Aethiopica* in the 3rd or 4th c C.E. in a decidedly different genre. The theme is the same, the banquet-turned-battle down to the image of wine and blood mixing (οἶνον αἵματι μίαννας καὶ συμποσίοις πόλεμον ἐπιστήσας, *Aeth.* 1.1.6); and the trope is the same, the inscrutable overabundance of paradoxical objects (μυρίον εἶδος, *Aeth.* 1.1.6). Bodies and sympotic objects are marked as signs for the reader to decode (τὰ φαινόμενα σύμβολα, *Aeth.* 1.1.4). As in Philostratus, the "visual" clues urge us to put together synechdochically and reanimate a past moment that is quickly vanishing: the tables are still set (τράπεζαι... ἔτι πλήθουσαι, 1.1.4), the dead cling on to the mixing bowls which are still dripping out wine (ἀπορρέοντες, 1.1.4), the clues point to the past as they are termed "remnants" (λείψανα, 1.1.4). This exercise in reanimation in both texts can also be linked to the cultural preoccupation with continuity and rupture that I ascribed to the banquets of Quintus *PH* 13 read against Athenaeus.¹⁰⁸

One could still argue reductively that all these texts are interlinked through a common denominator of rhetorical education. But this particular trend had informed readers' reflexes and habits from a much earlier period and from within a poetic (rather than rhetorical) tradition that continued to shape intertextuality under the Imperial era. We can trace a genealogy for this mode of reading going back to Hellenistic epigram and what Bing has called the game of supplementation (*Ergänzungsspiel*).¹⁰⁹ Literary epigrams toy with creative omissions, they tease the reader's imagination by leaving gaps between the fiction of a

physical inscription that they create, the material and spatial context they imply, and their actual existence as ink on a papyrus roll. These gaps can take various forms, but what I am particularly interested in here is the significant term λείψανον: the “remnant,” the physical residue that survives destruction or decay, or, in some instances, a human cadaver. We saw an emphasis on this concept in Heliodorus and by extension in Philostratus; we will encounter it again in Aelius Aristides, while the aesthetic of the remnant will also provide the interpretive key of my reading of *PH* 13 in the final section. The λείψανον acquired broad programmatic and metafictional dimensions in epigram—a remarkably long-lived genre that shaped reading habits throughout the long post-classical period and beyond—although these dimensions have largely remained unexplored.¹¹⁰

It will be sufficient to treat the topic only in outline here. The term λείψανον occurs mainly in dedicatory,¹¹¹ funerary,¹¹² and erotic¹¹³ epigram. ‘Remaining’ material objects in the Hellenistic and Imperial aesthetics of epigrammatic poetry engage a reader’s imagination in reconstructing the totality of the scene or in referring to absent, fictional worlds. In each case the imagery of fragmentary remains engages the synecdochic imagination according to the situation required by the genre. In dedicatory epigrams λείψανα are often the tools of the trade of the dedicatee (e.g. nets, mirrors, sickles, etc.) which trigger narratives for the reader well beyond the confines of the short epigram. In amatory epigrams, λείψανα are material reminders of past beauty or erotic sensations that are accessible only through recollection by the narrator and by the reader. In the funerary mode, λείψανα engage with the absence and fictional presence of the person memorialized, at times through a double reading of what “remains” as the cadaver of the deceased contrasted to their lively memory or oeuvre (e.g. in epitaphs for poets).¹¹⁴ These epigrammatic λείψανα invite an ongoing and open-ended

process of interpretation that revolves around the notion of λείψονον as an object of memory (dedicatory and funerary) and desire (erotic), phrased through the aesthetics of physical destruction, rupture, decay, loss, and fragmentation.

Section IV: Destruction and fragmentation

It is (I hope) clear then that Imperial Greek readers' minds had been trained by long traditions of physical description that invested physical "remnants" with a particular focus as useful conduits for a complex web of signification. But what is the pay off for Quintus? In this final section, I turn to the descriptive trope of destruction ('disasterscape'¹¹⁵) which provides heaps of ruins, fragments and clues to the reader of an ekphrasis, such as we can see in Quintus's lists of body parts, deaths, and objects. While the theme of the banquet-turned-battle forms one aspect of Quintus's paradoxical Troy, the emphasis on physical dismemberment and fragmentation constitutes the other (related) dominant tenor of *PH* 13. As the Greeks invade Troy they begin the slaughter (*PH* 13.90-99):

[...] οἳ δ' ἄρα χερσὶ (90)

δράγδην ἔγκατ' ἔχοντες ὀιζυρῶς ἀλάληντο

ἀμφὶ δόμους, ἄλλοι δὲ ποδῶν ἐκάτερθε κοπέντων

ἀμφὶ νεκρούς εἴρπυζον ἀάσπετα κωκύοντες·

πολλῶν δ' ἐν κονίησι μαχέσασθαι μεμαώτων

χεῖρες ἀπηράχθησαν ὁμῶς κεφαλῆσι καὶ αὐταῖς, (95)

φευγόντων δ' ἐτέρων μελίαι διὰ νῶτα πέρησαν

ἄντικρυς ἐς μαζούς, <τ>ῶν δ' ἰξύας ἄχρισ ἰκέσθαι

αἰδοίων ἐφύπερθε διαμπερές, ἦχι μάλιστα

Ἄρεος ἀκαμάτοιο πέλει πολυώδυνος αἰχμή.

Some had their entrails 90

Clutched in their hands and in that piteous state were roaming

Round their houses. Some had both their feet cut off

And crawled among the corpses with wails that beggar description.

Many who were eager to fight, after biting the dust,

Had their hands and heads hacked from them all at once. 95

Others, attempting to flee, had spears run through their backs

Out to the breast. In other cases they penetrated

Down to the groin, above the genitals, where the spear

Of the tireless war god is most agonizing of all.

And (*PH* 13.151-6):

Ἄλλοι δ' αὖ πελέκεσσι καὶ ἀξίησι θοῆσιν

ἤσπαιρον δηθέντες ἐν αἵματι· τῶν δ' ἀπὸ χειρῶν

δάκτυλοι ἐτμήθησαν, ἐπὶ ξίφος εὔτ' ἐβάλοντο

χεῖρας ἐελδόμενοι στυγεράς ἀπὸ Κῆρας ἀμύνειν.

Καί πού τις βρεχμόν τε καὶ ἐγκέφαλον συνέχευε (155)

ἄλλὰ βαλὼν ἕτεροιο κατὰ μόθον [...]

Others had been cut down by sharpened axes and hatchets

And lay convulsing in their blood. From the hands of some

The fingers had been cut off, just as they reached for a sword

In their desire to defend themselves from a hateful fate.

Another crushed the brow and brain of someone else 155

With a stone cast during that melee.

Throughout the battle descriptions there is a pronounced emphasis on the moment of impact and rupture.¹¹⁶ Is this simply the epic trope of bodily disfigurement inherited from the *Iliad*?¹¹⁷ Yes and no. Let me begin by unpacking what complicates the Iliadic influence. More generally, destruction of cities looms large in Imperial rhetorical theory as a special opportunity for exhibiting descriptive skill: as Webb points out, one of the most quoted and discussed instances of city *ekphraseis* in Imperial rhetorical handbooks was Demosthenes' *Or. 19.65 (On the False Embassy)* on the destruction of Phocis.¹¹⁸ The interest in urban disasters is in this period is something that has grown and developed beyond Homer; it has taken on a life of its own, and the intertexts have multiplied.¹¹⁹

But why is this theme spreading? What does it do? Surely, rhetorical influence is not the only motivator nor is influence an automatic process. Imperial Latin poetry can be of help here. In discussing the predilection of Neronian poetry for mutilation and amputation, Most has argued that the motif of dismemberment engaged with anxieties expressed in Stoic philosophy about the unity and cohesion of the body and the preservation of one's identity.¹²⁰ The question goes like this: if my body is the same as my identity, then if I lose a leg do I continue to be the same person? Ultimately, Most reads the Neronian emphasis on dismemberment as a meditation on loss and disruption. But if we consider the supplementation that partial objects and body parts (whether or not they are actually termed *λείψονα*) mechanically invoke in the Imperial Greek reader, I would argue that Most gives us only one side of the coin. The emphasis on destruction in descriptions highlights the *moment* of fragmentation and as such it looks both backwards and forwards: backwards

towards reimagining the unity that used to exist and forwards towards a lingering sense of loss and rupture. In this sense—in that fragmentation and wholeness are interdependent opposites—the Iliadic dialectic of the beautiful death between the beautiful death and the disfigurement of the corpse, between a celebration of life in its prime and its abrupt and total destruction is still alive and rephrased in a new literary landscape.¹²¹

To make the point consistently with my readerly focus, I will read Quintus’s passages quoted above by side with a rhetorical description delivered by Aelius Aristides in 142 C.E. of a real-life earthquake that hit Rhodes.¹²² The moment that the earthquake hits is described in the following way (*Or.* 25.19-20 Keil):

ὁ δὲ ἥλιος τελευταῖα δὴ τότε ἐπέλαμπε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πόλιν, καὶ παρῆν ἐξαίφνης πάντα ὁμοῦ τὰ δεινά. ὑπανεχώρει μὲν ἢ θάλαττα καὶ πᾶν ἐψιλοῦτο τῶν λιμένων τὸ ἐντὸς, ἀνερριπτοῦντο δὲ οἰκίαι καὶ μνήματα ἀνερρήγνυντο, πύργοι δὲ πύργοις ἐνέπιπτον καὶ νεώσοικοι τριήρεσι καὶ νεῶ βωμοῖς καὶ ἀναθήματα ἀγάλμασι καὶ ἄνδρες ἀνδράσι [καὶ πύργοι λιμέσι] καὶ πάντα ἀλλήλοις. ἐν ὅσῳ δὲ ἀνὴρ ἄγκυραν εἰς ἀπόπλουν ἀνήρτητο, μεταστραφεὶς οὐκέτ’ εἶχεν ἰδεῖν τὴν πόλιν, ἀλλ’ ἐγίγνετο πάντα ὁμοῦ, οἱ λιμένες ἐπὶ ξηροῦ, ἢ πόλις ἐν κόνει, δρόμοι κατ’ οἰκίας ἐκ στενωπῶν, εἰς στενωποὺς [ἐξ οἰκιῶν], θάνατοι κατ’ οἰκίας, ἐν ἱεροῖς, ἐν θύραις, ἐν πύλαις. ἔξω μὲν τὰ μνήματα ἀνερρίπτει τοὺς κειμένους, ἔνδον δὲ ἐκρύπτοντο οἱ τελευτήσαντες· τῶν δ’ ὥσπερ τὰ εὐκταῖα ἀναθήματα χεῖρες ἐπ’ ἄκρων τοίχων, τῶν δὲ πόδες, τῶν δ’ ἄλλο τι λείψανον ἐωρᾶτο· καὶ οὐδὲ ταῦθ’ ἕκαστα ἐνῆν εἰκάσαι τίνων λείπεται.

And then the sun shone his last upon his city and all evils appeared at once. The sea began to pull back and the interior of the harbors to empty out, houses were being thrown around and tombs were breaking open; tower upon tower fell, ship-sheds on

triremes, temples on altars, offerings on statues, men on men, towers on harbors, everything upon each other. In as much time as it would take a man sailing off to raise anchor, had he turned around he would not see the city anymore, but everything became one heap, the harbors on dry land, the city in the dust, men darting out of alleys into houses, out of houses into alleys, death in the houses, in the temples, at the doors, at the gates. Tombs threw out their dead, whereas inside their homes those killed were buried; like votives, here the hands of someone appeared from behind the edge of a wall, there the feet of another, and there all kinds of bodily remains. And it was not possible to imagine which one was missing from whom.

There is a parallel here in the way that both authors dwell on the moment of irrevocable rupture. The wounds and cuts described by Quintus in 13.95-8 are full and clear (διὰ νῶτα πέρησαν/ ἄντικρυς ἐς μαζούς ... <τ>ῶν δ' ἰξύας ἄχρις ἰκέσθαι / αἰδοίων ἐφύπερθε διαμπερές). Elsewhere the dismemberment is incomplete and durative and dwells on the act and moment of severance, such as in those who are hopelessly and horrendously wounded and yet have not died yet (οἱ δ' ἄρα χερσὶ /δράγδην ἔγκατ' ἔχοντες οἰζυρῶς ἀλάληντο / ἀμφὶ δόμους, ἄλλοι δὲ ποδῶν ἐκάτερθε κοπέντων / ἀμφὶ νεκρούς εἵρπυζον ἀάσπετα κωκύοντες, *PH* 13.90-93). For Aristides, the choppy and paradoxical fragmentation of his sentences is matched by the emphasis on body parts that stand in the ekphrastic isolation of a dedicatory epigram or the metonymy of an ex-voto offering: τῶν δ' ὥσπερ τὰ εὐκταῖα ἀναθήματα χεῖρες ἐπ' ἄκρων τοίχων, τῶν δὲ πόδες, τῶν δ' ἄλλο τι λείψανον ἐωρᾶτο. The λείψανα of both Quintus and Aristides invite a supplementation game, an urge to make whole again, troped at times as desire. The slicing of the Trojans' hands and fingers plays

against the fact that these very hands were extended in desire (μεμαώτων, 13.94; ἐελδόμενοι, 13.154). The mangled bodies of the Rhodians and the loss of a once complete city are filtered through the eyes of surviving relatives yearning for their own, trying to make whole again, and failing (καὶ οὐδὲ ταῦθ' ἕκαστα ἐνῆν εἰκάσαι τίνων λείπεται, 25.20), a theme that culminates in the following picture in which the death of relatives is also starkly equated to the mutilation of one's own limbs (*Or.* 25.26):

οἱ μὲν <έν> τοῖς σώμασι τῶν φιλτάτων σκηνοῦντες ἐλάνθανον αὐτοὺς, οἱ δὲ ἐζήτουν τὰ λοιπὰ ἑαυτῶν οἱ μὲν πόδας, οἱ δὲ χεῖρας, οἱ δ' ὅ τι ἕκαστος ἐπηρώθη τοῦ σώματος, οἱ δὲ καὶ συνέθαπτον ταῦτα τοῖς οἰκείοις [...]

Some did not know that they were camping on the bodies of their dearest, others were looking for their own remains, one man his feet, another his hands, and everyone what had been maimed off their bodies; others were even burying them together with their relatives [...]

And yet Rhodes is not a lost city. Aristides in describing this Rhodes that is no more employs descriptive tropes that are common with encomia of cities that still exist, such as those we find in encomia of cities: stereotypical features and buildings are described (the towers, the houses, the moorings, the altars, the statues).¹²³ Besides the rhetorical training that brings about such convergences between the expression of presence and that of absence, we also need to take into account the emotional readerly response that sees both wholeness and obliteration when faced with disasterscaapes described in their undoing.

Quintus's description of the sacking of Troy both foregrounds its loss and reanimates its previous wholeness; but at the same time this Troy provides a model of an urban

community that is at once the mythical Troy and the contemporary urban context of its readers. As Webb discusses, Augustine of Hippo offers a fascinating theory of synecdoche in the description of cities.¹²⁴ Augustine wonders how is it that he can visualize Alexandria, a city he had never visited, when reading about it; he suggests that this is analogical fiction, created on the basis of his experience from Carthage (*De trinitate* 8.6.68-89). This kind of readerly supplementation happens when descriptions give you stereotypical features of a city (the gymnasium, the walls, the streets), which you then populate with your own urban experiences. This aspect of the generic, basic structures of a city is evident in these images of destruction in Aelius Aristides where nothing is localised or specific.

On the other hand, the bird's eye views of Troy that we get in Quintus are a mixture of generic cityscape and specific features. The opening of *PH* 13 quoted earlier moves between overviews of the city (ἀνὰ πτολίεθρον, 13.1; ἀνὰ πτόλιν, 13.11) and generic private homes (καί ῥά οἱ ἐν μεγάροις κειμήλια καὶ δόμος αὐτὸς /φαίνεται κινυμένοισιν ἔοικότα, 13.9-10).¹²⁵ The same happens in the alternation of scenes where death comes upon anonymous, 'everyman' Trojans, described seriatim (13.78-167 and 13.430-95), and then upon named and famous heroes (168-429 and 496-563). Here we can see this alternation of generic and specific characters mapping onto a clear pattern of alternation; generic urban locations¹²⁶ are interlaced with named heroes and locations known and 'specific' on the basis of their Iliadic fame: Αἰνείαιο δόμος (13.432a), Ἀντιμάχοιο μέλαθρα (13.433), Πέργαμον ἀμφ' ἔρατην (13.434), περί θ' ἱερὸν Ἀπόλλωνος (13.434, known from books 5 and 6 of the *Iliad*), νηὸν τε ζάθεον Τριτωνίδος (13.435, known from *Il.* 6), ἀμφὶ τε βωμὸν / Ἐρκείου (13.434-5, constructed out of *Iliad* 24.306 combined with 24.308-13¹²⁷), and θάλαμοι... ἔρατεινοὶ / υἱωνῶν Πριάμοιο (13.436-7). Furthermore, as Carvounis has shown, there is a

broader negotiation within the *Posthomerica* of Iliadic and later Trojan space in a way that links them to the Imperial present, mainly through an aetiological mode: Quintus repeatedly draws attention to the fact that certain Trojan landmarks can still be seen.¹²⁸ Vian has also argued that this ‘archaeology’ of the present that Quintus intersperses in the *PH* bears a connection to Roman era pilgrimages to the Troad and especially to funerary monuments.¹²⁹ In this context, we can see that Quintus’s Troy like other Imperial “elemental” or generic cityscapes becomes inescapably (by virtue of intertextual and cultural webs) and self-consciously both part of the reader’s world and something foreign. Death visiting named heroes opens a dialogue with a radically past Trojan moment, while the disfigured corpses of everyman in the unnamed houses of Troy open a dialogue with the beautiful death that Roman-era audiences expect to reach in their Imperial present. Looking at these scenes, then, of past cities and bodies in pieces we see that they invoke at once both a sense of familiarity and a sense of distance.

Conclusion

It is for the same reason that the outsider’s viewpoint is invoked in such descriptions. An integral part of an Imperial orator’s description of a city was the περιήγησις or narrative tour, a term that links literary representation and traveling experience, and that shows how rhetoric could enlist historiography and travel writing.¹³⁰ But literary and rhetorical influences are not inert forces; they perform a function in the cultural imaginary. When Aelius Aristides tries to catch the moment when the earthquake strikes Rhodes and affects the whole city, he invokes, as we saw above, the focalization of a sailor sailing off from the city (...έν ὄσω δὲ ἀνὴρ ἄγκυραν εἰς ἀπόπλουν ἀνήρτητο, μεταστραφείς οὐκέτ’ εἶχεν ἰδεῖν τὴν πόλιν, ἀλλ’ ἐγένετο πάντα ὁμοῦ..., *Or.* 25.19-20). This focal moment, through which

Aristides wants to invoke the whole fabric of a city that is about to change, encourages Aristides' Rhodian audience (the survivors) to identify with an outsider; and this is the focalization later readers (and a later author himself, if the speech is pseudonymous) received too. But, as mentioned above, disasterscape more generally balance on equal tensions between familiar cities of personal experience and 'other' cities of geographical or temporal distance. The outsider's view, the tourist's view explores precisely this familiarity and otherness. We can see this dialectic in action in the famous non-description of Alexandria in Achilles Tatius (early 2nd c C.E.? ¹³¹), which describes *flânerie* in the city with a wonderful phrase: "Between the columns there lay the city's open area. Crossing it is such a long journey that you would think you were going abroad, though you are staying at home" (ἔνδημος ἀποδημία, 5.1.3).¹³² The wonderful phrase ἔνδημος ἀποδημία ('peregrination at home/ – or 'immigrant emigration') taps precisely into this Alexandria's sense of place as both the reader's hometown and a foreign, invisible city.

It is with this same mode of periegetic description that Quintus rounds off his description of the sack of Troy. This is a mode that offers a cumulative and outside view and encapsulates the tensions between proximity and distance (*PH* 13.464-79):

The flames rose into the holy heavens spreading a marvelous
 brightness, which was seen by the peoples who lived all round, 465
from as far away as the lofty peaks of Mount Ida,
of Thracian Samos, and of sea-girt Tenedos.

Someone sailing out on the deep sea spoke these words:

"Those stout hearted Argives have finished their great undertaking
 after enduring so much for the sake of bright-eyed Helen. 470

Troy that was once so prosperous is now consumed

with fire and no god gave the help that was desired.

All mortals' affairs are watched by irresistible Fate.

Many undistinguished and inconspicuous things

are raised to glory, while the exalted are brought to little. 475

Often out of good comes evil and from evil

something good with the changes of our harsh life.”

Such were the words of someone who saw from afar that marvelous

brightness. The Trojans were still in the grip of grievous distress.

Significantly for the reading of Quintus's disasterscape examined here, we can find these same dynamics between familiarity and otherness as well as proximity and distance in the way the (probably) near contemporary *Heroicus* of the Elder Philostratus focuses heavily on the fiction that for a Roman-era visitor in the Troad, the presence of the epic past depends on an active process of decoding signs (dreams, apparitions) and relics (archaeological finds, ruins, monuments, skeletons, ghosts). In light of my discussion in Section III, I would like to place these “clues” in the *Heroicus* to the same broad family of Imperial reader habits as the scattered presence of *leipsana* discussed earlier. As Whitmarsh has argued, the text's emphasis on the fading presence of the past negotiates notions of cultural continuity (the Homeric world is still there), rupture (but only just), and the agency of the reader/visitor in constructing these connections and types of relationship with the past, an agency which is in turn part and parcel of the broader nature of Imperial Greek identity as process, construction, and positional identity.¹³³ These literary workings are not divorced from cultural reality. In historical terms, this agency of Philostratus controlling and filtering local and panhellenic traditions, literary and social memory, and cult is paralleled by observable tendencies with regard to monuments in the Greek East, as Alcock has shown.¹³⁴ Similarly, the visitation of

the past as a performance and construction of identity is thoroughly engrained in the tradition of Roman-era pilgrimage to the Troad by both Roman Imperial authorities and Greek *pepaideumenoι*. For such visitors, Quintus’s epitaph for Troy in the mouth of the anonymous traveller would have been a talking point, with its flavour of a tragic *exodos* but also with overtones of imperialist manifest destiny, while defining ambiguously the relationship between Imperial present and mythic past: “All mortals’ affairs are watched by irresistible Fate (ἄσχετος Αἴσα). / Many undistinguished and inconspicuous things / are raised to glory, (καὶ τὰ μὲν ἀκλέα πολλὰ καὶ οὐκ ἀρίδηλα γεγῶτα / κυδήεντα τίθησι) while the exalted are brought to little. / Often out of good comes evil and from evil / something good with the changes of our harsh life. (πολλάκι δ’ ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ πέλει κακόν, ἐκ δὲ κακοῦ / ἐσθλὸν ἀμειβομένοιο πολυτλήτου βίοτιο)” (13.473-7). The foundational role of the fall of Troy and the paradigmatic status of Homer were significant reference points in the public and private self-defining acts of visitors, like Hadrian, Caracalla, and Julian, at times mediated through the famous visit of Troy by Alexander the great, or at least the Imperial memory of this visit. As Borgeaud puts it, “the ruins are *susceptible* to be reelevated, restored by memory.”¹³⁵

Besides the accumulation of literary texts and reading tactics, is there something else that is particular to this period that gives shape to the literary themes and tropes I have covered? Agosti has termed the mixture of specific detail and generic urban structures in cityscapes ‘ambiguous realism’ and defines it as a Late Antique phenomenon.¹³⁶ But it is not only a Late Antique perspective shared between art and literature. To begin with, the aesthetic is much earlier. Idealised, generic urban features exist as early as Homer. In art the mixture of the generic and the specific Trojan cityscape and the variety of readings it invites

is already present in the early Imperial *Tabulae Iliacae*, as Squire has discussed with reference to their depiction of the *Iliou Persis*.¹³⁷ Moving back, an archaic depiction of the *Iliou Persis* on a relief vase from Mykonos (ca. 675 BCE) shows the Wooden Horse and twenty panels that mix individual scenes of violence, some generic and some specifically tied to known characters or episodes from the Epic Cycle.¹³⁸ But equally importantly the dialogue between specific and generic cityscapes is not an inert formal structure that we find eternally and mechanically replicating itself in art and literature.¹³⁹ It is rather in the reader's eye—and power centers within Imperial contexts (Athens, Alexandria, Rome) changed the perception of literary description. It is the nature of Empire to create generic literary cityscapes that are not any more about a contrast between local knowledge and exotic flavour, but are rather cityscapes that travel to different readers and that are at once both familiar and unfamiliar to them. This is the literary manifestation of a broader negotiation of Greek identity under the Roman Empire that is constantly informed by and divided between the double perspective of local experience from below and a globalised consciousness associated with Empire.¹⁴⁰ It is in this sense that the descriptive strategies of Quintus are partly self-conscious authorial effects but mainly inescapable functions of reading under the Empire.

I have argued that inebriation offers a way of reading Quintus's Troy in book 13 through a blurred mixture of Greek and Trojan/Roman eyes, while the theme of the banquet implicates the depicted Trojan world in the symbolical space of the learned reader; furthermore, that the ruins of the destroyed city and body become the focus for considering both rupture and continuity, both a sense of belonging and of distance from the heritage of the Trojan moment; finally, that this same focus on parts and fragments meshes with a synecdochic mode of reading in which stereotypical elements of the city and its community signal both Augustine's Alexandria and Carthage – both your own world and another. These

modalities of fiction fit into a broader negotiation of the Greek and Roman past and a flexible view of identity that recognises the agency of the *pepaideumenos* in the act of memory and the bicultural tensions of being Greek in the Roman Empire.

Works cited:

- Accorinti, D., ed. 2016. *Brill's Companion to Nonnus of Panopolis*. Leiden: Brill.
- Agosti, G. 2014. "Contextualizing Nonnus' visual world." in: K. Spanoudakis, ed. *Nonnus of Panopolis in Context: Poetry and Cultural Milieu in Late Antiquity with a Section on Nonnus and the Modern World*. Berlin: De Gruyter. 141-74.
- Ahern Knudsen, R. 2012. "Poetic speakers, sophistic words." *AJP* 133: 31-60.
- Alcock, S. E. 2004. "Material witness: An archaeological context for the *Heroikos*." In: E. B. Aitken and J. K. B. Maclean, eds., *Philostratus's Heroikos: Religion and Cultural Identity in the Third Century C.E.* Leiden: Brill. 159-68.
- Anderson, G., 1993 *The Second Sophistic. A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*. London: Routledge.
- Anderson, M. J. 1997. *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Ando, C. 2010. "Imperial identities." In: Whitmarsh 2010a. 17-45.
- Asmis, E. 1991. "Philodemus' poetic theory and 'On the Good King According to Homer.'" *ClAnt* 10: 1-45.
- Avlami, P. 2010. *Aesopic Lives: Greek Imperial Literature and Urban Popular Culture*. Diss. Princeton.
- Avlami, P. 2011. "Isis and the people in the *Life of Aesop*." In P. Townsend and M. Vidas, eds., *Revelation, Literature, and Community in Late Antiquity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. 65-101.

- Bachvarova, M. R., Dutsch, D., and A. Suter, eds. 2016. *The Fall of Cities in the Mediterranean: Commemoration in Literature, Folk-Song, and Liturgy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baier, N., 2013. *Neun Leben des Homer: Eine Übersetzung und Erläuterung der antiken Biographien*. Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovač.
- Bakker, E. J. 2013. *The Meaning of Meat and the Structure of the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bakola, E. 2008. "The drunk, the reformer and the teacher: agonistic poetics and the construction of persona in the comic poets of the fifth century." *CCJ* 54: 1-29.
- Bannert, H. & N. Kröll, eds. 2018. *Nonnus of Panopolis in Context II: Poetry, Religion, and Society*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bär, S. 2007. "Quintus Smyrnaeus und die Tradition des epischen musenanrufs." In Baumbach and Bär, eds. 2007a. 29–64.
- Bär, S. 2010. "Quintus of Smyrna and the Second Sophistic." *HSCP* 105: 287-316.
- Bartol, K. 2007. "The voice of tradition: Representations of Homeric singers in Athenaeus 1.14a-d." *CQ* 57: 231-43.
- Bartsch, S. 1989. *Decoding the Ancient Novel: The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Baumbach, M. & S. Bär, eds. 2007a. *Quintus Smyrnaeus. Transforming Homer in Second Sophistic Epic*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Baumbach, M. & S. Bär, 2007b. 'An introduction to Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*.' in: Baumbach and Bär, eds. 2007a. 1-26.
- Baumbach, M. 2007. "Die Poetik der Schilde: Form und Funktion von Ekphraseis in den *Posthomerica* des Quintus Smyrnaeus." in: Baumbach and Bär, eds. 2007a. 107-42.

- Baumbach, M. and N. Dümmler, eds. 2014. *Imitate Anacreon! Mimesis, Poiesis and the Poetic Inspiration in the Carmina Anacreontea*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Becker, A. S. 1990. "The Shield of Achilles and the poetics of Homeric description." *AJP* 111: 139-53.
- Bing, P. 1995. "Ergänzungspiel in the epigrams of Callimachus." *A&A* 41: 115–131.
- Borgeaud, Ph. 2010. "Trojan Excursions: A Recurrent Ritual, from Xerxes to Julian." *History of Religions* 49: 339-53.
- Borthwick, E. K. 1988. "Odysseus and the return of the swallow." *G&R* 35: 14-22.
- Bouquiaux-Simon, O. 1968. *Les lectures homériques de Lucien*. Mémoires de la Classe des Lettres ser. 2, t. lix, fasc. 2. Brussels: Palais des Académies.
- Bowersock, G. W. 1969. *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bowersock, G. W. 1994. *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bowie, E. L. 1970. "Greeks and their past in the Second Sophistic." *P&P* 46: 3-41.
- Bowie, E. L. 1989. "Greek Sophists and Greek Poetry in the Second Sophistic." *ANRW* 33: 209–58.
- Bowie, E. L. 2002. "The chronology of the earlier Greek novels since B. E. Perry: Revisions and precisions." *AncNarr* 2: 47–63.
- Bowie, E. L. 2008. "Aristides and early Greek lyric, elegiac, and iambic poetry." In: W. V. Harris and B. Holmes, eds. *Aelius Aristides between Greece, Rome, and the Gods*. Leiden: Brill. 9-29.
- Bréchet, Chr. 2009. "Les Grecs de l'époque impériale et l'origine troyenne de Rome." In: M. Fartzoff, M. Faudot, E. Geny, and M.-R. Guelfucci, eds. *Reconstruire Troie:*

- Permanence et renaissance d'une cite emblématique.* Besançon: Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté. 425-44.
- Bruss, J. S. 2005. *Hidden Presences: Monuments, Gravesites, and Corpses in Greek Funerary Epigram.* Leuven: Peeters.
- Burgess, J. S. 2001. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Burgess, J. S. 2014. "Framing Odysseus: the death of the suitors." In: Christopoulos and Paizi-Apostolopoulou, eds. 337-54.
- Cameron, A. 2014. *Byzantine Matters.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Campbell, D. A. 1988. *Anacreon, Anacreontea, Choral Lyric from Olympus to Alcman.* vol. 2: *Greek Lyric.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cantilena, M. 2001. "Cronologia e tecnica compositiva dei *Posthomerica* di Quinto Smirneo," in: F. Montanari, S. Pittaluga (eds), *Posthomerica: Tradizioni omeriche dall'Antichità al Rinascimento*, vol. 3, Genova: Dipartimento di archeologia, filologia classica e loro tradizioni. 51-70.
- Carvounis, K. 2007. "Final Scenes in Quintus of Smyrna, *Posthomerica* 14." In: Baumbach and Bär, eds. 2007a. 241-58.
- Carvounis, K. & R. Hunter, eds. 2008. *Signs of Life? Studies in Later Greek Poetry = Ramus* 37.1-2.
- Carvounis, K. 2014. "Landscape markers and time in Quintus' *Posthomerica*." In: M. Skempis & I. Ziogas, eds, *Geography, Topography, Landscape: Configurations of Space in Greek and Roman Epic.* Berlin: De Gruyter: 181-208.

- Christopoulos, M. and M. Paizi-Apostolopoulou, eds. 2014. *Crime and Punishment in Homeric and Archaic Epic: Proceedings of the 12th International Symposium on the Odyssey: Ithaca, September 3-7, 2013*. Ithaca: Centre for Odyssean Studies.
- Clay, J. S. 1994. "The *dais* of death." *TAPA* 124: 35-40.
- Clay, J. S. 2011. *Homer's Trojan Theater: Space, Vision, and Memory in the Iliad*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clay, J. S. 2016. "How to construct a sympotic space with words." In: V. Cazzato & A. Lardinois, eds. *The Look of Lyric: Greek Song and the Visual: Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song, vol. 1*. Leiden: Brill. 204-16.
- Clover, C. J. 1987. "Her body, himself: Gender in the slasher film" *Representations* 20: 187-228.
- Collard, C. 1989-90. "The *Stasimon Euripides, Hecuba 905–52*" *Sacris Erudiri* 31: 85–97.
- Cook, I F. 1995. *The Odyssey in Athens: Myths of Cultural Origins*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Crowther, N. B. 1979. "Water and wine as symbols of inspiration." *Mnemosyne* 32: 1-11.
- D'Alessio, G. B. 2004. "Language and pragmatics." In F. Budelmann, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 114-29.
- Davidson, J. 2000. "Pleasure and pedantry in Athenaeus." in: D. Braund and J. Wilkins, eds., *Athenaeus and His World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*. Exeter: Exeter University Press. 292-303.
- Demoen, K. 2001. "'Où est ta beauté qu'admiraient tous les yeux?': La ville détruite dans les traditions poétique et rhétorique." In K. Demoen, ed. *The Greek city from antiquity to the present: historical reality, ideological construction, literary representation*. Leuven: Peeters. 103-25.

- Dickey, E. 2007. *Ancient Greek Scholarship: A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dickey, E. 2015. "The sources of our knowledge of ancient scholarship." In F. Montanari, S. Matthaios, and A. Rengakos, eds. *Brill's Companion to Ancient Scholarship*. Vol. 1, Leiden: Brill. 459-514.
- Dougherty, C. and L. Kurke 1993. "Introduction." In C. Dougherty and L. Kurke, eds. *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-12.
- Dougherty, C. and L. Kurke 2003. "Introduction: The cultures within Greek culture." In C. Dougherty and L. Kurke, eds. *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-19.
- Edwards, C. 2013. "The city in ruins: Text, image, and imagination." In: P. Erdkamp, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 541-57.
- Elsner, J. ed. 2002a. *The Verbal and the Visual: Cultures of Ekphrasis in Antiquity*. Ramus 31.1-2
- Elsner, J. 2002b. "Introduction: The genres of ekphrasis." in: Elsner, ed. 2002a. 1-18.
- Elsner, J. 2007. "Philostratus visualizes the tragic." in: C. Kraus, S. Goldhill, H. P. Foley, and J. Elsner, eds., *Visualizing the Tragic: Drama, Myth, and Ritual in Greek Art and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 309–37.
- Elsner, J. & M. Squire, 2017. "Homer and the ekphrasists: Text and picture in the Elder Philostratus' Scamander (*Imagines* I.1)." In J. Bintliff and K. Rutter, eds., *The*

- Archaeology of Greece and Rome: Studies in Honour of Anthony Snodgrass.*
Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 57-99.
- Ernst, N. 2006. *Die D-Scholien zur Odyssee: Kritische Ausgabe.* Diss. Köln (digital edition: <http://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/id/eprint/1831>)
- Fantuzzi, M. & Chr. Tsagalis, eds. 2015. *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception.*
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Felson, N. and L. Slatkin, 2014. “*Nostos, tisis*, and two forms of dialogism in Homer’s *Odyssey*.” In Christopoulos and Paizi-Apostolopoulou, eds. 211-22.
- Fields, D. 2014. “Quintus Smyrnaeus” Review of C. A. Maciver, 2012. *Quintus Smyrnaeus’ Posthomerica: Engaging Homer in Late Antiquity.* Leiden: Brill. CR 64: 101-3.
- Ford, A. 1992. *Homer: The Poetry of the Past.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press
- Fowler, D. 1991. “Narrate and describe: The problem of ekphrasis.” *JRS* 81: 25-35.
- Franco. C. 2008. “Aelius Aristides and Rhodes: Concord and consolation.” in: W. V. Harris and B. Holmes, eds., *Aelius Aristides Between Greece, Rome, and the Gods.* Leiden: Brill. 217-49.
- Gaertner, J. F. 2001. “The Homeric catalogues and their function in epic narrative.” *Hermes* 129: 298-305.
- Geertz, C. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays.* New York: Basic Books.
- Gerlaud, B. 1982. *Triphiodore: La prise d’Ilion.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Gkourogiannis, Th. K., 1999. *Pindaric Quotations in Aelius Aristides.* Diss. UCL.
- Goldhill, S. 1990. *The Poet’s Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Goldhill, S. 1994. "The naive and knowing eye: Ecphrasis and the culture of viewing in the Hellenistic world." in: S. Goldhill and R. Osborne, eds. *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*. Cambridge. 197-223.
- Goldhill, S. ed. 2001. *Being Greek Under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldhill, S., 2007. "What is ekphrasis for?" *CP* 102: 1-19.
- González, J. M., 2013. *The Epic Rhapsode and his Craft: Homeric Performance in a Diachronic Perspective*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Graverini, L., 2014. "From the epic to the novelistic hero: Some patterns of a metamorphosis." In E. P. Cueva and S. N. Byrne, eds. *A Companion to the Ancient Novel*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 288-99.
- Graziosi, B., 2002. *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenblatt, S. 1997. "The touch of the Real." *Representations* 59: 14-29.
- Griffin, J. 1980. *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gutzwiller, K. 2014. "Anacreon, Hellenistic epigram, and the Anacreontic poet." In: Baumbach and Dümmler. 47-66.
- Hadjitoffi, F. 2007. "Res Romanae: Cultural Politics in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica* and Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*." in: Baumbach & Bär, eds. 2007a. 357-78.
- Hall, E. 2008. *The Return of Ulysses: A Cultural History of Homer's Odyssey*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Hardie, Ph. R. 1985. "Imago mundi: Cosmological and ideological aspects of the Shield of Achilles." *JHS* 105: 11-31.
- Heath, M. 2002-3. "Theon and the history of the *Progymnasmata*." *GRBS* 43: 129-60.

- Henrichs, A. 1994-5. “‘Why Should I Dance?’: Choral Self-Referentiality in Greek Tragedy.” *Arion* 3: 56-111.
- Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobden, F. 2013. *The Symposium in Ancient Greek Society and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hornblower, S. 2015. *Lykophron: Alexandra*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Householder, F. W. 1941. *Literary Quotation and Allusion in Lucian*. New York: King’s Crown Press.
- Hunter, R. 2009. *Critical Moments in Classical Literature: Studies in the Ancient View of Literature and its Uses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunter, R. 2018. *The Measure of Homer: The Ancient Reception of the Iliad and the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacob, C., 2013. *The Web of Athenaeus*. Transl.: A. Papaconstantinou. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- James, A. (2004) *Quintus of Smyrna: The Trojan Epic: Posthomeric*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Johnson, W. A. 2010. *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: a Study of Elite Communities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, C. P. 1990. “The *Rhodian Oration* ascribed to Aelius Aristides.” *CQ* 40: 514-22.
- Jones, C. P. 1991. “Dinner-theatre.” In W. J. Slater, ed. *Dining in a classical context*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 185–198.
- Kannicht, R. 1982. “Poetry and art: Homer and the monuments afresh.” *ClAnt* 1: 70-86.
- Kaldellis, A. 2007. *Hellenism in Byzantium: The Transformations of Greek Identity and the*

- Reception of the Classical Tradition*. Cambridge.
- Kapur, A. 2010. *Vulnerable India: A Geographical Study of Disasters*. New Delhi.
- Katz, M. A. 1991. *Penelope's Renown: Meaning and Indeterminacy in the Odyssey*. Princeton.
- Keaney, J. J. and R. Lamberton, eds. 1996. *[Plutarch] Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer*. Atlanta.
- Kelly, A. 2015. "Ilias Parva." in: Fantuzzi & Tsagalis, eds. 318-43
- Kim, L. 2010a. *Homer Between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature*. Cambridge.
- Kim, L. 2010b. "The Literary Heritage as Language: Atticism and the Second Sophistic." In: E. J. Bakker, ed. *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Chichester & Malden, Mass. 468-82.
- Kindstrand, J. F. 1973. *Homer in der zweiten Sophistik*. Uppsala.
- Knox, P. E. 1985. "Wine, water, and Callimachean polemics." *HSCP* 89: 107-19.
- König, J. 2012. *Saints and Symposiasts: The Literature of Food and the Symposium in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lamberton, R. 2002. "Homeric allegory and Homeric rhetoric in ancient pedagogy." In: Montanari, ed. 185-205.
- Lightfoot, J. L. 2008. "Catalogue technique in Dionysius Periegetes." in: Carvounis and Hunter, eds. 11-31
- Losada, L. A. 1985. "Odyssey 21.411: The swallow's call." *CP* 80: 33 -34.
- Maciver, C. A. 2007. "Returning to the mountain of Arete: Reading ecphrasis, constructing ethics in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*." In Baumbach & Bär, eds. 2007a. 259–284.

- Maciver, C. A. 2011. "Reading Helen's excuses in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*." *CQ* 61: 690-703.
- Maciver, C. A. 2012a. *Quintus Smyrnaeus' Posthomerica: Engaging Homer in Late Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill.
- Maciver, C. A. 2012b. "Representative bees in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*." *CP* 107: 53-69.
- Maciver, C. A. 2012c. "Flyte of Odysseus: Allusion and the *hoplōn krisis* Quintus Smyrnaeus *Posthomerica* 5." *AJP* 133: 601-628.
- Maciver, C. A. 2016. "Nonnus and Imperial Greek poetry." In Accorinti, ed. 529-48.
- Miguélez-Cavero, L. 2007. "La Nyktomachia de Triphiodoro: una ekphrasis mixta." in: J. A. Fernández-Delgado, F. Pordomingo, and A. Stramaglia, eds. *Escuela y literatura en Grecia Antigua*. Cassino: Edizioni dell'Università degli studi di Cassino. 497-508.
- Miguélez-Cavero, L. 2008. *Poems in Context. Greek Poetry in the Egyptian Thebaid 200-600 AD*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Miguélez-Cavero, L. 2013. *Triphiodorus, The Sack of Troy: A General Study and a Commentary*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Miletti, L. 2017. "'I also have to dialogue with the posterity'. Aelius Aristides' legacy to the Late Antiquity." In A. J. Quiroga Puertas, ed. *Rhetorical Strategies in Late Antique Literature: Images, Metatexts, and Interpretation*. Leiden: Brill. 7-25.
- Montanari, F., ed. 2002. *Omero tremila anni dopo: Atti del congresso di Genova 6-8 luglio 2000*. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Montiglio, S. 2011. *From Villain to Hero: Odysseus in Ancient Thought*. Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press.
- Morales, H. 2004. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, J. R. 1991. "Readers and audiences in the *Aethiopica* of Heliodoros." *GCN* 4: 85-103.

Most, G. 1992. "*Disiecti membra poetae*: The rhetoric of dismemberment in Neronian poetry." in: R. Hexter and D. Selden, eds. *Innovations of Antiquity*. New York: Routledge. 391-419.

Most, G. 2014. "Τὸν Ἀνακρέοντα μιμοῦ: Imitation and enactment in the *Anacreontics*" In: Baumbach and Dümmler, eds. 145-59.

Mullaney, S. 1996. "Discursive forms, cultural practices: History and anthropology in literary studies." In T. J. McDonald, ed. *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 161-89.

Murnaghan, S. 2011. *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey*. 2nd edn. Lahnam: Lexington Books.

Nagler, M. N. 1990. "Odysseus: The Proem and the Problem." *ClAnt* 9: 335-56.

Newbold, R. F. 1981. "Space and scenery in Quintus of Smyrna, Claudian and Nonnus." *Ramus* 10: 53-68.

Niemeyer, K. A. E. 1883. "Über die Gleichnisse bei Quintus Smyrnaeus, I. Teil", in: *Gymnasium zu Zwickau. Jahresbericht über das Schuljahr von Ostern 1882 bis Ostern 1883*. Zwickau: R. Zückler.

Nünlist, R. 1998. *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner.

Nünlist, R. 2009. *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olson, S. D. 1990. "The stories of Agamemnon in Homer's *Odyssey*" *TAPA* 120: 57-71.

- Paulas, J. 2012. "How to Read Athenaeus' *Deipnosophists*." *AJP* 133.3: 403-439.
- Pauw, J. C. de 1734. *Quinti Calabri Praetermissorum ab Homero Libri XIV: Graece, cum versione Latina et integris emendationibus Laurentii Rhodomanni; et anotamentis selectis Claudii Dausqueji curante Joanne Cornelio de Pauw, qui suas etiam emendationes addidit*. Leiden: J. van Abcoude.
- Pompella, G. 1993. *Le Postomeriche: Libri VIII-XIV*. Cassino: Garigliano.
- Pompella, G. 2002. *Quinti Smyrnaei Posthomerica*. Hildesheim: G. Olms.
- Porter, J. I. 2001. "Ideals and ruins: Pausanias, Longinus, and the Second Sophistic." In: S. E. Alcock, J. F. Cherry, J. Elsner, eds. *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 63-92.
- Puech, B. 2002. *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d'époque impériale*. Paris: Vrin.
- Purves, A. C. 2010. *Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richardson, N. J., 1980. "Literary criticism in the exegetical scholia to the *Iliad*." *CQ* 30: 265-87.
- Robert, L. 1936. "ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΟΣ." *REG* 49: 235-54.
- Rose, C. B. 2013. *The Archaeology of Greek and Roman Troy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Rossi, A. 2002. "The fall of Troy: Between tradition and genre." In: D. S. Levene and D. P. Nelis, *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*. Leiden: Brill. 231-51.
- Rosenmeyer, P. A. 1992. *The Poetics of Imitation: Anacreon and the Anacreontic Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Rutherford, R. B. 1986. "The Philosophy of the *Odyssey*." *JHS* 106: 145-162.
- Rutherford, I. C. 2012. "The *Catalogue of Women* within the Greek epic tradition." in: Ø. Anderson and D. T. T. Haug, eds. *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 152-67.
- Sage, M. 2000. "Roman visitors to Ilium in the Roman Imperial and Late Antique period: The symbolic functions of a landscape." *Studia Troica* 10: 211-31.
- Said, S. 1979. "Les crimes des prétendants, la maison d'Ulysse, et les festins de l'Odysée." In S. Said, F. Desbordes, J. Bouffartigue, and A. Moreau, eds. *Études de littérature ancienne: Homère, Horace, le mythe d'Oedipe, les Sentences de Sextus*. Paris: Presses de l'École normale supérieure: 9-49.
- Said, S. 2011. *Homer and the Odyssey*. Transl.: R. Webb. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Saliou, C. 2006. "Antioche décrite par Libanios: La rhétorique de l'espace urbain et ses enjeux au milieu du quatrième siècle." In E. Amato, ed. *Approches de la Troisième Sophistique: Hommages à Jacques Schamp*. Brussels: Latomus. 273-85.
- Saradi, H. G. 2006. *The Byzantine City in the Sixth Century: Literary Images and Historical Reality*. Athens: Society of Messenian Archaeological Studies.
- Schmidt, M., 2002. "The Homer of the Scholia: what is explained to the reader?" In Montanari, ed.: 159-83.
- Schmitz, T. A. 1997. *Bildung und Macht: zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*. Munich: C.H. Beck.
- Schmitz, T. A. 2007. "The Use of Analepses and Prolepses in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*." In Baumbach and Bär, eds. 2007a: 66-84.
- Schubert, R. 2007. "From the Epics to the Second Sophistic, from Hecuba to Aethra, and finally from Troy to Athens: Defining the Position of Quintus Smyrnaeus in his

- Posthomerica.*” In Baumbach and Bär, eds. 2007a: 339-55.
- Segal, C. 1971. *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the Iliad*. Leiden: Brill.
- Segal, C. 1994. *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the Odyssey*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Shorrock, R. 2007. “Nonnus, Quintus, and the Sack of Troy.” In Baumbach and Bär, eds. 2007a: 379-91.
- Slatkin, L. 1996. “Composition by theme and the *mêtis* of the *Odyssey*.” In S. L. Schein, ed. *Reading the Odyssey: Selected Interpretive Essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 223-38.
- Sommerstein, A. 2015. “Tragedy and Epic Cycle.” In Fantuzzi and Tsagalis, eds.: 461-86.
- 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: De Gruyter.
- Squire, M. 2011. *The Iliad in a Nutshell: Visualizing Epic on the Tabulae Iliacae*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Squire, M. 2013. “Ekphrasis at the forge and the forging of ekphrasis: The ‘shield of Achilles’ in Graeco-Roman word and image.” *Word & Image* 29.2: 157-191.
- Squire, M. 2015. “Visual and verbal interactions in ancient Greek and Latin literature.” In *Oxford Handbooks Online in Classical Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935390.013.58.
- Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50-250*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Tagliabue, A. 2015. “Heliodorus’s *Aethiopica* and the Odyssean *Mnesterophonia*: An Intermedial Reading.” *TAPA* 145: 445-468.

- Telò, M. 2011. "The eagle's gaze in the opening of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*." *AJP* 132: 581-613.
- Tomasso, V. E. 2010. "*Cast in Later Grecian Mould*": *Quintus of Smyrna's Reception of Homer in the Posthomerica*. Stanford diss.
- Torrance, I. 2013. *Metapoetry in Euripides*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Touchefeu-Meynier, O. 1968. *Thèmes odysseïens dans l'art antique*. Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard.
- Tsagalis, C. 2010. "The dynamic hypertext: Lists and catalogues in the Homeric epics." *Trends in Classics* 2: 323-47.
- Tsagalis, C. 2012. *From Listeners to Viewers: Space in the Iliad*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tueller, M. 2008. *Look Who's Talking: Innovations in Voice and Identity in Hellenistic Epigram*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Van Hoof, L. 2010. "Greek rhetoric and the Later Roman Empire: The bubble of the 'Third Sophistic.'" *AnTard* 18: 211-24.
- Vermeule, III, C. C. "Neon Iliion and Ilium Novum: Kings, soldiers, citizens, and jurists at classical Troy." In: J. B. Carter and S. P. Morris, *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule*. Austin: University of Texas Press: 467-82.
- Vernant, J.-P. 1991. "A 'beautiful death' and the disfigured corpse in Homeric epic." in: J.-P. Vernant, *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays*. ed. F. I. Zeitlin. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 50-74.
- Vian, F. 1954. "Les comparaisons de Quintus de Smyrne." *RPhil* 28: 30-51, 235-43.
- Vian, F. 1959a. *Histoire de la tradition manuscrite de Quintus de Smyrne*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France

- Vian, F. 1959b. *Recherches sur les Posthomerica de Quintus de Smyrne*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Vian, F. 1963. *Quintus de Smyrne: La suite d'Homère: Tome I: Livres I-IV*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Vian, F. 1969. *Quintus de Smyrne: La suite d'Homère: Tome III: Livres X-XIV*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Warner, M. 2011. *Stranger Magic: Charmed States & the Arabian Nights*. London: Vintage.
- Webb, R. 1999. "Ekphrasis ancient and modern: The invention of a genre." *Word and Image* 15: 7-18.
- Webb, R. 2008. *Demons and Dancers: Performance in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Webb, R. 2009. *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- West, M. L. 2013. *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Whitby, M. 1994. "From Moschus to Nonnus: The evolution of the Nonnian style." In N. Hopkinson, ed. *Studies in the Dionysiaca of Nonnus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 99-155.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2001. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2002. "Written on the body: Ecphrasis, perception and deception in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*." *Ramus* 31: 111-25.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2005a. "Heliodorus Smiles." In: S. Harrison, M. Paschalis, and St. Frangoulidis, eds. *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel*. Groningen: Barkhuis. 87-104.

- Whitmarsh, T. 2005b. "Quickening the Classics: The politics of prose in Roman Greece." in: J. I. Porter, ed. *Classical pasts: The classical traditions of Greece and Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 353-74.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2009. "Performing heroics: Language, landscape and identity in Philostratus' *Heroicus*." In: E. Bowie and J. Elsner, eds. *Philostratus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 205-229.
- Whitmarsh, T., ed. 2010a. *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2010b "Thinking local." In Whitmarsh 2010a: 1-16.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2013a. *Beyond the Second Sophistic: Adventures in Greek Postclassicism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2013b. "Resistance is futile? Greek literary tactics in the face of Rome." In: P. Schubert, ed. *Les Grecs héritiers des Romains*. Vandoeuvres: Fondation Hardt.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2017. "Greece: Hellenistic and early Imperial continuities." In D. S. Richter and W. A. Johnson, eds. *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic*. 11-23.
- Winkler, J. J. 1982. "The mendacity of Kalasiris and the narrative strategy of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*." *YCS* 27: 93-158.
- Woolf, G. 1994. "Becoming Roman, staying Greek: Culture, identity and the civilizing process in the Roman East." *PCPS* 40: 116-143.
- Woolf, G. 2010. "Afterword: The local and the global in the Graeco-Roman east." In Whitmarsh 2010a: 189-200.
- Zeitlin, F. 2001. "Visions and revisions of Homer." In Goldhill 2001: 195-266.
- Zetzel, J. E. G. 2005. *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance: The Commentum Cornuti and the Early Scholia on Persius*. London: Institute of Classical Studies.

Zwingmann, N. 2012. *Antiker Tourismus in Kleinasien und auf den vorgelagerten Inseln:*

Selbstvergewisserung in der Fremde. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt.

* This article emerges from the research project “Greek Epic of the Roman Empire: A Cultural History,” funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, UK, whom I thank for their support. I would like to express my gratitude to my collaborators on the project Emily Greensmith, Emily Kneebone, Laura Miguélez-Cavero, and Tim Whitmarsh for formative discussions and feedback. I have presented material from this article to audiences in Bristol, Houson, London, and Cambridge, and thank them for comments, suggestions, and corrections. Last but not least, I would like to extend my thanks to the anonymous readers of *TAPA*, as well as the journal’s editor, Andromache Karanika, for insights and suggestions. All errors remaining are my own.

¹ See especially Baumach & Bär 2007a; Carvounis & Hunter 2008; Miguelez-Cavero 2008; Bär 2010; Maciver 2012a. On earlier scholarship on Quintus, see the overview in Baumbach & Bär 2007b: 17-23.

² On the question of date, see Baumbach & Bär 2007b. For recent work exploring the Imperial context of Quintus, see n. 1 above. More generally on Imperial and Late Antique Greek epic in its context see especially Miguélez-Cavero 2008, with further bibliography. On the central 5th c C.E. figure of Nonnus see Spanoudakis 2014, Accorinti 2016, and Bannert & Kröll 2018.

³ Bär 2010: 287-8 rightly points out that three more general factors have held back our appreciation of Quintus within the context of his period: a) neglect of Quintus in modern scholarship, b) the uncertainty of Quintus’s date, and c) the non-Atticising nature of Quintus’s project within the context of an Atticising literary period makes the *PH* an awkward outlier.

⁴ A critique explored in various ways in Whitmarsh 2001: 42-45; 2005c: 4-10; 2013a: 2-7, while the idea also provides the connecting thread of the entire book.

⁵ See Whitmarsh 2013a: 3-5, who gives a sense of the breadth of “postclassical Greek literature” with recent bibliography that incorporates in its purview Jewish and Christian literature, poetry, the broad range of non-sophistic fiction, historiography, antiquarian literature and miscellany, technical literature of various kinds including medical and physiognomic works, ancient scholarship, musicology, astrology, dream interpretation.

⁶ Whitmarsh 2013a: 1-7.

⁷ It is here taken for granted that these are indeed important aspects of Imperial Greek culture emphasised in earlier, foundational studies: Bowersock 1969; Bowie 1970; Anderson 1993; Swain 1996; Schmitz 1997.

⁸ Whitmarsh 2001: 41-89 has shown, for example, that side by side with Imperial Greek attempts to represent the archaizing imitation of the past as a natural and smooth process, there are several ways in which Imperial Greek texts concurrently and contradictorily dwell on cultural rupture or even a celebration of modern innovation. Whitmarsh 2013b discusses how complicity with and reappropriation of the dominant Imperial discourse of Roman power can coexist in the same authors and texts. Whitmarsh 2005b (reprinted and updated in 2013a) shows how the opposition between poetry and prose, which becomes instrumental in the self-definition of Imperial Greek prose authors, is a malleable polarity used for elite self-definition—it neither presents an ubiquitous and coherent attitude nor offers an objective description of the demise of poetry in the period or an actual incompatibility between the two forms of literary composition.

⁹ E.g. Vian 1963: viii-ix; or Cantilena 2001: 55-56. Cf. Baumbach & Bär 2007b: 1-8.

¹⁰ Other contributions do touch upon Quintus in his historical and cultural context although largely in passing and the methodological direction is different than the one presented here: Schubert 2007 delineates a loose context of Imperial hexametric poetry for Quintus and follows an author-focused approach unpacking Quintus's attempt in *PH* 13 to rewrite Virgil and inscribe Athens as the "future" city of glory instead of Rome of the *Aeneid*. Hadjitoffi 2007 contrasts four scenes in Quintus and Nonnus: Quintus's negotiation of Greek identity (mainly through his treatment of Aeneas in book 11-13 of the *PH* and the catastrophe of Electra in *PH* 13.551-9) is juxtaposed to Nonnus's to argue that Quintus's view of Rome is characteristic of Second Sophistic constructions of a double identity, Greek and Roman, characterized by tensions (largely seen here as resistance), whereas Nonnus's view of Rome echoes the development of a cosmopolitan model of identity in Late Antiquity, beyond the categories of Greek, Roman, and barbarian.

¹¹ Baumbach & Bär 2007b: 15.

¹² Bär 2010. On Homeric revisionism see the bibliography cited in Bär 2010: 289-91, to which one should add Bowersock 1994: 1-27, who coins the term, and now Kim 2010a.

¹³ Maciver 2012c: 607. Cf. Maciver 2012a: 17-8 and 2012c: esp. 602-7, mainly responding to Baumbach & Bär 2007b and Bär 2010.

¹⁴ Baumbach & Bär 2007b: 11-12.

¹⁵ Kindstrand 1973, on Dio of Prusa, Aelius Aristides, and Maximus of Tyre; Householder 1941 and Bouquiaux-Simon 1968 on Lucian. More generally, see Swain 1996: 55-6 and 68-9; and especially Kim 2010a, with the overview in 1-21. On Homer as a model in Imperial rhetorical training see Lamberton 2002; and Kim 2010: 11n37 with further bibliography. The genealogy of this influence goes back to the classical models of Imperial sophists as Homeric poetics had been formative in sophistic rhetoric of the 5th c B.C.E.: Ahern Knudsen 2012.

¹⁶ The influence of declamation is only part of Bär's argument. The part of his argument that Quintus's continuation of Homer in the *PH* can be seen as a response to prosaic Homeric revisionism in the period has not been questioned. A caveat though: seeing Quintus as the traditionalist juxtaposed to the innovative nature of sophistic Homeric revision does not do justice to the fact that prose Homeric revisionism is itself both traditionalist and innovative, as it privileges Imperial literary creativity over the paradigmatic past, while reaffirming the cultural centrality of Homer: see especially Kim 2010: 216-20, and Whitmarsh 2011: 87. More generally, as argued here, such responses are more convincingly seen as part of reader response and broader cultural forces than authorial self-consciousness.

¹⁷ Maciver 2012a: 17-18, and 2012c: 604-5 and 606-607. Cf. Fields 2014 with similar reservations about this kind of contextualisation of Quintus. Maciver's approach to Quintus's context here is surprising given that in 2012a: 7-13 he explains that his view of intertextuality in Quintus is reader-oriented and that he "take[s] into account, throughout this book, the idea of the educated ancient reader, and the contemporary culture in which the *Posthomerica* was composed" (10); cf. Maciver 2011: especially 692-3, although without abandoning the author-centered question of Quintus's actual sources (702-3). Similarly, Maciver 2007 and 2012a: 101-123 show a broader understanding of Imperial context, exploring the influence of contemporary Stoic ideas on Quintus's representation of the divine and morality.

¹⁸ Baumbach & Bär 2007b: 8.

¹⁹ "...Quintus ... might have written his epic... for the opposite reasons..." Baumbach & Bär 2007b: 12. In a similar direction, the Second Sophistic is configured as a static backdrop that Quintus 'reflect[s]' (2007b: 13) or conforms to (2007b: 14) or strategically subverts.

²⁰ See e.g. Bär 2010: 290-91, e.g. “[works of sophistic Homeric revisionism] may also be read as attempts to integrate Homer and his poetry into the required “system” of Atticizing prose literature ... the *Posthomeric* can be read as a “traditional response” to these.”

²¹ Bär 2010: 310.

²² Furthermore, even this smaller canon of Homeric revisionism is in itself both traditionalist and innovative, as discussed in n16 above.

²³ School exercise: θεός οὐκ ἄνθρωπος ὁ Ὅμηρος, *Michigan Papyri* VIII, no 1100 (3rd c. C.E.) and cf. *AP* 16.301 with context in Zeitlin 2001, especially 204-5, and Hunter 2009: 173-4; on the range of positioning between reader and text that Homeric scholarship could offer Imperial readers: especially Schmidt 2002, as well as Richardson 1980 and Lamberton 2002. Hunter 2009: 169-201 offers a similarly helpful perspective on the complexities of Imperial resistant readings of Homer as evidenced in Plutarch’s *Quomodo adul.* Hunter 2018 (which I I saw only as I was adding final touches on this article) is particularly insightful in teasing out the complexities of Homer’s presence in postclassical Greek culture for Greek identity in terms of past and present (esp. 2018: 1-41) but also in further ways that go beyond the currently dominant focus on nostalgia/modernism. Kim 2010a explores the complexities of this issue with a closer focus on the Imperial trope of Homeric revisions and refutations. Rhapsodic performance in the Imperial period: Gonzalez 2013: 479-518. Philostratus *Imagines* 1.1 and meta-ekphrastics: Elsner & Squire 2017. Homeric biography as scholarship in this period: Keaney and Lamberton 1996 and Baier 2013, cf. Graziosi 2002 and Lefkowitz 2012: 14-29. *Odyssey*, nostos, and ancient novel: see especially Whitmarsh 2011: 14-16 (but also the broader argument of the entire book focusing on novelistic *nostos*), and on the broader relationship between archaic epic and ancient novel, see Graverini 2014 with further bibliography. Even

among Imperial Greek epic poets the uses of the authority of Homer are diverse: Whitby 1994 and Tomasso 2010: 215-79.

²⁴ Maciver 2012a: 17-18 and 2012c: 606-7. Maciver puts emphasis on Scopelianus of Clazomenae and his hexametric poem *Gigantias* as the exception to the “rule” about sophists not composing epic—a point drawn from Bowie 1989: 229 and 255-6, who however focuses not on the inherent incompatibility of Imperial epic and rhetoric as literary forms, but rather on the practical limitations that prevented the same individual to excel through time-consuming practice in both epic and rhetoric. I am not convinced that there is an unbridgeable distance between the Atticism of sophistic literature and the Homeric language of Quintus, as these are not incompatible on some metaphysical level. Sophists could be poets using non-Attic language on a smaller scale, see Puech 2002: 241-2 no 110 on Falernus “ποιητής ἠδὲ σοφισ[τῆς]” (of epigram presumably; cf. Bowie 1989) and 270-72 no 122 on Titus Flavius Glaucus “ποιητής καὶ ῥήτωρ καὶ φιλόσοφος”, both of which were active in the 3rd c C.E; on these individuals and on Herodes Atticus (another poet-sophist in the epigrammatic genre) see Bowie 1989: 229-43. But more importantly, as I discuss here, if we consider the social presence of Atticism and Homeric language in the Imperial period we are essentially talking about reception and reading habits. Imperial epic poets did not draw distinctions between prose and poetry in their reading lists (see following discussion and n25), while Homer (and a variety of non-Attic texts) played a significant role in the reading and rhetorical practice of Imperial sophists. Atticism certainly constitutes an ideology and a cultural phenomenon under the Empire (and beyond) but should not mask the fact that actual elite reading habits and aesthetic experiences were not limited to reading texts written in Attic. This is not the place to follow this argument systematically; on the place of Homer in the underlying tensions of the inherently utopian project of Atticism, see Swain 1996: 55-56; on the variability of Atticism in reality and

the tensions between normative discourse and its practical application, see Kim 2010b with further bibliography.

²⁵ See e.g. Miguélez-Cavero 2008: 264-370 on the influence of rhetorical education on Greek Late Antique poets more generally, and 2013: 38-87 on the panorama of influences on a single poet, Triphiodorus.

²⁶ Jacob 2013: 39-40 and 106-7; Paulas 2012 with apposite analysis of the ways in which Athenaeus's interlocutors and their analyses and clustering of quotations model ways of reading: the host Ulpian (or Keitoukeitos) models a kind of reading that looks for specific answers to specific questions (which is what regularly initiates discussion in the *Deipnosophists*; cf. Jacob 2013: 71-83 on *zêtêsis* and 85-94 on its archaizing dimensions), while the Cynic Cynulcus finds pleasure in the variety and abundance of the anthology of readings and passages that results during the conversation. Cf. König 2012: 30-59 and especially 38: "Symptotic miscellanies were valued [...] not just because they showed knowledge in action, but also because they had the potential to draw their readers into dialogue."

²⁷ The text meditates on the variety of elite reading habits as well as the tensions between strict Atticism and broader archaism by allowing large swathes of the discussion to be led by the hyperatticist symposiarch Ulpian interspersed with responses from other interlocutors who chastise the inflexibility of Ulpian and advocate a broader appreciation of the literary heritage: see Jacob 2013: 92-94. The varieties of Greek past that Athenaeus engages with are particularly evident in *Deipnosophists* 5, where the discussion on the cultural history of the symposium (and hence the range of models for Athenaeus's own work) moves chronologically from Homer to the Hellenistic period.

²⁸ Johnson 2010: 179-199.

²⁹ Gkourogianis 1999 on the frequent Pindaric citations of Aristides, on which see also Bowie 2008: 7-31. Gkourogianis 1999: 361 counts a total of 346 citations of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in Aristides. Swain 1996: 254 with n1 on Aristides' ancient reception, as well as Milette 2017 for reception context not focused only on language.

³⁰ Thus the approach here balances (in the vein of Hinds 1998: 47-51) between reader-oriented intertextuality and the acknowledgment that texts limit readers' interpretive moves by virtue of textual clues that anchor reader response and by presenting the reader with a fiction of authorial intent at work.

³¹ For example, my reading of the *Odyssey* against the *PH* in Section II below moves in this direction, unpacking not only how the *Odyssey* itself affects the meaning of the *PH*, but also how Imperial contexts of interpreting the *Odyssey* such as the *scholia* and their intellectual and educational background come into play.

³² In this sense the argument here takes for granted the tensions between coexisting Imperial narratives about Troy's status between Greece, Rome, and the barbarians such as those analysed by Brechet 2009 whereby the view of the Trojans as the ancestors of the Romans coexists with the view of the Trojans as barbarians, and their combination allows a range of strategic and rhetorical positions.

³³ It is in this vein that I use Clifford Geertz's (1973) term "thick description" in the following sentence, as the intertextual model presented here lays emphasis on the ways in which texts of high literature (e.g. Quintus, Athenaeus, Philostratus, Heliodorus, epigram) or paraliterary texts (e.g. *scholia*, rhetorical treatises, Athenaeus [again]) or stories about and practices of travel and tourism (see section IV and conclusion) can be seen to produce meaning through their interactions, by commenting on each other and reinforcing or contesting ways of reading, seeing, and knowing. My emphasis in this article on the textual

ambiguities, opposite and contradictory readings, and the contestation of normative Imperial discourses (e.g. Hellenocentrism, nostalgia) arises partly from the way “thick description” has been adopted by new historicism to emphasise the way in which texts and practices negotiate and contest culture in a range of contradictory ways; see Dougherty and Kurke 1993: 5-6 and 2003: 6-8; Mullaney 1996: 166-168; Greenblatt 1997.

³⁴ In this approach the literary texture of the episode is important, but besides work on Quintus’s sources for this book, the literary texture of Quintus’s depiction of the sack of Troy has rarely been explored, even in the wake of the recent attention to the *PH*. The most relevant approaches are: Hadjitoffi 2007 who explores differences in the treatment of Greece and Rome in Quintus and Nonnus; Schmitz 2007 who engages closural gestures and prolepsis/analepsis in *PH* 13; and Shorrock 2007 who explores how Nonnus rewrites aspects of *PH* 13.

³⁵ The city of Troy is configured as a spectacle already in the *Iliad* (Purves 2010: 24-64 on the eusynoptic poetics of the poem; Clay 2011; Tsagalis 2012: especially 130-40); the divine audience as focalizer enriches such narrative uses of space (Griffin 1980: 179-204).

³⁶ The celebrations of the Trojans are a topos in the epic tradition and in other sources, starting with the epic cycle: Vian 1959b: 58-9 and 1969: 128n1; West 2013: 208 and 229-30; Kelly 2015: 322-3. Euripides explores the contrast of celebrations and carnage in *Tro.* 542-57 and *Hec.* 914-22. Brief mentions: Bacchylides 13.162-3; Lycophron’s *Alexandra*: εἰσεκόμασαν, l. 1355 with Hornblower 2015: *ad loc.*: the drunken celebrations have been possibly transferred to the Greeks; [Apollodorus] 5.17a; Dio of Prusa, *Or.* 11.128-9 with ludic misattribution to Homer. Cf. Virgil *Aen.* 2.265 with Rossi 2002: 243n35. On Triphiodorus, see below.

³⁷ On the Epic Cycle in tragedy see Sommerstein 2015. Euripides *Tro.* 542-557 (first stasimon) has the chorus weave together the dance of the Athenian chorus, the dance of the chorus in character (Trojan women) in dramatic time (shortly after the sack), and the narrated moment

of past celebration and dance (by the very same chorus) just before the sack of Troy, a metatheatrical trope that Henrichs 1994-5 terms “choral projection.” Cf. Torrance 2013: 218-22 with further bibliography; and Eur. *Hec.* 914-22 with Collard 1989-90.

³⁸ All translations of Quintus have been adapted from James 2004. All other translations are mine unless otherwise noted.

³⁹ Cf. Newbold 1981 who highlights the general prominence of embedded focalization in Quintus’s treatment of space by comparison to Claudian and Nonnus.

⁴⁰ Cf. [Hermogenes] *Prog.* 10 (3rd c C.E.); Aphthonius *Prog.* 37-8 Rabe (4th c CE); Nicolaus the Sophist, *Prog.* 67-71 Felten (5th c C.E.).

⁴¹ For treatises see e.g. Dion. Hal., *Dem.* 26. On the use of *νοῦς* and cognates in Greek scholarship more generally, see Dickey 2007: 248 s.vv. *νοέω*, *νοητός*, *νοῦς*, and 203, nr. 158 and 205, nr. 166b for examples from the Euripidean and Pindaric scholia of the typical scholiastic expression *ὁ δὲ νοῦς* (‘and the sense of the passage is’). On this expression in the scholiastic tradition on Homer see Nünlist 2009: 168 with n. 21, 235 n. 34.

⁴² Cf. Nünlist 2009: 154 with n. 76, 198 with n. 12, and 291. The date of the Homeric scholia can be determined only roughly: see Dickey 2007: 18-23 and 2015: 499-503 with further bibliography. We know that the D scholia on the *Iliad* are the most conservative in the old material they preserve, as they include lexicographical material that may predate Hellenistic scholarship, that the redaction that underlies the surviving tradition of the A scholia may be dated to the 4th c C.E., and that the bT scholia are likely Late Antique; but all groups of scholia, regardless of the date of the redactions that influenced later transmission, are accretive texts, absorbing earlier material that can persevere for a long time in ancient paraliterary texts (e.g. the ‘Late Antique’ bT scholia also contain elements of Hellenistic scholarship), so their content cannot be dated through stemmatics alone. On this process of accretion in paraliterary texts see

especially Zetzel 2005: 144-61. Here, at some risk, I assume a maximalist position, taking all scholia that do not offer clear indications of a later date as material that in one form or another was part of the scholarship available to Imperial readers in Quintus's time or shortly after.

⁴³ Cf. e.g. Dio Chr., *Or.* 62.1-2, or John of Gaza, *Ekphrasis* 152-59 alongside his iambic prologue (1-25). See Section III 'Synecdoche and cityscape' below.

⁴⁴ Goldhill 1994; Elsner 2002b: 8, and n. 44 with further bibliography. Possibly within Quintus's lifetime, the elder Philostratus takes this problematic center-stage in his *Imagines* with Homer an important point of reference for his exploration of the nature of intermediality between text and image: see Squire 2015 with bibliography, and Elsner and Squire 2017.

⁴⁵ Fowler 1991: 35.

⁴⁶ Compare *PH* 13.6-7 (βαρύθοντο δέ οἱ φρένες ἔνδον, / ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὀφθαλμοὶ στρεφεδίνεον.) and 10-13 (πάντα δ' ἐώλπει / ἀμφιπεριστρωφᾶσθαι ἀνὰ πτόλιν· ὅσσε δ' <ἄρ'> ἀχλύς / ἄμπεχεν· ἀκρήτω γὰρ ἀμαλδύνονται ὀπωπαὶ / καὶ νόος αἰζηῶν, ὁπτό' ἐς φρένα χανδὸν ἴκηται) with Laocoon's affliction: *PH* 12.400-401 (μέλαινα δέ οἱ περὶ κρατὶ / νύξ ἐχύθη· στυγερόν δὲ κατὰ βλεφάρων πέσεν ἄλγος), 12.404 (περιστρωφῶντο δ' ὀπωπαὶ), and the double vision described in 12.411-2. Also note that the word ὀπωπαὶ in Quintus appears almost exclusively in descriptions of faulty and impaired vision that restricts human understanding: 9.374 (the affliction of Philoctetes), 11.250 (a dust cloud leads the combatants to kill warriors on their own side), 12.404 and 414 (the affliction of Laocoon), and 13.12 (the inebriated Trojan). 13.426 is a slightly different case: Athena averts her gaze as Ajax rapes Cassandra.

⁴⁷ Goldhill 1994, and 2007: esp. 1-8.

⁴⁸ The connection between wine, intoxication, inspiration, and poetry has a very long history in Greek literature and is certainly part of the Imperial reader's baggage: Crowther 1979; Knox 1985; Nünlist 1998: 199-205 and 317-325; Bakola 2008. A moralising discourse on wine, poetry, and moderation exists in the period (e.g. in Plutarch: Hunter 2009: 177-79) but inebriation is not consistently othered to elite self-control as Rosenmeyer 1992: 12-29, Gutzwiller 2014: 61-64, and Most 2014 show through the emphasis on inebriation in the postclassical reception of Anacreon and the *Anacreontea* (cf. Paus. 1.25.1 for an Imperial description of a drunk Anacreon's statue on the Acropolis).

⁴⁹ Ekphrasis in ancient rhetorical thought, as has been amply debated, is a domain much larger than descriptive pieces on works of art: Webb 1999, and 2009: 1-11 and 61-86; Elsner 2002b; and especially Squire 2013: 157 and 162, and 2015, with bibliography on the debate about the meaning of ekphrasis in classical studies with a balanced assessment of some of its blind-spots.

⁵⁰ On the Homeric passage see Becker 1990: 143-8.

⁵¹ On ekphrastic language more generally in these two passages see Baumbach 2007: 113-5 and 121-3.

⁵² The *Progymnasmata* falsely attributed to Hermogenes of Tarsus, possibly composed during Quintus's lifetime, discuss ekphrasis of persons, actions, occasions, space, and time: [Hermogenes] *Prog.* 10 Rabe; see the overview on ekphrastic subject-matter in Webb 2009: 61-86; cf. Heath 2002-3: 130-31, 147, and 158. On the relative dating of [Hermogenes'] *Prog.* see Heath 2002-3; Webb 2009: 14.

⁵³ Squire 2013.

⁵⁴ Miguélez-Cavero 2007; 2008: 130, 301-9, 381; 2013: 29, 387-95.

⁵⁵ Theon *Prog.* 119 Spengel; [Hermogenes] *Prog.* 10; Aphthonius *Prog.* 37 Rabe. Aphthonius actually specifies an example of this mixed type: the night-battle in Epipolai in Sicily from

Thucydides 7.42-5 (*Prog.* 37 Rabe) and Miguélez-Cavero 2007 makes a strong case for influence of this particular school model on Triphiodorus. The scene from Thucydides had a direct influence on Quintus too: in the description of a sandstorm before the walls of Troy during an inconclusive battle between Greeks and Trojans (*PH* 11.247-59). The sandstorm has the same effect as the night in Thucydides, as the combatants cannot tell whom they are fighting: καὶ ἐς χέρας ὄν τιν' ἔλοντο / κτεῖνον ἀνηλεγέως, εἰ καὶ μάλα φίλτατος ἦεν / οὐ γὰρ ἔην φράσσασθαι ἀνὰ κλόνον οὐτ' ἐπιόντα / δήιον οὐτ' ἄρ' ἐταῖρον· ἀμηχανίη δ' ἔχε λαούς (*PH* 11.251-4). Cf: ... ὥστε τέλος ξυμπεσόντες αὐτοῖς κατὰ πολλὰ τοῦ στρατοπέδου, ἐπεὶ ἄπαξ ἐταράχθησαν, φίλοι τε φίλοις καὶ πολῖται πολίταις, οὐ μόνον ἐς φόβον κατέστησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐς χεῖρας ἀλλήλοις ἐλθόντες μόλις ἀπελύοντο (Thuc. 7.44.7-8) and ...εἰ φίλιον εἶη τῶν ἤδη πάλιν φευγόντων, πολέμιον ἐνόμιζον (7.44.4).

⁵⁶ Cf n48 above on this poetic tradition. Shorrock 2007: 385 for a possible reworking of this aspect of *PH* 13 in Nonnus.

⁵⁷ See Miguélez-Cavero 2013: 72-4 with further bibliography; cf. Gerlaud 1982: 30 on the relationship between Quintus and Triphiodorus, 158n577-580a on relationship between Triphiodorus and Virgil, and 158-9n582 on Odyssean thematic influences on Triphiodorus in the quoted passage.

⁵⁸ ἄκριτος could also be drawn into the symposiastic imagery, partly because of the influence of κεκύκητο and partly because ἄκριτος and ἄκριτος in this period could be homophones on account of iotacism. The realities of pronunciation in poetic reading would have been varied and unstable, varying between archaizing and vernacular pronunciations, so the connection between the two words would be always open and potential. If indeed Triphiodorus is drawing

on Quintus, then the ἄκριτος φόνος of *Iliou halosis* 513 could be in dialogue with Quintus's ἄκριτος ἀντή of *Posthomerica* 13.3.

⁵⁹ The lacuna was identified by Pauw 1734: 762 *ad loc.* who conjectured that a single line declaring the new grammatical subject must have dropped between 13.137 and 13.138. Later editors (Vian 1969; Pompella 1993 and 2002) repeat this conjecture of a single line missing, although the omission might as well be longer. if there is indeed a lacuna. On Pauw's edition, see Baumbach & Bär 2007b: 17-18. The passage receives attention only in terms of sources in Vian 1954: 31-2 and 1969: 134n1; Vian 1954: 242-3 and 1959a: 118 touches upon the corruption of the separate but thematically linked simile of 13.72-5.

⁶⁰ Niemeyer 1884: 18; Vian 1954: 31-2.

⁶¹ This intertext is not free from interference of Trojan connotations: cf. the same simile in *Il.* 15.323-6 where the Greeks are pushed back towards the ships by the Trojans.

⁶² Vian 1954: 31-2

⁶³ Whitmarsh 2002. Cf. Goldhill 1994 and Elsner 2002b.

⁶⁴ Kim 2010: 85-215.

⁶⁵ Niemeyer 1884: 7; Vian 1969: 133 n. 6.

⁶⁶ There are a further three occurrences of the word λύθρον in the *Iliad*: 6.268, 11.169, and 20.503.

⁶⁷ Olson 1990, with an overview of earlier bibliography (57n1); Katz 1991, esp. 20-53; Segal 1994: 78-9, 94-6, 108-9; Slatkin 1996: 227-8.

⁶⁸ Carvounis 2007.

⁶⁹ Bakker 2013: 51-7 and 69-73. The connection works on the thematic level of their parasitic imposition on Odysseus's household; otherwise wolf-similes are absent from the *Odyssey*: Said 2012: 348-9.

⁷⁰ Said 1979 and 2011: 33-7 and 64-9; Bakker 2013: 36-52.

⁷¹ Rutherford 1986: 151 with n. 37; Nagler 1990; Segal 1994: 220-22; Cook 1995, esp. 15-48 and 128-70; Burgess 2014: 347.

⁷² Rutherford 1986: 151 with n37; Segal 1994: 220-22.

⁷³ Cf. Carvounis 2007: 244 with n7 and 252-3 with n42. Greek ἀτασθαλίη: 13.280 (Andromache calls her fate ἀτάσθαλος), *PH* 13.428-9 and 14.435 (on the rape of Cassandra), and 14.218 (Achilles asks for Polyxena's sacrifice because of the Greeks' ἀτασθαλίη).

⁷⁴ Felson and Slatkin 2014. Cf. Nagler 1990; Burgess 2014.

⁷⁵ Segal 1994: 98-100; cf. 116-7.

⁷⁶ On the latter point, see Bartol 2007.

⁷⁷ Segal 1994: 55 and 108-9.

⁷⁸ This is troped through bird imagery: Losada 1985; Borthwick 1988.

⁷⁹ Cf. Bakker 2013: x-xi, 110, and 156.

⁸⁰ Ford 1992: 129 and cf. 125-6; cf. Goldhill 1990: 66-68.

⁸¹ On book 22 as an interruption of song, see Murnaghan 2011: 124.

⁸² *Anacreontea* 2 is likely Imperial or Late Antique, although dating is problematic (see Campbell 1988: 10-20 for an overview of debates). The poem shows more broadly a postclassical reception of the lyre-bow simile of *Od.* 21.406-411 and the opening of the *mnêstêrophonia* in *Od.* 22.1-20 with its *recusatio* of the murderous lyre-string of Homer and its emphasis on cups within the ordered world of the peaceful symposium, echoing the *Odyssey*'s ἄεθλος ἀάατος (*Od.* 22.5 with Nagler 1990: 351-3), ἄλεισον (*Od.* 22.9), δέπας (*Od.* 22.17), and other sympotic vocabulary: δότε μοι λύρην Ὀμήρου φονίης ἄνευθε χορδῆς, φέρε μοι κύπελλα θεσμῶν, φέρε μοι νόμους κεράσσας, / μεθύων ὅπως χορεύσω, / ὑπὸ

σώφρονος δὲ λύσσης / μετὰ βαρβίτων αἰείδων / τὸ παροίνιον βοήσω. / δότε μοι λύρην
Ὀμήρου φονίης ἄνευθε χορδῆς.

⁸³ I owe this point to Emily Kneebone and Tim Whitmarsh.

⁸⁴ The other is the duel of Achilles and Hector in *Il.* 22 and (a mix of ἔκπληξις and pity) the “events concerning Andromache,” Hecuba, and Priam (*Il.* 6, 22, and 24). Cf. Hall 2008: 176.

⁸⁵ Cf. Asmis 1991: 42-3; Montiglio 2011: 104.

⁸⁶ Kim 2010a: 3-4 with bibliography in 4 n. 5, 58-60, and 140-74.

⁸⁷ ... καὶ γὰρ ταῦτα πολλῶν ἔνεκα προσεπιθεωρητέον..., [Long.] *Subl.* 9.11

⁸⁸ Goldhill 2007: 6-8.

⁸⁹ προπαρεσκεύασεν ἵνα μὴ ζητήσωμεν πῶς ἀπὸ μιᾶς πληγῆς ἀναιροῦνται οἱ μνηστῆρες, schol. D *Od.* 1.262b Ernst; δῆλον οὖν ὅτι προκατασκευάσματα τῆς μνηστηροκτονίας εἰσὶ ... ἦν γὰρ τὸ βέλος οὐ μόνον διὰ τοῦ σιδήρου, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τοῦ φαρμάκου ἀναιροῦν, ὅθεν οὐδὲ δέονται δευτέρας πληγῆς, Porph. *Od.* 1.262.

⁹⁰ 3rd c. C.E.: Swain 1996: 422-5; 4th c C.E.: Bowersock 1994: 149-60.

⁹¹ Telò 2011.

⁹² Prominence: Touchefeu-Meynier 1968: 256-265 and 269; on the three Imperial sarcophagi depicting the scene: Tagliabue 2015.

⁹³ Said 1979, and 2011: 33-7 and 64-9; Bakker 2013: 36-52.

⁹⁴ That even the archaic banquet was characterized by concern for the proper appreciation and evaluation of storytelling is argued strongly by Ford 2002: 27-31 (esp. 27 with n9).

⁹⁵ Davidson 2000.

⁹⁶ Jones 1991; Johnson 2010: 37-42, 58-9, 94-6, 104-6, 127-9, and 175-8.

⁹⁷ König 2012: 30-59 explores in this vein the reasons for the appeal of sympotic literature under the Empire; cf. his discussion of Plutarch (60-89) and Athenaeus (90-120). Cf. now Hunter 2018: 92-135. In this sense, the banquet of Imperial Greek literature is an occasion that resembles the carpet as an object with its connotations in the *Arabian Nights*, as unpacked by Warner 2011: they are figures that transcend the boundaries of literature and life, that embody a world of social transactions, that create and explore types of focalization, and that carve out a readerly occasion in reality and in fiction.

⁹⁸ In this sense the prominence of the setting (banquet) within the text (*PH* 13, sympotic literature) is similar to the thematic prominence of the sympotic setting within archaic lyric and elegy (D'Alessio 2004: 117 with bibliography; Hobden 2013: 22-65; Clay 2016). Of course, unlike lyric, *PH* 13 is only obliquely mimetic of such a setting, but in all texts the symposium is thematically prominent because the rhetoric and fiction of the symposium is implicated in the self-positioning of the audience.

⁹⁹ Roberts 1989: 38-65 with emphasis on Latin. On the Greek side: Webb 2009: 90-93.

¹⁰⁰ Roberts 1989: 72.

¹⁰¹ Roberts 1989: 67-121.

¹⁰² Throughout Roberts 1989: 38-121 the roots of the jeweled style are shown to go back at least to the early Empire. Cf. Elsner and Lobato 2017 for further nuancing of historical change and a deeper focus on the impact of Christianity (*pace* the statement about an “unprecedented miniaturization of taste” [11]).

¹⁰³ Indeed the transition from the Imperial period to Late Antiquity in terms of literary production needs to be seen as a continuum and significant shifts explored in fine granularity; this has been done excellently in terms of postclassical Greek poetry by Whitby 1994 and

Maciver 2016, and in terms of rhetorical culture by Van Hoof 2010. Cf. Whitmarsh 2017 for related reflections on hard periodization between the Hellenistic and Imperial periods.

¹⁰⁴ Elsner 2007.

¹⁰⁵ Elsner 2007: 330-31.

¹⁰⁶ Elsner 2007: 333-7

¹⁰⁷ Elsner 2007: 337.

¹⁰⁸ Of course alternative readings (modern and ancient) are not mutually exclusive: see Whitmarsh 2005a and 2011: 108-35 for the opening ekphrasis of the *Aethiopica* as an act of defamiliarisation ultimately playing into the novel's decentering of Hellenism. Or seeing the ekphrasis as programmatic and suggestive to the reader of ways of reading the novel:

Winkler 1982: esp. 95-103. Cf. Bartsch 1989: 46, and 3-79 more generally; Morgan 1991;

Whitmarsh 2002: esp. 116-9, and 2005a; Telò 2011.

¹⁰⁹ Bing 1995.

¹¹⁰ The relationship between λείψανον and *enargeia* is explored in a different perspective in Avlamiis 2010: 115-95 in relation to a broad variety of Imperial texts. Bruss 2005 in his insightful study of funerary epigram does not discuss the term. One off interpretations: Telo 2011: 600 interprets Heliodorus's λείψανα as the traces of the *Odyssey* within the *Aethiopica*; Paulas 2012: 617-8 reads λείψανα in Athenaeus as “a byword for the *Deipnosophists*' fragmentary discourse.”

¹¹¹ E.g. Leonidas of Tarentum *AP* 6.4 or 6.293, Antipater of Sidon *AP* 6.223, Archias *AP* 6.192; λειψανηλόγους in Philip of Thessalonica *AP* 6.92 is especially marked as a metafictional term.

¹¹² E.g. Leonidas *AP* 7.506, Dioscorides, *AP* 7.708, Antipater of Thessalonica *AP* 7.666; cf. the “epideictic” epigram of Crinagoras *AP* 9.439 on a skull found by the roadside.

¹¹³ E.g. Meleager *AP* 5.166, Rufinus *AP* 5.62.

¹¹⁴ Cf. e.g. the anonymous Imperial (on account of the eulogized mimographer Philistion's date) epigram *AP* 7.155, which characterizes Philistion as λείψανον παντός βίου (7.155.3) playing on the contrast between Philistion's entombed remains and the memory of his κωμωδία βιολογικά (on Philistion see E. Wüst, s.v. Philistion (3) *RE* 19.2402-5, and on βιολόγοι see Robert 1936: 239-41 and Webb 2008: 96 and 103. This particular pun and trope has itself a long history: cf. Dioscorides' 3rd c BCE on Machon of Alexandria and the contrast between Machon's "remains" as a "washed out drone" (κηφῆνα παλίμπλυτον) and a "relic worthy of the ancient art [i.e. of comedy]" (τέχνης / ἄξιον ἀρχαίης λείψανον) (*AP* 7.708.3-4). On the dynamics of presence/absence in funerary epigram see Bruss 2005 and Tueller 2008.

¹¹⁵ Kapur 2010: 5

¹¹⁶ See also *PH* 13.438-63.

¹¹⁷ I am referring to this Iliadic theme both as the intense violence that underscores the abruptness of death to reflect on life in its prime (Vernant 1991; Griffin 1980: 46-49 and 90-92), and as the morally abject disfigurement of corpses that forms a leitmotif in the poem from the proem to the ultimate fate of Hector's body in *Il.* 24 (Segal 1971).

¹¹⁸ Webb 2009: 74. On the theme of the fall of cities more generally see especially Rossi 2002; and Bachvarova, Dutsch, and Suter 2016.

¹¹⁹ On macabre battles in Triphiodorus and Nonnus, see Miguelez-Cavero 2009: 303-4.

¹²⁰ Most 1992.

¹²¹ Vernant 1991. Cf. Griffin 1980: 46-49 and 90-92. The doubleness of vision that is inherent when narratives focus on physical pain and mutilation is equally eloquently established in the classic article by Clover 1987 who reads the double male/female and sadistic/masochistic point

of view inherent in the modern slasher film genre. The cultural specificity of Clover’s argument (that the double vision of slasher film audiences was contextually enabled by the transition in the 70’s and 80’s from a patriarchal society to a “loosening of the categories” [221]) in our case has to be translated: the double vision of mutilation as rupture and as meditation on wholeness/reanimation is enabled by the fraught relationship between Imperial Greek *pepaideumenoι*, their conflicted view of their own community (elitism vs belonging; cf. Avlamiς 2011) and their view of the past (nostalgia vs modernism). Cf. Porter 2001, with a similar argument in terms of ruins (rather than bodies) who sees a tension between nostalgia and the reanimating mediation of the later author/reader in Pausanias’s and Longinus’s negotiation of part and whole in ruins and literary fragments; cf. Edwards 2013 on the reanimating agency Latin texts on the ruins of Rome.

¹²² On context and authenticity see Jones 1990 and Franco 2008.

¹²³ Cf. especially Demoen 2001, on shared elements between encomia and laments for cities; and Saliou 2006, on urban space in Libanius’s Antiochean oration and Aristides’ Smyrnaean orations against the backdrop of [Dionysius] *Ars Rhetorica* and Menander Rhetor.

¹²⁴ Webb 2009: 121-3.

¹²⁵ Imperial rhetoricians term this aesthetic *μερισμός*, a relationship between part described and whole implied: Miguelez-Cavero 2008: 287, and 2013: 304-5 on Triphiodorus’s use.

¹²⁶ πάντη δ’ ἄλλοθεν ἄλλα κατηρείποντο μέλαθρα, 13.430; ἀγυαί, 13.432; σφετέρων τε μελάθρων, 13.439; ἐπὶ προθύροισιν, 13.442; εἴσω / δώματος, 13. 449-50; ἐκ μεγάροιο, 13.451; ὑπὸ δώμασι, 13.454; δόμων, 13.456; δι’ ἄστεος, 13.457; ἀμφίαχεν ἄστῳ, 13.460; κέλευθα, 13.463.

¹²⁷ Carvounis 2014: 185.

¹²⁸ Carvounis 2014.

¹²⁹ Vian 1959b: 116-21, and especially 120-21.

¹³⁰ Webb 2009: 51-5.

¹³¹ Bowie 2002.

¹³² Transl. J. J. Winkler. The visuality of Alexandria is indeed about vision as a process itself more than about the landscape, as in Morales 2004: 100-106. But the outsider's view, the periegetic trope, is also part of another set of dynamics in Imperial literature.

¹³³ Whitmarsh 2009, see especially 227-9. On the more general view of Greek and Roman identity in the period as a process of self-making: Woolf 1994; Whitmarsh 2001: 20-40.

¹³⁴ Alcock 2004. Cf. Rose 2013: 238-76 whose overview of the archaeology of Roman Troy in the High Empire and beyond elucidates Imperial interest in the Troad and local responses.

¹³⁵ Borgeaud 2010: 350 (my emphasis). On Roman era pilgrimages to Troy, the self presentation of the city through coinage and public building, and the related issue of tourism as performance of identity see Vermeule 1995; Sage 2000; Rose 2013: 238-76; Zwingmann 2012: 29-106 with 400-407.

¹³⁶ Agosti 2014: 154, following Saradi 2006.

¹³⁷ Squire 2011: 127-96, and especially 158-65.

¹³⁸ Kannicht 1982: 82-4; Anderson 1997: 182-191; Burgess 2001: 38-9.

¹³⁹ For example, Quintus's stroke of literary tourism cited above is a descriptive trope that is not new; it has a long literary pedigree going back to the similes of Homer (e.g. *Il.* 2.455-8 or 19.375-80). But the cumulative context of description has changed in the Roman Empire, as have the dynamics of readers' cultural identity, and the meaning of the particular themes.

¹⁴⁰ See the contributions in Whitmarsh 2010a and especially Ando 2010, Whitmarsh 2010b, and Woolf 2010.