

Structures of Epic Poetry

Structures of Epic Poetry

Volume I: Foundations



Edited by
Christiane Reitz and Simone Finkmann

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-049200-2

e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-049259-0

e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-049167-8

Library of Congress Control Number: 2019953831

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2019 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Typesetting: Eric Naujoks (Rostock), Dr. Jörn Kobes (Gutenberg)

Cover image: Carrara Marble Quarries, © Wulf Liebau (†), Photograph: Courtesy of Irene Liebau

Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

Contents

Acknowledgements — V

Christiane Reitz and Simone Finkmann

Introduction — 1

Part I: Theories of epic

Philip Hardie

Ancient and modern theories of epic — 25

Joseph Farrell

The narrative forms and mythological materials of classical epic — 51

Egbert Bakker

Learning the epic formula — 81

Robert Kirstein, Andreas Abele, and Hans-Peter Nill

Narratology and classical epic — 99

Christiane Reitz

Epic and rhetoric — 115

Gregor Bitto

Alexandrian book division and its reception in Greek and Roman epic — 133

Part II: Classification and genre

Annemarie Ambühl

Intergeneric influences and interactions — 167

Jason Nethercut

History and myth in Graeco-Roman epic — 193

Abigail Buglass, Giulia Fanti, and Manuel Galzerano

Didactic and epic: origins, continuity, and interactions — 213

Alison Sharrock

Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: the naughty boy of the Graeco-Roman epic tradition — 275

Silvio Bär and Elisabeth Schedel

Epic fragments — 317

Simone Finkmann

Narrative patterns and structural elements in Greek *epyllia* — 357

Nicola Hömke

Epic structures in classical and post-classical Roman *epyllia* — 443

Part III: Core structures

Claudia Schindler

The invocation of the Muses and the plea for inspiration — 489

Andrew Zissos

Closure and segmentation: endings, medial proems, book divisions — 531

Heinz-Günther Nesselrath

'Almost-episodes' in Greek and Roman epic — 565

Anke Walter

Aetiology and genealogy in ancient epic — 609

Christiane Reitz, Cédric Scheidegger Lämmle, and Katharina Wesselmann

Epic catalogues — 653

Ursula Gärtner and Karen Blaschka

Similes and comparisons in the epic tradition — 727

Stephen Harrison

Artefact *ekphrasis* and narrative in epic poetry from Homer to Silius — 773

Indices — 807

Part II: Classification and genre

Silvio Bär and Elisabeth Schedel
Epic fragments

Abstract: The epic poems of antiquity that have survived to the present day in their complete form constitute only a small part of what originally was composed. In many cases, we only know the titles and/or have synopses of the numerous epics which are now lost, or we only have sparse fragments consisting of as little as single words or lines that were cited by grammarians and antiquarians, generally without much context. Fragments and summaries are therefore rarely sufficient to allow coherent propositions on structural elements and narrative patterns. In this chapter, several questions will be addressed that arise from the seemingly inescapable conflict between the fragmentary state of the poems in question and a narratological approach: is it possible to find recurrent structural elements and narrative patterns in epic fragments? Which methodological requirements could plausibly be useful with respect to analysing fragments along those lines? And, what additional value can be gained from such an analysis? To this end, a selection of important fragments from ancient epic is analysed and discussed. The first main section of the chapter addresses Greek epic (esp. the so-called Epic Cycle, Panyassis' *Heraclea*, and Callimachus' *Hecale*); the second part is devoted to Latin epic (esp. Livius Andronicus' *Odusia*, Naevius' *Bellum Poenicum*, and Ennius' *Annales*).

1 Introduction

Only few of the epic poems that were produced in antiquity have survived in their complete state. Of the numerous epics which are now lost, we often only know their titles, or we merely have synopses of their content, or short fragments that consist of as little as a few individual words or lines that have been preserved in quotations by grammarians and antiquarians, generally without much context. Therefore, research has so far mainly focused on the analysis of aesthetic phenomena of the remaining fragments as part of the poetic techniques of their authors, on the introduction and evolution of epic in archaic Greece and in early Republican Rome, respectively, and on the possible contextualisation of individual fragments. In contrast, fragments and summaries are rarely considered to be sufficient to allow coherent propositions on structural elements and narrative patterns. Indeed, various questions arise from the seemingly inescapable conflict between the fragmentary state of the poems and a narratological approach: is it possible to find recurrent structural elements and narrative patterns in epic fragments? Which methodological requirements could plausibly be useful with respect to analysing

fragments along those lines? And, what additional value do we eventually gain from such an analysis? This chapter attempts to tackle these and similar problems by approaching some of the early Greek and Latin epic fragments from a narratological, purely text-based perspective, leaving aside any problematic speculation concerning their hypothetical contextualisation. To this end, a selection of important fragments from ancient epic is analysed and discussed diachronically. The first section addresses Greek epic and discusses, by way of example, some relevant testimonies and fragments of the Epic Cycle, Panyassis' *Heraclea*, and Callimachus' *Hecale*. The second part is devoted to Latin epic and exemplarily discusses the three pre-Vergilian epics of Livius Andronicus, Naevius, and Ennius from a narratological viewpoint. In Livius Andronicus' *Odusia*, the primary focus lies on the invocation of the Muse, which is analysed from a spatial narratological perspective. In the discussion of Naevius' *Bellum Poenicum*, aspects concerning a fragmented *ekphrasis* are in the centre of attention. An examination of Ennius' *Annales* with specific consideration of aspects of focalisation in a battle scene completes this chapter.

2 Greek epic fragments

2.1 The Epic Cycle

Epic Cycle is a collective term for a number of epic poems that dealt with episodes from the Trojan War 'around' the Homeric epics, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. They were composed in the 7th and 6th century BC and they were attributed to different authors, comprising the *Cypria*, the *Aethiopis*, the *Ilias parva*, the *Iliou persis*, the *Nostoi*, and the *Telegony*.¹ Aside from very few fragments (amounting to a total of approximately 100 lines), the content of these epics can only be reconstructed through later testimonies, the most important of which is a prose renarration by Proclus in his *Chrestomathia* (a text which has not survived in full, but only in a series of summaries by the Byzantine patriarch Photius as well as in the

¹ Research literature on the Epic Cycle is immense. The most recent, and most important, reference works are the commentary by West (2013) and the companion edited by Fantuzzi/Tsagalis (2015). Further important studies, which also have introductory character, are those by Davies (1986), Davies (1989), and Scafoglio (2014–2015). In this chapter, fragments of the Epic Cycle are quoted according to the numeration system by West (2003), the latest and most accessible edition. The two other editions most commonly used are Bernabé (1987) and Davies (1988); cf. West (2003, 300–3) for a comparative numeration. The translation used is that by West (2003), with occasional modifications.

form of excerpts in some manuscripts of the *Iliad*).² Judging by these remains, the cyclic epics were probably considerably shorter and more straightforward in their narrative structure than the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Each of these poems was self-contained, but in total they were, as West (2015, 97) aptly puts it, “designed to form a segment of a vaster narrative continuum.” Despite this overarching narrative entity, it is important to note that the cyclic epics were not originally intended as a coherent collection, let alone a coherent piece of work. In fact, the designation Epic Cycle (ἔπικὸς κύκλος) was nothing more than a convenient umbrella term; indeed, the term was probably coined in the 4th century BC, but even then, the collection served primarily practical (or didactic) purposes. In addition to this, there was (and is) also disagreement as to which epics would actually have been classified as ‘cyclic’. Whereas the canonical definition only includes the Trojan Cycle, a broader interpretation would also incorporate the epics of the Theban Cycle (that is, the *Theogony*, the *Titanomachy*, the *Oedipodea*, the *Thebaid*, the *Epigonoï*, and the *Alcmeonis*).³ The following discussion will focus solely on the Trojan Cycle.

In his brief chapter on narrative techniques in the Epic Cycle, Rengakos (2015b, 154) states that “one can say next to nothing about other elements of the narrative such as the narrator, the focalisation or the insertion of direct speech.” Furthermore, he also points to the fact that in Proclus’ summaries, there is considerable overlap in the plot of some of the Trojan epics,⁴ so that it is not always clear “whether the fragments that seem to exceed the boundaries of each epic as set by Proclus should be seen as analeptic or proleptic passages within their respective time frame or if we are simply faced with an artificial and therefore erroneous demarcation of each epic plot on his part.”⁵

With respect to epic structures, in turn, the situation may appear slightly more optimistic, as Proclus’ summaries give us a relatively good sketch of the content of each epic of the Trojan Cycle. Since the cyclic poems stem back from the same centuries-old oral roots as the Homeric epics do,⁶ we must assume that their authors/composers had access to the same system of fully-fledged, formulaic

² Cf. Davies (1986, 100–9) and Fantuzzi/Tsagalīs (2015, 34–40). The most comprehensive study on Proclus’ *Chrestomathia* is still that by Severyns (1938). Cf. also Scafoglio (2004).

³ On the scope and formation of the Epic Cycle, cf. the overviews provided by West (2013, 1–54) and Fantuzzi/Tsagalīs (2015), as well as the chapter by West (2015), all with further references. West’s commentary (2013) only includes the six Trojan epics, whereas the chapters in Fantuzzi/Tsagalīs (2015) also incorporate the Theban Cycle.

⁴ Cf. Scodel (2012, 514–15) and the overview in Fantuzzi/Tsagalīs (2015, 2 n. 3).

⁵ Rengakos (2015b, 154).

⁶ See especially Holmberg (1998) and Burgess (2001).

structures and that they made good use of it. However, the scarce textual evidence leaves us unable to decide what their concrete scope and implementation might have looked like.⁷ The beginning of Proclus' summary of the *Cypria* (attributed to either Homer, Stasinus, or Hegesias) may give us a better idea of the problem:

Ζεὺς βουλευέται μετὰ τῆς Θέμιδος περὶ τοῦ Τρωικοῦ πολέμου. παραγενομένη δὲ Ἔρις εὐω-
χουμένων τῶν θεῶν ἐν τοῖς Πηλέως γάμοις νεῖκος περὶ κάλλους ἐνίστησιν Ἀθηνᾶ, Ἥρα καὶ
'Αφροδίτη, αἱ πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον ἐν Ἴδῃ κατὰ Διὸς προσταγὴν ὑφ' Ἑρμοῦ πρὸς τὴν χρίσιν
ἄγονται.

Zeus confers with Themis about the Trojan War. As the gods are feasting at the wedding of Peleus, Strife appears and causes a dispute about beauty among Athena, Hera, and Aphrodite, who, on Zeus' instruction, are conducted by Hermes to Alexander on [mount] Ida for adjudication.

These lines evoke three well-known epic structures, namely, a divine council, a banquet scene, and an arrival scene. At the same time, it seems impossible to comment on their concrete nature and scope because of the 'skeleton-like' quality of the summary. For example, was the conversation between Zeus and Themis composed as a dialogue proper, or did it take place in the presence of other gods? Did it happen on Mount Olympus, or elsewhere? Was the divine banquet scene structured in analogy to the highly formalised type of banquet scenes among humans, as we know them from the Homeric epics onwards?⁸ And, in how much detail was Strife's arrival reported? Simultaneously, the proem is not mentioned, since it is, obviously, not part of the plot; however, we must assume that the *Cypria*, too, opened with this traditional *bauforn*.⁹

It is only on rare occasions that Proclus is comprehensive enough so as to allow the conclusion that a specific epic structure must have been fully elaborated. Such a case may be seen in the opening lines of the summary of the *Iliou persis* (attributed to Arctinus), which clearly points to an assembly proper, given the detailed character of the dispute (Procl. Chr. 1):

†ώστ' τὰ περὶ τὸν ἵππον οἱ Τρῶες ὑπόπτως ἔχοντες περιστάντες βουλευόνται ὅ τι χρῆ ποιεῖν.
καὶ τοῖς μὲν δοκεῖ κατακρημνίσαι αὐτόν, τοῖς δὲ καταφλέγειν, οἱ δὲ ἱερὸν αὐτόν ἔφασαν δεῖν
τῇ Ἀθηνᾶ ἀνατεθῆναι· καὶ τέλος νικᾷ ἡ τούτων γνώμη.

7 Cf. the accordingly clipped treatment of the 'war motifs' in the Epic Cycle in Miniconi (1951, 21–4).

8 Cf. Bettenworth (2004) and Bettenworth in volume II.2.

9 Cf. also below on *Ilias parva* fr. 1 West.

The Trojans are suspicious in the matter of the horse, and stand round it debating what to do: to some it seems wise to push it over a cliff, and to some to set fire to it, but others say it is a sacred object to be dedicated to Athena, and in the end their opinion prevails.

Only few of the remaining fragments contain traces of what we would typically call an epic structure. An *ekphrasis* is to be found in fr. 5 West of the *Cypria*, a passage that displays a description of Aphrodite's beautiful garment which she puts on for the beauty contest:¹⁰

εἴματα μὲν χροὶ ἔστο, τὰ οἱ Χάριτες τε καὶ Ὑραι
 ποίησαν καὶ ἔβαψαν ἐν ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖσιν
 ὅσσα φέρουσ' ὥραι, ἔν τε κρόκῳ ἔν θ' ὑακίνθῳ
 ἔν τε ἴῳ θαλέθοντι ῥόδου τ' ἐνὶ ἄνθει καλῶ
 5 ἠδέε νεκταρέῳ ἔν τ' ἀμβροσίαις καλύκεσσιν
 ἴανθεσι ναρκίσσου καλλιρρόου δ' οἶατ' Ἀφροδίτη
 ὥραις παντοίαις τεθωμμένα εἴματα ἔστο.

Her body was dressed in garments that the Graces and *Horai*
 had made for her and steeped in the spring flowers
 that the seasons bring forth, in crocus and hyacinth,
 and springing violet, and the rose's fair,
 sweet, nectarine bloom, and the ambrosial buds
 of narcissus [...] So Aphrodite
 was dressed in garments scented with blossoms of every kind.

More precisely, this fragment is in accordance with the traditional epic type-scene of a goddess getting dressed in order to encounter (or seduce) a lover (or make an impression on someone else), as we know it, most famously, from Aphrodite dressing to seduce Anchises in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, and from Hera dressing up for Zeus in *Iliad* 14.¹¹ In his commentary, West (2013, 76) notes that the “diction of the fragment is largely conventional” and Currie (2015, 299) concludes that this fragment, along with fr. 6 West (which describes the crowning of Aphrodite and her attendants), is “hard to square with any view that the *Cypria* had a uniformly rapid narrative pace.” At the same time, it must be acknowledged that an *ekphrasis* always constitutes retardation in the narrative development, since it is, by definition, a non-narrative element.¹² Therefore, we cannot draw too general a conclusion about the nature of the narrative pace in the cyclic epics on the sole

¹⁰ On this fragment, see Huxley (1969, 130–1), Griffin (1977, 50–1), West (2013, 75–6), and Currie (2015, 297–9, with further references).

¹¹ Cf. West (1997, 203–5) on this epic genre scene and its Near Eastern parallels; see also Arend (1933, 97–8) on epic dressing as a Homeric type-scene.

¹² Cf. Harrison in this volume.

basis of these two fragments; we can, however, safely maintain that this passage was (part of) an elaborated, non-narrative epic structure in a cyclic epic.

The following (heavily damaged) line from the *Aethiopsis* (attributed to Homer or Arctinus), transmitted on papyrus, suggests an arrival scene, namely, the arrival of Penthesilea at Troy and the words spoken to her upon arrival, probably by Priam:¹³

["τίς πόθεν εἰς] σύ, γύναι; τίνος ἔκγον[ος] εὔχ[ε]ται εἶναι;"]

["Who and whence are] you, lady? Whose child do you praise yourself to be?"]

Due to the fact that these words conform to the highly standardised Homeric practice of how a stranger is addressed and asked about his/her background (viz. name, provenance, and descent), we may speculate that they were followed by a fully-fledged, formulaic arrival scene.¹⁴

In the case of the *Ilias parva* (attributed to either Homer, Lesches, or Thesotorides), two lines of the proem have survived, quoted in Ps.-Herodotus' *Life of Homer* (fr. 1 West):¹⁵

"Ἴλιον αἰείδω καὶ Δαρδανίδην εὐπωλον,
ἧς περὶ πόλλα πάθον Δαναοὶ θεράποντες" Ἀρηός.

Of Ilios I sing, and Dardania land of fine colts,
over which the Danaans suffered much, the servants of Ares.

Another two-liner, transmitted through Plutarch and attributed to Lesches, is sometimes also regarded as the proem to the *Ilias parva* (fr. 1 Bernabé = fr. 2 dub. Davies):¹⁶

Μοῦσά μοι ἔννεπε κεῖνα, τὰ μήτ' ἐγένοντο πάροιθε
μήτ' ἔσται μετόπισθεν. [...]

Muse, sing me these things which neither happened before
nor are going to be again afterwards. [...]

Scafoglio (2006) argues that both fragments may have been the beginning and the end, respectively, of one and the same proem, with the middle part being lost.

¹³ On this fragment, cf. West (2013, 139) and Rengakos (2015a, 309–10). West also considers the possibility that the words may be spoken by Achilles upon his first encounter with Penthesilea on the battlefield.

¹⁴ Cf. Ripoll in volume II.2.

¹⁵ On this fragment, cf. West (2013, 173–4) and Kelly (2015, 329–31).

¹⁶ This fragment is not included in West's edition (2003). The translation is ours.

If this is correct, the proem of the *Ilias parua* may be viewed as a precursor to the proem of Vergil's *Aeneid*, which displays a similar shift from a first-person announcement (Verg. Aen. 1.1 *arma uirumque cano*, "of arms and the man I sing") to a Muse invocation (1.8 *Musa, mihi causas memora*, "Muse, bring the reasons back to my memory"). It might even be speculated that the proem of the *Ilias parua* served as an intertextual model for Vergil's national epic.¹⁷

Fr. 6 West of the *Ilias parua* provides us with an example of an epic genealogy:

ἄμπελον, ἦν Κρονίδης ἔπορεν οὐ̅ παιδὸς ἄποινα
 χρυσεῖην, φύλλοισιν ἀγαυοῖσιν κομόωσαν
 βότρυσι θ', οὓς Ἥφαιστος ἐπασσῆσας Διὶ πατρί
 δῶχ', ὃ δὲ Λαομέδοντι πόρεν Γανυμήδεος ἀντί.

The vine that Zeus had given in compensation for his son,
 golden, luxuriant with splendid foliage
 and grape clusters, which Hephaestus had fashioned and given to father Zeus,
 and he had given it to Laomedon in lieu of Ganymede.

To be more precise, this is an example of the traditional epic structure of a genealogy that explains the provenance of a precious heirloom (to which, in turn, a brief *ekphrasis* is added)¹⁸ – in this case, a gift offered to Ganymede's father in recompense for the abduction of the beautiful youth, which is now in Priam's possession. As the commentators point out,¹⁹ it deviates from the Homeric account in two respects: first, Ganymede is the son of Laomedon in this scene, whereas in the *Iliad* (Hom. Il. 5.265–6 and 20.231–5) and in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (h. Ven. 5.202–17) he is the son of Tros, thus two generations older. Secondly, according to the *Iliad* (Hom. Il. 5.265–7) the gift did not consist of a vine, but of divine horses. This fragment therefore represents a case where the cyclic version is not congruent with that of Homer. Since this concerns a non-trivial point, we are prone to conclude that there may have been further, significant deviations, which almost certainly will have affected the scope and nature of the cyclic structures.

One line of the *Ilias parua*, fr. 14 West (transmitted by a scholiast on Euripides' *Hecuba*), states that the sack of Troy happened in the middle of the night:²⁰

¹⁷ On Vergil's relation to the cyclic epics, cf. Kopff (1981).

¹⁸ Cf. Harrison and Walter in this volume.

¹⁹ Cf. West (2013, 191–2) and Kelly (2015, 342–3). On the different genealogies of Ganymede in Greek mythology, see Gantz (1993, 557–60).

²⁰ On this fragment, cf. West (2013, 208–9) and Kelly (2015, 334–5). The silent night motif (viz. the description of the peaceful night before the manslaughter) can also be found again at Triph. 498–505.

νύξ μὲν ἔην μέσση, λαμπρὰ δ' ἐπέτελλε σελήνη.

It was the middle of the night, and the bright moon was rising.

Upon first glance, this line clearly insinuates that what was following must have been a *nyktomachy*, which probably combined elements of mass combat with elements of single combat.²¹ On the other hand, we must bear in mind that the capture of Troy is, of course, not an ordinary battle – it does not take place on the battlefield, and it is not a fair fight, but, rather, a one-sided manslaughter as a result of the ambush. We are therefore in no position to judge to what extent the description of the Trojan massacre in the *Little Iliad* may, or may not, have followed the conventions of an epic *nyktomachy*.²²

Finally, in fr. 12 West from the *Nostoi* (attributed to either Homer, Agias/Hegias, or Eumelus), we can catch a quick glimpse of a cyclic battle scene:²³

Ἴσον δ' Ἑρμιονεὺς ποσὶ καρπαλίμοισι μετασπῶν
ψύας ἔγχει νύξε. [...]

Hermioneus chased after Isus with his swift feet
and stabbed him in the groin with his spear. [...]

Scholars disagree about the possible context of this fragment: West (2013, 270) argues that it must “no doubt [stem from] the battle in Aegisthus’ house” (Hermioneus being a son of Menelaus and a helper of Orestes in the killing of Aegisthus, and Isus being a helper of Aegisthus); Danek (2015, 366) disagrees with West and suspects that it may rather be a detail from the battle between Aegisthus and Agamemnon on the occasion of the latter’s return, arguing that the author of the *Nostoi* “strove for epic colouring in a fully described battle scene.” What seems most striking here, though, is the similarity to the type of battle scene we find in the *mnesterophonia* of the *Odyssey*; it therefore seems likely that the battle scene in the *Nostoi* may have been composed along similar lines.²⁴

²¹ Proclus’ summary of the *Ilias parva* does not provide any information on the type of fights employed, but cf. the combination of mass combat and single combat in the according scenes in Book 14 of Quintus of Smyrna’s *Posthomerica*. See also Littlewood and Telg genannt Kortmann in volume II.1.

²² Cf. Dinter/Finkmann/Khoo in volume II.1.

²³ On this fragment, cf. Huxley (1969, 167–8), West (2013, 269–70), and Danek (2015, 364–6).

²⁴ Cf. Petropoulos (2012, 291), who argues that the *Nostoi* “underlay and fertilised the *Odyssey* as a whole and key sections of the *Telemachy* in particular.” See also Barker/Christensen (2014) on the idea of a ‘rivalry’ between the *Odyssey* and the *Nostoi*.

2.2 Panyassis, *Heraclea*

Aside from the stories of the Theban and the Trojan saga, the life and deeds of Heracles were a theme that prevailed in Greek epic from the 7th to the 5th century BC; one may mention the Ps.-Hesiodic *Shield of Heracles* (extant), Creophylus' *The Capture of Oechalia* (fragmentary), and Pisander's *Heraclea* (fragmentary).²⁵ Moreover, we can find several references to Heracles and his adventures in the Homeric epics (fewer in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*); on the basis of these references, the so-called 'neo-analytic' school has claimed the existence of further, lost 'Heracles epics' during the archaic period.²⁶ Here, however, we will focus only on one example of a Heracles epic, namely, the *Heraclea* by Panyassis of Halicarnassus. Panyassis was a contemporary (and relative) of Herodotus and is often regarded as the last representative of archaic Greek epic. The *Heraclea* consisted of 14 books and 9000 hexameters, of which only some 30 fragments, comprising a total of c. 60 lines, survive.²⁷ Based on these few fragments, it can be demonstrated that Panyassis' epic language must have been largely Homeric; however, we cannot draw the conclusion that the *Heraclea* must also have displayed a narrative structure similar to that of the Homeric epics.²⁸ In fact, in consideration of the epic's focus on the achievements of one hero, it seems more probable that the *Heraclea* would have displayed a relatively linear narrative. Matthews (1974, 21–6) attempts to establish the arrangement and layout of the labours in the poem, but simultaneously acknowledges the difficulties of this enterprise. In what follows, some of the surviving fragments wherein epic structures can be recognised are presented and discussed briefly. Let us begin with fr. 3 West, which is an example of catalogue poetry:²⁹

τλῆ μὲν Δημήτηρ, τλῆ δὲ κλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυΐεις,
 τλῆ δὲ Ποσειδάων, τλῆ δ' ἄργυρότοξος Ἀπόλλων
 ἀνδρὶ παρὰ θνητῶ θητευσέμεν εἰς ἑνιαυτόν,
 τλῆ δὲ <καὶ> ὀβριμόθυμος Ἄρης ὑπὸ πατρὸς ἀνάγκης.

²⁵ Cf. Huxley (1969, 99–112) and West (2003, 19–24) for an overview.

²⁶ Cf. Kullmann (1956, 25–35), Huxley (1969, 99–112), and Sbardella (1994). On Heracles in Greek epic from a narratological point of view, cf. Bär (2018).

²⁷ Cf. *Suda*, s.v. Πανύσσις. Fragments of the *Heraclea* are quoted according to the numeration system by West (2003). The major scholarly edition, with a commentary, is that by Matthews (1974). Furthermore, the *Heraclea* is also included in the editions by Bernabé (1987) and Davies (1988); cf. West (2003, 304–5) for comparative numeration. The translation used is that by West (2003), with occasional modifications. Otherwise, research on Panyassis is scarce; cf. only McLeod (1966) and Huxley (1969, 177–88).

²⁸ Cf. McLeod (1966, 103–4).

²⁹ On this fragment, see Matthews (1974, 91–5).

Demeter put up with it; renowned [Hephaestus], crooked on both sides, put up with it;
 Poseidon put up with it; silverbowed Apollo put up with
 menial service with a mortal man for the term of a year;
 and grim-hearted Ares too put up with it, under compulsion from his father.

According to Matthews (1974, 92), this passage most likely originates from a scene where someone was trying to console Heracles “for having to undergo service” – which will, in all likelihood, have been the service for either Omphale or Eurystheus. Additionally, since epic catalogues often have a metapoetic quality,³⁰ it might also be possible that these lines stood in connection with some sort of metapoetic statement, perhaps even with a Muse invocation.³¹ Furthermore, Matthews (1974, 93) argues that this four-liner constitutes an intertextual reference to Hom. Il. 5.383–4:

πολλοὶ γὰρ δὴ τλήμεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
 ἐξ ἀνδρῶν, χαλέπ' ἄλγε' ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι τιθέντες.

For many of us who have dwellings on Olympus have suffered
 at the hands of men, while bringing grievous woes on one another.³²

These lines, in turn, are spoken in a lengthy digression in which Dione consoles her daughter Aphrodite who has been wounded by Diomedes in battle with her stories about other divinities who were physically injured by mortals (Hom. Il. 5.381–404). Two of the stories include Heracles, which is why the intertextual link seems very probable. Since we do not know the context of Panyassis' fr. 3 West, any further interpretation must remain speculative. However, it seems likely that what is going on here is an ironic inversion of the Iliadic subtext, insofar as Heracles is forced out of his role as an active hero and turned into a passive victim, along with a humiliating gender reversal. If this is so, we may understand the use of the catalogue, together with its salient anaphoric structure, as a means of adding emphasis to the ironic inversion.

Unsurprisingly in an epic about Heracles, we find some fragments of the *Heraclaea* that display scenes of drinking, dining, and feasting. These may, in turn, all point to a banquet scene, and it is well conceivable that the *Heraclaea* could have featured several fully-fledged scenes of this type. Fr. 9 West may, as Matthews (1974, 48) suspects, come from Heracles' “visit to the Centaur Pholus by whom he was entertained”:³³

³⁰ Cf. Reitz (2013) and Reitz (2017).

³¹ Cf. Reitz/Scheidegger Lämmle/Wesselmann, and Schindler in this volume.

³² This translation is taken from Murray/Wyatt (2001).

³³ On this fragment, cf. Matthews (1974, 48–9).

τοῦ κεράσας χρητῆρα μέγαν χρυσοῖο φαινόν
σκύφους αἰνύμενος θαμέας πότον ἠδὺν ἔπινεν.

Mixing some of it in a great shining golden bowl,
he took cup after cup and enjoyed a fine bout of drinking.

As we know from various sources, this scene ends with a bloody fight between Heracles and the Centaurs who are attracted by the scent of the wine.³⁴ We may therefore speculate that the feast was followed by a mass combat and that the banqueting scene itself might have been an example of what Bettenworth (2004, 395) calls ‘anti-banqueting scenes’ (“Antigastmähler”) – that is, “regalements which do not reach a normative ending, but which are abruptly reverted to a bloody fight in which the majority of the participants die”³⁵ – the most salient example of which is, of course, the killing of the suitors in the *Odyssey*.

The three longest fragments from the *Heraclea* clearly belonged to banquet scenes (frs. 19–21 West), amounting to a total of 39 lines (19 + 15 + 5). It is even likely that they all belonged to one coherent passage, in which case we can assume that this must have been a particularly long and comprehensive banquet scene.³⁶ Fr. 19 West consists of a verbose invitation and encouragement to drink. Matthews (1974, 76) remarks that “according to Apollodorus, Pholus was reluctant to give Heracles wine when he called for it, and Heracles himself had to open the jar”; therefore, a reference to this banquet seems less probable, and a “more likely banquet is the one at the house of Eurytus, from which Heracles was ejected by his host.”³⁷ The subsequent two fragments, clearly also speeches, are admonitions against excessive drinking. Scholars disagree about their attribution: Matthews (1974, 77) hypothesises that it “may represent the sober moralising of Eurytus after he has thrown out his unruly guest”, whereas West (2003, 207 n. 21) believes them “to be from Heracles’ reply as he tries to restrain his too bibulous host” (in which case Panyassis would be depicting the *Hercules Stoicus* here).³⁸ West’s interpretation seems more plausible since dialogues and speeches between host and guest are

³⁴ Cf. esp. Ps.-Apollod. 2.83–7 and D.S. 4.12.3–8. For more details, see Gantz (1993, 390–2).

³⁵ Original German text: “Bewirtungen, die nicht in mehr oder weniger normgetreuer Weise zu Ende geführt werden, sondern unvermittelt in einen blutigen Kampf umschlagen, bei dem die Mehrzahl der Beteiligten den Tod findet.” This epic structure is discussed by Bettenworth (2004, 395–477). See also Bettenworth in volume II.2, as well as Sharrock in this volume on similar perverted banqueting scenes in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.

³⁶ On these three fragments, cf. Matthews (1974, 74–87); see also Galinsky (1972, 24–5).

³⁷ Matthews (1974, 76).

³⁸ We can find traces of a *Hercules Stoicus* also in Apollonius Rhodius, e.g. on the occasion of his admonition to the Argonauts to leave behind the isle of Lemnos and the feasting with the Lemnians (A.R. 1.865–74), and when he decides to abstain from dinner because he needs to find a

typical features of epic banquet scenes; indeed, they often constitute their actual climax.³⁹

A further detail should be highlighted: Matthews (1974, 81) notes that the first line of fr. 21 West may be modelled on a fragment from the *Cypria* (fr. 18 West):

οἶνος <...> θνητοῖσι θεῶν πάρα δῶρον ἄριστον.

Wine is mortal's finest gift from the gods.

(*Heraclea* fr. 21 West)

οἶνόν τοι, Μενέλαε, θεοὶ ποίησαν ἄριστον
θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποισιν ἀποσχεδάσαι μελεδώνας.

Wine, Menelaus, is the best thing the gods have made
for mortal men for dispelling cares.⁴⁰

(*Cypria* fr. 18 West)

If we accept the possibility of verbal intertextuality between these two fragments, we might conclude that Panyassis may have composed the entire banquet scene (Heracles feasting at Eurytus' palace) with reference to a banquet scene from the *Cypria*. Again, it is well conceivable that some sort of ironic inversion may have been at play here: the two-liner in the *Cypria* was "perhaps spoken by Nestor when Menelaus went and told him of Helen's disappearance," as West (2003, 97 n. 13) claims: Nestor (the host) may have offered Menelaus (the guest) wine as consolation, which the latter possibly turned down (in accordance with the ethic code of refusing food and drink in a context that requires sober thinking). In the *Heraclea*, in turn, Heracles (the guest) is reminding Eurytus (his host) of the necessity to drink in moderation after the latter already overdid it. Again, any attempt at further reconstruction would lead us into the realms of inappropriate speculation; yet, it is tempting to hypothesise that Panyassis' epic could have been characterised, *inter alia*, by several (comic?) inversions of Homeric and cyclic structures.

2.3 Callimachus, *Hecale*

Hecale is the eponymous heroine of a fragmentarily preserved hexameter poem by the Hellenistic/'Alexandrian' antiquarian poet Callimachus of Cyrene.⁴¹ From

tree for a new oar first (1.1187–9). This strand of interpretation was particularly emphasised by Fränkel (1968, 115 and 143).

³⁹ Cf. Bettenworth (2004, 92–7).

⁴⁰ On this fragment, cf. Huxley (1969, 135), West (2013, 101), and Currie (2015, 303–4).

⁴¹ The major scholarly edition, with translation and commentary, is Hollis (²2009). We use Hollis' translation with occasional modifications. For further editions, commentaries, and critical read-

the original poem that probably comprised c. 1000–1500 lines, a total of c. 180 fragments have survived (largely derived from papyri and from quotes in the *Suda*), but most of them consist of no more than a single line; often, all we have is as little as a few words.⁴² Thus, our knowledge of the plot details and, even more so, of the narrative structure is extremely limited. The general plot line must have been this:⁴³ on his way to Marathon, Theseus, sent by Medea in order to capture the Marathonian bull, seeks shelter from a storm in Hecale's hut. Hecale – a poor, but hospitable and god-fearing old woman – promises to make a sacrifice to Zeus in case Theseus should be victorious against the bull. However, shortly thereafter she is found dead upon Theseus' successful return. Theseus subsequently names one of Attica's demes after Hecale. As this rough plot sketch demonstrates, we can trace several epic structures which will, in one way or another, have formed part of Callimachus' *Hecale*: storm, arrival, 'banquet', departure, (failed) reunion, (failed) sacrifice, and perhaps also a funeral at the end. In what follows, we discuss some fragments which reveal traces of, or hints at, what could be regarded as a typically epic *bauforn*.

Frs. 18–19 Hollis describe the cloudless afternoon and, subsequently, the first signs of the approaching storm prior to Theseus' departure from Athens:

ὄφρα μὲν οὖν ἔνδιος ἔην ἔτι, θέρμετο δὲ χθών,
 τόφρα δ' ἔην ὑάλιοι φαάντερος οὐρανὸς ἦνοψ,
 οὐδέ ποθ' ἔκλυε κενεχίς ὑπεφαίνετο, πέπτατο δ' αἰθήρ
 ἀν[ν]έφελος· σ[
 5 μητέρι δ' ὀπι[ό]τε
 διελλόν αἰτί[ζ]ουσιν, ἄγουσι δὲ χεῖρας ἀπ' ἔργου,
 τῆμος ἄρ' ἔξ[.]...[
 πρῶτον ὑπὲρ Πά[ρ]νηθος,] ἔπιπρὸ δὲ μᾶσσον ἐπ' ἄκρου
 Αἰγαλέως θυμόμεντος, ἄγων μέγαν ὑετόν, ἔστη·
 10 τῶ δ' ἐπ[ι] διπλόον· [

ings, cf. the bibliography in Hollis (²2009, 362–8 and 437). Two more recent pieces of research that deserve to be singled out here are the narratological study by Sistakou (2009) and the monograph by Skempis (2010). For further references, cf. Skempis (2010, 353–99).

42 On the history of the text, cf. Hollis (²2009, 26–53); on the length, cf. Hollis (²2009, 337–40). For Hellenistic standards, this was a μέγα ποίημα, as the scholiast on Call. Ap. 2.106 (= test. 1 Hollis) notes; cf. Gutzwiller (2012). We avoid the term *epyllion* in this contribution because it implies the existence of a genre that in reality is a modern invention; on this complex issue, cf. Baumbach/Bär (2012) and Bär (2015). See also Finkmann and Hömke in this volume, who exclude Callimachus' *Hecale* from their discussion of *epyllia* in accordance with their definition of the term.

43 An important source for the reconstruction of the plot line is the *Diegesis* to the *Hecale* preserved on P.Milan 18 Vogliano, 1937; cf. Hollis (²2009, 48–9). For the further sources of the myth, see Gantz (1993, 256) and Hollis (²2009, 5–10).

τρηχέος Ὑμηττ[οῖο]⁴⁴
 ἀστεροπα[ι] σελάγι[ζον
 οἶ[ο]ν ὅτε κλονέ . [.
 Ἀυσόν[ι]όν κατὰ π[όντον
 15 ἦ δ' ἀπὸ Μηρισιό θ[υ]οῦ βορέαο κατὰίξ
 εἰσέπεσεν νεφέλ[ηισιν
 ... [..]ν ὄθ[η]
]ερ.[

As long as it was still noonday, and the earth was warm,
 so long was the brilliant sky more translucent than glass,
 and nowhere did a small white cloud show itself, but the heaven stretched out
 cloudless [...].

But when <? girls, bringing> to their mother <the allotted weight of wool>
 demand the evening meal and turn their hands from work,
 at that time suddenly <? a cloud> [...]
 stood first over Parnes, and further onwards over the summit
 of thyme-bearing Aigaleos, bringing a great rainstorm.
 Thereupon a double [...]

of rough Hymettus,
 lightning flashed [...]

just as when <clouds> cash [...]

over the Ausonian Sea [...]

and the swift down-rushing hurricane of Boreas from Merisos
 falls upon the clouds [...]

Fr. 19 Hollis:

καὶ ἥερος ἀγλύσαντος

And, as the air became murky

Two observations should be made here: first, it must be noted that with and since
 Hom. Od. 5.282–399 epic storms are, by default, sea-storms.⁴⁵ Thus, with his storm
 on land, Callimachus distances himself from this firmly established epic tradition;
 at the same time, though, he harks back to it by comparing it with a sea-storm in
 18.13–16. In other words, a traditional epic *bauforn* is transformed and, simultane-
 ously, transferred onto a metalevel. Secondly, lines 18.5–6 deserve special attention:
 for one thing, the imagery of the weaving girls who finish work bridges the gap
 between the calm afternoon and the approaching of the storm in the evening. For
 another, the girls foreshadow the domestic context which is going to be important

⁴⁴ On these fragments, cf. Hollis (²2009, 156–62), who argues for an insertion of fr. 19 at this position of fr. 18.

⁴⁵ Cf. Biggs/Blum in volume II.2.

in the following course of action; as Skempis (2010, 268) puts it, “the image of the daughters who are famished in the evening functions as an implicit *prolepsis* of Theseus’ later plea to Hecale for supper.”⁴⁶

Several very small fragments point to Theseus’ arrival and reception and Hecale’s subsequent preparation of the meal (frs. 28–35 Hollis):⁴⁷

Fr. 28 Hollis: [...] διερῆν δ’ ἀπεσεΐατο λαΐφην

<he undid his sandals> and shook off his wet cloak

Fr. 29 Hollis: τὸν μὲν ἐπ’ ἀσκάντην κάθισεν [...]

she made him sit down on the couch [...]

Fr. 30 Hollis: αὐτόθεν ἐξ εὐνῆς ὀλίγον ῥάκος αἰθύζασα

snatching up a small rag from where it lay on the bed

Fr. 31 Hollis: [...] παλαίθετα κᾶλα καθήρει

[...] she brought down logs which had been stored away long ago

Fr. 32 Hollis: δανὰ ξύλα [...] κεάσαι [...]

to break [...] dry sticks [...]

Fr. 33 Hollis: ἀΐψα δὲ κυμαίνουσαν ἀπαίνυτο χυτρίδα κοίλῃν

at once she took off the bulgy pot as it was boiling

Fr. 34 Hollis: ἐκ δ’ ἔχεεν κελέβην, μετὰ δ’ αὖ κερὰς ἠφύσαστ’ ἄλλο

she poured out the basin, and drew another draught of warm water

Fr. 35 Hollis: ἐκ δ’ ἄρτους σιπήθηεν ἄλις κατέθηκεν ἐλοῦσα
οἴους βωνίτησιν ἐνικρύπτουσι γυναῖκες.

She set down in abundance loaves taken from a bread-bin,
such as women hide under the ashes for herdsmen.

Despite the scarcity of these fragments, it is possible to retrace the general plot line, which seems to have been in accordance with the structural elements of an

⁴⁶ Original German text: “[Das Bindeglied des Gleichnisses mit der Haupthandlung liegt offenbar darin, dass] das Bild der am Abend ausgehungerten Töchter als impliziter Vorverweis auf Theseus’ spätere Bitte an Hekale um Abendbrot fungiert.”

⁴⁷ On these fragments, cf. Hollis (2009, 168–73).

arrival scene followed by a banquet scene:⁴⁸ Theseus takes off his wet coat upon entering (fr. 28 Hollis) and takes a seat (frs. 29–30 Hollis), Hecale fetches wood and boils water, either for preparing food or a bath (frs. 31–34 Hollis),⁴⁹ and entertains Theseus (fr. 35 Hollis). As Skempis (2010, 72–209) lucidly demonstrates in his profound analysis, the entire scene must have been modelled in close analogy to, and dialogue with, the hospitality scene between Eumaeus and Odysseus in the *Odyssey* (Hom. Od. 14.409–56). On the one hand, the characters of Eumaeus and Hecale show clear parallels, the most evident of which are their low social standing and their generosity; on the other hand, they also display differences, saliently, the host's transformation from a minor to a major character as well as the gender shift. Aside from this concrete intertextual dialogue, the modesty of Hecale's place and her limited means also constitute a programmatic *Gegenentwurf* to a typically heroic banquet scene: Theseus, the famous hero, needs to sit on a rag (ῥάκος, fr. 30 Hollis) that Hecale has fetched from her own bed (ἐξ εὐνής, fr. 30 Hollis) and has put on the couch (ἀσκάντην, fr. 29 Hollis) for him,⁵⁰ and he is offered food that is normally prepared for herdsmen (βωνίτησιν, fr. 35.2 Hollis). Furthermore, from fr. 31 Hollis it becomes evident that Hecale is not accustomed to hosting guests, since “she brought down logs which had been stored away *long ago*” (παλαίθετα). With a small amount of speculation, we might perhaps even go so far as to read the last-mentioned adjective on a metapoetic level, that is, as an implicit comment by Callimachus on his recourse to, and transformation of, the inherited epic tradition, as the old-fashioned *bauforn* of heroic feasting is something that has similarly been ‘stored away long ago’.

As we noted in the context of our discussion of Panyassis' *Heraclea*, dialogues (even individual speeches) between hosts and guests are typically climactic features of epic banquet scenes. Callimachus pays homage to this tradition by having Theseus and Hecale enter into a dialogue which must, as the remaining fragments indicate, have been relatively verbose (frs. 40–63 Hollis). The first fragment of this part reveals that Theseus and Hecale take up the traditional dialogue opening of asking for someone's provenance and, in the case of a traveller, the aim of his journey (fr. 40 Hollis):⁵¹

⁴⁸ Cf. Ripoll in volume II.2.

⁴⁹ One might think of Hecale preparing hot water for a footbath, in which case her intertextual model would be Odysseus' nurse Euryclea. On this association, cf. in detail Skempis (2010, 306–48); on the bath as a possible component of an epic banquet scene, cf. Bettenworth (2004, 109–10).

⁵⁰ On the rare and obscure word ἀσκάντη, cf. the commentary by Hollis (²2009, 168). It is attested at Ar. Nub. 633 where it refers to Strepsiades' shabby couch.

⁵¹ On this fragment, cf. Hollis (²2009, 177–8).

],ς Μαραθῶνα κατέρχομαι ὄφρα.
] δὲ καθηγήτρια κελεύθου
] ηκας ἄ μ' εἶρεο καὶ σὺ [γε] μαῖα
 ι τι ποθὴ σέο τυτθὸν ἀκούσαι
 5] γρηὺς ἐρημαίῃ ἔνι ναίεις
],ι γενέθλη

[...] I am going down to Marathon, so that [...]
 [...] and <? Pallas> is guide of my journey
 <Thus you have learned from me> what you asked; and you too, gammer
 [...] since I also desire to hear a little something from you
 [...] must tell me why, as an old woman, you live in a deserted place,
 [...] and what is your origin.

Hollis (²2009, 178) notes that Theseus' addressing Hecale as μαῖα is "particularly recalling the way Euryclea is addressed in the *Odyssey*." Thus, the intertextual equation Euryclea – Hecale and Odysseus – Theseus is continued, and it may therefore be speculated that the *Odyssey* served as a foil for the composition of some of the *Hecale's* structural elements also in the further course of action.

Most of the subsequent fragments show traces of an extended dialogue between Theseus and Hecale. The ending of the 'banquet scene', then, is marked by bed rest (fr. 63 Hollis):⁵²

λέξομαι ἐν μυχάτῳ· κλισίη δέ μοι ἔστιν ἐτοίμη.

I will sleep in the recess; a bed is prepared for me.

There is scholarly disagreement as to who is speaking these words to whom: the words may be attributed to Hecale who is offering her bed to Theseus, or to Theseus declining the offer. Hollis (²2009, 178), in turn, remarks that in the Homeric epics, a host's sleeping place is, by default, in the corner of the house (cf., e.g., Hom. Od. 7.346 μυχῶ δόμου); therefore, the words will, most probably, have been put in Theseus' mouth who is directing himself to his (traditionally) assigned resting area. Furthermore, Hollis (²2009, 178) points to the fact that the superlative μυχάτῳ "does not seem to occur before Call[imachus]." We might thus read it as another implicit comment by Callimachus on the inherited tradition: sleeping "in the corner" is part of the corresponding Homeric type-scene;⁵³ Callimachus' Theseus enhances this tradition by going to rest "in the remotest corner" of the house.

⁵² On this fragment, cf. Hollis (²2009, 212–13). See also Bettenworth and Ripoll in volume II.2 on the role of bed rest in arrival and banquet scenes.

⁵³ On sleep(ing) as a Homeric type-scene, see Arend (1933, 99–105).

The three longest fragments surviving from the *Hecale* are frs. 69, 70, and 74 Hollis. With regard to epic structures fr. 69 is of particular interest:⁵⁴

- οἰόκρωτος ἕτερον γὰρ ἀπλοίησε κορύνη.
 ὡς ἴδον, ὡ[ς] ἅμα πάντες ὑπέτρεσαν, οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
 ἄνδρα μέγαν καὶ θῆρα πελώριον ἄντα ἰδεῖσθαι,
 μέσφ' ὅτε δὴ Θησεύς φιν ἀπόπροθι μακρὸν ἄυσε.
 5 “μίμνετε θαρσήεντες, ἐμῶ δέ τις Αἰγεί πατρί
 νεύμενος ὃς τ' ὤκιστος ἐς ἄστυρον ἀγγελιώτης
 ὦδ' ἐνέποι – πολέων κεν ἀναψύξειε μεριμνέων –
 ‘Θησεύς οὐχ ἑκάς οὗτος, ἀπ' εὐύδρου Μαραθῶνος
 ζῶν ἄγων τὸν ταῦρον.” ὁ μὲν φάτο, τοὶ δ' αἰόντες
 10 πάντες ἰὴ παιῶν ἀνέκλαγον, αὐθι δὲ μίμνον.
 οὐχὶ νότος τόσσην γε χύσιν κατεχεύατο φύλλων,
 οὐ βορέης, οὐδ' αὐτὸς ὅτ' ἔπλετο φυλλοχόος μ<ε>ίς,
 ὅσσα τότε ἀγρώσται περὶ τ' ἀμφὶ τε Θησεὶ βάλλον,
 οἳ μιν ἐκυκλώσα[ν]το περισταδόν, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες
 15 ἰστόρνησιν ἀνέστεφον.]

single-horned, for the club crushed the other one.

As they saw, so did they all at once start backwards, and nobody dared to look directly at the great hero and the enormous beast, until Theseus shouted to them from wide afar:

“Be of good courage and stay where you are, and to my father Aegeus let someone who is the swiftest messenger go to the city and address him as follows (he would relieve him of many worries):

“Theseus is here, not far away, from well-watered Marathon bringing the bull alive.” So he spoke, and they, on hearing his words, all uttered a cry of triumph and stayed on the spot.

The south wind did not pour down such a deluge of leaves, nor did the north wind, not even when it was the month of leaf-shedding, as the country people did on that occasion round about Theseus as they pelted him, those who stood around and encircled him; and the women [...] crowned him with their girdles [...].

This passage shows Theseus' victory over the Marathonian bull; we may classify the scene as a special case of single combat, that is, a combat of man versus beast (this type of *bauforn* was probably widespread in the lost Heracles epics such as Panyassis' *Heraclea*). Hollis (2009, 220) notes Euph. Hist. fr. 51.14–15 Powell (Heracles dragging the conquered Cerberus) and A.R. 3.1293 (two bulls approaching Jason) as parallels for “the motif of the frightened onlookers.” It is very possible that this motif was common in the epic structure ‘single combat man versus animal’. Moreover, in his direct speech (fr. 69.5–9 Hollis), Theseus evokes a messenger scene

54 On this fragment, cf. Hollis (2009, 217–24).

by calling for a messenger to deliver the news about his victory to Athens.⁵⁵ We do not know if – and if so, by whom and in which form – the message was actually delivered, and how it was received; however, fr. 122 Hollis seems to indicate that it played a role in the further course of action:⁵⁶

[...] ἀπούατος ἄγγελος ἔλθοι

[...] an unwelcome messenger might come

Hollis (²2009, 307) states that a “possible context” for this fragment “might be Aegaeus (or even Hecale) dreading a message that Theseus has succumbed to the Marathonian bull.” As an alternative, we might also think of Medea for whom the news about Theseus’ victory would indeed have been unwelcome, since she had been hoping that Theseus would not succeed.

3 Roman epic fragments

3.1 Livius Andronicus, *Odusia*

Livius Andronicus (3rd century BC) introduced the epic genre to Rome with a Latin adaption of Homer’s *Odyssey*.⁵⁷ Although composed in the Saturnian meter, Livius’ Latin *Odusia* is generally considered to be the first Roman epic ever written. The meter itself remains a mystery. Sciarrino (2006, 457–8) contends that the

rhythm was more or less explicitly linked to the dominant members of Roman society. [...] In fact, what Livius did was to graft the contents of a text in which the whole Greek speaking world recognised itself onto a song rhythm that signified the cultural hegemony of those who held political and social power in Rome.

⁵⁵ Cf. Dinter/Khoo and Finkmann in volume II.2.

⁵⁶ On this fragment, cf. Hollis (²2009, 221 and 306–7).

⁵⁷ The fragments are quoted according to the edition by Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (³1995) with the numbering of Morel (²1927) in brackets. Not included are the four hexameter fragments 37–40 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (6, 25, 32, 35 Morel), as they seem to belong to a version of the *Odusia* by an unknown author composed only after Ennius had eventually introduced the dactylic hexameter as metric rhythm for Latin epic. The surviving fragments have been attributed to 12 of the 24 books of the Greek original. Büchner (1979, 61) concludes that Livius almost certainly rendered the complete *Odyssey* into Latin producing a verse-to-verse translation with hardly any omissions. Suerbaum (1992, 168–71), by contrast, has convincingly argued that the *Odusia* most probably fit on a single role.

Goldberg (2014, 173–5) objects to this common opinion. After examining the sparse remains of verses written in the Saturnian meter, he concludes that

no honorific Saturnians and only the most erratic of ritual Saturnians predate the career of Naevius. What is early is either socially neutral [...] or it is not really quite Saturnian. [...] The chronological difficulty we face in attributing the Saturnian's appeal for epic poets to its 'official' sound encourages the obvious alternative, viz. that the public language of inscriptions came to be shaped by the epic example. [...] According to this scenario, the rhythmic *cola* of ritual language were reshaped by Rome's first poets to create a new medium for Latin epic.

Today, only 36 scattered lines of the *Odusia* survive, which makes any thorough analysis of the epic's structural elements and Livius' narrative technique extremely difficult. Nevertheless, several pieces of single-lined text can be identified which might once have belonged to a fully-fledged epic *bauforn*. Frs. 2, 12, 13, and 21 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (2, 14, 15, 23 Morel), among a few others, are examples of epic genealogy. None of those fragments can clearly be attributed to a single Homeric model; all of them, however, avoid Greek patronymics. Fr. 2 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (2 Morel) may serve as a representative example:

pater noster, Saturni filie <...>

our father, son of Saturn

ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη, ὕπατε κρειόντων (Hom. Od. 1.45, 1.81, and 24.473)

An example of the preparations introducing a banquet, possibly following an arrival scene, may be recognised in fr. 6 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (4 Morel):

argenteo polubro, aureo eglutro

In a silver basin, in a golden pitcher

χέρνιβα δ' ἀμφίπολος προχόω ἐπέχευε φέρουσα
καλῆ χρυσεΐη, ὑπὲρ ἀργυρέοιο λέβητος (Hom. Od. 1.136–7)

According to the equation of the fragment with Hom. Od. 1.136–7 by Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (³1995) the listed objects are part of Athena-Mentes' arrival scene at Odysseus' palace and the subsequent banquet.⁵⁸ The phrase, however, is a common device and a case of formulaic language that can be found six times in the *Odyssey*.⁵⁹ A final example of two typical epic structures, the proem and the invocation of

⁵⁸ Cf. Ripoll on arrival scenes in volume II.2.

⁵⁹ Cf. Hom. Od. 1.136–7, 4.52–3, 7.172–3, 10.368–9, 15.135–6, and 17.91–2.

the Muse, is fr. 1 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (1 Morel),⁶⁰ a narratological analysis of which is intended to complement the summary of the remains of epic structures in the *Odusia*. Trying to identify Livius' narrative technique is an ambitious enterprise, for first, the amount of text to work with is very limited and, secondly, the remains of the text 'only' belong to a translation.⁶¹ It goes without saying that the first Roman epicist borrowed his plot from Homer and certainly drew on the knowledge of his Greek predecessor(s) when he re-wrote the age-old Greek *Odyssey*.

Our aim in this chapter is to highlight the achievement of Livius: he adopted the Greek *bauforn* of the invocation of the Muse in the proem and adapted it for his own purpose of writing the first ever Roman epic. We argue that for Livius Homer was not a model simply to be 'copied and pasted' into his translation project, but provided the inspiration for the creation of a truly Roman epic.⁶² In order to identify how Livius not only managed to 'Romanise' the Greek *Odyssey*, but also to reveal his strategic intentions, the fragment will be approached from a spatial narratological perspective⁶³ and with some semantic considerations on remarkable linguistic features of Livius' Latin.

Fr. 1 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (1 Morel) of Livius' *Odusia* recognisably echoes Hom. Od. 1.1:

Virum mihi, Camena, insece uersutum

Of the man, Camena, tell me, of the quick-witted

Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον.

At first glance and despite the metrical divergence of the somewhat shorter Saturnian meter, Livius' rendering seems to be a *uerbatim* translation of Homer's original as the syntax, diction, and word order are identical to the Greek. One seemingly minor twist, however, which has been argued to have metrical reasons,⁶⁴ reveals the structural and lexical patterns to be a clever Roman adaption rather than a

60 On fr. 1, cf. Büchner (1979, 39–41), Goldberg (1995, 64–5), Hinds (1998, 58–63 and 71), and Sciarrino (2006, 453–7). See also Schindler in this volume.

61 On the Roman translation project in general, cf. Possanza (2004, 1–77) and Feeney (2016).

62 Cf. Feeney (2016, 69): "We are used to thinking of the process of Roman translation as 'Hellenising', [...] but from his own point of view Livius is not Hellenising, he is 'Latinising', or 'Romanising'. Indeed, the translation project itself is part of a larger process in which 'Hellenisation' and 'Romanisation' are inextricable and mutually implicated aspects [...]." On the introduction and evolution of literature and epic in Rome, cf. Waszink (1972), Goldberg (1995), Sciarrino (2006), and Goldberg (2014) with further references.

63 The four narratological concepts of space as developed by Lotman (1977, 217–31), Ronen (1986), Haupt (2004, 70–7), and de Jong (2014, 105–31) are used. Cf. also Kirstein in volume II.2.

64 Cf. Goldberg (1995, 64–5).

pure translation, which is indicative of the creative freedom with which Livius composed his *Odusia*.⁶⁵

The most obvious Romanised alteration when compared to Homer's original is probably Livius' choice of invoking the goddess *Camena* instead of Homer's Muse.⁶⁶ From the perspective of a Roman audience, Livius relocates the Homeric and Hesiodic Muse from the distanced spaces of Mount Olympus and Mount Helicon to the spring in the grove outside the *Porta Capena* in Rome. According to Lotman's (1977, 217–18 and 229–30) model of space, the structure of space in a text and the border dividing that space into two semantically separate subspaces become an organisational principle for the structure of the universe, providing one of the elementary instruments for comprehending reality. In locating the *Camena*-Muse in the grove at the *Porta Capena*, Livius has her transgress the geographical and topographical border between Greece and Rome and thus between the two separate topological fields of 'out there' and 'here' with their semantic aspects of 'theirs' and 'ours', 'back then' and 'now', 'foreign' and 'own', 'Greek' and 'Roman'.⁶⁷ Indeed, the *Camena*'s location at the *Porta Capena* is only theoretically implied by the text and as such not part of the story-space but of what Ronen (1986, 423 n. 3) would call the extra-scenic space 'offstage'. Nevertheless, the narrator creates a frame that conjures up the atmospherically charged contextual reference to Vestal duties and Roman state cult. This is due to the fact that the famous well rose in the *Camena*'s grove outside the *Porta Capena* from where the Vestal virgins drew their daily waters to carry out the state cult.⁶⁸ The politically and theologically relevant acts of the Vestal virgins that are implied by the mention of the space are not involved in the setting's actual events.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, the Livian narrator

⁶⁵ Cf. Büchner (1979), Goldberg (1995, 64–73), Possanza (2004, 37 and 46–56), as well as Feeney (2016, 53–6).

⁶⁶ Whether or not Livius was the first to establish the link between the Greek Muses and the Roman *Camena* in Rome is still a matter of debate. For an overview of the discussion, cf. Otto (1954, 30–1), Suerbaum (1968, 47), Waszink (1979), Schmidt (1996, 293–7), and Feeney (2016, 54–5 n. 56).

⁶⁷ Similarly Sciarrino (2006, 458): "The *Odussia* points to the poets as active agents situated on a critical cosmological threshold between two distinct sites located on a geographical axis (the 'here' and the 'out there') and two other equally distinct sites located on a temporal axis (the 'now' and the 'back then')."

⁶⁸ Cf. Otto (1954, 30–1) and Schmidt (1996, 294).

⁶⁹ The duties of the Vestal virgins included keeping the fire that burnt in the *focus publicus* (e.g. Ov. fast. 6.258 and Cic. leg. 2.20), preparing the *mola salsa* used as sacrificial offerings in Roman cult, as well as cleaning substances (Ov. fast. 4.731–2), and participating in the celebrations of the state cult. Cf. Cancik-Lindemaier (2006).

manages to Romanise the story as a result of the sheer allusion to these actions, hence, placing the tuned space into the foreground.⁷⁰

The central position of the Roman *Camena*-Muse is highlighted by the framing hyperbaton *uirum* [...] *uersutum*. This seemingly inconspicuous rendering of Homer's original ἄνδρα [...] πολύτροπον self-referentially underlines the Romaness of Livius' poetic adaption of the *Odyssey* and reveals Livius' self-conception of being a creative translator-poet rather than a schoolmasterly translator. In choosing *uersutus* Livius disambiguates the Greek πολύτροπος in favour of the meaning "quick-witted, clever, cunning" and omits its second implication of the "well-travelled" and "much-wandered" Odysseus.⁷¹ At the same time, however, *uersutus* itself introduces a new lexical ambiguity. The second meaning of *uersutus* self-referentially imports the concept of translation: Livius' *uir* is thus 'the Roman Odysseus' as Odysseus' translated self. When Livius uses the semantic ambiguity strategically and purposefully, he programmatically refers to the status of his 'Odysseus' (and *Odusia*) as a translated version of Odysseus (and the *Odyssey*). On the one hand, the disambiguation of *uersutus* as compared to the original πολύτροπον emphasises the *topos* of 'cunningness' and 'finesse'; on the other, the ambiguity of *uersutus* introduces the concept of translation. Taken together, 'Odysseus' "owes his textual existence", as Hinds (1998, 61) puts it, to a strategically employed linguistic trick performed by Livius who self-referentially demonstrates his own creative linguistic versatility and presents himself not as passive translator but rather as an active and productive poet.⁷²

Livius' self-assured use of *uersutus* in the first line of his epic might have become functional as what Genette (1980, 76) calls an "insignificant seed" [...] whose importance [...] will [...] be recognised [...] retrospectively" in the process of reading and decoding a particular narrative and its narrative code. Because of the fragmentary state of the *Odusia*, it is difficult to identify further 'seeds' that hint at Livius' self-conception of being a creative poet of Roman epic. One such seed, however, may be found in fr. 21 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (23 Morel):⁷³

70 For a different interpretation of the introduction of the *Camena* instead of the Muse, cf. Otto (1954, 30–1), Ernout/Meillet (⁴1959, 89–90), Walde (⁴1965, 146), Waszink (1979), and Schmidt (1996, 293–7) with reference to Hes. Th. 1–8.

71 Cf. Feeney (2016, 54). Similarly already Büchner (1979, 40), who refers to the "almost philosophical depth" of Livius' disambiguation.

72 Cf. Hinds (1998, 61–2), Sciarrino (2006, 457), and Feeney (2016, 53–5 and 58).

73 On fr. 21, cf. Büchner (1979, 43) and Schmidt (1996, 295–7).

nam diua Monetas filia docuit

for the divine daughter of *Moneta* taught

οὐνεκ' ἄρα σφέας / οἴμας Μοῦσ' ἐδίδαξε (Hom. Od. 8.480–1)

ἦ σέ γε Μοῦσ' ἐδίδαξε (Hom. Od. 8.488)

θεὸς δέ μοι ἐν φρεσὶν οἴμας / παντοίας ἐνέφυσεν (Hom. Od. 22.347–8)

The fragment genealogically refers to the *Camena* as daughter of *Moneta*, that is, of the leading goddess of the Roman state religion, Juno. According to Hardie (2007, 556–7), *Moneta* is associated with memory and knowledge, just as Hesiod (Hes. Th. 53–4), too, referred to the Muses as the daughters of Μνημοσύνη.⁷⁴ Livius Andronicus, however, does not simply translate the Hesiodic Μνημοσύνη with *Memoria*, but he decides to denominate the Homeric Muse periphrastically with Hesiodic genealogy and theological connotations deduced from *Moneta*. In this creative way, he does not only attribute musical-poetical powers to a nymph by making her the official patron for his epic but he also associates her with the deeper knowledge of *Moneta*. By thus establishing a direct line of succession from *Moneta* to himself through his own patron *Camena* he boldly and self-referentially stresses his own excellence in being a productive poet.

3.2 Gnaeus Naevius, *Bellum Poenicum*

Gnaeus Naevius (3rd century BC) “made [the world of epic] Roman by elevating current events to epic proportions,” as Goldberg (1995, 51) nicely puts it.⁷⁵ He wrote his epic *Bellum Poenicum* (still in the Saturnian meter)⁷⁶ about the First Punic War (264–241 BC) which ended with the Romans’ victory at the Battle of the Aegates Islands and the seizure of Sicily. According to some autobiographical lines preserved as fr. 2 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (2 Morel), Naevius took part in the war as soldier and eyewitness.⁷⁷ Yet, the plot is not restricted to the events concerning the Punic War. The historical outline begins with Aeneas’ flight from Troy (e.g. frs.

⁷⁴ Homer does not mention this genealogy.; cf. Schmidt (1996, 295–7) and Hardie (2007, 556–60, with further references).

⁷⁵ The fragments are quoted according to the edition by Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (³1995) with the numbering of Morel (²1927) in brackets. Seminal work on Naevius’ *Bellum Poenicum* has been done by Strzelecki (1935). Important studies with introductory character are those by Mariotti (1970), Häußler (1976), and von Albrecht (1979).

⁷⁶ On the Saturnian meter, see above.

⁷⁷ On fr. 2, cf. Suerbaum (1968, 13–14 and 21–7) as well as Sciarrino (2006, 459–61). Naevius’ insisting on recounting from memory is reminiscent of the historiographical concept of autopsy, cf. von Albrecht (1979, 17).

5–7 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel; 4, 5, 11 Morel), maybe touches on the conflict-laden liaison between Aeneas and Dido (e.g. frs. 17, 20 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel; 6, 23 Morel) and continues up to the founding of Rome by Romulus (fr. 27 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel; 25 Morel). This mythological narrative, the so-called archaeology, makes Naevius the first Roman poet who powerfully combined contemporary history and mythological legend and thus presented the contemporary conflict before the foil of the legendary past.⁷⁸

Despite the rather scant textual evidence – only some 60 fragments, none of which are longer than three lines, of originally seven books survive⁷⁹ – traces of no less than six epic structures can be identified:

1. Fr. 1 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (1 Morel), for instance, belongs to an invocation of the Muse:

nouem Iouis concordēs filiae sorores

Nine harmonious sisters, daughters of Zeus

2. The classification as fr. 1, too, suggests that the fragment was part of the proem, but Latacz (1976) convincingly shows in his close reading of the fragment that this aspect is in fact open to discussion.
3. Fr. 14 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (13 Morel), summarised in prose by Macrobius (Macr. Sat. 6.2.30), mentions a sea-storm which Aeneas and his comrades had to face in Naevius.
4. In addition, he also hints at a divine council wherein Venus asked Jupiter about Aeneas' and Rome's future. It may be speculated that Jupiter's answer to Venus' inquiry included mention of the eternal future of Rome in the form of a *prolepsis*. Macrobius suggests that the entire scene (together with others not further specified) served as a model for Vergil's version of the same scene(s) in the *Aeneid*.⁸⁰ Frs. 22 and 23 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (29, 51 Morel) are, according to Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (³1995), further instances of a divine council scene:

78 Cf. similarly Suerbaum (1968, 16) and von Albrecht (1979, 17). Mariotti (1970, 13) claims that Naevius wanted to combine elements of the Homeric *Iliad* (historical part) and *Odyssey* (mythological part) in one poem. This would make Naevius, not Vergil, the first Roman epicist to have synthesised the two epics into one. However, as Goldberg (1995, 55), to our mind rightly, asserts, the fragments offer little evidence for this claim.

79 The division into seven books was added later by C. Octavius Lampadio; see also Suerbaum (1992, 153–63).

80 On Vergil's dependence on Naevius, cf. Buchheit (1963) and Luck (1983).

Fr. 22 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel; 29 Morel
prima incedit Cereris Proserpina puer

First, Proserpina, the daughter of Ceres, approaches

Fr. 23 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel; 51 Morel
magnam domum decoremque Ditem uexerant

They had brought Pluto to the big and beautiful house

5. Fr. 22 and fr. 9 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (29 and 12 Morel) provide us with examples of epic genealogies explaining Proserpina's and Neptune's descent, respectively, as well as Neptune's function as ruler of the seas.
6. Our discussion will focus on fr. 8 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (19 Morel) which belongs to an *ekphrasis* that describes the Gigantomachy and has been in the focus of scholarly attention ever since Paul Merula's 16th century commentary on Ennius' *Annales*.⁸¹ In the case of fr. 8 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (19 Morel), three lines have survived:

*inerant signa expressa, quomodo Titani,
 bicorpores Gigantes magnique Atlantes
 Runcus ac Purpureus filii Terras*

Modelled on it are figures, how the Titans,
 the double-bodied Giants and the great *Atlantes*
Runcus and *Purpureus*, the sons of Earth

It has been suggested that this description belonged to various objects including a ship, a mixing bowl, a shield, or a temple.⁸² The sheer number of different objects to which the fragmentary *ekphrasis* was ascribed is a striking example of how “the process of interpretation may [...] lead with disconcerting speed from fact to conjecture”, as Goldberg (1995, 13) aptly puts it. The interpretation of a heavily fragmented piece of text which originally was a fully-fledged epic *bauforn* is a difficult endeavour. We want to approach the *ekphrasis* from a narratological perspective in order to demonstrate how any argumentation concerning the contextualisation of a fragmentary epic structure needs to be stretched to its limits. Those considerations will contribute to the much-debated question of how the mythological narrative was originally combined with the historical part and support the theory according

⁸¹ On fr. 8 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (19 Morel), cf. Merula (1595, 50), Goldberg (1995, 13, 51–2, 74–5), and Faber (2012, with further references).

⁸² Ship: Büchner (1957, 25) and Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (³1995, 47); mixing bowl: Morel (²1927, 20); shield: Fraenkel (1954, 16); temple: Fränkel (1935, 59–61), Strzelecki (1935, 10–11), and Rowell (1947, 32–40). For more details, cf. Faber (2012, 417).

to which the mythological tale was originally integrated into the historical frame in the form of an *excursus* by some kind of flashback-technique. According to this theory, the mythological part probably began in the middle of Book 1 (after historical events of the year 262 BC had been related) and continued up to the end of Book 3 or the beginning of Book 4 (where the historical narrative was then resumed with events of the year 261 BC).⁸³

When dealing with the complex presentation of an *ekphrasis* from a narratological point of view, de Jong (2014, 120–2) proposes six parameters to be considered which are 1) narrator-focaliser, 2) narratees, 3) artist, 4) observer, 5) work itself, and 6) image depicted on it. Since the *ekphrasis* in question is seriously fragmented, it is not possible to discuss all of them in detail. However, a few assertions can be made, which are based on three premises: firstly, Rowell's (1947, 32–40, esp. 35) assumption that the historical narrative was interrupted after events of the First Punic War at Agrigentum had been recounted; secondly, Fränkel's (1935, 59–61) suggestion that the *ekphrasis* may belong to the (unfinished)⁸⁴ temple of Zeus at Agrigentum,⁸⁵ and, thirdly, Naevius' autobiographical affirmation in fr. 2 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel (2 Morel) of having participated in the war himself. Based on those three preliminary considerations, we may ascribe parameter 1, the role of the narrator-focaliser, to Naevius himself, "who looking at the work of art and putting his view into words," as de Jong (2014, 120) specifies his role, "makes the narratees 'see' it in their imagination." In this case, Naevius may have admired the temple of Zeus and the figures modelled on it after having arrived as a soldier in Agrigentum. As we do not have any other evidence with respect to parameter 2, the narratees, and because we have ascribed to Naevius the role of the external primary narrator-focaliser, we may further assume that he is describing the figures on the temple to external primary narratees, that is, the (Roman) readers. Unfortunately, no information concerning parameters 3 and 4, the artist of the piece of art as well as the observer, e.g. one of the characters, can be extracted from the remaining

83 On the *excursus*-theory, cf. Strzelecki (1935, 5–11), Rowell (1947), and von Albrecht (1979, 18–19). This theory is opposed by another according to which the mythological narrative was located as an introductory part in Books 1–3 before the contemporary events of the First Punic War are described in Books 4–7 so as to chronologically and aetiologically explain Rome's founding and historical development up to the present; cf. Büchner (1957, 29–33) and Richter (1960, 42–5). For a discussion of the research undertaken until 1972 on the structure of the *Bellum Poenicum*, cf. Waszink (1972, 905–21).

84 According to D.S. 13.82.1, the temple of Zeus was never completed, presumably missing its roof.

85 We do not, however, follow the interpretation of Fränkel (1935, 61) according to which Naevius either invented a temple similar to the one in Agrigentum or even projected the historical temple of Agrigentum into the legendary past, both of which Aeneas would then have admired himself.

three lines of the fragment. As to parameters 5 and 6, the work of art itself, and the image depicted on it, again not very much can be said. We are only told that the figures described were *magni* and that they were doing ‘something’. Indeed, this brief description may resemble the *ekphrasis* of the temple of Zeus at Agrigentum as described by Diodorus in the 1st century BC.⁸⁶ Diodorus, however, does not only describe the figures on the temple of Zeus belonging to the Gigantomachy, but also mentions the fall of Troy modelled on the west pediment of the temple. Accordingly, it may be assumed that Naevius did not ignore the figures depicting the fall of Troy if he described the temple of Zeus at Agrigentum and the figures which belonged to the Gigantomachy. This would then have been a moment perfectly suited for the transition from his historical narrative to the mythological *excursus*.

It is, of course, impossible today to define the exact point from where the historical part might have been interrupted by the mythological *excursus*. Nevertheless, from a narratological perspective an *ekphrasis* represents a good starting point to shift from one narrative to another. An *ekphrasis* does not promote the events of the story, but the flow of the events is brought to a stop. As such, it can be characterised as a narrative pause (or standstill) with no *fabula* time corresponding to story time.⁸⁷ Hence, just as Rowell (1947, 39) states that “it would have been appropriate” for the historical Naevius in the actual world at Agrigentum “at such a moment before the next irrevocable step was taken [...] to pause for consideration of the contestants and their antecedents,” the narrator-focaliser might have created that same pause by some kind of flashback-technique triggered by a description of the history-changing events of Rome’s early history in order for his (Roman) readers to step back for a moment and reflect on those very same events. The *ekphrasis* thus becomes a figure of interpretative reflection.

Naevius achieved his narratees’ reflection about and engagement with the events described by his ability literally to bring them ‘before their eyes’ and to create the dramatic illusion ‘as if’ the characters of the past came alive into the present.⁸⁸ On that point, *quomodo* is of importance: it must have introduced a

⁸⁶ Cf. D.S. 13.82.4 τῶν δὲ στοῶν τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τὸ ὕψος ἐξάισιον ἔχουσῶν, ἐν μὲν τῷ πρὸς ἕω μέρει τὴν γιγαντομαχίαν ἐποίησαντο γλυφαῖς καὶ τῷ μεγέθει καὶ τῷ κάλλει διαφερούσαις, ἐν δὲ τῷ πρὸς δυσμᾶς τὴν ἄλωσιν τῆς Τροίας, ἐν ᾗ τῶν ἠρώων ἕκαστον ἰδεῖν ἔστιν οἰκείως τῆς περιστάσεως δεδημιουργημένον, “The porticoes were of enormous size and height, and in the east pediment they portrayed the battle between the Gods and the Giants in sculptures which excelled in size and beauty, and in the west the capture of Troy, in which each one of the heroes may be seen portrayed in a manner appropriate to his role.” This translation is taken from Oldfather (1989).

⁸⁷ Cf. Fowler (1991, 66) and de Jong (2014, 92 and 95–6). On the terms *fabula* and story, see de Jong (2014, 76–8).

⁸⁸ On the reality effect, cf. Barthes (1989, 141–8); on the relation between description and narration, cf. Fowler (1991, 66–71).

clause that originally included a finite word.⁸⁹ We may assume that with the events surrounding the fall of Troy – so it was described in the *ekphrasis* – the Naevius-narrator proceeded in a similar way and vividly described scenes that became stories themselves with events following one after the other. This is a phenomenon that de Jong (2012, 7) calls “the dynamisation or narrativisation of descriptions.” It is used as a narrative device to naturalise descriptions. As such, it constitutes a calculated literary strategy that not only merges narration and description with their boundaries becoming blurred but also exercises an affective influence on the recipients who are emotionally activated to engage with the situation depicted. From the very moment the description develops a life of its own, the narratees are drawn right into the action. From here, the narrator may easily have ‘digressed’ from his historical frame story to the mythological events of Rome’s legendary past with the *ekphrasis* serving as a bridge passage to an embedded story in the form of a tale within the tale.⁹⁰

The functions of the mythological narrative understood as an embedded story triggered by a narrativised *ekphrasis* are at least threefold:⁹¹ first, the embedding of the mythological narrative is explanatory in that “by way of flashback or *analepsis*, [it] recount[s] how the present of the main narrative has come to be,” as de Jong (2014, 35) clarifies the explanatory function. It is possibly predictive through divinely inspired prophecies in the form of *prolepseis* predicting the Eternal City’s great future. And, if the conflictual love affair between Aeneas and Dido was dealt with in the *Bellum Poenicum*, its function would be thematic in that the present hostilities between Rome and Carthage in the frame narrative would have been explained by events from the legendary past in the embedded tale.

3.3 Ennius, *Annales*

Quintus Ennius (3rd/2nd century BC) is the third in the row of Roman epicists but the first to write an epic poem about the history of Rome in linear chronology from

⁸⁹ See Faber (2012, 420).

⁹⁰ Similarly Goldberg (1995, 52): “Readers, having followed the consul Valerius to Sicily, then stand before the temple at Agrigentum. [...] One of Naevius’ Romans could have recognized Aeneas among [the figures]. One association would bring on another, leading to the story of his flight and his voyage to Italy. The effect would be similar to *Aeneid* 1, where the pictures of Troy on Dido’s Temple of Juno prefigure Aeneas’ narrative in Book 2.” On the observers of an *ekphrasis* and their point of view, cf. also Fowler (1991, 71–7).

⁹¹ De Jong (2014, 34–7) lists five functions of embedded narratives in relation to the main narrative: 1) explanatory, 2) predictive, 3) thematic, 4) persuasive, and 5) distractive. Cf. also de Jong (2012, 13–17).

its early beginnings up to his own days.⁹² Ennius might have chosen the epic's title *Annales* with reference to the chronicle-like *Annales Maximi* based on the records of the *pontifex maximus*.⁹³ Of the monumental 18 books c. 600 verses in total have survived, involving single fragments of up to 20 lines (e.g. 72–91 Skutsch). Elliott (2016, 141), in sketching Macrobius' influence as one of our sources for the *Annales*, claims that "Ennius recast many of the unique events of Roman history [...] as type-scenes [...]." Fr. 1 Skutsch,⁹⁴ which is part of the proem and very likely the first line of the epic, provides us with a very elaborate example of the invocation of the Muse: *Musae, quae pedibus magnum pulsatis Olympum*, "Muses, who you beat high Olymp with your feet."

Ennius explicitly evokes the Muses instead of Livius' *Camena*. "He thus expresses his intention to subject Roman poetry more closely to the discipline of Greek poetic form," as Skutsch (1985, 144) comments on this line. This observation is also true for his introduction of the dactylic hexameter as metrical rhythm for (his) epic. It may even be safe to assume that Ennius intended "to 'annotate' through a reflexive pun in the word *pes* the metrical innovation which is being enacted even as we read" since "invocations of poetic goddesses do not invariably focus upon their dancing feet," as Hinds (1998, 56–7 n. 6) remarks on fr. 1 Skutsch. Ennius' decision to substitute both the Roman *Camena* with the Muses of Greek epic and the Roman Saturnian verse with the Greek epic hexameter in the first line of the *Annales* can thus be understood as a first straightforward hint at his authorial selfhood. He does not only emphasise his refined poetic skills of being an *alter Homerus* and true *poeta* in the tradition of Greek epic but also explicitly corrects his predecessors' poetic experiments. Further striking instances of his authorial self-fashioning can be found in 7.206–7 Skutsch where he calls Naevius' verses such *quos olim Faunei uatesque canebant* stating that he himself is *dicti studiosus* (7.209), as well as in 10.322 Skutsch where he invokes the Muse with the words *insece Musa [...]* clearly referring to Livius' *insece Camena* (fr. 1 Blänsdorf/Büchner/Morel; 1 Morel) on an intertextual level. Ennius' innovations, then be-

⁹² In this chapter, fragments are quoted according to Skutsch's (1985) valuable edition and commentary. There is abundant research on Ennius' *Annales*. Suerbaum (2003) provides an extensive bibliography for 20th century scholarship on Ennius; more recent contributions are collected by Breed/Rossi (2006) and Gowers (2007). See also the influential recent monographs of Elliott (2013) on the architecture of the *Annales* and of Fisher (2014) on the *Annales* as multicultural dialogue.

⁹³ For a thorough and critical discussion of Ennius the 'annalist', cf. Gildenhard (2003) and Elliott (2013, with further references). Cf. also Gildenhard (2007, 84–6).

⁹⁴ On fr. 1 Skutsch, cf. Suerbaum (1968, 46–9), Dominik (1993, 38–9), Hinds (1998, 56–7 and 59–63), Sciarrino (2006, 463–4), as well as Fisher (2014, 29–31 and 35–44).

coming the default case for Latin epic poetry, made him, in Gowers' (2007, p. ix) words, "the sanctified father of Latin literature."⁹⁵

Due to their historical plot, the *Annales* provide us with several instances of epic battle scenes. One example is the 'lengthy' eight-line fr. 15.391–8 Skutsch:⁹⁶

*Vndique conueniunt uelut imber tela tribuno:
Configunt parmam, tinnit hastilibus umbo,
Aerato sonitu galeae, sed nec pote quisquam
Vndique nitendo corpus discernere ferro.*

³⁹⁵ *Semper abundantes hastas frangitque quatitque.
Totum sudor habet corpus, multumque laborat,
Nec respirandi fit copia: praepete ferro
Histri tela manu iacentes sollicitabant.*

From every side the weapons come upon the tribune like a rainstorm:
they pierce through his small round shield, of spears rings its boss,
with brassy sound his helmet, but no one is able
to tear the body in pieces although the swords press from all sides.
Always does he crush the spears and shake them off that abound in large measures.
Sweat keeps the whole body, he struggles hard,
but there is no opportunity to take a breath: with swift swords
the Histrians disturbed him throwing the weapons with their hands.

Not much can be said about the context of this fragment. It is located in Book 15 in which Marcus Fulvius Nobilior's campaign in Aetolia as well as preparations for the siege of the Aetolian town Ambracia are related. Naming its Homeric predecessor (Hom. Il. 16.102–11: Ajax) and Vergilian successor (Verg. Aen. 9.806–14: Turnus) Macrobius (Macr. Sat. 6.3.2) states that the Roman tribune strenuously warding off Histrian missiles is Caelius or C. Aelius. However, some compelling observations on narrative patterns can be made, which indicate an imbalance of effects that the text has on the reader wherefore we call them part of what might have been Ennius' literary strategy. The two crucial points for understanding the workings of this fragmented battle scene are: first, the question of who focalises the scene described and, secondly, the spatial standpoint of the narrator.⁹⁷

⁹⁵ On Ennius' authorial self-fashioning as well as his influence on later epic poetry, cf. Suerbaum (1968, 43–295), Häußler (1976, 121–42, 308–10, 312–13), Dominik (1993, 38–48), Goldberg (1995, 83–6, 89–92, 94), Sciarrino (2006, 463–4), Gildenhard (2007, 75–9), and Fisher (2014, 31–5).

⁹⁶ On this fragment, cf. Skutsch (1985, 553 and 557–62), Goldberg (1995, 87–8), Elliott (2013, 226–8), and von Albrecht (³2014, 14–17).

⁹⁷ On focalisation in general, cf. de Jong (2014, 47–72). On the spatial standpoint of the narrator, cf. de Jong/Nünlist (2004).

On a structural level, the battle scene is intricately designed with a thorough arrangement of parallel *cola* resulting in an elegant, but abstract scene.⁹⁸ Moreover, the Homeric focus on visual facets is heavily reduced.⁹⁹ While Homer's text abounds in epithets that visualise Ajax' armour, specifically names Ajax' body parts, and clearly defines Ajax' signs of fatigue,¹⁰⁰ the Ennian narrator refrains from using such visualising attributes opting for a more restrained and plain phrasing with the nouns *parma*, *umbo*, and *galeae* (Enn. ann. 15.392–3), the more abstract concept *corpus* (15.394 and 396), and the summarising *multumque laborat* (15.396). Moreover, he stylistically calls the readers' attention to the rapid action in using numerous dactyls in 15.392 and short sentences throughout the fragment. He emphasises the omnipresence of weapons by referring six times to the enemies' weapons in ternary and alternating terminology.¹⁰¹ At the same time, however, he assures that no one can actually hurt the unwaveringly fighting tribune.¹⁰² The scene as described from this fairly neutral and rational perspective is focalised by the external primary narrator who, looking at the forceful attack, is sufficiently involved in the scene to perceive the battle as swift and dangerous but at the same time remains sufficiently uninvolved to report the events to his external primary narratees in an objective manner.

It is striking, however, how the narrator gradually shifts the focus of his narration in a concentric fashion from the outside to the inside, gradually directing the view onto the hard-pressed body. First, the *tela* fall like a rainstorm from all sides (*undique*), transfixing the shield (*umbo*), which the tribune is holding with his hands; then, attention is directed to the helmet, which brings along acoustic *stimuli*; from the armour, the view moves to the body itself (*corpus*) before zooming in on the sweat (*sudor*); the perspiration that covers the entire body corresponds in an intriguing way to the rainstorm (*imber*) of missiles covering the complete armour, hence putting even more emphasis on the inbound movement; finally, the narrator even describes the tribune's breath (*respirandi*), thus transgressing the physical boundary into the inside.¹⁰³

⁹⁸ Cf. von Albrecht (³2014, 15–16).

⁹⁹ Von Albrecht (³2014, 15–16) names this poetic technique rationalisation, reduction, and abstraction.

¹⁰⁰ Epithets: φαεινή πήληξ (Hom. Il. 16.104–5), φάλαρ' εὐποίηθ' (16.106), σάχος αἰόλον (16.107); body parts: κρόταφος (16.104), μέλος (16.110); fatigue: ὃ δ' ἄριστερόν ᾧμον ἔχαμνεν (16.106).

¹⁰¹ *Telum* (Enn. ann. 15.391, 15.398), *hasta* (15.392, 15.395), and *ferro* (15.394, 15.397).

¹⁰² Explicitly: 15.393–5; implicitly: cf. the conative aspect of *sollicitabant* (15.398).

¹⁰³ *Contra* Goldberg (1995, 88): “Ennius moves from the shower of missiles in the first four lines to his hero's efforts to ward them off, and then back again to the enemy [...]. Emphasis in Ennius

This observation is not conform to a rational perspective on the battle scene. Explicit verbs of seeing, hearing, or thinking are lacking. Nevertheless, other evaluative signs can be detected that hint at an implicit embedding of the Roman tribune's focalisation into the narrator-text. The missiles hit the armour with great force from every side, the centripetal movement and on-going pressure of their masses being underlined by several details in the text: the *anaphora* of the spatial adverb *undique* (15.391 and 15.394), the repetition of the prefix *con-* (15.391 and 15.392), the simile *uelut imber* (15.391),¹⁰⁴ the plural of *tela* (15.391 and 15.398) and *hastilibus/hastas* (15.392 and 15.395), and the durative aspect of the polysyllabic *sollicitabant* (15.398) all underline the massive hail of bullets as perceived from someone standing right in the centre of the attack. Acoustic elements emphasise the tribune's subjective focalisation of the events. His shield rings of the spears hitting it (*tinnit*, 15.392), his helmet, in contrast, darkly drones under the endlessly hitting blows (*aerato sonitu* with the plural *galeae* 15.393). The historical present throughout the battle scene creates immediacy, which is also evoked by the intriguing phrasing *totum sudor habet corpus* (15.396) generating the realistic and subjective illusion of an exercising body fully covered in uncontrollably flowing sweat.¹⁰⁵

The analysis shows that there is textual evidence which can be ascribed to either the primary narrator-focaliser or the embedded focalisation of the Roman tribune, respectively. The embedding of the tribune's subjective focalisation makes the focalisation of this episode ambiguous: it cannot be decided from textual clues whose focalisation is at the fore, the narrator's or the tribune's. The ambiguous focalisation of the battle scene oscillating between the rational, neutral, and objective external primary narrator-focaliser on the one hand and the individualised, heroic, subjective embedded focalisation of the Roman tribune on the other is effected by the narrator's spatial standpoint: it can be classified, firstly, as scenic, that is, the narrator is located within the scene; secondly, as shifting between non-actorial and actorial, which means it is alternating between a character's and the narrator's standpoint; and, thirdly, as fixed on one character, namely the Roman tribune.

The effect that the intriguing focalisation of this battle scene has on the recipient is threefold: firstly, the narrator's objective description of contemporary events fought out by a real Roman tribune resembles a reliable report about the events. In

lies on the attackers' onslaught. We read more about their missiles and their efforts than of the immovable hero who fends them off."

104 On the simile, cf. Skutsch (1985, 445–6 and 560). See also von Albrecht (³2014, 151).

105 Von Albrecht (³2014, 14–17) names this poetic technique dynamisation, musicalisation, intensification, and heroisation.

addition, the strongly allusive title *Annales* is suggestive of the historiographical annalistic tradition, which contributes to the impression of reading informative history in verse; secondly, by means of the Roman tribune's embedded focalisation with which Ennius distances himself from a purely chronological manner of narration and gives the text a genuinely narrative mode. This highly intensifies the scene described and fuels suspense. Thirdly, the ambiguity of focalisation makes it impossible for the reader to decide who is focalising the events, the objective narrator-focaliser or the subjective tribune-focaliser. Textual evidence for both a record of a contemporary historical event with a real Roman tribune and an epic battle scene with elaborate narrative elements is balanced. In this way, Ennius distances himself from Homer's mythological epic and manages to make Roman epic a truly politico-historical genre, portraying Roman men as epic heroes and highlighting the standing of Roman history.¹⁰⁶

4 Conclusion

The goal of this chapter was a narratological close reading of some key fragments of early Greek and Roman epic, ignoring speculations about their lost contexts. Essentially, three questions were addressed: first, whether it was possible to find recurrent structural elements and narrative patterns in fragmented epic at all. Although, at times, the argumentation needed to be stretched to its outer limits due to the very restricted textual evidence, a range of epic building blocks could be discovered both in the Greek and the Roman epic fragments, including divine councils, banquet scenes, arrival scenes, Muse invocations, as well as parts of *ekphraseis*, and battle scenes. In Greek epic, the remnants of the Epic Cycle are the earliest attestations of fragmented epic poetry. Both the later summaries by Proclus and some of the extant fragments allow us to catch occasional glimpses of what may have been elaborate type-scenes, such as, for example, Aphrodite's dressing scene in the *Cypria* and the genealogy of a precious heirloom in the *Ilias parva*. The analysis of Panyassis' *Heraclea* turned out to be particularly insightful because some of the fragments clearly reveal traditional epic structures such as catalogues and banquet scenes, and at times even suggest the possibility of (verbal

106 Cf. Elliott (2013, 250–1): “The combination of the poem's title with Ennius' allusion to Greek literature results in a generic hybrid that is, I suggest, particularly effective in promoting a strongly Romanocentric universalising vision [...]. By amalgamating *annales* with Homerising poetry, Ennius staked a confrontational claim to the identity of Roman history and world history [...]. Ennius successfully offered an arresting vision of Rome as the focal point of the known world.”

or structural) intertextuality with the Homeric epics and the Epic Cycle. At the same time, however, these examples also clearly showed the limitations of a narratological analysis since the lack of context does not justify further speculations about the nature of these structural elements and their intertextuality. Finally, a number of fragments from Callimachus' *Hecale* was analysed. Although these fragments often consist of no more than a single line or a few words, many of them allow insights into the way they may have been embedded in a larger narrative structure, and some suggest intertextuality with (and variation of) the archaic (Homeric) model as well.

Concerning the Roman epics, the examination of the invocation of the Muse in Livius Andronicus' *Odusia* highlighted the creative freedom with which Livius composed his 'translation' of the *Odyssey* and put special emphasis on his achievements as being the first ever Latin epicist. As such, he managed to Romanise the Greek *Odyssey* in both adopting the Greek and adapting it to his own purposes. The discussion of the *ekphrasis* in Naevius' *Bellum Poenicum* attempted to contribute to the much-debated question of how the mythological archaeology was originally integrated into the historical part and supported the theory according to which it may have been by means of an *excursus* in the form of a flashback technique. This made Naevius the first Roman epicist to have combined mythological legend and contemporary history in an epic manner. The examination of an epic battle scene in Ennius' *Annales* with specific consideration of ambiguous focalisation showed that the Ennian narrator was uniquely skilled in designing both a reliable and informative report about historical events according to the annalistic historical tradition and an epic narrative focusing on a single hero's achievements in battle. Thus, Ennius generates suspense by interrupting the purely chronological progress of the narrative.

Bibliography

- Arend, W. (1933). *Die typischen Scenen bei Homer*. Berlin.
- Bär, S. (2015). Inventing and deconstructing *epyllion*: some thoughts on a taxonomy of Greek hexameter poetry, *Thersites* 2: 23–51.
- Bär, S. (2018). *Herakles im griechischen Epos. Studien zur Narrativität und Poetizität eines Helden*. Stuttgart.
- Barker, E. T. E./Christensen, J. P. (2014). *Odysseus's nostos and the Odyssey's Nostoi: rivalry within the Epic Cycle*, *Philologia Antiqua* 7: 87–112.
- Barthes, R. (1989). *The rustle of language*. Translated by R. Howard. Berkeley, CA/Los Angeles, CA.
- Baumbach, M./Bär, S. (eds., 2012). *Brill's companion to Greek and Latin epyllion and its reception*. Leiden/Boston.

- Bernabé, A. (ed., 1987). *Poetarum epicorum Graecorum testimonia et fragmenta pars I* [PEG]. Leipzig.
- Bettenworth, A. (2004). Gastmahlszenen in der antiken Epik von Homer bis Claudian. Göttingen.
- Blänsdorf, J./Büchner, K./Morel, W. (eds., ³1995). *Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum praeter Ennium et Lucilium*. Stuttgart/Leipzig.
- Breed, B. W./Rossi, A. (eds., 2006). Ennius and the invention of Roman epic. Baltimore.
- Buchheit, V. (1963). Vergil über die Sendung Roms. Untersuchungen zum *Bellum Poenicum* und zur *Aeneis*. Heidelberg.
- Büchner, K. (1957). *Humanitas Romana*. Studien über Werke und Wesen der Römer. Heidelberg.
- Büchner, K. (1979). Livius Andronicus und die erste künstlerische Übersetzung der europäischen Kultur, *SO* 54: 37–70.
- Burgess, J. S. (2001). The tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle. Baltimore/London.
- Cancik-Lindemaier, H. (2006). Von Atheismus bis Zensur: römische Lektüren in kulturwissenschaftlicher Absicht. Würzburg.
- Currie, B. (2015). *Cypria*, in: M. Fantuzzi/C. C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its ancient reception. A companion*. Cambridge: 281–305.
- Danek, G. (2015). *Nostoi*, in: M. Fantuzzi/C. C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its ancient reception. A companion*. Cambridge: 355–79.
- Davies, M. (1986). *Prolegomena and paralegomena to a new edition (with commentary) of the fragments of early Greek epic*. Göttingen.
- Davies, M. (ed., 1988). *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* [EpGF]. Göttingen.
- Davies, M. (1989). *The Greek Epic Cycle*. Bristol.
- De Jong, I. J. F. (2012). Introduction. Narratological theory on space, in: I. J. F. de Jong (ed.), *Space in ancient Greek literature. Studies in ancient Greek narrative*. Leiden/Boston: 1–18.
- De Jong, I. J. F. (2014). *Narratology and Classics. A practical guide*. Oxford.
- De Jong, I. J. F./Nünlist, R. (2004). From bird's eye view to close up: the standpoint of the narrator in the Homeric epics, in: A. Bierl/A. Schmitt/A. Willi (eds.), *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung*. Munich: 63–83.
- Dominik, W. J. (1993). Ennius' *Annales*, in: A. J. Boyle (ed.), *Roman epic*. London/New York: 37–58.
- Elliott, J. (2013). Ennius and the architecture of the *Annales*. Cambridge.
- Elliott, J. (2016). Commenting on fragments. The case of Ennius' *Annales*, in: C. S. Kraus/C. Stray (eds.), *Classical commentaries. Explorations in a scholarly genre*. Oxford: 136–56.
- Ernout, A./Meillet, A. (⁴1959). *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots*. Paris.
- Faber, R. A. (2012). The *ekphrasis* in Naevius' *Bellum Punicum* and Hellenistic literary aesthetics, *Hermes* 140: 417–26.
- Fantuzzi, M./Tsagalis, C. C. (2015). Introduction: *Kyklos*, the Epic Cycle and cyclic poetry, in: M. Fantuzzi/C. C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its ancient reception. A companion*. Cambridge: 1–40.
- Feeney, D. (2016). *Beyond Greek. The beginnings of Latin literature*. Cambridge/London.
- Fisher, J. (2014). *The Annals of Quintus Ennius and the Italic tradition*. Baltimore.
- Fowler, D. P. (1991). Narrate and describe: the problem of *ekphrasis*, *JRS* 81: 112–22.
- Fraenkel, E. (1954). The Giants in the poem of Naevius, *JRS* 44: 14–17.
- Fränkel, H. (1935). Griechische Bildung in altrömischen Epen II, *Hermes* 70: 59–72.

- Fränkel, H. (1968). *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios*. Munich.
- Galinsky, G. K. (1972). *The Herakles theme. The adaptations of the hero in literature from Homer to the twentieth century*. Oxford.
- Gantz, T. (1993). *Early Greek myth. A guide to literary and artistic sources*. 2 vols. Baltimore/London.
- Genette, G. (1980). *Narrative discourse. An essay in method*. Translated by J. E. Lewin. Oxford.
- Gildenhard, I. (2003). The 'annalist' before the annalists. Ennius and his *Annales*, in: U. Eigler et al. (eds.), *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius. Gattungen, Autoren, Kontexte*. Darmstadt: 93–114.
- Gildenhard, I. (2007). Virgil vs. Ennius, or: the undoing of the annalist, in: W. Fitzgerald/E. Gowers (eds.), *Ennius perennis. The Annals and beyond*. Cambridge: 73–102.
- Goldberg, S. M. (1995). *Epic in Republican Rome*. New York/Oxford.
- Goldberg, S. M. (2014). Fact, fiction, and form in early Roman epic, in: D. Konstan/K. A. Raaflaub (eds.), *Epic and history*. Chichester: 167–84.
- Gowers, E. (2007). Introduction, in: W. Fitzgerald/E. Gowers (eds.), *Ennius perennis. The Annals and beyond*. Cambridge: pp. ix–xiii.
- Griffin, J. (1977). The Epic Cycle and the uniqueness of Homer, *JHS* 97: 39–53.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. (2012). The *Hecale* and Hellenistic conceptions of short hexameter narratives, in: M. Baumbach/S. Bär (eds.), *Brill's companion to Greek and Latin epyllion and its reception*. Leiden/Boston: 221–44.
- Häußler, R. (1976). *Das historische Epos der Griechen und Römer bis Vergil. Studien zum historischen Epos der Antike, I. Teil: Von Homer bis Vergil*. Heidelberg.
- Hardie, A. (2007). Juno, Hercules, and the Muses at Rome, *AJPh* 128: 551–92.
- Haupt, B. (2004). Analyse des Raums, in: P. Wenzel (ed.), *Einführung in die Erzählanalyse. Kategorien, Modelle, Probleme*. Trier: 69–87.
- Hinds, S. E. (1998). *Allusion and intertext. Dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry*. Cambridge.
- Hollis, A. S. (ed., 2009). Callimachus. *Hecale*. Second edition with introduction, text, translation, and enlarged commentary. Oxford.
- Holmberg, I. (1998). The creation of the ancient Greek Epic Cycle, *Oral Tradition* 13: 456–78.
- Huxley, G. L. (1969). *Greek epic poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis*. London.
- Kelly, A. (2015). *Ilias Parva*, in: M. Fantuzzi/C. C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its ancient reception. A companion*. Cambridge: 318–43.
- Kopff, E. C. (1981). Virgil and the cyclic epics, *ANRW* II.31: 919–47.
- Kullmann, W. (1956). *Das Wirken der Götter in der Ilias. Untersuchungen zur Frage der Entstehung des homerischen 'Götterapparats'*. Berlin.
- Latacz, J. (1976). Zum Musenfragment des Naevius, *WJA* 2: 119–34.
- Lotman, J. M. (1977). *The structure of the artistic text*. Translated by R. Vroon. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Luck, G. (1983). Naevius and Virgil, *ICS* 8: 267–75.
- Mariotti, S. (ed., 1970). *Il Bellum Poenicum e l'arte di Nevio. Saggio con edizione dei frammenti del Bellum Poenicum*. Rome.
- Mathews, V. J. (ed., 1974). *Panyassis of Halikarnassos. Text and commentary*. Leiden.
- McLeod, W. (1966). Studies on Panyassis – an heroic poet of the fifth century, *Phoenix* 20: 95–110.
- Merula, P. (ed., 1595). *Annalium libb. XIII quae apud varios auctores superant, fragmenta: conlecta, composita, inlustrata*. Leiden.
- Miniconi, P.-J. (1951). *Étude des thèmes 'guerriers' de la poésie épique gréco-romaine*. Paris.

- Morel, W. (ed., ²1927). *Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum praeter Ennium et Lucilium*. Leipzig.
- Murray, A. T./Wyatt, W. F. (eds., ²1999). Homer, *Iliad*. Edited with translation by A. T. Murray. Revised by F. W. Wyatt, 2 vols. Cambridge, MA.
- Oldfather, C. H. (1989). Diodorus Siculus. Diodorus of Sicily in twelve volumes with an English translation by C. H. Oldfather, vols. 4–8. London/Cambridge, MA.
- Otto, W. F. (1954). Die Muse und der göttliche Ursprung des Singens und Sagens. Darmstadt.
- Petropoulos, I. (2012). The *Telemachy* and the cyclic *Nostoi*, in: F. Montanari/A. Rengakos/C. C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric contexts. Neoanalysis and the interpretation of oral poetry*. Berlin/Boston: 291–308.
- Possanza, M. A. (2004). *Translating the heavens. Aratus, Germanicus and the poetics of Latin translation*. New York.
- Reitz, C. (2013). Does mass matter? The epic catalogue of troops as narrative and metapoetic device, in: G. Manuwald/A. Voigt (eds.), *Flavian epic interactions*. Berlin: 229–46.
- Reitz, C. (2017). Das Unendliche beginnen und sein Ende finden. Strukturen des Aufzählens in epischer Dichtung, in: C. Schmitz/J. Telg genannt Kortmann/A. Jöne (eds.), *Anfänge und Enden. Narrative Potentiale des antiken und nachantiken Epos*. Heidelberg: 105–18.
- Rengakos, A. (2015a). *Aethiopsis*, in: M. Fantuzzi/C. C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its ancient reception. A companion*. Cambridge: 306–17.
- Rengakos, A. (2015b). Narrative techniques in the Epic Cycle, in: M. Fantuzzi/C. C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its ancient reception. A companion*. Cambridge: 154–63.
- Richter, W. (1960). Das Epos des Gnaeus Naevius. Probleme der dichterischen Form, in: H. Neumann (ed.), *Die Schiffsallegorie im Ezzoliede*. Göttingen: 41–66.
- Ronen, R. (1986). Space in fiction, *Poetics Today* 7: 421–38.
- Rowell, H. T. (1947). The original form of Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*, *AJPh* 68: 21–46.
- Sbardella, L. (1994). Tracce di un epos di Eracle nei poemi omerici, *SMEA* 33: 145–62.
- Scafoglio, G. (2004). Proclo e il ciclo epico, *GFA* 7: 39–57.
- Scafoglio, G. (2006). Two fragments of the Epic Cycle, *GRBS* 46: 5–11.
- Scafoglio, G. (ed., 2014–2015). *Studies on the Greek Epic Cycle*. 2 vols. Pisa/Rome.
- Schmidt, E. A. (1996). Römische Theologie in der *Odusia* des Livius Andronicus, in: H. Cancik/H. Lichtenberger/P. Schäfer (eds.), *Geschichte. Tradition. Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*. Tübingen: 287–303.
- Sciarrino, E. (2006). The introduction of epic in Rome. Cultural thefts and social contests, in: B. W. Breed/A. Rossi (eds.), *Ennius and the invention of Roman epic*. Baltimore: 449–69.
- Scodel, R. (2012). Hesiod and the Epic Cycle, in: F. Montanari/A. Rengakos/C. C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric contexts. Neoanalysis and the interpretation of oral poetry*. Berlin/Boston: 501–15.
- Severys, A. (1938). *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus*. Liège/Paris.
- Sistakou, E. (2009). 'Snapshots' of myth: the notion of time in Hellenistic *epyllion*, in: J. Grethlein/A. Rengakos (eds.), *Narratology and interpretation. The content of narrative form in ancient literature*. Berlin/New York: 293–319.
- Skempis, M. (2010). 'Kleine Leute' und große Helden in Homers *Odyssee* und Kallimachos' *Hekale*. Berlin/New York.
- Skutsch, O. (ed., 1985). *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*. Oxford.
- Strzelecki, W. M. L. (ed., 1935). *De Naeviano Belli Punici carmine quaestiones selectae*. Krakow.
- Suerbaum, W. (1968). *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter. Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius*. Hildesheim.

- Suerbaum, W. (1992). Zum Umfang der Bücher in der archaischen lateinischen Dichtung: Naevius, Ennius, Lukrez und Livius Andronicus auf Papyrus-Rollen, ZPE 92: 153–73.
- Suerbaum, W. (2003). Ennius in der Forschung des 20. Jahrhunderts. Eine kommentierte Bibliographie für 1900–1999 mit systematischen Hinweisen nebst einer Kurzdarstellung des Q. Ennius (239–169 v. Chr.). Hildesheim/Zurich.
- Vogliano, A. (1937). *Papiri della Università di Milano*, vol. I. Milan.
- Von Albrecht, M. (1979). Naevius, *Bellum Poenicum*, in: E. Burck (ed.), *Das römische Epos*. Darmstadt: 15–32.
- Von Albrecht, M. (32014). *Römische Poesie. Werke und Interpretationen*. Darmstadt.
- Walde, A. (41965). *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg.
- Waszink, J. H. (1972). Zum Anfangsstadium der römischen Literatur, ANRW II.2: 869–927.
- Waszink, J. H. (1979). *Camena*, in: J. H. Waszink (ed.), *Opuscula Selecta*. Leiden: 89–98.
- West, M. L. (1997). *The East face of Helicon: West Asiatic elements in Greek poetry and myth*. Oxford.
- West, M. L. (ed., 2003). *Greek epic fragments: from the seventh to the fifth centuries BC*. Cambridge, MA.
- West, M. L. (ed., 2013). *The Epic Cycle: a commentary on the lost Troy epics*. Oxford.
- West, M. L. (2015). The formation of the Epic Cycle, in: M. Fantuzzi/C. C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its ancient reception. A companion*. Cambridge: 96–107.