

# Speech in Ancient Greek Literature

*Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, Volume Five*

*Edited by*

Mathieu de Bakker  
Irene J.F. de Jong



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

# Contents

Preface IX  
Notes on Contributors XI

Introduction: Narratological Theory on Speech 1  
*Mathieu de Bakker and Irene de Jong*

## PART 1

### *Epic and Elegiac Poetry*

- 1 Homer 33  
*Irene de Jong*
- 2 Hesiod 56  
*Hugo Koning*
- 3 The Homeric Hymns 77  
*Irene de Jong*
- 4 Apollonius of Rhodes 100  
*Jacqueline Klooster*
- 5 Callimachus 120  
*Annette Harder*
- 6 Theocritus 135  
*Jacqueline Klooster*
- 7 Quintus of Smyrna 154  
*Silvio Bär*
- 8 Nonnus 172  
*Berenice Verhelst*

**PART 2*****Historiography***

- 9 Herodotus 197  
*Mathieu de Bakker*
- 10 Thucydides 223  
*Tim Rood*
- 11 Xenophon 246  
*Luuk Huitink and Tim Rood*
- 12 Polybius 266  
*Luke Pitcher*
- 13 Appian 290  
*Luke Pitcher*
- 14 Cassius Dio 309  
*Luke Pitcher*
- 15 Herodian 329  
*Luke Pitcher*
- 16 Josephus 350  
*Jan Willem van Henten and Luuk Huitink*

**PART 3*****Choral Lyric***

- 17 Pindar and Bacchylides 377  
*Bruno Currie*

**PART 4*****Drama***

- 18 Aeschylus 407  
*Evert van Emde Boas*

19 Sophocles 428  
*Evert van Emde Boas*

20 Euripides 448  
*Evert van Emde Boas*

## PART 5

### *Oratory*

21 Early Orators 475  
*Luuk Huitink*

22 Later Orators 499  
*Mathieu de Bakker*

## PART 6

### *Philosophy*

23 Plato 539  
*Kathryn Morgan*

## PART 7

### *Biography*

24 Plutarch 565  
*Judith Mossman*

25 Philostratus 583  
*Kristoffel Demoen*

## PART 8

### *Christian Narrative*

26 The Gospels 609  
*Michal Beth Dinkler*

**PART 9*****The Novel***

- 27 Chariton 635  
*Koen De Temmerman*
- 28 Xenophon of Ephesus 654  
*Aldo Tagliabue*
- 29 Achilles Tatius 673  
*Koen De Temmerman*
- 30 Longus 692  
*J.R. Morgan*
- 31 Heliodorus 715  
*J.R. Morgan*
- Epilogue: Speech in Ancient Greek Narrative 743  
*Mathieu de Bakker and Irene de Jong*
- Glossary 747
- Index 749

## Quintus of Smyrna

*Silvio Bär*

### Introduction

Quintus of Smyrna's *Posthomerica* (2nd/3rd century CE) takes a unique standing in the long tradition of Greek epic poetry. It is self-evident that all epic poems after Homer are in a constant dialogue with their Homeric model, but the *Posthomerica* (*PH*) is a special case because it initiates a direct continuation of the *Iliad*. Beginning directly after the burial of Hector, it covers the remaining part of the Trojan War until the sack of Troy and the return of the Greek warriors in fourteen books and a total of 8786 hexameter lines. Owing to the lack of a proem, the sequel nature is programmatically emphasized—so much so that the Posthomeric<sup>1</sup> narrator is represented as a *Homerus novus*: a Homer who, as it were, has been resurrected from the dead in order to narrate those parts of the Trojan saga which he neglected to tell a thousand years earlier. The missing initial proem is later compensated for by an in-text proem at *PH* 12.306–313 (which recounts the poet's 'Dichterweihe' 'in the land of Smyrna',<sup>2</sup> viz., in Homer's traditional birthplace) and by a verbal allusion to the proem of the *Odyssey* at *PH* 14.630–631 (by way of which the *PH*'s role as a prequel to the *Odyssey* is established).<sup>3</sup>

As a result of this, the analysis of any parameter of the *PH* must necessarily be centred around the question of Homericity: to what extent is a given parameter in the *PH* congruent with, or deviant from, the corresponding parameter in Homer's epics? In the case of deviance, does it appear randomly, or is it systematic? How can any deviance from the Homeric model be reconciled with the claim for Homericity as implied by the Posthomeric narrator? And can we ultimately go so far as to speak of a decidedly Posthomeric aesthetics—

1 In this chapter, the term 'Posthomeric' is always used specifically with reference to Quintus' *PH*.

2 Translations of passages from the *PH* are mine, based on the Greek text by Vian 1963, 1966, 1969.

3 On the *PH*'s poetological programme, see Bouvier 2005; Bär 2007 and 2009: 69–78; Boyten 2010: 239–246; Maciver 2012a: 27–38; Greensmith 2018.

an aesthetics that appears to be defined by the tension between its claim for Homericity and a simultaneous undermining of this claim?

Before considering such questions in detail, it seems important to note that the *PH* is, strictly speaking, not 'Post-Homeric', but (mainly) 'Post-Iliadic' and (to a much lesser extent) 'Pre-Odyssean'. The *PH* is clearly more Iliadic than Odyssean due to its overall Iliadic subject matter, while the allusion to the proem of the *Odyssey* at *PH* 14.630–631 channels the ending of the *PH* onto an Odyssean course. Therefore, a comparison between the *PH* and the Homeric epics should always take into consideration the differences between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.<sup>4</sup>

Until the turn of the millennium, Elderkin's doctoral thesis, *Aspects of the Speech in the Later Greek Epic* (1906), was the only study to provide a comprehensive account of the use of speech in the *PH*. A few more recent studies are devoted to specific aspects of speech in the *PH*, such as Dillon (1995) on a pair of female speeches at *PH* 1.403–476, Schenk (1997) on the role of the assembly speeches (*boulai*) for the overarching structure of the *PH*, Bär (2010) and Maciver (2012b) on the *hoplōn krisis* at *PH* 5.180–317, Scheijnen (2016) on the parallel composition of *PH* 1 and 2 achieved (inter alia) through speech, and Scheijnen (2018) on characterization through speech.<sup>5</sup> This increase can be explained in a wider context, since until the turn of the millennium research on the *PH* was for the most part concerned with source criticism and/or verbal intertextuality, whereas broader (including narratological) approaches have only been adopted for the past 15–20 years. However, despite this recent development, the scholarly interest in speech in the *PH* can still be described as relatively low in comparison with the vast amount of research on speech in Homer's epics.

### Speech Ratio and the Avoidance of Repetition

It has long been noted that the speech ratio in Greek epic decreases significantly from Homer (→) onwards, is lowest in Apollonius (→) and Quintus, and increases again in Nonnus (→). The same development applies to the phenomenon of embedded speech (speech within speech).<sup>6</sup> In contrast to this

4 Research on the *PH* has virtually never considered this crucial differentiation; see only my brief remarks at Bär 2009: 53–54 and Scheijnen 2018: 353–355.

5 See especially Scheijnen 2018: 131–152. There are also sections on the use of speech in some commentaries (Vian 1963: xxxviii–xl; James and Lee 2000: 16–18; Bär 2009: 98–102).

6 For exact statistics, see Elderkin 1906: 3–6. Verhelst 2017a: 24–31 provides a more detailed quantitative analysis. Furthermore, see also Verhelst's 2017b online database.

decrease, the *PH* displays an ‘increasing number of one-time speakers’, as Verhelst puts it: whereas in the Homeric epics, only 5% of all speeches are spoken by a one-time speaker, this proportion increases to 24% in the *PH*.<sup>7</sup> In other words, the Homeric epics have more speeches, but fewer speakers, whereas in later epic, it is the other way around. The decline of the total number of speeches can, at least in parts, be explained as the result of the change from the oral nature of the Homeric epics, with its tendency towards verbatim repetition of large passages, including entire (parts of) speeches, to the non-oral, ‘bookish’ nature of epic from the Hellenistic period onwards. Such an explanation seems evident in the case of Apollonius, who, in accordance with the aesthetics of his period, never repeats even a single line, let alone an entire speech, type-scene, etc.<sup>8</sup> However, in the case of Quintus, the decline is surprising because we would expect a close imitation of the Homeric practice by an author who programmatically stages himself as a *Homerus novus*. As it is, however, Quintus never repeats a speech and, in this respect, takes Apollonius rather than Homer as his model. Similarly, he avoids the Homeric practice of speech in speech, but on one occasion, acknowledges his knowledge of the Homeric device (*PH* 12.35–38).

Numerically, the lack of repetition can help to explain the *PH*’s decreased speech ratio compared to that of the Homeric epics. But what is the reason for this marked difference? If Quintus wanted to ‘be Homer’ on a large scale, the repetition of speeches would have been an obvious choice for imitation. However, a look at Quintus’ handling of repetition in general reveals an overall avoidance of repetition.<sup>9</sup> For example, iterative lines can be found considerably less often in the *PH* than in the Homeric epics: whereas in the latter, repeated lines constitute circa 20% of the entire text, the ratio in the *PH* is as low as 2%. Furthermore, although Quintus uses many words in very high frequency and thus conjures up the Homeric notion of repetitiveness, at the same time circa 45% of the *PH*’s entire vocabulary is made up of *hapax* and *dis legomena*. This high frequency of rare words is, in turn, more congruent with that of Apollonius’ *Argonautica* than with that of the Homeric epics. Consequently, it can be stated that despite its overall Homericity, the *PH* also displays clearly non-Homeric traits which tie in with a more Hellenistic/‘Apollonian’ approach, and that the relatively low speech ratio, along with the complete lack of repetition of speech, is to be viewed in line with this aspect.<sup>10</sup>

7 Verhelst 2017a: 31.

8 Cf. the discussion of feigned orality in the chapter on Apollonius (→).

9 The statistical data quoted here are taken from Bär 2009: 54–61, 98–99, 558–560.

10 On Quintus as an ‘Alexandrian’ poet, see Chrysafis 1985; Giangrande 1986; Bär 2009: 61–69; Ferreccio 2010; Greensmith 2018.

### Attributive Discourse

Quintus follows the Homeric practice of always framing speech with an introductory phrase and a capping.<sup>11</sup> Regarding speech-introductions, common Homeric phrases such as ὦδε δέ τις εἶπεσχε(ν) (20× in Homer), τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη (102×) and καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (284×) are strikingly absent from the *PH*. Indeed, the avoidance of the last type is congruent with the phenomenon that Quintus never takes over an entire Homeric line. This is a phenomenon which, in turn, matches the 'Alexandrian' traits of the *PH*.<sup>12</sup> Speeches are often simply introduced by standard Homeric verbs and short phrases like προσέειπε(ν) (17×), φάτο μῦθον (12×, often in combination with a qualifying adjective that indicates the speech type) and προσεφώνεε (4×). Furthermore, we can find short formula-like (pseudo-Homeric) phrases such as ἔπος ποτὶ τοῖον ἔειπε (6×) and τοῖον δ' ἔκφατο μῦθον (4×), which both follow a Hellenistic model.<sup>13</sup>

When it comes to cappings, it must first be noted that despite his partial tendency towards 'Alexandrianism', Quintus does not imitate the practice of omitting cappings as we repeatedly observe, for example, in Callimachus' *Hymns* (→) or Pindar and Bacchylides (→).<sup>14</sup> Secondly, in contrast to the freedom and variation employed in speech introductions, Quintus' use of capping phrases is comparatively restricted and schematic. The (altogether short) capping phrases which are used in the *PH* are the following (always at the beginning of the line; all except for one are already Homeric): ὡς φάτο (56×), ὡς εἰπὼν (27×, coupled with a subsequent main clause), ὡς ἄρ' ἔφη (25× [un-Homeric]),<sup>15</sup> ὡς ἔφατ' (13×),<sup>16</sup> ἦ ῥά (11×), φῆ/ῆ μέγα (7×, coupled with a participle that indicates the speech type). Thirdly, speech cappings constitute a comparatively large number of Quintus' (altogether few) iterative lines: throughout the *PH*, a total

11 See the chapter on Homer (→), with bibliography. There is no research on attributive discourse in the *PH* apart from Schau 1890.

12 On Quintus avoiding the adoption of complete Homeric lines, see Bär 2009: 55–57.

13 The phrase ἔπος ποτὶ τοῖον ἔειπε is modelled on A.R. 4.738 ~ 4.1097 ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τοῖον ἔειπε(ν) and [Theocr.] *Id.* 25.77 ἔπος δ' ὄγε τοῖον ἔειπε(ν) (cf. Campbell 1981: 7 and Bär 2009: 517). The phrase ἔκφατο μῦθον occurs 9× in A.R., and Quintus' τοῖον δ' ἔκφατο μῦθον is modelled on A.R. 2.10 τοῖον δ' ἐν πάντεσσι παρασχεδὸν ἔκφατο μῦθον (cf. Campbell 1981: 13).

14 With one exception: the brief speech by Agamemnon at *PH* 4.408–409 is not followed by a capping. Again, we observe that Quintus avoids Homeric practice but once acknowledges his knowledge of the Homeric device.

15 James and Lee 2000: 102 note that the phrase occurs 2× in Homer and 19× in the *PH*.

16 In addition to this, once ὡς ἔφαν at *PH* 14.120.

of 31 exact iterative lines can be found; among these, eight are capping lines, of which one is repeated five times, which is more than any other iterative line in the *PH*.<sup>17</sup>

A special case are lines that function as a hinge between two consecutive speeches. The first part of the line serves as the capping to the preceding, and the second part as the introduction to the following speech. In most of these cases, capping and introduction are simply juxtaposed in the same line, e.g. *PH* 2.156: 'so he [= Memnon] spoke; but the old man [= Priam] said to him in admiration'. They are, however, often syntactically linked (15×), as for example at *PH* 5.165: 'to him [= Nestor], after he had spoken thus (ὡς φάμενον), Agamemnon with the good ash-wood spear said'. As it stands, this phrase is un-Homeric, but it represents a case of *variatio Homeri* that is typical of the *PH*. The Homeric phrase ὡς φάμενος/-οι/-ένη (+ main clause) is used as a capping that refers to the speaker and his/her subsequent action after the speech, e.g. at *Iliad* 5.290: 'after having spoken thus (ὡς φάμενος), he [= Diomedes] hurled [his spear]'. The Posthomeric phrase is based upon this Homeric expression and could thus be labelled as pseudo-Homeric.<sup>18</sup> Nonetheless, Quintus also pays homage to the Homeric phrase by employing it on one occasion, at *PH* 10.328: 'having spoken thus, she [= Oenone] sent the groaning [Paris] from her chambers'.<sup>19</sup>

### Types of Speech

Considering the different types of speech which Quintus employs, the first impression is that of a close proximity between the *PH* and the Homeric epics (and, especially, the *Iliad*).<sup>20</sup> Upon closer consideration, though, some significant differences become apparent. Most conspicuously, some typically Homeric

17 *PH* 1.373 = 4.32 ὡς ἄρ' ἔφη Τρώων τις ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πάγχυ γεγηθῶς; 3.250 = 7.522 ὡς ἔφατ' ἀκράαντον ἰεῖς ἔπος, οὐδέ τι ἦδη; 3.504 = 5.568 ὡς ἔφατ' ἀχνύμενος κέαρ ἔνδοθεν ἀμφὶ δὲ λαοί; 5.165 = 5.427 ὡς φάμενον προσέειπεν ἑυμμελῆς Ἀγαμέμνων; 5.317 = 5.598 ὡς φάτο Λαέρταο κλυτὸς πάϊς ἀντιθέοιο; 6.84 = 14.165 ὡς φάμενον/-ην προσέειπε πύκα φρονέων Μενέλαος; 7.219 = 7.700 = 8.146 = 12.66 = 13.237 ὡς φάμενον προσέειπεν Ἀχιλλέος ὄβριμος υἱός; 7.667 = 12.274 ὡς φάμενον προσέειπε πάϊς ξανθοῦ Ἀχιλλῆος.—On iterative lines in the *PH*, see Bär 2009: 56–57, 558–560.

18 See James and Lee 2000: 77. The other occurrences of Homeric ὡς φάμενος/-οι/-ένη are *Il.* 5.290, 835; 22.247, 460; *Od.* 10.446; 11.150; 18.206; 23.85.

19 Further variations of the same Homeric phrase can be found at *PH* 2.623; 4.495; 6.429; 13.532; 14.246, 302.

20 In order to allow for a comparison between the Homeric epics, I use the same typological categories as those used in the chapter on Homer (→). These categories are, essentially, based on the terminology of Fingerle 1939, supplemented by that of Martin 1989.

speech types are used considerably less often, or are even completely absent. These concern soliloquies and prayers, of which we only find a few,<sup>21</sup> whereas supplication speeches, oaths, and messenger speeches do not occur at all.<sup>22</sup> In contrast, certain other speech types inherited from the Homeric tradition are considerably more common in the *PH*, notably, laments, paraenesees, challenges/flytings, vaunts, collective speeches, and assembly speeches. In what follows, these will all be briefly discussed.

*Laments* take pride of place in the *PH*. In the *Iliad*, mourning principally concerns the two deceased protagonists Patroclus and Hector, as well as Thetis who bemoans the impending death of her son Achilles (*Il.* 18.51–65).<sup>23</sup> In a similar vein, in the *PH* the main laments are those for the dead heroes Achilles (*PH* 3) and Ajax (*PH* 5) as well as that for Oenone (*PH* 10). The laments for Achilles constitute a virtual orgy of dirge, containing no fewer than eight DD or RSA speeches, spoken by Ajax, Phoenix, Agamemnon, Briseis, the Nereids and the Muses (RSA), Thetis, followed by a speech of consolation by the Muse Calliope to Thetis, and, after Achilles' ritual cremation, a speech by Achilles' immortal horses (RSA).<sup>24</sup> The other two clusters of laments are spoken by three characters each: Teucer, Tecmessa and Odysseus bemoan Ajax in *PH* 5; and Hecuba, Helena and Oenone bewail Paris in *PH* 10.<sup>25</sup> Individual laments include that by Eos for her dead son Memnon (*PH* 2.609–622) and that by Hecuba for her sacrificed daughter Polyxena (*PH* 14.258–303).<sup>26</sup>

The types of speech associated with duel and combat are paraenesees, challenges/flytings, and vaunts. As in Homer (→), paraenesees in the *Posthomeric*

21 Soliloquies: *PH* 1.100–114 (Andromache); 3.57–60 (Apollo); 5.465–581 (Ajax); 10.424–431 (Oenone; but this speech may also be categorized as a lament). On the Posthomeric soliloquies, see also Elderkin 1906: 37–39, who emphasizes that the *PH* lacks the typically Homeric deliberative soliloquy ('Entscheidungsmonolog'). Prayers: *PH* 1.186–197 (Priam to Zeus); 9.9–22 (Antenor to Zeus); 12.153 (Epeius to Athena); 14.117–119 (the Greeks to Zeus). In addition to this, at *PH* 14.246 it is stated that the Greeks 'prayed [to Achilles] like to a god' (RSA), and Neoptolemus' invocation of his father Achilles at *PH* 14.308–312 closely resembles a prayer (inter alia because of the invocation formula  $\kappa\lambda\upsilon\theta\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\rho$  in 308, which is otherwise reserved for gods; see Bär 2009: 482).

22 We can find ordinary promises on several occasions, but these are typologically different from oaths. Neoptolemus' report of his dream to the Greeks at *PH* 14. 235–245 is what comes closest to a messenger speech.

23 See the chapter on Homer (→). On laments in the *PH*, see Tsomis 2007.

24 *PH* 3.435–458 (Ajax), 463–489 (Phoenix), 492–503 (Agamemnon), 560–573 (Briseis), 582–596 (the Nereids and the Muses), 608–630 (Thetis), 633–654 (Calliope comforts Thetis), 743–765 (Achilles' horses).

25 *PH* 5.509–520 (Teucer), 532–558 (Tecmessa), 574–597 (Odysseus); 10.373–384 (Hecuba), 392–405 (Helena), 424–431 (Oenone).

26 On the latter, see the commentary by Carvounis 2019: 128–151.

are typically addressed to the masses of the soldiers by an individual hero with the responsibility and authority of a leader.<sup>27</sup> Aside from these typical cases, we can find a few special ones: a paraenetic collective speech, directed by the masses to each other (*PH* 1.212–219; see also below), a paraenesis spoken by a hero to another hero (1.497–507: Ajax to Achilles), and the paraenetic speech uttered by Nestor during the funeral games for Achilles, in which the aged hero calls for two new pugilists because no one dares to fight against Idomeneus (*PH* 4.303–322). The Homeric speech type of the *challenge*, that is, a speech in which one hero challenges another to combat (often, but not necessarily, in combination with boasting and/or insults), is also found in Quintus,<sup>28</sup> as are *vaunts*, speeches of triumph spoken by the victor over the dead, or dying, opponent.<sup>29</sup> The latter type is of particular relevance because it is, as Kyriakou points out, ‘peculiar to the *Iliad* and very rare in extant literature after Homer’.<sup>30</sup> Thus, by reviving it, Quintus adds a strong flavour of ‘Iliadcity’ to his epic.

Homericity is also created through collective *tis*-speeches, which are found throughout the *PH*.<sup>31</sup> However, there are differences between Homer and Quintus in this respect, too. De Jong distinguishes two types of Homeric *tis*-speeches,<sup>32</sup> whereof only the ‘actual’ *tis*-speech occurs in the *PH*, while the ‘potential’ *tis*-speech device is never used in the *PH*. Furthermore, with one exception, Quintus avoids the use of a *verbum dicendi* with the iterative suffix *-σx-* as it is common in the introductions and/or cappings to collective speeches in Homer, and instead uses an ordinary third-person-singular predic-

27 *PH* 4.83–87 (Diomedes); 6.604–608 (Eurypylos); 7.422–430 (Diomedes); 8.15–22 (Neoptolemus), 8.256–267 (Helenus); 9.85–109 (Deiphobus), 275–283 (Neoptolemus), 537–539 (Philoctetes); 11.217–220 (Neoptolemus).

28 *PH* 1.553–562, 575–591 (Penthesilea challenges Achilles; Achilles replies); 2.412–429, 431–451 (Memnon challenges Achilles; Achilles replies); 3.246–249, 253–266 (Glaucus challenges Ajax; Ajax replies); 9.248–252, 261–263 (Neoptolemus challenges Deiphobus; Deiphobus replies after having been carried off by Apollo); 11.491–495 (Philoctetes challenges Aeneas; Aeneas ignores him).—‘Flyting’ is a category that is sometimes used by scholars to describe a mutual battle challenge that involves ample boasting and/or insults (see e.g. *PH* 2.412–451: Memnon denigrates Achilles’ mother, and Achilles in return emphasizes his noble origin). Maciver 2012b argues that the speech contest between Ajax and Odysseus over Achilles’ armour at *PH* 5.180–317 should also be understood as a flyting.

29 *PH* 1.644–653 (Achilles against Penthesilea), 757–765 (Achilles against Thersites); 5.441–448 (Ajax against the dead ram whom he believes to be Odysseus); 6.385–389 (Eurypylos against Nireus), 415–424 and 431–434 (Eurypylos against Machaon); 8.211–216 (Neoptolemus against Eurypylos); 13.354–384 (Menelaus against Deiphobus).

30 Kyriakou 2001: 250.

31 *PH* 1.212–219, 358–372, 751–754; 4.20–31, 34–42; 10.471–476; 12.254–258, 553–561; 13.15–18, 469–477; 14.117–119, 254–257, 602–604.

32 De Jong 1987: 69.

ate.<sup>33</sup> Finally, as noted above, we can find one collective speech that is coupled with a battle exhortation (*PH* 1.212–219). This combination has no precedent in Homer; it merges one speech type, the paraenesis (which is typically spoken from an individual to the masses) with another one, the collective speech (which is typically spoken from an individual to his neighbour). To conclude, we can maintain that in the *PH* there is an occasional tendency towards blurring the boundaries between individual and collective speech.

Perhaps the most distinguished type of speech in epic poetry is the *assembly speech*. Characteristically, this speech is part of a type-scene that encompasses the convocation of the army, followed by several speeches and a final resolution. In Homer (→), the assemblies take place at critical points, and the decisions that are taken have an important impact on the further course of action. In imitation of the Iliadic scheme, the *PH* also features four long assemblies with several speeches each, as well as a shorter assembly with a simple pair of speeches.

Schenk lucidly demonstrates how these assemblies ‘give the poet the possibility to develop long-term perspectives and to present the topic of an entire episode’ and thus contribute to the *PH*’s overarching composition and unity, and how each of the assemblies aligns with their intertextual models from the *Iliad*.<sup>34</sup> At *PH* 2.9–99 (five speeches), the Trojans debate the further course of action after Penthesilea’s catastrophic defeat; options that are proposed include retreat and Helena’s return, but in the end they decide to wait for Memnon.<sup>35</sup> At *PH* 6.1–93 (five speeches), Menelaus tests his soldiers by pretending that he wishes to return home. This scene is recognizably modelled on Agamemnon’s famous test of the army (‘Heerprobe’) at the beginning of Book 2 of the *Iliad*. However, unlike the situation in the *Iliad*, there is no imminent danger that the test might go wrong because the other heroes (notably, Diomedes and Odysseus) are able to change course immediately.<sup>36</sup> *PH* 10 opens with a brief assembly and a dialogue between Polydamas, who suggests retreating into the city with a defensive strategy (*PH* 10.10–25), and Aeneas,

33 The most common Homeric formula introducing a collective speech is ὦδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν (20×), often supplemented with the phrase ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον (11×). In the *PH*, the verb form εἶπεσκεν is used only once, at *PH* 1.750 καὶ ῥά τις ὦδ’ εἶπεσκεν ἀρηιθόων Ἀργείων. For a full discussion of these formal differences, see Bär 2009: 516–517.

34 Schenk 1997: 366: ‘[Dies] eröffnet dem Dichter die Möglichkeit, langfristige Perspektiven zu entwickeln und das Thema eines ganzen Handlungsabschnitts vorzugeben.’

35 *PH* 2.10–25 (Thymoetes), 27–40 (Priam), 43–62 (Polydamas), 68–80 (Paris), 87–92 (Polydamas).

36 *PH* 6.9–31 (Menelaus), 41–55 (Diomedes), 59–67 (Calchas), 72–83 (Odysseus), 85–92 (Menelaus).

who successfully opposes this suggestion by pointing out that this would ultimately lead to starvation (*PH* 10.27–44). Later, at *PH* 12.1–104 (five speeches), the Greeks assemble again to evaluate the current situation. On this occasion, Odysseus' idea of building the Wooden Horse is advanced, discussed, and finally approved of (with the exception of Neoptolemus who, for the time being, still objects to it).<sup>37</sup> Finally, the Greeks convene again shortly afterwards in order to discuss the concrete implementation of the ruse (*PH* 12.218–305, seven speeches). Atypically, this series of speeches includes also a collective (actual) *tis*-speech in which the Greeks praise Sinon's courage.<sup>38</sup> As this overview shows, in addition to providing structure and channelling the development of the plot, these assembly speeches also provide a constant change of perspective, as they alternate between the Trojan and the Greek side. Moreover, they also evoke the typically epic technique of providing side shadowings—that is, alternative narrative developments that could have taken place, but did not.<sup>39</sup>

### The Influence of Contemporary Rhetoric

Quintus belongs to the same period as the Second Sophistic, and it is logical to assume that contemporary rhetoric must, one way or another, have left its traces in the *PH*, irrespective of the fact that this is not the type of text which the representatives of the Second Sophistic would typically put at the centre of their interest (Atticizing prose).<sup>40</sup> Indeed, it could be argued that the *PH* is a response to the Second Sophistic fashion of rewriting and correcting Homer (as found e.g. in Philostratus' *Heroicus* and Dio Chrysostom's *nth Oration*) and that this interpretation is in line with the *PH*'s overall strong emphasis on rhetoric and speeches.<sup>41</sup> In his *RE* article on Quintus, Keydell points out that Nestor's encomiastic song about Achilles at the beginning of the funeral games (*PH*

37 *PH* 12.8–20 (Calchas), 25–45 (Odysseus), 51–65 (Calchas), 67–72 (Neoptolemus), 74–83 (Odysseus).

38 *PH* 12.220–242 (Odysseus), 246–252 (Sinon), 254–258 (collective speech), 260–273 (Nestor), 275–280 (Neoptolemus), 287–296 (Nestor), 298–302 (Neoptolemus).

39 On side shadowing in the *PH*, see Nesselrath 1992: 53–66. On false predictions in the *Iliad*, see Morrison 1992.

40 On poetry in the Second Sophistic, see e.g. Bowie 1990 and Baumbach 2017.

41 See Bär 2010: 289–296. In contrast, Maciver 2012b maintains that the influence of contemporary rhetoric on the *PH* is minimal and that the *PH* can, and should, be understood within the framework of Homeric continuation only. See also Avlamis 2019.

4.128–170, reported in ID) reflects the practice of Quintus' own time because, in that period, the 'Olympian' games at Smyrna also included song contests.<sup>42</sup> This, in turn, reinforces the idea of the *PH* as a potentially 'Second Sophistic epic', which may perhaps even have been performed orally. Indeed, Nestor's song may be read precisely as that: a *mise en abyme* of the *PH*'s own potential for performance.

Another indication of the influence of contemporary rhetoric may be seen in the speech contest between Ajax and Odysseus over Achilles' armour at *PH* 5.180–317, the so-called *hoplōn krisis*.<sup>43</sup> A first aspect to be noted is the structure of the speech contest, which consists of two long speeches in DD (*PH* 5.181–236 [Ajax] and 238–290 [Odysseus]) followed by two brief replies (*PH* 5.292–306 [Ajax] and 307–316 [Odysseus]). This format was common courtroom practice in antiquity, which indicates that the Posthomeric *hoplōn krisis* had a certain 'Sitz im Leben' because it was connected to extratextual reality at the time of the *PH*'s composition. Content-wise, the contest centres around the question of priority between 'brain' and 'brawn', whereby Ajax stands for the latter, emphasizing his physical strength and his kinship with Achilles and accusing Odysseus of being a coward. Odysseus, in turn, represents the former, arguing that he possesses both strength and intellect, but that intellectual qualities were more important. Furthermore, Odysseus is characterized as a wily sophist who resorts to a blatant lie (and gets away with it, because he wins the contest) by claiming that it was he who rescued Achilles' dead body from the battlefield (*PH* 5.285–286)—although he, in fact, only marginally participated in the rescue operation because he was injured (*PH* 4.296–331). The Posthomeric *hoplōn krisis* thus ultimately reflects and thematizes the power of speech *per se*: speech is the most powerful weapon humankind has ever developed, and Odysseus is the most proficient and successful warrior in the use of speech. Evidently, these points do not automatically convert the entire *PH* into a 'Second Sophistic epic' proper, but they nevertheless suggest that there is an extra layer of meaning beneath the Homericizing surface which is, in one way or another, connected to contemporary rhetorical practice.

42 Keydell 1963: 1279; cf. also Appel 1994: 9–12.

43 The following discussion is based on Bär 2010: 296–308. Although the *hoplōn krisis* is, of course, inherited from a centuries-old tradition, as is Ajax's ensuing suicide (see Vian 1966: 7–16 for the sources), the way the battle of words is presented in the *PH* bears a clear resemblance to contemporary rhetorical practice. In contrast, Maciver 2012b argues that the Posthomeric *hoplōn krisis* should be analysed in strictly Homeric terms and labels it a flyting.

### Indirect Discourse and Epic Memory

Both in Homer and Apollonius, ID is considerably less common than DD and is often used for mere narrative economy. However, there are some instances where ID is used with particular significance. In the *Odyssey*, famously, the three songs of Demodocus performed at the court of the Phaeacians are reported in ID, as well as Odysseus' report of his adventures to Penelope after their reunion (→Homer). In Apollonius' *Argonautica*, ID is, inter alia, used for Jason's brief report of the Argonauts' journey at the court of King Lycus (→Apollonius of Rhodes). In two significant passages, Quintus follows the tradition of using ID for the narration and memorization of the epic past.<sup>44</sup> The encomium of Nestor for Achilles (*PH* 4.128–170) constitutes the prelude to the funeral games for the deceased hero. The passage falls into two distinctive parts, the wedding of Peleus and Thetis (128–145) and Achilles' glorious deeds (146–170). In the other passage, the retelling of Achilles' and Neoptolemus' accomplishments after the final conquest of Troy (*PH* 14.125–142), the figures of father and son almost merge.<sup>45</sup> In both these IDs, the boundaries between Iliadic and Posthomeric events seem to be consciously blurred, and the *PH*'s sequel character is thus programmatically emphasized, to the extent that the *PH* can be perceived as in fact still being the *Iliad*.

ID may also function as a hinge between the story world and the world of the narratees because it allows the narrator to be more flexible in linking the two worlds. For example, *PH* 4.162–163 states that Nestor 'sang [a song] to the Argives although they already knew it'. In the story world, Nestor's song refers to the Greeks' memory of what happened in the past years, whereas for the narratees, it can refer to the *Iliad*. At *PH* 10.340–361 a dialogue between Hera and the Horae is represented in ID, which may serve the purpose of emotional detachment because divinities in the *PH* typically do not engage in conversation (see below). In addition, narrative economy may also be at play: instead of presenting a dialogue with speakers taking turns, Quintus merely mentions the topics that are discussed, which are familiar to the narratees from the Trojan saga and therefore do not need to be fleshed out.

At *PH* 9.410–422, finally, ID is used to report how Odysseus and Diomedes persuade Philoctetes to abandon his anger and leave the isle of Lemnos with them in order to join the Trojan War. Arguably, this mode of speech is chosen in order to reinforce the feeling of spatial detachment as compared to the main setting (the city and area of Troy).

44 This tradition is also adapted and developed further by Nonnus (→).

45 See the commentary by Carvounis 2019: 80–82 on this passage.

### Characterization through Speech

Scholars have demonstrated that certain characters in Homer (→) such as Achilles, Agamemnon and Odysseus have their own vocabulary and thus some sort of idiolect. Research on characterization through speech in the *PH* is still in its infancy. Recently, Scheijnen has convincingly argued that Achilles' son Neoptolemus, who is programmatically introduced and staged as a 'new version' of his father, is, to a considerable extent, characterized through speech.<sup>46</sup> As the character who delivers the largest number of speeches (19) from his arrival in *PH* 6 onwards, he displays a recognizable development, from a youngster to a fully-fledged warrior, by the way he speaks.<sup>47</sup> Notably, he does so by making numerous references to his father as his principal model, by expressing the desire not to shame his father's honour, as well as by repeatedly resorting to the authority of fate and/or the gods.

In contrast to Neoptolemus' 'youngster speeches', the speeches by Achilles (*PH* 1–3) and Ajax (*PH* 1–5) reflect their status as adults and established heroes and warriors. Inter alia, they achieve this by multiple self-references using superlative expressions of excellence such as ἄριστος, ὑπέρτατος, φέριστος, φέρτατος, etc.<sup>48</sup> Along similar lines, observations have been made about Odysseus' language in his speeches in the *PH* and the way in which that language serves to characterize him. Maciver notices that in his speech against Ajax at *PH* 5.238–290 Odysseus uses words and expressions that suggest equating Ajax with the dishonourable Thersites, for example when Odysseus addresses Ajax as ἀμετροεπής ('unbridled of tongue', 239). This is an extremely rare adjective and echoes the qualification of Thersites uttered by the Homeric narrator at *Iliad* 2.212.<sup>49</sup> In a similar vein, Baumbach has demonstrated that in the same speech, Odysseus alludes to Quintus' description of Achilles' shield (*PH* 5.5–101) by way of literal quotations from its description in Homer (*Il.* 18).<sup>50</sup> Thus, Baumbach argues,

46 Scheijnen 2018: 156–225.—There is scholarly disagreement about the further ramifications of Neoptolemus' role as a second, and potentially 'improved' or 'developed', Achilles. Maciver 2012a: 191–192 unconvincingly argues that he is not much more than a copy of his father. Some scholars view him as an 'improved version' of Achilles (see e.g. Boyten 2010: 183–237), whereas others interpret him as a 'Stoic' hero (see e.g. Langella 2016). According to Scheijnen 2015 and 2018: 156–225, Neoptolemus' main function consists in maintaining and spreading his father's glory.

47 The same phenomenon can be observed in the *Odyssey* with Telemachus; cf. the chapter on Homer (→).

48 See Scheijnen 2018: 256–261.

49 Maciver 2012b: 616–618.

50 Baumbach 2007: 119–121.

Odysseus ‘has been using the time of narration of the ekphrasis in order to “read” the shield so as to organize his speech in accordance with the shield, and hence he recommends himself as its future bearer by way of the spoken word.’<sup>51</sup> What we find here is a device of an almost metaleptic nature: characters make intertextual quotations. Obviously, the characters do not know that they are speaking intertextually, but the primary narratees are aware of this.<sup>52</sup> As a result, we can conclude that the Posthomeric Odysseus displays a manner of speaking which is commensurate with his role as an eloquent, sophist-like trickster who is able to use the right quotes and allusions in the right moment in order to achieve his goals. Unlike the speech of characters such as Achilles, Ajax and Neoptolemus, Odysseus’ language is perhaps not so much an idiolect but, rather, a manner of speaking that is adapted to the situation and circumstances. This, in turn, again defines him as a sophist.

### Silence

There are moments of silence in the *PH*, but they do not necessarily happen at the same moment as in Homer. Specifically, we can find two distinct constellations in the *PH* where speech is omitted, although it is expected according to the Homeric tradition. One such constellation is a god who, in human disguise, approaches and addresses a human being for the purpose of advice or reprimand. In contrast to the Homeric epics, but in line with Apollonius’ *Argonautica* (→), this situation is found only rarely in the *PH*, and when it is, the communication takes place in an indirect and rather diffuse way. At *PH* 8.247–254, Ares is reported urging the Trojans to fight, but except for the seer Helenus, they can only hear Ares’ voice without understanding what he is actually saying, and the narrator does not report Ares’ words. At *PH* 12.104–156, Athena, disguised as a young girl, orders Epeius to build the Wooden Horse, but the instruction takes place in Epeius’ dreams, and the wording is not reported directly. Gods voice a DD to humans on only one occasion: at *PH* 11.137–141, Apollo, disguised as the seer Polymestor, encourages Aeneas and Eurymachus to fight and predicts a long life for them.

In equally distinct contrast to Homeric practice, inter-divine communication is practically non-existent in the *PH*. In other words, Quintus’ gods do not

51 Baumbach 2007: 120: ‘Er hat die Erzählzeit der Ekphrasis zum “Lesen” des Schildes genutzt, um seine Rede dem Schild entsprechend zu gestalten und sich dadurch als künftigen Träger bereits über das Wort zu empfehlen.’

52 This device is already found e.g. in Theocritus *Idylls*; see *SAGN* IV: 120, 122.

talk to each other. The divine council at *PH* 2.162–184 is an instructive case-in-point. In the Homeric epics (→), we find several divine councils.<sup>53</sup> In contrast, in the *PH* this brief assembly is the only occasion on which the gods are explicitly reported as coming together. The main intertextual model of this scene is the divine council at *Iliad* 8.1–40, where Zeus bars the other gods from intervening in the war and supporting their parties—an order which is met with protest by his daughter Athena. In contrast, the Posthomeric assembly lacks any sort of protest, dialogue, or interaction. On the contrary, after Zeus has proclaimed that he will not tolerate divine participation in tomorrow's battle in which Memnon is going to die (*PH* 2.167–172), the narrator explicitly states that the other gods do not respond but simply obey the order (*PH* 2.173–179). From an intertextual perspective, Zeus' order can be read as a confirmation of his orders from the *Iliad* (as a narratorial remark in line 173 suggests: 'so he [= Zeus] spoke in their midst to them *although they knew it themselves*'). Thus, on this occasion, the omission of speech actually helps to reinforce the idea of the *PH* as a direct continuation of the *Iliad*.

Further examples of divine non-communication include *PH* 1.689–703 (Zeus hurls thunderbolts at Ares, rather than addressing him); 3.90–138 (Apollo does not respond to a long speech of vituperation by Hera); 4.56–61 (Zeus does not answer Hera's accusation of having neglected Thetis); 8.340–354 (Zeus uses no words but his thunder to keep Ares and Athena from fighting against each other); 9.321–323 (Apollo wordlessly obeys Poseidon's order not to kill Neoptolemus). There is, however, one exception: towards the end of the epic, Athena addresses Zeus and asks for punishment of the Lesser Ajax because he has violated Cassandra in her temple. In her rage, Athena goes so far as to threaten her father (14.433–434): 'Neither am I going to stay on Olympus / nor will I be called your [daughter] anymore.' Zeus, in turn, meets his daughter's request immediately with a positive response (14.444–448).<sup>54</sup> This is the first and only time in the *PH* when a god replies in DD to another god's words. As indicated above, *PH* 14 channels the narratees towards the *Odyssey* for which the *PH* serves as a prequel.<sup>55</sup> The communication between Athena and Zeus

53 The following remarks are to a large degree based on my analysis in Bär 2016: 219–226.

54 On this dialogue, see Wenglinsky 2002: 182–187; Bär 2016: 225–226; Carvounis 2019: 197–199.

55 As pointed out above, this connection is prominently established by way of an allusion to the proem of the *Odyssey* at *PH* 14.630–631. Further aspects that strengthen the ties between *PH* 14 and the *Odyssey* are, for example, the mention of the palace of Aeolus and his winds at *PH* 14.476–479 and the high significance of Poseidon and his rage in *PH* 14 (otherwise, Poseidon plays a marginal role in the *PH*). See also Carvounis 2019: lxvi–lxvii.

can be read along those lines because it foreshadows the dialogue between the two with which the *Odyssey* famously opens (*Od.* 1.26–105).

Furthermore, the Posthomeric dialogue between Athena and Zeus displays close resemblance to the dialogue between Helios and Zeus at *Odyssey* 12.376–388, where Helios successfully asks Zeus for revenge because of the slaughter of his cattle. This dialogue is the only occasion in the *Odyssey* where a divine request to Zeus receives an immediate (and positive) reply. A further parallel can be seen in the fact that Helios, too, announces severe consequences in the case of non-compliance (*Od.* 12.382–383): ‘If they [= Odysseus’ comrades] are not going to pay me appropriate expiation for my cattle, / I will plunge down into Hades and shine among the dead.’<sup>56</sup> With this model in mind, Quintus establishes a link not only to the beginning but also to the centre of the *Odyssey*.

### Conclusion

From a quantitative perspective, it can be noted that the speech ratio in Quintus’ *PH* is significantly lower than that in the Homeric epics. In this respect, the *PH* is in line with Apollonius’ *Argonautica*. At the same time, more individuals speak in the *PH* than in the Homeric epics, and with few exceptions, the *PH* shows the same variety of speech types as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. As it is the case with many other Posthomeric parameters, beneath the surface of a strongly Homericizing first impression, we can find differences and innovations in many details. These differences do not appear randomly, but systematically, when viewed from an overarching perspective, and thus contribute to the overall texture and architecture of the *PH* as a text which *is*, and simultaneously *is not*, Homeric.

Variation of the Homeric model can be found in Quintus’ handling of attributive discourse, as well as in certain speech types such as *tis*-speeches, where a tendency towards blurring the boundaries between individual and collective speech can be noticed. Nevertheless, for the most part, the *Iliad* remains the towering model, as could be noted with respect to the compositional function of the assembly speeches which structure Quintus’ epic and clearly refer to their Iliadic equivalents. In a similar vein, the inherited tradition of using ID for the renarration and memorization of the epic past is continued in the *PH*, as is the Homeric practice of endowing some of the most eminent heroes with their own specific manner of speaking.

---

<sup>56</sup> For a comprehensive analysis and discussion of this dialogue, see Zekas 2017.

Regarding silence, the phenomenon of non-communication between gods and humans, as well as the almost complete lack of inter-divine communication, is a striking difference with the Homeric epics. This may be explained by the *PH*'s overall tendency to attribute less importance to divine authority, in favour of abstract concepts such as fate and destiny. Divine communication is used on one exceptional occasion, in order to establish and consolidate the *PH*'s role as a prequel to the *Odyssey*.

Finally, the influence of contemporary rhetoric on the *PH* must not be underestimated. Although the *PH* is not a typically Second Sophistic text, the way in which speeches like Nestor's encomium and the *hoplōn krisis* are composed and presented suggest viewing the *PH* as a 'Second Sophistic epic'. Further research is necessary for almost all parameters of Posthomeric speech, especially in three areas. First, a systematic investigation of speech introductions and cappings may provide new insights into Quintus' handling of Homeric formulas. Secondly, characterization through speech will, in all likelihood, prove to be an extraordinarily rewarding field. Thirdly, further studies on how contemporary rhetoric shaped the *PH* may help to understand the position of this text in its wider cultural context.

### Bibliography

- Appel, W., 'Grundsätzliche Bemerkungen zu den *Posthomerica* und Quintus Smyrnaeus', *Prometheus* 20 (1994) 1–13.
- Avlami, P., 'Contextualizing Quintus: The Fall of Troy and the Cultural Uses of the Paradoxical Cityscape in *Posthomerica* 13', *TAPhA* 149 (2019) 149–208.
- Bär, S., 'Quintus Smyrnaeus und die Tradition des epischen Musenanrufs', in M. Baumbach, S. Bär (eds.), *Quintus Smyrnaeus: Transforming Homer in Second Sophistic Epic* (Berlin-New York 2007) 29–64.
- Bär, S., *Quintus Smyrnaeus »Posthomerica« 1: Die Wiedergeburt des Epos aus dem Geiste der Amazonomachie. Mit einem Kommentar zu den Versen 1–219* (Göttingen 2009).
- Bär, S., 'Quintus of Smyrna and the Second Sophistic', *HSPh* 105 (2010) 287–316.
- Bär, S., 'Reading Homer, Writing Troy: Intertextuality and Narrativity of the Gods and the Divine in Quintus of Smyrna's *Posthomerica*', in J.J. Clauss, M.P. Cuypers, A. Kahane (eds.), *The Gods of Greek Hexameter Poetry: From the Archaic Age to Late Antiquity and Beyond* (Stuttgart 2016) 215–230.
- Baumbach, M., 'Die Poetik der Schilde: Form und Funktion von Ekphraseis in den *Posthomerica* des Quintus Smyrnaeus', in M. Baumbach, S. Bär (eds.), *Quintus Smyrnaeus: Transforming Homer in Second Sophistic Epic* (Berlin-New York 2007) 107–142.

- Baumbach, M., 'Poets and Poetry', in W.A. Johnson and D.S. Richter (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic* (Oxford 2017) 493–507.
- Bouvier, D., 'Penthésilée ou l'absence de la muse au début des *Posthomériques* de Quintus de Smyrne', in A. Kolde, A. Lukinovich, A.-L. Rey (eds.), *κορυφαίω ἀνδρῖ: Mélanges offerts à André Hurst* (Geneva 2005) 41–52.
- Boyten, B., *Epic Journeys: Studies in the Reception of the Hero and Heroism in Quintus Smyrnaeus' Posthomérica* (London 2010).
- Bowie, E., 'Greek Sophists and Greek Poetry in the Second Sophistic', *ANRW* 11.33.1 (1990) 209–258.
- Campbell, M., *A Commentary on Quintus Smyrnaeus Posthomérica XII* (Leiden 1981).
- Carvounis, K., 'Final Scenes in Quintus of Smyrna, *Posthomérica* 14', in M. Baumbach, S. Bär (eds.), *Quintus Smyrnaeus: Transforming Homer in Second Sophistic Epic* (Berlin-New York 2007) 241–257.
- Carvounis, K., *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna, Posthomérica 14* (Oxford 2019).
- Chrysafis, G., 'Pedantry and Elegance in Quintus Smyrnaeus, *Posthomérica*', *Corolla Londiniensis* 4 (1985) 17–42.
- Dillon, J., 'The Equality of the Sexes—Variations on a Rhetorical Theme in the Fourth Century AD', *Hermathena* 158 (1995) 27–35.
- Elderkin, G.W., *Aspects of the Speech in the Later Greek Epic* (Baltimore 1906).
- Ferreccio, A., *Commento al libro II dei Posthomérica di Quinto Smirneo* (Rome 2010).
- Fingerle, A., *Typik der homerischen Reden* (unpubl. diss. Munich 1939).
- Giangrande, G., 'Osservazioni sul testo e sulla lingua di Quinto Smirneo', *Siculorum Gymnasium* 39 (1986) 41–50.
- Greensmith, E., 'When Homer Quotes Callimachus: Allusive Poetics in the Proem of the *Posthomérica*', *CQ* 68 (2018) 257–274.
- James, A.W. and K. Lee, *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna Posthomérica V* (Leiden-Boston-Cologne 2000).
- de Jong, I.J.F., 'The Voice of Anonymity: *tis*-Speeches in the *Iliad*', *Eranos* 85 (1987) 69–84.
- Keydell, R., 'Quintus von Smyrna', *RE* xxiv.1 (1963) 1271–1296.
- Kyriakou, P., 'Warrior Vaunts in the *Iliad*', *RhM* 144 (2001) 250–277.
- Langella, E., 'L'eroe stoico e le similitudini in Quinto Smirneo', *Koinonia* 40 (2016) 555–581.
- Maciver, C.A., *Quintus Smyrnaeus' Posthomérica: Engaging Homer in Late Antiquity* (Leiden-Boston 2012a).
- Maciver, C.A., 'Flyte of Odysseus: Allusion and the *Hoplōn Krisis* in Quintus Smyrnaeus *Posthomérica* 5', *AJPh* 133 (2012b) 601–628.
- Martin, R.P., *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad* (Ithaca-London 1989).
- Morrison, J.V., *Homeric Misdirection: False Predictions in the Iliad* (Ann Arbor 1992).

- Nesselrath, G., *Ungeschehenes Geschehen: 'Beinahe-Episoden' im griechischen und römischen Epos von Homer bis zur Spätantike* (Stuttgart 1992).
- Schau, R., *De formulis, quas poetae Graeci in conclusione orationis directae posuerunt* (Tilsit 1890).
- Scheijnen, T., "Always the Foremost Argive Champion"? The Representation of Neoptolemus in Quintus of Smyrna's *Posthomerica*, *Rosetta* 17.5 (2015) 93–110.
- Scheijnen, T., 'Facing Achilles in Two Lessons: Heroic Characterization in Quintus of Smyrna, *Posthomerica* 1 and 2', *LEC* 84 (2016) 81–104.
- Scheijnen, T., *Quintus of Smyrna's Posthomerica: A Study of Heroic Characterization and Heroism* (Leiden-Boston 2018).
- Schenk, P., 'Handlungsstruktur und Komposition in den *Posthomerica* des Quintus Smyrnaeus', *RhM* 140 (1997) 363–385.
- Tsomis, G.P., 'Vorbild und *aemulatio*: An der Kreuzung von intertextuellen Bezügen in den Totenklagen dreier Frauen in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*', in M. Baumbach, S. Bär (eds.), *Quintus Smyrnaeus: Transforming Homer in Second Sophistic Epic* (Berlin-New York 2007) 185–207.
- Verhelst, B., *Direct Speech in Nonnus' Dionysiaca: Narrative and Rhetorical Functions of the Characters' "Varied" and "Many-Faceted" Words* (Leiden-Boston 2017a).
- Verhelst, B., *Direct Speech in Greek Epic Poetry*, online database: dsgep.ugent.be (Gent 2017b).
- Vian, F. (ed., tr., comm.), *Quintus de Smyrne: La suite d'Homère*, 3 vols. (Paris 1963, 1966, 1969).
- Wenglinsky, M.H., *The Representation of the Divine in the Posthomerica of Quintus of Smyrna* (unpubl. diss. New York 2002).
- Zekas, C., 'Odysseus as Storyteller: Narrator and Speech Formulation in the Thrinacia Episode', *Mnemosyne* 70 (2017) 721–739.