Introduction

HELEN LOVATT AND CAROLINE VOUT

This book presents a visual perspective on Greek and Latin epic, from Homer to late in the Roman empire, and on the reception of epic from ancient art to modern opera.[1] Its focus is neither reading nor orality, but visuality. We approach the interactions between epic and visuality in three key, intersecting ways. First, we think about what putting a premium on visuality offers for a reading of epic. We examine the ways in which epic conjures up and withholds images, directs its reader's gaze and uses sightlines to initiate dialogue which can itself serve as visual stimulus. How readers see, and how they are made to see through others' eyes, is as fundamental to their understanding of epic, ancient and modern, as what they read or hear, and exposes the mechanics of epic narrative and the ways it animates myth. This realisation directs our encounter with the epic environment: the gods watch from Olympus and women watch from the battlements; heroes eyeball each other on the battlefield; darkness and disguise impede vision and prophetic visions assist it; and similes and ekphrasis puncture the frame by enabling us to see and not see simultaneously. Where the *Iliad* and *Aeneid* are foundational texts which have shaped the epic visions of later authors, these later epics, and the more negative picture of power and society inculcated within them, make us see the *Iliad* and *Aeneid* differently. This volume is not without these alternative visions and the anxiety that comes with them.

---

[1] On defining epic, see the thoughtful discussion of Martin 2005: 9, writing in a broadly comparativist mode, which suggests that epic in a sense transcends genre: 'epic stands out precisely by presenting itself, time after time, as the "natural" state of speech, the pre-existent mode, the word-before-genre, the matrix of other forms'. He does go on to list the following aspects of content as typically epic: 'a cosmic scale; a serious purpose; a setting in the distant past; the presence of heroic and supernatural characters; and plots pivoting on wars or quests'. The more succinct definition of Beissinger, Tylus and Wofford 1999: 2 is also useful: 'a poetic narrative of length and complexity that centers around deeds of significance to the community'. The popular conception of epic seems to owe a great deal to works such as Bowra 1952: 4, which defines epic heroes as 'the champions of man's ambition to pass beyond the oppressive limits of human frailty to a fuller and more vivid life, to win as far as possible a self-sufficient manhood, which refuses to admit that anything is too difficult for it, and is content even in failure, provided that it has made every effort of which it is capable'.

Second, we step outside of these poems to take a particularly epic perspective on the relationship between word and image. We ask whether, within this contested relationship, there should not be a sub-category of epic and image; whether the visual stimuli and ways of seeing offered by the *Iliad* or *Aeneid* are not distinct from those offered by other literary genres. In the process, visuality shifts in status from the tool of analysis to the primary subject. Yet our understanding of epic increases *pari passu*. The rhetorical device of ekphrasis, for example, started with Homer; no ekphrasis, whatever the genre of the text that contains it, can be cut free from the Trojan web. Traditionally, interpreters of material artefacts have turned to literature to help them unlock the meaning in an image. We ask what a better understanding of epic vision can contribute to the *paragone* of art and text. The book moves broadly from text towards art, but intervening intersections are many and varied.

This emphasis on envisaging epic leads us to the book's third strand, 'reception' – not so much how or why artists and authors have been inspired to restage epic as what these 'performances' look like; and how they have served to embed and challenge existing ways of seeing. The material of epic, and particularly the Trojan story, endures the vagaries of history – from Aeschylus' *Oresteia* to the *Tabulae Iliacae*, from *Les Troyens* to *Troy* (2004). Because Homer and Virgil had a special status in Greek and Roman culture, and then in the Western education system for many centuries, we see them everywhere, even if their presence is always partly illusory.[2] But ancient engagement with epic was already an act of reception, and Archaic pottery vessels decorated with the blinding of Polyphemus or Latin texts like *The Chronicles of Dictys of Crete*, are a crucial and complex part of its influence.

Our authors consider tragedy, opera, film, painting and sculpture from a number of different places and periods. Reception is an integral process of reading and engaging with both art and text, so we have not kept it separate: nearly all chapters engage with reception of one sort or another, either ancient or modern, sometimes both. These epic visions offer a multiplicity of perspectives on what epic does, what marks it out and sets it apart.

──────────────────

We open with the *Iliad*. The *Iliad* is not just the model for epic narrative and epic conduct: it is a paradigm or *Urtext*, which authors of many genres, as well as painters, have seen as their inspiration or point of departure. The

---

[2] On education, see Keith 2000, Too 2001 and Cribiore 2001. For one slice of the reception of Homer, focusing on recent history, see Graziosi and Greenwood 2007.

following example, from towards the start of the poem, is helpful in revealing what is special about the way in which the epic poet controls the viewpoint so as to create a picture in his reader/listener's mind. It begins to expose how the mix of wonder and terror which is so characteristic of epic viewing is created.[3]

As a miniature of a ten-year siege, the *Iliad* often gestures at a wider expanse of time, and the beginning of the poem is no exception. The catalogue in Book 2 and the viewing from the walls in Book 3 give Greek and Trojan perspectives on the armies gathered below, as if for the first time. With, and through, these internal audiences, we as readers, or listeners, are encouraged to create mental images of the scene. What do the armies look like? A dizzying sequence of extended similes at 2.441–83 encourages viewing by analogy (they were *like* this), evokes complex emotions, and distances as much as it attracts by sacrificing description for stylistic bravura. The gathering Greek armies are compared to a forest fire (455–8), then to migrating birds settling (459–66), leaves and flowers in the field of Scamander (467–8), swarming insects in the sheepfold (469–73), and finally goat flocks (474–7) with Agamemnon as goatherd. One final image focuses in on Agamemnon, only to present the audience with competing images of a hybrid personality: he has a head and eyes like Zeus, a waist like Ares, and a chest like Poseidon. These correspondences fragment his body, only to make him seem greater than himself, an ox among cattle, the pre-eminent hero, or at least protagonist of the ensuing drama.[4]

The gathering of the troops is initiated by Agamemnon with the help of Athene and her aegis: we share the perspective of the gods as we imagine ourselves looking down on the immeasurable movements of multitudinous troops.[5] Such is their number that these troops are indescribable. Their broad sweep is inevitably broken down into swarms of smaller and smaller

---

[3] On *thauma*, see Prier 1989. On epic viewing and spectacle, see Leigh 1997, Salzman-Mitchell 2005, Slatkin 2007, Lev Kenaan 2008, Lovatt 2006 and 2013.

[4] 'The epic hero' is a problematic category from the beginnings of the genre; see Feeney 1986. On Achilles as hero, see Nagy 1979, King 1987. Burgess 2009: 8 insists that Achilles is just one character in the *Iliad*, but goes on to show how Achilles' biography pervades the poem. Problematic heroes abound in the ancient epic tradition, from Odysseus through Jason in Apollonius' (and Valerius') *Argonautica* to Aeneas and Nonnus' Dionysus (in the interstices not only of the genders, but also of mortality and immortality). This is well served by the literature: see for instance (on Jason) Hunter 1988, Jackson 1992; (on Aeneas) Stahl 1981; (on Lucan) Johnson 1987; (on Statius) McNelis 2007: 124–51.

[5] On the vertical gaze in Ovid, see Salzman-Mitchell 2005: 24; Lucretius has a paradoxically important role in the relationship between the divine perspective and the narrator in epic: see De Lacy 1964, and more recently Hardie 2009: esp. 67–135 and 153–79.

groups, giving a sense of both the collective power and the individual vulnerability of men. There comes a point in the narrative at which the epic poet has to find a coping mechanism. His invocation sets in motion the catalogue that takes up the rest of the book:

> Ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ᾽ ἔχουσαι –
> ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε, πάρεστέ τε, ἴστέ τε πάντα,
> ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν –
> οἵ τινες ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι ἦσαν·
> πληθὺν δ᾽ οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ᾽ ὀνομήνω,
> οὐδ᾽ εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ᾽ εἶεν,
> φωνὴ δ᾽ ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δέ μοι ἦτορ ἐνείη,
> εἰ μὴ Ὀλυμπιάδες Μοῦσαι, Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο
> θυγατέρες, μνησαίαθ᾽ ὅσοι ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθον·
> ἀρχοὺς αὖ νηῶν ἐρέω νῆάς τε προπάσας.

> Tell me now, you Muses who have your homes on Olympos.
> For you, who are goddesses, are there, and you know all things
> and we have heard only the rumour of it and know nothing.
> Who then of those were the chief men and lords of the Danaans?
> I could not tell over the multitude of them nor name them,
> not if I had ten tongues or ten mouths, nor if I had
> a voice never to be broken and a heart of bronze within me,
> not unless the Muses of Olympia, daughters
> of Zeus of the aegis, remembered all those who came beneath Ilion.
> I will tell the lords of the ships, and the ships' numbers.   (*Iliad* 2.484–93.
>   Trans. Lattimore)

Here the perspective of the gods meets that of the narrator: the poet envisages the Muses, twice linked with Olympus, as actually present at the scene and able to see for themselves, in strong contrast to his own reliance on *kleos*. Viewing is knowledge, and the narrator sees the Greeks only second-hand, by virtue of poetic inspiration.

By the beginning of Book 3, narrative motion has resumed. Now the Trojans are cranes (3.3–7), contrasted in their clamour to the determined silence of the Greeks. Still, however, battle does not commence: instead we have nearly two books concerned with the duel between Paris and Menelaus. Finally, at 4.422–56, the armies meet:

> Ὡς δ᾽ ὅτ᾽ ἐν αἰγιαλῷ πολυηχέϊ κῦμα θαλάσσης
> ὄρνυτ᾽ ἐπασσύτερον Ζεφύρου ὕπο κινήσαντος·
> πόντῳ μέν τε πρῶτα κορύσσεται, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
> χέρσῳ ῥηγνύμενον μεγάλα βρέμει, ἀμφὶ δέ τ᾽ ἄκρας
> κυρτὸν ἐὸν κορυφοῦται, ἀποπτύει δ᾽ ἁλὸς ἄχνην·

ὣς τότ᾽ ἐπασσύτεραι Δαναῶν κίνυντο φάλαγγες
νωλεμέως πόλεμόνδε· κέλευε δὲ οἷσιν ἕκαστος
ἡγεμόνων· οἱ δ᾽ ἄλλοι ἀκὴν ἴσαν, οὐδέ κε φαίης
τόσσον λαὸν ἕπεσθαι ἔχοντ᾽ ἐν στήθεσιν αὐδήν,
σιγῇ δειδιότες σημάντορας· ἀμφὶ δὲ πᾶσι
τεύχεα ποικίλ᾽ ἔλαμπε, τὰ εἱμένοι ἐστιχόωντο.

As when along the thundering beach the surf of the sea strikes
beat upon beat as the west wind drives it onward; far out
cresting first on the open water, it drives thereafter
to smash roaring along the dry land, and against the rock jut
bending breaks itself into crests spewing back the salt wash;
so thronged beat upon beat the Danaans' close battalions
steadily into battle, with each of the lords commanding
his own men; and these went silently, you would not think
all these people with voices kept in their chests were marching;
silently, in fear of their commanders; and upon all
glittered as they marched the shining armour they carried.   (*Iliad* 4.422–
     32. Trans. Lattimore)

The advance of the Greek armies is brought to life by the simile, using both sound and vision.[6] The panorama of surf, sea and open water makes these armies seem similarly expansive, as they swell to fill the plain and the reader's vision.[7] The sound of marching feet becomes the noise of the waves, echoed by the repeated words and sounds of the poem. Yet the image of violent motion is just as important as the thunderous sound, as the water foams far out to sea and then white caps race to break explosively against the rocks. It works to make reader and warriors similarly excited. The terror of those who march 'silently in fear of their commanders' comes as a surprise after the chaos, but only until we realise that the turmoil suggested by the waves is inner turmoil. This realisation is further offset by the sight of the as yet undimmed armour and its gesturing towards future glory, wonder, spoils. The contrast is emblematic of an emotive tension at the heart of epic viewing.

[6] We are not alone in finding this section particularly cinematic: Winkler 2007a: 54–7 picks the same simile in order to discuss the way Petersen's *Troy* appears to express Homeric imagery at 1.17.19–1.23.31 of the DVD: 'In this battle sequence the attack of the Greeks is indeed cresting, smashing, driving, and breaking on the Trojans while shields massive in the middle clash against each other.'

[7] Winkler 2007a: 54 finds that this passage 'implies an observer stationed on an elevation, such as a mountain top, and looking down along the beach'. This presages his 'philological' approach to film in Winkler 2009a, about which we are rather ambivalent. The actual visualisations in films do not exhaust the possibilities available to readers, artists and other adapters of texts.

A few lines later, this vision is at the mercy of the goddess of Discord, Eris, who grows into a cosmic force looking down on the battle and orchestrating from above (4.439–45). In a sense atypical, the sequence of passages, in which she interferes, does not showcase one hero proving his prowess, killing many, or fighting a duel: instead it pans out to give us the big picture of epic as the marshalling of nations, as the conflict between man and god, and – through the imagery – as the fabric of nature itself, disturbed.[8] Epic combines length with scope, and the mechanisms for accommodating this sway are largely visual or visualising.[9] The word 'image' is not a dead metaphor, and extended similes are one of the defining features of epic style.[10] As we muster our troops, then, for the battle ahead, a rudimentary sense of the nature of epic viewing emerges: a layered world, in which gods, narrator and internal audiences continually mediate between spectacle and audience;[11] the combined sense of wonder (at the enormity, the beauty, the grandeur) and terror (at the imminence of death); the struggles of men elevated to cosmic significance, and the struggles of the narrator to live up to his task. Later we will engage with ekphrasis and prophetic visions, both of which are ways of generating epic power, the cultural hegemony of epic, augmenting the extraordinary impact that Homer, and poets who came after him, especially Virgil, had on the world around them. For now, we divide the rest of the introduction into two: reflections on the definition of epic and its literary resonances from Helen Lovatt ('Defining epic'), and on the art-historical *mise en scène* from Caroline Vout ('Visualising epic').

Defining epic

What constitutes epic? The project of understanding 'epic' is complicated by slippage from ancient to modern uses of the word. Scholarship on film shows the recent appropriation of epic to mean 'big' and 'impressive', not

---

[8] Hardie 1986 set off the discourse of epic and cosmos; on the Greek side see, for instance, Allan 2006, Clauss 2000; on Lucan, Murgatroyd 2007; on Statius, Lovatt 2005: 101–39.

[9] One can never completely separate the visual from the aural, especially in a text. In film, too, the soundtrack is an important generator of emotion and a sense of sublimity: see Cohen 2001; Reay 2004.

[10] As mentioned by Martin 2005: 10–11, for instance. See also West 1969 and Nimis 1987.

[11] This mediation contributes to the sense of 'objectivity' and 'detachment' which has characterised scholarly discussion of epic style, along with the concept of an 'omniscient narrator': see Richardson 1990. A more sophisticated approach is offered by de Jong 1987. On later developments see, for instance, Culler 2004 and Nelles 2006.

to mention the currency of the word in the British playground (roughly synonymous with 'awesome'). For recent publicists of and writers about film, 'epic' often simply flags up 'ancient'. Similarly, while secondary literature on opera tends to equate Greek and Roman material with 'tragedy', writing on film tends to lump together any Greek, Roman and biblical material as 'epic', even Cacoyannis' versions of Euripides (such as *Trojan Women* (1971) and *Ifigenia* (1977) in Elley 1984).[12] Loose association of 'epic' with 'size, length, spectacle, and, above all, unusual human feats – possibly of heroic proportions' (Santas 2008: 1) means nearly anything can be 'epic'. This reception of the word 'epic' can dilute our sense of the workings of the ancient genre, but such dilution is not new: even in the ancient world, epic is the default genre against which all poets, whatever their expertise, kick.

Epic has always had a tendency to generate opposition, both within itself and beyond the limits of the genre. Poets who want to state their independence from poetic tradition and from political influence do so by refusing to write epic. A classic example of the *recusatio* as opposition to epic is Horace, *Odes* 1.6.5–12:[13]

> nos, Agrippa, neque haec dicere, nec gravem
> Pelidae stomachum cedere nescii
> nec cursus duplicis per mare Vlixei
>   nec saevam Pelopis domum
>
> conamur, tenues grandia, dum pudor
> imbellisque lyrae Musa potens vetat
> laudes egregii Caesaris et tuas
>   culpa deterere ingeni.
>
> We do not try, Agrippa, to tell of these things, not the serious
> pique of the son of Peleus, who doesn't know how to give up,
> nor the course through the sea of double Ulysses
>   nor the savage house of Pelops
>
> great matter for slender men, while shame
> and the Muse, powerful over the unwarlike lyre, forbid me
> from wearing away the praises of outstanding Caesar
>   and your own, through lack of talent.

Horace is here refusing to write epic, because the Muse forbids him and because he worries that his implied inadequacy as an epic poet will lead to

---

[12] Winkler 2007b also includes Cacoyannis in his list of Troy films, although he is not specifically focusing on epic.

[13] Thomas 2007, with further reading.

bad poetry and bad praise of his patrons. He equates panegyrical poetry with the epics of Homer, hinting, with the phrase *imbellis lyrae*, at the opposition between action and poetry (in this way praising his patrons, who are men of action), along with the opposition between epic and other poetry. The Muse, like the Muse of *Iliad* 2, is divinely powerful, and in his submission to inspiration he assimilates himself to an epic poet, while *stomachum* subtly belittles the Homeric Achilles and the Callimachean phrase *tenues grandia* plays on the Hellenistic poet's assertive creation of an anti-epic aesthetic. With this, Horace becomes part of a long list of famous poetic names who define themselves in opposition to epic, from Callimachus in the *Aetia* through Lucretius, Virgil before the *Aeneid*, Propertius, Ovid, Persius, Petronius and Martial, to name but a few. This opposition to epic is even embraced by epic poets who feel insufficiently epic, or insufficiently panegyrical (for instance, Statius in the proem of the *Achilleid*).[14]

More interesting, perhaps, is the tendency of epic as a genre to generate opposition from within. The *Odyssey* is often seen in opposition to the *Iliad*, as a comic, complex, convoluted poem.[15] It offers many different oppositions to the *Iliad*: woman versus man; domestic discord versus international war; a single hero versus a complex alliance of different forces; return versus conquest; the marvellous versus the divine; a more complete picture of a complex society versus a claustrophobic focus on aristocratic heroism.[16] In place of the shield, we have ekphraseis of spaces and settings: the palace of Alcinous (7.78–133); Calypso's cave (5.59–73).[17] Purves argues that the linear, embodied perspective of the Odyssean traveller replaces the synoptic view of the Muses dominant in the *Iliad*.[18] For Purves, this tendency marks the beginnings of prose narrative, a foreshadowing of Herodotus.

---

[14] Nauta 2006, with bibliography on *recusatio*.

[15] For instance, Silk 2004: 31: 'The Odyssean universe, by comparison, seems restless and less assured of any ultimate correspondence [between human striving and divine facilitation] than concerned to achieve one'; on the complex comic tone of the meeting with Nausicaa, 36; 'The *Odyssey*, though committed to the eventual triumph of Odysseus, is – like its own twisted tales – all twists and turns, with Odysseus supreme *polutropos*¸ 'man of many turns' (1.1), himself.' (42)

[16] On the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* together, see Pucci 1987. On gender, see Cohen 1995; Katz 1996; on the divine: Clay 1997.

[17] Calypso's cave is called by Hall 2008: 11 the first *locus amoenus* in Western literature, and gave rise to visual receptions, such as the painting by Jan Brueghel the Elder, 'A Fantastic Cave with Odysseus and Calypso' (oil on canvas. Johnny van Haeften Gallery, London). The scale of the cave in this representation and the painting's emphasis on the relationship between gods and mortals might still evoke something recognisably epic, but it is supernatural fruitfulness, epic pleasure and delight.

[18] Purves 2010: 65–96 on the *Odyssey*.

Yet this Odyssean perspective is equally important and influential in later epic (and might already have existed in early versions of the Argonautic myth, for instance).[19] Apollonius' *Argonautica*, too, follows the itinerary of its protagonists, presenting a catalogue of marvels as much as a teleological narrative.[20] The *Aeneid* incorporates both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, not just in matching halves, but also by intermingling recollections of different scenes and elements, as does Horace in the *recusatio* quoted above.[21] The *Metamorphoses* multiplies almost impossibly any attempt to discern types or streams of epic, incorporating numerous epic journeys (Perseus, Hercules, Theseus, as well as Odysseus and Aeneas) and no comfortably Iliadic battle scenes. So effectively does the *Metamorphoses* both embrace and diverge from epic, that it generates ever-renewed discussion of its generic status,[22] while remaining a milestone in the reception of both epic and mythology.[23]

Post-Augustan epic offers opposition and problematisation of the epic genre in still more complex ways: Lucan's poem, more rhetorical than poetic, too cavalier with its material to make it history, a generic refusenik which pushes the boundaries of epic just as much as the *Metamorphoses* (or more so), is an important bridge to the Flavian poets.[24] The obsession with civil war can be seen as Latin poetry's particular contribution to the epic genre.[25] The Flavian period brings this obsession with civil war to a climax, an almost incestuous give and take between three poems, each with their own conception of epic and civil war: the close proximity of Valerius' Argonauts and Statius' tragic Thebans with the historical heroes of early Rome in Silius' *Punica*

---

[19] In contrast, Silk points to the non-linear nature of Odyssean narrative in comparison to the linear *Iliad* (44). Perhaps the difference is dimensionality: the multiple twisting lines of Odyssean stories that double back on themselves recall Ovid's metapoetic river Maeander (*Met.* 8.162–8, with Boyd 2006) while the *Iliad* offers a fully two-dimensional space. Or we might make something of the importance of time in Odyssean narrative.

[20] On the *Argonautica*, see Harder 1994.

[21] Aeneas' visit to the site of Rome in Book 8, for instance. The classic work: Knauer 1964; a more complex approach: Quint 1993. Statius' *Thebaid*, too, has a journey followed by a battle.

[22] Most importantly: Otis 1970; more recently: Hardie 2002b and Papaioannou 2005.

[23] On the reception of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Taylor 2000, Lyne 2001, Hardie 2002a.

[24] On Lucan and Valerius: Stover forthcoming; Lucan and Statius: Lovatt 1999; Lucan and Silius: Marks 2010.

[25] From the war in the second half of the *Aeneid* to Lucan's literal civil wars, Valerius' insertion of civil war into the Argonautic myth (Book 6), and Statius' narrowing of civil war to fratricide. It continues to be an important theme in later receptions from Dante to Milton and beyond.

allows for all sorts of generic contamination, from the repetitions of Hypsipyle to a Hannibal who seems very like Capaneus.[26]

The essays in this book have tended to start from the normative end of epic, with an emphasis particularly on the *Iliad* (Hesk, Squire, Lorenz, Vout) and the *Aeneid* (Lovatt, Fotheringham, Rees) and their receptions. In order to think about the nature of epic, it is important to start here, in the heart of the genre. For later readers and visualisers of epic, the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid* can never be ignored, even if the *Odyssey* is more pervasive across a broader range of cultural production.[27] Ovid's *Metamorphoses* does come into Dinter's chapter, but has received important visual readings already.[28] From the core, we move to the edges of epic, with Lucan's *Bellum Civile* (Dinter), Statius' *Thebaid* (Gervais) and Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* (Buckley), poems more centrally concerned than those in the alternative Odyssean stream with the matter of epic as defined by Horace at *Ars Poetica* 73–4: kings and battles.

One of the main oppositions, internal and external, which helps to define epic is the tension between epic and tragedy. The debate on epic and tragedy has always focused around issues of spectatorship, ever since Aristotle in the *Poetics* put emphasis on the effects of different genres on different audiences (1448b, cf. 1460a). Epic and tragedy are the first genres mentioned (1447a13) and much of the discussion in the *Poetics* sets them against each other.[29] Yet Aristotle's distinctions do bring out the common ground between the two: both are elevated in contrast to the 'low' subject matter of comedy (1448a26 links Sophocles and Homer). Drama, as the more recent development, takes centre stage of Aristotle's analysis, while epic is already the norm, from which tragedy deviates, or upon which it improves.[30] Aristotle sees the unity of time and space in tragedy as a significant improvement, an

---

[26] Gibson 2004.

[27] At least according to Hall 2010: 9: 'advocates of the superiority of the *Iliad* can only envy the cultural penetration achieved by the *Odyssey*: it is also an ancestral text for cartographers, geographers, navigators, explorers, historians, philosophers, psychologists, anthropologists, occult magicians, novelists, science-fiction writers, biographers, autobiographers, movie directors and composers of opera'.

[28] Notably Hardie 2002b and Salzman-Mitchell 2005. Similarly we do not focus closely on the *Aeneid* itself, but rather on visual receptions of it, given the proliferation of recent visual readings of Virgil: Smith 2005, Syed 2005, Reed 2007.

[29] Aristotle also talks specifically of making tragedies from epics (1459a–b), of the epic cycle as a mine for tragic material.

[30] 1449a4–6 on the tendency of epic poets to take up tragedy. See Halliwell 1998: 253–66 for more on Aristotle's view of the continuity between tragedy and epic, and epic's inferiority to tragedy.