Rewriting Homer: Dictys, Septimius and the (Re-)shaping of the Trojan War Material

Sara Kaczko
Sapienza Università di Roma, Italia

Abstract   The present paper deals with variation in and (re-)use of ancient sources, chiefly epics, in the fictional chronicle of the Trojan War composed by 'Dictys of Crete' and its Latin adaptation, the *Ephemeris belli Troiani*, by a certain L. Septimius, both dating to the Roman Empire. I discuss how the authors of these texts used inconsistencies in the literary tradition and their own invention to characterise the heroes of the Trojan War in ways that 'correct' Homer and allow insertion of adventure and 'romance'.

Keywords   Trojan War. Romance. Homer. Dictys of Crete. Dares the Phrygian. Second Sophistic.

Summary   1 Troy Romances. – 2 Homeric ἐπανορθώσεις and Beyond. – 3 The Style of the "Troy Romances". – 4 Dictys' Narrative Strategies. – 5 Homer, Dictys, and the Epic Heroes.

1   Troy Romances

Three supposed memoirs of eyewitnesses to the Trojan War are known to have circulated in the ancient world.[1] The earliest, com-

---

[1]   The existence of other texts allegedly composed by participants in the Trojan War, notwithstanding some hints in ancient sources, is doubtful. A possible exception is the work of Sisyphus of Cos, described in Malalas' *Chronicles*, 6th cent. CE, as a fellow of Teucer and author of a history of the Trojan War used by Homer in the composition of the *Iliad* (cf. Griffin 1907, 60-81; Jeffreys, Croke, Scott 1990, 177, 192; Merkle 1989, 17-18; Cameron 2004, 149-50).

posed in Greek in the 1st-2nd cent. CE by a certain "Dictys of Crete" – a (non-Homeric) companion of Idomeneus, the Cretan hero and king who appears in the *Iliad* – is preserved only on papyrus scraps.[2] Another is Septimius' Latin version of Dictys' Greek text known as the *Ephemeris belli Troiani*, or simply *Ephemeris*, which dates to the 3rd-4th cent. CE. The third, known as the *De excidio Troiae historia* or *Acta diurna belli Troiani*, dating to the 5th-6th cent. CE by "Dares the Phrygian" (a certain Dares is mentioned in the *Iliad* as the father of a minor Trojan character); allegedly, though, the *De excidio Troiae historia* was translated into Latin by the historian Cornelius Nepos, though it is in fact much later than the 1st cent. CE when Nepos lived.[3] My focus here is on the first two. The Greek chronicle that, for the sake of convenience, I refer to as the work of Dictys, has been reconstructed as having been composed of ten (or sometimes nine) books[4] that narrated the unfolding of the Trojan War from its origins through the fall of Troy and the returns (*nostoi*) of the Greek heroes. The plot was based on the Homeric and non-Homeric epics (in chronological sequence, the *Cypria*, *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, *Aethiopis*, *Little Iliad*, *Iliou Persis*, *Nostoi*, and *Telegony*) and for the

---

2   The papyri are P. Tebt. 268 = Pack^2 no. 338 (early 3rd cent. CE) containing Book 4.9-15; *P.Oxy.* XXXIII 2539 (2nd-3rd cent. CE), containing Book 4.18; *P.Oxy.* 4943 (2nd cent. CE, perhaps first half; see Hatzilambrou 2009, 83) containing 2.29-30; and *P.Oxy.* 4944 (early 3rd cent. CE; Hatzilambrou, Obbink 2009, 89) containing 5.15-17. Cf. Ihm 1909; Eisenhut 1973, 64-9; 1969, 116-17; Merkle 1989, 113-18; Hatzilambrou, Obbink 2009; Ruta 2018. *P.Oxy.* 4944, 93-109 reads the σφραγίς of Dictys from Crete and the Latin *Ephemeris* (cf. *Ephem. Epist.*; *Prolog.*; *Ephem.* 5.17) provides the information about the author's identity, as well; the choice of homeland has been interpreted as motivated by the proverbial status of Cretans as liars in the ancient world (Zanusso 2015, 13-16). The *terminus post quem* for the Greek *Ephemeris* is established by the mention of a date that corresponds to 66 CE in the prologue (though, of course, it is part of the *Beglaubigungsapparat*), and the *terminus ante quem* is ca. 150 CE, on the basis of the dating of the recently discovered *P.Oxy.* 4943, the allusion to Dictys in Lucian's *Hist. conscrib.* 16, and stylistic analysis of the papyri of the *Ephemeris* cf. Hatzilambrou 2009, 80; Ruta 2018, 25-37, 41-2, with bibliography and previous discussions. See similarly Horsfall 2008-09, 43-4, 55-7 (after Ptolomaeus Chennus' *Kaine Historia*, but before Philostratus' *Heroicus*) and Zanusso 2015, 17-22 (who does not take into account *P.Oxy.* 4943 and argues that Lucian's *Hist. conscrib.* 16 may have inspired Dictys).

3   The Latin *Ephemeris* has been dated 3rd-4th cent. CE by (among others) Merkle 1989, 263-83; 1999, 162-3; Cameron 1980, 172-5 (arguing for the 3rd cent. CE); Eisenhut 1983, 26-8. Dares' *Acta*, in 44 small chapters, which traces events from the causes of the conflict between the Greeks and Trojans to the end of the War, are dated by the majority of scholars around the 5th cent. CE (or 5th-6th cent. CE), cf. Merkle 1989, 263-83; Schetter 1987; Beschorner 1992, 254-63.

4   On this issue, see Lapini 1997, who surveyed previous discussion and argued that the number 9 given by the Suda, θ' in the usual Milesian system, was easily confused with the 10 given by the prefatory letter, ι' in this system, resulting in a misunderstanding of as ι = Book 9 according to the Homeric-style numeration of books.

most part maintained the traditional order of events.[5] The first five of the six books of L. Septimius' *Ephemeris* take the story of the war from Helen's abduction to the sack of Troy, precisely as in the Greek original, while Book 6 summarises the various *nostoi*. Comparison of the corresponding passages indicates that, so far as the evidence goes, Septimius' version, though showing evidence of elaboration to improve the clarity and style of the Greek original (and, on more than one occasion, incorporating literary allusions), remains essentially faithful to the content of Dictys' text (e.g. Septimius appears to have added no additional stories or characters), the main difference being the condensation of events after the war in Book 6.[6]

In terms of *genre*, these works combine Homeric revisionism, pseudo-epigraphy, and historiography with novelistic literature and, as such, they are fairly typical of the vast literary production of the Graeco-Roman world at the time, which saw an enormous increase in creation of fiction, including rewriting or inventing the legendary past.[7] With regard to historiography, Dictys and Septimius alike deploy an array of strategies to frame their works as reliable records of the Trojan War, beginning with the framing as an eyewitness account and inclusion of rationalising events, offering alternative versions of scenes that appear in Homer (usually drawing on non-Homeric traditions) and shaping events in the manner of histories. This 'rewriting' of Homer also gave the authors scope to insert adventures, poetic allusions, and other literary devices with appeal to learned and not-so-learned audiences.

---

5   *Ephem.* 1-2.28, from the causes of the war to Chryses' plea to Agamemnon, is based on the *Cypria*; *Ephem.* 2.28-4.1, from the Chryses episode to Hector's burial, is based on the *Iliad*; *Ephem.* 4.2-5, from the arrival of the Amazones and Memnon to the fall of Troy, is based on the *Aethiopis*, *Ilias Parva*, and *Iliou Persis*; and *Ephem.* 6 is based on the *Nostoi*, *Odyssey*, and *Telegony*. On the changes in the chronological sequence, attributable to the presentation of the text as a war-chronicle, see below § 4; on the fictional and novelistic additions, see §§ 4 and 5.

6   Again, though it is not clear that Septimius is a historical individual, I will for convenience use this name to refer to the author of the Latin *Ephemeris* when it is necessary to distinguish the Latin and Greek texts of Dictys.

7   See e.g. a number of works by Lucillius, Petronius, Apuleius, Lucian, Philostratus, Ptolomaeus Chennus, the abovementioned Dictys and Dares and others mentioned below in § 2, various "Greek novels", and the "Alexander romance". The immense bibliography on the subject includes Gabba 1981; Bowersock 1994 (who assigns to Nero's reign and specifically the authors of that period Lucillius, Petronius, Ptolomaeus Chennus, and Dictys, a crucial role in the evolution of fiction in the following century; cf. especially pp. 31-3); Gill, Wiseman 1993; Schmeling 1996; Cameron 2004, 89-163; Panayotakis, Zimmerman, Keulen 2003; Kim 2010. Ironically, both the *Ephemeris* and Dares' *Acta* came to be regarded as authentic over the centuries; thus, the Greek text of Dictys was used cited as a reliable source by several Byzantine chronographers, and both the Latin *Ephemeris* and *Acta* deeply influenced the Medieval reception of the Trojan myth (e.g. Benoît de St. Maure), cf. e.g. Merkle 1989, 21-4.

2 Homeric ἐπανορθώσεις and Beyond

From the 6th cent. BCE, several authors – historians such as Herodotus and Thucydides, authors of genealogies such as Hecataeus, and philosophers such as Theagenes and Xenophanes – sought to create a reliable reconstruction of the events of the Trojan War in explicit contrast with the imaginative accounts of the epic poets, above all Homer. Alternatives to the Homeric accounts of the war were already found in poetry (early on in Stesichorus' *Palinodia*) and rhetoric (e.g. Gorgias' *Enc. Hel*.). In Hellenistic times, alongside the 'serious' work of grammarians such as Zenodotus and Aristarchus, the Homeric material was also subject to creative rewriting. Examples include the works known as *Troika* composed by the grammarians Dionysus Scytobrachion (mid-3rd cent. BCE) and Hegesianax of Alexandria Troas (3rd-2nd cent. BCE, under the name of Cephalon of Gergis). These "Trojan histories" took the form of mythological narratives based on supposed epigraphical or literary documents.[8] In essence, over time, the Homeric ἐπανόρθωσις came to be perceived no longer as a theoretical problem but rather as a rhetorical and literary game. Thus the *Anthomeros* and *Kaine Historia* by Ptolemaeus Chennus' (1st-2nd cent. CE)[9] contained, among other things, Homeric corrections, and they may have exerted considerable influence on later writers. The game was fashionable also during the Second Sophistic,[10] as indicated by the well-known *Troikos* of Dio Chrysostomus (*Or*. 11) and *Heroicus* of Philostratus (ca. mid-3rd cent. CE) and the (again ironic) Homeric revisionism in Lucian's *Somn*. 17. As has been seen, common strategies in the Homeric ἐπανορθώσεις include framing as ostensibly ancient and reliable sources, including literary ones, for example documents dating before the Homeric poems were composed (a strategy especially favoured in Ptolemaeus Chennus' *Kaine Historia*),

---

[8] Cf. Jacoby *FGrH* 45 (559-60); *GH* 238-40, Kommentar 561-2; Grossardt 1998, 365-9.

[9] On Ptolemaeus Chennus' work, see Chatzis 1914; Tomberg 1968, 54-62; Bowersock 1994, 24-37; Kim 2010, 18-21.

[10] However, both Dio's and Philostratus' works served not only as an intellectual exercise entertaining for an audience familiar with the Homeric poems but also to convey an ideological message. In Dio's speech, the reversal of the normal outcomes of the Trojan War (Hector kills Achilles, Troy does not fall, the Trojans make peace with the Greeks, etc.) possibly functioned as Roman propaganda, with the philo-Trojan attitude showing favour to the Romans as heirs of the Trojans according to the well-established tradition; further, the end of the Trojan war through a treaty between Trojans and Greeks may be meant to suggest a possible future harmonious blending of West and East under the Romans (Saïd 2000, 177-85; cf. Desideri 1978, 496-503). Likewise, the heroes' deeds and cults in Philostratus are consistent with the religious policy of the imperial family (in which worship of heroes played an important role) and with the construction of the cultural identity of Greek *élites* in the Roman Empire; cf. several papers in Berenson Maclean, Bradshaw Aitken 2004 and Berenson Maclean, Bradshaw Aitken 2001, lxxvi-lxxxvii.

or as eyewitness accounts (in addition to Dictys from Crete and Dares the Phrygian, i.e. Greek and Trojan soldiers, e.g. Protesilaos in Philostratus' *Heroicus*).[11] This framing came with the *corollarium* that, in contrast with Homer and other archaic poets, who had not actually been present at Troy during the war, eyewitnesses could offer *historia verior*. The finding of lost-long documents, usually written in an ancient language, is a common *escamotage* in *pseudo-epigraphica* and forgeries, from the Pythagorean texts supposedly recovered from the grave of Numa to such recent examples as the world bestseller *The Name of the Rose* (1980) by Umberto Eco.[12]

Both devices, the finding of a long-lost document and the point of view as an eyewitness, are exploited in the *Ephemeris*, which is presented as the journal (ἐφημερίς, i.e. ὑπομνήματα, *commentarium*) of Dictys of Crete, the alleged official war-chronicler of Idomeneus, king of Crete, and of Meriones. Thus Dictys' chronicle, according to the prefatory letter and prologue that form the beginning of the Latin version,[13] was found in its author's grave in Cnossos in 66 CE and then sent to the emperor Nero, who had it transliterated from the 'Phoenician script' into the Greek one. Finally, Septimius supposedly obtained a copy of the Greek text and translated it into Latin. Dictys, then, as a member of the Greek expedition, is positioned to correct Homer's imaginative account by 'faithfully' recounting his experiences and those of other eyewitnesses during the Trojan War

---

11 Philostratus' *Heroicus* is structured as a dialogue between a Phoenician merchant and a man who tends a vineyard around the tomb and sanctuary of the hero Protesilaus, who regularly appears at his own sanctuary. The conceit of the work is, then, that the vinedresser reports to the Phoenician the risen Protesilaus' account of the Trojan War; vd. e.g. Berenson Maclean, Bradshaw Aitken 2001, xxxvii-xvix and *passim*.

12 Plut. *Num*. 22; Plin. *NH* 11.2.84-87 (cf. the tablet supposedly written by Heracles excavated from Alcmena's grave on Agesilaus' orders, Plut. *De Gen*. 5.577 E-F, 7.578 F-G, though the origin and scope of the legend are debated; cf. Parker 2010). As for fictional works, Antonius Diogenes prefaced *The Wonders Beyond Thule* (1st cent. CE) with a letter explaining that he was simply editing the adventures of certain Deinias inscribed on wooden tablets and found by one of Alexander the Great's soldiers at Tyre. The similar trope in the *Acta* involves a prefatory letter addressed to Sallust by Cornelius Nepos in which the latter claims to have translated the chronicle of Dares the Phrygian into Latin. Cf. also Philo of Byblos (2nd cent. CE), who claimed to have found and translated into Greek a Semitic history of the Phoenicians dating from before the Trojan War (cf. *FGH* III.C.790). On literary forgery of this sort in the ancient world, see e.g. Speyer 1971; Hansen 2003 (with discussion of devices typical of such works); cf. also Nì-Mheallaig 2008.

13 Cf. *Ephem. prologus*; as for the relationship between the prologue and the prefatory letter in the Latin *Ephemeris*, most scholars agree that the former was part of Dictys' Greek original that was included in the Latin translation while the prefatory letter is a wholesale invention of Septimius; cf. Griffin 1908, 335; Merkle 1989, 91-113. Timpanaro 1987, 202-13, drew attention to some overlaps and contradictions between the prologue and the prefatory letter in the Latin *Ephemeris* and proposed that they point to two distinct ancient editions, one containing only the prologue and the other only the prefatory letter, that were combined during the transmission of the text.

and in its aftermath.[14] To begin with, Dictys offers the 'real' version of events such as Achilles' quarrel with Agamemnon and Hector's death, in which 'real' means different from Homer. This conceit is both Homeric revisionism and a device for the author to insert novelistic elements and literary allusions; thus Dictys combines a variety of sources, including tragedy and mythography, that would appeal to his readers (see §§ 4-5). Also, to support his claim of being an eyewitness, Dictys claims knowledge that someone who fought at Troy would possess, e.g. details of battle formations and strategies (military strategies were, moreover, also the subject of actual war chronicles and historiographical works in antiquity) and a catalogue of the Greek ships and troops reminiscent of the famous passage in *Iliad* 2. Incidentally, Dictys' "Catalogue of Ships" appears early in the conflict (*Ephem*. 1.17), logically, as the Greeks are preparing their expedition against Troy, whereas the analogous Homeric passage occurs during the main narrative of the *Iliad* in the ninth year of the war.[15] The framing of the *Ephemeris* as an historiographical work also, again, is consistent with the rationalistic versions of the events and explanations for their causes that it presents. Thus, for example, the gods never intervene directly in the narrative, a sharp contrast with their roles in shaping the course of the war in the Homeric and Cyclic poems.

3 The Style of the "Troy Romances"

Finally, Dictys and Septimius appear to have carefully chosen the title, lexicon, and style of their texts in order to frame them as war chronicles. Thus Septimius refers to his work using the word *annales* in the prologue and the term that serves as its title, *ephemeris*, in the dedicatory letter. The latter term presumably translates the Greek ἐφημερίς (as mentioned, 'military record', 'diary', 'journal of a war' and a synonym of ὑπομνήματα) used in the original; for though the relevant passages are not preserved among the papyri,

---

14　It should be noted that Dictys' text adds verisimilitude by presenting, when possible, a Crete-centric version of the story (e.g. Helen leaves with Paris while Menelaus is in Crete in Book 1; Orestes, Menelaus, Odysseus etc. visit Crete on *nostoi* in Book 6.2); cf. e.g. Venini 1981, 169. On the other hand, the role of the Cretan king, Idomeneus, is far from prominent.

15　Cf. Apollod. *Epit*. 3.11-13; see e.g. Venini 1981, 166; owing to the pretension of writing a war-chronicle, Dictys also extends the time required to prepare the expedition, so that the main narrative of the *Iliad*, from Chryses' visit to the Greek camp to Hector's funeral, is presented as occurring, not during the tenth, but rather, and more plausibly, during ninth year of the siege and the tenth year after preparations for the expedition commenced; cf. Merkle 1989, 124 fn. 109.

some ancient sources indeed refer to Dictys' text in this way;[16] and the word elsewhere describes the kind of records kept by Alexander the Great's staff.[17] Consistent with this framing, both Dictys' and Septimus' texts feature elements typical of historiography, including a prologue, a statement of the author's historiographical methodology (cf. the Herodotean, Thucydidean, and Polybian principles of αὐτοψία, ἀκοή, and ἐμπειρία), and a σφραγίς (*P.Oxy.* 4944, 93-109; *Ephem.* 5.17).[18] Lastly, the simple prose style of these works seems consciously chosen to reflect what readers would expect in an ἐφημερίς or *commentarium*. Dictys' text, for example, shows a clear preference for parataxis, being composed largely of simple sentences linked by particles such as the connective καί and the adversatives δέ (and also οὔτε... οὔτε / οὐδέ), while subordinate clauses are rare and participial phrases often occur where a more literary account might employ subordinate clauses (e.g. genitive absolutes or circumstantial participles instead of temporal or causal secondary clauses). This unadorned style is typical of the simple later Greek *koine* prose, as is the use of the articular infinitive, also found in Dictys (*P.Oxy.* 4943, l. 5). Likewise, the present tense is frequent, including in the historical sense, as again is typical of the war chronicle *genre*, though aorist and imperfect forms are occasionally found. On the whole, then, the diction is plain and at times repetitive, with no particular effort having been made to avoid hiatus (see *P.Oxy.* 4943, ll. 3, 7, 9), though there is some evidence of refinement in, for example, the usually symmetrical word order.[19]

In sum, the style of Dictys' and Septimius' Trojan War accounts is consistent with both the (alleged) *genre* and the style of the historical period to which these texts belong. Each naturally displays certain idiosyncrasies. Dictys' fragments, for example, include significant Homeric *glossae*, in particular for the key terms μῆνις, νόσος, νόστος (in the *iunctura* κακὸς νόστος), and λαός, possibly meant as literary allusions to be identified by cultivated readers, alongside lexical items (e.g. ἐμφοροῦμαι, ἡμερῶν διαγενομένων) and usages typi-

---

16 *FGrH* 49 T1.1 ἔγραψεν Ἐφημερίδα (ἔστι δὲ τὰ μεθ᾽ Ὅμηρον καταλογάδην ἐν βιβλίοις <θ> Ἰλιακά) Τρωικοῦ διακόσμου.

17 Cf. Plut. *Alex.* 23.4; 76.1; 77.1; Arr. *Anab.* 7.25 (quoting the βασιλεῖοι ἐφημερίδες, possibly redacted under the direction of the ἀρχιγραμματεύς Eumenes of Cardias); Ath. 10.434b.

18 Over time, the concepts of αὐτοψία and ἀκοή became common terms in historiography, even if in reference to an empty *topos*, the most significant example being Ctesias (cf. the irony in Luc. *Hist. conscrib.* 39); on the evolution of these concepts in Greek historiography cf. e.g. Nenci 1953.

19 See Hatzilambrou 2009, 84-8 and Hatzilambrou, Obbink 2009, 90-1.

cal of Hellenistic prose and, again, *koine* Greek.[20] Septimius seems to have sought to elevate the stylistic level of Dictys' simple Greek prose, embellishing it with rhetorical features and allusions to Sallust (and, in a few instances, to Cicero), in this way as well shaping his *Ephemeris* as an historiographical work.[21]

4 Dictys' Narrative Strategies

As mentioned, Dictys in many respects follows the chronological sequence of events as it is presented in the epics but also adopts some changes that, once more, support the illusion that his is a reliable historical record. Thus he provides alternative accounts of such key episodes as Achilles' wrath and his conflict with Agamemnon, the battle around the Greek ships, and Hector's death and the return of his body.[22] These versions usually combine various sources including, as well as the epics (including the Cycle), lyrics, Attic tragedy, mythographical works, Hellenistic literature, and various *scholia* and commentaries. The coexistence of versions of a myth or tale is, of course, a common feature of many literary genres; well-known examples include the story of Oedipus in tragedy, Stesichorus' poetry, and the Cyclic poems (e.g. regarding Jocasta/Epicasta's destiny, marriage, and various children or no children with Oedipus). Examples of Homeric revisionism closer in time to those found in Dictys include Dio's (*Or.* 11) depiction of Paris as the legitimate husband of Helen, Hector as the killer of Achilles, and the Trojan War as a conflict concluding with a peace treaty between the Trojans and Greeks brokered by Helen. Similarly, in Philostratus' *Heroicus*, Hephaestus has no opportunity to make a new armor for Achilles because Patroclus never wears the latter's armor into battle, and the ethnicity of the Memnon who kills Antilochus is Trojan rather than Ethiopian. These efforts to 'correct' Homer thus not only frame the *Ephemeris* as an authentic war chronicle but also, as mentioned, provide opportunities to insert new adventures, poetic allusions, and various literary devices that audiences of the time would appreciate. My particular

---

20   See Hatzilambrou 2009, 84, 86-7; cf. also Hatzilambrou, Obbink 2009, 90-1 and recently Ruta 2018 (esp. 33-43) on the linguistic features of the papyri that preserve the fragments of Dictys and their consistency with the prose of the time.

21   On Septimius' quotations and allusions to Sallust, see already Pratje 1874; Brünnert 1883; cf. Merkle 1989, 118-22.

22   An exhaustive list of differences between Dictys and Homer in their descriptions of the events that transpired at Troy can be found e.g. in Venini 1981 and Timpanaro 1987. The same scenario is found in Dares' *Acta*, in which Achilles and Agamemnon do not quarrel, Hector is killed early in the war, and Aeneas betrays Troy to the Greeks (the latter's perfidy being an early and well-established strand of the epic tradition).

focus in the following discussion is on the characterisation of some of the heroes in the *Ephemeris* through the combination of various established traditions and the authors' invention, characterisation, which, I would argue, plays a key-role in the *Ephemeris*.[23]

For example, the 'love story' between Achilles and Priam's daughter Polyxena has been identified as a conspicuous innovation[24] (in any case, it is already found in Lycophron and, perhaps, appeared even earlier)[25] and in this part of the narrative, which extends from *Ephem*. 3.2 to 4.13, the hero behaves completely differently than he does in the *Iliad*. Thus, he does not hesitate to suggest withdrawing from battle (and is, as a consequence, suspected of treachery by the Greek army, 4.10, 13, 15) if the Trojans allow him to depart with Polyxena after he is smitten by her (3.2).[26] This motivation to kill Hector substitutes for his very different desire in the *Iliad* to avenge Patroclus;[27] also, while Achilles is depicted in both the *Ephemeris* and the *Iliad* as being torn by contrasting feelings, in the former, the tension is between his love for Polyxena and his sense of duty, while in the latter it is between duty and personal honour (particularly in *Il.* 1 and 9). Thus Merkle 1989, 200 observed that "Die Liebe zu Polyxena ist also Ausgangspunkt, Endpunkt und wesentliche Motivation für die Taten des Peliden". However, the love story episode is perhaps less of a plot device and more of an opportunity to create a striking contrast between the two texts, with the *Ephemeris* portraying Achilles in more than one occasion (also before the "Polyxena section") as an especially controversial and negative personality stripped (though not consistently) of much of the nobility of the Homeric Achilles. To this end, Dictys both picks up on a hint found in Homer (in particular at *Il*. 1.187-189, where Achilles is only restrained from killing Agamemnon by Athena) that the dominant hero can be dangerously

---

23   The analysis draws on both the version attributed to Dictys and Septimius' Latin *Ephemeris*; this approach is both necessary given the fragmentary status of the Greek original and at the same time justifiable given the apparent faithfulness of Septimius' version to Dictys', notwithstanding the efforts to elevate the latter's prose discussed above (see § 2); certainty regarding the consistency between the two texts is, of course, impossible given the incompleteness of Dictys' text.

24   See Lentano 2018 (see also Milazzo 1984, 6 and *passim*).

25   The episode of Achilles' demand for the sacrifice of Polyxena in the *Iliou Persis* does not necessarily imply an erotic liaison between them; moreover, scholars tend to see this romantic element as Hellenistic or later, cf. Fantuzzi 2012, 14-15.

26   However, after hearing the conditions that Hector imposes on such an outcome – which include either declaring publicly his betrayal of the Greeks or killing some of them – Achilles is enraged swears to kill him (3.3).

27   Later, after Achilles has indeed killed Hector, Priam offers him Polyxena's hand in exchange for the restitution of the body, but Achilles dismisses the proposal (3.27), in what has been identified by Timpanaro 1987, 182 as one of the many *aprosdoketa* of the *Ephemeris*.

impulsive, but also invents for him contradictory and less-than-he-roic motivations (i.e. love or lust).[28] Similarly, in the *Ephemeris* the hero is concerned about the sufferings of the soldiers during the plague (2.31) but nevertheless withdraws from the war shortly there-after, leaving the Greek soldiers exposed to attacks by the Trojans (for which there is again an Homeric parallel).[29] Also, Achilles' with-drawal in the *Ephemeris* is motivated partly by Agamemnon's demand that he gives up Hippodamia (Dictys' name for Briseis) and partly, and even less justifiably, by Agamemnon's failure to invite him to a dinner attended by the other Greek champions (2.36),[30] a slight that induces him to attempt a treacherous attack on his fellow Greeks (2.37).[31] When Achilles re-joins the fight against the Trojans, he is motivated, not by the desire for revenge over the death Patroclus (who has not yet died; cf. 3.20), but by the entreaties of his friends and the realisation that the soldiers are not responsible for the situ-ation (2.52). Thus, the considerable modification of Achilles' charac-ter in this manner, especially the emphasis on his unpredictability, served to both offer an alternative to the depiction of the hero in the *Iliad* (and Epic Cycle) and to add romance and adventure, aspects of the tale apparently considered desirable by Dictys' target audience.

An analogous principle is also at play, I suggest, in Dictys' con-struction of the opposition between the civilised Greeks and barba-rous Trojans. Among the main themes in Dictys' chronicle, scholars have singled out the recurrent, though not entirely consistent, oppo-sition of the Greeks, often called *nostri*, to the Trojans, often called *barbari*, in what is presented as a clash between a civilised society and, well, a 'barbaric' one. Thus, for example, the Greeks collectively during their councils (*Ephem.* 1 and 2) and their embassy seeking the return of Helen reach unanimous decisions (*consensu omnium*, 1.16) and try to find a peaceful resolution to Paris' offence and individual-

---

28 The Achilles *qua* lover motif appears in the Epic Cycle (meeting with Helen in *Cypria*, love of Penthesilea in *Aithiopis*); as a result of Dictys' changes to this version the hero is both more driven by love than in Homer/the Epic Cycle with respect to Polyxena and also less driven by love with respect to Penthesilea and Briseis/Hippodamia.

29 As it is well-known, in *Iliad* Book 1 Achilles prompts to call the meeting at which Calchas reveals the cause of the plague, and then, at the same meeting, he announces his withdrawal from the conflict.

30 The pettiness of Achilles regarding the dinner insult (as Timpanaro 1987, 179 com-ments, "la magnanima ira di Achille si è trasformata in bizza, in permalosità") is not unprecedented nor Dictys' invention, but traces back at least as far back as Aristotle (*Rhet*. 2.24), though, of course, Dictys' choice to deploy this motif was driven by his agenda to distance his narrative from other Trojan War narratives.

31 Interestingly, whatever its cause, Achilles' absence is not responsible for as many Greek casualties in the *Ephemeris* as it is in the *Iliad*, and the Greeks even win some battles in his absence (*Ephem.* 2.41, 42, 46, for which there is, again, a precedent in the *Iliad*, cf. especially Book 13.

ly deliver effective and touching speeches, as do, e.g. Palamedes and Odysseus (1.6 and 2.22, respectively). Priam and/or his young sons, by contrast, disrespect their opponents by interrupting Palamedes' speech, twice break armed into the council of the Trojans and compel the Trojan elders not to return Helen to the Greeks, and are only prevented by Antenor from kidnapping and killing Greek envoys (1.6, 7, 11, 2.20-22). The characterisation of the two sides extends to their methods of warfare: the Greeks fight in proper battle formation and following the orders of their leaders, while the Trojans rush shouting onto the battlefield, lack discipline, and often attack treacherously. Thus, at one point, Pandarus, as he does in the *Iliad*, wounds Menelaus while the latter is engaged in a duel with Paris (*Ephem.* 2.40), and at another the Trojan *barbari* attack the Greeks during the winter truce (2.42; cf. e.g. 3.13, 17 and 4.5, but see at 3.15 Achilles attacks Hector performing *dolum...ex improviso*). As has been seen, this contrast, though largely maintained on a general level, is not entirely consistent across characters, situations, or points in the narrative. To begin with, the Greeks are depicted as responsible for earlier disreputable behaviour, such as the abductions of Europa, Medea, and Io (as Aeneas reminds them at *Ephem.* 2.20). More importantly, the assassination of Palamedes, who is a particular favorite of the soldiers, by Odysseus and Diomedes early on (2.15) foreshadows conflict and shameful conduct by them and other Greeks, who, as mentioned earlier, become gradually more prone to cruelty and treachery as Dictys' narrative proceeds (a negative behaviour notably well attested in the Epic Cycle). Thus, they storm Troy in defiance of a treaty (5.10) and during the ensuing sack of the city slaughter Trojans even as they for their lives at the altars of gods (5.12 and 5.13). Consistent with the overall trend in the behaviour of the Greeks, the individual heroes' despicable characteristics tend to become more prominent as the narrative proceeds. The somewhat paradoxical result of this trend (of which Achilles is the prime example) is that the civilised Greeks vs. barbaric Trojans construct evident in the first two books becomes less pronounced in the following four books. In fact, most of the heroes are presented ambiguously, with both positive and negative aspects, and the latter often prevailing.[32] Indeed, only a few characters remain consistently virtuous in Dictys' narrative, particularly Palamedes and, but for an episode, Ajax (see in detail below, § 5) on the Greek side and, on the Trojan side, Antenor and es-

---

32   Of course this is not unparalleled and, as it is often the case with Dictys, builds upon an element already found in Homer; on the other hand in several cases the negative aspects of Dictys' heroes overshadow the positive ones, e.g. Agamemnon, who is accused, *inter alia*, of having plotted with Diomedes and Odysseus to kill Palamedes, thus fixing on the extreme negative aspects of the Homeric Agamemnon and, to some extent, Menelaus.

pecially Aeneas, who evolves from a relentless belligerent to an advocate of the Greeks' truce proposal.[33] But these are exceptions to the general rule; the behaviour of Dictys' heroes, including the Greek ones, as just observed, becomes largely negative by the end of the war. Passages in Homer and later texts may have inspired this representation of the Greeks and Trojans,[34] but Dictys-Septimius appears to have emphasised it in the service of a specific agenda, perhaps, as has been proposed, to reflect the author's pessimistic view of war;[35] alternatively, more compelling is Timpanaro's explanation that it reflects instead Dictys' taste for *aprosdoketa*[36] or, I suggest, the hypothesis that the character-portrayal is crucial to achieve distinctive features of Dictys' work, i.e. correction of Homer and insertion of adventure and 'romance'.

5 Homer, Dictys, and the Epic Heroes

In other words, Dictys' reuse and recombination of ancient sources and traditions, including alternatives to Homer, with wholesale invention and new ways of ordering the material in Homer and the Cyclic epics, served to characterise the heroes in distinctive ways, which in turn, I suggest, was a crucial means to the key achievement of the *Ephemeris*, namely Dictys' reworking, 'correction', and supplementing (with adventure and 'romance') of the Trojan War tradition.

---

33 Nestor and Idomeneus acquit themselves nobly but play only minor roles (notwithstanding the relationship of Idomeneus and Dictys, the latter being a soldier of Idomeneus' army). Hector, while at one point makes the difficult decision to oppose returning Helen because he respects her status as a suppliant and indicates that he is ashamed of his brother Paris's crimes and ready to return the gold and goods stolen by him (2.25), he also, as noted above, attempts to compel Achilles to commit acts of treachery (in a way that seems utterly inconsistent with Hector's depiction in either the *Iliad* or the *Cypria*). Other characters are portrayed in a consistently negative light, such as Priam and his other sons (especially Paris), who are referred to in the *Ephemeris* as *reguli* ('petty kings').

34 See e.g. *Ephem.* 2.38: "composite Graecis ac singulis per distributionem imperia ducum exsequentibus, contra sine modo atque ordine Barbaris ruentibus". Timpanaro 1987, 184 suggested that this passage was inspired by Homer (e.g. at *Il.* 3.1-19, where the Trojans advance calling out like birds vs. the Greeks proceeding in silence), the opposition of Greeks vs. barbarians in warfare is, of course, found also in Herodotus, cf. Merkle 1989, 142 fn. 114.

35 Thought the (alleged) Cretan origin of Dictys may have determined a pro-Greek perspective, the Greeks' behaviour, as mentioned, deteriorates toward the end of the siege; an important factor to be considered is that in the late 1st BCE to 2nd cent. CE especially, from the Roman perspective traditionally, the Greeks are, of course, the 'bad guys' and the Trojans, as Rome's (and especially Caesar's) supposed ancestors, the 'good guys'.

36 See, respectively, Merkle 1989, 241-2 (cf. also Merkle 2004, 137-8) and Timpanaro 1987, 181-3, and, subsequently, Merkle 1996, 570-1.

Following, though in different terms and in a different context (cf. also § 2), in the steps of earlier poets such as Stesichorus, the Greek tragedians, and Hellenistic authors, Dictys' narrative 'corrects' Homer by humanising Achilles and other major figures in the Trojan war, providing them with different motivations and at the same time introducing unexpected twists and turns in the familiar story and allusions to a range of literary traditions. It must be noted that the versions of the heroes presented in the *Ephemeris* may be not only less noble than those in the Homeric version, as in the case of Achilles, but also more noble or more relevant, as in the case of Ajax (already, of course, an important hero in the *Iliad*) and Palamedes (the latter, though completely absent from the Homeric poems, was an important figure already in the Cyclic version and in later traditions, cf. Stesichorus, Pindar, and tragedy).[37] This reinvention of the story is, then, a key strategy in the *Ephemeris*, and it suggests some interesting parallels with other re-imaginings of the Homeric narratives, such as Philostratus' aforementioned *Heroicus*, which also presents a flattering version of a Greek hero participating in the Trojan War based, again, on a combination of alternative sources including the Epic Cycle, Greek tragedy, and mythography and invention. Exploring the parallels between the two writers a bit further, each turns the spotlight on heroes who are marginal in or entirely missing from the Homeric narratives, not only Palamedes but also Protesilaus in the *Heroicus*, two heroes who are killed early in the war,[38] before the main story of the *Iliad* begins. Dictys' and Philostratus' inventions, then, capitalise on the fact that, in Homer, Protesilaus is barely mentioned and Palamedes, an important hero in many other traditions, is not mentioned at all. In the *Ephemeris*, that shares Philostratus' *Heroicus* interest in the hero,[39] Palamedes is chosen as

---

37 Palamedes' story, as narrated in non-Homeric sources, including the *Cypria*, Stesichorus (*PMG* 213), Pindar (fr. 260 S.M.), tragedy (Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides all composed a tragedy labelled *Palamedes*), and the well-known Gorgias' *Defence of Palamedes*, included invention of letters, seeking Helen's hand in marriage and unmasking Odysseus' feigned madness to prevent the latter from evading participation in the Trojan War; this latter act motivates Odysseus to plot Palamedes' death. Scholars have been debating whether the tradition about Palamedes in the Epic Cycle is late or whether there are other reasons for the omission of Palamedes from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, for example that he and Odysseus shared many traits, being therefore incompatible (or 'rivals') in the Homeric narrative and also the fact that the Homeric Odysseus is too virtuous to plot Palamedes' death; cf. e.g. Woodford 1994; Mestre 2018; on the relationship between the Epic Cycle and Homer see Burgess 2001, 132-43, with previous discussions.

38 E.g. in Dictys' version at *Ephem*. 2.15 and 3.11, respectively.

39 Philostratus makes him the favorite fellow hero of Protesilaus; on Palamedes see also Philostr. *VA* 4.14. In the *Heroicus* (43.11-14) it is even stated that Odysseus made it a condition of his confiding to Homer the true story of the Trojan war that Homer would suppress all mention of Palamedes. Palamedes seems to have been of much in-

a member of the delegation sent to Troy to demand the restitution of Helen, where he delivers an impressive speech (1.4-6); in the *Iliad*, by contrast, neither mention of the delegation (*Il*. 3.205-6; 11.139-40) includes him in it. Palamedes is also chosen to command part of the army (*Ephem*. 1.16, 19) alongside Achilles, Ajax, Idomeneus, and Odysseus; and he and Ajax alone consistently maintain the affection of the soldiers, who express a preference for Palamedes over Agamemnon as their commander (2.15). A second strategy that both Dictys and Philostratus employ is a running parallel between the dominant Iliadic figure of Achilles and another major hero, Ajax in the *Ephemeris* and Protesilaus in the *Heroicus*.[40] Indeed, it seems to me that Dictys uses a variety of narrative strategies to depict Ajax as the 'best of the Achaeans'. The present article lacks the scope for a full account of this effort, but I draw attention in the first place to the fact that Ajax in the *Ephemeris* is associated with Achilles in friendship, kinship,[41] and especially in battle. For example, the two fight side-by-side (rather than Ajax being with Teucer, as in the *Iliad*) against Sarpedon (*Ephem.* 2.11), advance similar tactics on different parts of the battlefield, at one point dividing the entire army between them (2.3), distinguish themselves in fighting on the front lines, and rout their enemies.[42] Thus, by presenting Ajax as a parallel and/or an alternative to Achilles on the battlefield[43] as well as in other contexts, particularly in council and embassies,[44] Dictys makes Ajax an outstanding hero both in battle (as he was traditionally) and in other fields,

---

terest to both Philostratus and Dictys, who share other similarities as regards the revision of the characteristics and actions of a few heroes of the Trojan war (see below as to Protesilaus and Ajax); a fact that begs the question, which however falls beyond the scope of this paper, of the relationship between Philostratus and Dictys as regards the rewriting of the events related to the Trojan War (and of the significance of Palamedes in general to the writers of the Second Sophistic).

40   Philostratus, possibly drawing on Homeric hints and ancient sources (i.e. the *Cypria*; *Il*. 15.704-725; Apollod. *Epit*. 4.46, cf. also 3.31), makes Achilles and Protesilaus friends from the same hometown and depicts them generally and in specific passages as sharing similarities in their stories, military skills, deaths, cult status, and roles as 'protectors of the Greeks'; Berenson Maclean, Bradshaw Aitkens 2001, lix aptly describe Philostratus' aim here as "the elevation of Protesilaus' heroic status through his close association with Achilles."

41   *Ephem*. 4.3; on such a tradition in literature and figurative arts see e.g. Apollod. *Myth*. 2.6.4. and *LIMC* s.v. "Aias".

42   Cf. also the matching expeditions by the two heroes in territories close to Troy narrated and then assessed collectively in *Ephem*. 2.17-19.

43   This strategy even occasionally includes reduplicating actions of the latter, e.g. *Ephem*. 2.27, referring to what in the *Iliad* (20.90-92) are described as attacks on Aineias' herds; cf. also Venini 1981, 171-2.

44   Dictys' inventions possibly draw on depictions of Achilles as a skilled orator (e.g. in the council of the Greeks in *Il*. 1 and in the embassy in *Il*. 9) and rare Homeric hints at such qualities in Ajax, in particular *Il*. 1.144-145, where he is described as an ἀρχὸς ἀνὴρ βουλήφορος along with Odysseus, Idomeneus and, notably, Achilles.

such as rhetoric. Particularly noteworthy in this context is Dictys' purposeful recasting of Ajax's death so as to make him an (almost)[45] entirely honorable hero. Thus, in contrast with the traditional story that the hero kills himself because Odysseus rather than he is awarded the dead Achilles' armor, Dictys' Ajax is found dead in the midst of a dispute with Diomedes (who soon withdraws his own claim in favor of Ajax's) and Odysseus regarding which of them should receive the Palladion (which in this context takes the place of Achilles' armor) after the Greeks take Troy. Agamemnon, Menelaus, and Odysseus are all suspected of having had a hand in Ajax's death, which the Greek soldiers compare explicitly to that of Palamedes,[46] referring to both as beloved figures treacherously killed by, apparently, the same envious trio of Greek leaders (*Ephem*. 5.15). As the narration of these events concludes, Dictys in an aside ponders whether the war would have had a different outcome had Ajax died earlier, thereby casting him, rather than Achilles, as the *sine quo non* for the Greek victory.

Bibliography

Berenson Maclean, J.K.; Bradshaw Aitken, E. (2001). *Flavius Philostratus*. *Heroikos*. Atlanta.

Berenson Maclean, J.K.; Bradshaw Aitken, E. (eds) (2004). *Philostratus's Heroikos. Religion and Cultural Identity in the Third Century C.E.* Atlanta.

Beschorner, A. (1992). *Untersuchungen zu Dares Phrygius*. Tübingen.

Bowersock, G.W. (1994). *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian*. Berkeley.

Brünnert, W. (1883). *Sallust und Dictys Cretensis*. Erfurt.

Burgess, J.S. (2001). *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Baltimore; London.

Cameron, A. (1980). "Poetae Novelli". *HSClPh*, 84, 127-75.

Cameron, A. (2004). *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*. Oxford.

Chatzis, A. (1914). *Der Philosoph und Grammatiker Ptolemaios Chennos. Leben, Schriftstellerei und Fragmente (mit Ausschluss der Aristotelesbiographie). Erster Teil. Einleitung und Text*. Paderborn.

Dederich, A. (1837). *Dictys Cretensis sive Lucii Septimii Ephermerides belli Troiani*. Bonnae.

Desideri, P. (1978). *Dione di Prusa: un intellettuale greco nell'impero romano*. Messina; Firenze.

Eisenhut, W. (1968). "Zum neuen Diktys-Papyrus". *RhM*, 112, 114-19.

---

[45]   At *Ephem*. 5.13 Ajax loses self-control and threatens to kill the Greeks who oppose awarding him the Palladion (Dictys attributes essentially every hero some flaw, even to Ajax, a fact that could be taken as a kind of realism, though, again, the Homeric heroes were not flawless themselves).

[46]   In doing so, Dictys also emphasises the high morality of Ajax by paralleling the hero and his unfortunate destiny with that of the virtuous Palamedes.

Eisenhut, W. (ed.) (1973). *Dictyis Cretensis Ephemeridos belli Troiani libri a Lucio Septimio ex Graeco in Latinum sermonem translati. Accedunt papyri Dictyis Graeci in Aegypto inventae*. 2a ed. Lipsiae.

Eisenhut, W. (1983). "Spätantike Troja-Erzählungen, mit einem Ausblick auf die mittelalterliche Troja-Literatur". *Mitt. Lat. Jb.*, 18, 1-28.

Fantuzzi, M. (2012). *Achilles' in Love. Intertextual Studies*. Oxford.

Gabba, E. (1981). "True History and False History in Classical Antiquity". *JRS*, 71, 50-62.

Gill, C.; Wiseman, T.P. (eds) (1993). *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*. Exeter.

Griffin, N. (1907). *Dares and Dictys: An Introduction to the Study of the Medieval Versions of the Story of Troy*. Baltimore.

Griffin, N. (1908). "The Greek Dictys". *AJPh*, 29, 329-35.

Grossardt, P. (1998). *Die Trugreden in der Odyssee und ihre Rezeption in der antiken Literatur*. Bern.

Horsfall, N. (2008-09). "Dictys's Ephemeris and the Parody of Scholarship". *ICS*, 33-34, 41-63.

Hansen, W. (2003). "Strategies of Authentication in Ancient Popular Fiction". Panayotakis, S.; Zimmerman, M.; Keulen, W. (eds), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*. Leiden, 301-14.

Hatzilambrou, R. (2009). "4943. Dictys Cretensis, Bellum Troianum II 29-30". Obbink, D.; Gonis, N. (eds), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, LXXIII*. London, 82-88.

Hatzilambrou, R.; Obbink D. (2009). "4944. Dictys Cretensis, Bellum Troianum V 15-17". Obbink, D.; Gonis, N. (eds), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, LXXIII. London, 88-103.

Ihm, M. (1909). "Der griechische und lateinische Dictys". *Hermes*, 44, 1-22.

Jeffreys, E.; Croke, B.; Scott, R. (1990). *Studies in John Malalas*. Sidney.

Kim, L. (2010). *Homer Between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature*. Cambridge.

Lapini, W. (1997). "I libri dell'Ephemeris di Ditti-Settimio". *ZPE*, 117, 85-9.

Lentano, M. (2018). "Che con Amore al fine combatteo». Achille e Polissena in Darete Frigio e Ditti Cretese". Brescia, G.; Lentano, M.; Scafoglio, G.; Zanusso, V. (eds), *Revival and Revision of the Trojan Myth. Studies on Dictys Cretensis and Dares Phrygius*. Hildesheim, 233-56.

Merkle, S. (1989). *Die Ephemeris belli Troiani des Diktys von Kreta*. Frankfurt am Main; Bern; New York; Paris.

Merkle, S. (1996). "The Truth and Nothing but the Truth: *Dictys and Dares*". Schemling, G. (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Leiden, 563-80.

Merkle, S. (1999). "News from the Past: Dictys and Dares on the Trojan War". Hoffmann, H. (ed.), *Latin Fiction*. London; New York, 131-40.

Mestre, F.; Gómez, P. (2018). "The *Heroikos* of Philostratus: A Novel of Heroes and More". Futre Pinheiro, M.P.; Konstan, D.; Duncan MacQueen, B. (eds), *Cultural Crossroads in the Ancient Novel*. Berlin; Boston, 107-22.

Milazzo, A.M. (1984-87). "Achille e Polissena in Ditti Cretese: un romanzo nel romanzo?". *Le Forme e la Storia*, 5, 5-26

Nenci, G. (1953). "Il motivo dell'autopsia nella storiografia greca". *SCO*, 3, 14-46.

Nì-Mheallaig, K. (2008). "Pseudo-Documentarism and the Limits of Ancient Fiction". *AJPh*, 129, 403-31.

Panayotakis S.; Zimmerman M.; Keulen, W. (eds) (2003). *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*. Leiden; New York.

Parker, R. (2010). "Agesilaus and the Bones of Alcmena". Nesselrath, H.-G. (ed.), *Plutarch. On the Daimonion of Socrates*. Tübingen, 129-37.

Pratje, H. (1874). *Quaestiones Sallustianae ad Lucium Septimium et Sulpicium Severum Gaii Sallusti Crispi imitatores spectantes* [Dissertation]. Göttingen.

Ruta, A. (2018). "I nuovi papiri greci di Ditti Cretese e la traduzione latina di Settimio: osservazioni su lingua, stile e 'intenzione' letteraria". Brescia, G.; Lentano, M.; Scafoglio, G.; Zanusso, V. (eds), *Revival and Revision of the Trojan Myth. Studies on Dictys Cretensis and Dares Phrygius*. Hildesheim, 23-51.

Saïd, S. (2000). "Dio's Use of Mythology". Swain, S. (ed.), *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*. Oxford, 161-86.

Schetter, W. (1987). "Dares und Dracontius über die Vorgeschichte des trojanischen Krieges". *Hermes*, 115, 211-31.

Schmeling, G.L. (1996). *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Leiden; New York; Köln.

Speyer, W. (1971). *Die literarische Falschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum: Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung*. München.

Timpanaro, S. (1987). "Sulla composizione e la tecnica narrativa dell'*Ephemeris* di Ditti-Settimio". *Filologia e forme letterarie. Studi offerti a Francesco Della Corte IV*. Urbino, 169-215.

Tomberg, K.H. (1968). *Die Kaine Historia des Ptolemaeus Chennos. Eine literaturhistorische und quellenkritische Untersuchung*. Bonn.

Venini, P. (1981). "Ditti cretese e Omero". *Mem. Ist. Lomb.*, 37, 161-98.

Woodford, S. (1994). "Palamedes Seeks Revenge". *JHS*, 114, 164-9.

Zanusso, V. (2015). "Introduzione". Lelli, E. (a cura di), *Ditti di Creta. L'altra Iliade*. Milano, 13-148.