The Classical Review

VOLUME 53 NO. 1

2003

ILIAD I

S. PULLEYN (ed.): *Homer:* Iliad *I*. Pp. xi + 304. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Cased, £40 (Paper, £12.99). ISBN: 0-19-924279-8 (0-19-872186-2 pbk).

Pulleyn and Oxford have produced a fine volume, similar to J. Griffin's *Homer: Iliad IX* (Oxford, 1995) but aimed at a wider audience. The novice will benefit from the introduction's sections on Homeric dialect and metre, as well as from the English translation facing the Greek text. P.'s commentary is more than twice as long as Griffin's, with substantial technical discussion primarily for advanced scholars offered in bracketed sections. Both the general index and the Greek index are far more detailed than those of *Iliad IX*, and there is a glossary of Greek vocabulary for Book I.

P. treats many complex problems with admirable clarity and judgement. His discussion of γλαυκῶπις (pp. 183–4), for example, first neatly separates the two linguistic questions—does γλαυκ- refer to color or owl and does -ωπ- denote face or eyes?—and then reviews the evidence and past interpretations to conclude that Athena is 'owl-eyed' (parallel to Hera's being 'cow-eyed'), which implies a bright and intense look. The note is exemplary in its range, concision, structure, and argumentation. Similarly impressive is P.'s treatment of ἑλίκωψ, l. 98: he shows the inadequacy of the traditional 'eye-rolling' (for both Chryseis here and Achaean warriors *passim*) and of translating ἕλικες βοῦς as cattle with curved horns (he pointedly asks, where are the horns?). I came away inclining toward P.'s suggestion that we may well be dealing with a lost adjective ἕλιξ meaning 'dark'.

P. shows himself to be a sensitive interpreter of the the human psychology and social drama that pervade this book. In the power struggle Achilles has with Agamemnon, his relation to Thetis, or the politics of Olympus past and present, P.'s observations constantly illuminate key issues.

Even a gifted commentator cannot meet every reader's expectations; and the vast bibliography on Homer inevitably leads to omissions. On ἰφθίμους ψυχάς, l. 3, P. leaves unquestioned the translation of ἴφθιμος (often applied to women) as 'brave' or 'strong'. I would have noted its problematic semantics and etymology and the discussions of J. Warden, *Phoenix* 23 (1969), 143–58, and A. Athanassakis, *Glotta* 49 (1971), 1–21. The comments on εὔχομαι (lines 91 and 397) could have used L. Muellner's *The Meaning of Homeric* εὔχομαι *through its Formulas* (Innsbruck, 1976), and comment on μῆνις, Muellner's *The Anger of Achilles: Menis in Greek Epic* (Ithaca, NY, 1996). On 185, the analysis of αὐτὸς ἀπούρας and αὐτὸς ἰών by A. Teffeteller, *CQ* 40 (1990), 16–19, would have given an added dimension (calculated

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ambiguity on Agamemnon's part) to P.'s demonstration that there is no inconsistency in Agamemnon's two statements.

On l. 203 the note on the important word ὕβρις seems weak, centered on fifth-century Athenian legal usage rather than on the epic situation at hand. On l. 207, Athena's words αἴ κε πίθηαι, it is easy to disagree with P.'s judgement that 'Achilles is quite at liberty to do as he pleases' when Zeus' powerful daughter has him by the hair. On p. 273 the etymology of nektar cited from C. Watkins should be credited to P. Thieme, whom Watkins acknowledges as its originator and whose analysis P. has himself cited earlier (p. 256) in commenting on the word ambrosia (the citation here of Thieme's two essays in *Indogermanische Dichtersprache* should read 102–31, not 102–52).

The note on Ζεῦ πάτερ, l. 503, could have offered a wider vision. Beginning with the obvious statement that Zeus 'did not, of course, father all gods . . . or all men' and ending with the Indo-European 'idea of a father-god in the sky', P. explains the Greek phrase as an inherited (and implicitly vacuous) old formula. This neglects the Greek belief that Zeus was indeed the father of the whole younger generation of Olympians as well as fathering the ancestors of many illustrious Greek heroes. P. could have mentioned an alternative Greek tradition where Zeus is the creator (and destroyer) of humankind (*Od*. 20.201–2; Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 109–81, where Zeus creates three of the five 'races'), perhaps a Near Eastern influence.

The one serious misinterpretation in the commentary is not of Homer but of James Redfield. P. on p. 140 strongly rejects Redfield's view of the Homeric gods quoted from p. 76 of *Nature and Culture in the Iliad*, and repeats the quote and its refutation on p. 176. But P. has misunderstood Redfield's concept of the Homeric gods as 'representations', and believes that Redfield, in characterizing the gods as 'lacking in numen' and as 'literary [not cult] gods', is thereby claiming they are 'not real', merely 'figures of speech' (p. 140). P.'s complaint (p. 176) 'what would happen if they were subtracted from the poem?' misses Redfield's point that these are representations of gods designed precisely to serve the literary ends of the poem. P's summation of Redfield's view of Athena's intervention to check Achilles—'Athena is a symbol for Achilles' inner process of decision making'—gets it completely wrong. Redfield on p. 77 explicitly rejects the view that Athena's intervention is 'merely a manner of speaking' and in fact says that 'the arrival of Athena is a completely literal event within the poem'. P. has unfortunately conflated Redfield's views with those of Dodds and Kirk, criticized earlier on the page for their 'façons de parler' approach to the Homeric gods. Elsewhere Redfield, far from being rejected, seems to suffer silent appropriation. His co-authored study with P. Friedrich, 'Language as Personality Symbol: the Case of Achilles', *Language* 54 (1978), 263–88, surely lies behind such observations as 'Scholars have found that the language of Achilles differs from that of others in the poem' (p. 167) and 'Achilles thinks in wider terms than others' (p. 18).

A small error has crept in on p. 20, where P. speaks of the opening lines of the *Iliad* as a fine 'example of compressed writing' when he meant 'compressed composition', since P. believes (p. 8) that Homer composed orally. On pp. 16–17 an inconsistency has slipped in, where first we are told 'over two-thirds of the *Iliad* is in direct speech' while on p. 17 we read 'in the *Iliad*, 7,018 [lines] are in direct speech; this represents some 45%'.

Other small errors, mainly typographical, include: p. 33, l. 8, for 'that Greeks' read 'the Greeks'; p. 34 n. 28, third line from bottom, insert 'as' after 'spoken of'; p. 62, last line, Greek should read ἔῆκε not ἔῆκε; p. 70, l. 24, θυμῷ lacks iota subscript; p. 82, in l. 186 of the Greek the word καὶ has dropped out before ἄλλος; p. 92, l. 335, read τί

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with acute accent; l. 354, rough breathing on ὑψιβρεμέτης; p. 98, l. 424, rough breathing on ἕποντο; p. 110, l. 585, read μητρὶ for μητεὶ; p. 118, the reference to Nagy lacks a citation (*The Best of the Achaeans*, Chapters 5 and 6). On p. 284, the second entry ἦ (‘he said’) should add 528 after 219. The lemma for 423 is misprinted as 424. In the general index the p. 174 reference to Hesiod is non-existent.

To sum up, this is a very good book, its observations acute, its judgements usually convincing. A reader from North America will notice significant omissions of familiar scholarship from our side of the Atlantic, and a high density of citations of British (primarily Oxonian) scholarship. I ascribe this to the tendency we all have to cite those authors we feel closest to.

Haverford College JOSEPH RUSSO

NARRATIVES WITHIN THE *ILIAD*

M. ALDEN: *Homer Beside Himself. Para-Narratives in the* Iliad. Pp. viii + 384. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Cased, £55. ISBN: 0-19-815285-X.

Alden’s thorough study of included tales or ‘para-narratives’ in the *Iliad* relates them all to the main narrative. This term (explained, pp. 13–16, 296) seems to her preferable to the pejorative term ‘digression’, and to the pejorative judgement implicit in deeming these tales extraneous (to what? why?). Rather than labeling them a natural by-product of the oral-traditional formation of the extant text, she considers them essential tools for a bewildering yet comprehensible archaic mode of discourse. A.’s thesis is that the narrator and his characters present these ‘secondary narratives’ of the past as paradigms for participants—hortatory, consolatory, and cautionary. That idea is not startling; cf. Appendix A: Oehler 1925, van Groningen 1953, N. Austin 1966, de Jong 1987, etc. Her comprehensive analysis offers an ‘insightful poet’ of a ‘highly integrated’ poem (p. 1).

Unexpected insights enrich her analysis, e.g. parallel ‘story-shapes’ in the ‘homecomings’ of Polyphemus and Odysseus (pp. 3–5), in prize distributions (p. 109), or explaining ‘surrogate fathers’ for Phoenix and Achilles (pp. 221–6), and why Glaucus made a witless trade (p. 168). All inset narratives produce meaning by juxtaposition, interpreting Achilles’ story or other significant characters’ episodes (pp. 10, 13). These tales offer explanatory parallels and contrasts. Achilles’ contests in *Iliad* 23—accompanied by quarrels, mutual concessions, and reconciliations—contrast to the disastrous failures to settle the chief quarrel initiated in 1 and aggravated in 9. The tales of Phoenix’ quarrel with his father, Meleager’s ‘mistake’, Nestor’s victory at Bouprasion, Achilles’ shield crowded with conflict, and Antilochus and Menelaos’ dust-up reflect the core quarrel motif (p. 33 n. 57).

Kakridis’s (1949) thrice-repeated folktale motif of ‘the ascending scale of affection’ and Willcock’s (1964, 1977) influential studies of Iliadic *ad hoc* inventions and creative warping of existing mythological paradigms in speeches shape the well read A.’s reading of Homeric narrative, especially Meleager’s ‘paradigming’ of Hector and Achilles (Chapter 7, one-third of the book). The para-narratives are not ornamental, but key the interpretation of the main narrative (p. 16). Often they derive from the speaker’s personal experience (Nestor repeatedly, Phoenix); sometimes from others’ experiences (Achilles’ account of Niobe, Phoenix’ of Meleager). They can describe in

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press