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/53.1.3 Published online by Cambridge University Press

veiled form a constant pattern of life or received divine history, such as the *ainoi* of Zeus' jars, Zeus' daughters the *Litai*, Zeus' *ate* according to wise Agamemnon, Heracles' trials, Hephaestus' mishaps at Zeus' hands, and Zeus' long catalogue of brief mistresses. A. could discuss why so many tales in this class connect to Zeus. The variations in the precedents (e.g. Paris' and Zeus' comparable 'erotic seizures', p. 45) emphasize the flexible utility of para-narrativity. Their obliquity also facilitates criticism in non-confrontational manners (Nestor to Agamemnon, Phoenix to Achilles, etc.; cf. Thersites' bluntness).

The Hephaestan shield 'extrapolates into narrative static motifs' (p. 48). Ancient epic ecphrasis tends to provide analogous repetition of its context; cf. Helen's tapestry, Thetis' wedding gift, or Arachne's weaving. Men quarrel in the cities pictured on the shield (compensation refused!); booty, destruction, and battle over cherished casualties reflect the primary narrative. Traditional motifs here—like similes elsewhere—sustain an untraditional, monumental expansion of this Achillean culmination of arming type-scenes.

Nestor suffers from a perception of comic garrulity and self-indulgent irrelevance. But Nestor advises 'at every turning point in the action' (p. 76), and he offers good advice to Achilles, Agamemnon, Patroclus, and Antilochus. His 'rambling' narratives always exhibit relevant content. The Lapith–Centaur retrospective refers to woman stealing—a fault also attributable to doomed Trojans and Agamemnon. His oblique criticisms of *basileis* avoid the candid (*antibien*) harsh criticism and blatant blame that Agamemnon rebukes in Achilles but practices himself (1.278, 291). Nestor's authority and advice fail once—but that failure created the *Iliad* (p. 111).

The chapter on Diomede, Achilles' foreshadow (p. 170 n. 40), concerns para-narratives of his cannibalistic father Tydeus, the two expeditions against Thebes, and god-battlers (Lycurgus and Bellerophon). The poet (pp. 138–42) often alludes to tales and details that the audience knows but that do not suit the momentary teller. Tydeus' brutal, god-provoking *atasthalie* (recklessness) with Melanippus' corpse hints at Achilles' with Hector's (22.418, 24.134–6). 'Genealogy as Paradigm' fits oddly into a book on para-narratives. The best point, the relevance of Bellerophon, was already explained (pp. 149–51).

Phoenix' eccentric story of irrational Meleager troubles many. A. says more about modern misinterpretation of supplication and the personified *Litai* (Entreaties) than about the coherence and relevance of the dissuasive para-narrative. Agamemnon, Achilles, Meleager, and Hector refuse *litai*, but A. argues philologically, following J. Gould, *JHS* 93 (1973), 74–103, that these were not full and proper, god-sanctioned *hiketeiai* (supplications). Achilles' vexed comment (11.609–10; cf. 16.72–3), anticipating full supplication, is defended as referring to Agamemnon's categoric failure to appear, or to have his surrogates supplicate for assistance, or even to negotiate. A. could strengthen her argument by incorporating the relevant studies of status, gift-exchange, and Achilles' rational and necessary refusal to subordinate himself: see esp. W. Donlan, *Colby Quarterly* 29 (1993), 155–72, and D. Wilson *Classical World* 93 (1999), 131–47. More issues are involved, as A. knows, than the body-contact of 'full supplication'.

Entreaties dot the *Iliad* from first incident to last, but supplications are much rarer, and the two acts are not identical. Achilles 'never receives [Achaean] *litai* in the envisaged context of *hiketeia*' (p. 199)—a valuable clarification. Achilles is not, however, a victim of *ate* (p. 203) when he rejects the threatening, morally bullying, and bribing diplomatic trio. There no 'right decision' is available (cf. the impasse on the shield, 18.499–500). A. rarely slips, but at 9.451, Phoenix' unnamed mother supplicates

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.3 Published online by Cambridge University Press

her son 'by the knees', not Althaea, Meleager's mother (p. 191). Althaea, whose entreaties for Meleager to fight (9.584–5) pose an unnoticed problem—she wants her son dead! (9.566–71)—only entreats him (*elissonto*) without supplication—by the restrictive Gould–Alden standard).

Agamemnon refuses Chryses' *litai*, and, like Meleager, eventually loses on terrible terms the goods that he could have enjoyed on excellent terms (pp. 210, 236). Both men fit Phoenix' *ainos* (veiled hint) of the *Litai*. The pattern recurs with Achilles' encounter with Odysseus, Ajax, and later Patroclus. Achilles reminds his guests of his true father's great wealth and claims to his presence at home (9.394, 400). His deracinated tutor, sterile Phoenix, then argues diplomatically for Achilles' compliance with Agamemnon's 'requests'/demands. A surrogate father himself, however, he miscalculates and argues for a potential father-in-law of known capriciousness and vast claims on dependents (pp. 223–4). The quondam wanderer's paternalism, sentimentally genuine, masks the menace of divine retribution in his scheme to manipulate Achilles. The hero penetrates it (9.612–15).

Meleager's long story is crucial to Phoenix' central speech in the pivotal scene of our *Iliad*. But its Homeric embeddedness and compressed allusiveness make it hard to apply, when we presume it relevant, as A. rightly does. A. describes its significantly different variants in mythology (pp. 237–9); R. Scodel, *AJP* (1982), emphasizes the comic and inept facets of Phoenix' remarks. Meleager, Achilles, and Hector all reject the repeated, serial entreaties (*litai*) from an increasingly dearer set of friends and family. Meleager bends to the final one, Cleopatra's; Achilles eventually caves to Patroclus' and Priam's, but infatuated Hector refuses any concession to anyone dear, early and late, in *Iliad* 6 and 22. A. notes (p. 264) that Astyanax alone sways his father from heroic obligations, but only for a few minutes, emphasizing, perhaps excessively, Hector's faults and limitations (including overconfidence: pp. 274–5, 277–81).

Meleager loses his promised material reward, Achilles loses his dearest friend, and Hector loses everything. *Ate* (delusion/infatuation) strikes down Agamemnon and Patroclus explicitly (19.134–8, 16.805), Achilles and Hector implicitly (pp. 262, 276–7, 284). Rejected entreaties and the necessity to respect pleas of a father (usually the hero's last test—although not Meleager's) are ubiquitous. All references to fathers (cf. 16.13–16) move Achilles. He—not Hector—finally complies with King Priam's request. Father and son achieve a long deferred (if still temporary) resolution of the super-quarrel.

This smart chapter could have been organized differently. One reaches the titling topic of Meleager only after fifty pages about character and ritual, human behavioral rules and divine punishment (*ate*). Further, Meleager's para-narrative contains no *ate*. The *ainos* of the *Litai*, rather, 'forms the centrepiece of [Phoenix'] speech' (pp. 229, 290, 318). The pressures of topic and subtitle have distorted the presentation.

A. has written an important study of an illuminating unusual characteristic of Homeric epic. Her conscientiously documented and well-argued monograph corroborates the considerable significance of para-narratives for the primary narrative. We understand better Nestor's virtues, Hector's vices, and the foundational significance for the *Iliad* of requests, rejection, and compliance with substantiated entreaties.

Ohio Wesleyan University DONALD LATEINER

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.3 Published online by Cambridge University Press