be a matter of status: does Achilles for example exact revenge for Patroclus exclusively or even primarily because he is concerned about the 'status disequilibrium' which his death has supposedly created? Elsewhere, W. argues that '. . . although the person who brings *apoina* . . . is usually the victim's father, the rôle has more to do with the hierarchical paternal relationship between one who gives *apoina* and the dependent victim than with biology' (p. 30). Statements of this kind are not uncommon and make W.'s book an example of a theoretically grounded brand of realism which is now fairly common in Homeric studies, and according to which 'soft' factors such as suffering or affection are in principle secondary to power structures and economic exchange mechanisms. Here, W.'s project might have profited from a clearer sense of its limitations. Inevitably, perhaps, the drawbacks of her approach become most apparent in her treatment of the gods. W. is generally careful not to write the gods out of her story, but occasionally she resorts to mere slogans where careful probing would be needed (e.g. Athena as the goddess 'who embodies *mētis*' on p. 60); or feels tempted to sideline the gods altogether (e.g. at p. 48, where Hera's rôle in the assembly scene of Book 1 is dismissed as part of a 'naïve', as opposed to 'political', reading).

Having said that, W. has certainly written an interesting and rewarding book. By focusing on the language of ransom and revenge she has considerably enhanced our understanding of Homeric epic, and in so doing has reminded us of the more general point that even—or perhaps especially—a text as well known as the *Iliad* repays careful engagement with its language.

University of Durham JOHANNES HAUBOLD

A MILLENNIAL CONFERENCE ON HOMER

F. MONTANARI (ed.): *Omero tremila anni dopo. Atti del Congresso di Genova 6–8 luglio 2000. Con la collaborazione di P. Ascheri.* (Storia e Letteratura 210.) Pp. xvii + 722, maps, ills. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2002. Paper, €76. ISBN: 88-8498-059-3.

This volume contains the proceedings of an ambitiously-named 'millennium' conference organized by Franco Montanari in Genoa in summer 2000 to present the multi-faceted condition of Homeric studies almost three thousand years after the poems were composed. The languages used are English, Italian, and French. Longer papers by outstanding scholars are grouped into three major sections: the expression of the text and its context; the transmission of the text; and archaeology and history as context. Sixteen ungrouped shorter papers discuss a variety of issues ranging from agent and instrument in violent death to sacrifice and the symposium. It would have been more convenient for readers if some of the shorter papers had been attached to these major groups: that of Maria Noussia, in particular, should be grouped with the papers of West and Rengakos, which are also concerned with the treatment of the Homeric text in the Alexandrian period. At the end we find summarizing and comment by Joachim Latacz, Richard Janko, and Wolfgang Kullmann for a round-table closing session. Three indices are offered, of modern authors, ancient authors, and Homeric passages cited. The final numbered

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

bibliography presents frequently cited works in the order in which they appear in the text: they are not alphabetized. The scope of the volume would daunt almost any reviewer, and the word limit precludes discussion of every paper. I shall use the headings of the volume.

Section 1. The Text: Forms of Expression and Forms of Content

Mario Cantilena suggests the high proportion of direct speech in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is in keeping with their oral style of performance, in which the rhapsode will impersonate characters. He refers to papyri marked to indicate the distribution of the dialogue between characters, suggesting oral dramatic performance (p. 35 n. 41). He goes on to hypothesize that heavy alliteration at the outset signals a speech performed with characterization.

Rainer Friedrich would abandon the 'idolatry of orality' in favour of a transitional text of an orally composed poem. He argues that the tests devised by Parry to demonstrate orally composed poetry (the formula, the theme, and parataxis and unperiodic enjambement) have been modified to such an extent that they have become meaningless: he would restrict themes to those mentioned in Arend's *Typische Szenen* (Berlin, 1933).

Georg Danek addresses the problem of quotation in the Homeric poems from referent texts which have no verifiable fixed form. The meaning of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is enriched by reference to events outside the text: Nestor's account of his advice to the Lapiths on the occasion of their fight with the Centaurs fits the context of the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon over bride-stealing. Up to a point the biographies of the Homeric heroes are fluid. The traditional system of reference familiar to Homer's audience is to a system of stories with certain fixed events which may in no circumstances be altered: these fixed events favour cross-references in individual tellings of a myth.

Jenny Strauss Clay draws attention to the reception by the audience of a new synthesis of earlier alternative versions, presenting us with the unresolved tension of an Odysseus who is part innocent hero, part trickster. The poet puts the Apologoi, which exonerate Odysseus from blame for the loss of his crew, into Odysseus' mouth and makes him begin with a reference to his trickery. Odysseus knows in such detail what his crew said while he was asleep that his veracity is undermined. The invention of the Laestrygonians as a means of disposing of eleven of the twelve ships the poet has given him to maintain consistency with the *Iliad* is similarly dubious.

Seth Schein discusses mythological themes and values set against one another in the *Odyssey*, making interpretation of the poem a challenge. Herakles is a paradigm for Odysseus (journey to the dead, triumph in an archery contest to win a bride, slaughter of guestfriend at his own table), but Odysseus dissociates himself from Herakles and Eurytos, whose skill at archery rivalled the gods. A series of verbal echoes associate him instead with the Apollo of *Iliad* 1 as he fires his arrows at the suitors.

Section 2. Transmission of the Text: Manuscripts and Ancient Exegesis

A. C. Cassio offers a useful way in to the treatment of the text in antiquity, with helpful bibliography. He argues that by the late seventh century the text was composed and fixed by a complex process involving orality and writing: this text was later affected by recitation. Respect for the Attic text which eventually prevailed gave

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

rise to complex λύσεις addressing the problems it appeared to present (although many of these would not now seem at all problematic). The textual emendations of Hippias and Stesichorus are rightly rejected, but we should recognize how deeply rooted they are in the dialectical practice of their time.

M. L. West argues that Zenodotus' text is not the result of a careful collation of manuscripts, explaining its eccentricities as the readings of a fourth-century Ephesian rhapsode's text from the late Ionian tradition, deformed by many oral variants and arbitrary abridgements, yet preserving certain genuine elements of the archaic text.

Rengakos, on the other hand, believes that Alexandrian scholars collated manuscripts: their readings are not always mere conjectures. He argues (against Van der Valk and others) that Hellenistic poetry imitating Homeric verses can indicate variant readings of Alexandrian origin, whether or not these were regarded as 'correct'. His criteria for imitation are 'quotations', where narrative situation, context, and expression allude exclusively to the Homeric verse in question, or the imitation of a *hapax legomenon* in the same verse position. Janko argued against him in the closing session: Timon's preference for old copies of Homer which had not been 'corrected' suggests emendation was rife by Zenodotus' time. Variants known in Hellenistic times could be the result of earlier conjectures. Maria Noussia argues that Bacchylides (3.35–6) and Solon (1 G.-P.^{2} = 13 W.^{2}) may have guided Zenodotus' reading αἰπὺς οὐρανός (*Il.* 3.364 and *Il.* 15.192) for εὐρὺς οὐρανός (vulgate and Aristarchus). But we still have no idea if Zenodotus' reading is correct.

Martin Schmidt's useful survey of recent work on the scholia (with excellent bibliography) is followed by an accessible account of the various groups of scholia and the kind of information they provided to the ancient reader. I would recommend this lucid explanation of the nature of the scholia with confidence to students.

Robert Lamberton discusses the use made of Homer in the schools of the Roman empire. The essay attributed to Plutarch, 'On the Life and Poetry of Homer', was used by aspiring teachers of philosophy to present Homer as the source of all reasonable traditions of thought (and of corrupt thought representing Homer's teachings in debased form). Homer was also used as a foundation course to present the fundamentals of rhetoric to children who would go on to study the subject.

Section 3. Context: Archaeology and History

The poems may refer to a past, but the world they reflect is in many ways contemporary. Vassos Karageorghis describes a 'Homeric' fashion in burial customs and luxury goods adopted by a wealthy aristocracy of Phoenicians, Greeks, and others, trading throughout the Mediterranean from the time the poems were composed to about the sixth century B.C. Jan Paul Crielaard demonstrates that the profound interest in the past and in objects with a pedigree displayed by Homer's characters is shared by the aristocrats of the eighth–seventh centuries. The developed polis and its society are shown by Hölkeskamp to be reflected in the poems. In a short paper Wecowski demonstrates features of the symposium already present in Homer. Arms, as Bouvier, says, are burned with a hero who has no male heir to inherit them: otherwise, they are transmitted to the next generation.

Since the *eulin* graffito places writing as early as 775 B.C., it is strange to see that many of the papers assume without argument that the time of Homer is the seventh century B.C. Lack of space prevents a challenge to this assumption and also precludes

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

discussion of much excellent work in this volume, which demonstrates how progress in a number of disciplines contributes to our understanding of the poems.

The Queen's University of Belfast MAUREEN ALDEN

ESSAYS ON HOMER

H. M. ROISMAN, J. ROISMAN (edd.): *Essays on Homeric Epic*. (*Colby Quarterly*, Volume 38, Numbers 1–2.) Pp. 263 (1–128 and 129–263). Waterville, ME: Colby College, 2002. Paper, US$5 for each number. ISSN: 1050-5873.

The two volumes under review comprise twelve independent articles about Homeric poetry, contributed by E. J. Bakker, J. S. Clay, D. Collins, M. Finkelberg, D. Lateiner, B. Louden, C. J. Mackie, A. J. Nussbaum, H. Pelliccia, R. J. Rabel, H. Van Wees, and D. Wilson. Nussbaum's contribution concerns morphology (not my field), Van Wees's the material and social circumstances in which the Homeric epics were composed. The remainder display certain family resemblances, in particular a preoccupation with genre. Bakker, Collins, and Rabel each argue that the Homeric narratives reflexively signal their own pragmatics as performance. Lateiner, Louden (on the duals in *Iliad* 9; cf. my remarks on the duals in F. Montanari [ed.], *Omero tremila anni dopo* [Rome, 2002], pp. 441–4), and Pelliccia (on Glaukos' comparison of human generations to leaves) elucidate specific passages by setting them in broader generic and/or ritual contexts; Wilson does likewise for similes comparing Achilles and Odysseus to lions. Finkelberg's investigation of *Iliad* 7 and the *Cypria* yields support for an unfashionably textual view of Homeric composition. Only Clay's article on *Iliad* 22 analyzes the artistry of a unique passage, and only Lateiner's accords due attention to the Homeric gods. The following comments are necessarily very selective.

Bakker's essay on Polyphemus' name strikes rich paydirt. Examining the *phê-* root, he finds that in the *Odyssey* its associations include two quite different types of speech. *phêmis*, public talk, implies 'unwanted openness', while *phêmê*, 'an utterance with prophetic properties of which the speaker is unaware', involves a 'sense of . . . revelation of something unsaid . . .'. Bakker posits that the *Odyssey* explores 'the link between poetry and gossip, *kleos* and *phêmis*', but his discussion, for all its insights, leaves *phêmê* under-analyzed. Here is a kind of speech whose utterance is openly audible, and whose meaning seems equally open, but is not. More poetic than *kleos*, *phêmê* (I suggest) acquires meaning from particular agents; for example, the effectiveness of Polyphemus' prayer/*phêmê* is in the heeding of it by Poseidon, Polyphemus' father. The Cyclopes-in-the-street who thought that *outis* meant 'nobody' were simply speaking the impersonal Greek *langue*, i.e. *phêmis*; Odysseus—a hero never caught dead professing linguistics—in making *outis* his name gave this definitively impersonal lexeme an improvised, definitively personal sense. Bakker credits Odysseus' reutterance of Polyphemus' prayer/*phêmê* with effecting his *nostos* and its epic; like Alcinous, Bakker forgets Poseidon's warning against conveying strangers indiscriminately. The teller of the ill-omened tale was lucky to get home at all.

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.278 Published online by Cambridge University Press