expressly says is the start of a cyclic poem (*AP* 135–6). In short, a great opportunity for yet further progress has been missed.

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor R. JANKO

THE HYMN TO DEMETER

A. SUTER: *The Narcissus and the Pomegranate. An Archaeology of the Homeric* Hymn to Demeter. Pp. xii + 268, ills. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2002. Cased, US$60/£42.50. ISBN: 0-472-11249-X.

One should be aware from the outset that the term 'archaeology' in the title of this book is understood broadly by its author. S. sets out to re-examine thoroughly the narrative of the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* (*Dem.*), and in doing so makes use of a diverse set of scholarly approaches. Indeed, there is an impressive array of information to grapple with here. The study considers the poem in the light of data from oral-diction analysis, narratology, genre stylistics, modern psychoanalytic theory, anthropology, other versions of the myth, linguistics, and, finally, archaeology itself. Evidence from all these fields suggests, according to S., a new understanding of the poem, that at its deepest levels *Dem.* is concerned with two things: (i) Demeter's take-over of Persephone's powers as fertility goddess at Eleusis, the latter having been the earlier goddess at the site who is subordinated to the rôle of daughter; and (ii) the superimposition of the Olympian frame onto the original core story, evident in competition between Zeus and Demeter for control of Persephone.

After a useful introduction which outlines the argument in each of the eight principal chapters of the book, S. chooses to deal with the second of these threads first. A sort of 'Olympianism' visible in the *Hymns*, the superimposition of the patriarchal Olympian frame, in which Zeus is the dominant player, onto pre-existing matriarchal myths, is not a new idea. The argument was first put forth by J. S. Clay, *The Politics of Olympus* (Princeton, 1989), and S. attempts to expand upon that study here. In itself, the idea is an intriguing one. As S. points out at the beginning of Chapter 2 apropos of *Dem.*, Zeus often remains a distant character in the *Hymns*, despite an underlying principle that his will ultimately controls events. The difficulty, of course, lies in the lack of surviving early epic. What once may have circulated, in written or oral form, remains a mystery. It is difficult, therefore, to say what is individual innovation in epic and what is a gradual development. Thus, while Clay's attractive work cautiously points to trends, what S. attempts to show here is something dangerously concrete; a conscious programme of 'Olympianization' by the poet of *Dem.*, which can be detected in the confrontation between Zeus and Demeter. The argument goes that the powerful rôle of Demeter in her interactions with Zeus points to the dominance of the original 'core story', over which the poet is imposing the Olympian frame. However, a particularly unique and striking confrontation between the two gods is not convincingly argued for here. S. first makes extensive use of R. Martin's distinction between μῦθος and ἔπος. He has suggested in *The Language of Heroes* (Ithaca, 1989) that μῦθος is the marked term in Homer, while ἔπος is the unmarked, more generic word. The former often denotes power and authority and frequently describes Zeus' commands in the *Iliad*. S. applies this theory to *Dem.*, arguing that in contrast to the *Iliad*, none of Zeus' speech acts is called a μῦθος in the hymn; Demeter, however,

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

asserts her power over μῦθοι by rejecting Zeus' offer of gifts and honours at *Dem.* 330 (ἠναίνετο μύθους). This is a slippery path. It is first perhaps artificial to say that none of Zeus' commands are μῦθοι in the hymn. Although the μῦθοι which Demeter rejects are spoken by the other gods, they are ultimately Zeus' commands. Certainly, Iris refers to Zeus' command as ἔπος at *Dem.* 323, but this distinction is not necessarily surprising. Martin (as S. herself recognizes, p. 28) allows room in his theory for some overlap in the use of μῦθος and ἔπος. A good example of this can be found in Zeus' command at the beginning of *Il.* 8. He orders the gods not to enter into the Trojan war and tauntingly invites them to transgress his ἔπος (v. 8). When his speech ends, however, the narrator refers to his speech as μῦθος (v. 29). Surely the distinction in power and force implied by the two words there is not great. This parallel is also of relevance to S.'s claim that Demeter's refusal of Zeus' command in the hymn is unique: 'such disobedience never occurs in the *Iliad*' (p. 31). But is such disobedience really foreign to the *Iliad*? Hera seemingly has no qualms (after such an explicit prohibition) about seducing Zeus in *Il.* 14, in order to allow Poseidon to keep helping the Greeks. The verbalization of Demeter's refusal at *Dem.* 330 does not seem to differentiate it greatly from the accepted state of affairs in the *Iliad*, where the other gods are naughty and disobedient despite Zeus' ultimate power.

In turning to S.'s proposal that the hymn reflects a takeover of Persephone's powers at Eleusis by Demeter, it is worth saying something briefly about her argument that Persephone's descent to the underworld represents a sacred marriage, rather than a coming-of-age story. This is a suggestion which many will find attractive and S. notes that others have discussed it before (p. 98 n. 87). An important piece of bibliography is missing here though. When she briefly mentions the well-known pattern of the sacred marriage in eastern myth, it is surprising not to find a reference to C. Penglase's *Greek Myths and Mesopotamia: Parallels and Influence in the Homeric Hymns and Hesiod* (London and New York, 1997). He provides a useful comparison of the story in *Dem.* to eastern myths (pp. 126–58), and he covers much of the same ground as S.: he rejects the idea that Persephone's journey is one of maturation (p. 156), discusses the symbolism of the pomegranate in light of eastern parallels (p. 143 etc.), and considers in detail the possible influence of the eastern schema of the desperate mother in search of her lost child, who has descended to the netherworld (*passim*). Also of relevance for S.'s arguments discussed above, Penglase explicitly rejects any programme of Olympianization in *Dem.* (p. 155)! This work should have been taken into account here.

The consideration of eastern material by Penglase is surely relevant also to S.'s argument that, at one time independent goddesses, Demeter and Persephone are in competition in the hymn. Again, the internal argument for such a reading is not persuasive. In chapter six, by trying to reconstruct what previous versions of the myth may have consisted of, S. once again falls to speculative guessing. The supposed competition between the two goddesses is hardly obvious, especially in such things as their joint invocation at the beginning of the hymn, or the length of their speeches, as she suggests (pp. 120, 125–7, etc.). Even more insubstantial is the claim that the fragmentary lines *Dem.* 396–7 have the poet 'essentially stating that Demeter is able to confer τιμαί upon Persephone (p. 129). Demeter is simply stating the facts, not conferring gifts; certainly at least, she is not explicitly asserting authority.

The final two chapters of the book look outside the hymn to linguistic and archaeological evidence, in order to support the claim that Demeter and Persephone were once independent goddesses at Eleusis. Indeed, the archaeological record is scanty in this area, and S.'s discussion is a useful and thought-provoking overview. But by this point, it is clear that evidence is being read into rather than out of the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

archaeological record. If one does not subscribe to the delicate literary arguments which have preceded, the archaeology of this book actually says very little.

Merton College, Oxford ANDREW FAULKNER

THREE STUDIES ON ANAXIMANDER

D. L. Couprie, R. Hahn, G. Naddaf: *Anaximander in Context. New Studies in the Origins of Greek Philosophy*. Pp. xiv + 290, maps, ills. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003. Paper, US$27.95 (Cased, US$81.50). ISBN: 0-7914-5538-6 (0-7914-5537-8 hbk).

This volume belongs to a curious genre. It is neither an edited collection of articles (though it has a brief anonymous introduction, a consolidated bibliography and a set of indices); nor is it a co-authored book, since the three authors have written separate essays; nor is it a monograph, since it contains three contributions without cross-references. It is, rather, a pair of covers, between which there co-exist in slightly uneasy harmony, three 'monographs' (that is the authors' term, p. 1) about Anaximander, each between sixty and eighty pages in length. Two of these are extensively illustrated: the volume includes sixty-two black and white photographs, diagrams and drawings, and six tables.

Nevertheless, despite this pictorial *embarras de richesse*, the volume hardly delivers 250 pages worth of new material. The illusion that we have three substantial new monographs for the price of one is somewhat transitory.

For a start, there is a good deal of overlap and repetition between the three contributions. Perhaps that is inevitable: when you think about it, what is there to write about? All of thirteen genuine words by Anaximander are preserved—maybe, on a generous estimate—in the form of fr. 1. Curiously, though, none of the authors quotes or discusses that text.

Still, the fewer the fragments, the more the scope for speculation. The authors of this book rise to the challenge, exploring tantalizing hints about the shape of Anaximander's earth, the distances to the circles that carry the stars, moon, and sun, and his pioneering map of the inhabited world. These are the slightly repetitive themes of the collection, together with the search for a sympathetic understanding of a man whose primitive tools and archaic images demand an immense effort of historical imagination.

The three essays cohere in their desire to trace the cultural background against which Anaximander's recorded activities made sense. All three use evidence from the civilizations of the ancient Mediterranean to ground their speculations. Both Naddaf and Hahn stress the routes whereby ideas from Egypt could have influenced Anaximander's thinking; Couprie, by contrast, sees a radical break from the traditional picture of the solar system as a dome of sky over a flat earth. Instead, Anaximander's achievement was to envisage depth in three dimensional space and to place the spinning chariot wheels of the heavenly bodies one behind the other. Couprie argues that these wheels must have progressed back and forth along a diagonal cylinder to provide the annual variation in the seasons and solstices.

The second essay ('Proportions and Numbers in Anaximander and Early Greek Thought', by Robert Hahn) is closely related to Hahn's previously published monograph *Anaximander and the Architects*. Here, as there, he argues that we should

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.286 Published online by Cambridge University Press