

'translation' of Berossos. W. Stephens provides a fascinating account of Annius' forgery of the *Defloratio Berosi Chaldaica*, together with ten other ancient texts, in order to vindicate Biblical chronology and 'prove' the glorious history of his home town.

In his introduction, Haubold states that the volume aims 'not to commit Berossos to a single voice, but to explore the interplay of voices, sometimes converging, at other times strikingly dissonant, that characterise his complex and fragile work' (8). The voices here are indeed sometimes dissonant, and not all are equally persuasive. Yet in guiding us towards a more nuanced understanding of the material that survives, such dissonance is productive, even crucial. This collection will be important reading for all those interested in Berossos, the Seleucid kingdom and cross-cultural contact between Babylonia and the Greek world.

KATHRYN STEVENS
University of Cambridge
 krs45@cam.ac.uk

MACIVER (C.A.) **Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*: Engaging Homer in Late Antiquity** (Mnemosyne Supplements 343). Leiden and Boston: Brill 2012. Pp. viii + 224. €102/\$136. 9789004230200.
 doi:10.1017/S0075426914001682

This book is the revised version of Maciver's PhD thesis, which was examined at the University of Edinburgh in 2008. It inscribes itself into a recent trend of unearthing, re-evaluating and rehabilitating Greek epic poetry from the imperial period, which has hitherto been neglected and/or denigrated in scholarship. Quintus of Smyrna's *Posthomerica*, to which Maciver's study is devoted, is one of these poems. Even more, Quintus is perhaps the one who has had the greatest share of prejudice over the past two centuries, since he is, more than any others, an 'imitator' in an emphatic sense. To put it simply, Quintus wrote a sequel to Homer's *Iliad*, starting from where the *Iliad* ends (viz. Hector's death) up until the point where the *Odyssey* begins (viz. the [non-]homecoming of the Greeks). In so doing, he recasts a strongly Homerizing setting, using an equally Homerizing formulaic language. Consequently, modern scholars and critics accuse him either of being a slavish epigone (when he is being deliberately Homeric) or of being unsuc-

cessful in trying to be Homeric (when he is, in fact, being deliberately un-Homeric). It is therefore most welcome that Maciver's monograph focuses on Quintus' specific belatedness and attempts to understand the *Posthomerica* within the frame of its characteristically imperial context, rather than as a would-be piece of epic by a pseudo-Homer who happens to be a millennium too late.

The first chapter (7–38) centres on the *Posthomerica*'s poetics. Although Maciver does not offer many genuinely new insights here, he neatly bundles, and thoroughly rethinks, what has been said before on the metapoetic implications of Quintus' belatedness. Unfortunately, however, the essential question as to what it ultimately means to be a 'belated new Homer' remains unanswered. We do not know anything about the contemporary reception of the *Posthomerica*, but we can be certain that Quintus' audience knew that this 'new Homer' was 'not really Homer'; therefore a strong tension must have arisen from a receptional point of view, and it would have been interesting to pursue this train of thought in the light of the *Posthomerica*'s poetics somewhat further.

The subsequent three chapters then consider three literary modes that are characteristic of ancient epic poetry: ephrasis (39–86), gnomai (87–123) and similes (125–92). The chapter on ephrasis focuses on the description of Achilles' shield in *Posthomerica* 5.6–101, which is the perhaps most obvious case where Quintus stages himself as a completer of Homer's *Iliad*. By recasting the description of Hephaestus' artefact (*Iliad* 18.478–608), he not only resumes the Homeric tradition, but virtually finishes an otherwise incomplete work of art. In this context, Maciver convincingly demonstrates that Quintus adds a specific new layer of meaning onto the shield description by incorporating Hesiodic, as well as Stoic, references (cf., most notably, the Mountain of *Areté*, 5.49–56) – so much so that Achilles' shield ultimately becomes an emblem of the *Posthomerica*'s 'own poetic identity', 85): the paradox of being Homeric *and* un-Homeric at the same time. However, the two other ephrasis of Quintus' poem unfortunately remain disregarded – that is, for one thing, the description of Heracles' labours on Eurypylos' shield (6.198–293), which is on an equal footing with that of the shield of Achilles, and, for another, the shorter description of Philoctetes' baldrick and quiver (10.180–205), which is reminiscent of Heracles' baldrick in the *Nekyia* (*Odyssey* 11.609–14). As it appears,

Heracles, who is Eurypylus' grandfather and acts as a father-figure of Philoctetes, plays a pivotal role in these two ecphrases; thus, it might have been rewarding to analyse them alongside that of Achilles' shield.

The two following chapters essentially pose the same main question from different viewpoints again: how, and why, is Quintus attempting to be simultaneously Homeric *and* un-Homeric? One of Maciver's most compelling arguments is that about the Stoic influences on the *Posthomeric*: these do not simply testify to Quintus' imperial context in the sense that they unmask him as post-Homeric, but they serve a specifically metapoetic function, since they invite the reader to rethink, and appropriate, the Homeric epics from a Stoic perspective. Therefore, ultimately the *Posthomeric* becomes, as Maciver puts it, 'both a reading of Homer and a revision of Homer' (123).

SILVIO F. BÅR
University of Oslo
 silvio.baer@ifikk.uio.no

HISTORY

GRECO (E.) *Ed. Lemno: dai 'Tirreni' agli Ateniesi. Problemi storici, archeologici, topografici e linguistici (Napoli, 4 maggio 2011)* and CULASSO GASTALDI (E.) and MARCHIANDI (D.) *Eds Gli Ateniesi fuori dall'Attica: modi d'intervento e di controllo del territorio (Torino, 8–9 aprile 2010)* (Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle missioni italiane in oriente 88 = serie III 10, 2010). Athens: Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2012. Pp. ix + 537, illus. €150. 0067-0081.

doi:10.1017/S0075426914001694

The proceedings of the two colloquia presented here pertain to the same research project concerning the island of Lemnos. Both proceedings take into full account the results of the archaeological and topographical investigations of Lemnos, and in particular the site of Hephaestia, lead by the Italian Archaeological School over the last 80 years (see also E. Greco and E. Papi (eds), *Hephaestia 2000–2006*, Paestum 2008).

The first proceedings offer a coherent and persuasive picture of pre- and early Athenian Lemnos, by combining archaeological evidence with historiographic and epigraphic sources. Here

I shall confine myself to the most significant research advancements, stressed also by M. Gras in his conclusions.

For the Late Bronze Age, L. Coluccia detects the presence at Hephaestia of a community marked by a strong Mycenaean facet, probably guarding the maritime route towards northern Greece, which might have taken advantage of the isthmus between Koukonisi and Hephaestia. In the Early Iron Age, between the late 12th and early 11th centuries, the presence of a new material culture, marked by the so-called Gray Ware pottery, suggests the arrival or emergence of different peoples.

For Archaic Lemnos, L. Ficuciello detects a phase of Euboian influence (late eighth to mid-seventh century), followed by distinct changes and discontinuities in material culture, necropoleis and cults. In this period (mid-seventh to late sixth century), the island, which was mainly involved in wine production and metallurgy, became an important centre of cultural and commercial interaction between the Cycladic and Near Eastern areas and the northern Aegean. The population lived in nucleated villages, organized around aristocratic clans and subject to a central authority.

The arrival of Athenian settlers between the late sixth and early fifth century is marked by a clear-cut break in the material culture of the island. A. Correale stresses the destruction of the sacred areas of Archaic Hephaestia, which was later put to different uses, while S. Camporeale points to the fact that the fifth-century settlement was completely reorganized in an urban grid with rectangular blocks. E. Greco recognizes here an urban plan *per strigas*, well-known from several western Greek *apoikiai* and usually dated from the late sixth to the mid-fifth century, while L. Ficuciello focuses on the main sanctuaries of the island, where cultic activities were revived in the mid-fifth century by the absorption and reinterpretation of former practices (which also influenced Athenian cults in turn).

E. Culasso argues that both the archaeological and epigraphic evidence reveal the presence of Athenian residents from the second quarter of the fifth century, pointing to a definitive settling in the Cimonian era.

E. Greco and O. Voza tentatively date the early (wooden) phase of the newly-discovered theatre of Hephaestia between the late fifth and the early fourth century, and discuss its importance for the political and cultural organization of the settlement.