13 examples of anthropomorphic divine representations in vase painting that visualize the relationship between humans and the gods.

Chapter 5 by Adeline Grand-Clément, 'Les sourcils bleu sombre du fils de Kronos: du Zeus d'Homère à la statue de Phidias', explores Homer's influence on Phidias' famous statue of Zeus, including the choice of ivory as its material. Chapter 6 by Vinciane Pirenne-Delforge, 'Imaginer les dieux. L'anthropomorphisme divin chez Artémidore et Dion Chrysostome', analyses how the gods appear in dreams, as discussed by Artemidorus, and the limitations faced by poets and artists when representing the gods, as discussed by Dio Chrysostom.

Chapter 7 by Corinne Bonnet, 'L'anthropomorphisme du Zeus d'Homère au miroir de Lucien', is a thought-provoking analysis of the reception of Homer's Zeus by Lucian, whose humour belies criticism of anthropomorphism even sharper than that of Xenophanes. Chapter 8 by Renaud Gagné, 'Les "dieux semblables à des étrangers" (Odyssée, XVII, 485–487)', is an in-depth study of the reception of these three lines from the Odyssey, ranging from Plato to early Christian authors. It also raises the question of theomorphism as opposed to anthropomorphism.

Chapter 9 by Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui, 'Xenophanes redivivus? L'anthropomorphisme des dieux d'Homère dans la littérature apologétique chrétienne', is a study of the Christian apologists' reception of the famous critique of anthropomorphic gods by Xenophanes. Finally, chapter 10 by Maurizio Bettini, 'Ad negotia humana compositi. L'agency humaine des dieux antiques', is a study of the dei minuti of the Romans; 'agency' is their only human characteristic and this can be identified as the essence of anthropomorphism.

With its comprehensive survey of the debate since antiquity about the anthropomorphism of the Homeric gods and its wide-ranging case studies of the literary and visual evidence challenging the conventional definition of anthropomorphism, this book is likely to make us rethink how we should imagine not only Homer's gods but divine beings in general.

NAOKO YAMAGATA
The Open University
naoko.yamagata@open.ac.uk

ZANKER (A.T.) **Metaphor in Homer: Time, Speech, and Thought**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. Pp. x + 263. £75. 9781108491884.
doi:10.1017/S007542692100015X

Andreas Zanker's *Metaphor in Homer* builds on George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's studies of the cognitive dimensions of metaphor to respond to primitivist readings of Homer by William Bedell Stanford (*Greek Metaphor*, Oxford 1971), Hermann Fränkel (*Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*, Munich 1953) and Bruno Snell (*The Discovery of the Mind*, Cambridge MA 1953). Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago 1980) explains metaphors in terms of interactions between two concepts, one of which is more immediately accessible to our minds and bodies than the other: for example, we might describe 'life' in terms of a 'journey'. Drawing on their insights, Zanker explores the networks of conceptual relations that undergird the metaphorical expressions of Homeric poetry.

In a first case study of Homeric conceptual associations, Zanker responds to Fränkel's argument that Homeric poetry lacks a fully developed notion of time. Zanker shows that Homeric metaphors of time are in fact much like those of modern English speakers. Like us, the Homeric poets and their characters describe time in spatial terms. They sometimes imagine time in terms of a subject's movement along a course: Homeric characters 'arrive at the edge of destruction' or 'reach the measure of youth' (75). In other passages, time and not the subject is in motion: evening 'comes'; years 'wheel round' (79–81). Two events can also be described relative to one another, rather than with reference to a human subject. For instance, ὀπίσσω means 'after', regardless of the temporal orientation of the speaker (89–94).

While Homeric concepts of time resemble our own, the conceptual metaphors underlying descriptions of speech depart from modern English usage. Modern English favours the 'conduit metaphor', according to which a speaker puts meaning into her/his words and a listener extracts that same meaning from them: for instance, 'putting things into words' and 'getting things out of someone's statement' (103). As Zanker points out, such metaphors suggest that meaning is something discrete and stable, and leave no room for multiple interpretations of the same utterance. The Homeric poems, by contrast, describe words and speeches as objects sent out by the speaker and received by the listener. Images of archery suggest the powerful impact that some acts of communication (described as arrows) have on their recipients. Like the Anglophone metaphors that Zanker mentions, such images give the impression that meaning can be conveyed directly. But other Homeric images explore the process of comprehension; they describe listeners 'throwing words together' (συνίημι) so as to make sense of them.

Zanker's third case study focuses on Homeric metaphors of the mind and mental processes. These exhibit greater variety than the other classes of metaphor that Zanker discusses. In the Homeric poems, mental processes may be described in terms of physical phenomena such as wind or fluids;

intention is imagined in terms of directed movement. Zanker also explores descriptions of Homeric characters conversing with their θυμός ('spirit') which, unlike Snell, he treats as metaphorical. Zanker argues that they resemble English phrases studied by Lakoff and Johnson that use the image of the split self to describe mental conflict (for example, 'I was of two minds', 195). According to Lakoff and Johnson, such phrases imagine competing impulses as if they were conversational partners but do not make a claim about the structure of our minds: contrary to Snell's assertion, then, the fact that Homeric characters address their spirits does not entail that the Homeric poets lacked a concept of the unified mind.

Zanker's book surpasses existing applications of cognitive theories of metaphor to the classics in its scope and clarity. It also succeeds in answering some of the primitivist readings mentioned above and therefore has important implications for our understanding of the world of the Homeric poems. By showing that Homeric diction and modern English reflect similar cognitive habits (in both, conceptual pairings undergird metaphor), Zanker provides a powerful response to Fränkel's and Snell's arguments that the Homeric conceptual universe is underdeveloped. I am not certain, however, that an approach drawing on Lakoff and Johnson is capable of responding to Stanford's critique of Homeric metaphor. Stanford acknowledges that metaphor is more common in Homeric poetry than simile, and so a demonstration of the widespread conceptual networks underlying Homeric imagery does not constitute a refutation of his argument. One of Stanford's chief points is rather that 'in quality, emphasis, vividness and imagination, [Homeric] similes heavily outweigh the more frequent metaphors' (*Greek Metaphor*, Oxford 1971, 120). To show that he is mistaken, we would need a study that explores the aesthetic qualities of metaphorical expressions in Homer, and which emphasizes the rare and arresting, as opposed to the familiar conceptual structures underlying such expressions.

WILLIAM BROCKLISS
University of Wisconsin-Madison
brockliss@wisc.edu

SWIFT (L.) **Archilochus: The Poems: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019. Pp. viii + 492. £100. 978019-8768074.

With this edition and commentary, Laura Swift adds to an impressive body of work that already includes monographs on Euripides' *Ion* and on tragic interactions with lyric genres, two co-edited collections of essays on early Greek poetry and nearly two dozen articles and book chapters. For about a decade, much of her work has focused on the seventh-century BC poet Archilochus, whose surviving poems and fragments have received neither a complete commentary nor even an English-language commentary on all the major fragments. The publication in 2005 of *P.Oxy*. 4708, which includes 25 fairly well-preserved lines of what is now known as the 'Telephos elegy', made the filling of this gap all the more urgent. Swift's articles, whose arguments she repeats and develops here, have contributed greatly to the understanding of this piece, especially its martial values, use of genealogy and myth, and contexts on Paros and Thasos. Her interpretation of the 'first Cologne epode' (*fr*. 196a, first published in 1974 and now the best known of the longer fragments) is likewise repeated from an earlier article and supported with fresh arguments. Here, as throughout the volume, her views are insightful and judicious, although scholars will no doubt continue to debate how much agency to attribute to the female with whom the narrator first talks and then engages in a sex act at the end of the poem. Swift persuasively makes the ambiguous presentation of the latter a cornerstone of her interpretation.

Swift's articles and chapters have explored topics relevant to the study of all early Greek poetry, such as the narrator's voice, sources of authority and genre, as well as the preoccupations and traditions of Archilochean verse in particular, such as praise and blame, sex and desire, war and colonization, and animal fable. The fruits of this work are on full display here, including in a wide-ranging and stimulating introduction. Swift attends to metrical, grammatical and textual matters, but, because others have studied these extensively, she focuses instead, and to excellent effect, on the fragments' literary and historical contexts.

As far as possible, Swift retains the numbering of the fragments from Martin West's *IE*[2]. She prints and translates the Mnesiepes and Sosthenes inscriptions, but not a full set of testimonia. Her presentation and translation of the fragments and, where applicable, the surrounding text in the quoting authors is clear and reliable, though a reader will occasionally need to have *IE* or another full critical text to hand. For example, to understand why *fr*. 200 is included among the epodes, we need a testimonium quoted by West but only cited by Swift, and to see where the verb in the three-word *fr*. 223 comes from, we need the text of two Byzantine imitators, who use it, and not just the paraphrase of Lucian, who does not.

On the strength of wide reading and direct examination of the original squeezes of the Sosthenes inscription, Swift prints an improved text of *fr*. 93a, and in so doing removes a notorious ethnic slur from line 6, where 'Thracians by