

NOTICES

M. HAMMOND (trans.): *Homer, The Odyssey* (with an Introduction by J. Griffin). Pp. xxviii + 290. London: Duckworth, 2000. Paper, £9.99. ISBN: 0-7156-2958-1.

Hammond's admirable translation of the *Odyssey* complements his translation of the *Iliad*, which appeared in 1987. He is remarkably successful in combining accuracy with a lively and highly readable style. 'Perhaps', he says (p. viii), 'the greatest "treason" is to make the *Odyssey* sound as if it was written by an Anglophone novelist (or poet) of the late twentieth century'. So he rightly makes no attempt to disguise the features of Homeric style and manner which might seem alien to the modern reader. Repeated lines and passages are usually repeated word for word (at 23.276 he even includes from 11.129 the formulaic epithet which in the later passage has actually been replaced by Homer with the verb which the context now requires), but there are very occasional variations: at 12.152 (cf. 14.256) 'held her on course' is a better translation of *ἴθυνε* than 'held her sails taut' (11.10). Almost all of the formulaic epithets are reproduced (an exception is *φίλον* with *κῆρ* or *ῆτορ*), though with such words as *δαίμονιος*, *δαΐφρων*, *διοτρεφής*, and *σχέτλιος* H. allows himself greater flexibility in translation. I counted no fewer than eleven different renderings of *ἀμύμων*, but never, I think, 'blameless'. One might quibble about the omission of the occasional word, and some of the meanings are inevitably debatable: for example, an *ἀμφικύπελλον* cup is probably 'double' rather than 'two-handled'.

The translation is hardly ever awkward: perhaps at 7.208 'that should not be any thought in your mind', at 18.33 'roughened their quarrel', and at 22.165–6 'that appalling man who we thought it was is on his way'. It is perhaps a little too colloquial at 1.209 'ever so much' and at 9.414 'my splendid know-how'. The 'town parliament' comes as something of a surprise at 15.468. Far more often one is struck by a simple but felicitous turn of phrase: 4.103 'a man soon tires of chilling tears', 8.185 'your words have stung my heart, and I rise to your challenge', 9.459–60 'my heart would feel some relief from the pain which that nobody of a Noman has caused me', 10.273 'But I am going—hard though it is, I have no choice'. H. attempts bravely to reproduce the pun on Odysseus' name at 1.62 and 19.407, 'at odds and issue with', but not at 5.340, 423, or 19.275. The alliteration (see p. ix) is slightly overdone at 2.276, 9.71, and 13.85–6, better at 14.267–8 = 17.436–7.

Jasper Griffin contributes an introduction which ranges widely but concisely over such matters as oral poetry, the relationship between *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, the two different kinds of hero represented by Achilles and Odysseus, the structure and unity of the poem, Odysseus' lying tales, and the rôle of the female characters—with many sensitive comments along the way. An astonishingly full index of proper names concludes this excellent book. It is indeed much more than an index, and will be invaluable for anyone who, for instance, wishes to see at a glance a list of all Odysseus' lying tales and the names of their recipients, or the various forms which Athene takes in the poem.

University of Glasgow

A. F. GARVIE

W. G. THALMANN: *The Swineherd and the Bow. Representations of Class in the 'Odyssey'*. Pp. xiii + 330. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1998. Cased, £37.50. ISBN: 0-8014-3479-3.

This book seeks to present an account of class discourse in the *Odyssey*, by examining 'vertical' class relations in the society of the poem, through the representation of slaves within a fundamentally aristocratic system, and 'horizontal', through the relations of the members of the élite with each other: the swineherd thus refers to the former, and the bow to the culture of competition which characterizes the latter. Without attempting to locate the poem(s) in any specific period of Greek society, Thalmann's contention is that they were 'centrally involved in the debates and struggles that attended the birth of the *polis*—as seeking to persuade their

audiences to a certain vision of social harmony under élite domination but potentially open to reinterpretation and appropriation by various groups then and later' (p. 278). In his Part 1 (Chapters I and II), he works from the (far from undisputed) standpoint that the poem's minor characters who are observed in a relation of subservience with the élite are all to be classed as slaves, and that this relationship should be seen as representative of all the poem's hierarchical social relations (pp. 16–17). The picture of slaves presented in the poem is thus a selective one, representing with approval the View from Above (Chapter II); by the same token, free peasants are virtually eliminated from the poem as being 'too independent in their views to have been worked easily into a picture of harmonious hierarchical relations without that picture ringing false to the actual experience of the poem's audience' (p. 50). The élite thus defines and confirms itself by reference to its other, the enslaved; and yet, by its very arbitrariness, slavery in the poem challenges the élite, for a Eumaios clearly outshines a suitor. So, Eumaios is a good slave because Odysseus is a good master, and the bad slaves are bad because they are associated with the suitors: 'through [Eumaios], the social organization is viewed from the perspective of one at the bottom who is content with it, and a system of social and economic inequality is presented as a harmonious reconciliation of potentially conflicting interests' (p. 91). In Part 2 (Chapters III and IV) T. examines horizontal relations, that is, between the males of different households, and, within individual households, between male and female, and between father and son. He instances the rivalry of Akhilleus and Agamemnon, and the duel of Paris and Menelaos in *Iliad* 3, as examples of the violence of masculine competition at the heart of the community; these rivalries over women serve as a paradigm for the contest of the bow between Odysseus and the suitors for possession of Penelope. Odysseus' victory in that competition serves not just to assert his status over that of the males of rival households, but within his own household too, as husband and as father: the result is that the very fidelity of Penelope, her like-mindedness, 'thus becomes a code word that masks actual inequality by suggesting equality, and its use reflects the dominance of a male-centered discourse' (p. 236). Part 3 (Chapters V and VI) attempts to locate the patterns of vertical and horizontal relations within the historical framework of the Dark Age, but here T.'s thesis is at its least persuasive, relying as it does on a reconstruction of a Dark Age characterized by class struggle which hardly seems justified from the evidence presented: 'there might also have been some who listened to the poem sometimes, economically exploited in real life, who reacted with resentment against "tax-and-spend" aristocrats and found their sense of injustice confirmed' (p. 298). T. has produced a valuable picture of the status and rôle of slaves in the poem, and of the competitive ethic of its male élite; but for many, his vision of the poem as 'an ideological force for unity in the emerging polis on aristocratic terms' (p. 299) will perhaps be rather less convincing.

University of Exeter

N. POSTLETHWAITE

F. FERRARI (ed.): *Pindaro, Olimpiche*. Pp. 205, 8 ills. Milan: Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, 1998. Paper, L. 13,000. ISBN: 88-17-17226-X.

The volume belongs to the eminently affordable BUR series of classical texts and translations, and follows the standard format. A Greek text is accompanied in the manner of the Loeb and Budé series by a facing Italian translation, and text and translation are preceded by introductory material intended for student and (non-specialist) scholarly use.

The introduction has sections on athletics and the victory ode; the context of commission and performance; the poet's rôle; the structure of the ode; the previously transparent but currently contentious issue of the manner of performance and the poet's imaginative play with the performative context and the speaking voice; the myth; and the religion of the odes. Separate short chapters deal with Pindar's life, the history of the text and the manuscript tradition, a brief range of critical views on Pindar, and a selective survey of scholarship. Collectively these sections provide a useful starting point for the reader trying to come to terms with one of the most difficult ancient authors. Ferrari provides a brief overview of the history of Pindaric criticism. Although what is said is eminently sensible, the brevity of the treatment leaves unclear how F. would resolve the question of unity; he contents himself (pp. 17–18) with a formalist description of three planes of reference (ode as sequence of encomiastic motifs, ode as sequence of image, etc., ode as part of political and performative context), without steering the reader towards their integration. Myth and religion too could have done with more discussion.

F. offers a text independent of his immediate predecessors in matters great and small: 1.12