

a still all too rare example of how medieval Greek texts may be brought to bear on such questions, with lessons for Byzantinists and non-Byzantinists alike. For the most part, she avoids subjecting the reader to the now hypertrophied formulas of narratology. When she does, as with Gerard Genette's "transtextual" scheme, she opts for economy and illustrates its application concisely enough to make the case for its usefulness.

One aspect of this book which reviews like this risk neglecting, although it is the one which should most recommend *Raconter Byzance* to a broad gamut of readers, is its author's unassuming appreciation of the texts she discusses. N likes her texts, and not just because they offer a stage for her to sound smart, a not uncommon vice of literary scholars. N acknowledges that delight in the pleasures on offer in Byzantine literature does not come easy, though she hints at an embarrassing (and largely suppressed) consonance, at times, between our own literary expectations and those of Byzantine audiences. Given the unlikelihood of unmediated appreciation of any pre-modern literature, *Raconter Byzance* enacts the source of such delight for a contemporary reader. Spend some time with this book and you are likely to seek out and (re)read for yourself at least a few of the texts mentioned here. What more can we ask of a literary scholar?

Emmanuel Bourbouhakis
Princeton University

E. Cullhed (ed.), *Eustathios of Thessalonike Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Volume 1: *On Rhapsodies A-B*. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2016. Pp. xxx, 58*, 471.
DOI:[10.1017/byz.2019.2](https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.2)

E. Cullhed's new edition of the *Commentary on Homer's Odyssey (Rhapsodies A-B)* of Eustathios of Thessalonike (c. 1115–1195) is an important contribution to classical and byzantine scholarship.

The *Commentary on the Odyssey*, as well as that on the *Iliad*, is organised in *parekbolai*, namely in a collection of texts from one or several sources. "Here, just as in the *Iliad*," so Eustathios writes at the end of the 'preface' to *Comm. Od.*, "our method of handling the subject matter will not be through exegesis, which others have concerned themselves with, but through collecting useful passages for those who run through the work and cannot easily permit themselves to go leisurely into the breadth of the poem. Many things relevant for the *Odyssey*, however, are passed over in silence in this commentary, because enough has already been said about them in the notes on the *Iliad*" (Cullhed's translation, 11).

The textual genesis of the *parekbolai* on the *Odyssey* has been long and complex. The analysis of the three manuscripts (autographs or at least produced under the author's eye) prove that they were not composed "in isolated operations from beginning to end, but resulted from processes of gradual accumulation of material that must have lasted for a number of years before they were eventually compiled into the texts as we know them" (5*). In fact, throughout his long life and even in the years he was archbishop of

Thessalonike (from 1178), Eustathios remained an active teacher and scholar and carried on working on his philological works. Probably those *Commentaries* began to be spread from 1168 and 1175/78. However, they also show traces of previous works too.

Eustathios, Master of Rhetoric in Constantinople (c. 1168), wrote the *Commentaries* conceiving them not as “a ‘popularizing’ piece, but a scholarly instrument” (11*) addressed to his students, with whom he kept contact through letters after he had moved to Thessalonike. Moreover, “Eustathios’ aim is not merely to ‘teach Homer’ but to amplify a didactic function perceived in the epics themselves” (12*). As Homer’s exegete, he adopts principles and methods certainly not new nor properly belonging only to him, but in such a way that “he appears to represent the zenith of a development in educational culture that had lasted for at least a century” (13*). In a close critical dialogue with his predecessors (Psellos) and contemporaries (Tzetzes, John the Deacon, Galenos), “through rhetorical analysis and allegoresis” Eustathios “engages with much more than the ABC of *grammatikē* and confidently ensures educated adults than they too will benefit from sitting in on the lessons offered in his commentaries” (17*).

The second part of the introduction (“Textual Witness and Editorial Principles”) is more technical, but by no means less important. The text of the *Commentary on the Odyssey* is transmitted by two manuscripts that Cullhed calls ‘authorial’, meaning that, if not autographs, they were at least prepared under Eustathios’ supervision: *Parisinus* gr. 2702 (= P) and *Marcianus* gr. 460 (= M). They have all the peculiarities of *Laurentiani* 59.2 and 59.3 (= L), which contain the *Commentary on the Iliad* seemingly written by the same scribe. The autographical problem of the three manuscripts remains *sub iudice*, because now Cullhed (38* n. 23) affirms himself to be “less sure” than he was in 2012 (*Mnemosyne* 65, 445–61). Remaining *codices integri* of the *Comm. Od.* and those with wide collections of *excerpta* were direct or indirect copies of M P. The relationship between M and P is properly examined with a focused analysis of the codicological structure of M, a more recent witness of P, in the irregular quires 6 and 27. All this leads Cullhed to assert with convincing arguments that M P derive from a unique lost manuscript exemplar (α).

The *editio princeps* of the *Comm. Od.*, published in Rome in 1549, was based on the *Vaticanus* gr. 1905, a copy of M collated with P. Cullhed summarises the main results of the editorial principles, which he had already discussed elsewhere (2016): “The authorial status of M P, combined with their stratigraphy and the interrupted revision process in M, means that the textual record offers differing textual versions for different parts of the text. [...] Therefore the edition will visually distinguish between two stages: before and after revisions” (55*). Cullhed prints the definitive version of the *Commentary* pointing out within double square brackets [...] the additions not included already in the first version; corrections (*marginalia et interlinearia*) are placed in the *apparatus criticus* followed by the designation “(corr.)”. Interlinear notes which are not additions or corrections “but part of the text itself as alternative endings are printed between the lines” (55*). Given his aim of limiting emendation only to textual errors,

but not mistakes, the conjectures are rare. Special attention is given to punctuation. There are three *apparati*: *apparatus locorum citatorum* (from Eustathios' work), *apparatus fontium et locorum parallelorum*, and *apparatus criticus*.

All that remains is to go into the reading, often tiring and sometimes boring but always useful, of the immense series of Eustathios' *parekbolai* on Homer's *Odyssey* (*Rhapsodies A-B*), preceded by his 'preface'. The text edition is excellent. The clear English translation facing the Greek text undoubtedly helps the reader.

The results of a modern edition of the first part of the *Commentary on the Odyssey*, parallel to that of the *Commentary on the Iliad* by M. van der Valk (1971–1987), are truly promising. Even with the awareness that the preparation of the *Commentary* in its entirety will take a long time, the hope of seeing it one day complete now appears to be concrete.

Tiziano Dorandi
Centre J. Pépin UMR 8230 CNRS/ENS, Paris

Susan Ashbrook Harvey and Margaret Mullett (eds.), *Knowing Bodies, Passionate Souls: Sense Perceptions in Byzantium*. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2017. Pp. 330.
DOI:[10.1017/byz.2019.3](https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.3)

This volume constitutes a feast for most senses. The reader's eye is delighted by the beautiful book with the high quality printing and colour illustrations. The online accessed companion audio file is a pleasure for the ears. While turning the pages, one feels the touch of and smells the expensive paper. *Knowing Bodies, Passionate Souls* is the amplified outcome of the homonymous symposium organized at Dumbarton Oaks in 2014 by the editors.

The volume is timely and relevant, responding to the early twenty-first century "sensory turn" in the social sciences and humanities, heralded by David Howes ("Charting the Sensorial Revolution", *Senses and Society* 1.1 [2006]: 113–128). Surprisingly, neither Howes' works on the senses or those of Constance Classen, who examines the sensorium across history and cultures, are well represented in the volume's bibliography. Nevertheless, the volume is an extremely important addition to Byzantine studies in which, apart from sight, the senses have attracted little attention.

Knowing Bodies, Passionate Souls has six thematic parts framed by an introduction and a general index. The first five parts are organized around the five senses ("Sight", "Hearing", "Smell", "Taste" and "Touch") while the last part entitled "The Sensorium" includes contributions that are not devoted to a particular sense. All together, this is a substantive volume, with sixteen chapters on topics including literary studies, history, art history, architecture, archaeology, musicology and theology. The volume's scholarship is in general of high quality. I only have a few quibbles here and there.