

A particular feature of the book is de J.'s provision of shorter notes that brilliantly elucidate a passage's importance as part of a larger structural or thematic sequence in the poem as a whole. The reader will find no better introduction to the importance of the 'Oresteia story' throughout the *Odyssey* than the commentator's note at 1.32–43. Another example of this type of 'holistic' note may be found at 2.143–207, the unit of text in which the first of many 'omen scenes' in the poem may be found. The accretion of such detailed notes facilitates the reader's navigation through the poem from a myriad of themes and perspectives; just how comprehensive is the range of issues covered in this commentary may be gleaned from the index of narrative subject-headings at the back of the book.

As might be expected, the commentary concentrates on the variety of narrative registers and narrators on display in the *Odyssey*. The prefatory analyses of Odysseus' Apology and the Cretan Lies are outstanding, and particular attention is devoted to elucidation of narratives of the same events by different narrators. See, for example, the comparison of Odysseus' own narrative of his departure from Ogygia (note *ad* 7.240–97) to the earlier third person narrative of Book 5, or the analysis of Amphimedon's account in Book 24 of the death of the suitors.

But perhaps the most important aspect of this book is what it achieves at the so-called 'meso-textual' level. As implied above, de J. has deliberately opted for a more relaxed style than one might normally expect from a commentary; restatement of ideas and re-examination of verses in different contexts are not necessarily precluded. Accordingly, readers are warned in advance that 'when consulting this commentary for a particular passage they would do well to cast their net wide'. The more discursive (for want of a better word) critical analysis applied by de J. reaps its major benefit in her identification of underlying structural rhythms in the narrative that are clearly and demonstrably present in the text, but not necessarily apparent in the reading of it. A perfect example of this is her precise analysis of the tripartite exchange of dialogue between Laodamas, Odysseus, and Euryalus in Book 8 (see note *ad* 8.132–255), or, even more directly, in her discussion of the speeches comprising the recognition sequence in Book 23 (see note *ad* 23.1–240). The subtleties of the rhythms identified by the commentator in this fashion shed new light on both the nature of communication and orality in this poem.

To sum up, this is one of the most important commentaries to be produced on the *Odyssey* for years. It is nothing less than the indispensable handbook of interpretation that all those interested in narrative issues in this poem have been awaiting.

University of Leeds

RAY CLARE

EPIC AUDIENCES

R. SCODEL: *Listening to Homer. Tradition, Narrative, and Audience*. Pp. x + 235. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2002. Cased, US\$49.50/£35.50. ISBN: 0-472-11265-1.

Ruth Scodel is an impressively well-equipped Homerist. She knows the Homeric poems inside out, has read widely in German scholarship as well as Anglo-American, and shows a balanced judgement in the discussion of disputed questions. She is experienced in the sciences of narratology and reception theory; and in addition has a wide field of reference, albeit at second hand, to oral traditions and performance techniques in other societies (South Slavic, Indian, Egyptian, Javanese). There is

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

much therefore to be learned here. Her last book was the brilliant *Credible Impossibilities: Conventions and Strategies of Verisimilitude in Homer and Greek Tragedy* (Stuttgart, 1999), reviewed by Barbara Goward in *CR* 51 (2001), 20–1.

The first two chapters offer a prolonged discussion of tradition and innovation in oral poetry, not too easy to follow. It appears that the norm in the non-Greek societies that she is able to quote is that the audience is familiar with the songs that it hears, having heard them before, and enjoys them for that very reason. Even if the bard occasionally makes changes, there is a kind of complicity between him and his hearers to treat the new song as if it is traditional. This would have been so in the Greek tradition too, but (pp. 52–3) there came a time of self-conscious artistic intervention, leading to the two monumental epics that we have. They are not representative of what preceded them.

In the course of this discussion S. defines different audiences for the poet's performance, especially the 'narrative audience' and the 'authorial audience'. The distinction, deriving from a 1987 book by R. Rabinowitz, has been progressively explained by her in *Arethusa* 30 (1997), 202, *Credible Impossibilities*, pp. 5–6, and here on p. 62. The 'narrative audience' is not, as we might suppose, the Phaeacians (who are the 'internal audience'), but those hearers or readers who accept the story as told, and treat it as true, whereas the 'authorial audience' shares the knowledge of the author that it is an artistic composition.

The third chapter (entitled 'Homeric Rhetorics: Traditionality and Disinterest') is still more difficult. This is partly because it is derived from another article of hers, in *AJP* 1998. Much of the difficulty stems from a new meaning given to the term 'oral tradition'. Unexpectedly, we find S. distinguishing between 'oral tradition' and 'epic tradition'. The former is *kleos*, which may be the reminiscences of characters such as Nestor, Menelaus, and Odysseus, or what a character has heard from others, as Nestor had heard (orally!) that all was not right in Ithaca, *Od.* 3.211–13; the latter is the song of the bard. This distinction lies behind a virtually incomprehensible statement on p. 77: 'Although Glaucus' recitation of his genealogy to Diomedes is epic performance in that he is an epic character, and although it is clearly an oral performance within the mimetic world, it is not epic performance within the mimetic world.' We may try to understand this by going back to the *AJP* article, where the (almost identical) sentence occurs on p. 176. For us, and for S. in the rest of the book, the oral tradition means the tradition of oral poetry, which she here calls the epic tradition.

The fourth chapter, 'Homeric Exposition', is more straightforward. S. considers (following previous treatment in the *Arethusa* article) what prior knowledge in the audience the poet assumes in first the *Iliad* and then the *Odyssey*. This is very well done. Similarly clear are the next two, which stand together: 'Abbreviated Narrative' and 'Narrative Teases'. These lead up to perhaps the most important contribution in the book, her suggested solution of the greatest narrative problem in the *Iliad*, that of the duals in the Embassy. S. questions the common assumption that where there is a gap in the information given by the poet, it is the function of the commentator or reader to deduce the missing information, as if the situation is one of real life, and there must be an explanation. In *Od.* 4.640, for example, we are told that the suitors thought that Telemachus might have gone 'to the swineherd'; but the importance of Eumaeus does not appear until Book 13, and his name not until 14.55. The assumption of the modern commentator is that so allusive an introduction implies that the audience knew who the swineherd was, and therefore that Eumaeus was part of the tale before the *Odyssey*. The same argument has been used by German scholars about Patroclus in the *Iliad*, first introduced by patronymic alone at 1.307; see p. 109. S. on

the contrary sees the poet as not worrying too much about instant transparency; the identity and significance of the swineherd, as of Patroclus, will become clear in due course.

From there she proceeds to the duals, and summarizes the explanations that have been vainly offered by previous scholars. For herself, she associates the uncertainty about the two who walked along the shore and were welcomed by Achilles with the unexplained and usually unaddressed problem of the presence of Phoenix among the Greek leaders addressed by Nestor. Indeed, at the time we, as the audience, know nothing at all about Phoenix, and should be a little surprised when Nestor gives him a leading rôle in the Embassy. The poet, she says, names this character, but leaves uncertainty about him in the minds of the audience; and their mystification is increased by the dual number given to the ambassadors. Clarity about the rôle of Phoenix comes only with his speech. (An earlier version of this subtle argument appeared in her 1997 *Arethusa* article.)

The book ends with a chapter on 'The Social Audience', considering whether we can deduce from the poems the social status and sympathies of their hearers.

There are imperfections, such as careless spellings ('Oelian' Ajax is the most disturbing—that irascible hero would not have been amused, and 'Cadmaeans'), and uncorrected misprints in Greek (and once in Latin), including after a time zetas in place of final sigmas.

University College London

M. M. WILLCOCK

REPRESENTATIONS OF HOMER

BARBARA GRAZIOSI: *Inventing Homer. The Early Reception of Epic*. Pp. xiii + 285. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Cased, £40/US\$60. ISBN: 0-521-80966-5.

This book is a study of 'biographic' representations of Homer, mostly in antiquity, but also with many observations on their relations to modern views. The present reviewer, having just completed the MS. of a book on Homer that, in part, deals with similar subjects, addresses some of the same problems, and considers some of the same evidence, has found G.'s book particularly interesting, but no doubt other students of Homer and classicists in general will also find here much that is of benefit. G.'s basic premise is that discussions of the figure of Homer, whatever their relation to 'truth', but all the more so if they are fictionalized, provide us with important insights for understanding the significance and meaning of the Homeric poems within specific contexts. There are always the details, of course, but in general this is obviously right. Any other view risks either the Scylla of naïve historicism which elides the distance between representations and 'reality', or the Charybdis of dismissing important and interesting evidence as irrelevant fancy. Strangely, perhaps, some able scholars of Homer have succumbed to one or the other of these risks. G. sails through them by and large safely, sensitively, and in a well-informed manner.

In Chapter 1 G. considers rhapsodes, singers, and the coming into being, as it were, of a figure 'Homer' in the tradition. She argues that the word *aoidos* belongs to a distant past in which composer and performer coincide, while the words *rhapsodos* and *poietes*, which appear only later, mark a distinction between author and performer. The 'emergence' of Homer, she suggests, may be connected to this process of distinction. Rhapsodes, so as to enhance their reputation, would claim a link to some well-known