In Elmer's reading, the *Iliad* begins with a 'state of exception'. Agamemnon is forced to give Chryseis back to her father, but in return claims Briseis, part of the booty promised to Achilles. In making this 'unilateral decision', Agamemnon veers off the customary path of consensus by imposing his will on the Achaeans as a whole. In consequence, the Achaeans react to his speech not with the consensus-denoting formula *epainesthai*, but with silence. From this point of the story on, the narrative aims to restore consensus as the norm. This tendency can be observed among the Achaeans and the gods as well. The Trojans are different, as manifested by Hector's decision to act against the assembly, whose will is finally formulated by Polydamas. Hector is not able to understand the social power of the 'consensus' principle and the Trojans must consequently fail. Yet, the Achaeans, too, are not able to put a complete end to the societal dysfunction. This is expressed, among other means, by the formula *epiachein*, which means only collective cheering, not decision making.

In Elmer's view, the poem does not fully restore the posited consensus; he draws a connection between this hypothesis and G. Nagy's assumption of ongoing performances of tradition, from which he derives a deliberate connection between the text and the various audiences. Hence these audiences, representing the 'national community', are presumed to be the forum where the thread of the *Iliad*'s story was followed to its intended end, again to enact the norm of consensus.

The argument is logically developed through the nine chapters of the book, arranged in three parts. The introduction sets out the methodological premises. To circumscribe the term 'consensus', Elmer picks up on Egon Flaig's definition ('Das Konsensprinzip im homerischen Olymp. Überlegungen zum göttlichen Entscheidungsprozess Ilias 4, 1-72', *Hermes* 122 (1994) 13–31) and circumscribes the term 'consensus' as 'disposition to yield'. To define the term 'conflict', he falls back on Carl Schmitt's simplistic differentiation of friend and foe (*Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, Chicago 2005; *The Concept of the Political*, Chicago 2007). By necessity, he then gives only an exemplary interpretation of the *Iliad*. Part one deals with the conflict between Agamemnon and Achilles and between Thersites and Odysseus. Part two describes the different understanding of consensus by the political communities of the Achaeans and the Trojans and then the relationships between the Olympian gods. Part three serves to connect the audiences within the *Iliad* and outside it in the 'real', historical world.

This book is full of excellent observations, for instance the reading of the simile of the waves beaten by the wind in its slightly different use for the Achaean and the Trojan armies. As for his main argument that the theme of consensus is central to the story of the *Iliad*, the question remains whether the *Iliad*'s message is directed at the audiences in the real world not to restore traditional conditions, but to prompt them to organize their political life anew along the thread developed in the story – a possibility Elmer is aware of, but does not follow to its end. This might also be a reflection of the fact that neither studies critical of his far-reaching notion of formula, nor the many philological and historical examinations of the topic's strife, community and consensus, nor those that take a narratological perspective of the Homeric epics or deal with ethnogenesis and Hellenicity, the function of the gift and the role of agon, nor those that analyse the archaeological record and give evidence of the 'real' world, nor, least of all, those that argue for an impact of 'oriental' texts on the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are given their due consideration. This is regrettable, as only a multi-perspective reading can help us come as close as possible to the world(s) of the Homeric epics.

CHRISTOPH ULF
University of Innsbruck
christoph.ulf@uibk.ac.at

FANTUZZI (M.) **Achilles in Love: Intertextual Studies**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. Pp. 336, illus. £74. 9780199603626.
doi:10.1017/S0075426914001499

This richly-detailed and erudite study traces the love life of the *Iliad*'s hero throughout the Graeco-Roman literary tradition and into late antiquity. Reconstructing the varied traditions of Achilles' relations with Deidamia, Briseis, Patroclus and Penthesileia, Fantuzzi illuminates an important chapter in the ancient reception of Homer, one in which later readers and rewriters respond to what is absent rather than present in the original source. Achilles does not appear as a lover to any significant degree in the *Iliad*: his entanglement with Deidamia on Scyros and his captivation by Penthesileia at the instant of her death occur

outside the time frame of the narrative and are not recalled or anticipated; within the *Iliad*, Achilles seems to care about Briseis more as a prize of honour than as an object of love, and his stronger feelings for Patroclus are not portrayed as erotic.

Such omissions may tell us something about the specific tenor of the *Iliad*, but Fantuzzi argues persuasively that love was treated as incompatible with military heroism elsewhere in early epic as well; the episode in the *Aethiopis* in which Thersites is harshly punished for exposing Achilles' passion for Penthesileia thematizes the unsuitability of love both as the experience of a true hero and as the subject of heroic epic. Behind this proscription lies the question of ideal masculinity, which is put at risk as the lover cedes control, whether to another person or to passion itself; the threat of feminization is especially highlighted in Achilles' liaison with Deidamia, in which he succumbs to love while hiding from the war in women's clothes.

Inevitably, genre plays a large role in determining how Achilles' amorous adventures are handled. In Athenian tragedy, with its interest in erotic passion, Aeschylus' *Myrmidons* portrays Achilles unambiguously as Patroclus' *erastes*, possibly for the first time, and Euripides' *Scyrioi* dramatizes his sojourn with Deidamia; both plays stress the pain of separation, as Achilles confronts Patroclus' death or is forced to leave Scyros and reassume his warrior identity. Achilles' role as lover, and its absence from Homer, are addressed most thoroughly in genres that define themselves in opposition to epic, especially Roman love elegy. In their defence of *militia amoris*, Propertius and Ovid 'uncover' Achilles' tender feelings for Briseis and cite them as proof that real soldiers are also motivated by love. In the *Ars Amatoria*, Ovid blames Achilles' mother Thetis for his cross-dressing and presents his rape of Deidamia as a paradigm of masterful self-assertion by the male lover. But these complex intertextual histories can also lead to a more expansive depiction of heroism within epic. Achilles' love for Deidamia is given greater dignity in Statius' *Achilleid*: his cross-dressing becomes a youthful right-of-passage, his departure from Scyros is the outcome of an inner struggle between the demands of his martial destiny and the legitimate claims of domestic love.

Fantuzzi's expansive treatment also draws attention to less immediately obvious contexts for these stories, often involving lost or understudied works, such as Sophocles' satyr drama *The Lovers of Achilles*, in which Achilles is the object of the satyrs' lust. Some especially interesting Hellenistic examples include Lycophron's *Alexandra*, in which Cassandra vilifies Achilles by alluding to his shameful love affairs, and the fragmentary *Epithalamium of Achilles and Deidamia* attributed to Bion, in which Achilles woos Deidamia in the language of Sappho. Particular attention is given to ancient scholarship, which Fantuzzi shows to have been influential on subsequent traditions. For example, ancient commentators wrestling with the Achilles-Briseis relationship in the *Iliad* developed a view of Briseis as deeply in love, which was then reflected in the lovelorn Briseis of Ovid's *Heroides*. Fantuzzi also discusses depictions of these stories in visual culture. The book ends with a series of Roman sarcophagi that represent the story of Penthesileia in order to symbolize the transcendence of love over death. Despite the *Iliad*, as Fantuzzi elegantly demonstrates, Achilles' identity as a lover is also irrepressible, surfacing again and again throughout antiquity to delineate the contested relationship between love and war.

SHEILA MURNAGHAN
University of Pennsylvania
smurnagh@sas.upenn.edu

WILKINSON (C.L.) **The Lyric of Ibycus: Introduction, Text and Commentary** (Sozomena: Studies in the Recovery of Ancient Texts 13). Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013. Pp. x + 318, illus. €109.95. 9783110288940.
doi:10.1017/S0075426914001505

A full commentary on the fragments of Ibycus is a *desideratum*. Wilkinson has done a useful job which contains much of value, but is in some ways disappointing. Not all fragments are treated, but most of the omissions are fragments with little or no continuous sense from *ipsissima verba*. The most surprising omission is that no fragment is included from 257 (a) *PMGF* (*P.Oxy*. 3538, counted by Wilkinson as Ibycean: 44).

The introduction is divided into sections on Ibycus' life and ancient reputation, date and poetry; the latter section is subdivided into content, imagery, performance, dialect and metre. There follows a brief account of transmission before the edition and commentary. Wilkinson has re-examined the papyri, but for quotation fragments relies on M. Davies' *PMGF*. Photographs of papyri at the end are not properly captioned.