

and carrion birds, as the will of Zeus was accomplished.
 Begin at the time when bitter words first divided
 that king of men, Agamemnon, and godlike Achilles.

Both language and rhythm are clear, rapid and elegant, and most of the content is kept. But one vital part is missing in this section, namely the introduction of one of the most important human characters in the *Iliad* as Peleus' Achilles. To be identified as the 'son of ...' is important for the construction of identity in the *Iliad*. We all know that a multitude of epithets of this kind are frequent in the *Iliad*. I see a risk that we today in our written culture may experience these epithets and repetitive words as unnecessary and time-consuming to read and thus dismiss them as uninteresting. The *Iliad* was not, however, originally meant to be read, and if we want to get close to the *Iliad* and its characters as well as to grasp a sense of the oral character of the narrative, these characteristics should be kept. There are other examples of crucial information being lost. For instance, M.'s translation of the bird named ἄρπη as 'sea hawk' in *Il.* 19.350. According to *LSJ* it is an 'unknown bird of prey', but it is unlikely that it is a sea bird since Athena, assimilated to this bird, departs from the mountainous area of Mt Olympus. This is not a natural place for a sea bird of any kind.

M.'s language is contemporary and his characters' speech is informal. Sometimes, however, the language becomes too simplistic, such as in the episode where the gods speak to each other in a way which reminds one too much of a family of today with teenagers round a dinner table: 'These words caused Athena and Hera to seethe with fury as they sat together devising grief for the Trojans. Athena was silent; though angry at Zeus, her father, and though a fierce passion gripped her, she held her tongue. But Hera could not contain herself, and she cried out, "Dread Lord, what are you saying?"' (4.18–23) And further on: 'Greatly annoyed by what she had said, Zeus answered, "How absurd you are!"' (4.29–30).

There are also problems with words such as κύων that M. translates as 'bitch' (*Il.* 9.373). 'Dog' and 'bitch' are not the same, and information and connotations get lost. Many replacements of words, sometimes archaic words, with contemporary words might be a way of reaching a new generation of readers of the *Iliad*, but such choices simultaneously run the risk of moving the text too far from its original meaning. One function of the archaic and formal language in the *Iliad* was surely, already at the time of its creation, to give a touch of a former period of time when the ancestors were stronger and mightier.

University of Gothenburg

KARIN JOHANSSON
karin.johansson@class.gu.se

THE CHRONOLOGY OF EARLY EPIC

ANDERSEN (O.), HAUG (D.T.T.) (edd.) *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*. Pp. xiv + 277, figs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Cased, £60, US\$99. ISBN: 978-0-521-19497-6.
 doi:10.1017/S0009840X13002084

The editors have brought together a top team of international experts to create a complex and sophisticated collection of essays looking at the possible internal techniques for dating and its importance for understanding the different levels of interaction between texts and traditions. One of the best features of this collection is its demonstration of progression within Homeric Studies, with influential voices of the late twentieth century revising

their work alongside the younger generation working in their wake. Of the thirteen contributions, those of G. Danek, M. Finkelberg, H., R. Janko, B. Jones and R. Wachter address relative chronology in the linguistic stratigraphy of early Greek epic, while the place of the extant poems and fragments in a wider circle of epic is addressed by A., J. Burgess, B. Currie, W. Kullmann, I. Rutherford, M. West and S. West.

The volume begins with Janko's summary and defence of his earlier work in statistical analysis in 'πρωτόν τε και ὕστατον αἰὲν ἀεΐδεται: Relative Chronology and the Literary History of the Early Greek Epos'. Jones uses the same method of statistical analysis in 'Relative Chronology and an 'Aeolic Phase' of Epic' to counter Janko's proposed earlier Aeolic phase of epic. Jones points out the continuation of Aeolic forms instead of Ionic equivalents with the same metrical value alongside hybrid forms, a mixture better understood as continual diffusion over a long period of time rather than fossilised inheritance. Although positioned later in the volume, a similar approach comes in the discussion of 'preferential hierarchy' in *tnesis* by H. ('Tmesis in the Epic Tradition'). After setting out the ways and means of *tnesis*, H. uses the quantitative strategy to compile a chart of frequency for the early epic corpus, supporting West's separation of the *Catalogue* from the rest of the *Theogony* and demonstrating the surprisingly higher frequency in the *Odyssey* than *Iliad*.

Statistical analysis on the micro-level leads to a larger scale investigation of formula in the chapters by Wachter and Finkleberg. Expanding the possible exchange between Ionic and Aeolic epic traditions described by Jones, Wachter proposes a North Ionian individual poet living in a place and time in which language was naturally dynamic and evolving ('The Other View: Focus on Linguistic Innovations in the Homeric Epics'). His interesting proposal that the combination of recent with older forms decreases over the course of the poet's life as he composes the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* merges the statistical results of Janko with a practical point about the way speakers use language. Finkelberg, 'Late Features in the Speeches of the *Iliad*', discusses the well-known linguistic peculiarities of speeches made by Hector (*Il.* 18.288–96), Menelaos (*Il.* 13.620–5) and Diomedes (*Il.* 6.130–7), considering the themes expressed as well as the later, unusual or unique words used to express them: not only are the words used 'later' but also the ideas, a nice integration of the Parry–Lord theory of the thematic significance of traditional formulae and the analytic deconstruction of linguistic layering.

Further revision to the work of Parry and Lord comes in Danek's interesting update to his own conclusions in 'The Doloneia Revisited'. With brief descriptions of linguistic and formulaic discrepancies, he details how the author of Book 10 of the *Iliad* violates 'Zielinski's law' on four occasions deliberately to highlight his mastery of Homeric language and style. This lack of stylistic cohesion is significant, since several 'test cases' in the recorded songs of Avdo Međedović do not exhibit such stylistic differences regardless of different modes of transmission of material to the singer: all songs become his own through adaptation to his characteristic ornate style. Danek concludes that a poet learned a written *Iliad* by heart and added a bit of his own material in the early sixth century, adopting an 'ironic stance to his master text' to showcase his mastery through deliberate differences (p. 121).

The volume takes a more literary turn with the contribution of S. West, 'Odyssean Stratigraphy'. Picking up some threads of neo-analysis, she points out the merger of several different poetic *topoi* to create a grander, fuller heroic status for Odysseus in Book 11. West finds hints of movement of micro-episodes within the book, outlining a 'stratigraphy' of episodes building from an original Thesprotian *nekuomanteion*. Analytic reconstruction of the *Odyssey* continues in A.'s chapter, 'Older Heroes and Earlier Poems: Heracles in the *Odyssey*'. A.'s subtle approach to the synopsis descriptions of Eurytus in Books 8 and 21

softens the bumpier results of strict neo-analysis by proposing that audiences are prepared to accept details and micro-episodes as they are presented and import significance based therein without necessary recourse to a larger picture outside the context, so that a possible Heracles cycle underlying these two descriptions need not be evidence of relative dating or hints towards an older tradition.

A nuanced discussion of the techniques of incorporation follows in the contributions of Rutherford, 'The Catalogue of Women within the Greek Epic Tradition: Allusion, Intertextuality and Traditional Referentiality' and Burgess, 'Intertextuality without Text in Early Greek Epic'. Focusing on the adaptation of genealogy of Sarpedon in the *Iliad* and in the catalogue of women in *Odyssey* 11, Rutherford hypothesises an earlier and relatively stable, but not necessarily written, text of the *Catalogue of Women*, which would have been perceived as generically different from heroic epic. Burgess looks at phrases which have become integrally associated with specific contexts: rather than 'quotation' as reference to the authority of one text or poet, he describes allusions to 'traditional stories' about the deaths of Achilles and Astyanax, using as examples repetition of specific phrases and images. Burgess points out that the relative chronology in the context of early epic is a reflection of performance history: a 'late' text may be relatively younger in terms of the point of textualisation, but this may obscure a long period of performance.

In 'Perspectives on Neoanalysis in the Archaic Hymns to Demeter', Currie approaches the question of transference between works as a method of dating by looking at the relationship between the 'Orphic' *Hymn to Demeter* preserved in the Berlin papyrus and the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. He finds the Orphic hymn to exhibit some primary features in both motif and word transference as well as in the contrast between 'surface' and 'deep' layers of narrative, suggesting self-conscious adaptation of traditional material in the *Hym. Dem.*, for example the contradictions between the accounts of the rape given by Persephone and the narrator-text.

The final two contributions of Kullmann, 'The Relative Chronology of the Homeric Catalogue of Ships and of the Lists of Heroes and Cities Within the Catalogue' and M. West, 'Towards a Chronology of Greek Epic', showcase the current conclusions of two highly influential scholars in this area. Kullmann revises his earlier hypothesis on the insertion of the 'Catalogue of Ships' through consideration of other poetic accounts of a Greek expedition to Mysia and second sailing from Aulis which, he argues, was omitted from the *Iliad* so as to ignore the Aeolian colonisation of Asia Minor. West concludes the volume with an elegant synthesis of his work on the chronology of early Greek epic, prioritising 'thematic dependence' as a method of dating over linguistic development or verbal echo. His *stemma* of epic (p. 240) brings into view the early lyric poets and their role in the development of the corpus and concludes the volume with the hope that 'a new overall chronology of early Greek epic founded on reason and observation rather than tradition and convention ... will be welcomed' (p. 241).

The editors have put together a collection of the highest academic standard to address the predominant cruxes in the composition and date of early Greek epic, from the digamma to Heracles in the *Odyssey*. Despite technical specificity and complexity, the contributions are generally accessible to scholars less familiar with the *status quo* in Homeric linguistics while providing a valuable overview of the history of scholarship. The individual contributions are excellent, but many present opposing viewpoints to those expressed elsewhere in the volume, some (for example Janko and Jones) pointedly so. Although the editors point this out in their introduction as a sign of the lack of consensus in the field, a clearer organising principle in the arrangement of chapters and the way in which they relate would help correct the 'chaos and confusion' pointed to by Janko (p. 20). Ironically, the

seemingly objective method of statistical analysis of Homeric language produces more debatable results than the generally harmonious conclusions drawn from literary features.

University of Oxford

SARAH HITCH
sarah.hitch@classics.ox.ac.uk

SPEECH IN HOMER

BECK (D.) *Speech Presentation in Homeric Epic*. Pp. xii + 256. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2012. Cased, US\$55. ISBN: 978-0-292-73880-5.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X13002096

Deploying the linguistic sub-field of pragmatics, narratological theory and speech-act theory, B. aims to contribute a systematic examination of how speech-events are cited, reproduced or referred to in Homeric epic. She has scrutinised every instance of this phenomenon from the grandest, the *apologoi* of Odysseus, down to lowly directives. B. classifies two sets of speakers: the ‘main narrators’ of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and their characters, arguing that the contribution of the latter has been underestimated by her predecessors.

Two further innovations. B. unifies Homeric modes of reproducing speech into a single ‘speech presentation spectrum’, enabling her to treat both poems together as one data set. She can thus restore neglected kinds of speech presentation, such as ‘speech mention’ (speech as pure act without citation of content) to an equal analytical footing as the others. To account for this unified spectrum of speech presentation, B. borrows from literary theory the idea of an ‘implied author’, the tutelary mind that maintains the continuity and balance of the spectrum between the two poems.

‘Direct quotation’ is the subject of Chapter 1. Though accounting for the greatest sum of lines, it does not furnish the most numerous kind of speech presentation. Furthermore, its use varies depending on who is doing the quoting. Thus, the main narrators use τῆς-speeches to report what a representative of a group will have said, whereas characters use τῆς-speeches for hypothetical quotations (‘some day . . . a man will say . . .’). This distinction yields many useful observations but confounds the discussion in one major way. B. uses the name Homer only once: as a heading in the *index locorum*. Her preference for ‘Homeric epic’ or ‘the main narrator(s)’ is understandable, but throughout the book B. regularly predicates thought and action – agency, almost – of Homer’s people: for example, ‘Nausicaa, like Hector, uses hypothetical direct quotation to depict her own emotions’ (p. 55). B. might say the ‘implied author’ put Nausicaa up to this, but it is impossible to tell, since she has corralled her discussion of this abstract entity into her introduction and conclusion – leaving the important problem of responsibility in oral performance unexamined. B. occasionally approaches, then recedes from, productive ideas of narrative responsibility as a process of embedding – which would have admitted the study of modulation in voice and persona.

Such ideas seem germane to Chapter 2, where B. claims to have discovered ‘free indirect speech’ (FIS) in Homer. A hallmark of the modern novel, FIS is the rhetorical modality by which an author gives voice to a character’s thought or speech without quotation: ‘Smith sulked and glowered. God damn it, he’d show them. You bet he would’. Does Homer do this? FIS, says B., is used to provide vividness when the main narrators or characters present indirect speech. Lattimore (B.’s preference): ‘So speaking brilliant Achilles