the existence of ancient forms in later manuscripts and the long influence of oral tradition. The Homeric work presents a different situation from written works, and it must be treated differently.

Chapter 3 starts with trivial information on terms such as 'papyri' and 'manuscripts' and their dating. The graphs demonstrating the chronological distribution of papyri and manuscripts of the *Iliad* prove that the Ptolemaic papyri represent only 6% of the evidence. B. conventionally defines as 'Ptolemaic' the papyri which were discovered in Egypt and cover the reigns of the first eight Ptolemies, but a history of their discovery and first editions in combination with the discussion of their provenance reveals problems in defining their exact location and date. B. revisits views of scholars on the interpolation or the authenticity of the plus lines and dedicates detailed tables in analytically examining the distribution of 'new lines' in the papyri of the *Iliad*; he concludes that the early papyri tend to contain additional lines, but that this tendency diminishes in the period first century B.C.E. – first century C.E. Although the numerical data may confuse the non-academic reader, the figures prove the 'expansiveness' of the Ptolemaic papyri with regard to the vulgate. Next, B. tries to prove that many of the plus verses, rather than being inserted into the text, have grown into their current positions and that they are an authentic alternative to our familiar version. The distribution of the plus verses in the books of the *Iliad* shows how little it is represented by papyri of the Ptolemaic period. It also proves that the books with the additional verses are those which have a high degree of coverage. B. concludes with an examination of both the plus verses and the context of passages from the Ptolemaic papyri in order to demonstrate that the plus verses have been an organic part of the episode. The conclusion is that the papyrus plus verses reflect live performances with heightened emotionality and dramatic intensity. B. underlines that the papyri preserve indications of the performer's ability to vary his performance, and hence of multitextuality.

All chapters of the book are related to the idea of multitextuality, although much of the trivial information included in the first chapter could have been dispensed with. Bibliography, notes, appendices with instances of multitextuality and glossary of terms and graphs contribute to a deeper understanding. Experts will appreciate Chapter 3; a wider audience might be more interested in Chapters 1 and 2. Overall, the volume will initiate productive discussion for scholars studying multitextuality in Homer.

University College London ANTONY MAKRINOS
a.makrinos@ucl.ac.uk

HOMERIC SPACE

CLAY (J.S.) *Homer's Trojan Theater. Space, Vision, and Memory in the* Iliad. Pp. x + 136, ills. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. Paper, £18.99, US$29.99 (Cased, £50, US$80). ISBN: 978-0-521-14948-8 (978-0-521-76277-9 hbk).
doi:10.1017/S0009840X11002678

C.'s book, joining several recent publications (e.g. A. Purves, *Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative* [2010]), emphasises the visual nature of the *Iliad* against a century of work on formulaic language. The Introduction and three chapters

explore 'how Homeric narrative can be understood not only in temporal but also in spatial terms' (p. 96) and the 'surprising degree of consistency and coherence in Homer's visualization of the Iliadic landscape' (pp. 96–7). While not as well organised as it could be, this book is an important contribution to Homeric studies.

The Introduction provides a limited preview of the material. In the first chapter, 'The Sighted Muse', C. surveys the importance of vision in Homer. From (too) few passages C. argues that epic 'memory' is essentially visual. After considering species of Homeric *enargeia* – defined as the visual and spacial aspects that 'unit[e] the Muse, the poet, and the recipients of his performance' (p. 26) – C. turns to recent studies in cognitive science that illustrate the significance of visual imagery and memory in oral traditions.

Although Homeric studies have emphasised mnemonic features of formulae and repetition, C. presents research on the visual and spatial mnemonics of oral traditions (see D. Rubin, *Memory in Oral Traditions* [1995]). Further research may support such claims. For instance, in Rajasthan the traditional singer (Bhopa) has a partner who illuminates the scenes he sings on a tapestry (see J.D. Smith, *The Epic of Pabuji* [1991]; W. Dalrymple, 'Homer in India: the Oral Epics of Rajasthan', *The New Yorker*, 82:38 [2006], 48–55.). Such comparative information, however, is not definitive – not all types of orality are the same. Nevertheless, C.'s focus on the 'interchangeability of the visual and verbal' (p. 29) in Homer reminds us *not* to assume that because something is verbal it cannot also be visual.

In searching the text for visualisation, C. pays some attention to deixis and makes an interesting, but under-developed, association between space and time. In exploring Homer's treatment of simultaneous events (against Zielinski's Law), C. indicates aspectual distinctions between the imperfect and aorist in descriptions of action. These seemingly unrelated moves come together when C., by illustrating the extent to which the *Iliad*'s narrative is fundamentally a-sequential, undermines Zielinski's conception of a visual Homer who can narrate in only one direction.

Chapter 2, 'Envisioning Troy', turns to the visual organisation of the epic. Books 6 and 10 are used to develop the topography of Troy and the Greek camp respectively; according to C., the epic does not precisely map the city because it is 'not described spatially, but emotionally' (p. 40). I found myself wishing for some evidence of *audience* visualisation from the Archaic and Classical periods. For instance, the performer in Plato's *Ion* emphasises his interest in his audience's *emotional* reactions (535e1–6) and locates his skill in knowing what is proper for different people to *say* (540a3–d3).

Rather than digress on such problematic issues, C. stays engaged with the text itself where, she argues, the spatial orientation of the battlefield is best understood by apprehending that the poet positions himself near Odysseus' ship in the centre of the camp facing Troy and that all deitic markers refer to that position. Since this is the central point for the narrator's visualisation, the audience, she suggests, visualises the action from the same perspective. The narrator's fixed perspective and the epic's absolute spatial orientation, when combined, constitute significant and persuasive guidance for re-visualising the epic.

At times, however, C. is not clear or precise enough in discussing the supporting deictic markers. In addition, I am not convinced from the sparse discussion of passages that the narrator's perspective cannot move or that the narrator's perspective dictates the audience's orientation. (C. addresses this question later at pp. 101–3; her argument, that the poet's descriptions are all marked and relevant, is not quite convincing.) The connection between the theatre-like layout of the Greek camp

and the narrator speaking from Odysseus' ship, almost like Ion from the *bêma*, is attractive – and may have implications for performance contexts – but C. imagines audiences visualising the action homogenously as a modern audience watches a movie (p. 36). These quibbles aside, C.'s suggestion deserves thorough consideration.

After establishing the layout of the Greek camp, C. focusses on the battle books (12–17), investigating the coherent spatial conception of the action; in turn, several Homeric problems are addressed through a clearer understanding of the organisation of space (e.g. Nestor's re-emergence in Book 14 [pp. 78–80] or the alleged interpolation of *Il.* 15.367–405 [pp. 82–3]). C. also focusses on temporal-spatial alignment in the use of imperfective aspect to mark ongoing actions (in contrast to aorist and perfective forms). While a useful reminder of the subtlety of verbal distinction in Homer, the aspect argument seems insufficiently integrated into the spatial discussion and could use additional parallels and support.

C.'s emphasis on the performer's perspective facing Troy makes the action in the books she addresses clearer. Whereas Books 12 and 13 organise the battlefield into two or three zones, Book 15 examines in depth the movement of the Greeks from their walls toward the ships. The two following books show how the visualisation of the action can modulate – both 16 and 17 focus on single actions, the former on Patroclus' advance and the latter on the actions around his corpse. Chapter 2's tours are not equally effective, but they are successful in achieving C.'s larger aims. It is a pity that some of the illustrations only available on the website (www.homerstrojantheater.org) well support her points for the 'zigzagging path' (p. 90) Patroclus takes and the symmetrical patterns created by the actions of Book 17.

In the final chapter, 'Homer's Trojan Theater', C. returns to theoretical issues that may have served her readers better if they had been integrated into the discussion. Presenting modern research and a discussion of space in early Greek literature, C. both draws a distinction between cartographic and hodological conceptions of space and illustrates how they can co-exist. Various inconsistencies in Homeric geography, she contends, result from distortions that modern studies anticipate when shifting from a hodological to a geographic conception. The value of this explanation is illustrated through skilful explorations of Achilles' fight with Scamander in Book 21 and Priam's path in Book 24. In closing, C. proposes that the spatial markers and the integration of visual elements imply that the composer of the *Iliad* used visual mnemonic techniques in co-ordinating such complicated actions with so many characters. (Whether C. thinks this mnemonic practice was traditional or a Homeric innovation is unclear.) C. supports this contention by suggesting that the consistency of the suitors' seating arrangement in the *Odyssey* parallels the apocryphal story of Simonides' memorisation of a symposium's attendees and by providing a useful discussion of the metaphor of the 'path of song'. When C. notes that the 'path' or itinerary of the story can follow 'scenes', it would strengthen her argument to refer again to the spatio-visual nature of many of the named episodes of the *Iliad* (e.g. *Teikhoskopia*, *Epipôlêsis*, *Dolôneia*).

C.'s overall approach proves effective, though some of her more speculative suggestions (e.g. the visualisation mnemonic) require additional examination. The book could use some revision in its structure; too many ideas and arguments are sprung on the reader. A more extensive treatment might reveal that the geographic regularity posited by C. is not so regular – as she anticipates in the hodological organisation of the Catalogue and the 'emotional' organisation of Book 6 (p. 41). On the other hand, at times C. may be too modest: she makes no claims about the implications of her study for textual fixity or Homeric authorship. Regardless

of these issues or others, C.'s framework should attract the interest of Homeric scholars and general readers alike; while not all her proposals are completely convincing, her framework merits serious consideration and application to other Iliadic passages and the *Odyssey*.

The University of Texas at San Antonio JOEL P. CHRISTENSEN
joel.christensen@utsa.edu

NESTOR

FRAME (D.) *Hippota Nestor*. (Hellenic Studies 37.) Pp. x + 912, ills, maps. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, Center for Hellenic Studies, 2009. Paper, £25.95, €31.50, US$34.95. ISBN: 978-0-674-03290-3.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X1100268X

In these days of hasty academic publishing, F.'s book is a rare enjoyment – a *magnum opus* of sorts, reporting on (and in some cases revising) his views over the course of more than three decades. The subject of the book is Homer's Nestor, though readers who are interested in the characterisation or literary function of this perennially fascinating figure will be disappointed; F.'s subject is rather an underlying mythology of Nestor that predates the composition of the Homeric poems as we know them. More than this, the book discusses the nature and origins of the poems themselves. It is ambitious both in the scope of its argument and in the radical nature of its claims. Even a lengthy review could hardly do it justice; the following necessarily brief remarks omit discussion of Part 3 (Chapters 8–9) and Part 5 (Chapters 12–14), which seem extraneous to the main argument.

In Part 1 (Chapters 1–3), F. revisits some ideas first developed in his earlier book *The Myth of Return in Early Greek Epic* (1978). He argues that Nestor's name shows him to be cognate with the Vedic Ashvins, twin horsemen gods who share the epithet 'Nasatya'. The mythology of these twin divinities, taken in conjunction with the more obvious Greek *comparandum*, the Dioscuri, reveals an 'Indo-European twin myth' in which an immortal twin brings his mortal counterpart back to life. To the comparison of the names Nasatya/Nestor, F. adds an etymological argument that Nestor's name means not only 'he who brings home', but 'he who brings back to life'. This meaning places Nestor in the role of the immortal twin. The problem that Nestor is nowhere called a twin is left for later discussion.

In Part 2 (Chapters 4–7), F. turns to the poems themselves. Nestor's autobiographical narrative in *Iliad* 11 tells how he first became a warrior and 'horseman' in the stead of his dead brother Periclymenus. F. notes that the association of Nestor with the pattern of the 'twin myth' is effected mostly through hidden or disguised hints, for example the presence of other twin figures (the Molione). Periclymenus, whose death is a central point of this veiled discourse, is never even mentioned by name. Nestor's autobiographical narrative in *Iliad* 23, relating how he lost a chariot race to the Molione, shows him before he took his brother's place and became a horseman. F. argues that the actual chariot race narrated in Book 23 has an extensive but carefully concealed relevance to Nestor's past race and sheds light on details of his twin myth. The strategies and outcomes of the race bear out this thematic in various ways. In *Odyssey* 3, Nestor's account of the Achaeans' homecomings re-enacts the pattern of the twin myth in that Nestor brings