

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 *Arctura* 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

name, whether a historical *aoidos* or a mythical figure, this name being 'Homer'. It is an elegant argument, which would make sense if the figure of Homer was construed as the ultimate, authoritative source of knowledge and discourse. Yet G. herself, rightly, points out that Homer is presented with 'considerable flexibility', sometimes as *aoidos*, as *rhapsodos*, and as *poietes*. Indeed, she stresses, rightly again, that 'this fluidity in early representations of Homer is not at all unusual; in fact it applies to every aspect of his life' (p. 48). One might add that *aoidoi*, inasmuch as they often claim to relegate authority to another, e.g. by calling on the Muse(s) for knowledge and song, are not quite, as G. suggests, a simple mix of composer and performer. G.'s view has many attractive aspects, but they require some further clarification. Chapter 2 discusses traditions of Homer's name and place of origin. G. stresses, for example, the absence of named authorial self-reference in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and argues for the universality achieved by such absence (and its possible links to pan-Hellenism). She suggests that early references that do overtly mention the name of Homer are used either 'to reinforce the point that the author of the text is making' or 'in order to distance themselves from him and express a less popular but superior point of view' (p. 59). As to Homer's place of origin, G. argues for a balance between 'local traditions' and 'universal appeal' (p. 82), concluding that 'the name Homer inspires attempts to link the poems to particular audiences and places; but that these links fail to establish themselves to the exclusion of others' (pp. 88–9). These are important points. However, the paradox of how these two diametrically opposed strands of characterization coexist and interact, a matter of key importance, requires more discussion. Consider, for example, that the very core of localizing efforts, the name Homer, is at the same time also the most universal aspect of Homer. Chapter 3 looks at the date of Homer. Here too, G. argues, the ancient tradition preserves many different views, relating Homer to places, events, or individuals, rather than deciding in favour of a single date. This, she adds, is essential to his status as 'the universal author'. G. offers some interesting and subtle analyses in this chapter. In the case of Homer's relation to Hesiod and other figures, she rightly stresses the link between competition over antiquity and judgements of poetic excellence. In the case of Herodotus and Thucydides, Homer's relation to the Trojan War serves as a backdrop for highlighting the claims by the historians to higher authority. Clearly, as she stresses, Homer's fluid universality is linked to his extraordinary general authoritative status. But if, as she says, 'every aspect of his life and person can become the object of debate' (p. 125), what exactly is the nature of Homer's authority? Chapter 4 considers Homer's blindness, poverty, and closeness to the gods, which are highly relevant in this context. She points to familiar arguments, linking blindness to prophecy and to divine knowledge, adding interesting suggestions about blindness as a symbol of impartiality ('equidistance' from all audiences) and about blindness and death. Chapter 5 investigates Homer's relationship to other poets, Hesiod in the first place, and poets like Stasinus, Lesches, Creophylus, and other minor poets associated with 'borderline' epic poems (i.e. on the border between Homeric authorship and authorship by others). Chapter 6 looks at those figures who were presented by the ancient tradition as the 'heirs' of Homer in antiquity, such as the rhapsodes and the Homeridae. She reads ancient 'biographic' discussions as a vehicle for expressing the process of transmission and canon formation. Other scholars have made similar assumptions implicitly. But doing so with conscious emphasis allows G. to make some interesting observations on an old and vitally important issue. I would have wanted her to explain with greater clarity how, from the process of transmission, Homer's universalized authority emerges.

G. has written an interesting book. Her approach is useful and pertinent, and her

familiarity with the sources and the bibliography is exemplary. The arrangement of separate components within arguments can be a little confusing, and questions can be raised about some of her detailed claims and conclusions. Nevertheless, the book points to the crucial importance of ancient representations of the figure of Homer in the tradition and makes a significant contribution to their study.

Northwestern University

AHUVIA KAHANE

THE NINTH OLYMPIAN ODE

D. E. GERBER: *A Commentary on Pindar Olympian Nine. (Hermes Einzelschriften 87.)* Pp. 94. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002. Paper, €34. ISBN: 3-515-08092-9.

Douglas Gerber has given heroic service to the cause of Pindaric scholarship. All Pindarists must acknowledge, in particular, his 1969 bibliography, his 1976 inventory of emendations, and his large 1982 commentary on *O. 1*. His new commentary on *O. 9*, the first ‘detailed commentary’ on this ode (Preface), is a learned study in the same vein.

Unlike some commentaries (from Jebb’s Sophocles—and Gildersleeve’s Pindar—to Macleod’s *Iliad* 24), this one has no literary-critical pretensions (which is not entirely predictable: G.’s *O. 1* commentary indeed had some). By Pindar’s own high standards, *O. 9* is not an overwhelmingly impressive work of the human spirit, but we learn little from the commentary what those high standards might amount to. The brief introduction, indicatively, hints at no interpretative perspectives beyond traditional historicist method and neo-Bundyan preoccupation with ‘compositional and encomiastic techniques’ (p. 11). G.’s audience, correlatively, is his fellow formalists: he eschews comment on various substantive topics, notably the foundation myths of Opous.

Within these limitations, philological expertise and command of secondary literature produce helpful discussions of detail. G. makes a good case for taking *ἀνήσαις ἐ καὶ νίόν* (14) as parenthetic, *κοίλαν* (34) as transferred epithet, *ἄεθλον* (108) as referring to Pindar’s ode. He is illuminating on the ‘illusion of intimacy’ in 21; on war and gods in 40–1; on ‘novelty’ (*νεωτέρων*) and ‘appeal to tradition’ (*λέγοντι*) in 49; on the operative implications of *ἐφάψαις* in 60 and *τόλμα* in 82; on the implicit comparison between victor Epharmostus and hero Patroclus that inheres in the metrical/phraseological parallelism of *παῖς ἄμ’ Ἄτρεΐδαις* (70) and *παῖς δ’ ἐν Ἀθάναις* (88); on the syntax in 103–4; on the ‘boldness’ (*θαρσέων*) that links poet and athlete (109); on the tricolon in 111. He has a useful comparative appendix on victory catalogues in Pindar, Bacchylides and ‘agonistic epigrams’ (pp. 71–8) that supersedes Thummer and De Conno.

And then one has criticisms. Bare notes of the form ‘uncommon word, found only here and in late prose’ (of *μεγαλόδοξος* 16) are frustrating: what follows from such a spread? 28: *σοφοί* is hardly evocative of *wrestling*. 70–3: the special status of Achilles (especially, but not only, in Aeginetan odes) deserves comment, even encomiastic comment (glory by association). On *ἄωτοι* (19) and *δεξιόγυιον* (111) see also my discussions in *CQ* (1983), 316–17, and *TAPA* (1998), 73. On *αἰών* (60), G. is content to refer to Pfeijffer (*Three Aeginetan Odes*), whose bibliography stops at Degani in the early 1960s; add e.g. Burkert, *Eranos Jahrbuch* (1982), 346–7, and Johansen-Whittle on Aesch. *Supp.* 46 (Pfeijffer’s is a generous but hit-and-miss compilation: here and