tence on its accuracy) but also 'acknowledges the rich and varied reception of Hesiodic poetry, and situates itself within it' (221). The conclusions summarize concisely each chapter and identify trends in Hesiod's fifth-century reception.

This book constitutes an important advancement in Hesiodic scholarship, showing how Hesiod's reception was more nuanced than previously thought; in so doing, it helps redefine an often oversimplified picture. Detailed readings of fifth-century texts and their engagement with Hesiod are combined with very careful analysis of textual problems and their wider implications (see, for example, 61–62, on whether *Theog*. 860 links Typhos to Sicily and how this relates to Pindar's version of the myth). The analysis is always of a very high standard and the results convincing. Some findings remain speculative because of the nature of the material analysed, but Stamatopoulou acknowledges that and her discussions always prove to be well informed and useful (so, for instance, when the author tentatively suggests the presence of Hesiod in Cratinus' fragmentary *Archilochoi* at 179–84, with discussion of the importance of poetic competitions in literature).

Importantly, Stamatopoulou considers not only the more famous works and myths, but also lesser-known texts, as well as often neglected ones, and very fruitfully too. The fresh interpretation of the two female figures mentioned above, Coronis and Cyrene, who feature only in fragmentary Hesiodic texts, contributes to one of the most innovative aspects of the book: namely, the new light it sheds on how fifth-century authors exposed and overwrote the 'simplistic' representation of women in the Hesiodic tradition (167).

Overall, Stamatopoulou has written a very well-researched and engaging book, which will be considered an important study in the field of the reception of ancient epic for many years to come.

PAOLA BASSINO
University of Winchester
paola.bassino@winchester.ac.uk

BASSINO (P.), CANEVARO (L.G.) and GRAZIOSI (B.) (eds) **Conflict and Consensus in Early Greek Hexameter Poetry**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. Pp. x + 228. £78.99. 9781107175747.
doi:10.1017/S007542692000018X

The nine essays in this volume were first presented in April 2012 at a conference in Durham where conflict and consensus were considered as thematic concerns in the early Greek hexameter poems themselves, and as aspects of their early reception.

Johannes Haubold ('Conflict, consensus and closure in Hesiod's *Theogony* and [the Babylonian] *Enūma Eliš*') demonstrates that Greeks and Babylonians drew on a shared stock of narrative themes and techniques in describing the earliest history of the universe. Greek myth displays family dysfunction until fathers learn to control the younger generation, whereas in Babylonian myth the father invests his powers in his son: the *Enūma Eliš* ends where Babylonian state ritual begins. Those without cuneiform would have been helped by direction to a translation, perhaps that of W.G. Lambert, *Babylonian Creation Myths* (Indiana 2013).

Barbara Graziosi ('Divine conflict and the problem of Aphrodite') explores how the shorter hymn to Aphrodite uses selection and omission to negotiate a kind of consensus between the conflicting traditions about the goddess in the *Theogony* and Homeric epic.

Oliver Thomas ('Sparring partners: fraternal relations in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*') explores the hymn's intertextual relationship to the earlier hymn to Apollo. The hymn to Hermes redeploys Apollo's first moments in its predecessor on the principle of one-upmanship and to the advantage of Hermes. The tension between the two gods expresses Greek ideas about hostility between brothers: in order to be introduced to Olympus, Hermes initiates a conflict with Apollo, eventually achieving consensus (and close friendship) by means of self-help, verbal humour, gifts, parental intervention, arbitration and negotiation.

Adrian Kelly ('Achilles in control? Managing oneself and others in the funeral games') argues that Achilles' attempts at arbitration reveal his shortcomings in the exercise of authority. In wanting to award the second prize to Eumelus (who came last), Achilles is attempting to redistribute after a distribution (behaviour he decries in Agamemnon). The right way to do things is illustrated in the quarrel (in which Achilles takes no part) between Menelaus and Antilochus, where conflict is avoided by the individual of higher status accepting loss while the other acknowledges inferiority.

Jon Hesk ('Uncertainty and the possibilities of violence: the quarrel in *Odyssey* 8') shows how the threat of violence, conveyed by Odysseus' glance (ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν, 8.165) at Euryalus and the hero's reckless throw of a particularly heavy discus over the Phaeacians' heads, must be partially defused by compliments from a local man (Athene in disguise). Odysseus warns against further provocation through a paradigm: 'you have angered me (μ' ἐχολώσατε) greatly' (8.205) … 'I would hit a man when I shot an arrow [at Troy]' (8.216–17) … 'Apollo killed Eurytus in anger (χολωσάμενος)' (8.227).

Donald Lavigne (‘ΙΡΟΣ ΙΑΜΒΙΚΟΣ: Archilochean iambos and the Homeric poetics of conflict’) argues that Irus and Thersites, who represent iambos in the epics, are marginalized by the (violent) deeds that supplement Odysseus’ (threatening) words to them. They are not killed, however, and their survival represents the complementarity of epic and iambos. Lavigne’s polarization of the two genres is excessive; I cannot accept that Homeric poetics ‘entails an eternal, unchanging consensus of praise’ (139): what about οἰνοβαρές, κυνὸς ὄμματ᾽ ἔχων (‘Drunken sot, with the eyes of a dog’, *Il*. 1.225)?

Jim Marks (‘Conflict and consensus in the epic cycle’) sees a thematic sympathy between the endings of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (with the gods reconciled, however grudgingly, to one another and reconciliation of a kind between mortal characters) and the context of their performance for a culturally diverse audience in the artificial concord of a Panhellenic occasion. He suggests that audiences for the cyclic epics (where closure is achieved without restoring consensus) may have been ‘more geographically and culturally homogeneous’ (162). He says that the Homeric and Hesiodic epics emerge from ‘proto-Panhellenic traditions’ as ‘fully Panhellenic narratives suitable for performance at … the Panathenaic and Olympic festivals’ (163). But would he also consider the Panionia a Panhellenic context of recitation? In the Archaic period, rhapsodic performance of Homeric poetry at the Panathenaia (and probably the Panionia, too) was not confined to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, but included other epics that at the time were attributed to Homer (see C. Tsagalis, ‘Performance contexts for rhapsodic recitals in the Archaic and Classical periods’, in C. Tsagalis and J. Ready (eds), *Homer in Performance*, Austin 2018, 29–75, at 37–40, 47).

Lilah Grace Canevaro discusses ‘Fraternal conflict in Hesiod’s *Works and Days*’, where the family of Amphidamas (whose sons jointly gave prizes at his funeral games) is contrasted with the intra-familial conflict generally prevailing in the Age of Iron, a context where the traditional transmission of wisdom from father to son will not do: Hesiod speaks of his father’s struggles with poverty. The exhortations to Perses to reflect, delivered with the authority of an older brother instructing a younger, are styled as an ongoing *neikos* with an equal who can argue back while he is being steered toward self-reliant prosperity.

Paola Bassino (‘On constructive conflict and disruptive peace: the *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*’) shows how the *Certamen* reflects aspects of the epic tradition shaped by constructive competition. King Panoides’ ‘ethical’ judgement in favour of peace is itself divisive, because it contravenes the consensus of the audience and its aesthetic appreciation of Homer, who allows his audience to experience the battle in the same way as the gods.

The standard of production is high, and although ‘former’ appears where ‘latter’ is intended on page 166, the reference to Bernabé should preclude the misapprehension that the *Odyssey* ends with the revenge of Orestes for the killing of Agamemnon. Anyone with an interest in early Greek poetry will benefit from reading this collection. The price, however, is eye-watering.

MAUREEN ALDEN
Independent researcher
m.alden@qub.ac.uk

JOHNSTON (S.I.) **The Story of Myth**. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press. Pp. 384. £36.95. 9780674185074.
doi:10.1017/S0075426920000191

The first, introductory chapter of this book proposes a heuristic definition of Greek myth in five parts, of which the most important is that a myth is a story. While Johnston is well aware of the various modes in which Greeks heard and retold stories, she proposes to focus on public poetic performances and on myths as ‘works of literary sophistication’ (17). Furthermore, she argues that these myths ‘helped to create and sustain belief in the gods and heroes’ (17). Johnston’s approach thus sounds ritualist and she turns in her second chapter to a history of the myth-ritual school, culminating in Walter Burkert. She, by contrast, will put the emphasis on the effectiveness of myths outside ritual contexts. The next three chapters discuss ways in which myths ‘engage their audiences emotionally and cognitively’ (66), so as to create a single large ‘story world’, with characters, divine and heroic, who serve this purpose in spite of their variation from one story to another. (For the concept of ‘story world’ see 122–25. Johnston does not refer to the use of ‘story world’ in cognitive narratology or in relation to possible worlds theory. For an overview of the first of these subjects, see D. Herman, ‘Cognitive narratology’ in P. Hühn et al. (eds), *The Living Handbook of Narratology* at http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/; for the second, see M.-L. Ryan, ‘Possible worlds’, chapter 3, in the same place.) The two concluding chapters deal with metamorphoses and heroes.

Both parts of Johnston’s main thesis are problematic. First, public performance was only one of the ways in which Greek myths of the Archaic and Classical periods were told and heard. From our ‘etic’ point of view, verse may seem the primary mode of communication. That the ‘emic’ experience was the same as ours would be difficult to show. Johnston refers to vase painting (and includes 16 or so illustrations; a list is not included