

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.

The introduction is useful. Wilkinson's Ibycus is (cautiously) dated into the first half of the sixth century. Under the heading 'Content' Wilkinson considers (among other things) the question of Ibycean epinician; her conclusion (27) that the relevant songs are not directly analogous either to later epinicians or to later non-epinician erotic praise seems sensible, but I wonder whether it is right to describe this as a form of *Kreuzung* ('bringing in elements from several genres') rather than supposing that epinician is not yet distinct from praise song generally. The section on dialect is brief but refers to more extensive treatments; the metre section is fuller (the treatment of 288 on page 40 has gone wrong: the wrong line is quoted, but in her edition of the fragment Wilkinson prints an emendation, so that the line intended is also different from the schema).

I illustrate the commentary from one quotation fragment and parts of the biggest papyrus fragment.

287 is handled well. As elsewhere, Wilkinson discusses imagery sensitively. The treatment of $\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\epsilon$ and $\delta\eta\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\epsilon$ could have been abbreviated and a reference given to S.T. Mace, 'Amour, encore! The development of $\delta\eta\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\epsilon$ in Archaic lyric', *GRBS* 34 (1993) 335–64. On $\tau\alpha\kappa\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}$ in 2, vocabulary from the root $\tau\eta\kappa\omega$ and from $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ (*Od.* 18.212–13; the adj. $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\mu\epsilon\lambda\eta\acute{\varsigma}$) should have been more carefully distinguished; the $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ expressions are not about melting or liquefaction. I like Wilkinson's observation that the image of Eros as a beater or hunting dog expresses his subordination to Aphrodite, and her note on 7 $\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ $\tilde{\alpha}\mu\iota\lambda\lambda\alpha\nu$ is subtle and sensitive.

'P.Oxy. 1790 is a palimpsest' is the unpromising start to the treatment of S151 (it is not a palimpsest; traces of unrelated texts are offsets from other document(s) with which the papyrus came into contact after it was written: J.P. Barron, 'Ibycus: to Polycrates', *BICS* 16 (1969) 119–49 at 119–20; E.G. Turner and P.J. Parsons *GMAW*², London 1987, 48). Much is useful and astute in the commentary, but especially in problematic places Wilkinson's treatment is not always satisfactory. On 20, I think that Wilkinson is mistaken to interpret $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ as *solitarium*: both this $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ and the one in 23 are picked up by $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in 25 (*cf.* J.D. Denniston, *Greek Particles* (2nd edition), Oxford 1954, 384). At 24–25, Wilkinson argues on metrical grounds that 'either $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omega[\iota$ or $\theta\nu\alpha\tau[\acute{\omicron}]$ is corrupt', but the force of her argument indicates that $\theta\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\omicron}$ is corrupt independently of $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omega[\iota$, unless $\theta\nu$ can operate as a syllable-releasing consonant in Ibycus (G.O. Hutchinson, *Greek*

Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces, Oxford 2001, ad 23–26 points out syllable-releasing mute + liquid at 288.4, perhaps 288.2, 298 and 315.1, but mute + nasal is perhaps more problematic; Wilkinson does not discuss this). Barron's $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\kappa$ $\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\eta\acute{\varsigma}$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ κ' $\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\rho$ is misreported (in the commentary; *apparatus criticus* is correct). At 40, the scribe inserted ϵ above the line, giving $\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\phi[\omicron]\varsigma$ instead of $\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\phi[\omicron]\varsigma$. Wilkinson prints the former but argues for the latter, but her argument is obscured by a misprint: it is because the scribe wrote $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\nu$ in 24 (with accent and *brevis* thus) that it seems that he believed that contraction could not occur here. At the end, Wilkinson sides with those who remove the papyrus' punctuation at the end of 46; it would have been helpful if parallels had been given to help us to judge the plausibility of $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\delta\alpha$ in the sense $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$, required if the punctuation is kept. Barron's metrical argument for the papyrus' punctuation (by which caesura after $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ is preserved) should have been acknowledged, and Wilkinson might have discussed $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$ as a hymnic closural formula. In the same final epode, it seems odd to comment that $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\acute{\omicron}[\epsilon]\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$ 'is frequent in archaic poetry to describe beautiful people or things' but to say nothing about the peculiar phrase $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda'$ $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\kappa\omicron\gamma$ $\delta\mu\omicron\tau\omicron\nu$.

In my view, the quality of this commentary is patchy, but there is much of value, and Wilkinson is often a helpful and lucid guide. Some problems seem to come from insufficient revision and proof-reading or production difficulties, an impression enhanced by numerous misprints.

RICHARD RAWLES

University of Nottingham

richard.rawles@nottingham.ac.uk

AGÓCS (P.), CAREY (C.) and RAWLES (R.) *Eds*
Reading the Victory Ode. Cambridge:
 Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. xxxiv +
 409. £70/\$113. 9781107007871.

doi:10.1017/S0075426914001517

This edited volume contains 16 essays on the victory ode: the first of its kind. It is divided into three sections. Part one examines the lost or nearly lost epinician poems of Ibycus, Simonides and Pindar, early music and prosopography. The second part discusses issues of (re)performance. Part three is a selection of critical approaches to the victory ode: rhetoric, imagery and narrative techniques. The editors acknowledge that they do