

fragments of hexameters and pentameters in these four chapters suggest that Herodotus is re-casting an earlier elegiac poem.

The index to this excellent book names nearly 500 authors. This is an indication of the breadth of D.'s scholarship.

STEPHEN INSTONE

*Institute of Classical Studies, London*

GONZÁLES GARCÍA (F.J.) *A través de Homero: la cultura oral en la Grecia antigua*. Santiago de Compostela, 1991. Pp. 188. Price not stated.

This book began life as a doctoral thesis, but is intended for the general reader. It contains very little reference to the text of Homer, and the Greek alphabet is not used. As in a doctoral thesis previous studies of the subject are carefully analyzed with cautious criticisms of each study. Indeed Chapter II, 'Visiones de Homero', which occupies almost half the book is a useful introduction to the Homeric question from 1795 (Wolf) to 1990. As the bicentenary of *Prolegomena ad Homerum* approaches, scholars could do worse than look at this second chapter, although carping critics might complain that there is too much about pre-Milman-Parry scholarship, no references to German or Greek studies of Homer, and some omissions (Mueller, Redfield, Macleod and some of Griffin) in the account of Anglo-American research. The citation system is faulty. Wolf and Willcock are mentioned in the text, but not in the bibliography. There is much mention in the text of Murray, sometimes referred to as G. Murray, sometimes as Gilbert Murray, rightly distinguished from P. Murray but misleadingly referred to as Murray 1949, though the *Rise of the Greek Epic* was published in the innocent pre-Parry days of 1907. These are minor blemishes in a good account of the changing tides of views on the Homeric question. Students of this question will gain less from the ritual bow in the first chapter to the fashionable names of Lévi-Strauss and McLuhan, interpreted by Goody, or from the conclusion of the second chapter to the effect that Havelock has resolved the problem of how the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* can both be literary masterpieces and oral poems. The thesis of Havelock is as unconvincing in this Spanish précis as it is when expanded in Havelock's many books on the literary revolution of the fifth century.

The third chapter of this book which looks at the history of the Homeric question in antiquity might have been expected to add some substance to Havelock's claims, but it can hardly be said to do so, although it is a useful summary, perhaps better placed before the second chapter. English readers, unused to seeing Achilles appearing suitably like an eagle as Aquiles, might welcome a translation of the third and second chapters in reverse order, but they could do without the theory.

T.J. WINNIFRITH

*University of Warwick*

LATA CZ (J.) *Ed. Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung: Rückblick und Ausblick*. Colloquia Raurica, 2. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1991. Pp. xi + 526. DM 136.

The Colloquia Raurica are held at the Dr. René Clavel Foundation at Augst (Augusta Raurica) near Basel in Switzerland, their purpose wide-ranging discussion of particular topics related to antiquity. Papers, revised by their authors in the light of discussion at the conference, are published in Proceedings such as this, in an impressively short time. The present volume derives from a conference held in August 1989; the previous one, on Oral Tradition, was published in 1988, after a conference in 1987.

The very distinguished contributors to this volume number twenty, mostly from Germany and Switzerland; all papers are in German except that of J. P. Holoka in English. A photograph on p. VIII shows all the speakers except two, in relaxed mood. The contents of the volume, briefly expressed, are: (*Archaeology*) H.-G. Buchholz, Historical survey; P. Blome, The Dark Ages, particularly Lefkandi; S. Hiller, The eighth century; M. Korfmann, Recent excavations at Troy. (*Ancient History*) G. A. Lehmann, Bronze Age Aegean connections with Egypt and Asia Minor; S. Deger-Jalkotzy, The Sub-Mycenaean period; W. Burkert, Oriental influences; F. Gschnitzer, Social and historical background; K.A. Raaflaub, The eighth century. (*Linguistics*) B. Forssman, The mixed dialect; A. Bartoněk, Mycenaean Greek; G. Neumann, Personal names. (*Religion*) F. Graf, Religion and mythology. (*Literary Criticism*) E. Vogt, Biography of Homer; J. Latacz, Structure of the *Iliad*; U. Hölscher, Structure of the *Odyssey*; W. Kullmann, Neoanalysis; J.P. Holoka, Oral poetry; E.-R. Schwinge, Narratology; K. Schefold, Evidence from art history.

Over five hundred pages have been put together with great accuracy. A grammatical table is regrettably omitted from Bartoněk's article (p. 310: Table D omitted, Table E headed D; see 301-2); otherwise there is hardly a misprint. The collection might be thought unbalanced, with nine contributions out of a total of twenty on archaeology and history, but the proportions relate to the complexity of the research rather than its significance for the study of Homer, and it is difficult to say that any of these is otiose; some might perhaps have been shorter. Almost all are about background issues; only Schwinge deals directly with the two epics.

New fields and repeated themes will interest Homerists. The most important recent discovery is the unearthing of the double princely burial in the large building beside the richest of the three cemeteries excavated at Lefkandi in Euboea, which is affecting our view not only of the dark ages, but also of the development of the Homeric *Kunstsprache*, with its dominant Ionic flavour. Blome (see also *WJb* 10 (1984) 9-22) identifies Lefkandi as for two centuries the richest centre in Greece after Athens. The burial has similarities with that described for Patroklos in *Iliad* 23. As to the possible connection with the history of heroic poetry, Schadewaldt had already suggested (*VHWW* 107-9) the probable significance of Euboea; and M. L. West (*JHS* 108 (1988) 166-7) has supported this view in the light of the new finds. Lefkandi comes into the arguments of Raaflaub, Bartoněk, Graf and Schefold, as well as Blome.

So  
poten  
ists, a  
arrive  
leave  
and h  
first s  
the h  
dos (s  
He be  
and tl  
elles  
curre  
Troja  
been  
14th/  
itself  
begin  
mann  
the c  
rema  
foun  
outs  
acrop  
mode  
A  
view  
surve  
espo  
manr  
Schw  
fairly  
they  
cases  
the 1  
impl  
resul  
conn  
(reli  
not l  
write  
brea  
tion  
expl  
cont  
dest  
genc  
after  
ope  
poli  
He :  
own  
thin  
ning  
To :  
cha  
nev  
aut  
inhe  
Tro  
nan

Second only to the discoveries at Lefkandi, and potentially of even greater long-term interest for Homerists, are the excavations of Korfmann in the Troad. (He arrived at the conference hot-foot from there, and had to leave early to get back.) The excavations began in 1981, and have been carried on annually since then. For the first six years, Korfmann and his team concentrated on the harbour of Beşik-Bucht, facing west towards Tenedos (see also Latacz in *Gymnasium* 95 (1988) 385-413). He believes that this was the historical harbour for Troy, and the place where ships planning to enter the Dardanelles would have to wait for favourable winds and currents. This could explain the wealth of Troy, and the Trojan war. Indeed, K. believes that there could have been many Trojan wars, and several of them in the 14th/13th centuries. From 1988 he has turned to Hisarlik itself. Here he has reopened previous excavations, beginning with the clearing of overgrowth from Schliemann's trench. He has also searched outside the walls of the city for evidence of wider occupation. Apart from remains of the later Hellenistic and Roman city, he has found evidence of buildings of 13th century Troy VI outside the walls, spreading far from the defended acropolis. The excavations will continue, using all modern archaeological techniques.

A number of the contributors, taking a responsible view of the title of the conference, give a historical survey (back to Wolf in many cases) of the field they espouse: these are Buchholz, Burkert, Bartoněk, Neumann, Graf, Vogt, Latacz and Holoka. Two, Latacz and Schwinge, go back, not just to Wolf, but to Aristotle's fairly meagre comments on epic in the *Poetics*, which they treat as of the most basic importance. In three cases, the impression given, at least to this reader, is that the fields being discussed are too confused, and the implications of the evidence too uncertain, for clear results to be gained; these are Lehmann (Bronze Age connections), Burkert (Near East influence), Graf (religion).

There are no contributions here from which one does not learn. I select some for comment. S. Deger-Jalkotzy writes fascinatingly about the period following the break-up of the Mycenaean civilisation with the destruction of the palaces. No single cause, she argues, can explain the phenomena, especially as Mycenaean culture continued for about 150 years after the palaces were destroyed. It is in that period, particularly in a resurgence in the middle phase of LH IIIC (i.e. before and after 1100) that she thinks epic poetry may have developed. Dorians remain difficult to find.

Gschnitzer writes with commitment about the political and social background to the Homeric poems. He sees of course that the poets took details from their own time to illuminate the far-off saga world. Indeed, he thinks that there is recognisable evidence for the beginnings of institutions found in the later Archaic period. To those who have argued that the picture is random, chaotic and disorganised, he points out that both epics nevertheless assume a background of normal political authority; but that, for reasons well known to be inherent in 'Heroic Ages', this has broken down both at Troy and on Ithaca.

Among the linguists, Forssman writes from a narrowly German standpoint. There is no mention of

Chadwick or Janko, nor any discussion of the distribution in the Mycenaean age of the ancestors of the later dialects. Chantraine is quoted, but F.'s main source for Homeric language is Thumb/Scherer, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, Part II (Heidelberg, 1959). Bartoněk is notably helpful, not only for the story of Mycenaean Greek since the decipherment, but for his judgement of where we stand now, and his grammatical tables. He points out that over half the words found on the tablets are personal names, and this is no doubt why the third contribution in this section, that of Neumann, is directed to these. His title, however, is deceptive. He calls it 'Die homerischen Personennamen ...', but is interested solely in their linguistic form, and hardly mentions the exotic ones, those of great antiquity, or non-Greek, in some cases recognisably middle-eastern, such as Achil(l)eus, Odys(s)eus, Paris, Priamos, Amisodaros, Thon. Nor does he show much concern whether there is historical reality behind the people who are named by Homer.

Joachim Latacz is editor of the whole volume. His own contribution is strangely unbalanced. In an article of thirty pages on the structure of the *Iliad*, with clearly modern and unitarian views, he reaches the mid-twentieth century (Schadewaldt) only on the 27th page; and the last thirty years only on the last page. Early on he spends a long time in an excursus on a suggested literary-critical meaning of κοσμέω; and there is another inappropriately long section on Aristotle. When he has reached modern times, he asserts that the breakthrough that brought old-style analysis to an end came with Wilamowitz and Schadewaldt. This is odd, because although he can quote Wilamowitz as pointing out the defects of the analysts (*Die Ilias und Homer*, p. 23), he has to admit that Wilamowitz himself then followed their path. I don't call that a breakthrough. However, he does give due credit to the massive achievement of Schadewaldt, clearly and rightly seeing *Iliasstudien* as the greatest work in the whole period since Wilamowitz. And, although his outlook is virtually limited to those who have written in German, I found the whole article deeply interesting. Hölscher on the *Odyssey* is much briefer, on the ground that his own long book on that poem was published just at that time, and he had expressed himself there.

We end with four contributions on different methods of interpretation: neanalysis, oral poetry theory, narratology, and—just as we begin to wonder whether old-style analysis has finally disappeared—the application of evidence from art history by Schefold, who piously upholds the views of P. Von der Mühl, virtually the last of the analysts.

Kullmann is the great authority on neanalysis, which he characterises as 'motivgeschichtlich', i.e. it deals in the history of motifs. He comes clean on the Cycle. It was post-Iliad, but much of the material would have been available in pre-Iliadic poetry. With some defensiveness, he protests that he has been misrepresented in the past, and that he did not claim in *Die Quellen der Ilias* that the cyclic *Aithiopsis* was pre-Iliad. The difficulty is that he was not clear there, and seemed to suggest something different from what he now accepts. A novelty in the presentation here is that he includes motifs from oriental epics (e.g. Gilgamesh) in

the neoanalytical picture. This of course brings him close to Burkert. I find it a dilution of the neoanalytical approach. For even if motifs from non-Greek tales may be supposed to have exercised an influence on the story of the *Iliad*, it is not the same situation as, for example, the *Aithiopsis* connections, where the poet of the *Iliad* was himself composing under the direct influence of other themes in oral poetry, part of his repertoire or known to him. For in these cases we approach an understanding of the mind and method of Homer himself. The oriental influence, if it existed, could hardly have been so direct. The picture given by neo-analysis applies specifically to the *Iliad* and its poet; K. himself points out that even the *Odyssey* cannot be neoanalytically treated in the same way.

Holoka gives the history of oral poetry theory. He carefully admits that Milman Parry had predecessors in the German-speaking world, for this has been a sore point among German scholars. He writes with a pleasing breadth and occasional irony. He points out that neo-analysis could come close to agreement with oral theory, were it not for the fact that most neoanalysts insist on a literate Homer; and he comments that post-Parry writers in English in recent years 'subscribe to oral theory as cogent literary history, while engaging in literary criticism essentially unmodified by that subscription'. This strikes home.

Schwinge writes on 'Erzählforschung'. This is not narratology as understood by de Jong, with its background in general literary theory, and names like Genette and Bal, but more simply a study of the way the narrative is put together. Indeed, it comes close to Latacz's 'structure', and S. too goes back to Aristotle. He sees each poem as composed of 'episodes' or separate scenes, their cohesion achieved rather differently in the *Iliad* from the *Odyssey*. He deals in digressions, personal histories, and self-contained scenes, with continual reference to the text; digressions, even if the *Iliad* poet has radically modified their content for his own purposes, lead us back into the subject matter of oral poetry, as do the songs of Phemios and Demodokos, and also individual reminiscences, as those of Menelaos and Nestor. He believes that there were many *Odysseys* before our *Odyssey*, but they would not necessarily have contained Calypso or the Phaeacians. This is a very valuable treatment, and the closest of all to consideration of the two epics themselves.

Current British scholars most often quoted are Coldstream and Snodgrass on the archaeology of dark age Greece, and M.L. West for his recent article, mentioned above, 'The rise of the Greek epic', *JHS* 108 (1988) 151-72.

M.M. WILLCOCK

University College London

KATZ (M.A.) *Penelope's renown: meaning and indeterminacy in the Odyssey*. Princeton UP, 1991. Pp. xii + 223. \$35.

If Katz's blend of feminism, narratology and *Rezeptionsästhetik* ever achieves any *kleos*, it is more likely to be of the Clytemnestran than the Penelopeian kind. For it may reach the ears of contemporary critical theory's

many detractors that here they will find much evidence to support their worst prejudices about the dangers such theory represents: pretentious chapter headings ('Chapter Five: the construction of presence'); ugly diction ('envision'; 'reference' used as a verb; an over-fondness for the -ate suffix: 'instantiate', 'replicate', 'potentiate'; even 'potentiation'); gross solecism ('his mother, like he, is oppressed by the suitors' presence'); 'brother-in-law of me, whom am an evil-devising, sharp-tongued bitch'); impenetrable prose (e.g. p. 6: 'For although on the denotative level of meaning Penelope's *kleos* is identical with her faithfulness, I argue that Penelope's *kleos* understood connotatively and from within an explicitly interpretative framework is itself a problematic concept, and that it is also one in which some of the poem's central narrative features are inscribed'); not to mention excessive quotation of secondary material, a split infinitive or two and a whole host of misprints.

K.'s starting point is the sort of narrative contradiction identified by analytic and neo-analytic criticism. The notorious crux, for example, of Penelope's appearance before the suitors, and of Odysseus' reaction to it at xviii 281-3: is she the loyal wife and mother who 'remains beside [Telemachus] and keeps everything secure' (xvi 74 = xi 178, xix 525)? or the woman who 'follows after whoever is best of the Achaeans' (xvi 76 = xi 179, xix 528)? An analyst sees here a botched attempt to splice together different narrative traditions, a psychologizing unitarian the subtle complexities of Penelope's characterization (cf., e.g. Russo, Fernandez-Galiano, Heubeck, *Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* vol. iii, pp. 5 ff., especially 9 ff.). K., however, sees a productive indeterminacy stemming from the creative combination of contrary story lines (cf. particularly Ch. 4, 'What does Penelope want?'). Penelope emerges as a consistently inconsistent figure poised against the examples of the two women with whom she is contrasted at xi 438 ff., Clytemnestra (betrayal) and Helen (remarriage, but also hospitality). She is, for K., an encapsulation of all the indeterminate and transitional states of the poem: 'Penelope resists conformity to the conventions of both sexual fidelity and character representation. She is constituted instead around a persistence of either/or that is drawn toward the unifying power of a monologic *kleos*, yet never comes fully under its sway. In this she is perhaps a better representative of the spirit that animates the *Odyssey* than Odysseus, even—a spirit of indeterminacy affecting both character identity and narrative form, and expressed principally as a refusal of closure, a persistence of uncertainty' (194).

K. does make some thought-provoking observations: the wide-ranging function of the House of Atreus story, e.g. the *lokhos* motif; the switch, in the second half of the poem, from the paradigm of the murderous Clytemnestra to that of the welcoming Helen; the displacement of the *anagnorisis* (K. prefers the form *anagnorismos*) from Penelope onto Eurykleia. And she is, on the whole, rightly dismissive of psychology in favour of narrative considerations—though, in his commentary on *Od.* xix and xx, pp. 29 ff. (published after K.) Rutherford does offer a persuasively sensitive and judicious account of Penelope's behaviour. She is, however, misguidedly committed to the notion of a Penelope who eludes the constraints of narrative control: 'Constituted as she is

throu  
nate  
a lon  
defie  
the su  
of th  
much  
conv  
outlir  
overl  
extra  
situal  
occas  
ing,  
serve  
wom  
men,  
*Odys*  
which  
types  
Arete  
inwa  
sense  
cours  
head  
pecu  
narra  
edly  
says  
it sc  
throu

S

LEFK

F

]

most

the c

this

been

deal

ian c

supp

to th

publ

need

in se

sing

the p

poet

of th

]

sugg

read

evid

ance

beyc

Pinc