

(p. 128). He continues: ‘Needless to say, the Homer in question here is not the poet and not his poems, but the very idea of Homer, which is irreducible to both’ (p. 128).

Chapter 4’s title ‘What Did Homer See?’ is a witty question that leads to the discussion of Homer’s legendary blindness as a *topos* (p. 145) as well as the multi-layered site of Troy, which prompts the question ‘Which phase of Troy – if any – corresponds to Homer’s Troy?’ (p. 155). P.’s star example in this chapter is Jorge Luis Borges’s ‘Escheresque’ (p. 167) short story ‘The Immortal’, which utilises the multiple layers of Troy and the multiple images of Homer as scattered fragments to construct ‘the image of Troy as Troy is reflected in Homer’s mind and in the minds of all those who have come after him’ (p. 169). P.’s conclusion is that ‘Troy and Homer has no life but only an afterlife, and that neither one nor the other can be coherently imagined, let alone seen’ (p. 174).

The final chapter, ‘Why War?’, has a markedly sombre tone. Here P. deals with the uncomfortable fact that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are poems about war. We are faced with the conundrum, ‘How can the greatest of Greek poets be appreciated when his poetry is so very troubling?’ (p. 190) To be sure, his poems ‘*problematize war*’ (p. 201; P.’s emphasis), but there have been ‘disenchanted readings’ of Homer. Prominent among them is Simone Weil’s ‘resolutely disenchanted and disenchanting reading of Homer’ (p. 213). Weil and others also directly challenged the ‘appropriation of Homer by European and especially German nationalists that culminated with the Nazis. The roots of this movement, they recognized, ran deep in modern culture, where the study of Homer had played so immense a role in fashioning that culture’s sense of identity’ (p. 213).

This book does not directly discuss how Homeric poems should be read. Indeed, any reader who happens to find this book on a library shelf with only the main title *Homer* shown on its spine will be surprised that it gives little information about the contents of the poems. Instead, it demonstrates the immense potential of the poems and their author to create new ideas according to the perspectives of their readers.

The Open University

NAOKO YAMAGATA
naoko.yamagata@open.ac.uk

ARISTARCHUS ON HOMER’S *ILIAD*

SCHIRONI (F.) *The Best of the Grammarians. Aristarchus of Samothrace on the Iliad*. Pp. xxvi + 908, ills. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2018. Cased, US\$150. ISBN: 978-0-472-13076-4.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X22002189

This volume sets out to replace K. Lehrs’s *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis* (1833¹, 1882³) as a comprehensive treatment of Aristarchus of Samothrace as a Homeric critic. Amongst its predecessors, A. Ludwig’s *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik* (1885) focused on textual issues, whereas A. Roemer’s *Die Homerexegese Aristarchs* (1924), while correcting and supplementing Lehrs, proved too apologetic and biased.

S. succeeds in producing a systematic descriptive encyclopaedia of Aristarchus’ philology: clearly written and elegantly produced, this volume is a major achievement, unlikely to be

replaced for decades to come. After some well-informed introductory discussion of the sources and the nature of Aristarchus' editorial and exegetical work, the longest chapter is devoted to the six parts of *ars grammatica* (orthography, tropes and figures, glosses and myths, etymology, analogy and literary criticism); the final sections address Aristarchus' attitude towards his colleagues (chiefly Zenodotus and Aristophanes) and his view of Homer's language, characters, influence (the *neoterōi*) and identity (the 'Homeric question').

No complete work of Aristarchus has come down to us, and no comprehensive edition of his fragments has been produced. S. – the editor in 2004 of 73 fragments gleaned from Byzantine etymologica – deems that a collection of fragments would be 'not only an immense task but actually less useful' (p. xviii): she confines her inquiry to some 4,300 scholia of the first-century grammarian Aristonicus to Homer's *Iliad*, taken from H. Erbse's edition of the *scholia vetera* to that poem. Scholia to the *Iliad* transmitted by other *Mittelmenschen* (Didymus of Alexandria, Nicanor and Herodian) are generally disregarded as less reliable witnesses to Aristarchus' *ipsissima verba*, even if they often certainly contain Aristarchan doctrine; so are the scholia to the *Odyssey*, whose manuscript transmission and terminological *facies* are less clear-cut. The scholia selected are equipped with an elegant and exact English translation, though with no *apparatus fontium* and no indication of the source manuscripts.

The selection of material has its rationale, but also its pitfalls. Aristarchus' only commentary to be preserved in the direct tradition is the fragment on Herodotus Book 1 in PAmherst 2.12: this papyrus is barely mentioned (p. 6 n. 14); nor does Aristarchus' exegesis to authors other than Homer fare any better. Among Iliadic commentators, Herodian is invoked – despite his alleged unreliability – on issues of prosody (e.g. pp. 103–22), but deserved a more important role; Nicanor's scholia on punctuation and other topics (see R. Nünlist, *BICS* 64 [2021], 35–47) are conspicuously absent.

As for Didymus Chalcenterus, one of the reasons for disregarding the scholia drawn from his Περὶ τῆς Ἀριστοταρχείου διορθώσεως is that S. sides with M. West in believing that their terminology and doctrines go back to Didymus rather than to Aristarchus (pp. 18–22; 65–71); should we take this claim to the extreme, much of what S. writes about Aristarchus' practice of consulting Homeric copies would become shakier. In a sort of mediation between the theories of van der Valk–West and Ludwig–Nagy, S. maintains that Aristarchus *may* have *occasionally* consulted other copies of the poems, but that he never relied on manuscript evidence alone for his textual choices (p. 69): this may be true, but it looks at odds with S.'s picture of Aristarchus (p. 759) as a champion of a 'systematic' method of textual analysis. S. also agrees with West in considering Zenodotus' Homeric text as representing a rhapsodic copy from Asia Minor rather than the fruit of conscious editorial choices (p. 577 n. 157): again taken to the extreme, this view would cast doubts on the extent and value of Zenodotus' critical activity, which S. admits and elaborates on (pp. 550, 592 etc.) – it would also make Aristarchus' (mis?)conception of Zenodotus as an original editor somewhat surprising.

S.'s decision to mostly neglect the *Odyssey* scholia proceeds from the uncertainty about the latter's relationship to the *Vier-Männer-Kommentar* (and hence to Aristonicus) as well as from the unreliability of their terminology, but it conflicts with Aristarchus' deep belief in Homer's sole authorship of both poems (pp. 623–50). Aristarchus' reason for quoting *Od.* 9.21–2 in the scholium to *Il.* 15.193 is to be found in schol. H *Od.* 9.21f (not mentioned on p. 154 n. 136); one of the most exciting cases of interference between Alexandrian exegesis and medical vocabulary (see pp. 225–6 and 749–52) concerns *Od.* 11.579 δῆρτρον, for which we have Aristarchus' explanation in fr. 65 Schironi (from the *Etymologica*) etc.

As for S.'s discussion of the evidence, the sixfold division of Aristarchus' grammatical principles follows the pattern of Dionysius Thrax's *Techne grammatike*: a more thorough inquiry into the relationship between Dionysius' categories and Aristarchus' terminology is missing, but may prove useful for understanding how justified it is to project later schemes back onto Aristarchus (e.g. the choice of the first-century Περὶ τρόπων of Trypho as the fountainhead of all doctrines on tropes is problematic, nor is PWürzburg 2 a papyrus of Trypho, as claimed on p. 127). In this respect, the best methodological lesson is offered by S. Matthaios's *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik Aristarchs* (1999), a substantial book not superseded by S.'s analysis and to be consulted throughout (the same holds, on literary criticism, for R. Nünlist's *The Ancient Critic at Work* [2009]).

The scholia discussed are fragments, and it is often hard to understand them outside of a wider net of exegetical materials normally listed in the *apparatus fontium et testimoniorum* of critical editions. For instance, Aristarchus' note on the repetition of a word (Αἰθιοπας) in *Odyssey* 1.22–3 is taken by S. as a trace of the polemic against the so-called Chorzontes (pp. 152, 169–70), who complained that repetition was a frequent figure in the *Iliad* but not in the *Odyssey*: this may be true, but the later rhetorical tradition (Ps.-Plut. *De Hom.* 2.32; Ps.-Hermog. *Meth. dein.* 9) quotes the lines for different reasons. The ancient debate on why Achilles and Ulysses are defined as πολίτορθοι, 'sackers of cities', is tackled (pp. 633–6) without reference to Porphyry's scholium to *Od.* 1.2h1 or to the earlier discussion of the topic by the fourth-century philosopher Antisthenes in his *Odysseus*. In *Iliad* 8.70 the κῆρες of Achilles and Memnon are weighed (p. 682), and Aristarchus blames Aeschylus for misunderstanding these κῆρες as 'souls' (rather than 'destinies') in his *Psychostasia*: this resonates with the Stoic interpretation of the Κῆρες as referring to the duplicity of the Μοῖραι (schol. bT Il. 8.69 = SVF II.931). Did Aristarchus' mythographic studies (here pp. 661–78), for example on Niobe or on Theseus' abduction of Helen, really ignore the works of earlier mythographers such as Pherecydes or Hellanicus (R. Fowler's *Early Greek Mythography* [2000] is not mentioned)?

S.'s ambition is to free Aristarchus from the negative light that some modern scholars have cast on him and to show the depth of his contribution to the shaping of classical philology as a discipline based on the systematic analysis of textual evidence (hence her insistence on Aristarchus' empiricism, pp. 753–61: but how does this sit with his ubiquitous use of analogy, see e.g. pp. 277–312?). This is sound and interesting, but other, substantial questions are left unanswered. Was Aristarchus really the first (pp. xxiii, 52 etc.) to produce a line-by-line running commentary to his edition, or should we follow W. Slater in believing that Aristophanes of Byzantium already did? (S. leaves the door open to such a possibility on p. 581, but a fresh analysis of the X (*chi*) critical sign, which S., p. 57, misreads in *P. Oxy.* 1086, may yield new insights.) What is the relationship between Aristarchus' refined philology and the didactic dimension of his work? (S., p. 123, believes this involved the 'reading aloud' of the poems to pupils: but the Museum and Library at Alexandria were not primarily places of teaching.) What is Aristarchus' role in the definition of the technical methods of etymology? (S.'s fascinating analysis on pp. 340–76 insists on the 'sharing of consonants', but how does this otherwise poorly attested principle match what we know from other sources?) What is the relationship between Aristarchus' grammatical categories and the earlier and contemporary – chiefly Peripatetic and Stoic – philosophical speculation? When Aristarchus presents Homer as an Athenian and his language as a form of 'ancient Attic' (pp. 601–21), does this resonate with the prestige enjoyed by Attic in Hellenistic literary culture and the desire to place Homer at the beginning of a glorious tradition? if so, why is no reference made to Aristarchus' famous dictum that Homer is 'the touchstone of *hellenismos*' (fr. 125A Matthaios)?

S.'s book is an important achievement, which deserves to become the standard reference work on Aristarchus' work on the *Iliad*. At the same time, it is not the last word on this grammarian, nor does it supersede some recent, more detailed scholarly inquiries. An edition of Aristarchus' fragments is still an urgent *desideratum*.

Ca' Foscari University

FILIPPOMARIA PONTANI
f.pontani@unive.it

WOMEN AND HOMER

COX (F.), THEODORAKOPOULOS (E.) (edd.) *Homer's Daughters. Women's Responses to Homer in the Twentieth Century and Beyond*. Pp. xviii + 341, ills. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019. Cased, £75, US\$100. ISBN: 978-0-19-880258-7.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X22002463

Building on the 'excellent review of women writers responding to Homer in Hall, *The Return of Ulysses*, 2008: 115–29', the volume editors have gathered a set of articles on women who, over the past 100 years (the time frame of the book), have written about their responses to Homer, as well as their interpretations (sometimes also translations) of his works, from the aftermath of the First World War to the most recent examples, such as the popularly acclaimed novels by Madeline Miller, *The Song of Achilles* (2012) and *Circe* (2018). The first part includes studies on the *Iliad*, followed by a comparable number of responses to the *Odyssey*. Along the way, the chapters discuss and illustrate the different focuses and styles of the first, second and third wave of feminism.

In the introduction the editors present the essays and briefly contextualise each of the authors and works covered. They conclude the informative essay by evoking the passage in the *Iliad* in which Hector sends Andromache to her rooms and her weaving, leaving war for men. The *Odyssey* repeats these words, in the mouth of Telemachus, addressed to Penelope, replacing 'war' with 'word'. The women writers included in this book are, on the contrary, proof that both war and words are also a woman's business.

The editors and contributors are all feminist critics, who have in the past written on women writers. The book opens with essays on H.D. (by G. Liveley) and Elizabeth Cook's *Achilles* (by P. Stoker). Liveley's essay presents an overview of H.D.'s works, focusing on the often-playful ways in which the poet engages with Homer's poetry in almost all her writings and despite her belief in the impossibility of writing poetry after Homer. This essay focuses on the poem *Helen in Egypt* (1961). Cook's *Achilles* retells the story of the hero in a poetic novella, in which Cook goes beyond what Homer, or even Statius, recounts. Cook reads Achilles through the lens of John Keats. Stoker highlights with well-chosen examples how Cook incorporates into her text Keats's poetic universe, which in turn, reworks John Milton, George Chapman and William Shakespeare. Keats's physicality, the experience of the body, is evident in Cook's language, as Stoker shows.

C. Burke concentrates on the French-speaking writers Simone Weil and Rachel Bepaloff, who, in their reactions to the horrors of the Second World War, emphasised Homer's humanity. Although the two differ in their response to the *Iliad* (Weil centring