

8-2017

Elton Barker, Stefan Bouzarovski, Christopher Pelling, and Leif Isaksen, eds., *New Worlds from Old Texts: Revisiting Ancient Space and Place*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. Pp. 400. Cloth (ISBN 978-0-19-966413-9) \$135.00.

Hamish Cameron
Bates College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://crossworks.holycross.edu/necj>

Recommended Citation

Cameron, Hamish (2017) "Elton Barker, Stefan Bouzarovski, Christopher Pelling, and Leif Isaksen, eds., *New Worlds from Old Texts: Revisiting Ancient Space and Place*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. Pp. 400. Cloth (ISBN 978-0-19-966413-9) \$135.00.," *New England Classical Journal*: Vol. 44 : Iss. 3 , 185-188.

Available at: <https://crossworks.holycross.edu/necj/vol44/iss3/7>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by CrossWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in *New England Classical Journal* by an authorized editor of CrossWorks.

Malcolm Davies,
The Aethiopsis: Neo-Analysis Reanalyzed.

Hellenic Studies 71. Center for Hellenic Studies.
 Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016. Pp. 120. Paper
 (ISBN 978-0-674-08831-3) \$22.50.

The *Aethiopsis* recounted the events in the Trojan War following the action of the *Iliad*, including the death of Achilles himself. Virtually no “physical” traces of this poem have survived, and we know the poem’s plot only through a paraphrase in Proclus; yet the poem wields outsize influence in the study of archaic Greek epic due to its being considered a “source” for the *Iliad* in the branch of Homeric scholarship that has come to be known as “Neo-analysis.” It is a reappraisal of this theory that Malcolm Davies wants to achieve in offering this analysis of the *Aethiopsis*.

After summarily dealing with older analytic theories according to which the *Aethiopsis* is an amalgamation of two earlier distinct poems, a *Penthesileia* and a *Memnonid*, Davies sets out, in Chapter 1, to survey the evidence customarily adduced for a dependency of the *Iliad* on the *Aethiopsis*. He resists the one size fits all approach of many of the Neoanalysts and goes through the relevant scenes one by one, taking the “complexity of the issues involved” (4) as a guiding principle without pledging allegiance to or outright rejection of the Neoanalytic program. In many cases, Davies argues, the primacy of the *Aethiopsis* “is not susceptible of proof” (6) and the traditional qualitative argument that the better version of the motif must be the older and original one does not hold water. Davies usefully points out that certain motifs may be so generic and traditional as to be interdependent, rather than being related to each other as a source and its derivation (10–12).

In the end it is only the scene in Book 8 in which Diomedes rescues Nestor from death at the hands of Hector after Paris has shot Nestor’s horse that is singled out as a sure case of the *Iliad* modeling itself on a scene in the *Aethiopsis*, the scene in which Antilochos saves his father Nestor from death at the hands of Memnon. He is killed in this action by Memnon, who in turn will be killed by Achilles. The rationale used is the Neo-analyst Wolfgang Kullmann’s reformulation of the qual-

ity argument that is other-wise inconclusive: “If there are two uses of a motif, one tragic, the other not, then the tragic version must be primary and original” (6). In all other cases (e.g., Antilochus saving Menelaus’ life, 5.561–73; Thrasymedes saving his brother Antilochus, 16.317–29; Patroclus’ pyre as modeled on Achilles’, 23.192–211; Patroclus’ death as modeled on Achilles’, 16.844–54; Sarpedon’s death as modeled on Memnon’s in the *Aethiopsis*; Hector’s death as modeled on Memnon’s) there is for Davies a contextually bound reason to argue that the Neo-analytic approach tends to be reductive. As Davies puts it in a capping phrase: “Neoanalysis seems to act as block to the understanding of a given passage’s impact” (p. 22).

In Chapter 2, Davies examines vase paintings as possible evidence for the *Aethiopsis* and concludes that only one scene, Eos carrying her son Memnon’s corpse from the battle location (34–6), finds secure attestation on archaic artifacts, including Attic red- and black-figure vases and Etruscan mirrors. One might add, however, that even if we can identify a character or scene that is recognizable from Proclus’ paraphrase, it does not necessarily follow that it is drawn from an *Aethiopsis* as an actual poetic work. This is *a fortiori* the case when details are not in easy or direct agreement with what we know of the *Aethiopsis*, such as Hermes, and not Zeus, as the deity who holds the scales in the vase paintings of a *Psychostasia* (a “weighing of the souls”) involving Achilles and Memnon. Davies remains skeptical on an *ad hoc* basis, drawing attention to the specific requirements of the visual medium which may account for the detail of the presence of Thetis and Eos, Achilles’ and Memnon’s mothers, in various painted scenes, such as the *Psychostasia* or the actual combat between the two heroes (29, 32). But here we can turn the argument around and entertain the possibility that the scene in the picture, adapted to the requirements of the visual medium and the space of the vase, *may* refer to a scene from the lost poem. In one case, Hypnos and Thanatos transporting a corpse that is supposedly Memnon’s, Davies voices strong doubts about this identification; and even if we somehow learned that the vases in question indeed depict Hypnos, Thanatos, and Memnon, we cannot exclude the possibility that the scene comes from the *Iliad* (16.676–83; Sarpedon’s corpse) and is transferred to Memnon.

The perspective shifts when in Chapter 3 instead of the *Iliad* the *Aethiopsis* itself is taken as vantage point, in the form of a commentary on the paraphrase of the poem we find in Proclus. Moving through the poem episode by episode Davies adopts the same skeptical stance as in the previous chapters, expressing hesitation on the question whether Attic vase paintings of Achilles and Penthesileia faithfully represent scenes from the lost poem; the question whether these scenes underlie our *Iliad* is of course moot. This is not the case for the Thersites episode in the *Aethiopsis*

which in Proclus' summary immediately follows the death and burial of Penthesileia. Thersites' death at the hand of Achilles when he insults the latter is more "tragic" than his beating in the *Iliad* at the hand of Odysseus, who intervenes in Thersites' quarrel with Agamemnon; but Davies still maintains that "the presence of elaboration and the absence of 'tragic' consequences are not infallible indexes of derivative status" (54), drawing attention to the possibility that the *Aethiopsis* draws on an un-Homeric tradition in which Thersites is of Aetolian nobility. When we come to the death of Antilochos at the hands of Memnon (61–4), the scene is less seen as a model for the death of Patroclus at the hands of Hector than for the scene in Virgil's *Aeneid* in which Lausus dies at the hands of Aeneas in an attempt to save the life of his father Mezentius. The discussion has suddenly, and not unreasonably, shifted into a (neo-)analysis of the *Aeneid*.

The discussion, sure-footed and even-handed throughout, is mostly a critical review of older scholarship and contains much useful material for scholars wishing to immerse themselves in the intricacies of the discussion over the years. There is, however, no reference to modern discussions of the *Aethiopsis*, with the exception of Martin West's 2013 *The Epic Cycle* (Oxford). Fantuzzi's and Tsagalis' *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception* (Cambridge 2015) and Bruno Currie's *Homer's Allusive Art* (Oxford 2016) may have been published too late to have been taken into account. But this is not true for much of the work of Jonathan Burgess since his 2001 monograph *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* (Baltimore, MD). And this work is precisely at the core of what is referred to on the back cover of the book as Neoanalysis' "recent revival in subtler form" ([the] "theory's more sophisticated reincarnation"). There is much recent work on the possibility of antecedents to the Homeric poems through a combination of oral poetry study and intertextuality: the recognition that salient traditional phraseology can be "re-used" in other epic stories and episodes, thus transferring its themes and associations to a new context. If this is the "revival" that is referred to on the back cover, then the book's argument neither acknowledges it nor benefits from it. This omission is especially felt in the discussion of the well-known lines describing Achilles' reaction to the death of Patroclus in formulas seemingly evoking Achilles' own death. Scholarship on this issue has much progressed since Kakridis (1949), Pestalozzi (1945), and Schadewaldt (1952).

In closing, then, this short book provides reliable guidance through the maze of older literature, but does not provide new perspectives nor does it engage with the most recent developments.

Elton Barker, Stefan Bouzarovski,
Christopher Pelling, and Leif Isaksen, eds.,
New Worlds from Old Texts: Revisiting Ancient Space and Place.

Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. Pp. 400. Cloth
(ISBN 978-0-19-966413-9) \$135.00.

This book is a display of the inquiry of learned scholars, so that the spatial humanities (especially the spatial analysis of Herodotus) might be known, and that great and marvellous research, some visualized with digital tools, some by traditional analog methods, may gain glory among Classicists.

Although his name is not in the book's title, Herodotus' *Histories*, especially book 5, is central to this volume. The book is divided into three sections: Part I addresses ideas of space in literary texts of the Classical period; Part II focuses on Hestia (<http://hestia.open.ac.uk/hestia/>), a digital humanities project initially funded from 2008-2010, that analyses Herodotus' *Histories* using various spatial tools; Part III introduces two more digital and spatial projects and two final chapters offering theory and concluding threads.

The first six chapters of the volume (Part I) all use Herodotus as a touchstone for addressing the use and representation of space in Classical Greek texts. Oliver Thomas ("Greek Hymnic Spaces") compares Herodotus' treatment of Delos to that of Greek hymns. Donald Murray ("The Waters at the End of the World: Herodotus and Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography") shows how Achaemenid imperial ideology drew on the cosmic geographies of Babylon and Assyria and appears in Herodotus' descriptions of the rituals and imperial language of Darius and Xerxes. Paola Ceccarelli ("Map, Catalogue, Drama, Narrative: Representations of Aegean Space") uses perceptions of the Aegean in visual images, catalogic texts, drama, and prose (Anaximander's map, Hecataeus, Aeschylus' *Persians* and Herodotus, respectively) to examine the Aegean's representation across time and genre. Mathieu de Bakker ("An Uneasy Smile: Herodotus and the Question of How to View the World") analyzes Herodotus' attitude towards cartography and spatial description, contrasting the *Histories*' characters' failed moments of cartographic viewing with Herodotus' own dynamic and hodological narration. Tim Rood ("Mapping Spatial and Temporal Distance in Herodotus and Thucydides") uses historical texts, modern anthropology and travel literature to contrast the fixity of modern cartographic representations with the fluidity of ancient narrative representations. Kathryn Stevens

(“From Herodotus to a ‘Hellenistic’ World? The Eastern Geographies of Aristotle and Theophrastus”) compares and maps geographical references in Aristotle’s *Historia Animalium* and Theophrastus’ *Historia Plantarum* to show the conceptual shift between Aristotle’s Herodotean world and the Hellenistic intellectual world of Theophrastus.

As Part I circles around Herodotus, Part II pulls the focus to the center of Herodotus’ work, Book 5, and to the work of the Hestia project. In Chapter 7 (“Between East and West: Movements and Transformations in Herodotean Topology”), Stefan Bouzarovski and Elton Barker construct a series of four network diagrams showing spatial relationships between the geographic entities mentioned in Book 5; in Chapter 8 (“Telling Stories with Maps: Digital Experiments with Herodotean Geography”), Barker, Leif Isaksen, and Jessica Ogden explain the process behind the creation of those network diagrams; and in Chapter 9 (“Space-travelling in Herodotus Book 5”), Barker and Christopher Pelling build on the network diagrams of Chapter 7 to closely examine their implications for a spatial reading of Herodotus’ narrative which brings out the importance of the cultural and physical geographies at work in his text.

Part III begins by exploding the frame of analysis both geographically and theoretically with two chapters describing digital projects which use network analysis tools to examine material evidence. Tom Brughmans and Jeroen Poblome (“Pots in Space: An Exploratory and Geographical Network Analysis of Roman Pottery Distribution”) use their ICRATES (Inventory of Crafts and Trade in the Roman East, <http://icrates.arts.kuleuven.be/icrates/network-analysis>) database for examining distribution patterns of Roman tableware in the eastern Mediterranean to advocate for the use of network analysis techniques beyond those included in commonly-used GIS suites. Lin Foxhall, Katharina Rebay-Salisbury, and the other 13 authors of “Tracing Networks: Technological Knowledge, Cultural Contact, and Knowledge Exchange in the Ancient Mediterranean and Beyond” describe the Tracing Networks project (<http://www.tracingnetworks.ac.uk>), an overarching conceptual approach and a common data ontology for seven archaeological projects examining networks of material culture and two related computer science projects. The final two chapters return the focus to texts: Øyvind Eide (“Verbal Expressions of Geographical Information”) discusses the relationship and relative affordances between maps and text in the digital humanities, and Christopher Pelling (“A View from the Boundary”) draws out a number of themes running through the chapters: alternative visualizations and focalizations, how to reconstruct the ancient mindset, the

political and imperial dimensions of space, and interactions between time and space.

This volume intervenes in three fields of scholarship, Herodotean studies, Classical geography and spatial analysis, and the digital humanities, and it does so with remarkable coherence. Part of the credit for this goes to Herodotus, whose *Histories* provides many valuable examples of the complex interplay between geographical and historical literature, previously examined by Katherine Clarke's *Between Geography and History* (Oxford 1999) and Alex Purves' *Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative* (Cambridge 2010), the latter of which underpins many of the spatial discussions in this volume. Each of the contributions in Part I demonstrate how a close spatial reading of ancient texts can illuminate narrative, focal, generic, and temporal issues. However, much of the credit for the volume's coherence must go to the editors, who have facilitated a considerable remarkable degree of dialogue between authors.

While Herodotus and spatial analysis are natural companions, integrating the digital aspect is a more challenging task, one at which this volume succeeds. The chapters on digital projects provide detailed case studies of how digital tools can be productively used to illuminate well examined areas of the ancient world. The emphasis throughout is on how digital approaches assist and open new opportunities for, but do not replace, close textual analysis. Part II presents the Hestia project as an example of the process of digital work and publications. Through three chapters, the authors emphasize the critical role of scholarly textual analysis in interpreting and contextualizing the inputs and outputs of digital tools. Understanding the importance of informed data preparation and analysis is critical for understanding digital scholarship.

There are some wrinkles. Several of the network diagrams in Chapter 7 are printed unaltered from a dynamic online interface. At times the text refers to an apparently important node in the network diagram which is nevertheless not large enough in the network to receive an automated label (Phrygia and Phoenecia in Figure 7.1, Aegina in Figure 7.2). The physical dimensions of the page also result in faint lines and very small printing on some diagrams, which may be an issue for some readers. As Chapter 8 notes, "time is rarely kind to the documentation of digital projects" (182); this is particularly true of URLs. As of the time of writing (May 2017), the printed link to the book's supplementary data visualizations (hosted by OUP) was dead. Much of the data can be found at Hestia's website (<http://hestia.open.ac.uk/hestia/>).

New Worlds from Old Texts is an excellent example of the integration of thoughtful humanistic inquiry and digital methods. It would serve as a fine example

for anyone curious about digital classics. Moreover, several of the papers in Part I make a strong claim for inclusion in a classical geography syllabus and the volume is essential reading for anyone considering the spatial dimension of Herodotus.

NEC 44.3

Hamish Cameron
Bates College

Philip Hardie, ed.,
Augustan Poetry and the Irrational.

Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. Pp. 336. Cloth
(ISBN 978-0-19-872472-8) \$125.00.

Scholars and librarians may perhaps be forgiven for any weariness in the face of so many edited volumes on classical subjects, whether “companions” or, as in the present case, collections of papers that originated in a colloquium. But lovers of Augustan poetry will want to make room on their shelves for this addition to the vast and somewhat unwieldy bibliography. Hardie’s collection will be of most interest to graduate students and professional scholars working on Augustan poetry; the essays assume a level of sophistication and background that may prove daunting for all but the most advanced undergraduates.

Including the editor’s introduction, there are fifteen papers in this volume, with four sections (of more or less equal length) to organize the contributions thematically. The first heading is concerned with civil war; subsequent movements of the volume address “Order and Disorder”; “Reason and Desire”; “Self-contradictions: Philosophy and Rhetoric”; and “Virgilian Figures of the Irrational.” While the divisions are both well-considered and the papers eminently appropriate for each section, there is something of an overlap that creates a synergy between the “chapters.”

Hardie’s introduction seeks to offer a definition—or at least to explore the process of attempting such a definition—of the elusive (not to say nebulous) concept of the “irrational.” The madness that is all too common in matters both martial and amatory is considered at length; the peculiar status of *furor* in the Roman consciousness (especially in an Augustan context) is of particular interest.

The individual contributions are of uniformly high quality and interest; a sur-