

## *New England Classical Journal*

### **Instructions to Reviewers**

Thank you very much for agreeing to review a book for *NECJ*. As you read the book and write your review, please keep the following guidelines in mind:

- The review should be between 1000 and 2000 words in length.
- If you know the author personally, or believe there may be a possible conflict of interests, please inform the Book Review Editor.
- Please return your review within 8 weeks after receipt of the book. If you are unable to do so, please contact the Book Review Editor.
- As you evaluate and respond to the book, please keep in mind that *NECJ* strives to offer productive responses that will help advance the field through rigorous inquiry, conscientious reading and evaluating practices, fair judgment free of distortions or personal attacks.
- *If this is your first review*, you may find the following advice useful: make sure you include a summary of the book's argument and approach as well as your responses to the questions listed below, using specific examples. Please feel free to include comments on smaller points at the end of the review.
- Guiding questions for new reviewers:
  - Does the book offer a convincing argument? Does it achieve what it sets out to do?
  - What theoretical frameworks does the author employ? How relevant/appropriate are they to the material in question?
  - What range of evidence does the book present? How is it organized (chronologically, thematically, geographically, etc.)? Is the presentation effective?
  - Are there any significant omissions or errors readers should be aware of?
  - What does the book do well, and what are potential areas of improvement?
  - Is the book well-written and coherent?
  - Does the book adequately engage with relevant scholarship? What is the book's unique contribution to the field?
  - How interesting and/or useful is the book for some or all of the following audiences: students (undergraduate and graduate), teachers (primary, secondary, college, university), scholars and others interested in the classical world?

- Are the notes, index and bibliography well-organized and easy to use?
- Is the inclusion of maps, graphs, illustrations, photographs, videos, activities, etc. effective? (Where applicable)
- Further guiding questions for reviewing **translations**:<sup>1</sup>
  - What do the accompanying materials (e.g. introduction, critical apparatus, etc.) add to the translation? What do they elucidate or omit about the challenges faced in the process of translating?
  - Did the author render the meter/tone/register/syntax/stylistic qualities of the original clearly and artfully?
  - How is this translation situated in the landscape of existing translations of the same work? Is this an under- or over-translated text? How does the author justify the need for a new translation? What kind of audiences does it address?
  - What does this translation add to our understanding of the original work?
- [Here is the complete stylesheet](#) you should follow when writing your review; bear in mind that we will only ask you to ensure adherence to NECJ's house style *after* your first draft, when the review is nearing completion. You will not be expected to do this when you hand in your first draft.
- The title should follow this format:  
Emily P. Austin, *Grief and the Hero: The Futility of Longing in the Iliad*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2021. Pp. 192. Cloth (ISBN 978-0-472-13232-4) \$54.95.
- At the bottom of your review, you should include and align right:

Your full name  
Your academic affiliation (if applicable)  
Your email address

For example:

Tobias Myers  
The American College of Greece and Connecticut College  
tmyers@conncoll.edu

- Please attach your review to an email to Francesca Bellei (francesca.bellei@gmail.com) as a Word document.

---

<sup>1</sup> Acknowledgement: this section was adapted from the MLA guidelines for evaluating scholarly translations, which can be found [here](#).