

tively notes Achilles' failure to constitute his manhood by raping Deidamia, and, based on a lengthy discussion of gender and sexuality in ancient mystery cults he attempts to track Statius' line of thought and examine the construction of the episode. The conclusions are convincing, and they show the author's familiarity with both cultic life in the classical Greece and its later literary representations. According to Heslin, the rape of Deidamia in the *Achilleid* fulfilled its purpose in cult and community – as a response to Euripides' *Bacchae*, Statius used the violent episode to transfer the power in a Bacchic rite from the female to the male sex. On a personal level, however, the act is stated as insufficient, as the sexual violence on its own was not enough to constitute an epic hero's manliness. In the conclusion of the book, Heslin considers the reasons that led to Achilles' failure and the consequences that finally enabled him to gain his masculinity.

The author approaches the subject through Achilles' complex relationship with his father. With outstanding perceptiveness, Heslin analyzes the almost complete absence of the hero's father in the story of his childhood, and the failure of numerous father figures to fulfill the role. The author considers Statius' view that the right kind of a father figure is crucial for a boy's transformation into a man, and that the acknowledgement of one's father is a necessary condition for a Homeric hero. Only upon the arrival of Ulysses and with his help, does Statius' Achilles fulfill these conditions, and is he able to leave his feminine *alter ego* behind. Heslin's perceptive reasoning, his psychological insight and his expertise in poetic and epic tradition enable him to draw a conclusion that is not only impressive and convincing, but also fresh and surprising. It connects the dots between the issues discussed in previous chapters and leaves the reader with broader understanding of Statius' poetry, and the value system within.

All in all, Heslin's survey is an admirable pursuit to fill the void concerning the study of the *Achilleid* by classical scholars. Heslin's open-minded approach to the subject, his deductive skills and his ability to effortlessly utilize cross-disciplinary theories and previous studies enables him to deal with a wide range of issues within the *Achilleid*. The book can be recommended not just for classical scholars, but for students of literature, gender theories and human behavior as well. The central issues of the book – construction of identity, the essentialist and constructivist nature of gender, and the blurring categories of feminine and masculine, humane and divine, and humane and bestial – are discussed in understandable and clear rhetoric that makes the book easily accessible. For further reading on the subject, the reader is provided with an extensive bibliography, and thorough notes on classical literature.

Elina Pyy

A. D. MORRISON: *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-87450-2. XII, 358 pp. GBP 55, USD 124.

This book discusses the way the Hellenistic poets Theocritus, Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes reflect and develop archaic models in using an outside speaker, a primary narrator. As the author (= M.) himself formulates, this study is meant to ask the question "who is speaking" and attempts mainly to illuminate the ways in which the narrators are portrayed in Hellenistic poetry and how the Hellenistic poets adapted and renewed narratological techniques of the archaic period. In his foreword, M. reminds the reader of the eternal *caveat* in studies on ancient

literature: the largely fragmentary state of the preserved (both Archaic and Hellenistic) literature and the fact that much has disappeared altogether. However, the author also notes that we do have a great deal of poetry and that he attempts to show the relationship between archaic and Hellenistic poetry on a general level. In the introductory chapter, M. discusses the premises of his study thoroughly and critically; topics such as the "Importance of voice" and "Voice, genre and poetics" are analyzed. Theoretical and methodological frames are set in the chapter titled "Narratology, primary narrators and quasi-biography" (p. 27ff).

The author concentrates on examining the similarities of the poetic manners and strategies of the Archaic and Hellenistic periods. M. shows (with references to earlier literature) how Hellenistic poets shared many techniques with their Archaic predecessors and that features that often are recognized as Hellenistic can actually be found already in Pindar. For example, the emphasis on "peripheral" instead of main events in Callimachean epic, which results, as the author phrases it, in an asymmetric and skewed narrative, has its models in Archaic choral lyric.

While there is a great deal of recent scholarship on the models of Hellenistic poetry, M. emphasizes that his book broadens the scope of Archaic poets and offers a systematic discussion of the narrators in the extant poems by Callimachus, Theocritus and Apollonius of Rhodes. This book deals only with poetry. Archaic lyric is more relevant for the study than epic, the latter using mainly direct speech. Dramatic texts have been excluded, as they do not have a primary narrator.

It is quite obvious that within the scope of Hellenistic poetry, which was mainly intended to be read (rather than orally received), authors systematically developed different kinds of narrators and literary personalities. The question, however, is more problematic in the case of the archaic period and there is a general and widespread assumption that archaic poetry differs from Hellenistic poetry principally in that archaic poetry was mostly orally transmitted, involved music and dance, whereas Hellenistic poetry was produced in a literary environment and was self-conscious of its written nature. M. examines some aspects of archaic poetry, looking at it both from the angle of performance and from that of the relationship between author and narrator. He concludes that while it is difficult to decide exactly how, e.g., choral *epinicians* were performed, we can be sure that there was more than one occasion to hear a presentation and that, in fact, this awareness of more than one audience is traceable in many Pindaric texts. Fame is what the poets wanted for themselves and promised to their patrons, and this fame was achieved, according to M., through repeated performances of poetic compositions. Consequently, the oral nature of archaic poetry does not mean that works could not have been widely known. As for the relationship between the real and historical poet and persons who speak in poems, M. points out that there is in archaic poetry (in lyric, not epic poetry) a tendency to offer quasi-biographical information. This external information about the narrator (which often is assumed to be "true" information on the real, historical author) actually is a literary device to create a feeling of intimacy and privacy between the narrator and the audience. The creation of a literary person, a narrator, is clear in the case of Hipponax, whose brutal and mocking voice does not fit with the aristocratic background the poet belonged to. Showing that archaic poetry was not restricted to one oral performance and that there are created literary narrator personas as well as other literary techniques, such as use of pseudo-intimacy and pseudo-spontaneity (the narrator acts as if he were composing the poem on the spot), M. points out that there is not as much of a gap between archaic and Hellenistic poetry as one might assume.

In his discussion of Callimachus, M. draws attention to the exemplary Hellenistic nature of Callimachus' poetry and points out the diversity of narrators. M. emphasizes that the generally assumed scholar-poet narrator in Callimachus' poems is often only apparent. The bookish narrator is most prominent in the *Aetia*; in the *Iambi*, instead, one can detect satire of this pedantry and the narrator's authority is often questioned as well. In the *Hymns*, Callimachus clearly plays with the relationship between the narrator and the historical author. M. notes that Callimachus' use of archaic models can especially be seen in mimetic hymns in which narrator creates a feeling of intimacy and spontaneity: in these aspects he can be seen to be exploiting non-epic poets, Sappho, Archilochus and Pindar in particular. Which one of Callimachus' narrator types, the self-ironising one of the *Iambi*, the bookish one of the *Aetia* or the epic one of the *Hymns*, is closest to the historical Callimachus is difficult to say (M. thinks it is the one in *Aetia*), they all probably reflect a side of his personality. In any case, it is clear that the wide range of voices in these works shows how deeply Callimachus was aware of the models he was using and of his capacity to make something new of them.

While Callimachus' works are cohesive poems within each genre that they represent, the *Idylls* of Theocritus offer different kinds of problems especially as they lack cohesive unity. M. begins his analysis of the *Idylls* by dividing them into 7 subcategories according to the type of narrator they present: groups 1–3 reflect the relationship between the author and narrator, in group 4 the narrator can be compared with the epic *aoidos*, group 5 (only *Idyll* 26) has a choral narrator, group 6 has an "unprominent" narrator and the *Idylls* in group 7 do not have a primary narrator at all. Within this frame M. discusses Theocritus and more closely *Idylls* 13, 22 and 24, which he interprets as texts "translating epic and lyric", i.e., taking a lyric theme and putting it in epic mode or the other way around. This change of meters and subject matters can be interpreted as the desire of the Hellenistic poet to transfer archaic models into new mode, now that their original context of performance had disappeared. All in all, there are many common features in Callimachus' and Theocritus' poems reflecting archaic poetry; for example, they both make their primary narrators much more visible than they are in Homer or Hesiod. The constant play between the roles of the narrator and the historical author is also notable in the *Idylls*.

Chapter 5 is dedicated to Apollonius of Rhodes. M. observes the differences between Apollonius and the other poets discussed, as his one long epic poem presents different kinds of narratological problems to the works of Callimachus and Theocritus. Compared to the Homeric narrator, Apollonius' narrator makes himself more audible, more involved in the show. M. points out how Apollonius' narrator develops from archaic epic's independent narrator into a narrator who is confused and becomes utterly subordinated to the Muses. The narrator's evolution seems to reflect the course of the story; the characters' despair is visible in the narrator's loss of confidence. The struggles of a narrator can be found also in Pindaric epinicians but in true Hellenistic manner Apollonius seems to have reversed the technique.

This study shows the diversity of Hellenistic poetry and the Hellenistic authors' awareness of literary styles, but also that of presenting different kinds of narrators. Especially interesting is the author's discussion of how the use of pseudo-intimate impression can be found in archaic literature and how Alexandrian writers exploited it. It gives the audience a feeling that it is a part of a private occasion or a ritual, transferred to a different time and place, as is the case in the mimetic texts of Callimachus and Theocritus. On the other hand, I think the book would have benefitted by concentrating on a smaller number of texts and on reading them as a

whole. As it stands now (the amount of literature it uses is so large that it may overwhelm a less erudite reader), it is necessary for one to have the whole corpus of, for example, Callimachus, at hand, although M. provides not only the Greek text but also a translation of the passages he uses.

The simple question of who is speaking within a certain text is fascinating and not easy to answer. M. succeeds in illuminating the question from various points of view. The question of the interplay between the personality of a narrator and the personality of a real poet is many-sided, too. I think the relationship between a literary and real self is, however, so complicated that it is difficult to make a clear distinction between them. A narrator of course in one way or another reflects some aspect of the personality of the real poet who created it. We also must bear in mind how little verified biographical information we actually have about ancient authors. Having said that, I conclude by welcoming this book as a thought-provoking addition to the scholarship on Hellenistic literature.

*Tiina Purola*

*Les jeux et les ruses de l'ambiguïté volontaire dans les textes grecs et latins. Actes de la Table Ronde organisée à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université Lumière-Lyon 2 (23–24 novembre 2000)*, édités par LOUIS BASSET – FRÉDÉRIQUE BIVILLE. Collection de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée 33. Série linguistique et philologique 4. Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée, Lyon 2005. ISBN 2-903264-26-0. 244 pp. EUR 25.

Questo libro raccoglie gli atti di una tavola rotonda dedicata all'attraente tema dell'ambiguità volontaria nei testi greci e latini relativi a vari campi storico-culturali del mondo antico: teatro e poesia, filosofia e cristianesimo, oracoli. Per ciò che riguarda l'area francofona, il tema è stato oggetto di almeno altri due lavori pubblicati, rispettivamente, nel 1988 e nel 2006 (*L'ambiguïté. Cinq études historiques réunies par I. Rosier*, Lille 1988; A. Orlandini – C. Moussy [a c. di], *Recherches linguistiques sur l'ambiguïté en Grèce et à Rome*, Paris 2006). Ecco il contenuto del volume: C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni: L'ambiguïté: définition, typologie; L. Basset: Aristote et l'ambiguïté volontaire; F. Biville, Formes et fonctions de l'ambiguïté volontaire dans les textes latins; I. Böhm: Le vocabulaire de la perception et l'ambiguïté dans la tragédie grecque; M.-D. Joffre: Les conditions morphosyntaxiques de l'ambiguïté volontaire: l'emploi de *videor* dans les chants II et III de l'*Énéide*; B. Jacquinod: L'ambiguïté volontaire dans le comique d'Aristophane; D. Vallat: Ambiguïté référentielle et stratégies courtisanes chez Martial; G. Bady: Le Socrate de Platon: pédéraste ou pédagogue?; S. Van der Meeren: Exhorter à la philosophie ou à la sagesse? Une ambiguïté manifeste dans les protreptiques à la philosophie; S. Gioanni: Les ambiguïtés de la "religion épistolaire" dans l'œuvre d'Ennode de Pavie; G. Lucas: La réponse d'Ammon à Alexandre corrigée par Plutarque; A. Orlandini: Paradoxes sémantiques, tautologies et textes oraculaires; G. Rougemont: Les oracles grecs recouraient-ils habituellement à l'ambiguïté volontaire? – Fra i contributi, tutti interessanti e di buona qualità, mi è piaciuto in particolare l'ultimo, in cui Georges Rougemont ha sicuramente ragione nel dare una risposta negativa alla domanda da lui posta nel suo titolo. Infatti, i responsi oracolari realmente e volontariamente ambigui sembra siano stati relativamente pochi, mentre quelli che ci sono stati trasmessi in forma apparentemente ambigua sono frequentemente spiegabili o per il carattere