

female authorship. Since the authors under study are virtually all from 20th-century Europe or North America, they all felt the impact of the two great world wars, and their aftermath, and lived through one or more of that century's multiple 'waves' of feminism. This helps to generate some common themes, most noticeably 'Penelopean poetics' (to use Barbara Clayton's term): the use of weaving, so closely associated with women in antiquity, as a metaphor and model for women's verbal art.

This theme shows up, for obvious reasons, throughout the book. But discussions of the *Odyssey* are not limited to Penelope. Circe, in particular, makes several welcome appearances. Other contributors discuss the appropriation of Odyssean male heroism (with its relegation of women to a static, home-bound existence) as a template for women's psychological journeys (a satisfying payback for the ancient male habit of appropriating creative female activities like weaving and childbirth). The *Iliad*, which is, refreshingly, nearly as prominent as the traditionally more 'feminine' *Odyssey*, provides another recurrent theme, namely the questioning of epic (masculine) heroism with its supposed glorification of violence.

Another pervasive theme is translation: what is it, how does it work, how can it be distinguished (if at all) from adaptation? Emily Wilson's account of translating the *Odyssey* while female is presented as an epilogue, but I would have liked to see it up front, raising the reader's awareness of the strategies and compromises involved in even the most 'faithful' rendition, before moving on to multiple variations on what 'counts' as a translation. A related thread (to use the inevitable metaphor) involves questions about reading with or against the grain, or what Genevieve Liveley, in regard to H.D., calls 'releasing', as opposed to 'resistant' readings. Rather than merely defying Homer as a patriarchal Ur-text, many of these authors draw on elements within the Greek epics that already raise uncomfortable questions about the glorification of heroic violence, such as the brief 'epitaphs' for fallen warriors in the *Iliad*. Alice Oswald, discussed by both Carolin Hahnemann and Georgina Paul, moved these moments to the centre of her poem *Memorial*, reframing them to highlight the costs of warfare to women.

Most readers, like myself, will be familiar with only a handful of the texts under discussion. This piecemeal attraction is the main weakness of such collections. It is counterbalanced, however, by one of the particular joys of reception studies: the joy of discovering unfamiliar reworkings of familiar ancient material. I will mention just three highlights from my own reading of this volume. First, Carol Ann Duffy's grotesquely hilarious treatment of Circe as an expert in cooking with pork (discussed by Isobel Hurst and by Sheila Murnaghan and Deborah Roberts). Second, Adèle Geras' *Ithaka*, which in Francesca Richards' reading seems like a brilliant attempt to walk the tightrope of presenting a feminist *Odyssey* to children without radically misrepresenting Homer. Finally, Gwyneth Lewis' modern epic *A Hospital Odyssey*, analysed here by Ruth MacDonald. In this powerful, extraordinarily creative poem, Lewis uses the *Odyssey* to parse the experience of caring for her cancer-ridden husband, an experience that modern medicine has rendered as long and wearying, as fraught with hope and despair, and as beset by monsters as the original hero's journey.

RUBY BLONDELL

University of Washington

Email: blondell@uw.edu

DAVIES (M.) *The Cypria* (Hellenic Studies 83). Washington DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2019. Pp. x + 212. £14.95. 9780674237919.
doi:[10.1017/S0075426923000150](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426923000150)

This book is the third of Malcolm Davies' commentaries on the cyclic epics; the earlier two are: *The Theban Epics* (Washington 2015) and *The Aethiopis* (Washington 2016) (the present

volume is also available Open Access at <https://chs.harvard.edu/read/davies-malcolm-the-cypria/>). It is the fullest treatment of the *Cypria* among the recent books about the epic cycle (in addition to recent works cited below, see also M. Fantuzzi and C.C. Tsagalis (eds), *The Epic Cycle and Its Ancient Reception: A Companion* (Cambridge 2015) and B. Sammons, *Device and Composition in the Greek Epic Cycle* (Oxford 2017)). It prints all fragments and testimonia in ancient Greek and English, with an extensive critical apparatus for each fragment, and is richly supplemented by other Graeco-Roman texts and by discussion of visual art. It is a brilliant book written in a jaunty and entertaining style that vindicates Davies' contention that there is 'still room' (vii) for commentaries that treat individual lost epics in the wake of Martin West's *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics* (Oxford 2013). As we would expect from Davies' previous research, the commentary offers excellent consideration of shared Greek-Near Eastern poetic motifs and the folk-tale background of the *Cypria*.

This work is more Analytic and less Oralist than other recent work on the cycle, even West's. Davies attempts to reconstruct a single, uniform poem by Stasinus that postdates and depends upon the *Iliad*, following West with a date of 580–550 BC (8). The fragments and testimonia of the *Cypria* present thorny problems of interpretation because they contain contradictory details. In addressing these, Davies resorts primarily to criticism of the text and the manuscript tradition of Proclus and others, and does not generally permit discussion or citation of ideas on multiformity with respect to the *Cypria*.

The notion of multiformity relates to the *Cypria* in two ways. Following Gregory Nagy's evolutionary model of Homeric poetry (*Homer the Classic* (Washington 2008), 7–9), we can imagine a relatively fluid period of performance and textualization extending from the period of the *Cypria*'s supposed composition through the later fifth century when we have our earliest testimony in Herodotus, resulting in some contradictory testimony about the content of the poem. This presupposes another kind of multiformity, which imagines that epics covering the same ground as the *Cypria*, *Cypria*-style epics (for which see K. Solez, 'Travelling with Helen', in J. Burgess, J.L. Ready and C.C. Tsagalis (eds), *Yearbook of Ancient Greek Epic*, Vol. 3 (Leiden and Boston 2019), 67–87), exist already in the pre-Homeric epic tradition. Knowledge of the content of these poems as they were performed through the Archaic and Classical periods could have contaminated the reports of ancient authors on the content of the *Cypria*, thus resulting in contradictions. Multiformity poses a threat to Davies' literary-critical approach to the cyclic epics, allowing the critic the easiest of escapes from difficult problems, but most scholars accept this possibility as a cogent explanation of the *Cypria*'s difficulties. West states that there was more than one version of the *Cypria* being read or performed in Herodotus' time (*The Epic Cycle* (Oxford 2013), 92), and the idea is considered in all the key scholarship on the poem.

Davies' perspective on this issue has various results for the commentary. He dismisses suggestions which presuppose multiformity by saying that only those who have a 'morbid fear of a post-Iliadic *Cypria*' support arguments about its drawing on non-Iliadic traditions (186). He states that nobody doubts that Herodotus (F12, 105–11) preserves the version of the one and only *Cypria* (107–08). He attributes details that likely belong to the mythological tradition, such as the Teuthranian expedition, to singular authorial invention in the *Cypria* (137).

Nevertheless, sometimes Davies reluctantly allows for the existence of pre-Homeric *Cypria*-style epics and multiforms of Stasinus' *Cypria*. When discussing the testimony of Σ AD on *Iliad* 1.5 (F1) where Zeus consults with Momos instead of Themis, as in the *Cypria*, he says that the Momos-version belongs 'to the fuller tradition [that] is not our business and is anyway unknowable' (20). When discussing F2 on the wedding of Peleus and Thetis he allows that a pre-Homeric song on this subject is the source for both *Iliad* 24.58–63 and the tradition 'enshrined' in a particular 'version of the *Cypria*' (42). Moreover, he allows exactly one interpolation to the *Iliad* from the *Cypria*: the catalogue of Trojan allies at *Iliad* 2.816–77 is interpolated from a passage near the end of the *Cypria* (187–88).

These observations on Davies' reluctance and inconsistency in considering multifor-
mity do not constitute a major flaw in the work; they are simply the only flaw worth
discussing here. Davies' volume is one of the indispensable books for working on the first
stages of the Trojan War myths and the epics that contain them.

KEVIN B. SOLEZ

Memorial University of Newfoundland and Labrador

Email: kevin_solez@hotmail.com

DAVIES (M.) (ed.) **Lesser and Anonymous Fragments of Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021. Pp. xiv + 376. £120. 9780198860501.
doi:[10.1017/S0075426923000162](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426923000162)

This commentary is part of a paired set of commentary and forthcoming edited volume bringing together the lesser-known and anonymous fragments of Greek lyric poetry, with fragments from the early Archaic period to those attributed to the emperor Julian. There are four sections (known authors, the *carmina popularia*, *carmina conuivialia* and *fragmenta adespota*), followed by addenda and indices *rerum*, *nominum* and *uerborum*. Outside of the sympotic tradition and the lyric poems attributed to well-known authors, Greek lyric as a connected tradition is not well represented by commentaries. Malcolm Davies' volume remedies this lack for the lesser-known fragments, and one of the benefits of having a full commentary such as this is Davies' ability to highlight shared themes and larger connections within Greek lyric. There are two exceptions to the commentary's comprehensiveness however: the entries for Terpander and Timotheus do not include any commentary but direct the reader to existing commentaries elsewhere. These two exceptions do not detract from the strengths of the overall comprehensiveness of the volume; at the same time, however, Davies' tendency to summarize and direct to existing scholarship, rather than advance new readings, suggests that the commentary will be most useful to those beginning projects on lyric and graduate students.

The commentary notes on individual poets and fragments are, for the most part, detailed, explicating content and the wider mythological context over syntax and grammar; there is discussion of poetic genres as well. Editorial choices are occasionally introduced as are scholarly debates about dating, authorship and so forth. Occasionally, entries will simply be a *cf.* note (as at Cydias 715) or a quote (as at Licymnias 773), and the division between fragment and paratext is sometimes muddled (as with Ion of Chios). While such instances may affect individuals working on specific texts, they do not detract from the strengths of the commentary as a whole.

The main difficulty with this commentary is that it lacks the complementary edition of fragments. This means that, currently, six volumes are required for the fragments and testimonia that Davies comments on: *Poetae melici Graeci* (PMG), *Supplementum lyricis Graecis* (SLG) and David A. Campbell's *Greek Lyric II-VI* Loeb volumes. The bibliography is also difficult to manage as there are three places for full bibliographic details to be found: the list of abbreviations for bibliography cited throughout in the Preface, the opening bibliography for some poets and anonymous fragments, and within the notes on the fragments themselves. A complete list of works cited at the end of the volume would have been helpful. A more recent bibliography for some of the poets (for example, Telesilla) would also have been useful, particularly in light of the increased interest in Greek lyric poetry.

While acknowledging that no volume can include everything, I did find it odd that Davies engaged little throughout with the sympotic lyric tradition (elegy, iambus and