

in his bones, but with a feeling that the whole of the literature of his own country has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order'. Famously, he asserted that when a new work is added to the tradition, the whole existing order is slightly altered, the past as well as the present. This insight is developed by Charles Martindale in *Redeeming the Text* (Cambridge 1993) and other reception theorists. Furthermore, Eliot points out that the historical sense is one of timelessness *and* the temporal together, and is 'what makes a writer traditional'; this seems to me borne out by Dougherty's discussions, which cannot (and need not) always dispense with a sense of time.

The second key plank in her platform is that, in contrast with both classical tradition and reception approaches, she deliberately chooses 'texts that do not claim an explicit relationship to Homer's *Odyssey*' in the hope that 'some new and surprising conversations will emerge from the serial unpredictability of reading these texts together' (15–16). We learn most from unexpected encounters, which oblige us, precisely, to improvise our response. My discreditable thought going in was that, nonetheless, there had to be *some* kind of intertextual relationship to make any comment meaningful. After all, anything can be made to look like anything if you work hard enough. But I soon discarded this philistine opinion. The intertextual reach of the *Odyssey* in world literature is hard to limit, of course, but more to the point, juxtaposing two unconnected texts (people, objects) can make one see qualities in either that one overlooked before. Dougherty does this repeatedly. One still needs to show, I think, that what you see really is in the text; otherwise, what you are talking about is some third object extrinsic to both texts suggested by your free association, and this is something other than criticism, however congenial the thought in question may be. But though I was not always persuaded by Dougherty's readings (for instance, the suggestion that Penelope was on some level disappointed at Odysseus' return, 128), others might be ('showing that something is in the text' is a periphrasis for 'persuading at least one other person'), and on any reading the book offers many (appropriately) surprising insights.

The texts Dougherty chooses for discussion all explore themes of travel, home, return, nostalgia, identity and family: Michael Ondaatje, *The English Patient*; Marilynne Robinson, *Housekeeping*; Cormac McCarthy, *The Road*; Rebecca West, *The Return of the Soldier*; Toni Morrison, *Home*. If, like me, you know some of these but not all, Dougherty's book will send you scurrying off to read them. Keep the *Odyssey* in mind as you do so, and be prepared to make it up as you go along.

ROBERT L. FOWLER
University of Bristol
Email: robert.fowler@bristol.ac.uk

CURRIE (B.) and RUTHERFORD (I.) (eds) **The Reception of Greek Lyric Poetry in the Ancient World: Transmission, Canonization and Paratext** (Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song 5). Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2019. Pp. xiv + 575. €29.95. 9789004414518.

doi:[10.1017/S0075426922001045](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426922001045)

The volume consists of an illuminating introduction by Bruno Currie and Ian Rutherford and 21 essays that offer a good, if obviously partial, overview of the reception ('ancient reworkings of the texts', 1) and transmission ('the process by which literary works passed on to later generations and made available to listener and readers', 1) of Greek lyric poetry from Classical times to Byzantine scholarship. The study of the circumstances of the transmission and reception is essential for our knowledge of ancient Greek lyric, because, as the editors

point out, 'few texts from these genres survive complete, and much of what comes down to us takes the form of short fragments scattered in the texts of other writers. Many of these are presumably faithful citations, but other could be distorted or even invented' (2).

It is not the purpose of the volume to offer a systematic study of such a vast and complex subject, but to expose some of its main themes and problems through the treatment of selected questions. The book is divided into chapters arranged more or less chronologically, encompassing a wide temporal spectrum that covers all the stages up to the Byzantine period. Within each chapter an exhaustive treatment of the reception and transmission of Greek lyric poetry in the corresponding period is not carried out, nor are the same topics reviewed in each of the periods (for example, the reception and transmission of Sappho or Solon or Archilochus in each of the periods), but different topics have been selected for each chapter. Inevitably, this approach gives rise to an unequal treatment of the issues and the periods. For example, the section dedicated to reception of ancient Greek lyric in all Latin literature includes only two contributions, both on similar aspects (Catullan and Horatian readings of Alcaeus and Sappho and also of their Hellenistic commentators, by Ewen Bowie; and the creative use by Horace, Propertius, Ovid and Statius of Pindar's text and its Hellenistic commentaries, by Gregor Bitto). Instead, the section dedicated specifically to the Second Sophistic is much longer (but not much more varied); it includes five contributions: two essays (by Stefano Caciagli and Renate Schlesier) concern the image that Athenaeus offers of Sappho and the context in which her verses were performed; two others (by Jessica Romney and Jacqueline Klooster) deal with the way that the ancient biographical tradition on Solon and the personal approach of individual authors have conditioned the interpretation of his political action and his poetry in the indirect transmission (Plutarch above all); and finally Francesca Modini's essay studies the reception of lyric poetry by Aelius Aristides. Eveline van Hilten-Rutten's essay on Tyrtaeus in Plutarch and Diodorus also deals with this period.

Contributions relating to the Classical period also deal with some aspects of reception (Krystyna Bartol on the reception of elegy; David Fearn on New Music and specifically on Timotheus as a continuator of dithyrambic traditions; Andrea Capra on Plato's reception of Stesichorus), but above all they deal with 'canonization', namely the shaping of the 'lyric nine' canon: Gregory Nagy argues for the crucial role played by Athens in the shaping of the canon; Claude Calame, on the contrary, maintains that the testimonies from Old Comedy invite us to think that the Alexandrian canon of the nine lyric poets was not yet clearly established in late fifth-century BC Athens. Theodora Hadjimichael, for her part, analyses the Peripatetic philosophers' studies on the lyric poets (she sees the Peripatetics as paving the way for the great Hellenistic commentaries) and their role in the canonization and transmission of lyric, considering (against Nagy) Athens' role relatively unimportant to the transmission of lyric; in contrast to this, Elsa Bouchard downplays the influence of the Peripatetics on Alexandrian scholarship.

Two more contributions focus on very specific aspects of the great Hellenistic commentaries: Tom Phillips on how the interpretation of the historical context of Pindar's poems by the Hellenistic commentators influenced the poet's readers, and Enrico Emanuele Prodi on the role that poem titles played in the reception of lyric. Two other essays deal with the reception and transmission of Greek lyric poetry in Imperial and Byzantine times: Johannes Breuer with Porphyrio's commentary on Horace, and Arlette Newmann-Hartmann on Eustathius as commentator of Pindar.

So, readers of this excellent book should look not for a general exposition of the reception and transmission of Greek lyric poetry in the Ancient and Byzantine world (this was not the purpose of the editors). But they will find very valuable and stimulating individual

contributions on the subject that offer varied and complementary perspectives (even defending opposing opinions) to address many of the abundant questions and problems raised by the reception, transmission and canonization of ancient Greek texts.

FERNANDO GARCÍA ROMERO
 Universidad Complutense de Madrid
 Email: fgarciar@ucm.es

LAVALLE NORMAN (D.) and PETKAS (A.) (eds) **Hypatia of Alexandria**. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020. Pp. xiv + 343. €99. 9783161549694.
 doi:[10.1017/S0075426922001057](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426922001057)

The editors of this excellent volume, resulting from a conference held in 2015 on the late antique philosopher Hypatia, open their work by asking the rhetorical question of whether ‘there is much left to be said’ (1). Indeed, there are several recent biographies of the philosopher (for example, M. Dzielska, *Hypatia of Alexandria* (Princeton 1995); D.J. Watts, *Hypatia: The Life and Legend of an Ancient Philosopher* (Oxford 2017)), and the scant ancient sources might not justify yet more scholarship. Nonetheless, this volume proves that there is much to be gained from combining close readings of the ancient texts (most of which are collected in appendices A and B) and a study of the immense reception of Hypatia.

The volume is divided into three sections. The first, ‘Hypatia and Synesius’, which includes three chapters, focuses on the relationship between Hypatia and her student the Christian Synesius of Cyrene. The seven preserved letters of Synesius to Hypatia are a key source for our knowledge on the philosopher. Alex Petkas argues that these letters testify to the role which Hypatia played in shaping late antique ‘classicism’, the debates about what education (*paideia*) in philosophy should encompass. In contrast, Helmut Seng reminds us that Synesius’ letters ‘are hardly to be read as straightforward biographical information’ (29): the Hypatia in the correspondence is to be interpreted less as the historical character than as a ‘symbol of philosophy’. Henriette Harich-Schwarzbauer goes even further by suggesting that the letters cannot be read as historical documents but rather as literary devices serving an important shaping function within the corpus of Synesius’ letters (156 in total).

In the four chapters of the second section, ‘Hypatia in Context’, we turn to the figure of Hypatia in the works of late antique authors. The two first essays focus on accounts of Hypatia’s death at the hands of a Christian mob, for which the philosopher is perhaps best known. Walter F. Beers argues that Hypatia’s killing played an important role in the career of the bishop Cyril of Alexandria, who would later go on to reshape Eastern Christianity with the empress Aelia Pulcheria. Mareile Haase offers a tantalizing comparison between literary descriptions of Hypatia’s death and Rufinus of Concordia’s (*Hist. eccl.* 11.23) depiction of the destruction and dismemberment of the cult image of the god Serapis in AD 391/2, concluding that Hypatia can be read as a ‘shattered icon’. In the third essay, David Frankfurter says little about Hypatia but gives important contextual information on the private devotion (domestic rituals) of Hellenes in the fourth and fifth centuries. Finally, Sebastian Gertz discusses what type of philosophy Hypatia might have taught, arguing that it went beyond the exact sciences, to encompass metaphysics and philosophy.

The final section, ‘Hypatia in Her Ancient and Modern Reception’, comprises four chapters on the reception of Hypatia, starting with very early reception in the form of Hypatian ‘resonances’ (153) in Nonnus’ depiction of female intellectuals in his *Dionysiaca* (Joshua Fincher). In one of the outstanding essays of the volume, Victoria Leonard focuses on the reception of the episode in which Hypatia used a menstrual rag to avert unwanted male sexual attention (Damascius, *PH* 43 A and C), showing that a positive feminist reading