

particular, is starkly defined by his mortality; blurring this distinction dilutes the force of the book's central argument. The same is true of sections that omit gods altogether, including a discussion of friendship in *Hamlet* and the *Libation Bearers*, and the final chapter's argument that 'actors can achieve a complex form of immortality' (126). The fading of the book's central focus is especially a pity because so many actual onstage gods go unexplored: Marlowe's comic portrait of the squabbling Juno and Venus in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, and the outrageous escapades of Olympians in Heywood's *Ages* plays, are just a few that call out for attention.

The book's juxtaposition of classical and early modern plays similarly has both strengths and weaknesses. Its comparative perspective usefully highlights the many classical gods crowding early modern stages, and opens a door to important conversations about influence, reception and the particular attractions and challenges offered by pagan deities to (largely) Protestant English playwrights. In rapidly shuttling between periods, however, the authors do not always attend sufficiently to their differences; and when they do, they sometimes make errors. After discussing Jupiter's dalliance with Ganymede in Marlowe's *Dido*, for instance, they write that playgoers would 'both recall and forget that Aeneas and Dido are played by an adult man and a boy, displaying the very same erotic dynamic that we have seen the gods display' (39). In fact, because Marlowe's *Dido* was written for and staged by the Children of the Chapel, both these characters were played by boys, as were both Jove and Ganymede. The authors are right that the actors' bodies highlight 'the double-work of mimetic representation of gender on the early modern stage' (39), but watching children portray adult men and male gods generates very different effects than the adult-child hierarchy they suggest.

The afterword leaves behind both classical antiquity and the age of Shakespeare to discuss Zimmerman's *Metamorphoses*, a retelling of Ovid showing 'that actors have the same power as the gods to transform into new shapes' (140). The play usefully reflects key themes from earlier chapters, but jumping to a new period extends the book's departure from the classical and early modern performances of gods introduced so persuasively in the introduction and first chapter. *Performing Gods* offers a provocative argument, with richly rewarding implications for a wide range of plays. While a more consistent focus would have been welcome, the book does a valuable service in opening a conversation on this important topic.

TANYA POLLARD 

Brooklyn College and the Graduate Center, City University of New York  
Email: [tpollard@brooklyn.cuny.edu](mailto:tpollard@brooklyn.cuny.edu)

DUBEL (S.), FAVREAU-LINDER (A.-M.) and OUDOT (E.) (eds) **Homère rhétorique: études de réception antique** (Recherches sur les rhétoriques religieuses 28). Turnhout: Brepols, 2018. Pp. 256. €75. 9782503580814.  
doi:[10.1017/S0075426923000022](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426923000022)

From the Hellenistic period, rhetoric became a branch of knowledge which addressed all forms of literary discourse, prose and poetry alike, and thus the only branch of knowledge specializing in the exegesis of poetry. For a number of reasons, Aristotle's theory of mimetic fiction exerted no significant influence on the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine literary culture, and it is not before the High Renaissance that poetics re-emerged as a self-contained discipline approaching literature on its own terms. This supremacy of rhetoric or, as Pierre Chiron puts it in this volume, 'l'impérialisme de la

rhétorique' (161) is the conceptual rationale behind the present collection of essays. The volume's focus on Homer is also amply justified. Homer was not only the initiator of the Graeco-Roman poetic tradition and the perpetual reference point for any form of literary discourse from the Classical period to the end of antiquity. He was also regarded as the founding father of rhetoric, and his comparison of the speaking styles of Menelaus and Odysseus in *Iliad* 3 became a *locus classicus* which, alongside the 'honey-sweet' manner of speaking characterizing his Nestor, laid the foundation for the universally accepted classification of the styles of oratory (cf. Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.64–65).

The editors of the volume under review are well aware of all this. What interests them, however, are not mere tokens of Homer's presence in the Graeco-Roman rhetorical tradition but, rather, a comprehensive engagement with the theme 'Homer and ancient rhetoric'. As stated in the introduction (14), the two main axes around which the 14 essays of this volume arranged are (a) the rhetorical reception of the oratory of Homeric speakers (the case studies include Hermes and Calypso in *Odyssey* 5 and the Embassy to Achilles in *Iliad* 9, both discussed in the scholia, as well as Telemachus' development as a speaker throughout the *Odyssey* as traced by Eustathius); and (b) Homer's rhetorical apparatus, that is, the rhetorical figures of speech employed in his poems as identified and analysed by ancient theorists. These correspond to Part One and Part Two, respectively; but there is also Part Three, which addresses references to Homer in rhetorical literature of different historical periods, from Quintilian in the first century AD (Pascale Paré-Rey) to Julius Caesar Scaliger in the 16th century (Christiane Deloince-Louette). The material discussed includes both such ancient texts that are exclusively dedicated to Homer, namely, Homeric scholia (Christodoulos Zekas, Anne-Marie Favreau-Linder, Sylvie Perceau, Françoise Létoublon), Pseudo-Plutarch's *On Homer* (Hélène Fuzier), Eustathius' *Commentary* on the Homeric poems (Jean-Luc Vix, Corinne Jouanno, Perceau, Pierre-Yves Testenoire) and compositions of a more general character: Pseudo-Longinus' *On the Sublime* (Sophie Conte), the *On Figures* by Alexander Numenius (Chiron), Aelius Aristides (Vix, Martin Steinrück, Johann Goeken) and more.

Although the material discussed mainly belongs to the Imperial period, it is reasonable to suppose that much of it originated in earlier times and that the majority of sources at our disposal represent a common rhetorical tradition rather than original contributions of individual authors (Chiron, 152). Nevertheless, not a few new syntheses emerge. Thus, Favreau-Linder convincingly argues that the approach to Homer adopted in the bT scholia is predominantly rhetorical and that the professional terminology the scholiasts employ corresponds to the one used between the end of the Hellenistic period and the first centuries of the Imperial era (60). Steinrück draws attention to the nonconformity of Aelius Aristides who, rather than routinely evoking the Menelaus-Odysseus comparison in *Iliad* 3, turns to a comparison of the rhetorical styles of Nestor and Menelaus as represented in books 3 and 4 of the *Odyssey* (95). Diverging from the scholia on which he normally heavily depends, Eustathius enthusiastically embraces parechesis (the repetition of the same sound), a rhetorical figure identified by Hermogenes in the second century AD, which is absent from the Homeric scholia; furthermore, he develops a full-scale theory of parechesis which is based on diachronic developments in Greek phonology (Testenoire, 163–76). It is a pity that there is nothing on Dio of Prusa, whose deconstruction of Homer's narrative in the *Trojan Oration* signalled a crisis in Homer's reputation as (to quote the subtitle of Paré-Rey's chapter on Quintilian) *summus et primus auctor*.

A tension between Homer and Vergil, already discernible in Quintilian (Paré-Rey, 202–04), culminates in the middle of the 16th century, in Scaliger's dismantlement of Homer's supremacy and his opposing of Homer's 'rude' style to the stylistic perfection of Vergil (Deloince-Louette, 229, 233–36). Scaliger's stance on Homer was highly influential in the subsequent centuries. Yet the middle of the 16th century was also when the revival of interest in Aristotle's *Poetics* stimulated the birth of literary criticism as an independent

discipline rather than a branch of rhetoric. This new development, however, lies beyond the scope of the present collection, which admirably fulfils its purpose to add a new chapter to the history of Homeric reception.

MARGALIT FINKELBERG  
Tel Aviv University  
Email: [finkelbe@tauex.tau.ac.il](mailto:finkelbe@tauex.tau.ac.il)

EARLEY (B.) **The Thucydidean Turn: (Re)Interpreting Thucydides' Political Thought before, during and after the Great War** (Bloomsbury Studies in Classical Reception). London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2020. Pp. xvi + 232. £85. 9781350123717.  
doi:[10.1017/S0075426923000113](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426923000113)

An increasing flow of research is inundating the field of reception studies. Thucydides is no exception, despite his work having already been thoroughly and variously investigated by classical scholars from different countries. This book focuses on a specifically British phase in Thucydides' reception, in the first decades of the 20th century, as an important turn allegedly took place. In the aftermath of the South African and First World War, the approach to Thucydides changed. From an historian, studied for the most part in Greek by purely classical scholars, he became seen as a source and a form of reference book for institutions devoted to the study of international relations. This development, which began actually with Thomas Hobbes, bears some similarity to the transformation of Machiavelli or Gramsci into general models, stretching beyond their specific fields. Graham Allison's theory of a 'Thucydides Trap' (in 2012, then in *Destined for War* (New York 2017)), is a well-known product of this trend (not necessarily the best), and the Greek historian is certainly studied now by political scientists and classical scholars, with their different agendas. The main thesis of this book is that this subject became important because of the 20th-century British 'turn', but Thucydidean studies in the 19th century were important, too. Earley focuses, vigorously, on the work of several British scholars. From Frances Cornford's *Thucydides mythistoricus* (London 1907) to Georg Frederik Abbott's *Thucydides: A Study in Historical Reality* (London 1925) and others, different contributions are scrutinized in detail (and with some repetition), with particular reference to the 'labels' that each scholar applied to the ancient historian (141): Thucydides was a 'Realpolitiker' for Powell, a 'tragedian' for Cornford, but a 'psychologist' for Zimmern and a 'scientist' for Cochrane; an actual 'contemporary' for Toynbee, but a 'realist' in Abbott's vision. The positions of these scholars are presented by Earley as invariably path-breaking, a point which is more asserted than proved.

It was probably high time to write for those interested in international relations studies rather than for an audience of scholars. But for readers accustomed to the sophisticated approach of classical studies, some of Earley's discussions might seem naive. He cites, for example, a scholar who writes on Thucydides as if human attitudes have remained unchanged through the intervening centuries. Another, on the other hand, accepts as literal truth some statements in the *History* which needed a cautious historiographic analysis (for example, the impact of the different layers in composition). In other cases, personal issues interfere with the interpretation of the ancient text. It is not easy to follow Earley in his choice of omitting the analyses of continental researchers, and of limiting the discussion to Thucydidean debates in the United Kingdom, then in the USA and Canada, which later became pivotal within the 'realist' school. Some attitudes ascribed to British