

decision to print scholars' first names (though not consistently) yields the usual mixed results. Not everyone will be satisfied by all Blank's individual readings in this monograph, or convinced that they add up to the compositional programme that he claims they advance, but that does not diminish his achievement in developing a stimulating new approach which explores areas of cardinal importance for the understanding of Isocrates' work. His interpretations invite committed engagement by Isocrateans and by others interested in the intellectual culture of late fifth to late fourth-century Athens.

Guy WESTWOOD

Sandrine DUBEL, Anne-Marie FAVREAU-LINDER et Estelle OUDOT (Éd.), *À l'école d'Homère. La culture des orateurs et des sophistes*. Paris, Éditions Rue d'Ulm, 2015. 1 vol. 24 x 16 cm, 295 p. (ÉTUDES DE LITTÉRATURE ANCIENNE, 24). Prix : 19 €. ISBN 978-2-7288-0526-6.

This volume, part of the proceedings of the international colloquium *Homère rhétorique. Études de réception antique* (Clermont-Ferrand and Dijon, 2010) is devoted to conceptualizations and deployments of the Homeric model in ancient rhetorical texts (broadly conceived) and their associated cultural contexts. After the introduction (by the three editors, summarizing the scope and contents of the volume), it contains eighteen contributions, sixteen in French and two in English. Papers in the first section (*Grecs et Romains à l'école d'Homère*) assess Homer's impact on various genres of rhetorical exercise, while those in the other three each examine a single author's encounter(s) with the Homeric model, looking, respectively, at authors' creative deployment of Homer, mostly in polemical or competitive situations (*Stratégies rhétoriques : modèles et détournements*), Homer's importance as a cultural referent in individual social contexts (*Enjeux critiques*), and the forms taken by literary and cultural responses to Homer in late antiquity and beyond (*Héritages*). The more successful papers typically address the stated themes of the volume head-on, combining careful analysis of how – and, crucially, *why* – their chosen authors engage with the texts and legacy of Homer with alertness to the contexts in which they are doing so. The quality of the numerous papers which do not stop at exposition, but seek to address the rubric of the volume in its full sense, provides a counterbalance to the effect of other contributions which privilege the big picture at the expense of the small (in which cases the Homeric poems themselves tend to be fairly absent), or vice versa (in which cases the context in which the chosen author is operating tends to be sidelined). This is not to say that the papers in this second category are inadequate as individual pieces of scholarship, but they do introduce a certain unevenness of purpose and execution into the collection. Less uneven is the coverage of authors and genres, which strikes a good balance between work on texts and genres whose responses to Homer have (for one reason or another) so far been under-treated in scholarship, and new contributions to areas which are already busy. I now attempt to give an idea of the volume's content; space does not permit extended comment. The authors in the first section take up the task of surveying material from whole genres, and not all contributors avoid the potential danger of privileging description over argument which survey work brings with it. They are preceded by a framing essay by

Flore Kimmel-Clauzet (p. 19-30), who examines the pseudo-Herodotean *Vita Homeri* and the *Certamen*, thus neatly setting up some of the concerns which will be relevant in particular for the high imperial chapters. Space rather hems in Rachel Ahern Knudsen (p. 33-45), who looks at how fifth- and fourth-century Greek sophistic texts appropriate aspects of the Archaic, especially Homeric, poetic tradition. Palamedes' much-discussed non-presence in Homer (introduced in connection with Gorgias' *Palamedes*) is a problem, though; given the volume's focus, Knudsen might have given the reader more of a sense of whether she sees any meaningful distinctions between sophists' interaction with the Homeric poems themselves and with the Archaic poetic tradition more broadly. Danielle Van Mal-Maeder (p. 47-60) surveys the significance of Homer in Roman rhetorical theory and highlights the disconnect between the educational importance of the Homeric poems and how relatively little this is actually reflected in practical and declamatory texts. Patrice Cauderlier (p. 61-71) outlines the place of two Homeric *parerga* in the tradition of the allegorists and of the defence of Homer against his critics, while Fabrice Robert (p. 73-86), in a thought-provoking and careful contribution, demonstrates (not too dissimilarly from Van Mal-Maeder) that composers of *progymnasmata* are much more interested in Homer as a point of cultural reference rather than as a practical model (beyond *ethopoiiai*). Finally, Bernard Schouler (p. 87-102) emphasizes the continuity of the values and moral systems endorsed by Libanius regardless of the different uses to which he puts Homeric characters, especially Achilles, in different works. The second section contains some of the most effective pieces in the volume. Jocelyne Peigney (p. 105-114) conducts a stimulating close reading of Odysseus' speech at Eur. *Cyclops* 285-312, arguing for an ironic Euripidean mirroring of contemporary Athens in the character of Polyphemus as addressed by a more ideal-looking 'Athenian' Odysseus; but Homer's Polyphemus himself is rather elusive in the paper, and the points to be drawn out about Euripides' specific response to Homer could have been made more explicit. In a detailed and largely convincing contribution (p. 115-131), Melina Tamiolaki argues for an Isocrates whose deployment of Homer is so difficult to get a grip on at first sight because it is part of a complex process of authority-creation. Dimitri Kasprzyk (p. 133-149) reads Dio Chrysostom's entertaining Homeric pastiche in *Or.* 32 as deliberately reflective in its form of the aspects of its addressees which Dio is criticizing; Lorenzo Miletto (p. 151-162) uses Aelius Aristides, *Or.* 28, to demonstrate the importance of Homer for the formation of standard notions of self-praise in which Aristides participates; and Michel Briand (p. 163-172) situates Homeric reference in Lucian's play of literary fictions. In the third section, Sophie Gotteland (p. 175-189) examines the place of Homer within Xenophon's portrayal of Socrates in the *Memorabilia*, in particular how Socrates' glossing of Odysseus assists Xenophon's own presentation of Socrates, while Katerina Oikonomopoulou (p. 191-201), in a paper which shows itself especially attentive to the volume's rubric, argues for the centrality of Homeric interpretation to the culture of legalistic display oratory as captured in Plutarch's *Quaestiones Convivales* 9.13. Ruth Webb (p. 203-214) explores the similar dynamics at work in Philostratus' *Imagines*, with an emphasis on the speaker's ability to draw on disparate parts of Homer to authorize interpretations of the paintings which manipulate, and exploit gaps and ambiguities in, the Homeric originals. In the final section, Aglae

Pizzone (p. 217-228) traces the role of *ethopoia* exercises which draw on Homeric models in manufacturing shared identity in the intellectual community of late fourth-century Gaza, and Annick Stoehr-Monjou (p. 229-238) briefly examines Dracontius' *Romulea* 8 and 9 to re-broach questions about the literary culture of Vandal Africa and Dracontius' own knowledge of Greek. Moving to Byzantium, Didier Pralon (p. 239-246) presents Isaac Comnenus Porphyrogenitus' sketch of the characteristics of Homer's heroes (and other Trojan War figures). Although Pralon outlines Isaac's world, there may have been room here for more detailed comment on why he might have produced such a work, and in what senses Pralon sees this as an encounter with the Homeric model. In the final paper, Marina Loukaki (p. 247-257) argues that although Homeric reference was something Byzantine *rhetores* indulged in quite happily, evidence for their deeper engagement with the world of Homer's poems is limited. Lastly, it is worth noting that the more successful papers are typically very clearly structured and respond well to the editorial policy on word limits. In other cases, individual arguments sometimes feel less strong than they might because contributors only feel able to give one example of a particular phenomenon (one example is Stoehr-Monjou, whose case is professedly a bold one, and could do with the space for more underpinning). Despite the reservations noted here and above, though, there is much in this volume to stimulate work on the rhetorical reception of Homer in antiquity. The book is well produced and typographical errors are few.

Guy WESTWOOD

Koen DE TEMMERMAN, *Crafting Characters. Heroes and Heroines in the Ancient Greek Novel*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014. 1 vol. XXI-395 p. Prix : 78 £ (relié). ISBN 978-019-968614-8.

L'ouvrage de Koen De Temmerman est la première étude publiée sur la caractérisation des personnages principaux dans l'ensemble du corpus du roman grec et mérite pour cette raison toute notre attention. On doit signaler cependant l'existence antérieure de la thèse de Jean-Philippe Guez, soutenue en 2001, sur les codes romanesques dans les romans de Chariton, Xénophon d'Éphèse et Achille Tatius, que K. De Temmerman ne semble pas connaître, alors même qu'il s'appuie sur une bibliographie très internationale et très abondante (p. 329-375) ; il est vrai que cette thèse n'a pas été publiée. Cet « oubli » n'enlève rien au travail publié ici qui est en tout point remarquable et est appelé à devenir une référence obligée dans l'étude des romans grecs. La question de la caractérisation des personnages est un phénomène complexe car c'est bien souvent un élément central du récit romanesque du fait de la focalisation du récit sur l'action des personnages principaux. La notion de « caractère » se réfère aux qualités morales et mentales d'un individu, tout en reconnaissant des motifs récurrents dans le comportement humain et en supposant des structures psychologiques qui sous-tendent ces comportements. La notion grecque correspondante, à savoir le terme *êthos*, est tout autant polysémique, sans recouper exactement ce que nous entendons par « caractère ». L'étude de K. De Temmerman reprend la définition usuelle des caractères en matière de littérature en tant que personnes fictives ou *analogà* d'êtres humains dans le cadre d'une fiction. Il comprend la