Homer stole, we are told). They wrote about love, sex, and beauty, family and childhood, and intimacy among women. To conclude the chapter he quotes a number of women, from Christine de Pizan to Dacia Maraini and Margaret Atwood, on the problems of creating a poetic voice as a woman. The second chapter traces the formation of the canon of nine women poets and their later reputations.

The main discussion is divided into two parts, epic and lyric. The first begins with ‘Fictional Pioneers’, including the authoress of the Odyssey, who according to Eustathius was Fantasia, daughter of Nearchus, not Nausicaa. There is a charming vignette of someone informing Samuel Butler of this. Although ill, he betook himself to Rome to check on it and pronounced it a distortion of the truth. As for the Iliad, Isocrates reports the story that Helen (but which Helen?) told Homer all by night. Daphne, daughter of Tiresias, or Manto pronounced hexameter prophecies at Delphi, which Homer borrowed. Phemonoe, also a prophet, invented hexameters, and the Sibyl Herophile was renowned.

Later, two historical Pythias are known by name, but the Pythia who taught Pythagoras is surely a cousin of the legendary Manto. De Martino assumes, as he should, that the Pythias themselves created the hexameter lines when they answered in verse, but he does not comment on any extant verses. In the Hellenistic period, three female poet-performers are attested, Aristomache, Aristodama and Alcinoe. The first won prizes; the second and third wrote praise of cities and hymns respectively. Thence to Eudocia, wife of Theodosius II, who wrote centos (pastiches of lines taken from Homer) in the fifth century CE. But the list is not complete without the writers of epic erotica. Astyanassa, a maid of Helen’s, was the predecessor for Philainis and Elephants, whose historicity is harder to decide. The section on lyric poets follows the same trajectory. To Eriphantis goes credit for inventing bucolic poetry with its first-person lament over hopeless love; Damophila was a ‘student’ of Sappho. Charixene, however, though early, was accounted a simple composer of ‘Ionian song’ and compares her name to Archilochus’ Charilaos and Pasphile. But insofar as the female poet represents the imagined lost, originary speaker, de M. offers no insight into the function of such a figure or the desire she answers. His book closes without a conclusion, and one might feel frustration at having only glimpses of an imaginative construct that affected women. Nonetheless, the book is full of interesting information and observations, enlivened with photographs of art works and magazine pages. Testimonia for, for example, Phemonoe, Herophile, the Sibyls, Astyanassa, Philainis, are collected. There is an index of the female poets and a large bibliography.
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This study deals with ‘capping’, a phenomenon traditionally associated with symposia, where participants were sometimes asked to respond to one another in a single or a small number of verses. Derek Collins argues that capping is not restricted to sympotic poetry, but lies at the heart of agonistic passages throughout early Greek literature. This is perhaps why he starts in Part I (‘Dramatic Representations of Verse Competition’) by discussing the (related) phenomenon of ‘stichomythia’ and other competitive exchanges in Greek drama, in Plato’s Euthydemus and in Theocritus’ representation of poetic competitions in Idylls 5, 6 and 8. Part II (‘Sporting at Symposium: Verse and Skolia Competitions’) is devoted to sympotic poetry – especially the Attic skolia, Theognis and the representation of sympotic verse competition in Aristophanes’ Wasps – but also to the distinction sympotic performers like Xenophon, Heraclitus, Solon and Anacreon draw between their own performances and those of the Homeric rhapsodes. This opposition between sympotic and rhapsodic performers is surprising (or not), because ‘capping’ underlies rhapsodic performances of Homeric
poetry as well, as C. argues in Part III (‘Epic Competition in Performance: Homer and Rhapsodes’). C.’s best example of this kind of rhapsodic performance is the exchange between Homer and Hesiod in the (late text of the) Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi, but he also adduces examples from the so-called ‘wild’ papyri of Homer, dating between 300 and 150 BCE, and he discusses references to this type of performance from the Homeric epics and from reports about the rhapsodic contests at the Panathenaia. The book closes with two appendices (one on aischrolophia and the other on verbal contestations in other cultures), a general index and an index of sources, which bears out the great number of texts on which this study touches.

C.’s study owes a debt and makes an important contribution to contemporary interest in the performance contexts of early Greek poetry. At the same time it reminded me of some of the (best) work of the French structuralists, who traced a concept (e.g. ‘mêîsî in the case of Detienne and Vernant) through a wide variety of Greek texts. In C.’s case it is the concept of competitive exchanges. Classicists have of course been long aware of the agonistic nature of Greek performance culture, but C. shows us how this competitiveness plays out in detail at the level of the texts.

One wishes that C. had explained more fully how he believes these, admittedly, different competitive exchanges exactly relate to one another. The title of Part I (‘Dramatic Representations of Verse Competitions’) suggests that he sees stichomythia and related phenomena in Greek drama as a direct imitation of poetic capping, but on pp. 28-9 he concludes that stichomythia is ‘a formalized poetic adaptation of a “live” mode of contestation’ (flying, perhaps, as Jon Hesk has suggested?) and that sympotic and rhapsodic capping are ‘comparable’, yet different adaptations of the same ‘mode of contestation’. I am also unconvinced that the Panathenaic performance of the Homeric epics (with different performers reciting in turn) is part of this same phenomenon, since these performances involve much larger chunks of texts, which were probably accompanied by fresh introductions (cf. the two parts of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo) and did not follow one another by means of capping. Finally, while C. adduces in Part II important evidence both from Greek literature and from sociolinguistics on how these poetic games helped to establish hierarchies and could lead to real hostilities among sympoiasitai, he should also have pointed out that, played correctly, they can create a sense of togetherness, as any group of people that plays a game together can attest. These are only minor points of disagreement and part of the expected ‘capping’ by scholars. Overall the book is very convincing and I can highly recommend it to any one interested in early Greek literature, performance and culture.
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The Soul of Tragedy includes thirteen papers by well-known, mostly American, classicists, written in honour of the late Charles Segal. The papers focus primarily on tragedy, and they are organized in four sections, each of them corresponding to a different aspect of Segal’s work and interests: suffering, psychoanalysis, the feminine and methodology. The themes discussed range from tragic emotions in Aristotle (David Konstan) to representations of heaven in Euripides (Pietro Pucci), constructions of manliness and understandings of the phallos in the comedy of fifth-century Athens and in modern American locker rooms (Martha Nussbaum), female choruses in Greek tragedy (Sheila Murnaghan), and modern philology and the sociology of music in Hellenistic society (Simon Goldhill). Some of the contributions focus on or relate to themes and plays with which Segal himself engaged with vigour. For instance, Seth Stein’s paper on the divine in Sophocles’ Philoctetes revisits Segal’s work on the subject, and the papers by Froma Zeitlin on Euripides’ Iphigenia Among the Taurians and by John Gilbert on Iphigenia at Aulis complement in interesting ways Segal’s work on the Helen and on other Euripidean plays. Other contributions take Segal’s methodological interests and preoccupations in new directions. For instance, Barbara Goff’s paper on Wole Soyinka’s The Bacchae of Euripides shows how Segal’s interest in structuralism and poststructuralism and his preoccupation with the issues of identity and difference can be productively employed for a consideration of Greek tragedy from the point of view of post-colonial studies. Mark Griffith draws on Segal’s psychoanalytic readings of the Euripidean characters of Hippolytus and Pentheus to revisit the relation between Greek tragedy and psychoanalysis. Focusing on Sophocles’ Antigone, Griffith uses the play as a case study for a systematic examination of the different interpretative positions offered by psychoanalysis for the exploration of the complementary issues of characterization, authorship and spectatorship. In an equally stimulating paper, Victoria Wohl discusses the workings of desire and identification in the contexts of Euripides’ Bacchae and the patriarchal and patrilinear structure of Athenian society. Setting against each other Freudian and Lacanian theories of sexuality and subjectivity based on lack and difference and Deleuze and Guattari’s anti-Oedipal theorization of sexuality, which privileges multiplicity, productiveness and transformativity, Wohl provides not only useful insights, but also an attractive alternative to the structuralist paradoxes and contradictions of Greek tragedy and sexuality so central to Segal’s approach. Karen Bassi’s paper on visuality, temporality and the tragic script provides another stimulating contribution to the volume. Revisiting the visual turn of studies of Greek tragedy in recent decades, she