

together with Euripides' *Ion* and focusing on the two figures who have been impacted by Apolline force. Cassandra's presence in the *Agamemnon*, rightly discussed as the most protracted silence on classical stage, is framed by the Watchman's words that choose to leave certain things unsaid, associating silence with powerlessness. This essay redirects our attention from Cassandra's status (virgin, concubine etc.) and puts forth a new reading focusing on her silences and enigmatic cries. It is the staged silence that makes her later lyric utterance a forceful and disquieting voicing. This dramatic technique also implicates Apollo as the god of prophecy and song. The same connection is convincingly argued for Creusa. Although Creusa, unlike Cassandra, speaks as soon as she enters the stage, her past trauma is disclosed and her silence ruptured in her lyric monody, in a play that constantly uses language of concealment, secrecy and coercion. Creusa swerves into lyric anapaests. This fascinating reading highlights the captive girl and the royal wife as two figures whose lyric utterance both 'outstrips the comprehension of their male interlocutors' (p. 237) and points to female trauma, with both figures being Apollo's victims.

K. Synodinou, through the perspective of epic female silences, moves to tragedy and how tragedy moves beyond the assumption of female submissiveness, focusing on Clytemnestra. This essay brings together the Aeschylean Clytemnestra from *Agamemnon* and the Euripidean one from *Iphigenia in Aulis* and traces the evolution of a character as she is transformed into a revolutionary figure who defies her husband.

The final essay by R. Seaford revisits the silences of Achilles and Niobe in the Aeschylean lost dramas, returns to Cassandra in *Agamemnon* and explores how Aeschylus innovated by introducing long silences, something not present in the earlier epic tradition. This essay subtly brings attention to the hymenaeal context by analysing Niobe's 'veiled silence' as also Cassandra's bridal silence. This essay aptly points out associations between isolation and silence in tragedy, as the silence of the mourner or the bride, which are evoked further, are ritualised silences, being merged with the silence of isolation.

This is a volume rich in detail, offering nuanced close readings that considerably change earlier views of how silence is present in ancient literature, making a compelling case that silence operates as an important agent in performative texts and beyond.

University of California, Irvine

ANDROMACHE KARANIKA
karanika@uci.edu

HOMERIC HEROES AND NORMS OF CONDUCT

MARI (F.) *Le héros comme il faut. Codes de comportement et contextes sociaux dans l'épopée homérique*. Pp. 304, figs. Paris: Éditions de Boccard, 2021. Paper, €39. ISBN: 978-2-7018-0596-2.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X21002055

The French term *politesse* may be used to imply that smooth facade of urbanity that we associate with high-level diplomacy. But for M. it will usefully refer to the collection of norms shared by members of a society or a given social group that prescribe models of conduct appropriate to different social occasions (p. 21).

M.'s work has two aims: to inquire into forms of social behaviour as exemplified in the Homeric epics and thereby to introduce an inquiry into the social values of ancient Greece. As he explains in an (over-long) introduction (Part 1, Chapters 1–4), M. takes the epics as the starting point in this wider investigation, not so much because of their antiquity but

because they depict models of behaviour that members of that ‘Homeric’ society saw as paradigmatic. These norms (‘judgements socio-esthétiques’, p. 290), taken together, add up to a ‘manuel de politesse homérique’ (p. 114); its collection of paradigms applies not only to the elite described there but to all Greeks of the archaic and classical periods (p. 257).

By contrast with linguists P. Brown and S.C. Levinson, whose Politeness Theory (*Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage* [1987]) disregards historical or anthropological perspectives, M. adopts an approach suggested in the work of German sociologist N. Elias (*Über den Prozess der Zivilisation* [1939]). Elias’s insistence that any account of social behaviour must acknowledge cultural factors is hinted at in M.’s subtitle: ‘codes of behaviour and social contexts in Homeric epic’. The true departure point for M.’s study of Homeric social interactions, however, is the work of Erving Goffman. In Goffman’s work on face M. finds significant links with *timê*, the behavioural norm that, along with *aidôs*, guides heroic behaviour in the epics. In this respect his work may be aligned with – and yet goes beyond – H. van Wees’s *Status Warriors* (1992) and, particularly, R. Scodel’s *Epic Facework* (2008).

M. proposes that the significant contextual factors for social behaviour in the Homeric epics may be mapped out along two axes: social density and authority. Where social density is high, as in the assembly of the Achaean army, authority should also be high (the effect of collaboration amongst many individuals). By comparison, in the palace of Nestor, where social density is lower, the force of authority is likewise lower, since that authority resides in a single individual, the king. But in the palace on Ithaca, prior to Odysseus’ return, there is no single source of authority: social order has broken down. Finally, in private, when there are no third parties as observers, modes of behaviour are less constrained; an individual’s authority may be more fragile. The single key to our understanding of all interaction within different social contexts is the protagonists’ concern to preserve their own face and to protect that of others.

The epics are the primary source of information on appropriate and inappropriate behaviour in the society they describe. M. imposes no agenda; the poems must speak for themselves. His attention, in Part 2 of his work, to situations of increasing social density provides an effective – and original – structure for the study. Thus M. examines selected interactions between mortals, from the dynamics of intimate one-on-one conversations (Chapter 5), through interactions in the domestic sphere (Chapter 6), to interactions in the public gaze (Chapter 7). He includes the interactions of the gods, with each other and, occasionally, with mortals.

Chapter 5, ‘Le miel et le vinaigre’, examines at length the quarrel of Achilles and Agamemnon in *Iliad* 1, supplementing this with the harsh words uttered by Hector to Paris in *Iliad* 3 and the (unheroic) insults delivered by Melanthius to Odysseus and Eumaeus in *Odyssey* 17. Each of these encounters features a challenge to *timê* and to face. In the case of the quarrel of *Iliad* 1 M. demonstrates how Agamemnon (whatever external audiences think of his methods) succeeds in protecting his *timê* (pp. 141–2). M.’s decision to address this quarrel as a ‘dialogue en tête à tête’ (p. 119) deliberately disregards for the moment those also present, the Achaean army. The dispute between Menelaus and Antilochus, one of the subjects of Chapter 7, takes place before the same body of men. The former, however, is no more private than the latter.

Chapter 6, ‘Maîtres des lieux homériques: formes de relation dans les contextes “domestiques” de l’épopée’, takes readers into the domestic setting, moving gradually along the axis of social density. Whether in a palace or in a simple hut, we find someone in charge – a king, a queen, a master or mistress – in whom rests a concentration of authority. This individual expects deference. Some heads of household are more secure

in their status than others: at *Od.* 11.342–53, for example, Alcinous is unfazed by Echeneos' apparent slight to his *timê*.

One of the principal themes of the *Odyssey* is the way in which relationships are established between individual households and outsiders. To organise his study of this broad field, M. has categorised the contexts in which *politesse*, or its antithesis, might be in play: the private room, the low-density home, the palace and the dwelling of a demi-god.

In the private room, the *thamos*, when interaction is tête-à-tête, the face of the master of the house is fragile (Helen and Paris in *Iliad* 3). When a third person enters that space, the *timê* of the master may be challenged: hence Helen's behaviour in *Iliad* 6, Odysseus' anger in *Odyssey* 23 and Hephaestus' fury in *Odyssey* 8. Other interactions discussed include Eumaeus' reception of Odysseus in *Odyssey* 14, Achilles' and Priam's occasionally fractious encounter in *Iliad* 24, the respective welcomes that Telemachus receives at the grand palaces of Nestor and Menelaus, and the significance for Telemachus of Athena's presence in the palace on Ithaca. Her arrival allows the young man to assert his authority. As master of the house, he puts his guest at ease, in the presence of the suitors, thus preserving his face. This small act of resistance signals new possibilities for Telemachus.

In Chapter 7, 'Gardés à vue: les élites homériques à l'épreuve du regard collectif', M. argues that in a situation of high social density, in the public gaze, we find a keener oversight of behaviours and a stronger degree of conformity. The repression of unacceptable behaviour is more severe (p. 221).

The Achaean leaders, indeed, draw down on their own *timê* to ensure that there is a single commander of the combined forces. Because even Nestor and Odysseus are prepared to acknowledge Agamemnon as *anax*, the authority that rests in the elite is all the higher. In protecting their collective face, they protect the social order. Thus, as M. observes, supplementing his earlier discussion, Achilles' attack on Agamemnon was socially dangerous: he threatened both Agamemnon's face and that of the elite (p. 238).

This well-produced volume includes an *index locorum* and an index of names. A brief glossary replaces the subject index. The text is clean, apart from some obscured text in my copy (*Od.* 17.74–7, at p. 205) and some wrongly identified lines from *Iliad* 23 (p. 244). To be sure, I would have preferred a brisker coverage of introductory material. M.'s acknowledgements indicate that this volume derives from his doctoral thesis. Part 1 of the volume offers evidence of the thesis-writer's urge to cover every angle, whether of immediate relevance or not.

There is, however, much to like here: M.'s focus on face, on *timê* and *aidôs*, in the context of social density, opens the way to some subtle readings and fresh insights into the dynamics of interaction in a range of social situations in the Homeric epics. In sum, the volume deserves our attention.

The Australian National University

ELIZABETH MINCHIN
elizabeth.minchin@anu.edu.au