

Introduction

Christina-Panagiota Manolea and François Renaud

This volume is the sequel to *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Homer from the Hellenistic Age to Late Antiquity* edited by Christina-Panagiota Manolea and published in 2022. From classical antiquity to the end of Byzantium—that is, in the East—Homer was at the centre of Greek culture, which in turn contributed to making the revival of Greek and Homer in the early Italian Renaissance possible. In the Latin Middle Ages, the Homeric epics disappeared from the educational canon for a millennium. This makes the Renaissance crucially important in the West for the rediscovery of the Homeric text, with the first Latin translation by Leontius Pilatus (1362), which would be followed by many others improving on it. Thereafter, despite the acute questioning of traditional ways of thinking, such as in the *Querelle des anciens et des modernes* or the Battle of Books—a critical spirit culminating in the Enlightenment—Homer remains a major reference in scholarship, literature, and the arts. Only the nineteenth and twentieth centuries can be said to manifest a clear distancing from the Greek bard, although his presence in many significant ways persisted. Modern receptions of Homer often take radically new forms based on new conceptions about the origins, nature, and merit of Homeric poetry. These can hardly be understood, however, without due consideration of ancient and Byzantine views, whether the new rejected the old or implicitly relied on it.

This volume is divided into three chronological sections (Byzantium, Renaissance, Enlightenment) and one thematic section, on fine arts and music. In this Introduction, we give a very brief account of each of the eighteen chapters of the volume. Let us state the obvious at the outset: these summaries cannot do full justice to their richness, complexity, and depth.

Part 1 on Byzantium opens with the rhetorical “School of Gaza” (c.475–540), a key period of early Byzantium. Delphine Lauritzen focuses on the major figures of the literary circle: John of Gaza, Procopius of Gaza, and Choricius. All three authors link their teaching with their oratory, as poetry was a central component of rhetoric. Lauritzen offers a detailed survey of uses of Homer in their rhetorical works, showing that Homer was the central cultural figure, as evidenced by references, citations, allusions, etc., in both prose and verse. All three authors apply, as Lauritzen demonstrates, the recommendations of Menander Rhetor on how to use Homer’s poetry in speech writing for ornamental, ethical, and symbolic effects. She examines how, in his anacreontic poems and description (*ekphrasis*), John used Homeric images (Sirens, Muse,

etc.) through references to and quotations of scenes in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, while explicitly approving of the Homeric vision. Procopius of Gaza uses Homer at least as much as John, and his techniques include reformulation (*metaphrasis*), in addition to explicit references, allusions, and quotations of Homeric similes, scenes, and characters, in the various genres he uses: preliminary talk, ethopoeia, description, panegyric, wedding and funerary speech. This allowed him to give a model of speech, enriched by Homeric references, for his students to follow. Choricus goes further in very frequent Homeric collages and was even criticised by Photius for his excessively poetic style. In his preliminary talk, he uses Homer to reflect on his own poetics. In his school declamations, Homeric examples are used, among other functions, as rhetorical disputation. Lauritzen examines two of his orations of praise in which explicit references, allusions, and paraphrases combine Christian and Homeric characters. In his nuptial orations and epitaphs, Choricus uses Homeric episodes, often without quoting, in order to propose moral examples to follow. Overall, then, the authors of Gaza make references to Homer in at least three ways, frequently combining them: by mention of Homer's name, by mention of specific characters and episodes serving mostly ethical purposes, and by actual quotations. Thus, Lauritzen's detailed survey reveals that the combined use of pedagogical functions and literary creation in Gaza already announces the classic status and permanent presence of Homer in Byzantium.

Floris Bernard then examines Michael Psellos' uses of Homer in the context of his teaching activities and of the interests of Byzantine society. He first analyses a funeral oration for Niketas, a former teacher of grammar. He refers to three different kinds of allegorical interpretations: cosmological, psychological-philosophical, and Christian (Ithaca as the "heavenly Jerusalem"). These can also be found in Psellos' own teaching practice for grammar and philosophy. In his autobiographical *Encomium to his mother*, he explains that he teaches secular learning, especially Homeric poetry, which he is often asked by his students to interpret. Bernard also discusses four teaching texts by Psellos in which the method used is allegorical, just like that of Niketas: the surface meaning of Homeric myths hides a mystic core. There and elsewhere, Psellos refers to an analogy used by Socrates in the *Pheadrus* (243d): myths are salt water that must be turned potable. Psellos' interpretative practice regarding allegory varies according to context. In *On the Assembly of Gods*, Zeus is explained etymologically as representing life; in *On the Cave of the Nymphs*, Psellos expounds Porphyry's views without adding to them; in *On the Golden Chain*, he discusses many Neoplatonic views while leaving open the various etymological interpretations for the name of Zeus; *On the Bow of Pandarus* proposes a primarily philological exegesis. Bernard shows how these

allegorical readings in Psellos are an exercise in inventiveness and rhetorical productivity, never claiming to offer a definitive interpretation of Homer. This personal and creative side of allegorising, in opposition to a unitary and consistent intellectual programme, constitutes a flexible practice responding to specific questions and adapting to the audience. Indeed, Psellos' use of Homer involves a redefinition of allegoresis as a tool for creative writing. He has internalised Homeric poetry to such a degree that he can improvise on it through allusions his audience can recognise and appreciate. Indeed, in some of his letters, the intertextual devices and the tone are even light-hearted and playful. Thus, his often-allusive uses of Homer vary according to his own agenda and the need or expectations of his audience. Whether allegorising or not, Homer's literary brilliance is a source of literary inspiration for him.

Baukje van den Berg discusses Eustathios of Thessalonike, arguably the best-known Homeric scholar of the Byzantine era. His monumental commentaries on the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* offer an immense wealth of material often only loosely connected to the exegesis of the Homeric poems. This chapter aims to connect the different types of material offered by the commentaries to the educational and textual culture of the twelfth century. Doing so allows a better understanding of the multiple ways in which Eustathios' work on Homer catered to the needs of students and writers of the time. Thus, Van den Berg adds a synchronic perspective to the usual diachronic approach, showing how Eustathios' commentaries reflect both a long tradition and the Byzantine culture of his time, and how these two are closely linked. For Eustathios and his contemporaries, Homeric poetry is a source of encyclopaedic knowledge (on history, genealogy, geography, medicine, etc.) contained notably in its similes. Intended primarily for rhetors and prose writers, Eustathios' commentaries include lexical, grammatical, and rhetorical lessons on both oral and written style. They employ Hermogenes' rhetorical theory for their analysis of Homer as literary authority. Eustathios' allegorical interpretation must also be understood in terms of twelfth-century reading habits, which consider ancient mythology symbolic rather than religious. Moreover, Eustathios' commentaries are intended to activate the textual memory of his educated audiences and enlarge their polymathy through the inclusion of inherited moral maxims and short stories. Furthermore, Van den Berg explains how Eustathios finds in Homer's poetry a network of knowledge similar to that of his own as commentator. Indeed, Eustathios' specificity resides in analysing Homeric material within a rhetorical and literary framework, thus including reflections on the art of speaking and writing. Like his contemporary John Tzetzes, he regards Homer's creativity as shaped by his life experience. For both Eustathios and Tzetzes, Homer's gods (Zeus, Athena, the Muse) are allegories for the poet's

wisdom and rhetorical skill; thus, they make Homer's literary excellence the result of the kind of erudition and rhetorical skill that they endeavour to cultivate in their readers through their teaching and commentaries.

Valeria Lovato focuses on John Tzetzes' assessment of the reliability of Homer's account of the Trojan War—an issue that he approached from different angles throughout his career, and which relates to his conception of *historia* (qua “history” and “story”), myth, and allegory. In the early *Little Big Iliad*, Tzetzes criticises Homer both for the untruthfulness of his “historical” account, which makes him a poor historian, and for the implausibility of his “stories,” which makes him a poor rhetorician. The poet's tendency to celebrate reprehensible heroes also calls into question his ethical credentials. Indeed, for Tzetzes, truthfulness is a complex notion encompassing three criteria: factual truth, verisimilitude, and moral truth. According to the *Little Big Iliad*, Homer is lacking in all three. Later, however, beginning with the *Allegories of the Iliad* and of the *Odyssey*, these shortcomings seem to become sources of admiration. In the *Historiai*, Homer is praised as a competent rhetorician, even as the inventor of “weak discourse,” a form of paradoxical encomium traditionally ascribed to the Sophists. How are this gradual shift and final reversal to be understood? Lovato finds an answer in the relationship between *historia* and allegory. In Tzetzes' exegetical works, the Olympian gods are usually intended as allegorical representations of higher concepts. But in some cases, Tzetzes' deliberately blurs—and builds on—the fine line between *historia* and allegory. This is the case with the *Allegories of the Iliad*, as shown by the discussion of the role of Apollo and Athena in the duel between Hector and Achilles. In Tzetzes' reading, the two gods play unedited roles in the Homeric narrative, allowing the poet to reveal the truth behind his apparent praise of Achilles, which turns out to be an example of “weak discourse.” This interpretation of Homeric poetry as an extended paradoxical encomium, however, inevitably calls into question Tzetzes' increasing appreciation of the poet and does not allow the reader to decide whether the eulogies of Homer that Tzetzes weaves into his works are to be taken seriously or whether they are also further examples of “weak discourse.” The resulting portrait of Homer therefore remains deliberately ambiguous.

In the next chapter, we move from Byzantium to the Renaissance. Matteo Venier discusses the early Italian Renaissance humanist Leonardo Bruni. Encouraged by Coluccio Salutati's dissatisfaction, mostly on stylistic grounds, with Leontius Pilatus' translation (1362), Bruni translates book nine of the *Iliad* (*Orationes Homeri*), which Venier dates to around 1438. Bruni's translation methods vary through his career, from literal to free translation. In his translation of the three speeches of *Iliad* 9 into Latin prose, he follows an

intermediary approach—that is, the “free oratorical translation.” In this he agrees with Salutati that a new prose translation of Homer is needed and that the translator is authorised to introduce stylistic changes conceived as improvements of the original Greek, a method meant also as a criticism of Leontius Pilatus. Bruni’s goal with this transposition into Latin prose, then, is to offer a model of oratorical art and thus a new text emulating the original. In his preface to the translation, Bruni gives insights into his motivation and translation theory. Following Quintilian and Cicero, he divides style into three kinds—refined, sublime, and moderate—and believes that the three speeches in book nine—those of Ulysses, Achilles and Phoenix—correspond to them respectively. He thinks that the oratorical translation should omit the repeated epithets of the formulaic style for the sake of variation and precision, although he does not always follow that rule in practice. Venier briefly compares Bruni’s translation with those of Pilatus and Michael Psellos, the latter of which Bruni does not seem to use. Bruni’s translation is not without inaccuracies, but on the whole, it displays skill and talent. It became an important reference for other humanists, such as Candido Decembrio (whose own translation of *Iliad* 1–4 and 10 was published jointly with Bruni’s) and Lorenzo Valla, also realised in the spirit of emulation. Venier discusses Carlo Marsuppino’s metrical translation of *Iliad* 1 and Achilles’ speech in *Iliad* 9. In his preface, Marsuppino claims that a prose translation cannot do justice to poetry’s beauty, thus opposing Bruni’s approach, while implicitly admitting that metrical translation might be beyond his talent and that prose translation might after all be a more effective and secure compromise.

Valentina Prospero examines the translations of Homer in Italy from Dante to the sixteenth century. She shows how early views on translation from Greek into Latin exerted an enormous influence on the centuries that followed. Dante and Petrarch both refer to Jerome’s pessimism about the possibility of translating Homer’s Greek into Latin prose while retaining the original’s musical beauty and eloquence. Their own views on the matter, however, were more nuanced, as they had the direct experience of fragments of Homer in Latin, such as in Horace’s poetry. Like Dante before him and Valerianus after him, Petrarch considers Homer as a distant beloved whom one longs to hold. The legacy of Jerome’s sceptical view nevertheless prevailed for a long time. The first complete Latin rendition of both Homeric epics by Leontius Pilatus in interlinear, word-for-word prose (1362) constitutes a major contribution to the revival of Greek in the West, thanks to Petrarch’s wishes and Boccaccio’s decisive help. Yet Leontius Pilatus’ translation will remain in the shadow of prejudices. Salutati had the impossible dream of a Homer in Latin verse, on the model of Virgil, and so was inevitably dissatisfied by Pilatus’ prose rendition.

Latin prose proved nonetheless the favoured medium. Many new Latin prose versions attempted at first to improve on the Leontian translation, but without real success owing to a lack of direct knowledge of Homer's Greek. The version of Lorenzo Valla and Francesco Griffolini (1474), on the contrary, rests on a solid competence in Greek and gained recognition and wide circulation, especially with Pierius Valerianus' substantially revised edition (1502). By then, Jerome's admonition had vanished. Inspired by the Valla-Griffolini-Valerianus translation, Raffaele Maffei realised the first Latin prose translation of the *Odyssey* to go to print, seeking again a compromise between faithfulness to the original and adaptation to contemporary taste. Several metrical translations in the vernacular of the *Iliad*—eight in total—were attempted in the sixteenth century, but they all failed to reach a receptive audience and were soon forgotten. Most of them were incomplete and based on Divus' Latin translation rather than on the Homeric Greek text. The poor reception of the vernacular translation in verse confirms the favoured choice for a prose version, as achieved, notably, by Leontius and Divus.

We then move from Italy to France. Silvia Montiglio examines the contribution of the poet and classicist Jean Dorat, an inspiring interpreter of Greek poetry who taught major French poets such as Pierre de Ronsard and Joachim du Bellay. The paper focuses on Dorat's *Mythologicum*, his exegetical work on *Odyssey* 10–12 that proposes translation, analysis, and interpretation. Sensitive to Homer's style and composition, Dorat is also keenly interested in esoteric meaning. His overall interpretation is characterised by the combination, not always fully consistent, of moral and metaphysical allegories. Silvia Montiglio shows how Odysseus represents, for Dorat, the soul longing for its celestial home, while Penelope represents the ultimate goal of the traveller's journey of knowledge. Odysseus' spiritual search is full of intricate tensions, reflected in Dorat's own rendering of it conceived in response to previous interpretations (Horace, Cicero, etc.). Key to his overall interpretation are the various meanings given to Odysseus' "fatherland" (*patria*), which include the metaphysical (or celestial) and this-worldly (or terrestrial). The objects of Odysseus' yearning are (true) wisdom and (true) happiness, symbolised by Penelope and Ithaca respectively. The Sirens as dangers of temptation do not symbolise the pleasure of the senses as often thought, but the pleasure of inferior studies, such as poetry, oratory, and scientific investigations. These are legitimate, however, if practised with moderation and without losing sight of wisdom (or philosophy) and the happiness that it brings. This is why Odysseus listens to the Sirens but does not linger over them. For his rather strained reading of the relevant passage in *Odyssey* 12, Dorat carefully examines, but in the end rejects, Cicero's interpretation (in *De fin.* 5) that Odysseus yearns exclusively

for the contemplative life and so prefers wisdom to his fatherland. The inferior sciences, in Dorat's view, belong for Homer to an encyclopaedic (Renaissance) view of education capable of forming the whole human being, both morally and intellectually. Thus, as Montiglio concludes, Dorat's reading of the *Odyssey* is inspired simultaneously by a Stoic—practical, this-worldly—orientation and by a Neoplatonic and Christian—spiritual, mystic—vision: study is valued by Odysseus-Homer as the necessary condition of moral virtue, which in turn is the means to the attainment of the heavenly fatherland, that is, the true face of Penelope.

Christiane Deloince-Louette's study on Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484–1558) shows that the reception of Homer was by no means a continuous victory march over the centuries. In opposing Homer's "rude" style to the elegance of Virgil, Scaliger's attack on Homer is in many ways characteristic of the period as well as deeply influential on the *Querelle d'Homère* and, more largely, the *Querelle des anciens et des modernes*. The Homer-Virgil comparison developed in book five of his *Poetics* (1561) condemns in the Greek poet an inappropriate *inventio*, a clumsy *dispositio*, and a flawed *elocutio*: Homer's unrefined (*rudis*) and impoverished (*ieiunus*) style is deemed unworthy of the heroic majesty that, by contrast, is fully embodied in Virgil, whom Scaliger crowns as the absolute model of the epic poet. Scaliger thereby overturns the prevailing chronological hierarchy: if Virgil improved upon Homer, then progress exists in literature. However, the interest shown by French monarchs and Renaissance poets—including Ronsard—made Homer's translation a site of poetic experimentation that, while operating within the framework defined by Scaliger, nonetheless sought to highlight the originality of the Greek poet. This is especially true of Protestant poets such as Salomon Certon and Jean de Sponde, for whom Homer's simplicity echoes the simplicity of the Bible. The Counter-Reformation, privileging Latin over Greek—and therefore Virgil over Homer—once again pushed Homer to the margins, until the success of Longinus' treatise rehabilitated him as a model of the "sublime" at the end of the seventeenth century. The *Querelle d'Homère* in the early eighteenth century reflects Scaliger's continued presence in literary debates, following the publication of Anne Dacier's prose translation (1711) and Antoine Houdar de La Motte's verse adaptation of the *Iliad*, reduced to twelve books. Scaliger's critiques of Homer now serve to support the idea that the Greek poet's language and style are incompatible with the perfection of the French language, thereby justifying a "free and noble" transposition of Homeric simplicity and roughness.

The next chapter examines the translation of the two Homeric epics by the English philosopher Thomas Hobbes. Why did Hobbes undertake those

translations and why should we be interested in them? Andrea Catanzaro concurs with Eric Nelson that Hobbes translations are “a continuation of *Leviathan* by other means” allowing a better understanding of his political thought. In the 1670s, Hobbes is old, ill, away from English political life, and under the threat of censorship. A close examination of Hobbes’s translation of key Greek terms reveals his general tendency to slant the Homeric text in the direction of his own political theory and concerns. Two key political problems for Hobbes are examined closely: the identification of the sovereign and the origins of political power. In both cases, Hobbes repeatedly uses three devices: excision, modification of words or groups of words, and rewriting of sections. Catanzaro’s textual analysis of the sovereign concentrates on the use of the Homeric terms for “king” (ἄναξ, βασιλεύς). According to the *Leviathan*, there can only be one holder of sovereignty, strictly distinct from his subjects, as an indispensable condition of political stability. In Homer, however, there are many kings, and the notion of king is not clearly defined. Hobbes regards Agamemnon as a model sovereign and therefore adjusts the Homeric text in order to secure the latter’s authority and image, such as in the quarrel between him and Achilles in *Iliad* 1. The comparison between Homer’s Greek, a standard English translation of it (Fagles-Knox), and Hobbes’s own instructively shows how the latter diminishes the status and image of Achilles through the omission of terms associated with “king” and its cognates. The discussion of the problem of the origins of political power evolves around two very frequent epithets, διοτρεφής, “nourished by Zeus” and διογενής, “born from Zeus.” According to Hobbes the political thinker, power can only rest upon human covenant. Regarding Achilles and other heroes, these two epithets, especially the second, are removed in the translation. As a result of these techniques, this new politicised Homer reflects Hobbes’s own ideas and concerns, while avoiding censorship.

Alexander U. Bertland opens **Part 3** on the Enlightenment by analysing Vico’s new way of thinking about Homeric poetry. Vico’s Homer is located within the context of the latter’s cyclical view of human institutions evolving from the age of gods to first that of heroes and then of humans. Vico explains how Homeric epic belongs to the age of heroes and reflects a primitive mentality. Bertland highlights Vico’s distinctive contribution by comparing it with that of his contemporary Gianvincenzo Gravina. Both agree that Homeric poetic thought is characterised by an immediate, pre-reflective sensibility and the ability to speak directly to his audience through the imagination. In Gravina’s view, Homer is a person sharing the pre-conceptual mentality of the Greek community of his time, while expressing sublime, philosophical insights separating him from the vulgar. Vico rejects the idea that Homer is

a single individual who expressed an esoteric wisdom. The morality of the Homeric heroes is childish, selfish, and violent. According to Vico, the universals developed by mythical, primitive thought by means of the imagination are not based upon abstraction and the generalisation of particulars, as Gravina claims, but on metaphor. Achilles and Ulysses are not particular individuals but poetic characters or “imaginative universals.” This is, he argues, the way everyone thought in Homer’s time: any Greek ruling through force became Achilles, any Greek ruling through deception became Ulysses. Likewise, Vico claims, Homer himself was a heroic character: any rhapsodist narrating a tale well became Homer. The importance of the Homeric epics lies, for Vico, in the fact that they are the texts closest to inceptive, poetic thought. According to Vico, we should not seek with nostalgia to return to this mentality and state but, on the contrary, regard that age of arbitrary heroes exemplified in Homeric poetry as responsible for the ills of his (and our) own contemporary political situation. As Bertland concludes, Vico’s lasting significance lies in this political lesson.

Pat Rogers examines Alexander Pope’s verse translation of the two epics. He does not focus on the philological or aesthetic aspects, but on the social and political context of their production and reception. While Pope had read the *Iliad* and other ancient epics with rapture when he was only a boy and retained a passion for Homer throughout his life, he never acquired an advanced or scholarly knowledge of Greek. He did, however, benefit from the help of classicists as well as of translations and commentaries, which gave him a very good grasp of the Homeric meaning and mood. Pope first had to ensure enough subscriptions for the roughly annual instalments. His *Iliad* (1715–1720) proved a great financial success, while the *Odyssey* (1725–1726) was a more difficult venture. For various reasons, Pope accepted the assistance of collaborators, two competent versifiers with solid classical training, Elijah Fenton and Rev. William Broome. The three translators did not, however, make their collaboration clear to the public from the outset, and as a result, much criticism arose that impeded the reception of the *Odyssey*, even if the translation displayed as much skill as that of the *Iliad*. For the *Odyssey*, Pope had to find a less lofty epic style for the civil and domestic material. Within a short period of time, however, the culture in England completely changed with the political hegemony of the Whig elite, the Hanoverian dynasty, and the Anglican Church increasingly opposed to the Jacobite cause. Pope thus lost his close connections with the establishment, while many Catholics became the object of a virulent campaign, the collateral victim of which was Homer. Part of the wider literary situation was Dryden’s epic translation defending a freer style, which helped Pope in his own effort towards a non-literal translation that nevertheless remained

faithful to English idiom and the Homeric mood. While staying relatively aloof from the Battle of Books dominating the French literary scene, Pope was favourable to the *anciens*, notably Anne Dacier, despite her later criticisms of his *Iliad*. Overall, Rogers concludes, Pope's verse translation of the two epics has had a durable impact on English literature by bringing Homer to life again and offering heroic poetry in its own right.

After the discussion of Vico and Alexander Pope, we move to Blackwell's Homeric scholarship, whose novelty consists in its methods investigating the social, economic, and religious conditions which made the genius of Homer possible. Ralph McLean concentrates on Blackwell and his relation to Ossianic poetry. McLean compares Blackwell's approach to that of many of his contemporaries, including David Hume, Adam Smith, and Adam Ferguson. In Blackwell's treatment, Homer emerges as a man belonging to a world situated between primitivism and classicism, not unlike Blackwell's own taste as a literary critic. Great poetry does not rest on mere imitation but on emulation. Homer's superior poetry consists in emulating nature and, thus, in portraying human passions vividly, in an emphatically metaphorical style. This metaphorical style is also bound up with a religious, polytheist vision. Homer's innate genius is explained by the fact that he belonged to a transitional period between the primitive and the civilised, free from both barbarity and luxury. In the second part of his paper, McLean shows how Blackwell's literary criticism contributed to the emergence of the Ossianic poems, that immensely popular production supposedly stemming from the third century but in reality forged—in part—by James Macpherson, who also translated the *Iliad*. Macpherson's achievement resides in adapting primitivist interests to contemporary taste: like Homeric epic, Ossianic poetry reconciled fierce ancient manners with delicate modern sensibilities. McLean shows how Blackwell's views on the historical conditions of Homeric poetry contributed to the creation of a superior poetry. Thus, his Homeric scholarship has not only value per se but also as a contribution to poetic creation.

Fabienne Moore then discusses the complex and changing image of Homer in the French Enlightenment. She focuses on three fundamental aspects: the *Querelle des anciens et des modernes*, the judgement of and uses by the *philosophes*, specifically in the *Encyclopédie*, and the impact of Ossian. In the *querelle* about Homer, the *anciens* defend Homer's times as being not yet corrupted and portray his poetry as sublime, while the *modernes* favour an elitist vision of refined poetry opposed to the masses. The idea of Homer as Counter-Enlightenment, however, is of limited usefulness, given the Enlightenment's paradoxical fascination for the primitive and marvellous. Anne Dacier's prose translation offers a democratised Homer compatible with Christianity, and the

equally “ancient” Fénelon depicts a moral utopia in contrast with contemporary mores in his highly popular *Les Aventures de Télémaque*, while Marivaux’s burlesque *Iliad* parodies neoclassical, aristocratic aesthetics in the spirit of his comedies. The *philosophes* examine the two epics as a source of knowledge about ancient life and poetry. The countless references to Homer in the *Encyclopédie* testify to the importance of the poet as a source of knowledge of all kinds. Louis de Jaucourt’s sober entries hint at desiderata of his time, such as heroism, simplicity, and the *mélange* of genres. While Voltaire’s views change during his long life, his objections are primarily aesthetic in nature, favouring good taste against the *vulgaire* found in Homer, as in Shakespeare. His criticisms rest on the preference for written, polished epic, as opposed to oral, musical epic, such as that defended by Rousseau. Homer is central to Rousseau’s view about the origins of language and culture, including his rejection of luxury as cause of corruption, as Dacier had already claimed. Denis Diderot, who knew Greek very well, stands out as the greatest admirer and possibly the best connoisseur of Homer of his time. While Homeric poetry left Voltaire cold, Diderot responds to it with strong emotions and even regards it as a model of *pathos*. For this same reason, he felt fervour for Ossian, the “Northern Homer,” while retaining his predilection for the Greek poet. Inversely, Voltaire’s neoclassical taste, reflecting the older generation, rejects Ossian’s (just like Homer’s) “Asiatic,” exaggerated style. Notwithstanding his dubious authenticity, Ossian paradoxically allowed Enlightenment readers and critics such as Germaine de Staël to celebrate Homer’s apotheosis.

Christina-Panagiota Manolea examines an unusual and neglected work by Eugenios Voulgaris, a prominent humanist figure of the modern Greek Enlightenment. This work consists of the joint translation into Greek of Everhard Feith’s *Antiquitatum Homericarum libri IV* (1st ed. 1677) and of Angelo Maria Quirini’s *Primordia Corcyrae* (1st ed. 1725). Feith’s high-profile and popular book, reedited many times in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, is a work of Homeric scholarship that meticulously discusses the various dimensions of the Homeric world: the gods, politics, daily life, especially that of the heroes, including negotiations and treaties. *Primordia Corcyrae* (edited twice) analyses the various names of this island in antiquity, ancient Greek myths in connection with Corfu, the island of the Phoenicians, its people, its mythology, and its history as known through Homer. The book includes many testimonies about the island from ancient historians. Manolea provides a detailed analysis of the edition used in both cases and the revisions Voulgaris introduced. His Latin translation is generally faithful, but it includes various abridgements and adaptations, presumably for greater readability. His decision to translate and publish these two works together is to be explained in terms of biography

and politics. The translation probably goes back to decades before its publication (1804). At the end of his life, old and sick, he apparently permitted rich Greek merchants Anastasios Zosimas and his brothers to undertake the editorial project of publishing his completed but unpublished manuscripts, including these two translations as one book, which Voulgaris possibly conceived as a textbook for future generations. This educational goal was coupled with a political intent, namely that of using Quirini's book on Corfu to highlight the revolutionary politics of the Ionian islands and, thus, praising the Septinsular Republic (1800–1807) at a time when the Greek Revolution was slowing brewing.

François Renaud's chapter discusses Friedrich August Wolf's Homer as well as its impacts on contemporary philosophers. Wolf, in his *Prolegomena ad Homerum* (1795), claims that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were originally composed orally, transmitted as short and disparate songs by rhapsodes until they were edited for the first time in the form of long and unified epics at the time of Pisistratus, after which they underwent series of revisions by Hellenistic critics. Wolf reconstructs the method of those critics as resting on aesthetic and ahistorical categories. Despite his very assertive tone, Wolf left the key question about the origins of the two epics undecided, as historical evidence only allowed for historical probability. Wolf recognised his debt to his predecessors, including Wood, Villoison, and Merian, whose work he sought to systematise. Wolf's originality lies more in his historical method than in his thesis. This method allowed him to write the first history of an ancient (non-biblical) text. His rigorous method is based on the techniques that Biblical scholarship had just developed, while being also inspired by a humanistic conception similar to that of Wilhelm von Humboldt. Renaud also examines the reception of the *Prolegomena* in Herder, F. Schlegel, and Schelling. While Herder sees in Wolf's treatise a confirmation of his own conception of natural and collective poetry, F. Schlegel creatively appropriates it to formulate the critical theory of early Romanticism, namely concerning the inseparability of text and reception, creation and criticism, and implying the inexhaustibility of eminent texts and of the reader's expectations. Schelling advances a speculative reading of Wolf's Homer that radicalises Schlegel's reception: he inverts Wolf in reuniting what the latter separated; "Homeros" is (etymologically) the identical, that which unites the two grand forces, nature and history. Wolf's history of the Homeric text was also seen by some contemporaries as the concrete paradigm of Humboldt's view of language as *energeia*, namely as an active, dynamic force distinguished from *ergon*, which is a written, static system in opposition to oral speech, such as performative interpretations in theatre and music.

Vincenzo Farinella opens **Part 4** on fine arts and music with a brief overview of emblematic cases in the long reception of Homer in the visual arts (accompanied in this volume by illustrations of many of them). The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are equally drawn upon in this selection, although Odysseus, notably in the company of the Sirens, proves to be a far more popular figure than Achilles. The artistic mediums used include painting, bas-relief, plaque, and sculpture. Faithful treatments of the Homeric material are presented alongside free adaptations of it. Only some of the twenty-four artistic creations can be mentioned here. Amongst the rather faithful picturing, often inspired by Greek vases and other archaeological documents available at the time, let us mention the two detailed paintings of Apollonio di Giovanni (1435–1445) portraying Odysseus' encounters with Polyphemus, Circe, Scylla, the Sirens, and Calypso, or the eighteenth-century bas-relief of Antonio Canova's *Dance of Alcino's Sons* (1790–1792), characterised by the simplicity typical of classical bas-relief; or again, a century later, William Waterhouse's two paintings of the seductive witch Circe and the Sirens authentically portrayed as bird-women. Free uses of Homer in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries include William Turner's painting of Ulysses mocking Polyphemus (1829), a pretext for exploring colours and the sun's divine rays, and Picasso's *Ulysses and the Sirens* (1946), transforming the inherited image of the Sirens as seductive and dangerous into an immaterial face whispering secret knowledge to Odysseus' infantile head. Other paintings explore the allegorical or symbolic in Homer. This is strikingly so in Correggio's portrait of a lady holding a metallic cup with the inscription *nēpenthēs* on it, referring to Helen's drink-drug for Telemachus which dispels the latter's sadness, a drug here representing the power of her refined conversation, beyond her renowned beauty. The comical sometimes takes the foreground, such as in Bartolomeo Passerotti's painting *Homer's Riddle* (c.1575), presenting a laughable episode of Homer's life preceding his tragicomic death, or in Honoré Daumier's series of satirical lithographs depicting Greek heroes, such as *Ulysses and Penelope* (1841–1843). Yet it is the serious and admiring treatments of Homer that emphatically dominate, as in the triumph of Homer in Raphael's fresco *Parnassus* (1510–1511), later emulated by Ingres's *Apotheosis of Homer* (1827), and in Rembrandt's *Aristotle with a Bust of Homer* (1653), inspired by Hellenistic Homer's busts while presenting a thoughtful Aristotle wearing contemporary clothes. (The other painting by Rembrandt referred to by Farinella, *Homer Dictating His Verses* from 1663, has been chosen for the cover of this volume.)

Wendy Heller examines the various treatments of the figure of Penelope in three Venetian operas. While most lamenting heroines—such as Ariadne, Medea,

or Dido—have fascinated the public as suicidal or vengeful figures, Penelope remains in control and resists extreme emotions. How could she nevertheless fascinate as she did? Monteverdi's *Il ritorno d'Ulisse in patria* (1640), especially in Badoaro's libretto (which Monteverdi sometimes moves away from), follows Homer's plot quite closely, portraying a patient, chaste, and faithful Penelope. It differs from Homer for instance in Penelope's long recitative lament at the beginning of the opera (act I, scene 1); while her mood shifts from sorrow to hope, she remains regally in control. Her cleverness is, however, quite limited, and she is silenced by Odysseus, whereas in Homer she sets the trap for the suitors in the contest for the bow. A crucial change in the opera's conventions thereafter is the replacement of recitative by the dominance of aria. *Penelope la casta* (1685), in Matteo Noris' libretto, has been set to music by many composers. While recitatives are often replaced by arias as vehicles of extreme emotions, this often happens within comic situations, through various misunderstandings. Noris uses the Homeric story very loosely, inventing many characters and plot twists, such as Odysseus' suspicion of Penelope's unfaithfulness and the latter's reaction to his lack of trust. While in many ways a farce, this opera presents Penelope nonetheless as a woman in control: she recognises Odysseus early and even designs a way to punish her indecisive and angry husband for distrusting her. *Ulisse* (1725), with a libretto by Domenico Lalli (with music, no longer extant, by Giovanni Porta), reflects other reforms in Venetian opera, such as the simplification of the plot. More serious in tone than Noris' opera, Lalli's is also more faithful to Homer's plot through clever variations of it, such as the introduction of Telemaco's love for Antiope and Ulisse' disguising himself as the bard Femio. This Penelope, contrary to Noris' treatment, is austere and dignified, singing an important aria followed by a recitative monologue that recalls the lament in Badoaro and Monteverdi referred to above. Lalli, however, portrays Penelope with more cleverness and resourcefulness than they did, following Homer.

Closing the volume, Holger Schmid's chapter examines how archaeologist, antiquarian, and art historian Johann Joachim Winckelmann's Homer is based on personal, concrete experience of epic poetry. Foundational for this experience is the young Winckelmann's recitation of Homeric poetry following his morning prayer. His youthful Homeric prayers prove inseparable from his thought on beauty, more particularly plastic beauty. Schmid defends Winckelmann's Homer and his conception of beauty against various criticisms, notably about the alleged contradiction between history and universal aesthetic norms in his *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* (1764). Goethe, despite his own reservations, puts his finger on something decisive when he says that reading Winckelmann does not teach us anything, it transforms us.

Here lies the ethical, “existential” dimension of his pedagogy. The close, profound bond between epic and sculpture in Winckelmann lies in the plastic quality of the Homeric verse. Schmid explains the way of seeing of the connoisseur, as opposed to that of the novice, in the light of the ancient anecdote referred to by Winckelmann: Pythagoras looks at the sun and sees god, while Anaxagoras sees a stone. Homer’s image of god is best represented for Winckelmann by Zeus signalling his assent to Thetis with his eyebrows and making all of Olympus tremble. According to Winckelmann, this striking image of Zeus’ quiet but overwhelming power will inspire Phidias’ famous statue of Zeus at Olympia, about which it was commonly said in antiquity that they who had not seen it had lived in vain. In other words, the intimate bond between ideal beauty and Homeric epic resides in “the noble simplicity and still grandeur,” namely in the inexpressivity (*Unbezeichnung*) of passion, exemplified in Achilles’ wrath against Agamemnon contained in silence with the help of Athena. Beauty as inexpressivity is sublime, which is akin to the dreadful, not opposed to it, as most of Winckelmann’s contemporaries claim. Thus art “history” for Winckelmann is not a scholarly or scientific discipline: the problem of art is the problem of beauty, which must be understood with historical, critical distance, but also and above all lived with receptivity as a transforming experience. This transforming experience is provided by Homeric poetry, which in turn inspires the creation of plastic beauty, such as in “Late Classical” style. There is, then, no contradiction between historical perspective and ideal beauty: it is Homer applied to oneself as heightened existence, as when one stands in front of statues of divine figures “living at ease” like the Homeric gods.

As these brief accounts already show—and as the chapters themselves richly demonstrate and illustrate—the various conceptions and uses of Homeric poetry during this very long period—about 1300 years—are many and varied, and these can hardly be collectively synthesised here even in broad terms. A few major tendencies and changes occurring during that period can, however, be mentioned. The allegorical and theological readings of Homer, stemming from antiquity and dominant in Byzantium, gradually recede, without vanishing completely. Likewise, the close bond between rhetoric and poetics, revived in new forms during the Renaissance, is questioned and finally rejected by the Romantic movement, the endpoint of the period covered here. Homeric scholarship from the School of Gaza to F. A. Wolf undergoes several mutations in aims and techniques, moving slowly towards various forms of historicism and culminating in *Altertumswissenschaft*, while almost never relinquishing entirely—for our period—the humanist and aesthetic assumptions which gave rise to it. The practice of translating Homer, which acquired new impetus with the advance of modern languages, initially competing with the prestige

of Latin, is inevitably bound up with poietic assumptions. Translating Homeric poetry, just like commenting on it, has often had the twofold motivation of making Homer speak again to new audiences and of proposing inspiration for poetic creation. More generally still, as the most commented classical texts for many centuries, Homer's epics have directly and indirectly contributed to debates on far-reaching issues such as the origins of language, the validity of moral norms, and the nature of beauty. Despite the great advances made in Homeric scholarship since the eighteenth century, some of those former insights and experiences, including their very otherness, can still prove useful today in reading Homeric poetry as object of scholarship and delight.¹

¹ We are grateful to Dylan Vaughan for his linguistic and technical revision of the manuscript as well to the anonymous reader for helpful comments and Brill's proofreader for final revisions.