



---

Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Cynthia King

Reviewed work(s):

Homer and the Nibelungenlied: Comparative Studies in Epic Style by Bernard Fenik

Source: *The Classical World*, Vol. 81, No. 3 (Jan. - Feb., 1988), pp. 231-232

Published by: Classical Association of the Atlantic States

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4350175>

Accessed: 13/08/2009 12:36

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=classaas>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*Classical Association of the Atlantic States* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical World*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

last two tribes were organized in 241 B.C. the newly enfranchised citizens and communities were inscribed into the existing rural tribes, a process continued under the Empire. The tribes served both as voting districts for the popular assemblies and as indicators of citizenship. Thus the full name of Cicero was *M. Tullius M. f. Cor(nelia tribu) Cicero*. Under the Empire, with the disappearance of popular assemblies and the ultimate grant of citizenship to most free inhabitants, the tribes became a constitutional relic. Beginning with the mid-second century in place of the old tribes in the onomastic formula frequently appear the "tribes" bearing imperial names, e.g. Iulia, Flavia, Ulpia, Traiana, Aelia. But no such tribes were ever established. Forni finds the explanation in the confusion between the indication of a tribe and of *origo*, which normally included the name of a city and of its imperial surname. The city of Poetovio in Pannonia was surnamed Ulpia Traiana and belonged to the *tribus* Papiria. In the inscription of the praetorian *M. Aurel(ius) M. f. Ulp(ia) Valerinu(s) Poet(ovione)*, Ulpia is the surname of the city, but it insinuated itself into the onomastic position where in earlier times would have stood the name of the *tribus* Papiria. It is a pseudo-tribe.

For the tribes of the Republic we have the masterly *Voting Districts of the Roman Republic* by L. R. Taylor (Rome, 1960); for the Empire we still must rely on W. Kubitschek, *Imperium Romanum tributim discriptum* (Vienna, 1889). Not for long: we are looking forward to vols. I and II of Forni's opus which will be devoted to "real" tribes. The volume on the pseudo-tribes is an auspicious beginning.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
CW 81.3 (1988)

J. LINDERSKI

Bernard Fenik. *Homer and the Nibelungenlied: Comparative Studies in Epic Style*. Martin Classical Lectures, 30. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986. Pp. xvii, 211. \$22.50.

Despite the title, there is in-depth treatment of only *Iliad* 11-13, and, in addition to the *Nibelungenlied*, the *Chanson de Roland*, the *Rolandlied*, several other medieval epics, the Gospel of Mark, Augustine's *Confessions*, and the novels of Jeremias Gotthelf! Fenik assumes his readers' familiarity with these epics, with "aventiuren" (chapters) and "laissez" (stanzas).

Fenik discusses "the artistry of the epics at the level of scene and episode to describe how the story is shaped and articulated over short to medium-sized episodes" in "narrative formulas", after Parry's Homeric "dictional" formula systems, and defines narrative formulas as "repeated actions and clusters of detail that have something of the same permanent definition as the verbal formulas and their same ability to enter numerous combinations." He concludes that "Homer's otherness has been exaggerated."

Fenik shows that *Iliad* 11 and 12 form a pair with contrasting portraits of Greeks and Trojans, including the wounding and removal from the scene of four Achilles-substitutes: Agamemnon, Diomedes, Odysseus, and Aias, with only Odysseus in a positive light. The narrative formulas in book 12 also involve "graded repetition" in three waves of Trojan assault against the Greek camp: the "futile Asios," the "reflective" Sarpedon, and Hector "charged with emotion and deceived" by Zeus. Book 13 he describes as "offering little more than one exciting fight after the other," but still using the same careful organization.

In the *Nibelungenlied* Fenik studies the “techniques used to organize short stretches of narrative” and draws examples from throughout this poem and from other medieval epics plus Homer, with chapters on “symmetry” (“the orderly disposition of straightforward repeats”), “correlation” (association by formal repetition—e.g., women watching at windows at arrivals and departures), “ring composition” (which “condenses the narrative and imposes a subordinating order”), “prolepsis” (an event first sketched out in general terms then narrated at length—explaining narrative “breaks”), and “accumulation” (“purposeful repetition but without a fixed architecture”).

Fenik emphasizes the importance of studying the way these poets shape small scenes and integrate them into larger constellations because here their creative genius can be observed forcing our attention back to the texts themselves, to what Kitto would have called their *poiêsis*. Much can be learned from this book.

Wright State University  
CW 81.3 (1988)

CYNTHIA KING

Anne Carson. *Eros The Bittersweet: An Essay*. Princeton University Press, 1986. Pp. xii, 189. \$20.00.

Anne Carson’s book (or “essay” as she calls it) is about *erôs*, and how it figures in both sexuality and discourse. She shows that for the ancient Greeks the concept of *erôs* is only partially sensual and sexual since it becomes equally epistemological and generally philosophical. And it is in this latter sense that she reads it back into archaic Greek poetry and thought.

She demonstrates that Plato’s Socrates, the *erastês par excellence*, reclaims much of the primordial potency attributed to Eros by Hesiod. Love is simultaneously terrifying and pleasureable; it functions more like a verb than a noun and seems to mean “to reach for the sweet” as Aristotle put it or to reach for what “floats” as Carson suggests. Love is paradoxical; it marks the known from the unknown by marking the difference. It is itself unknown and marks its own presence by instilling a feeling of lack in the lover or the knower. Love helps us know ourselves by insisting on “the edges” of where we end and “the other” begins.

Carson convincingly shows that the advent of the alphabet and the production of texts may have presented a kind of refuge for the archaic poets who traditionally viewed *erôs* as “an assault from without.” In her scheme the alphabet is intrinsically erotic since it marks the edges of words (and things). But it also presents us with an inert text which is subject to abuse and misrepresentation by the illusion of control which seems natural to reading. “Exegesis mars and disrupts pure absorption in the narrative.” (p.90). It is, she suggests, analogous to the non-lover in Plato’s *Phaedrus* who wants to freeze his *erômenos* at the golden acme of beauty. I suspect that Carson here has much to tell classicists about the hazards of reading, especially in the age of computers and their implications of controlled texts.

True to her theory, Carson’s own text is delightful as well as instructive. Her chapters are short and suggestive while her themes are woven and re-woven in seductive intricacy. Like Sappho’s Aphrodite, her text is *doloplokos*. She has much to teach anyone who reads books. Like Socrates and unlike some of the modern theorists upon whom she occasionally relies, her insights are sensitive *and* clear. Like Socrates she teaches that wisdom cannot be fixed, and that *erôs* is, beyond all else, transpersonal. And finally,