adornment’ and ‘Politics and warfare’, in chapters three and five, respectively, is also notable.

Each chapter begins with an introduction to the period, offering a brief historical outline in three pages. The rest of the chapter consists of museum artefacts, each presented with a photograph, information about chronology, material, size, what period it belongs to, origin and which museum currently holds it. An accompanying paragraph gives more information about the object, explains the relevance of the specific object for the theme, but also offers a historical, social or archaeological context for the artefact. Because the objects are of various sizes, a sense of scale is also conveyed in the picture, where a silhouette of the objects is depicted alongside a human hand or body, a clever touch. Some objects are accompanied by a slightly more extensive paragraph, often highlighting the relevance of a particular object in scholarly debates.

In this review I will not argue with the canon as chosen in this book, because every scholar will make his or her own choices. The objects chosen by Smith fit very well in the overall narrative, and though some are unavoidable because of their iconic status, he succeeds in including some more mundane objects in the book as well, giving glimpses into the material environment of non-elites. The objects are said to derive from ‘museum collections around the world’ (page 9), this is true, but there might be an imbalance. In fact, slightly over half of the objects presented in the book are kept in museums in Greece (especially in the National Archaeological Museum in Athens), a quarter derives from musea in the Anglo-Saxon world, whereas only 22 objects (11%) come from elsewhere. Especially French, German and Italian collections seem a bit underrepresented.

Because of the nature of the book, it is a rather ‘staccato’ read and more suitable for every now and then picking the book up and reading a few pages, rather than reading it from beginning to end in one go. Though the book starts with an introduction, the concluding chapter is not succeeded by an afterword, which might have been the right place to tie the various themes together, sketching the afterlife of the objects and giving a brief outline of further developments in Greek history. As it is now, the ending of the book is rather abrupt.

This brings me to the main question: who is the intended audience for this book? This is not mentioned in the book itself, and is not entirely clear either. On the one hand, the fact that a glossary is included at the end of the book seems to suggest an audience with only basic knowledge of the subject. The words included in this glossary, by the way, might have been highlighted in the text. On the other hand, the ease with which chronological terminology like ‘Neolithic’ and ‘Early Cycladic’ are mentioned, without giving these more specific dates or including these in the timescale in the beginning of the book, seems to be pointing to an intended readership with more detailed knowledge of Greek history. A similarly semi-advanced level of Greek topography is necessary for understanding the spatial setting of the objects, with place names mentioned in the text that do not occur on the map which is included in the beginning of the book. However, since the book does not include any references or suggestions for further reading, it is not really suitable for students. It is a book that will surely be enjoyed by anyone with an interest in Greek history or archaeology, which is important, especially in a time when valorization is increasingly important. In addition, it might also attract more people to visit museums, and moreover creates a referential framework for the museum visitor in which they can contextualize the objects on display.

This ‘world museum’ of ancient Greece in a book is a fun and engaging read. It shows how visiting a museum can be much more than strolling past vetrines filled with dusty Greek vases, and makes the objects tell history instead.

ANNA MEENS
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM
A.Meens@uva.nl


Can a firm line be drawn between man and beast? If so, on what grounds? And what distinguishing feature sets man apart from all other creatures? These questions, summarized in the so-called ‘question of the animal’, features prominently in philosophical debates throughout antiquity. In particular, Aristotle and the Stoics made the case for a strong dividing line that separates man from animal, invoking numerous human attributes – speech, reason, justice, morality, to name just a few – that are allegedly specific to man and man only (see in detail Sorabji)1.

1 Sorabji 1993.
The Stoic position proved particularly powerful. It had a distinct influence on early Judaism and Christianity and thus on modern attitudes towards the same question. Yet, to think that the ancient world propagated a hostile attitude towards non-human creatures would be privileging only one side of the ancient debate. In the ancient world, just as in the modern, the question of the animal was widely and controversially discussed.

**Human and Animal in Ancient Greece**, is part of a growing number of publications which have set out to illustrate that there were more voices sympathetic to animals in the ancient world than one may be inclined to think. To this end, several scholars have recently looked within and beyond philosophy to illustrate attitudes towards animals in Greek thought and literature which sought commonalities rather than differences between human and non-human creatures (most notably: Heath, Newmyer and Osborne2).

Korhonen and Ruonakoski contribute to the debate a study of empathy and encounter between man and beast in select pieces of Greek literature. The main focus is on archaic and classical texts, including Homer, Sophocles, and Aristophanes. However, the epigrams of the early Hellenistic poet Anyte are also considered. They do not aim at a comprehensive survey of human/animal relationships in these periods; rather, the overall goal is to illustrate the exemplary and representative.

The book is divided into four chapters/parts, as well as an introduction and conclusion. The introduction explains a number of key concepts that inform the subsequent chapters, including those of *empathēia* and ‘sympathy’. It also sets out the paradigmatic question that guides the enquiry throughout: ‘Do Greek writers show us things from the perspective of the non-human animal, or do they at least provide the reader with such descriptions of the animal’s behaviour that it is easy to empathise with the animal?’ (p. 3).

Part 1, ‘Reading Ancient Greek Literature through Phenomenology’ (pp. 8-41), is one of methodology, concepts, and approach. The authors set out the principles and practices of exploring empathy and encounter between man and beast in ancient Greek literature. The chapter includes a discussion of scholarly approaches to empathy (including those of the German philosophers Edmund Husserl (pp. 19-20) and Max Scheler (p. 22)) as well as definitions of anthropocentrism, anthropomorphism, and hybridism as further central terms. It is also in this chapter that another central concept of the book is introduced: that of ‘embodiment’. Korhonen and Ruonakoski envisage the human/animal encounter as a bodily one. It is their status as living, moving, sentient, embodied beings that animals share with humans and that makes them potential objects of human empathy (see in particular pp. 13-90).

Part 2, ‘Encounters with Animals in Greek Literature’ (pp. 42-72), explores the way in which animals feature in ancient Greek literature and, to a lesser extent, the material evidence. The authors start from discussions of ancient theories of representation, before they move on to examine some of the major genres of ancient Greek literature, principally tragedy, comedy, and poetry. They show that a major strand of ancient representational thinking encouraged lifelike representations, and suggest that such depictions of animals gave rise to feelings of empathy.

Part 3, ‘The Spectrum of Human-Animal Relationships in Greek Antiquity’ (pp. 73-105), surveys different kinds of ancient-world texts and contexts in which encounters and interactions between man and beast occurred. The chapter touches upon domestic animals, working animals, hunting, animal husbandry, as well as evidence for particularly intimate human/animal relationships and articulations of respect towards animals in the ancient evidence. Different modes of interaction feature here: from merely looking on, to directly addressing certain animals, to the imagined transformation of human bodies into animal bodies. Due to the rich source base presented here, this section is particularly successful in ‘opening up the complexity of the human-animal relationship, as reflected in Greek literature’ (p. 74).

Part 4, ‘Case Studies’ (pp. 106-86) is the longest section of the book. Specific subsections investigate in detail how animals feature in Homer’s *Iliad* (pp. 106-27), Sophocles’ *Philoctetes* (pp. 127-44), Aristophanes’ *Birds* (pp. 144-59), and in Anyte’s epigrams (pp. 159-84). It is in this section that the book offers sustained readings of ancient texts. Again, the focus here is on the nexus between empathy and encounter between non-human characters in the texts and the reader. Some aspects of the way in which animals feature in Greek literature discussed here, such as the extensive and much-studied animal similes of the *Iliad*, will already be familiar to most readers. Others, however, such as the vividness of Anyte’s goat epigrams will be new and interesting to many.

The fundamental thesis that informs the various sections of the book and ties its individual parts together is that literature can serve as a powerful
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medium to evoke empathy towards non-human creatures (see e.g. p. 6 ‘a literary text opens up not just one but several points of view on its world and reveals alien consciousnesses to us as if from the inside’). Throughout the study, the authors suggest that naturalistic and life-like representations of animals invite the reader to empathise with these creatures.

To this reader at least, the equation between life-like representations and the creation of empathy remains a bit too speculative to be convincing. This is not to say that Greek literature was not familiar with situations of a genuinely emphatic encounter between man and beast. The famous recognition scene between Odysseus and his old dog Argus in the Odyssey is certainly a powerful example. Yet, to extend this conception to lifelike representation of animals more widely, even in contexts when clearly human identities are at stake occasionally appeared a bit forced. I suspect it speaks more of the desire of the book’s authors to offer a perspective on animal different from the prevailing anthropocentrism than a larger move within classical literature to overcome the human/animal boundary.

Moreover, even if empathy was an (intended) aspect of lifelike animal representations, these representations ultimately remain a human projection. The genuine viewpoint or outlook of animals is not accessible to us. The authors themselves acknowledge this openly several times throughout the book, yet some passages seem to suggest otherwise. With regard to a poem by Bacchylides featuring an eagle, the authors argue that ‘the poet may invite the reader to partially immerse herself in the animal’s situation’ (p. 63). And about a poem by Anyte featuring a dolphin they state: ‘reading Anyte’s poem, the reader transcends the norm of human embodiment and approaches non-human embodiment, in this case dolphin embodiment and the dolphin’s effortless movement in the deep waters’ (p. 166). While both poems do indeed describe an animal’s bodily existence, this description is still a human imagining, a human projection of what it may feel like to be an eagle or dolphin. And, more likely than not, this projection is meant to reflect back on our own humanity.

Such observations, in turn raise the important question of the status of anthropocentrism as a point of view. The authors seem to suggest that it would be desirable to overcome it – hence the question, ‘can anthropocentrism ever be completely avoided?’ (p. 6). Given that the answer is probably ‘no’, we may wonder whether it would not be more productive to embrace it and to enquire into the role of empathy towards animals (and of non-human views about the world) within anthropocentric conceptions of the world, rather than as an alternative to them. Surely human empathy towards non-human creatures can only ever occur within the limits set for the human condition? There is ultimately no escape from anthropocentrism (of the purely heuristic, non-chauvinistic kind aptly defined on pp. 33-36), nor would such an escape be in any way desirable. Our humanity depends on it.

Exempting such disagreements, however, the book certainly has its place in the field. It is highly informative due to the broad source-base on which it is based and the kinds of questions it raises about the ancient world and our engagement with it. This research is important, because, it throws light on a central aspect of Greek definitions of humanity and the human which, in turn, mattered in a number of ancient world texts and contexts, including politics, gender relations, and ethnographic literature. At the same time, as the philosopher Richard Sorabji first pointed out, the ancient debate about the question of the animal also anticipates current views towards non-human creatures; many of the current positions on human/animal relations were first articulated in the ancient world. Korhonen and Ruonakoski’s study contributes to a broadening of perspectives on ancient attitudes towards animals.

The book is part of a growing number of books, articles, and conferences which seek to relate classical scholarship to the emerging field of human/animal studies. The book’s main achievement is to make the rich ancient sources on human/animal relations available to a larger audience. Particularly in part 2, there is much material that has so far not been considered in mainstream scholarly debates on the topic. The book is theoretically and conceptually informed, blending historical and literary perspectives in a way that will be of interest for a wide array of scholars and students working in different disciplines, including those of Classics, ancient history, literature, philosophy and human/animal studies as an emerging interdisciplinary field of research and debate.

Julia Kindt
Department of Classics and Ancient History
The University of Sydney
Julia.Kindt@sydney.edu.au
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1 Homer. The Odyssey 17.290-327 with Korhonen and Ruonakoski 2017: 59-60
2 See Kindt 2017.
In this relatively short essay, the author discusses the historical and religious background of the 4th c. BC Attic dedicatory offerings, their archaeological and artistic contexts, and their inscriptions. In particular she addresses the cult of Athena according to the epithets attested for the Goddess in that period (= Athena Ergane, i.e.) and the health deities, among whom are Asklepios and Aynos.

Francesca Giovagnorio’s light volume (less than 100 pages excluding indexes and references) is written in Italian, a thing which automatically precludes a good portion of scholars from carefully reading it. Given the length of the book, an English translation might have been arranged relatively quickly. Anyhow, a short English summary is offered at the beginning of the book, and one might be surprised to read the author referring to the volume as a ‘paper’. I would also say that, very likely, the syntax, the choice of words, and the entire structure of the summary did not undergo a native-speaker reviewing process, as it reads a little bit awkwardly in English.

As far as it is understandable in the preface (pp. 3-4) the volume directly derives from the author’s MA thesis, which has been completed at the Sapienza Università di Roma, under the supervision of Maria Letitia Lazzarini. The existence of a strong umbilical cord between the author and her supervisor is manifestly expressed in the very same preface. Giovagnorio’s volume is declared as the natural sequel to Lazzarini’s earlier work Le forme delle dediche votive nella Grecia arcaica, published in the Memoria dell’Accademia dei Lincei in 1976.1 This is a topic which has experienced renewed interest in recent years, such as books on private dedications like Theodora Jim’s Sharing with the Gods, which have emphasized the relevance of this particular medium in the framework of Greek society and its relation with the divine.2 And yet, Jim’s observation about the lack of details in private dedications and their uninformative character should be kept well in mind in order to properly approach the topic. In this sense, the analysis that the author offers of the private dedications is very fascinating in principle, as it aims to shed a new light on some cultic aspects that involved private citizens. The author also focuses on the archaeology of the sanctuaries involved, on the artistic features of the offerings, on the employment of specific formulae, and on the private dedicators themselves.

By private Giovagnorio primarily refers to dedications offered by individuals regardless of their own social or political status. These dedications were accomplished out of private citizens’ own money and they represented a clear expression of social religiosity, which is well manifested in the dedicatory evidence.

The focus on the morphological aspects of the figurative decorations as well as the analysis of the accompanying texts can be combined in order to investigate the dedicatory’s background, supplying necessary evidence to contextualize the archaeological and epigraphic datasets as well. Private dedications, as rightly observed by the author, are more common in local rather than Panhellenic sanctuaries, and they mostly refer to local and civic deities. This particularity does fit especially well in the chronological context of the book. Indeed, the 4th c. BC - and by extension the Hellenistic Age - saw the reinforcement of the role of individuals and private citizens in shaping religious constructions.

In regard to the volume’s structure, Giovagnorio’s volume is divided into three chapters, addressing respectively the typology of the dedications and their provenance, the formulas employed, and the particular formulas. There is a bizarre discrepancy between the sections, as Chapter 1 covers approximately 75 pages, whereas Chapters 2 and 3 are summarized in just eight pages.

Short archaeological notes are provided in order to contextualize the examined findings. Among
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1 Lazzarini 1976.
2 Jim 2014.