defend his prerogatives and protected by the privilege of foundation, the archimandrite appealed to Frederick II, heir of Roger I as a secular guarantor authority. The papal letters testify to an unresolved, and therefore reiterated, controversy that the current examination of the marginal notes not only confirms but also illustrates more closely. Drafted by a 13th-century hand, they reveal how the attempt to reach a solution favourable to the archimandritate was the concern of someone who, for this purpose, cites and annotates relevant passages of canon legislation. This means that even when recourse to the law appears vain because it is obsolete, the antiquity and the authority of the source provide legitimacy to conduct: the imperial mode gives way to the paideutical mode.

The three appendices constitute perhaps the most important part of the entire volume. They consist of a review of the 'Italian' nomocanons, with displays of stemmatic filiation or groupings, built on the basis of palaeographic attributions. Although there are no significant innovations with respect to the attributions already proposed by Italian scholars who have dealt with Italo-Greek manuscripts, it is necessary to underline the usefulness of these appendices. They have the merit of taking stock of both the manuscripts of uncertain attribution and those that are certainly not Italo-Greek.

The conclusion of the book, accessible for a public not necessarily expert in the cultural history of Byzantine and post-Byzantine southern Italy, can be summed up as an example of the juridical pluralism that characterised the central centuries of the Middle Ages in southern Italy, Italo-Greek manuscripts of the nomocanons, unlike other 'products' of Byzantine culture, show no sign of hybridism, no Latin influence, no trace of multiculturalism. Observing Byzantine canon law, even though it was obsolete, was a sign of genuine belonging to Orthodox Greekness, and it represented a form of resistance to the increasing Latinisation of Greek-speaking communities.

Cristina Rognoni
Università degli Studi di Palermo
Email: cristina.rognoni@unipa.it

MYERS (T.) **Homer's Divine Audience: The *Iliad*'s Reception on Mount Olympus**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019. Pp. xiii + 231, illus. £63. 9780198842354.
doi:10.1017/S0075426923000216

Tobias Myers' *Homer's Divine Audience: The* Iliad*'s Reception on Mount Olympus* masterfully presents the complexities of viewing in the *Iliad*. The 'divine audience' of the title refers both to the gods, who become audience-like in the poem, and to the mortal listeners of the poem, who become godlike in their vicarious viewing. Myers offers a compelling new account of the gods' role in the *Iliad* by delineating their 'metaperformative' function (2), through which the poem's live audience faces ethical quandaries about enjoying the spectacle of death. Where previous scholarship explored divine viewing in terms of fate, mortality and immortality, or the dramatic effects of delay and foreshadowing, Myers' book opens a new horizon. As his discerning analysis of these scenes demonstrates, the poet continuously aligns gods and audience throughout the *Iliad*, an alignment which subtly alters and complicates our sympathies as 'viewers' of the poem's events.

After an engaging introduction ('With what eyes …?'), which deals lucidly with previous scholarship, Chapter 1, 'Zeus, the poet, and vision', turns to how the poem presents itself as performance. The *Iliad*'s proem sets its audience on a path of viewing, shaped by *enargeia* and poetic self-consciousness (that is, how it emphasizes its ability

to compel viewing). Myers cuts through vexed questions of the proem's significance with his 'metaperformative' reading: the mini-narrative of *Il.* 1.2–5 sets us on a path whereby Zeus and the poet 'staging' and 'direction' the *Iliad*'s action, death on the battlefield (*cf.* 65), thereby drawing the audience into twofold reactions of 'emotional response and viewer complicity' (60).

Chapter 2, 'The duel and the *daïs*: Iliadic warfare as spectacle', elucidates two paradigms of viewership: the divine viewing from the *daïs* (banquet), which involves collective entertainment, and that of the duel, in which viewers are implicated and partisan to what they observe. Book 4's opening scene forms a key text: Zeus's conversation with Athena and Hera about ending the war takes place at a banquet, suggesting aloofness, yet we are drawn into the goddesses' partisan engagement when Zeus challenges their desire to ensure (and enjoy) Troy's sack, the very story we have set out to 'view' as the *Iliad*'s audience.

Chapter 3, '"Let us cease": early reflections on the spectacle's end', develops the idea of audience engagement through the duel of Book 7. Myers discerns how Athena and Apollo's presence *on* the battlefield during this duel brings the duel-and-*daïs* paradigm into greater tension: on the one hand, the two gods together take pleasure in the entire spectacle (*Il.* 7.60); and yet their partisan responses to the fighting set the audience up to experience various types of engagement: desire for Achaean victory, and pity for the doomed Trojans.

Chapter 4, '"Many contests of the Trojans and Achaeans": the *Iliad*'s battle books', ramps up the tensions of these viewing models over the next three days of battle (books 8, 11–18 and 19–22). Zeus (and the poet) position the audience in a challenging liminal space: participative watching (duel paradigm) in tension with our desire for the known outcome (*daïs* paradigm). Additionally, in scenes like the extended fighting over Sarpedon's or Patroklos' corpse, battle narrative blends with funeral rites: a third paradigm of viewing, which entails honouring the dead from a communal viewpoint. Zeus stages these great contests over his son and over his son's killer to maximize the spectacle and thereby honour the dead. In such 'funeral rite' spectacles, the audience finds itself aligned with the community honouring each dead warrior, further complicating their position as viewers of the war.

The last chapter is my favourite. Chapter 5, '"A man having died": watching Achilles and Hector', shows how the poet's nuanced configuration of gods as audience affects our evaluations of Hector and Achilles. The chase in Book 22 is a duel (Achilles and Hector) and also an athletic contest, as if at a funeral, with a common audience. Myers offers a nuanced interpretation of the critique embedded in the chase scene: they run *not* like men in a foot race for prizes, since they run for the life of Hector. The audience is subtly invited to question our enjoyment of this dramatic contest, fought for a man's life, not a prize. The shift to Zeus capitalizes on audience excitement: Zeus ponders whether it is the right time to kill Hector, and the audience shares his pity for Hector and, uncomfortably, recognizes its complicity in wanting the story's necessary end. The story of Troy's fall is a spectacle, with attendant pleasure and pity. Led by Zeus's stage directions, we watch the contest, engaged, removed, horrified, entertained, and ponder the ethics of our viewing.

Homer's Divine Audience reads beautifully, with clear prose and persuasive arguments. Each section brings a new bit of interpretive light. Every Homerist, scholar or person with interests in performance studies, divine-human interaction or the ethics of war poetry must read this book.

Emily Austin
The University of Chicago
Email: eaustin1@uchicago.edu

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426923000216 Published online by Cambridge University Press