indici (di passi, di nomi e cose notevoli) che ne avrebbero agevolato la consultazione, e si avvale di una ricca ma a volte ipertrofica bibliografia, distribuita e spesso ripetuta, secondo criteri poco perspicui, tra il corpo delle note a piè pagina e il ‘Literatur- und Quellenverzeichnis’ (445–92).

Olimpia Impero


This is the all-you-want-to-know about Herinna book. The poetess, whose remaining verses were not previously deemed enough to justify a monograph, would now be pleased with not one but two separate monographs by the same author. Neri’s ‘Testimonianze e frammenti’ reviewed here, follows ‘Studi sulle testimonianze di Erinna’ published in 1996. Though the latter longer book recapitulates the conclusions of the former, they overlap only to a limited extent.

The Introduction considers Herinna’s fortune through the centuries and up to modern times, her life and literary output, genuine and spurious (5–114). Next comes an edition of, all in all, twenty one testimonies and seventeen fragments and epigrams (115–179). The bulk of the book consists of an exhaustive commentary on testimonies and fragments/epigrams (181–461). There follow three appendices: a thesaurus of conjectures with a papyrological commentary (463–517), a study of Herinna’s language (519–548) and metre (549–577). The volume concludes with a bibliography (579–640), various indexes (641–715) and with four clear, well presented photographs of PSI 1090.

The Introduction begins with Herinna’s adventurous ‘Nachleben’. The modern reader may be surprised at how lightheartedly impossible ascriptions to Herinna were attempted and how such adynata persisted through time, including a ‘Hymn to Rome’ by the obscure poetess Melinno (Spuria fr. 9 = SH 341), first proposed by C. Gesner in 1549, then enjoying acceptance until it was decisively refuted by Welcker and Gaisford at the beginning of the 19th century. Concerning her biography, the perception that Herinna actually came from Lesbos, allegedly relying on ancient authority, had an even more lasting and pervasive career. N(eri) 1996, 115 f. established the poetess’ name as having the aspirated form Herinna, and determined her date to be as early as 400 BC. He also established that Herinna’s real biographical data were quickly lost and her life was already by the 3rd cent. BC enshrouded by a mist of fiction. The distaff, the childhood-friend, the early death are «a romanzo biografico, di quelli che hanno fatto versare lacrime a pubblici di molte epoche» (47).

1 Il libro è ben stampato: pochi i refusi che ho notato nel greco (πόνηρος in luogo di πόνηρος [157 n. 135], Σύμναι in luogo di Σύμναι [203 e 204]; κεδέστης in luogo di κεδέστης [408 n. 116]).

It seems that there is deliberate application of Baucis’ fate in the poem to the ‘biography’ of the poetess and, with regard to her age, confusion between Herinna agens and Herinna auctrix. It is conceivable that such distortions originated in an early charge against Herinna similar to that which later Callimachus had to contest in the Aetia-prologue, fr. 1.5–6 ἐπος δ’ ἐπὶ τυπὸν ἐλίσσων / παῖς ἄτε, τὸν δ’ ἐπέων ὤ κτείς, οὐκ ὀλίγη. This would be perfectly possible around 400 BC and Antiophanes T 11 may partly echo such a charge. The praise by the neotrites such as Asclepiades T 4 may take up the accusation for a different purpose. The practice is common1 and N. 187 f. points out the hypothetical wording of Asclep. T 4.2 ὥς ἴν παρθηκών ἴνεναναικείτενς.

The question about Herinna’s patria is complex.

Stephanus Byzantius T 15 gives Τῆνος … ὀ πολέτης Τῆριος … ἄψ’ ό καί “Ἡρίννα Τηήνα ποιήσα in original wording as it would appear from the entry s.n. Θυάτείρα … τὸ ἐθνὸν Ὀὐστείρηγος … ἄψ’ ό Νικανόρος γραμματικὸς Ὀὐστείρηγος (FGrH 343 T 1). It is not clear whether he means the Laconian town (as Neri holds) or the Cycladic island.

In any case, the Doric elements of the origin. Baucis In any case, the Doric elements of the inscription on Telos and the early attributable testimonies all have a SE Aegean connection: ThnÝa ṭiwtåw ni …lfåtnw. This would be perfectly possible around 400 BC and Antiophanes T 11 may partly echo such a charge. The praise by the neotrites such as Asclepiades T 4 may take up the accusation for a different purpose. The practice is common1 and N. 187 f. points out the hypothetical wording of Asclep. T 4.2 ὥς ἴν παρθηκών ἴνεναναικείτενς.
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Some additional remarks on individual points may be made:

P. 8: Antipater of Thessalonica «lascia solo Erinna priva di un epiteto o di un’espansione elogiativa (T 10)», but cf. v. 3 on Praxilla and Moiro. Is this a ‘venomous reference’ at all? P. 52 n. 71: Herinna’s hoary hair (fr. 4.45–46) as an anticipation of her future image was first proposed by West 1977, 110. The verse is difficult to contextualise, but the natural reading is that, when she writes, Herinna is on the verge of old age. Possibly there is a contrast between young and old age in fr. 1.5–6 ἐπος δ’ ἐπὶ τυπὸν ἐλίσσων / παῖς ἄτε, τὸν δ’ ἐπέων ὤ κτείς, οὐκ ὀλίγη. This would be perfectly possible around 400 BC and Antiophanes T 11 may partly echo such a charge. The praise by the neotrites such as Asclepiades T 4 may take up the accusation for a different purpose. The practice is common1 and N. 187 f. points out the hypothetical wording of Asclep. T 4.2 ὥς ἴν παρθηκών ἴνεναναικείτενς.
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Old questions receive a far from frivolous treatment. An idea can be gleaned from the question of the authenticity, earlier accepted by Wilamowitz, of the three epigrams which Meleager knew as of Herinna.

Page, FGE, 155 considered them spurious on the grounds of three commonsensical but partly presumptuous or inaccurate arguments: a. two of the three epigrams draw their

1 The controversy over Antimachus can well illustrate the point: Callimachus’ rejection of Lyde (Epigr. fr. 398 P. = T 15a Mat.) employs, in parody, wording from Asclepiades’ praise (HE §2 = T 13 Mat.), then Antipater of Sidon’s praise (HE 66 = T 19 Mat.) distorts C. l. 172. 2. 132. Tisso- ni 2000, 134 traces the possible impact of Call. HyAp. 110–112 on Christodorus T 12. Another point of interest is the approach (cf. p. 55) of Anon. T 7.6 (Herinna) Μονοτέων λόπτως ἐξαποτεμένη with Archilochus IEG 1.
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4 Hesitant to endorse a Laconian origin is also I. C. Rutherford, ClQu n.s. 51, 2001, 376–377.
theme from the ‘Distaff’. It is unlikely that Herinna, in addition to the ‘Distaff’, composed two epigrams on the same theme, b. If Herinna lived in the mid-4th cent. ‘the writing of pseudo-epitaphs would be in advance of her time’, and c. the sophisticated style of these epigrams is redolent of a Hellenistic spirit. N. 8§ f. essentially draws the same conclusion, but on substantially different grounds: a. the Aeolic βάσσαις ἔσοι’, ‘Ἄιδη (fr. 2), cited as Herinna’s words by Leonidas of Tarentum T 6.4 can not come from the wholly Doric epigram 6.3 trading under Herinna’s name, b. two epitaphs on the same person by a single author are not surprising, but that they contradict each other in their description of Baucis’ tomb, c. the data in these epigrams reproduce the partially contradictory doxography on the life of Herinna; this suggests a Hellenistic falsification, such as those known for Homer, Anacreon, Sappho and others, and d. Suidas T 16a ἕποιησε δὲ ἐπιγράμματα recalls similar information on Sappho and Corinna, it looks like an addition of the compiler and is omitted by Eustathius T 16b who depends on Suidas.

In the edition of the testimonies there is no textual change with regard to N.’s earlier collection (1996). But the presentation is improved in many respects.

Take T 4 as an example. The long concordance of nine previous editions has been reduced to the AP and HE. The notes on metre have been removed. In v. 1 the conjecture Ἡρίνης is now attributed to Malzow, not Stadtmüller, in v. 3 the conjectures of Hecker and Bothe have reciprocally changed priority. In all cases the apparatus criticus have been condensed. This holds true for the epigrams too, where, e.g., the twelve lines long apparatus of epigr. 5 (N. 1996, 77–78) is now reduced to three and a half lines; what has been removed can be found in the thesaurus on pp. 471 f. Furthermore, in T 1d ‘(ὁ Γεωργιός) [Strabo XIII 3, 6]’ is now helpfully added, in T 10.9 στάσας/ now bears, as it should, an acute, not a grave accent (so now does ὀνομάτω/ in epigr. 6.7, but unfortunately ὀνομάτω/ on p. 208). Finally, in T 14b the Armenian version of Eusebius’ ‘Chronicle’ does not anymore appear in the original, to many incomprehensible, script but in Latin and German translations.

The edition of the fragments and epigrams poses a challenging task. Only two couplets were known (one being considered dubious) before Vitelli published PSI IX 1090, in 1928/29, preserving fifty four mutilated verses from the ‘Distaff’. Important progress was then achieved by the critical acumen of Paul Maas (‘Erinnae in Baucidem nenia’, Hermes 69, 1934, 206–209). Readers now use the authoritative edition of SH (fr. 401). N. improves on this tradition. He reserves much praise for the SH for clearing the field of many impossible or improbable emendations, but notes that the editors have failed to evaluate ‘important details’ (cf. pp. 68–71) such as the position of accents, prosodic symbols and a stichometric note at the left margin of fr. 4.51 indicating the 300th verse of the poem (which West 1977, 112 had noticed, although he was uncertain as to the exact figure). With his edition N. supersedes SH’s conservative text by verifying and adopting readings of Vitelli, Maas, Bowra or of his own. Other sensible, but less safe, supplements or restitutions of whole verses are recorded in the apparatus. In only thirteen verses, of the fifty four, is N.’s text identical with that of SH. Half of these verses are single-worded. It deviates from it, more or less, in the remaining forty one lines.

Of these deviations a representative selection would include: 2 [ὥσιον. [...], SH : (-)σοίονες Neri; 12 ἀνγ. ν SH : ἀνγ. ν Neri; 13 ἀσπίζεται SH : ἀπίζεται πεῖζεται(-) Neri; 15 ἀναάγαν μανομένη[ [...] σοφαρφ. [...], SH : λε]σούαν μανομένη(σοφαρφ) πεῖζεται θυ' [π]ισιον ν Neri; 18 ταύτη τάυτα ἤφαντα θαλάσσα ἡσύα γομή] SH : τα[ύτα τα ἤφαντα θαλάσσα βαίνει στονά]χεια μήποτε[ unis Neri but the new Sappho v. 15 τα <μέν> στενοχώδοι θιμέος (the text follows West, ZPE 151 [2005], 5)
would render θέμα στοιχείας conceivable; 29 init. άσσει [ SH : ]έσσει ήγηματι [ (_ ) ] SH : κράτα δέ ήπειροι [ ] Neri; 32 .] o SH : άπο Neri (sic: the photo shows Neri to be correct); 36 init. αµηρ . . [ ] de SH : αµηρ . , . [ SH : άμηρ έλλεις τέλος- Neri. It is to Neri's credit that he restores the Doric or Aeolic accentuations of τεύχος in 18, 19 and 42, of στοιχείας in 18, of Βασιλεία in 3, 48, 54, of βεβάλοι in 32 and of έσσειας in 39. In 19 fin., where West 1977, 124–125 had noted that the accent between the 2nd and 3rd letter implies a dipthong, N. secures 3]1 έρως ( .. . , γυνα SH, favouring -αις έρως) and attributes the reading to Diehl, not to Latte (SH). He quite sensibly publishes the emblematic βουςκον τον, 'Αιδών as fr. 2, for the first time after Hartung (1879) and, unlike SH [424], he integrates fr. 1 as a propemptic on the occasion of Baucis' wedding. In fr. 3, he keeps κατάφερε (Stob. cod. 1) for Bergk's καταφερε (SH). In the epigr. 6, 6 (= 2. 5 in N. 1996) έρως ζηθει πιστίκες he now relegates his own έρως στήν σπονω to the apparatus; in the next verse he now opts for Stadtmüller's τόνυδ' instead of Jensius' τόνυδ'. In 34, however, θυραντίσας απόδος was corrected by a second hand into θυραντίσας, which should, I think, be retained. Neither am I convinced that 16 should read αιτεί έχων instead of αιτεί έγι(ν) (West 1977, 98, SH) and that the former can mean 'mi blocco, mi fermo'. If this is partly generated by the intention of having Baucis, not Herinna, being caught and made a 'tortoise', a scenario portending her capture by Hades, this would rather look like a pettio principii. The photo shows that there is no reason to print a dot below 28 ένθε, and the publisher was not made to print dots for missing letters below the line.

C. M. Bowra," who first identified part of the action as the game of χελελελόνη, had considered the possibility of a ritual being described, but in the end concluded that there is not «any trace of religious rites». The greatest contribution of N.'s monograph is the reconstitution of a «rito di nibilità» (in fr. 4.8 N. reads ήτεληθή instead of ήτεληθ [SH]).

The moon, the puppets, the nocturnal game of χελελελόνη, the χορός αυλός, the morning of a feast with food preparation, the 'psychagogic' terror of Mormo, all point to a rite of passage involving play, music and dance, flowers, offering of hair, toys, puppets and baby-cloths, usually associated with a public festival and having the girls classified in συντευτία (Herinna is συντευτίας of Baucis in epigr. 5.7).

With such a rite Baucis enters an age of apprenticeship which will teach her how to meet the requirements of married life. But the passage from childhood to maidenhood works as a mirror for Baucis' future passage from life to death, an initiation into her άφως τάντας: the images described are replete with symbols of death. Herinna retraces, in the games and rites of their common infancy, the early intimations of Baucis' tragic death. This is the 'Leitmotiv' that defines N.'s commentary.

So, for example, the assonance of fr. 4.5–7 aims at rendering the atmosphere of the feast and is of ritual character (258–259). Φίλλος in 4.8 refers to flowers for the ritual, puppets (4 νύσσα, 21 δειγμάδια) function as links between the world of the living and that of the dead (241). The motif of Baucis' marriage to Hades is dominant in fr. 4 and culminates at the end of the fragment (which appears to be the end of the poem too), with direct addresses to Hymenaeus (4.51, 53), whom 'the last of hymns' seized at the first night of his wedding (Pind. Thren. fr. 128c M.). The interjected evocations of Baucis (18, 30, 47, 48, 14) are also seen as a parody of the wedding song (305–306). That part of the poem bears the features of a well-attested anti-genre, the funerary hymeneus.

1 C.M. Bowra, Problems in Greek Poetry, Oxford 1953, 154 f.
It is hard to resist this interpretation. The old perception that the poem describes with childish naivety scenes of every day life must be laid to rest once and for all. Along with the main line of interpretation N. clears the field on a number of individual points of uncertainty.

It would suffice to mention a couple of such instances. In fr. 4.29 Maas read ἱάποι ἐπὶ γυμνεύσει (._.) τ. [- but was discontented («sed γυμνεύσιν expectasse») because the participle should mean ‘during your infancy’, whereas N. 357 shows that the reference is to the moment in which Baucis concluded the age of her γυμνεύσεις. In 4.32 ἵνα μοι πονῆς ...[._.] ἱέκο ὁμώς ἰεπᾶλλον the meaning of ἰεπᾶλλον, after a flux of imaginative explanations (371–372) remained obscure, because little attention was paid to E. Reiner’s suggestion that young women of childbearing age, to avoid pollution, were legislatively prohibited from attending funerals.1 – A possible addition: in 4.18–19 the anaphora of ταύτα may be paralleled with the recollections of the young girl deserted by her lover in the so-called ‘Mädchenklage’ ending in ταύτα μ’ ἄδειει, ταύτα μ’ ὀδύνυ (1.17 Cunningham).2

A conjectural reconstruction of the poem appears in pp. 91–94. It is as precocious as it is attractive. But considering the available information, the reconstruction seems largely persuasive.

For example, the circumstances of Baucis’ death are, I think, convincingly reconstructed. The πλάσις in fr. 1, Baucis’ leap εἰς βῆς (θ)ν κόμμα (4.14) and her apparent εἰσβολη on the matrimonial bed (4.28–30) suggest that Baucis and her husband were lost together in a shipwreck, so that her father in law (σφηνοτριον), not her husband, had to light the funerary pyre (epigr. 6.6). Here the comparison (p. 99) with Parthenius’ ‘Epicedium for Timander’ (SH 626 = 27 Lightfoot), the friend of the poet lost in a shipwreck apparently just before or after his wedding, is particularly interesting.

Martin West in his 1978 comment on Hesiod ‘Works and Days’ 373 πυροτόλος referred to F. Martinazzoli, PP 15, 1960, 203–221 discussing the word, as he put it, ‘at Italian length’. N. leaves no stone unturned.

The bibliography alone is sixty pages long; it begins with Politian (1493) and Pocchus (1502) and ends in Magnelli’s Studi su Euforione (2002).3 The commentary on fr. 4 extends to almost two hundred pages. It is not just a papyrological and philological commentary in the traditional sense but, simultaneously, an exhaustive history of its editing and interpretation. Equally copious are the commentaries on the fragments which do not have the traditional sense but, simultaneously, an exhaustive history of its editing and interpretation. In the notes, long lists of references are accrued. The record is held by note 33 on page 43, providing no less than sixty four references; an average note, such as 65 on page 51, provides forty one.

Judgement on the length of a book is, I guess, a question of taste; but less so when length is aggravated by numerous repetitions.

West’s remark quoted on p. 86a appears again on p. 89. The note on T 4.2 (p. 187) is repeated almost verbatim on p. 53 n. 72. A comment on the epic prosody Χίδεις appears on

---


2 For the literary awareness of this monody see P. Bing, ‘The Alexandrian Erotic Fragment’ or ‘Mädchen Klage’ in K. Vandorpe, The Bilingual Family Archive of Dryton, his Wife Apollonia and Their Daughter Senmouthis, Brussels 2002, 184.

3 And yet one misses Tissoni 2000.
pp. 188; 193; 229 and is referred to on pp. 230; 432; 435. Bion Epit. Adon. 87–90 is cited on p. 427, then again on p. 437 for the same purpose. The procedures of the rites described in fr. 4 are repeated several times (e.g. on fr. 4.5 and on p. 333). P. 327 n. 378 on the orthography of ἰγριθόν is redundant in view of the fine explanation produced on p. 335. On p. 41 the possibility of Herinna hailing from Laconian Tenos «resta ... aperta» (cf. Neri 1996, 127), but Laconian origin seems to be presupposed on pp. 49 and 52. – Misprints do not disturb reading, even if on p. 347 four occur in a single quotation of Od. 12.86–92, and on p. 384 another two in the quotation of a single Euripidean verse (IA 187). Other minor typos would include p. 70 «corresponded», 199 «Lys. 2.179» for '2.79' (print dots between ὁμόγενες and μυθήμα), 258 «simmetrical», 373 2nd par. «ἀν» for 'ἀν' (correct on p. 374), 402 3rd line «v. 35» for 'v. 36', 421 «ἄνω» for 'ἄνω'.

But it is only fair to say that such cases are not representative of the quality of the production.

All loss of classical literature is regrettable, but the loss of Herinna’s ‘poème noire’ is to be particularly regretted. At least we now have an edition of her surviving work daring enough to tell us, often credibly, what the missing parts could contain. The book is the outcome of long, profound reflection on Herinna’s personality and her celebrated poem. It will no doubt become the standard reference work on its subject.

Rethymno

Konstantinos Spanoudakis


With the exception of the ‘Oath’, the work entitled ‘On the Sacred Disease’ is probably the best known among the so-called ‘Hippocratic’ writings. Its (anonymous) author, writing presumably around 430 BCE, criticises ‘magical’ concepts and treatments of epilepsy and advances his own medical account of the nature, cause and development of the disease, its curability and its ‘divine’ aspect. The work is of great interest both for the information it provides about magical and religious beliefs and healing practices in the Greek world, and for the author’s own ideas about (hereditary) disease, the workings and failings of the body, the influence at environmental factors, and especially the role of the brain in providing intelligence and consciousness to the rest of the body. In these respects, it shows similarities with the views of other Greek medical and philosophical writers such as Alcmaeon of Croton and Diogenes of Apollonia. It is written in an attractive and rhetorically elaborate style, and thus provides a powerful testimony to the argumentative and competitive nature of classical Greek medicine.

It is therefore warmly to be welcomed that this work has now been treated for inclusion in the Collection des Universités de France by one of the world’s most distinguished Hippocratic exegetes. Jacques Jouanna’s editions of Hippocratic texts in the Budé-series have been widely acclaimed for their very high standards of textual scholarship, and the present work lives up to the expectations raised by these earlier publications. It provides a meticulous account and a judicious