
In recent years a greater volume of solid work on the early Greek iambic, elegiac, and melic poets has been coming from Italy than from anywhere else. It has concentrated on interpretation with the help of parallels and on study of the indirect tradition, with particular attention to Hesychius. The present book is a worthy product of this tradition. It began as an edition, with substantial commentary, of the major specimens of the Ionian iambographers’ Epodes preserved on papyrus: the Strasbourg Epodes first published in 1899, now commonly ascribed to Hipponax, and the Cologne Epodes of Archilochus published in 1974.1 The appearance in 2005 of what may be called Archilochus’ Telephos elegy prompted N. to incorporate that too.

N. has worked with great industry. The great virtues of the work are the full surveys of previous scholarship on these texts and the quantity of illustrative material gathered into the commentaries. Their amplitude may be gauged from the number of pages they occupy: 84 on the Strasbourg Epodes, 100 on the Cologne Archilochus, 237 on the new elegy. Each of the three sections begins with some introductory pages, a text with extensive apparatus, and translations. Before all this there are two pages headed ‘Grammatica’ and ‘Metrica’, incompletely listing some dialectal and prosodic phenomena. The volume is completed by a Librorum conspectus (43 pp.), Index locorum, Index verborum, Tabulae comparationis, and a good colour photograph of the Strasbourg fragments.

The commentaries are richer than any previous ones on these texts. On the other hand it must be said that some of the amplitude is achieved by repetition of material, some over-generosity in the length of quotations, over-diligent reporting and discussion of superseded or simply bad readings and supplements or of far-fetched interpretations, and a tendency to include blocks of irrelevant matter. N. clearly had the ambition to make her book appear substantial. Where all that we have of a verse is /G5D/G61 at line-end, it is simply a waste of paper to comment /GAB l’unica traccia di lettera superstite sembra concludere il verso, a meno che non si supponga una caduta d’inchiostro nel vacuo sussegente (331).

These are papyrus texts, and their accurate reading has demanded papyrological skills of their editors. Although in her apparatus to the Archilochus papyri she writes «ipsa vidi», N. has nothing to contribute in this department. A certain incomprehension is suggested by her comment on Archil. fr. 196, 29, where the papyrus has xo%g%guK. Merkelbach and I proposed o0 x[af+t]e0n g0o, while Ebert and Luppe declared that ‘wahrscheinlicher ist wohl ou%co’; N. writes ‘ma, come hanno osservato Ebert–Luppe 1975, 229, nel papiro si legge ou%v e non o0 x[af+t]’ (216). In discussing the end of line 26 she cites my restoration in ZPE 26 (1977) 47f but disregards the exact description of the traces that I gave there. She

---

1 It would not have been inappropriate to include the remains of a further Hipponactean Epode preserved in a commentary, P. Oxy. 2176 = Hippon. fr. 118 West/129–131 Degani. On this we have S. R. Slings’s commentary in J. M. Bremer, A. Maria van Erp Taalman Kip, and S. R. S., Some Recently Found Greek Poems (Mnemosyne Suppl. 99, Leiden 1987), 70–94.

2 Contrast the more concise commentary of S. R. Slings (as in n. 1), 24–69.
speaks of a reading in the Hipponax as having been «autorevolmente confermata» by J. Schwartz (123); a papyrologist’s readings may be right or wrong, but they are not to be advocated on the grounds of his or her authority.

N. takes it for granted that the Iliad and Odyssey existed before Archilochus and are often the source of his diction. She is too ready to argue as if what remains of early Greek verse were a complete record of Greek poetry and speech at that period. If Archilochus uses διπλοὶ to mean ‘duplicitious’, we should assume that his hearers were familiar with the usage, not that it «sarà un’innovazione, dovuta forse al nostro autore» (224). Again, she considers it possible that Hipponax’s phrase δούλων Ἰστών ἑδον is newly coined and the model for similar expressions in later authors (61). It surely belonged to the popular language, deriving probably from Semitic idiom.1

In her introduction to the Strasbourg fragments N. reviews scholarly opinions and arguments on their authorship, rightly siding with the modern consensus that they are Hipponax. From her comments on the first one I can illustrate what I have said about excessive amplitude. The self-explanatory γυμνών in line 5 is given three pages of long-winded discussion (48–51). The inapposite quotation of [Archil.] 329 triggers a page of irrelevant discussion of it (58). On line 15 we get a long excursion on oaths, not one that advances the subject (87–90).

Points of detail: the Thracian Sea in ll. 23,230 is surely the north Aegean, not the Black Sea (47). There is no hint of a river in the shipwreck scene, and therefore no significant link with Od. 5,44ff (ibid.). Archil. 93.6 speaks of gifts to, not from Thracians (51). In line 10 I believe that the papyrus, which I examined in 1969, has ἐπίστοι in any case ἐπίστοι, in any case not be scanned as a trisyllable. In 13 the lengthening by initial rho does not signify «l’implicita presenza … del digamma» (77) any more than it does in Aristophanes.

Lines 17–19 of the same fragment contain the exiguous remnants of the opening of another Epode, fr. 116 W./196 D. N.’s suggestion of κόπτειν μην is attractive (102, comparing Ar. Eq. 1139, Nub. 170, 478, Pax 617, etc.), but the next word will not have been κλέφος or κλέφτος, or there will be no caesura. I suspect that it was something like κόπτειν μην κλέφων Δημοκριτίδας or κλέφτοιν Ἐμυλονοκτίδης. The double accentuation in the papyrus (κόπτειν)6 betokens hesitation as to whether it was imperative or indicative.

In fr. 117 W./196 D., line 4, perhaps ταύτης δ’ ἠπώνειν ἐπ θνων ὡς ὠν. In ἐφ᾽ ὧν μέναι εἴτε[ε]ν ἠμφωτίτης νῶσ εἴδο N. sees an inversion of the typical μακαρισμος of those who have seen (the Mysteries); she should have cited Hymn. Dem. 48ε with Richardson’s note.

Below the texts of both the Hipponactean and Archilochian Epodes N. prints a number of entries from Hesychius as if they were testimonia. Some of them clearly are, but others are equally clearly not. In the commentary on the Archilochus we again find some unconvincing proposals to see direct affiliations with other texts, as with the Iliad (210), the Odyssey (183, 259), Anacreon (258), or
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1 In the ninth- or eighth-century Babylonian poem Erra and Isum, I 49, the Seven Demons, trying to rouse the war-god to his duty, ask him ἵ πά λα αἶδι σείρα νικκάλα ακάλ σίμνις? ‘Like one who does not go to the plain, are we to eat woman’s bread?’, i.e. lead a womanish, stay-at-home life. In the Hebrew Bible we meet analogous expressions such as ʾok lēl ʾlehem hāʾāḥāhōm ‘eating the bread of toil’ (Ps. 127.2), kā lehem ʾomāni lāhem ‘the bread of sorrows (shall be their) bread’ (Hos. 9.4), lehem lāhās ‘the bread of oppression’ (1 Kings 22.27), etc. – Oriental material collected in my book The East Face of Helicon might have been cited in connection with ἐμῳμου (18ε: EFH 41) and γῆ ἐφάρμοσα (187: EFH 161f).
Aristophanes (166: Eccl. 952–973 printed out in full). The collection of illustrative material is valuable, but needs to be treated with discrimination.

Linguistic analysis is not always accurate: ἐν ἠμετέρων is not adequately explained with «la preposizione è qui costruita con genitivo di pertinenza e dativo sottinteso» (174); μην is not «la forma anaforica del pronome demostrativo» (179); ήδεος ἐκφωνεῖν does not express «un giudizio sulle doti morali della giovane» (159); the absence of augment in ἑκτιπέρφερε, being paralleled in ‘normal’ Sappho and in Herodotus, cannot be put down as an epicism (182); in τὸ δὴ τῶν γνώθι, the demonstrative cannot refer to the following imperative ἐξέτασθε, which cannot be an object of knowledge (207); τηρεθήκειν cannot be formed from a nominative in -άντις (232). On pp. 262f there seems to be confusion between ἀράα and δρέα. Metre: in considering supplements in the iambic dimeters account must be taken of Porson’s Law.¹

For the Telephos elegy N. was able to take account of scholarship up to ZPE 156 (2006); one must now note the contributions of W. B. Henry in ZPE 157 and H. Bernsdorff in ZPE 158. N. again betrays some lack of judgment.

In line 4 the problem of ἐπιγυν αἰτεῖν receives no light from the two passages quoted where the participle αἰτεῖν is combined with a perfective compound (ἐξαφανίζεται, προφερείσθαι). The suggestions that ὀδέλεψισ in 14 is not qualified by ὅθεν but means «celebri fratelli come Agamennone e Menelao» (310), and that ἁλεμφάνετες in 16 might contain an anticipatory allusion to Telephos’ later fate (312 n. 43), are alike absurd. At 22, in support of the reading ἤττερον, it would be appropriate to quote Il. 22.203 ἤττερ’ Ἀττιλαυν (Apollo comes to the support of Hector).

Obbink’s suggestion that the minor fragments of the papyrus contained reference to shipwreck rests on so frail a basis that it hardly justifies N.’s filling out two pages (324–6) with the other Archilochean fragments and testimonia relating to that theme.

The Pasiphae epigram, Archil. fr. spur. 331, is several times cited as if it were Archilochean (146, 183, 225, al.). As I have pointed out three times since 1975, the ascription is not only indefensible but must be a corruption in the manuscripts of Athenaeus, who says that the verses referred to the fourth-century hetaira Plangon.

The book does not contain much in the way of new insights on these texts, but scholars dealing with them in future will find it an indispensable resource. It is in general accurately printed. One misprint that may perplex is ‘run around’ for ‘run aground’ on p. 81.

Oxford

Martin L. West


Christopher Rowe (R.), dem wir neben einer Reihe wichtiger Aufsätze zu Platon mehrere Kommentare zu Platonischen Dialogen verdanken,² möchte mit seinem neuen Buch die vor allem in der angelsächsischen Platonliteratur verbreitete Vorstellung korrigieren, Platon habe sich nach einer sokratischen Phase in den Frühdialogen zu einem metaphysisch ausgerichteten Philosophen entwickelt, eben zu

---

¹ See Slings (as in p. 385 n. 1), 57.