In the scholarship on the corpus of the Homeric Hymns two of four long hymns (Aphr. and Dem.) have drawn more attention than the others surviving in the collection, but only the latter has been – until recently – fully explored in the form of an exhaustive, detailed line-by-line modern commentary on the complete text. In this respect Faulkner’s (hereafter ‘F.’) book fills in the gap in the scholarship on Aphr. inasmuch it provides a solid and meticulous large scale commentary on the entire text, attempting to explore as full a range as possible of issues which concern this hexameter piece.

F. has reworked and expanded his Oxford doctoral dissertation into a densely informative and serviceable treatment of the diversity of interpretative issues related to Aphr. The careful construction of the book should be stressed at the beginning of this review: the data collected in the ‘Introduction’, aimed at reaching some general conclusions situating the hymn in the context of epic environment, are discussed in more detail in the running commentary on the individual lines. This arrangement of the material profitably provides the readership with an ample overview of matters related to the text. The second part of the book does not duplicate information included in the first.

The ‘Introduction’ runs to over 55 pages. It starts with a short summary of the poem (1–3). Next follows the section ‘The Aineiadai and Interpretation of the Hymn’ (3–18): in considering how traditional literary themes, especially the theme of future offspring and that of mortal-divine sexual relationships, work alongside the concentrated attention given to Aeneas and his descendants in the hymn, F. offers a subtle attempt to combine the Aineiadai hypothesis with aetiological code of the text’s interpretation. The merit of fusing these two ways of perceiving of Aphr., usually treated by scholars as two opposed assessments, lies in drawing a credible picture of the rhapsodic poet skillfully manipulating the topoi by adjusting them to the demands of extra-discursive situation. A separate part of the ‘Introduction’ (18–22) surveys a number of mythical and literary motifs associated with the love goddess which match in both, the Hellenic and the near eastern, traditions. These pages of the book do not make an innovative contribution to our understanding of the Asiatic influence on early Greek epic, but a good case is made for summarizing current thinking and research on the issue.

A long discussion of the question of imitatio starts with the section ‘Overview of Language and Relationship to Early Poetry’ (23–42). Under eleven headings F. singles out examples of linguistic similarities between Aphr. and other early poetry. This part of the book displays the deep knowledge of the author and the discussion yields some new insights. Despite warnings and hesitations repeatedly expressed throughout all the subsections, F. claims, however, that Aphr. makes allusions to other poems on the level of specific words and phrases. F.’s desire to discover direct relationship between individual works (or at least through a lost common model) is puzzling, and his thinking of these poetic products in terms of interrelations between fixed texts is very difficult to sustain with reference to

oral culture. Generally speaking the question of archaic intertextuality (F. avoids this term using instead the word ‘imitation’) is a very difficult and vague topic. It would be risky to assume that some linguistic patterns recurring in various authors’ poems presuppose direct or exclusive link between them. Such analogies do not necessarily imply imitation and a close affinity may be the effect of poets’ operating in a common formulaic environment. F. remains strangely untroubled by this fact when he insists – in my opinion unconvincingly – on reading the archaic poetic production as consciously allusive (on a massive scale).

The concept of imitation remains of chief importance also in the section 'Impact on Later Literature' (50–52). F. registers the most – as he says (50) – remarkable cases of the appearance of clear echoes of Aphr. in Hellenistic and Imperial poetry. It is, however, disappointing that he restricts himself (here and in the commentary) to indicating allusions made on the level of specific words only and omits the cases in which the fertile interaction with Aphr. becomes the artistically constructive principle of literary rivalry. I would welcome the indication of passages whose relation to Aphr. is primarily marked by their ‘sensivity’ to a network of inspiring meanings, not by a merely mechanical repetition of words.

It would suffice to mention e.g. several instances of such intertextual transformation where Aphr. is the ‘matrix of possibilities’ against which later texts should be read. For example, Aphr. 31 – A. R. 1 716 (the conscious allusion to the phrase οὐκ εἰσίν οὐντο to stress the sexual exploitation of men by aggressive women1), Aphr. 7–20 – Nonn., D., 16. 147–150 (Nicaia’s speech addressed to Dionysos is a clear allusion to the mention in Aphr. of three virgin goddesses not conquered by love, with Nicaia’s striking substitution for Hestia in D.), or Aphr. 147–60 – Nonn., D., 16. 94–8 (‘a well-spread’ bed covered with skins of lions, prepared for Nicaia by Dionysos seems to have had a possible model for imitation in Aphr., and presuppose the god’s seductive intentions, although he submissively declares that he is willing to be the servant in her chamber).

In the edition of the text there are very few changes with regard to Càssola’s earlier edition. It is worth saying, however, that F.’s edition is based on the collation of MSS made by himself. None of these changes raise disagreement (except for some dubious minor propositions concerning punctuation marks, e.g. using the colon at the end of lines 148 and 152 instead of respectively a comma and a full stop). Also the sigla and the stemma codicum containing Aphr. correspond to those of Càssola. F. has rightly priviledged the readings or conjectures which are justified by the Ionian poets’ practice by the mid-seventh century. Therefore the πᾶσιν δ’ ἑργα is preferred to Hofmann’s conjecture πᾶσιν δὲ ἑργα (v. 6), the χρυσῆ to Barnes’ proposal χρυσή (v. 93), and West’s σέο to MSS reading σεῦ (v. 293). F. rightly proposes his own conjecture τεμένεα in v. 267 (convincingly explained on 290).

F.’s decision to keep in the apparatus – against the generally accepted editorial rule – the acute of an oxytone followed (in the hexameter line) by another word with accent of its own (e.g. v. 17, 114, 136, 164, 212, 283) is questionable. He is, however, inconsistent in this practice (cf. Ruhnke’s emendation mentioned in the apparatus, v. 173, and in the commentary, 239).

The very efficiently presented commentary (69–298) contains all needed to
give the reader a useful companion to the diverse body of issues concerning
texual exegesis and complex interpretation of Apbr. Although it provides a rich set
of information some additional remarks on individual points may be made.

So, for example: v. 4 (78): to examples of the noun ἁμαρτιά of sea animals Alexis, fr. 76. 2
K.-A. may be added (for ἁμαρτιά not suggesting any diminutive sense see also the title of
Crates’ comedy); v. 38–9; the fragrance as an attribute of Aphrodite’s cult finds its clear
manifestation in Sapph. 2. 3–4 Voigt: ὀλίγον τὴν ἀμαρτιὰν; although the adjective θωός
does not occur there, it is worth mentioning in the context of the sensuousness of
the atmosphere of the goddess’s ritual. Cf. also Pi., 122. 17: ἀματόν ... δόκησ τιμήτει with
reference to Aphrodite’s hierodoulia; - ‘of much gold’ (v. 1, πολυχρύσους): this adjective,
similarly to other determinative compounds containing the stem χρύσ-, as well as to the
χρύσος itself, may be treated as generally expressing splendour and excellence of all divine
belongings; for gold traditionally joined with Aphrodite see also Sapph. 1. 7–8 Voigt:
δόμον χρύσον. The epitet ‘gold’ is also applied to Aphrodite in Mimn., 1. 1 W., and in
epigrams (IG V 1.960 = v. 6 of ep. 318 GG Peek = GV 924 Peek; IG 14 1893 = 392. 4 GG
Peek = GV 1164. 4 Peek); - The sepulchral epigram CEG 124 quoted by F. (115) in the
comment on the expression ἀντὶ γάμου (v. 29) should be referred to also on 218 with the
explanatory note to the phrase ἄλοχος κεκλέσθη in line 148: κόρε κεκλεσθείμι (‘I will be
called girl’, not wife, because of premature death) illustrates the same type of phrasing
denoting women’s marital status; - v. 224 of Apbr: the idea of throwing out old age is
expressed in Greek not only by using the verb ἀποξύω, but also ἕκτω (see spectacular
examples, Ar. Pax, 336 τὸ γήρας ἔκτως and Call., fr. 1. 33–35 Pi.: ἤν γήρας ἐκδύσα ταύτης,
Ancr., 33 W.: πολύν ... γῆρας ἕκτως), for the same idea see also Simon., 22. 14 W.: Λευκάκης
φαρκίδος ἐκτὸς ἐλαίων (West’s emendation); - On 92 and 133 F. underlines the connection
of Aphrodite’s laughter with her trickery and boasting. In his commentary on v. 49 he fails
to mention that the ἡδω γελοιώσε ἀμφικτότης Ἀφροδίτη may express other emotional
attitudes (cf. Theo., Id., 1. 95–96 with the subtle analysis of this phrase presented by
George Crane in the article unnoticed by F.).

Some queries: I think there is little point in F.’s insisting (73) on the delicate
irony or even joke presupposing the mood of the core narrative of the hymn,
introduced by the phrase ἔργα Ἀφροδίτης in v. 1. The mood of Apbr. remains
traditionally solemn and unquestionably glorifying the goddess’s power till v.
45: the announcement of Zeus’ revenge makes Aphrodite – the master of ἔργα
(persona a.g.) the victim of ἔργα (persona pa.g.). Lines 1–44 are aimed at em-
phasing Aphrodite’s power, which is necessary to build a striking and unex-
pected contrast between the introductory part of Apbr., and its pars media. It
would also be profitable to note that a similar way of ‘lowering’ the solemn
mood of the first part of the hymn has been employed in Herm., where Apollo’s
mantic omnipotence is ridiculed in the descriptive part of the piece (the god is
not capable of using mantic skill for his own sake).²

2 This parallel has been indicated by J. Danielewicz, Morfologia hymnu antycznego, Poznañ 1976, 23.

The volume has been supplied with the general ‘Index’ and ‘Index locorum’ which makes the job of consulting the book very easy.

The ‘New Sappho’ (P. Köln 21351 + 21376, edd. M. Gronewald, R. Daniel, ZPE 147 (2004), 1–8 and ZPE 149 (2004), 1–4) is rashly referred to as Fr. 58 West 2005 (270, 341). As can be assumed from F.’s explanation on 270, West’s proposal of deciphering and supplementing the text (ZPE 151 (2005), 1–9) has been accepted by him; the means of indicating the ‘New Sappho’ by F. can, however, be misinterpreted: it seems to acknowledge West as the editor princeps of the papyri.

F.’s book maintains the high standards of volumes published in the series ‘Oxford Classical Monographs’. It will be an invaluable assistance to anyone interested not only in Aφρ., but also in the entire archaic corpus of hexameter poetry.

Poznań

Krystyna Bartol


The Antidosis [=Ant.] is a huge and complex speech and one of central importance for several reasons within the work of Isocrates [=Is.]. For this reason, in the wake of the renewed interest in Is. and after the publication of commentaries to four of his works in recent years,¹ the commentary on the Ant. by Yun Lee Too [=T.] – a scholar who devoted her PhD thesis to this author and has been working on him ever since² – came as good news.


The Ant. has had a complicated textual history. A complete text was rediscovered only at the beginning of the 19° century in four Mss.: the Vat. Urb. Gr. 111 (I) with its two close descendants (Vat. Gr. 936 [J] and Ambros. O 144 sup. [E]) and the Laur. plut. 87,14 (Θ). The remaining extant Mss. (the Vat. Gr. 65 [A] and 12 other Mss. ultimately deriving from it) all display a vast lacuna between § 72 and § 310, which affected nearly 3/4 of the text. The Ant. was therefore known in this shorter form for centuries, from when it was first printed in Milan in 1493, in the editio princeps of Is.’ works from a mutilated Ms. Only in 1811–1812, did a Greek scholar living in Italy, Andreas Mustoxidis, find Θ and E

¹ Busiris by N. Livingstone (Leiden 2001), Helena by S. Zajonz (Göttingen 2002), Panathenaeicus by P. Roth (München-Leipzig 2003), Evagoras by E. Alexiou (Thessaloniki 2005).