birth/nature (φύσι)' replaces the commonly read 'Thracian dogs (κυσί)'. In a 2003 article ('Archilochos fighting in Thasos: *frr*. 93a + 94 from the Sosthenes inscription', *Hellenica* 53 (2003) 235–55, at 241), Kyriakos Tsantsanoglou defended the new reading, which seems to have originated with him. Swift cites him and another scholar for their agreement that the first letter is more likely φ than κ, but in an uncharacteristic slip, she neglects to attribute the whole word φύσι. In her discussion of the *crux* in *fr*. 130.1, she misunderstands Anastasios Nikitas' reply to West's objection to the emendation τοῖς θεοῖσι ῥεῖα πάντα. Assuming that initial rho closes the preceding syllable, West (*Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin 1974, 132) notes that the proposed first metron violates the prohibition against word break after (…) ⏑ – – (except at the caesura or unless the last *longum* is a proclitic monosyllable). Nikitas ('Ἀρχιλόχου ἀπ. 58 D. (= 130 W.)', *Archaiognosia* 1 (1980) 237–60, at 241–46) counters with archaic examples of open syllables before initial rho, but, after making the separate objection that ῥεῖα πάντα in the *second* metron yields a pattern (–⏑|–⏑|) generally avoided by early elegists and attested elsewhere in Archilochus only at *fr*. 115.2, he prefers ῥεῖ' ἅπαντα. Swift was perhaps misled by Thomas Gärtner ('Kritische Überlegungen zu den Fragmenten des Archilochos', *Hermes* 136 (2008) 1–14, at 10–12), whose misunderstanding of the metrical situation she repeats while tacitly correcting the report of Nikitas' proposed solution. She may nevertheless dismiss Gärtner's own conjecture (τοῖς θεοῖς εἴκει τὰ πάντα) too lightly, as there are much better parallels for εἴκει (for example, in Sophocles) than Gärtner himself provides.

Observations like these may give a small taste of the technical scholarship an editor of Archilochus has to confront; they certainly do very little to detract from Swift's achievement. Swift maintains throughout an acute, well-informed sense of the big picture while dealing with such technicalities as arise, and thus we are able to benefit from her considerable flair for literary and historical interpretation.

JOHN GIBERT
University of Colorado Boulder
john.gibert@colorado.edu

LOSCALZO (D.) **Saffo, la hetaira** (Syncrisis 4). Pisa: Fabrizio Serra editore, 2019. Pp. 167. €64. 9788833150130.
doi:10.1017/S0075426921000173

Donato Loscalzo's monograph proposes that Sappho's afterlife, which includes current research on gender and sexuality, blurs our appreciation of the original context of the poet. Loscalzo therefore argues that Sappho's context needs to be reconstructed afresh, and the present book aims to offer such a reconstruction. It thus contributes to the body of research on the so-called 'Sapphic question'. This research speculates on the original performance context of Sappho's fragments, for which there is little evidence. At the heart of this research there arguably also lies another question: how could a woman end up as one of the most famous poets of antiquity? Loscalzo's answer: because she was a *hetaira* (60, 139).

The book consists of five chapters, an introduction and 'conclusions'. In the first chapter, which is entitled (in my English translation of the Italian) 'Saving Sappho?', Loscalzo presents examples of Sappho's reception history. The next three chapters attempt to reconstruct Sappho's world: 'The house of the servants of the Muses' considers where Sappho had her 'atelier'; 'The *hetairai*' asks who were Sappho and her students; and 'Sappho, teacher of love and Eros, weaver of stories' draws on relevant philosophy and literature. The final chapter, 'The cults', focuses on deities and religious practices relevant to Sappho's fragments. As Loscalzo claims, these were destined for internal use amongst Sappho's *hetairai*, as well as on public occasions.

It is not clear what level of erudition readers are expected to possess. At one point, Loscalzo explains that it may seem 'illogical', in our day and age, that love could be a subject of 'dissection and education', thus assuming that the readership is unfamiliar with, for example, Ovid's *Ars amatoria* (89), which a classical philologist would normally know. At the same time, Loscalzo leaves most quotations in Greek untranslated, which presupposes an expert audience.

Moreover, given the fact that the fame of Sappho, which remains worldwide today, rests on her being *not* a 'courtesan', the regular translation of the word *hetaira* in scholarship, but a 'poet', Loscalzo's claim seems contentious indeed. In order to bolster his stance further, Loscalzo could arguably have made more of his reference to Athenaeus, whose transmitted text referring to Nymphodorus' *Voyage on the Coast of Asia* actually does not include ποητρίας ὁμώνυμος ('namesake of the poetess'), which is a post-classical supplement. In the transmitted text, the words *hetaira* and 'Sappho' are thus juxtaposed.

The most acute question remains what we gain from juxtaposing these two words, which is what Loscalzo has done in the title of his book. For what does *hetaira* mean? Alternative translations range from 'erotic/non-erotic companion', via 'courtesan/escort', to 'prostitute', as is discussed by Loscalzo. The significance of the word *hetaira* is especially critical as Sappho uses it to refer to her companions in her own poetry (*cf. frr*. 126, 160 Voigt), which calls for a comparison with the *hetaireia* ('companionship') associated with

Sappho's contemporaneous compatriot Alcaeus, as already explored by S. Caciagli in *Poeti e società: comunicazione poetica e formazioni sociali nella Lesbo del VII/VI secolo a.C.* (Amsterdam 2011; scarcely referred to by Loscalzo: see, for example, 102 n.3) and *L'eteria greca arcaica e classica* (Bologna 2018; not referred to by Loscalzo).

To some degree, Loscalzo rehabilitates the term *hetaira* and clearly does not intend for it to have a derogatory meaning. However, in Loscalzo's reconstruction, some evocation of (potential) prostitution nevertheless seems to remain, even in the archaic sense of the word, which is that which applies to Sappho's original context. For Loscalzo presents Sappho quite consistently as an instructor in both marital and non-marital seduction, apparently achieved through artistic accomplishments in poetry, music and dance. Indeed, so famous was Sappho in this regard, Loscalzo claims, that from all over Greece young female students who aspired to acquire such seductive and artistic skills would gather 'in the house of the servants of the Muses' of Sappho. And within the group they thus formed, in which Sappho was their natural leader, a dynamic arose that was so strongly affectionate that it created, allegedly, all the powerful emotions of love, anxiety, delight in beauty and fear of abandonment that we know and appreciate in Sappho's poetry.

According to Loscalzo, his reappreciation of Sappho the *hetaira*, liberated from the influence of the poet's *Nachleben*, renders her as a more coherent figure with the surviving poems. As long as we have only fragments of these texts and Loscalzo largely dismisses the reception of her figure as irrelevant, some explanation of the theoretical groundings of this alleged match between his image of the *hetaira* and Sappho's poetry, and the gains to be derived from it, remains, at least to this reader, a *desideratum*.

THEA S. THORSEN
The Norwegian University of Science and Technology
thea.selliaas.thorsen@ntnu.no

RUTHERFORD (I.) (ed.) **Oxford Readings in Greek Lyric Poetry**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019. Pp. xi + 479. £100. 9780199216192.

doi:10.1017/S0075426921000185

This volume is an admirable attempt to bring back Greek lyric to the forefront, for both scholars and students of classics. The collection includes seminal papers on important themes ranging from offerings dating to the 1970s to contemporary contributions by eminent scholars in the field. However, Pindar and Bacchylides are excluded because, as the editor notes, a separate volume will be devoted to them in the future. Rutherford has divided the volume into two parts: (1) general themes and (2) individual poets. This structure offers an attractive balance for the reader and makes the work a good starting point for anyone interested in Greek lyric.

The introduction attempts to clarify some of the most controversial issues regarding Greek lyric. This is a difficult but important task, and the result helps the reader navigate better the ocean of different interpretations and approaches to a genre that, admittedly, can be quite intimidating for the uninitiated for several reasons: the unfamiliar terminology regarding the different modes of song (monody, choral, citharodic among others); the problem of classification of the extant fragments as well as the issues arising from the very fragmentary nature of the poems; and the often significant absence of reliable context. Rutherford, understandably, does not attempt to solve these problems, but highlights them for the benefit of the reader, making the introduction informative and well placed.

The first part on general themes comprises seven papers by Claude Calame, Malcolm Davies, Wolfgang Rösler, Gregory Nagy, Ewen Bowie, Simon Slings and Andrew Ford. These cover a broad array of themes, mainly focused on questions of genre and context (chapters 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7) but also the important issue of the so-called lyric 'I' (chapter 3), the subjectivity and personal nature of lyric poetry as opposed to the more objective/collective approach of epic. Most of these papers are well known to the expert, but having them collected together in one volume provides the reader with an important diachronic dialogue which not only displays the advances of the discipline but also offers an exegesis for the debates that are very much still active today on many of the issues discussed.

In the second part the editor has chosen 11 contributions on individual poets by leading scholars in the field; once more these span the scholarly debate from the 1970s to the modern day. The chapters discuss specific issues of the works of Alcman (Emmet Robbins), Archilochus (Bernd Seidensticker), Hipponax (Ralph Rosen), Semonides (Robin Osborne), Alcaeus (Leslie Kurke), Sappho (André Lardinois), Stesichorus (Anne Burnett), Ibycus (Deborah Steiner), Theognis (Giovanni Cerri), Anacreon (Margaret Williamson) and Simonides (Glenn Most), and thus offer a comprehensive picture of the surviving corpus from the seventh to the early fifth century BC. Unlike part 1, these contributions are more specialized and require at least some prior knowledge of the works discussed, the issues related to them and the debates surrounding them. There is also a slight imbalance between the