

and C.'s bibliography contains surprising gaps.² Moreover, the interpretations offered in all three contributions rely excessively on speculation based on vague parallels or general likelihood. C.'s first contribution contains distracting factual errors (p. 5: Sapph. fr. 112.4 V. refers either to the bride or the bridegroom, not to Aphrodite; p. 9: Helen's lover is Paris, not Patroclus; p. 10: the speaker at *Od.* 10.347 is Odysseus, not 'il poeta'). Textual variation is not sufficiently taken into consideration, which is particularly detrimental in the case of Sappho's '*Kypris Song*' (fr. 26 V. + *P.Sapph. Obbink*), where the choice of reading has a significant effect on the interpretation (cf. now *inter alia* L. Benelli, *Sapphostudien* [2017], pp. 111–27; K. Tsantsanoglou and S. Tselikas, *Eikasmos* 28 [2017], 23–36; A. Lardinois, *ZPE* 205 [2018], 1–5). In contrast, Ferrari, Calame and Liberman develop their arguments thoroughly, on the basis of verifiable evidence, and with full accounts of previous scholarship.

The merit of this volume lies in revisiting existing interpretations rather than in finding new ones. Despite any shortcomings, it will be useful to readers of Sappho, Theognis and Pindar. In addition to the focus on gender theory, the volume's wealth of textual and linguistic observations makes it interesting also for more conservative scholars.

Universität zu Köln

FELIX J. MEISTER
felix.meister@uni-koeln.de

OBSERVATIONS ON THE LANGUAGE OF HIPPONAX

BETTARINI (L.) *Lingua e testo di Ipponatte*. (Synthesis 3.) Pp. 154. Pisa and Rome: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2017. Paper, €52. ISBN: 978-88-6227-938-3.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X18001075

This is not, as the title might suggest, a comprehensive study of the language and text of Hipponax, but a series of discursive yet interrelated studies on various aspects of his language and style. Central to B.'s endeavour is a conviction that Hipponax was a complex and subtle poet, and that Hipponactean Greek operates on a range of levels, from grand epic parody to representation of colloquial registers of speech. This is certainly true, and B. has much to say on the fragments that he devotes attention to. Yet in many cases B.'s proposals are problematic; some are forced and rely on a selective interpretation of evidence. Many read far too much into isolated lemmas and meagre fragments, where the complete lack of context renders his suggestions nothing more than idle speculation.

²For the first contribution, the treatment of φιλότης in *Lfgre* s.v. is absent as is e.g. M. Landfester, *Das griechische Nomen "philos" und seine Ableitungen* (1966); P. Karavites, *Promise-Giving and Treaty-Making* (1992), esp. pp. 48–58; G. Kloss, *Untersuchungen zum Wortfeld "Verlangen/Begehren" im frühgriechischen Epos* (1994). For the second contribution, 'reciprocity' is treated as a pervasive cultural phenomenon in Archaic Greece (pp. 58–9), but no recent literature is mentioned. At p. 78, consultation of F.S. Naiden, *Ancient Supplication* (2006), esp. p. 7, might have prevented the wrong statement that supplication is primarily a relationship between humans and gods.

In addition, a lack of engagement with Lydian and Anatolian linguistics (a familiarity with which should be a *sine qua non* for any serious student of Hipponax) marks a backward step in the interpretation of various passages, particularly in light of S. Hawkins's recent *Studies in the Language of Hipponax* (2013) (see also Hawkins's *BMCR* review of B. [2017.12.36]).

B.'s first and longest chapter is on what he identifies as kennings. As B. observes, metaphorical compound formations are part of the Greek poetic tradition, for which he cites, for example, ἡμερόκοιτος, 'day-sleeper' = 'thief' in Hesiod, *Op.* 605; φερέοικος 'house-carrier' = 'snail' at *Op.* 571. Yet the definition of kennings that B. employs is so broad as to render the concept almost meaningless as a category, and what we have instead is a selective discussion of metaphors and euphemisms (B.'s approach would have been well served by reference to M.L. West's discussion of kennings in *Indo-European Poetry and Myth* [2007], pp. 81–3). Take, for instance, ἀνασεισίφαλλος (fr. 151), 'cock-shaker', which B. argues is a kenning = 'prostitute'. Even assuming it is a noun and not an adjective, is it truly a kenning or simply an evocative metaphor / euphemism? We might compare the later χαματύπη, 'ground-thumper' = 'prostitute'. Most of the lexical items B. identifies as kennings (and all those referring to prostitutes at pp. 36–8) are isolated lemmas, and we thus have no idea of the context in which they were used. If, for example, ἀνασεισίφαλλος qualified a noun (πόρνη, Arete etc.), then the 'kenning' hypothesis begins to fall apart. For example, if we had no textual attestation of ἄγρουλος, but only a few late glosses along the lines of the *Etymologicum Gudanium's* οἱ ἄγρικοι κτλ., we might call it a kenning. But at *Il.* 18.162 and Hes. *Theog.* 26 it qualifies ποιμένες – thus not a kenning, not even a noun, but simply a descriptive adjective. By restricting himself to this vague and interpretively questionable self-imposed category, rather than, say, examining the contextual poetics and linguistic registers of metaphor and compounds, B. seems to have missed an opportunity to provide a valuable contribution to our understanding of Hipponax, which his otherwise meticulous attention to detail suggests he is well equipped to achieve. Unfortunate also is B.'s discussion of fr. 2. His suggestion that κυνάγχα is a kenning = 'thief', with no reference to the choking of dogs, is unpersuasive and is in part a perpetuation of the misidentification in Hesychius κ4511 *Latte* κυνάγχη ... οἱ δὲ τὸ κυνάγχα ἀντὶ τοῦ κλέπτα, which almost certainly derives from an interpretation of our passage of Hipponax. Furthermore, here and elsewhere B.'s lack of engagement with Lydian is a serious impediment. B. perpetuates F. Solmsen's 120-year-old interpretation of Candaules as 'dog-throtter', despite near fatal flaws to the derivation; the relevant scholarship is clearly laid out in Hawkins (2013), pp. 167–82. Again, a missed opportunity.

Chapter 2 provides a discussion of various words, forms and usages that B. argues are comic or parodic evocations of Homeric or epicising language. Epic parody has often been seen and sought in Hipponax, but how far B. advances our understanding of and appreciation for the phenomenon is questionable. The grandiloquently epic ἐμερ|μήριξε at fr. 79.15 certainly suggests parody, particularly given the context of the immediately preceding lines, but whether we need in excess of a full page (pp. 43–4) of dense text to explain this is questionable. At pp. 44–8, B. provides a long discussion of the two instances of the iterative -σκ- suffix in Hipponax at fr. 78.11 (φοίτε[σκε] and 107.48 (θύεσκε). (For other possible instances of epicising, 'mock-Homeric' language in this fragment see now A. Dale, 'Notes on Hipponax fr. 104 W (107 Degani)', *ZPE* 205 [2018], 6–12.) B. argues that the -σκ- suffix represented an elevated ('auliche') linguistic marker for Hipponax and his audience, derived from the language of epic. Yet this is problematised by the relative frequency of the -σκ- suffix in Herodotus, where there is no suggestion of Homericising or elevated usage in its distribution. A better engagement with historical linguistics here might have enriched the discussion. C. Watkins ('An Indo-European

Linguistic Area and its Characteristics: Ancient Anatolia. Areal Diffusion as a Challenge to the Comparative Method?', in A.Y. Aikhenvald and R.M.W. Dixon [edd.], *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance: Problems in Comparative Linguistics* [2001], pp. 44–63, at 58) has observed the formal correspondence between Ionic -σκ- and the Hittite imperfective suffix *-ske* as well as the matching functional use of the Luwian cognate *-za-*, which suggests that the Ionic iterative suffix reflects an areal feature common to Western Anatolia. Thus, rather than an elevated style, Hipponax' use of the -σκ- suffix suggests a colloquial feature of Asiatic Ionic. (Here we might compare Hipponax' use of the ethnic suffix -ηνος in Λαμψακηνός at fr. 36.3. The suffix is otherwise alien to archaic poetry, but is attested in Herodotus and, more to the point, amply attested in the epigraphic record of Western Anatolia, which all points to a colloquial register.) B. might well disagree with such an analysis, but any work that seeks to engage with the language of Hipponax and its registers must engage with the relevant scholarship.

Chapters 3 and 4 deal more closely with issues related to the textual constitution and dialect of several passages (for the material in Chapter 3, see Hawkins's discussion in his review). I find appealing the argument (pp. 89–93) that the metathesis of aspiration in κύθρος (χύτρος) at fr. 118 and θεῦτις (τευθίς) at fr. 162 might be meant to characterise the language of the speaker, but here again lack of context makes this impossible to argue with any degree of conviction. And, leaving aside the problematic issue of whether we read ἔγγυτον, ἔγγυτρον or ἔγκυθρον at fr. 107.49, it would have been good to know whether B. thinks ἐγκύθροτις in an inscription from Lydia (*SEG* 34.1213.6) has any bearing on his proposed interpretation.

The final chapter is, to this reviewer, one of the most interesting and informative. B. examines the onomastic repertoire of Hipponax, noting Hipponax' fondness for toponymic and mythological names that often have comic and parodic resonances. And, as B. notes, this is an aspect of Hipponactean iambus that differentiates him from Archilochus.

This is, in the end, an uneven book. At times prolix even given its diminutive size (the five chapters themselves occupy 100 pages), one walks away with the uncomfortable feeling that not much has been gained from B.'s endeavour, one which, furthermore, might more profitably and economically have been made through a few articles and notes in journals. B. is undoubtedly meticulous and thoughtful, and there certainly are useful insights scattered throughout the book; scholars who engage closely with Hipponax' text and language will have to consult B. and will benefit from the experience, but there is little that will endear the book to a wider audience.

Concordia University, Montreal

ALEXANDER DALE
alexander.dale@concordia.ca

THOUGHTS ON EPINICIAN POETRY

FEARN (D.) *Pindar's Eyes. Visual and Material Culture in Epinician Poetry*. Pp. x + 318. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. Cased, £70, US\$99. ISBN: 978-0-19-874637-9.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X18001269

In the introduction, F. positions himself as moving away from historicising readings of Pindar's engagement with material culture and visual phenomena (such readings having