

In the final Chapter (6), S. takes on an analysis of the gods' role in the Cycle. Understandably, this is the part of the book that suffers the most from lack of evidence, as neither Proclus' summary nor the surviving fragments provide enough information for concrete conclusions. S.'s analysis is yet again insightful and leads to thought-provoking points as when he highlights the important function of prophecy in the *Nostoi*, not as part of the action but as programmatic announcement to the audience, similar to Zeus's forecasting of events in the *Iliad* (pp. 205–7). Other points, however, appear controversial since inevitably S.'s argument turns speculative. For instance, S. sees a direct connection between the strange rendezvous of Achilles with Helen in the *Cypria*, and the hero's restraining of the fleeing Achaeans that follows it. However, there is nothing to suggest that Achilles' actions are the result of his romantic meeting with Helen and not simply his expected heroic behaviour or even the effect of divine interference, as happens with Odysseus in *Iliad* 2. All three solutions are possible, and it is hard to see why one should be favoured over the other two.

S.'s study, even when dealing with problematic issues, proves to be an invaluable tool for students and scholars alike. Despite the problems posed by the fragmentary nature of his material, S. succeeds in doing justice to the cyclic poets by identifying and bringing to the surface the narrative and structural devices employed in their composition, while steering away from speculative reconstructions of the poems. S.'s innovative study has opened the way for a positive reevaluation of the Greek Epic Cycle, and no further study of the subject can afford not to take his contribution into account.

Durham University

G. A. GAZIS  
[g.a.gazis@durham.ac.uk](mailto:g.a.gazis@durham.ac.uk)

## ASPECTS OF LOVE IN ARCHAIC GREEK LITERATURE

CACIAGLI (S.) (ed.) *Eros e genere in Grecia arcaica. (Eikasmos. Studi 28.)* Pp. x + 228, map. Bologna: Pàtron Editore, 2017. Paper, €26. ISBN: 978-88-555-3379-9.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X18000549

This collected volume is the product of a symposium convened by C. in Bologna on 30 October 2015. All the original speakers (C., S. Boehringer, C. Calame, F. Ferrari, G. Liberman) contributed to the volume. Additional contributions were made by A. Chabod, C. Neri and R. Tosi. The aim of the book, as stated by Tosi in the preface, is to combine philological analysis and anthropological comparison in order to study the evolution of the concept of ἔρως in Archaic Greece.

The first contribution, by C., 'Amore fra ἔρως e φιλότης', serves as an introduction to the volume. C. contends that 'love' is a modern notion employed inadequately as a translation for various Greek terms like ἔρως, φιλότης, πόθος or ἕμερος, all of which convey specific connotations. His aim is to pursue the connotations for the term φιλότης, for which he observes two distinct contexts. In erotic contexts, φιλότης denotes forms of consensual sexual intercourse or those aspiring to it. In non-erotic contexts, it denotes reciprocal alliances between individuals or groups. C. then examines whether these two usages might have a common origin and locates this origin in the wedding, where the legitimisa-

tion of sexual intercourse among two individuals represents and completes an alliance between two families. For C., this suggests that the erotic usage is secondary, resulting from its occurrence in the particular context of the wedding, and that the primary sense of the term is that of a reciprocal relationship.

The second contribution, by Boehringer and Chabod, ‘Sotto il rischio di *eros*: genere e poesia melica in una società che precede sessualità’, provides the theoretical foundations for the study of gender and sexual identity in antiquity. The first half of the contribution contains a (rather) general survey of the history of gender studies. It concludes that, given the constructed nature of modern binary categories like heterosexual/homosexual, these categories are unlikely to have been meaningful in antiquity. The second part argues that, for archaic poets, there exists in fact no ‘hierarchy of sexuality’, since certain erotic constellations of sexes in the *hic et nunc* may correspond to mythical paradigms that contain different constellations. This argument is illustrated through two examples. The first is the ‘New Sappho’ (fr. 58 V. + *P.Köln* XI 429), where Tithonus serves as a paradigm for the female speaker and Eos for her female beloved. The second example is Thgn. 1283–94, where a boy’s defiance against the speaker’s advances is compared to Atalanta’s refusal to marry.

The third contribution, ‘Chi ama Astimelusa? Gli attori di Alcm. *PMGF* 3 nel loro contesto’, also by C., aims to shed light on the figures in Alcman’s obscure second Partheneion. Starting from the observation that the description of Astymelosa by the chorus is amorous in tone, C. juxtaposes similar descriptions of homoerotic relationships in Sappho and Theognis. He points out that, though both male and female homoerotic relationships usually involve a form of asymmetry between ἐραστής and ἐρώμενος, this asymmetry is often inverted as the ἐρώμενος grows up. C. then applies these categories to the second Partheneion, where he observes that Astymelosa is depicted in terms evocative of both the lover and the beloved. C. seeks the reasons for this unusual kind of asymmetry in the performance context of this song. Unlike Theognis and Sappho, whose songs were supposedly sung in front of small, stable audiences, Alcman’s song was, according to C., directed at the entire Spartan citizen body. Here, he argues somewhat vaguely, different visions of feminine erotics may be voiced.

Sappho, fr. 1 V. is the focus of the contribution by Ferrari, ‘Sapph. fr. 1,18–24 e la grammatica dell’*eros*’. This contribution is directed against the traditional interpretation whereby Sappho wishes that an unfaithful girlfriend may return to her. Ferrari pursues an alternative interpretation, first advanced by A. Giacomelli (‘The Justice of Aphrodite in Sappho fr. 1’, *TAPhA* 110 [1980], 135–42), whereby Sappho merely complains about a girl impervious to her first advances. Here, Aphrodite does not promise that the girl will love Sappho, but that, when the girl is grown up and herself in the position of the adult lover, her own advances will be equally unrequited by young girls. Ferrari reviews all the support for this interpretation. He also seeks to corroborate it through a number of different readings. In 24, he favours ἐθέλοισαν (Schäfer) instead of the more commonly printed ἐθέλοισα. In 22, he proposes ἄλλα instead of ἄλλά. For 18–19, he produces τίνα δηῦτε Πείθων (Ahrens) | μᾶσ’ (Wilamowitz) ἄγην ἐς σὴν φιλότατα, where Πείθων is accusative and μᾶσ(αι) an uncontracted form of the second-person present indicative of μαίομαι/μάομαι (‘whom do you want Peitho to lead into union with you’). The resulting interpretation is coherent and convincing, though doubts may remain about ἄλλα.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>As Ferrari points out, ἄλλά in *apodosis* is common in poetry, especially after a negative protasis. Ferrari objects that such ἄλλά tends to convey, outside of Homeric epic, an inferior substitute to the protasis (*pis aller*). Since, on his interpretation, Aphrodite offers

Calame's contribution, 'Saffo e il "genere", il "genere" e Saffo: le protagoniste femminili della poesia erotica greca', is an Italian translation of an article that originally appeared in French in 2013 (*Eugesta* 3, 6–24). In it, Calame approaches feminine identity in Sappho through the lexical terms used to refer to female individuals, including *πάις*, *πάρθενος*, *νύμφα* and *γύνα*. He emphasises the close correspondence of these feminine identities with the biological development of the female body. In a second step, Calame aims to integrate these findings into the study of gender in general. He deplores the distinction between nature and culture, which underlies most feminist approaches today. His contribution ends with an appeal for greater attention to the organic and biological realities on which the social and cultural construction of gender identities is based.

The long contribution by Liberman, 'L'elogio pindarico di Teosseno (fr. 123) rivisitato', offers a comprehensive re-examination of Pindar's fr. 123 S.-M. Liberman first assesses the central role played by this poem in the formation of the legend of Pindar's death in Argus, which he traces back to Chamaeleon. He then provides a text of the fragment followed by comments on selected issues. The remaining parts are dedicated to two broader issues. The first concerns the question of whether the speaker's affection for Theoxenus is merely a sympotic *topos* or whether Pindar was in fact in love with the boy. Liberman is emphatically in favour of the latter and aims to revive a pre-Bundyan interpretation as it is found, most clearly, in Wilamowitz. In the course of this argument, he also re-examines the relationship of fr. 123 S.-M. with *N.* 11 and concludes that Aristagoras, the victor of *N.* 11, must be the brother of Theoxenus and Agesilas their father. The second issue concerns the corrupt term *ψυχράν* in line 9 of fr. 123 S.-M.: Liberman reviews and rejects all available conjectures and proposes the reading *ψυδράν*, a rare variant of *ψευδή*.

A conclusion to the volume is offered by Neri's contribution, 'La forza e la forma. Appunti su necessità e metamorfosi dell'amore tra Omero, Platone e i Cristiani', which broadens the scope from archaic Greek poetry to the treatment of love across antiquity. As opposed to the other contributions, Neri's aim is not to pursue a specific argument or interpretation, but to offer a panorama of reflections on love from Homer to Augustine. The appeal of this contribution lies in Neri's elegant translations of the passages selected, particularly his verse translations of Greek poetry.

For the volume as a whole, C.'s efforts are to be commended, not only because he organised the original symposium and the speedy publication of the contributions, but also because he procured the Italian translations of the contributions of Boehringer/Chabod and Calame. The volume is well produced. Typographical errors are infrequent, though some are obvious. Greek text, which is quoted abundantly, for instance, in Neri's contribution, has been checked carefully. There is an index of passages discussed, but a thematic index would have increased the usefulness of the volume.

As for the quality of argument, the individual contributions vary. A particular contrast is manifest between the first three contributions and the last four. This difference is not merely one of seniority or experience, but perhaps also of thoroughness. C. and Boehringer/Chabod frequently refer to their previous work, but treat other secondary literature only superficially. Boehringer/Chabod refer to entire books without page numbers,

---

no immediate help to Sappho but rather a remote disadvantage for the girl, this sense of *πισ aller* works well ('if she does not accept gifts now, well, at least she will give them herself in the future'). In contrast, *ἄλλα* (with Hdt. 3.39.2) would seem preferable, if not necessary, for the traditional interpretation.

and C.'s bibliography contains surprising gaps.<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup>For 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.