

aim is to identify and explain the character of the group that participated in the performance of Sappho's poetry (gender and age, social and ideological characteristics of the participants, and ties and affiliations among the members). He concludes that the Sapphic group was the female equivalent of the male *hetairia* one can identify in Alcaeus' poetry. Alcaeus' poetry is the starting point for any discussion related both to the character and purpose of existence of the Sapphic group, and to the audience and performance contexts of Sappho's poetry. The connection he sees between the poetry of Alcaeus and Sappho is one of the main reasons why Caciagli rejects the two predominant scholarly interpretations of the Sapphic persona and group: Sappho as the leader of an organized institution with an educational character initiated by F.G. Welcker (*Sappho von einem herrschenden Vorurtheil befreit*, Göttingen, 1816), and Sappho as the leader of an informal group of women united by erotic *philotes* as discussed by H.N. Parker ('Sappho schoolmistress', *TAPhA* 123, 1993, 309–51).

In his first chapter (which contains the core of his argument) Caciagli attempts, painstakingly, to define the term *philotes* as the main element of *hetairia*. He looks at both the different meanings the word can have (companionship, hospitality, *xenia*, *eros*) and its use in other literary contexts such as Homer, Theognis, and other narratives. He concludes that the Sapphic community was based on loyalty, reciprocity and companionship (*philotes*), the latter of which ranged from friendship to *eros*, and had an aristocratic ideology and an educational function. One of the main differences that Caciagli identifies between the Alcaean and Sapphic *hetairia* is the occasions of the poetry's performance as well as the social commitments and statuses of its members. He recognizes that both groups performed their poetry at public, private and cultic occasions, but concludes that, whilst the symposium was the main setting for Alcaeus' poetry, Sappho's poetry was used in all types of occasions. Caciagli notes that the female singing groups participated mainly in religious and not political occasions. He places emphasis on the religious and ritual character of a number of Sappho's poems, as he perceives Sappho's female group as having a leading role in the festivities of Mytilene.

Although the author devotes a large part of the book to presenting and discussing existing scholarship, against which he places his own

work, the book is a good addition to previous studies on Aeolic poetry. Caciagli attempts to show how the poetry of Sappho (and Alcaeus) and the institution of *amicitia* can reflect the reality of the *polis* and the aristocratic society of Lesbos. He achieves this by taking into account the historical, political and cultural contexts of the poetry. Caciagli places emphasis on the original occasion of performance and the *persona loquens* at the first performance, and does not take into account subsequent performances in similar or other contexts on the island. This could eventually lead to conclusions of a different nature related to poetic, social and aristocratic relationships within both the group and the broader community.

A tendency to over-analyse the fragments is prominent in the book. In his attempt to present the group's dynamics, Caciagli perceives Aphrodite as the distinctive element of the Sapphic community, and he interprets her presence in S.1 as one of imposing *philotes* among the groups of the Sapphic group. Similarly, the majority of comments on Alcaeus' community and ideology are based on and compared to the composition and function of Pittacus' *hetairia*. A few words on the methodology would have helped the reader accept the conclusions on *hetairia* as a social phenomenon; the author uses a number of literary genres that belong to different eras in order to present *hetairia* as a consistent phenomenon throughout the centuries.

THEODORA A. HADJIMICHAEL  
University College London/  
Open University of Cyprus  
t.hadjimichael@ucl.ac.uk

CURTIS (P.) **Stesichoros' Geryoneis**  
(Mnemosyne Supplements 333). Leiden and  
Boston: Brill, 2011. Pp. xvii + 201. €95/\$133.  
9789004207677.

doi:10.1017/S0075426913000153

Curtis offers the first commentary on Stesichoros' *Geryoneis*. It follows the standard format with an introduction, text with translation and *apparatus*, and a commentary. There are three appendices: the first two are Stesichorean *testimonia* and the third contains Indo-Iranian parallels. The bibliography dates until 2008. For the fragments there is a *tabula comparationis* with *PMGF*, but not for the *testimonia*.

The introduction contains 11 sections: biography, the Geryon myth and cult, historical background, performance, language, metre and the order of the papyrus fragments. There are interesting parallels for three-headed monsters and Curtis proposes that this poem was performed at a Sicilian festival for Heracles or Geryon (22), though evidence for this is lacking. Curtis dismisses solo performance and Page's reconstruction due to the damaged state of the papyrus, while giving little evidence for choral. 212 *PMGF* refers to the beginning of spring (a festival?) and 'public' songs, which perhaps indicates initial choral performance. TB23 *PMGF* also describes solo sympotic performance. Both are unacknowledged. Curtis refers to E. Cingano's works ('L'opera di Ibico e Stesicoro nella Classificazione degli Antichi e dei Moderni' *AION*(filol) 12, 1990, 189–224; 'Indizi di esecuzione corale in Stesicoro', in R. Pretagostini, (ed.), *Tradizione e Innovazione nella Cultura Greca da Omero all'Età Ellenistica: Scritti in Onore di Bruno Gentili*, Rome, 1993, 1.347–61) on a point unrelated to performance (59 n.210). Cingano's chapter in *La poésie grecque antique* (Paris, 2003) is also not in the bibliography.

Curtis' text contains 26 fragments, which is a selection of *P.Oxy.* 2617 and other sources. The indirect citations (S16(a), S85–87 *PMGF*) ought to have been included. There is no indication of strophes, antistrophes or epodes in the text, though the commentary notes the division. The translation of Athenaëus (15 Curtis = S19) is missing. Curtis has radically reordered Page's reconstruction of the *Geryoneis*. This is based upon Apollodorus (2.5.10) and the fragments' contents, though Curtis considers both to be unreliable (63). Barrett's and Page's hypothesis however has its merits on account of the evidence and the problems that Curtis raises are acknowledged by both scholars. Curtis can demonstrate the faults of previous scholarship, but he submits little evidence in support of his own opinions and at times is so cautious that he offers no opinion at all.

Curtis proposes 26 supplements. Eight are recollations (7.24, 8.2, 9.12, 12.ii.8, 12.ii.12, 17.1, 20.5, 24.3). The others have metrical or linguistic problems, and offer little improvement on previous suggestions. I first quote Curtis then *SLG/PMGF*. 1.9 (S17) is the last line of a strophe/antistrophe. Text and *apparatus* print -σκίον ὄκα ποσὶν πάϊς Διὸς ἐϋς for -σκίον <ε>ν ποσὶ πάϊς Διὸς [- υ υ -]. This ought to scan as  $\underline{\underline{υ}} - \underline{\underline{υ}} \underline{\underline{υ}} - \underline{\underline{υ}} \underline{\underline{υ}} - \underline{\underline{υ}} \underline{\underline{υ}}$ , but

here it is  $\underline{\underline{υ}} - \underline{\underline{υ}} \underline{\underline{υ}} - - \underline{\underline{υ}} \underline{\underline{υ}} -$ . Disyllabic πάϊς cannot be  $\underline{\underline{υ}} \underline{\underline{υ}}$  as it is followed by Διὸς, which means it scans  $\underline{\underline{υ}} -$ . Διὸς ἐϋς is  $- \underline{\underline{υ}} \underline{\underline{υ}} -$ , however Διὸς when followed by a word beginning with a vowel would scan  $\underline{\underline{υ}} \underline{\underline{υ}}$ . The commentary prints the transmitted πάϊς Διὸς (104). This seems to be an amalgamation of Aeneas' ἐϋς πάϊς Ἀγχίσαιο (Hom. *Il.* 2.819, 12.98, 17.491) and Achilles' πόδας ὠκὺς, though Curtis is silent.

ποτέφα [ φῶς Γαρύονας, τέκος ἄ- ~ ποτέφα [ κρατερός Χρυσάορος ἄ- (7.3 = S11). This is from the penultimate line of a strophe/antistrophe and scans as  $\underline{\underline{υ}} \underline{\underline{υ}} - - - \underline{\underline{υ}} \underline{\underline{υ}} - \underline{\underline{υ}} \underline{\underline{υ}} -$ , whereas it should be  $\underline{\underline{υ}} \underline{\underline{υ}} - \underline{\underline{υ}} \underline{\underline{υ}} - \underline{\underline{υ}} \underline{\underline{υ}} - \underline{\underline{υ}} \underline{\underline{υ}} -$ . Curtis even says that there is no evidence for a monosyllabic biceps in this position (120). φῶς is commonly part of a line-end formula ἰσόθεος φῶς and used instead of a name.

The majority of Curtis' supplements are in 10 (S14), a speech by Athena to Poseidon to protect Geryon, and 12.i (S15.i), the fight between Heracles and Geryon. Linguistic problems include εὔ φάσκειν ἰθὺς ~ φάτ' ἐυφραδέω]ς (10.4). εὔ + φάσκω is unattested and sounds prosaic. φάσκω occurs once in lyric (Bacch. 11.50) and seldom in epic (Hes. *Theog.* 209; Hom. *Od.* 10.331, 11.306, 24.75; *Hymn. Hom. Ven.* 126). The same for ὄδ' ὦν ἀγαθὸς ~ "ἄγ' ὑποσχέσιος]ς (10.6). ῥέσκευ (10.9) is not Greek and one presumes Curtis meant ῥύσκευ (*Il.* 24.730) from ῥύομαι. No vases show Poseidon helping Geryon.

12.i.12–17 is based upon *Il.* 16.793–96, when Apollo knocks off Patroclus' helmet. Homeric parallels with Doric flavourings inspire others, for example ἰθὺς ποτὶ (10.4) from ἰθὺς πρὸς (*Il.* 12.137), the same for 10.3, 6, 8–10. Curtis is over-reliant on Homer. The *Geryoneis* is quite a Homeric poem, but there is a re-contextualization and rewriting of epic poetry in Stesichorus.

Curtis changes the transmitted Attic-Ionic κλεινᾶς for the pseudo-Aeolic κλεενᾶς (14.1 = S7). It is unattested with one nu and κλεενᾶς is not in the *apparatus*. There are instances with -vv- (Alcm. 10b.12 *PMGF*; Pind. *Pyth.* 9.15; Bacch. 5.182), but Curtis cites only the one parallel in Stesichorus (S118.6 *PMGF*). κλεενᾶς is attested (Pind. *Pyth.* 5.20; 887.1 *PMG*), but is metrically unsuitable here because of the lost digamma (\*κλεεφρονος > κλεεννος), the resolvable anceps and the double consonant. Synecphonesis is unlikely. The word in this form usually scans as  $\underline{\underline{υ}} - -$ , whereas here it should be  $\underline{\underline{υ}} \underline{\underline{υ}} -$ . κλεινᾶς is more common in choral lyric and is best left alone.

Text, translation and commentary do not

always match. Barrett conjectured *παρὰ ματρὶ* φίλαι in 6.8 (S13), which suits the dative. Curtis prints and translates *τόκα ματρὶ* φίλαι, but there is no attribution in the *apparatus* for *τόκα* and the commentary states (118) that Barrett's conjecture 'fits the context of Kallirrhoe's speech'. The line apparently begins *ὄκα* on page 117. Which one does Curtis prefer?

Curtis has placed the *Geryoneis* in its wider Indo-European context and has undertaken a difficult task. The back cover states that the commentary focuses 'on the poet's usage of metre and language'. The proposed supplements however are suspicious precisely because of their metre and language. A commentary is usually the first port of call for the student or scholar; this one should be approached with caution.

T.R.P. COWARD  
King's College London  
thomas.coward@kcl.ac.uk

LULLI (L.) **Narrare in Distici. L'elegia greca arcaica e classica di argomento storico-mitico** (Quaderni dei seminari romani di cultura greca 13). Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 2011. Pp. 122. €31. 9788871404486.  
doi:10.1017/S0075426913000165

This short study of narrative elegy is well worth reading. Lulli's book presents a reliable overall assessment, even if it contains little that is new.

After an introduction, the book falls into four chapters, of which chapter 1 explores ancient testimonies on the use of the elegiac distich for historical/mythical narration and assesses various scholarly views on the nature of elegy with historical/mythical argument (namely those of Mazzarino, West, Bowie and Sider).

Chapter 2 discusses narrative elegy from Archaic times to the early Classical age. Taking her cue from S. Mazzarino (*Il pensiero storico classico* I, Bari, 1966), who discussed the anticipation of historiographical subject matter and method by Callinus and Mimnermus, Lulli postulates a narrative component for the elegiac production of many elegists. The merit of this chapter is that it discusses elegies up to Ion of Chios (excluding Tyrtæus); the problem is that we cannot say for sure whether or not the narrative hints that Lulli pursues function as part of a larger project, namely whether such elegies happened to deal occasionally with historical subjects or were exclusively historical narratives.

D. Sider ('The new Simonides and the question of historical elegy', *AJPh* 127, 2006, 332) notes that Callinus' poem on Magnesia combined history (an earlier invasion of the Cimmerians) with the present (the Magnesians are still prosperous), rightly pointing out at least one instance of what else a narrative/historical fragment might contain. Similarly in Mimnermus *fr.* 9 W<sup>2</sup>, the reference to the *hybris* of the Greeks during the colonization of Colophon may not be a sign of Mimnermus' search for the causes of historical events, which, according to Lulli would represent a first step towards the creation of a historiographical method, but rather could well be a form of exhortation from narrator to audience, the message being that the Smyrnaeans must not resign themselves to the imminent onslaught as something fated, a divine punishment for their ancestors' seizure of Smyrna, because that was not just another adventure in *hybris* but rather an act sanctioned by the gods themselves (following A. Allen, *The Fragments of Mimnermus*, Stuttgart, 1993, 11). Again in Xenophanes *fr.* 3.2 W<sup>2</sup>, the reference 'while without hateful tyranny' may be relevant not because it responds to the need to furnish precise chronological indications in a narrative structure oriented towards the treatment of historical events (as Lulli notes), but rather because it points to the connection the poet establishes between the personal (Colophonian) behaviour of *hybris* and the fall of the city precisely as Solon had warned the Athenians in *fr.* 4.1–10 W<sup>2</sup>.

In Chapter 3, a discussion of the new Simonides, Lulli brings out a new angle regarding *fr.* 3 W<sup>2</sup> (the reference would be to Achilles and not Nereus, so that the Artemisium elegy would have strong similarities with the Plataea elegy in their adoption of the myth of Achilles), which, however, given the nature and present state of the source material, is improvable. The rest of the chapter includes an examination of the sources regarding the elegiac production of Simonides (which does not alter the conclusions by M.L. West, 'Simonides redivivus', *ZPE* 98, 1993, 2–3), a criticism of L.M. Kowerski, *Simonides on the Persian Wars* (New York, 2005) and a survey of *fr.* 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 15–16 W<sup>2</sup>.

Chapter 4, on the new Archilochus fragment (*P.Oxy.* LXIX 4708), gives an exhaustive panorama of the scholarship produced so far. The autopsy of the papyrus by the author has not produced new readings and occasionally pushes