

Citation style

Skempis, Marios: review of: Marco Fantuzzi / Christos Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception. A Companion*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015, in: *Museum Helveticum*, 73(2016), 2, p. 223-224, DOI: 10.21245/rec.ant.87657065



copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

Athanasios Vergados: The Homeric Hymn to Hermes. Introduction, Text and Commentary. Texte und Kommentare 41. De Gruyter, Berlin/Boston 2012. XIII, 717 p.

Athanasios Vergados (V.) sets high standards with a much anticipated and magisterial piece of work on an archaic Greek narrative as diverse as *h. Herm.* The main virtue of this voluminous yet handy commentary is that it spans as it should from lexical matters treated with philological sovereignty and intellectual vividness to the pitfalls of intra-/intertextual contextualization and textual criticism. The introductory section (p. 1–159) consists in eight comprehensively structured parts: a. a two-page précis of the poem's plot that lays emphasis on nodal points of the narrative; b. the kitharodic attributes assigned to H(ermes)' double performance and the way this shapes itself as *mise en abyme*, the semiotics of poetry and its relation to divination, the ambiguity of rhetorics linked with H.; c. the humorous tone pervading the narrative; d. the particularity and formulaicity of the poem's language, its prosodic style, and its thematic points of intersection with narrative traditions hosted in Homer's *Odyssey*, in Hesiod, and in *h. Apol.*; e. the story's *Vor-* and *Nachleben*, from Alcaeus down to Nonnus, and pinpointed allusions to the particular treatment of the story in *h. Herm.*; f. the structural organization of the plot by aid of the principle of ring-composition; g. chronology and location of original performance; h. history of the text's transmission. This is a kaleidoscopic examination of aspects innately or remotely connected to the poem designed to serve a variety of purposes. The following section (p. 161–212) presents the Greek text without English translation. V.'s text relies on the edition of Càssola. V. integrates three apparatuses: the first documents the degree of *h. Herm.*'s connection to other texts from the epic tradition in terms of formulaic language; the second indexes parallels from later literature, thus giving a sense of *h. Herm.*'s poetic impact; the third is a traditional critical apparatus, which, apart from designated cases, again follows Càssola's edition. The next section (p. 213–586) is covered by the commentary proper that pays so close attention to detail as to discuss the poem's title. V. leaves literally nothing out of heed and treats his material with due caution. To take one example out of many: at l. 250, Apollo enters the cave where H. dwells, takes a quick scan, and spots Maia's abundant storage in purple and white garments. V.'s starting comment centers on the epithet *φοινικίοντα* whose differentiated function in Homeric poetry he properly justifies. Not only does he point out the epithet's close semasiological affinity to *ἀλιπόρφυρα*, again in Homeric context, but he provides an explanation for the particular choice in *h. Herm.* over the Homeric norm of *σιγαλέοντα* when it comes to *εἴματα*. In what follows, V. focuses on the second epithet *ἄργυρα* and notes the junction's innovative character against the Homeric and Hesiodic backdrop where *ἄργυρεος*, rather than *ἄργυρος*, is used with respect to garments. V.'s comments demonstrate in splendid manner how the dictional stylization of *h. Herm.* marks off the small yet significant distance it takes from the established order that the Homeric and Hesiodic language represent. Diligent, apposite comments such as these that bear out V.'s sense of awareness of what is pertinent when discussing the diction of a *Homeric Hymn* abound in the commentary section. Criticism is indeed exhaustive, though it never crosses the line over to the unnecessary and tantalizingly digressive. The book ends with an extensive bibliography (p. 587–645), which is a token of V.'s toil and profound acquaintance with every aspect, both crucial and lateral, of his subject matter, and a set of illustrations whose aim lies in mapping out spatial shifts of H. and Apollo, on the one hand, and setting forth visual evidence for the central themes of the narrative, on the other (p. 647–455). Two carefully compiled indexes, an index rerum and an index locorum (p. 657–717), round off the work. Book projects such as this ought to be congratulated and set an example for respective undertakings; *h. Apol.* is the first case that pops in mind, as it is in need of a full-scale commentary in English.

Marios Skempis

Marco Fantuzzi/Christos Tsagalis (eds): **The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion.** Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2015. XII, 678 p.

This is a much awaited book; especially for those who have a shared interest in collecting and interpreting fragmentary poetry and in redeeming a major chapter in the literary history of early Gr(eek) epic. The volume comprises three sections, one on approaches to the E(pic) C(ycle), one on present-

ing the epics themselves, and one on its fortune. The problem with books such as this lies in the relation between making existing scholarship accessible to readers, usually with a bent toward summarizing and recontextualizing, and in the prompts it gives for further innovative work. The former purpose it serves very well, in the latter it falls short. For instance: it is essential that one is au courant with the habits and pitfalls of scholarship on the Gr.E.C. and has a savor of its language and narrative style, but it is also paramount to be able to trace unsparing pointers to what remains to be done in terms of research.

It is not clear why the part concerning ancient reception is structured the way it is. A demanding reader of the volume expects to find a discussion about Gr. comedy and satyr play next to the one about Gr. tragedy. It would have been far more compelling to have a genre-based survey on Gr. comedy's use of E.C. material (e.g., Alexis, Amphis, and Eubulus) and another on how Gr. satyr play treats Cyclic theme and content (textual evidence may be scant in Achaeus, Aeschylus, Aristias, Astydamos, Euripides, and Sophocles, but still there is room for supplementation and ingenuity). Likewise, I have not managed to fathom why the editors devote two chapters on Gr. lyric, both deftly argued as they are, which, however, do not appear to justify their requisiteness: one dealing with Stesichorus and Ibycus, and another with Pindar. It is not easy to see why Alcaeus, Sappho, and Bacchylides are missing. This is a rare example of circumstantial editorial opacity concerning how the contents have been put together.

One of the major shortcomings of this volume is its undertow toward overtheorising the links of Homeric poetry with the traditions of the E.C. and toward the problems the application of refined theoretical models causes for a better apprehension of existing cross-references. To the end of reaching that goal, however, the editors have been rather lax about textual evidence. One would have welcomed a thorough survey on the narrative environments that prove fertile to the overlap of Homeric storytelling with Cyclic traditions. To give just one example: the relation of Homeric poetry's connections to the E.C. with catalogue poetry deems a meticulous examination, for (1) the most dense sample of such an overlap to be traced in Homeric epics is in the Catalogue of Men in *Odyssey* 11, and (2) "irregular catalogue indexing" adheres to contexts channeling the traditions of the E.C. into Homeric narrative: A. *t/hoios* indexing: *Il.* 4.399 (*Thebaid*); *Od.* 1.209 (*Cypria*); 4.248 (*Ilias parva*); 4.250 (*Ilias parva*); 4.270–271 (*Ilias parva*); 11.135 (*Telegony*); 11.519 (*Ilias parva*); 11.556 (*Ilias parva*); 24.377–379 (*Alcmeonis*); B. *t/hoion* indexing: *Il.* 20.250 (*Cypria*); 22.347 (*Aethiopsis*); 24.528 (*Cypria*, *Aethiopsis*, *Ilias parva*); *Od.* 1.32 (*Nostoi*); 4.242 (*Ilias parva*); 11.364 (*Capture of Troy*); 11.429 (*Nostoi*); 11.536 (*Capture of Troy*); 24.91 (*Aethiopsis*); C. *t/hoie* indexing: *Il.* 4.390 (*Thebaid*); *Od.* 11.394 (*Nostoi*); 11.549 (*Ilias parva*); 21.107 (*Alcmeonis*); 22.227 (*Cypria*). That said, it is easy to discern the points where theory may turn into an impediment to akribic assessments of hotly debated scholarly issues rather than head in the right direction in order to improve precisely what falls into the category of "basics".

Marios Skempis

Giovanni Maria Leo (ed.): **Anacreonte. I frammenti erotici.** Testo, commento e traduzione.

SemRom 18. Edizioni Quasar, Roma 2015. 239 p.

Leos Buch stellt die überarbeitete Fassung seiner Dissertation dar. Nach einer kurzen Einführung (S. 9–32), wo auf Anakreons Dichtung allgemein, auf seine «metamorphische» Darstellung von Eros und auf seine Rolle als Modell für die Alexandriner eingegangen wird, widmet L. den Hauptteil seines Buches der Besprechung von 27 Fragmenten erotischen Inhalts (S. 33–193) mit italienischer Übersetzung (S. 195–200). Eine Konkordanz der Ausgaben von Gentili, Page (PMG) und Rosokoki, eine detaillierte Bibliographie und von Lisa Severi verfasste Indizes runden die Ausgabe ab. Wir wollen das Augenmerk nunmehr auf den Editionsteil richten. Die Fragmente, die sich in eigener Nummerierung präsentieren (1–27), eröffnen jeweils mit einem kurzen Apparat (1. Verweis auf die obengenannten Ausgaben; 2. Testimonia; 3. Metrik; 4. einschlägige Bibliographie), worauf eine allgemeine Einführung zum Fragment folgt (insbesondere die Forschungsgeschichte und die metrische Form). Es folgt der Text des Fragments, begleitet von einem kritischen Apparat, dann der detaillierte Kommentar. Damit verschwindet der Text zwischen Einführung und Kommentar, was unangenehmes Hin- und Herblättern zur Folge hat. Da es im Buch zudem keine