μὰν. **347**, add Gal. *Caus. procatarct.* 38. **369**, read μελιάδεος, | ἄλλοτ' ὀξυτέρω (gl[2d])? **386** (n. 341), if the addressee is Dionysus, why is Kronos involved? **423**, τεμένηος is a problematic genitive; I suspect that it was really an adjective, = -ειος. There are a few faults in L.'s generally fluent Latin: *lacinia* treated as a neuter plural; *utrique* for *uterque*; *exeuns*.

The printer has on the whole risen to the challenges inherent in this type of material, though not yet to the extent of setting dots for missing letters below line level. The *f* used to represent a coronis ought to have been a good deal larger; as it is, it is easily overlooked.

There is an index of proper names in the fragments (in French form), indexes to the introduction and notes (*Index rerum*, *Mots et syntagmes grecs*, *Passages discutés*), and concordances with Bergk and Diehl. There is also a fold-out map of Lesbos (Kiepert, from *IG* xii[2]).

We shall still need to use Voigt, especially for her fuller apparatus and collections of parallels. But we shall now need to consult Liberman as well. A Sappho from the same hand would be no bad thing.

All Souls College, Oxford M. L. WEST

LYRIC LEXICON

H. Rodríguez Somolinos: *El léxico de los poetas Lesbios. Diccionario Griego-Español Anejo* IV. Pp. 381. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1998. Paper. ISBN 84-00-07753-9.

A slightly more accurately descriptive title for this volume would be *El léxico* no homérico *de los poetas Lesbios*, because Somolinos, observing that most work done on the lexicon of the Lesbian poets has emphasized the relationships with specifically Homeric epic, sets out to supplement this earlier work by concentrating on the words in the other third of the lexicon which are either found not in Homer but in other hexameter or lyric poetry, or appear for the first (or only) time in Sappho and Alcaeus. In making this point, she devotes her introductory pages to a broad and judicious critical account of previous work on the language of these poets. The aim of the book is to contribute to the on-going discussion of questions as to the existence of an Aeolic tradition of poetry, the relationships between Sappho and Alcaeus and other lyric poetry, the origin of the Lesbian poetic lexicon, etc. The ultimate result is an illustration of the notable heterogeneity of the lexicon.

S. proceeds by listing the words according to category (non-Homeric lexicon, words shared with lyric, *hapax legomena* [broadly defined], 'new' lexicon) and type (noun, compound epithet, etc.). Each word is accompanied by a detailed lexicographical account of its use in Lesbian and other relevant authors. This is then followed by a 'visíon de conjunto'. A third of the book is taken up with a massive study of 'el léxico nuevo', that is, words which make their first appearance in Sappho and Alcaeus. This examines the lexical items in terms of their linguistic aspects—the formation of verbs, adjectives, composition, archaisms, and dialectalisms—and in terms of their semantic field (everyday life, politics, etc.), and of differences in their meaning from later writers; finally she looks at neologisms which were little used in later times.

S. is well aware of the problems of treating the lexicon as she wishes: we have very

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press

little Lesbian poetry and much Homeric, and the lexicon is the most fluid aspect of a language. The nature of the evidence also poses problems. It is to her credit that, though she wishes to draw conclusions and consequences from the material, these difficulties are always kept before the reader's eyes. Tentative conclusions can, however, be drawn. Sappho is quantitatively more innovative than Alcaeus, but he is qualitatively more so too. This originality can be seen especially in the treatment, sometimes comic, of traditional compound-adjective formation, and in the frequency of derivatives of athematic form. There is a small residue of vocabulary and, more interestingly, potential formulae, which are shared with Hesiod and other hexameter verse and not Homer, e.g. *φαίνολις αὔως*. Comparison of Sappho, Alcaeus and other lyric, elegiac, and iambic poetry fails to show any poetic lyric vocabulary expressing significant concepts, etc. alien to Homer: the common inheritance with Homer is much more striking. Amongst words attested in Sappho and especially Alcaeus for the first time, there are a number which are 'clasificables como de prosa o más exactamente del lenguaje culto e intelectual' (p. 308), and which do not reappear until the fifth century. In the *hapax legomena*, she isolates some few possibly archaic forms which have been succeeded by later forms elsewhere in Greek (e.g. *κίνδυς*, *ὄλοφυς*, *σέος*, *μύναμαι*), and which may be elements from older Lesbian tradition. There remain, however, uncertainties about the precise history of these words: 'casi siempre se puede dudar entre la atribución dialectal, poética o no poética, el arcaísmo general, el arcaísmo lesbio, el arcaísmo poético general o el arcaísmo poético lesbio' (pp. 289–90; cf. pp. 310–11 for a list of fourteen or fifteen non-Homeric words which seem to join poetic and archaic characteristics, Lesbian or other).

The book is the result of considerable detailed lexicographical labour, and is now the fullest description we have of this aspect of the Lesbian poets. There is a great deal of material, and it is not the fault of the scrupulous author that the broad conclusions one would like to be able to draw, either about the corpus as a whole or concerning the origin or nature of individual words, are rendered very provisional by the nature of the evidence. Nonetheless, there is much for the student of Lesbian poetry to reflect on.

The Queen's College, Oxford A. M. BOWIE

ΑΠΟΤΡΟΠΟΣ ΓΝΩΜΗ

I. L. Pfeijffer: *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar. A Commentary on* Nemean V*,* Nemean III*, and* Pythian VIII. (*Mnemosyne* Supplement 197.) Pp. xii + 721. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 1999. Cased, $191.25. ISBN: 90-04-11381-9.

In this revised Leiden dissertation, Pfeijffer offers, besides a general introduction in which he defends his approach and discusses some features which seem to him characteristic of 'Pindar's style', 'interpretations' of three odes, each accompanied by a discussion of the metre and a detailed commentary. Unfortunately, the 'interpretations' are fantastic, and the whole work is characterized by a scarcely credible level of incompetence and carelessness.

The quality of Pf.'s interpretative essays may be judged from a consideration of that on *Nemean* 5. In ll. 19f. of this ode, having announced that he will not continue with

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.6 Published online by Cambridge University Press