HOMERIC HYMNS AND APOCRYPHA

M. L. WEST (ed., trans.): *Homeric Hymns. Homeric Apocrypha. Lives of Homer.* (Loeb Classical Library 496.) Pp. xii + 467. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2003. Cased, £14.50. ISBN: 0-674-99606-2.

M. L. WEST (ed., trans.): *Greek Epic Fragments. From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries B.C.* (Loeb Classical Library 497.) Pp. x + 316. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2003. Cased, £14.50. ISBN: 0-674-99605-4.

These two volumes, with a third containing Hesiod, replace the single Loeb of Hesiod, the *Hymns* and Homerica by H.G. Evelyn-White (1914). They easily surpass their predecessor, and everyone will need them. Both have indexes of names. I will take the *Hymns* first, and call the volume of epic fragments 'II'.

W. dates the *Hymns* between the seventh and the fifth centuries B.C. or later (p. 5). He offers a complex reconstruction of how *Hy. Ap.* was put together, believing that Cynaethus composed the Delian section (rather than appropriated a seventh-century original), not citing the crucial evidence of Hes. fr. 357. He also asserts that Cynaethus crassly interpolated ll. 305–56 (p. 2), whereas this passage, composed in a complex ring-structure typical of oral poetry and inserted like the story of Odysseus' scar in *Od.* 19, takes up the theme of challenges to the power of Zeus and his son that runs through the Pythian section. W. dates the other major hymns at least half a century too low, eliding all other views; this matches his assertion that Hesiod antedates Homer, which statistical analysis of the distribution of the commonest alternative forms in epic diction demolished long ago. He refuses any notion of oral composition: thus *Hy*. 18 is 'abstracted' (p. 18) from the long hymn to Hermes rather than an oral variant of a traditional proem. Hence he offers no explanation for the disparities in length among the *Hymns* (p. 4); this variation suited the needs of bards composing in this genre (see my article 'The Structure of the *Homeric Hymns*', *Hermes* 109 [1981], 9–24, missing from his bibliography).

Thanks to R. Merkelbach in *ZPE* 12 (1973) and A. Hurst's Geneva papyrus, W. is able to present a much fuller text of *Hy.* 1 to Dionysus. He rightly assigns *Hy.* 8 to Proclus. The poem *Εἰς ξένους* is wrongly omitted; the other version (p. 362) is an oral variant. His text of the *Hymns* contains numerous emendations, many palmary (e.g. *Hy. Herm*. 116, 126, 325, 385, 423, *Hy.* 29.12), others superfluous (e.g. *Hy. Dem.* 328, *Hy. Ap.* 364, 391). He often deletes supposed 'doublets'. He follows indirect tradition (Thucydides) rather than the MSS in the Delian hymn (p. 83) and wrongly restores more archaic forms in places (e.g. *Hy. Ap.* 24, *Hy. Herm*. 402, *Hy. Aphr.* 125 and 54, on which see *Glotta* 56 [1978], 192–5). At *Hy. Aphr.* 63 he even imports the reading *ἐδανῶι* from the vulgate of *Il.* 14.172, where it is a *lectio falsa* contradicted by the best sources.

The prose translation, generally readable, is rarely antiquated: I noted 'lief' (p. 189) and 'forsooth' (p. 331). But it is often eccentric or inept, especially over the traditional epithets. W. renders Hades' epithet *πολυσημάντωρ* 'the Major General' (always with capitals), 'because he has so many under his command' (p. 33 n.); the explanation is correct but the effect is ludicrous—why not say 'ruler of many' or the like? (Yet *σημάντορες* are 'ruffians' on p. 43.) There are ungainly phrases like 'dark-cloud Zeus' and 'gold-wand Hermes'. Then there is 'goat-rider Zeus' (*Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο*), which is

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.283 Published online by Cambridge University Press

never glossed. Even if the Indo-European thunderer did drive a car drawn by birds called 'goats', our bards never present Zeus as goat-propelled, but as holder of the aegis (see my comments on *Il.* 15.18–31, 15.308–11). Then there is Artemis 'of the view-halloo' (κελαδεινή,161), also unglossed. Will our students understand this? Did the press have no readers, or the series editor a nap?

There are other problems too. W. takes χεῖρες as 'hands' and πόδες as 'feet', not 'arms' and 'legs' (pp. 291, 293, 331), which is why he often omits them in translation (Apollo drops Hermes *from his arms*, p. 137); the semantic field of these nouns is the same as in Russian рука and нога. Since W. takes μακρός as 'long', mountains are 'long' (39, 73), and ἔρματα μακρά are 'a long line of props', not 'tall props' (p. 111); the Derveni commentator had the same problem (col. xii). Worst, Apollo tells Hermes 'you have better not go on growing much longer' (μακρὸν ἀέξεσθαι, 145), as if measuring the baby in centimetres; students will think a length of time is in question, as if ἔτι were in the text. Apollo actually fears what Hermes will do when he grows in stature. One cannot correct a mistake by repeating it, *nimium amator vitii sui.*

In a list of places δῆμος Ἀθηνέων is 'the people of Athens' rather than 'village' (p. 73, with the same error at p. 371) and πόλις is a 'home' (p. 75). Mansions are 'bustling' (ἠχήεντα, p. 41), the gods have a 'congregation' (ὁμηγυρις, p. 71), the thunderbolt is 'august and reverend' (the epithets belong to the gods, p. 71), Typhaon is 'problematic' (ἀργάλεον, p. 95), ἤθελεν means 'was hoping' (p. 139), and δρυσί are 'oak-trunks' (p. 141) rather than tamarisk and myrtle 'twigs' (cf. p. 119), where the poet uses the archaic sense of δρῦς, cognate with 'tree'. When the fixed epithet in ἵππων ὠκειάων is rendered 'racehorses' (p. 91), readers will fancy that there were games at Telphousa's spring, which was actually a watering-hole (see my article in *CQ* 36 [1986], 38–59, at 55). In no atlas does the gulf of Crisa 'cut through the rich Peloponnese' (p. 105). There are a few brief notes: W. finds space to tell us all about the Thriae (p. 157), but much else needed a word of explanation, e.g. the 'cutter of roots' (p. 51) or the rôle of Telphousa, or even a note that the matter is obscure, e.g. the rites at Onchestus. At p. 45 n. 7 'he' is impossible, cf. *Hy. Dem.* 223.

W. is at his best in the 'Homeric Apocrypha'—*Margites*, *Cercopes*, *Epikichlides*, *Animal and Bird Epics*, including the new *Battle of the Cats and Mice* from Michigan papyrus 6946 (although W. makes the cats 'weasels'). The editing is brilliant and the translations give full rein to a sense of fun. At *Batr.* 118 read ὃς τρίτος ἦν.

The *Lives of Homer* are also an invaluable collection of texts. Unfortunately W. omits from his account of the *Certamen* Hes. fr. 357, Plut. *Mor.* 153F and the second century B.C. papyrus *Greek Papyrological Society* inv. M2 (B. Mandilaras in *Papyrologica Lupiensia* I, ed. M. Capasso [Lecce, 1992], 55–62). The traditions about the poets are much older than he allows (p. 304), since Heraclitus knew the story of Homer's death (22 B 56 D.-K.). His editing of this neglected prose, despite some palmary conjectures, can be timid: ἔστιν . . . Ἡσιόδου (p. 328) must be deleted as a gloss, like that at pp. 333–5; read <ἦσαν> Ἀπελλῆς (p. 404), and πάσχοι not πράξοι (p. 436). There are some needless conjectures in the verse, e.g. ὀλιγηπελέοντα (p. 370). δύναται is not 'means' (p. 337), nor γυμνός 'naked' (p. 339); πρόφρων means 'kindly' (p. 365), ἐν ἡλικίηι 'at that age', not 'of age' (p. 383). Pisistratus' epigram has no reference (p. 441); the numerous references to Crates (pp. 28, 434, etc.) should cite the edition of M. Broggiato (La Spezia 2001), which has replaced Wachsmuth's. W. usefully adds the *Appendix Romana*, but should have included the similar passages in Dindorf and the extract from Aristonicus in Venice (Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* I, p. lxv).

Volume II is disappointing. The user of early epic fragments has faced a

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.283 Published online by Cambridge University Press

confusing situation, where the collection of M. Davies errs on the side of omission and that of A. Bernabé on that of inclusiveness (my own preference), with different fragment-numbers. With the great majority of the possible fragments so well collected and edited, W. could easily have offered us this mass of fascinating and partly new material in its entirety. However, although Volume II is much slimmer than Volume I, W. chooses to omit the numerous papyri containing unidentified hexameters with no post-archaic features (p. 35). Many of these are archaic, even if we cannot say to which poem they belong. I think, above all, of the extraordinary *Meropis* called 'post-Homeric' by Apollodorus of Athens; this is an anonymous seventh- or sixth-century local epic from Cos (see my note on *Il.* 14.250–61). Aristeas of Proconnesus and Epimenides are missing too. Panyasis is in, Choerilus of Samos and Antimachus of Colophon out; this may be a sensible point at which to draw the line, but leaves in the lurch the reader who needs a translation of the latter poets. W.'s subtitle conveys his agenda—the systematic down-dating of the archaic epos. He tries to date the *Thebaid* to after 573 B.C. (p. 7) even though Callinus mentioned the poem (p. 8), the *Cypria*, amazingly, to the later sixth century (p. 13) and the *Alcmeonis* even to the early fifth century (p. 11). How could Panyasis have 'rescued the art of verse from extinction' (p. 189), if so much was being composed just before his time? There are fanciful theories about the *Expedition of Amphiaraus* (p. 9). In cavalier fashion, W. turns upside-down the painstaking conclusions of the Neoanalysts without even acknowledging their work (p. 14).

The fragments are superbly organized, with many good suggestions and ingenious reconstructions. We must live with yet another numeration of most of them (but there is a concordance). Proclus' summary of the Cycle is usefully supplemented from Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* (the brackets are impossible to follow at 72, and Apollodorus' information is left out at 154). Two glosses are printed in *Theb*. fr. 11 (see Davies's text); the existence of the 'Mythographus homericus' ought to have been acknowledged. Brackets are missing in the translation of *Cyp.* fr. 2. In fr. 11.12 read δεινὰ for αἰνὰ (the converse error is in fr. 30.1). W. does not note that fr. 14 contradicts Proclus' summary. πέλωρα should be 'monsters' (107). In *Aeth*. fr. 2 read ἐΐς. In *Il. Parv.* fr. 4 ἀργάλεον λιμένα is rendered 'harbour with difficulty'; much of fr. 6 belongs in the Testimonia. An emendation falsely limits the punishment of Locrian Ajax to that sinner, as if innocent people are never punished for what the guilty do (147). In *Nostoi* fr. 9 read κα[τακαυ]θῆναι. διαλύει means 'reconciles', not 'pacifies' (167). In *Teleg.* fr. 5 read Τηλεγόνωι for Τηλεμάχωι (the only misprint I noticed in either volume). The fr. of Pisander in Ap. *Bibl.* 1.8.5 is omitted; in fr. 7 πολλὰ μογήσας is verse. ὥς is omitted in Panyasis fr. 21.1. 'Simonides' needed to be glossed 'of Amorgos' (221). The citation of Apollodorus is very incomplete in Eumelus fr. 6: see my note on *Il.* 14.295–6. οὐ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔχειν δεομένηι συγγνώμην should be 'he would not forgive her although she begged him' (Eum. fr. 23). The text of fr. 26 is impossible; in fr. 32 read 'Amyclas' for 'Amyclus' (cf. Paus. 3.1.3 etc.). In Asius fr. 13.5 emend to ἶκον, in *Danais* fr. 2 to τὸν Ἡφαίστου. Several Testimonia ascribing the *Minyas* to Prodicus of Samos, Phocaea, or Perinthus are missing (cf. 251, 271); W. rightly assigns *P.Ibscher* to it. In *Naup.* fr. 8 τὸν αὐτοῦ οἶκον is impossible: transpose αὐτοῦ to follow οἶκον. The *Epica Adespota* are a sorry crew. W.'s fr. 11 is a plus-verse to *Od.* 3.130 in Philodemus' *De bono rege secundum Homerum* col. 33.32 (so J. Fish in his forthcoming edition), while K. Tsantsanoglou has seen that fr. 12 is Orph. *Theog.* fr. 16 Bernabé (see my 'The Derveni Papyrus: an Interim Text', *ZPE* 141 [2002], 1–62, app. crit. to col. xxiii.11, with a new reading). Other pieces are left to languish in the *Supplementum Hellenisticum* or nowhere, e.g. *fortunam Priami cantabo et nobile bellum*, which Horace

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.283 Published online by Cambridge University Press

expressly says is the start of a cyclic poem (*AP* 135–6). In short, a great opportunity for yet further progress has been missed.

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor R. JANKO

THE HYMN TO DEMETER

A. SUTER: *The Narcissus and the Pomegranate. An Archaeology of the Homeric* Hymn to Demeter. Pp. xii + 268, ills. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2002. Cased, US$60/£42.50. ISBN: 0-472-11249-X.

One should be aware from the outset that the term 'archaeology' in the title of this book is understood broadly by its author. S. sets out to re-examine thoroughly the narrative of the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* (*Dem.*), and in doing so makes use of a diverse set of scholarly approaches. Indeed, there is an impressive array of information to grapple with here. The study considers the poem in the light of data from oral-diction analysis, narratology, genre stylistics, modern psychoanalytic theory, anthropology, other versions of the myth, linguistics, and, finally, archaeology itself. Evidence from all these fields suggests, according to S., a new understanding of the poem, that at its deepest levels *Dem.* is concerned with two things: (i) Demeter's take-over of Persephone's powers as fertility goddess at Eleusis, the latter having been the earlier goddess at the site who is subordinated to the rôle of daughter; and (ii) the superimposition of the Olympian frame onto the original core story, evident in competition between Zeus and Demeter for control of Persephone.

After a useful introduction which outlines the argument in each of the eight principal chapters of the book, S. chooses to deal with the second of these threads first. A sort of 'Olympianism' visible in the *Hymns*, the superimposition of the patriarchal Olympian frame, in which Zeus is the dominant player, onto pre-existing matriarchal myths, is not a new idea. The argument was first put forth by J. S. Clay, *The Politics of Olympus* (Princeton, 1989), and S. attempts to expand upon that study here. In itself, the idea is an intriguing one. As S. points out at the beginning of Chapter 2 apropos of *Dem.*, Zeus often remains a distant character in the *Hymns*, despite an underlying principle that his will ultimately controls events. The difficulty, of course, lies in the lack of surviving early epic. What once may have circulated, in written or oral form, remains a mystery. It is difficult, therefore, to say what is individual innovation in epic and what is a gradual development. Thus, while Clay's attractive work cautiously points to trends, what S. attempts to show here is something dangerously concrete; a conscious programme of 'Olympianization' by the poet of *Dem.*, which can be detected in the confrontation between Zeus and Demeter. The argument goes that the powerful rôle of Demeter in her interactions with Zeus points to the dominance of the original 'core story', over which the poet is imposing the Olympian frame. However, a particularly unique and striking confrontation between the two gods is not convincingly argued for here. S. first makes extensive use of R. Martin's distinction between μῦθος and ἔπος. He has suggested in *The Language of Heroes* (Ithaca, 1989) that μῦθος is the marked term in Homer, while ἔπος is the unmarked, more generic word. The former often denotes power and authority and frequently describes Zeus' commands in the *Iliad*. S. applies this theory to *Dem.*, arguing that in contrast to the *Iliad*, none of Zeus' speech acts is called a μῦθος in the hymn; Demeter, however,

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.283 Published online by Cambridge University Press