glib or downright false (thus p. 34: the 'greatest exploit' of the Myceneans 'was the Trojan War. It was also their last.'). Her remarks on the performability of the Hesiodic poems (pp. 42–3) are equally ill-informed: it is not true to say that 'Hesiod's poems, like Homer's, are too long for a single performance', and N.'s tentative use of formulaic theory at this point to explain the (ostensible) discontinuity of *Works and Days* is a non-starter which she rapidly abandons. To some extent such lapses can be explained by the intended audience of N.'s book, one wider than 'professional Classicists' (p. ix); hence N. claims to be relegating her allusions to more strictly academic debates to the very extensive footnotes. There may be doubts as to whether N. has really succeeded in making Hesiod accessible to the general reader, or fallen between academic and popular stools.

Grene's translation of the *Works and Days*, with which the main body of the book begins, captures the ruggedness of the original well, although I can see no grounds for his claim (p. 7) to be replicating Hesiod's metre.

Brasenose College, Oxford LLEWELYN MORGAN

ALCAEUS

G. LIBERMAN (ed., trans.): *Alcée.* Fragments (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. cxxvii + 95; 96–279 (1–195 double; 2 vols); 2 pls, 1 map. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 2-251-00476-9.

Since Edgar Lobel set new standards in the 1920s, the Lesbian poets have been fortunate in their editors. The *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta* of Lobel and Page (Oxford, 1955) still stands as a gaunt landmark with only slight signs of erosion. Eva-Maria Voigt's monumental *Sappho et Alcaeus* of 1971 has remained unchallenged as the edition of first recourse, while D. A. Campbell's Loeb (*Greek Lyric* i, 1982) reproduces most of its virtues at a much lower price. Now, to replace the long outdated Budé volume by A. Puech (after T. Reinach), we have an outstandingly good Alcaeus from Gauthier Liberman. Here is an editor in complete command of his material, one who is not only extremely well informed but has a mind of his own and good judgement to match: *rara auis in terris.*

The long and rich introduction begins by sketching the situation of music and poetry at Lesbos in the seventh century and noting the dominance of Ionian epic, which is such as to constitute 'un arrière-fond' of Alcaeus' and Sappho's poetry. Next the events and chronology of Alcaeus' life are examined; the view that he, Sappho, and Pittacus are to be down-dated to the time of Croesus is firmly rejected. Then the character of his poetry is discussed, and the circumstances of its production and transmission. L. rightly concludes that it was predominantly sympotic in origin, enjoying some oral diffusion, but necessarily (for survival in such quantity) collected in writing at an early stage. Theophrastus and Phaenias, as natives of Lesbos, perhaps played a rôle in stimulating Peripatetic study of the poems and so giving them passage to Alexandria (pp. xxxviiif.), where they were imitated by Theocritus and edited successively by Aristophanes and Aristarchus. The orthography of the Alexandrian edition may have reflected that of a fourth-century Lesbian text (pp. xliii–xlv). The poems were not arranged by metre or genre; there are perhaps signs of an attempt to

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

group together those reflecting similar situations and to order them chronologically. The later tradition can be followed down to the fifth century A.D., but no further, in contrast to that of Sappho, who continued to be copied at least into the seventh century. The introduction concludes with a survey of metres, with appropriate quotations from ancient metricians.

The collection of fragments (preceded by a collection of fifty-seven *Testimonia vitae atque artis*, grouped under various headings) is very complete, except that L., like Voigt, omits some of the tinier papyrus scraps that yield no meaning. He also excludes, as being by Sappho rather than Alcaeus, the fragments of P. Oxy. 1788, 2291, 2299, and P. Fouad 239 (frr. 115–28A V. = 115–28 L.-P.; 303A V. = Sa. 99 L.-P.; inc. auct. 28–41 V. = Alc. 252–82 L.-P.; Sa. 44A V. = Alc. 304 L.-P.). On the other hand he includes thirteen of V.'s *fragmenta incerti auctoris.* All these decisions are justified in careful discussion on pp. lxxxvii–c.

The presentation of the texts is accurate. The metre of each fragment, where determinable, is indicated in the heading. Often there are several lines of introduction on the left-hand page, which exacerbates the usual problems of Budé layout. Quotation contexts are given in full (a major lack in Lobel–Page), and the critical apparatus, while not as extensive as Voigt's, is as ample as the series format can be expected to accommodate, and generally sufficient. Textual and exegetical problems are given detailed treatment in numerous substantial notes keyed to the translation.

'Exception faite des citations pré-alexandrines, le texte d'Alcée que veut produire un éditeur moderne est celui de l'édition alexandrine d'Aristophane de Byzance ou plutôt d'Aristarque' (p. lxxxii). In obedience to this principle, L. considers it proper to print forms thought to have stood in the Alexandrian text even where they represent neo- or hyper-Lesbianisms, such as the nominative type *Αἰολίδαις* (made on the analogy of the type *ἐλέφαις* < *-*αντς*). This is also the practice of other editors, but I see nothing to be said for it. If we believe that Alcaeus wrote *-αις*, why perpetuate a later falsification?

L.'s text differs little from Voigt's. His introduction of written digammas in **140**.15 *Ϝέργον* and **347**.1 *Ϝοίνωι* is debatable (cf. E.-M. Hamm, *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios* [Berlin, 1957], p. 23). Other notable novelties are **130b**.10 *ὠθά[ν]α̣ος* (from P. Oxy. 3711); **208**.9 *ἀγκύλαι* (Unger); **298**.3 *ἄμ]φενι*; **324** *ζάγυιοι* ci.; **325**.2 <*πεδίω*> *μέδ*<*ηις*>; **358**.3 *νηπ[ίαι]ς* ci.; **384** *Ἄφροι* (Pfeiffer); **401B** *ἄρμενα δ' οὔ· χύταν δ' ἀλέκτοριν*.

Some notes and comments. A few mistranslations are apparent, especially in the *Testimonia vitae atque artis*: p. **iii**, *ἐν τῶι τοσούτωι χρόνωι τῶι μνημονευομένωι* is 'in all this span of recorded time'; p. **xxxv**, unless I misread the French, Horace's point is completely missed; p. **xlviii**, *τὰ μόρια* are 'particles'. Fr. **8**.2, *θά[νην* is metrically problematic. **42**.15, to get rid of the Phrygians Hall proposed *δάμεντες*. **45**.1, the accent added by the second hand in the papyrus implies Lobel's *Α[ἶνον*. **113**.–1, e.g. *μη]κύνειε* (or *μα]κ-*, if verse); anyway not 'donner un baiser'. **129**.7, better *Αἰολήαν* (*Phil.* 110 [1966], 151). **167**.13, *]ν̣ᾰ̈ων*, not *ν̣ᾰ̈ων*. **207**.5–6, the join with 305a.6–11 has been made independently by G. Lentini, *ZPE* 127 (1999), 47–51. **283**.3, Helen's *πτόησις* was not 'terreur'. **296b**.3, *ὀείγ-* is to be restored with Lobel. **298**.18–20, more supplements might be mentioned, e.g. *ἄνδρεσ]σι* Gallavotti; *πικρο]τάτα* Treu; *ἐν χέρ]σι* (the attested Lesbian form) West. **299**.3 al., *ἄβα* (hyper-Lesbian) is nowhere certain. **306g**.8 (and n. 203), *ἐπιδοίη* is surely unlikely to = *ἐπίδοι*, despite Sappho's *λαχοίην* and *ἀγαγοίην* (33.2, 169); for the third person she has *εἴποι* (88.13). Cf. Hamm, 164. **306g'**.4, *Οὐρ[ανοῦ υἱός* . . . ? Cf. Sapph. 198. **317**, **363**, better *σ' αὔτωι, Ϝ' αὔτωι*? **328** ≈ 425? **341**, not Procl. in Hes. but sch. vet. **344**, unwanted punctuation after

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/51.1.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press