



Project
MUSE[®]

Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.

beginning and end of nearly every verse of Callimachus's *Prologue* to the *Aetia* does not discourage him from tracing the organization of this passage. On the other hand, he does not take on the same task in the case of fragment 1 of *P.Oxy.* 4708, which contains the new elegy of Archilochus, because, as he explains, "[it] is very damaged, missing the beginning and end of nearly every line" (157, n. 2). Generally speaking, it is a pity that Faraone has avoided a discussion of the "new Archilochus." It would be extremely interesting, for example, to know Faraone's opinion of the provocative hypothesis recently formulated by Antonio Aloni and Alessandro Ianucci (*L'elegia greca e l'epigramma dalle origini al V secolo. Con un'appendice sulla 'nuova' elegia di Archiloco* [Florence, 2007]), who suggest the possibility of treating lines 5–15 and 16–25 as two *exempla* referring to two points of one mythic story, presented *a catena* as a pair of sympotic pieces (a consolatory and a celebrative one, joined together in the course of the later transmission)—all the more given that lines 16–25 especially could be fruitfully examined as specimens of five-couplet stanzas.

The presentation of arguments in the book is clear and lucid. Introductory and concluding remarks in each chapter as well as a glossary and indices are very user-friendly. However, it must be noted that the "Index of Passages" occasionally suffers from mistakes: e.g., the entry "Archilochus, fr. 1" refers the readers to page 157, n. 2, where they find a note on the fifteen-verses-long fragment 1 of the new papyrus, and not, as everybody would expect, on fragment 1 West.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that, although the five-couplet stanza theory must still remain an open issue, Faraone's book is a fruitful contribution to our understanding (or at least our attempt to understand) the repeating, definitely non-stichic scheme (as well as the musical framework subordinated to this scheme) as an important, if not primary, artistic medium of Ionic occasional verses.

KRYSZYNA BARTOL

UNIVERSITY OF POZNAŃ
e-mail: kbartol@mail.icpnet.pl

ÉVELYNE PRIOUX. *Petits musées en vers: Épigramme et discours sur les collections antiques*. L'Art & l'essai 5. Paris: CTHS, 2008. 416 pp. 26 color plates. Numerous black-and-white figs. Paper, €40.

This book investigates a relatively unstudied chapter of the well-known, competitive flirtation between poetry and the plastic arts, which is first evidenced by the fact that, from Homer onward, the vast majority of *ekphraseis* concern works of art. This flirtatious antagonism between text and artefact is connected with the fact that epigrams, in particular, display a symbiotic relationship with the monuments (funerary or dedicatory, real or imagined) which they often caption. Epigram as the ἀοδή τεχνήσεσσι λίθοι (CEG 429), although belonging originally to the archaic, epigraphic beginnings of the genre, became either a practical or a fictional mode, which was recycled in the literary, multifaceted epigrams of the

Hellenistic age. Not enough attention has been paid so far to the idea that, in the Hellenistic period, interest in collections of both works of art and poetry books might overlap time and again. Part of the reason for this scholarly inattention lies in the fact that the evidence for such collections is scanty. On the one hand, later anthologizers selected, dismembered, and reassembled most of the original collections of epigrams (indeed, this book could hardly be written before the discovery of the untouched original collection of the “New Posidippus,” whose structural organization has opened new horizons to literary analysis). On the other hand, we are left with even less information about ancient collections of artistic objects. Prioux concentrates on some of the border-crossing cases of anthologies of epigrams that comment or pretend to comment on collections of works of art and explores their iconographic projects.

The book is divided into two large sections, the first of which (25–140) considers three series of epigrams that illustrate works of art assembled as small, concrete, museological exhibitions. All three series were found *in situ* together with the relevant works of art: first, the “house of epigrams” at Pompeii (1.1); second, the crypto-portico of the so-called “house of Propertius” at Assisi (1.2); third, the Roman “villa of Aelian” (1.3). The second large section (141–335) deals with three series of epigrams that came to us as parts of poetic books from either papyrus or the Medieval transmission. These epigrams are separate from any physical monuments, but they presuppose, either fictionally or actually, a collection of works of art: first, Nossis 4–9 *HE*, all of which possibly comment on objects dedicated in a temple of Aphrodite (2.1); second, the *lithika* and the *andriantopoiika* of the “New Posidippus,” reflecting, respectively, an imaginary collection of rings intended to homage the Ptolemies and a sort of condensed history of art (2.2); third, the thirteen epigrams on statues gathered in the *Apophoreta* of Martial (170–82), corresponding to a selection of favorite images drawn from Domitian’s propaganda (2.3).

In section 1.1, Prioux argues that the five more or less readable epigrams found in the *exedra* of the “house of epigrams” are intended to interpret, rather than describe, the emotions or motivations of the painted characters—a density of meanings that the corresponding upper frescoes could only hint at. The foregrounding of a defiantly interpretive mode in these epigrams resonates with the crucial role played by the picture and epigram that are featured in the center of the *exedra* and represent Homer killed by the riddle posed by the young fishermen, according to the biographic tradition. This image of agonistic challenge could also be a metaphor for the superiority of epigram over epic poetry; in my opinion, however, not of the epigram *tout court*, but specifically of the riddle epigrams, which depict the interpretive “contest” between the poet and the obscure sense of the *stelai* images (they date at least from Leonidas Tar. 22 *HE*, and come into fashion with and after Antipater Sid. in the first century B.C.E.). The character of the epigram by Euenus (3 *GP*) accompanying the picture of a ram that insolently eats a vine and is retributively carried away to sacrifice (Dionysiac, of course) is also agonistic, as is the epigram and picture of Pan challenging Eros (a contest not infrequently associated with the Dionysiac sphere).

To this last Pan panel are connected the picture and epigram (by Leonidas Tar. 46 *HE*) on the three brothers—fowler, hunter, and fisherman—dedicating to Pan their respective nets.

The very bad condition of the Assisi temperas necessitates the conjectural character of Prioux's attempts in the next chapter (1.2) to reconstruct the relationships between text and picture. For instance, the hexameter, reproduced from *Il.* 7.264, which describes Hector in his fight with Ajax as he draws back and seizes a huge stone, is connected with a tempera in which only two goats and a ram are still visible. M. Guarducci suggested that the picture represented Ajax killing the herds in his madness. Prioux supposes that it might depict Polyphemus throwing rocks at Odysseus. Were this second option actually the case, the epigram would be neatly paralleled by another tempera and epigram on the same wall of the corridor representing Polyphemus and Galatea, or at least would have something in common with the other tempera and epigram of Narcissus (cf. the Cyclops of Theocritus 6.34–40 and Ovid, *Met.* 13.840–45, where the Cyclops sees himself in the water and finds his body attractive). It would thus certainly enhance Prioux's reading, which aims to identify all possible elements of coherence. But referring the Iliadic line to a scene totally unrelated to Ajax seems less economic than assuming, with Guarducci, its metaphorical re-use in another Ajax episode. In any case, Prioux shows that Apollonian themes, among them music, musical instruments, and divination, are doubtless leitmotifs shared by several temperas and epigrams: Apollo's chariot with the god's lyre, pendant to the badly preserved epigram of Dionysus and the panther (hence the idea that the relevant tempera of the latter may have included a chariot with Dionysiac attributes); Apollo nourishing his new-born son Iamos with the help of two snakes; the finding of the aulos of Marsyas who had been defeated by Apollo; Heracles in female disguise as a slave of Omphale after offending Apollo's Delphic priestess (this labor was often interpreted by the ancients as a kind of *servitium amoris*—was it here a homage to Propertius?); the lovesick Cyclops and Galatea, with the tempera representing him together with his syrinx, and the epigram focusing upon him as singing to Galatea and shepherding at the same time (ποιμαίνει Πολύφημος αείδων). In my opinion, this last epigram may involve a departure from the Theocritean tradition of the professionally irresponsible Cyclops-in-love who can no longer take care of his flocks (cf. Theocritus 11.11–13, confirmed by Ovid *Met.* 13.778–86), and suggests a synthesis of erotic song and good shepherding. This departure would be in tune with the way the erotic-pastoral poet Bion (fr. 16) represents the Cyclops' singing as an almost perennial elegiac *servitium amoris*, or with the happy ending of matrimonial life with Galatea, which is adopted by Propertius 3.2.7–18 (after Timaeus, *FGH* 566F69). After all, as Prioux correctly remarks (116), the texts of the north wall mainly deal with bucolic motifs, whereas on the south wall Tereus, Heracles and Omphale, and Narcissus point to erotic motifs. Perhaps we can then suppose that the juxtaposition of the two walls hints at the synthesis of pastoral and erotic motifs, which was a significant theme, after Bion, of Propertius' poetry (cf. M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* [Cambridge, 2005]: 171–90).

Chapter 1.3 deals with two herms (one representing Homer, the other Menander) found in a villa south of Rome. Each herm includes three epigrams written by one Aelian, who “signs” epigram 2 on the Homer-herm and may have been the Praeneste polymath of the *Varia Historia*. It cannot be ruled out that Antipater Sid. was the model for the technique of variation on a theme which Aelian followed in juxtaposing three epigrams on each poet, as Prioux suggests. But Aelian’s epigrams seem to me to express the polyphony of different points of view (adopted as the norm in pairs of inscribed epigrams of the archaic and classical age) rather than to indulge in the technique of formal variation on a theme that is typical of the Hellenistic age. More definitive are Prioux’s analyses of the strong debt of epigram 1 on the Homer-herm to Antipater Sid. 9 *HE* and to Antipater Thess. (?) 85.4 *GP* (Homer as ἀρχέτυπος; the epigram has been variously assigned to both Antipaters; however, Sid.’s paternity is made more probable by the epigram on the Homer-herm). The connection which Prioux advocates between the erotic seductiveness of Menander’s gaze according to epigrams 1 and 3 on the Menander-herm and the tradition about the gaze of the “Eros of Thespiæ” by Praxiteles is also quite plausible.

Prioux next addresses Nossis 4–9 *HE* (chap. 2.1) and argues that these poems develop a discourse on female religiosity and a “way of seeing” similar to Theocritus 15. She suggests that Herondas *Mim.* 4 possibly parodies Nossis, and the references to the character “Nossis daughter of Erinna” at *Mim.* 6.20 and 33 are indeed intriguing. Along these lines, it seems to me that this kind of “desecrating” allusion would parallel the parody of Callimachus *HPall.* 2 in Posidippus (or Asclepiades) *127 AB. However, in consideration of the technical/topic nature of the verb χαίρειν, I think that the greeting to Athena in *Mim.* 4.58 could hardly be identified by the ancients as an allusion to the frequent occurrence of χαίρειν in Nossis (cf., e.g., Theocritus 15.131), unless, improbably, Herondas intended to poke fun at Theocritus and Nossis jointly.

In chapter 2.2, Prioux discusses a section of the “New Posidippus,” the epigrams on precious stones (*lithika*) to whose structural arrangement modern scholars have already discovered some clues (e.g., P. Bing, who saw that the geographic provenance of the various stones outlines the borders of Alexander’s empire, and R. Hunter, who perceived that they progress from the smallest to the largest stones). Prioux detects other probable structural threads. The bracelet of Mandane, in connection with Darius (4 AB), the carnelian with the emblem of Darius (8 AB), the cylindrical stone connected to a Nabataean king of the Arabs (10 AB), and Polycrates’ ring, unavoidably recalling the pharaoh Amasis (9 AB), all disseminate images of royal power to be contrasted with the ideal monarchy of the Ptolemies. In a similar vein, Prioux reads Bellerophon’s defeat of the Chimera (14 AB) as symbolizing the attitude of Greece towards the subjugation of Asia (a temporary victory, however, and less durable than Alexander’s conquest); the seal ring with the lion which was Darius III’s and later possibly Alexander’s (13 AB) as symbolizing the continuity between Alexander and the Persian kings; the mention of the sharp eye of Lynceus (15 AB) as possibly evoking the Egyptian god Horus, thus hinting at forms of continuity between the Ptolemies and

pharaohs. S. Stephens (*Seeing Double* [Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2003]) collects abundant evidence of precisely this double reading of Greek mythology in terms of Egyptian religion; its omission is the only serious instance of bibliographic neglect by the splendidly informed Prioux.

It is to be expected that the epigrams of the *andriantopoiika*, focusing on artists of very different ages, reflect a sort of history of art or, at least, that they magnify aspects of the most widespread Hellenistic views on poetics (cf. A. Sens in K. Gutzwiller, ed., *The New Posidippus* [Oxford, 2005]). Prioux adds that they may reflect Posidippus' own aesthetics, which seem open to the appreciation of a compromise between the classical idea of sublimity/grandeur (and big size) on the one hand and the Callimachean, and more widely third-century, taste for the λεπτότης (and small size) on the other; Posidippus would especially exemplify this approach through the works of Theodorus of Samos (67 AB) and of Chares of Lindus (68 AB). Posidippus' mediatory stance may actually help us understand the opposition between Callimachus and himself, who seems to be listed as one of the Telchines in the *Aitia* diegesis.

In my opinion, Posidippus' *hippika* might be considered as further validation of Prioux's approach to the *lithika* and *andriantopoiika* as exemplifying authorial projects. These epigrams, which mainly celebrate Ptolemaic queens who had won chariot races, seem to be (and, in normal circumstances, would have been) captions to statues celebrating the victors in the relevant sanctuaries hosting the games (cf. the epigram on the statue celebrating the Olympian chariot victory of Cynisca, the sister of a Spartan king, *CEG* 820 = *AP* 13.16). However, neither archaeology nor Pausanias offers any evidence of sanctuary monuments recording the equestrian victories of Ptolemaic queens. Posidippus will thus have autonomously constructed a κῦδος for the queens that did not depend upon such a monumental celebration but rather figuratively "accompanied" it.

In her final chapter (2.3), Prioux revives the hypothesis (formulated by K. Lehmann many years ago) that Martial's *Apophoreta* may evoke some of the statues adorning the temple of Augustus later renovated by Domitian. Prioux presents fresh arguments to show that these epigrams may constitute a miniature political history which parallels or rather combines the origins and ideological motivations of Augustus' principate with the Flavians' ascent to power: Io and Europa (180) and Hero and Leander (181) hint at the imperial wars in Asia; Danae (175) evokes the prince's liberality through the golden rain associated with her; Apollo Sauroctonos (172) suggests Apollo-Augustus; Heracles strangling the snakes (177) recalls Heracles-Domitian; the mask of a German (176) points to the expedition of Domitian against the Catti (the relevant triumph was celebrated in 83 C.E., one or two years after the publication of the *Apophoreta*), etc. Last but not least, Martial appears to have associated suggestions of long, epic poems (184, 186) with the humbler statues (*sortes pauperis*), and parodic or short poems (183, 185) with the richer statues of expensive materials (*sortes divitis*)—perhaps a tacit revelation of Martial's aesthetic preferences?

These few pages cannot not do justice to the richness of this thoughtful and brilliant book. My tentative further suggestions should only show how fruitful and

provocative are the issues it has selected and investigated. There are few typos, and the Greek is quite correct (ἀγών written as perispomenon more than once in chap. 1.1, though disappointing, remains an isolated case).

MARCO FANTUZZI

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY AND UNIVERSITÀ DI MACERATA
e-mail: mf2481@columbia.edu

WALTER SCHEIDEL, IAN MORRIS, AND RICHARD P. SALLER, eds. *The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. xv + 942 pp. 29 black-and-white figs. 26 maps. 15 tables. Cloth, \$225.

Douglass North is the hero of this project. He is an Americanist economic historian who was awarded (with Robert Fogel) the 1993 Nobel Prize in Economics “for having renewed research in economic history by applying economic theory and quantitative methods in order to explain economic and institutional change” (Nobel Committee). Can it be that North has rescued scholars from the formalist/substantivist, modernizer/primitivist debates that have been distracting the study of the ancient economies for more than a hundred years? The editors of this volume tell us that North has urged scholars of economic history to emphasize “the structure and performance of economies through time” (*Structure and Change in Economic History* [New York, 1981]: 3). By performance he means how much is produced, how stable that production is, how product and its costs are distributed. By structure he means the political, economic, and cultural institutions, the demographics, and the technology within which the performance is accomplished and measured. North provides guiding principles for this collection of first-class studies of aspects of antiquity’s economies. Except where noted below, the emphases in the twenty-eight chapters, each about thirty pages and each successful in their own ways, are regularly *production*, *distribution*, and *consumption*, what I will call the Northian Triad. Many of the best chapters adhere to the editorial imperative that, if it can be measured, measure it. This means new approaches to especially the Greek materials, including new efforts at estimating populations and the effects of changing demographics on production and consumption.

The editors are distinctly suited to this task. Walter Scheidel’s work on demographics, especially, but not only, on the Roman side, brings a coherence to the entire project. Ian Morris’ thoughtful and often bold treatments of Greek material culture articulate with the volume’s emphasis on measurement. Richard Saller brings to the project his long experience in studying the ancient economy, especially the production and membership of Roman households.

Following the coeditors’ introduction, part 1, “The Determinants of Economic Performance,” is comprised of five chapters, on the environment, demography, the household (mostly Roman), law, and technology. In general this part