

of cognoscenti. As snapshots of where the field of Homeric scholarship stands at this particular moment, these three volumes constitute an illuminating work and it is a pleasure to see so many diverse voices and views gathered under this single well-modeled roof. But with resources like the recently revised *Oxford Classical Dictionary* and Ian Morris and Barry Powell's *New Companion to Homer*, with its much fuller discussion of some of the topics treated here, to say nothing of the multiple electronic means of discovering information about the characters, places, artifacts and institutions cited in the Homeric songs, it is hard to see what niche the *Encyclopedia* is designed to fill (particularly with its \$600 price tag). This is not to detract from the undoubted merits and richness of what F. and her team have produced; only to question whether it is not time for putting a curb on publishers' seemingly insatiable taste for ventures of this kind.

Deborah Steiner

Columbia University

Paul Curtis, *Stesichoros's Geryoneis* (Mnemosyne Supplement 333), Leiden: Brill, 2011. 201 pp. ISBN: 978-90-04-20767-7.

In *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 32, 1967, Lobel published P.Oxy. 2617, a collection of 66 fragments which have been assigned to Stesichorus' *Geryoneis*. Many of the fragments are too small or too tattered to be of any real value, but some are large enough to provide clues to the contents of the poem. Not surprisingly, the publication of these fragments elicited studies on a grand scale. There have been at least thirty articles devoted exclusively to the *Geryoneis* and this does not include many other studies which deal in part with the poem. Now we have three books to add to the list. The first appeared over thirty years ago, *Die Geryoneis des Stesichoros und die frühe griechische Kunst*, Würzburg 1980, by P. Brize. Valuable though this study is for artistic representations, there are many aspects of the poem that lie outside the author's concern. The areas not covered by Brize are now the subject of two full-scale studies, one by M. Lazzeri, *Studi sulla Gerioneide di Stesicoro*, Napoli 2008, and the other by Paul Curtis (C.). This is not the place to discuss at length Lazzeri's book and I restrict myself to the statement that in my view, in spite of its considerable length (470 pp.), it is a less rigorous treatment than that by C.

I begin with an outline of the book. The Introduction (pp. 1-65) covers all the areas that one might expect: the prosopography of Stesichorus, the myth and cult of Geryon, performance, language, metre, description of the papyri, and more. This is followed by the text of 26 fragments, with translations and detailed apparatus, and then the commentary. Concluding are a text and translation of 35 testimonia, parallels from oriental languages (Vedic and Iranian) with text and translation, bibliography, and indices.

The introduction is a model of hard facts combined with a healthy skepticism. C. shows, for example, that the myth of Geryon was well established before Stesichorus and consequently the *Geryoneis* is not necessarily 'to be directly linked with remains of 6th and 5th century visual sources' (p. 19). Particularly impressive is his treatment of the arguments for a choral vs. monodic performance of Stesichorus' poems. C. supports the former, and I agree. The metrical schema is essentially the same as Page prints in his *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis* (p. 5), but the analysis of this schema is extremely detailed. Unfortunately, as will be pointed out below, the supplements he provides do not always agree with his metrical outline. The final sections are on the papyri. Although the handwriting is the same for all the fragments, this is no guarantee that all belong to the *Geryoneis*. A tentative order of the fragments is proposed by C. and it is on this basis that the 26 fragments are printed.

The presentation of the texts differs in two ways from Davies' *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Davies, as is appropriate for the format of his edition, is much less willing to print supplements or emendations and his apparatus is restricted to the bare minimum, whereas

the latter in C. is extremely full. The introductions opening the commentary to each of the fragments are good, but in a number of instances the text he prints and the relevant commentary present problems. I cite from Davies' enumeration with that of C. in brackets. In S17.7 (= fr. 1.7) C. prints $\pi\acute{\alpha}\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \tau\epsilon$ (Smyth's emendation), but $\pi\acute{\alpha}\iota\delta\alpha\varsigma \tau\epsilon$ in the commentary (as in Page and Davies). Such inconsistencies between text and commentary appear elsewhere. In v. 9 he prints his own emendations, which make adequate sense but result in a faulty metre. Here too he prints $\pi\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma$ and in the commentary $\pi\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma$. In S13.1 (= fr. 6.1) only a μ is printed in the text, whereas $\omega\mu\omega[\xi\epsilon\nu$ appears in the commentary without any indication of its source (apparently his own supplement). In v. 8 he prints $\tau\acute{o}\kappa\alpha$, but $\acute{o}\kappa\alpha$ in the commentary. In the same verse he prints supplements (again apparently his own), which he does not discuss in the commentary and which result in a grammatical construction that is baffling to me. Here and elsewhere he tends to print supplements much too boldly. One particular typographical error occurs throughout. When a word ends in two vowels and the second one is elided, the mark of elision is printed over rather than after the preceding vowel, as in $\delta\epsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa[\acute{\epsilon}$ (S11.6 = fr. 7.6). Apart from this, I have not noticed any misprints of significance, but on p. 118 read Simon. for Semon.

My overall assessment of the book is that it makes a valuable contribution not only to our understanding specifically of the *Geryoneis* but also to various aspects of the poet as a whole. My one major reservation concerns the commentary. Too often the defense of his restorations is inadequate, especially since some of them are quite extensive. I regret that C. decided to provide a new numbering of the fragments. He could easily have kept the standard enumeration and simply arranged the fragments in the order he considered most plausible.

Douglas E. Gerber

University of Western Ontario

Robin J. Lane Fox (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Macedon: Studies in the Archaeology and History of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*, Leiden: Brill, 2011. xiii + 642 pp. ISBN 978-90-04-20650-2.

As its subtitle indicates, this volume does not aim at comprehensive coverage of Macedonian history, society and culture. Rather, in an introduction and twenty-eight chapters, it provides up-to-date discussions of the archaeology of several of the most important sites in ancient Macedonia, surveys of Macedonian art, studies of aspects of political and economic life, and a sequence of essays on the history of Macedon, focusing particularly on the fourth century. Robin Lane Fox (henceforth L.F.) himself provides the bulk of the historical material in five chapters, covering '399-369 BC' (209-34), 'The 360s' (257-69), 'Philip of Macedon: Accession, Ambitions, and Self-Presentation' (335-66), 'Philip and Alexander's Macedon' (367-91) and "'Glorious Servitude ...': The Reigns of Antigonos Gonatas and Demetrios II' (496-519). L.F.'s main concern is to establish a revised chronology for the reigns of kings from the death of Archelaus (400/399 BC) to the accession of Philip II (early 360/59 — that is, in 360), and to emphasize the weakness of Macedon at the time of Philip's accession, therefore maximizing the achievement of Philip himself. This is done through a detailed examination of the epigraphic and literary evidence, with a significant degree of trust being placed in the details provided by late chronographers and commentators. Frequently statements are accompanied by comments such as 'I accept', 'I suggest', 'in my view', and other similar indications that his conclusions are in opposition to those of some other scholars: it can generally be said that L.F.'s version of events is no less plausible than any other, even if sometimes the evidence is too limited to allow the reader to share his confidence. L.F.'s interest in Philip is brought out still more in his introduction to the volume (1-34), which, rather than giving an overview of ancient Macedon, concerns itself with the question