

Supplementum Supplementi Hellenistici. By HUGH LLOYD-JONES, ed. Texte und Kommentare 26. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2005. Pp. xiv + 159. Cloth, \$89.60. ISBN 978-3-11-08537-7.

When Hugh Lloyd-Jones and Peter Parsons published their massive *Supplementum Hellenisticum* in 1983, the fragments of Hellenistic poetry suddenly became more accessible to modern scholars than they had ever been before. The shattered bits and pieces of a few “major” poets were already available in separate editions (notably Pfeiffer’s magisterial Callimachus), and the epigrams had been organized and briefly commented on by Gow–Page. But the standard text of most other “lost” Hellenistic poets was still Powell’s 1925 *Collectanea Alexandrina*, which was incomplete from the first and rapidly became more so, as additional papyri and inscriptions were read and published, and the ancient literary sources scrutinized more closely.

As the title of their book made clear, Lloyd-Jones and Parsons aimed to supplement the existing editions rather than replace them. But the sheer volume of new material abruptly made available in an up-to-date and reliable form in the *Supplementum* was nonetheless astounding: 862 fragments, some over 100 lines long, attributable to individual poets in Section A; 98 papyrus adespota (most admittedly very badly damaged) in Section B; and 186 previously overlooked bits and pieces (only three of them longer than two verses or partial verses, and many consisting of only a few words) of unidentified poets, drawn from scholiasts, lexicographers and the like in Section C. In addition, the Greek text in the *Supplementum* was accompanied by a solid critical apparatus, substantial if concise notes, and a series of massive indices, including an *index verborum* that also took account of the material collected in Powell. The most obvious weaknesses of the volume were the fact that the apparatus for the book fragments was generally drawn from the standard edition of the source author, rather than from inspection of the manuscripts themselves, and its price. But the book was beautifully produced, and whatever it cost, there was little doubt that it was worth it.

In part due to the existence of the *Supplementum* itself, an increasing amount of work has been done on Hellenistic poetry in the last few decades, and new papyri continue to be published. The *Supplementum Supplementi Hellenistici* (produced by Lloyd-Jones alone, Parsons being committed to other projects) is an attempt to respond to the dilemma posed by this wealth of new texts, conjectures and commentaries, by offering a “supplement to the *Supplement*.” The most substantial contribution of the volume for the non-specialist will be the adespota papyrus fragments, all previously published elsewhere, but now made available to a broader audience. Parti-

cularly intriguing are *SSH* 970 (a marvelous 24-line elegiac threat by the goddess *Dikê* against a shameless wrong-doer, considerably expanded from the version of the text printed in *SH* via the discovery of a new scrap of the papyrus); 985 (a substantially improved text of a terribly damaged, but still intriguing set of epigrams on early Athenian dramatic poets); and 1190 (a Michigan papyrus containing about 40 lines of a mock-Homeric *War of Mice and Weasels*, originally published by Schibli in *ZPE* 53 (1983) 1–25). Also worth noting are a few new bits and pieces of Callimachus (notably *SSH* 257–8; 276A; 279A–B) and other poets (notably Euph. *SSH* 454C). Beyond that, the average reader will find little of interest. Instead, the bulk of the volume consists of brief textual notes and notices of new bibliography or editions, with the material often presented less succinctly than it might have been; indeed, many pages contain little more than very generously spaced lists of equivalent numbers. One might nonetheless argue that the volume is worth owning, if only for the papyri; and de Gruyter is to be commended for offering a combination of the reprinted *SH* (seemingly on different paper, and thus much thinner than in its previous incarnation) and *SSH* at a relatively affordable price.

The bad news is that *SSH* has been so poorly produced and proofread that there is little point in purchasing it until a systematically corrected second edition appears. The most obvious, if least significant problem involves matters of editorial consistency. Should inclusive page-number references be written out in full (e.g. “223–229” at *SSH* 76), or in a modestly more succinct if still pleonastic form (e.g. “286–88” at *SSH* 79A), or in the most economical fashion possible (e.g. “132–4” at *SSH* 81)? Ought there to be a period at the end of citations of equivalent numbers (e.g. “= Page, *FGE* 439–444.” at *SSH* 226) or not (e.g. “= Page, *FGE* 444–9” at *SSH* 225)? Should a notice of an equivalent number be followed by a return (as in *SSH* 121), or should the line continue (as in *SSH* 122)? And is “Herodotus” to be abbreviated “Herod.” (as in *SSH* 145) or “Hdt.” (as in *SSH* 135)? Much more important, something has gone systematically wrong with the Greek, transforming numerous half-stops into what appear to be English cola (e.g. *SSH* 289A.5; 738.3; 975.1; 976.6, 10, 12, 20), and obels into something resembling crude plus-signs (e.g. p. 54, Euph. fr. 84 *CA*; *SSH* 1187.21). Likewise enough primary and secondary references are obviously incorrect to suggest that no one has checked them systematically (e.g. at fr. 140 *CA* read “= Gow–Page, *HE* 1801–4” [not 1001–4]; at *SSH* 758 read “Sophron, *PSI* XI” [not X!]; at *SSH* 975 read “= Page, *FGE* 1686–91” [not 459–60]; and in the apparatus on p. 116 read “ $\Sigma^{\text{VEBarb}\theta}$ Ar. Ra. 473” [for the multiply garbled “c Ar. *VEBarb}\theta* ad *Ran.* 473”]).

The *index verborum* is similarly chaotic. In the corresponding index in *SH*, words are given in the case and number in which they appear in the poetic text or testimonium in question, and this form serves as the lemma unless it would disturb the alphabetical order: thus the accusatives ἄγχιτον and ἄγωνα appear as lemmata in place of the alphabetically equivalent nominatives ἄγχιτος and ἄγων, but ἄγαγον is indexed under ἄγω. In *SSH*, this system is sometimes respected, but sometimes not: although genitive Αἰακίδαο in Euph. fr. 40.2 CA, for example, is indexed in that form between ἄθλον and Αἴγειραν, Ἀγαμέμνονα in *SSH* 276A.13 is unnecessarily indexed under the nominative Ἀγαμέμνων (between ἀγάλλω and ἄγγελος), while Ἀθήνης in *SSH* 276A.9 is unnecessarily indexed under the nominative Ἀθήνη (between Ἀθήνα and ἄθλον)—in neither case with any indication that the word appears in an oblique case in the text. ἔπεα, meanwhile, is indexed between ἐπαύλιον and ἐπί, where no one will ever find it, rather than under ἔπος. In addition, numerous words or fragments of words are missing from the index (e.g. Σωσιφάνους, αειδο- and κερτο- in *SSH* 985, 16, 24); others are included that should not be (e.g. Ἀσίης in *SSH* 319.2, which is a comparandum rather than a conjecture); indications of dubious (*) or conjectural (**) readings are frequently omitted or garbled (e.g. ἀκούσας in *SSH* 1190.59 and βίην in *SSH* 1187.18 are both ** rather than *); and other, seemingly random errors abound (e.g. s.v. ἀθάνατος read “79 A 2” [not 97 A 2]; remove the parentheses around ἄρθρων).

The most unfortunate aspect of *SSH*, however, is the way the papyri have been handled. In some cases, the text has merely been badly set up: *SSH* 1187, for example, represents the right-hand side of one column of elegiac couplets and the left-hand side of the next, but the text has been so clumsily laid out on the page as to render it unrecognizable as such. Many problems are more serious than this. Thus *SSH* 985 (the epigrams on Athenian playwrights) draws on the work of F. Maltomini, who in a marvelous bit of scholarly detective work rediscovered the papyrus (long thought lost) in the Bodleian Library and published a radically improved version in *ZPE* 134 (2001) 55–66. Comparison with Maltomini’s article, however, shows that what appears in *SSH* is a strikingly inferior text. 25 ἐπὶ τ. [, for example, although set all the way to the left in *SSH*, is a title introducing the epigram partially preserved in 26–9, and should be set in about three letters—as on the papyrus and in Maltomini pp. 56–7—to match the titles in 30, 35 and 40; and 35 is patently to be restored ἐπ[ι], while ἐπιτ in 40 must represent ἐπὶ τ[.]. So too what *SSH* prints as οὔτεσκηνο. [in 37 is undoubtedly οὔτε σκηνο- (thus Maltomini—and the *SSH index verborum* s.v. οὔτε!), just as κρηνασπαρ. [in 29 must be κρήνας παρ-, and δισκαιτων in 39 is surely δῖς καὶ τῶν (both Maltomini; cf. the *SSH index verborum* s.v. δῖς);

while the mysterious *δαλλατον* in 38 ought to be articulated *ἀλλὰ τὸν* (Maltomini), the initial *δ* (absent from *SH*) being an intrusion into *SSH* rather than into the papyrus. Some of the most basic conventions for the presentation of fragmentary papyrus texts, meanwhile, have been ignored throughout the volume. Thus sublinear dots (which indicate badly damaged letters that require a bit of guesswork to be read) are routinely omitted, while the precise relative position of letters, lines and gaps in the papyrus—upon which proper restoration and often sense depend—is misrepresented again and again. In the case of badly damaged and obscure texts in particular, where interpretation often turns on tiny points, these are not trivial errors; and the ubiquity of such problems in the most interesting sections of this volume defeats what would seem to be its primary purpose, of making difficult but important material more widely available in a reliable form.

Exactly what went wrong with *SSH* is unclear. But the press (which has a distinguished history of publishing top-quality work in the classics) would be well-advised to cease printing and distribution of the volume until it can be re-issued in a more carefully produced form.

S. DOUGLAS OLSON

University of Minnesota