

Citation style

Jenny Strauss Clay: Rezension von: Michael Meier-Brügger (Hg.):
Homer, gedeutet durch ein großes Lexikon. Akten des Hamburger
Kolloquiums vom 6.-8. Oktober 2010 zum Abschluß des Lexikon des
frühgriechischen Epos, Berlin: de Gruyter 2012, in sehepunkte 13
(2013), Nr. 6 [15.06.2013],
URL:<http://www.sehepunkte.de/2013/06/22925.html>



copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

Michael Meier-Brügger (Hg.): Homer, gedeutet durch ein großes Lexikon

Along with my toothbrush and passport, Beekes, and the *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (Kühner-Gerth being available on line) are an indispensable - although not lightweight - part of my travel gear (it is certainly welcome news to hear that the *Lexikon* will soon be available on-line). The completion of the *LfgE* in 2010 did indeed warrant celebration and, of course, a scholarly conference. The volume under review is the result, but unfortunately disappoints on several counts. Of the 17 contributions, few have much to do with the *LfgE*, some of the articles are recycled, and by some whim of fairness, they are arranged in alphabetical order by author. The result is that a general statement of the genesis and history of the *Lexikon* come somewhere in the middle (M. Schmidt, "Snells Erben: Zur Geschichte des *Lexikons des frühgriechischen Epos*"). While describing the acceleration of publication after the first volume containing the letter *alpha*, Schmidt does not explain what must have been the methodological changes that allowed the rest of the alphabet to be treated in only three final volumes. Part of the answer here comes from the three-page contribution of the final editor of the *Lexikon*, Meier-Brügger, who notes the drastic abridgement of etymological discussion after volume one. He also schematically outlines what he learned from his experience, and charmingly recounts his favorite discovery: the etymology of $\alpha\phi\theta\eta$. His further remarks "mit einem weinenden und lachenden Auge" on work on the *LfgE* appeared in the conference program, but are not reproduced here, although Nordheider's masterful scholarly analysis of the *Bremer Stadtmusikanten* is. Explicit engagement with the role of Bruno Snell and his notions of the evolution of the Greek *Geist*, which were the founding impulse for the undertaking, comes toward the end in A. Schmitt's, 50-page piece "Vom Gliedergefüge zum handelnden Menschen. Snells entwicklungsgeschichtliche Homerdeutung und ein mögliches Homerbild heute" (whose focus is really the unity of the *Iliad*'s plot and whose counterpart for the *Odyssey* is the contribution of Radke-Ullmann, "Odysseus bei den Phäaken"); and albeit indirectly in Scodel's, $\frac{1}{26}$ and Theory of Mind in the *Iliad*, where she explores the use of $\frac{1}{26}$ in speeches in which one character either assumes or questions, often ironically, the intentions or motivations of another. The theoretical underpinnings seem unnecessary to me, but such statements certainly imply that characters within the poem look at others as integral subjects. It is furthermore almost ironic that those several discussions that do engage with lexemes and lexicographical issues focus on matters not dealt with in the *LfgE* (Hettrich "Präpositionalausdrücke bei Homer," de Jong, "Double deixis in Homeric speech: on the interpretation of *hode* and *houtos*," and Scodel again). Three articles deal with Alexandrian scholarship (Montanari, Nünlist, Rengakos); Niemeier presents a useful *Stand der Forschung* on the late Bronze Age in Greece and Asia Minor; Danek suggests that the south Slavic "post-traditional singer" Avdo Medodovic rather than Cor Huso offers an appropriate analogy for Homer, while Führer offers an outline of a project for "Naming Patroklos," to restate the argument for the importance of context for the deployment of formulas. Finally, Tichy provides a sample of her *Ilias diachronica* with her analysis of *Iliad* 14 and concludes that the *Dios apate* should be considered an older independent piece, now embedded in our *Iliad*. Amid these very different contributions, there is, nevertheless, a general insistence, characteristic of German scholarship, on the uniqueness of the Homeric epics, and an uneasiness with pure "orality".

I would have liked to have seen included at least a few juicy examples of scholars exploiting, taking issue, or elaborating on specific lemmata drawn from the *LfgE* and demonstrating its utility. Some engagement with the following issues would also have been welcome: what does the *Lexikon* do for us that the *TLG* or the Chicago Homer doesn't? Are all those years of

collecting and sorting strips of paper *depassé* in our electronic age? Or can the intensive application of scholarly categorization and discernment nevertheless make productive contributions to our understanding of early Greek epic?