little Lesbian poetry and much Homeric, and the lexicon is the most fluid aspect of a language. The nature of the evidence also poses problems. It is to her credit that, though she wishes to draw conclusions and consequences from the material, these difficulties are always kept before the reader's eyes. Tentative conclusions can, however, be drawn. Sappho is quantitatively more innovative than Alcaeus, but he is qualitatively more so too. This originality can be seen especially in the treatment, sometimes comic, of traditional compound-adjective formation, and in the frequency of derivatives of athematic form. There is a small residue of vocabulary and, more interestingly, potential formulae, which are shared with Hesiod and other hexameter verse and not Homer, e.g. *φαίνολις αὔως*. Comparison of Sappho, Alcaeus and other lyric, elegiac, and iambic poetry fails to show any poetic lyric vocabulary expressing significant concepts, etc. alien to Homer: the common inheritance with Homer is much more striking. Amongst words attested in Sappho and especially Alcaeus for the first time, there are a number which are 'clasificables como de prosa o más exactamente del lenguaje culto e intelectual' (p. 308), and which do not reappear until the fifth century. In the *hapax legomena*, she isolates some few possibly archaic forms which have been succeeded by later forms elsewhere in Greek (e.g. *κίνδυς*, *ὄλοφυς*, *σέος*, *μύναμαι*), and which may be elements from older Lesbian tradition. There remain, however, uncertainties about the precise history of these words: 'casi siempre se puede dudar entre la atribución dialectal, poética o no poética, el arcaísmo general, el arcaísmo lesbio, el arcaísmo poético general o el arcaísmo poético lesbio' (pp. 289–90; cf. pp. 310–11 for a list of fourteen or fifteen non-Homeric words which seem to join poetic and archaic characteristics, Lesbian or other).

The book is the result of considerable detailed lexicographical labour, and is now the fullest description we have of this aspect of the Lesbian poets. There is a great deal of material, and it is not the fault of the scrupulous author that the broad conclusions one would like to be able to draw, either about the corpus as a whole or concerning the origin or nature of individual words, are rendered very provisional by the nature of the evidence. Nonetheless, there is much for the student of Lesbian poetry to reflect on.

The Queen's College, Oxford A. M. BOWIE

ΑΠΟΤΡΟΠΟΣ ΓΝΩΜΗ

I. L. Pfeijffer: *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar. A Commentary on* Nemean V*,* Nemean III*, and* Pythian VIII. (*Mnemosyne* Supplement 197.) Pp. xii + 721. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 1999. Cased, $191.25. ISBN: 90-04-11381-9.

In this revised Leiden dissertation, Pfeijffer offers, besides a general introduction in which he defends his approach and discusses some features which seem to him characteristic of 'Pindar's style', 'interpretations' of three odes, each accompanied by a discussion of the metre and a detailed commentary. Unfortunately, the 'interpretations' are fantastic, and the whole work is characterized by a scarcely credible level of incompetence and carelessness.

The quality of Pf.'s interpretative essays may be judged from a consideration of that on *Nemean* 5. In ll. 19f. of this ode, having announced that he will not continue with

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.7 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the story of Phocus, Pindar sets out as alternatives some themes that he would be happy to treat: *εἰ δ' ὄλβον ἢ χειρῶν βίαν ἢ σιδαρίταν ἐπαινῆσαι πόλεμον δεδόκηται* . . . . He goes on to sing of Peleus' *ὄλβος*, giving an account of his marriage to Thetis and its background. Nothing could be simpler. Pf., however, ignoring *ἢ* . . . *ἤ* and the context of the passage, imagines that these lines contain Pindar's 'program for this ode', and that 'the choice of these three examples is motivated by their applying to the current situation' (p. 69); and since war is mentioned, he supposes that Pindar's 'program' includes 'praising Aegina for fighting a war against Athens'. Pf. finds such praise in 46f. *χαίρω δ' ὅτι | ἐσλοῖσι μάρναται πέρι πᾶσα πόλις*. Now since the lines on either side of this sentence are concerned with athletics, it is generally taken to refer to athletic competition in particular. Pf., however, has an objection: 'Pindar nowhere says that a city as a whole takes part in the games' (p. 81 n. 38 = 177). It will be interesting to see this argument applied to Aeschylus, who nowhere, except at *Ag*. 1106, writes of 'a city as a whole' shouting.

Pf. prints metrical schemes, but he has not scanned the odes for himself. Snell's error at *P*. 8 ep. 2 is repeated (p. 460), and ⏑ appears for – six times in the scheme for *N*. 5 (p. 92) through false expansion of Snell's E. Pf.'s knowledge of prosody is distinctly shaky. He takes *ματέρ'* at *N*. 5.6 as a dative, and supposes that the iota of *'Ιαολκόν* following *καί* at *N*. 3.34 is consonantalized, without showing any awareness of the solecisms involved (M. L. West, *Greek Metre* [Oxford, 1982], pp. 10, 14). At *N*. 3.78 he writes *ἐέρσ'* for *ἔερσ'*, noting that 'the elision of the long final vocal [*sic*] is irregular' (p. 221 = 395 = 404). We are informed that 'the *ι* in *ἔκνισ-* is short . . . , whereas the *ι* in *ἔκνιξ-* is long (as it must be in *I*. 5.58 and can be in *P*. 10.60 and *I*. 6.50)' (p. 512). Pf.'s metrical analyses are in the tradition of C. M. J. Sicking's *Griechische Verslehre*; no notice is taken of the review of this work by West (*GGA* 246 [1994], 183–97). I have lost count of the passages quoted in unmetrical form.

Pf.'s command of the Greek language is no more impressive. At *N*. 3.27, he wishes to read *παραμείβηις*, intended as a 'deliberative subjunctive': 'the force of a deliberative subjunctive would suit the fiction of the poet . . . asking himself why he has lead [*sic*] astray his own poem'. At *P*. 8.12, where the relative refers to Hesychia, whom Pindar is addressing, Pf. recognizes instead a demonstrative with the same reference. *φίλαν ξένων ἄρουραν* at *N*. 5.8, we are told, is 'not so much a "land dear to strangers" but a "land belonging to strangers" ': not a word of *P*. 3.5 *νόον . . . ἀνδρῶν φίλον* or the adjective *φιλόξενος*. Pf. notes that *δέξαι* at *Pae*. 6.5 is taken by Radt as an imperative, but he himself takes it as an infinitive (p. 557). Perhaps one should not complain if a scholar of this calibre fails to discuss textual problems, e.g. at *P*. 8.96, where the reading of the Pindar manuscripts, lately defended by Lloyd-Jones (*Academic Papers* i.78 n. 40; *SCI* 15 [1996], 25–31), is not mentioned, or at *N*. 3.78, where Instone (1996) prints an emended text but Pf. keeps *κιρναμένα*, though he has not decided whether it means 'mingling' (p. 404) or 'mingled' (p. 407).

The long lexicographical notes with which the commentary is encumbered depend largely on Slater's *Lexicon to Pindar* and LSJ. Little attempt has been made to update references. The reader who takes the trouble to locate 'Anacr. 17, 65' (p. 146, in a string of citations from LSJ) in *PMG* will find the first to be corrupt (373.3) and the second spurious (505[*d*], where the reference is to Eros [LSJ], not 'children' [Pf.]). A commentator content to fill his pages in this way is likely to miss much relevant material, and so it is with Pf. For the imagery of *N*. 5.6, LSJ s.v. *ὀπώρα* III gives him Chaerem. 71 F 12 (p. 107 n. 21: misquoted) but not Eur. fr. 82.14f. Au. or Call. *H*. 5.75f. (West, *BICS* 30 [1983], 80). D. S. Robertson's important treatment of *N*. 3.47f. (*CR* 54 [1940], 177–80) is not mentioned. On *N*. 3.63, he cites a few examples of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.7 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ἀνεψιός from Slater and LSJ, but not the similarly oblique ἀνεψιὸς | Αἰόλου Ἰπ[π]οτάδα at Stes. *PMGF* i App. fr. 62.4f. (compared by Lloyd-Jones, *ZPE* 87 [1991], 299); he appears not to know Christ's explanation of the reference to Helenus (favoured by Lloyd-Jones), and proposes instead an absurd one of his own (p. 230).

Large-scale repetition is common. The 'interpretations' consist in large part of passages lifted verbatim from the commentaries. Often a passage will be used three times (e.g. the references at p. 62 n. 3 = 111 n. 32 = 112 n. 36). Statements about other odes of Pindar and Bacchylides are unreliable (e.g. *O*. 8.56–9 [p. 216 n. 39: Melesias' victories, not his pupils'], *P*. 10.66 [p. 491], *N*. 4.23 [p. 111], *I*. 7.31 [p. 168], B. 5.69f. [p. 363]).

The book has not been read through before publication. Spelling mistakes and other errors in the English are legion (e.g. 'the these' [p. 215]; 'in line opening lines' [p. 223 = 419]; 'devided into two cathegories' [p. 193]), and Greek quotations are regularly corrupt, often unintelligible (e.g. sch. *N*. 5.78c [p. 605], sch. *P*. 8.53a [p. 522], *O*. 10.80–3 [p. 173], Hdt. 1.14.4–15 [p. 122]); even lemmata are not exempt (e.g. *N*. 3.84, *P*. 8.6f., 29). It is astonishing that such a shoddy piece of work should have been accepted for publication.

Merton College, Oxford W. B. HENRY

FIFTH-CENTURY *PERSIANS*

T. HARRISON: *The Emptiness of Asia. Aeschylus'* Persians *and the History of the Fifth Century.* Pp. 191. London: Duckworth, 2000. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-7156-2968-9.

Aeschylus' *Persae* has been ill-served by modern critics. Many scholars have found it easy to dismiss it as static and undramatic. Its evident patriotism causes embarrassment (which is not diminished by over-exaggerated modern productions like that of Peter Sellars). Although the *Persae* has repeatedly been seen as a test-case for the political impact of fifth-century tragedy, critical judgements of Aeschylus' political writing have all too often lacked sophistication. Yet its representation of war, of the 'otherness' of the Persian East, of the significance of an epoch-making victory, should make the *Persae* central to our understanding of the development of Athenian democratic language.

Harrison's first and very short book—barely 100 pages of text, swelled by another eight-five pages of notes and bibliography—approaches Aeschylus' work very much through this critical tradition. There are three sections. The first, 'Framing the Play', looks extensively at how twentieth-century critics have treated the play's historical importance, its political implications, and its contribution to Athenian ideological formation. The third section, 'Conclusion', moves from specific conclusions about the *Persae* towards a more general contention about how the texts of tragedy can be understood as politicized documents. Both sections line up critic after critic for genial, swift, knowing put-downs (which never transgress the games of politeness, however). In contrast, the middle section, 'Finding Athens', sets out to analyse the stichomythia of Queen and Chorus (230–45) to demonstrate how Aeschylus' patriotism can be subtle, ideologically fascinating, and even exploratory. This reading draws closely on the work of Edith Hall and others, but makes its own nuanced restatements within the context of his general approach to the problem of 'tragic sympathy' and to the normative force of tragic theatre. H. (regrettably, to my mind) does not offer extensive

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.7 Published online by Cambridge University Press