perhaps hopes to have settled many questions once and for all, and set western *Geistesgeschichte* on a completely new footing (II.231), but I doubt his interpretations will win general assent. Specialists will wish to engage with his arguments, and he has provided an enormous bibliography (156 pp.) as a reference.

University of Bristol ROBERT L. FOWLER

PINDAR, *OLYMPIAN* 7

A. RETTER: *Das Prooimion von Pindars siebter olympischer Ode: Versuch einer integrierenden Lösung von Bezugsproblemen*. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft Sonderheft 113.) Pp. 321. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, 2002. Cased, €52. ISBN: 3-85124-205-X.

The opening verses of Pindar's epinicians are often elaborately constructed and are clearly designed to make an immediate impact on the audience. Nowhere is this more obvious than in the first two stanzas of *O*. 7, and not surprisingly they have been analysed in some detail by a number of scholars. In very general terms, all would agree that Pindar is comparing his poem for Diagoras to a valuable wine cup given to a bridegroom, but there is disagreement about certain aspects of Pindar's language and there is certainly room for a thorough treatment of these verses. Such a treatment has now been the subject of Retter's 2001 dissertation under the supervision of Erich Thummer at Innsbruck, and the present book is the dissertation with only minor changes.

Apart from an introductory and a concluding chapter, the book concentrates on six problematic passages. The first is of relatively minor importance, the question whether *πάγχρυσον* (verse 4) is an adjective modifying *κορυφάν* or *φιάλαν* or an adjective with substantival force. He argues for the first possibility, rightly I think since *πάγχρυσον κορυφὰν κτεάνων* seems to be balanced by *γλυκὺν καρπὸν φρενός* in verse 8. As a result, no comma should be printed after the adjective.

The second problem is the question whether *φιάλαν* is the object of just *ἑλών* and *δωρήσεται* or of *προπίνων* as well. This leads to a long discussion (pp. 103–34) of the various meanings of *προπίνω* ('vorher trinken', 'austrinken', '[ver]schenken', 'zutrinken') and to the conclusion that *φιάλαν* is also the object of *προπίνων* with the meaning 'zutrinken'. This may well be correct, but since he argues that the participle is coincidental in time with *δωρήσεται*, I am surprised that he says nothing about whether the verb is a short-vowel subjunctive or a future. Also, in a long note on pp. 120–1 he gives the impression that he was the first to point out the similarities between *O*. 7.1–12 and Dionysius Chalcus fr. 1 W., but this was done over a century ago by E. Graf, *De Graecorum veterum re musica* (Marburg, 1889), pp. 40–1.

The third problem is the most contentious one. He rightly argues that in *τις ἀφνειᾶς ἀπὸ χειρός* the adjective means 'rich', not 'munificent', the preposition is not instrumental, and the hand belongs to a third person, not the father-in-law (*τις*). Thus the phrase should be translated 'from a rich hand'. But whose hand? R. opts for Bowra's 'divine patron', primarily because this provides a balance for Pindar's poem, a *Μοισᾶν δόσιν* (verse 7). I do not see how 'divine' can be assumed from the Greek and I prefer to follow Hartung who takes the hand to belong to a rich friend. If this is correct, the phrase is simply a further illustration of the cup's magnificence, but I must

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.9 Published online by Cambridge University Press

admit that Pindar has chosen a strange way to convey this, especially by his use of ἑλών rather than a word meaning 'having received' *vel sim.*

Fourthly, he treats οἴκοθεν οἴκαδε as adverbial with δωρήσεται rather than προπίνων, on the rather weak grounds that Homer uses one or the other (but not both together) with δίδωμι and comparable verbs, whereas there is no example with προπίνω.

The fifth problem is more substantial. Some have taken συμποσίου τε χάριν in apposition to what precedes, some treat χάριν as prepositional, and some, the majority, assume that χάριν, like κῶδος, is the direct object of τιμάσαις. R. rightly follows the majority, but his lengthy discussion of the various meanings of χάριν ignores the most substantial study of the word, B. MacLachlan's *The Age of Grace* (Princeton, 1993).

Finally, he discusses ἱλάσκομαι, the precise meaning of which is much disputed. His conclusion is that Fränkel's 'ich erwirke den Siegern göttliche Gunst' is the best rendering.

Without question this is an important study, but its scope should have been reduced for publication. For example, we do not need to have thirty passages with ἀπὸ χειρός printed in full in order to make the point required. In contrast, the bibliography is briefer than one would expect. Particularly surprising is his use of Sandys' Loeb edition instead of or together with Race's.

University of Western Ontario DOUGLAS E. GERBER

THE *EUMENIDES* AND HISTORY

M. BRAUN: *Die* Eumeniden *des Aischylos und der Areopag*. (Classica Monacensia 19.) Pp. 261. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 3-8233-4878-7.

Braun's approach to an old question begins with a statement of aims: first, to re-evaluate the relationship of the *Eumenides* to the reforms of Ephialtes in the light of revised understanding of the history of the Areopagus council; secondly, to explore the relationship between politics, myth, and religion which underlie Aeschylus' literary decisions throughout the *Oresteia*. The book sets out the evidence for the historical debate in a systematic manner, giving a fluent narrative supported by full footnotes. The following section considers a number of passages from the trilogy as evidence for political concerns, with attention to the idea of *nomos*, the influence of Solon, and the contemporary Athenian attitude towards Argos. The discussion examines both wider interpretative stances as well as the relevant details of textual divergence.

While B. provides a useful survey of previous approaches, his approach to the play as literature is dominated by comment on nineteenth-century ideas, and lacks engagement with the dramatic aspects. For example, he notes Agamemnon's comment on civil strife at *Ag*. 883/4 as a clear indication of a contemporary political message, with the dismissive comment 'Die Warnung des Strophios hat im Kontext des Stückes keine Funktion' (p. 146). This analysis takes no account of the dramatic movement as Clytemnestra bamboozles Agamemnon, or the ongoing debate as to the exact meaning of the political vocabulary. In general, I found that such blindspots in the appreciation of the trilogy as a piece of fiction were a weakness in B.'s case, and indicated a curious avoidance of the last generation of literary criticism.

Braun's conclusion, that Aeschylus was espousing a moderate view, calling for

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.9 Published online by Cambridge University Press