does not account for the presence of Aeolus' cousin, but considers it plausible nevertheless (p. 40). Like Garner, he seems prepared to read back into isolated attestations of ζάκοτος (frr. 64(*a*).2, 67(*a*).5) an association with Memnon on the basis of Pind. *Nem.* 6.53 ἔγχεος ζακότοιο, of the spear by which Memnon died (p. 42). Hom. *Il.* 16.291 ἄπασιν, referring to the Paeonians, suggests to S. the same reference for S88 i.13]ραπασιν (p. 174), though it is doubtful whether the Paeonians suit Stesichorus' context.

Facts and references have not been thoroughly checked. In the first two pages, I note 'Menelaos' for 'Meleagros' (p. 1 n. 2) and Stesichorus II placed two centuries too late (p. 2). The allegation (p. 201) that LSJ fail to cite anyone earlier than Bacchylides for καλλίρ(ρ)οος is based on the wrong entry (καλλιρόας). In stating that κλεεννός is rare in 'Chorlyrik' (p. 213), S. ignores Pindar and Bacchylides. In four lines of p. 195 n. 122 we find '*X* 774' for '*Λ* 775' and an omission in the quotation, '*K* 76' for '*K* 46', βωμοῖς wrongly accented, and (*Op.*) '774' for '755'. Such forms as νῆκνια, ἀπήματος, ἀμφικαλύψε, δείθιθι, and ἀναρεῖται (pp. 205, 65, 189, 191, 103) appear too often.

Oriel College, Oxford W. B. HENRY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni009

PINDARIC PERFORMANCE

D. Loscalzo: *La parola inestinguibile. Studi sull'epinicio pindarico.* (Filologia e Critica 90.) Pp. 174. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 2003. Paper. ISBN: 88-8476-038-0 (88-8476-037-2 hbk).

After a fairly brief introduction and seven-page bibliography there follow three chapters and ample indexes. The first chapter, entitled 'Epinicio ed *epos*', is essentially a commentary on *Olym.* 2.83–90, one of Pindar's most controversial passages. The most significant conclusions reached are the following. ἐς τὸ πάν (85) is equivalent to πάντως, as several times in Aeschylus, and δέ is connective, not adversative. Concerning ἑρμανέων, he argues that Pindar is 'un *interprete*, nel senso che esprime, *comunica* le idee, le annuncia'. Pindar's quiver, defined later as his φρενός (90), contains many arrows, i.e. many words of praise, and they are totally in need of being expressed. By the plural ἑρμανέων Pindar means 'tutta la categoria dei poeti', but there are two categories as the subsequent verses indicate. The first is represented by the crows, the second by the eagle. The dual verb does not refer to any specific pair, but has plural force, and the crows stand for epic poets (but not Homer) and rhapsodes whose verses contain 'parole inutili' (ἄκραντα) in contrast to the eagle, i.e. to lyric poets such as Pindar, and also Bacchylides, who uses similar imagery to refer to himself in 5.16–30. The kind of poetry attributed to the crows is characterized as merely learned, hence unoriginal, and as all-inclusive (παγγλωσσίᾳ), whereas Pindar, avoiding excess (95), concentrates on what is necessary and appropriate. The contrast is similar to that between Menelaus and Odysseus in *Iliad* 3.212–22. Finally, πρός (88) does not mean 'against', but 'compared with'. All these arguments, together with others, are supported by extensive documentation from other passages in Pindar, some of which are discussed in considerable detail.

The second chapter, an expanded version of an article published in *Prometheus* 26 (2000), 1–18, is entitled 'Repliche dell'epinicio'. The basic question is: 'La diffusione nel tempo e nello spazio di un epinicio è un fatto reale, o Pindaro teorizza e postula

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni010 Published online by Cambridge University Press

semplicamente potenzialità illimitate di esecuzione del canto di lode?' L. argues for the first alternative and begins by examining evidence for repeated performance 'nel tempo'. An example of this is *Nem*. 4.13–16, where he retains *ὕμνον* against Bergk's *υἱόν* and stresses the importance of *θαμά*. This passage provides evidence that an epinician could be often repeated in the form of a monody by a family member. Repetition within the household is said to be implied by other passages, although I do not see how *Pyth*. 1.97–8 can be considered evidence for 'la riedizione di un epinicio in forma corale'. Some epinicia appear to have been performed at festivals (e.g. *Pyth*. 5.77–81), and L. suggests that they were also performed at subsequent festivals. When it comes to repetition, 'nello spazio', the evidence is much more problematic. In a passage such as *Nem*. 6.29–34 he assumes that Pindar expected the victor's clan would transport the ode, along with other cargo, for repeated performance wherever their ships put in. This is, I suppose, possible, but when Pindar proclaims in *Olym* 9.21–5 that he will send his message everywhere (*παντᾷ*), the most we are entitled to assume is that he envisions the ode being sung at various places in the future. To what extent an ode was actually sung in places different from the victor's homeland we have no means of knowing. The boast of pan-Hellenic diffusion of his odes in *Olym*. 9 and elsewhere is both a proud claim of his superiority as a poet and an encomiastic technique, one way of assuring the victor that his achievements will be widely recognized.

The third chapter, entitled 'La Musa artigiana', is the least significant, since it contains little that is new or controversial. Here he discusses metaphors associated with '(1) la costruzione di edifici, (2) il *thesaurós*, (3) la stele, (4) i prodotti dell'arte toreutica, (5) l'intreccio di corone, la tessitura e il ricamo, altre forme di artigianato', and he provides 'alcuni elementi di analisi sulla polemica con la statuaria'. It should be stressed, however, that there is considerable value in the thoroughness with which some passages are examined, such as his treatment of *πτυχαῖς* in *Olym*. 1.105 (pp. 140–1). After listing and rejecting previous explanations, he argues, perhaps rightly, for a 'riferimento a un *rivestimento* a strati e quindi alla tecnica dello *sphyrélaton*, cioè a un'opera rivestita con lamine di metallo prezioso battuto'.

The main bibliography is for the most part adequate and in addition numerous other sources are cited in the notes. J. Strauss Clay, however, is wrongly cited as Clay Strauss. The full 'Indice dei luoghi citati' makes consultation easy. In 2000 L. published a commentary on *Nem*. 7 and now, three years later, we have his second book. Both make valuable contributions to Pindaric studies and I hope we will see more from this promising young scholar.

University of Western Ontario DOUGLAS E. GERBER
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni010

AGAMEMNON

P. DE MAY (trans.): *Aeschylus:* Agamemnon. Pp. x + 133, map, ills. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Paper, £4.95. ISBN: 0-521-01075-6.

The Cambridge Translations from Greek Drama series is designed for pedagogical purposes, and for that purpose I rate this edition of *Agamemnon* as the best of its kind. Most competitors provide the whole *Oresteia*, albeit at a higher price, and

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni010 Published online by Cambridge University Press