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/bni011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

educators will certainly take this into account when choosing textbooks; but this edition has some very strong points which may outweigh this consideration.

The translation is on right-hand pages; a commentary is given on left-hand pages, with line numbers and exceptionally clear lemmata. Major lemmata have headings of their own which are cross-referenced throughout the play: when Agamemnon resists Clytaemnestra's urging that he walk on the carpet, a note on divine *phthonos* (p. 72) suggests '(see Resentment page 40)'. These frequent cross-references are outstandingly useful. The comments also feature pedagogically oriented questions, covering staging (p. 76, 'When should Agamemnon begin to walk on the cloth? . . . Should he hear Clytaemnestra's final exultant prayer (946–7)?'), ethics (p. 38, 'Do you think it is implied that it was not worth fighting such a costly war over a woman?'), and interpretation. M.'s commentary is clearly aimed at a lower mental age-group than Collard's, but it is uniquely well-designed, and it serves as an excellent thematic guide to the play. By itself the commentary is enough to set M.'s translation ahead of the competition.

Marginal line numbers in the translation make it very easy for students to refer to the text, though they do not match the original Greek line numbers, which are given in the footer of each page.

M.'s edition includes no stage directions whatsoever. This has both advantages and disadvantages from a pedagogical point of view, but to my mind it is a good feature: it forces students to realize that stagecraft is a matter for interpretation and debate, as well as providing a reminder of how the text has looked throughout its 2500-year history. The directed questions in the commentary encourage this kind of thinking.

At the start of the book there are a summary of the background story of the *Oresteia*, a genealogical table, and a map; at the back are a synopsis of the play, a guide to pronunciation, a short 'Introduction to the Greek theatre' by P. E. Easterling (including plans of theatres at Athens and Epidauros and a list of further reading), a time-line, and a general index. This aspect of layout seems poorly thought out: it would make sense to put introductory material at the start and only reference material at the back. The book contains several illustrations, mostly of the 1981 National Theatre production in London. There is no bibliography or guidance for further reading about the play.

The translation itself is good but uneven. In my eyes the *parodos* is the real challenge: M.'s translation is built from accumulation and asyndeton, which at its best is reminiscent of *Beowulf*. See for example 142–4 (= 154–5 in Greek):

> . . . For the one
> Who runs the house, formidable and deceitful, is waiting
> To rise up again: child-avenging Anger that will not forget.

M. does not improve on Fagles' dramatic, frenzied nightmare, though he is certainly more accurate (Fagles: 'Memory womb of Fury child-avenging Fury!'); but he easily surpasses Collard's often stilted language ('an unforgetting Wrath which avenges children'). '[T]he one/ Who runs the house' for *oikonomos* is horrible socio-economic pedantry; but the appositions make for an effective portrayal of a train of thought. It is characteristic of M.'s translation to juxtapose the two.

Victoria University of Wellington PETER GAINSFORD
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni011

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni011 Published online by Cambridge University Press