[edd.], *L'Empédocle de Strasbourg: (P. Strasb. gr. Inv. 1665–1666)* [Berlin and Strasbourg, 1999]), Empedoclean studies have undergone a surge of interest not seen since the sixties. These are the first ancient papyrus fragments of Empedocles, and indeed the first papyrus fragments of any of the Presocratic philosophers, and the material they contain has forced nearly everyone who works on Empedocles to seriously rethink their interpretations of both his philosophy and poetry. Central questions are still whether Empedocles wrote two poems (*On Nature* and the *Purifications*) or one poem (perhaps with the alternative titles *On Nature* and the *Purifications*, or perhaps *On Nature and Purifications*), with the physical doctrine in *On Nature* and the contrasting religious doctrine in the *Purifications*, and whether Empedocles' cosmology describes two worlds or one. The former point is more crucial than it may seem; the Strasbourg fragments can be confidently attributed to *On Nature* and contain both physical and religious material. This fact strongly suggests that, for Empedocles himself at least, there was no disjunction between his physical and religious views: both are part of a unified system, and there was probably only one poem (see especially Simon Trépanier, *Empedocles: an Interpretation* [New York and London, 2004], pp. 1–30). While B. has discussed the Strasbourg fragments elsewhere ('Voir la Haine: Sur les nouveaux fragments d'Empédocle', *Methodos* 1 [2001], 173–85), here in his edition of the *Purifications* they receive barely a mention, and B.'s views are essentially unchanged since the sixties: there are two poems, which he calls *Les Origines* and *Les Purifications* (or les *Catharmes*), and only one world. As a consequence, this edition seems somewhat out of date. For example, B. prints the old text of fr. 139 from the indirect tradition and does not mention in his note that Strasbourg ensemble 'd' is considered by the editors to contain fr. 139 but with a new and better reading ('Alas that merciless day did not destroy me sooner, before I devised with my claws ['about my lips' in fr. 139] terrible deeds for the sake of food'). Elsewhere B. has rejected Martin and Primavesi's identification of fr. 139 with ensemble 'd' (*Methodos* 1 [2001], 173–4), but here passes over ensemble 'd' in silence. Therefore this edition relies on assumptions about Empedocles' system and poetry that are now very difficult to support in the light of the Strasbourg fragments, but does not highlight the problems this brings. Simply publishing an edition of the *Purifications* as a work separate from *On Nature* is now a radical act, and requires defence. Accordingly it is difficult to give the book a warm reception.

On the other hand, B.'s overall ethical reading of Empedocles' purificatory material is more valuable; B. sees Empedocles' stance against warfare, slaughter, animal sacrifice, and meat-eating as a radically political one 'Les *Catharmes* se présentent comme un manifeste et un projet de réforme universelle des sociétés' (p. 1). It is just a pity that this stimulating view is not backed up by better evidence.

National University of Ireland, Maynooth GORDON CAMPBELL
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni008

STESICHORUS IN THE PAPYRI

G. SCHADE: *Stesichoros: Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 2359, 3876, 2619, 2803.* (*Mnemosyne* Supplementum 237.) Pp. viii + 239, ill. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2003. Cased, €74, US$100. ISBN: 90-04-12832-8.

Schade provides in this revised *Habilitationsschrift* editions with introduction and

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni009 Published online by Cambridge University Press

commentary of selected fragments of the papyri in his title (*PMGF* 222, 222(*a*), S88–132, S133–47). The principal novelty is the attachment of S90 to S89 shown in the frontispiece (suggested by A. Pardini). This gives more text at the start, in which a Muse-invocation may be recognized. R. A. Coles has also confirmed the combination of 222(*a*) frr. 64(*a*).5–6 and (*b*).1–2 considered in M. W. Haslam's *editio princeps*. In these places and elsewhere, S. profits from contributions of R. Führer, a few of which appeared at *ZPE* 130 (2000), 8 (not cited).

S. helpfully collects many of the results of earlier scholarship and other relevant material. His indications of the metrical contexts of preserved sequences enable one to judge the suitability of the metrical assignments proposed for S88–132 (but in S88, the strophe begins at ii.15, not 7; a 'long' is omitted at S104.5). S.'s discussion of the metre of this text (pp. 130–38) follows Führer's closely, but Führer's scheme for the strophe in Maas's notation (*GGA* 229 [1977], 12) brings out its organization more clearly than the mere sequence of 'longs' and 'shorts' in S.: even regular word-end is not marked. S.'s epode begins with *D*, not –*D*, a choice nowhere discussed.

Following Page and Führer, S. doubts whether S88–132 and S133–47 represent the same poem. His presentation of the evidence is not beyond reproach. If the two readings proposed at *POxy.* 2619 fr. 18.13 (S105.14) are both acceptable (p. 126 n. 28),]$\nu\eta$ (without sublinear dots) does not belong in the text. The placing of S137 within the metrical scheme for S88–132 allowed on p. 139 assumes that the text continued on the right at line 9. S.'s edition, however, records blank surface at the end. In fact, the upper layer is missing. Similarly, we cannot say whether S115–16 began a column (so S., p. 133, after Führer): the surface is stripped at the top. Where Haslam explicitly mentions surface damage in 222(*a*), S. duly records it, but his 'fibrae verticales avulsae' (frr. 4.12, 35.6) is inapposite: the text is on the horizontal fibres.

The editions frequently eliminate clearly visible traces. So in 222(*a*), Haslam's $\pi o\iota\epsilon\hat{\iota}]\dot{\varsigma}\theta\dot{\alpha}\dot{\iota}$ at fr. 62.8 becomes $\pi o\iota\epsilon\hat{\iota}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota]$, his $\tau\dot{\epsilon}$ $\sigma\epsilon\lambda[\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\nu$ at fr. 35.16 $\tau[\epsilon]$ $\sigma\epsilon[\lambda\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\nu$. At S88 ii.8, the traces allow $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\gamma}\dot{\lambda}\theta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, not $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\gamma}\dot{\lambda}\kappa\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, as Lobel and Page saw: S. has both readings in his apparatus, but adopts the latter, saying nothing of the traces (p. 184). Barrett's supplement at 222 i.9 is deemed too short. My own tracing supports Barrett's: the line need not begin an epode.

There are surprising omissions. 222(*a*) fr. 62 is printed without fr. 63, which belongs just below. S. claims to include all fragments of importance for the metrical schemes (p. 8), but omits 222(*a*) fr. 26, which has suggested conclusions regarding stanza-length, mentioning only (p. 50) a clausula found there, ⏑ – ⏑ – – ‖ (given as '⏑ – ⏑ – ‖'); the fragment is overlooked in a list of stanza-lengths (p. 131 n. 39), as is 222(*b*). Of S88–132, S123, identified as ep. 5–9, is neither printed nor even included in the list of fragments placed (p. 136). Nor are the commentaries comprehensive. In 222(*a*) I miss, for example, elucidation of the variant at fr. 39.30 and of fr. 62.10. $\kappa\alpha\theta[\alpha\rho]\alpha\hat{\iota}\dot{\varsigma}$ (Haslam) is registered as an alternative to $\kappa\alpha\theta[\epsilon\acute{\sigma}]\alpha\iota\dot{\varsigma}$ (Davies) at fr. 62.5, but the commentary discusses only the latter. Haslam's 'suitable for]$\dot{\tau}\alpha\iota$ and perhaps also for $\kappa\alpha\hat{\iota}$' at fr. 2.9 becomes merely '$\dot{\kappa}\alpha\grave{\iota}$ Haslam'. At fr. 69.2, $\dot{A}\pi\acute{o}\lambda\lambda]\omega\nu\alpha$ $\kappa\dot{\lambda}[\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\tau o\xi o\nu$ is placed in the text and the alternative articulation forgotten. The first editions remain indispensable.

S. wastes apparatus space by giving credit for obvious articulations, most of them already assumed by the *POxy.* indexes, to whoever first printed an articulated text (e.g. at S94.5–6, S137.7–9). In 222(*a*) alone, proposals in Haslam's edition or index are wrongly assigned at frr. 2.3, 8, 4.3, 35.4 ($\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$), and 64(*b*).8.

Some suggestions are overspeculative. In 222(*a*) fr. 62, where Aeolus' cousin tends a corpse, R. Garner found an account of Achilles' funeral. S. admits that this hypothesis

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni009 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/bni009 Published online by Cambridge University Press