

The introduction is useful. Wilkinson's Ibycus is (cautiously) dated into the first half of the sixth century. Under the heading 'Content' Wilkinson considers (among other things) the question of Ibycean epinician; her conclusion (27) that the relevant songs are not directly analogous either to later epinicians or to later non-epinician erotic praise seems sensible, but I wonder whether it is right to describe this as a form of *Kreuzung* ('bringing in elements from several genres') rather than supposing that epinician is not yet distinct from praise song generally. The section on dialect is brief but refers to more extensive treatments; the metre section is fuller (the treatment of 288 on page 40 has gone wrong: the wrong line is quoted, but in her edition of the fragment Wilkinson prints an emendation, so that the line intended is also different from the schema).

I illustrate the commentary from one quotation fragment and parts of the biggest papyrus fragment.

287 is handled well. As elsewhere, Wilkinson discusses imagery sensitively. The treatment of *αῖτε* and *δηῖτε* could have been abbreviated and a reference given to S.T. Mace, 'Amour, encore! The development of *δηῖτε* in Archaic lyric', *GRBS* 34 (1993) 335–64. On *τακερά* in 2, vocabulary from the root *τήκω* and from *λύω* (*Od.* 18.212–13; the adj. *λυσιμελής*) should have been more carefully distinguished; the *λύω* expressions are not about melting or liquefaction. I like Wilkinson's observation that the image of Eros as a beater or hunting dog expresses his subordination to Aphrodite, and her note on 7 *ἔς ἄμιλλαν* is subtle and sensitive.

'P.Oxy. 1790 is a palimpsest' is the unpromising start to the treatment of S151 (it is not a palimpsest; traces of unrelated texts are offsets from other document(s) with which the papyrus came into contact after it was written: J.P. Barron, 'Ibycus: to Polycrates', *BICS* 16 (1969) 119–49 at 119–20; E.G. Turner and P.J. Parsons *GMAW*<sup>2</sup>, London 1987, 48). Much is useful and astute in the commentary, but especially in problematic places Wilkinson's treatment is not always satisfactory. On 20, I think that Wilkinson is mistaken to interpret *μέν* as *solitarium*: both this *μέν* and the one in 23 are picked up by *δέ* in 25 (*cf.* J.D. Denniston, *Greek Particles* (2nd edition), Oxford 1954, 384). At 24–25, Wilkinson argues on metrical grounds that 'either *λογω[ι]* or *θνατ[ό]ς* is corrupt', but the force of her argument indicates that *θνατός* is corrupt independently of *λογω[ι]*, unless *θν* can operate as a syllable-releasing consonant in Ibycus (G.O. Hutchinson, *Greek*

*Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces*, Oxford 2001, *ad* 23–26 points out syllable-releasing mute + liquid at 288.4, perhaps 288.2, 298 and 315.1, but mute + nasal is perhaps more problematic; Wilkinson does not discuss this). Barron's *οὐκ ἄδαῖς δέ κ' ἀνὴρ* is misreported (in the commentary; *apparatus criticus* is correct). At 40, the scribe inserted *ε* above the line, giving *χρυσέοστροφ[ος]* instead of *χρυσόστροφ[ος]*. Wilkinson prints the former but argues for the latter, but her argument is obscured by a misprint: it is because the scribe wrote *ἐμβάειν* in 24 (with accent and *brevis* thus) that it seems that he believed that contraction could not occur here. At the end, Wilkinson sides with those who remove the papyrus' punctuation at the end of 46; it would have been helpful if parallels had been given to help us to judge the plausibility of *πέδα* in the sense *πέδεστι*, required if the punctuation is kept. Barron's metrical argument for the papyrus' punctuation (by which caesura after *τοῖς μέν* is preserved) should have been acknowledged, and Wilkinson might have discussed *καὶ σὺ* as a hymnic closural formula. In the same final epode, it seems odd to comment that *ἑρό[ε]σσαν* 'is frequent in archaic poetry to describe beautiful people or things' but to say nothing about the peculiar phrase *μᾶλ' εἴσκοι ὄμοτον*.

In my view, the quality of this commentary is patchy, but there is much of value, and Wilkinson is often a helpful and lucid guide. Some problems seem to come from insufficient revision and proof-reading or production difficulties, an impression enhanced by numerous misprints.

RICHARD RAWLES

*University of Nottingham*

*richard.rawles@nottingham.ac.uk*

AGÓCS (P.), CAREY (C.) and RAWLES (R.) *Eds*  
**Reading the Victory Ode.** Cambridge:  
 Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. xxxiv +  
 409. £70/\$113. 9781107007871.

doi:10.1017/S0075426914001517

This edited volume contains 16 essays on the victory ode: the first of its kind. It is divided into three sections. Part one examines the lost or nearly lost epinician poems of Ibycus, Simonides and Pindar, early music and prosopography. The second part discusses issues of (re)performance. Part three is a selection of critical approaches to the victory ode: rhetoric, imagery and narrative techniques. The editors acknowledge that they do

not cover all the possible academic approaches, such as the New Historicism (xxvii), which was unintentional on their part. Contributors however do reference and make use of the key players in that area (for example Nicholson and Kurke). There are also the essays in S. Hornblower and C. Morgan (eds), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals* (Oxford 2007). The volume has a sister book by the same editors (*Receiving the komos: Ancient and Modern Receptions of the Victory Ode* (BICS Supplement 112), London 2012), which examines the *epinikion* after Pindar and Bacchylides. On account of space, I offer comments only on a selection of chapters.

G.B. D'Alessio's chapter (28–57) on the lost *Isthmian* odes of Pindar offers a tantalizing glimpse of his forthcoming edition of the Pindaric fragments, and explores a few interactions between Greek lyric and tragedy. The reconstructions of the missing 10% of the Alexandrian edition of Pindar's *epinikia* are cogent and convincing. It may have been helpful though for orientation purposes to have included a second appendix showing the reconstructions and arrangement of all the fragments discussed together. L. Prauscello's piece (58–82) is the go-to source on the state of ancient Greek music in the late Archaic and early Classical periods. It is both accessible, which is something sorely needed in Greek music, and groundbreaking. It plausibly makes the case on how sixth- and early fifth-century poets such as Pindar, Lasus and Pratinas may have innovated and influenced ancient music.

The chapters of L. Athanassaki (134–57), F. Budelmann (173–90) and P. Agócs (191–223) together provide essential information on and reconstructions of the cultic and choreographic aspects of the victory ode and its sympotic interactions. R. Rawles (3–27), who examines proto-epinician features in Ibycus and the *epinikia* of Simonides, and G.W. Most (249–76) and D. Fearn (321–46), who comment on Bacchylides, provide interesting and thought-provoking material. This helps to balance out our own Pindaro-centric view of the *epinikion*, which is due to the surviving material, and offers comments on the style and language of these authors. These chapters would be helpful to both scholars and students alike.

A.D. Morrison's chapter (111–32) on Sicilian victory odes is a little redundant on account of his 2007 book (*Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes* (BICS Supplement 95) London) and his supplementary piece on the Aigenetan odes in D. Fearn (ed.), *Aegina:*

*Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry: Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century BC* (Oxford 2011) 227–56. G.O. Hutchinson's chapter (277–302) is a useful macroscopic catalogue of certain metaphors in *epinikia*, but it offers little analysis. C. Calame (303–20) however offers some analysis in his microscopic piece on *Olympian* 6. Typographical errors are few and far between. S. Hornblower's chapter (93–107) talks about numbered sections in the text, but none of the sections are numbered. These are minor points.

In an age when we are saturated with companion volumes, sometimes several on the same author or genre, although many of them are helpful, this collection of essays is both useful and original. They demonstrate the complexity and diversity of approaches to the victory ode and of the odes themselves. The reader will find the indices very helpful in dealing with such a wide array of topics. If a *Companion to the Victory Ode* were put together, many of the essays in this volume would be liberally and justly cited as authoritative sources, and may well render such a project unnecessary. The editors and contributors should be praised for a volume that is helpful and thought-provoking for both students and scholars.

T.R.P. COWARD

King's College London  
thomas.coward@kcl.ac.uk

SEAFORD (R.). **Cosmology and the Polis: The Social Construction of Space and Time in the Tragedies of Aeschylus.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. xiii + 366. £65/\$110. 9781107009271.

doi:10.1017/S0075426914001529

Few things in life are more important than what we think about Greek tragedy, and Seaford has been provoking us to think for quite a while. The present book builds on his earlier monographs, *Reciprocity and Ritual* (Oxford 1994) and *Money and the Early Greek Mind* (Cambridge 2004), as well as his many articles. The majority of the concepts will be familiar to those who know his earlier work, and the book is characteristic in other ways too. It combines a large, sweeping argument with detailed attention to the text and it examines its material, sometimes somewhat repetitively, from a series of different angles. The preface makes it clear that the book is partly driven by a critical view of contemporary politics, and this too is an important part of its contribution.