

audiences to a certain vision of social harmony under élite domination but potentially open to reinterpretation and appropriation by various groups then and later' (p. 278). In his Part 1 (Chapters I and II), he works from the (far from undisputed) standpoint that the poem's minor characters who are observed in a relation of subservience with the élite are all to be classed as slaves, and that this relationship should be seen as representative of all the poem's hierarchical social relations (pp. 16–17). The picture of slaves presented in the poem is thus a selective one, representing with approval the View from Above (Chapter II); by the same token, free peasants are virtually eliminated from the poem as being 'too independent in their views to have been worked easily into a picture of harmonious hierarchical relations without that picture ringing false to the actual experience of the poem's audience' (p. 50). The élite thus defines and confirms itself by reference to its other, the enslaved; and yet, by its very arbitrariness, slavery in the poem challenges the élite, for a Eumaios clearly outshines a suitor. So, Eumaios is a good slave because Odysseus is a good master, and the bad slaves are bad because they are associated with the suitors: 'through [Eumaios], the social organization is viewed from the perspective of one at the bottom who is content with it, and a system of social and economic inequality is presented as a harmonious reconciliation of potentially conflicting interests' (p. 91). In Part 2 (Chapters III and IV) T. examines horizontal relations, that is, between the males of different households, and, within individual households, between male and female, and between father and son. He instances the rivalry of Akhilleus and Agamemnon, and the duel of Paris and Menelaos in *Iliad* 3, as examples of the violence of masculine competition at the heart of the community; these rivalries over women serve as a paradigm for the contest of the bow between Odysseus and the suitors for possession of Penelope. Odysseus' victory in that competition serves not just to assert his status over that of the males of rival households, but within his own household too, as husband and as father: the result is that the very fidelity of Penelope, her like-mindedness, 'thus becomes a code word that masks actual inequality by suggesting equality, and its use reflects the dominance of a male-centered discourse' (p. 236). Part 3 (Chapters V and VI) attempts to locate the patterns of vertical and horizontal relations within the historical framework of the Dark Age, but here T.'s thesis is at its least persuasive, relying as it does on a reconstruction of a Dark Age characterized by class struggle which hardly seems justified from the evidence presented: 'there might also have been some who listened to the poem sometimes, economically exploited in real life, who reacted with resentment against "tax-and-spend" aristocrats and found their sense of injustice confirmed' (p. 298). T. has produced a valuable picture of the status and rôle of slaves in the poem, and of the competitive ethic of its male élite; but for many, his vision of the poem as 'an ideological force for unity in the emerging polis on aristocratic terms' (p. 299) will perhaps be rather less convincing.

University of Exeter

N. POSTLETHWAITE

F. FERRARI (ed.): *Pindaro, Olimpiche*. Pp. 205, 8 ills. Milan: Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, 1998. Paper, L. 13,000. ISBN: 88-17-17226-X.

The volume belongs to the eminently affordable BUR series of classical texts and translations, and follows the standard format. A Greek text is accompanied in the manner of the Loeb and Budé series by a facing Italian translation, and text and translation are preceded by introductory material intended for student and (non-specialist) scholarly use.

The introduction has sections on athletics and the victory ode; the context of commission and performance; the poet's rôle; the structure of the ode; the previously transparent but currently contentious issue of the manner of performance and the poet's imaginative play with the performative context and the speaking voice; the myth; and the religion of the odes. Separate short chapters deal with Pindar's life, the history of the text and the manuscript tradition, a brief range of critical views on Pindar, and a selective survey of scholarship. Collectively these sections provide a useful starting point for the reader trying to come to terms with one of the most difficult ancient authors. Ferrari provides a brief overview of the history of Pindaric criticism. Although what is said is eminently sensible, the brevity of the treatment leaves unclear how F. would resolve the question of unity; he contents himself (pp. 17–18) with a formalist description of three planes of reference (ode as sequence of encomiastic motifs, ode as sequence of image, etc., ode as part of political and performative context), without steering the reader towards their integration. Myth and religion too could have done with more discussion.

F. offers a text independent of his immediate predecessors in matters great and small: 1.12

πολυμάλωι (I prefer πολυμήλωι; sheep are staples, apples are not), 2.45 Ἀδραστίδων, 52 ἀφροσύνας παραλύει (though he is forced to dilute *aphrosyna* as ‘*ossessione*’), 60 φράσαισ’ (possible but unnecessary), 87 γαρύετον with the MSS, 6.54 βατεία (correction) ἐν ἀπειράτωι (short penultimate = ἀπειράντωι) with the MSS, 9.112 Αἰάντειόν τ’ (correction), 10.9 τόκος θνατῶν with MSS (scarcely credible in my view), 11.10 ὁμῶς ὄν with T. Mommsen (unnecessarily), 13.114 μάλα (with Wilamowitz), 14.17 Ἀσώπιχ’ ἐν (with Van Groningen, MSS text retained in v. 5; bold but appealing). In particular, he admits anomalous respension offered by the MSS far more freely than Maehler in the Teubner and Lehnus in the Garzanti editions: 1.73 *Εὐρυτρίαιναν*, 2.97 *θέλων κρύφιον τιθέμεν*, 3.35 *βαθυζώνου*, 7.85 *Αῖγνα*, 10.25 *βώμων*, 105 *ἄλακε*. Since in most cases change is relatively easy, retention requires considerably more faith in the MSS tradition than (I think) it deserves. 2.97 and 10.105 are justified with appeal to the anomalies in Bakkh. 17, an ode where (in my view) scholars have likewise accorded the papyrus tradition unearned respect, though I note that even Maehler, who in his Brill edition emends or obelizes most alleged *Responsionsfreiheiten*, accepts some.

The textual choices receive discussion in the plentiful but brief footnotes, which also address matters of mythology and religion (especially for *O.* 2), history, syntax, and specifics of interpretation. Thus there are short but sensible comments on issues such the religion of *O.* 2, on the meaning of 2.85 (where F. crisply cuts the interpretative knot), on the place of performance of *O.* 8, on the reference of 11.20. There is a general silence on larger matters of interpretation, since individual odes do not receive an introduction, so that the reader is left to navigate unaided a disorienting text. The notes are also silent on some smaller (but still significant) issues where the novice would like some help, such as the structure of the myth in *O.* 3, baffling for the reader not fully conversant with lyric ring-narrative, and the puzzling rhetoric at various points.

The Italian translation is a reliable guide to the content of Pindar’s text, though F. could have risked staying closer to Pindar’s syntax and word-order on occasion, given the relative flexibility open to the writer in Italian in places where English risks confusion.

Though the constraints of space are very visible, this is for all its brevity a scholarly volume, and one which will have to be consulted by professional students of Pindar.

Royal Holloway, London

C. CAREY

C. NERI: *Studi sulle testimonianze di Erinna*. Pp. 234. Bologna: Pàtron Editore. Paper. ISBN: 88-555-2398-8.

Only one poem by Erinna (or more correctly Herinna: see below), the 300 line *Elakate* or *Distaff*, was known to ancient editors, partly preserved in PSI 1090 and now to be found as n. 401 in the *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. The modest aim of Neri’s book is to serve as an edition and commentary of the testimonia to Erinna’s poetic activity, by way of a prolegomena to a full edition of the *Elakate*. In fact it amounts to a complete re-evaluation of Erinna, covering every conceivable angle, including several aspects of the *Elakate* itself. Without a doubt, N.’s book will henceforth be the standard work on Erinna, superseding all previous studies.

The first part of the book is a collection of the testimonia, together with the text of the epigrams attributed to Erinna, with full apparatus and Italian translations. Usefully, N. includes the full text of the several Hellenistic epigrams which deal with Erinna, and three attributed to her. Some idea of the thoroughness of the work can be gleaned from the fact that the text of Eusebius’ *Chronicle* (14b) is cited in the Armenian, in both transliteration and original script. At the end of the book an appendix provides critical comments on the testimonia (pp. 207ff.), and there is even a stemma illustrating the relation between the testimonia (p. 236).

The second part is a study of the various issues raised by the testimonia: (i) an introduction, including a fascinating survey of cases of misattribution to Erinna: pp. 100–7; (ii) Erinna’s name and city: N. establishes that the correct form of the name, attested in the older testimonia, is Herinna, a diminutive from Hera; the psilotic form could have its origin in the false belief that Erinna was a Lesbian (cf. *AP.* 9.190); in Italian the rough breathing is ignored, of course; hence N. himself uses the form ‘Erinna’; as for her city, N. advances the hypothesis that Erinna hailed not from the islands Tenos (the Doric dialect is a problem for that) or Telos, but from a little known town of the same name in Laconia, so that the *Elakate* would be a rare example of Spartan women’s poetry, in the tradition of Alcman; this is an ingenious solution to a long-standing problem, and argued with meticulous attention to all the data, but in the end I am not