

Linguistic Area and its Characteristics: Ancient Anatolia. Areal Diffusion as a Challenge to the Comparative Method?', in A.Y. Aikhenvald and R.M.W. Dixon [edd.], *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance: Problems in Comparative Linguistics* [2001], pp. 44–63, at 58) has observed the formal correspondence between Ionic -σκ- and the Hittite imperfective suffix *-ske* as well as the matching functional use of the Luwian cognate *-za-*, which suggests that the Ionic iterative suffix reflects an areal feature common to Western Anatolia. Thus, rather than an elevated style, Hipponax' use of the -σκ- suffix suggests a colloquial feature of Asiatic Ionic. (Here we might compare Hipponax' use of the ethnic suffix -ηνος in Λαμψακηνός at fr. 36.3. The suffix is otherwise alien to archaic poetry, but is attested in Herodotus and, more to the point, amply attested in the epigraphic record of Western Anatolia, which all points to a colloquial register.) B. might well disagree with such an analysis, but any work that seeks to engage with the language of Hipponax and its registers must engage with the relevant scholarship.

Chapters 3 and 4 deal more closely with issues related to the textual constitution and dialect of several passages (for the material in Chapter 3, see Hawkins's discussion in his review). I find appealing the argument (pp. 89–93) that the metathesis of aspiration in κύθρος (χύτρος) at fr. 118 and θεῦτις (τευθίς) at fr. 162 might be meant to characterise the language of the speaker, but here again lack of context makes this impossible to argue with any degree of conviction. And, leaving aside the problematic issue of whether we read ἔγγυτον, ἔγγυτρον or ἔγκυθρον at fr. 107.49, it would have been good to know whether B. thinks ἐγκύθροτις in an inscription from Lydia (*SEG* 34.1213.6) has any bearing on his proposed interpretation.

The final chapter is, to this reviewer, one of the most interesting and informative. B. examines the onomastic repertoire of Hipponax, noting Hipponax' fondness for toponymic and mythological names that often have comic and parodic resonances. And, as B. notes, this is an aspect of Hipponactean iambus that differentiates him from Archilochus.

This is, in the end, an uneven book. At times prolix even given its diminutive size (the five chapters themselves occupy 100 pages), one walks away with the uncomfortable feeling that not much has been gained from B.'s endeavour, one which, furthermore, might more profitably and economically have been made through a few articles and notes in journals. B. is undoubtedly meticulous and thoughtful, and there certainly are useful insights scattered throughout the book; scholars who engage closely with Hipponax' text and language will have to consult B. and will benefit from the experience, but there is little that will endear the book to a wider audience.

*Concordia University, Montreal*

ALEXANDER DALE  
[alexander.dale@concordia.ca](mailto:alexander.dale@concordia.ca)

## THOUGHTS ON EPINICIAN POETRY

FEARN (D.) *Pindar's Eyes. Visual and Material Culture in Epinician Poetry*. Pp. x + 318. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. Cased, £70, US\$99. ISBN: 978-0-19-874637-9.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X18001269

In the introduction, F. positions himself as moving away from historicising readings of Pindar's engagement with material culture and visual phenomena (such readings having

been in vogue over the course of the last generation of Pindaric scholarship) in order to take a more literary approach to Pindar's material worlds. In doing so, he does not plan to return to a New Critical formalism, but plans to offer a reading that is engaged with questions of aesthetics, literary form and context (p. 5). He perhaps best articulates this approach when he says, 'A view of Pindaric epinician poetics emerges that is much more focused on the issue of the representability of reality, and the extent to which encomiastic poetry can ever fully preserve and allow access to the rich contextual circumstances of its *laudandi*' (p. 9). In closing, F. contextualises epinician poetry in relation to contemporary commemorative materials (victory sculptures and epigraphic texts) and provides an outline of the chapters to follow.

In Chapter 1 F. focuses on *Nem. 5*, and he begins with the famed opening ('I am not a statue maker . . .'). F. urges that, instead of viewing Pindar as antagonistic to sculpture, readers should see him here as offering an 'attitude' towards it, poetry and their 'efficacy' (p. 20); here F. nicely points out that Pindar's reference need not be restricted to victory statuary. F. suggests that in the ode's opening 'Pindar's sense of lyric space and movement offers an aesthetics concerned with art's scope and potential, not with space as immediately or directly conceivable as historical or sociopolitical' (p. 21). I would counter that Pindar comments on the ability of his song to be mobile in a manner that sculpture is not: he does not make a claim about 'lyric space'; Pindar's space is literal. The chapter includes discussion of *Ol. 1.28–34*, but I do not think that F. understands Pindar's Greek in that passage (*kharis* does not mean Grace; cf. a similar problem regarding the signification of the Charites at p. 60). (For discussion of *kharis* in this passage, see C. Eckerman, 'Notes to a Recent Edition of Pindar's *Olympian Odes*. A Review Article to Accompany Michel Briand, *Pindare. Olympiques (texte établi par A Puech)*', *Exemplaria Classica* 19 [2015], 193–202.) Later in the chapter, F. turns to interpret the end of *Nem. 5*, but his reading is based on a misunderstanding of lines 50–4 (for discussion of the end of *Nem. 5*, see C. Eckerman, 'I Weave a Variegated Headband: Metaphors for Song and Communication in Pindar's Odes,' *HSCP* 110 [forthcoming]); and F. does not have the requisite familiarity with bibliography on this passage. Having worked through *Nem. 5*, F. closes the chapter by turning to Herodotus' intertextuality with Pindar.

Chapter 2 revolves around *Nem. 8*. F. begins with reflections on the erotic subject matter of the proem and then turns to the role of Aegina's Aiakeion in the poem (pp. 108–9). This is a problem: there is not any clear-cut reference to the Aiakeion in *Nem. 8*, but F. develops an extended reading on the supposition that there is. Similarly, there is no reference to wreath dedication at lines 14–16, but F. takes it as a given (p. 132) (for further discussion, see Eckerman forthcoming). Included in this chapter, however, is a rich and valuable discussion of gesture and haptic diction in *Nem. 8*. A coda on *Pyth. 8.56–60* concludes the chapter.

*Pyth. 1* is the focus of the third chapter. F. begins with the famed apostrophe of the lyre at the ode's opening. F. asserts, 'there is a sense here that lyric as a cosmic force is creating its own autonomous time' (p. 174). There is no 'lyric' in this passage, however; there is a lyre. As noted above, F. made a similar slip with regard to space at the opening of *Nem. 5*. However, F.'s discussions of time, tense, ekphrasis, sound and prayer in this chapter are rewarding and extend the book's scope beyond the 'visual and material culture' promised in its subtitle. The chapter closes with reflections on the problematics of time in relation to the historical Hieron.

In the final chapter F. turns to Simonides, Bacchylides and *Nem. 10*. When addressing Simonides' Danae fragment, F. claims that its opening words ('in the decorated chest') 'gesture towards' (p. 234) an ekphrastic frame for the passage. This is not obvious, and the claim will seem unwarranted to some readers: the phrase 'gesture toward' seems to be chosen to provide F. with intellectual wiggle-room. Nonetheless, having made this statement,

F. develops further claims from it, for example, that the phrase ‘in the decorated chest’ ‘raise[s] the stakes for the relation between artifice and truth, and art and text, in lyric’ (p. 234). I note, however, that with the words ‘in the decorated chest’ Simonides is only stating Perseus’ and Danae’s location; F. here makes tendentious claims regarding Simonidean poetics. It is not obvious that Simonides here raises ‘ambivalent questions about poetry and materiality’ (p. 235). Such sleights of hand are a recurrent problem of F.’s argumentative style. Having developed an ‘aesthetic’ reading of the Danae fragment, F. turns to the opening of Bacchylides 5 and provides an insightful reading of the visual poetics of its opening. In a very brief conclusion (three pages), F. reflects on the goals of his project and makes suggestions for developing similar methodological approaches to Pindar’s odes.

I offer some final thoughts. F.’s chapter-theses are not argumentative theses; they are open-ended declarations of themes that F. will touch on. In this regard, I was left treading water, wondering if in any particular chapter there is an argument being made and how one could decide if F. had adequately defended it if there were. Readers expecting scholarship based on deductive reasoning will at times be disappointed, and inductive trains of thought can lead F. to over-interpret. As noted above, F. occasionally slips from one phenomenon (A) to another (B), as though they were akin, for example literal space (A)/lyric space (B); lyre (A)/lyric(B), and thereafter develops a reading related to B, although the text does not provide evidence for anything other than A; this is a serious impediment to following F. where he wants to lead us. With regard to his engagement with scholars who have worked on Pindaric poetry, F. at times skims the bibliographic surface; this is unfortunate, given the historical depth of excellent scholarship on Pindar. F. regularly gives agency to inanimate phenomena (e.g. ‘Pindaric lyric is interested in’ [p. 17]; ‘N.5 manipulates audiences’ reactions’ [p. 23] etc.) and thereby has a related tendency to muddle important literary phenomena (e.g. texts and authors) that should be discussed with precision. Within the framework of this review I have focused more attention on questions of philology than on F.’s extended overviews of theoretical positions (e.g. ritual/ritualization, pp. 118–24) because it is not the theories but the outputs of engagements with theories that are most important for the interpretation of Pindar’s odes.

The book is generally well produced, but there are eye-raising errors: for example, an *Iambi et Elegi Graeci post Alexandrum Cantati* attributed to M.L. West (p. x); J. Fenno is not a woman (p. 58). With regard to the new method promised in the introduction, I cannot say that I found anything particularly novel. What I did find was an inclination to employ inductive reasoning within a cross-temporal frame, while argumentative theses were not developed; and, as noted above, F., while employing this method, has a tendency to make assertions that the texts cannot support. Nonetheless, F. is a powerful exegete of Pindar, and one has to evaluate all his readings individually.

*University of Oregon*

CHRIS ECKERMAN  
eckerman@uoregon.edu