

πολυμάλωι (I prefer πολυμήλωι; sheep are staples, apples are not), 2.45 Ἀδραστίδων, 52 ἀφροσύνας παραλύει (though he is forced to dilute *aphrosyna* as ‘obsession’), 60 φράσαισ’ (possible but unnecessary), 87 γαρύετον with the MSS, 6.54 βατείαι (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 Ἀγγίνα, 10.25 βώμων, 105 ἄλλακε. 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

convinced that Tenos in Laconia is any more likely than Telos; (iii) chronology: in a fine survey taking all the evidence into account, including literary stylistics, N. argues for an early fourth century date, combatting the view of Martin West, *ZPE* 25 (1977), 95–119, that the poem is an early Hellenistic forgery; (iv) biography: the tradition that Erinna died young is probably right, but the idea that she died at the age of 19 is a confusion with the age of Baucis' death; (v) the oeuvre: a good survey of what we know of the *Elakate* and its poetic dialect, offering the suggestion that it was probably transmitted on its own in a rather short papyrus roll consisting of fifteen columns of twenty lines (pp.158–9); (vi) the indirect tradition, in which N. attempts to demonstrate the authenticity of the *πομπίλος* fragment (*SH* 403), and even the possibility that it comes from the *Elakate* itself, which could have contained within it a mini-propempticon; (vii) the title: a nuanced discussion both of its meaning and the question of its authenticity; (viii) the genre: N. discusses and in the end accepts the idea that the *Elakate* is an example of *Kreuzung der Gattungen*; (ix) epigrams: N. examines the three epigrams in the *Anthology* attributed to Erinna, and argues that they should be approached as part of the Hellenistic doxography of Erinna; (x) a conclusion. The book is completed by four indexes, which are systematic and comprehensive.

N.'s book is an impressive achievement, and a real pleasure to read. Immense learning is tactfully deployed. Even in the rare cases where one wants to disagree with the author's conclusions, the evidence one needs to do so is all included. I have never before seen 'easy listening' used as an adjective in literary criticism (p. 179). We look forward to N.'s edition.

*University of Reading*

IAN RUTHERFORD

S. SCHRÖDER: *Geschichte und Theorie der Gattung Paian. Eine kritische Untersuchung mit einem Ausblick auf Behandlung und Auffassung der lyrischen Gattungen bei den alexandrinischen Philologen*. Pp. xv + 172. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1999. Cased, DM 68. ISBN: 3-519-07670-5.

Schroeder offers a critique of Lutz Käppel's (K.) important study of the paean (*Paian. Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung* [1992], reviewed in *CR* 44 [1994], 62–5). The main issue is this: K. argued that in the classical period, genre is about function; a paean is essentially a special form of prayer, not exclusively linked to any one god; from the fourth century, the concept of genre is supposed to be transformed, and formal features become critical (e.g. the 'paeian-refrain'), and in this period paeians are written where the formal features are particularly prominent, a transformation that K. labels 'Automatisation', borrowing the term from Russian formalism.

After a survey of K.'s position in Chapter I, S. proceeds in Chapter II to argue that paeians were after all addressed only to Apollo and his circle in the classical period. That means explaining away cases where they were sung to other deities, at least for the classical period. S. rightly points out that one important group of fragments ('Pindar Paean 13–22'), which do not involve Apollo, and which K. followed Snell-Maehler in labelling 'paeians', are not in fact paeians at all (cf. D'Alessio, *ZPE* 118 [1997], 23–60), but there are other contexts, including battle and the symposium, in which paeians do seem to have been sung to other deities. Another failing is that S. leaves out what some have seen as the core of the genre, the tendency of paean-performance to be correlated with scenarios where the collective male strength of the community is on display.

In Chapter III S. develops the argument that a defining rôle should be assigned to formal features as early as the classical period. One of the key texts is Philodamus of Scarpheia's Paean to Dionysus, which K. had seen as a generic innovation, crossing dithyrambic theme with paeianic refrain, and so pointing to the Hellenistic period; S. agrees that for Dionysus to be the dedicatee of a paean would have been disconcerting to an audience, but argues that (i) this is nothing to do with genre, (ii) it is intelligible within the ritual framework of the Delphic Theoxenia, and (iii) it would have been possible in the fifth century as well as the fourth. I certainly agree with (iii), though I doubt whether we can keep genre out of it entirely (cf. Bacchylides 16).

The most valuable chapter for me was Chapter IV, in which S. takes on K.'s use of contemporary literary theory, specifically of H. R. Jauss's essay, *Theorie der Gattungen und Literatur des Mittelalters* (available in English translation in *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, tr. T. Bahti [Brighton, 1982]). Jauss took issue with what he regarded as the traditional 'normative' theory of genres, in which generic identity is judged against a canonical model, and argued instead for a fluid notion of genre which varies over time, as individual works of literature