

elsewhere G. relies on it too readily). Discussion of the text in 112 is inadequate: Hermann's *Αἴαν τεόν τ'* is accepted on trust (as by most edd. except Farnell), despite introducing the twin oddities of (i) an invocation to Ajax tacked onto an address to the chorus/poet (*ᾄρυσαι* 109) and (ii) an anomalous *τε* after the vocative—whereas the otherwise unexceptionable *Αἴαντεῖον* (codd.) seemingly has papyrus support (as G. himself notes) and (as G. and others fail to note) is open to prosodic interpretation as the iambic metron (with internal correction: cf. *O.* 13.81, *P.* 8.55, Bacch. 16.8, 17.92 and 129) which the infelicitous conjecture is designed to restore.

My chief criticism, however, is of G.'s treatment of the creative marvel of Pindaric language, especially the way he underinterprets Pindar's connotation play. Take 1–2, *μέλος φωνάεν*, Archilochus' 'song that *spoke, communicated*' (cf. the adj. at *O.* 2.85, *I.* 4.40, Xen. *Mem.* 2.7.13, and *ποτιφ.* at *Od.* 9.456, with West's note on *Theog.* 584), where G.'s response to *φ.* is 'a somewhat colourless word' 'meaning nothing more than "having a voice"': there are comparably reductive comments on (most obviously) *σκύταλον* (30) and *ἀπειναί* (108). Reading poetry is not a predictive science, but 'meaning nothing more than' must count as one of the most unpromising hermeneutic handles on Pindar, whose stock-in-trade is the *callida iunctura*, the defamiliarizing distortion, the subtly suggestive configuration. Hellenist commentators can do better: witness Garvie's *Choephoroi*, Sommerstein's *Aristophanes*, and—of old, once again—Gildersleeve's *Pindar*.

It would be churlish not to welcome what is, as G. says, the first detailed commentary on *O.* 9. It is only a shame that its perspectives are narrow and its contribution to critical appreciation limited.

King's College London

M. S. SILK

LYRIC RECEPTIONS

M. CANNATÀ FERA, G. B. D'ALESSIO (edd.): *I lirici greci. Forme della comunicazione e storia del testo. Atti dell'Incontro di Studi, Messina, 5–6 novembre 1999.* (Pelorias 8.) Pp. 205. Messina: Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità dell'Università degli Studi di Messina, 2001. Paper, €30. ISBN: 88-8268-007-X.

This volume has its origins in a conference held at Messina in November 1999. Its stated subject is not only the history of the texts of the lyric poets, but also the ways in which Archaic lyric was communicated and performed. Pindar is the best represented author, with five papers (out of thirteen), and another on a papyrus commentary to Pindar or Ibycus, while Sappho, Alcaeus, Anacreon, Archilochus, and Mimnermus get one each. One paper (by M. C. Martinelli), on the division of the Homeric hexameter into *cola*, is out of place.

The overall quality of this careful and thorough collection is high, though the 'presentazione' is too brief, which has unfortunate consequences. In their explanation of the connection between the textual history of the lyric poets and the performance of the poems the editors claim that the communication and diffusion of Greek lyric was almost exclusively oral (p. 9). Put as bluntly as this, no mention is made of the complexities involved in an accurate picture of the performance and early diffusion of Archaic poetry. Happily, several of the papers show a clear awareness of the difficulties.

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

Most importantly, C. Carey explores how the concrete reality of the performance of public lyric is reflected in the poems themselves. He rightly stresses that the experience of the audience hearing an ode for the first time is an inescapably linear one (p. 16). Hence the audience of an epinician ode cannot know how or when the narrative will end, nor how the ode will proceed. Pindar exploits this, with delayed announcement of the details of the victory (e.g. in *O.* 1), and changes of speed, mood, or narrative direction (e.g. *N.* 3.26–30). For C. this makes Pindar the most performative and dramatic of the lyric poets, despite suggestions about the influence of writing on Pindar (e.g. T. K. Hubbard, *The Pindaric Mind* [Leiden, 1985], pp. 66–70). Nevertheless, C. also emphasizes the contrast between the specificity of detail and connection to the original communal context of Alcman's *Partheneia* or Pindar's *Paeans*, and the reduction of detail and lack of emphasis on the occasion as a physical event in Pindaric epinicians (pp. 18–21). This is partly to be explained by the differences involved in celebrating individuals (p. 21), but also as part of an attempt to include a wider audience than simply the original one (p. 26). This is achieved through reperformance (cf. *N.* 4.13–16), and it is in this light that allusions to a sympotic context in some Pindaric epinicians (e.g. *N.* 9.48–52) should be viewed (pp. 21–3, 26). This 'textualization' through and in song must also, I think, modify our view of the 'orality' of at least late Archaic poetry (cf. G. Nagy, *Homeric Questions* [Austin, 1996], pp. 100–12, L. Edmunds, in A. Cavarzere et al. [edd.], *Iambic Ideas* [Lanham and Oxford, 2001], p. 79).

M. Cannatà Fera also deals with the performance of Pindaric poems, in particular the execution of *N.* 2 (pp. 153–8), and the occasion of *N.* 10 (pp. 158–63), while D. Loscalzo, in a valuable examination of myth and truth in Pindar, also touches on Pindaric awareness of the reperformance and decontextualization of his epinician poetry (pp. 167–8). Awareness of future audiences means Pindar liberates himself from the strict confines of the occasion of his poems, and L. connects this with Pindar's need to present the past in a coherent and logical form (p. 168). He argues convincingly (from *O.* 1.28–32, *N.* 7.20–7, *N.* 8.32–4) that in Pindar *μῦθος* is presented as an elaboration on *λόγος*, which Pindar must uncover, removing the accretions deforming the truth (pp. 168–73).

Of the textual papers, G. B. D'Alessio's is the best, making an important contribution to our knowledge of the structure of the Hellenistic edition of Pindar's *Paeans* through close material analysis of P. Oxy. 841, to demonstrate that Grenfell and Hunt's sections C and D could not have been placed to the right of sections A and B (p. 79–81), and that P. Oxy. 841 probably had two rolls (p. 83). There are also clear and useful re-examinations of the evidence for the authenticity of Pindar's *O.* 5 (by M. Ruffa), the transmission of Alcaeus fr. 347 V. (by A. Ponzio), and P. Oxy. 2636 (by G. Ucciardello). G. A. Privitera's suggested emendation of *ἀνθρώπων* at Mimnermus fr. 2.16 W. to *τῶν γεραίων* is unconvincing. It is based on nothing more than a supposed inconsistency with Mimnermus fr. 6 W., a separate, contextless fragment whose speaker is uncertain (not determined by Solon fr. 20 W.).

Elsewhere, there are competent contributions on four tiny fragments of Archilochus' lyric poetry (by S. Grandolini), first-person statements in Anacreon (by G. A. Bragheti), and the *Διὸς ὀδός* in Pindar's *O.* 2 (by S. Lavecchia). Odd and unenlightening is F. Ferrari on Sappho fr. 31 and fr. 2 V.

Typographical errors are few, the collection attractively presented, and the best papers very good.

University of Manchester

A. D. MORRISON