

always match. Barrett conjectured *παρὰ ματρὶ* φίλαι in 6.8 (S13), which suits the dative. Curtis prints and translates *τόκα ματρὶ* φίλαι, but there is no attribution in the *apparatus* for *τόκα* and the commentary states (118) that Barrett's conjecture 'fits the context of Kallirrhoe's speech'. The line apparently begins *ὄκα* on page 117. Which one does Curtis prefer?

Curtis has placed the *Geryoneis* in its wider Indo-European context and has undertaken a difficult task. The back cover states that the commentary focuses 'on the poet's usage of metre and language'. The proposed supplements however are suspicious precisely because of their metre and language. A commentary is usually the first port of call for the student or scholar; this one should be approached with caution.

T.R.P. COWARD
King's College London
thomas.coward@kcl.ac.uk

LULLI (L.) **Narrare in Distici. L'elegia greca arcaica e classica di argomento storico-mitico** (Quaderni dei seminari romani di cultura greca 13). Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 2011. Pp. 122. €31. 9788871404486.
doi:10.1017/S0075426913000165

This short study of narrative elegy is well worth reading. Lulli's book presents a reliable overall assessment, even if it contains little that is new.

After an introduction, the book falls into four chapters, of which chapter 1 explores ancient testimonies on the use of the elegiac distich for historical/mythical narration and assesses various scholarly views on the nature of elegy with historical/mythical argument (namely those of Mazzarino, West, Bowie and Sider).

Chapter 2 discusses narrative elegy from Archaic times to the early Classical age. Taking her cue from S. Mazzarino (*Il pensiero storico classico* I, Bari, 1966), who discussed the anticipation of historiographical subject matter and method by Callinus and Mimnermus, Lulli postulates a narrative component for the elegiac production of many elegists. The merit of this chapter is that it discusses elegies up to Ion of Chios (excluding Tyrtæus); the problem is that we cannot say for sure whether or not the narrative hints that Lulli pursues function as part of a larger project, namely whether such elegies happened to deal occasionally with historical subjects or were exclusively historical narratives.

D. Sider ('The new Simonides and the question of historical elegy', *AJPh* 127, 2006, 332) notes that Callinus' poem on Magnesia combined history (an earlier invasion of the Cimmerians) with the present (the Magnesians are still prosperous), rightly pointing out at least one instance of what else a narrative/historical fragment might contain. Similarly in Mimnermus *fr.* 9 W², the reference to the *hybris* of the Greeks during the colonization of Colophon may not be a sign of Mimnermus' search for the causes of historical events, which, according to Lulli would represent a first step towards the creation of a historiographical method, but rather could well be a form of exhortation from narrator to audience, the message being that the Smyrnaeans must not resign themselves to the imminent onslaught as something fated, a divine punishment for their ancestors' seizure of Smyrna, because that was not just another adventure in *hybris* but rather an act sanctioned by the gods themselves (following A. Allen, *The Fragments of Mimnermus*, Stuttgart, 1993, 11). Again in Xenophanes *fr.* 3.2 W², the reference 'while without hateful tyranny' may be relevant not because it responds to the need to furnish precise chronological indications in a narrative structure oriented towards the treatment of historical events (as Lulli notes), but rather because it points to the connection the poet establishes between the personal (Colophonian) behaviour of *hybris* and the fall of the city precisely as Solon had warned the Athenians in *fr.* 4.1–10 W².

In Chapter 3, a discussion of the new Simonides, Lulli brings out a new angle regarding *fr.* 3 W² (the reference would be to Achilles and not Nereus, so that the Artemisium elegy would have strong similarities with the Plataea elegy in their adoption of the myth of Achilles), which, however, given the nature and present state of the source material, is improvable. The rest of the chapter includes an examination of the sources regarding the elegiac production of Simonides (which does not alter the conclusions by M.L. West, 'Simonides redivivus', *ZPE* 98, 1993, 2–3), a criticism of L.M. Kowerski, *Simonides on the Persian Wars* (New York, 2005) and a survey of *fr.* 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 15–16 W².

Chapter 4, on the new Archilochus fragment (*P.Oxy.* LXIX 4708), gives an exhaustive panorama of the scholarship produced so far. The autopsy of the papyrus by the author has not produced new readings and occasionally pushes

the reader back to an unsupplemented text (for example v. 4 εἴμ]εθ' ἄρ[η]α φουγείν, proposed by West). Lulli carefully highlights the connections of this elegy to the narrative techniques of the *epos* and in particular the flashback technique (also pointed out in previous scholarship), but runs the risk of presenting as peculiar what may in fact be quite normal, since she neglects to connect this Archilochean elegy with the genre of elegy itself to which it belongs: Mimnermus *fr.* 11 W², which has a clear *hysteron proteron* (vv. 1–3 refer to the completion of Jason's journey whereas v. 4 refers to an arrival in Ocean which must have taken place before the journey ended) is the equivalent at a microtextual level of the narrative technique of flashback. The techniques of repetitions and alliterations which emphasize certain concepts in the poem (especially vv. 4, 6–7), thus creating the *gusto espressionistico* that the author notes for Archilochus, are also an important characteristic of the expressiveness of the military poetry of Tyrtaeus (*cf.*, for example, C. Prato, *Tyrtaeus*, Rome, 1968, 60*–61*). No mention is made either to the rest of Archilochus' poetry, and, most importantly for the topic of the book, to other narrative elegy like that of Simonides. I would also have liked to find a comparison with Archil. *fr.* adesp. iamb. 38 W² (for example about the rareness of expressions taken from Homer in contrast to the new elegy which makes an abundant use of formulas or on the differences in their argumentative techniques, on which, see G.B. D'Alessio, 'Note al nuovo Archiloco (POxy LXIX 4708)', *ZPE* 156, 2006, 22: if he is correct that Archilochus may have reenacted a situation in which he was accused and therefore responding to the criticism in what remains of the poem, this would find a parallel in the tetrameters of Solon, *fr.* 32 W²; according to the sources, Solon would have presented these lines as his reply to/against a specific addressee, Phocus, who probably had preceded Solon in the sympotic exchange by speaking of his refusal to become a tyrant and perhaps eulogizing tyranny).

J. Grethlein, 'Diomedes redivivus. A new reading of Mimnermus *fr.* 14 W.', *Mnemosyne* 60, 2007, 102–11 and C. Nobili, 'Tra epos ed elegia: Il nuovo Archiloco', *Maia* 61, 2009, 229–49 should be added to the bibliography. I noticed only very minor misprints in Greek (59 n.196, read ἀθανάτων; 66, οὐδ' and ὄ[λλοι]).

MARIA NOUSSIA-FANTUZZI
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
minoussia@lit.auth.gr

LATTMANN (C.) **Das Gleiche im Verschiedenen: Metapher des Sports und Lob des Siegers in Pindars Epinikien** (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 102). Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2010. Pp. xi + 370. €109.95 978311-0247107.

doi:10.1017/S0075426913000177

If Greek epinician poetry is about praising athletes, why is the victor so small a presence in Pindar's victory odes? This book, which revises a doctoral thesis defended at the Christian-Albrechts-Universität in Kiel in 2008, gives us one possible answer to that question. It is built around a series of chapter-length readings of Pindaric epinicians (*Nemean* 8, *Olympian* 8, *Nemean* 4, *Pythian* 4 and *Pythian* 9) like those of Douglas Young and Adolf Köhnken, and falls square in the Bundy tradition (D. Young, *Three Odes of Pindar: A Literary Study of Pythian 2, Pythian 3 and Olympian 7*. Leiden, 1968; A. Köhnken, *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar: Interpretationen zu sechs Pindar-gedichten*, Berlin, 1971; E.L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica*, Berkeley, 1987): the question these interpretations are designed to resolve is the familiar one of unity. Lattmann argues that the coherence of Pindar's odes is grounded in an exclusive focus on victor-praise; which, however, is mediated, mostly for religious reasons, in a way that is largely indirect and implicit. Sport-metaphors – parallels created between sport and other spheres of human activity, and between the victorious athlete and other people (the poet, other family members, the heroes of old) – are the *Leitmotiv* of Pindar's praise.

There is much originality here. Lattman's work represents a new approach to metaphor in Pindar in the sense that he does not discuss imagery piecemeal, classifying it by tenor or vehicle, but tackles it at the level of entire odes. He extrapolates his account of metaphor from a remark of Charles S. Peirce, privileging semiotics over the traditional notion of metaphor as a figure of speech, and working with a more inclusive definition of the concept. He sees Pindar very much as a poet of his time. A lengthy if somewhat inconclusive chapter (44–59) compares his poetic metaphors and the role of argument by analogy and induction (τεκμαίρεσθαι) in sixth- and fifth-century philosophical writers, emphasizing the poet's tendency towards advanced forms of linguistic abstraction.