

In summary, Hosty's stimulating commentary not only provides the reader with a clear and level-headed guide through the *Batrachomyomachia*'s textual difficulties but also uncovers a host of features revealing the depth and significance of the poet's intertextual engagement. The volume is well produced, with barely any typographical errors, and its dustjacket features a delightfully armed mouse wielding (as in lines 129-30) a sewing-needle spear.

NICHOLAS WILSHERE
University of Nottingham
Nicholas.Wilshere@nottingham.ac.uk

CÉCILE DAUDE, SYLVIE DAVID, MICHEL FARTZOFF, CLAIRE MUCKENSTURM-POULLE, *Scholies à Pindare. Volume II: Scholies à la deuxième Olympique*, Institut des sciences et techniques de l'Antiquité, Besançon: Presses Universitaires de Franche-Comté, 2020, 38.00 €, 310 pp., ISBN 978-2-84867-771-2.

The second volume in this series appeared seven years after the first.¹ PRODI'S estimate that the series will comprise 17 volumes in total² would mean that anyone awaiting a French translation of the ancient scholia to the Pythians (let alone the Isthmians) will need a great deal of patience, not to mention longevity, since at the current production rate the final volume may not appear until the third decade of the next century. The editors deserve some thanks for making available a serviceable translation of the ancient scholia to *Olympian 2* (although it is not free from error) and for some interesting discussion in the commentary. However, they have paid insufficient attention to the constructive criticisms made by reviewers of the first volume³ and as a result the second volume is not an adequate piece of scholarship. That it should have taken a team of four seven years to produce a volume of the scholia to a single ode of Pindar serves to show what a sterling job Drachmann (henceforward 'DR.') did having regard to the materials and time available to him.

Daude's introduction (13-41) is well-written and contains some good discussion of the interest in history, myth and poetic language apparent in the scholia to *Olympian 2*.

¹ The concept of the series seems confused. On the one hand, it aims to provide a translation for those with insufficient Greek or who need assistance to translate the scholia themselves (a laudable task). On the other, it purports to provide a detailed scholarly commentary. There are therefore two different audiences. The editors serve the needs of the first, but a much better job could and should have been done serving those of the second.

² E.E. Prodi, *BMCR* 27 December 2014 <https://bmc.brynmawr.edu/2014/2014.12.27/>.

³ See the reviews of M. Cannatà Fera, *Gnomon* 88, 2016, 677-84; T. Phillips, *CR* 65, 2015, 341-3; Prodi (n. 2) and G. Ucciardello, *Mnemosyne* 6, 2015, 1035-9. A. Neumann-Hartmann, *MH* 71, 2014, 214-15 is little more than a notice. The review of G. Lachenaud, *REG* 127, 2014, 231-3 seemed to be puffed up with patriotic pride and lacking in objectivity.

The text (50-118) mostly reproduces that of DR. faithfully.⁴ I spotted two errors: Σ 14b (54.19): the lemma should read ὀρθόπολις; Σ 162a (112.26): φρενος lacks an oxytone. There are 31 brief footnotes to the text in which the editors discuss their approval of/divergences from DR. (I counted 18 instances of the latter). The editors offer no emendations of their own and limit themselves to discussing others' interventions. Unhelpfully and oddly, they do not print suppressed text in square brackets or consistently indicate where suppressed words were situated in the text.⁵ On the other hand and again oddly, where they disagree with the bracketing of words and phrases by DR. they sometimes retain the text in his brackets.⁶ Another idiosyncrasy is the inconsistent updating of DR.'s cross-references to fragmentary authors. Thus, while references to FHG are updated to FGGrH, at Σ 70d a reference to Mnaseas of Patara in FHG is retained where reference should have been made to Cappelletto's recent edition.⁷ Again, references to Callim. fr. 361 should have been consistently updated to fr. 43.46 Pfeiffer.⁸ Where references to Sappho fr. 80 are updated, they are updated to 'fr. 148 LP' rather than the later edition of Voigt (although the fragment in question happens to have the same numeration in her edition as it does in Lobel and Page).⁹ The inclusion in margins of the MSS' sigla for where the scholia appear seems an unnecessary complication in the absence of an apparatus to distinguish between readings. The cross-references which DR. included after individual scholia are omitted. At Σ 16a (58.1) DR.'s marginal cross-reference '(cfr. A 70)' has strayed from the margin into the text; at Σ 70f (80.7), 'cfr. V 16' has been omitted. Otherwise, I found two errors in the attribution of the scholia to MSS: at Σ 107 (96.25), where Q has been added at the end of B(C)DE, and at Σ 150d (108.24), where Q should appear in the margin. In places the textual notes are imprecise or misleading (the absence of an app. crit. does not help), such as:

- Σ inscr. (50 n. 1): ' Ici, nous gardons θυγατέρα comme dans les mss ABQ'. All three MSS have θυγατέρα, but their comment suggests that B has the word in the same place as A and Q when in fact it follows ἔγημε in B.

- Σ 7a (52 n. 5.): 'ἐπι παντός est une corr. de Dr. pour ἄπολλ'. DR.'s ἐπι παντός seems not to be a direct correction of ἀπολλ, but rather of the 'correction' from ἀπολλ to ἀπὸ παντός in A.

⁴ Even maintaining his orthographical inconsistencies; e.g. at Σ 15d (56.17) they follow DR. in printing οὐδόλωσ (at Σ *Nem.* 11 inscr. a/b he prints οὐδ' ὄλωσ).

⁵ E.g. they do not at Σ inscr. (50 n. 1), but they do at Σ 78 (82 n. 14).

⁶ Σ 50 (70 n. 12), 102a (94 n. 18), 113c (98 n. 20), 135c (104 n. 24), 162c (114 n. 29), 173f (116 n. 30), 177d (118 n. 31). Their practice is, however, inconsistent: see e.g. Σ 35b (68 n. 9) where DR. printed the suppressed text in square brackets but the editors do not.

⁷ P. Cappelletto, ed., *I frammenti di Mnasea. Introduzione, testo e commento*, Milano 2003.

⁸ Σ 29d (66.19); 70g (80.19) (inconsistently the translation [81 l. 23] refers to Pfeiffer but without the line number).

⁹ C. Neri, ed., *Saffo, testimonianze e frammenti: introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento*, Berlin 2021, was not available for this volume, but will be for future volumes.

- Σ 15d (56 n. 8): The suggestion that the accentuation κατόκισθεν is adopted ‘conformément à l’édition Snell-Maehler’ may confuse some readers since there is no edition of the scholia by Snell and Maehler. As to ‘la lecture κατωκίσθεν adoptée par Drachmann avec paroxyton est fautive’, the editors should have explained why they say that the accent is faulty.¹⁰

- Σ 102a (94 n. 18): ‘Nous conservons, contrairement à Drachmann, le texte du ms A’. This is misleading in various respects. First, the editors print A’s καὶ ὀλόκλαρον in square brackets despite purporting to retain the reading. Second, they give no indication that DR. only printed καὶ in square brackets but deleted ὀλόκλαρον entirely. Third, A has ἐξάριετον, but the editors print Schneider’s -τέον (which is part of the same short phrase), so it is incorrect to say that they retain the text of A.

Where the editors differ from DR.,¹¹ I have generally found DR.’s approach preferable, e.g.:

- Σ 48f: DR.’s bracketing of ὁμοῦ is queried saying that he did not give reasons (72 n. 11). But editors do not always give reasons and it is self-evident that there is no need here for ὁμοῦ (and certainly not in the sense, namely that given by LSJ s.v. II.3 ‘in all, in round numbers’, advocated by the editors). The point being made by the scholiast is the specific one that there are 15 cola here uniquely.

- Σ 113c: DR.’s deletion of οἶ seems more plausible than the editors’ proposed retention. I have not been able to find any other instances where the scholia have ἔνιοι ... οἶ ... ἀκούουσιν as opposed to simple ἔνιοι ... ἀκούουσιν/ἤκουσαν, but this is not considered by the editors.

- Σ 162a: The editors refer to their commentary (no. 45, without referring to pages 260-1 which are relevant here [the note in question spans pp. 255-62]). In the commentary (260) they provide a translation (‘au lieu de dire un esprit amolli’) and they translate DR.’s conjecture ἐπεικοῦς (for εἰπεῖν) as ‘plein d’aménité’. But in neither place do they say what the original text is (ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰπεῖν μαλθακὴν φρένα). The editors may be right that there is a case for accepting DR.’s conjecture, but its presentation is poor.

The translation (51-119) is largely faithful to the Greek and I think the translation is satisfactory overall. Supplements in the text are not indicated in the translation and there are places where the translation is wrong, not nuanced appropriately or is too flowery. For example:

¹⁰ Modern editorial practice is to print the short form 3pl. aor. pass. as proparoxytone: e.g. in Pind. τελεύταθεν (*Ol.* 7.68), φύτευθεν (*Pyth.* 4.59), ἔμυχθεν (*Nem.* 2.22, *Isthm.* 2.29), ἐτέκνωθεν (*Isthm.* 1.17), ἔφανθεν (fr. 70d.41 Maehler). But κατωκίσθεν represents κατωκίσθησαν and it should at least have been acknowledged that there was ancient debate about the accentuation of such forms: see e.g. H.W. Chandler, *A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation*, Oxford 1881², 221, § 782.

¹¹ Little point seems to be served by the textual notes where the editors indicate agreement with DR. (e.g. 82 n. 14, 84 n. 15, 106 n. 26).

- Σ 8a (53): συγγενεῖς are not specifically ‘parents’, but ‘relatives’ or ‘kinsmen’ (in this case cousins).¹² This leads to confusing commentary (133) which tells us that Callistrates is cited to ‘évoquer des « parents » de Théron’ (but Callistrates is referred to regarding Theron’s cousins). One is then told that ‘notre scholie parle de « parents »’ (it does not) and that Σ 173g ‘est plus précise et parle de «cousins»’. Readers of the translation may wonder why ‘cousins’ is more precise than ‘parents’. If the translation of συγγενεῖς had been correct, this confusion would not have arisen.

- Σ 14a (55): ‘Ou bien, plein de rectitude dans la cité, ou maintenant la cité dans la rectitude’ does not really translate ἢ ὀρθὸν [sc. ὄντα] ἐν τῇ πόλει ἢ ὀρθὴν πόλιν ἔχοντα. It means simply ‘either [sc. being] just in the city or having a just city’.¹³ The scholium has no ‘plein de’, no ‘dans la rectitude’ and the participle may mean ‘maintenant’ but probably just has the simple sense ‘ayant’.

- Σ 16b (59): ‘les “difficultés” (καμόντες)’. This mistranslation means that readers of the translation may find it difficult to understand ‘il convenait plutôt d’entendre les “difficultés” ... comme se référant aux fondateurs de Géla’. καμόντες does not mean ‘difficulties’. It means those who faced difficulties.

- Σ 24c (61): ‘Le participe νέμων est un facteur commun’. The editors translate ἀπὸ κοινοῦ ‘est un facteur commun’¹⁴ without indicating to what the word in question is said to be common, which is unhelpful (readers would have benefitted from having this explained where the scholiast does not expressly do so).¹⁵

- Σ 52b (75): ‘Leucothée ... a obtenu l’honneur d’être une divinité’. θεῶν ἐξέμμορε τιμῆς does not mean that she earned the honour of being a god but rather that she obtained a share of the honour of the gods.

- Σ 68e (79): ἀσφαλεῖ does not mean ‘Affermi’; it simply means ‘safe’.

- Σ 101b (93): ἐκδηλός means ‘conspicuous’, not ‘resplendissante’.

- Σ 121f (101): the lemma is ἀπροόρατον, not ἀπροσόρατον.

- Σ 150a (109): ἀλληγορεῖ ἀπὸ τῶν τόξων μεταφέρων ἐπὶ τὰ ποιήματα is translated as ‘il parle de façon figurée, opérant un transfert (par métaphore) depuis les arcs vers les poèmes’, but in the commentary (240) it is translated as ‘il part des arcs pour parler autrement de ses poèmes’. Neither is a particularly good or accurate translation (albeit the first is better than the second), but one wonders why a different and inferior translation is given in the commentary.

¹² Pind. himself uses the adj. as a noun in this sense: see W.J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar*, Berlin 1969, 476 s.v. συγγενής c, ‘m. pl. kinsfolk’.

¹³ Or, although this seems unlikely because there is then less of the difference suggested by the disjunctives, if ὀρθόν = τὸ ὀρθόν, it could mean (with ἔχοντα governing both ὀρθόν and πόλιν) ‘either maintaining justice in the city or maintaining a just city’.

¹⁴ Also in Σ 25 (63) and 113i (101).

¹⁵ The commentary, which mentions this scholium in passing (165), would perhaps have benefitted from a cross-reference to the editors’ discussion of ἀπὸ κοινοῦ as technical language in the first volume: vol. 1, p. 240.

- Σ 177d (119): ὁ κόρος κρύψιν θέλων [καὶ ἀφανισμόν] θεῖναι τοῖς τῶν ἐσθλῶν καλοῖς is translated as ‘la jalousie née de la satiété, qui veut imposer obscurité et disparition aux belles actions des gens vertueux’. But κόρος does not mean ‘jealousy born of satiety’; it simply means ‘excess’.¹⁶ The editors’ gloss is dubious because it overinterprets what the scholiast writes: I would argue that Pindar is not talking directly about jealousy here, but of the obscuring effect of excessive praise. On the other hand, to translate τῶν ἐσθλῶν as ‘des gens vertueux’ fails to convey the sense of nobility which ἐσθλός normally has in Pindar.¹⁷ So having overinterpreted one word, they overlook an important nuance of another.¹⁸

As to the commentary (121-273), the reviewer noted the following infelicities while reading the first fifty pages: 121 l. 10 ‘au v. 47’ (v. 43); 121 n. 1: the editors do not translate the Greek of Hdt. 4.147.1 and are inconsistent in their practice (elsewhere they supply translations of Greek quotations, normally from the Budé series); 122 text beneath the image of the Syracusan demareteion: a link to the Berlin Münzkabinett’s Online Catalogue (<https://ikmk.smb.museum/object?id=18200827>) would have helped; 123 n. 4: ‘en 689’ (‘vers 689’? 689 is the date given in PECS, but it is 690 in DNP and 688 in OCD4 [s.v. Gela in both]; the editors should have stated their source); 124 n. 6 ‘p. 145’ (p. 245); 125 n. 9 ‘p. 155-156’ (p. 156; Schmidt’s hesitation over the active/passive interpretations appears in his comment on ἀναξιφόρμιγγες quoted by Hummel on p. 156 [nothing on p. 155 is directly relevant here]; the editors should have quoted directly from and cross-referred to the ‘éditeurs anciens’ rather than relying second-hand on Hummel); 125 n. 12 ‘Race 1997, p. 62’ (lacks reference to vol. I and the translation is on p. 63; the editors appear to assume that all translations share the Budé tradition of printing facing pages with the same number); 129 ll. 8 and 9: the references in brackets are to fragments in Delattre’s edition; l. 16: ‘Lettre 1473, section 3’ (section 5); 129 n. 23: Lib. *Ep.* 1473 is in vol. 11 of Foerster’s edition, not ‘vol. 10-11’; 130 n. 25 ‘Abel 1891’ lacks the page and line number (117.7) – there is little point in such unspecific footnotes: contrariwise, the editors give page numbers in Abel when referring to others who cite him (see e.g. 125 n. 8); 132 l. 8: there is no ‘« μέμνηται (il le mentionne) car etc. »’ in Σ 4b (there is in 4a); 132 ll. 11-12 ‘la X^e Olympique, qui date de cette même année 476’: the ode relates to a victory in 476, but by Pindar’s own admission it was late and both the Teubner

¹⁶ See e.g. W.H. Race, *Pindar: Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes*, Cambridge, MA-London 1997, 73 n. 3: ‘Κόρος is excess in praise that becomes tedious to the audience and obstructs a just assessment of achievements (cf. *Pyth.* 1.82, 8.32 and *Nem.* 10.20’. It need not imply jealousy. H. McKie, *Graceful Errors: Pindar and the Performance of Praise*, Ann Arbor 2003, 17 says that the chattering of the greedy men is ‘an envious attempt to obscure the victor’s fame’. But the text here is very corrupt and ‘greedy’ is not the same as ‘envious’.

¹⁷ See Slater (n. 12) 202 s.v. ἐσλός 2a ‘the noble’ (including this instance).

¹⁸ Incidentally, by translating κρύψιν θέλων [καὶ ἀφανισμόν] θεῖναι as ‘imposer obscurité et disparition’ the editors demonstrate, contrary to their view, that Δρ. was justified in considering καὶ ἀφανισμόν ‘une redondance inutile’ (118 n. 31; the editors also neglect the unusual word order, which is alleviated by the deletion).

edition and B. Gentili, C. Catenacci, P. Giannini, L. Lomiento, eds., *Pindaro, Le Olimpiche*, Milano 2013, 262 tentatively give 474 as its date (W.S. Barrett, *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, & Textual Criticism: Collected Papers* [ed. by M.L. West, Oxford 2007] 54-72 discusses the ode as if he considered it to have been composed at some time after spring 475); 132 ‘Schol. 7a-b-c’: there is no mention or awareness shown of the anonymous *Lexeis Rhetorikai* (M.N. Naoumides, ed., *Ρητορικάι λέξεις*, Athens 1975), in which ἀκροθίνια is the first of 17 lemmata, numbered 111-27, for words appearing in *Ol.* 2.4-55; 132 ll. 21-2 ‘attesté seulement au neutre singulier et pluriel’: true, but at *Plut. Mor.* 871a Ἀκροθίνιον (apparently fem. despite the form; see *DGE s.v.*) is the name of a daughter of the Corinthian general Adeimantus; 132 n. 29 ‘p. 64’ (p. 63, l. 12; p. 64 is where n. 34 appears in the translation of the Life); 132 n. 30 lacks a verse end mark after τὰκροθίνια (the editors’ numeration is also inconsistent: here the editors write ‘*Eum.*, 834-35’, when they would normally write 834-835); 132 n. 30 ‘(θύος, -ους) (-εος): the discussion of ἀκροθίνια would have benefitted from a mention of T. Suk Fong Jim, *Sharing with the Gods: Aparchai and Dekatai in Ancient Greece*, Oxford 2014, 45-6; 135 ll. 1-2: a reference to e.g. *LSJ s.v.* παρά C.I.6.b for this usage would have been helpful; 135 l. 3 ‘du radical de ἀείρω’: the editors do not identify the root, but see e.g. H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3 vols., Heidelberg 1960/72, *s.v.* ἀείρω 2: ‘Neben dem primären Verb steht ein Nominalstamm -αορ-, etwa “Band, Kopel”, in ... τετροπος’; 135 l. 4 ‘du radical ἀρ/άρ-, « adjuster »’ (sc. of ἀραρίσκω: cf. *DELG s.v.* -ήρης (1)); *ibid.* ‘en -ηρησ’ (-ήρησ); 135 ll. 12-20 ‘mais qui s’entend aussi ... γλωσσαί’ and n. 34: this is all irrelevant waffle since there is no good reason to think that λέξις is being used here in the sense ‘idiotisme’; 135 n. 33 ‘Chantraine (*DELG, s. v.*)’ (sc. ἀείρω 2); 137 l. 13 ‘X^e Pythique, aux v. 27-30’: a reference to the discussion of this metaphor by J. Péron, *Les images maritimes de Pindare*, Paris 1974, 68-71 would have been helpful; 140 ll. 2-4: lacks a cross-reference to where Boeckh made the remark; 140-1 ll. 25 and 1 ‘« adverbis | d’augmentation »’ (d’intensification?); it is odd to say that such adverbs ‘existe’ in the grammarians when the editors presumably mean that the term ἐπιτάσεως ἐπιρρήματα was used by the grammarians; 141 ‘Schol. 14a-b’: there is no comment on ὅτι συνέκτισε καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν Ἀκράγαντα (Σ 14a) or ἐνταῦθα διὰ τὸ ἐνοικίσαι τὴν Ἀκράγαντα, ὁμώνυμον οὔσαν τῷ ὁμώνυμῳ ποταμῷ Ἀκράγαντι (Σ 14b), but they illustrate the banality of certain scholia (Theron did not found Acragas with his forefathers and the fact that the city has the same name as the local river is irrelevant here); 141 l. 3 ‘ἄνθος (pour ἄωτον dans Pindare)’ (ἄωτος): the editors seem to mean specifically at v. 7 ‘dans Pindare’, but if that is wrong it is relevant to note that ἄωτος is by no means always glossed or understood as ἄνθος in the scholia; on the association between the two nouns I missed a reference to the discussion of D.L. Cairns, “Ἄωτος, Ἄνθος, and the Death of Archemorus in Bacchylides’ Ninth Ode”, *PLLS* 10, 1998, 57-73; 141 ‘Schol. 14a-b’: a reference to and comparison with Anon. *Lex. Rhet.* (see on 132 ‘Schol. 7a-b-c’ above) 114, *s.v.* ὀρθόπολις: ὁ ἀνορθῶν τὴν πόλιν

(which shows no awareness of the alternative meanings supposed by Σ 14a and b) would have been useful (perhaps also a cross-reference to Soph. *OT* 46?); 141 n. 42: there is no reference to ἐπιτάσεως ἐπιπρήματα at Dion. Hal. Isoc. 13.20; 145ff: the editors' discussion of Emmenid genealogy (Σ 16c and 70f) lacks reference to/consideration of A. Tibiletti, "Commenting on Pindar, *Olympian* 2: The Emmenid Genealogies", *CCJ* 64, 2018, 166-77; 150 unnumbered footnote '(probablement pour des raisons de métrique)': Schroeder's proposal at *Nem.* 10.5, i.e. καταοικισθεν, is in fact metrically unlikely itself;¹⁹ 152 n. 65 'Th., 934-937' (933-7); 153 n. 67 'P. VIII, 68' (67-71); 153 n. 67 'Race 1997 traduit, vol. I, p. 334' (p. 335); 153 n. 67 'N. IV, 45' (44-5); 154 ll. 6-7, the quotation of fr. 29 lacks verse end marks after Θήβαν, τιμᾶν and Ἀρμονίας; 154 n. 71 'Hérodote, V, 60' (59); 157 n. 79 'Race 1997, p. 282' (lacks reference to vol. II); 159 l. 16 Εὐξενίδα (-ξέν-); 159 n. 83 'O. III, 44' (43-44); 160 l. 20: the quote from Plut. *Quomodo adul.* lacks the words οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ at the beginning; 162 n. 89 '(schol. 145 Dindorf)' (148 Dähnhardt, whose text they print; Dindorf printed τοῦτ' ἔστιν for τουτέστιν); 163 n. 89: the reference to 'West 1990', i.e. *Studies*, should have been placed before 'p. 78-79' and it is not quite accurate to say that WEST 'conserve ces mots' since although he retains the words he prints C's v.l. ἡμ- for ἀμέτερον—this sort of problem could have been avoided if the editors had relied on current rather than obstinately relying on outdated French editions of other authors; 164-5 n. 96: the references to Hdn. and Phot. are incomplete (lacking l. 20 and β 243 Theodoridis respectively); 167 l. 2: the editors refer to O. Szemerényi, *Scripta Minora: Selected essays in Indo-European, Greek and Latin*, 4 vols (ed. P. Considine and J.T. Hooker), Innsbruck 1987/91, but it is missing from the bibliography (280); 167 n. 97: the editors should have referred to the current edition of Chantraine *DELG* (ed. A. Blanc, Ch. de Lamberterie and J.-L. Perpillou, Paris 2009), i.e. the edition cited in the bibliography to their first volume; 168 n. 100: the 'intéressante expression' κατὰ λέξιν is itself a restoration by Schneider; 169 ll. 13-16: the editors are aware that there is a problem with μεταστάς in τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις μεταστάς αὐτὸν ἐκ τῆς Σικελίας, but do not engage with or show any awareness of Somazzi's palmary conj. μεθιστάς (which is adopted by Braswell);²⁰ 170 l. 22 'se rapportant aux vers 19-34' (19-24 [or 16-22 in the modern numbering]). The reviewer lacked the Sitzfleisch to complete this exercise, but a clear impression should emerge from the above that insufficient care has been taken by the editors on many points.

The editors do not refer to relevant scholarship. In addition to bibliographical material identified as missing above, further lacunae that surprised the reviewer included (this is by no means exhaustive): A. Bernabé, "Imago Inferorum Orphica", in P. Casadio, P.A. Johnston, eds., *Mystic Cults in Magna Graecia*,

¹⁹ B.K. Braswell, *Two Studies on Pindar* (ed. A. Neumann-Hartmann), Bern 2015, 241 notes that it would involve a theoretically possible anaclysis but one which has no parallel in Pind.

²⁰ B.K. Braswell, ed., *Didymos of Alexandria: Commentary on Pindar*. SBA 41, Basel 2017², 134 (with 135 n. 12). Incidentally, there is no reference to Braswell's notes (*loc. cit.*, 138-9) on Σ 82a in the editors' discussion of that scholium (193-5).

Austin 2009, 95-130; B.K. Braswell, “Reading Pindar in Antiquity”, *MH* 69, 2012, 12-28; G. Calvani Mariotti, “Ricerche sulla tecnica esegetica degli Scholia Vetera a Pindaro”, *Ricerche di filologia classica* 3, 1987, 83-167; G. Calvani Mariotti, “Modi e fini delle parafrasi negli Scholia Vetera a Pindaro”, *SCO* 46, 1996, 269-329; M. Cannatà Fera, “Criticism of Pindar’s Poetry in the scholia vetera”, in N. Ercoles, L. Pagani, F. Pontani, G. Ucciardello, eds., *Approaches to Greek Poetry*, Berlin-Boston 2018, 233-59; J. Defradas, “Sur l’interprétation de la deuxième Olympique de Pindare”, *REG* 84, 1971, 131-43; L. Edmunds, “A Hermeneutic Commentary on the Eschatological Passage in Pindar *Olympian* 2 (57-83)”, in U. Dill, C. Walde, eds., *Antike Mythen, Medien, Transformationen und Konstruktionen*, Berlin-New York 2009, 662-77; P.C. Konstas, “Eine pindarische Metapher (O. 2, 21/22)”, *WS* 116, 2003, 57-70; J. van Leeuwen, *Pindars’ tweede olympische ode*. 2 vols, Assen 1964; A. Hurst, “Observations sur la deuxième Olympique de Pindare”, *ZAnt.* 31, 1981, 121-33; K.A. Morgan, *Pindar & the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century B.C.*, New York 2015; M. Negri, *Pindaro ad Alessandria*, Brescia 2004; A. Neumann-Hartmann, “Belege griechischer Historiker in den Pindar-Scholien und ihre Bedeutung für die Pindar-Exegese”, *MH* 76, 2019, 30-51; N. Nicholson, *The Poetics of Victory in the Greek West. Epicinian, Oral Tradition, and the Deinomenid Empire*, New York 2016; F.J. Nisetich, “Immortality in Acragas. Poetry and Religion in Pindar’s Second *Olympian Ode*”, *CPh* 83, 1988, 1-19; R. Nünlist, “Observations on Aristarchus’ Homeric studies”, in N. Ercoles, L. Pagani, F. Pontani, G. Ucciardello, eds., *Approaches to Greek Poetry*, Berlin-Boston 2018, 11-24; T. Phillips, “Callimachus in the Pindar Scholia”, *CCJ* 59, 2013, 152-77; T. Phillips, *Pindar’s Library. Performance Poetry and Material Texts*, Oxford 2016; W.H. Race, “The end of *Olympia* 2: Pindar and the Vulgus”, *CSCA* 12, 1979, 251-67; W.J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar*, Berlin 1969; W.J. Slater, “Problems in Interpreting Scholia on Greek Texts”, in J.N. Grant, ed., *Editing Greek and Latin Texts*, New York 1989, 37-61. While modern interpretation is not always directly relevant, occasional comparisons and contrasts between ancient and modern interpretations would have been helpful in setting the scholia within the broader framework of Pindaric interpretation and in helping the reader to appreciate their relative value.

The commentary contains some useful discussions of specific points, but generally I found it to be insufficiently directed at the relationship between the scholia and Pindar’s text and often rather long-winded. It does not compare favourably with the commentaries of e.g. Österdahl or Braswell, both of which are commendably succinct and expert.²¹ I was surprised not to find any commentary on:

²¹ P. Österdahl, ed., *Pindaric Scholarship between Aristarchus and Didymus: An Edition of the Fragments with Explanatory Notes and a Discussion of Early Pindaric Scholarship*, Stockholm 2021; Braswell (n. 20).

- Σ 25: The scholiast indicates erroneously that πόρον ... Ἀλφειοῦ (v. 13) means Elis, when it means ‘the course of Alpheos [sc. the river]’,²² which flows past Olympia. Elsewhere the scholia have no difficulty identifying Alpheos as the local river and/or its eponymous deity.²³ Does it show a scholiastic indifference to accuracy in topographical matters? Or is the lemma πόρον Ἀλφειοῦ in C (DEHQ give a different lemma: ἔδος (δὲ) Ὀλύμπου from v. 12) an error for ἄρουραν ... πατρίαν (v. 14)?

- Σ 91: Consideration of why ἄνθεα is glossed νίκας in B (rather than e.g. στεφάνουζ) would have been helpful.

The use in the bibliography (275-80) of reverse chronological order is non-standard, counter-intuitive and inconsistent with the forward chronological order adopted in the bibliography of the first volume.

There are helpful indices (281-307). However, there is no index of Greek passages discussed (although there is an index of ancient authors mentioned – but why not with passages cited to make it more helpful?) and no general index of Greek words discussed in the commentary, only an ‘Index idiolectal et énonciatif’, although the reviewer is not sure how the index is ‘énonciatif’. There is a not very useful ‘Index des noms de chevaux’ consisting of 3 entries. The ‘Index des noms de personnes’ includes a number of ‘personifications’, but I fail to see why for instance ‘Rumeur’ is listed rather than ‘Écho’ (the actual personification in question).

Ucciardello concluded his review of the first volume by suggesting that ‘[the editors] remove specific mistakes and methodological weaknesses in future volumes to pay a more valuable service to Pindaric scholarship than has been done in [the first] volume’.²⁴ It is such a shame that this sage advice has not been taken. For future volumes, if the editors will not take advice from abroad, hopefully they will heed the opening line of the Besançon carol, ‘Berger, secoue ton sommeil profond ...’.

NICHOLAS LANE
London
njglane@yahoo.com

²² Cf. Slater (n. 12) 442 s.v. πόρος c, ‘channel, course’.

²³ E.g. *Ol.* 1.92 Σ 148, *Ol.* 10.48 Σ 58ς and *Ol.* 10.51 Σ 61 (river); *Ol.* 10.48 Σ 58a and d (deity).

²⁴ (n. 3) 1039.