

HENRY, W.B., *Pindar's Nemeans. A Selection*. Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Commentare, München-Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 2005, pp. xii + 133, ISBN 3-598-73028-4.

The *Nemeans* of this erudite edition are 4, 6, 8, 10 and 11, the first three for Aeginetan victors, the last two anomalous odes that were appended to the other *Nemeans* though they do not themselves commemorate Nemean victories. Why Henry chose this pentad of odes is not clear. The edition is based on a 2001 DPhil thesis supervised by M.L. West, and contains both meticulous scholarship and imaginative ideas. Henry speculates that the metre of *N.* 4, 'one of Pindar's simplest Aeolic stanzas' (26), was designed so that members of the family could perform the ode: taking his cue from 13-6, 77-9 and 89-90 he says that 'the victor's family included amateur musicians'; on *N.* 6 he suggests that an apparent shift in metre from aeolic to dactylo-iambic in the third line of each strophe, by means of a 'blurring' $\cup \cup - \cup \cup -$ colon, is designed to mirror on its first appearance what Pindar says in the first strophe about how the distinction between men and gods can be blurred by exceptional men: 'This opposition would surely be felt to be mirrored on the musical level' (52-3). Henry prints Bergk's $\upsilon\acute{\iota}\acute{o}\nu$, not $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\nu\omicron\nu$, at *N.* 4.16 (' $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\nu\omicron\nu$ here, besides duplicating $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota$, does not suit $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\psi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$ '), $\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$ at *N.* 4.36 ($\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$ $\beta\alpha\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ $\pi\omicron\nu\nu\tau\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\mu\alpha$ / $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\omicron\nu$ – where others prefer $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$, though $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\rho$ nowhere else takes the indicative), West's $\acute{\Lambda}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\iota$ for mss. $\text{E}\acute{\upsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu\omega\iota$ at *N.* 4.49 (cf. *P.* 4.203; 'Pindar is unlikely to have used both forms'), and Vauvilliers' $\phi\theta\acute{o}\nu\omega\iota$ $\epsilon\iota\acute{\iota}\nu$ at *N.* 8.21 ($\acute{\omicron}\psi\omicron\nu$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\iota$ $\phi\theta\acute{o}\nu\omega\iota$ $\epsilon\iota\acute{\iota}\nu$ for mss. $\acute{\omicron}\psi\omicron\nu$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\iota$ $\phi\theta\omicron\nu\epsilon\rho\omicron\iota\varsigma\iota\nu$ – ' $\phi\theta\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ is required as subject in 22f.'). It is a pity there are no indexes, but nevertheless this is a valuable work.

STEPHEN INSTONE
University College of London
s.instone@ucl.ac.uk