

ZSOLT ADORJÁNI, *Pindars sechste olympische Siegesode. Text, Einleitung und Kommentar* Leiden and Boston : Brill, Mnemosyne Supplementa 370, 2014, xiv + 394 pp. ISBN 978-90-0427-435-8.

Only three years after his first monograph (*Auge und Sehen in Pindars Dichtung*, Hildesheim 2011), Zsolt Adorjáni has completed a detailed edition, with full introduction and commentary, of Pindar's *Olympian Six*, one of that poet's most attractive works. This volume, the result of work on his Habilitationsschrift at the Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Budapest, is a notable achievement in Pindaric scholarship, and will be essential reading for anyone concerned with this poem.

Adorjáni's weighty book begins with an illuminating 'Vorwort' in which he explains some of its features. There follows a list of manuscripts, mediaeval and ancient (why not put the ancient ones first?), the text of the poem with two detailed apparatuses (one of testimonia, the other of manuscript variants and conjectures), a concordance of divergences between Adorjáni's edition and that of Snell–Maehler, a translation into Latin, and a translation into German. All that constitutes the first part of the book; the second is a five-page discussion of the metre of the poem, straightforward dactylo-epitrites. The third part is the introduction proper or 'Prolegomena', itself divided into three sections: 'Prosopographische Untersuchungen zu *Olympie 6*', 'Entstehungszeit und Aufführung von *Olympie 6*', and 'Die Einheit von *Olympie 6*' (a shorter version of which appeared in *Hermes* in the same year as this book). The Commentary takes up the fourth and main part of the volume, extending over more than two hundred pages, and including three pages of addenda. The fifth and sixth parts comprise the Bibliography and Indexes, the latter appearing under the following headings: 'Loci classici laudati', 'Auctores vulgari eloquentia usi', 'Index nominum', 'Index rerum notabilium', 'Index vocabulorum Graecorum', and 'Index scholarium antiquorum necnon recentiorum'.

Adorjáni's text is virtually identical to that of Snell–Maehler. Of the seven differences that he lists, three are relatively trivial matters of punctuation, and one a matter of dialectal colouring. That leaves three substantive changes: his adoption of Wilamowitz's conjecture τελεσθεισᾶν for manuscript τελεσθέντων at 15, his retention of the paradosis ὑπ' ὠδίνος τ' ἔρατᾶς at 43, where Snell–Maehler print Wilamowitz's conjecture ὑπ' ὠδίνεσσι' ἔρατᾶς, and his retention of the paradosis ἀκόνας λιγυρᾶς, albeit with one letter capitalised, as Ἄκόνας, at 82, instead of adopting Hartung's transposition λιγυρᾶς ἀκόνας. The first two can be argued for, and Adorjáni does so in

the commentary; the last introduces an unwelcome hiatus, and the capital is odd. (Adorjáni argues that the whetstone in question is a kenning for the Muse, but even if that is correct, and I have reservations, that would not demand a capital in Greek as per the conventions of modern editions.) But the similarity of his text to that of Snell–Maehler is a good thing. By no means all of their decisions were right, but in general their text is the product of good judgment, and an edition of Pindar which looked very different from theirs would be a surprise. The apparatus is much more detailed than that of Snell–Maehler, yet not overly full, and the Latin comments that it includes are usually helpful.

The content of the introduction and commentary is sober, judicious, and interesting. The only fault that I would note is a certain excessive length in both. In the introduction, Adorjáni frequently cites great slabs of the poem, always following them with a translation; but a text and translation appear elsewhere in the book. The text is already (rightly) repeated by means of the lemmata to the commentary; we do not need further continuous, lengthy citations in the introduction too. Also, Adorjáni often cites every scholar known to him who agrees with a particular point of Pindaric interpretation – sometimes giving more than a dozen references. In such cases it is preferable to cite only the first person who came up with the idea, plus anyone else who made a subsequent particularly notable contribution to the issue; too many such references can seem like overkill. And frequently too many parallels are cited, and quoted, to illustrate fairly basic matters. Attention to all these points could have saved Adorjáni’s publisher several pages, and made the text that bit tighter. The lengthy commentary could do with more paragraphing, too – occasionally a page has no paragraphs at all, making it harder to consult. Despite all this, Adorjáni is not on the whole verbose, and his work, even if it takes a long time to read, is nevertheless readable.

Adorjáni’s command of the bibliography and knowledge of editions are extremely good, but occasionally there are gaps. So W. S. Barrett’s *Collected Papers* (Oxford 2007) are unknown to him, which means that he misses the discussion of a passage in *Olympian Six* by Barrett at p. 264 n. 92 of that volume (where read 6.100 for 6.10), and probably much useful material elsewhere – I would be surprised if nothing else in that rich trove of learning had any bearing on the interpretation of Pindar’s poem. Simonides’ lyric fragments should be cited from Poltera’s edition rather than from *PMG*; if the latter is nevertheless used, it should be cited by the continuous numeration that runs throughout the book, not by the separate individual numeration given to each poet. Wherever possible, poets from the ‘Greek Anthology’ should be cited from the editions of Gow and Page (*Hellenistic Epigrams*, *The Garland of Philip*, and, by Page alone, *Further Greek Epigrams*). Adorjáni’s addenda suggest that since the completion of his manuscript he has started to go through the works of the late Martin West (he refers to several

there, when only two are cited in the main bibliography): the beginning, I hope, of a life-long passion.

P. J. FINGLASS
University of Nottingham
patrick.finglass@nottingham.ac.uk

