
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-iamic in the third line of each strophe, by means of a ‘blurring’ ς ς ς ς 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 υἱόν, not ὑµνον, at N. 4.16 (‘ὑµνον here, besides duplicating μέλει, does not suit πέµσαντα’), κεὶ περέχει at N. 4.36 (κεὶ περέχει βαθεῖα ποντιὰϲ ἅλµα / µέϲον – where others prefer καίπερ ἔχει, though καίπερ nowhere else takes the indicative), West’s Ἀξένωι for mss. Εὐξείνωι at N. 4.49 (cf. P. 4.203; ‘Pindar is unlikely to have used both forms’), and Vauvilliers’ φθόνωι εἰϲίν at N. 8.21 (ὄφου δὲ λόγοι φθόνωι εἰϲίν for mss. ὄφον δὲ λόγοι φθόνεροιϲίν – ‘φθόνοϲ is required as subject in 22f.’). It is a pity there are no indexes, but nevertheless this is a valuable work.
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