discussion of a few particular moments of engagement with classical sources and of the contexts of this engagement. Rather, H.'s book is organized, somewhat loosely, around themes, such as, for instance, Pindar as a poet, that cannot be easily assimilated to the present or Pindar's voice as a praise poet. In discussing such themes, H. ranges freely across periods, revisiting some periods and authors several times.

This approach allows H. to bring out thematic links between texts that are not usually put together, and it also allows him to introduce his own readings of Pindar at some length in the middle of the book, giving the source texts more prominence than many discussions of reception by classicists. As a result, *Soliciting Darkness* prompts questions about how we should best think about the classical tradition in general and the tradition of one classical poet in particular. Grand narratives are out of fashion, but inevitably the long survival and changing fortunes of ancient texts over many centuries remain central to reception studies. Clearly, H.'s thematic approach is one way of responding to this issue.

By contrast, what H.'s approach does not always let him do is go into full detail about historical contexts or to make full use of earlier scholarship, certainly for the ancient material. The need for selectivity is one of the main challenges in writing reception history across different centuries and cultural settings. H. has chosen one way of making selections. I have come away from the book with the sense that at the heart of his undertaking is ideas and themes, rather than history or readings of poetry (though there are plenty of those too). Perhaps at times, these choices can make the book a little vulnerable and elusive. However, H.'s focus on Pindaric obscurity over the centuries is compelling, and certainly provokes thought about how to read Pindar and how to 'do reception'.

The Open University FELIX BUDELMANN
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni225

THE NEW SIMONIDES

D. Boedeker, D. Sider (edd.): *The New Simonides. Contexts of Praise and Desire*. Pp. xii + 312. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. Cased, £48. ISBN: 0-19-513767-1.

The editors published a shorter version of this book in *Arethusa* 29:2 (1996), stemming from a conference held in Atlanta in December 1994. The present version incorporates additional contributions stemming from a conference held in Oxford in November 1997. The contribution by Peter Parsons, which figures as Chapter 2 of the present version, provides the best introduction to the subject at hand, the so-called 'New Simonides'. The centerpiece is *POxy.* 3965, originally edited by Parsons himself in 1992. In the same year, the new fragments of *POxy.* 3965, which Parsons joined with *POxy.* 2327 in his *editio princeps*, were included in the second edition of Martin West's *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*, Volume II (1992). The most important new evidence for understanding the elegiac poetry of Simonides is to be found in fr. 11 W^2; also important are 20–2 W^2. At the beginning of the book, David Sider provides a text, apparatus criticus, and translation of frr. 1–22 W^2. Following Sider is Chapter 1, 'The New Simonides: Toward a Commentary', by Ian Rutherford. This work is useful as an introduction, though the facts that it adduces overlap extensively with the facts adduced in the introduction of Parsons, which follows as Chapter 2. It would have been better for the editors to start with the introduction of

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni226 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Parsons and then continue with the introduction of Rutherford. Despite the many overlaps between these two works, the reader will doubtless not wish to part with either of them. The same cannot be said about the rest of the book, with its plethora of further overlaps resulting from the merger of the Atlanta and Oxford papers, and still further overlaps resulting from further mergers. Proceeding from beginning to end, the reader feels increasingly overwhelmed by needless repetitions. Judicious pruning could have reduced the book to about a half its present bulk, without any serious loss. The result would have been a better book.

Among the outstanding contributions to *The New Simonides*, besides the introduction of Parsons, is the piece by Dirk Obbink on the 'genre' of what he calls 'the Plataea poem', as represented by *POxy.* 3965 and 2327, which represent 'two different copies' of a single elegiac poem composed by Simonides to celebrate the Hellenes who fought and died at the battle of Plataea in 479 B.C.E. Obbink argues against the default classification of this poem as a 'sympotic elegy', suggesting that the occasion of performance was not a symposium but some public event commemorating the Hellenic victory over the Persians at Plataea. Further, he shows that the *prooimion* of the Plataea poem is functionally a *hymnos* invoking Achilles as the premier epic hero of the Trojan War. The *hymnos* draws Achilles into a direct parallel with the Hellenic warriors who fought in the Persian War, specifically at Plataea. Such a hymnic invocation of Achilles is morphologically parallel to the hymnic invocation of gods in the *Homeric Hymns* as also in archaic Greek lyric traditions in general. This parallelism, then, raises the possibility that Achilles is represented in the Plataea poem as an object of worship, much as gods invoked in hymns are objects of worship.

Such a representation of Achilles amounts to a poetic recognition of his status as a cult hero. The chapter by P.-J. Shaw provides a useful survey of external evidence corroborating this status. Of particular interest is the fact that the attested hero cults of Achilles gravitate toward Aeolic locales in the Greek-speaking world (p. 170). From the standpoint of Homeric poetry, the most significant of these locales is the notional tomb of Achilles near Sigeion on the Hellespont (p. 167). The territory of Sigeion was contested by the cities of Mytilene and Athens in an ongoing war that dates back to the days of figures like Alcaeus, Pittakos, and Periandros, that is, all the way back to the late seventh and early sixth centuries B.C.E. As we see from the relevant narratives of Herodotus (5.94–95), Strabo (13.1.38–9 C599–600), and Diogenes Laertius (1.74), the territory of Sigeion kept changing hands for many years in the ongoing war between the two rival cities. At stake was the poetic territory of the Trojan War. In the wording of Herodotus, the territory of Ilion or Troy is simultaneously the epic of Troy, that is, the *Iliad* (*τῆς Ἰλιάδος χώρης* 5.94.2). This poetic territory is evidently what is being visualized in the description of the tomb of Achilles in *Odyssey* 24.80–4 and in the allusion to this tomb in *Iliad* 19.374–80 as a beacon that flashes a light of salvation for sailors lost at sea (p. 167). The Achilles of the Plataea poem is an elegiac equivalent of this epic hero.

Even if the Plataea poem is in fact a hymn that honors Achilles as the cult hero whose tomb is the landmark of the Trojan War, there is no need to infer that the venue for performing this composition of Simonides was the territory of Sigeion (for bibliography on such an inference, see Rutherford, p. 41). The status of Achilles as cult hero of the Iliadic topography is inherent in the Homeric *Iliad* itself, as this reviewer has argued (for bibliography, see Shaw, p. 167 n. 10 and Stehle, p. 112 n. 31).

The form of the Plataea poem, elegiac meter, is particularly appropriate to a composition that begins with a *prooimion* addressed to Achilles as a cult hero. There

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni226 Published online by Cambridge University Press

are indications of laments performed by women in honor of Achilles as cult hero (at Olympia: Pausanias 6.23.3; at Croton: scholia to Lycophron, *Alexandra* 857; cf. Shaw, p. 169 n. 24). The connection between women's lament and elegiac meter is highlighted by Dimitrios Yatromanolakis in a close examination of Simonides 22 W^2. He argues that the wording of this elegiac composition re-enacts a woman's lament (the counter-arguments of Mace, curiously placed by the editors ahead of the arguments of Yatromanolakis, fail to persuade). He further argues, most convincingly, that the form of elegiac meter is historically linked to the threnodic function of a composition like 22 W^2. Thus the elegiac meter of the lament of Andromache in Euripides, *Andromache* 103–16 represents an archaic revival, not a modernistic experiment (cf. also Aloni p. 90). The point that Yatromanolakis makes about the threnodic function of 22 W^2 can also be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Plataea poem itself, 11 W^2 (cf. Aloni, p. 98 n. 47).

There are many other points of interest in this book, too numerous to be treated properly in a short space. Among these are the chapters on Callimachus and Theocritus (by Hunter and Fantuzzi respectively). Special honors should go to Alessandro Barchiesi for proving that the *exemplum* of Horace *Odes* 4.6 is the Plataea elegy of Simonides.

Harvard University GREGORY NAGY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni226

SOPHRON'S MIMES

J. H. HORDERN: *Sophron's Mimes*. Text, Translation, and Commentary. Pp xiv + 202. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-19-926613-1.

Archaic and classical Sicilian texts have virtually disappeared: we regret the loss of Stesichorus' lyric, Epicharmus' comedies, Empedocles' poems, and Sophron's mimes all alike. But whereas it is at least possible to form a rough idea of the first three authors' works, the fragments of Sophron are so tantalizingly uninformative that we can only guess what a complete mime of his would have looked like.

H.'s book constitutes a welcome and successful attempt to bring some light into this darkness—welcome even though, with the publication of *Poetae Comici Graeci* I in 2001, nearly all the material (except for H.'s fr. 30A from Athen. 9.394d and the doubtful fr. 172 from Pl. *Rep.* 10.607c) had already been assembled and *PCG* I will remain the standard edition: since H.'s text and apparatus follow those of Kassel and Austin but '[provide] only the more essential details', 'Kassel–Austin should always be consulted for a full account' (p. 34); even 'full bibliographical references for each fragment' and 'other details . . . mentioned in the apparatus' have to be looked up in *PCG* (p. 35). The strength of H.'s contribution should, and does, therefore lie in the introduction, translation, and commentary.

The introduction (pp. 1–34) comprises sections on Sophron's life and dating (fifth century), the themes and character of his mimes (whose bawdy humour is more easily recognized than the character-drawing praised by Diog. Laert. 3.18), their style and language (including a brief treatment of the thorny question of orthography), their influence on later writers (certainly on Theocritus, perhaps on Herodas and Callimachus), and the history of the text (from Apollodorus of Athens in the second century B.C. up to some twentieth-century papyrus finds, especially *PSI* 1214, which

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni226 Published online by Cambridge University Press