more charitable towards ourselves: our taste is for a Petrarchan-like humanism, a 'Grâce un peu fragile, simplicité du ton . . . une importance accordée . . . au sentiment de la fuite du temps et de la vanité des richesses et grandeurs de ce monde' (p. 16).

University of Western Ontario BONNIE MacLACHLAN

FRAGMENTS OF SIMONIDES

B. GENTILI, C. PRATO (edd.): *Poetae elegiaci. Testimonia et fragmenta. Pars altera. Editio altera novis Simonidis fragmentis aucta*. (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana.) Pp. xxiii + 233. Munich and Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2002. Cased, €80. ISBN: 3-598-71702-4.

Up to p. 181, this is an unchanged reprint of the first edition from 1985, which Malcolm Davies reviewed in *CR* 37 (1987), 297–8. There follows a new section devoted to the elegies of Simonides, a poet who was not admitted at all in the first edition but who has emerged, since the publication of P. Oxy. 3965 in 1992, as the major figure in fifth-century elegy. The fragments are printed in a different Greek font from the preceding part of the volume, and (what a surprise!) with a new numeration. As in the first part, but in reverse sequence, there is a *librorum conspectus* and a collection of 'Grammatica et metrica', but Simonides has to do without his *testimonia vitae atque artis*. At the end there is a table comparing the numeration with the second edition of my *Iambi et Elegi*, and an *index verborum* supplementing that in the first part, but no index of sources.

The fragments that come from P. Oxy. 2327 had previously been edited among the Adespota, and there they still stand (pp. 131–41), with no note referring forward to the new Simonidean section; indeed, pp. 132–40 might conveniently have been omitted from the reprint, as they are entirely superseded by the appendix.

The editing of the fragments is quite conservative, and many letters that I think clearly legible or identifiable are left as blanks. The editors have not, I suppose, had the opportunity to work with the originals. In a couple of places they have not caught the papyrological logic. They do not accept the consecution of 2327 frr. 5 (column-end) and 6 (column-top) in my fr. 11 (their frr. 3g and 3b), saying that both might have stood in the same column; but that would imply a prodigiously long column, at least 38 cm. (Even 30 cm would be exceptional.) In fr. 9 they say 'inter 18 et 19 quot versus desint incertum', not appreciating that Lobel's placing of the pieces with a one-line gap between them was based on the matching of horizontal fibres with the preceding column.

There are a few new supplements, not all of them judicious: Peek's *παισὶν Μή*[*δων* at 1d.5 gives a very unlikely rhythm for starting a verse; at 3b.13 *τὴν αὐδὴν*] *θείην* (Catenacci) is quite dreadful, and *ἄεισ'* in the next line too short; at 7.19 I do not understand what Gentili's *σιγὴν γὰρ*] *γλώσσης ἔκφυγε* is meant to signify; nor is his *ἄγαλμα Δ*[*ιός* convincing at 9.8. On the plus side, the suprascript at 1a.15 is given more correctly than in my edition; Danielewicz's neat solution of the crux at 3g.4 is well adopted; Gentili's *τέρμα συν*]*ηθείης* at 8.6 is an interesting suggestion; *ἐκτ*[*ανύων* at 9.14 modifies Bernsdorff's *ἐκτ*[*ανύσας*; the allusion to 7.1 *Χῖος ἀνήρ* in ps.-Plut. *de Homero* 2.2 is picked up (though apparently without awareness of J. F. Kindstrand's edition of this work). No elegy on Salamis is admitted, and hence my fr. 5 (= Plut.

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.299 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Them. 15.4) disappears; I came to this position shortly after my edition appeared (*ZPE* 98 [1993], 2–3). Other fragments of mine (8, 25, 26, 87–92) are excluded on the (debatable) grounds that they come from lyric or epigram rather than elegy.

In the 'Grammatica et metrica' survey 16.10 ἀ̓φέτω· οὐκ is wrongly listed as an instance of hiatus instead of epic correption, and the anapaestic ἐ̓ρέβεος in 1a.7 is wrongly described as uncontracted. In the word index ἐ̓λάσει (3e.7) is oddly construed as from the noun ἔ̓λασις.

The volume is accurately printed, except that on p. 189 (Grammatica et metrica) the last two headings, 'Positio debilis' and 'Notabilia', have fallen under the sway of 'Digamma'. In the text it is regrettable that dots representing lost letters are not printed below line level. The vertical alignments in some fragments are faulty; thus the preserved portions of 1b.10, 3b.37–8, 7.23, 9.2–5, and 9.7 should all appear a good bit further to the right. At the end of p. 196 the Herodotus reference should be 9.33.1, not 9.11.1. 'Textimonium' is a nice *addendum lexicis* in the apparatus to 1d.

All Souls College, Oxford M. L. WEST

PINDARIC PRAISE

H. Mackie: *Graceful Errors. Pindar and the Performance of Praise.* Pp. viii + 127. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2003. Cased, US$57.50/£36. ISBN: 0-472-11330-5.

The primary purpose of this book is to illustrate and explain the strategies used by Pindar in order to praise the victor without offending him, his family, his fellow citizens, and the gods. To accomplish this purpose, Mackie divides her book into three sections, the first concentrating on the present, the second on the past, and the third on the future.

Much of the first section is devoted to break-off passages and to the danger of *koros*. Here she argues that all such passages have the same function, namely, to avoid the risk of incurring various kinds of *koros*. What precedes the break-off may run the risk of elevating the victor to such a height that divine resentment or the envy of fellow citizens might be felt; lengthy praise of heroes in the ode's myth or of the family's accomplishments might detract from the victor's achievement; the treatment of certain subjects might be deemed morally offensive and thus excessive.

In the second section, M.'s emphasis is on the invocation of the Muse and on Pindar's allusions to various aspects of the past. She describes at some length Homeric invocations and notes the similarities between them and Pindar's. But there are also significant differences, an important one being that Pindar often represents the Muse as a collaborator. This, M. argues, 'symbolizes the need, in epinician poetry, to combine past and present themes appropriately' (p. 66). The primary purpose of Pindar's treatment of past events is to explain the present, hence the frequent use of καί νυν in transitions from the past to the present occasion.

The major part of the final section is entitled 'The Poet as Prophet in Pindar'. It is not that Pindar represents himself explicitly as having sure knowledge of the future, but rather that his perspective on the past is displayed in such a way that he 'can discern the connections between, and the patterns in, events that are remote from one another in time' (p. 81). This ability implies that he can speak with some confidence of what might reasonably be expected to occur in the future. As a result, Pindar's wishes and prayers for the future happiness and success of the victor or his homeland, in spite of

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.299 Published online by Cambridge University Press