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/54.2.300 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the frequent references to life's vicissitudes, suggest to the recipient that such wishes and prayers have some compelling force or authority behind them.

In the outlines given above I have touched on the major areas covered in M.'s book, but there are also many other areas that receive a less detailed treatment. These can be easily identified by consulting the index. As a general assessment, I think it can be said that those familiar with Pindar will find little that is new here, but at the same time, I know of no other study which approaches Pindar from the viewpoint of the rôle played by the present, past, and future in his odes. This is one of the few general books which I would recommend as required reading for those beginning their study of Pindar. The style is refreshingly lucid, a genuine pleasure to read, and the argumentation is easy to follow. The bibliography, however, is woefully inadequate. Of the 153 items listed, only three are in German and two in Italian, and even in English, numerous works of importance have been disregarded. If more attention had been paid to these other studies, the reader would be in a better position to determine the extent to which previous scholars disagree with or support M.'s arguments. Perhaps this deficiency can be explained, in part at least, by the fact that M. does not seem to have been trained in Pindar in graduate school. As she states in the prologue, 'I first became interested in Pindar in the winter of 1997, when a Postdoctoral Mellon Fellowship at Stanford University gave me the opportunity to teach a graduate course on epinician poetry'.

University of Western Ontario DOUGLAS E. GERBER

FRAGMENTS OF SOPHOCLES

A. H. SOMMERSTEIN (ed.): *Shards from Kolonos: Studies in Sophoclean Fragments*. ('Le Rane' 34.) Pp. 573. Bari: Levante Editori, 2003. Paper, €61.97. ISBN: 88-7949-307-8.

This collection of essays is a welcome contribution to Sophoclean studies. It deserves to be widely read by scholars of Greek drama, not—alas—because it contains any astonishing new discoveries, but because the best contributions use the fragments to raise important questions about Sophocles and fifth-century drama in general. As Sommerstein writes in his Introduction (p. 16), the broad aim of the volume is to use the evidence of the fragments, alongside the extant plays, to re-assess the traditional scholarly image of Sophocles. That Sophocles was more staid and less adventurous than his younger contemporary Euripides is a commonplace which persists: but is it accurate?

The volume is based on a conference held in Nottingham in 2000, and it is good to see that many younger scholars are represented here as well as more established names. There are twenty essays, widely varying in subject matter and approach, which have been divided (not very helpfully) into seven loosely defined sections. A brief summary can scarcely do justice to the content of the contributions, but at least testifies to their diversity and range.

André Lardinois (pp. 23–44) attempts to demonstrate that the 'adviser figure' is a recurring character type in Sophocles; but in fact the paucity of evidence and the number of divergences from the supposed pattern make it hard to discern a 'character type' except in very broad terms. Elizabeth Craik (pp. 45–56) draws attention to the presence of medical language in the fragments, but finds it difficult to conclude what such language signifies. Katerina Zacharia (pp. 57–74) examines the evidence for

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.300 Published online by Cambridge University Press