Too progressive thoughts and too rapid scientific advances could have fatal effects, as in the case of Socrates.

Unfortunately L. could not take J. Rudolf, 'Das prärationale Konzept der Heiligen Krankheit und seine Darstellung in der attischen Tragödie des 5. Jahrhunderts vor Christus', *Schriftenreihe der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Geschichte der Nervenheilkunde* 7 (2001), 267–77, into account. Rudolf's paper helps us understand the 'sacred disease' from both neurological and literary points of view, for its author applies both aspects to the analysis of poetic texts. The best place to refer to him would have been the section on the *Geschlechterfluch* (p. 148), a motif often found in Attic tragedy. L. gives also a wide and detailed analysis of the peculiar rôle of goats in regard to the 'sacred disease', but she does not discuss veterinary aspects in this context.

The *De morbo sacro* is an important witness of the far-reaching influence the sophists had on public and private life and even on non-fictional literature. It is a kind of sophistic apology that could have been delivered as a speech in either this or quite a similar form.

L.'s study illuminates especially the rhetorical aspects and the composition of this Hippocratic text. Her formal analysis is a useful contribution to the understanding of the treatise in all its facets. Therefore, whoever wishes to comprehend the *De morbo sacro* in its complexity and literary charm can now refer to L.'s monograph.

University of Cologne FERDINAND PETER MOOG

ANACREON AND ANACREONTEA

G. LAMBIN: *Anacréon. Fragments et imitations.* Pp. 327. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2002. Paper, €14.50. ISBN: 2-86847-740-2.

The popularity of certain ancient poets waxes and wanes with the preferences of the ages, and to ask why we are seeing a flurry of attention awarded to Anacreon and the Anacreontic poets in the last decade is to ask a question about ourselves. (In addition to the book under review, we have Patricia Rosenmeyer's *The Poetics of Imitation. Anacreon and the Anacreontic Tradition* [1992] and John O'Brien's *Anacreon Redivivus* [1995]; the status of the *Anacreontea* was assured in the classical community only in 1984, when Martin West produced the first Teubner edition.) Part of our interest is of course piqued by the poetic virtues and defects of the texts, and L. is well situated to illuminate these, as a scholar well versed in the musical and poetic nuances found in other Greek poetry (L.'s dissertation [Lille, 1986] was a study of the Attic skolia; in 1992 he published *La chanson grecque dans l'antiquité* and *Homère, le compagnon* and in 1999 *L'épopée: genèse d'un genre littéraire en Grèce*). But why, he invites us to consider, should those in the Anacreontic vein have particular appeal at the moment? The corpus of the *Anacreontea* was condemned by Wilamowitz as insipid, *matte Limonade*. This stands at odds with their great popularity among poets from Ronsard and Corneille to Goethe, who continued the process of imitation begun with the Anacreontics. The contrast in reception between the scholar and the poet was predicted by Henri Estienne in his preface to the first edition of the Anacreontics, where he acknowledged that their appeal would be greater for the reader who was *philomousos* than the one who was *philoponos*. Where do we situate ourselves? It is perhaps Lambin's greatest gift in this book, that in exposing the poetic virtues of

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.297 Published online by Cambridge University Press

both Anacreon and his successors he enables us *philoponoi* to read them as *philomousoi*.

L. gives equal time to Anacreon and to the Anacreontics, conscious throughout of their intertextuality as he uncovers features in the poetry of the former whose mobility saw them reappear in poetry from the Roman period to the nineteenth century. In his study of several of the poems he finds in Anacreon a 'sagesse aimable' combining seriousness with humour, satire with an epicurean lifestyle. The game of love, so prominent in the surviving verses of Anacreon, is played with urbanity and a light detachment, while engaging in its risks and fragility with style. Picking up on Ronsard's description of Anacreon as 'doux', L. reads the poet's 'douceur mélancholique' as a precursor to Hellenistic poetry, with the plaintive tone naturally enhanced by the anacreontic rhythm. The poet's iambic streak, where the derision is directed sometimes at himself, sometimes at others, L. reads as a feature of Anacreon's urbanity, a mocking of the ridiculous that is expressed with wit and word-play, and *para prosdokian* worthy of Aristophanes. In Artemon, the poet's memorable target in fr. 8G = 372P and fr. 82G = 388P, L. finds character construction in the vein of Theophrastus, but notes that Anacreon's Artemon is a *parvenu* treated with both hyperbole and detachment, and an indulgent smile.

L. connects the earliest poems of the *Anacreontea* with the literary renaissance of the Hadrianic period. L. asks why Anacreon should have inspired these sixty imitations of his symposiastic poems for five more centuries, and singles out characteristics such as his engagement with the present moment, with the anti-heroic, and with the individual. Anacreon's Muse was firmly tied to earth, and his verses embedded in the *hic et nunc*. L., too, is grounded in historical moments, applying his critical tools to contextualize the various poems in the Anacreontic collection. He distinguishes earlier from later poems by singling out metrical 'flaws' that occurred as stress accents began to replace the quantitative metres of the earlier poets. He does not, however, attempt to make claims for a chronological/metrical arrangement of the poems in the *sylloge*, as does West (pp. xvi–xvii). He associates their elegiac strain with the *ennui* of an educated class of individuals involved as functionaries in Imperial Greek administration or legal life, as teachers or rhetors, particularly in outlying areas of the empire such as Gaza or Alexandria. L. makes some striking identifications of a few poems as composed under the influence of Christianity, such as no. 56, where the longing for a Dionysian Liberator is a thinly veiled desire for the Christian Savior, or no. 55a–c, where the rose motif may represent the mystic rose of the Virgin Mary. For the most part, however, he sees the poems as the last flowering of pagan Greek literature, at one with the spirit and human-centred orientation of the Greek novel.

As musical and poetic critic, L. offers us an assessment of the virtues and vices of the Anacreontics, seeing poetic vigor and talent in some—no. 29, for example—and banal artificiality in others, such as no. 46. L.'s musical and poetic sensibility is the strongest feature of this book, and guarantees it a secure place in the reflective scholarship of the Anacreontic tradition. On a few occasions he takes issue with other readings of the text, such as in the *Anacreontic* no. 51.4–5, where L. would keep the text transmitted by the Paris manuscript on the ground that it need not follow classical usage. He translates all poems under study, and in several cases the translation is particularly inspired (e.g. the catalogue from nature in *Anacreontea* no. 24, p. 217). The text is followed by a useful list of the metres found in both Anacreon and the Anacreontics, and a glossary.

Are we drawn to these verses because of a sense of *ennui* similar to that of the Imperial functionaries? If L.'s assessment of 'Anacréontisme' is correct, we can be

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.297 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/54.2.297 Published online by Cambridge University Press