Andrej Petrović, *Kommentar zu den simonideischen Versinschriften*. Mnemosyne Supplements, 282, Leiden: Brill, 2007, pp. xv + 345, ISBN 978-90 04 15153 6.

This is a most welcome addition to the scholarship on the epigrams attributed to Simonides, "lightly reworked" from Petrovic's Heidelberg doctoral dissertation. Whereas Luigi Bravi in his recent book has concentrated on more literary matters[1], Petrovic has set out to comment only on those epigrams that are either extant (in the usual fragmentary way) on stones (his nos. 1-7)[2] or reported by at least one literary source, presumably on the basis of autopsy, to have been recorded from a stone (Pe 8-15), most but far from all of them being ascribed by at least one literary source to Simonides. One exception is Pe 4 = Sim. 20a-b *FGE*, two epigrams on the Athenians who died fighting the Persians, which no extant literary source ascribes to this poet, and which Petrovic himself thinks not truly his ("the association of the poem with the name of Simonides remains at present on very weak legs," p.177); see further, below. The latter group is not included by the fastidious Hansen in his *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, but Petrovic has the right to his more generous criterion, which produces a collection of epigrams rich in historical matter, since only two do not concern historical events or at least persons of great interest to a historian: a private dedication on a Herm (Pe 2) and an athletic victory monument (Pe 15). What this does do, however, is raise the question of why he stopped with these two. Any epigram one thinks reasonably ascribed to Simonides by any literary source, usually but not always the *Greek Anthology,* could just as readily be included. To mention only a few with a historical context, see 2, 5, 7-8, 10, 12 *FGE*, not one of which in my opinion can be denied to Simonides on objective grounds. There some few elegiac couplets under the name of Simonides that may well have been excerpted from elegies (such as 18 *FGE*), but this still leaves many that look like inscribed poems without any sure sign of being a later, literary, composition in this style; on the fascinating subject of "fictional" epigrams see Petrovic's account on pp. 19-24, reviewing the work of Bing, Baumbach, and others, where he rightly points out that the eighth-century epigram exclaiming "I am the cup of Nestor…" (454 *CEG*) is fictional, although this is not we normally mean by this word in this context. (One could also point out that many claims found in authentic public inscriptions contain questionable statements designed for political and/or patriotic reasons.)

[1] Luigi Bravi. *Gli epigrammi di Simonide e le vie della tradizione*. Rome 2006.

[2] In this review it makes sense to give Petrovic's own numbers, but these are found only on his table of contents, not on the text pages where he prints and discusses each epigram. For most purposes, *FGE* and *AP* numbers will suffice. In the forthcoming edition and commentary (to be edited by myself and E. Cingano), I will identify his numbers with Pe to distinguish them from those of Pr(eger).

Thus, what concerns an editor of Simonides, whether or not the Cean poet wrote this, that, or the other poem assigned to him in mss., is only incidental to Petrovic's main purpose, although his individual discussions on authorship are always worth study. *Simonideischen* in his title thus means "Simonidean" not in the sense "a work of Simonides," but rather either vaguely "a work of a Simonidean sort," or more specifically "a work labeled 'by Simonides'," a distinction not usually worth spelling out, but necessary here, where *every* epigram labeled Σιμωνίδου has been questioned by one or another editor, especially by Denys Page, who, outdoing Wilamowitz, seems displeased to have to accept even the epigram on Megistias as genuine.

Petrovic of course is well aware of this problem of authenticity, as one can see from the very title of his 27-page third chapter, "Echtheit: Simonides, [Simonides] und 'simonideisches'," an excellent survey of the scholarship on this subject, from Junghahn (an author usually ignored) to Erbse. Still, for all that Petrovic knows the pitfalls, one has to note that he includes in his collection epigrams that nobody in antiquity ever ascribed to Simonides: such as 4 Pe (see above), 7 Pe = 4 *FGE* ("no evidence to support the hope that this epigram was composed by Simonides," p. 230), 13 Pe = 26b *FGE* ("no indication that this belongs to any known poet," p. 266). Petrovic thus continues a long tradition of knowingly including poems not even the editor believes to be by Simonides. One could fuss and ask Why not just comment on any (or all) fifth-century inscriptions of historical interest (like Meiggs-Lewis). Instead, let us rather be grateful for whatever Petrovic has given us, however louche one may find the rubric. In any case, the markedly inscriptional nature of Petrovic's chosen corpus guarantees (as a more comprehensive collection of "Simonidean" epigrams cannot) that the poems, by whatever author, are of classical date. It also leads to what is often the most thorough description of the stone containing the inscription, which goes well beyond what would be appropriate in a more literary study of Simonides. Note, e.g., his review of the evidence of 1 Pe = 1 *FGE*, discussing the validity of Merritt's join of Eustathius and the stone. Nowadays this is taken for granted, but it is salutary to have the tenuous nature of this link reviewed.

The heart of this book clearly lies in its text and commentary on the fifteen epigrams chosen for inclusion. What one finds in each section is, first, a clear exposition of the text with its sources, accompanied by an extraordinarily full bibliography; then a lemmatized commentary that, although it concentrates on historical matters, does not neglect the literary side of things. Nobody working on early epigrams, Simonides, or fifth-century history can afford to neglect it, a judgment that is not impaired by the few, almost arbitrary, comments that follow.

Pe 1 = *FGE* 1. The final sigma of Ἁρμόδιος should be half-bracketed. T. L. Shear, *AJA* 40 (1936) 190, thought he could see traces of the sigma, but Lewis in *IG*^{3} disagrees. Petrovic favors Friedländer's conjecture for v.2, ἐν ἐλευθερίᾳ, without suggesting the one missing syllable; perhaps οἳ δ' or οἵ γ'. (I myself favor Peek's ἰσόνομον.) **p. 121:** Petrovic notes the Aeschylean parallel to μέγα φῶς at *Pe.* 300, the queen exclaims on hearing that Xerxes is still alive, ἐμοῖς

μέν εἶπας δώμασιν φάος μέγα, but he does not consider the possibility that the Athenian audience would be familiar with this statue and its base, so that these words would resonate oddly.

Pe 2 (ascribed to both Anacreon [15 *FGE*] and Simonides in *AP*). Although Petrovic reports the stone's reading correctly on p. 133, in the presentation of the poem itself and in the lemma, the alpha of παῖ is indicated as missing from the stone, although the most recent editors, Hansen and Lewis note it as present (Hansen with a sublinear dot). The stone contains only one distich, whereas in the *Anthology* it is followed by a second. What the relationship between lapidary and literary versions is unclear, but I am not convinced by Petrovic's argument that the second distich is simply a later, literary, expansion, occasioned by the later poet's misunderstanding the reference to the Graces as a topographical reference, which I find unlikely. An inscription commissioned by Leocrates for his success at Platea could have well have been composed by Simonides (who also wrote an epinician for him according to Quint. 11.2.14), an ascription that is strengthened by the fact that εὖτε appears in yet another epigram ascribed to Simonides (*AP* 7.511 = 75 *FGE*), although it is otherwise unknown in pre-Hellenistic epigram.

Pe 3 = *FGE* 11. Although Petrovic, quite reasonably, prints νᾶας (3) and ἰαράν (4), he neglects to credit Boegehold, *GRBS* 6 (1965) 179-186, for these Doric forms. A less than fully attentive reader reading pp. 148-9 on the dialect of the epigram would thus think that these two forms were provided by one or another of the sources. p. 151: Petrovic construes 1 ἄστυ Κορίνθου as "the city of (the eponymous founder) Corinthus," but more likely the genitive is an appositive genitive; i.e., the city of Corinth = Corinth.

Pe 5 = 49 *FGE*. Although Petrovic follows others in translating (and then defending) the first three words of ἀριστῆες πολέμου μέγα κῦδος ἔχοντες as "Fürsten des Krieges," the genitives elsewhere with ἀριστῆες stand for men or groups of men, not an inanimate object or abstraction like πολέμου (e.g., μέγα κῦδος Ἀχαιῶν; *Od.* 9.673 etc.; κ. ἀνδρῶν Pi. *O.* 9.88), which most likely here is a gen. of cause with κῦδος: these men have attained glory thanks to (their actions in) battle. His note on κῦδος is excellent, but it should be spelled out that κῦδος is almost always associated with a verb of giving/taking/receiving, since it represents the divine favor granted on an ad-hoc basis; cf. (with Petrovic) E. Benveniste, *Les vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes* (Paris 1969) 2.57-69; note in particular that "le vertu du *kûdos* est temporaire" (62). Only a divinity or semidivine quality can maintain this magic quality: [Hes.] *Scutum* 339 (Athena) κῦδος ἔχουσα, Ba. 1.159-60 φαμὶ καὶ φάσω | μέγιστον κῦδος ἔχειν ἀρετάν, where Arete is the subject (at Pi. *O.* 9.88 Ἄργει τ' ἔσχεθε κῦδος ἀνδρῶν, the aorist is ingressive). Since it is most unlikely that Simonides would have used κῦδος in its later sense of κλέος, this is yet another reason to add to those others that correctly convince Petrovic that is poem is not by Simonides.

Pe 15 = 41 *FGE*. Petrovic, unlike Page, properly prints a third line to this epigram, which, according to Schneidewin, Petrus Victorius (Pietro Vettori, 1499–1585) in his commentary on Aristotle, who cites vv. 1-2, claimed to have found

in some codices of the *Rhetoric*. Schneidewin, however, gives the last word as ὀλυμπιονίκαις, which Bergk (followed by Petrovic), citing Schneidewin, prints as ὀλυμπιονῖκαι as though this is what Victorius records, but which I suspect is a typographical error on Bergk's part, since the dative makes more sense.

Since Simmias of Rhodes (3 G-P = *A.P.* 6.113) contains the same πρόσθε μέν/ νῦν δέ contrast, not only should Victorius probably be trusted in his citation of the third line, this further suggests that our epigram too was written by Simmias, the name being corrupted somewhere in the transmission between Aristophanes and Eustathius. Since the victor's name would have been given in the fourth line, and since Aristotle twice quotes from vv. 1-2 with the phrases τὸ ἐπίγραμμα τῷ ὀλυμπιονίκῃ and τὸ τοῦ ὀλυμπιονίκου (and both times with a reference to a similar statement about Iphicles), it is certain that he knew only the first two lines (as Petrovic p. 277 notes), and that the third line seen by Victorius in some mss. was added by a later reader who recognized the epigram from another source.

David Sider
New York University
david.sider@nyu.edu