



SHL ITEM BARCODE

**REFERENCE ONLY****UNIVERSITY OF LONDON THESIS**

Degree PhD Year 2008 Name of Author RAWLES, Richard John

**COPYRIGHT**

This is a thesis accepted for a Higher Degree of the University of London. It is an unpublished typescript and the copyright is held by the author. All persons consulting this thesis must read and abide by the Copyright Declaration below.

**COPYRIGHT DECLARATION**

I recognise that the copyright of the above-described thesis rests with the author and that no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author.

**LOANS**

Theses may not be lent to individuals, but the Senate House Library may lend a copy to approved libraries within the United Kingdom, for consultation solely on the premises of those libraries. Application should be made to: Inter-Library Loans, Senate House Library, Senate House, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HU.

**REPRODUCTION**

University of London theses may not be reproduced without explicit written permission from the Senate House Library. Enquiries should be addressed to the Theses Section of the Library. Regulations concerning reproduction vary according to the date of acceptance of the thesis and are listed below as guidelines.

- A. Before 1962. Permission granted only upon the prior written consent of the author. (The Senate House Library will provide addresses where possible).
- B. 1962-1974. In many cases the author has agreed to permit copying upon completion of a Copyright Declaration.
- C. 1975-1988. Most theses may be copied upon completion of a Copyright Declaration.
- D. 1989 onwards. Most theses may be copied.

***This thesis comes within category D.***

☐

This copy has been deposited in the Library of \_\_\_\_\_

☒

This copy has been deposited in the Senate House Library,  
Senate House, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HU.



# **Simonides and the rôle of the poet**

Thesis submitted for the degree of Ph.D.

Richard John Rawles

University College London



UMI Number: U593381

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U593381

Published by ProQuest LLC 2013. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against  
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346



### **Declaration**

I, Richard John Rawles, confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information and analysis have been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

## **Abstract**

This thesis is an investigation of Simonides' construction and problematisation of issues to do with the rôle of the poet in the world in which he lived, as manifested in parts of his own poems and in his subsequent ancient reception.

Chapter 1: A new interpretation of the “Platea elegy” of Simonides. Simonides is shown fashioning a rôle for himself as a successor of Homer, especially the Homer of the *Iliad*. Simonides presents a reading of the *Iliad* which informs and validates his own pan-Hellenic rhetoric, thus creating an important document of the history of Hellenic identity and the “invention of the barbarian.”

Chapter 2: Simonides' encomiastic and epinician poems are largely lost; however, through a new reading of Pindar's *Isthmian* 2 we can perceive traces of Simonides' engagement with the poetics of praise and changes brought about in the rôle of the poet through its reception in this problematic poem of his younger contemporary.

Chapter 3: Simonides' reputation in antiquity is reflected in an anecdotal tradition rivalled in its interest perhaps only by that of Sappho. Close readings of varied texts, from canonical authors to sub-literary papyri, lexicographical and scholiastic sources, support an argument that reads this tradition as founded upon reception of Simonides' own work: in particular, his negotiation of developments in the rôle of the poet in the late archaic/ early classical period regarding the impact of changes in economic exchange and patronage.

Chapter 4: Theocritus 16 uses the figure of Simonides as an important part of its exploration of the poetics of patronage in the early third century world. However, new papyrus fragments allow a more sophisticated and nuanced reading of his allusions to Simonides. Combined with a closely historical reading of Theocritus' engagement with the ideology of Hieron II's Sicily, these contribute to a reading of the poem which sheds light both on Theocritus' own presentation of the rôle of the poet in his time, and on Simonides' treatment of similar problems two centuries previously.

## **Acknowledgements**

This thesis has been supervised by Alan Griffiths and Chris Carey. I owe a very great amount to both for the scholarship, advice and kindness which they have shared with me, and for the inspiration of their own work. I owe them a very great deal.

I am also grateful to Cornelia Römer for her substantial help, advice, and kindness, on matters both papyrological and non-papyrological. Simon Hornblower kindly read and commented on chapter 4, providing valuable reassurance and corrections.

The earlier part of my work was financed by the assistance of the Students Awards Agency for Scotland (subsequently integrated into the Arts and Humanities Research Board).

The initial inspiration of this thesis (at a time when it was expected to look very different from its eventual form) was derived from my experience of studying Hellenistic poetry as an undergraduate in the classes of Alan Griffiths. His teaching, in which he effortlessly and casually opened intriguing vistas in many directions, was the impetus for my choice to attempt my own research under his supervision. It is a great pleasure to mention also many other teachers to whom I owe a lot, including Michael Comber, Richard Janko, Cornelia Römer and K.J.V. Thomson.

For supplying me with unpublished work and similar assistance, I would like to thank Emmanuela Bakola, Lawrence M. Kowerski, David Sider and Mario Teló. My research into Simonidean anecdote involved travel to Princeton to examine the papyrus discussed in section 3.10. This was enabled by financial help from UCL's Dept of Greek and Latin and Graduate School and by the assistance of Don Skemer and his staff in the Dept. of Rare Books and Special Collections in Princeton University Library, and also gave me the opportunity to enjoy the exceptionally generous and kind hospitality of David and Sandra Sider.

As undergraduate and as graduate I have been fortunate to work in the stimulating and friendly atmosphere of the Dept. of Greek and Latin in UCL, and of the Institute of Classical Studies in the University of London. Throughout my research, the expertise, efficiency and good humour which characterises the ICS librarians have been a constant, including at times when their work was

disrupted and the future of their excellent library threatened. I have learnt much from my fellow researchers at UCL and the ICS, both through the papers and discussions arranged by organisers of the ICS work-in-progress seminar and through less formal contact. In scholarly and other ways I have been supported by the companionship of these friends and colleagues, among whom I would mention Emmanuela Bakola, Susan Beresford, Silvia Ferrara, Jean-Michel Hulls, and David and Kristin Leith.

Two names require special mention. Very little is presented in this thesis which has not been discussed with Peter Agócs, and I can trace the first inklings of many parts to conversations with him. These have always been important, as much when they revealed our differences of approach as when they showed agreement. He has read and criticised my work and has shown me work of his own, from which I have learnt a lot. The intellectual importance of this to me has been very great, and he has also sustained me with kindnesses in many other ways. Equally important in latter years has been the presence in London of Lucia Prauscello. She has provided me with comment and advice in unstinting quantities, and I have benefited greatly from her wide knowledge and scholarship and from the example of her own research. She has read all of this thesis and has frequently improved its clarity, accuracy and range of scholarly reference. On a more personal level I also owe her a great deal for the kindness and support which she has given to me over the past two years.

Had I listened more and earlier to many of those named above, this thesis might well have been better, and would certainly have been rather different from what follows; the usual caveat, that all errors remain my own, therefore applies.

I have left the most important debt until last. To catalogue the thanks I owe to my parents would be folly; it will have to suffice here to mention that it has included substantial financial and practical assistance, as well as unstinting emotional support in sometimes difficult times, intellectual discussion and the inspiration of their own researches. A few of my relatives and closest friends may realise what an inadequate description this is; I hope that my parents realise it too. It is to them that this work is affectionately dedicated.

## Table of Contents

Title Page	1
Declaration	2
Abstract	3
Acknowledgements	4
Table of contents	6
Abbreviations	8
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Chapter 1: The Pan-Hellenic Poet: Simonides on Plataea</b>	<b>28</b>
1.1: Introduction	28
1.2: Simonides' elegies on the Persian Wars	30
1.3: Date and place	45
1.4: The Plataea Elegy: outline	46
1.5: Hellas and Sparta	49
1.6: Homer and Praise Poetry in Simonides and Pindar	52
1.7: Allusions to Homer in the Plataea Elegy	62
1.8: 'Αεὶ φιλέλλην ὁ ποιητής;	65
1.9: Adaptation of Homer in the Plataea Elegy	70
1.10: Evil-minded Paris	76
1.11: Allusion and interpretation	80
<b>Chapter 2: Pindar, Simonides and Money: Pindar's <i>Isthmian</i> 2</b>	<b>84</b>
2.1: Pindar <i>Isthmian</i> 2	84
2.2: <i>Isthmian</i> 2 and Simonides: ancient interpretation	90
2.3: A Carian and an Argive: <i>Isthmian</i> 2 and Simonides 514 <i>PMG</i>	92
2.4: Aristodamus the Argive	93
2.5: Kurke on <i>Isthmian</i> 2 and Pindar's citation of Aristodamus	96
2.6: κοφός, Pindar and Simonides	98
2.7: Inclusivity, argument and κοφία	101
2.8: <i>Isthmian</i> 2, money and Simonides	105
<b>Chapter 3: Simonides in the anecdotal tradition</b>	<b>110</b>
<b><i>Part 1: a critical description of the tradition</i></b>	
3.1: Introduction: anecdotes, reception and scholarship	110
3.2: Simonides κίμβιξ: a sketch	114
3.3: Xenophanes	115
3.4: Aristophanes	119
3.5: Plato and [Plato]	122
3.6: Xenophon	131
3.7: Aristotle (and more Plato)	132
3.8: Chamaeleon	140
3.9: An anonymous compilation (3rd century BC)	147
3.10: Callimachus	149
3.11: The third century and later; observations	155
<b><i>Part 2: the tradition and the historical Simonides</i></b>	
3.12: O for a beaker full of the Cold North! Simonides fr. 25W	158
3.13: The "Snow Poem" and Hesiod	160

3.14: Cloaks: Aristophanes	164
3.15: Cloaks: <i>Odyssey</i>	165
3.16: Cloaks: Hipponax	170
3.17: Interpretation of the “Snow Poem”	172
3.18: Simonides, editors and readers: the attribution of fr.25W	176
3.19: The Cloak and the Octopus: Simonides 514 <i>PMG</i>	186
3.20: Epinician and Iambus	193
<b>Chapter 4: Simonides, history and κλέος: Theocritus’ <i>Charites</i> or <i>Hieron</i></b>	202
4.1: Introduction	202
4.2: Simonides in Theocritus 16: an outline	204
4.3: Theocritus 16 and Sicilian ideology: historical readings	205
4.4: Simonides in Theocritus 16: the anecdotal tradition	213
4.5: Simonides in Theocritus 16: Sicily and Thessaly	219
4.6: Theocritus’ Thessalians and archaic presentations of κλέος	228
4.7: Simonides in Theocritus 16: allusions to elegy	235
4.8: Contrasting presentations of κλέος in Theocritus 16	241
4.9: Conclusions	246
<b>Appendices</b>	
1. “Næke’s Law” in Simonides’ elegies	253
2. Simonides fr.11.14 W	255
3. The end of Ibycus’ encomium for Polycrates	260
<b>Bibliography</b>	268

## Abbreviations

In a few cases, standard editions and commentaries have been referred to in short form in the text without further specification. This includes, for instance, the authors of the Cambridge commentary on the *Iliad* (e.g., “Cf. Kirk ad *Il.* 1.20” or similar; also references such as “compare Race’s translation in the Loeb” or the like, where the context makes the reference clear). It is hoped that this has only been done in places where there is no likelihood of misunderstanding. The abbreviations used for journal titles in the Bibliography are all in common usage. The following have been used in the text and notes:

<b>A-B</b>	C. Austin and G. Bastianini, <i>Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt</i> , Milan, 2002.
<b>AP</b>	<i>Anthologia Palatina</i>
<b>CAH</b>	<i>Cambridge Ancient History</i>
<b>Campbell</b>	used for testimonia to Simonides in D.A. Campbell, <i>Greek Lyric III</i> , Cambridge MA, 1991 (Loeb).
<b>Degani</b>	E. Degani, <i>Hipponactis Testimonia et Fragmenta</i> , Stuttgart, 1991 (Teubner).
<b>D-K</b>	H. Diels, <i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> (3 vols), Berlin, 1951 -2 (6th ed., rev. W. Kranz).
<b>Drachmann</b>	A.B. Drachmann, <i>Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina</i> , 3 vols., Leipzig, 1903-27 (Teubner)
<b>Der Neue Pauly</b>	H. Cancik and H. Schneider (edd.), <i>Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike</i> , 16 vols., Stuttgart, 1996-2003.
<b>EGF</b>	M. Davies, <i>Epiconum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , Göttingen, 1988.
<b>FD</b>	<i>Fouilles de Delphes</i>
<b>FGE</b>	D.L. Page, <i>Further Greek Epigrams</i> , Cambridge, 1981.
<b>FGrH</b>	F. Jacoby, <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , Berlin, 1923 –.
<b>FHG</b>	C. Müller, <i>Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum</i> , Paris, 1878-85.
<b>Gow</b>	A.S.F. Gow, <i>Theocritus</i> , Cambridge, 1952 (2nd ed.).
<b>IEG<sup>2</sup></b>	M.L. West, <i>Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati</i> (2 vols.), Oxford, 1989-92 (2nd ed.). See note below, on the abbreviation ‘W’.
<b>K-A</b>	R. Kassel and C. Austin, <i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> , Berlin, 1983-2001.

<b>LGN</b>	P.M. Fraser et al., <i>A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names</i> , Oxford, 1987 –.
<b>LP</b>	E. Lobel and D.L. Page, <i>Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta</i> , Oxford, 1955.
<b>LSJ</b>	H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , 9th ed. revised by H. Stuart Jones, Oxford, 1925-40.
<b>M</b>	for Pindar fr.: H. Maehler, <i>Pindari carmina cum fragmentis</i> , pars ii., Leipzig, 1989 (Teubner). for Bacchylides fr.: H. Maehler, <i>Bacchylides carmina cum fragmentis</i> , Munich, 2003 (Teubner).
<b>OCD<sup>3</sup></b>	S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (edd.), <i>The Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> , Oxford, 1996 (3rd ed.).
<b>Pf./Pfeiffer</b>	R. Pfeiffer, <i>Callimachus</i> , Oxford, 1949-53.
<b>PLG</b>	T. Bergk, <i>Poetae Lyrici Graeci</i> (3 vols.), Leipzig, 1878-82 (4th ed.).
<b>PMG</b>	D.L. Page, <i>Poetae Melici Graeci</i> , Oxford, 1962.
<b>PMGF</b>	M. Davies, <i>Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , Oxford, 1991.
<b>R.</b>	V. Rose, <i>Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta</i> , Leipzig, 1886.
<b>S</b>	e.g. “Ibycus S151” refers to the numeration of <i>SLG</i> (below).
<b>SLG</b>	D.L. Page, <i>Supplementum Lyricis Graecis</i> , Oxford, 1974.
<b>TGF</b>	B. Snell et al., <i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , Göttingen, 1971-2004.
<b>Voigt</b>	E.-M. Voigt, <i>Sappho et Alcaeus fragmenta</i> , Amsterdam, 1971.
<b>W</b>	refers to the numeration of M.L. West’s <i>IEG<sup>2</sup></i> (above). Please note that, unless it is specifically stated otherwise, the reference of the siglum <i>W</i> is to the second edition, <i>IEG<sup>2</sup></i> (the numeration of Simonides being changed from <i>IEG<sup>1</sup></i> ).



## **Introduction**

This thesis is a description and interpretation of ways in which the late archaic/early classical poet Simonides of Ceos can be seen reflecting upon, problematising and constructing ideas associated with the rôle of the poet in the world in which he lives: a world made up of social relations and identities and of discourses concerning these relations and identities, including other poetic texts. It consists of analyses of different aspects of Simonides' poetic work and its reception in antiquity. It is therefore also an attempt to find ways of using this reception such as to tell us not only about the concerns, interests and practices of recipient communities and individuals but also about Simonides himself, his poems (mostly lost) and his interaction with the world(s) of Greek culture in the late sixth and early fifth centuries BC.

It is hoped that the methodologies employed and assumptions made and defended are clear in the course of the chapters themselves; however, it may be helpful to set these out here briefly, and to contextualise the work presented here in the context of some recent developments in the study of Greek poetry.

### **Recent research and the approach of this study**

For a number of reasons, this is a good time to work on Simonides.

Firstly, it is now some time since the 1992 publication of important new papyri which dramatically enhanced the amount of material available to us from a substantial body of work which remains largely lost. The first chapter of the present study is an analysis and interpretation of part of this new material, while in particular the last also makes special use of it.

Secondly, study of Simonides of the sort offered here is timely at a point in the study of Greek literature where models of historicist interpretation and cultural history are undergoing a kind of renaissance. It is sufficient here to mention two aspects which have been directly and importantly influential upon the work presented here: a new approach to the study of ethnicity and Greek cultural production which one may associate in particular with Edith Hall's book,

*Inventing the Barbarian*,<sup>1</sup> and a rapidly expanding body of work concerned with the relation between archaic and classical Greek literature and the ideological and cultural impact of changes in the mechanisms of economic exchange (especially, but not exclusively, monetisation). This latter is especially exemplified, with regard to the present study, by the works of Leslie Kurke,<sup>2</sup> and to a lesser degree (particularly because little concerned with lyric), Richard Seaford.<sup>3</sup> In broad terms, a large part of the argument of this thesis is directed towards the conclusion that Simonides' work was extremely important with regard to both of these phenomena, having a special place both in the history of the representation of Greek ethnicity and in the history of Greek cultural responses to important socio-economic changes which took place during the sixth and fifth centuries BC. The overall subject matter of this study is the way in which Simonides seems to have reacted to these cultural pressures in such a way that he could be (and was) interpreted as mapping out aspects and problems of the rôle of the poet and his relation to the world in which he lived.

That Hall's *Inventing the Barbarian* did not focus on Simonides' 'Plataea elegy,' the subject of chapter 1, is easily explicable: it had not yet been published. Now (almost fifteen years after the publication of *P.Oxy.* 3965), as I have made clear in my treatment, scholars have perceived elements of Simonides' striking use of Homer in the 'Plataea elegy' and have also related our fragments of the same poem to developments in the perception and articulation of Hellenic ethnicity. These two phenomena are the main concern of my treatment of this elegy, and it will be clear that I have worked on well-tilled ground here. Nevertheless, what is offered below takes the interpretation of these elements further than previous scholarship, and most importantly analyses them together as two facets of the same phenomenon. It will be argued that, *through* a re-reading of Homer's *Iliad*, Simonides articulates a new perception of Greek identity as a response to the Persian Wars. By recasting his precise and specific allusions to the *Iliad* in a way which presents the earlier poem as describing a conflict between Greeks who are presented in a heroic light and associated with Achilles, and Trojans who are presented in a negative light and associated with Paris, Simonides retrojects a

---

<sup>1</sup> Hall 1989.

<sup>2</sup> Kurke 1991, 1999.

<sup>3</sup> Seaford 2004.

moralising reading of conflict between Hellene and 'barbarian' on to Greek poetry's most canonical text, while making the same a model for his own commemoration of the recent battle.

I would wish to claim, therefore, to have gone some way here towards achieving one of the regular ambitions of historicist criticism: an interpretation which treats (aspects of) both 'ideas' and 'expressions,' or (to use equally problematic conceptions) 'form' and 'content,' together, in such a way that the limitations of this familiar dichotomy are to some extent overcome. 'What?' and 'how?' are seen to be inseparable. This should not, of course, be read as a claim of holism or completeness: it goes without saying that different questions brought to the text would rightly provoke different answers.

This expression of pan-Hellenism through allusive relationship to the Homeric poems represents at once an instance of and a reaction to the changed and changing nature of the poet's commemorative rôle as provider of κλέος in a world which was itself changing and felt to be changing. It will subsequently be seen (in chapter 4) that two centuries later this elegy could be received by Theocritus as an important document from the point of view of his own attempt to find ways of describing, constructing and problematising *his* rôle as a poet of praise and commemoration in relation both to the poetic past and to Greek identity as defined against 'the barbarian.'

It may be perceived that this picture of the early history of the long-lasting and still influential barbarian/ Hellene dichotomy, and of its roots in violence and the creative re-reading of canonical texts, can provide food for thought in terms of its continuity in patterns of thought even today.

Simonides' relation to a new world of increased commodification and economic change has not gone unremarked. There is a short and stimulating discussion, for instance, in Bruno Gentili's *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece*.<sup>4</sup> More substantial and intriguing is the discussion of Simonides in a world of economic change which begins the third chapter of Jesper Svenbro's *La Parole et le Marbre*.<sup>5</sup> In the more recent work mentioned above, however, concerning the cultural expression of developments in exchange in archaic and classical Greece, Simonides has

---

<sup>4</sup> Gentili 1988 (Italian original 1985).

<sup>5</sup> Svenbro 1976.

received little treatment. For example, in neither of the important books *The Traffic in Praise* and *Coins, Bodies, Games and Gold* does Kurke discuss Simonides at any length at all. In many respects this is surprising (more in the latter than in the former, which is about Pindar in particular). As will be seen in the study of the anecdotal tradition concerning Simonides below (chapter 3), when *ancient* authors considered the relationship between exchange and poetic production, they regularly did so by speaking about Simonides. Indeed, it was sometimes believed in antiquity, and has sometimes been stated by modern scholars, that Simonides was the first poet to write in a straightforward exchange for payment.

The most probable reasons for this apparent neglect in the most recent scholarship are two: firstly, and most obviously, the fragmentary state of the remains of Simonides' poems as we have them, and secondly a powerfully sceptical attitude towards the evidence value of anecdotal tradition. Modern scholarship, for good reasons, tends to hold such material at arm's length; the prevailing mood of scepticism is especially associated with Mary Lefkowitz's book *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (scholarship which takes a more credulous approach may be found in the work of J.H. Molyneux).<sup>6</sup> One recent place where the relationship between Simonides and new forms of exchange (specifically, monetisation) is treated directly and given great importance is in Anne Carson's book, *The Economy of the Unlost*.<sup>7</sup> Here Simonides is perceived as an ironic and rueful observer of changes in social relations caused by the invention of money (coin), which is described according to Marxist views of the alienating effects of capitalism. It is not altogether surprising that this book is an exception in this respect, since whatever its insights and interest, it is marked (as is shown in chapter 3, and has been observed by its reviewers) by a refusal to come to grips with the problematic nature of the anecdotal sources of which it happily makes use: the problems which, it is surmised, have tended to warn scholars off the tradition concerning Simonides and exchange are for the most part brushed under the carpet. This was unfortunate: however unsatisfactory Carson's methodology has (correctly) been perceived as being, and whatever the historical and philological defects of her book, some of her insights may be seen as

---

<sup>6</sup> Lefkowitz 1981, Molyneux 1992.

<sup>7</sup> Carson 1999.

validated by the investigations presented here. In this study, the anecdotal and biographical traditions concerning Simonides are taken seriously but critically as sources for the study of Simonides himself, and are treated in part as a form of *reception*, and it is to that that we now turn.

### **Reception and historical research**

A description of the approach to the reception of Simonides adopted here seems called for. A striking modern example of *modern* Simonidean reception-through-anecdote may be helpful as well as stimulating reflection by means of both similarity and contrast, while indicating the continuing interest of elements of the tradition concerning Simonides as a resource for the presentation of problematic aspects of poetry and its place in the wider world.

The recent collection *Landing Light* by the Scottish poet Don Paterson<sup>8</sup> includes a poem “The Reading,” which consists of a first person narration of the most famous of the anecdotes concerning Simonides: the episode known to us chiefly from Cicero and Quintilian, in which the house of a Thessalian patron falls down on the diners within (see below, chapter 3). At the stage in Paterson’s book where it occurs, such an explicit engagement with an ancient poet is not altogether a surprise: it is preceded by a poem which represents itself as a letter addressed to the young Romulus and Remus (“Letter to the Twins”), and then by a poem describing a type of poetic initiation, where in place of a “Castalian spring” the speaker finds a stream while “crossing / a field near Bridgefoot” (“A Fraud”; Bridgefoot is a village in Angus, to the north of Dundee). “The Reading” then presents a narrative of the episode where the house fell down, spoken by a narrator who, with a hint towards the metaphor of literary indebtedness or continuity as metempsychosis, seems to be a reincarnation of Simonides in a contemporary poet’s voice: “The first time I came to your wandering attention / my name was Simonides.” Continuity might seem emphasised by the implication that the audience of the present poet is essentially the same one which knew Simonides; subsequently, the audience seems to be rooted today: “I invented the thing you *now* call the commission” (my emphasis).

---

<sup>8</sup> Paterson 2003.

In a number of ways, the description of the performance in Thessaly (as one may read it; Paterson's poem contains no place names) elides the distinctions between the imagined performance circumstances of Simonides' time and of the time of the contemporary poet: thus, Simonides' performance is "The Reading," and there is no mention of song or music. It develops further the impression given in the accounts of Cicero and Quintilian, where the interconnection of praise and narrative characteristic of early Greek encomiastic writing is ignored and the narrative (concerning the Dioskouroi) treated as digression: in Paterson's version, Simonides is "fleshing... out" his encomium with material from an earlier poem, a hymn rather than an encomium. The description of the fall of the house again exhibits easy movement between the time of Simonides and of the present day: the aftermath is characterised by "the dust and the sirens," and while one may think of the goddesses of song one will think of the police car and the ambulance first.

The point (or part of the point) of the appeal to Simonides is clear. The partial elision of temporal distance between now and Simonides' time, and the construction of a composite identity of Simonides then and a poet speaking now, serve the purpose of constructing a model for the modern poet: not a bardic voice from on high, but a man in a world of customers with expectations, whose sense of his own independence and value is in part located in the world of money and payment (at the end of Paterson's poem, the poet goes to the corpse of the patron and removes the remaining part of the fee from his purse). Already the title ("The Reading") hints at the pressures of today: this is a Simonides who might read at Waterstones at the behest of publishers, hoping to sell a few more copies. One may wonder at the identity of the implied addressees of the poem, which presents itself not as a poem but as a kind of lecture: "But first to the theme / of this evening's address: the reading." (Paterson's treatment of the ideas presented here concerning craft and status as 'a poet,' the problem of lecturing about poetry, and the poet as a expert in memory, can be connected with the themes of his 2004 T.S. Eliot lecture<sup>9</sup>). It is easy to observe, therefore, that this form of reception is properly understood as being largely about *now*: it is from the recipient perspective (Paterson's perspective, the perspective of the voice created

---

<sup>9</sup> Paterson 2004.

within the poem, our perspective as his readership) that the rôle of Simonides here is to be understood.

This perspective is today usual in the study of reception, and for good reason. After all, how sensible would it be here to use Paterson's poem as a way of learning about the historical Simonides? Clearly Paterson is not especially trying to tell us anything about the late sixth or early fifth century BC, and the answer to one who tried to find such information would properly be, as the joke has it, "I wouldn't start from here." There is no reason (at least, I found none) to suppose that Paterson's poem is based on reading the fragments of Simonides: in fact, the *Quellenforschung* which may be employed with our ancient anecdotal sources is revealing here too, where it seems clear that Paterson's main source is in fact the book of Anne Carson mentioned above (we may be confident, of course, that such 'second-hand reception' occurred in antiquity as well). The giveaway phrase is "lyric economies," and once this is appreciated other features too seem to be illuminated by Carson's discussion. For example, the corpses of the diners are described as the "tenderised menfolk" of their wives: the word expresses both the callousness of the narrator, who considers them as if pieces of meat, and his sympathy – his capacity to feel or at any rate recognise "tenderness" – shown where he addresses one wife as "poor woman." These uncouth men were once "applauding like seals" and "wolfing and hollering:" only at their deaths are they "tenderised." Once the basis of the poem as a reading of Carson's reading of the same story is recognised, it is tempting to consider this in the light of her analysis of poetic "economics," and the question what it means to "save" words, or to give one word double "value."

Such questions of recipient-oriented interpretation and of *Quellenforschung* are not ignored in the treatment of Simonides' anecdotal reception which takes up a large portion of this study. The reception of Simonides is of interest in its own right, just as Paterson's poem is, and has proved rewarding to such study. However, in contrast with a powerful trend in the modern interpretation of ancient biographical and anecdotal material concerning poets, this material is also examined in the hope that it can help us to see something about the historical Simonides, and the songs and poems he composed during the fifth and sixth centuries BC. Studies such as Lefkowitz's book have properly cautioned us about the very great dangers of extracting simple, factual information from

traditions about the lives of Greek poets (dates, itineraries of travels through the Greek world, details of relations with famous contemporaries, etc.). It is in the context of these dangers that such studies warn us that data presented as external *realia* concerning the biographies of poets are often derived from biographical (i.e., it is usually implied, *falsely* biographical) readings of their works, the jokes of comic poets, and so on. Rather than as the disappointing conclusion of a search for hard information, this is here treated as the inviting beginning to a different sort of inquiry. Such material is treated as a form of reception, but the interpretative approach to such reception is not restricted to the concerns of the recipient authors, texts and communities, but is conceived of more broadly. The reason for this is that, at least in some cases, there is an important difference between reception of Simonides in an ancient source and reception of Simonides in a poem by Don Paterson. The difference is not necessarily one of the approach and concerns of the recipient, though of course these also may differ (Theocritus, for instance, uses the figure of Simonides to talk about patronage and praise in a manner which has some points in common with that of Paterson; see chapter 4). Rather, this is a difference from the point of view of the reader who wants to interrogate these texts about the historical Simonides and his works. We must remember that the ancient traditions concerning Simonides grew in a world where his songs were available and in at least some cases well known. While the anecdotal personality of Simonides may sometimes have taken on a life of its own, the study of these anecdotes here is founded upon and intended to test the hypothesis that this tradition derives from and to some extent reflects elements which were present in the poems themselves: poems which are mostly lost to us, but were not lost to the communities in which the traditions arose. The likely foundation of the tradition upon reception is thus treated less as a regrettable lack (of external data) and more as a fortunate, if risky, opportunity.

The particular focus of the study of the anecdotal tradition presented here is the large amount of material which associates Simonides with related issues connected with exchange: relations between the rich and others, and specifically rich patrons and the poets whose rôle is to praise them, and associated problems to do with the effects of cash exchange upon social relationships and interactions. These are studied in chapter 3, which is both a survey and an analysis of this tradition, ranging across many authors and other sources. The hypothesis which



is made is that this set of issues is prominent in the anecdotal tradition concerning Simonides because it was prominent in his poems. This hypothesis is tested against the possibility of recovering traces of this concern from the fragmentary remains of the poems. The antiquity of this tradition is examined: the later it starts, the better the chances of an argument which might present it as based on the misleading response of recipients whose distance from the world of late archaic and early classical song-culture has led them (from the point of view of a historicist concerned with Simonides) into error and misunderstanding.

The dangers of this approach are clear. The study of reception is not supposed to work backwards, from known receiving texts to unknown received texts. It is probable that ancient reception is sometimes very misleading or worse, though the assumption made here is that it is at least not entirely random. While it is appropriate for the reader to bear these dangers in mind, as I too have done, this approach has in any case had some interesting and significant results. It has been suggested that the tradition examined is both early and valuable, since it is argued from the testing of the tradition against the fragments that Simonides did at any rate sometimes treat these issues in striking and surprising ways, which the tradition helps to emphasise and primes us to look out for. These traces, it is argued, are our meagre signs of this fascinating poet's interactions with the socio-historical developments in exchange which were adverted to above.

Chapter 2, therefore, consists of a reading of the text which is here presented as the earliest and in certain respects most important case of the association of Simonides with tensions concerning the rôle of the poet in the world of the cash relationship. This is Pindar's second *Isthmian*, the beginning of which represents the most striking engagement of Simonides' younger contemporary with the same issue. This poem has already been the object of special consideration in relation to the relationship between poetry and developments in exchange (for example, a reading of *Isthmian* 2 forms the culmination and most important 'test case' of Leslie Kurke's *The Traffic in Praise*), and it has also been long associated (since the sources of the scholia) with Simonides. The reading presented here also posits a Simonidean connection, visible in rhetorical patterns which the beginning of *Isthmian* 2 has in common with a number of the fragmentary poems of Simonides, and posits that the use of Simonidean rhetoric by Pindar is interpretable in connection with the fact that this is also the place where Pindar is

engaging with the problem of cash payment for poetry, which problem is so consistently associated by our other ancient sources with Simonides: it is because he is treating a theme which he considers Simonidean that Pindar engages with Simonides here by means of allusion. This reading of *Isthmian* 2 will, it is hoped, be seen as a useful and important contribution to the interpretation of a difficult and controversial poem. In the context of the present study, however, it is especially important because it presents a strong case for supposing that elements in the later reception of Simonides were already in place at the time of a poem composed while Simonides was still alive. It therefore coheres closely with chapter 3, which treats the later tradition: the two represent two parts of the same argument concerning Simonides' reception.

The anecdotal tradition is thus neither entirely misleading nor devoid of valuable pointers towards interesting features of Simonides' poetic oeuvre. Taking it seriously does not entail believing that Aeschylus died when a tortoise fell on its head; rather, it involves the recognition that, especially in the event that our knowledge of his work were as meagre as it is of the work of Simonides, evidence of his ancient reception might sometimes tell us something about him as well as about his readers and audiences. In the case of Simonides, it is argued that we can see the reflections, through a glass darkly, of an intriguing and perhaps troubling engagement with the changed and changing rôle of the poet in a world where new and changing mechanisms of exchange and corresponding alterations in social relations were both real and perceived.

In the fourth chapter of this study, the different threads of the whole come together: exchange and remuneration; pan-Hellenism; reception through anecdote; reception through allusion and the reading and re-presenting of poems. Theocritus 16 is a complex and intriguing poem, and represents Theocritus' reception of and response to what must have seemed to him and his readership (as to us) the final 'great generation' of the highest achievements in song-dance: Simonides, Pindar and Bacchylides. The treatment offered here is extensive and detailed, but particularly directed towards the study of the poem as an instance of Simonides' reception. However, it was not and is not possible to study this aspect of the poem independently of other issues which it raises, and chapter 4 can therefore also be read as a general interpretation of Theocritus 16, focusing on its interaction with poets and poetry of the past, particularly

Simonides, and its interaction with aspects of pan-Hellenism and Sicilian ideological perceptions of the wars of the early fifth century, as famously commemorated by Simonides. The poem is shown to be interpretable at once as a serious, albeit not unambiguous, encomium of Hieron II of Syracuse, interacting in an encomiastic manner with aspects of his personal propaganda, and as a complex but not altogether aporetic exploration of the problem of poetry composed for remuneration. It shows interaction with Simonides through the anecdotal tradition and through direct engagement with his poems, and Simonides is presented both as an instance of the poet motivated by the desire for remuneration and as an instance of the poet motivated by the desire to commemorate great deeds. For Theocritus, it is suggested, the Simonides of anecdote and the Simonides of the poems to which he alludes are not separable from each other: his poem receives and positions itself against both together. In a manner similar to Simonides' handling of pan-Hellenism and of Homeric allusion in the 'Plataea elegy,' so also in Theocritus' poem allusion, reception and the creation of an ideologically motivated picture of ethnicity and of his patron's place in this context are seen to be inseparable from one another.

### Allusion

As will be clear, the interpretation of allusion is of considerable importance in this study: in the Plataea elegy, it is argued (chapter 1), Simonides alludes to Homer, and especially the *Iliad*; the use of Simonidean patterns of rhetoric in Pindar's second *Isthmian* is analysed as a form of allusion (chapter 2); the reception of Simonides and other lyric in Theocritus 16 is also described in these terms (chapter 4). As will be clear in the chapters concerned, allusion can be a form of reception – thus, it is by alluding to particular passages and scenes that Simonides creates a reading of the *Iliad* for his own times, and that Theocritus handles disparate elements in the picture available to him of Simonides in order to treat questions relating to patronage in his world as well as the world of choral lyric. "Allusion" is not an unproblematic concept. In particular, from a classicist's perspective, recent work in Latin studies has involved extensive discussion of the relation between "allusion" and "intertextuality" and connected problems in interpretation and in the theorisation of interpretative practices. It is because this

recent debate provides a clear view of the issues at stake – and *not* because there is a special reason why such issues should be more important to Latinists than Hellenists<sup>10</sup> – that we turn briefly to an example from Roman poetry, the treatment of which, while it does not purport to be a complete description of a complex debate, makes clear what approach is taken in the present study.

A famous example of the difficulties of interpreting similarities between texts, and the apparent conflict between allusion-based and intertextual approaches, is to be found at Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.460, whose similarity to Catullus 66.39 is clear. Vergil's Aeneas addresses the shade of Dido; in Catullus, Berenice's severed lock addresses the queen:

inuitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi (Vergil)

“Unwillingly, Queen, did I leave your coast”

inuita, o regina, tuo de uertice cessi (Catullus)

“Unwillingly, O Queen, did I leave your head”

This created problems for allusion-based critics, who felt that it was inappropriate for Vergil to use the ‘frivolous’ Catullan source text here. They accordingly asserted that Vergil could not have intended the allusion, and that this was a coincidental or involuntary echo.<sup>11</sup> This situation is presented by Oliver Lyne as the point where he, who had used allusion as a highly productive concept in his previous work, converted to discussing such similarities between texts within a non-intentionalist, intertextual framework.<sup>12</sup>

His argument may be briefly paraphrased as follows.

Regardless of Vergil's intention, the evidence of the text viewed in its own right, and of its reception, indicates that the Catullan passage is an intertext here. Lyne proceeds to interpret it as such. He observes other intertextual links between the presentation of the Dido story in the *Aeneid* and Catullus 66, noting the following:

adiuro teque tuumque caput (Cat. 66.40)

“I swear by you and by your head”

---

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Fowler 1997, 28-31.

<sup>11</sup> For bibliography, v. Harrison 1970, 241n.1.

<sup>12</sup> Lyne 1994.

testor utrumque caput (*Aen.* 4.357)

“I swear on both our heads”

testor, cara, deos et te, germana, tuumque / dulce caput (*Aen.* 4.492f.)

“I swear, my dear, by the gods and on you, my sister, and your sweet head”

He also points out that Dido, like Berenice, has had a lock of hair removed (by Iris: 4.693ff.). He points out that Aeneas (like Berenice, but unlike Dido) *will* achieve his own catastrophe, both metaphorical and literal. In short, he replaces a picture focused closely on the two specific passages with a pattern of analogy between Dido, Aeneas and Berenice within which the intertextual link between the two similar lines is situated. Finally, he interprets the link with reference to *contrast*: he explicitly compares the capacity of intertextuality to stress both similarity and difference with the similar capacity of simile and metaphor.<sup>13</sup>

A number of comments may be made. First of all, this argument is clearly an improvement on narrowly focused discussion of whether it is or is not Vergil's intention to allude to Catullus at this precise point in *Aeneid* 6. The vulnerability of the argument that interprets the relationship between texts in terms of allusion but refuses to do so here is laid bare. Is it through the rejection of allusion and adoption of intertextuality that Lyne has arrived at this improved interpretation? The key advances that he has made are, in my judgement, firstly that he has expanded awareness of the connection between the two texts such as to cover parts of the *Aeneid* which needed to be brought into the discussion: he has shown sensitivity to context by means of careful readerly openness to the text. Secondly, he has made and employed the observation that an analogy between two texts can convey meaning both in terms of similarity and in terms of contrast, and this has enabled him to conceive of the apparent misfit between the tragic context of *Aen.* 6 and the more light-hearted context of Catullus 66 in a more interpretatively productive way.<sup>14</sup> Although he presents his analysis as a demonstration of the benefits brought through the jettisoning of ‘allusion’ and its replacement by ‘intertextuality,’ neither of these advances is in fact dependent on his use of a non-intentionalist model (or, as we shall see, strictly speaking his use

---

<sup>13</sup> *ibid.*, 190-3. For another analysis of this same famous example, which also refers to further studies subsequent to Lyne's article, see Barchiesi 1997, 212ff.

<sup>14</sup> For more subtle developments of similarity and contrast, cf. Barchiesi 1997, 212-3.

of non-intentionalist *language*). More sensitive awareness of context is not the preserve of intertextuality-based reading as opposed to allusion-based reading, and we may make the argument from the same data that *the poet* has presented a pattern of analogy between Dido and Aeneas on the one hand and Catullus' Berenice on the other. Nor is it the case that perceiving analogy between texts in terms of both similarity and contrast is specific to an intertextual model of relationships between texts: Conte has shown this very clearly in his discussion of *allusion* as a figure similar to metaphor and simile.<sup>15</sup> Lyne's discussion is more a demonstration of the value of sensitive critical awareness in general than of the advantage of intertextuality-based reading in particular.

Intertextuality has advantages other than those claimed for it by Lyne in his discussion of *Aen.* 6.460. In particular, it allows for a different approach to historicism from the traditional one prevalent in classical studies and implicit in Lyne's article. If, as Lyne and others advocate, we adopt an approach to this problem which does away with the conception of the intending author, instead perceiving the text as a kind of object in its own right, this enables us to ask different questions of the texts concerned. It is notable that Lyne's discussion of Catullus 66 and Vergil's *Aeneid* is in fact a discussion only of the later poem *in the light of* the earlier, with or without the invocation of Vergil himself. But in fact the intertextuality approach opens up the possibility of reversing the procedure.<sup>16</sup> We could suggest many ways in which, from the point of view of a reader, the Vergilian text impacts upon Catullus 66. Perhaps our Berenice's triumph is contrasted with the downfall of an earlier African queen: *as we read Catullus*, we can see that Berenice has achieved the catasterism which Dido failed to achieve. Perhaps we could further suggest that, for the reader with Vergil on his or her mind, the praise of Berenice is ironically undercut by the knowledge that her kingdom, like that of Dido, will eventually fall before the might of Rome: her catasterism will not help at Actium... (The frequently remarked connections between Vergil's Dido and the last Cleopatra help here). This kind of reading is sometimes parodied and presented as if it were a sort of *reductio ad absurdum* of non-intentionalist, reader-based critical strategies. This is unfair, since it has a

---

<sup>15</sup> Conte 1986, 38-9, 56.

<sup>16</sup> cf. Lyne 1994, 200-1 (an unnecessarily negative view of this procedure), and (e.g.) Fowler 1997, 26-8, Hinds 1998, 100-104.

valid place as an attempt to describe and understand human behaviour. Human experience includes reading Vergil with Homer (or Catullus) and the real and possible reading experiences are worthy of description.<sup>17</sup>

In any case, as I say, while he acknowledges their existence Lyne does not explore the possibilities of a-historical readings of intertextual connections. Perhaps for this reason, it may be noted that to a large extent he does not really move very far away from an allusion-based, intentionalist model after all.

Consider the following:

By these ironies, the text insists upon the intertwining of Trojan success with other people's disaster, the familiar theme. By these ironies, the text underscores Aeneas' own involvement in this tragic chain of connections. And by these ironies, the text leaves Aeneas unwittingly speaking rather smugly, as he cites an intertext simultaneously radiating Dido's disaster and his own stardom.<sup>18</sup>

"The text insists," "the text underscores," and so on. In the end, Lyne's concern with asking a historical question of the text and asking for a definable and historical set of meanings to be attributed to it inevitably pushes him towards the notion that this meaning is purposively achieved. By a move which is close to a simple sleight of hand, he sidesteps the problem of appearing to claim privileged access to the private thoughts of a long-dead poet by attributing a purposive, intentional capacity to the personified *text*. In the end, he interprets the similarities between the Vergilian and Catullan texts by means of invoking something very close to the intentionalist model he claims to avoid.

His solution, then, is in the end perhaps misguided, but it may point us towards a reasonable and practical conclusion. If we see the text in a way which is completely independent of intention, we will inevitably either move towards an a-historical approach towards the text in question or end up allowing intentionalist ideas in through the back door. This need not seem problematic insofar as that,

---

<sup>17</sup> In a novel by David Lodge, a character is represented as working on "The Influence of TS Eliot on Shakespeare." This appears to be absurd because of the historicist terms in which it is phrased. However, the ways in which the experience of modernism and of Eliot in particular make Shakespeare a different text *for us* are a perfectly legitimate object of study. This possibility of a-historical intertextuality is rather grudgingly accepted (with reference to the same example of Eliot and Shakespeare) by Lyne 1994, 200-1 ("not wholly absurd").

<sup>18</sup> Lyne 1994, 193. How far have we really come by saying "the text does this and that" rather than "the poet does this and that"?

as has been suggested above, various questions other than the traditional historical ones are worth asking. On the other hand, it is the case from a historical point of view that texts, while they are surely never entirely under the control of their authors, are nevertheless intentionally (perhaps ‘purposively’) produced. When the question which we wish to bring to the text is a historical question of this sort, we should not fear to speak of allusion and to use other sorts of ‘intentionalist’ language. The objection that it is absurd to claim knowledge of the inner workings of an author’s mind is perhaps not as problematic as it seems as long as we keep it in mind and beware of some of its pitfalls.<sup>19</sup> The critics who decided that Vergil’s allusion to Catullus was inept and as such must be unintended were applying a method based on allusion in an unreflective and careless way, in that, as Lyne points out, they were privileging a notion of intention before the text. This is to put the cart before the horse, since clearly the best place in which to discern intention is the text itself,<sup>20</sup> but it does not for that reason discredit the very notion of conceiving of the text as intentionally produced.

The questions being asked of the texts being studied here are unashamedly historical ones: thus (in chapter 1) Simonides’ elegy will be read in a historical and social context, and the background of the discussion will be the fact that they were produced by an individual acting in a historical and social context. As such, the relations between texts will be discussed in the language of allusion.<sup>21</sup>

In addition to the general arguments rehearsed above, it is hoped that this is justified by arguments suggesting that the phenomena concerned merit something more specific in the way of explanation than the all-pervading presence of intertextuality in discourse generally.<sup>22</sup> In chapters 1 and 4,

---

<sup>19</sup> For an attempt to remove intentionalism from the “intentionalist fallacy,” i.e. to deny that intentionalism involves a form of privileged access to another’s mind independently of the text, see Heath 2002, chapter 3, especially 63-5 (where he briefly engages with the same article of Lyne’s which I have just critiqued).

<sup>20</sup> Strictly speaking, the best place to discern the kind of intention *which helps us to interpret texts* is in the text: if our primary purpose were to psychoanalyse the author, for instance, a quite other attitude towards the priority of different ways of perceiving intentions might be in order.

<sup>21</sup> Compare the concession of Fowler 1997, 27: “... directionality is required for many of the constructions we wish to make about antiquity...”

<sup>22</sup> With regard to chapter 1, the all-pervasive presence of *Homer* in discourse generally (cf. e.g. Marrou 1981 [1965], 33-35, on Homer’s continuous centrality in education) is of course a double-edged sword: it makes it more plausible that a poet needing to communicate with an audience could assume that specific allusion to Homeric passages would be effective, but it also



Simonides and Theocritus explicitly refer to authors to whom they also allude, and in the latter case it will become clear there are other reasons to posit allusions in Theocritus' poem as well as Simonides' name.<sup>23</sup> In these circumstances, these types of identifiable and specific allusion make it possible for one to discuss phenomena under the head of 'allusion' which, if they occurred in a different context, would perhaps not qualify for similar treatment. The more readily identifiable allusions lower the evidential bar for the identification of others in the vicinity.

In terms of the interpretation of allusions, again a historicising line is taken. Viewed in a vacuum, allusions can be very slippery; for example, by what criteria can we choose between an interpretation which sees an allusion as emphasising *contrast* and another interpretation which sees it as emphasising *similarity*? Here Conte's<sup>24</sup> interpretation of allusion as a figure seems particularly apt, since this phenomenon is one of the respects in which allusion resembles simile and metaphor. Sometimes context can help us to avoid aporia. What we know about the historical circumstances of the poetry and the expectation of the audience may help to direct our interpretation. Greeks of Simonides' time did not primarily encounter poetry as a quiet, reflective and private experience; it took place in social contexts, and social contexts will have helped them to understand a phenomenon like allusion in a directed way.<sup>25</sup> The audience, with its awareness of genre and circumstance, will have collaborated with the poet in achieving a relatively stable meaning. Theocritus' poems were perhaps experienced in a rather different way; but a poem which is clearly in part an encomium of a living ruler at least to some extent inscribes a form of guidance for readers. Post-modern critics often complain that scholarly commentators confine

---

makes non-allusive coincidence of language, themes etc. with the Homeric poems more likely, since their phrasing and ideas come to mind 'naturally'. Of course, for simple metrical reasons similarity in vocabulary and phrasing is inherently likely in elegy. On this sort of question, see Hinds 1998, chapter 2.

<sup>23</sup> From a reception point of view, I suppose that one could refer to this as a sort of 'directed intertextuality': a sort of trigger, like a specific reference to an earlier poet, points the reader's (hearer's) attention in a particular direction, and thereby encourages intertextuality not as a generalised confluence of culturally present ideas but as a focalised sensitivity in that particular direction.

<sup>24</sup> Conte 1986, 38-9, 56.

<sup>25</sup> This reception process will have changed over time: another reason why it is worthwhile to try to recover the meaning of a communication happening at a particular point in history. Specifically, in the case of Simonides' "Plataea elegy," it will not have felt the same after the disgrace of Pausanias.

interpretation excessively by telling their readers what *not* to think (“no reference to *x, y, z* should be read here”).<sup>26</sup> To some extent, awareness of social contexts must have directed the interpretative element of poems’ initial reception; privileging this type of interpretation is a legitimate strategy for a historicising reading.<sup>27</sup> Nevertheless, as will be seen especially in chapter 4, this study does not take a fundamentalist line on this point, and allows for the stressing of ambiguous and polysemous elements. Awareness of social context does not require reductive readings: historicism can enrich and broaden our perceptions of texts, and need not be seen as closing them down.

### Prospects

Even in the unlikely and undesirable event that this study were considered the last word on the questions it addresses, more dissertations on Simonides could be started tomorrow. It is hope that this one has shown some of the prospects which arise when Simonides is perceived in the light which has been described above, in terms of his interesting and important reflections on and problematisations of the rôle of the poet. Other work is forthcoming, and will see the light of day over the coming months or years: these are exciting times in Simonidean studies. Andrej Petrovič’s study of Simonidean epigrams will soon be published. Orlando Poltera is working on a commentary on the melic fragments. David Sider and Ettore Cingano are planning the first full single-author edition of Simonides since Schneidewin’s in 1835, with commentary. It may be suspected and hoped that work of the rigour and brilliance of some recent work on Pindaric fragments (one thinks especially of GiovanBattista D’Alessio and Ian Rutherford) might find equivalent scope in the melic papyrological fragments of Simonides, which, with some notable exceptions, have been comparatively neglected. It is in any case a pleasure to see much space for further study, before resorting to the conventional prayer that we may continue to hope for more from the papyri.

---

<sup>26</sup> e.g., Fowler 1995, 260. Scepticism such as Fowler’s about the legitimacy of such confining of interpretation is legitimate; and deliberate closing of a particular interpretative avenue can sometimes have something of the feeling of “do not think of an elephant!”

<sup>27</sup> Of course, our responses to allusion and/or intertextuality do not happen in a vacuum either; if we read the words “coffee spoons” in a slim Faber volume we will be more likely to think of Prufrock than if we read the same words in a John Lewis catalogue, or even if we read them in a Jeffrey Archer novel, since our response is conditioned by issues of context, genre and canonicity.

## Chapter 1

### The Pan-Hellenic Poet: Simonides on Plataea

#### 1. Introduction

This chapter is an analysis of the “Plataea Elegy” of Simonides. This is studied from the point of view of its allusive relation to the Homeric *Iliad* and its use of this text to create a new model of Hellenic identity. Simonides is seen creating a rôle for himself as a pan-Hellenic Homer for our times, at the same time as his reception of and allusion to Homer remodels the earlier text to make it into the explicitly pro-Hellenic and pan-Hellenic model which his own construction requires.

There are particular problems which immediately impose themselves upon the interpreter of a text or group of texts such as those which are here supposed to constitute the fragments of Simonides’ “Plataea Elegy.” The most obvious is the fragmentary state of the texts. The peculiar opening to a recent paper on the works of an author who has now become a ‘papyrological poet’ first waxes lyrical on the possibilities offered by the discovery of books produced in antiquity, before adding a significant *caveat*:

La papyrologie, mes ami(e)s, est un élixir, un élixir de vie, qui contrecarre à merveille les ravages du temps. Comme dans un rêve, sa magie nous transporte, à travers les siècles, dans un monde disparu, d’où surgit une réalité nouvelle. *Mais* cette réalité est souvent disloquée, lacuneuse et fragmentaire.<sup>1</sup>

The problems of dislocations, lacunae and the generally fragmentary nature common to many papyrus texts are perhaps even greater in Simonides’ elegy on the battle of Plataea than they are, for the most part, in the magnificent Posidippus papyrus on which Austin is commenting.<sup>2</sup> The texts provided by the overlaps of two papyri (that is to say, two sets each comprising several papyrus pieces believed to be from the same roll) with each other and with quotations from the indirect tradition are very fragmentary; in the longest of the new

---

<sup>1</sup> Austin 2002, 126 (my italics).

<sup>2</sup> Bastianini and Gallazzi 2001; editio minor: Austin and Bastianini 2002.

fragments in terms of number of lines of which something is preserved, fr.11,<sup>3</sup> there is no complete verse surviving. Usually we have at most half of a line, and the fact that scholars have succeeded in restoring plausibly in many places<sup>4</sup> should not allow us to forget that much of this supplementation is highly conjectural.<sup>5</sup> However, the fragmentary nature of the texts as preserved should not scare us off; we must still try to find the best ways of thinking and speaking about Simonides' poems rather than rejecting the new material on account of its difficulties. In what follows, the shifting sands of other people's supplements are on occasion used as foundations for arguments. This makes these arguments speculative, but not thereby invalid. It has not always seemed appropriate to clutter the prose with frequent iterations of the word "perhaps."

Some theoretical issues concerning how to discuss allusion and intertextuality have been discussed above, in the Introduction. Here we may note that, if one discusses issues connected with allusion and intertextuality in the present poem, one runs into more problems of textual survival, similar to those described above, but associated with the possible intertexts of Simonides' elegy. Even if it were possible to make a complete description of the allusive and/or intertextual properties of a poem written yesterday (which it would not be), this is certainly not available to us in the case of Simonides, because much of what was available to him and to his audience is lost to us. There are accordingly some glaring omissions in what follows. Perhaps most notable is that the post-Homeric *Cypria* is discussed very little, an epic poem which certainly contained the Judgement of Paris (which I shall discuss below) as an integral part of its main narrative. This poem was known to Simonides and his audience,<sup>6</sup> and it is likely that, if it were

---

<sup>3</sup> All numerations are from West, *IEG*.

<sup>4</sup> Martin West has led the way: see the text of fr.11 reconstructed according to his suggestions at Boedeker and Sider 2001, 27-8, and cf. West 1993a, a work of bold and speculative reconstruction which begins, memorably, with the sentence "*Redivivus* is not a word to be brought out and batted around every time a few more shreds of an ancient writer come to light." See also West's translations of the new material at West 1993b.

<sup>5</sup> cf. Parsons 2001, 60-2.

<sup>6</sup> West 2003, 13 states that the epic "can hardly be earlier than the second half of the sixth century"; whatever the true circumstances of its composition, its author had already become 'mythologised' as Homer by Pindar's time, if Aelian's testimony is correct (the first testimonium in West 2003: Ael. *VH* 9.15 = Pindar fr. 265 M). Is it therefore possible that Simonides might have believed a poem composed during his own lifetime to be by the poet of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*? If we can infer from the confusing evidence concerning the so-called 'Peisistratid recension' that pan-Athenaic recitations (and the education of Athenian noblemen?) concerned specifically the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, then perhaps Simonides and his audience will already have been putting the two

known to us other than from the second-hand summary of Proclus and a few fragments, we might perceive all sorts of interesting connections between its treatment of the beginnings and causes of the conflict and Simonides'.<sup>7</sup> However, the type of detailed examination which is aimed for here is clearly not possible,<sup>8</sup> and accordingly has not been attempted.

## 2. Simonides' elegies on the Persian Wars

A satisfying thing about the fragments of Simonidean elegy which were first published in 1992<sup>9</sup> is that their appearance substantially confirmed the arguments made in an article by E. Bowie,<sup>10</sup> in which he persuasively argued for a two-fold division of archaic elegy into smaller, sympotic pieces (such as we find in Theognis and the Theognidea) on the one hand, and on the other larger pieces, containing historical narrative and intended for performance at large festival gatherings. Thus, for example, Mimnermus' book known as the *Nanno* will have been a collection of sympotic elegies, presumably including erotic pieces on the woman of the same name; his *Smyrneis* was a historical poem on the city of Smyrna, and probably contained direct speech and began with 'mythical' history (a modern distinction, as Bowie points out).<sup>11</sup> In at least two cases, that of

---

epics which we have into a different mental box from the 'cyclic' epics. For Kyriakou 2004, 226, Simonides "glosses over" "non-Homeric" Trojan war poetry: but this is only the case if we suppose that for Simonides as for us "Homer" meant the two big poems only.

<sup>7</sup> cf. Gantz 1993, 567-8, *EGF* pp.30-32 (Proclus' summary).

<sup>8</sup> It is possible that fr. 4-5 *EGF* could come from shortly before the Judgement (Aphrodite beautifies herself).

<sup>9</sup> West *IEG*<sup>2</sup>; Parsons 1992a (the transcript by Parsons had been made available to West before its papyrological publication and the two hit the shelves more or less simultaneously: cf. Parsons 2001, 60 with n.41). The fact that *P.Oxy.* 3965 contained overlaps with the quotation tradition in and with *P.Oxy.* 2327 such as to fix both as being by Simonides was first advertised by Lobel 1981. A cautious partial text of fr. 11, 13, 14, 15-17 *W* with translations and historical notes is given at Flower and Marincola 2002, 315-19.

<sup>10</sup> Bowie 1986, responding to and improving on the account in West 1974. For a study of elegy and genre from the archaic to Hellenistic periods, see Barbantani 2001, 3-31; for a vastly more detailed study of elegy and genre with regard to the present texts, see Kowerski 2005, chapter 3. Kowerski is a "lumper" rather than a "splitter" and pushes for considering all elegy together: but in terms of length alone, there is surely a point where elegies become unsuitable for symposia and require another place of first performance, and this was surely to some extent constitutive of genre; however, he does well to react sceptically to Bowie's treatment of the relationship between elegy and mourning (cf. Aloni 2001, *passim*).

<sup>11</sup> Bowie 1986, 28-30. Presumably the book division happened after Mimnermus' time, and the elegies cannot have been composed to follow one after another, as in Callimachus' *Aetia*. If it is correct a) to identify an allusion to the two books of Mimnermus at Call. fr.1.11-12 *Pf.* and b) to read the allusion as indicating some sort of parallelism between what Callimachus read in

Semonides of Amorgus' 'Archaeology of the Samians' and Xenophanes' 'Foundation of Colophon', it would appear that such an elegy could be long enough to be divided into two books. Further, if Panyassis' 'Ionica' should be considered as elegiac, which it surely should (a poem of any length composed exclusively in pentameters is impossible to believe, at any rate in this period), we are told that it was as much as 7000 lines long.<sup>12</sup>

Before the emergence of the new material, we had evidence (in the *Suda* entry, σ439 Adler; *IEG*<sup>2</sup> ii.114) that Simonides had written in elegiacs concerning the sea battle at Artemisium; the same source states that the battle of Salamis was celebrated by Simonides in a melic poem. It had been suggested that the *Suda* had got these two the wrong way round, since we have a melic fragment concerning Artemisium (533 *PMG*); now it might be that Simonides wrote elegies concerning both battles.<sup>13</sup> In addition, it is possible that Aeschylus and Simonides were among the competitors for a similar elegy concerning the battle of Marathon (*Vita Aeschyli* p.332 Page OCT; *TGF* iii.33f; T15 Campbell). This could be taken as referring to epigram, but the anonymous author's comment about the light touch required by elegy (τὸ γὰρ ἐλεγεῖον πολὺ τῆς περὶ τὸ συμπαθὲς λεπτότητος μετέχειν θέλει "for elegy is preferably characterised by a gentleness directed towards pathos") seems to suggest elegy proper rather than epigram, and I am not aware that we have any evidence for competitions in epigram production.<sup>14</sup>

Now, with the evidence of new material, it seems reasonable to suppose that, in addition to the 'historical' elegies such as Mimnermus' *Smyrneis* etc., it was reasonably well established practice to commemorate battles in the Persian Wars (perhaps other battles too) with long elegies in which the events of the battles

---

Mimnermus' *Nanno* and what he intended in his own *Aetia*, then I suspect that the *Nanno* will have felt rather as Catullus feels to us: not quite a connective sequence (like the first two books of the *Aetia*) or an architecturally designed whole (like Vergil's *Eclogues*), but nevertheless somehow coherent and seeming to contain some continuity between as well as within poems.

<sup>12</sup> Bowie 1986, 32.

<sup>13</sup> cf. *IEG*<sup>2</sup> ii.114.

<sup>14</sup> West prints this testimonium *sine numero* under the heading "Incertum an ex epigrammatis," *IEG*<sup>2</sup> ii.136. Epigrams on Marathon attributed to Simonides (an attribution which may or may not be correct): *FGE* 'Simonides' 21, 22. On the *Vita Aeschyli* testimonium, cf. Obbink 2001, 79. Lefkowitz 1981, 71 implicitly questions the historicity of this contest; but it may be that the fiction represented in the *Vita* consists only of the allegation that Aeschylus' defeat in the contest was the reason for his departure from Athens, rather than that it happened at all. Cf. Barbantani 2001, 15.

were recounted. This type of elegy should be regarded as a sub-species of the long elegy identified by Bowie. Accordingly, the evidence seems not to bear out the views of the scholar who described the Plataea elegy as an “anomaly,” stating that “the Plataea elegy is unique, for it does not treat the events of a single city and the more distant past.”<sup>15</sup> The evidence seems to me to suggest that the performance of this sort of elegy to commemorate a recent battle was by no means unheard of; Simonides had already composed elegies like this more than once. It may be closer to the mark to comment that the pan-Hellenism of the elegy was a special case; this is a function of the greater amount of co-operation between Greek *poleis* which fought at Plataea, and suggests performance in a pan-Hellenic context.<sup>16</sup>

In what follows concerning the ‘Platea elegy,’ it is assumed that the object of enquiry, in particular fr.11 W, represents just that: the remains of a ‘Platea elegy,’ as had been supposed in the *editio princeps* and in the edition by M.L. West,<sup>17</sup> and most subsequent scholarship. Since this chapter was written, however, I have become aware of the work of Lawrence M. Kowerski, first (thanks to the assistance of David Sider and of Kowerski himself) as PhD dissertation and advance sight of his book, and now in the form of the book itself.<sup>18</sup> It is now no longer possible simply to assume that the ‘Plataea elegy’ (or, *mutatis mutandis*, the ‘Salamis elegy,’ the ‘sea battle at Artemisium,’ etc.) is to be identified as such a composition, since in a thorough study of the question how to reconcile the new material with the previous testimonia for Simonides’ compositions concerning the Persian Wars, Kowerski has concluded that the material from the new papyrus, including fr.11, probably represents fragments of a single composition in which multiple battles were treated. Elsewhere I have attempted to describe and to some extent to assess Kowerski’s book in a review,<sup>19</sup> but it is appropriate to consider Kowerski’s argument here at slightly greater length.

---

<sup>15</sup> Stehle 2001, 106.

<sup>16</sup> In any case, it seems unnecessary for Stehle to present the Plataea elegy as anomalous for the rest of her argument to hold; metapoetical mapping out of the rôle of the poet can happen in well-established genres as well as new ones, and needs no special generic anomaly to explain it. A brief exploration of explicit reference to Homer in Pindar (below) may help to illustrate this. Issues to do with pan-Hellenism will be discussed further below.

<sup>17</sup> See Parsons 1992a, 6; *IEG*<sup>2</sup>, ii.118 “De proelio Plataico;” Gentili and Prato 2002, ii.193.

<sup>18</sup> Kowerski 2005.

<sup>19</sup> Rawles forthcoming, 2006.

The problems are not uncommon ones, and may be briefly summed up as follows. Our information about Simonides' elegiac commemoration of the Persian Wars is derived from ancient testimonia (some with quotations) and from the evidence of the papyrus fragments. The ancient testimonia are frequently late, and are often of the sort where we might expect to find confusion, corruption or both, especially as a consequence of the nature of the processes by which they have been transmitted or compiled (especially with the *Suda* entry and with scholia). The papyri are regularly fragmentary and difficult to read, so that sometimes sense may only be obtained from them through speculative supplementation or through choosing readings of ink which are not the only possibilities. These factors are well stressed by Kowerski.<sup>20</sup> It may reasonably be conceded that a very strong degree of certainty on some of the questions addressed by Kowerski is likely to be unattainable:<sup>21</sup> we are in the realm, therefore, of relative probabilities.

We shall therefore consider Kowerski's arguments concerning the identification of particular supposed poems among the fragments and testimonia and the relative merits of his alternative model for the combination of the evidence.

For the 'Battle of Artemisium,' the testimonia are the *Suda* and Priscian.<sup>22</sup> The former tells us that Simonides celebrated the battle of Artemisium in elegiacs but the battle of Salamis in melic metre, while the latter quotes from a melic poem which he identifies as "Simonides in ἐπὶ Ἀρτεμίδῳ ναυμαχίαι." The inference had been drawn that the *Suda* had transposed the metres.<sup>23</sup> However, both Parsons and West have now proposed that there was in fact an elegiac poem on Artemisium, and that Simonides commemorated the same battle twice.<sup>24</sup> West gathers four fragments (his fr. 1-4). The first is a scholion on Apollonius of Rhodes: Simonides mentioned Skiathos in some unidentified poem. As Kowerski comments, this does not help us to identify anything about the metrical form of any poem about Artemisium, though it gives a slightly misleading impression to

---

<sup>20</sup> Kowerski 2005. The *Suda* and its sources: Introduction, *passim*; the difficulties of the papyri: chapter 1, *passim*.

<sup>21</sup> And since the problems addressed by Kowerski are foundational and concerned with the basic nature and subject matter of the poems, it follows that other, more interpretative arguments will to some extent share in this uncertainty, albeit to varying degrees.

<sup>22</sup> See *IEG*<sup>2</sup>, ii.114; 533 *PMG*.

<sup>23</sup> Bergk, *PLG* iii.423-4.

<sup>24</sup> Parsons 1992a, 6; Simonides fr. 1-4 W.



write that “The reference is understood to be to the ‘Artemisium poem’ because the island is also mentioned by Herodotus in his account of Artemisium.”<sup>25</sup> Looking at a map would suggest the same conclusion independently of Herodotus.<sup>26</sup>

As Kowerski suggests, there is no reason to feel any degree of confidence that fr.2 (*P.Oxy.* 3965 fr.13) is from an Artemisium poem; fr.4 seems to come from the same column as fr.3, but by virtue of its own content need not refer to one sea battle rather than another.

Fr. 3 (*P.Oxy.* 3965 fr.20) is the crux. Here the critical question is whether it is legitimate to read κάλαϊ[ν at fr. 3.5, which in turn suggests the supplement Ζήτην καὶ] Κάλαϊ[ν, suggested by Parsons and printed by West, which would correspond to the invocation of Zetes and Kalais (the children of Boreas) before the battle recorded by Herodotus and connected by a scholion on Apollonius of Rhodes with a poem of Simonides which the scholiast refers to with the phrase ἐν τῇ Ναυμαχίαι.<sup>27</sup> While it would not be impossible for Simonides’ mention to have been in some other poem about a sea battle,<sup>28</sup> this would seem a strong reason to suppose a) that Simonides composed a poem in which he referred to Zetes and Kalais, as recorded by the scholiast, b) that he did so in the context of recording a sea battle, c) that this sea battle was the one at Artemisium, where Herodotus tells us that Zetes and Kalais were invoked, and d) that the elegiac fr.3 W is from the same poem. The phrase “strong reason” is used rather than “certainty” – but such a strong reason might seem as good as we are likely to get. Is the reading κάλαϊ[ν then correct? It cannot be called certain. *Pace* Kowerski, the initial κ seems unproblematic.<sup>29</sup> Most interesting are a) the fact that the first α is accented in the papyrus and b) the fact that the probable ι which is the last visible letter appears to have traces of a supralinear mark which is likely (though not certain) to be a diaeresis. The accentuation is suggestive of a word where the

<sup>25</sup> Kowerski 2005, 25.

<sup>26</sup> Skiathos lies about eight miles away from the northern tip of Euboea, so it would seem likely that it might have played a part in the battle and that a poem treating the battle might well have mentioned it. The island was not known for very much else.

<sup>27</sup> Hdt. 7.189, Σ A.R. 1.211-215c Wendel, quoted at *IEG*<sup>2</sup> ii.116.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. the sceptical treatment at Kowerski 2005, 24.

<sup>29</sup> Kowerski 2005, 29: “it must be admitted that ]ϵ is also a possible reading.” By my reading of the photographs, this seems not to be so: at the very least, I would say that ]κ was very much more likely.

reader is seen as wanting help (the scribe uses accents only exceptionally), and the diaeresis if read would clearly be suggestive of the proper name. A scholar need not be unnecessarily prone to credulity to find good reason to suppose that the fragment does indeed treat Artemisium; certainty is not available.

The scholiast to Apollonius might of course be confused or imprecise, but given the attribution to Simonides ἐν τῇ Ναυμαχίᾳ (i.e., the use of the singular) and the evidence of Herodotus the most natural assumption would be that this poem concerned the battle of Artemisium specifically, so that it could reasonably be thought of as “the Artemisium elegy.” Kowerski concludes that there remains “considerable doubt that Simonides composed a separate elegy solely on Artemisium that is represented in the ‘new Simonides.’”<sup>30</sup> We may conclude that, while this is true in the sense that the reasoning of the first editors might be false or vulnerable to the possibility of re-evaluation in the light of new evidence, the answer to the question “what is the most plausible way in which to make sense of the available data?” points in a more positive direction.

The question of the ‘Salamis poem’ is more murky.<sup>31</sup> The testimonia are the *Suda* entry, the Ambrosian Life of Pindar (i.2.21 Drachmann) and a passage from Plutarch’s *Life of Themistocles* (15.4 = Simonides fr.5 W). The combination of the *Suda* entry and the *Vita Pindari* strongly suggest that a poem existed to which one could reasonably refer as “the Salamis poem.”<sup>32</sup>

*Suda* σ439 Adler: καὶ γέγραπται αὐτῷ... ἡ ἐπ. Ἀρτεμισίῳ ναυμαχία, δι' ἐλεγείας· ἡ δ' ἐν Καλαμῖνι μελικῶς

And he wrote... “the Sea Battle at Artemisium” in elegiacs, and “the Sea Battle at Salamis” in melic metre.

*Vita Pindari Ambrosiana* 1.2.21 Drachmann: καὶ γὰρ Σιμωνίδης τὴν ἐν Καλαμῖνι ναυμαχίαν γέγραφε, καὶ Πίνδαρος μέμνηται τῆς Κάδμου βασιλείας.

---

<sup>30</sup> Kowerski 2005, 33.

<sup>31</sup> Kowerski 2005, 33-9.

<sup>32</sup> Despite Kowerski’s scepticism, where he suggests that “at most... each of these witnesses only informs us that Simonides mentioned the battle of Salamis in some poetic context.” In fact, as Kowerski previously conceded, the Ambrosian Life of Pindar clearly presupposes a Simonidean poem whose main emphasis is on this battle: Kowerski 2005, 34.

For example [the point is chronology: the author of the *Vita* is arguing that Pindar and Simonides were contemporaries], Simonides wrote on the sea battle at Salamis, and Pindar mentions the reign of Cadmus [sc. of Cos; cf. Hdt. 7.163f.].

As Kowerski has shown, γέγραφε in the *Vita* is likely to describe the principal subject matter of the poem.<sup>33</sup> The question whether this poem was elegiac or melic is uncertain, and depends on how to correct a part of the *Suda* which is likely to be muddled, corrupt or both: as Kowerski is right to argue, we cannot feel a very great degree of confidence in the question whether any of our elegiac fragments corresponds to this battle rather than to some other sea battle. The most reasonable conclusion is that Simonides composed at least one poem which was specifically if not exclusively concerned with Salamis, but that we know almost nothing about it.

We turn therefore to the question of the 'Plataea elegy.' As Kowerski has noted, there is no explicit testimonium for such a poem from ancient sources. He further notes that, before the overlap from *P.Oxy.* 3965, the quotations from Plutarch's polemic against Herodotus had been seen as possibly deriving from epigram.<sup>34</sup>

Kowerski first questions the extent to which the poem represented by fr.11 W and probably also by fr.15-16 W focuses on the Spartans and the extent to which it might also have included passages paying more attention to other *poleis*, a tricky question because of the poor state of survival of certain pertinent verses, although of course as soon as we believe (as seems reasonable though not absolutely certain) that fr.15-16 are from the same poem as fr.11, we can see that the Corinthians were praised to a fairly great extent. From the likelihood that the poem represented by fr.11 W treated the achievements of several *poleis*, he continues to suggest that it is therefore possible that this poem also treated other battles. This is indeed possible; one may, however, note that there is not a single piece of evidence for it. We have no reason at all to suppose that any *polis* is mentioned which was *not* a participant at Plataea. In fact, the three which we find – Sparta, probably Athens, certainly Megara – are the very same which were

---

<sup>33</sup> Kowerski 2005, 34.

<sup>34</sup> Kowerski 2005, 39-40; Plut. *de mal. Hdt.* 872d = Simonides fr. 15-16 W, printed in the first edition of *IEG* as "Incertum an ex epigrammatis."

named first on the ‘Serpent Column’ which especially commemorated the battle at Plataea, as Kowerski himself observes.<sup>35</sup> West’s fr.11 is clearly concerned with Plataea, as the prominent position accorded to Pausanias of Sparta makes clear. So was the passage of Simonides from which fr.15 and 16 were quoted by Plutarch. It is reasonable to suppose, if not fully certain, that given the overlap in fr.16 between the Plutarch quotation and *P.Oxy.* 3965 fr.5 these come from the same poem treating Plataea. Kowerski’s objection to the construction of this ‘Plataea Elegy’ is that there is no reason to be confident that this poem was specifically concerned with Plataea, rather than treating Plataea as one among many battles. The most obvious retort is that Kowerski’s argument entails a move from the imperfectly known (what we can see in fragmentary form) to the totally unknown (whatever else we cannot see). Of course, Kowerski could (entirely correctly) respond that this is an area where there is inherently a lot of “unknown” about, and that we do well not to ignore it. After all, the parts of the poem which we do not have are in a sense unknown by definition; but it is equally certainly known that the parts which we do have do not constitute the whole.

It is appropriate, therefore, to examine briefly the question whether a poem treating Plataea specifically or a poem treating multiple battles seems a more likely context for the verses which we find in fr.11 (and, ideally, fr.15-16). We can consider this in two ways. Firstly, which of the two options seems to cohere better with our other evidence for the contemporary and near-contemporary commemoration of the battles of the Persian Wars in verse? Secondly, which is the more likely conclusion from the evidence of the content, structure and rhetoric visible in the fragments themselves? Kowerski considers the first of these questions extensively, but the second rather less.<sup>36</sup>

With regard to the first question, it is essential first to observe that “pan-Hellenism,” defined by Kowerski as “a notion of community among Greek cities derived from a shared sense of Hellenic identity,” is in no respect antithetical to the assertion of hegemony in Greece by either an individual or a single *polis*. It is

---

<sup>35</sup> Kowerski 2005, 48.

<sup>36</sup> Kowerski 2005 ch. 2 argues on the basis of comparison with other texts that the poem represented by fr.11 is likely to have been pan-Hellenic in perspective and to have treated multiple battles in the same composition.

entirely possible – indeed, it happened – for an individual such as Pausanias of Sparta or for a *polis* such as (most obviously) Sparta or Athens to assert leadership in a pan-Hellenic context as a claim to hegemony in the Greek world.<sup>37</sup> It follows that the identification of elements of pan-Hellenic ideology in the fragments is no pointer towards the idea that the poems represented by the fragments treated the Greek *poleis* or the battles in which they participated equally. Also the link between treating *poleis* as equal and undifferentiated members of a pan-Hellenic community and treating battles together and equally is false. In the end, it is not *a priori* to diminish the fact that many battles and many *poleis* were felt to be important to commemorate either one battle or one *polis* especially or exclusively in any given text (a poem commemorating the Somme does not *ipso facto* diminish the importance of Verdun – though of course it *might* do so). It follows that in order to argue on contextual or *a priori* grounds for the poem represented by fr. 11 as a poem commemorating multiple battles together, it is not legitimate to argue from the prevalence of pan-Hellenic ideology in the early fifth century, or from the awareness in the early fifth century that the Persian Wars were won through more than one battle. Rather, it ought to be argued that the regular way in which to commemorate the battles of the Persian Wars in poems was together rather than (at any rate, more than or to a similar extent as) separately. Finally, we may note that it would seem natural to assign more importance (with regard to the poem represented by fr. 11) to commemoration which seems closer to Simonides' poem in generic and other respects than to commemoration of very different kinds such as the narrative of Herodotus. It will not be adequate to treat all of these together as evidence for a general flavour or ideological climate, since as is clear from Kowerski's valuable treatment of literary responses to the Persian Wars a general awareness of pan-Hellenism was manifested in very different ways in different texts,<sup>38</sup> and still less (as outlined above) will it be appropriate to

---

<sup>37</sup> I argue below (section 1.5) that the poem was marked by strong emphasis on the achievements of Sparta and specifically Pausanias, and used these achievements to support Pausanias' claims to pan-Hellenic leadership.

<sup>38</sup> Thus, by Kowerski's argument, Aeschylus' *Persae* is marked by Athenocentrism but "does not completely mask the view of the Persian Wars as a panhellenic effort" (Kowerski 2005, 84). Herodotus melds together views emphasising collective effort and views emphasising the individual exploits of different cities (Kowerski 2005, 85-6), epigrams sometimes commemorate the fighters of various battles collectively, but may also be seen commemorating Pausanias as an individual leader (Kowerski 2005, 78-9). The conclusion of varying responses to panhellenism which is drawn here is not the one drawn by Kowerski; rather (Kowerski 2005, 86) he concludes

move from such an impression of ideological climate to an answer to the separable question whether a poem treated one battle or more than one battle.

Thus, while the fact that Aeschylus' *Persians* is willing to refer in laudatory terms to the victory at Plataea<sup>39</sup> is interesting and suggestive, it does not push us in any particular direction in the present inquiry concerning the content of the poem represented by fr.11. It suggests a general awareness of the Persian Wars as a pan-Hellenic effort in which individual cities' contributions could be singled out and emphasised, but it does not tell us or suggest anything about how such a possible attitude might be manifest in the elegies of Simonides. The same goes, naturally, for Herodotus' account.<sup>40</sup>

The epigrammatic record might seem more promising: generically perhaps closer to the longer elegies with which we are here concerned, and similar to a picture which one might imagine for the longer elegies, in that they seem likely to be (most characteristically) public and commemorative responses to recent events, without being removed so far from the elegies as Aeschylus' *Persae* is by virtue of its dramatic form and Herodotus by virtue of its surely much greater compass, scope and length (and its temporal distance from the events described). Kowerski provides an appendix in which he presents the known epigrams commemorating the Persian Wars.<sup>41</sup> In the conclusion to his second chapter, he writes that "The evidence of Herodotus, Aeschylus' *Persae* and the epigrammatic record has also suggested that we should expect fr.11 W<sup>2</sup> to represent a poem with a multi-battle perspective."<sup>42</sup> The dangers of extrapolating in this manner have already been stated. To what extent is in fact true that the epigrammatic record does in fact point in this direction? In Kowerski's collection of epigrams we find in fact a wide variety (I disregard for the moment the question whether these all date back to the early fifth century; of course, many of them certainly do). Some commemorate individuals as epitaphic monuments, as for instance Simonides'

---

that an underlying shared panhellenism in these varied sources should lead us to seek a reconstruction of the Simonidean elegy which does not privilege a single battle or community.

<sup>39</sup> A. *Persae* 817.

<sup>40</sup> It need not be stressed that this does not make Kowerski's account of varying literary responses to the Persian Wars a waste of time; it is on the contrary an interesting and helpful survey. The point being made here is the dangers of extrapolating from this survey to particular questions about the make-up of the elegies of Simonides.

<sup>41</sup> Kowerski 2005, 151-60.

<sup>42</sup> Kowerski 2005, 106.

epitaph for Megistias.<sup>43</sup> Some perform the same function for the collective dead of different individual *poleis* or regions, as the epigram for the Athenians who died at Marathon, for the Corinthians who died at Salamis, for the fighters “from the Peloponnese” at Thermopylae and others.<sup>44</sup> Some especially commemorate individual leaders’ rôles, as in the cases of both Leonidas and Pausanias.<sup>45</sup> Some seem to commemorate the wars in general rather than particular battles; the distinction is not always clear.<sup>46</sup>

It would seem obvious that what Kowerski’s argument in fact requires is a tradition of epigrams commemorating multiple battles. Among the thirty-three epigrams collected by Kowerski there is one: an epigram from Megara attributed to Simonides, which begins with the general statement that the speaking warriors died while protecting freedom “for Hellas and the Megarians,” and then lists the battles in which they took part.<sup>47</sup> A number of observations may be made. Firstly, while it acknowledges that the Megarian dead were fighting “for Hellas and the Megarians,” the epigram does not in fact instantiate the association between the treatment of multiple battles and the treatment of multiple cities for which Kowerski argues.<sup>48</sup> Rather, the point seems to be specifically that *Megarians* fought in all of these battles: the poem is concerned with emphasising their particular contribution. Secondly, the poem is exceptional and cannot be treated as normative. It is a one-off both in its providing a list of battles and in the (obviously related) fact of its length. It is tempting to go further and suggest that the Megarian epigram is the exception that proves the rule: with this single exception, where epigrams mention or refer to individual battles, the number of battles is one. Thirdly, this epigram is a weak case on which to rely for another reason: it is known only from an inscription “not earlier than the fourth century

---

<sup>43</sup> Simonides *FGE* 6 = no. 7 Kowerski.

<sup>44</sup> ‘Simonides’ *FGE* 21 = no.1 Kowerski; ‘Simonides’ 11 *FGE* = no.13 Kowerski; ‘Simonides’ *FGE* 22a = no. 5 Kowerski.

<sup>45</sup> ‘Simonides’ *FGE* 7 = no. 10 Kowerski; ‘Simonides’ *FGE* 39 = no. 19 Kowerski; ‘Simonides’ *FGE* 17a = no. 21 Kowerski.

<sup>46</sup> ‘Simonides’ *FGE* 17b = no. 22 Kowerski; ‘Simonides’ *FGE* 14 = no. 24 Kowerski; quite a few borderline examples, where if we knew an archaeological context we might choose to associate the epigrams with specific battles which are not named in the text and may not have needed to be. Epigrams which would have been read initially as commemorating Plataea may have been interpreted later as now as commemorating the wars in general: it need not have been immediately evident that Plataea was the last major battle on mainland Greece.

<sup>47</sup> ‘Simonides’ *FGE* 16 = no. 23 Kowerski.

<sup>48</sup> Kowerski 2005, 95, 106-7.

AD.”<sup>49</sup> The inscription contains the epigram with prose before and after it, informing us that it was set up by one Helladius to replace a previous epigram “destroyed by time.” It is at the very least possible to imagine that the combination of the anomalous length and content of the epigram, combined with its provenance from this late inscription, might indicate that it does not in fact date – or does not *all* date – from the fifth century BC. The solution of Wilhelm was to posit, not implausibly, that the initial couplet, which could make a very likely epigram by itself, had been expanded in the course of subsequent tradition.<sup>50</sup> Page’s defence, as mentioned above, involves a not altogether convincing appeal to the unknown: “An Athenian would have been briefer; a Megarian might (for all we know) express himself more fully, reassuring his countrymen that their city had played a more notable part in the Persian War than the Hellenes generally supposed.”<sup>51</sup> This might of course be correct: perhaps the epigram is just unusually long, but still from the early fifth century BC. In any case, it will be seen that even allowing for the authentic fifth century BC origin of this epigram, it is hard to agree with Kowerski that the epigrammatic record should lead us to expect that multiple battles will be treated together. The problem seems to lie in Kowerski’s apparent (though not clearly stated) assumption that pan-Hellenism at the level of ideology, as visible in epigram through claims that the dead commemorated were fighting to preserve the freedom of all Greece or the like, ought to be reflected in explicit reference to more than one of the battles against the Persians in Simonides’ longer elegies. On the basis of the epigrams which we have, it seems apparent that pan-Hellenic ideology need not be so reflected, and we can see that in the one epigram which we do have commemorating multiple battles the purpose does not seem to be to commemorate the contributions of multiple *poleis* in a spirit of pan-Hellenic inclusiveness but rather to emphasise the extent of the participation of Megara specifically. I therefore see no reason to agree that the epigrammatic record

---

<sup>49</sup> *FGE* ad loc. (213). The inscription is *IG* vii.53.

<sup>50</sup> Wilhelm 1972 [1899], 314.

<sup>51</sup> *FGE* ad loc. (214). The only other Persian Wars epigram which presents itself in a length of more than two couplets is ‘Simonides’ *FGE* 12, which is given in three couplets at Aristides *Or.* 28.65. The first couplet, however, is presented by itself as a complete epigram at *AP* 7.250 and *Plut. de mal. Hdt.* 870c, and the inference is clear: an epigram of one couplet has been expanded in subsequent transmission before the time of Aristides (see Page, *FGE* ad loc.; Wilhelm 1972 [1899], 321-2).



supports the idea that the elegy represented by fr.11 W ought to have commemorated multiple battles.

In the light of the discussion above, we may further ask another comparative question: is the evidence that Simonides' longer elegies generally were predominantly concerned with single or multiple battles? In the absence of more than scraps from the poems themselves, we cannot say very much on this matter: no fragment certainly treats more than one battle, but given the size and state of the fragments, nothing can be deduced from this. However, we are not without evidence altogether. Allowing for the fact that our evidence is partial, sometimes derived from corrupt sources, regularly derived from second-hand sources which need not be drawing on direct acquaintance with the poems, and in general less than we might hope for, it is in fact consistent on this matter. Frequently, sources refer to Simonides' commemoration of the Persian Wars in such a way that it is not clear how what they perceive as the principal content or subject matter of the poems concerned. This is the case, for instance, where Plutarch quotes from (probably) the same elegy as the one from which we have fr.11.<sup>52</sup> When, however, they do refer to Simonides' compositions on the Persian Wars in such a way as indicates whether they perceive them as treating one battle or many, the answer is always the same: while there are some sources which clearly believe in the existence of poems chiefly or exclusively to be associated with single battles, there is none which suggests the idea that Simonides might have composed poems in which he treated multiple battles together. Thus the "Sea Battle at Artemisium" is used to denote a poem by the *Suda*, and it appears that a scholion to Apollonius of Rhodes refers to the same poem as "the sea battle" (ἐν τῇ Ναυμαχίαι),<sup>53</sup> which, while vague, is clearly to be understood as a poem about *one* battle. Again, the same *Suda* entry refers to the "Sea Battle at Salamis" as a way of designating a poem, and the Ambrosian *Life of Pindar*, stating that Simonides "described the sea-battle at Salamis" (τὴν ἐν Καλαμῶνι ναυμαχίαν γέγραφε), seems, as the parallels for the expression gathered by Kowerski

<sup>52</sup> Simonides frs.15-16 W = Plut. *de Hdt. mal.* 872d. Plutarch does in fact here seem to be making a comment about generic distinctions between different poems, since he distinguishes ἐλεγεία from ᾠδα as part of his assertion that Simonides' is not a biased account of the battle. But it would not be possible to judge from this whether he considered that Simonides' poem treated one battle or many.

<sup>53</sup> *Suda* σ361.9 Adler (see *IEG*<sup>2</sup> ii.114); Σ A.R. 1.211-215c Wendel (see Simonides fr.3 W).

suggest, to give the same impression that this was the principal subject matter of the poem to which it referred.<sup>54</sup> It is entirely proper to be cautious about concluding too much from these sources, of which the *Suda* at any rate is clearly influenced by corruption or some other source of error. However, the general point is clear: where sources describe the subject matter of Simonides' Persian War poems, they refer to single battles. Never do we find, e.g., "as Simonides wrote in his poem 'on the war against the Persians.'" Despite the good reasons for treating these sources sceptically, it appears that, as regards the ancient testimonia, the movement to the idea of Simonidean Persian War poems treating multiple battles together is a movement from poor and partial evidence to no evidence at all.

From the point of view of external evidence, then, it seems more likely that the poem represented by fr.11 W was principally concerned with one battle: so far, we may feel justified in speaking of a "Plataea elegy." Internal evidence may be treated more briefly. This aspect of the question is less extensively treated by Kowerski, and his caution is to some extent appropriate: it is possible that the survival and reconstruction of fr. 11 W, which seems on the face of it a powerful witness to the structure of the poem from which it comes, creates a misleading impression. Here, a *proem* concerning the Trojan war is followed by reflection on the rôle of Homer and a hymnic address to Achilles before giving way to material initially concerning Pausanias and Sparta. Kowerski comments that "it is... uncertain whether the fragment is the opening of a poem or an internal prooimion."<sup>55</sup> The latter is not impossible. However, it need not seem particularly likely. The structure and content of fr.11 is considered further below. Here we may summarise. A Trojan section, treating Patroclus, Paris and Achilles and the fall of Troy, is followed by reflection upon the rôle of Homer in providing κλέος to the Danaans. A hymnic address to Achilles follows, and an invocation to the Muse, before the transition to the contemporary world. This cannot be seen as a general proem to a poem perceived as about the Persian Wars in general, since the move to the contemporary world is also a move

---

<sup>54</sup> The Ambrosian *Vita Pindari*: i.2.21 Drachmann. See Kowerski 2005, 34-5. This is especially the case where the *vita* goes on to say καὶ Πίνδαρος μέμνηται τῆς Κάδμου βασιλείας: there is a contrast between main subject matter (Simonides) and a simple mention (Pindar).

<sup>55</sup> Kowerski 2005, 86.

specifically to Sparta and then to the named Spartan Pausanias. The proem therefore introduces Plataea. If this was an internal proem, we should I suppose imagine that the surviving part was preceded by treatments of other battles. Yet it seems to me very unlikely that Simonides would really have narrated or described (as it might be) Salamis, then stopped, invoked the most central moments of the Trojan War, reflected upon the rôle of Homer in commemorating the same, addressed Achilles, appealed to the Muse and finally turned to Sparta and Pausanias, emphasising the parallel between Achilles and the latter by designating him ἄριςτος (u.33). Such a proem counts as “pulling all the stops out.” How was any previous battle introduced? (Could, e.g., Leonidas, Themistocles and Pausanias *all* have been ἄριςτοι in the same poem, and all introduced in such an expansive manner?) This sort of extensive proem seems to me the sort of thing which could fit into a poem only once, and even allowing for the fact that Plataea, as the final victory, might seem appropriate as a climax to the poem, it is hard to avoid believing that this treatment fitted into a poem as the introduction of the principal and most important subject matter. Even in a composition comparable in length to a substantial epic, such as to be spread across several books in a Hellenistic edition, it is hard not to believe that this grand and expansive introduction would be very disproportionate in a composition concerning multiple battles, unless the point was clearly to introduce the battle which was the main point and subject of the narrative. In a shorter composition (and however long it was, the elegy represented here surely fitted into one book), it is very difficult to believe that this proem introduces only one of many battles treated together. If other battles were mentioned, they must have occupied distinctly subordinate parts of the poem, while Plataea was the main point: and the present discussion is an argument that this is what Plataea was.

This is of course a dangerous line of argument. One should be sceptical of an argument which states, as I have suggested here, that “in these circumstances, Simonides *must have* done it this way,” firstly because our knowledge of the characteristic formal features of elegies such as the one represented by fr.11 W is very limited, and secondly because Simonides was doubtless more ingenious than the present interpreter and capable of being more surprising. Nevertheless, especially when the external evidence considered above is considered as well, it seems that the most probable way of interpreting the content of fr.11 W is as a

poem introducing the main subject matter of the poem of which it forms a part, and that this main subject matter was the battle at Plataea. Needless to say, it does not follow that other battles were not mentioned: who could deny the possibility of (e.g.) “the Athenians, glorying in their victory by sea” or, for that matter, “the men of Nisus’ city, excellent oarsmen in the straits before Salamis”?<sup>56</sup> This, however, would not contradict the view of the poem represented by fr.11 W as being predominantly concerned with the battle of Plataea, and reasonably describable as “the Plataea elegy,” which is the present contention.

### 3. Date and place

There is no explicit internal evidence and probably no external evidence as to the occasion of the poem’s first performance. It is possible that Plutarch’s statement<sup>57</sup> that Simonides’ elegy was not composed for Corinth is based on an independent tradition concerning its historical first performance, but it looks more as if Plutarch were in fact arguing from internal evidence only. Either way this is suggestive of performance in a pan-Hellenic context, either because Plutarch had external evidence to that effect, or (more likely) because it was reasonable for him, with a full text of the poem, to assert that it did not show signs of being composed for a particular *polis*. If Plutarch, who was interested in Delphi, knew of a tradition that the poem had been first performed there, he would most likely have said so. In fact, his language suggests that he does not have performance on his mind (ἄλλως δὲ τὰς πράξεις ἐκείνας ἐλεγεία γραφὼν ἱστορήκεν “but he simply recorded these achievements by *writing elegies*”).<sup>58</sup>

It seems most likely that the poem will have been performed in a festival context, and strong candidates include Delphi (at the same time as the dedication of the ‘Serpent Column’? see below) and the Eleutheria Festival at Plataea itself, if its existence may be back-dated into the years immediately after the battle.<sup>59</sup> In

---

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Kowerski 2005, 89-90 on the possibility that the Megarians were praised for their seamanship in the same poem from which we have fr.11 W.

<sup>57</sup> *de mal. Hdt.* 42 p.872d = Simonides fr.16W.

<sup>58</sup> See further below, section 1.5.

<sup>59</sup> Delphi suggested by Rutherford 2001, 41, promising more to come. For a guide to the many suggested occasions and places of publication (Thessaly, Eleutheria festival at Plataea, Olympia,

terms of date, however, we have a relatively short window, and there can be little doubt that the poem was composed at most a very few years after the battle. Pausanias, who appears in the poem in a very positive light, soon fell out of favour in Sparta and was accused of helotising and medising before the ephors eventually had him killed.<sup>60</sup> The poem's first performance occurred in the early 470s.

#### 4. The Plataea Elegy: outline

While the other fragments are not ignored, most of what follows will focus above all on fr.11 W, the largest and most important part of the new material:

fr. 11 W (= *POxy* 2327 fr. 5 + 6 + 27 col. i + *POxy* 3965 fr. 1 + 2):

πα[ι[...][...]  
 ἡ πίτυν ἐν βή[...]  
 ὑλοτόμοι τάμ[...]  
 πολλὸν δ' ἡρώ[...]  
 ]ος λαδ[...]  
 Πατρ[...]  
 οὐ δὴ τίς ἐδ[...]  
 ἀλλ' ὑπ' Ἀπόλλ[...]  
 ]...  
 Πρ[...]  
 εἶνεκ' Ἀλεξά[...]  
 ] θείης ἄρμα καθεῖλε δίκ[...]  
 5  
 10

etc.), v. Rutherford 2001, 40-1. See in particular Aloni 2001, *passim*. West 1993a does not refer to Bowie's important article on elegiac performance (Bowie 1986), and seems to skirt around the whole question: "... to be performed, as entertainment, in that setting in which elegy was usually performed, with aulos accompaniment." (5). Rutherford 2001, 40 considers that West means the symposium. This may be the case, but West 1974 seems willing to accept all sorts of situations for elegiac performance (e.g., in the agora for Solon's *Salamis*, on a ship for Archilochus fr.4 etc.) (West 1974, 10ff.). Perhaps unkindly, I suspect that the lack of clarity in West 1993a on this matter is a consequence of reluctance explicitly to acknowledge Bowie 1986, which refuted many of his earlier arguments.

<sup>60</sup> Pausanias' later life is related by Thucydides at I.128-135.1. The chronology is not entirely clear, but it seems unlikely that he would have been referred to in the terms in which Simonides refers to him here other than fairly shortly after the battle. See Hornblower 1991 ad loc., Lewis 1992, 100-101.

τοὶ δὲ πόλι]ν πέρσαντες ἀοίδιμον [οὔκαδ' ἵ]κοντο	
]ων ἀγέμαχοι Δαναοί[	
οἷσιν ἐπ' ἀθά]νατον κέχυται κλέος ἀν[δρὸς] ἔκητι	15
ὃς παρ' ἰοπ]λοκάμων δέξατο Πιερίδ[ων	
πάσαν ἀλη]θείην καὶ ἐπώνυμον ὅπ[λοτέρ]οισιν	
ποίης ἤμ]ιθέων ὠκύμορον γενεή[ν.	
ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲ]ν νῦν χαῖρε, θεᾶς ἐρικυ[δέος υἷέ	
κούρης εἶν]αλίου Νηρέος· αὐτὰρ ἐγώ [	20
κικλήσκω] σ' ἐπίκουρον ἐμοί, π[ολυνώνυμ]ε Μοῦσα,	
εἴ πέρ γ' ἀν]θρώπων εὐχομένω]ν μέλει·	
ἔντυνο]ν καὶ τόνδ[ε μελ]ίφρονα κ[όσμον ἀο]ιδῆς	
ἡμετ]έρης, ἵνα τις [μνή]σεται υ[	
ἀνδρῶ]ν, οἱ Σπάρτ[ηι	25
] ἀμυν[ ].. [	
]ω[	
οὐδ' ἄρε]τῆς ἐλάθ[οντο	
]ν οὐρανομ[ήκη]ς	
καὶ κλέος ἀ]νθρώπων [ἔσσετ]αι ἀθάνατον·	
οἱ μὲν ἄρ' Εὐ]ρώταν κα[ὶ Σπάρτ]ης ἄστυ λιπόντ[εσ	
ῶρμησαν ]Ζηνὸς παισὶ σὺν ἵπποδάμοις	30
Τυνδαρίδα]ις ἥρῳι καὶ εὐρυβίηι Μενελάω[ι	
πατ]ρώϊης ἡγεμόνες π[ό]λεος,	
τοὺς δ' υἱὸς θείοιο Κλεο]μβ[ρ]ότου ἔξ[α]γ' ἄριστ[οις	
]αγ. Πανσανίης.	
] καὶ ἐπικλέα ἔργα Κορίν[θου	35
] Τανταλίδεω Πέλοπος	
Ν]ίκου πόλιν, ἔνθα περ ὦλλοι	
]φῦλα περικτιόνων	
θεῶν τεράε]σσι πεποιθότες, οἱ δὲ σὺν[	
ἴκον. Ελευσίνοσ γῆς ἐ]ρατὸν πεδίο	40
Παν]δίονος ἐξε[λάσας]ντες	
μάν]τιος ἀντιθέου[	
]· σ δαμάσαντ[	
]· εἰδομεν[	
ὠ]νυμον α [	45

Struck... or a pine tree in the groves... the woodcutters chop it down... much...  
the army... of Patroclus... it was no mortal creature of a day that laid you low

by himself, but you were conquered struck by the hand of Apollo... Angry with the sons of Priam, on account of evil-minded Paris... the chariot of Justice destroyed... And they, having sacked the song-famed city, made their way home, ... the Danaan battle-leaders, upon whom immortal fame has been poured on account of that man who received all truthful renown from the violet-haired Pierian Muses, and made the short-lived race of demigods famous to men who came after. But hail to you now, son of the glorious goddess, of the daughter of Nereus of the sea! Now I call upon you, Muse of many names, as my ally, if you do care for the prayers of men. Put in order this well-tempered ornament of my song, so that somebody will remember... of the men, who from Sparta... the day of slavery... nor did they forget their excellence... high as heaven... and the glory of these men will be undying. Leaving the Eurotas and the city of Sparta they set out, with the Tyndarid heroes and wide-ruling Menelaus... the leaders of the homeland... and the son of godlike Cleombrotus led them, the best... Pausanias... and the renowned fields of Corinth... of Tantalid Pelops... Nisus' city, from which the others... the tribes of neighbours... having trusted the signs of the gods... and these... arrived at the lovely plain of the Eleusinian land... driving out from the land of Pandion... of the godlike seer... conquered...

It seems that the Plataea poem began with a hymn-like proem section, addressed to Achilles (fr. 10, 11).<sup>61</sup> At the end of this part is an explicit reference to Homer as provider of fame (κλέος); the transition from proem to the main part of the song employs the formulaic farewell to the laudandus of a hymn, using χαῖρε, followed by αὐτὰρ ἐγώ.<sup>62</sup> These would characteristically be followed by a verb of singing in a Homeric Hymn, performed before epic poetry. In the Plataea elegy, there follows an invocation of a Muse, and then the poet begins to narrate the march from Sparta towards Plataea. Of the other fragments, one (fr.13) may come from the battle narrative, or from the events immediately before the battle.

---

<sup>61</sup> The sequence of fr. in West is governed by the sequence in Hdt.; the order cannot be established from column sizes, fibres etc. NB that fr.11.1-4 (bottom of a column) need not be correctly placed in front of 5-45 (starting at the top of a column); if they come from later on in the poem, the 'Homeric' simile may go with the death of Mardonius or Masistius rather than that of Achilles (Lloyd-Jones 1994, 1-3).

<sup>62</sup> Cf. *h.Apollo* 545-6, *h.Hermes* 579-80, etc.

Another (fr.14) contains direct speech (14.3): ]εγω in the third line must represent either the pronoun or the end of a verb in the first person (λ]έγω West). It is plausibly considered by West<sup>63</sup> to contain Simonides' account of the prophecy of Tisamenos, the seer who, according to Herodotus,<sup>64</sup> warned the Greeks not to cross the river Asopus to fight, but to wait for the Persians to come to them. Two fragments from Plutarch's polemic against Herodotus (fr. 15, 16<sup>65</sup>) appear to come from some sort of catalogue section; if both of these fragments are from a catalogue, then it must have been in a fairly expansive style. Another (fr. 17W) probably comes from the battle narrative itself, since it preserves the beginning of the name of Demeter or of her shrine the Demetrium (Δημητρ[ u.1), about which Herodotus tells that there was particularly intense and prolonged fighting;<sup>66</sup> unfortunately, only the very beginnings of the lines are preserved.

## 5. Hellas and Sparta

Of the material which we have concerning Plataea, some seems to present the battle in a rather pan-Hellenic light, emphasising the alliance of *poleis* rather than one individual or state. But some also seems to emphasise Sparta, and especially the Spartan general Pausanias.<sup>67</sup>

Among the pan-Hellenic elements may be counted the parallelisms implicitly drawn between the warriors who fought on the multi-*polis* Achaean side at Troy and the Plataiomachoi, also drawn from several *poleis*.<sup>68</sup> Albeit in a polemical context, Plutarch (who will doubtless have had a complete text at his disposal) found it possible to argue that Simonides did not have a particular *polis* in mind (*de Hdt. mal.* 872d; immediately following fr. 16):

<sup>63</sup> West 1993a, 8.

<sup>64</sup> Hdt. 9.36.

<sup>65</sup> Plut. *de Hdt. mal.* 872d.

<sup>66</sup> Hdt. 9.62.

<sup>67</sup> On panhellenism and glorification of individuals and *poleis*, compare my comments above, section 1.2, criticising the approach to this question taken in Kowerski 2005.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Hall 2002, 175: "Nor is it by chance that the first explicit attempt to compare the Persian War with the Trojan War is to be found in the epigrams [sic; but his n.13 refers to fr.10-17 W] composed by Simonides immediately after the Greek victory." The comparison could scarcely have been made before the war happened; Hall means something like "The comparison between the Persian War and the Trojan War dates from soon after the fighting in mainland Greece ended, when Simonides composed an elegy on the battle of Plataea." cf. Miller 1997, 3.





ταῦτα γὰρ οὐ χορὸν ἐν Κορίνθῳ διδάσκων, οὐδ' αἶμα ποιῶν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ἄλλως δὲ τὰς πράξεις ἐκείνας ἐλεγεία γράφων ἱστορήκεν.<sup>69</sup>

For he was not training a chorus in Corinth, nor composing a song in honour of that city, but rather he simply recorded these events by writing them in elegiacs.

If, as seems at least plausible, the lines favourable to Corinth cited by Plutarch came from a catalogue passage, then presumably *poleis* other than Corinth came in for similarly positive treatment.

Further emphasis on the alliance generally as opposed to the Spartans or another individual *polis* is probably to be detected in fr. 14.7-8:

ἐξ. Α]ρί[η]c ἐλάσει, νεύσαντο[c  
 ]νην συμμα[χ]ίην φιλέω[ν

... will drive them out of Asia, with the approval of...

... an alliance of kin...

“An alliance of kin” *uel sim.* seems secure; this probably emphasised the pan-Hellenic nature of the battle, and certainly so if combined with a reference to Asia. Unfortunately, the readings ]c[ are far from secure (the traces are barely visible at all on photographs, either in paper-published sources or on the *P.Oxy.* website).<sup>70</sup>

Other passages seem to have a specifically Spartan emphasis. At fr.11.25, the

<sup>69</sup> Because Plutarch is accusing Herodotus of partiality and correcting his account from Simonides', it is clearly in his rhetorical interests to emphasise the impartiality of Simonides' account. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to suppose that the more educated of Plutarch's readership will have been aware of Simonides' poem. There were at least two copies in second century AD Oxyrhynchus. The marginalia on the papyri tell us that it was worked on by Apion (?fl. first half of the first century AD; cf. Pfeiffer 1968, 275) and Nicanor (2nd AD; cf. *ibid.* 219); on the New Simonides read and alluded to by Horace, v. Barchiesi 2001 and Harrison 2001. It also appears that Plutarch may be emphasising the generic distinction between this poem and choral lyric (ἀτρεα suggests melic poetry), but that too suggests that he found it less obviously partial to a particular *polis*. Accordingly, it seems unlikely that Plutarch could have misrepresented the Plataea elegy too drastically.

<sup>70</sup> See [www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk](http://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk) (viewed August 2006), and photographs with Parsons 1992a and in Boedeker and Sider 2001. West 1993a sees a reference to the Delian league here, which seems to me unlikely; but if he is right, it still fits into a discourse of pan-Hellenism. Flower 2000, discussing pan-Hellenism in the sense “the ideology of a united Greek crusade against Persia” (*ibid.*, 66), identifies its first expression here.

men of the present whose actions will be remembered appear to be associated especially with Sparta (whether or not we accept West's restoration οἱ Σπάρτ[η] τε καὶ Ἑλλάδι δούλιον ἦμαρ coll. 'Sim.' epigr. 16.1). The emphasis on Sparta in uu.29-32 need not be explained away by simply saying that troops really did leave Spartan territory towards the battle; Simonides is free to select material as he wishes, and chooses to make quite a bit of this passage, picking up the river Eurotas, the Dioscuri and Menelaus, especially associated with Sparta. (Sparta will not have been named in u.29; the mention of the Eurotas makes the name of the *polis* superfluous, and one should avoid supplementing a spondee before bucolic diaeresis here.<sup>71</sup> Fowler's κα[ὶ] ἐὺκλεε[ς] is preferable to Parsons' supplement both in sense and metre). The Spartan commander, Pausanias, is clearly named in very laudatory terms in the following verses (it is unfortunate that the state of the text gets slightly worse here): he has a whole couplet to himself, with patronymic, the adjective ἄριστος, and his own name emphatically placed in the final position of the pentameter at what represents the end of a section. In fr.13, Medes and Persians are contrasted with Dorians and the children of Heracles; this provides a Peloponnesian if not specifically Spartan emphasis. Finally, it could be, if the text is sound, that the striking Doric form ἀγέμαχοι (fr.11.14) emphasises the Spartan element. This word occurs only here and in Hesychius,<sup>72</sup> where it is glossed as πολέμαρχος. The unparalleled intrusion of a single Doric form here is certainly puzzling, since as a general rule genre seems to have taken precedence over ethnic/chauvinist sentiment in this regard: even Tyrtaeus uses Ionic dialect for elegy. In fact, however, corruption seems on the whole most likely here; this problem is discussed in an appendix, where the reading ἀγχεμαχοι is proposed.<sup>73</sup>

All of the above seems to me to make it highly likely that the elegy was commissioned by Sparta or by a Spartan individual, and it seems to me most probable that it was commissioned by Pausanias himself.<sup>74</sup> We know that he was

---

<sup>71</sup> 'Nacke's Law' (that word-end at the end of the fourth foot may not be preceded by a spondee) is more rigidly observed in the elegiac than in the monostichic hexameter (cf. van Raalte 1988, 155, table at 165). van Raalte had little Simonides at his disposal, but we can now see that this rule appears to apply to his elegiacs also: cf. Appendix 1.

<sup>72</sup> Hesych. s.v. ἡγέμαχος.

<sup>73</sup> See Appendix 2.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Aloni 2001, esp. 102-3.

keen to present himself as a pan-Hellenic leader, not least from the inscription he had inscribed on the celebrated ‘Serpent Column’ at Delphi:

Ἑλλάνων ἀρχαγὸς ἐπεὶ στρατὸν ὤλεσε Μήδων

Παυσανίας Φοίβωι μνᾶμ' ἀνέθηκε τόδε.<sup>75</sup>

The leader of the Greeks, when he destroyed the army of the Medes, Pausanias dedicated this memorial to Phoebus.

The already clear way in which Pausanias can here be seen appropriating pan-Hellenism in the service of his own κλεός will have been emphasised by the original position of the epigram, close beneath the column of three serpents inscribed with the names of the *poleis*.<sup>76</sup>

A similar impression is gained from the epigram inscribed on the bronze crater which Pausanias dedicated to Poseidon at Heracleia:

μνᾶμ' ἀρετᾶς ἀνέθηκε Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι

Παυσανίας, ἄρχων Ἑλλάδος εὐρυχόρου,

πόντου ἐπ' Εὐξείνου, Λακεδαιμόνιος γένος, υἱός

Κλεομβρότου, ἀρχαίας Ἡρακλέος γενεᾶς.<sup>77</sup>

To Lord Poseidon Pausanias dedicated this memorial of great achievement, the leader of spacious Greece on the Euxine Sea, Spartan by race, the son of Cleombrotus, of the ancient stock of Heracles.

## 6. Homer and Praise Poetry in Simonides and Pindar

As mentioned above, Simonides quite explicitly refers to Homer as having provided κλέος for the heroes of Troy, as Simonides is doing for the Plataiomachoi (fr.11.15-22):

<sup>75</sup> ‘Simonides’ 17a *FGE* (*AP* 6.197, Thuc.1.132.2 with Ionic forms, anonymously and expressed in the third person, al.); cf. Meiggs and Lewis (1988) no.27.

<sup>76</sup> No trace of the inscription, which was erased by the Spartans, remains; perhaps it was on one of the steps beneath the monument (Meiggs and Lewis 1988 ad loc.).

<sup>77</sup> Nymphis 432 *FGrH* 9 = Athenaeus 12.50 p.536B = *FGE* ‘Simonides’ 39, cited at Shaw 2001, 173. This epigram is supposed to have been inscribed on a large bronze crater, presumably after Byzantium was taken by a fleet commanded by Pausanias in 478 (Page in *FGE* ad loc.).

οἷσιν ἐπ' ἀθά]νατον κέχυται κλέος ἀν[δρὸς] ἔκητι  
 ὃς παρ' ἰοπ]λοκάμων δέξατο Πιερίδ[ων  
 πᾶσαν ἀλη]θείην, καὶ ἐπώνυμον ὅπ[λοτέρ]οισιν  
 ποίης ἡμ]ιθέων ὠκύμορον γενεή[ν.  
 ἀλλὰ cὺ μὲ]ν νῦν χαῖρε, θεᾶς ἐρικυ[δέος υἱέ  
 κούρης εἰν]αλίου Νηρέος· αὐτὰρ ἐγώ[  
 κικλήσκω] ς ἐπίκουρον ἐμοί, π[ολυώνυ]με Μοῦσα,  
 εἷ πέρ γ' ἀν]θρώπων εὐχομένω[ν μέλεια·

[the Danaans,] on whom immortal fame has been poured thanks to that man who received the full truth from the violet-haired Muses, and made the short-lived race of heroes known to later men. But now: hail to you, son of the glorious daughter of marine Nereus! As for me, I call upon you, celebrated Muse, if you care for the prayers of men.

At least the bare bones of the sense here seem to be fairly clear, which is not to say that the supplementation is not speculative. But Homer seems to be fairly clearly described as a provider of κλέος to the men who fought at Troy; his doing so is consequent upon the fact that he received truth from the Muses. πᾶσαν ἀλη]θείην is attractive because it echoes *Od.* 11.507.<sup>78</sup> Further, it seems clear that the presence of Homer in the poem is a presence which validates Simonides' κλέος-providing project; αὐτὰρ ἐγώ[ represents the movement from Homer's activity to Simonides'.<sup>79</sup> It does not of course follow that Simonides' activity is to be conceived of as identical to Homer's; Eva Stehle has teased out some of the ways in which Simonides employs a rhetoric of differentiation from Homer, notably in his use of the striking idea of the Muse as ἐπίκουρος (u.21) and the distinction between the κλέος of the Homeric heroes, which is inherently ἀθάνατον (u.15, attributive adj.: "for Homer's song, coming from the Muses, has staying power *ex hypothesi*"), rather than that of the Plataiomachoi, which will be

<sup>78</sup> Stehle 2001, 108. The line in the *Odyssey* is spoken by Odysseus to the shade of Achilles.

<sup>79</sup> Theocritus' use of the Plataea elegy in his sixteenth poem shows his understanding of Simonides' use of Homer to validate an encomiastic programme (cf. Rutherford 2001, 45, and see below, chapter 4, esp. section 4.7); a similar rhetoric is in play at the end of Theocritus 22, where Alan Griffiths suggests to me the wholly convincing emendation of ὑμῖν to τοῖς μὲν at the beginning of u.218; this poem is interpreted as alluding to Simonides fr.11W in Kowerski (unpublished). A similar use of Homer may be found in Simonides' contemporary Ibycus, 282 *PMG* = S151 (where Homer is not explicitly named in the surviving uu.): cf. the excellent analysis by Barron 1969, and below, section 4.6 and Appendix 3.

ἀθάνατον (u.28, predicative adj.) as a consequence of Simonides' poetic activity.<sup>80</sup> The validating use of Homer which can be seen here is of course not the only way in which to refer to him. Elsewhere, Simonides can be seen using Homer as the source of a gnomic hexameter, which Simonides seems to use as a jumping-off point for a meditation on the human capacity for self deception (*Il.* 6.146; Simonides fr. 19 W = Stob. 4.34.28):

ἐν δὲ τὸ κάλλιστον Χίος ἔειπεν ἀνὴρ·  
οἷη περ φύλλων γενεή, τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν.  
παῦροί μιν θνητῶν οὔσαι δεξάμενοι  
στέρνοισι ἐγκατέθεντο· πάρεστι γὰρ ἐλπίς ἐκάστωι  
ἀνδρῶν, ἣ τε νέων στήθεσιν ἐμφύεται.

The man of Chios said one most excellent thing: "as is the generation of leaves, so is that of men." Few mortals, receiving this with their ears, have laid it down in their hearts. For hope remains beside each man: hope, which grows in the breasts of the young.

This line and the celebrated parable of Bellerophontes which follows it was famous in antiquity as it is now.<sup>81</sup> Simonides, however, chooses to take the line ('as is the generation of leaves...') very much as an isolated gnome; as the fragment stands, it in a sense represents the failure of wisdom<sup>82</sup> even when expressed as the best saying of the most celebrated poet. The very fact that hope (mistaken hope) "grows" (ἐμφύεται) in a young man's heart shows his failure to understand the cyclical movement of the generations, by which that which grows like the leaves will inevitably die again and be replaced ("man that is born of a woman hath but a short time to live; he groweth up and is cut down like a flower..."). The image of Homer is in a sense a validating presence, in that he is the source of wisdom which Simonides implicitly acknowledges as true and describes as κάλλιστον, but in a pessimistic note the failure of men to learn from

<sup>80</sup> Stehle 2001, 116. On structural parallels between Simonides' presentation of Homeric commemoration and his own commemoration of the Plataiomachoi, see now also the sensitive study of Capra 2004, esp. pp.119-20. Kyriakou 2004, 226 comments that Homer is implicitly treated as if a contemporary of the Achaeans at Troy, as Simonides of the fighters at Plataea.

<sup>81</sup> cf. Sider 2001 on the tradition derived from it.

<sup>82</sup> Perhaps the line seemed appropriate in the context of human folly because of Glaucus' subsequent folly in exchanging gold armour for bronze (*Il.* 6.234-6).

this wisdom (and, we surely understand, from Simonides' wisdom also) is also acknowledged. The fact that the quoted line of the *Iliad* is in fact presented by Homer in direct speech (of Glaucus, addressing Diomedes) is not acknowledged, for it is apparently not regarded as relevant to the use here being made of the line as a gnome which may be extracted and valued for its philosophical/theological value.

The apparent pessimism of this fragment is somewhat mitigated by the passage which follows in Stobaeus' anthology. We now know that this cannot have followed immediately upon fr. 19 (as in Stobaeus cod. S; cf. West *IEG2*), since the traces surviving in *P.Oxy.* 3965 fr.26 are inconsistent with this, but it may well have come from the same elegy.<sup>83</sup> The same emphasis on the brevity of life and the failure of men to realise this is present, expressed more discursively; but now it appears that the wisdom imparted through poetry may allow a positive conclusion to be drawn (uu.11ff.):

ἀλλὰ cὺ ταῦτα μαθὼν βιότου ποτὶ τέρμα  
 ψυχῇ τῶν ἀγαθῶν τλήθῃ χαριζόμενος.  
 UUUU ]φράζεο δὲ παλα[  
 UUUU ]γλώσσης ἔκφυγ 'Ομηρ[  
 ]παιδαμά[τωρ  
 ]ω ψυδρῆς ε[  
 ]ἐν θαλίῃσι[  
 ]ι ἐϋστρέπτων [  
 ]ων, ἔνθα καὶ [

But you, learning these things towards the end of your life, endure, rejoicing in your soul in good things. Consider the... of old... Homer escaped the [silence] of the tongue... falsehood... in banquets... well-plaited [garlands]... here and [there]...

The part of the text provided by Stobaeus finishes just before the reference to Homer, so that the text is rather badly preserved. We now see that the whole elegy is addressed to an individual man who is close to the end of his life. He is told to endure and to delight in the good. He must take thought of something to

<sup>83</sup> See Sider 2001, 276-80.

do with the past; given the next line, he must be told to consider ancient Homer. Homer has escaped something to do with the tongue, which must indicate something similar in sense to West's ἡ λήθην] γλώσσης. Unfortunately, πανδαμάτωρ is incorrectly read by West in the next line: the third letter has a small loop which cannot belong to a nu.<sup>84</sup> But in any case, here again the most likely rhetoric of the reference to Homer is as a validating presence, whose provision of long-lasting κλέος is analogous to Simonides' own; in addition, he is a figure who has to some degree escaped death through the continuity of his verse.

The following explicit reference to Homer comes from "his account of Meleager" (564 *PMG*):

ὅς δ' οὐρὶ πάντας  
νίκαε νέους, δινάεντα βαλὼν  
Ἄναυρον ὕπερ πολυβότρυος ἔξ. Ἰωλκοῦ·  
οὔτω γὰρ Ὀμηρος ἤδ' Ὀτασίχορος ἄειρε λαοῖς.

Who beat all the young men in spear-throwing, casting over the eddying Anaurus from Iolcus, rich in grapes – for so Homer and Stesichorus sang to the peoples.

Athenaeus tells us that this is from a poem concerning Meleager, who won the spear throwing event at the funeral games for Pelias. No such event is related in the Homeric poems we have, and Simonides must here be referring to games described in a cyclic epic.<sup>85</sup> This fragment would fit well enough into a rhetoric something like the following: 'Meleager won that contest and Homer and Stesichorus sang the fact to the people and his κλέος lives on; you have won this contest, and I shall do likewise for you'. At any rate nothing prevents us from seeing this reference to earlier poets as fitting into a similar pattern to the one we find in the Plataea elegy.

However, it is well worth remembering that Simonides' use of Homer as a positive figure and a validating presence is in no respect the only possibility open

<sup>84</sup> cf. Parsons 1992a ad loc., Haslam 1993. West thought of Simonides 531.5 *PMG* and got carried away.

<sup>85</sup> "Homeri autem nomine Simonides uidetur appellasse auctorem Thebaidis cyclicae, cuius carminis Homericum fuit indoles" Schneidewin 1835 ad loc. (35-6).

to him. Within poetry which, while generically distinct from historical elegy, is nevertheless concerned with praise, Pindar is willing to refer to Homer in ways which differ from this considerably and in many cases seem to me rather harder to understand. West refers us to Pindar, *N.7.20ff.*:<sup>86</sup>

ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον ἔλπομαι  
λόγον. Οδυσσεός ῃ πάθαν  
διὰ τὸν ἄδυεπῆ γενέεσθ' Ὅμηρον·

ἐπεὶ ψεύδεσι οἱ ποτανᾶι <τε> μαχανᾶι  
σεμνὸν ἔπεστι τι· σοφία  
δὲ κλέπτει παράγοις μύθοις.

I believe that Odysseus' story became greater than his actual experience through sweet-versed Homer, since upon his falsehoods and his winged craft is a kind of majesty: his skill deceives, leading one astray with stories.

Though of course characteristic of Odysseus also, the “falsehoods and winged craft” here clearly refer principally to the poetic skill (σοφία) of Homer himself.<sup>87</sup> Even though the poet goes on to describe how the arms of Achilles were awarded to Ajax rather than to Odysseus (which could be described as an instance of Odysseus' own power of speech), there is no sensible way in which to disassociate the charge of poetic untruth from Homer.<sup>88</sup> A treatment of the contest for the arms of Achilles follows: it is almost as if Homer had been Odysseus' advocate instead of Odysseus having spoken for himself; the eloquence of the hero and the poet seem almost merged together. It seems rhetorically perhaps a high risk strategy to differentiate oneself from Homer in such a way as this, since it draws attention to the possibility of praise poetry as an instrument of deceit. Unlike Hesiod at *Theog.* 26ff., Pindar attributes to the epic poet himself responsibility for lies. Further, by the association of lies with sweetness (ἄδυεπῆ 22) and with “winged craft” Pindar enhances the risk that we will associate this conception of

<sup>86</sup> West 1993a, 6.

<sup>87</sup> cf. Carey 1981 ad loc.

<sup>88</sup> Fränkel attempted to have ψεύδει and μαχανᾶι refer to Odysseus, and have πάθαν refer to the stories told by Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, rather than the poet's own voice; Köhnken wanted ποτανᾶι μαχανᾶι to refer to Homer, ψεύδει to Odysseus. Both attempts to get Pindar off the hook of accusing Homer of deceit are clearly refuted by Carey 1981, 144-5.



poetic craft and deceit with him as much as with Homer. In terms of sweetness, in this very poem he has referred to praise poetry in terms of honey (u.11), and a quick glance at words of this root<sup>89</sup> in Slater's *Lexicon* confirms that its use to refer to Pindar's own poetry is regular. Similarly, ποτανὸν ἀμφὶ μαχανᾷ is used of the χρέος owed by Pindar to the victor at *P.8.34*, and ποτανός is used in several places in such a way as to refer to Pindar's own art.<sup>90</sup>

West refers to *I.4.35ff.* (=3/4.53ff.) as a parallel to Simonides' validating use of Homer. This is by no means clear, since the passage in question is fraught with difficulty:

ἴστε μάν

Αἴαντος ἀλκὰν φοίνιον, τὰν ὀψίαι  
ἐν νυκτὶ ταμῶν περὶ ᾧ φασγάνῳ μομφὰν ἔχει  
παίδεσσιν Ἑλλάνων ὅσοι Τροίανδ' ἔβαν.

ἀλλ' Ὅμηρός τοι τετίμα-  
κεν δι' ἀνθρώπων, ὃς αὐτοῦ  
πᾶσαν ὀρθώσας ἀρετὰν κατὰ ῥάβδον ἔφρασεν  
θεσπεσίῳ ἐπέῳ λοιποῖς ἀθύρειν.  
τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον φωνᾶεν ἔρπει,  
εἴ τις εὖ εἴπητι τι·

Surely you know the bloody might of Ajax, which he pierced at night with his sword, so casting blame upon the sons of the Achaeans, as many as went to Troy. But Homer has honoured him among men, who straightened out his full greatness and spoke it with his staff of divine verses for men of the future to enjoy. For a things goes out with immortal voice, if someone speaks it well.

There are at least two possible ways in which to understand this. The problem is with the phrase μομφὰν ἔχει παίδεσσιν Ἑλλάνων. The question is whether μομφὰν has an active or a passive sense. The phrase could mean "incurs blame among the sons of the Hellenes" or "holds a grudge against the sons of the

<sup>89</sup> ἀδύγλωστος, ἀδυεπής (for which cf. *Ol.10.93*, *N.1.4*), ἀδύλογος, ἀδυμελής, ἀδύπνοος, ἀδύς. See Slater 1969.

<sup>90</sup> cf. Slater 1969 s.v. And it is likely that, at *Pa.7b.14*, the adjective describes the chariot in which Pindar will ride when he is differentiating himself from Homer (see below).

Hellenes.” In the first case, Ajax acquired a bad name among the Greeks at Troy [because they disapproved of his suicide and possibly his madness]; Homer has rehabilitated his reputation [by not explicitly recounting his suicide and by ignoring the story of his madness].<sup>91</sup> In the second case, while Ajax bears a grudge against the other Hellenes at Troy [sc. because they awarded the arms to Achilles], Homer has now rehabilitated his reputation among [sc. present-day] mortals [who would thus not make the same mistake in deciding Odysseus before Ajax]. Both of these readings are *a priori* possible, and I do not have a great degree of confidence in choosing between them. The present ἔχει might be seen as a problem either way, and a past tense might be preferred.<sup>92</sup> Bury is certainly mistaken to suggest that the question whether Ajax is held blameworthy by the Hellenes is irrelevant; it makes good sense for his reputation then to be contrasted with his Homeric reputation now.<sup>93</sup> While it is accepted that Pindar’s language is frequently idiosyncratic, it is worth examining the available parallels for μομφάν (-ήν) ἔχειν with dative. The number of parallels is small, and they present a number of textual problems:

Sophocles, *Ajax* 180. The chorus is wondering what made Ajax mad. ‘Did Artemis send you mad because you had neglected her in sacrifice,  
 ἦ χαλκοθώραξ κοί τι νῦν. Εὐνάλιος  
 μομφάν ἔχων ξυνοῦ δορὸς ἐννυχίοις  
 μαχαναῖς ἐτείκατο λώβαν;

179 κοί Reiske; ἦ mss.

‘Or did Enyalios of the brazen corselet bear a grudge against you after some joint exploit and in darkness contrive to outrage you?’ (trans. Lloyd-Jones, Loeb. Understand ‘contrive to commit an outrageous act against you’).

<sup>91</sup> Odysseus tactfully leaves the circumstances of Ajax’ death vague and shows no sign of knowing about the madness idea (*Od.* 11.541ff.); at least as far as the suicide is concerned, this is doubtless an instance of Homeric reticence, since it is known in artistic representations since at least 700 (Gantz 1993, 633: “Oldest in time is certainly a Protocorinthian aryballus of about 700BC”).

<sup>92</sup> ἔχεν Christ, ἔχεν Bergk. If the active sense of μομφάν is read, then a heroised Ajax might be seen as continuing his anger after death.

<sup>93</sup> Bury 1892, 70. cf. Privitera 1982, 179: “L’opposizione, implicita ma evidente, è tra onore negato dai Greci e onore dato da Omero.”

That the transmitted text is corrupt is clear; Reiske's *coí* is attractive, but in any case cannot be seen as a secure parallel. If it is correct, it gives the active sense of *μομφὰν ἔχων*, i.e. 'bearing a grudge' (dative 'against').

Euripides, *Orestes* 1069. Orestes says that he will kill Agamemnon and is about to leave in order to do so (loq. Pylades):

ἐπίσχεε. ἐν μὲν πρῶτά σοι μομφὴν ἔχω,  
εἰ ζῆν με χρῆιζειν σοῦ θανόντος ἡλπισαε.

'Wait. One thing, to begin with, I hold against you, if you thought I would want to go on living after your death.' (trans. West)

Here the sense 'hold a grudge against' is clearly paralleled.

Aristophanes *Pax* 664. Hermes is pretending to have a conversation with Peace and to report what she says to the audience (661ff. quoted):

εἶφ' ὅ τι νοεῖς αὐτοῖσι πρὸς ἔμ', ὦ φιλότατη.  
ἴθ', ὦ γυναικῶν μισοπορπακιστάτη.  
εἰέν' ἀκούω. ταῦτ' ἐπικαλεῖς; μανθάνω.  
ἀκούσαθ' ὑμεῖς ὧν ἕνεκα μομφὴν ἔχει.

664 ὑμεῖς VΓρ; ἡμεῖς R; ...ν Π61 = P. Lit. Carlini 17, ὑμῖν Carlini 'doubtfully'; ἡμῖν Richter.

Say to me what you have in mind with regard to them, darling lady. Come now, O most shield-despising of women. All right. I'm listening. That's the charge? I get it. Listen, you lot, to the reason for her resentment. (my translation).

The medieval tradition is divided between *ἡμεῖς*, which is impossible, and *ὑμεῖς*, which is possible (Hermes makes it clear that he is now addressing the audience rather than Peace). *ἡμῖν* is unattractive.<sup>94</sup> *ὑμῖν* is desirable but scarcely sure; since this is not securely read even on the papyrus, I suppose that a

<sup>94</sup> Hermes is not identifying with the audience here.

responsible editor must go with transmitted ὑμεῖς; this is therefore no parallel.<sup>95</sup> The only secure parallel, then, is from Euripides (*Orestes* 1069).<sup>96</sup> Here the sense “bear a grudge against” is required. This sense is consistent with the most likely reading for the Sophoclean passage, and nothing in other passages tells against it. If we are to trust in parallels, then, the Pindaric passage should be translated as follows: “You know well the might of Ajax, cutting bloodshed late at night around his sword he *bore a grudge against the sons of the Greeks*, as many as went to Troy.” The natural sequence is inverted, since his bitter resentment caused his suicide. No parallel supports “he incurred blame among the sons of the Greeks.” My inclination is therefore to read the active sense of μομφὰν, but I concede that certainty is not possible here. The contrast between his reputation among the Greeks at Troy and his reputation now is still present, but is less explicit than if we read μομφὰν as “the bad reputation which he has among the sons of the Hellenes.” Homer, we understand, gave the honour due to Ajax but denied by his contemporaries, from which denial came Ajax’ resentment and suicide. If there is a reference to hero cult revealed by the present tense ἔχει, perhaps Homer is even seen as reconciling Ajax with the present day: his potentially dangerous resentment is directed only against the Greeks ὅσοι Τροίανδ’ ἔβαν. The rôle of Homer in the construction of Pindar’s poetic persona is as the correct evaluator of reputation and glory.

The following is the most difficult (because fragmentary) explicit reference to Homer in Pindar (Paeon 7b.11-14 = C2.11-14 Rutherford):

Ὅμηρου [ca. 4 letters τρι]πτον κατ’ ἀμαξιτὸν  
 ἰόντες, ἀ[ca. 5 letters ἀλ]λοτρίαις ἀν’ ἵπποις  
 ἐπεὶ αυ[ca. 6 letters π]τανὸν ἄρμα<sup>97</sup>  
 Μοῖα[ca. 10 letters]μεν.

The supplementation as printed in Maehler’s edition (Lobel, Snell) has been

<sup>95</sup> μομφὴν ἔχειν πρὸς τινα occurs in *Colossians* 3.13 and in Christian writers quoting or alluding to it, with μομφή understood in an active sense (“if one has a complaint against another” RSV).

<sup>96</sup> Also cited by Privitera 1982 ad loc.

<sup>97</sup> vel πο]τανὸν ἄρμα (Slater 1969, s.v. ποτανός).

shown to be incompatible with the space required.<sup>98</sup> The nature of the lacunae means that it cannot be said for certain whether Pindar is stating that he will follow Homer or that he will not. The clear reminiscence at Callimachus Aetia fr.1.25-8 Pf. (where it must be conceded that ἀτρίπτο]υς is also a supplement, which Pf. proposed before he became aware of the Paean<sup>99</sup>) does not help as much as it might; it might be that Callimachus is echoing the sense as well as the imagery of the Pindar passage, but it would be equally characteristic if he adopted Pindar's image and turned the sense around ('oppositio in imitando'). Assuming that the Homer referred to is in particular the poet of the Homeric Hymn to Delian Apollo, it is certainly the case that from what we can gather Pindar has not followed the Homeric account, at least in subject matter and key facts (esp. the distinction between Delos and Ortygia). It seems to me on balance more likely that Pindar here rejects 'banal dependence' (Rutherford) on Homer, and that something like this is therefore the right idea for 11-12.<sup>100</sup>

Ὅμηρου [ἐκὰς ἄτρι]πτον κατ' ἀμαξιτόν

ἰόντες, ἀ[εὶ οὐκ ἀλ]λοτρίαις ἀν' ἵπποις

Far from Homer, going along an untrodden highway, always with horses not belonging to another.

While I find it entirely possible that Pindar might have stated that he planned to follow an authoritative account attributed to Homer, I agree with D'Alessio (1995) in finding it at least unlikely that he would have done so by using the word πολύτριπτος, which suggests the unfavourable notions of dependency and lack of autonomy rather than the positive aspects of authority and tradition.

## 7. Allusions to Homer in the Plataea Elegy

I here briefly list the places in which it appears that Simonides may have been

<sup>98</sup> D'Alessio 1992. The antistrophe is almost entirely lost, so responson cannot help us here. (But it apparently included the word δέλτου, fascinatingly enough; cf. Call. fr.1.21 Pf. This short and λεπτός poem was very possibly an important text for Callimachus).

<sup>99</sup> Lobel had drawn the apparent parallel in the *Paean* to Pfeiffer's attention in time for the "addenda et corrigenda" (Pfeiffer 1949 vol.1, 499).

<sup>100</sup> D'Alessio 1995. He relates the sense to the concept of the remote path of truth in Parmenides. I am here broadly following Rutherford 2002.

thinking of a particular Homeric passage or passages in fr.11 of his Plataea, which is especially suitable for this sort of examination, both in that it is rather better preserved than the other fragments and in that, as described above, it contains explicit reference to Homer as well as other passages where, though the allusion is less explicit, I still wish to argue that it is present.

The first three verses of this fragment, though poorly preserved, clearly represent a powerfully Homerising moment-of-death simile. While the details are of course speculative, it seems hard to deny that the sense must be reconstructed along the lines of West's translation:<sup>101</sup>

str[uck you... and you fell, as when a larch]  
or pine-tree in the [lonely mountain] glades  
is felled by woodcutters...

If either Simonides or his audience had a specific Homeric passage in mind, it will probably have been Il.13.389-91 (=16.482-4),<sup>102</sup> of which the beginning of fr.11.2 is especially reminiscent:

ἤριπε δ' ὥς ὅτε τις δρῦς ἤριπεν ἢ ἀχερωΐς,  
ἢ ἐ πίτυς βλωθρή, τήν τ' οὔρεσι τέκτονες ἄνδρες  
ἐξέταμον πελέκεσσι νεήκεσι νήϊον εἶναι.

He fell, as when an oak falls, or a poplar, or a tall pine, which craftsmen cut down in the mountains with sharp axes to be a timber of a ship.

In any case, the passage will have had an immediately perceptible epicising and Homerising effect. If West is correct to reconstruct this passage as an apostrophe addressed to Achilles,<sup>103</sup> then that will have added a degree of piquancy to the Homerising: apostrophe of characters in Homer is unusual and occurs only at special moments when the generally objective persona of the narrator is briefly abandoned. This would be especially suitable if it is correctly placed close to what

---

<sup>101</sup> West 1993b, 168. On the uncertain placing of fr.11.1-4, v. n.10 above.

<sup>102</sup> cf. Lobel ad *P.Oxy.* 2327.

<sup>103</sup> It would seem to be suggested if παῖ[... ]ς[... ] is the correct reading of the papyrus at 2327 fr.5.1 (παῖ[cé] ς. West c.g.), but the traces do not seem to admit of any certainty. "Bases of letters which may be combined in various ways; the beginning might be παῖ" Lobel ad loc.

looks like a reference to the death of Patroclus (fr.11.6): the *Iliad*-poet's special sympathy for him is marked out by the fact that he is several times apostrophised, with (sym)pathetic effect, in the *Iliad*.<sup>104</sup>

Another clear Homeric allusion is surely to be read in line 13 of the fragment, which is based on the speech of Chryses in *Il.*1 (u.19):<sup>105</sup>

ἐκπέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι  
to sack Priam's town, and make a good homecoming

Here the reminiscence is secure however we supplement the line; naturally enough, scholars have used the Homeric line as a starting point. It has been pointed out that ἀοίδιμος is a carefully chosen adjective for Troy;<sup>106</sup> it occurs only once in the *Iliad* (never in the *Odyssey*) at 6.358, where Helen uses it of herself and Paris:

ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν εἴσελθε καὶ ἔζεο τῷδ' ἐπὶ δίφρῳ,  
δᾶερ, ἐπεὶ σε μάλιστα πόνος φρένας ἀμφιβέβηκεν  
εἶνεκ' ἐμεῖο κυνὸς καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔνεκ' ἄτης,  
οἷσιν ἐπὶ Ζεὺς θῆκε κακὸν μόνον, ὥς καὶ ὀπίσσω  
ἀνθρώποισι πελώμεθ' ἀοίδιμοι ἐκκομένοι.

But come now: come in and sit upon this chair, brother-in-law, since for you especially the effort has surrounded your mind, on account of me, bitch that I am, and on account of Alexandros' folly. Zeus placed a bad fate on us, so that in future we might become the stuff of song for people yet to come.

As has been pointed out, this makes Luppe's supplementation of καὶ Τροίην unattractive, since the city is identified as Troy by the adjective in any case (πόλις is also closer to the line from Chryses' speech).<sup>107</sup>

Finally, it has also been observed that ὠκύμορος is a striking choice of adjective

<sup>104</sup> On Homer's apostrophes for Patroclus and Menelaus, the two male characters in the *Iliad* with a sense of gentler virtues, cf. Parry 1972, 9-21; Janko ad *Il.*13.602-3, 16.20. Patroclus is so addressed only in the sixteenth book, in which he dies.

<sup>105</sup> cf. Parsons 1992a ad loc.

<sup>106</sup> Lloyd-Jones 1994.

<sup>107</sup> Lloyd-Jones 1994; Luppe 1993, 6.

in line 18, being used in the *Iliad* almost exclusively of Achilles: on four out of five occasions it is used of him by Thetis.<sup>108</sup> In this connection, I favour the supplement ἔξοχοι ἥρωων suggested by Capra and Curti for u.14:<sup>109</sup> though they do not point this out, the phrase on which the supplement is modelled, ἔξοχον ἥρωων, is also used in the *Iliad* only by Thetis of Achilles, and the poet clearly wishes to emphasise the identity of ἀγχέμαχοι Δαναοί of u.14<sup>110</sup> with the ὠκύμορον γενεή[ν] of u.18.<sup>111</sup>

So much for fairly secure identifications of verbal allusion. Simonides' use of Homer will be discussed in a more focused way after a brief excursus on the nature and extent of 'pan-Hellenism' and/or chauvinism in the *Iliad*.

### 8. Ἀεὶ φιλέλλην ὁ ποιητής;

During the archaic and classical periods, the Greeks spent a lot more time fighting each other than fighting speakers of other languages, and the degree of cooperation between *poleis* which appears to have been a phenomenon at Plataea was unusual and consequent upon the state of crisis caused by the invasion of an army which, disregarding the impossibility of determining the numbers concerned, would presumably have been expected to beat the forces mustered by the Greeks either together or separately. While it was argued above that the Plataea elegy gives a special emphasis to both Sparta and its leader Pausanias, it was also asserted that in various respects it also celebrated the pan-Hellenic aspect of the battle, and argued that this combination of factors strongly suggested that the poem was commissioned by Pausanias himself. In the course of that discussion, it was suggested that the implied analogy drawn between Simonides and Homer in fr.11 was in itself an element which could be read as emphasising the pan-Hellenic element of the poem, since it implied the corresponding analogy between the Plataiomachoi and the Achaean force at Troy, made up of contingents from many *poleis*.

<sup>108</sup> Lloyd-Jones 1994.

<sup>109</sup> See Appendix 2.

<sup>110</sup> ἀγχέμαχοι is my correction; ἀγέμαχοι ms. See Appendix 2.

<sup>111</sup> In addition to the question of ethnicity which I discuss here, this would also remind the audience that, like Achilles, some of the warriors at Plataea will have died fighting the barbarian – and, perhaps, would receive cult like him as well (cf., on heroisation, Boedeker 2001).



It has been demonstrated that the way in which Greeks of the classical and later periods divided up the world into Hellene (Greek-speaker) and Barbarian in no way represents a given, but should rather be seen as a social and in part literary construct of the fifth century.<sup>112</sup>

It is frequently observed that a characteristic of Homeric style is that the narrator tends to present the story in a remarkably unobtrusive manner; he only rarely makes explicit comment on the events he describes (the passages in which the narrator explicitly contrasts the heroic age with the present day – οἱοι νῦν βροτοί εἶσι – are remarkable precisely because they are so uncharacteristic of the poet's general procedure).<sup>113</sup> Similarly, devices which emphasise the persona of the narrator as a separate individual are rare and tend to be reserved for special occasions. Thus, all of the apostrophes addressed to Patroclus occur in the book in which he dies, and in general use of apostrophe is rare.<sup>114</sup> The narrator at no point tells us anything explicit about himself,<sup>115</sup> and is very disinclined to present himself as commenting on the action and events of the poem. So powerful is the lack of moral judgement voiced by the narrator that some have even suggested that, contrary to what a plot-summary would lead one to believe, there is in fact no pattern of justice running within the poem at all.<sup>116</sup> This argument was convincingly refuted by Lloyd-Jones, who identified at the heart of the problem a misguided tendency to believe that a work's ethical content could be inferred simply from an analysis of its vocabulary,<sup>117</sup> but the fact that it was possible for people to think that way shows the extent of the narrator's apparent neutrality.

More recently than that dispute, Griffin showed that the refusal of the narrator to pass *explicit* moral judgement on the events of the narrative can be observed at a

---

<sup>112</sup> This is the argument of Hall 1989 (and of its memorable title), and should be associated with a general increase in awareness of the historical and constructed nature of ethnicity.

<sup>113</sup> Please note here the word "explicit": Homer is nevertheless far from simply "telling it as it is" such that no narratorial engagement is visible at all (if such a thing were possible). Narratorial engagement is present but quiet and inexplicit. For criticism of insufficiently nuanced accounts of Homeric "objectivity," see de Jong 1997, 308 with further references, and especially de Jong 1987, 14-26; note that de Jong can still conclude (1997, 306) that "the Homeric narrator is a somewhat hazy figure, who seldom steps forward to reveal his persona."

<sup>114</sup> Cf. e.g. de Jong 1997, 307 for the narrative significance of apostrophe.

<sup>115</sup> De Jong 2006 suggests that, despite such reticence, the Homeric narrator makes certain implicit claims for his own work.

<sup>116</sup> Adkins 1960, ch.1.

<sup>117</sup> Lloyd-Jones 1971, ch.1.

purely lexical level: a large number of terms bound up with moral approval or disapproval occur far more frequently in speeches than in narrative, where the poet seems to avoid them.<sup>118</sup> Similarly, certain kinds of vehemence were considered inappropriate for narrative but suitable in the mouths of characters; thus even the emphatic particle ἦ is almost altogether excluded from narrative (Griffin can find two usages, one in a passage which is peculiar on independent grounds).<sup>119</sup> I find that an additional search to those performed by Griffin (easier now, with more in the way of electronic resources; I used the *TLG*, where Griffin used Ebeling) demonstrates that the words ἔνεκα, εἵνεκα, οὖνεκα and τοῦνεκα (τοῦνεκα) are also considerably more common in speech than in narrative (20xN, 77xS; the phenomenon considerably more marked – 4xN, 49xS – with ἔνεκα and εἵνεκα than with οὖνεκα and τοῦνεκα). The narrator finds it quite appropriate to have the characters impute motives and reasons for events (cf. the speech of Helen quoted above), but when he does so himself he does so inexplicitly, i.e. by narrating rather than explaining.<sup>120</sup>

The narratorial reticence on the question of the justice or lack of it present in the poem is related to the question of the presence or absence of chauvinism, inasmuch as that the quietness on the theology and morality of the poem means that any ‘Achaeans good, Trojans bad’ flavour is certainly easily missable.

Certain passages in the poem, especially when given by themselves and without parallels from other parts of the poem, can certainly lend themselves to interpretation along these lines, however;<sup>121</sup> perhaps the most celebrated is the

---

<sup>118</sup> Griffin 1986. Griffin 1980 implies a strong contrast between Achaean and Trojan, seeing Paris as the “archetypal Trojan.”

<sup>119</sup> Griffin finds two uses of ἦ in narrative: *Od.* 22.31, 21.99 (Griffin 1986, 45). De Jong adds *Il.* 16.46 (de Jong 1988, 188). For De Jong, the presence of vocabulary outside direct speech which is more commonly found in the speeches is regularly indicative of focalisation (i.e., speech vs. narratorial voice is an inadequate dichotomy). Given that a notable place where the poet speaks to the audience in something approaching his own personal voice is in the similes, which are known to be more innovative linguistically than most of the poems and are receptive to anachronisms (iron etc.) more than the ‘straight’ narrative, it would be interesting to factor them in and to find out whether the words which are rare in narrative but common in speech are more or less likely to occur in similes, but I am not aware that this has been done. It is in any case worth noting that the only place in the *Iliad* where Zeus is explicitly said to punish those who infringe Δίκη occurs in a simile (16.383ff; cf. Lloyd-Jones 1971, 6).

<sup>120</sup> cf. Reinhardt [1938] 1997. On “judgement” in the narratorial voice, see Richardson 1990, 158–66, who rightly stresses the limits of the concept “objectivity” but stresses the rarity of “overt commentary” (165).

<sup>121</sup> For an attempt to read a chauvinist *Iliad*, v. van der Valk 1953, refuted by Kakridis 1971; NB in particular Kakridis’ point that Homer has chosen to sing of the one year in the war in which

comparison between the noisy Trojans and allies and the silent Achaeans at the beginning of the third book. This is one of the stronger passages for the scholar who would argue for a chauvinist Homer. Even here, however, much of its force derives from the effect of isolating it; when the Trojans are doing well and marching on the ships, the situation is reversed.<sup>122</sup> Naturally, the strongest argument in favour of an *Iliad* expressive of a chauvinistically pro-Achaean view is to be found in the basic structures of the plot.<sup>123</sup> It cannot be ignored that the whole war is known by both sides to be a consequence of Paris' abduction of Helen, which is not only a hubristic violation of the honour of her husband but also an infringement of the rules of *xenia*. In addition, perhaps as a result of the poet's desire to have the plot of the *Iliad* mirror the story of the conflict as a whole, most of the fighting in the poem is also a consequence of a Trojan act of bad faith, when Pandarus breaks the truce in book 4 and thus initiates the fighting once more, again by a breach of trust committed against the person of Menelaus.<sup>124</sup> In general, as has been frequently observed, Paris is an inadequate man characterised by excessive concern for his appearance and excessive interest in sexuality and the female world of indoors, as opposed to fighting and the male outdoors.<sup>125</sup> However, it is not with an Achaean that Paris is typically contrasted but with another Trojan, his brother Hector,<sup>126</sup> who is unambiguously a courageous and great warrior and whose marriage to Andromache is clearly placed in the sixth book in such a way as to contrast with the relationship

---

the Greeks do very badly (this would not of itself refute the notion of a chauvinist/nationalist poem – such a thing could be easily conceived of, as, e.g., Dunkirk in British mythology – but it does refute van der Valk's argument that Homer prefers to dwell on Achaeon victories when he can).

<sup>122</sup> *Il.* 13.41; Hall 1989, 30. In this argument on the chauvinism or otherwise of Homer, what follow are now essentially selected highlights from Hall's treatment of the subject.

<sup>123</sup> Most of the plot will perhaps have been a given before the creation of the *Iliad*, but the question whether the poem expresses a chauvinistic attitude is independent of the question of from which stage in the history of its tradition this attitude derives. The opinion expressed here is that chauvinism seems to have left little mark on the *Iliad* as we have it, regardless of its 'traditional' or 'authorial' origin.

<sup>124</sup> For a brief account of the relationship between the plot of the *Iliad* and the story of the war as a whole, see e.g. Silk 1987, 41-3.

<sup>125</sup> But even Paris' inadequacy can be overstated; for a defence, v. Bowra 1930, 210 (cf. Hall 1989, 31n.11). See Collins 1987 for a nuanced view of Paris' ethical status in the *Iliad*.

<sup>126</sup> In order to contrast one thing with another, it is helpful first to bring them close together; hence parallels between Hector and Paris such as the horse simile (5.506ff.=15.263ff.), which repetition was unattractive to the Hellenistic editors Zenodotus and Aristarchus, and to some modern editors (266-8 del. West, against all mss. evidence). The lines are correctly defended by Janko ad loc.; cf. Bowra 1930, 92 and Redfield 1975, 113ff., who treats the contrasting pair Paris/Hector well.

between Paris and Helen.<sup>127</sup> If we are to compare him with an Achaean, then I suppose the most natural choice is Menelaus, but Menelaus, though in some respects an appealing figure, is also a rather second-rate hero; the Trojan/Achaean dichotomy which might have been created from the character of Paris and the nature of the story of the war has in fact been allowed to lie present in the story but on the whole rather unutilised in the *Iliad*: in many respects, the failings of Paris seem to me to serve principally not in such a way as to contrast with the Achaeans but rather in such a way as emphasises the most appealing characteristics of the most important *Trojan* hero.

Another way in which to address the question of Homeric chauvinism would be to consider the rather obvious question: do we wish Troy to fall? To a certain extent, the answer may be yes. Like most of the characters we might wish the war over, and we know that the war must end with the fall of Troy. We might desire the reintegration of Menelaus' *oikos* and the righting of the injustice done to him (and this is probably more true of the attitudes of the original audience than of our own).<sup>128</sup> But in the end, I find it hard to imagine that anybody could wish that Andromache and Astyanax suffer the fate that is predicted for them.<sup>129</sup> The scenes in which we observe Hector, Andromache and Astyanax seem almost inevitable to us, in that they have some of the patina of familiarity, and in that they are worked into the structure so well (we can observe the contrasts between the familial life of Hector and of Paris; like the shield of book 18, the scenes in book 6 help to underline the tragedy of Achilles, when he decides to re-embrace the world of battle; in any case, the whole poem emphasises the disruption of peaceful life cycles by means in particular of the 'obituary' passages for minor characters – Achaeans and Trojans – such as Simoeisius; etc.). It is therefore worth noting that in plot terms there is absolutely no necessity that this should be

---

<sup>127</sup> On Hector and Paris as 'two brothers' (cf. Cain and Abel, etc.), and the possible relevance of this for the Judgement of Paris passage in *Iliad* 24, see Davies 2003, esp. 39.

<sup>128</sup> It is worth noting that in the *Odyssey* (book 4) it seems to have been quite possible for Helen successfully to be reintegrated into Menelaus' household; this seems strange even in its Odyssean context (cf. Griffin 1980, 77-8). But perhaps some of our wonder at this is a consequence of our view of marriage as a compact between loving individuals; the original audience might have felt that Paris' crime was essentially a form of theft, which can be dealt with by the restoration of Helen to her rightful owner, at which point everything is all right again. If Hermione is Helen's child by Paris, rather than by Menelaus, which is left open (*Od.* 4.12-14), even this seems not to have caused a problem.

<sup>129</sup> *Il.* 6.544ff.

the case. The scenes (and others such as the lament of Andromache in *Il.*22, the reminiscence of Troy in peace at 22.154-6, etc.<sup>130</sup>) are in no way *extraneous*, since they contribute to a thematic unity throughout the poem, but there was nothing *inevitable* about their presence; on the contrary, they speak of a desire on the part of the poet to call forth pity for the effects of the war on both sides.

The poem begins with strife among the Achaeans as a consequence of reprehensible behaviour by the most senior of the Achaean force; it ends with a scene of reconciliation based on the recognition of shared humanity between the most senior Trojan and the Greek hero who has killed his sons.<sup>131</sup>

## 9. Adaptation of Homer in the Plataea Elegy

It is here argued that it is inadequate simply to observe the explicit mention of Homer and strong implicit analogy between a) Simonides and Homer and b) the Achaeans and the Plataeomachoi. While certainly the case, it is equally not all that can be observed if we simply comment that “there are some spectacular redeployments of epic language in these lines.”<sup>132</sup> Much of my procedure will consist of starting from others’ observations about particular words and phrases and showing how (especially when taken together) they can be seen to have more interpretative value than has been observed.

The beginning of the portion we have of the elegy concerning Achilles has been reconstructed in such a way as to emphasise his special personal identity. Certainly ]ωνος χειρὶ [ (fr.11.8) here cries out for Ἀπόλλ]ωνος χειρὶ; given that ]άμασθεν ἐφ[ is in the previous line, the idea that the sense is that it required not only a mortal but also a god to kill Achilles is attractive, and West has successfully

---

<sup>130</sup> cf. Hall 1989, 31.

<sup>131</sup> I feel somewhat as if I had laboured the point even in this brief account (see Hall 1989 for more); to me it seems fairly obvious that any chauvinism in the poem is very insignificant (it does not of course follow from this that Homer is unaware of ethnicity; for a recent treatment of Homeric ethnicity as expressed through awareness of linguistic difference, see Ross 2005). But both the scholia (whence the quotation from ΣbT in *Il.*8.78; cf. Kakridis 1971) and modern scholars perhaps under their influence have sometimes read chauvinism into the poem, and my point must therefore be argued, even when it requires a bit of stating the obvious. A comparison with Vergil, e.g. *Aen.*8.678-fin., helps us to see the flavour of the *Iliad* in this regard by means of contrast.

<sup>132</sup> Rutherford 2001, 44, ad fr.11.13-18 (he goes on to detail some of the redeployments; interpretation is here taken a stage further).

reconstructed to this sense.<sup>133</sup> The uniqueness of Achilles is also emphasised by the two matronymics which are restored with a high level of certainty as to sense at fr.10.5 and fr.11.19-20; these emphasise Achilles' divine ancestry.

Other factors assimilate Achilles and his contingent, the Myrmidons, with the Achaean force in general. Of these, the most uncomplicated is perhaps the phrase ἥμ]ιθέων ὠκύμορον γενεή[ν (fr.11.18). This adjective ("short-lived," or "quickly-lived") is associated in the *Iliad* with Achilles in particular.<sup>134</sup> On four out of its five usages it is used of Achilles by Thetis,<sup>135</sup> in particularly memorable passages. It may be that it further emphasises Achilles' relationship with Thetis (many of the passages in which we are most aware of his mortality are in his encounters with his mother); it is certainly the case that it assimilates the Iliadic Achilles with the whole host at Troy, seen as a "race of demi-gods." In the *Iliad*, Achilles is of course separated from the rest of the Achaeans, but here they are brought closer together.<sup>136</sup> In addition, this is an instance of a word of the type analysed by Griffin, which the poet prefers to leave to the speakers in the poem rather than using in the narrative; here Simonides uses it in the narratorial voice.<sup>137</sup>

A somewhat different assimilation seems to be taking place at fr.11.33-4. Here the state of the text is rather poor, but it seems most likely that ἄριςτ[ος refers to the leader Pausanias. It is not possible from internal evidence to judge certainly

<sup>133</sup> In the *Iliad* the fact of both a man and a god tends to be stressed where Achilles' death is predicted towards the end of the poem; the prophecies of his death generally get more specific as the poem goes on (19.416, by the horse Xanthus; 22.359, by the dying Hector); cf. Edwards ad 18.95-6, 19.415-7.

<sup>134</sup> cf. Lloyd-Jones 1994; Poltera 1997, 354-5. Poltera elides the distinction between words used by the narrator and those used by a speaker: "c'est l'épithète préférée d'Achille, dont Homère dit qu'il est ὠκυμωρῶτατος ἄλλων"; this is something the poet would be very unlikely to say in his own voice.

<sup>135</sup> 1.417, 18.95, 18.458, 1.505 in superlative form; in its one other use it has a different sense ("bringing rapid death," of arrows) 15.441. In the *Odyssey* the adjective is always used of the suitors when it has the same sense as here, and always in speech (1.266=4.346=17.137). The alternative sense occurs once, again of arrows (22.75).

<sup>136</sup> I feel that the fact that the adjective is so used in the *Iliad* would have assured that its Achillean flavour would have come through to the audience here. If more were needed, it will have helped that the adjective has the ὠκύ- element, which makes it even easier to make the connection because of the connection with πόδας ὠκύς. Ἀχιλλεύς | which perhaps suggested the less common ὠκύμορος in the first place. The adjective is used twice in the position before the caesura and once at the beginning of the line, and its use is not formulaic, at least not according to any definition of the formula in which metrical conditions are a factor.

<sup>137</sup> ὠκύμορος is not discussed in Griffin 1986, but it resembles a group of words generally or only used in speeches where the speaker refers to him/herself, except that the word is regularly used by Thetis of her son rather than of herself (Griffin 1986, 41).

whether the adjective means here ‘very excellent’ or ‘most excellent’, though if the name of his father, Cleombrotus, is correctly read here it might suggest the latter, since υἱός... Κλεομβρότου ἄριστος involves the risk of ‘best son of Cleombrotus’, i.e. better than the other sons, which would be inept; it would therefore be better for the sense to be clarified by a following genitive plural, ‘best of the such-and-such’. I am tempted to supplement ἄριστος | Ἑλλήνων. In terms of external evidence, it is certainly preferable to read “most excellent,” “best”; only a few lines after the explicit reference to Homer’s commemorative activity and his rôle in preserving the κλέος of the Achaeans, the audience will naturally think of the Iliadic theme of Achilles as “Best of the Achaeans.”<sup>138</sup> It may be relevant that Pindar’s references to Homer in *N.7* and *I.4* (see above) may both be related to the “Best of the Achaeans” motif, with reference to the contest between Ajax and Odysseus over the arms of Achilles.<sup>139</sup> It might be objected that it would be tactless of Simonides to say this of Pausanias, and that the other Greeks would have found such praise of him excessive. Perhaps: but it would not be the only occasion where Pausanias caused annoyance by his self-promotion. It is recorded that the Spartans found the epigram offensive which Pausanias had inscribed beneath the Serpent Column (attributed to Simonides, as Persian Wars epigrams generally are) in which he presents himself as a pan-Hellenic leader.<sup>140</sup> I suspect that ἄριστος | Ἑλλήνων would correspond well to the sort of thing Pausanias would have liked said. However, it would be an excessively blatant case of circular argument (nor can I claim that the supplement is more than plausible) if I were to insist upon | Ἑλλήνων before going on to argue from the supplement, so I shall leave it simply as a possibility and restate that in any case the use of ἄριστος creates an analogy between Pausanias and Achilles.

If the use of ὠκύμορον γενεήν assimilates the whole Achaean army to Achilles, something similar appears to be going on on the other side as well, again using an Iliadic word with a special pedigree. It has been pointed out<sup>141</sup> that the word

<sup>138</sup> Cf. Nagy 1999, 26-41.

<sup>139</sup> Cf. Nisetich 1989, Part 1.

<sup>140</sup> See above, section 1.5. Huxley 2001, 76, suggests that the true wording of the epigram “may have been less boastful,” suggesting e.g. ἐπεὶ στρατὸς ὤλετο Μήδων. Assuming the historicity of Thucydides’ account of the erasure of the inscription, the transmitted text seems far more likely.

<sup>141</sup> Lloyd-Jones 1994.

δοίδιμος, used at fr.11.13, has a special resonance, as it is a word used only once in the *Iliad*, at 6.358 (Helen speaking to Hector, quoted above). It is not made explicit whether the phrase εἵνεκ ἐμεῖο κυνὸς καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔνεκ ἄτης refers to the Judgement of Paris or, more likely, to his abduction of Helen. Helen blames herself and Paris (I shall discuss this further below), and it is specifically upon the two of them that she says that Zeus has put a terrible fate, so that it is these two who will become δοίδιμοι. The reminiscence of this line by Simonides is intertwined with that of *Il*.1.19,<sup>142</sup> from which Parsons supplemented πόλι]ν and [οἴκαδ ἵ]κοντο (Chryses prays that the Achaeans will make a safe homecoming, 18-19 quoted):

ὑμῖν μὲν θεοὶ δοῖεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ ἔχοντες<sup>143</sup>  
ἐκπέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ οἴκαδ ἰκέσθαι·

May the gods who have their homes on Olympus grant to you to sack Priam's city and make a good homecoming.

This confluence of reminiscences from two specific sources is well described by Poltera:

Ce passage [sc.*Il*.6.357-8] est important pour la compréhension du vers de Simonide. Comme nous le savons depuis l'exorde de l'*Iliade*, la phrase prophétique d'Hélène est devenue la dure réalité: ἐκπέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ οἴκαδ ἰκέσθαι. L'un et l'autre des vers d'Homère devaient résonner dans les oreilles de l'auditoire, chaque fois que ce vers de Simonide était déclamé.<sup>144</sup>

Now, Poltera also states that, on the basis of the etymology of the word and its attestation in epic (the Iliadic line quoted and *h.Aphr.*299), the word should not be seen as having the negative associations given by LSJ's "notorious, infamous."

<sup>142</sup> Cf. the good analysis of Poltera 1997, 199-200.

<sup>143</sup> The synizesis of θεοί required by the metre is attested only here; Bentley's ὕμμι θεοὶ μὲν δοῖεν is possible. Cf. Pulleyn 2000 ad loc.

<sup>144</sup> Poltera 1997, 199. As Poltera suggests (200n.15), the specificity of reference in the word δοίδιμον is reason enough to reject Luppe's supplement καὶ Τροίην; this had already been pointed out by Lloyd-Jones 1994.



Accordingly, he says that “πόλιν ἀοίδιμον de Simonide ne comporte aucun jugement de valeur.”<sup>145</sup> This is in a limited sense true; the *words* do not have negative or evaluative connotations. However, the contextualised *effect* here is not neutral in value terms. In *Iliad* 6, Helen’s speech personalises the ethics of the situation in focusing on herself and Paris specifically: the two of them are the cause of the war, the two of them have a κακὸν μόνον from Zeus and the two of them will be ἀοίδιμοι. Simonides, by bringing the adjective into the context of a line which focuses on the conflict seen as being between two cities and two armies, effects a kind of assimilation between the unhappy pair and Troy viewed as a single unit. The responsibility of Helen and Paris for the war is brought into very close contact with the city as a whole. All of this happens in a line immediately after one which must have somehow described the conflict at Troy in terms of δίκη, something which never happens in the *Iliad*.<sup>146</sup> Just as the use of ὠκύμορος in u.23 of the fragment seems to have an assimilative effect vis-à-vis Achilles and the entire Achaean host, so ἀοίδιμον seems to have the same effect here between the Trojans and the pair viewed as responsible for the war. In context, Helen’s speech in *Iliad* 6 is pathetic and we pity her feelings of shame and guilt, and the narrator does not validate her account of her own guilt and Paris’; in its Simonidean reincarnation the word used to echo it has acquired the authority of the narratorial voice.

Having rejected the temptations of circular argument in my discussion of the possibility of supplementing Ἑλλήνων as the first word of fr.11.34 above, I shall now embrace their siren charms once more in discussing the text of u.14. Here there are two issues. The first is the question of how to supplement the first one and a half feet of the line, and the second is what to make of the peculiar ἀγέμαχοι. With regard to the first part of the line, the letter after the two omegas must surely be a nu, though the trace as seen on the published photographs is by no means obviously so; we are dealing with a genitive plural.<sup>147</sup>

<sup>145</sup> Poltera 1997, 200n.14.

<sup>146</sup> ἄρμα... δίκη as an image is elsewhere unattested in Greek (Rutherford 2001 resorts to parallels from Old Irish and the *Rig Veda*) and peculiar. The hesitation of the scribe of *P.Oxy.*2327 between ἄρμα and τέρμα may indicate that the text is defective here, but ἄρμα rather than δίκη appears to be the problem. Alan Griffiths suggests ἔρμα as an emendation, which is certainly plausible. In any case, it seems to be the case that the Trojan war is (as never in Homer) discussed in terms of justice.

<sup>147</sup> Parsons reports (Parsons 1992a, 10) more traces visible by autopsy, which happily suggest nu

The possibilities for this word would seem to be Τρ]ώων or ἥρ]ώων, both of which were suggested by Parsons. I consider it preferable to read a genitive here which refers to Δαναοί, and thus to have the whole line paralleling more closely u.18, thereby emphasising the identity of the Danaan host with the race of demigods.<sup>148</sup> Thus I would prefer to read ἥρ]ώων, and find a noun with a sense ‘leaders’ uel sim. or an adjective which may be followed by a genitive. Two of the latter have been suggested: φέρτατοι (Parsons) and ἔξοχοι (Capra and Curti).<sup>149</sup> Both are possible; Capra and Curti point out that the collocation φέρτατοι ἥρώων is unattested in archaic and classical Greek, whereas the phrase on which | ἔξοχοι ἥρώων is modelled occurs twice in the *Iliad*. On both of these occasions it occurs in the line:

ἔξοχον ἥρώων, ὃ δ' ἀνέδραμεν ἔρνεϊ ἱcoc

Outstanding among heroes, he grew up like a sapling.

This highly memorable line, in which we see a striking combination of Achilles as great hero and Achilles as growing boy, is spoken on both of its occurrences by his mother Thetis.<sup>150</sup> I would note that this supplement is already attractive before the special status of the Homeric phrase is noted, for reasons noted above by me and for the reason given by Capra and Curti, that it is a phrase with a good archaic pedigree and seems to give good sense. If we choose to accept it, then it also represents a further instance of the phenomenon I have observed with reference to the word ὠκύμορος, by which the poet’s careful use of diction seems to assimilate the Achaeans at Troy to their greatest hero. This is especially strong since whatever the supplement at u.14, it in any case seems to be a line to be read (indeed, heard) as corresponding to u.18, which is where ὠκύμορος occurs.

The problem of ἀγέμαχοι I consider to be one which should very likely be solved by emendation, and it is my opinion that we should here read ἀγχέμαχοι. I have discussed this at greater length in an Appendix; I deliberately

---

on palaeographical grounds as well as sense grounds.

<sup>148</sup> cf. Sbardella 2000, 6. The parallelisms of structure between the two pentameters would seem to encourage this.

<sup>149</sup> Parsons 1992a ad loc., Capra and Curti 1995, 28.

<sup>150</sup> *Il.* 18.57 (addressing the Nereids) = 18.437 (addressing Hephaestus). Cf. 2.483, where ἔξοχον ἥρώεσσιν | is used of Agamemnon, at one of his highest points in the poem.

(and perhaps with a hint of disingenuity) argue there only on grounds separate from my argument here, where I shall point out that if ἀγχέμαχοι is read, then that too would perhaps serve the same purpose of collapsing the distance between Achilles and the Achaean host as a whole. On three out of four uses in the *Iliad*, it is used with special reference to Achilles' henchmen, the Myrmidons, in particular at points where the 'best-ness' of Achilles is part of the point of the passage.<sup>151</sup>

## 10. Evil-minded Paris

The poor state of preservation of the following lines (11.9-12W = *P.Oxy.* 3965 fr.1.1-4 with 2327 fr.6) is particularly to be regretted. I give Parsons' edited transcript (first line quoted is hexameter):

]ρεουσαπ. [                      ]ετ[  
 Πρ]ιάμου παιεὶ χ[... ]ομ[  
 . Αλεξά]νδρῳ κακόφρ[ονο]ς ως... [  
 ]θείης ἄρμα καθεῖλε δίκ[η(-)]

sons of Priam... of evil-minded Alexandros... the chariot of justice destroyed...

This follows a part which has been plausibly reconstructed to refer to the death of Achilles and/or Patroclus, and comes before 11.13, which certainly refers to the destruction of Troy. "The general drift," says Parsons,<sup>152</sup> "emerges from κακοφρ[, καθεῖλε and δίκ[, that the destruction of Troy resulted from the sin of Paris." This is surely correct, and it seems certain that, had we more to go on, these two couplets would be very important for our understanding of the way in which Simonides presents the Trojan War. An obvious question is "*which* sin of Paris?" i.e., was there a reference to the abduction of Helen, or to the Judgment of Paris, or was there only a general reference to his bad character, leaving the

<sup>151</sup> 16.248: Achilles' prayer for Patroclus' safe return to the ships "with all his armour and his close-fighting companions"; 16.272 Patroclus urges the Myrmidons to fight "so that we may bring honour to Pelcus' son, who is by far the best by the ships of the Argives, and his close-fighting henchmen [sc. are also best/excellent; cf. Janko ad loc.]"; 17.165 Glaucus echoes Patroclus' words in pointing out to Hector that Achilles is the best of the Argive warriors. The other usage is with Μυοί, 13.5.

<sup>152</sup> Parsons 1992a, 29.

audience free to think of either or both of these? A variety of possible approaches to supplementation is considered by Parsons *ad loc.*, and the variety indicates the high degree of uncertainty. A central issue is the participle (probably) to be supplemented in u.10. The options considered by Parsons are χ[αριζ]ομ[εν]- (Parsons, with excellent parallels cited *ad loc.*) and χ[αλεπτ]ομ[εν]- (West). If somebody is granting favour to the sons of Priam, that should be Apollo killing Achilles (or possibly Patroclus). If somebody is angered at the sons of Priam, in the context of the sinfulness of Paris, that should be one or more of the anti-Trojan deities. In favour of the latter idea, as pursued by West, if u.10 still refers to Apollo, then the movement to 11, which must concern not the death of Achilles but the transition to the fall of Troy, would seem very abrupt (*cf.* Parsons *ad loc.*). In addition, there is the factor that u.9 looks rather as if it might contain the feminine participle ἐοῦσα (or ἐοῦς ἀπ-), though it could represent -εοῦς ἀπ-. This might suggest one of the anti-Trojan goddesses, Hera or Athene. For a sure reference to the Judgement of Paris, we might prefer both goddesses, and this is what West supplies *e.g.* for this couplet:

Παλλὰς δ' ἐγγὺς ἐοῦσα περικλεῆς ἄ]στ[υ καθεῖλεν<sup>153</sup>,  
 cὺν δ' Ἥρῃ, Πρ]ιάμου παιδὶ χ[αλεπτ]όμ[εναι

Pallas, being close by, destroyed the famous city, and with her Hera: they were angry with the sons of Priam.

One may object that the placing of cὺν δ' Ἥρῃ here seems rather an afterthought.

It is worth noting that the sigma in West's ἄ]στ[υ should be dotted (as it is by Parsons, even in his edited transcript): it could equally be the right hand part of a kappa, which raises the further possibility of Hector's name. Sbardella restores a reference to the death of Hector here, with Athena but without Hera:<sup>154</sup>

Παλλὰς δ' ἐγγὺς ἐοῦς ἀπε[τείσατο Ἑ]κτ[ορα δῖον  
 ἔγχεϊ cῶι, Πρ]ιάμου παιδὶ χ[αλεπτ]όμ[ενη.

<sup>153</sup> With characteristic boldness, West (in *IEG*<sup>2</sup>) suggests (*ad u.12*): “(ἐ)κίχανε malim; puta καθεῖλε ex 9 irrepsisse.”

<sup>154</sup> Sbardella 2000, 10.

Pallas, being close by, took vengeance on godlike Hector  
with your spear, being angry with the sins of Priam.

If there was a reference to the Judgement of Paris discernible in these lines, it would have represented, certainly in this Iliadic context, a cue for the audience to remember the famous single reference to the same incident in the *Iliad*. This is in any case a useful comparandum, as a place where the poet goes further than is his custom in appearing to attribute responsibility for the war (*Il.*24.25-30):

ἔνθ' ἄλλοις μὲν πᾶσιν ἐήνδανεν, οὐδέ ποθ' Ἥρηι  
οὐδὲ Ποσειδάων οὐδὲ γλαυκῶπιδι κούρηι,  
ἀλλ' ἔχον ὥς εἰς πρῶτον ἀπήχθετο Ἴλιος ἱρὴ  
καὶ Πρίαμος καὶ λαὸς. Αἰεξάνδρου ἔνεκ ἄτης,  
ὃς νείκεσσε θεάς, ὅτε οἱ μέσσαυλον ἴκοντο,  
τὴν δ' ἦνιθε ἥ οἱ πόρε μαχλοσύνην ἀλεγεινὴν.

This pleased the others; but it never pleased Hera, nor Poseidon, nor the grey-eyed maiden, but they kept on the same as since holy Ilion became hateful to them, along with Priam and his people, because of the folly of Alexandros, who angered the goddesses when they came to his bothy, and praised the one who offered him shameless lust.

The authenticity of these lines has been disputed since antiquity.<sup>155</sup> I shall not give a defence here, but rather refer to the celebrated treatment of Reinhardt, augmented by further work by M. Davies.<sup>156</sup>

This is an remarkably explicit narratorial assignment of responsibility, though it is to some extent mitigated by the fact that it is clearly focalised through the

<sup>155</sup> Σ bT record the athetesis of 23-30 by an unknown scholar, and the athetesis of 24-30 by Aristarchus; Aristonicus records the athetesis of 25-30, which may have been Aristarchus' real position. Most of the perceived problems can be eradicated by the removal of 29-30 only (which remains West's solution in the Teubner (West 1998-2000)).

<sup>156</sup> Reinhardt [1937] 1997. Davies 1981 points out that Reinhardt's argument explains why the judgement is *not* mentioned in other places more effectively than why it *is* mentioned here, and suggests that the refusal of the goddesses to put aside their anger is contrasted with the reconciliation between Achilles and Priam. Davies 2003 suggests a parallelism between the three women visited by Hector in *Iliad* 6 and the three goddesses of the judgement. The *da capo* reference to the origin of the war is apt towards the end of the poem, as Eustathius saw: καὶ ὅρα ὅπως τὴν τοῦ Τρωϊκοῦ πολέμου αἰτιωτάτην πράξιν τῷ τέλει τῆς Ἰλιάδος ἐταμιεύσατο, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἀναρτήσας τὸν ἀκροάτην (ad 24.28-30); cf. Richardson ad loc.

viewpoint of the anti-Trojan divinities. There is nevertheless no word here to compare with Simonides' κακόφρ[ονο]ς: the phrase Αλεξάνδρου ἔνεκ ἄτης |, which is used also in the speech by Helen where she describes the source of her present woes (6.354-8, quoted above), does not carry the same force as this.<sup>157</sup> To accuse somebody of being afflicted with ἄτη is not necessarily to make an assertion about his bad character, since the word frequently refers to a sort of folly or delusion which comes upon a person from outside and over which he has no control. Thus, famously, Agamemnon explains his wrong-headedness in the quarrel of the first book of the *Iliad* by saying that he is not responsible *because* he was afflicted by ἄτη (19.86-9):

ἐγὼ δ' οὐκ αἴτιός εἰμι,  
ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς καὶ Μοῖρα καὶ ἡεροφοῖτις. Ερινύς,  
οἳ τέ μοι εἰν ἀγορῇ φρεσὶν ἔμβαλον ἄγριον ἄτην,  
ἥματι τῷ ὄτ' Ἀχιλλῆος γέρας αὐτὸς ἀπηύρων.

I am not to blame. Rather, Zeus and Moira and air-stepping Erinys, who cast wild ἄτη into my mind in the assembly, on that day when I myself stripped Achilles of his prize.

Again, the passage from book 6 already mentioned gains much of its force from the fact that Helen, in her self-hating misery, attributes their present sufferings to Paris' delusion (ἄτη), but to herself in her very nature as a 'bitch' (6.356):

εἵνεκ' ἐμέϊο κυνὸς καὶ Αλεξάνδρου ἔνεκ ἄτης.

On account of me, bitch that I am, and on account of the folly of Alexandros.

If a reference to the Judgement is correctly to be restored here, the closeness between this passage and the passage from the last book of the *Iliad* makes εἵνεκ' (Parsons ad loc., printed in textu by West) a particularly attractive supplement at the beginning of u.11.

However, this is all in the realms of speculation. Regardless of exactly how and why Paris is held responsible for the fall of Troy here, we at least have enough to

---

<sup>157</sup> As mentioned, its unusualness in blaming Paris even to this degree is reduced to the extent that it should be seen as focalised through the standpoint of the goddesses.

say with certainty that certain features are striking precisely because of their un-Homeric tone. One is the use of *κακόφρων*: this epithet is unhomeric, occurring only as a worthless emendation of Zenodotus at *Il.* 11.123 and 138;<sup>158</sup> the regular epithets for Paris, as Parsons notes *ad loc.*, are *δῖος* and *θεοειδής*. Further, Griffin shows<sup>159</sup> that *all* words of the *κακ*- group are considerably less common in the narratorial voice; I can add that there is no place in the whole of the *Iliad* where Paris is named (he is not named in the *Odyssey*) where an adjective of the *κακ*- group refers to him.<sup>160</sup> The word *κακόφρωνος* will have had a striking effect, surrounded by Homeric vocabulary as it is. The fall of Troy as a consequence of Paris' error is not attributed (or not only attributed) to the unforgiving malice of the anti-Trojan gods (as in the Judgement passage in *Il.* 24), but is described in terms of the workings of *δίκη*.

## 11. Allusion and Interpretation

In the light of the large number of Homeric allusions that others and I have identified in the elegy, and most obviously in the light of the explicit reference to Homer in *uu.* 15ff., it seems to me that establishing what Simonides does with his Homeric allusions is integral to the interpretation of the fragment as a (false) whole. Allusion here resembles metaphor or simile;<sup>161</sup> resemblance and contrast are both important. In particular, it is interesting to look at Simonides' allusions to the *Iliad* and the ways in which he adapts and changes from his source text.

I have shown respects in which Simonides assimilates Achilles and the Achaean force as a whole; we have nothing to suggest the rupture between the Achaeans which forms most of the plot of the *Iliad*, but instead Achilles' adjective *ὠκύμορος* is made to qualify all the Achaean side at Troy, who are further implicitly

---

<sup>158</sup> Zenodotus will have considered it inappropriate to call Antimachus *δαΐφρων* "wise, prudent," i.e. the correction is based on lack of understanding of oral style. He may of course have taken the epithet from here.

<sup>159</sup> Griffin 1986, 39.

<sup>160</sup> The closest thing to it is at *Il.* 5.63, where the word *ἀρχεκάκους* refers to the ships with which Paris went to abduct Helen (Griffin does not include this word in his list of words with *κακός*, which is a consequence of the fact that he was using paper sources only rather than a search string *κακ* in a digital concordance, which would now be the way to go; Griffin 1986, 39).

<sup>161</sup> Conte 1986, cf. above, Introduction.

compared with the men who fought at Plataea.<sup>162</sup> In addition, the lines concerning the Trojan war and its causes are given a new set of resonances by the combination of multiple source texts from the *Iliad*, in such a way as to focus attention much more explicitly on the evil character of Paris and also to associate his wrong-doing with the city of the Trojans as a whole. Rather than with the sympathetic Hector, Paris is juxtaposed with the best of the Achaeans, Achilles. The overall effect is that Achilles and Paris have become representative figures, from which we may gauge the moral characters of the two sides fighting at Troy. The fall of Troy is presented as an illustration of the notion that justice always catches up in the end. In uu.15ff., Homer's glorificatory function looks rather as if it refers only to the Achaeans who fought at Troy, rather than to the Trojans as well.

Taking these points in isolation from each other, it could be said that I have provided numerous instances of a phenomenon by which elegy tends towards being a more 'subjective' genre than Homeric epic: the elegiac poet is willing to speak in a more explicitly judgmental way than the epic poet. Accordingly, he selects his Homeric allusions in a way which corresponds to his own elegiac style, for example taking vocabulary which in epic is more commonly associated with speeches and happily deploying it in the narratorial voice. It is in generic terms more natural for the elegiac poet to present his material in an ethically charged manner, where the epic poet leaves ethical reflection as it were immanent in the poem, in the voices of the characters and the reflections of the audience. (Ethically reflective characters function like the chorus in a tragedy; they are not necessarily representing an 'authorised' comment on the poem, but they do provide the audience with an encouragement to perceive the events of the poem as ethically charged and to reflect upon them themselves. This is surely how we still behave when, for example, we read Achilles' version of the Niobe story in *Il.*24).

In addition, it seems to be characteristic of elegy that it celebrates or reinforces the identity of a group. Sympotic elegy like Theognis tends towards a kind of inward-turned definition of the circle of 'good men'; the addressee is warned of

---

<sup>162</sup> Thus they too may be seen as having chosen a short and glorious life and their death at Plataea, which choice is now associated with all of the Achaeans at Troy as well as with Achilles specifically.



the dangers presented by social and ethical instability which makes it difficult to define the *esthloi*. There here appears to be a degree of continuity between sympotic and large-scale elegy, since the festival elegies seem to have dealt with subject matter which places emphasis on the collective identity of the *polis*, such as local history, especially foundation myths; Mimnermus' *Smyrneis* most likely dealt with both 'mythical' foundation material concerning Ephesus (maybe even including an Amazon: the archetypal other against which political identity may be determined) as well as recent material concerning fighting with the Lydians.<sup>163</sup> Both sympotic elegy and festival elegy seem to employ a rhetoric of inclusion/exclusion and group definition.<sup>164</sup> The practice of commemorating a battle like Plataea with a performance of an elegy brings into play a new expansion of the elegiac group; rather than the group of symposiasts or the oligarchic class, or the *polis* as a whole, the group whose identity can be celebrated is the wide ranging assortment of states that fought at the battle. As such, the poem seems to celebrate this group as well as the general Pausanias, whose interests were also served by the presentation of a group consisting of Hellenes, of which he could be presented as a leader.

Inasmuch as that it commemorates the combined military action of Greek speakers from numerous *poleis* against peoples to the east of the Greek world, the *Iliad* might have seemed like an excellent mythological exemplum for Simonides to use as an analogy for the men who fought at Plataea.<sup>165</sup> Yet the *Iliad* of Homer is pervaded by division among the Achaean side; the Trojan side is in no respect demonised; in numerous ways which I have discussed above it may be seen as a rather inappropriate model for a poet who wished to celebrate Pausanias' supposed leadership of a united pan-Hellenic front against the Persians. Simonides' response is to adapt motifs from the *Iliad* in such a way as to present a consistently revisionist account of the poem, in which it emerges as a conflict

---

<sup>163</sup> Cf. Bowie 1986, 28-9.

<sup>164</sup> This aspect is both a link and a difference with regard to Callimachus' elegy. His use of local histories (from prose sources) is done at a distance from the court and library in Alexandria (excepting his special interest in Cyrene); he gathers together interesting stories from all over the Greek world. Mimnermus presumably performed his *Smyrneis* in a socially embedded setting in Ephesus, as an Ephesian among other Ephesians (as Solon his *Salamis* among Athenians).

<sup>165</sup> This is related to pan-Hellenic ideology in Simonides' treatment of Plataea by e.g. Capra 2004, 120; but Capra does not observe the extent to which Simonides re-presents and reinterprets his source text in order to use Homer for this purpose.

between a united Achaean force closely associated with Achilles and a Trojan force associated with Paris and with his moral inadequacy, perhaps as presented in the story of his Judgement between the three goddesses, so that the war is presented explicitly as the activity of justice. The way in which he does so in the specific historical circumstances which were operative in the aftermath of the Persian Wars may be seen not only as a fascinating example of allusive appropriation between genres but also as a key document in the early history of pan-Hellenic ideology. As such, in its reinvention of the most important poetic text of Greek antiquity, it should be seen as a crucial text in the cultural history of Europe: the 'Invention of the Barbarian' in the fifth century BC was a key moment in the mythologisation of European identity as viewed in the very long term. When, for example, journalists marvel at the wealth amassed in palaces by despotic Oriental rulers – generally unremarkable compared with the Leonardos and Rembrandts of our own dear Queen – we can see the long shadow cast by the Greek notion of the freedom-loving Hellene and the despotic, wealth-loving barbarian: a notion of which we can see the early history in Simonides' commemoration of the battle at Plataea.

## Chapter 2

### Pindar, Simonides and Money: Pindar's *Isthmian* 2

#### 1. Pindar *Isthmian* 2

In this chapter and the following we leave the question of ethnic definition and identity and turn to a different aspect of Simonides' creation of and reflection upon the rôle of the poet in his time: the interaction of the poet with the economic world of exchange. (Simonides' associations with Hellenic ethnicity will resurface in chapter 4, which shows both themes together as important features of Simonides' reception in Theocritus 16). In chapter 3, the substantial and intriguing tradition surrounding Simonides' supposed interest in money, wealth and associated tensions in patronage will be examined in detail, and an attempt will be made to relate this to aspects of his own poetic practice which can still be seen even in the meagre scraps of his songs available to us. The present chapter focuses much more narrowly on the ode of Pindar in which the same theme seems to be presented and problematised more strongly than elsewhere in the younger poet's oeuvre: *Isthmian* 2. It would in any case seem worthwhile to spend some time examining the work of Pindar which seems most obviously relevant to this general theme.<sup>1</sup> However, *Isthmian* 2 is here used as more than simply a comparandum. The present chapter argues that features of this song are marked by Pindar's engagement with the poetic practice of Simonides, and that this engagement is most naturally interpreted together with the ode's unusual (for Pindar) problematising of economic relations in connection with song. Essentially, therefore, this chapter argues that *Isthmian* 2 belongs in the same tradition as the (mostly later) sources considered in chapter 3. These two chapters should therefore be seen as cohering especially closely together.

They are, however, argued separately, for a number of reasons. One is simply that the reading of *Isthmian* 2 presented here, if correct, has a special importance in the reception of Simonides by virtue of its date and provenance: this song, if the argument of this chapter is accepted, shows us that Simonides is seen as an

---

<sup>1</sup> On economics and exchange in Pindar more generally, see in particular the important treatment of Kurke 1991, whose reading of the present poem will be examined below.

important figure in the construction of the poetic response to the economics of patronage during his own time and in the work of a poet who moved in the same world as he did, and probably on much the same terms. This testimonium to Simonides' reception, therefore, should not be marked by anachronism and misunderstanding of the poetics or cultural world of early classical song-culture, since it is itself a product of that same world. Another reason is more pragmatic: by virtue of its date and for other reasons, this aspect of Simonides' reception is capable of being discussed alone, and for the convenience of the reader has therefore been separated from the treatment of the rest of the tradition of which it is argued to form a part in order to break the material up into more digestible pieces. A third reason is rhetorical. It has proved possible to argue separately for a genuinely Simonidean origin for the tradition associating Simonides with issues of wealth and remuneration both in Pindar and also in the later tradition. The fact that these *two* strands of argument can point independently in the same direction might seem to enhance the plausibility of each separate strand, and of the general conclusion which they share (two arguments tending to the same point are better than one). This conclusion is that the problematising treatment of aspects of the relationships involved with the world of money and of the payment of a fee in exchange for poetic commemoration were associated with Simonides by others because they were treated by Simonides himself in his own work in a striking and remarkable way, and that this tradition therefore reflects the difficulties and interest of the construction of the rôle of the poet in Simonides' own times.

Pindar's second Isthmian was probably composed in the late 470s and was addressed to Thrasyboulus of Akragas. The poem owes its place in the book of Isthmians to the fact that it especially commemorates the victory of Thrasyboulus' deceased father Xenocrates in the Isthmian games. It is thus slightly anomalous as an epinician by virtue of its occasion and the fact that it has two *laudandi*: Xenocrates, the victor, and Thrasyboulus, who commissioned the poem and to whom it is addressed.<sup>2</sup> In any case, the poem has many epinician

---

<sup>2</sup> cf. Bowra 1964, 356; contra, Verdenius 1988 (~ Verdenius 1982) ad *I*.2.12. Perhaps Nisetich has it about right where he draws attention to the fact that, because of the death of Xenocrates, the poem is necessarily addressed to Thrasyboulus, and Pindar has therefore "adapted the epinician form to suit his needs and those of Thrasyboulus, who is not a victor" (Nisetich 1977, 151).

characteristics and treats athletic victories as one of its main topics for praise, while also perhaps initially alluding to an erotic flavour more characteristic of non-epinician encomia, such as Pindar had previously composed for the same Thrasyboulus.<sup>3</sup>

The section of the poem which has made it a place of special interest in connection with the economics of paid-for poetry is the beginning, occupying the larger part of the first triad (the whole consisting of three triads: this is no small part of the total):

Οἱ μὲν πάλαι, ὦ Θρασύβουλε,  
 φῶτες, οἱ χρυσαμπύκων  
 ἐς δίφρον Μοῖσάν ἔβαι-  
 νον κλυτᾷ φόρμιγγι συναντόμενοι,  
 ῥίμφα παιδεῖους ἐτόξευον μελιγάρυας ὕμνους,  
 ὅστις ἐὼν καλὸς εἶχεν. Αφροδίτας  
 εὐθρόνου μνάστειραν ἀδίσταν ὀπώραν.

Ἄ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδής  
 πω τότ' ἦν οὐδ' ἐργάτις·  
 οὐδ' ἐπέρναντο γλυκεῖ-  
 αι μελιφθόγγου ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας  
 ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλθακόφωναι ἀοιδαί.  
 νῦν δ' ἐφίητι <τὸ> τώργειον φυλάξαι  
 ῥῆμ' ἀλαθείας <ἐτᾶς> ἄγχιετα βαῖνον,

"χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνὴρ"  
 ὅς φᾶ κτεάνων θ' ἅμα λειφθεὶς καὶ φίλων.  
 ἐσσι γὰρ ὦν σοφός· οὐκ ἄγνωτ' ἀείδω  
 Ἰεθμίαν ἵπποισι νίκαν...

<sup>3</sup> fr.124 M; cf. the erotic encomia fr. 123, 128 M. Pindar also commemorated the athletic victories of his father (*Pyth.* 6) and uncle (*Ol.* 2 and 3). Given that *Pyth.* 6, composed during Xenocrates' lifetime, also spends a lot of time on praise of Thrasyboulus, it does not seem to me that biographical speculations suggesting that Pindar was personally well-disposed towards the son should be dismissed out of hand (e.g., the introduction to *Isthmian* 2 in Bury 1892); personal friendship with Thrasyboulus and his family might have allowed him a degree of licence in the present poem which would have been undiplomatic in a poem addressed to a new patron. For a possible way of interpreting eroticism in encomiastic poetry in connection with changes in exchange and patronage, see Nicholson 2000.

7. μελιφθόγγου Heyne: - ot mss.  
 9. suppl. Heyne.  
 10. suppl. Bergk : <ὁδῶν> Turyn post Hermann.

The ancient men, Thrasyboulus, who would embark upon the chariot of the Muses with golden headbands, joining themselves to the fame-bringing lyre, would readily shoot sweetly-singing songs of love for boys – for whoever was beautiful and had the sweetest ripeness such as to attract Aphrodite of the fine throne.

For the Muse was then not yet a lover of gain, nor a working girl. Nor were the sweet, gentle-voiced songs sold for a fee by honey-voiced Terpsichore, their faces silvered. But now she enjoins upon us to pay attention to the saying of the Argive, which comes closest to the true state of affairs:<sup>4</sup>

“Possessions, possessions are the man,” he said who lost at the same time his goods and his friends. For truly you are wise.<sup>5</sup> Not unknown is the victory I sing, with horses at Isthmia...

As was seen by Wilamowitz,<sup>6</sup> the vocabulary used to describe the present-day Muse and her songs is that of prostitution: this is the way in which both ἐργάτις and ἐπέρναντο would have been understood.<sup>7</sup> Even if parallels were not available, it would remain a likely interpretation; what can it signify where we see the combination of “working woman” with the idea of personified (feminine)

<sup>4</sup> Referring “to true reality rather than to truth as a quality of human statements” (Verdenius 1988 ~ 1982 ad loc.). Otherwise, “to [sc. speaking] the real truth”; with ὁδῶν “closest to the paths of truth,” for which Verdenius compares *Pyth.* 3.103.

<sup>5</sup> Thrasyboulus is skilled in *mousike*; cf. *Pyth.* 6.48-9. γὰρ οὖν: v. Denniston 1954, 446 “in post-Homeric Greek, οὖν adds to γὰρ the idea of importance or essentiality,” and in the examples he usually conveys the force of οὖν with words of *emphasis* (“really, certainly, in sooth,” and equivalent use of italics). On the present instance Denniston puts in brackets “looking forward” (sc. to οὐκ ἄγνωτ' αἰδέω), which smooths the asyndeton into the next clause; see further below.

<sup>6</sup> Wilamowitz 1922, 311 with n.1.

<sup>7</sup> For ἐργάτις with this sense, Wilamowitz cited Archilochus (fr. 206 W); he was expressing himself briefly, but might have added (references only from LSJ) ἐργάζομαι in the sense “sollicit, work as a prostitute” (LSJ s.v. II.6 “esp. of courtesans”, first citation Dem. 59.20); ἐργασία of the trade of a prostitute (LSJ s.v. II.3 “esp. of a courtesan’s trade”; LSJ seems here to use “courtesan” out of politeness, rather than to distinguish *hetaera* from *porne*; first citation Hdt. 2.135); ἐργάειμος as an adj. to designate a prostitute (LSJ s.v. II, Artemidorus 1.78); ἐργαστήριον of a brothel (LSJ s.v. “*euph.*” first citation Dem. 59.67). On the relation between πόρνη and πέρνημι, see LSJ s.v. πόρνη and Davidson 1997, 117. The point is here laboured because some who have argued against this have written as if the Archilochus were the only relevant passage (e.g. Verdenius 1988 ~ 1982 ad loc.: “Wil... thinks that the word suggests ‘prostitute,’ because Archilochus used it in that sense”).

songs being “sold,” with “their faces silvered,”<sup>8</sup> as an instance of φιλαργυρία, in a context where the activity is being contrasted with erotic pursuit of boys which is distinguished as being unmotivated by profit?<sup>9</sup> This is in many ways the nub of the problem; despite parallels,<sup>10</sup> it is not possible to find another place in Pindar where the modern Muse is so denigrated and so negatively presented. Even if the imagery of prostitution were ignored, it would remain the case that the vocabulary is that which is regularly used where money and the desire for remuneration is spoken of in a rather negative light: we may note φιλοκερδής (u.6), a negative term<sup>11</sup> found also in the tradition concerning Simonides and money.<sup>12</sup>

The most important comparandum for the treatment of remuneration for poetry in the epinician corpus is in *Pyth.* 11, for Pindar’s compatriot Thrasydaios of Thebes, probably to be dated to 474 BC.<sup>13</sup> Here the poet refers to his financially incurred obligations (presented as obligations for his Muse) in the course of the break-off from the unusually gloomy myth – the so-called “Little Oresteia” – and return to the explicitly encomiastic concerns of the song (36-45):

ἀλλὰ χρονίῳι cὺν Ἄρει  
πέφνεν τε ματέρα θῆκέ τ’ Αἴγιον ἐν φοναίῃ.  
ἦρ , ὦ φίλοι, κατ’ ἀμευσίπορον τρίοδον ἐδινάθην,  
ὀρθὰν κέλευθον ἰὼν

<sup>8</sup> Verdenius (1988 ~ 1982 ad loc.) is mistaken to read πρόσωπον as meaning here “the facade of a building,” despite parallels in Pindar (*Ol.* 6.3 and *Pyth.* 6.14; but in both of these places the building image is already unambiguously introduced before the word πρόσωπον is used to mean the front of it). Here the personification of the songs is already established inasmuch as that they have voices (μαλακόφωναι): surely the songs are not “sweet-voiced with a silvered front wall.”

<sup>9</sup> For the contrast between payment and eroticism, and the idea that eroticism in encomiastic poetry might represent an attempt to construct a fictive non-commercial relationship between poet and patron, see Nicholson 2000.

<sup>10</sup> For passages concerning the fee in lyric, see in general Gzella 1971; with particular reference to the present poem, cf. Woodbury 1968.

<sup>11</sup> φιλοκερδής is found only here in Pindar; κέρδος in Pindar regularly has negative connotations, and always so where presented as a motive for human behaviour (*Pyth.* 1.92, 2.78, 3.54, 4.140, *Nem.* 9.33); it requires to be carefully limited (*Nem.* 11.47). Elsewhere, it is φίλτατον where it comes from a willing giver (*Pyth.* 8.13), or receiving praise is the highest κέρδος (*Isthm.* 1.51: but the point is the contrast between the material profit of other activities and the immaterial one of receiving praise).

<sup>12</sup> cf. the discussion of Simonides in [Pl.] *Hipp.* (below, section 3.5), and compare φιλάργυρος in the account of Simonides given in *P.Oxy.* 1800 (see below, section 3.9), φιλαργυρία of Simonides in Σ Aristoph. *Birds* 697 c-c (below, section 3.3); αἰχροκερδής and κίμβιξ would have been more powerfully derogatory words.

<sup>13</sup> The scholia give a conflicting account (454 is the other possibility). See Bernardini’s introduction in Gentili et al. 1995, 283ff., with bibl.

τὸ πρίν· ἢ μέ τις ἄνεμος ἔξω πλόου  
 ἔβαλεν, ὥς ὅτ' ἄκατον ἐνναλίαν;  
 Μοῖσα, τὸ δὲ τεόν, εἰ μισθοῖο συνέθειν παρέχειν  
 φωνὰν ὑπάργυρον, ἄλλοτ' ἄλλαι {χρηῇ} ταρᾶσκέμιν  
 ἢ πατρὶ Πυθονίκῳ  
 τό γέ νυν ἢ Θρακυδαίῳ,  
 τῶν εὐφροσύνα τε καὶ δόξ' ἐπιφλέγει.

But in time and with the help of Ares he [sc. Orestes] killed his mother and put Aegisthus in a violent death.<sup>14</sup> My friends, was I whirled around at a junction where the road is confused, having been taking a straight road before? Or did some wind blow me off course, as if I were a skiff at sea? Muse, your job is this, since you have contracted to provide your silvered voice for gain: to keep it moving one way and the other, either to Pythonikos his father [or “to his father who won at Pytho”] or, the present concern, to Thrasydaios, for their festivity and glory are ablaze.

Here we find an unusually frank acknowledgement of the financial relationship by which epinician was contracted between laudandus and poet; as in *Isthm.* 2, the potentially disturbing nature of this relationship is emphasised by its being described as a feature of the present *Muse* rather than the poet. In *Pyth.* 11, however, the acknowledgement of the financial relationship is expressed in a relatively unproblematised and matter-of-fact manner, and presents itself as motivated by the need to return to the praise of Thrasydaios (and his father). Surely the original effect of Pindar’s frankness here would have been humorous as much as alarming, as the master-poet presents himself as having foolishly lost his way mid-song. The poet’s address to the Muse in u.41 is part of a sort of dramatic monologue of excuse-making: first, though speaking of himself, he does so using the passive ἐδινάθην and putting himself as the helpless object of the actions of the wind (where he was *subject* of an *active* verb, all was well – ὁρθὰν κέλευθον ἰὼν τὸ πρίν). It is within this comedy of excuses that he then turns

<sup>14</sup> Bernardini (in Gentili et al. 1995 ad loc) comments on this peculiar expression (θῆκε... ἐν φοναίῃ) that it is stronger than πέφνεν because it implies “l’idea di un’ agonia violenta.” She gives parallels only from Aelian; more to the point, Liberman (Liberman 2004, ad loc.) cites Soph. *Ant.* 696-7.



away from himself altogether and pointedly blames the Muse (τὸ δὲ τέον “this is your job!”): in a reversal of the usual situation by which the poet has obtained his capacity to sing well from the Muses, Pindar blames his Muse for an apparent fault, and reminds her of the epinician contract which he himself has made.

The financial circumstance is presented as part of the understood background to epinician poetry, whereas in *Isthm.* 2 it is much more explicitly foregrounded and problematised, and is not, as in *Pyth.* 11, presented in a context where it is made to seem partially motivated by the stage which the “I”-voice has reached in the fictive performance of the song. The reference to μισθός here must have been shocking, and the humour of the situation would have derived from its apparent inappropriateness,<sup>15</sup> but it nevertheless seems not to present as problematised and challenging an issue to the listener as the beginning of *Isthm.* 2.

## 2. *Isthmian* 2 and Simonides: ancient interpretation

As will be discussed below,<sup>16</sup> this poem’s interpretation by ancient scholars forms part of the tradition of reception of Simonides which is the object of inquiry here; the scholia suggested (among other biographical explanations) that Pindar’s intention in addressing the modern connection between poetry and remuneration was indirectly to attack Simonides: Σ 9a (iii.214 Drachmann) states that Simonides had invented remuneration (μισθός) for poetry, and the second scholion on the same line (9b, iii.214 Drachmann) runs as follows:

οὐδ' ἐργάτις, ὃ ἐστὶν αἰτοῦσα μισθὸν ἐφ' οἷς ἔπραττεν. ἔνθεν καὶ  
Καλλίμαχος φησιν·

οὐ γὰρ ἐργάτιν τρέφω

τὴν Μοῦσαν ὡς ὁ Κεῖτος Ὑλίου νέπους. (fr. 222 Pf.)

λέγοι δ' ἂν πρὸς Σιμωνίδην ταῦτα, ὡς φιλόργυρον διακύρων τὸν  
ἄνδρα.

Not a working girl: i.e., asking for payment for what she was doing. Thence Callimachus says ‘I do not keep<sup>17</sup> my Muse as a working girl, as did the Cean

<sup>15</sup> This sort of humorous inappropriateness was, I suggest, more characteristic of Simonides than of Pindar: see section 3.7 below.

<sup>16</sup> Section 3.10.

<sup>17</sup> τρέφω may denote the relation between a man and a *hetaira* living as his lover in his household

offspring of Hylichus.’ These things should be said against Simonides, ridiculing the man for his avarice.

If, as it seems, the scholiast is right in supposing that Callimachus had in mind the present Pindaric passage, the interpretation of the lines as a veiled criticism of Simonides was probably current already in scholarly discussion of the third century; perhaps it derives from peripatetic περί scholarship of the sort known to us from the fragments of Chamaeleon.<sup>18</sup> As will be seen below (in chapter 3), this interpretation of *Isthm.* 2 cannot be the source of the tradition concerning Simonides and money, since it is very unlikely to pre-date the references to Simonides’ avarice in Aristophanes (and perhaps Xenophanes).<sup>19</sup> On the contrary, it depends on the pre-existence of a connection between Simonides and poetic avarice, since it is only in this context that the interpretation would have been made in the first place: Pindar seems to contrast different periods rather than different contemporary poets, and (however reluctantly) identifies himself with the newer mercenary poets and not with the old (νῦν, u.11, is the speaker’s own time...). Again, it is surprising that an encomiastic poet has been believed to start a poem by belittling a previous encomiast of the same family:<sup>20</sup> it is a not a good praising technique to begin by devaluing the praise which the laudandus has already received from others.

It was a common practice of the scholiasts to explain phenomena by means of supposing them to be motivated by rivalry between Pindar and Bacchylides or

---

(Antiphanes fr. 2 K-A), or between a *pornoboskos* (pimp) and the women from whose activities he earns his living (Diphilus fr. 87 K-A); these two senses, of which the latter rather than the former seems to fit Callimachus’ usage, are represented at LSJ s.v. τρέφω II.2.

<sup>18</sup> See below, section 3.8.

<sup>19</sup> See below, sections 3.3-3.4. Slater 1972 argued that the tradition might stem from the present interpretation of the scholia.

<sup>20</sup> Simonides had composed an epinician for Xenocrates mentioning both his Isthmian and Pythian victories, as a scholion points out (Simonides 513 *PMG* = Σ P. *Isthm.* 2 argumentum, iii.212 Drachmann) – unless this is a consequence of falsely biographical reasoning based on Pindar’s poem, which there is no particular reason to suppose. Even if the poem of Simonides were a fiction, if the scholiast(s) responsible for the interpretation of the poem as containing an attack on Simonides also believed that Simonides had composed for the same family then obviously the same objection to their argument would apply independently of the truth of its premises. We may further note that, in *Paean* 4, a paean to be sung by a chorus from Ceos on Delos, Pindar appears to praise Ceos for its association with song: γινώσκ[ο]μα[ι] δὲ καὶ μοῖσαν παρέχων ἄλις “Also I am known as providing poetry in abundance” (*Paean* 4.24 = fr.52d24 M; the island speaks). The scholiasts’ attitude towards the relationship between Pindar and Simonides in this passage is viewed sympathetically by Sommerstein 2005, 169-70.

(especially) Simonides.<sup>21</sup> It is of course possible that a scholiast or his source perceived an intertextual relationship between the phrasing of part of *Isthm.* 2 and a specific passage of Simonides, as happened in the interpretation of *Ol.* 9.48-9,<sup>22</sup> but since they do not quote or cite any passage of Simonides it will not be possible to tell. In any case, the scholiasts here showed the usual tendency to associate problems associated with poets and payment with Simonides, combined with the tendency indicated above to assume that various kinds of peculiarities in Pindar were to be explained as veiled criticism of the other two celebrated contemporary epinician poets, and especially Simonides.

### 3. A Carian and an Argive: *Isthmian* 2 and Simonides 514 *PMG*

It remains the case, however, that there are features of this poem which might be seen as providing some sort of parallelism to the aspects of Simonides' own poems to which attention has been drawn. In the context of the analysis given below of the poem represented by fr. 514 *PMG*,<sup>23</sup> we see an apparent resemblance inasmuch as that the poem draws close attention to the importance of money (χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνὴρ, "Possessions, possessions are the man") and that it does so by means of explicit comparison with poverty (ὅς φᾶ κτεάνων θ' ἅμα λειφθεῖς καὶ φίλων "he said who lost at the same time his goods and his friends"). In the Simonidean poem, an epinician for Orillas, the poet seems to have drawn a comparison with a figure from the so-called "Carian fable," a fisherman who faces a dilemma: should he dive for an octopus in winter in order to feed his family, thereby freezing, or should he let himself and his children starve? There is a parallel between the two poems, since it is the strong contrast between poverty and wealth which motivates the drawing of a non-mythical exemplum by means of reaching outside the group envisaged by the poem (i.e., laudandus, poet, and the circle of the laudandus).<sup>24</sup> Suddenly the field of view of the poem is expanded and allowed to encompass a person quite outside of the

<sup>21</sup> cf. *Σ Ol.* 2.157a, 158c-d (i.99 Drachmann: the two crows as Bacchylides and Simonides), *Σ Ol.* 9.74b, d (i.285 Drachmann), *Σ Nem.* 4.60b (iii.75 Drachmann).

<sup>22</sup> *Σ Ol.* 9.74b, d (i.285 Drachmann) (Simonides 602 *PMG*); even by the evidence which the scholiasts cite, it is clear that in fact Pindar and Simonides were making the same point as each other, albeit using the imagery of wine differently in order to do so.

<sup>23</sup> Below, sections 3.19-20.

<sup>24</sup> This portion of my discussion was greatly influenced by conversation with Peter Agócs.

present situation: in the Simonidean epinician, the anonymous Carian, and in *Isthm.* 2 the Argive who perceived when he lost it the meaning of money, a figure who, though probably identifiable to the audience as the κοφός Aristodamus (see below), is presented in a similarly nameless fashion. This Argive, however, is presented in a manner which gives authority to his statement. Pindar accentuates his relevance to the concern of the poem and his claim to the attention of the addressee Thrasyboulus and by implication the rest of the audience: νῦν δ' ἐφίητι <τὸ> τῶργείου φυλάξαι | ῥῆμ' ἀλαθείας <ἐτᾶς> ἄγχιετα βαῖνον “But now she [sc. “the Muse”] enjoins upon us to pay attention to the saying of the Argive, which comes closest to the true state of affairs.”

#### 4. Aristodamus the Argive

Since it is of interest to the reading of the poem and has in fact been little treated by commentators, it will be worthwhile to consider the question of the identity of the Argive mentioned. First we should note that, whether or not Pindar and his audience would have been able to identify him in their own minds, within the poem he is not explicitly named: an aspect in common between the rhetoric of this poem and that of Simonides 514 *PMG* is that “the Argive” has something of the generic, fable-like flavour of “the Carian.” This remains the case independently of whether everybody knew which Argive was meant. A scholiast<sup>25</sup> naturally wished to find a source for the quotation, and identified the Argive in a poem of Alcaeus which cited a similar saying and attributed it to Aristodamus (fr. 360 LP = Voigt):

ὥς γὰρ δὴ ποτ' . Αριστόδαμον φαίς οὐκ ἀπάλαμνον ἐν Σπάρται  
λόγον  
εἶπεν, χρήματ' ἄνηρ, πένιχρος δ' οὐδ' εἷς πέλετ' ἔσλος οὐδὲ  
τίμιος

They say that once Aristodamos said in Sparta a word which was not inept: “Possessions are the man, and not one pauper has ever been good or honourable.”

<sup>25</sup> Σ *Isthm.* 2.17 (iii.215 Drachmann).

It may be worth trying to tease out what we can from this. Commentators have drawn attention to the allusion to the Alcaeus poem (if there was such an allusion; the saying may have become sufficiently proverbial that it would not have provoked specific associations with Alcaeus) and noted that it seems to be from the point of view of older poets that the present Muse is described.<sup>26</sup> This may be reasonable, but requires qualification: we should not allow ourselves to lose sight of the fact that Pindar does *not* himself attribute the χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνὴρ maxim to Alcaeus. He attributes it to “the Argive,” which, since it certainly cannot mean Alcaeus, presumably indicates Aristodamus. Aristodamus is one of a number of shadowy figures who were sometimes counted among the Seven Sages.<sup>27</sup> Apart from the Alcaeus fragment, our principal source is Diogenes Laertius, according to whom the historian Andron of Ephesus (a contemporary of Theopompus) recorded that the tripod “to the wisest” was given first to Aristodamus, who passed it on to Chilon.<sup>28</sup> Both Diogenes and the scholia to the present Pindaric passage call Aristodamus Σπαρτιάτης.<sup>29</sup> Since both cite Andron as their source, the natural inference is that he did as well, although they do not quite state this explicitly. It is not impossible that the opinion that Aristodamus was a Spartan is derived from the Alcaeus fragment; though if the (dubious) inference had been drawn in this way, one might have expected the prose sources to have Λακεδαιμόνιος rather than Σπαρτιάτης: a less common word, which may mean not only “Spartan” but also “member of the oligarchic aristocracy of Sparta.”

Given the evidence of Diogenes Laertius it has usually been considered that Aristodamus was in fact a Spartan. However, this seems to me far from certain. We may note in particular, following Farnell,<sup>30</sup> that there is no strict inconsistency between our most ancient witnesses, i.e. the Alcaeus fragment and the present poem of Pindar: Pindar identifies Aristodamus (albeit without naming him) as an Argive, and Alcaeus tells us that the dictum in question was *said in Sparta* (just as, for instance, we have Simonidean dicta supposed to have been said

<sup>26</sup> Woodbury 1968, followed on this point by Kurke 1991, 245.

<sup>27</sup> cf. Martin 1998, 109.

<sup>28</sup> D.L. 1.30-31; Andron of Ephesus *FHG* II.347 (not in *FGH*). Theopompus is supposed to have been perceived as deriving information from Andron, who was therefore presumably a contemporary or predecessor.

<sup>29</sup> D.L. 1.31; Σ *Isthm.* 2.17 (iii.216 Drachmann).

<sup>30</sup> Farnell 1932, ad loc.

on Sicily).<sup>31</sup> The scholia comment,<sup>32</sup> not unintelligently, that Pindar might have used Ἀργεῖος to mean “Peloponnesian,” and they compare the description of Helen as “Argive” rather than “Spartan” in Homer: but Pindar speaks of Argos in this way once only, and that where he has in mind ‘heroic’ geography and history, and not when speaking of more modern times.<sup>33</sup> Going further, Alcaeus’ words might better lead us to infer that Aristodamus, wherever he came from, was in fact *not* a Spartan: if he were, he might be assumed to speak there, rather than its being necessary to specify the place where he spoke. It therefore seems more likely that Aristodamus was in fact an Argive, who for one reason or another spent time in Sparta: perhaps as an exile, or perhaps for some other reason.<sup>34</sup> The later witnesses will have been misled by the Alcaeus fragment (as the scholia to the Pindaric passage) or by a larger tradition of Aristodamus’ activities in Sparta to which we do not have access. We conclude, then, that Pindar called Aristodamus “Argive” because he was an Argive, and that no further explanation is therefore necessary, and that we need not resort to the conjecture of a pun between Ἀργεῖος and ἄργυρος in order to explain the ethnic.<sup>35</sup> Later sources reflect a misunderstanding, probably of the Alcaeus passage.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>31</sup> We may add to Farnell’s argument a Pindaric parallel for an authoritative figure from the past being identified by ethnic alone: at fr. 104b.4 M., Pindar appears to refer to Xenocritus, the inventor of the Locrian mode, as τῶ[ν] γε Λοκρῶν τις (“one of the Locrians”): cf. Race ad loc. (in the Loeb, vol.2, 375n.1).

<sup>32</sup> Σ *Isthm.* 2.17 (iii.216 Drachmann).

<sup>33</sup> *Ol.* 7.19 (sense is “Doric” and Heraklid descent is the point; cf. the following strophe), and cf. *Pyth.* 4.49 (where the migrations of heroic times were from “great Sparta, the gulf of Argos, and Mycene”). Apart from at *Ol.* 7.19, Pindar’s use of Ἀργος and Ἀργεῖος always refers to the city of Argos, and not to the Peloponnese as a whole.

<sup>34</sup> cf. Nafissi 1991, 345 with n.2, who suggests that the story may have its meaning in a tradition where Sparta is “un centro che ha la fama di essere immune dai pericoli che fanno passare le ricchezze di mano in mano.” This would have its sense in a story of Aristodamus as an exile, which might especially suit the rhetoric of the Alcaeus passage, which looks rather as if it might have come from a poem in which the Lesbian complained of his own exile and concomitant loss of land and money: cf. Bernardini 1984. Alternatively, as Alan Griffiths has suggested to me, Aristodamus might have been in Sparta in order to reconcile some argument, having a privileged rôle as an arbitrator by virtue of coming from a hostile outside community (but it may be that the hostility between Argos and Sparta should post-date Aristodamus and Alcaeus’ time: Kelly 1970); cf. e.g. the advice given by Panites the Messenian at *Hdt.* 6.52.

<sup>35</sup> The pun first suggested by Bury 1892 ad loc., followed by Verdenius 1988 ~ 1982 ad loc.; this is in any case a counsel of despair, and seems to me not in the least bolstered by “parallels” at *Ol.* 9.88-90 and *Nem.* 10.40-3 (cited by Verdenius from Barkhuizen 1975).

<sup>36</sup> If one will wish to give more credence to the prose tradition than I have here, it might seem preferable to explain Pindar’s description of Aristodamus as Argive by some other means than the pun which has been discussed. On this view, we may wonder whether Pindar called the (putatively *Spartan*) Aristodamus “Argive” as a way of identifying him with the Heraklid

As part of the opening contrast between the time of the former poets and the present circumstances, therefore, Pindar privileges a *gnome* which he associates not explicitly with the former poets but with a *coφός* from Argos, who, probably in the context of exile in Sparta, complained χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνὴρ. He does so at a structurally important point in the poem. *Isthm.* 2 has neither myth nor narrative separate from the story of the victories of the family of the laudandus, except inasmuch as that the movement from the old poetry to the new and also the story of Aristodamus himself (as given in the relative clause ὃς φᾶ κτεάνων θ' ἅμα λειφθεὶς καὶ φίλων “who spoke having lost at the same time his goods and his friends”) might be seen to constitute such a narrative. The citation of the *gnome* of Aristodamus, and the one-clause narrative of the context in which he said it, occur at the turning point from the initial quasi-narrative to the material concerning the victories of Thrasyboulus’ family. This is clearly a crucial hinge of the movement of the poem.

##### 5. Kurke’s interpretation of *Isthmian* 2 and Pindar’s citation of Aristodamus

The overall interpretation of the poem has been treated a great deal by others, and it will not prove necessary to expound upon it at great length here. As has been indicated above, it is not possible to escape the conclusion that, at the beginning of the poem, a point of view is expressed which gives a strongly negative value to the present condition of poetry, where choral poems such as epinician are commissioned in an exchange of money which can be perceived of as inimical to the spontaneity and sincerity of the earlier poets, who wrote according to their feelings: specifically, when the love of beautiful boys motivated them. The interpretation which I find on the whole most attractive is that which has been presented by Leslie Kurke, in the context of her more general study of the relation of Pindar with the changing economic world of his times.<sup>37</sup> For

---

aristocracy (the mythical Aristodamus of Sparta was the grandson of Herakles and father of Eurysthenes and Procles, the first joint kings, and by some accounts he led the Spartans to Lakonia: Hdt. 6.52, and cf. Cartledge 2002, appendix 3). For Ἀργεῖος in Pindar appearing to evoke “ancient history” and aristocracy, cf. *Ol.* 7.19, *Pyth.* 4.49; cf. above, the scholiastic explanation.

<sup>37</sup> Kurke 1991, ch.10.

Kurke (to paraphrase very briefly), the initial attitude towards the new, paid poetry is expressed “*from the point of view of the older poets*,”<sup>38</sup> an element of focalisation being achieved through the use (as she sees it) of Alcaeus and of imagery drawn from Anacreon.<sup>39</sup> This view is then revised during the course of the poem, as it becomes clear that, in the poetic economics of Pindar’s own time, the use of money can be assigned a positive value: it enables aristocrats like Thrasyboulus to show *megalo

```
peia
```* and to integrate their aristocratic *kleos* into the world of the polis. Thus the poem enacts a movement from a deeply problematised view of the cash relationship between patrons and poets such as Pindar, as expressed through the contrasts of the first two strophes and the apparently cynical dictum of Aristodamus in the epode, to a view which is more positive, but is not set forth in such a direct or startling manner. The view expounded in the first part of the poem is implicitly critiqued by the more conventional second part and found wanting.

In the light of what has been said above, however, we can revise and reconsider this analysis of the poem. It has been seen already that it is not an adequate response to Pindar’s quotation of “the Argive” to comment that the saying *χρήματα χρήματ’ ἀνὴρ* is expressed from the point of view of the older poets: rather, it is explicitly attributed to an alternative source of authority, i.e. a *κοφός*, Aristodamus, whose name is not associated with the composition of poetry but with the kind of performative *κοφία* which is the regular and traditional attribute of the Sages of the earlier sixth century, regardless of their poetic activity or lack of it.<sup>40</sup> This strategy, just as the technique of reaching outside and away from the present song to a non-mythical exemplum mentioned above, is not one which is generally found in Pindar: the closest analogy is perhaps the famous passage at *Nem.* 7.20ff. where Homer is said to have exaggerated the greatness of Odysseus by means of his poetic skill, but the question is not concerning the validity or

<sup>38</sup> Kurke 1991, 245 (Kurke’s italics).

<sup>39</sup> Kurke cites with approbation Woodbury’s description of the poem of *Isthmian* 2 as “an almost baroque development” of Anacreon 384 *PMG*, cited by the scholia (Woodbury 1968, 533; Kurke 1991, 245). Earlier critics, naturally, had read the Anacreon fragment as directed against Simonides (Barnes 1705, 290; Bergk 1834, 132-4); Bergk’s (1834) comment on this fragment, carefully distinguishing Anacreon’s aristocratic attitude to money from that of Simonides (“Ipse enim Anacreon fuit liberali ingenio”), is a good instance of literary history presented entirely from dubiously historical anecdotes and ancient reception: the tendency against which Lefkowitz 1981 and similar works reacted.

<sup>40</sup> On this performative aspect of the figures who may be included among the Seven Sages, v. Martin 1998, 115-6.



otherwise of a *gnome* but rather a matter of mythical-historical accuracy,<sup>41</sup> and appeal to/ rejection of Homer as an authority is clearly a special case and not closely analogous to the present circumstance, where Aristodamus is not a source of mythical-historical knowledge, not a poet, and not a figure with the kind of cultural centrality enjoyed by Homer.

## 6. σοφοί, Pindar and Simonides

The place where we do find the kind of cultural and intellectual sparring with rival sources of σοφία in a way which is extremely analogous to what we have found in the present poem is in the surviving fragments of Simonides, who seems to have made a habit of structuring an argument as a response to the dictum of one of the sages of the early sixth century. One obvious comparandum is Simonides' famous poem addressed to Scopas of Thessaly and containing reflections on the nature of goodness (Simonides 542.11-16 *PMG*):

οὐδέ μοι ἐμμελέως τὸ Πιττάκειον  
νέμεται, καίτοι σοφοῦ παρὰ φωτὸς εἰ-  
ρημένον· χαλεπὸν φάτ' ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι.  
θεὸς ἂν μόνος τοῦτ' ἔχοι γέρας, ἄνδρα δ' οὐκ  
ἔστι μὴ οὐ κακὸν ἔμμεναι,  
ὄν ἀμήχανος συμφορὰ κατέλῃ.

Nor does the dictum of Pittacus seem to me aptly said, though spoken by a wise man: he said that it was difficult to be good. Only a god might have this lot, but for a man it is not possible to avoid evil, when he is overwhelmed by helpless disaster.

In this case, we may note that Simonides, as Pindar, names in order to criticise but more particularly in order to refine and revise. For Simonides it appears that the saying "It is difficult for a man to be good" was not so much incorrect as inadequate, because it did not express sufficiently the extent of the incompatibility between the human condition and true, complete goodness, which difficulty should have been expressed in terms of impossibility. In a similar

---

<sup>41</sup> cf. corrections of anonymous tradition with regard to the mythical-historical facts, as *Ol.* 1.28ff.

manner, it seems that for Pindar the saying that “money maketh the man” was not exactly false, but could not be left as said by Aristodamus:<sup>42</sup> it was necessary for him to show how it could be in the present time that a high value could be accorded to money in a way which corresponded to the high-minded attitude he would wish his poems to express, rather than the apparently slightly desperate and potentially cynical tone of the quotation (especially given its context, as indicated in the relative clause in 11). We may note in particular the description of the dictum as ῥῆμ' ἀλαθείας <ἐτας> ἄγχιστα βαῖνον “a saying which comes closest [or “very close”] to the true state of affairs.” It might be, of course, that ἄγχιστα simply indicates that this is as close to the truth as we can get, and should not be seen as drawing attention to any kind of gap between the words of Aristodamus and the real way things are. However, given the nature of the initial description of the Muse and the shocking use of the imagery of prostitution discussed above, we may suppose that the audience is by this point expected to be listening for qualifications: for the listener, part of the challenge presented by the song is to see how the poet can find an acceptable way in which to place himself and his present song despite the opening imagery. From this “closest” or “very close,” then, the addressee is invited to close the gap and find the full truth, to which the remainder of the song points him.<sup>43</sup>

The same Simonidean tendency to define himself against the saying of a κοφός may be seen in his celebrated response to the verse inscription which was supposed to have been composed by Cleoboulos of Lindos (581 *PMG*):

τίς κεν αἰνήσειε νόωι πίκυνος Λίνδου ναέταν Κλεόβουλον,  
 ἀεναοῖς ποταμοῖς ἄνθεσι τ' εἰαρινοῖς  
 ἀελίου τε φλογὶ χρυσεῖας τε σελάνας  
 καὶ θαλασσαιαίαι διναίς ἀντία θέντα μένος ἐτάλας;  
 ἅπαντα γάρ ἐστι θεῶν ἥσσον· λίθον δὲ  
 καὶ βρότεοι παλάμαι θραύοντι· μωροῦ

<sup>42</sup> For a sensitive description of this figure here (“refutatio sententiae”) see Easterling 1974, 41-3, comparing A. *Agamemnon* 750ff. and Soph. *Trach.* 1ff; cf. Easterling 1982 ad Soph. *Trach.* 4-5, Davies 1991 ad Soph. *Trach.* 1ff.

<sup>43</sup> Note here the way, observed by Kurke 1991, 246-7, in which the revision of the sense of the *gnome* is accomplished through repeated imagery of poetic marksmanship and the poetic missile “coming close” to the target: cf. u.35. No very metaphysical notion of “complete truth” need be attributed to Pindar here: ἀλάθεια means here “the way things actually are” (see above). Compare the similar usage of this word at *Nem.* 7.25.

φωτὸς ἄδε βούλα.

Who, trusting in his wits, would praise Cleoboulos, the dweller in Lindos, who set up against the ever-running rivers and the spring flowers, the blaze of the sun and the golden moon, and the whirlings of the oceans, the force of a stele? All things are less than the gods; but even mortal hands can break a stone. This was the counsel of a foolish man.

Despite his own celebrated activities in the composition of epigrams, Simonides clearly wishes to make a claim for the value of poetic κλέος as disseminated along oral channels and through reperformance.<sup>44</sup> We may note that the epigram of Midas, supposed to have been composed by Cleoboulus, did not speak of everlasting κλέος triggered or provoked by the monument, but of the monument itself being possessed of such longevity: this will have been the element which provoked Simonides' disagreement, rather than the notion that long-lasting or indeed perpetual κλέος could be perceived as in some respects related to inscribed commemoration, such as he had practised himself.<sup>45</sup> Again, we see that Simonides makes his claim by defining himself against a κοφός whose claim he cites. In this case his rhetoric is vastly more aggressive, and the similarity to the Pindaric usage in *Isthm.* 2 is correspondingly less. This might be perceived as differing from the poem for Scopas and the Pindar passage in another respect, inasmuch as that Simonides here engages with Cleoboulus *as a poet*. This does not trouble me much, since in fact the point is that, according to the logic of Simonides' dismissal of him, Cleoboulus is not acting as a poet in the same way as Simonides at all: the contrast which is operative is that between two claims to provide lasting κλέος, one of which is the claim made by Cleoboulus' epigram on the statue, in which the statue itself will always proclaim Midas' burial place, and

<sup>44</sup> For a recent treatment of this poem, see Ford 2002, 101-109.

<sup>45</sup> The κλέος imparted by an inscription is, so to speak, merely potential: it must be 'defrosted' and actualised by means of a speech act (see Svenbro 1993, 14-16, 24, etc.). I suggest here that, for Simonides, the inscription for the tomb of Midas is transgressive because it celebrates the endurance of the monument rather than of the κλέος which it preserves, and thereby reverses the 'proper' relation between the two, by which the inscription is secondary to the κλέος and subservient to it. For perpetual κλέος and kindred ideas in inscriptions of Simonides' time, cf. 'Simonides' *FGE* 6.1 (by Simonides), 8.4, 9.1 (if not later), 21(a), etc. The problem is not the phenomenon of inscription on a monument as such, but the value which the Midas epigram gives to it (contra, Ford 2002, 108, for whom the key distinction seems to be that between inscribed and non-inscribed monuments). Cf. Fantuzzi's criticisms of Ford's position in Fantuzzi 2003, 495-6.

the other of which is Simonides' implicit claim that only the renown given by poetry as spoken, sung and repeated can provide such perpetual κλέος. Although his words for the tomb are in verse, they give priority to the statue over the verse, and function in Simonides' poem as a kind of anti-poetry: it is almost as a rival to poetry rather than a rival poet that Cleoboulus is cited. There is, as Ford has pointed out, a pun in the final words, μωροῦ φωτὸς ἄδε βουλά: "the one 'famed for advice' turns out to have offered 'a fool's advice.'"<sup>46</sup> The pun works better, however, if we adopt an alternative rendering of the sage's name: Cleoboulus could also be perceived as "man whose βουλή ("<good> counsel") is oriented towards κλέος," but it is in fact precisely with regard to κλέος that his βουλή is foolish.<sup>47</sup>

It appears from these that Simonides was aware, and expected his audience to be aware, of a possible appeal to the authority of wise men of the past; probably he could have listed a number of such wise men and identified them as being such (both Pittacus and Cleoboulus were among the usual group of the "Seven Sages"; it is not necessary to my argument to suppose that the canonical number was already current in Simonides' time). We may further note that it appears that he associated them with the word σοφός: scarcely very surprising this, but a pointer towards the use of the word as a substantive and a sort of technical term ('a σοφός'). Simonides found Pittacus' dictum inadequate, καίτοι σοφοῦ παρὰ φωτὸς εἰρημένον: perhaps φῶς σοφός is here functioning both as description and as definition. This seems particularly likely if we contrast the description of Cleoboulus just discussed: μωροῦ φωτὸς in the last (or last surviving) verse of Simonides' response to the Midas inscription appears as if it might have been used in the context of an expected definition of Cleoboulus as being, like Pittacus, a φῶς σοφός: μωροῦ φωτὸς ἄδε βουλά is Simonides' retort.

## 7. Inclusivity, Argument and σοφία

One may note also the use of φῶς of the sage in these passages: this probably had

<sup>46</sup> Ford 2002, 105.

<sup>47</sup> Compare again Svenbro (Svenbro 1993, 13-14): Phrasikleia could mean "she who is famous for her thoughts," "she who pays attention to *kléos*" or "she who draws attention to *kléos*."

an archaicising flavour, but also suggested “great man,” which is at any rate a tendency in Pindar.<sup>48</sup> This will have emphasised the sense of authority about the citation (which, of course, increases by the same token the authority assumed by the singer who corrects or rejects the wisdom of the sage). In particular, we may notice in 542 *PMG* that φῶς of Pittacus may be contrasted with the colourless ἀνὴρ elsewhere in the passage,<sup>49</sup> which corresponds precisely to the rhetoric of the poem more generally: the contrast is between the φῶς who sets an impossible bar and the ordinary ἀνὴρ who must live in the world as it is. In this poem (at any rate, in the parts of it we have), the main argument is between the φῶς κοφός Pittacus and the “I” created by the song (probably in fact the “I” of a singing chorus, albeit representing an authorial persona): the only “you” is found in u.26, where, should the “I” find a completely blameless man, he will tell the (plural) addressees (ἐπὶ δὲ ὑμῖν ἀπαγγελέω). Where it was suggested above that the parallelism with *Isthm.* 2 was closer in the case of 542 *PMG* than with 581 *PMG* (the poem about the inscription for Midas) with regard to the point that the Pindaric poem and the poem on virtue have a considerably less aggressive tone in how they react to the wisdom criticised, we may now see a respect in which 581 *PMG* makes a closer parallel. I have in mind that the poem concerning the inscription of Midas seems to be expressed in a way which contrasts the κοφία of Cleoboulus not with a speaking ἐγώ, as with Pittacus’ saying, but with somebody who is νόωι πίκυνος, “trusting in his wits.” This seems to suggest a more inclusive rhetoric than that which we may see in 542 *PMG*, where the audience seems, so to speak, to look on at a kind of contest between Pittacus and the speaking “I,” and is addressed very much as an audience (u.26). In the poem concerning Cleoboulus, it is for anybody – including, presumably, any listener – to reflect upon the assertion of Cleoboulus, and under the guidance of the singer to join with him in rejecting it. A caveat is of course required that this perspective might well require some qualification in the case of 581 *PMG*, according to the question whether the fragment as we have it constitutes a complete poem or not. It has been read as a complete poem, inasmuch as that it is the same length as the

<sup>48</sup> cf. Privitera 1982 ad *Isthm.* 2.1, Thummer 1968-9 ad *Isthm.* 2.1; the objections of Verdenius 1988 ad *Ol.* 1.46 seem to me to indicate that the phenomenon should be perceived as a tendency rather than a rule.

<sup>49</sup> uu.1, 14 (where the contrast with φῶς is most apparent), 17, and NB 36 ὑγιῆς ἀνὴρ; cf. ἀνθρωπος at 24.

version of the epitaph for Midas as given by Diogenes Laertius immediately before his citation of Simonides' response.<sup>50</sup> Ford cautiously comments that the epitaph circulated in various different versions, but draws attention to the ring composition seen in the return to Cleoboulus at the end (marked by the pun discussed above) and thus comes to the same conclusion.<sup>51</sup> The former argument may have some force, and the second has more, but neither is really conclusive: we may still suppose, entirely reasonably, that a coherent and neatly arranged section of a longer song has been excerpted, and we do not know enough about the arrangement of Simonides' songs to tell whether ring composition within one section would be characteristic or not.<sup>52</sup> In this latter circumstance, we might wonder whether it had a place in an encomiastic poem (i.e., an encomium or epinician), inasmuch as that it seems to combine the question of how properly to transmit κλέος and deals with praising or withholding praise (τίς κεν αἰνήσειε...);<sup>53</sup> In this circumstance, the τίς of the first preserved line might suggest "what [poet of praise such as myself] would compose αἶνος [such as I am presently doing]..."; the inclusivity of the rhetoric would be rather diminished in these circumstances, though I think it would still be a poem which to some extent invited the listener to participate in the reflection upon the words of the σοφός rather than treating them as passive spectators of the singer's rejection of it.

Specifically from the point of view of this distinction between inclusive and exclusive rhetoric, the appeal to the wisdom of a σοφός in *Isthmian* 2 seems closer to that in 581 *PMG* than in 542 *PMG*. The citation of the Argive's dictum is followed by the appeal to his experience in the relative clause ὅς φᾶ... (u.11), and then immediately by the turn to Thrasyboulus: ἐκκὶ γὰρ ὧν σοφός. The sense of this short but tricky phrase has already been discussed above: the γὰρ appears to look forwards rather than back, and ὧν has an emphatic effect, so that the point is that Thrasyboulus, being wise, can draw his own conclusions from the fact that

<sup>50</sup> D.L. 1.89; Campbell 1967, ad loc. (p.393) (cited by Ford 2002, 105).

<sup>51</sup> Ford 2002, 105 and cf. 101 n.30. Paradoxically enough, the epitaph seems to have textual variations "because [it] circulated widely in oral tradition" (ibid., 101): in fact, Midas gained his κλέος according to the more traditional poetic and not according to the durability of the monument, of which nothing survives.

<sup>52</sup> Note, however, the ring formed by εὖ δ' ὠπτεῖς, γαλαθηνῶι | δ' ἥθεῖ κνωόσσεις (8-9) and εὖδε βρέφος, | εὖδέτω δὲ πόντος, εὖδέτω δ' ἄμετρον κακόν (21-2) in 543 *PMG*, marking off a clear first section of Danaë's speech, addressing the baby Perseus, with the repeated εὖδέτω forming the link to the section addressing Zeus.

<sup>53</sup> Its inclusion in a longer song might be analogous to Pindaric passages contrasting songs with statues such as, in particular, *Nem.* 5.1ff. (Ford 2002, 119ff.).

his father's victories are "not unknown" and can appreciate the ways in which the judicious use of money in the pursuit and commemoration of praiseworthy activities can be viewed in a positive light as not being incompatible with an aristocratic ethos. It is worth noting that this appeal to the *κοφία* of the addressee is *unusual* in Pindar. Where he comments explicitly on the discrimination, understanding or appreciative attitude of the addressee, he regularly does so using *συνίημι* or a word of its family.<sup>54</sup> In some places he speaks of *κοφία* in gnomic expressions, whose potential application to the *laudandus* is left implicit.<sup>55</sup> *κοφία* with regard to discrimination in poetry may be used in a rather general manner<sup>56</sup> (naturally, it is always possible to argue that a positive quality referred to in the poem was intended to be perceived as a property characteristic of the *laudandus*). The exceptions to this general tendency *not* to attribute *κοφία* directly to individual addressees or *laudandi* are two in number: the present instance in *Isthm.* 2 and at *Pyth.* 6.49. In both places the reference is to the same Thrasyboulus of Akragas. In the earlier poem (*Pyth.* 6), the reference is clearly to Thrasyboulus' musical skill (ἄδικον οὐθ' ὑπέροπλον ἦβαν δρέπων, | κοφίαν δ' ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων "harvesting his youth with neither injustice nor arrogance, and wisdom in the places of the Muses").

However, given what has been suggested above concerning the use of *φῶς κοφός* in Simonides, and the analogy with the present passage, another explanation may seem appropriate here (this explanation can compliment the idea that Thrasyboulus might be seen as a poet or musician rather than needing to displace it). We might naturally count Aristodamus as (though not a poet) one of the *πάλαι... φῶτες* and also as being *κοφός*, certainly in a general sense inasmuch as that he must have had a reputation for being wise, and quite likely also, according to the usage of later times, as one of a group perceived as being *by definition* *κοφοί*. In this context, the description of Thrasyboulus as *κοφός* takes on a different colour: in addition to its other connotations of general wisdom, good sense and refinement, especially with regard to poetry, there is an implication that he need not regard Aristodamus as a man in a different category from himself. Rather, as a man with his own claim to *κοφία*, Thrasyboulus may view

<sup>54</sup> *Ol.* 2.85, *Pyth.* 3.80, *Nem.* 4.31, fr.105.1M; cf. *Pyth.* 5.107, *Bacch.* 3.85.

<sup>55</sup> *Ol.* 5.16, *Pyth.* 5.12, *Nem.* 7.17.

<sup>56</sup> *Pyth.* 9.78, 10.22.

with a critically appreciative spirit the *gnome* of the σοφός Aristodamus. His acumen makes him a σοφός himself. He is thus invited to be an active participant, engaging with the “I” in the remainder of the poem. Here, without explicit re-engagement with Aristodamus’ statement, the movement to more usual epinician motifs, such as the praise of athletic victories, attention drawn to the songs which accompany victory, and praise of hospitality will represent, so to speak, a journey taken by the addressee with the song, in which his σοφία will enable him to perceive the implicit re-evaluation which this entails, both of Aristodamus’ wisdom and of the narrative about song with which the poem opened.<sup>57</sup> This lack of explicitness about the re-evaluation of the dictum attributed to a σοφός differentiates the Pindaric use of this motif from the Simonidean examples. Pindar uses Aristodamus’ statement in the context of a complex of ideas about song itself, its function and social context: an argument which the poem applies to song is then treated by means of *instantiating* an alternative conception of song.

### 8. *Isthmian* 2, Money and Simonides

This Pindaric poem represents the most striking place in which he engages with the perceived problem – and the poem itself is clear evidence that it *could* be so perceived – of the financial relationship involved in the commissioning and composition of praise poetry. In what has been written about it here, the argument of Kurke has been modified but essentially followed concerning the broad interpretation of the poem, which is seen as presenting the fact of remuneration for praise as a heavily problematised issue and then as somehow resolving this issue in the course of the poem. However, this resolution cannot be made into a sort of nullification of the peculiar and rhetorically dangerous strategy of this difficult poem. The beginning of the poem is forthright and emphatic in its presentation of a point of view in which paid poetry is seen in a

---

<sup>57</sup> For the appeal to the understanding of his patrons in Pindar as inviting thoughtful engagement with wisdom from the past, cf. *Pyth.* 3.80ff. (Homer), *Isthm.* 6.66ff. (Hesiod, named). The vocabulary of the ‘understanding’ of Pindar’s ideal listener is regularly expressed not in terms of σοφία but with the verb συνέημι and related words (cf. above). The attitude which I am suggesting here is a more critical one than in these parallels, albeit constituting re-consideration of a gnomic utterance rather than outright rejection of it. At *Ol.* 2.83-6, Pindar’s own σοφία requires listeners possessed of understanding (συνετοίεν 85).



strongly negative light; the way in which the rest of the poem reevaluates this phenomenon, in contrast, is subtle, inexplicit and understated. We do well, therefore, not to be so grateful for an interpretative approach which does hold out a sort of resolution of the difficulties presented by the beginning of the poem that we end up minimising those very difficulties. These difficulties do not seem to be the product of our ignorance or failure, but are rather consequential upon the heavy problematisation in this poem of a particular aspect of epinician. In other words, the fact of its being somehow 'resolved' does not altogether cancel out the original 'problem' presented at the start of the poem. The presentation of the contrast between ancient and modern song at the start of the poem is sufficient as a corrective to anybody who would wish to argue that remuneration for poetry was viewed as unproblematic in the late archaic/ early classical period, and only became seen otherwise in later reception. For Pindar in this song composed for Thrasyboulus, this problem was real and was sufficiently present that he apparently rejected the most obvious way in which to treat it – i.e., not to draw attention to it at all – but rather wrote a song which engages with a problem which could, one might otherwise have imagined, more tactfully and easily have been ignored.

There is an inevitable question: why here? It is assumed, and surely correctly, that Pindar (and Simonides and Bacchylides likewise) was regularly paid for his songs; but although the present poem is not the only place in which he acknowledges the fact, it is the place where he addresses and problematises it to a far greater extent than anywhere else. By definition, appeals to aspects of epinician as a genre cannot completely explain singularities, and I believe that there is a large extent to which this poem represents such a singularity. In the article cited above,<sup>58</sup> Nisetich has suggested that we perceive the generic features and regular strategies which have been recognised as vital to understanding Pindar since Bundy not as rules or invariable patterns but as tools, the use of which will be modified according to the poet's rhetorical needs, which themselves will be modified according to the particular pressures of the occasion. In the present instance, Nisetich suggests, the circumstance that Thrasyboulus is the commissioner of the poem but has not himself won athletic victories motivates

---

<sup>58</sup> Nisetich 1977.

some of Pindar's tactics of praise. We may similarly suspect that the occasion of Pindar's finding it appropriate or necessary to confront the question of money might also be a factor specific to this poem. At this point, however, we have to confess to *aporia*: there have been numerous attempts to explain the circumstances which might have occasioned the unusual focus on money in the poem, and they fail to persuade taken individually, while collectively it does not bode well to see how many different and mutually contradictory (or indeed directly opposite) conceptions have been imagined to explain why the poem was composed in such a way, from the ancient scholars onwards.<sup>59</sup> Perhaps part of the story is a change in the political situation of Akragas: the use of money is a way in which Thrasyboulus can safely express his aristocratic identity in a city where, having been a member of a ruling family, he is now a wealthy and distinguished private individual.<sup>60</sup> We may note that Pindar was composing his poem for a patron whose family he had praised more than once in the past: probably he would not have composed a song such as this as a first commission for a family previously unknown to him.<sup>61</sup> Whether this by itself will seem adequate extra-textual information to motivate the unusual nature of the poem, however, seems to me dubious.

Separately from the poem's unusual focus on money and the striking, and indeed disturbing, handling of this theme which has just been discussed, it has been shown that features of this poem, exceptional in Pindar, appear as far as we can see to have been characteristically Simonidean or at any rate to have parallels in Simonides' practice. An analogy has been drawn between *Isthm.* 2 and Simonides' epinician for Orillas (514 *PMG*), inasmuch as that in both poems there seems to be an appeal to the experience of a non-mythical person who is quite distinct from the group of persons who are involved with the victor's achievement and the poet's commemoration of it: in Simonides' poem we can see

---

<sup>59</sup> Older interpretations are conveniently gathered by Woodbury 1968, 527-32. Wilamowitz followed (with modifications) the theory of ancient scholars according to whom Pindar attacks Simonides; for Bury, Pindar indicates that he is not asking for payment for this song; for Farnell (following Callistratus at *Σ Isthm.* inscr. a = iii.213 Drachmann), he indicates that he is; for Norwood, Thrasyboulus himself has become a poet as a way of attempting to make a living, and Pindar is expressing light-hearted sympathy.

<sup>60</sup> Kurke 1991, 255-6.

<sup>61</sup> *Ol.* 2 and 3 were composed to commemorate the victories of Theron, Thrasyboulus' uncle, in the Olympian games of 476; *Pyth.* 6 commemorates Xenocrates' victory at Delphi, probably in 490, and in fact is largely devoted to praise of the filial piety of Thrasyboulus. He also composed an encomium for Thrasyboulus (fr.124 M.).

the appeal to the experience of the Carian fisherman, and in Pindar's the appeal to the experience of "the Argive." In both cases, the persons concerned are exempla for poverty. Perhaps more remarkably, the Pindaric poem is remarkable for being partially organised, at the crucial turning point of the poem, as a citation of the words of a *κοφός* and subsequent development and correction of the sage's pronouncement: a rhetorical strategy which is not a feature found elsewhere in Pindar, but which seems on the basis of what we know to have been a favoured device of Simonides. It is hoped that the analysis above shows if nothing else that the comparison of the Pindaric song with the remains of some Simonidean ones is a productive one, shedding some light on both. Going further, however, it seems reasonable to suggest that the poem might be read as having been composed in a way which includes the adoption (and adaptation) of elements of a distinctively Simonidean manner.

If this is the case, it is remarkable indeed that the adoption of this manner coincides with Pindar's most striking engagement with that problem which, in the anecdotal tradition,<sup>62</sup> is the most distinctively Simonidean theme: I mean, the engagement with money and with remuneration for poetry. It is immediately very tempting to make a small leap: what would be easier than to suppose that there is a significant relation in the composition of *Isthm.* 2 between this identifiably Simonidean theme and this equally identifiably Simonidean manner? It seems to me very likely that, when Pindar chose to address and problematise the problem of remuneration in such a striking way in this poem, he felt that this choice somehow represented taking on a characteristically Simonidean problem, and that it was this thematic choice which motivated the elements of a Simonidean manner which, I have argued, we may perceive in the song. Thus, I suggest, the poem's unusual features as perceived in terms of expression and manner and as perceived in terms of its handling of subject matter would have cohered, because both the direct and striking problematisation of money and the way in which the poem was structured would both have seemed to some extent recognisably Simonidean. We need not think, as the scholiasts did, of a polemical relationship with Simonides (we have already seen that this was the instinctive reaction of the scholiasts to perceived connections between Pindar and

---

<sup>62</sup> See chapter 3, *passim*.

Simonides, whether or not well-motivated); but it might nevertheless seem on this argument that the scholiasts' instinct to appeal to Simonides in the context of the interpretation of this poem was (whether by accident or by design) an appropriate one. If the interpretation which I am proposing is correct, then of course it tells us that Simonides' association with money and with engagement with the fact of remuneration for poetry was a feature not only of his later reception but also of his own songs, as known in his own lifetime by his rival and younger contemporary.

Needless to say, it may be the case that the fact of resemblances between Pindar's rhetoric in this poem and the rhetoric we can perceive in a few of the scanty remains of Simonides' work, and the fact that this resemblance coincides with the strong presence of the money theme, does not demand a special explanation. Again, it is certainly the case that the elements of the poem which I have identified as Simonidean, while not insignificant, are not the whole poem and have been emphasised here for the very reason of their apparently Simonidean flavour. Nevertheless, the coincidence of these (for Pindar) uncharacteristically Simonidean elements in this poem with the equally remarkable treatment of the money theme is a very striking one, and makes an interpretation such as the one proposed here seem suggestive not only in the context of an attempt, like the present one, to investigate the roots of the tradition concerning Simonides and money, but also in the context of trying to understand one of Pindar's most peculiar and challenging songs.

## Chapter 3

### Simonides in the Anecdotal Tradition

#### *Part 1: a critical description of the tradition*

#### 1. Introduction: anecdotes, reception and scholarship

In the absence of more than a few fragments, Simonides can sometimes seem almost more vivid as a personality through the testimony of others than from his own words. This is not simply a reflection of the lack of real poems, but also of the fact that in antiquity Simonides seems to have attracted an unusually large number of anecdotes, stories, jokes and other such material; perhaps it would be fair to say that, with the possible exception of Sappho, Simonides attracted both the most extensive and the most interesting treatment of this sort of all of the canonical nine lyric poets. The previous chapter concerned itself with the idea of Simonides' apparent concern with remuneration for poetry in a single poem of Pindar. It was mentioned in the course of that discussion that this apparent concern on the part of Simonides was an important feature of his later reception in anecdote also (indeed, this is one respect in which the findings above concerning Pindar's *Isthmian* 2 are especially important, for they suggest an early origin for the tradition which we mostly see only later). Any study of the rôle of the poet constructed in and through Simonides' works will wish to treat such material; the anecdotes often seem to engage with precisely this question of the poet's creation of a rôle for himself, and particularly his interaction with the issues concerning patronage and exchange which have already arisen in the previous chapter. The question how to use these anecdotes is however fraught with difficulty.

Scholars diverge considerably concerning the question how best to interpret such anecdotes.<sup>1</sup> One approach, recently seen, for example, in the work of Molyneux,<sup>2</sup> has consisted largely of the patient separating out of strands in an attempt to reconstruct the occasions, dates and perhaps nature of particular poems. A high

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. Parsons 2001, 56-8.

<sup>2</sup> Molyneux 1971, 1992.

degree of credence is here given to the inherently historical nature of at least many anecdotes; it is naturally acknowledged that retrieving real historical information from them is difficult, because traditions have become muddled and altered in our sources. This relatively optimistic procedure is countered by another approach which has been in many cases more persuasive and dominant: scholars have questioned the extent to which any very large amount of historical information is preserved in the stories, and have poured large amounts of cold water on to the attempts of others to retrieve biographical information about the poet. This approach to the biographies of poets in general is particularly associated with Lefkowitz' book *The Lives of the Greek Poets*,<sup>3</sup> and is exemplified for Simonides in a learned and acute article by Slater.<sup>4</sup> The general approach of these scholars is to attribute a great deal to 'traditional elements' (e.g. shipwrecks, folktale elements such as 'helpful animals'<sup>5</sup>), to falsely biographical readings of the poems, to error made by ancient sources either through inept treatment of the evidence available to them (frequently misunderstandings of jokes in comedy) or through motivations other than scholarly ones. It is now well understood by most that, as a source of reliable biographical information, the *Lives* of poets such as we sometimes find before their works in manuscripts, and the anecdotes which we find about them in a great variety of sources, are at best of very limited value. I say "by most" because in the case of Simonides there is an important exception, which must be named here as a book which has addressed head-on the most characteristic attribute of Simonides in the anecdotal tradition, his association with money: I mean the highly idiosyncratic treatment of Simonides by Anne Carson, who treats his life and works in conjunction with those of the German-language poet Paul Celan.<sup>6</sup> In this book, among other things, Carson paints a picture of Simonides as a poet of the period in which money (coins) has been introduced for the first time, describing and interacting with the alienating effect which Marx saw as produced by money.<sup>7</sup> This notion is one of very great interest and it seems to me a suggestive line of enquiry; unfortunately Carson's book is

---

<sup>3</sup> Lefkowitz 1981; cf. Fairweather 1974.

<sup>4</sup> Slater 1972.

<sup>5</sup> On folk-tale elements in traditions concerning the life of Simonides, see most recently Davies 2004 (where, crucially, at 273n.2 "M. Boas, *De epigrammatis* [...], pp.9ff." read "pp.98ff.").

<sup>6</sup> Carson 1999.

<sup>7</sup> More will be said about ways of thinking about the introduction of coinage and its effects below.

unusually rich in error, and attracted a great deal of opprobrium as soon as it was published.<sup>8</sup> Apart from its frequent inaccuracies,<sup>9</sup> the main problem of this book lies in its refusal to confront historical questions, specifically those of attribution (epigrams are for the most part read as if authentically Simonidean, even in the case of ones which are certainly much later) and of the reliability or type of reliability of biographical information, i.e. the anecdotes which are being considered here. Normally, Carson assumes that these are historically true; in one place she appears to notice the problem, but unfortunately refuses to engage with it in a meaningful way.<sup>10</sup> So at any rate if we are concerned with historical matters (and the present discussion is largely an attempt to deal with problems which are broadly speaking historical), Carson's book is a great disappointment; but it may be that her insights could be developed with greater respect for source materials and accuracy and found to be valuable all the same. Again, the book may be considered useful in that it foregrounds in a timely manner the extent of the tradition associating Simonides and money and related tensions in the patronage situation and may provide encouragement to provide a better way of looking at this tradition in the light of important recent work on money and its impacts on archaic and classical Greece.<sup>11</sup>

The present study does not represent an attempt to describe the whole of the tradition of anecdotes concerning Simonides, although it begins with a survey of one element of the tradition as a guide to orientation and an illustration of

---

<sup>8</sup> v. e.g. Sider 1999; Willett 2000 (especially savage). Goldhill 2000, clearly well-disposed, can nevertheless find little in the way of commendation and plenty of health-warnings.

<sup>9</sup> The author prepares us for these in her preface, where, if I understand her correctly, she describes and in part justifies a difficulty with 'fact' and, indeed, 'facticity', and describes her own work as a form of 'attention'; if this contrast can be mapped on to a contrast between 'historical' scholarship and 'non-historical' criticism, it still does not account, for example, for her failure (more surprising in a poet) accurately to describe the metrical scheme of an elegiac distich (89).

<sup>10</sup> 39n.73: "[...] It may seem unsound to cite Cicero and Theokritos, who are after all harking back from centuries later to an icon of Simonides' life and times derived from literature and literary gossip. But this icon is our subject. Simonides began it. Tolstoy really did die waiting for a train." I take this to mean the following: a) Carson does not mind conflating the historical Simonides with his reception (despite the fact that, e.g., arguments about the psychology of Simonides, such as she frequently deploys, can only be predicated of an individual, especially where they concern the effects of a historical event, i.e. the introduction of coinage, on his individual psychology); b) she assumes that the images later generations had of Simonides derive from his self-presentation (which begs the question); c) in any case, sometimes the events of poet's biographies seem to cohere well with their work, as with the death of Tolstoy (so what?). Willett 2000 does well to comment that Carson is not so cavalier with the details of Celan's life; carelessness with the historical record is more obviously reprehensible when it is closer to us.

<sup>11</sup> Particularly the work of Leslie Kurke (1991, 1999) and Richard Seaford (2004).

certain pervasive aspects.<sup>12</sup> Nor is it an attempt to ascertain the extent to which it is possible to derive real biographical data from this tradition, at least not of the conventional type, consisting of names of patrons, places and dates, which approach has been tried and found wanting.<sup>13</sup> On the other hand, this is not exclusively or principally a work of *Quellenforschung* either, although questions of this sort are not ignored. The principal attempt of this investigation is, by means of detailed description and analysis, to look at a rather vaguer question: to explore the extent to which we can see whether and in which respects the biographical and anecdotal tradition might be the product of interaction with the poems which were available to ancient readers. Rather than attempting to show whether the biographers have made true or false statements about Simonides' life, character and behaviour, I have thus looked at the question whether we can sometimes see a degree of continuity of concern and interest between the fragments of Simonides' poems and the interests of his biographers, and in this way gain at least a little more of an impression of the character of the poetry than we might otherwise be allowed. It is shown that, at least in some cases, there was a strong element of such continuity of discourse. In other words, it appears that the anecdotal tradition is marked by features which were also characteristic of some of Simonides' poems, and that the former is so marked because it has its roots in the reception of the latter.<sup>14</sup> The value of such a conclusion is limited; it is no substitute for the poems which we have lost to know that they seem to have been, sometimes and in part, marked by striking engagement with particular areas of concern and interest which the anecdotal tradition picked up. Nevertheless, it is here argued that this way of looking at fragments and anecdotes together can help us to see more of Simonides' interaction with his world than might otherwise be possible.

One may suspect that the fact of remuneration for poetry and the tensions created by this fact presented an important problem in the construction of a rôle for the poet in Simonides' time;<sup>15</sup> the contention of this section is that we can

---

<sup>12</sup> For a more thorough and wide-ranging survey, see Bell 1978.

<sup>13</sup> As shown above; Molyneux 1992 is an extended attempt to derive such data from the anecdotes.

<sup>14</sup> For a similar contention concerning the roots of the anecdotal tradition about Sappho, see Most 1996, esp. 32ff.

<sup>15</sup> Chapter 2, above, discusses the expression of such tensions in Pindar's *Isthmian* 2.



recover traces of Simonides' interaction with this problem. It is therefore, I argue, sometimes possible to conclude more from the anecdotal tradition's interaction with the poems than that the tradition may not be mined for data external to the poems.

This is obviously a difficult and dangerous procedure: a kind of reversed reception study, where part of the project concerns working backwards from the receiving-text to the source-text (alternatively seen, a kind of "transcendental question": what circumstances existed to let such a tradition come into being?). While it is therefore necessarily the case that what follows has a speculative element, it is hoped that careful attention to the sources and engagement with the problems they present has rescued this study from the faults of Carson's book, even at the same time as validating some of her conclusions by basing them in work which engages with difficulties which she ignores.

The particular concern of the first part of this study is an area which has been mentioned above in the context of the book of Anne Carson: I mean Simonides' regular association with money, and related subjects concerning his relations with his patrons. This is not the only strong or remarkable element in the anecdotal tradition about Simonides, but it is the most prevalent and perhaps the most remarkable, and at present timely, since work of the greatest interest concerning the cultural impact of monetisation on archaic Greece provides us with interesting ways of thinking about money and economics as reflected in cultural production such as poetry, but has (remarkably) in fact treated Simonides very little, despite the fact that ancient sources can be seen to have been extraordinarily inclined to think about Simonides in connection with the relationship between poetry, money and profit.<sup>16</sup>

## 2. Simonides κίβηξ: a sketch

The deep-seated association of Simonides with money in the ancient imagination is shown by the brief and anonymous account (biography would seem a misleading term; this is more like a brief encyclopedia entry) given in a book of

---

<sup>16</sup> I think here in particular of the books of Kurke and Seaford cited above. For earlier treatments of patronage and especially of patronage, Simonides, and payment, see Gentili 1988, esp. 161-2, Svenbro 1976, ch. III; see also Bremer 1991.

short literary lives on a papyrus from Oxyrhynchus:

*P.Oxy.* 1800 fr.1 col.ii.36-47 (edd. Grenfell and Hunt)

περὶ Σιμωνίδου

Σιμωνίδης τὸ μὲν [γένος ἦν] Κεῖος πόλεως δὲ Ιουλίδος πατρὸς δὲ  
Λεοπρεπο[ύς γέγονεν] δὲ φιλάργυρος· τ[ινὲς] δ' αὐτῷ τὴν τῶν  
μν[ημο]νικῶν εὗρεσιν προσ[τιθέα]σιν· καὶ αὐτὸς δέ που [τοῦτο] φαίνει  
διὰ τῶν ἐπιγ[ραμ]μά[τ]ων προσευρεῖ[ν δέ φα]σιν [αὐ]τὸν τινὲς καὶ δ' [ ]  
[κε[ ]οστον τῶν κδ απ[ ]τ [ ] ] εὐ [ ]ησα[ ]εν[ ] ]

Simonides' *genos* was Keian, his *polis* was Ioulis, his father was Leoprepes and he was a money-lover. Some people attribute the invention of memory-systems to him and indeed he himself says that he invented them somewhere in his epigrams. Some also say that [he did something to do with the alphabet].

Here Simonides' φιλαργυρία is the first item given after his ethnic, polis and patronymic. It is possible that the source for the anonymous compiler of lives was the peripatetic Chamaeleon, who wrote what was presumably a rather more extensive biography of the poet (from which see in particular fr.33 Wehrli, concerning φιλαργυρία, which will be treated more extensively below), since he is explicitly cited on the papyrus as a source concerning the life of Sappho, who is treated immediately before Simonides. However, Simonides' association with money in the history of his reputation goes back far earlier than Chamaeleon; indeed, it would seem fair to say that in every period or author where we might expect to find it, with the exception of the authentic dialogues of Plato, we do find it. It is this association which is traced in this section.

### 3. Xenophanes

Simonides' presence in Pindar's *Isthmian* 2 has been discussed above (chapter 2). Here, it is set to one side while the same tradition is examined through different types of source. By this means, it is hoped, this chapter and the previous one can be seen as complementing each other but not relying upon each other; each case is made independently of the other. Earliest in date, then, is another author

contemporary with the poet himself, the philosopher Xenophanes of Colophon. Our source is a scholion to Aristophanes:

Σ Aristoph. *Birds* 697 c-e = Xenophanes fr. 21 W = T22 Campbell (Loeb)

ὁ Cιμωνίδης διεβέβλητο ἐπὶ φιλαργυρίαι... καὶ < > μέμνηται ὅτι  
μικρολόγος ἦν· ὅθεν Ξενοφάνης κίμβικα αὐτὸν προσαγορεύει.

“nomen scriptoris cuiusdam excidisse uidetur” Holwerda; <Χαμαιλέων> West, coll. Athenaeus 656d (= Chamaeleon fr. 33 Wehrli).

Simonides is accused of avarice... Also <Chamaeleon> records that he was stingy. For this reason Xenophanes called him “skinflint.”

The fact that the scholion is clearly to some extent corrupt is unfortunate. West’s supplement is based on the attribution of a similar statement to Chamaeleon made in the *Deipnosophistae* of Athenaeus (656d = Chamaeleon fr.33 Wehrli):

ὄντως δὲ ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς κίμβιξ ὁ Cιμωνίδης καὶ αἰσχροκερδής, ὡς  
Χαμαιλέων φησὶν.

In truth, Simonides really was a skinflint and indecorously greedy, as Chamaeleon says.

This follows upon the account, also attributed to Chamaeleon, of an occasion when Hieron is said to have provoked an autoschediastic parody of Homer from Simonides by omitting to serve him roast hare (see below for a treatment of this anecdote), and immediately before another anecdote recording Simonides’ habit of selling food given to him by Hieron, for which no source is given (Chamaeleon might be conjectured; but see below). It is possible that Athenaeus might have been expressing himself rather loosely, and should be paraphrased as follows: “When Chamaeleon attributed miserliness and greed to Simonides (sc. by telling this anecdote), he was surely right, as *this* anecdote leads us to the same conclusion.” In this way it would be unclear whether the words κίμβιξ and αἰσχροκερδής were indeed used by Chamaeleon. It may however be considered more probable that Athenaeus means us to understand that the words κίμβιξ and αἰσχροκερδής were used by Chamaeleon, on the basis of the most natural

reading of Athenaeus and of the tendency of the word κίμβιξ to occur in Aristotelian sources (the impression given by LSJ is borne out by a TLG search: with the exception of the present fragment of Xenophanes, the word and its cognates occur principally in the works of Aristotle and his followers until much later times).<sup>17</sup>

This leads to a further consideration: that the word κίμβιξ may not have been used by Xenophanes after all. The source of the scholion on *Peace* 697 certainly stated that Xenophanes had used the word: the idiom strongly suggests modern ‘inverted commas’ (compare, e.g., Xen. *Mem.* 3.2.1, cited by LSJ s.v. προκαγορεύω 3: τοῦ ἔνεκεν, ἔφη, “Ὅμηρον οἶει τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα προκαγορεύειν ποιμένα λαῶν; “For what reason, he said, do you suppose that Homer called Agamemnon ‘shepherd of the people?’”). The possibility remains that the source of the scholion misunderstood a passage of Chamaeleon in which Chamaeleon used the word κίμβιξ in his own proper voice and also adduced a passage of Xenophanes in support or simply alleged that his own opinion was also that of Xenophanes; the confusion could have arisen in the writing of an intermediary between Chamaeleon and the scholiast from “the well known scholiastic use [of *et* and καί] joining together the name of the direct and indirect source;”<sup>18</sup> this intermediary would have said something like ὡς Χαμαιλέων καὶ Ξενοφάνης, meaning “as Chamaeleon says, citing Xenophanes as a source.”

On the other hand, the following points seem to indicate the likelihood that the word κίμβιξ really was used by Xenophanes to describe his contemporary. Xenophanes would probably have found Simonides offensive on the grounds that he praised athletic victories and that his cash relationship with his patrons was contrary to Xenophanes’ alternative vision of κοφία. Xenophanes and Simonides probably came into contact on Sicily. Again, my argument above pays little attention to the fact that *in the scholion as we have it* the attribution to Chamaeleon (if that is the missing name) and the attribution to Xenophanes are made separately, so that we would need to postulate an intermediate place where the confusion occurred, and perhaps here “*entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter*

<sup>17</sup> Apart from the passages already cited, cf. Ar. *EV* 1121b22, *EE* 1232a12, 1232a14, *Magna Moralia* 1.24.1, Andronicus Rhodius *de passionibus* 9.7.2, 9.7.5.

<sup>18</sup> Slater 1972, 232 (Slater is not speaking of the present issue here).

necessitatem.”<sup>19</sup>

Nevertheless, the possibilities of error which I have outlined are not the only ones. It is also very possible that the origin of the notion that Xenophanes called Simonides κίμβιξ is derived from a falsely biographical reading of one of his works, in which a mention of a κίμβιξ was taken as a reference to Simonides, where this inference might have been an unsound one: an equivalent of a source saying “Pindar had a low opinion of his contemporary poets, for which reason he called Simonides and Bacchylides ‘crows’”: the writer would be quoting Pindar’s word correctly (*Ol.* 2.87), but the idea that Pindar was really referring to Simonides and Bacchylides here<sup>20</sup> is at best dubious, and, if we did not have Pindar’s ode to read for ourselves, this would not be possible for us to judge. Indeed, if only the word κόρακες were preserved in quotation, we would have lost the principal argument in favour of the scholiastic interpretation, i.e. the dual number of the verb γαρεύετον.<sup>21</sup>

It is unfortunate that it seems necessary to indicate uncertainty as to this earliest testimony; I consider it on the whole more likely than not a) that Xenophanes censured Simonides for his *philarguria* and b) that the word κίμβιξ was used by Xenophanes, but the point may not be securely demonstrated.<sup>22</sup> If both a) and b) are correct, this is of considerable importance: whatever the reason for Xenophanes’ censure, it was not rooted in simple misunderstanding of Simonides’ poems consequent upon cultural distance from Simonides’ time and milieu, since this was also the time and milieu in which Xenophanes circulated; again, it was presumably not based more narrowly on misunderstanding of generic features of Simonides’ poems, since Xenophanes, however much he may have disliked a great amount of archaic poetry, was nevertheless presumably not ignorant of it, though he might have adopted a kind of rhetorical strategy of (for example) deliberately taking figurative language literally or the like. Xenophanes would then be engaged in an ideological dispute in which he identifies Simonides

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Bell 1978, 34-5. Bell takes the Xenophanes tradition as genuine, as does Leshner 1992, 28.

<sup>20</sup> Σ P. *Ol.* 2.158d (i.99 Drachmann) is our source.

<sup>21</sup> Which seems to have been the problem which the scholiasts’ sources set out to solve; v. Σ *Ol.* 2.158b, 158d (i.99 Drachmann): the second scholion is a retort to the first.

<sup>22</sup> The authenticity of the Xenophanes fragment and its being directed towards Simonides are accepted by Gentili 1988, 161 in his discussion of Simonides as a key figure in “professionalisation,” in which he more commonly hedges his bets on the strict historicity of anecdote while happily (and, I think, reasonably) treating it as good evidence for Simonides’ practice.

as opposed to his own views concerning wealth and κοφία. If it is genuine, we do not know to what extent his criticism was based on his estimation of Simonides' personal behaviour and character and to what extent it was based upon his view of the content of Simonides' poems, but we might guess that the latter was at least a factor, given the critical approach of Xenophanes towards Homer and Hesiod,<sup>23</sup> towards athletics,<sup>24</sup> as celebrated by Simonides in epinician, and towards many mythical themes in sympotic literature.<sup>25</sup> However, it seems that it would not only have been because of his use of inappropriate mythical material that Xenophanes censured Simonides in such a way; some reference to the fact of making a living from such poetry or some other perception or allegation of Xenophanes concerning Simonides' participation in and attitude towards exchange-related behaviour would have been a factor.

#### 4. Aristophanes

It was noted above that we have this account of Xenophanes' attitude towards Simonides from a scholiast on Aristophanes, and it is in Aristophanes that we first find unambiguous and securely placed material associating Simonides with money and with the stinginess of which Xenophanes may have accused him.<sup>26</sup> This is the passage from *Peace* to which the scholion was attached:

Aristophanes *Peace* 696-9:

EP. ... Πρῶτον δ' ὅ τι πράττει Σοφοκλέης ἀνῆρετο.

TP. Εὐδαιμονεῖ· πάσχει δὲ θαυμαστόν.

EP. Τὸ τί;

TP. Ἐκ τοῦ Σοφοκλέους γίγνεται Σιμωνίδης.

EP. Σιμωνίδης; πῶς;

TP. Ὅτι γέρων ὦν καὶ σαπρὸς  
κέρδους ἕκατι κἂν ἐπὶ ῥιπὸς πλέοι.

Hermes: ... First of all she asks how Sophocles is getting on.

Trygaeus: He's fine. But an extraordinary thing is happening to him.

<sup>23</sup> Xenophanes fr. 11-12 D-K.

<sup>24</sup> Xenophanes fr. 2 D-K.

<sup>25</sup> Xenophanes fr. 1 D-K.

<sup>26</sup> cf. Bell 1978, 38-41.

Hermes: What's that?

Trygaeus: He's turning from Sophocles into Simonides.

Hermes: Simonides? How?

Trygaeus: Because even as a wrinkled old man  
for money's sake he'd go to sea in a sieve!

Clearly Sophocles is censured for some sort of activity directed at profit, and in order to present this notion Aristophanes has Trygaeus compare him with Simonides, who is apparently immediately recognisable as a type of the poet excessively interested in remuneration (doubtless his reputation for longevity is also a factor).<sup>27</sup> The imagery of u.699 is proverbial (Olson compares Eur. fr. 397 Nauck; Pellizer,<sup>28</sup> noting the mention of an obscure iambic poet immediately before the scholion quoted above – 697e τοῦ λαμβοποιου – suggests that the line which became proverbial had occurred in the iambics of Semonides of Amorgos); hence my loose translation of ῥίψ, which is properly “a wicker mat.”<sup>29</sup> The scholiasts had no difficulty in recognising Simonides here as a regular exemplum of the greedy poet, and Aristophanes' audience cannot have had too much difficulty either, as we can see from another reference to Simonides in Aristophanes.

Aristophanes *Birds* 917-19:

ΠΟΙΗΤΗΣ Μέλη πεποίηκ εἰς τὰς Νεφελοκοκκυγίας  
τὰς ὑμετέρας κύκλιά τε πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ  
καὶ παρθένεια καὶ κατὰ τὰ Σιμωνίδου.

Poet: I have made songs for your Cloudcuckooland: many fine dithyrambs  
and maiden-songs and all à la Simonides.

This seems a glancing reference, and may be partially a response to Simonides' virtuosity across multiple genres (i.e., καὶ κατὰ τὰ Σιμωνίδου could imply “and

<sup>27</sup> Sophocles will have been in his seventies when *Peace* was produced in 421; the precise nature of the remunerative activity in which he must have been believed to be involved is unclear; cf. Olson 1998 ad loc.

<sup>28</sup> Pellizer 1981. The mention of the iambographer in the scholion should not be taken as suggesting that we think of Semonides of Amorgos *rather than* Simonides of Keos (nor does Pellizer suggest that it should); Simonides of Keos was the more famous by far (and the only one mentioned by Aristophanes), and the money association ‘fixes’ it as him.

<sup>29</sup> Regularly ψίαθος in Attic; v. Olson 1998 ad loc.

any kind of song you like”). We have evidence that, in addition to the list in the Suda entry (elegiac and lyric battle poems, “*threnoi*, *encomia*, epigrams, paeans, tragedies and others”), which one would expect to follow the outlines of the Alexandrian edition (tragedies presumably deriving from an error somewhere along the line), Simonides was the author also of *partheneia* and *prosodia*, according to the author of [Plutarch] *On Music* 17; *PMG* 539 (Strabo 15.3.2) records a dithyramb “Memnon” preserved in the mysterious book called the *Deiaka*.<sup>30</sup> It seems very likely that this very *polyeidea* associated with Simonides can be associated also with his *philarguria*; the money-loving poet, like Simonides or like the anonymous poet of *Birds*, will set his hand to anything, if the price is right. However, *polyeidea* cannot be treated as a sufficient cause of the reputation which Simonides had for *philarguria*, since a similarly various list associated with Pindar did not have the same effect upon how he was perceived.<sup>31</sup> One might consider, however that, in the context of his *polyeidea*, Simonides’ variety of style and of self-presentation could have been a factor: he seems to vary in tone and style a great deal between poems, perhaps more than others, which may have made it seem that he was too chameleleon-like to be trusted, and adopted different personae according to where his financial advantage seemed to lie.<sup>32</sup> In any case, the primary associations of Simonides’ name are clearly that he is associated with money-grubbing; the poet in *Birds* is there because he hopes to obtain benefit from the birds, just as Simonides was associated with his travels around the Greek world to obtain profit from his various patrons.<sup>33</sup> In the comedy, what would in the ‘real world’ presumably have been substantial payments, at least for the pan-Hellenic ‘big names’ like Simonides and Pindar, are simply second-hand clothes; however, despite the fact that this motif is explicable in this way as characteristic of comedy, I shall below develop further the interpretation of clothing as payment for poetry, and argue that the same notion may have been

---

<sup>30</sup> See, recently, Poltera 2005.

<sup>31</sup> The Ambrosian Life of Pindar preserves a list, largely coinciding with that of the Suda, assumed to reflect a Hellenistic edition of seventeen books.

<sup>32</sup> Thus it would not seem particularly obvious that, e.g., the Danaë poem (543 *PMG*) and the poem concerning virtue (542 *PMG*) were by the same poet; cf. the remarks of Parsons 2001, 62: “not one manner, but several, according to circumstance.” I owe this idea to discussion with Prof. C. Carey.

<sup>33</sup> Which is unattractive from a point of view of democratic hostility towards tyranny; cf. Dover 1972, 141n.1.



found by Aristophanes and known to his audience from Simonides' own poetry.<sup>34</sup> It may be further noted how specifically Aristophanes seems to associate the figure of the avaricious poet with Simonides when it is considered that this reference to the poet immediately precedes the parody of poetry which is not by Simonides but by Pindar (926-30 and 941-4 are both parodic imitations of Pindar's *hyporchema* celebrating the foundation of the city of Aetna by Hieron in 476/5 BCE; the particular lines parodied are provided by scholia (Pindar fr. 105 SM)). This shows up how strong the association was between Simonides and avarice; Pindar's name would not have been adequate, or at least would have been less suitable, to make Aristophanes' point.<sup>35</sup>

### 5. Plato and [Plato]

In the fourth century, Simonides came into his own as a privileged place for moral reflection and discussion. It is to Plato that we owe one of our longest fragments, selected for its ethical interest (542 *PMG*; Pl. *Protag.* 339a-346d), and we see Plato engaging with Simonides as a 'thinker,' usually in ethics, in places such as *Protag.* 316d (named together with Homer and Hesiod). Then at *Resp.* 331d-332c Simonides' alleged *dictum* is that τὸ τὰ ὀφειλόμενα δίκαιον εἶναι ἀποδιδόναι ("the just action is to render to each the things owed to him"). This was received into *PMG* by Page as 642 (a), and although it might represent a prose apophthegm, given the remarkable nature of the poem quoted in the *Protagoras* the possibility that some such definition is derived from paraphrase of a passage of a poem should not be rejected. It is thus conceivable that some notion of poems deserving payment or themselves representing payment of a debt (ὀφείλω regularly of debt in the financial sense; for poem-as-debt in Pindar, using this verb, see *Ol.* 10.3, *Pyth.* 4.3; and compare the similar use of χρέος 'debt') lies behind the quotation of Simonides. He might have written something like "I owe a debt of praise to [the laudandus]; indeed, it is just to render to each his due, and [the laudandus] has excelled beyond compare at [reference to the place of the contest]." At any rate, if this is the case, Plato makes little of it; later

<sup>34</sup> Probably Aristophanes comically conflates the wealthy stars like Pindar and Simonides with the idea of the starving poet as found in the iambs of Hipponax; cf. Dunbar 1995 ad 903-57 (p.521) and ad 935; on all of this see below.

<sup>35</sup> For *contrast* between Pindar and Simonides concerning attitudes to patrons, see the story from the Ambrosian Life of Pindar (Drachmann i.3.20ff.), cited below.

he pairs Simonides with Bias and Pittacus ἢ τιν ἄλλον τῶν σοφῶν τε καὶ μακαρίων ἀνδρῶν “or any other among wise and blessed men,”<sup>36</sup> and it seems clear that σοφία and not κίμβικία is the point here.

In the *Protagoras*, Socrates in his account of the poem accounts for Simonides’ motivations only vaguely, and in ways which are not strongly associated with the present interest, i.e. Simonides’ interest in money and his patronage relations. First, Socrates attributed his interest in refuting the celebrated *dictum* of the sage Pittacus (οὐδέ μοι ἐμμελέως τὸ Πιττάκειον νέμεται 542.11PMG = *Protag.* 339c) to φιλοτιμία:

Plato *Protag.* 343 b-c (loquitur Socrates)

ὁ οὖν Ciμωνίδης, ἅτε φιλότιμος ὢν ἐπὶ σοφαίαι, ἔγνω ὅτι εἰ καθέλοι τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα ὥσπερ εὐδοκιμοῦντα ἀθλητὴν καὶ περιγένοιτο αὐτοῦ, αὐτὸς εὐδοκιμήσει ἐν τοῖς τότε ἀνθρώποις. εἰς τοῦτο οὖν τὸ ῥῆμα καὶ τούτου ἕνεκα τούτῳ ἐπιβουλεύων κολοῦσαι αὐτὸ ἅπαν τὸ αἷμα πεποίηκεν, ὥς μοι φαίνεται.

[Socrates:] Simonides, then, since he was keen to win honour for wisdom, knew that if he could bring down this saying as if bringing down a respected athlete and overcome it, he would himself become respected among the people of his time. It is against this saying, then, and with the intention of discrediting it for this reason, that he has made the entire song, as it seems to me.

Disregarding the tricky question of what sort of generic label should be attached to this song (skolion, encomium, etc.), we can see that here Socrates takes no interest in the original performance context, and the fact that the poem presumably contained praise of Scopas. His account places Simonides (as Simonides placed himself) in a circumstance of parity of status with Pittacus, the former tyrant of Mytilene and opponent of Alcaeus, and the agonistic situation delineated through the wrestling simile in a way makes the opposition between Simonides and Pittacus analogous to that between himself and Protagoras.<sup>37</sup> The question of Simonides’ desire for payment, then, would undermine this strategy,

<sup>36</sup> On Simonides and the figure of the σοφός, see above, section 2.6.

<sup>37</sup> cf. Most 1994, 129-30 with n.11.

by which Simonides is presented as a freely acting agonistic personality, motivated by a quasi-aristocratic sense of φιλοτιμία rather than anything like financial greed and context-bound rhetorical strategy. At first sight, however, this impression might appear to be undermined by a later statement of Socrates:

Plato *Protag.* 346b (loquitur Socrates)

πολλάκις δὲ οἶμαι καὶ Σιμωνίδης ἡγήσατο καὶ αὐτὸς ἢ τύραννον ἢ ἄλλον τινὰ τῶν τοιούτων ἐπαινέσαι καὶ ἐγκωμιάσαι οὐχ ἐκῶν, ἀλλ ἀναγκαζόμενος.

[Socrates:] And often, I think, even Simonides himself composed praise and encomium either for a tyrant or some other such person not willingly, but through compulsion.

ἀναγκαζόμενος might seem a glancing reference to the notion that Simonides wrote out of ἀνάγκη caused by poverty;<sup>38</sup> but I do not believe that this argument can hold much water. The argumentative context is that Socrates wishes to assert that Simonides uses the word ἐκῶν (“willingly, freely”) at 540.28 *PMG* with reference to his own praising (construing it as ἐπαίνημι καὶ φιλέω ἐκῶν “I willingly praise and love” rather than ἐκῶν ὅστις ἔρδῃ μὴδὲν αἰσχρόν “whoever does nothing disgraceful willingly”). His rhetorical interest, therefore, is in demonstrating that there is some point in ἐκῶν with reference to Simonides by suggesting that sometimes he would have had to compose praise even when unwilling. This is therefore not, despite the proverbial wealth of tyrants, a reference to payment, since surely Simonides would have been assumed *regularly* to be paid for his services, where Socrates needs him to be regularly praising ἐκῶν but on occasion ἀναγκαζόμενος. The sense must therefore be not that he can be compelled to praise a tyrant because of his need to obtain payment but rather because of the political power wielded by tyrants, which deprives others of their autonomy freely to praise or to withhold praise. ἢ τύραννον ἢ ἄλλον τινὰ τῶν τοιούτων must be intended to mean “somebody powerful enough to make you do what you do not wish to do.” This interpretation seems to me also more coherent with Socrates’ previous argument that a good man may be “compelled”

<sup>38</sup> On ἀναγκαζω used in this way, cf. Dover 1974, p.109.

by his own sense of what is right to praise country or parents even when they act towards him unjustly. No reference to payment or money should therefore be read here.<sup>39</sup>

Interestingly, works generally believed to be falsely ascribed to Plato give a different picture. This is the case with the pseudo-Platonic *Hipparchus*,<sup>40</sup> where, in his description of the son of Peisistratus, Socrates refers to Hipparchus' having brought Anacreon and Simonides to Athens.

[Plato] *Hipp.* 228c (loquitur Socrates)

καὶ ἐπ' Ανακρέοντα τὸν Τήϊον πεντηκόντορον στείλας ἐκόμιεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν· Σιμωνίδην τὸν Κεῖον αἰεὶ περὶ αὐτὸν εἶχε, μεγάλοις μισθοῖς καὶ δώροις πείθων· ταῦτα δ' ἐποίει βουλόμενος παιδεύειν τοὺς πολίτας, ἵνα ὡς βελτίστων ὄντων αὐτῶν ἄρχοι, οὐκ οἰόμενος δεῖν οὐδενὶ σοφίας φθονεῖν, ἅτε ὦν καλὸς τε κάγαθός.

[Socrates:] And, having sent for him a penteconter, he brought Anacreon of Teos into the city. And he always had Simonides of Ceos around him, persuading him with large fees and gifts. He used to do these things in order to educate the citizens, so that he might rule over the best possible people, thinking it wrong to begrudge wisdom to any, since he was such a gentleman.

This account purports to present a favourable view of poetry and poets as educators (in a manner rather foreign to Plato). Simonides seems to have composed a mixture of 'private' and 'public' genres, including paeans and dithyrambs, which could be thought of as bringing παιδεία to the citizens en masse (as could the practice of public rhapsodic recitation). One might doubt, however, the extent to which the general public were entertained or educated by the sympotic lyrics of Anacreon, songs performed, one may suppose, in small gatherings at the tyrant's house. Of course, it is entirely possible that, from a fourth century point of view, these have the effect of general public παιδεία as a result of their diffusion through sympotic performance among the Athenians more generally (as we know, for example, that at least some of Simonides' poems

<sup>39</sup> contra, Bell 1978, 75; but cf. *ibid.* 72n.162.

<sup>40</sup> "Its authenticity is almost universally denied by scholars (including Souilhé), though defended by Friedländer." Guthrie 1962-81, v.389.

were favourites at symposia).<sup>41</sup>

It is notable that this discussion of Hipparchus and his poetic patronage is embedded as a kind of digression in a discussion of what it means to be φιλοκερδής; it has been read by at least one scholar as a kind of ironic meditation on the corrupted παιδεία and corrupted appetites of tyrants;<sup>42</sup> we may suppose that not only Hipparchus but also Simonides is intended to represent the φιλοκερδής, and may, more surprisingly, note the difference between the emphasis in the case of Anacreon on the grand style in which he came to Athens and in the case of Simonides on his profit from fees and gifts.<sup>43</sup> As in the use of κατὰ τὰ Ciμωνίδου at *Birds* 919 (above), Simonides seems to be singled out for special association with money, and again as in the *Birds* passage there seems little ‘real-world’ justification for this: it is probable that both Anacreon and Pindar profited financially from their poems, and that both Aristophanes and the imitator of Plato would have assumed the same.<sup>44</sup>

The second of the collection of letters attributed to Plato in the mss. comments upon popular interest in the common theme ‘sage and ruler’:

[Plato] *Epist.* 2. 310e-311a

πέφυκε ξυνιέναι εἰς ταῦτὸ φρόνησίς τε καὶ δύναμις μεγάλη, καὶ ταῦτ ἄλληλ ἁεὶ διώκει καὶ ζητεῖ καὶ συγγίγνεται· ἔπειτα καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι χαίρουσι περὶ τούτων αὐτοῖ τε διαλεγόμενοι καὶ ἄλλων ἀκούοντες ἔν τε ἰδίαις ξυνουσίαις καὶ ἐν ταῖς ποιήσεσιν· οἷον καὶ περὶ Ἰέρωνος ὅταν διαλέγωνται ἄνθρωποι καὶ Πausανίου τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου, χαίρουσι τὴν Ciμωνίδου ξυνουσίαν παραφέροντες, ἃ τε ἔπραξε καὶ

<sup>41</sup> Aristoph. *Clouds* 1355ff.

<sup>42</sup> Massaro 1991. Massaro reads the dialogue as authentic but ‘minor.’

<sup>43</sup> The broader context of discussion of the meaning of φιλοκερδής is not appreciated by Bell 1978 (43-4), who seems to me to miss the point of this passage. Anacreon was even described as refusing gold from Polycrates: Aristotle, *Chreiai*, at Stob. 4.31c.91 (Bell 1978, 77).

<sup>44</sup> The assumption is stronger for Pindar than for Anacreon, who may have been characteristically attached to a single court for a long time, where Simonides and Pindar worked free-lance. However, if there was a significant difference between the working arrangements of Anacreon and Simonides, it does not appear to have been in the mind of the author of the *Hipparchus*, since he shows them working in much the same way in this respect (coming to be resident at the court of Hipparchus, as Anacreon had been resident with Polycrates). Again, it will be seen below that Simonides is seen in some anecdotes as resident at the court of Hieron in the same way. So it is hard to say that this possible difference in working practices is a formative factor in the anecdotal construction of Simonides as κίμβιξ.

εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς.

It is naturally the case that wisdom and great power are inclined to come together, and these are always pursuing and seeking and meeting together. Again, both in their own gatherings and in poems, people in general like to talk about these things, and to hear about them from others. Thus when people talk about Hieron and about Pausanias the Spartan, they like to bring up how these spent time with Simonides, and what he did and what he said to them. [There follows a list of other examples, going back to mythological instances.]

This is not directly connected to the money theme treated here, but has been included because of its tantalising interest. If this could be shown to come from Plato's time, it would be even more remarkable; unfortunately it is unlikely to be by Plato; see below for a brief account of this problem. It may be noted that these stories are regarded as both the subject-matter of conversation *and* of poems (ἐν ταῖς ποιήσεσιν: the use of ποίησις to mean "poem" is neither late nor un-Platonic: cf. *Ion* 531d, cited by LSJ s.v.). Perhaps the most interesting sentence for our purposes is ἔπειτα καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι χαίρουσι περὶ τούτων αὐτοὶ τε διαλεγόμενοι καὶ ἄλλων ἀκούοντες ἔν τε ἰδίαις ξυνουσίαις καὶ ἐν ταῖς ποιήσεσιν. This sentence is widely mistranslated, and perhaps not immediately clear; it therefore seems appropriate to treat it in detail. The two τε... καί pairs are to be construed in parallel and not in subordination: i.e., ἔν τε ἰδίαις ξυνουσίαις καὶ ἐν ταῖς ποιήσεσιν qualifies not ἄλλων ἀκούοντες but χαίρουσι περὶ τούτων. The Loeb (Bury) gives the incorrect "discussing themselves in private conversation and hearing others discuss in their poems"; Brisson<sup>45</sup> is even further away (and the footnote ad loc. does not justify the translation but simply indicates his nervousness; in his heart, he knew that the Greek did not say what he translated); Ciani gets it right: "E gli uomini amano parlarne o sentirne parlare tanto nelle conversazioni private quanto nelle opere poetiche".<sup>46</sup>

The difficulty of the sentence derives from the fact that it is slightly loosely put; the source of this looseness of expression is the regular appeal in Greek of bipolar

<sup>45</sup> Brisson 1987.

<sup>46</sup> Ciani in Parente and Ciani 2002.

expression generally, and of the contrast between speaking on one's own authority and hearing information from others, and the closely related contrast between seeing and hearing.<sup>47</sup> It seems unlikely that the "ordinary people" or "people in general" are actually supposed to be composing poems (though they may be imagined as performing them); I think that the sense intended must be conveyed by the following inelegant paraphrase: "People enjoy talking about the interaction between wise men and powerful men, and they also enjoy hearing about the same. This enjoyment is reflected in their reception of the poems, and in their choice of conversation in company (whether at parties or at the barber's shop or at the *lesche*, etc.)." It may be that the idea is that the *way* in which they read poems is the feature of their taste to be understood here, or it may be that it is the *choice* of poems which they like to read (hear, sing, etc.).

These poems are presumably the poems of the poets concerned; in other words, people, according to the author of the epistle, have a special interest in reading the poems of Simonides and others in a way which privileges poems and ways of reading poems which seem to provide extractable data concerning the interactions of the poets and their patrons. Such popular interest seems very plausible; it would show the general cultural attitude in which the (to us) excessively biographical readings of scholia, ancient biographers, etc. were embedded: not to mention anecdotes of the sort considered here. On the other hand, the possibility is not to be excluded that the author of the letter had in mind collections of verse anecdotes of the kind called *χρεῖται* and known to us from the fragments of the third century BC Machon.<sup>48</sup>

Hieron and Simonides make a regular pair in the anecdotes we know about,<sup>49</sup> and especially in the *Hieron* of Xenophon, as will be discussed below. Less common is the pairing of Simonides and Pausanias of Sparta. The victor of Plataea was probably also the one who commissioned Simonides' elegy to commemorate it, and epigrams which he had erected in various contexts were

<sup>47</sup> *Il.* 2.484-6; cf. Svenbro 1993, 14-15 (κλέος is an acoustic term); cf. [Hes.] fr. 199.3 M-W, Eur. *Orestes* 532-3, Soph. *OT* 7, etc.

<sup>48</sup> Gow 1965. On *χρεῖται* as a genre, see 12-15. Machon does not treat any person of a date as early as Simonides in his anecdotes concerning historical people, but there were other writers of this sort whose works have been lost.

<sup>49</sup> cf. Bell 1978, 34: "Simonides' relationship with Hieron appears here in what seems already to be a canonical list of such associations"; but what is remarkable is that Simonides appears with two possible 'great men' where every other has only one, and that Pausanias is not, from our evidence, an obvious candidate.

attributed (like most Persian Wars epigrams) to Simonides.<sup>50</sup> But stories concerning “what Simonides did and said to him” are not so common; we have only an anecdote where Simonides, asked for advice by Pausanias, advises him to remember that he is only a man. This was not, as far as we can see from our sources, a common story.<sup>51</sup> We may wonder, however, whether our sources are here misleadingly unrepresentative. The tone and argument of the letter is elitist and snobbish. ‘Plato’ is keen to distinguish between himself and the tyrant as a privileged pair, worthy to be considered as equivalent to Hieron<sup>52</sup> and Simonides and the other pairs named. Again, a contrast between the enlightened few and the ignorant many is implicit in Plato’s instruction not to allow the doctrines divulged to him to be made public among the ἀπαίδευτοι (314a), since doctrines sound absurd to ordinary people which seem most wonderful and inspiring to the well-born (πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς... πρὸς τοὺς εὐφυεῖς 314a).<sup>53</sup> The language in which he asserts that anecdotes about powerful men and sages are popular is less strongly marked by such distinctions, but it may be seen that these distinctions are implied there as well: note in particular ἔπειτα καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι χαίρουσι κτλ.; the use of καὶ is adverbial rather than conjunctive and contrasts the generic οἱ ἄνθρωποι with the abstracted φρόνησίς τε καὶ δύναμις μεγάλη of the previous sentence. Plato contrasts the wise and powerful with the ordinary people, who have a different interest in the same subject: for the many, such characters are glamorous and other-wordly, where for the wise and powerful they are potential models to follow. We may note in this connection Plato’s use of traditional χάρις motifs which also serve to highlight the analogy between the pair Plato-Dionysius with the historical and mythological paradeigmata: see at 312c τιμώμενος μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ σοῦ τιμήσω ἐγώ (“being brought honour by you, I shall bring honour to you”), and in particular ἐγὼ δὲ ἐὰν τιμῶν μὴ τιμῶντα πλοῦτον δόξω θαυμάζειν τε καὶ διώκειν (“If I do

<sup>50</sup> Cf. above, section 1.5. On attribution of epigrams, see below, section 3.18.

<sup>51</sup> I can find only Plut. *Consolatio ad Apollonium* 105a1, Aelian *V.H.* 9.41.1. Some parallels given at Hani 1972 ad loc. (162n.22).

<sup>52</sup> Hieron comes first on the list, perhaps because of a perception that Dionysius would like to be perceived as *Hieron noster*; cf. the implicit analogy between the third century Hieron and the patron of Simonides, Bacchylides and Pindar in Theocritus 16 (below, section 4.3).

<sup>53</sup> This esoteric flavour to the letter has been identified as characteristic of a Pythagoreanising version of Platonism which probably grew up in the 1st century BC: v. Parente in Parente and Ciani 2002 ad 314c1 (p.198) and ‘Introduzione’ pp.xxvii-xxviii. On dating implications, see below.



honour to you while you do not to me, I shall be considered to be dazzled by wealth and chasing after it"). Where οἱ ἄνθρωποι at 310e are shown ('also,' 'even') having an interest in the interaction of sages and powerful men, both in their conversation and in their literary consumption, it seems to me that the writer of the letter may intend his audience to have in mind popular, 'sub'-literary traditions about poets and powerful men: a different kind of thing from what 'Plato' and Dionysius might be expected to be interested in. It may be that various kinds of anecdotal material were strongly represented in this kind of tradition which were less prevalent in more high-brow contexts, and that this might account for the surprising choice of Pausanias of Sparta as a figure about whose intercourse with Simonides anecdotal material circulated (Hieron is unsurprising to us; but otherwise why not e.g. Scopas or Themistocles or "the lords of Thessaly," which would be the obvious choices on the basis of the material available to us?). Of course, if such a tradition was embedded in ways of reading the poems, it will have found meat on which to feed concerning Simonides and Pausanias: the latter occupied an important role in the Plataea elegy,<sup>54</sup> and had inscribed Persian War epigrams which were subsequently (inevitably) attributed to Simonides.<sup>55</sup> It is not difficult to see that the vainglorious tone of these epigrams might have generated the story about Pausanias and Simonides which we do have: that Simonides reminded him of his own mortality. We know from the quoting sources that these inscriptions were viewed as hubristic and disapproved of.<sup>56</sup>

Analysis of the dating of this letter is beyond the scope of the present study; since Bentley, the most famous of de-bunkers of the attribution of letters, maintained that the Platonic epistles, at least, were authentic,<sup>57</sup> scholars have see-sawed between accepting or rejecting the letters *in toto*, and various intermediate positions where some letters have been accepted but others rejected, without a strong consensus on where to draw the line.<sup>58</sup> The present state of scholarship

<sup>54</sup> fr.11.33-4 W; cf. section 1.5 above.

<sup>55</sup> *FGE* 'Simonides' XVII (a), XXIX.

<sup>56</sup> Thuc. 1.132.2 states that *FGE* 'Simonides' XVII (a), which he does not attribute to an author, was erased by the Spartans shortly after Pausanias had it inscribed; Athenaeus 12.536a, citing Nymphis, records the tradition that Pausanias had XXXIX inscribed on a bronze bowl, claiming that he had dedicated it when it had already been there when he found it.

<sup>57</sup> Bentley 1697, cited at Parente and Ciani 2002, xii n.1.

<sup>58</sup> cf. Guthrie (1962-81), v.399-401; and a full treatment of *opinioniones uirorum doctorum* given by

seems to be a consensus that this letter, at any rate, is not to be attributed to Plato himself. The argument of the most recent editor is that we should date the second letter as part of a group which was not recognised by Aristophanes of Byzantium<sup>59</sup> as part of the Hellenistic edition of Plato's works, but can be dated, as a result of some of its strangely esoteric content, by association with a strand of Platonism influenced by Pythagorean ideas and current in the late Hellenistic period, apparently starting in the first century before our era. The present letter, therefore, has been recently dated to the period first century BC to first century AD.<sup>60</sup>

Returning to our diachronic sequence, it is thus perhaps notable that Plato *ipse* seems to have refrained from comment on the association of Simonides with money and stinginess, when we know that such an association was extremely prevalent in his times, as has been seen from the discussion of Aristophanes' use of it. The sense that this silence may be somehow worthy of remark is enhanced by the fact that, as soon as we move to look at Simonides in the falsely ascribed part of the Platonic corpus, the familiar notion is once more present (of course, this contrast is only valid if we follow the majority of scholars in denying Platonic authorship to the *Hipparchus*). One might wonder whether Plato's silence on the matter of payment is borne from a desire to deny poetry the status of a τέχνη or whether he wished not to devalue the sources from which he drew possible ethical doctrines before allowing Socrates to interpret or confound them.<sup>61</sup> At any rate, whether this requires an explanation or not, Plato in the genuine dialogues will continue to seem an exception when we leave him and turn first to Xenophon and then, naturally, to Aristotle.

## 6. Xenophon

This study will treat Xenophon's dialogue between Simonides and his patron

---

Parente in Parente and Ciani 2002, xi-xv (historical) and xvff. (Parente's own argument, with reference to modern positions).

<sup>59</sup> *ibid.* xxiii.

<sup>60</sup> *ibid.* xxvi-xxviii, 13. cf. Keyser 1998, who argues that the *φαιδρίον* of 312d is an astronomical tool which did not exist before the late second century BC, and that the letter should be dated to the first century BC.

<sup>61</sup> On the technique of inflating the value of an opponent in order to magnify the one who wins against him, cf. Servius ad *Aen.* 8.686

Hieron only briefly, not because it lacks interest but because it has recently been considered in this light by Richard Hunter,<sup>62</sup> who has treated interesting ways in which the Simonides κοφός of Xenophon (who, on a first reading, could seem little more than a name given to κοφός τις) can be seen as interacting in a quietly ironic way with the Simonides κίμβιξ tradition described here.<sup>63</sup> Hunter notes that this Simonides is shown advising Hieron to spend money on self-promotion of various kinds, including horse-breeding for athletic purposes and sponsoring of competitions, and tells him that in this way he will gain *charis* and goodwill. Hunter surely picks up on something significant here, where he suggests that “part of the point of the second half of the *Hiero* is that Simonides cunningly disguises his famous φιλαργυρία behind the improving language of civic administration.” One might further add that perhaps Xenophon in this ironic project was somehow interacting with the equally ironised treatment of Hipparchus in the eponymous pseudo-Platonic dialogue. Again, “disguises,” though it makes Hunter’s point well, might not be the best word to describe the relationship between the φιλαργυρία of the Simonides constructed by the anecdotal tradition and the language of χάρις and benefaction such as we find in the *Hieron* of Xenophon; Simonides can be seen as not so much a dissembler or disguiser as one who exposes some of the ways in which it might appear that different ways of expressing relationships where money is a factor are in a way necessarily false because money has weakened pre-monetary forms of social relation to a point where their vocabulary fails. To put a similar point in a slightly different way, it is not that “the improving language of civil administration” is one thing and φιλαργυρία another, but rather that the Simonides of the tradition seems to have an awareness that the difference between such categories might be purely linguistic and constructed. This way of reading Simonides in anecdotes will be developed further below.

## 7. Aristotle (and more Plato)

---

<sup>62</sup> Hunter 1996, 98-100.

<sup>63</sup> For less ironised and less interesting readings of the choice of Simonides as Hieron’s interlocutor, see for example Gray 1986 (who also argues that the Platonic epistle discussed above might refer to Xenophon’s *Hieron* – which I find unlikely for the reasons already rehearsed); Gelenczey-Mihálcz 2000, 115 (“Simonides ... is one of the first characteristic portrayals of the new, emerging intelligentsia...”).

For Aristotle, Simonides' nature as a skinflint is as proverbial as it was seen to be in Aristophanes. The following glancing reference in the *Nicomachean Ethics* assumes his audience's familiarity with the notion:

Aristotle *EN* 1121a:

καὶ εὐκοινωνητος δ' ἐστὶν ὁ ἐλευθέριος εἰς χρήματα· δύναται γὰρ ἀδικεῖσθαι, μὴ τιμῶν γε τὰ χρήματα, καὶ μᾶλλον ἀχθόμενος εἴ τι δέον μὴ ἀνάλωσεν ἢ λυπούμενος εἰ μὴ δέον τι ἀνάλωσεν, καὶ τῷ Σιμωνίδῃ οὐκ ἀρεσκόμενος.

τῷ Σιμωνίδου coni. Bywater in app., fort. recte.

Again, the liberal man is easygoing when it comes to financial matters. He may suffer injustice, since it is not money that he honours, and he is more distressed if he has not paid something which he should have done than upset if he has paid something which he should not have done, and he takes no delight in Simonides [*or, reading with Bywater's conjecture* "in the saying of Simonides"].

The reference is presumably to a *dictum* of Simonides regardless of whether we accept the (very attractive) conjecture of Bywater. Commentators profess ignorance as to which of his sayings is referred to here<sup>64</sup> (the general impression is naturally consistent with the picture at Aristotle fr.92 R. and *ibid.* *Rhet.* 1391a, on both of which see below), but in fact the probable answer was already provided in 1906, with Grenfell and Hunt's publication of the papyri which they recovered from mummy cartonnage removed from the necropolis at Hibeh.<sup>65</sup> *P. Hibeh* 17 is a third century BC list of sayings attributed to Simonides, which will be discussed below. The relevant portion here is the following: καὶ πρ[ὸ]ς τὸν πυνθανόμενον διὰ τί εἶη φειδωλὸς ἔφη διὰ τοῦτ' εἶναι φειδωλὸς ὅ[τ]ι μᾶλλον ἄχθοιτο τοῖς ἀνηλωμένοις ἢ τοῖς περιούσιον "To one who asked him why he was miserly he replied that he suffered more as a result of expenditures than of profits." This looks like the saying referred to by Aristotle, and was identified as such in the *editio princeps*. Again the impression is that a large amount

<sup>64</sup> Rackham ad loc. (Loeb); Gauthier and Jolif 1970 ad loc. (ii.258).

<sup>65</sup> Grenfell and Hunt 1906.

of material concerning Simonides was in circulation and well known, preserved for us in this instance by the chance survival of the papyrus. We may note how easily and casually Aristotle is able to refer to this dictum. He recounted in a little more detail the following anecdote, already mentioned. The context is that rich men have been said to believe that everybody else wants what they have, the subject being οἱ πλούσιοι.

Aristotle *Rhet.* 1391a (2.16) = Simonides T47d Campbell

ἄμα δὲ καὶ εἰκότως τοῦτο πάσχουσιν (πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν οἱ δεόμενοι τῶν ἐχόντων· ὅθεν καὶ τὸ Σιμωνίδου εἴρηται περὶ τῶν σοφῶν καὶ πλουσίων πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν Ἱέρωνος ἐρομένην πότερον γενέσθαι κρεῖττον πλούσιον ἢ σοφόν· "πλούσιον" εἰπεῖν· τοὺς σοφοὺς γὰρ ἔφη ὁρᾶν ἐπὶ ταῖς τῶν πλουσίων θύραις διατρίβοντας), καὶ τὸ οἶεσθαι ἀξίους εἶναι ἄρχειν· ἔχειν γὰρ οἴονται ὧν ἔνεκεν ἄρχειν ἄξιον.

Indeed, it is natural that they are affected this way (for many people do want what they have. This phenomenon is the origin of the saying of Simonides said concerning the wise and the wealthy, when the wife of Hieron asked him whether it was better to be wealthy or wise. "Rich," he replied, since he said that he saw the wise spending their time at the doors of the wealthy). [And it is natural] that they think they are worthy to rule, since they believe that that which they own gives them a claim to power.

This anecdote is not being told for the first time here; but it is here that we find it first associated with Simonides. Previously it had been alluded to by Plato, at *Resp.* 489b-c; later Aristippus is said to have added a further twist.<sup>66</sup> Plato, however, did not name his source. Socrates has been making an analogy between the city and a ship on which the sailors are striving to take charge without having any notion what is required to become a captain; just as they would not recognise somebody who had the necessary skills and seamanship, so the city does not recognise the need for the philosopher.

<sup>66</sup> DL 2.69, cited by Grimaldi at the Aristotle passage (Grimaldi 1988, 219). Aristippus is supposed to have been asked by Dionysius, the later tyrant of Syracuse, why the philosophers went to the doors of the wealthy, and not *vice versa*, and replied wittily that the philosophers knew what they lacked where the wealthy did not. Putting the Simonidean anecdote into a general wise man and tyrant tradition, see Wilamowitz 1913, 148 with n.1.

Plato *Resp.* 489b-c (loquitur Socrates)

καὶ ὅτι τοίνυν τἀληθῆ λέγεις, ὥς ἄχρηστοι τοῖς πολλοῖς οἱ ἐπεικέεσται τῶν ἐν φιλοσοφίαι· τῆς μέντοι ἀχρηστίας τοὺς μὴ χρωμένους κέλευε αἰτιάσθαι, ἀλλὰ μὴ τοὺς ἐπεικεῖς. οὐ γὰρ ἔχει φύσιν κυβερνήτην αὐτῶν δεῖσθαι ἄρχεσθαι ὑφ' αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν πλουσίων θύρας ἰέναι, ἀλλ' ὁ τοῦτο κομψευσάμενος ἐψεύσατο, τὸ δὲ ἀληθὲς πέφυκεν, ἕαντε πλούσιος ἕαντε πένης κάμνηι, ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι ἐπὶ ἰατρῶν θύρας ἰέναι...

[Socrates: ...] and that you speak the truth when you say that the most accomplished in philosophy are useless to the many. However, [the analogy between philosophers and the captains of ships] bids you blame this uselessness on those who fail to make use [of the accomplished philosopher], but not on the accomplished [philosopher]. For it is not natural that the captain should *require* them to obey him, nor that the wise should go to the doors of the rich, but the man who made this witticism was lying: the true situation is that, whether someone is rich or poor, if he is sick it is necessary for him to go to the doctor.

Even if the story about Aristippus had been already current in Plato's time (which I doubt), the dramatic date of the *Republic* is before Aristippus' and Dionysius' time, and it seems unlikely in any case that Plato would have had Socrates react in this way to an anecdote where Aristippus' point is approximately similar to that being made by Socrates here, i.e. that the reason why others do not come to the philosopher is that they are unaware of their need for his wisdom. It appears, then, that Plato's Socrates is here referring to an anecdote more or less the same as the one which we find in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. It remains to be asked whether Plato and his readers would have identified ὁ τοῦτο κομψευσάμενος with Simonides. Given that the strength of the association of Simonides with money is so deep-rooted already by this time, I find it more likely that he made a rhetorical choice not to name Simonides here; I also think that Aristotle read a reference to Simonides in this passage, since the latter philosopher clearly means the passage quoted above to be read as a contradiction of Plato's statement. Plato's argument is not about money but about only knowledge and ignorance; Aristotle, who also

discusses the fact that the rich consider themselves *worthy to rule* (the key point of Plato's discussion) has a more sociological and economic view of power and politics, so he has a more positive view of Simonides' supposed dictum. In addition to the considerations mentioned above concerning the question why Plato elsewhere does not draw attention to the tradition associating Simonides with money, perhaps it is also for this reason that Aristotle chooses to name Simonides where Plato does not: it is more common for ancient authors to name sources with whom they are in agreement than those with whom they are disagreeing. Nevertheless, the possibility that the anecdote was a free-floating story and not attached to any particular person cannot altogether be dismissed (note that Plato does not mention Hieron's wife; his mention contains no particular detail, but only the general point). Aristotle is here encouraging the reader to take seriously the amusing story which Plato had dismissed as a "clever-dick" remark (κομπευκάμενος).

It will be observed that neither philosopher is in the least concerned with the historical question whether the remark was really made by Simonides or not; this is unsurprising, since the anecdote's value for them is not historical. We may notice that Simonides' reputation has become a place where authors can mark their attitudes towards the meaning of money, in the present Aristotelian instance even by a process of double allusion, both to the anecdote and to the way in which Plato had used it: for Plato, separating people according to their wealth distracts attention from the general ignorance which he perceives, where for Aristotle it is an essential part of social understanding.

In the examples just quoted and discussed, we have little clear idea to what extent the story employed by Plato and Aristotle might have been derived from a way of looking at a particular poem (as has been indicated, the question to what extent and how the view of Simonides promulgated or assumed by such anecdotes may have interacted with the nature of his poems *in general* will be taken very seriously below); in the next case of Aristotle's interaction with the figure of Simonides, however, the anecdotal material is firmly attached to a particular song.

Aristotle *Rhet.* 1405b = Simonides 515 *PMG*

καὶ ὁ Σιμωνίδης, ὅτε μὲν ἐδίδου μισθὸν ὀλίγον αὐτῷ ὁ νικήσας τοῖς ὀρεῦσιν, οὐκ ἤθελε ποιεῖν, ὥς δυσχεραίνων εἰς ἡμιόνους ποιεῖν, ἐπεὶ δ

ἱκανὸν ἔδωκεν, ἐποίησε

χαίρετ ἀελλοπόδων θυγάτρες ἵππων

καῖτοι καὶ τῶν ὄνων θυγατέρες ἦσαν.

And Simonides, when the victor in the mule-car race was giving him a small fee, did not want to compose a poem, since he was disgusted at writing in praise of half-donkeys, then when the victor gave him enough, he composed

Hail, daughters of storm-footed horses!

even though they were the daughters of donkeys as well.

This poem, composed for Anaxilas the tyrant of Rhegium,<sup>67</sup> was probably a relatively famous one; it was referred to, again by first line, also in the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Rhegians*, from which the reference was excerpted by the second century BC scholar Heraclides Lembus;<sup>68</sup> it is from him and the scholia to Aristotle that we have the name and *polis* of the victor. This anecdote is of special interest for our investigation, since it is a place where a good case may be made for its early date. It seems to me likely to date from Sicilian tradition during or close to Simonides' own time. Anaxilas' victory in the mule cart seems to have occurred around the same time as the battle of Himera: it is generally placed in the Olympic games of either 484 or 480.<sup>69</sup> Until Himera, he had been allied with the Carthaginians on Sicily against the allied Greek cities of Syracuse and Acragas. Afterwards, however, he must have come to an accommodation with the Deinomenids of Syracuse, since he gave his daughter in marriage to Hieron I. One might assume, however, that many Syracusans, who had recently fought against Anaxilas when he was allied to the 'barbarian' Carthaginians, retained a degree of animus towards him. It was again shortly after Himera that he issued a new coin, stamped with a hare on one side and with the mule cart on which he had won his Olympic victory on the other. The coin must postdate the reconciliation with the Deinomenids, since it marks the point when the coinage of Rhegium and Messene became organised according to the same weight system as on the rest of Sicily.<sup>70</sup> The picture of the mule cart will therefore have been

<sup>67</sup> Heraclides Lembicus *Politia* 55 Dilts (~ Rose 1886, 381-2), in Dilts 1971.

<sup>68</sup> Previously identified as the contemporary of Aristotle, Heraclides Ponticus, or as another; see Dilts 1971, 8.

<sup>69</sup> See Moretti 1957, no. 208 (p.89), and for the historical issues D. Asheri in *CAH*<sup>2</sup>, 4.766ff.

<sup>70</sup> Kraay 1976, 214 with plates 772 and 781. Anaxilas' coin was mentioned in a lost work of



recognisably the counterpart of the horse-drawn *quadriga* which was the device of the coins of Syracuse. I suggest that it was in this context that the story we see in Aristotle came about. Syracusans who remembered their hostility towards Anaxilas would have found it easy to make the comparison between their rulers' victories with horses and chariots and Anaxilas' lesser achievement with the mule-cart, especially where Anaxilas' imitation of the Syracusan coin emphasised the contrast. Anaxilas would have seemed to imitate a Rolls Royce by showing off his own BMW. It is easy to imagine how this, combined with the fact of Anaxilas' commission of a song from Simonides, a regular encomiast of the Deinomenids, could have resulted in the story which we find in Aristotle. The conclusion is not inevitable, but it seems very likely. If it is the case, it indicates that concern about the phenomenon of remuneration for song was already a feature of the reception of encomiastic poetry in the early fifth century, and suggests that it may have been associated already with Simonides.

It would appear that the anecdote is derived from a way of reading the poem itself, but without more information on the contents of the poem we cannot tell whether the ironically pointed way of describing mules was the only motivation for biographical explanation or whether some other feature within the poem encouraged its audiences to think that there should be an associated financial issue. At least this part of the poem must have had a witty and ironic flavour, and the original audience might have been expected to laugh. Part of the humour for Aristotle will have been derived from an attitude which post-dates the removal of the mule-car race from the programme of the games, but by the argument above the story is too old for this to be an explanation, and the interpretation of these lines as to some extent light-hearted and ironic is in keeping with a generally irreverent, jocular tone which may be discerned in a surprisingly large number of Simonidean epinician fragments (such as the ram joke at 507 *PMG* and the suggestion that Glaucus of Carystus was a better boxer than Polydeuces at 509 *PMG*, which was presumably said with tongue firmly in cheek).

We may wonder whether this striking feature was in part associated with a greater frankness concerning the fact of cash-payment for poems. The favourite candidate for a Pindaric passage which must have been (as it now is)

---

Aristotle (fr. 568 R.).

straightforwardly *funny* would seem to be the interchange between Apollo and Chiron at *Pyth.* 9.30-51;<sup>71</sup> but here the humour is of a quite different order and does not seem to involve the same destabilising of the encomiastic situation as Simonides' jokes, which seem to threaten the very fact of praise by adverting to the fact that it was 'only' the mule race, or exaggeration of the boxing abilities of the laudandus beyond the point of credibility and propriety. We can see, then, that whether or not it has a degree of randomness in narrowly conceived terms (by which I mean, whether or not the poem contained material concerning payment which might have seemed to motivate the anecdote), the story seems to have something which more broadly 'makes sense' in terms of the poem itself, since the foregrounding of the cash-relationship has a similar destabilising effect vis-à-vis the praise relationship to the foregrounding of the ancestry of mules which occurred in the poem.<sup>72</sup> It is at least likely that this perception of the beginning of the poem was available and was adopted by early audiences, who chose to receive it in a way which emphasised a perceived cynically insincere attitude on the part of Simonides, motivated by an interest in remuneration regardless of the real worth of the patron or his achievements.

The following excerpt comes from a lost work of Aristotle *περὶ εὐγενείας*. Aristotle cites a number of possible definitions, including the following attributed to Simonides.

Aristotle fr.92 R. (apud Stob. 4.29.25) = T47g Campbell

Σιμωνίδην δέ φασι ἀποκρίνασθαι διερωτώμενον τίνες εὐγενεῖς, τοὺς ἐκ πάλαι πλουσίων φάναι.

They say that Simonides, asked who were the noble, replied that they were people with inherited money from a long time ago.

Here Simonides is presented as a deflator of aristocratic ideology<sup>73</sup> and a man capable of perceiving the meaning of wealth: to be called "well-born" is simply a matter of having been rich for longer than others. Aristotle does not commit himself to judging whether or not Simonides really said this, and it surely did not

<sup>71</sup> Though cf. my treatment of *Pyth.* 11.36-45, section 2.1 above.

<sup>72</sup> Fränkel 1975, 436 treats some of these passages as examples of Simonidean "realism." These issues will be picked up and treated more fully below.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Gentili 1969, 17: "una dissacrazione dei valori aristocratici".

much affect his own use of the dictum whether he believed it or not. The phenomenon by which Simonides is shown choosing to view or describe in terms of wealth phenomena otherwise described in more nuanced social terms will be observed again in anecdotes which follow.

## 8. Chamaeleon

Aristotle's interest in Simonides, apparently not premised on historical concern about the poet but on an interest in character types which can be illustrated through the use of a personality already known as such to his readers or listeners, is continued in the works of his followers, and takes a critical move from the telling of anecdotes as and when rhetorical context can motivate them to the compilation of monographs. Chamaeleon's works of literary scholarship and history<sup>74</sup> included *περί* titles on both *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (frr.14-22), possibly Hesiod (fr.46?), Alcman (frr.24-5) and Stesichorus (frr. 28-9), certainly Sappho (frr.26-7), Lasus (fr.30), Pindar (frr. 31-2) and Simonides (frr.33-5), Anacreon (fr.36), Thespis (fr. 38) and Aeschylus (frr. 39-42), as well as a treatise on Comedy (frr. 43-4). Most of our fragments come from Athenaeus. These *περί* books seem not to represent what we would call biographies, but rather collections of passages (of the authors themselves and of others) with biographical inferences taken from them.<sup>75</sup> Sometimes he seems to have gathered others' biographical inferences from poems and presented them to his readers without necessarily passing judgement on the legitimacy or otherwise of the inference; this is the case in his treatment of the famous poem of Anacreon (358 *PMG*) where Anacreon speaks of a girl from Lesbos. Inevitably, this had been taken as evidence that the poem was addressed to Sappho, who had therefore rejected the erotic approaches of Anacreon. It appears from Athenaeus' account (599c = Chamaeleon fr. 26 Wehrli) that Chamaeleon merely reported this interpretation (in his *περὶ Καπφοῦς*) without passing comment on its accuracy or otherwise (λέγειν τινὰς φησιν εἰς αὐτὴν πεποιηθαι ὑπὸ Ανακρέοντος τάδε· "[Chamaeleon] says

<sup>74</sup> Wehrli 1967-9, ix.52-63.

<sup>75</sup> Momigliano 1993, 70ff. (v. esp. 70: "Chamaeleon was prone to infer the personal circumstances of his poets from what they wrote"). This genre of writing was first identified by Leo: cf. Momigliano 1993, 70n.6.

that some people say that these verses were made by Anacreon for her").<sup>76</sup> Athenaeus then points out the anachronism. It is therefore entirely likely that Chamaeleon was less important as a creator of biographical interpretations (doubtless he will have done this sometimes) than as a gatherer and transmitter of pre-existing material, previously scattered in the way in which we find it in Aristotle and comedy.

Of the three fragments of the book *περὶ Cιμωνίδου* collected by Wehrli, it is the first which is relevant to the present concerns.

Chamaeleon fr. 33 Wehrli (Athenaeus 656c) ~ Simonides fr. 26 W ~ Simonides eleg. 7 and T23 Campbell

περὶ δὲ λαγῶν Χαμαιλέων φησὶν ἐν τῷ περὶ Cιμωνίδου ὡς δειπνῶν παρὰ τῷ Ἱέρωνι ὁ Cιμωνίδης, οὐ παρατεθέντος αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν καθάπερ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις λαγωῦ ἄλλ' ὕστερον μεταδιδόντος τοῦ Ἱέρωνος, ἀπεσχεδίασεν·

οὐδὲ γὰρ <οὐδ> εὐρύς περ ἐὼν ἐξίκετο δεῦρο

ὄντως δ' ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς κίμβιξ ὁ Cιμωνίδης καὶ αἰσχροκερδής, ὡς Χαμαιλέων φησὶν. ἐν Cυρακούσαις γοῦν τοῦ Ἱέρωνος ἀποστέλλοντος αὐτῷ τὰ καθ' ἡμέραν λαμπρῶς πωλῶν τὰ πλείω ὁ Cιμωνίδης τῶν παρ' ἐκείνου πεμπομένων ἑαυτῷ μικρὸν μέρος ἀπετίθετο. ἐρομένου δέ τινος τὴν αἰτίαν· "ὅπως," εἶπεν, "ἢ τε Ἱέρωνος μεγαλοπρέπεια καταφανὴς ἦ καὶ ἡ ἐμὴ κοσμιότης."

Concerning hares, Chamaeleon says in his *On Simonides* that Simonides was dining at the house of Hieron, and that when hare was served to all the others but not put on the table in front of him, but Hieron later did give a share to him, he improvised

No, wide though it was, it did not reach this far!

In fact, Simonides really was a skinflint and shamefully concerned with gain, as Chamaeleon says. In Syracuse, indeed, when Hieron was sending daily rations to him on a magnificent scale,<sup>77</sup> Simonides would sell most of what

<sup>76</sup> contra, Bell 1978, 60 ("Chamaeleon... made Sappho and Anacreon address poems to one another... Chamaeleon's error may have arisen from a misunderstanding of the poems themselves").

<sup>77</sup> Campbell's Loeb translation takes λαμπρῶς with πωλῶν ("Simonides would openly sell"); Alan Griffiths points out to me that it would seem more natural Greek to take it with the preceding ἀποστέλλοντος. But perhaps there is a slight ambiguity in the expression, and the adverb could

had been sent to him and keep only a small portion for himself. Asked why, he replied “So that both Hieron’s munificence should be conspicuous and my own moderation.”

It may be noticed here that Athenaeus seems inclined to be sceptical about Chamaeleon’s testimony: ὅντως δ’ ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς κίμβιξ (“in fact, he was truly a *kimbix*”) might simply introduce an extra piece of evidence, but suggests that Chamaeleon might have been disbelieved: possibly Athenaeus was at least sometimes aware of the dangers of Chamaeleon’s approach. He also viewed the anecdote concerning the hare as suggesting that Simonides was κίμβιξ καὶ αἰσχροκερδής (on the face of it, this is not altogether obvious, though it certainly speaks of the tense relations with patrons which are more plainly associated with Simonides’ meanness elsewhere). This interpretation also should derive from Chamaeleon, however, since, as we have commented above, he is very likely to have used this very peripatetic word (perhaps first used of him by Xenophanes) of Simonides, and the most natural way in which to read the sentence is to suppose that ὡς Χαμαιλέων φησὶν applies also to the words immediately before it. It appears, therefore, that Athenaeus first gives the testimony of Chamaeleon concerning the hare, and then argues that Chamaeleon’s testimony – including identification of Simonides as κίμβιξ καὶ αἰσχροκερδής – was correct, and that he then cites another anecdote about Simonides as evidence. It is not necessarily the case, therefore, that this second anecdote was found in Chamaeleon’s περὶ Κυμωνίδου, as was apparently assumed by both Wehrli and Campbell.<sup>78</sup> The second anecdote is possibly free-floating and might come from another source prior to Athenaeus.<sup>79</sup>

Treating the first anecdote first, the hexameter supposed to have been improvised by Simonides is a parody of *Il.* 14.33, where the beach at Troy is broad, but not broad enough to take all the Achaean ships in one line (33-4 quoted):

---

qualify either.

<sup>78</sup> I say “apparently” because in fact it is only the disposition of the material on the page which indicates that these editors seem to have supposed both stories to derive from Chamaeleon.

<sup>79</sup> On the other hand, Athenaeus’ argument, as described here, would be more persuasively so described if he had cited a *different* source for the second anecdote. The source is assumed to be Chamaeleon by Bell (Bell 1978, 41). My broader argument here is in any case not affected; but I find ὅντως ... ὡς ἀληθῶς difficult to explain unless what follows is from another source.

οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδ' εὐρύς περ ἔων ἐδυνήσατο πάσας  
αἰγιαλὸς νῆας χαδέειν, στείνοντο δὲ λαοί·

Wide though it was, the beach was not wide enough to hold all the ships, and  
the people were straitened.

The humour of the alleged response of Simonides to the socially graceless snub lies in the mismatch between his situation and that to which he alludes; the context in the *Iliad* is the battle by the ships of the Achaeans. Atheneaeus has his character Ulpian read the story as concerned with the stinginess of Simonides, continuing to cite another anecdote on the same subject, as detailed above. One may feel that the story might as easily have been told as an anecdote illustrating the stinginess of Hieron. Hieron seems here to demonstrate the opposite of the proper way in which to behave towards a guest; the importance of *xenia* in the pre-monetary economy of earlier poetry and especially Homer need not be stressed, and we may remember in this context the mythical pattern of enmity caused by failure to give an appropriately honour-bearing cut of meat to a person deserving of respect.<sup>80</sup> Again, in the world of the *Odyssey*, and in a book where the importance of *xenia* is especially prominent, we see that the Phaeacian bard Demodocus is especially honoured, and we notice that he is fed along with everybody else (*Od.* 8.69-71) and that Odysseus especially honours him with a fine cut of meat (*ibid.* 480-486). Segal comments that “The signal marks of honour bestowed upon the bard make him virtually equal in status to any other guest,”<sup>81</sup> and contrasts the treatment of the bard on Scheria with that of Phemius in Ithaca. Simonides, then, is shown in this anecdote reacting to a failure of the archaic reciprocity-based rules of exchange, and the Homeric basis of the quotation, though not itself from a passage concerning exchange and reciprocity, may nevertheless be seen as constituting a contrast between the *mores* of the earlier archaic, pre-monetary systems of exchange and those of his own time, where the failure of Hieron to treat him as a guest is symptomatic of a decay in

<sup>80</sup> This is one of the two explanations apparently offered by the epic *Thebaid* for the wrath of Oedipus against his sons: *Thebaid* fr.3 EGF = Bernabé = West (Loeb). In a striking parallel to the Simonidean traditions, our source (*Σ Soph. OC* 1375) accuses Oedipus of behaving μικροψύχως (Bell 1978, 30n.4).

<sup>81</sup> Segal 1994, 147, and ch.7 passim; cf. Bell 1978, 30.

reciprocal values.<sup>82</sup>

The choice of meat here, which differentiates the situation from that of Homeric hospitality,<sup>83</sup> can be seen to add a further social nuance. Hare appears to have been the chief object of recreational hunting,<sup>84</sup> and this hunting seems to have been characteristically aristocratic behaviour.<sup>85</sup> Xenophon's treatise on the subject treats hunting as a proper part of the education of a gentleman, and records wistfully that law used to protect game from other types of human predation in order to reserve it for 'sporting' purposes, and to allow huntsmen to damage standing crops.<sup>86</sup> This is the voice of an aristocrat looking back to the days before the democracy (regardless of the historical veracity or lack of it in the reminiscence); a concentration of hunting imagery on Athenian pottery around the time of the reforms of Cleisthenes and Ephialtes and the development of the democracy increases the impression that hunting had a strong ideological resonance.<sup>87</sup> Again, iconography relating to the hunt (especially hares as gifts) is extremely common in pottery with content associated with pederasty, which "claimed a central place in the ideology of aristocratic masculinity in Athens."<sup>88</sup> The commensality in which Simonides is denied a full place, then, is a commensality of a specifically aristocratic sort.

In addition, it may be imagined that hare would have been perceived as having a special flavour, so to speak, in a more narrowly economic sense. We do not know to what extent there would have been a market in hare meat, either in the fifth and fourth centuries or in the time of Hieron and Simonides, but it seems likely that a contemporary reader of Chamaeleon would have assumed that this hare had been hunted by Hieron himself or by the young men of his circle, since this is

<sup>82</sup> cf. Carson 1999, 21-2.

<sup>83</sup> The Homeric poems mention the hunting of hares in a simile (*Il.* 10.361) and another simile uses as vehicle an eagle swooping upon a lamb or a hare (*Il.* 22.310); they are part of the world of the poem at *Od.* 17.295 (the hound Argos used to be a hunting dog, for goats, deer and hare). We do not see hare eaten. Homer is more interested in boar hunting, perhaps because it seemed to him more appropriate to heroic epic: Doty 2001, 10.

<sup>84</sup> cf. Anderson 1985, ch.2. The bulk of Xenophon's *Cyngeticus* is devoted to the hunting of hares.

<sup>85</sup> cf. Anderson 1985, 18; Barringer 2001, ch. 1.

<sup>86</sup> *Cyn.* 12.6-7; but he lives in different times, and the hunter should take care to damage neither crops nor water-sources (*Cyn.* 5.34).

<sup>87</sup> Barringer 2001, 15-16, and ch. 1 passim (but Barringer treats hare hunting separately).

<sup>88</sup> Barringer 2001, 72, and see her ch. 2 passim. The question whether this would have applied equally in Sicily is not answerable; but we may guess that at least to some extent the cultural practices of super-aristocrats like Hieron were pan-Hellenic in nature (although of course in Athenian pottery we see an ideological interaction of these practices with specifically Athenian political institutions, norms and developments).

the natural way in which hare would fit into aristocratic discourse. This gives it a kind of relation to exchange which another food would not have had, at any rate from the point of view of the later classical period when the story doubtless came into being. Beef, for instance, is a meat of sacrifice; rules apply to its butchery and distribution, enforced by religious custom. Fish, on the other hand, is of the ἀγορά, a commodity which arrives at the tables of the wealthy through cash-based commerce.<sup>89</sup> Hare might have been seen to occupy a distinctive position: likely to have been hunted by members of the same aristocratic group who were eating it, it would have had the cachet of its association with an elite activity but not the commerce-based commodity status of other luxury foods.<sup>90</sup> This would have given it special value in the context of aristocratic commensality and sodality: and it is from this kind of commensality and sodality that the anecdote shows Simonides as being excluded.

The 'Simonides' quotation, i.e. the hexameter, appears to be not a fragment but a one-off one-liner. As such, it cannot have travelled by itself as a Simonides poem without explanation, since without context it makes no sense. Therefore, if Chamaeleon did not make it up himself (which I doubt; but it must come from somewhere), he found it as a pre-existing anecdote, rather than simply inferring a performance-circumstance from the words of the line. This must have been found either in a previous author as an isolated anecdote or in a collection of anecdotal material. It seems very unlikely, despite West's acceptance of it into *IEG*,<sup>2</sup> that we can consider this a true fragment of Simonides (at best, it can be considered a rather unlikely dubium), since we should surely be doubtful whether such a one-line poem, meaningless without prose context, could have been transmitted from his time; and where it is travelling with the anecdote and incapable of standing without it, it is subject to the general scepticism appropriate to such anecdotes as bearers of direct tradition, and the likelihood that the anecdote and the hexameter were created together since Simonides' time.<sup>91</sup>

<sup>89</sup> On this distinction between (domestic) meat and fish, see Davidson 1997, 12. On regular animals for sacrifice (and anomalous instances), see Burkert 1985, 55-6; on the movement from sacrifice as hunting ritual to sacrifice in agricultural societies, see Burkert 1983, 42-8.

<sup>90</sup> In the *Kolakes* of Eupolis (fr. 174 KA), hare appears in a list of luxurious foods including fish: but of course there is no reason why an aristocrat could not combine hunted food with the most important commodity food: venison from His Lordship's own parks served with the best imported Burgundy.

<sup>91</sup> Of course, it is not inconceivable that an oral tradition in Sicily *could* have preserved a genuine



The anecdote of unknown origin which I discuss here for convenience, concerning Simonides' selling of the food given to him by Hieron, shows an different distortion of *xenia* from that seen in the unequal distribution of the hare. This is one of the most memorable of the money stories, perhaps reminiscent of the tradition of Diogenes as a kind of philosophical performance artist (DL 6.20ff). Simonides, it seems, is imagined as having been put up by Hieron in some house other than the tyrant's own, to which Hieron has a large daily ration of food sent, rather than doing Simonides the honour of having him dine at his own table. Simonides eats only a small portion and converts the rest to cash by selling it, presumably in the *agora*. The practice of selling food in a way that removes it from the exchange world of *xenia* was a standard *topos* of ethical literature,<sup>92</sup> but seems to me to take on a special force in the context of this story, where Simonides' behaviour should be read as a response to Hieron's defective and partial *xenia*: although he gives Simonides food rather than money, this food is arriving in a basket held by a slave and has become separated from the face-to-face personal interaction and indication of esteem which constitute true *xenia*. Simonides' reaction is to remove all pretence that Hieron is treating him as a guest, and to treat the foods not as gifts, which are not fully separable from the social relations in which the act of giving has taken place, but as commodities to be converted into coin. Hieron's perversion of *xenia* is indicated by his keeping Simonides at a distance from his *oikos*; Simonides responds by moving the "gifts" from the substitute *oikos* to the public world of impersonal commodity exchange, i.e. (presumably) the *agora*: he completes the distancing from true *xenia* inherent in Hieron's behaviour, thereby drawing attention to it.<sup>93</sup> I read, then, the explanation which Simonides gives in the anecdote as marked by a rather bitter irony: Hieron may be μεγαλοπρεπής inasmuch as that his provision of food to

---

single hexameter of Simonides until it was later written down and transmitted to Chamaeleon that way; but our default assumption should be that this anecdote is a fiction. This hexameter differs in this respect from fr.25 W, which it in other ways rather resembles, inasmuch as that that poem, though found by us embedded in a biographical context, would have been quite capable of travelling as a poem independently of anecdotal context before being used in an anecdotal way (as any poem might).

<sup>92</sup> cf. Bell 1978, 41-2, citing in particular Theophr. *Characters* 22.4 and relating the Simonidean tradition to allegations made against Themistocles (Plut. *Them.* 5.1), which might have contributed to Simonides' anecdotal personality through his association with the statesman.

<sup>93</sup> It would have been entirely proper *xenia* behaviour to send food to somebody who could not make a special occasion (like the present custom of sending slices of wedding-cake or sugared almonds: cf. Diggle ad Theophr. *Char.* 22.4, with references), but Simonides is in Syracuse but not invited, which is a different matter: he perceives his relegation to doggy-bag status as a snub.

Simonides is generous to the point of excess, since it leaves such a surplus that a market-stall can be set up from the leftovers, but this munificence is distant and unaccompanied by personal contact, a poor replacement for the true *xenia* which might have given a sense of personal value and shown a valuation for Simonides' sense of τιμή.<sup>94</sup> Again, Simonides characterises his own behaviour as κοσμιότης, an ethically positive characteristic elsewhere in the thinking of later times associated with poverty: while it points the way to respects in which Simonides' behaviour could be given a positive evaluation from an ethical point of view, it also emphasises the point which I make here concerning the ironic nature of his reply, for by its very association with poverty it emphasises the assertion of status difference already implied by Hieron's incomplete *xenia*.<sup>95</sup>

### 9. An anonymous compilation (third century BC)

The period around and after the time of Chamaeleon's death in the earlier part of the third century BC is marked by two changes in the nature of our material. One is that 'scholarly' poets like Callimachus and Theocritus start to take a new kind of interest in literary history, and our sources for anecdotal material start to include poems as well as the prose and comedy from which our material from the fifth and fourth century was drawn, and the other is that we start to have a different level of insight into types of transmission as a consequence of the preservation of papyri from Egypt. The next testimonium which I quote, already referred to in my discussion of Aristotle *EN* 1121a, is of the latter category: a collection of sayings of Simonides, preserved on a papyrus which Grenfell and Hunt removed from cartonnage taken from a mummy in the necropolis of Hibeh. It was written in a cursive script – this was not a commercially produced book – and Grenfell and Hunt date it to "Circa B.C. 280-240".

#### *P. Hibeh* 17 ~ T47f Campbell

---

<sup>94</sup> The reading of Lefkowitz 1981, 53, seems to me to take the sentiment of Simonides' statement in too straightforward a fashion (as an instance of Simonides' attitude to wealth taking on "a positive ethical function"), so that the story illustrates good exchange behaviour. Bell 1978, 41-2, reads Simonides' act as a "perversion" of a behaviour intended to convey τιμή, but does not perceive the inadequacy of Hieron's regard for Simonides' τιμή which I argue for here.

<sup>95</sup> κοσμιότης as a positively valued quality: in particular, see Aristoph. *Wealth* 563-4 and bibl. at Bell 1978, 49n.65.

ἀνηλωμάτων·

Κιμωνίδου

εὐδοκιμεῖ δ' αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἀλήθει[ι]αν καὶ τὸ πρὸς τὴν Ἱέρωνος γυναῖκα  
λεχθέν· ἐρωτηθε[ίς] γὰρ εἰ πάντα γηράσκει "ναί" ἔφη "πλήγ γε  
κέρδους· τάχις[τα] δὲ αἱ εὐεργεσίαι." καὶ πρ[ὸς] τὸν πυνθανόμενον  
διὰ τί εἶη φειδωλὸς ἔφη διὰ τοῦτ' εἶναι φειδωλὸς ὅ[τι] μᾶλλον  
ἄχθοιτο τοῖς ἀνηλωμένοις ἢ τοῖς περιοῦσιν. τ[ο]ύτων δὲ ἐκάτερον  
ἦθος μὲν ἔχειν φαῦλον παρὰ δὲ τὰς οργὰς καὶ τὰς α[ ] τῶν  
ἀ[ν]θρώπων [ ] λειν διόπε[ρ] οὔτε π[ ] οὔτε ἀπλ[ῶς] εἰπεῖν [ἐξ  
αὐτῶ]ν ὠφελείθ[α]ι χαλεπὸν [δὲ εἶναι] τὸ μὴ χρῆσθαι τοῖς αὐ[τοῦ] ]  
ικοῖς ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἄλλοτρίοις τὸ δὲ ἀνηλωθὲν ὀλίγου μὲν εἴληπται,  
προσαναλίσκεται δὲ τὸ διπλάσιον διὸ δεῖ ἔλκειν τὰς ψήφους καὶ τὸ  
παρ' αὐτοῦ δανείζεσθαι ὅταν τῇ ἀναγκαίᾳ καὶ φυσικῇ τροφῇ  
χρήσεται ὥσπερ τὰ ζῶα ἀπλῇ

Concerning expenses

From Simonides

Also respected with regard to its truthfulness is the remark which he made to the wife of Hieron. When she asked him whether everything grows old he said "Yes, except profits, but especially kind services." To one who asked him why he was miserly he replied that he suffered more as a result of expenditures than of profits. Each of these traits has an element of meanness, but is [...] owing to the passions and [...] of people. So one can say neither that one [is harmed] or simply benefits from them. It was difficult to use not one's own property but [...] other people's. When expenditure is counted as little, twice as much is spent again; so one should draw back the counters. One borrows one's own money when one uses only natural and necessary sustenance, as the animals do.

The association of Simonides with miserliness begins to take on a kind of positive ethical function ("miserliness" becoming "frugality"), though the writer is anxious on this point, conceding that Simonides' perceived opinions could be seen as meanness. Stories like, perhaps, that where Simonides sells the surplus food, metamorphose into a discourse where poverty and simplicity are viewed positively, even to the point where Simonides appears to be an advocate of simplicity and natural living: an unlikely notion for Simonides to have

entertained in the sixth and early fifth century, but common in the mid third century when this was written,<sup>96</sup> and quite unlike the ethos of most of the anecdotes recounted here. For the scribe of the papyrus, Simonides is a name around which ideas about poverty and greed can cluster.

### 10. Callimachus

It is possible that Callimachus might have been involved in the editing of Simonides' poems and their disposition into books. In any case he will have been fully aware of Simonides' poems and the anecdotes and stories which circulated about him, and he took a keen interest in the figure which tradition gave to him. His is the first attestation we have of a story which became the most popular and famous of the anecdotes concerning Simonides: I mean the story in which the house of a Thessalian patron fell down but Simonides was saved as a result of the intervention of the Dioskouroi (fr.64.11ff.). The same fragment from the *Aetia*, spoken in the voice of the dead Simonides, records another anecdote, where Simonides' tombstone was sacrilegiously removed and built into a tower (another indication of Simonides' regular association with epigram). This fragment will be treated briefly below. A fragment of his iambics relates to Simonides:

Callimachus fr.222 Pf. = Simonides T3 Campbell

οὐ γὰρ ἐργάτιν τρέφω

τὴν Μοῦσαν, ὡς ὁ Κεῖλος Ὑλίου νεπὸς

For I do not bring up my Muse as a tart, like the Cean descendent of Hylichus.

Hylichus was the eponymous progenitor of the Cean clan of the Hylichidae,<sup>97</sup> of which Simonides was presumably a member. This fragment is known to us from a scholion to Pindar's second *Isthmian*, which poem has been discussed above,<sup>98</sup> and the scholiasts were right to perceive the allusion intended in the word ἐργάτιν (~ *Isthm.* 2.6). The present fragment cannot tell us whether Callimachus really believed that Pindar had intended the references to money and payment in

<sup>96</sup> Cf. (c.g.) Epicurus *Ratae Sententiae* 29 (with Σ) as a parallel.

<sup>97</sup> Known to us from inscriptions; v. Pfeiffer ad loc.

<sup>98</sup> Chapter 2, *passim*.

the opening portion of that poem as an attack on Simonides, as the scholia believed, since we will not successfully extract a sure argumentative position on such a matter from a two line fragment of this famously slippery and ironic poet.<sup>99</sup> We can see, however, that the generally perceived *philarguria* of Simonides was already being used by Callimachus' time to explain the Pindaric poem in terms of Pindaric self-definition against Simonides (in other words, the gist of the scholiastic interpretation goes back at least as far as Callimachus' time). It was in any case a tactic sometimes used in the sources of the scholia to assume that Pindar's poems were marked by his rivalry with Simonides (and sometimes Simonides' nephew Bacchylides),<sup>100</sup> and this clearly became irresistible in the present context of discussion of poetry and money: we have already seen in the discussion of Simonides in Aristophanes' *Birds* the extent to which, even in an earlier period, Simonides was far more associated with *philarguria* than Pindar was.<sup>101</sup>

The anecdote adverted to at Callimachus fr. 64.11ff. was perhaps the most celebrated of the stories concerning Simonides circulating in antiquity. It has received some important scholarly attention,<sup>102</sup> and is of renewed interest at present, since a new and early testimonium to the story has recently been published from a papyrus in Princeton.<sup>103</sup> The first attestation which is preserved is that of Callimachus, but we can tell from the fuller treatments of Cicero (*de oratore* ii.86) and Quintilian (11.2.11ff.) that it was studied by a large number of scholars of his time and later: these two Latin texts are quoted by Page as Simonides 510 *PMG*, indicating that that scholar believed that information about specific poems could be inferred from them (Page did not include testimonia for their own sake). Doubtless the scholars cited by Quintilian<sup>104</sup> did use poems in

<sup>99</sup> Bell 1978, 37 considers other possible readings of this fr.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. e.g. Σ P. *Ol.* 2.157a (i.99 Drachmann), Σ P. *Nem.* 4.60b (iii.74 Drachmann); in the latter case the scholiast's wish to look for a reference to Simonides is especially superfluous.

<sup>101</sup> In the reading of the poem presented in chapter 2, however, a different association with Simonides is proposed, according to which it is because Pindar associates the problem of remuneration for songs with Simonides that he adopts certain rhetorical strategies which are particularly characteristic of the older poet.

<sup>102</sup> Molyneux 1971; Slater 1972; Carson 1999, 38-44.

<sup>103</sup> The *editio princeps* of the new papyrus was Kraut 2004; see now the re-edition with further comment at Rawles 2005.

<sup>104</sup> Apollodorus, Eratosthenes, Euphorion, 'Larissacus Eurypylus,' Apollas and perhaps Callimachus (depending on the reading chosen); Eurypylus of Larissa, as Slater saw (Slater 1972, 232) was not a historian or scholar but another Thessalian nobleman. He has therefore jumped from one list to another and there was once a tradition where it was his house that fell; I have

forming their views on this anecdote (which need not signify, of course, that the anecdote has its roots in the reading of any one given poem, such as a *threnos* for those who died when the house fell). The question to what extent the contents, dates or occasions of poems may now be inferred from the salad which Quintilian serves up is a different one. Page ad loc. suggests possible conclusions of this sort, though cautiously (“*fictis vera ita forte discernenda*,” my emphasis), and was followed in this approach by Molyneux. It is hard, however, to imagine a reconstruction of that sort which would stand up to the arguments assembled with destructive zeal in the article of Slater cited above, which demonstrates persuasively the unreliability of Quintilian as a source here. It is, however, clear from the list of sources given by Quintilian that the story had been the object of serious scholarly concern in the third century BC and later.

Be that as it may, the story may be summarised as follows, differences between accounts being suppressed: Simonides presented a song (usually an epinician) for a Thessalian nobleman (usually Scopas), which contained praise of the Dioskouroi. The nobleman was displeased because he felt that the praise of the Dioskouroi detracted or at any rate distracted attention from his own praise, and consequently paid Simonides only half of the fee agreed for the song (Simonides is perceived as working “cash-on-delivery”, rather than being paid at the time of commission). At a dinner, which appears sometimes to be a separate occasion from the performance of the song, Simonides is called to the door by two mysterious young men; when he has got outside, the house in which the dinner was being held falls down, killing the diners and mangling their bodies to such a degree that their relatives cannot identify their bodies for burial. Simonides, however, being known as the inventor of spatial mnemonic techniques, can remember where each was sat from their relative spatial positions.

Most of our direct sources for this story come from the Roman period, but the list of sources given by Quintilian push it back to the third century BC, and a new papyrus has been published which probably tells this story and has been dated to the second century BC.<sup>105</sup>

The new papyrus does not on the whole seem to share the scholarly character

---

elsewhere suggested that this tradition was alluded to by Ovid at *Ibis* 511-2 (Rawles 2005, 65 n.12).

<sup>105</sup> *P.Princeton* inv. 87-59A. See the *editio princeps* of Kraut 2004, corrected and supplemented at Rawles 2005.

attested for the tradition by Quintilian. Here is the verso (the portion treating the Simonidean anecdote<sup>106</sup>):

ἐ]πὶ Θετταλῷ τ[ινι  
 δ]ιὰ τὸν Σιμωνίδην  
 ε]ἰς τοῦτο [ ]νοδι[  
 ] πᾶσιν εὖ δοκ[ ]ν[  
 ]ιραν οὐχ ἅπασι εἰ [ ]  
 τ]ίνα τῶν ἐπινικ[ί]ων ὕμνων  
 ]ομένης ἐν τῇ [ ]  
 ]ιπαμεν ἄκρως [ ]  
 τῷ Θεττά]λῳ γὰρ ἐπιφαν[ ]  
 ]τ[ ]τ[ ]( )τ[ ]

to a certain Thessalian... through Simonides... to him (?)... everybody decided  
 (?)... not once... one of his epinician songs... [as we ] said, utterly (?)... for to the  
 Thessalian, manifestly (?)...

This is far from clear, and it is not possible to be entirely certain that the anecdote where the house fell down is in fact the subject matter here. Working on the (not implausible) assumption that it is, however, it seems possible to make a number of observations. Firstly, there seems to be no attempt made to identify the laudandus, which one might expect a scholarly source to do. The Thessalian is just that: “a Thessalian” (this is especially the case if I am correct in supplementing τ[ινι in the first line, as the lack of article suggests; see below on the anti-Thessalian stereotyping implicit in this story). The exception to this tendency is ἐπινικ[ί] in u.6, but the vague way in which this is presented (“one of his epinicians”) suggests that the author of this account felt that epinician was especially appropriate for a song with extensive mention of the Dioskouroi, or in any case chose to mention it for reasons other than an interest in pinning down a particular text. It seems that this papyrus is evidence for a kind of telling of the story which, unlike that attested by Quintilian’s list of scholarly authorities, was

<sup>106</sup> As re-edited by me at Rawles 2005, 63-4, where an apparatus is provided. Kraut 2004 believed that the recto also might be related to the present story, but this is unlikely: see Rawles 2005, 66-7.

interested chiefly in other aspects of the anecdote than its potential for dating or similar scholarly activities: perhaps its moral value or entertaining qualities, or perceived utility in the elucidation of another text.

In any case, Callimachus was able to assume his readers' knowledge of the story, as we can see from his use of it.

Callimachus fr.64.1-14 Pf. ~ T21 Campbell

Οὐδ' ἄν τοι Καμάρινα τόσον κακὸν ὀκκόσον ἀ[ν]δρός  
 κινήθεις ὀκίου τύμβος ἐπικρεμάσαι·  
 καὶ γὰρ ἐμόν κοτε σῆμα, τό μοι πρὸ πόληος ἔχ[ευ]αν  
 Ζῆν ] Ακραγαντῖνοι Ξείνι[ον] ἀζόμενοι,  
 κ]ατ οὖν ἤρειψεν ἀνὴρ κακός, εἴ τιν ἀκούει[ς]  
 Φοίνικ]α πτόλιος σχέτλιον ἡγεμόνα·  
 πύργω] δ' ἐγκατέλεξεν ἐμὴν λίθον οὐδὲ τὸ γράμμα  
 ἠιδέσθη τὸ λέγον τόν με Λεωπρέπεος  
 κείσθαι Κήϊον ἄνδρα τὸν ἱερόν, ὃς τὰ περιεσσά  
 καὶ] μνήμην πρῶτος ὃς ἐφρασάμην,  
 οὐδ' ὑμέας, Πολύδευκες, ὑπέτρεσεν, οἳ με μελάθρου  
 μέλλοντος πίπτειν ἐκτὸς ἔθεσθ' ἐκοτε  
 δαιτυμόνων ἀπο μῶνον, ὅτε Κρανώνιος αἰαῖ  
 ὤλισθεν μεγάλους οἶκος ἐπὶ Σκοπάδας.

Even Kamarina does not threaten so great as evil as the disturbed tomb of a pious man! For even my tomb, which the Akragantines piled up for me in front of their city, in awe of Zeus Xeinios, a wicked man tore down – have you heard of him? – a Phoenician, the wicked leader of the city. He built my stone into a tower, nor respected the epigram declaring that the son of Leoprope, a holy man, a knower of remarkable things, and the deviser of Memory. Nor, Polydeuces, did he fear you two, who took out only me among the diners from the palace about to fall, when the Krannonian house – alas! – fell upon the mighty Scopads.

The dead poet speaks of the destruction of his epitaph in a poem which is itself an exuberant elaboration of the funerary epitaph. It is hard to imagine that Callimachus did not perceive the practice of false attribution of inscriptional



epigrams to Simonides and make a metapoetic comment on it: though deprived of his own epitaph, Simonides goes on speaking epitaphically even today. Φοῖνιξ, as has recently been argued convincingly, is not a proper name, but the ethnic: this is the Hannibal who besieged Akragas in 406 BC.<sup>107</sup> The Simonides of this elegy is informed by the Simonides of anecdote not only in the reference to the house falling down but also in the emphasis of the former part on power after death, which was a feature of a number of the more peculiar stories told about the poet (in which he is rewarded for burying an unburied corpse).<sup>108</sup> The attention to Zeus Xeinios would have seemed natural, given the prevalence of the theme of *xenia* in the anecdotal tradition.

The story in which the Thessalian house fell down stands out in many respects when perceived in the context of the anecdotal tradition here described; despite its popularity (for which of course the most obvious explanation is its dramatic impact: it is, after all, a good story) it is not representative, in that Simonides' own concern with money is not at all foregrounded, but only the meanness of his patron. Indeed, the whole story seems clearly one in which Simonides is a 'good' character and the wronged party; his miraculous act of memory occurs after and despite the wrong done to him. Part of this will doubtless have to do with anti-Thessalian stereotyping which lies in the background of this story (Thessalians are boorish and lack *paideia*; cf. the story told by Plutarch at *aud. poet.* 15c).<sup>109</sup> Again, the story is more complex and developed as a narrative (novelistic?) than others, which would not normally require a plot summary of more than one sentence (and, indeed, are often presented to us by our sources in a single sentence). Another aspect of this is the way in which, unusually, characteristics of

<sup>107</sup> Livrea 2006; for fuller discussion of this element of Callimachus' treatment and Simonides' rôle here in relation to ethnicity, see below, section 4.5.

<sup>108</sup> *FGE* 'Simonides' LXXXIV, LXXXV; Cic. *de divin.* I.56, etc., on which see Boas 1905, 98ff. These stories are examined from a folk-tale point of view by Davies 2004.

<sup>109</sup> Simonides says the Thessalians were "too stupid to be deceived" by his poems; this has been treated by van Groningen 1948, who concluded that, after the debacle of the poem with the Dioskouroi, Simonides did not include mythological material in the poems for Thessalian patrons, who lacked the sophistication to understand it: thus the poem in Plato's *Protagoras* (542 *PMG*) lacks mythological material. This argument seems to give more historical credence to the anecdotes than they can be expected to bear (and, one might add, if the poem on virtue is an example of poetry for the unsophisticated, one could wish heartily to be so unsophisticated as to understand it). See also Svenbro 1976, 165-6, for whom ἐξαπατᾶν is an ironic way of signifying "l'acte de vente," which seems to me unlikely (and is premised on the assumption that Plutarch is repeating a historically accurate anecdote about Simonides which he himself has failed to understand, which premise one might well doubt). On Thessalian lack of sophistication, see LSJ s.v. Θεσσαλικός and cf. Bakola 2005.

the anecdotal Simonides (money and payment in a hospitality-related setting; memory as a technique; commemoration of the dead) which are often treated separately are brought together in one narrative. In this respect as well as in its popularity it is “the” Simonides story, despite its unrepresentative nature.<sup>110</sup>

### 11. The third century and later; observations

Poetic use of aspects of the anecdotal tradition concerning Simonides is present also in Callimachus’ contemporary Theocritus, whose allusive use of both anecdotes concerning Simonides and of Simonides’ poems in his sixteenth idyll will be discussed separately below.<sup>111</sup> He clearly uses the story known to us from Σ Aristoph. *Peace* 697 and other late sources, in which Simonides keeps money and *charites* in two boxes, which I shall not discuss here but keep in reserve for the chapter concerning Theocritus.<sup>112</sup>

Also reserved for fuller discussion is the fascinating section of Athenaeus (125c-d) in which he cites Callistratus as his source for a short elegy attributed to Simonides (fr. 25W ~ *FGE* ‘Simonides’ LXXXVIII); if this poem is correctly attributed to Simonides, it represents a vital bridge between the poet and the anecdotal tradition, and its interpretation and authenticity are therefore analysed in more detail than would have seemed possible in this survey.

Naturally, the tradition of telling anecdotes did not stop in the third century BC, and some of the stories which are known to us are preserved only in later or undateable sources (including scholia),<sup>113</sup> though in many cases we might well be right to surmise that they were in fact known by the Hellenistic period (thus, the reference in the passage of Callimachus’ *Aetia* quoted above would be obscure if we had not the later material from the Roman period; again, we know the story concerning the two boxes (see below on Theoc. 16) from accounts in scholia,

---

<sup>110</sup> In addition, by virtue of its presence in both Cicero and Quintilian, it was the story about Simonides which was known to the Latin part of Europe in the middle ages and early modern period. On Simonides at the beginning of a tradition of memory systems, see the first chapter of Yates 1966. On Callimachus fr.64 and the tradition concerning Simonides and the Thessalians, see further below, on Theocritus 16 (chapter 4; esp. section 4.5).

<sup>111</sup> Chapter 4.

<sup>112</sup> Chapter 4, sections 4.2, 4.4.

<sup>113</sup> See, for example, Plut. *Them.* 5 (114c) = T12 Campbell; Plut. *an seni* 786b = T47e Campbell; Stob. 3.10.61; Aelian *VH* 8.2 (making more explicit the account in [Plato] *Hipparchus* discussed above); *ibid.* 9.1. This list does not claim to be exhaustive.

Plutarch, and Stobaeus: but when we possess that knowledge we can see that Theocritus knew the story already). However, by the time we reach this period we have seen most of the most striking and prominent features of the tradition and have set the scene for the discussion of Theocritus 16 which will follow below. It may therefore be worth drawing a few conclusions and making a few observations. As was stated at the beginning, the tradition described here is striking in its very ubiquity. There is a contrast to be drawn with Pindar: on occasion, he too is accused of *philarguria*, though he was never such a source of anecdote as Simonides, and we at any rate do not have access to these explanations of Pindaric passages (for that is what they are, in a way which cannot be said of many Simonidean anecdotes in the form in which we know them) until they come up in the scholia.<sup>114</sup> With Simonides, on the other hand, such exegetic interests are very unlikely to be the main explanation of his association with *philarguria* and concerns about exchange, since it goes back too far (cf. above, on Xenophanes and Aristophanes; chapter 2, on Pindar's *Isthmian* 2). Thus Slater cannot be correct to suggest<sup>115</sup> that "Simonides was the *exemplum* for avarice rather than Pindar because the passage Pind. *Isthm.* 2.6 ἀ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδὴς πω τότ' ἦν οὐδ' ἐργάτις was notoriously taken to be a jibe at Simonides," unless he believes that this interpretation (of peripatetic origin?) is early enough to explain the presentation of Simonides in Aristophanes, which would seem to me very unlikely. Again, it simply throws back the question one stage further, since it is not ever so obvious that a reader should be inclined to see a specific reference to another living poet at the beginning of *Isthm.* 2 at all (the crows of *Ol.* 2.86ff. (= T20 Campbell), identified by the scholia with Simonides and Bacchylides, make a good comparandum: it is obvious here that the scholiasts would have wanted to tie them with individuals, especially given the dual number). Thus, even if the widespread tradition of Simonides' *philarguria* derived from this reading of *Isthm.* 2, we might still reasonably inquire why it was that that poem had seemed obviously to call for interpretation as an attack on Simonides, when its rhetoric appears to contrast epochs and not contemporary poets (and Simonides was in any case older than Pindar...), and then the same

<sup>114</sup> Σ to *Nem.* 5.1a, *I.5.2a*, Eustath. *Proim.* 24.3.295 Drachmann. See Bell 1978, 33 with n.10; Lefkowitz 1981, 51.

<sup>115</sup> Slater 1972, 235.

question “why was Simonides strongly associated with *philarguria*?” would recur. One of the most common motifs, seen for example in the story about the hare (from Chamaeleon), in the remarkable story of Simonides’ selling of food in Syracuse, transmitted by Athenaeus beside the hare anecdote but (as argued above) not necessarily taken by him from Chamaeleon, to some extent in the story where the house falls down and reflected in the emphasis on Zeus Xeinius in the passage of Callimachus cited above, is that Simonides’ displays of avarice regularly occur in situations where he is involved in a relationship of host to guest. This relationship is one which is abused by the host, who does not treat Simonides as an honoured guest, for example in distribution of food, and the consequent social situation is a place where Simonides’ *philarguria* is identified by our sources; we will analyse in more detail a striking example of this sort next. In the story of the house falling down, money is a part of the story but illustrates the meanness and boorishness of the Thessalian patron. It is often not obvious why the stories should be told to the disadvantage of Simonides rather than of his patron. Thus the story of the hare could be told as an instance of ungracious behaviour by Hieron; the story of the house falling down, exceptionally, is told in a way which seems to take Simonides’ side.

We can compare also the poet scene in Aristophanes’ *Birds*, where the poet is abused and leaves singing songs which will detract from the κλέος of Cloudcuckooland; the humour of the scene is derived from the fact that the protagonists are not interested in the aristocratic game of agonistic κλέος competition on which praise poetry is premised, and as such they are not bothered by the bad publicity which the poet will generate. The poet of *Birds* made a (not entirely unnatural) mistake: he recognised Euelpides and Peisetaerus as κτίσται of a new city, and assumed that this meant he could identify them with other such founders, aristocrats who would be willing to invest in their κλέος, such as patrons of the lyric poets like the Battiads or, of course, Hieron (the founder of Aetna: u.926 ~ Pindar fr. 105a3 M). Here again the praise relationship is broken, but this happens because the apparently (from the poet’s point of view) aristocratic tyrant figures are in fact quite different people from the Hierons and Scopases of the world.

So one of the features of the Simonides tradition seems to be an interest in what happens when the relationship between patron and poet breaks down, and we

are shown the result; it puts both in a negative light. The name in Greek for this sort of heavily reciprocal relationship is *χάρις*: it will consequently be no surprise when we later find Theocritus interacting with Simonides' poetic personality through an anecdote contrasting *χάριτες* with money, in a poem where *χάριτες* are a key term.<sup>116</sup>

*Part 2: the tradition and the historical Simonides*

**12. "O for a beaker full of the Cold North!" Simonides fr. 25 W**

A treatment of Simonides fr. 25 W has been promised. This disputed poem was quoted from Callistratus, the pupil of Aristophanes of Byzantium (*FGrH* 348 F 3), by Athenaeus (125c-d), and appears at first sight to be a close comparandum for the story about the hare, taken by the same author from Chamaeleon and discussed above. This purports to be a poem composed (improvised) by Simonides in circumstances closely parallel to some that we find in anecdote: if this is the case, it is of crucial importance to any study that seeks to examine the connections between the poetic oeuvre of Simonides and the personality created in the anecdotal tradition. It is also a fascinating poem independently of the historical question: allusive, witty and pointed. Here it will be examined independently of the question of attribution first, with particular attention being paid to its use of allusion and its negotiation of meaning against certain *topoi* of archaic poetry, first through study of the allusion to Hesiod which (as will be shown) was recognised by our sources, and then by considering ways in which its meaning is constructed through the *topos* of poets lacking cloaks which can be found elsewhere in Greek literature, before and after Simonides' own time. Finally the transmission and authenticity of the poem will be examined, including the crucial question whether here the poem might have *generated* anecdote or should rather be seen as created after Simonides' time and as a *consequence* of his characteristics in the anecdotal tradition.

Athenaeus 125c-d ~ Callistratus *FGrH* 348 F 3 ~ Simonides fr. 25 W ~ *FGE*

---

<sup>116</sup> See below, chapter 4.

‘Simonides’ LXXXVIII

Καλλίστρατος ἐν ζ´ Συμμίκτων φηεῖν ὡς ἐστιώμενος παρά τισι  
 Σιμωνίδης ὁ ποιητὴς "κραταιοῦ καύματος ὥραι" καὶ τῶν οἰνοχόων  
 τοῖς ἄλλοις μισγόντων εἰς τὸ ποτὸν χιόνος, αὐτῷ δὲ οὐ, ἀπεσχεδίασε  
 τόδε τὸ ἐπίγραμμα·

τὴν ῥά ποτ Οὐλύμποιο περὶ πλευρὰς ἐκάλυψεν

ὥκ' ἀπὸ Θρήικης ὀρνύμενος Βορέης·

ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀχλαίνων ἔδακεν φρένας, αὐτὰρ ἐκάμφθη

ζωὴ Πιερίην γῆν ἐπιεσσαμένη,

ἔν τις ἐμοὶ καὶ τῆς χεῖτω μέρος· οὐ γὰρ ἔοικεν

θερμὴν βαστάζειν ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ πρόποσιν.

Callistratus, in the seventh book of his "Miscellanea," says that Simonides was once sitting with some people "in the season of mighty heat" and that when the wine-pourers were mixing snow into the drink for the others but not for him he improvised this epigram:

"That with which swift Boreas, rushing from Thrace, once covered the sides of Olympus; that which bit at the innards of men without cloaks, but was humbled, clothed while alive in Pierian earth; of that let somebody pour a share for me: for it is not proper to raise a warm glass to a friend."

The poem is set in Thessaly: the snow fell on Olympus and "from Thrace" is a natural way in which to say "from the North."<sup>117</sup> Along with Sicily, Thessaly was a regular setting for stories about Simonides' relationships with his patrons, as most obviously in the story concerning the house falling down,<sup>118</sup> and again in the passage from Theoc. 16 discussed below.<sup>119</sup> Viewed as a story, this seems closest in content to the story about the hare, where, as here, Simonides is a guest who is rudely denied his share of something which is served to the others, and who responds by improvising a witty comment on the situation which is marked by allusion to epic poetry.<sup>120</sup> It can be seen that it ties in closely, in a more

<sup>117</sup> Wilamowitz 1913, 142-3n.3.

<sup>118</sup> Simonides 510 *PMG*; cf. above, section 3.10.

<sup>119</sup> See below, chapter 4, esp. section 4.5.

<sup>120</sup> I take ῥά as a feature of inscribed autoschediasm. It is used in the sense described by Denniston 1954, 35, as "ἄρα expressing the surprise attendant upon disillusionment" ("well, now that I get the picture: that with which Boreas etc."). Compare the use of inceptive ἀλλά and δέ to create a similar impression of speech in context (see Denniston 1954, 20-1 and esp. 172-3, noting the emphasis on Theognis: this is a characteristic of sympotic verse). For other probable instances

general way, with the tradition of Simonides' engagement with *xenia* and tense relationships in a *xenia* context. The supposedly autoschediastic 'epigram' is, in formal terms, a kind of riddle.<sup>121</sup> Thus "snow" is not named; the listener or reader has to figure out what the central noun of the poem is from the attributes given to it in the sequence of relative clauses of which the first four lines are composed. Clearly this form, in its indirectness, is appropriate to a request which is in a sense a form of reproof (οὐ γὰρ ἔοικεν u.5: Simonides' host should not behave in this manner<sup>122</sup>) and has the potential to be tactless. What Simonides wants is snow, so that its coldness can cool his warm (θερμὴν u.6) drink. But the snow is described according to its potential to cool in a perhaps surprising way (ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀχλαίνων ἔδακεν φρένας), the setting on Olympus emphasising the contrast between the inhospitable outdoors and the comfortable sympotic setting of the poem, and the same phrase of u.3 encourages the contrast between the vulnerability of the unfortunate men without cloaks (on which see below) and the relative comfort of Simonides in his present circumstance, where the reaction to the description of the dangerous discomfort of the snow is to say "let somebody give me some of that" (u.5).

### 13. The "Snow Poem" and Hesiod

The context includes a curious feature: κραταιοῦ καύματος ὥραι is apparently a quotation from a hexameter verse; although recognised by editors of the Simonidean poem it has not, as far as I have been able to find, been collected in its own right in any of the editions of fragments. There is no particular reason to suppose that it was from Simonides or that Athenaeus believed it to be so. κραταιοῦ καύματος is found only here, and this appears to be the only surviving instance of this metaphorical extension of the sense of κραταιός (cf. LSJ s.v., citing the present passage as "Poet. apud Callistr. apud Ath."), which is regularly applied to people, animals, weapons, and parts of human or animal bodies. Nor can a parallel be found with either of its brothers κρατερός and

---

of inceptive ἄρα, cf. the adespota 910 *PMG*, 929a *PMG*.

<sup>121</sup> This portion of my analysis has been greatly assisted by the comments made to me by Alan Griffiths. Catenacci 2005, 30-1, suggests that πρόποεν, the final word, occurs *para prosdokian* for a word indicating a bath; but I am more attracted to Alan Griffiths's suggestion that the listener would think first of a request for a cloak: see below for the possible significance of this.

<sup>122</sup> Again for reasons of tact, this phrase is strictly speaking applied not to the host's behaviour, but to the possibility that *Simonides* might drink a toast to him with warm wine.

καρτερός. καύματος ὥρη (with the ionic termination) is found only at Nonnus *Dionysiaca* 48.258-9: καὶ ποτε διψαλέοιο πυραυγεί καύματος ὥρη παρθένος ὑπνώουσα πόνων ἀμπαύετο θήρης “Once in the blazing season of parched heat, the maiden slept and rested from the labours of the hunt.”<sup>123</sup> The model is the epic phrase χείματος ὥρη (found fourteen times in epic in various cases – and, apart from as lemmata for scholia and the like, nowhere else<sup>124</sup>), which is derived from Hesiod *WD* 450 (448-451 quoted):

φράζεσθαι δ, εὖτ' ἂν γεράνου φωνὴν ἐπακούσῃς  
 ὑψόθεν ἐκ νεφέων ἐνιαύσια κεκληγυίης,  
 ἥ τ' ἀρότοιό τε σῆμα φέρει καὶ χείματος ὥρην  
 δεικνύει ὀμβρηροῦ, κραδίην δ' ἔδακ' ἀνδρὸς ἀβούτῳ.

Pay attention, when you hear the voice of the crane crying each year from the high clouds; she brings the signal for ploughing and marks the season of rainy winter, and she bites the heart of the man with no oxen.

Cranes spend the summer to the north of Greece proper<sup>125</sup> and are seen as passing migrants in large flocks. The autumn migration is the time for ploughing (followed by sowing; cf. Ar. *Birds* 710 with Dunbar ad loc.), when the cranes pass over en route to wintering areas in Africa; it is at this time that they are believed to fight with the pygmies (*Il* 3.1-7). This southward migration attracts more attention; but Callimachus (fr. 1.13-14 Pf.) features their return northwards, in a cluster of spring images,<sup>126</sup> and, perhaps following Callimachus, Posidippus also focuses on the northward journey, as marking the beginning of the sailing season (Posidippus 22 A-B; the crane will fly, as the speaker will sail, northwards from Egypt towards Greece).

There are striking resemblances between this passage of Hesiod and the epigram attributed to Simonides. The second line of the epigram, ὥκ' ἀπὸ Θρήικης

<sup>123</sup> The maiden is Aura, an tomboy-ish, outdoor type.

<sup>124</sup> After Hesiod, A.R. 2.1086; Aratus *Phaen.* 1.850, 977; Oppian *Hal.* 4.532, *Cyn.* 3.308, 4.437; Q.S. *Posthom.* 2.218, 8.51, 9.72, 13.311; Nonnus *Paraphr. Ioann.* 10.11, *Dionys.* 22.213; Musaeus *Hero and Leander* 293.

<sup>125</sup> Macedonia and the Danube, according to Thompson 1936 s.v. γέρανος; Hdt. 2.22.15 has cranes going south from Scythia.

<sup>126</sup> The cranes, the military campaigning season, and the nightingale ἀηδών (*Luscinia megarhynchos*), another bird which winters in Africa and breeds in Greece (v. Dunbar 1995, 140; wintering in Africa: Svensson et al. 1999, 258).



ὀρνύμενος Βορέης, could apply to cranes as well as to snow (this point, if it is agreed that there is an allusive relationship between the epigram and the Hesiod passage, tells against Valckenaer's emendation of ὠκύς to ὀξύς).<sup>127</sup> The following is an especially pointed resemblance: in Hesiod, κραδίην δ' ἔδακ' ἀνδρὸς ἀβούτεω, and in the epigram ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀχλαίνων ἔδακεν φρένας. In each case the subject bites (ἔδακεν) a part of the man or men whose lack of something desirable is indicated by an adjective with α-privative.<sup>128</sup> Perhaps especially intriguingly, the Hesiodic passage here embodies reflection on the relationship between those who have, and those who have not (the man without an ox). Hesiod continues as follows (452-4):

δὴ τότε χορτάζειν ἔλικας βόας ἔνδον ἐόντας.  
 ῥηίδιον γὰρ ἔπος εἰπεῖν· "βόε δὲ καὶ ἄμαξαν".  
 ῥηίδιον δ' ἀνανήνασθαι· "πάρα δ' ἔργα βόεσσιν".

Then is the time to feed oxen in your own stable.  
 For it's easy to say "give me a pair of oxen and a cart";  
 and it's easy to reply "I have work for my oxen."

Hesiod makes the time for ploughing a point for reflection on the relationships between the man who has and the man who has not: the folly of relying on the kindness of the former is his point. The parallel is clear with the situation in the Simonidean anecdote: association with princes of the wealth required to afford such luxury as all-year snow for wine is no guarantee that they will be well-disposed or liberal enough to give some to an associate, even to one who claims to be φίλος.

The resemblance seems to me sufficient to allow one to state that the snow poem alludes to this passage: and that it does so in a sophisticated and effective way. The allusion is especially pointed in the first part of u.3 of the epigram, where ἀχλαίνων is the equivalent of the Hesiodic ἀβούτεω, which occurs in Greek only at that place in *Works and Days*. It would therefore appear that either (more probably) Athenaeus or his source Callistratus has wished to draw attention to the allusion and the associated play on weather imagery by himself either creating or importing from another source the witty variation κραταιοῦ

<sup>127</sup> Noted by Page in *FGE* ad loc.

<sup>128</sup> The resemblance is noted as a "parallel" by West ad *WD* 450f.

καύματος ὥραι on the same Hesiodic model: the use of this hexameter end is a way of telling the reader that he has spotted the allusive use of Hesiod going on in the poem.

If we read the texts together we may further make a contrast between the cranes in the context of their battle with the pygmies, where they are usually described as predatory and successful aggressors, and the snow, which has been “subdued,” captured and buried alive. The word ἐκάμφθη has been held to be corrupt; Brunck corrected to ἐκρύφθη, and other suggestions have been put forward.<sup>129</sup> Page prints it with cruces, and chastises Wilamowitz for his translation “schmiegsam zusammengebacken”; but I think Campbell’s translation<sup>130</sup> “was humbled” allows the text to stand. For κάμπτω “I humble another, make one bow” see LSJ s.v. IV. Additionally, in the present case the metaphor probably draws upon the language of wrestling: κάμπτω refers to the move where one wrestler trips another by making his knee bend.<sup>131</sup> The snow was formerly actively biting the unwary, but its aggressive behaviour has been stopped by its being put underground: “clothed, though alive, in Pierian earth.” This last relates to the image of the men without cloaks, but also suggests the notion that the snow has been defeated in battle: for “clothed in earth” of persons with the sense “buried” compare (from LSJ s.v. ἐπιέννυμι) Pindar *N.* 11.15-16 (θνατὰ μεμνᾶσθω περιτέλλων μέλη, καὶ τελευτὰν ἀπάντων γὰρ ἐπιεσσόμενος) and Xen. *Cyr.* 6.4.6 (γῆν ἐπιέσασθαι), and compare Hom. *Il.* 3.57.<sup>132</sup> The poet of the epigram may have had in mind the most famous reference to the battle of cranes and pygmies, at the beginning of *Il.* 3 (1-7 quoted):

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κόσμηθεν ἄμ' ἡγεμόνεσσιν ἕκαστοι,  
 Τρῶες μὲν κλαγγῇ τ' ἐνοπῇ τ' ἴσαν ὄρνιθες ὦς,  
 ἥύτε περ κλαγγὴ γεράνων πέλει οὐρανόθι πρό,  
 αἶ τ' ἐπεὶ οὖν χερσὶν ἀφύγον καὶ ἀθέσφατον ὄμβρον

<sup>129</sup> See Page ad loc. in *FGE*.

<sup>130</sup> In the Loeb (*Greek Lyric* III, eleg. 6, p.511).

<sup>131</sup> v. Poliakoff 1982, 134-5.

<sup>132</sup> Page’s comment that he is unaware of other references to the practice of keeping snow underground in cellars is unworrying; if this really dates from Simonides’ times in Thessaly, it is from the period of the *psykter* and the whole panoply of the symposium; the snow must have been kept somehow.

κλαγγῇ ταί γε πέτονται ἐπ' Ὠκεανοῖο ῥοάων  
 ἀνδράσι Πυγμαίοισι φόνον καὶ κῆρα φέρουσαι,  
 ἥεῖραι δ' ἄρα ταί τε κακὴν ἔριδα προφέρονται.

Now, when both sides were marshaled by their leaders,  
 the Trojans advanced with clangour and war-shouts, like birds,  
 as when the clangour of cranes comes down from the sky,  
 when they flee from winter and portentous storms  
 and with clangour they fly towards the streams of Ocean,  
 bringing bloodshed and death to the Pygmies,  
 at dawn they bring terrible strife to them.

Verbal parallels, however, are less striking than with the Hesiod passage, so we need not suppose a specific allusion to these lines; one may imagine, however, that any crane flying south may be seen as doing so in order to fight the pygmies, especially where, as is the case in the epigram, the vocabulary of combat is in evidence.<sup>133</sup>

#### 14. Cloaks: Aristophanes

It is time now to consider further the men without cloaks. We have already seen that the clause ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀχλαίνων ἔδακεν φρένας represents the closest link between the snow poem and the Hesiodic passage to which it alludes. We may add that the image is reinforced and strengthened by the metaphor which has already been discussed above in u.4 of the poem: though alive, the snow was “clad in earth.” The phrase is of interest also, however, for the way in which it locates the poem within a tradition of associations between beggars, poets and lack of clothing. This tradition goes back as far as Homer, but in the present context we may as well start from the scene in Aristophanes’ *Birds* from which a passage has already been treated.<sup>134</sup> In that play the poet appears in a sequence of characters who would attempt to cajole money from Euelpides and Peisetaerus by means of their supposed expertise in various fields. He is poorly clad, as Peisetaerus comments (915), and in his songs he drops broad hints at his desire for remuneration. Initially this occurs in a parody of a song by Pindar, addressed

<sup>133</sup> On this simile and its interpretation in Homer, see Muellner 1990.

<sup>134</sup> Above, section 3.4.

to Hieron (929-30: δὸς ἐμὶν ὃ τι περ τεᾶι κεφαλᾷ θέλεις πρόφρων δόμεν “grant unto me whatsoever by thy nod thou wishest generously to grant”); the response of Peisetaerus is to give him a leather jerkin (σπολάς). Unsatisfied, he sings another snatch of song (a parody of Pindar fr.105b M) referring to the lack of a tunic (941-5):

νομάδεσσι γὰρ ἐν Κύθαις ἀλᾶται στρατῶν

ὃς ὑφαντοδόνητον ἔσθρος οὐ πέπαται.

ἀκλεῆς δ' ἔβα

σπολάς ἄνευ χιτῶνος.

ξύνες ὅ τοι λέγω.

Among Scythian nomads wanders from the hosts

who has no shuttle-iterated garment.

Inglorious he goes:

a jerkin without a tunic.

Understand what I say to you!

The poet is not satisfied with the jerkin and wants a tunic (χιτῶν); this is understood by Peisetaerus, who again gives him clothing and sends him on his way. Characters, poet and audience seem to find it easy to understand the conception of a poet as a kind of mendicant, travelling in rags, and hoping to be rewarded with clothing. This may have been a feature of fifth century life, so that Aristophanes has comically conflated a “sub-literary” tradition of genuinely poor poets who exchanged wit and compliments for much-needed necessities with the wealthy pan-Hellenic stars such as Pindar and Simonides;<sup>135</sup> but if no such thing existed, literary tradition will have supplied a ready association between both poets and beggars and broad hints intended to provoke gifts of clothing.

### 15. Cloaks: *Odyssey*

Most notably, begging is regularly associated with the hope to be given clothing in the *Odyssey*. Here the garment referred to in the snow poem – the χλαῖνα – is

<sup>135</sup> Presumably a σπολάς or χιτῶν would have represented a lucky day for a wandering beggar, available only from the rich and generous; a χλαῖνα was made of wool, and must have been more valuable again (the cost of a woollen coat today would be generous enough as a gift).

regular. In the scenes where Odysseus appears to be a beggar, it is consistently assumed that he wishes to be given a cloak or a cloak and a tunic. Thus at 14.131-2 Eumaeus says the following:

αἰψά κε καὶ κύ, γεραιέ, ἔπος παρατεκτῆναιο,  
εἴ τίς τοι χλαῖναν τε χιτῶνά τε εἴματα δοίη.

You too, old man, would immediately construct a story, if somebody would give you a cloak and a tunic as clothing.

The context is that Eumaeus is emphasising the tendency of wanderers to lie in order to receive the gifts which they desire (14.124-5); here he identifies Odysseus as such a one.<sup>136</sup> εἴματα seems a little superfluous in this line: the reason is that it is a not entirely successful variation on the regular pattern where the last word is not δοίη but καλά.<sup>137</sup> Eumaeus' suspicion is not without foundation, since of course throughout this episode Odysseus does indeed tell him multiple lies. The repetition of the names of the articles of clothing in the reply of Odysseus at 14.154 occurs in a line which is probably an interpolation, but later on he affirms that it is a cloak and tunic that he wishes to receive (14.396); he is speaking in character as a beggar, and a few lines later identifies himself as such (πτωχός, 14.400). Again at 15.338, Eumaeus tries to dissuade Odysseus-as-beggar from going to the palace by suggesting that, if he waits where he is, Telemachus will give him a cloak and tunic. This is duly promised by Telemachus at 16.79; he, as Eumaeus, seems to assume that this is what the beggar will want. Again, at 17.550 Penelope declares that if the stranger has spoken the truth she will give to him the same clothes: cloak and tunic; the same is found at 21.339, just before the stringing of the bow. During the period of Odysseus' disguise, then, this is the regular assumption of the characters who interact with him: in the world of the poem, cloaks and tunics are what beggars are perceived as wanting.<sup>138</sup>

We may suppose that a cloak and tunic are perceived as being at the top end of the scale, so to speak, as gifts to beggars, whether in the Homeric poems or in the societies which produced them. It is first of all in the circumstance that Odysseus-

<sup>136</sup> The connection between wandering and lying is made through word plays between ἀληθής and ἀλήτης and cognates: see Montiglio 2005, 92-3.

<sup>137</sup> Heubeck and Hockstra 1989 comments ad loc. on the choice of χλαῖνα rather than (metrically equivalent) φᾶρος.

<sup>138</sup> For an account of these passages discussed in the context of the Odyssean themes of deception and recognition, see Block 1985, whose analysis draws on the observations of Schadewaldt 1959 and Fenik 1974, 61-2.

as-beggar has correctly predicted the return of Odysseus to the *oikos* that he will receive such a gift: in other words, if he gives correctly both the best and the most important piece of news imaginable from the point of view of the loyal members of the *oikos*.

The most important and interesting passage in the *Odyssey* for our purposes, however, occurs at 14.462-506, where Odysseus tells an elaborate lie in order to persuade Eumaeus to lend him a cloak for the night.<sup>139</sup> He begins by “framing” his story in a proto-sympotic setting, playing on the notion *in vino ueritas* (462-6):

κέκλυθι νῦν, Εὐμαίε καὶ ἄλλοι πάντες ἑταῖροι,  
εὐξάμενός τι ἔπος ἐρέω· οἶνος γὰρ ἀνώγει  
ἦλεός, ὅς τ' ἐπέηκε πολύφρονά περ μάλ' αἰεῖσαι  
καὶ θ' ἀπαλὸν γελάσαι, καὶ τ' ὀρχήσασθαι ἀνῆκε,  
καὶ τι ἔπος προέηκεν ὅ περ τ' ἄρρητον ἄμεινον.

Listen, now, Eumaeus and all you others, his companions. I'm going to tell a boasting tale. For wine is urging me on: wine the crazy, which drives even a wise man to singing, and gentle laughter, and leads him to dancing, and brings forth a word which were better unspoken.

He continues by narrating a night-time ambush which occurred at Troy, led by Odysseus and Menelaus. They lie in ambush near the city, and night falls (475-81):

νύξ δ' ἄρ' ἐπῆλθε κακὴ Βορέας περόντος  
πηγυλίσ· αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε χιῶν γένετ' ἥϋτε πάχνη,  
ψυχρή, καὶ κακέεσσι περιτρέφετο κρύσταλλος.  
ἔνθ' ἄλλοι πάντες χλαῖνας ἔχον ἠδὲ χιτῶνας,  
εὐδον δ' εὐκηλοὶ, κάκεσιν εἰλυμένοι ὦμους.  
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ χλαῖναν μὲν ἰὼν ἑταροῖσιν ἔλειπον  
ἀφραδίης

Night came, harsh with the falling of the North Wind, and icy. Then snow fell from above and settled like frost, bitterly cold, and ice froze on to the shields. All of the others had cloaks and tunics, and they slept peacefully, their

<sup>139</sup> On the rhetorical strategy of Odysseus' speech, intended to play on Eumaeus' well developed sense of *xenia*, see King 1999.

shoulders covered by their shields, but when I departed I left my cloak behind in my stupidity.

Eventually, he became too cold and feared dying from hypothermia. He told Odysseus, and Odysseus saved him by cunningly sending a runner back to the camp, who left his cloak behind in order to run; Odysseus-as-beggar thus uses his cloak.

The disguised Odysseus finishes his speech as follows (503-6):

ὥς νῦν ἡβώοιμι βίη τέ μοι ἔμπεδος εἴη·  
δοίη κέν τις χλαῖναν ἐνὶ σταθμοῖσι κυφορβῶν,  
ἀμφότερον φιλότητι καὶ αἰδοῖ φωτὸς ἐῆος.  
νῦν δέ μ' ἀτιμάζουσι κακὰ χροῖ εἴματ' ἔχοντα.

If only I were now young and my strength were still firm. Then one of the men who feed pigs in the farmyard would give me a cloak, both out of fellow-feeling and of respect for a good man. But now they dishonour me because of the bad clothes I wear.

The lines just quoted were considered dubious in ancient scholarship, perhaps because it was felt that the point of the story should not have been adverted to so explicitly: these four lines were obelised in one manuscript,<sup>140</sup> and the scholia record that Athenocles, the older contemporary of Aristarchus, προηθέτει: this means that he athetised them *first*: i.e., that Aristarchus did as well.<sup>141</sup> They felt that a story identified subsequently by Eumaeus as an αἶνος (508) and which they think of as an αἶνιγμα should not contain its point in such a straightforward way, i.e. that the disguised Odysseus should not have made explicit the connection between the lying tale and the present circumstances. Modern editors generally disagree and print the lines (thus Allen, von der Muehl).<sup>142</sup>

Eumaeus in any case takes the hint and lends him a cloak for the night. The general parallels between this lying story of Odysseus and the riddle attributed to

<sup>140</sup> Venetus 613 = M of von der Muehl and U<sup>3</sup> of Allen.

<sup>141</sup> v. Dindorf 1855 ad loc. (ii.600) and ad Σ *Od.* 1.185 (i.35n.9).

<sup>142</sup> cf. Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989 ad loc., pointing out the use of αἶνος at *Il.* 23.652 of an equivalently non-enigmatic story.

Simonides are clear: in both cases, the speaker talks about distanced events outdoors in contrast with a present position indoors, in a sympotic/convivial setting, in which he perceives himself as lacking something which everybody else present has; in both cases the lack of a cloak (χλαῖνα) in cold and snowy weather is an important feature of the speech (and the North wind Boreas is mentioned); in both cases the speaker wants something and begins by talking about this same thing in an indirect way before expressing himself more explicitly at the end of the speech. Both speakers predicate their claim to the hospitable generosity which they hope to receive on φιλία (Odysseus at 14.505 φιλότητι, the speaker of the snow poem at u.6 ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ). We may further note that both speakers are producing speech-acts which are a part of the special discourse of *poetry*: the introduction to the speech of the disguised Odysseus suggests (but does not quite positively assert) that the following narrative is to be seen as a poetic one: an ἔπος (463) which he will, perhaps, sing (ἀείδει 464).<sup>143</sup> This argument does not lean only on the characterisation of ἔπος as “poetic utterance”<sup>144</sup> (which would be vulnerable, since of course the word can regularly mean in Homer simply a “thing said”); we can see that Eumaeus identifies the beggar’s words as marked and performative, when he congratulates him afterwards (508-9):

ὦ γέρον, αἶνος μὲν τοι ἀμύμων, ὃν κατέλεξας,  
οὐδέ τί πω παρὰ μοῖραν ἔπος νηκερδὲς εἶπες·

Old man, that was a fine *ainos* which you told, nor have you so far spoken any *epos* which was inappropriate or unprofitable.

One may speculate that even the use of the verb εὔχομαι here suggests a *performative* speech act; commentators generally assign to it the sense “boast” here, given that, in his story, Odysseus-as-beggar claims near-equality of status with the heroic Odysseus;<sup>145</sup> the regular senses of the verb include “claim,” “swear,” “boast,” “pray,” which would appear to suggest a radical sense “say (in a marked rather than unmarked fashion);” this would cover a sense here of “say (in a way

<sup>143</sup> Nagy 1999, 236; cf. Segal 1994, 155.

<sup>144</sup> Nagy, loc. cit.

<sup>145</sup> Thus Nagy, loc. cit., Heubeck and Hockstra 1989 ad loc.



which requires special attention from the listener).<sup>146</sup> This can naturally overlap, of course, with the more traditional interpretation. In any case, the cunning response of both speakers, we can see, is to address the lack which they perceive by a kind of performance.<sup>147</sup> In both cases, like the lyric poet of Aristophanes *Birds*, the speakers wish to gain immediate benefit as a result of their performances: in Homer, as in Aristophanes, this benefit will be manifested as gifts of clothing; in the snow poem, by a kind of reversal, we are in a hot setting rather than a cold one, and the snow, instead of a discomfort or a danger, is a desideratum; nevertheless, the composer of that poem found it appropriate to mention the men without cloaks as victims of the snow which he desires.

### 16. Cloaks: Hipponax

The passage from the *Odyssey* quoted above was in any case becoming a standard locus for poetic engagement with poverty in the later archaic period: we see this in the fragments of the late sixth-century iambic poet Hipponax. Studies of Hipponax have drawn attention to the fact that he regularly models his self-presentation around responses to the Homeric Odysseus,<sup>148</sup> picking up in particular on the name of the wife of Bupalus, Arete, a strong pointer to encourage the reader to read Hipponax with the *Odyssey*. Rosen has argued that we should read fr. 121, 122, and 132 Degani (120, 121 and 73 W) as coming from a poem which alludes to the fight between Odysseus-as-beggar and the beggar Irus in *Od.* 18,<sup>149</sup> and that testimonia 19-19b Degani are derived from a poem in which Hipponax alluded to the athletic competition with the Phaeacians in *Od.* 8 (esp. 8.186-90).<sup>150</sup> He comments, intriguingly, on the poem represented by fr. 74-77 Degani (= West) as an extended engagement with the Phaeacian scenes of the *Odyssey* in which the poet also names Bupalus, in what Rosen describes as “a narrative involving a Homeric setting but with transparent

<sup>146</sup> Cf. the conclusion of the extensive treatment of Muellner 1976: the root meant “say (in a functionally marked context)” (139).

<sup>147</sup> It should be stressed that, despite its prose embedding in Athenaeus, these statements about the snow poem are not dependent on the information with which it seems to have travelled from Callistratus to that author: the situation of the poem, as will be discussed further below in the context of discussion of the poem’s authenticity, is internal to the poem, “inscribed,” and in fact the fictive “data” within the poem are barely augmented by its prose context. See further below.

<sup>148</sup> cf. Rosen 1990.

<sup>149</sup> Rosen 1990, 15-17.

<sup>150</sup> Rosen 1990, 12-15.

connections to contemporary characters.”<sup>151</sup> In this context, it seems likely that we should be inclined to read also some of the many references to cloaks in Hipponax in the context of this analogy between the poetic persona and Odysseus-as-beggar. Thus fragments such as 42 Degani (= 32 W), 43 Degani (34 W), 87 Degani (85 W), all of which mention cloaks in some context (not necessarily a recoverable one), may have involved interaction with the Homeric passages cited (and especially the *ainos* told to Eumaeus and discussed above).<sup>152</sup> In any case, the general associations between poverty, the lack of a cloak, and begging are clearly emphasised in Hipponax; and an intriguing movement from asking for gifts of clothing (beginning with the Odyssean *χλαῖνα*) to asking for hard cash is visible in 42 Degani (32 W):

Ἑρμῆ, φίλ Ἑρμῆ, Μαιαδεῦ, Κυλλήνιε,  
 ἐπεύχομαί τοι, κάρτα γὰρ κακῶς ῥιγῶ  
 καὶ βαμβαλύζω...  
 δὲς χλαῖναν Ἰππώνακτι καὶ κυπακίσκον  
 καὶ σαμβαλίσκα κάκερίσκα καὶ χρυσοῦ  
 στατήρας ἐξήκοντα τοῦτέρου τοίχου  
 Hermes, dear Hermes, Maia’s son, Cyllene’s lord,  
 I beseech you, because I’m shivering hard  
 and chattering my teeth...  
 Give Hipponax a cloak, and a little tunic,  
 and a little pair of sandals, and warm socks,<sup>153</sup> and gold:  
 sixty staters, on the other side.<sup>154</sup>

Unfortunately, we cannot be sure whether, had our source for the latter part of this fragment (Tzetzes in *Lycophron* 855) continued his quotation further, the list or requested items would have been continued; but it may be thought more likely

<sup>151</sup> Rosen 1990, 24. We might read this as a precursor of the style of Homeric parody which became a genre in its own right in the work of Hegemon of Thasos (see the fragment edited at Brandt 1888, 42ff., and cf. the comment of Athenacus before the quotation (15.698b). However, *παρωδία* proper probably needed to share metrical features with its source-text (as with the hexameters of Hipponax quoted by Athenacus in the same place).

<sup>152</sup> cf. Carey 2003, 220, suggesting that Odysseus-as-beggar may lie behind Hipponactean poverty in general.

<sup>153</sup> A kind of shoe made of felt; presumably intended for cold weather.

<sup>154</sup> Sense uncertain; v. Degani 1991 ad loc.

that it would not have been, partly because of the fact that the last item (the money) is the only item qualified (albeit with a phrase whose sense is not entirely clear), which might make it look like the last of the list, and partly because the sixty gold staters (whether coins or a weight), with which I expect all of the other items could have been bought several times over, would have made any other non-monetary gifts seem superfluous.<sup>155</sup> Hipponax' willingness to talk explicitly about poverty and money is by no means confined to this fragment (cf. 44 Degani = 36 W, 47 Degani = 38 W); but this one is particularly interesting in that it combines objects which could be exchanged as gifts with metal (probably coins) which is of value to him only as *money*.<sup>156</sup> Hipponax and his attitude to poverty will be discussed further below, on Simonides 514 *PMG*.

### 17. Interpretation of the "Snow Poem"

It might be tempting to refer to the parallelisms between Simonides 25 W and the scene from the *Odyssey* discussed above using the language of allusion: as the line of the snow poem in which it occurs has already been identified as alluding to a passage of Hesiod's *Works and Days* in a way which can be identified as contributing to the meaning of the poem in an interpretatively productive manner, so it could be argued that the same phrase ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀχλαίνων which was connected with the Hesiodic phrase ἀνδρὸς ἀβούτῳ might also be connected in the same way with the present Homeric passage.<sup>157</sup> This specific claim is tempting, and to my mind not altogether one to be discarded. Nevertheless, it might be considered a risky extension of the specific language of allusion into territory where it is always difficult to draw the line between specific and generic similarities, between purposive use of individual poems, passages and

<sup>155</sup> An alternative possibility would be that the lost context would have told us that Hipponax was in debt to the amount of 60 staters; then the sense would be that he wants to receive the necessities of adequately warm living, and to be free of his debts. Sixty is a generic number (Degani 1991 ad loc.); but it is a generic *large* number. Staters vary in value from place to place, but from the table at Kraay 1976, 329-30 the *lowest* stater weights seem to be about 8g; so the amount which the audience would imagine is at least approaching half a kilogram.

<sup>156</sup> One ten pound note is, as money, identical with any other.

<sup>157</sup> It might also be tempting to consider that one of the reasons for Aristophanes' association of Simonides with the poet of *Birds* was his knowledge of this poem and its play on the idea of performance for clothes (we have already noted that Simonides was a popular poet in Athenian symposia, and at least some of his poems were well-known in the Athens of Aristophanes); this, of course, would require one to be confident that the poem was really by Simonides (or, at least, was believed to be so in the late fifth century); on which question, see the discussion below.

phrases, and the general intertextual soup in which such poems, passages and phrases float. It might be argued that we lack here a smoking gun such as the specific resemblance between the individual lines which we were able to point to in the Hesiodic case. In any case, it is clear that as part of the communicative strategy of the poem, the men without cloaks function in a significant way: it is clear from this analysis that the snow poem is drawing on and engaging with a tradition of songs sung in the hope of payment in the form of clothing, which songs might be expected to advert by a strategy of broad hints to the hoped-for remuneration. The poet of the snow poem uses this tradition, visible to us in Homer and Aristophanes, as part of the ironised construction of his own reaction to the situation which that poem supposes and communicates to its readers.

Pushing the resemblances a little further, we may note that Nagy, in his study of the Homeric passage, finds in it specifically the early uses of what becomes later the standard vocabulary of *praise*, and of epinician as a form of praise poetry: appeals to *xenia*, description of the host as *philos* and above all the characterisation of Odysseus' speech as *ainos* are all suggestive of the vocabulary familiar from the epinicians of Pindar and Bacchylides.<sup>158</sup> In the Odyssean passage, however, the strategy of the "poet" (i.e., Odysseus) is geared towards simple acquisition of the cloak; the epinician poets naturally speak of lavishness and spending, but we do not find such a straightforward pitch for a particular kind of remuneration (we do not find, for instance, Pindar telling a pointed story of an occasion when a kind host paid him exceptionally well for his song). Nagy identified the ancestry of the linguistic construction of the relationships created within praise poetry in the passage where Odysseus' lying tale was intended to provoke the gift (or loan) of the cloak; perhaps the author of the snow poem also recognised the pre-history of the encomiastic genres.<sup>159</sup> In this way the speaker of the poem, in circumstances of luxury, and lacking only the ice for his drink, recognises himself in the begging-poet situation not only with regard to his position in terms of exchange relationships, but also in terms of the supposed history of the genre of poetry for which he has been hired by his patrons. Perhaps the poet's reference to the figure

---

<sup>158</sup> Nagy 1999, 235-40.

<sup>159</sup> This need not be true as a statement about literary history for it to be true about the "snow poem" as a form of reception.

of the begging poet is not simply a reflection of economic dependence and its discontents, but also a wry recognition of an apparent history of genre. This argument does not seem to me to necessitate that we posit a specifically allusive reading of the relationship with the passage from the *Odyssey*; the analysis by Nagy depends on a regular cultural pattern, in the context of which certain codes<sup>160</sup> can be used and understood. The poem is a riddle: it is composed to be interpreted, such as to render a paraphrase which naturally cannot carry the density of meaning of the poem itself. At one level, the decoding is simple, and the paraphrase is “give me some snow.” According to a reading with the intertexts invoked here, however, a further decoded paraphrase of the sense conveyed by the speaker constructed in the poem might seem something like this: “as I sit surrounded by wealth and luxury on a hot day, asking for ice for my drink, I can see back to the roots of my own calling as a poet of praise, and can see that even now I am still there in the pit whence I was digged: not an honoured Demodocus, but just a beggar on a cold night, asking for a cloak.” One might be tempted to consider the technique of highly sophisticated, allusive engagement with the texts of earlier poetry, and especially the “master-texts” of hexameter poetry, as in itself a distinctive characteristic of Simonidean elegy. The discussion of Simonides’ ‘Plataea elegy’ presented at the beginning of this study<sup>161</sup> represents an analysis of the sophistication and, especially, the interpretability of such allusive behaviour: this is not to be considered simply a matter of generic *color epicus* but rather a major part of a consistent communicative strategy, marked by such features (of the sort sometimes perceived as characteristically “Hellenistic” or “Alexandrian”) as deliberate picking-up of *hapax* words and combination of adherence to and differentiation from source-texts.<sup>162</sup> We can now see that this sophisticated and (for us) interpretatively significant poetic technique marks also the elegy concerning snow. Needless to say, to move from this observation to the assertion of Simonidean authorship would be a dangerous

---

<sup>160</sup> “Codes” is a metaphorical term: such cultural patterns are like codes inasmuch as that they are patterned rather than arbitrary, involve correspondence (as “for x, understand y”) and inasmuch as that they convey meaning; they are of course also quite different from codes, since they are not constructed in order to conceal meaning and since the correspondence model is not adequate to convey their semantic function (whereas in a code in the narrow sense, if “Biggles Hotel” – or the number 613 – stands for “Heathrow airport,” then as soon as the meaning “Heathrow airport” has been extracted, the coded text’s semantic content is exhausted and fully described).

<sup>161</sup> Above, chapter 1.

<sup>162</sup> Above, chapter 1, esp. sections 1.7-1.11.

step: this kind of allusion is, at least potentially, a game anyone can play.<sup>163</sup> Nevertheless, the continuity we can see between this elegy and elegies securely attributable to Simonides is at least a small point in favour of Simonidean authorship.

It would be possible, but again scarcely conclusive, to argue that, if the poem was *not* composed by Simonides, the use of such a highly allusive technique suggests imitation of Simonides' own elegies based not simply on a caricatured conception of the poet's avarice and strained relationships with his patrons, but rather on sustained engagement with Simonides' own poetic practice and therefore as a result of close reading of Simonides' poetic oeuvre, which might itself suggest that the conception of the poem was more broadly derived from Simonidean concerns in thematic terms. But this again, clearly, cannot be regarded as a conclusive argument, but only as a suggestive possibility.

In the context of discussion of the relationship between the Simonides of the anecdotal tradition and the poems themselves, this is clearly a poem of considerable interest and significance. The author of the snow poem engages in witty reflection on the relations between those with money and those without by using a complex variety of source texts and literary traditions. He uses an ironic and rueful stance to offer a jocular comment which draws attention to a failure of *xenia* and with it of the proper exchange behaviour of pre-monetary aristocratic economics; however obliquely this was done, it would surely have raised laughter of the sort that accompanies reference to something which another might have left unspoken. The poem draws attention to the gap which has opened between the world of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and the world of the present day: a gap centred on the nature of different kinds of exchange behaviour. On internal grounds, the poem is set in Thessaly; if it is by Simonides, it was presumably (as Callistratus and Athenaeus believed) performed by him in Thessaly, in front of one of the same Thessalian patrons whose interactions with Simonides were so crucial in the tradition of the anecdotes. Simonides seems to engage with the relationship between wealth and power and personal interaction in disconcerting and prickly ways; he is sensitive to changes in status relationship between his own time and

---

<sup>163</sup> And a sceptical reader of this analysis might even retort that this practice of reading through the epic master texts is one that *we* can choose to adopt with any text; but where I claim *allusion* to a specific text I mean to make a historical claim, however tentative, about the time of the genesis of the poem; cf. above, Introduction.

earlier periods, changes which were surely in part an effect of the monetization of exchange relationships. If, then, this poem was by Simonides, it represents a very striking bridge between the poems and the anecdotal tradition; it would seem to suggest that at least some elements of the anecdotal tradition, while of course of dubious historicity, were derived from the poems not in arbitrary or misguided ways, but from a reasonable perception of the concerns and anxieties and difficulties which we also would perceive as characteristic of parts of the Simonidean *corpus* if it remained to us. It seems to point in the direction where we might say that the tradition of Simonides' obsessive concern for money and his often strained relationship with his patrons was based on the problematisations of the same relationships in the poems themselves. The readings on which the tradition was based might seem to be based on a more astute way of reading than treatments such as those of Lefkowitz and Slater generally assume.

#### 18. Simonides, editors and readers: the attribution of fr. 25 W

Now it is therefore necessary to consider a question which has been sidestepped or ignored above: whether the elegiac verses included under Simonides fr. 25 W should be considered as the work of Simonides himself, or as the work of a later poet which became attached to his name.

The poem is included by West, in both the first and second editions of *IEG*; he explained this by using arguments about the distinction between 'epigram' and 'elegy'.<sup>164</sup> His point is essentially that in or by the Hellenistic period short elegiac poems of many kinds could be called ἐπιγράμματα, where in the archaic and classical periods epigrams were by definition inscriptional.<sup>165</sup> Thus the present lines are an instance of a short, sympotic poem which was subsequently called an epigram because it was short, witty and in the elegiac metre. West, therefore, does not explicitly argue for the genuineness of the poem, only for its being reasonably contained in the category "elegy" rather than the category "epigram." On the other hand, Gentili and Prato exclude the present lines from their edition, apparently on the grounds that they are not to be included under the

<sup>164</sup> West 1974, 16-7, 20-21 (using the numeration of the first edition of *IEG*, in which the present poem is numbered 6 and the poem about the hare (26 in *IEG*<sup>2</sup>) is numbered 7).

<sup>165</sup> cf. Puelma 1996, 125 with n.8 (where for αὐτοσχέδιον read ἀπο-); he dates change in the sense of the word "kaum vor dem Ende des 4. Jahrhunderts" (125).

term “elegy” and not because of any judgement on authorship: “*exclusimus tamen poemata quae ex ipso fontis testimonio traduntur ut ἐπιγράμματα [...] vel ut γρίφοι / αἰνύματα.*”<sup>166</sup> It seems to me that West here has judged better than Gentili-Prato, since the fact that Callistratus or Athenaeus called a passage like fr.25W ἐπιγράμμα, at a time when we know that short poems in elegiac metre which made no pretence to being inscriptional were called ἐπιγράμματα,<sup>167</sup> is no reason not to include it under the category “elegy.”

It might be that the fact that the source (Callistratus or Athenaeus) uses the word ἐπίγραμμα in itself casts doubt on the Simonidean authenticity of the lines, since it might indicate that the poem has come from the so-called *Sylloge Simonidea*, the posited source for the epigrams attributed to Simonides in the *Garland* of Meleager and subsequently the Palatine Anthology.<sup>168</sup> Since we

<sup>166</sup> Gentili and Prato 2002, ii., Praefatio (p.VII) (my italics). It should be emphasised that Gentili-Prato do not here make *their own* distinction between genres; they simply state that they will not include fragments or poems where the *source* uses a word such as ἐπίγραμμα. From a methodological point of view this seems eccentric: a way of refusing to make an editorial judgement (what about where the source is mistaken, or, as in the present instance, where the meaning of a word has changed between the time of the poet and the time of the source?). Again, the principle seems illogical where the source makes no generic identification of the quoted text: this would suggest that where (e.g.) Athenaeus says, as it might be, ὡς Τιμωνίδης then it is for the editor to decide how to label what follows, whereas when the source says (e.g.) ὡς Τιμωνίδης ἐν ἐπιγράμματι the editor should simply switch off this critical judgement.

<sup>167</sup> ἐπίγραμμα used of poems with no hint of inscriptionality in Athenaeus: e.g. anon. at 2.39c, anon. at 10.442c (from an epigram collection of Polemon, which, while its name would make us think of inscribed epigrams, polis-by-polis, seems from its fragments to have been a collection of ‘symptotic,’ non-inscribed epigrams; cf. Argentieri 1998, 2), “Simonides” at 10.456c (two hexameters), Hedyllus at 11.472f-473b, “Sophocles” at 13.604f (fr.elcg.4W), etc.

<sup>168</sup> On the *Sylloge Simonidea*, see Boas 1905, ch.2 passim; Page *FGE* pp.119-123; Sider (forthcoming). The doctoral dissertation of Andrej Petrovič (Heidelberg), concerning the Simonidean epigrams, is forthcoming as a *Mnemosyne* supplement. By the time of Meleager (and thus also of Athenaeus), and almost certainly by the time of Callistratus, the *sylloge* contained both anonymous inscribed epigrams and non-inscribed compositions; the evidence suggests that it was augmented over time. Cf. Page, *FGE* pp.122-3, where the inappropriateness of terms conceptually associated with printing for describing processes occurring in ms. traditions is especially clear (how do you ‘republish’ a ms. volumen? cf. Cameron 1995, 104ff.); better to suppose a variety of different processes of accretion. Argentieri 1998 makes helpful distinctions between different words of approximate sense “collection” (“raccolto”), and considers the possibility that the late fourth century *sylloge* was revised (‘una revisione posteriore’ 3) by Callimachus at the time of his compiling the *Pinakes*, which is likely to be the source of the traditional grouping of the works of Simonides into books; but I see no reason to suppose Callimachus more likely than anybody else to have revised the *sylloge*, if a single editorial revision is what we need to find (by this way of thinking one could end up attributing almost all of the editorial activity of his age to Callimachus, whenever tradition has not given us a name). Page at any rate, apparently working from rather subjective criteria of style, believes that some of the material in the *sylloge* as read by Meleager was later than Callimachus’ time (*FGE* p.122). On the possibility that the Milan Posidippus might give an impression of how such a *sylloge* would have been arranged, see now Bravi 2005. For the possibility that the *first* collection of Simonidean epigrams could date to the fifth century, and even have been assembled by Simonides before a process of gradual accretion, see Sider (forthcoming), whose observations on the likelihood that



suppose, surely correctly, that this hypothetical book (or, as more likely, the practice of gathering epigrams under Simonides' name, which resulted in the circulation of multiple, differing books, whether viewed synchronically or diachronically)<sup>169</sup> was the source of transmission of anonymous inscribed epigrams to later collections, including a large number certainly not by Simonides, and again that it also included non-inscribed epigrams of considerably later date than Simonides, a dark cloud of suspicion is necessarily cast upon any Simonidean material which can be shown to come from this source. But again, as West states, this is in no way a "necessary assumption;"<sup>170</sup> in the time of Callistratus and Athenaeus, ἐπίγραμμα was a perfectly natural word to use of a short, witty, elegiac poem, and it is not even to accuse the sources of error if we suggest that they might well have used this word of a poem composed by Simonides other than for inscription, but only to allow them to use the language of their own time. West further points out that his fr. 91 W<sup>2</sup> (= 16 W<sup>1</sup>, "incertum an ex epigrammatis," = 'Simonides' *FGE* 75 "plainly the beginning of a longer poem"), preserved in the Palatine Anthology (7.511), would appear to be a non-epigraphic couplet which somehow found its way into the corpus of epigrams rather than of elegy;<sup>171</sup> again, Plutarch (*de mal. Hdt.* 36, 869c) called "epigram" what is probably a short, non-inscriptional elegy of sympotic origin concerning the actions of Democritus of Naxos in the battle of Salamis ('Simonides' *FGE* 19, not included by West in *IEG*). This seems to be a complete poem,<sup>172</sup> and thus provides another parallel for the use of epigram, in a Simonidean context, to mean "short elegy," regardless of the question whether it was inscribed. The first of these two instances (91 W<sup>2</sup>) comes to us from a Meleager sequence in *AP*, and thus presumably from the *Sylloge Simonidea*;<sup>173</sup> the second is known only from Plutarch, whose source cannot be determined. So the first was contained in a book with a title which should have been Κυμωνίδου

---

multiple different syllogae were circulating undermine many traditional ways (such as Boas') of dating the sylloge, which depend on the assumption of a single book.

<sup>169</sup> cf. Sider (forthcoming).

<sup>170</sup> West 1974, 20.

<sup>171</sup> *ibid.*, 21, cf. Page ad loc.; the suggestion that it is a fragment of elegy goes back to Schneidewin 1835 (his Simonides 173: "Fortasse particula est Elegiac"). *Contra*, Wilamowitz 1913, 212 ("natürlich auch, daß es kein Bruchstück ist"), with, as Page comments, no reason given for the bald assertion; Wilamowitz also acknowledged that the poem is not a sepulchral epigram (*ibid.*, 211: "Das ist zwar kein Gedicht für das Grab des Megakles...").

<sup>172</sup> cf. Page ad loc.

<sup>173</sup> cf. Page, *FGE* ad loc. and p.121; Boas 1905, 182-3.

ἐπιγράμματα or the like, while the latter was called “epigram” by Plutarch. Short elegies, therefore, including poems of classical date, could become “epigrams” in normal usage of later times, probably regardless of whether they found their way into the *sylloge* or not. There is therefore no reason to suppose that the poem concerning snow need have been a part of the *Sylloge Simonidea*, which presumably became (give or take whatever scholarly activities were performed upon it) the book of ἐπιγράμματα of the Hellenistic edition as catalogued in the *Pinakes* of Callimachus and probably reflected (through a glass darkly) in the *Suda* entry; of course, this remains a possibility, which cannot be discounted by virtue of the absence of the poem from *AP*, which might reflect only (for example) that it was not included in the Garland of Meleager (perhaps it was on the long side for Meleager’s taste).<sup>174</sup> So the question whether the poem was included in the *Sylloge* is an open one; it might have been included in a book of elegies of Simonides, which would probably not have shared the extreme hospitality to non-Simonidean material which was a characteristic of the epigram book (consequent originally on the fact that early inscribed epigrams did not include the poet’s name and that epigrams were obvious candidates for the practice of collecting and/or anthologising, both because of their short length and, especially in the early period, probably also because in particular the epigrams of the Persian Wars, regularly attributed to Simonides, were of interest to many through their value as historical propaganda and documents of cultural identity).<sup>175</sup>

It has been shown that both Gentili-Prato and West consider more the question whether we should properly call the poem epigram or elegy than the question whether we should attribute it to Simonides or not. This latter question is addressed more directly by Page, who in his introduction to the epigram assumes that the poem is falsely attributed to Simonides: “We have already seen comparable examples in LXXXIV and LXXXV – fictitious epigrams designed by the author of an anecdotal biography to add substance and colour to his narrative.”<sup>176</sup> Page does not state the reasons for his confidence. I do not see anything in the poem which rules out Simonidean authorship on internal

<sup>174</sup> For Meleager’s preference for shorter poems, see e.g. Sider 2004, 39-40; the Milan Posidippus shows that epigrams before Meleager were often longer.

<sup>175</sup> On practices of collecting epigrams, v. Argentieri 1998, esp. 1-2.

<sup>176</sup> *FGE* ad loc. (p.301).

grounds.<sup>177</sup> We are thus thrown up against a chicken-and-egg problem, namely whether (as Page supposes) a biographical narrative about Simonides is prior to the poem, or whether the poem itself might have generated such accompanying narrative.

This question is probably not answerable at a level of definite proof, but it is certainly possible to test out the relative likelihood of the two scenarios. Let us consider first how Callistratus and Athenaeus use this poem.

Here is the passage of Athenaeus, quoted more fully. The participants in the dialogue have been discussing means of cooling drinks, and have moved from snow to cold water, cooled underground, and thence to keeping water in cisterns; Myrtilus calls attention back to snow in the following manner:

Τούτων ὁ Μυρτίλος ἀκούσας ἔφη· "ἐγὼ δ' ὦν φιλοτάριχος, ὃ ἑταῖροι, χιόνος πιεῖν βούλομαι κατὰ Ciμωνίδην." καὶ ὁ Οὐπιανὸς "κεῖται μὲν ὁ φιλοτάριχος," ἔφη, "παρ' Ἀντιφάνει ἐν Ομφάλῃ οὕτως [Antiphanes fr.176 K-A].

οὐ φιλοτάριχος οὐδαμῶς εἰμ, ὃ κόρη

"Ἀλεξίς δ' ἐν Γυναικοκρατίαι καὶ ζωμοτάριχόν τινα κέκληκεν ἐν τούτοις [Alexis fr.43 K-A].

ὁ δὲ Κίλιξ

ὅδ' Ἰπποκλῆς, ὁ ζωμοτάριχος ὑποκριτής.

τὸ δὲ κατὰ Ciμωνίδην τί ἐστὶν οὐκ οἶδα" "οὐ γὰρ μέλει σοι," ἔφη ὁ Μυρτίλος, "ἱστορίας, ὃ γάστρων. κνισκολιχὸς γάρ τις εἶ καὶ κατὰ τὸν Κάμιον ποιητὴν "Ἀσιον τὸν παλαιὸν ἐκέῖνον<sup>178</sup> κνισκοκόλαξ. Καλλίστρατος ἐν ζ' Συμμίκτων φηεῖν ὡς ἐστιώμενος παρά τινι Ciμωνίδης ὁ ποιητὴς "κραταιοῦ καύματος ὦραι" καὶ τῶν οἰνοχόων

<sup>177</sup> Prof. M. Silk helpfully suggested to me that I consider whether the word *πρόπος* might be evidence of post-Simonidean authorship. The word is first found here, but is paralleled by *μετάστασις*, found also probably in its first attestation at Simonides 521 *PMG* (also Pindar fr. 70d40 M). Cf. Poltera 1997, 450-1.

<sup>178</sup> This is the text as given by Kaibel and in Gulick's Loeb, both of which editors follow Casaubon in adding καὶ before κατὰ τὸν Κάμιον and deleting it after ἐκέῖνον; I considered that the phrase τὸν παλαιὸν ἐκέῖνον, which seemed slightly redundant, might be a corruption masking a title (ἐν τῷ παλαιῷ + proper name, e.g.); but the point is that the elegiac fragment quoted below (not given in my quotation; = Asius fr.14 W) refers to the wedding of 'Meles'; somebody has taken this (rightly or wrongly) for the river said to be the father of Homer (*Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* 2, [Plut.] *de Homero* 2.2, Suda s.v. "Ὀμηρος init., etc.; cf. Huxley 1969, 97) and drawn the conclusion that Asius was a contemporary and therefore an earlier poet than Homer. The other possibility (if the text is good) is that the notion of two poets called Asius had been suggested (because of the contrast between the genealogical material and lighter-hearted writing such as the elegiac fr. and also fr. 13 *EGF*= Bernabé). Bowra 1957 dated Asius to the fifth century (on slight grounds).

τοῖς ἄλλοις μισγόντων εἰς τὸ ποτὸν χιόνος, αὐτῷ δὲ οὐ, ἀπεσχεδίαιε  
 τόδε τὸ ἐπίγραμμα·  
 τήν ῥά ποτ Οὐλύμποιο περὶ πλευρὰς ἐκάλυψε  
 ὥκους ἀπὸ Θρήικης ὀρνύμενος Βορέης·  
 ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀχλαίνων ἔδακεν φρένας, αὐτὰρ ἐκάμφθη  
 ζῶη Πιερίην γῆν ἐπιεσσαμένη,  
 ἔν τις ἐμοὶ καὶ τῆς χεῖτω μέρος· οὐ γὰρ ἔοικεν  
 θερμὴν βαστάζειν ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ πρόποσιν.

Having heard these things, Myrtilus said “Being a Saltfishophile, my friends, I want to drink snow after the fashion of Simonides.” And Ulpian said “‘Saltfishophile’ is found in the *Omphale* of Antiphanes, as follows:

I’m no saltfishophile, no way, my girl.

And Alexis in his *Gynaecocracy* calls somebody a saltfishstew in these words:

And this Cilician Hippokles here, this saltfishstew actor.

But as for what ‘after the fashion of Simonides’ is, I don’t know.”

“No, you don’t,” said Myrtilos, “for you have no interest in History, you glutton, because you’re a fat-licker and, as the Samian poet Asius would put it, that ancient one, a fat-scrounger. Callistratus, in the seventh book of his ‘Miscellanea,’ says that Simonides was once sitting with some people ‘in the season of mighty heat’ and that when the wine-pourers were mixing snow into the drink for the others but not for him he improvised this epigram:

‘That with which swift Boreas, rushing from Thrace, once covered the sides of Olympus; that which bit at the innards of men without cloaks, but was humbled, clothed while alive in Pierian earth; of that let somebody pour a share for me: for it is not proper to raise a warm glass to a friend.’”

Callistratus, then, treated this material in a book called *Κύμματα*. This is described by Jacoby (ad loc.: *FGrH* 348 F 3) as an appropriate title for a grammatical work (Callistratus was a pupil of Aristophanes of Byzantium), and it is possible that this work may have dealt specifically with writings about or associated with the symposium, since there seem to have been a number of such sympotic compendia with similar titles.<sup>179</sup> Of course we cannot tell from what

<sup>179</sup> Cf. Poltera 1998, with reference to the useful list at Schmidt 1854, 378-9.

source Callistratus took either the poem or whatever else he might have said about it, and therefore cannot entirely rule out that he was using a (peripatetic?) source rooted in the biographical/anecdotal tradition, but a number of factors combine to make this seem unlikely. Firstly, we might expect that a scholarly student of Aristophanes of Byzantium would go for the works of a famous poet not to a biography but to the Hellenistic critical edition gathered and divided into books by an unknown scholar (perhaps Callimachus, perhaps another).<sup>180</sup> Secondly, the information which we have passed on to us in paraphrase by Athenaeus looks rather unlike what we might expect to see if it had been drawn from something looking similar to, say, the biography of Chamaeleon. The anecdote concerning the occasion where Simonides lost out on his share of the hare, taken by Athenaeus not from Callistratus but from Chamaeleon, makes a good comparandum (Simonides fr.26 W = Athenaeus 656c-d, Chamaeleon fr.33 Wehrli):

περὶ δὲ λαγῶν Χαμαιλέων φηεῖν ἐν τῷ περὶ Σιμωνίδου ὡς δειπνῶν  
παρὰ τῷ Ἱέρωνι ὁ Σιμωνίδης, οὐ παρατεθέντος αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν  
τράπεζαν καθάπερ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις λαγωῦ, ἀλλ' ὕστερον μεταδιδόντος  
τοῦ Ἱέρωνος, ἀπεσχεδίασεν  
οὐδὲ γὰρ <οὐδ> εὐρύς περ ἐὼν ἐξίκετο δεῦρο

Concerning hares, Chamaeleon says in his book *On Simonides* that when Simonides was dining in the house of Hieron and hare was not served to him at table, even though it was to the others, but later on Hieron offered some, he improvised:

“Wide though it was, it was not wide enough to reach this far”

The difference is marked. If this hexameter was ever improvised by Simonides, it is dubious whether it could have been transmitted by itself, unaccompanied by a description of the circumstances, without which it simply does not make adequate sense. It is thus also unlikely that it travelled in a book of poems; a book of anecdotes or apophthegms is possible, and the reliability of the attribution

<sup>180</sup> On Callistratus, v. Holwerda 1987. Callistratos' writings on the Homeric poems have been treated by Barth 1984: non uidi.

reduced as a result. Crucially, the occasion is tied to a host (Hieron) and includes details which the *ipsissima verba* attributed to Simonides could not allow anybody to deduce or guess (for example, why should it be that Hieron later offered some to Simonides after all? Why Hieron rather than some other patron? This perhaps had a point in the story as told by Chamaeleon, independently of the supposed improvised line).

On the contrary, Callistratus seems to have done something rather different. The snow poem may be considered, from the point of view of a reader,<sup>181</sup> as a kind of dramatic monologue. By this is meant that it represents the words of a speaker placed in a dramatic situation, which is not explicitly described but which the readers rather infer from the words spoken. In such a poem, it is generally possible for an attentive reader to figure out from traces in the text the situation which must be imagined in order for the speech to make dramatic sense; but of course a reader may have difficulty and it is therefore entirely natural that an editor or commentator may decide to take it upon himself to make explicit the scene-setting present in the text only by subtle clues. This is even more obviously the case where the monologue is itself a riddle where the key noun ("snow") is never expressed. In the present case, cued by the mention of men without cloaks (as discussed above with reference to scenes in the *Odyssey* and Hipponax) and understanding the tone of mild, tactful reproof embodied in the riddle form as discussed above, such an editor would likely end up imagining the situation described for us by Athenaeus from Callistratus. Admittedly the other guests who do receive snow are not explicitly mentioned in the poem, but their presence would seem implied by the tone of reproof which is. The level of biographical invention is minimal; Chamaeleon or a similar source might have been expected to name the host and/or location, not least since the latter at least – the house of a Thessalian nobleman – is discernible on internal grounds<sup>182</sup> (he would probably have called him Scopas, since Scopas is generally the most popular choice for the

<sup>181</sup> "From the point of view of a reader" should be stressed: this is a point about reception. I do not mean to suggest that the poem, if Simonidean, was originally the same sort of thing in literary terms as (e.g.) Browning's dramatic monologues (the analogy is made below), a very 'literary' type of 'overheard' poetry which, I would suggest, is not found in Greek until later times. On the other hand, this is not, of course, to suggest that the distinction between *persona loquens* and the historical poet is to be elided either; indeed, disregarding the question whether such a thing could theoretically ever be the case, we know that sympotic elegy could be sung in a voice which was immediately and identifiably not the singer's own (Bowie 1986, 16).

<sup>182</sup> Wilamowitz 1913, 142-3n.3.

host in the celebrated scene where Simonides is rescued from the falling house by the Dioskouroi).<sup>183</sup> By this reading, then, Callistratus is not resorting to a strong form of biographical criticism at all; he is like a critic who might introduce his account of a poem by writing “Alfonso II d’Este, fifth duke of Ferrara, speaks unkindly and coldly of his late wife and with more interest concerning his art collection, even when he addresses the emissary of the man whose daughter he plans to marry” (Browning, *My Last Duchess*); in context, no statement about the historical duke would be intended, and in context none would be likely to be understood. Confusion with the construction of a biography, then, is caused in the first place by the lack of distinction between Simonides, the historical person, and ‘Simonides,’ assumed by Callistratus to be the speaker of and within the poem; in the second place by Athenaeus’ excerpting and paraphrase of Callistratus; and in the third place by the ease with which we can see continuity between elements of this poem (and therefore, naturally, also Callistratus’ account of it) and other material concerning Simonides which is more properly perceived as (intended to be understood as) biographical. Callistratus, then, seems more interested in establishing what is necessary to understand the sense of the poem than in mining it for potential biographical information about the historical Simonides; this is a good indication that his interest is exegetical rather than biographical, and that the poem is prior to his comment on it. What we see here in Athenaeus is the moment where a poem is just in the process of becoming an anecdote: ‘Simonides’ the supposed speaker of the poem on the point of becoming ‘Simonides’ the subject of biography.

If this argument is accepted, Page’s objections to Simonidean authorship do not seem to carry great force. At this point, the remaining grounds for doubt are two: firstly, that the poem *may* have been transmitted as far as Callistratus by the *Sylloge Simonidea*, any of whose contents are suspect by virtue of that book’s known tendency to include certainly non-Simonidean material; secondly, that we might doubt it for the reason that it is hard to imagine in whose interests it might have been preserved. With regard to this second question (“cui bono?”), it is indeed difficult to imagine who would have had an interest in writing and preserving the poem in the period close to its own composition. Of course, one response to this

---

<sup>183</sup> Simonides 510 PMG; cf. section 3.10 above.

might be to retort that we do not really know in general how *any* archaic poetry was transmitted through its first decades,<sup>184</sup> so that it might seem perverse to make this into a specific problem with regard to this one poem. Nevertheless, with some kinds of song (epinician, for instance) we can imagine that families and/or communities would have had a strong interest in preserving the poems, either for reperformance or as reading documents or both, because of the lasting κλέος-value of such poems. In the present case we would have to suppose that the poem was transmitted and written down (not necessarily at the same time) out of general admiration for its poetic craft.<sup>185</sup>

It will be seen that the reasons which have been brought forward either to deny the place of this poem among Simonides' sympotic elegies or to deny its Simonidean authorship are weak, but that at the same time the reasons to accept it, while they are (in my opinion) strong, are not altogether conclusive. If the arguments assembled here are accepted, the poem has at least a place as a dubium – and a dubium with a good chance at that. An element of doubt may remain. While acknowledging that certainty is not possible, I am inclined to accept it as by Simonides,<sup>186</sup> with all the implications for the development of Simonides' anecdotal reputation that this entails. If, of course, the poem was not by Simonides, it takes its place as another item in the survey of Simonides' reception which made up the first part of this chapter, and an especially interesting and complex one at that. If one chooses not to accept this poem as Simonidean, the following discussion of Simonides 514 *PMG* stands or falls independently of the attribution of this poem, and it is to that that the argument will now turn.

---

<sup>184</sup> Two recent groups of hypotheses are Currie 2004, Hubbard 2004, with bibl.

<sup>185</sup> Later symposiasts might have performed it as a kind of joke: all they would have needed to do in the way of contextualising would have been to say "I'm going to sing some Simonides;" the assembled company might enjoy the verbal dexterity of the poem, the implied negative characterisation of the Thessalian hosts, and the reaffirmation of their own sympotic equality by contrast with the implied situation of the poem. Perhaps some would have enjoyed also the contrast between their own parties and the effete elaboration of the Thessalian aristocrat (the *psykter* went out of use in Athens by the end of the first half of the fifth century; probably the use of snow to cool drinks, then, went with it or at any rate became less common; cf. Kanowski 1984, 123; Robertson 1975, 121).

<sup>186</sup> Andrej Petrovič, the author of a forthcoming study of the epigrams of Simonides, provides qualified encouragement: "I would not be very quick in rejecting the authorship," though he also warns that "there can be no definite answer to the problem of authenticity" (private communication).



### 19. The Cloak and the Octopus: Simonides 514 *PMG*

It might be argued that, even if (as I would like) the elegiac poem 25 W were taken as genuinely Simonidean, and even if the interpretation of it which I have proposed above were accepted, it remained an isolated instance: a one-off joke and in any case a small and insignificant poem in the context of Simonides' large and varied output. Again, it might be thought that, for the broader argument to stand that the anecdotal tradition concerning Simonides, money and exchange behaviour was derived from the foregrounding of the same concerns in the poems, we might expect to find traces of the same phenomena in the poems which Simonides wrote for the wealthy patrons of epinician and other choral songs, such as Hieron and Scopas, prominent in the anecdotal tradition. It is to a fragment of epinician that we now turn. The *ipsissima verba* of the fragment are two only, and are quoted by our source, again Athenaeus, for quite other reasons. Fortunately, they are supplemented by information from elsewhere which gives us some idea of the content of the part of the poem from which these words were taken, and tells us its occasion and laudandus. Nevertheless, a glance at the available evidence makes it clear that the interpretation of this poem is a rash and perilous undertaking, where certainty is unlikely to be found. However, the information which we do have seems both surprising and interesting, especially in the context of the present investigation, and cannot be left alone here.

Athenaeus 7.318f = Simonides 514 *PMG*

Δωριεῖς δ' αὐτὸν διὰ τοῦ ω καλοῦσι πώλυπον, ὡς Επίχαρμος. καὶ  
 Ciμωνίδης δ' ἔφη

πώλυπον διζήμενος

Ἀττικοὶ δὲ πούλυπον.

Dorians call the octopus with an omega "pólupos", as Epicharmus [fr. 54 K-A, cited at Athen. 318e]. Also Simonides said

"seeking an octopus"

Attic speakers say "poulupos."

These two words, πώλυπον διζήμενος, represent the whole of the fragment; no

other certainly Simonidean words are known from this poem. However, editors have identified other texts which, without providing more words, seem almost certainly to refer to the same poem, and give us intriguing further information.

Anonymous paroemiographer in Cod. Paris. suppl. gr. 676, cited at Simonides 514 *PMG* (with fuller reference):

ὁ Κάριος αἶνος· μέμνηται ταύτης Ciμωνίδης ἐπαινῶν τινα ἡνίοχον νικήσαντα ἐν Πελλήνῃ καὶ λαβόντα ἐπινίκιον χλαμύδα, ὡς χρησάμενος ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ ῥίγου χειμῶνος < 1-2 vocc. illeg. > ἐν Πελλήνῃ ἐπετελείτο. φασι δὲ ἀλιεὺς ἰδὼν ἐν χειμῶνι πολύποδα εἶπεν· εἰ μὴ κολυμβήσω, πεινήσω. τοῦτον οὖν εἶναι τὸν Κάριον αἶνον.

The Carian *ainos*: Simonides mentions this when praising a charioteer who won in Pellene and took the epinician cloak, using which he found relief from the cold. Winter is when [the competition] in Pellene is held. They say that a fisherman, seeing an octopus in winter, said “If I do not dive, I shall starve,” and that that is the Carian *ainos*.

Similar but not identical information is provided by another late source.

[Diogenianus] *Praef. paroem.* i.179 L-S = Walz, *Rhetores Graeci* ii.11 ~ Simonides *PMG* 514 and Timocreon *PMG* 734

Καρικὸς δὲ αἶνος λέγεται, ὃν ἀναφέρουσιν εἰς γένει Κᾶρα ἄνδρα· τοῦτον γὰρ ἀλιέα τυγχάνοντα χειμῶνος θεασάμενον πολύποδα εἶπεν εἰ μὲν ἀποδὺς κολυμβήσαιμι ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ῥιγώσω, ἐὰν δὲ μὴ λάβω τὸν πολύποδα, τῷ λιμῷ τὰ παιδί ἀπολω. κέχρηται δὲ τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ καὶ Τιμοκρέων ἐν μέλεσι, καὶ Ciμωνίδης δ’ αὐτοῦ μνημονεύει ἐν τῷ εἰς Ὀριλλαν ἐπινικίῳ.

The Carian *ainos* is so called because it is told about a man whose race was Carian. This fisherman, happening to see an octopus in winter, said “If I strip and dive after him, I shall freeze; if I don’t catch the octopus, I shall lose my children to starvation.” Also Timocreon uses this story in his melic poems, and Simonides mentions it in the epinician for Orillas.

We find similar information from the *Suda* s.v. Καρικῆς Μούσης (κ 388 Adler):

Καρικῆς Μούσης· τῇ θρηνώδει. δοκοῦσι γὰρ οἱ Κᾶρες θρηνωιδοί τινας

εἶναι καὶ ἀλλοτρίους νεκροὺς ἐπὶ μισθῷ θρηνεῖν. τινὲς δὲ ἐξήκουσαν τῇ βαρβάρῳ καὶ ἀσαφεῖ· ἐπειδὴ οἱ Κᾶρες βαρβαρόφωνοι. καὶ παροιμία Καρικὸς αἶνος. ὅτι ἄλιεὺς ἰδὼν ἐν χειμῶνι πολὺπουν εἶπεν· εἰ μὴ κολυμβήσω, πεινήσω.

Carian Muse: “the threnodic Muse.” For it appears that the Carians are some sort of *threnos*-singers, and sing *threnoi* for a fee for the bodies of unrelated people. But some understand it as “the barbarous and unclear Muse,” since the Carians do not speak Greek. And there is a proverb, the “Carian fable.” It says that a fisherman seeing an octopus in winter said “If I do not dive, I shall starve.”

That none of these versions includes the natural end of the story, i.e. the fisherman’s choice and its consequence, would apparently suggest that the story was not generally continued: it is therefore intended to illustrate a particular kind of dilemma, where either of two possible choices would be disastrous.<sup>187</sup>

The poem, in any case, was composed to celebrate a victory at the games held at Pellene, a town in Achaia, and the victor was called Orillas (or by another name corrupted in [Diogenianus]). It should probably be assumed that this was the owner of the horses or mules rather than, as the Paris author has it, the charioteer. This will be assumed *a priori* for the simple reason that we have no other instance of a poem written for the charioteer, and in the second place because we can surely also assume that the cloak was given to the owner and not to the driver.<sup>188</sup>

The games at Pellene were chiefly famous for the fact that the prize there was a cloak: this was the regular detail which came to mind when Pellene was mentioned.<sup>189</sup> The games were held on the occasion of a festival variously called

<sup>187</sup> An alternative explanation for this would be that all of the accounts are derived from the same incomplete source. This would appear likely for the Paris ms. and the Suda entry: but the passage from [Diogenianus] seems to contain independently derived information.

<sup>188</sup> This would be demonstrable with certainty if we had an instance in Pindar where he talks about Pellene in the context of an event involving a charioteer, but in fact (by chance, as I assume) he only mentions the cloak in poems for victors in non-equestrian events: *Ol.* 7.86 (for a boxer), *Ol.* 9.98 (wrestler), *Ol.* 13.109 (stadion and pentathlon), *Nem.* 10.44 (wrestler). Perhaps the slip by the paroemiographer in taking the laudandus and the driver to be identical would have been facilitated by the fact that, in Byzantine chariot-racing, the drivers were stars in their own right.

<sup>189</sup> Aristoph. *Birds* 1421 with Dunbar ad loc. and Σ (and see below), *P. Ol.* 9.97-8 with Σ ad loc. (Σ *Ol.* 9.146a, g. 148 a-b (i.300-301 Drachmann)), Σ ad *P. Ol.* 7.86 (Σ *Ol.* 7.156a, c (i.232

Ἑρμαῖα or Θεοξενία, which occurred in winter.<sup>190</sup> It is not surprising, therefore, that it was natural for people to associate the prizes with the time of year, as some of the scholia cited do, and as Pindar seems to do where, in a list of the laudandus' victories, he names the cloak by the periphrasis ψυχρᾶν... εὐδιανὸν φάρμακον αὐρᾶν ("pleasantly warm remedy against cold winds").<sup>191</sup>

Nevertheless, given the associations of the idea of obtaining a cloak described above on the basis of the use of this motif in the *Odyssey* and in other places, it is not surprising that we seem to find ironic and witty use of the epinician cloak of Pellene, which draws attention to the contrast between the aristocratic associations of the games and the lowly status of the beggar. To observe this, we may turn first once more to Hipponax (fr. 43 Degani = 34 W):

ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἔδωκας οὔτε κω χλαῖναν  
δασειαν ἐν χειμῶνι φάρμακον ῥίγος  
οὔτ' ἀσκήρησι τοὺς πόδας δασείησιν  
ἔκρυψας, ὥς μοι μὴ χίμετλα ῥήγνυται.

You never gave a cloak to me, a shaggy one, for a remedy against the cold in the winter. Nor did you cover my feet with shaggy winter shoes, to stop my chilblains bursting.

This seems to belong with the prayer to Hermes quoted above (42 Degani = 32 W): apparently the prayer went unanswered. The similarity between the phrasing of u.2 ἐν χειμῶνι φάρμακον ῥίγος "a remedy against the cold in the winter" and the Pindaric ψυχρᾶν... εὐδιανὸν φάρμακον αὐρᾶν ("pleasantly warm remedy against cold winds"), quoted above, has been noted by commentators,<sup>192</sup> and it has been very plausibly argued by Degani that Hipponax intends his

---

Drachmann)), P. *Nem.* 10.44 with Σ ad loc. (Σ *Nem.* 82a (iii.176 Drachmann)), Strabo 8.7.5 (386 Casaubon), and see also Degani 1971, 100n.31 ~ Degani 1984, 169n.27.

<sup>190</sup> One or both of these names given by Σ Aristoph. *Birds* 1421 (ENeapMLh), Σ ad P. *Ol.* 7.86 (Σ *Ol.* 7.156a, c (i.232 Drachmann)), Σ ad *Ol.* 9.97 (Σ P. *Ol.* 9.146c, h, 148b (i.300-301 Drachmann)), Σ ad P. *Nem.* 10.44 (Σ P. *Nem.* 10.82b (iii.176 Drachmann)). Σ P. *Nem.* 10. 82a states that ὁ δὲ ἀγὼν Διός· καλεῖται δὲ Δίῖα ("The competition was of Zeus, and was called the Diia"), but must be mistaken; the writer did not know, cast about within the poem, and found the reference to Zeus (in fact Zeus Lykaios in Arcadia) at u.48, and thought this might refer to the games at Pellene. The dog's breakfast at Σ RENEap ad *Birds* 1421 appears to result from corruption of Ἑρμαῖα and consequent false corrections.

<sup>191</sup> P. *Ol.* 9.97.

<sup>192</sup> Degani 1971, 98 with n.24 ~ Degani 1984, 168 with n.21.

audience to understand his prayer to Hermes for a cloak as an amusing reference to the celebrated prize in the games held at the Ἑρμαῖα in his honour.<sup>193</sup> *Olympian* 9 commemorates a victory of 468, which is certainly too late for Hipponax, so if the similarity of phrasing is to be explained in terms of allusion then the source text must be Hipponax and the alluder Pindar. This is the conclusion drawn by a number of commentators on Pindar and by Degani, yet seems somehow unlikely. Why would Pindar want his audience to think of the crude and undignified picture of Hipponax?<sup>194</sup> If he were aware that Hipponax had used such a phrase, I should have thought that he would be more inclined to avoid it. It certainly cannot be demonstrated, but I wonder whether some sort of 'official' language in the prize ceremony at which the cloak was presented might be the object of allusion in *both* of these poets; but on the basis of the evidence available to us this can be no more than a guess.

If Degani is right to see a specific link between the passage of Hipponax and Pellene, and it is surely a persuasive argument if not an absolutely certain one, then he is surely right to analyse it in terms of contrast between the aristocratic *mores* of athletic competition and the concrete physicality and low register of the mock-prayer of Hipponax: "Nel contesto della sua preghiera, la χλαῖνα δαεῖα, già simbolo di κῦδος e di ἀρετή, si riduce ad un prosaico pezzo di lana, che serve unicamente a far fronte al gelo che fa 'battere' i denti e 'crepare' i geloni."<sup>195</sup> This was probably during the latter part of the sixth century, in or close to the time of the earlier part of Simonides' career, and at the time when aristocratic cultural expression was on a sharp upswing in Greece: the time of the most elaborate development of the wares of the elite Attic symposium, of an increasing interest in athletic competition and, of course, of the development of epinician poetry.<sup>196</sup>

<sup>193</sup> Degani 1971, 98-103 ~ Degani 1984, 167-70. The bones of the argument are set out in the commentary to Degani 1991.

<sup>194</sup> In *Pythian* 2 Pindar certainly interacts in an interesting manner with the iambic blame tradition, naming Archilochus at u.55, but this does not seem in other respects a close comparandum; see below, section 3.20. On *Pythian* 2 see below. Gerber, the most recent and fullest commentator on *Ol.* 9, seems sceptically non-committal: "Degani is convinced that Pindar is indebted to Hipponax" (Gerber 2002, 64).

<sup>195</sup> Degani 1971, 103 ~ Degani 1984, 170.

<sup>196</sup> We may wonder but cannot ultimately tell whether Hipponax' poem might have been a reaction to the development of epinician poetry. Still less, of course, can we tell whether Hipponax might have taken an idea from Simonides (perhaps from the poem for Orillas) and developed it, though of course chronology does not forbid it. On Hipponax' date, v. Degani 1984, 19-20 and

It is very difficult (one should say impossible) to tell with any degree of confidence precisely how or at what length Simonides made reference to the story identified by our sources as the “Carian *ainos*.” There is no reason to suppose that the epinician contained the direct speech in the mouth of the fisherman which is a basic element in our sources. In Simonides’ own (and only) words from the poem, we cannot see to what extent a narrative element was a feature. The fisherman may have occurred only in one phrase: ὥςπερ ὠνήρ πώλυπον διζήμενος or the like. The context in which he was mentioned, however, might give us at least a few suggestions.

It must have been the case that, in Simonides’ epinician for Orillas, the emphasis on the value of the cloak against the cold was much greater than that afforded to it by Pindar, even at *Ol.* 9.97. On the basis of the Paris ms., it seems to have been the case that Simonides drew attention somehow to the transition between cold and warm which occurred *when the laudandus put on the cloak*: ὡς χρησάμενος ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ ῥίγου (‘‘using which, he found relief from the cold’’). This is already a step further than Pindar’s καὶ ψυχρᾶν ὁπότ’ εὐδιανδὸν φάρμακον αὐρᾶν Πελλάναι φέρε (*Ol.* 9.97-8 ‘‘and at Pellene where he carried away the pleasantly warm remedy against cold winds’’).<sup>197</sup> Again, this seems in Simonides to have been the link to the story concerning the fisherman: the point is that both occurred in winter. This latter point would hold even if the impression given by ὡς χρησάμενος κτλ. were a consequence of an unwarranted inference or inaccurate paraphrase contained within the paroemiographic source: the connection or juxtaposition of the cloak with the reference to the unfortunate fisherman will have drawn attention to the heat-giving properties of the cloak. This extra emphasis is in itself peculiar: it is to the poor or unfortunate man that the gift of a cloak, even an especially thick one, is a great benefit from the simply calorific point of view, but the laudandus will not have been in the position of the freezing Hipponax or of Odysseus in Eumaeus’ hut, constantly defined by his lack of good clothes and assumed to be hoping for better ones. We may assume that a victor in an equestrian event is not short of clothing.

It will seem rather striking that Simonides seems to have made at least an implicit

1991, 1, M.L. West s.v. Hipponax in *OCD*<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>197</sup> φέρω used here in sense VI.3 of LSJ, where no sense such as ‘‘put on’’ or ‘‘wear’’ is recorded. Pindar’s kenning does not suggest that the laudandus had been cold previously, which is a surprising aspect of Simonides’ apparent treatment.

comparison of the victor with the fisherman in this story. The fisherman of the story is, necessarily, poor to the point of near-starvation. As a starving Carian fisherman he is (from a Greek point of view) multiply marginal: ethnically, geographically, and in socio-economic terms both from the fact of his profession and from the fact of his extreme poverty.<sup>198</sup> The aspect of his marginalisation, however, to which the story draws attention is specifically his poverty, which is the cause of the aporetic situation in which he finds himself. At least a part of the effect of the comparison or juxtaposition of the fisherman and the aristocratic laudandus on the point of success must, then, have been to draw attention to overlapping *contrasts* between the two: the laudandus at a moment of celebration and achievement, the fisherman in a desperate double-bind in a situation of grave misfortune; and, more simply, the laudandus wealthy and the fisherman poor. Going a step further, the mark of poverty to which the contrast would have drawn attention is material deprivation of the simplest and harshest kind; the contrast would appear to emphasise, then, not wealth as a source of political power or κλέος, or as a means to do proper honour to the gods, or any such elevated or “embedded” use of wealth, but simply to its protection of the wealthy man from the harsh realities of the environment. The effect is to lay emphasis on the material benefit of the cloak, rather than the aspect which would surely in fact have been of most concern to the recipient, i.e. its symbolic value as a prize and a symbol of his ἀρετή.

The very collocation of the notion of cold and extreme poverty with the mention of a cloak and the warmth brought by it *might* in itself have suggested the cultural pattern concerning begging and the begging poet described above, in Simonides (fr. 25 W) as in Hipponax; the extent to which Simonides is here interacting with the same cultural pattern, however, is unfortunately obscure. In particular, there is no reason to suppose that, as in the passage of Hipponax above and also in the snow poem (Simonides fr. 25 W), the context included the element of implicitly adverting to a lack which the addressee is expected or hoped to fill which might be thought to be a necessary part of the begging motif. Any attempt to relate this Simonidean fragment to that cultural pattern beyond a very vague similarity will therefore be possible only at the outer edges of speculation.

---

<sup>198</sup> Fishermen are regularly poor in ancient thought, and are marginal over and above the fact of their poverty: see Purcell 1995, esp. 134-6.

However, we may consider further the way in which the use, however fleeting, of the tradition concerning the Carian fisherman may be interpreted in Simonides. Fränkel found the idea pleasantly amusing, describing Simonides' use of the *ainos* as "attractive realism" and stating that "Simonides contrariwise [i.e., compared with Pindar] jokingly brings the achievement down to the level of the simplest humanity and estimates the reward at its practical value."<sup>199</sup> Something of this must have been the flavour of the passage; but there seems to be something missing, since as well as emphasising the simple, "down-to-earth" warmth provided by the cloak the use of the *ainos*, however expressed, would almost certainly, as I argued above, have emphasised the difference between wealth and poverty and thus the nature of wealth. The Carian fisherman is not an "everyman" figure, as Fränkel's interpretation might lead one to expect, a normative specimen of simple humanity with whom everybody could identify (as perhaps the hero of Aristophanic comedy might be described<sup>200</sup>), but rather, as delineated above, a type of extreme marginality, from the point of view of the chorus and audience, one would imagine, as much as of the poet or the laudandus. So there seems to be something more striking than "attractive realism": in the epinician song by which the victor, at his moment of high achievement, is celebrated and integrated into his community, he is apparently contrasted with a figure beyond the community, the opposite both of his high status and of any sense of socially integrated κλέος.<sup>201</sup>

## 20. Epinician and Iambus

The peculiarities of Simonides' reference to the story of the Carian fisherman can be expressed in generic terms. It is not common, as far as we can tell (mostly from Pindar and Bacchylides) for epinician to interact with fable in this manner; still less to refer to specific existing fables. Thus, for example, van Dijk's survey of fable in Greek literature finds the present instance (and only the present instance) in Simonides, but nothing from Pindar and Bacchylides.<sup>202</sup> On the contrary, the

<sup>199</sup> Fränkel 1975, 436.

<sup>200</sup> Cf. e.g. Dover 1972, 41.

<sup>201</sup> Once more the comparandum seems to be Hipponax, on whose differences from Archilochus and iambic tradition in this regard, see Carey 2003.

<sup>202</sup> van Dijk 1997. The present passage is discussed at 160-2. On the apparent absence of fable in



genre which seems to interact most happily with fable is iambus. Thus we find in Archilochus “the fox and the eagle” (frr. 174-81 W),<sup>203</sup> “the fox and the ape” (frr. 185-7 W),<sup>204</sup> and perhaps “the wolf and the dog” (fr.237 W);<sup>205</sup> in Semonides of Amorgus, apparent use of fable can be detected at frr. 9 and 13 W.<sup>206</sup> Hipponax does *not* seem, on the basis of the surviving fragments, to have treated fable material.<sup>207</sup> Perhaps the teller of a fable attributes to himself a kind of moral authority which Hipponax’ unusual *persona loquens* would not; but absence of evidence might account for the lack just as well.<sup>208</sup>

It is unsurprising, therefore, that an attempt should have been made to reconcile the sources with the possibility that we have here a tradition concerning not Simonides of Ceos but Semonides of Amorgus, especially since certain of the phrases in our sources have a iambic sound to them. Adrados cleverly altered the words of [Diogenianus] to produce a choliambic fragment of Semonides of Amorgus.<sup>209</sup> Before discovering Adrados’ argument, I considered doing the same with the testimony of the Paris manuscript and the Suda, which requires the insertion of only a single syllable to provide a possible choliambic fragment something like the following:

εἰ <δὲ> μὴ κολυμβήσω

πεινῆσω

If I do not dive, I shall starve.

(The following word must begin with a vowel to allow for the final syllable of πεινῆσω to be shortened by correption). Ultimately, however, it requires great liberties to be taken with the evidence to believe that a source has mistaken a poem in scazons for an epinician, and it seems in the end to be impossible, given the sources’ clear references to epinician, to take this away from Simonides of

---

Pindar and Bacchylides, see Lasserre 1984, 68.

<sup>203</sup> van Dijk 1997, 138-44.

<sup>204</sup> van Dijk 1997, 144-7.

<sup>205</sup> van Dijk 1997, 147-8; on Archilochean fable cf. Lasserre 1984, 63-4.

<sup>206</sup> cf. van Dijk 1997, 148-50. In a looser sense, the repeated comparison of women to various animals of fr. 7 W would seem to ally Semonides’ iambics to the fable tradition.

<sup>207</sup> Lasserre 1984, 69.

<sup>208</sup> On Hipponax’ persona as anomalous even within iambus, v. Carey 2003.

<sup>209</sup> Adrados 1982, 173-6.

Ceos.<sup>210</sup>

The general point, however, that fable might seem to be especially associated with iambus, and barely associated with epinician at all, remains. An exception, which will be discussed briefly here, is Pindar's second *Pythian*.<sup>211</sup> Here Pindar introduces material which (while not strictly identifiable with an individual fable) seems, as Simonides' story of the fisherman and the octopus, to take us into the animal world of fable, at the same time as interacting specifically with Archilochus, the most important poet of iambus. This is not analogous to the present poem of Simonides (514 *PMG*) to a very high degree: in particular, the use of features associated with fable and iambus are clearly motivated in Pindar's song by a desire or need to engage with the question of blame, envy and the relationship of these to praise, which problem, if it was present in the poem for Orillas, is not visible to us. It is nevertheless instructive to examine the ways in which Pindar here interacts with both fable and the iambic tradition: I take the presence of both of these features as to be considered together (it is not a coincidence that it is in the poem in which he names Archilochus that Pindar also uses fable-like animal imagery).<sup>212</sup> Firstly, then, we may note that the iambic tradition, as represented by Archilochus, is named to be rejected (52-6):

ἐμὲ δὲ χρεῶν  
 φεύγειν δάκος ἀδινὸν κακογοριᾶν·  
 εἶδον γὰρ ἐκὰς ἐὼν τὰ πόλλ' ἐν ἀμαχανίαι.  
 ψογερόν Ἀρχίλοχον βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσιν  
 παινόμενον· τὸ πλουτεῖν δὲ σὺν τύχαι  
 πότμου σοφίας ἄριστον.

But I must flee the continuous biting of slander. For I have seen far off the  
 blameful Archilochus, often resourceless, feeding upon heavy-speaking

<sup>210</sup> Again, perhaps the fact that it was possible to make two *different* possible choliambic fragments from the sources confirms the wisdom of Lasserre 1984, 66n.5, in sceptically referring to Aristotle's comments at *Poet.* 1449a, *Rhet.* 1408b: note that it cannot be that Adrados and myself are both correct: we have versified two different ways of phrasing the same point in the story. In any case, we have, as far as I am aware, no evidence that Simonides of Amorgos composed choliambics.

<sup>211</sup> On this baffling and fascinating poem, see in particular Carey 1981, Most 1985, Gentili et al. 1995 (with bibliography), and most recently, arguing for a special connection with hero-cult, Currie 2005, 258-95. Note in particular the simple and ingenious emendation by which he suggests that the place of the victory can be fixed as Thebes: in u.5, ἐν αἰ<ς> (Currie 2005, 259).

<sup>212</sup> Cf., e.g., Rankin 1975, 252.

hatreds. But to be wealthy through the allotment of destiny is the best part of wisdom.<sup>213</sup>

This might seem a total rejection of the iambic tradition and with it also of blame and enmity in poetry. However, what follows and the parallels given by other passages in Pindaric epinician suggest otherwise. One may find other passages in which Pindar seems to reject blame: most conspicuous is *Nem.* 7.61-3. There as here, it is natural to read the rejection as closely concerned with the present encomiastic situation: in *Nem.* 7, Pindar rejects blame because it is not appropriate in the context of his assumed rôle as a guest-friend (ξεῖνός εἰμι 61) or in the light of the laudandus' qualities as a good man (cf. ἀγαθοῖσι 63). A laudandus by definition should not be the object of blame, so that it is unsurprising if Pindar seems sometimes hostile to blame poetry; but this hostility is not as straightforward as it seems. In *Pyth.* 2, the poet goes on to illustrate Hieron's praiseworthy qualities in the form of his well-used wealth and his successes in battle (it is natural to understand, surely, that his wealth and success is also the *occasion* for envy and slander from lesser men).

Elsewhere it is clear that Pindar can in fact describe the discourse of enmity and blame without rejecting it: thus, at the end of *Nem.* 4 (uu.89-fin.), he states that whoever would praise the trainer Melesias would be a highly effective speaker, "being softly disposed towards good men, but rough when entering the ring against the spiteful." The job of praising the good man seems potentially to entail (at any rate, not to rule out) speech of enmity towards his detractors. The overall impression is summed up by *Nem.* 8.38-9:

ἐγὼ δ' ἀστοῖς ἀδὼν  
καὶ χθονὶ γυῖα καλύψαι,  
αἰνέων αἰνητά, μομφὰν δ' ἐπιπείρων ἀλιτροῖς.  
But I [pray] to cover my limbs with earth finding favour with the townsmen,  
praising the praiseworthy and sowing blame upon evildoers.

<sup>213</sup> The last phrase is capable of being translated in many ways, according to which noun is taking as depending on which. Carey 1981 ad loc. presents the options and argues for the reading given here, taking together a) εὖν τύχαι πότμου and b) σοφίας ἀριστον.

Pindar's rôle as a praise poet does not commit him to the rejection of the poetry of enmity and blame *tout court*: rather, in a world where both praise and blame have their place,<sup>214</sup> any given song of praise is potentially contrastable with the possibility of blame, which possibility is naturally not desirable for the present encomiastic purpose. At the same time, since anybody being praised by Pindar is either potentially or actually the object of somebody else's blame, the poet may choose to reject that blame as being ill-directed, as seems to be the case in *Pyth.* 2.<sup>215</sup> Also within *Pyth.* 2, Pindar's rejection of those who would *wrongly* indulge in blame – i.e., of slanderers – continues as a theme, and it is immediately striking that in this rejection the poet himself takes on some of the characteristics of the iambic poet. Thus, like Archilochus, he uses the animal imagery of fable to describe both the slanderer, whose disposition (ὀργά) is like that of a fox (u.77), and his own desire to “help friends and harm enemies” (83-5):

φίλον εἴη φιλεῖν·  
ποτὶ δ' ἐχθρὸν ἄτ' ἐχθρὸς ἐὼν λύκοιο  
δίκαν ὑποθεύομαι,  
ἄλλ' ἄλλοτε πατέων ὁδοῖς κολιαῖς.

May I be a friend to friends, but towards an enemy, as an enemy I shall run him down in the manner of a wolf, chasing him this way and that on twisting paths.

“Helping friends and harming enemies” is a commonplace;<sup>216</sup> nevertheless, given the wolf image and the explicit reference to Archilochus earlier, it is striking to notice the very close parallel at Archilochus fr.23.14-15 W: ἐπ[ίσταμαί τοι τὸν φιλέοντα] μὲν φιλῆειν, τὸν <δ> ἐχθρὸν ἐχθα[ίρ]ειν “I know how to be

<sup>214</sup> Cf. Nagy 1999, 222; Detienne 1996 [1967], chapter 2, esp. 45-7. *Contra*, Kirkwood 1984, who does his best to minimise the significance of the passage just cited from *Nem.* 8.

<sup>215</sup> And it is hard not to suspect that the occasion of *Pythian* 2 might have been at a time where Hieron had reason to suspect or fear enmity which could easily be conceived of as blame and hatred premised on envy: cf. Most 1985, 89-90. However, the biographical premise that Pindar himself was angry that the commission for the victory went to Bacchylides (e.g. Rankin 1975, following the scholia) seems very unpersuasive. On the other hand, Lloyd-Jones 1973 seems to me to go too far towards Bundy in denying any specific historical answer to the question why blame is so much foregrounded in this poem (the question whether we may tell *what* historical factor might have prompted this is separate from the question whether or not a generic explanation is adequate; cf. my remarks on similar questions regarding *Isthm.* 2, above section 2.8).

<sup>216</sup> Cf. Carey 1981 ad loc.; Cingano ad loc. in Gentili et al. 1995.

a friend to a friend, and an enemy to an enemy.” Both Pindar’s adoption of something of the manner of iambus, in the shape of the animal imagery, and his use of ὀδοῖς κκολιαῖς, suggest that his treatment of the enemy is in a sense his willingness to act as a blamer, a poet of enmity: note the contrast between the chase along crooked paths and the *straight*-talking manner which is best suited to civic life, regardless of constitution (εὐθύγλωσσος ἀνὴρ 86). It is appropriate to act thus against the bad, but not against the good; and the metaphorical expressions leave unclear precisely *how* the poet of praise will attack his enemies.<sup>217</sup>

In *Pythian* 2, therefore, the poet rejects blame and enmity which is premised on envy and expressed through slander, and he associates these with Archilochus and the iambic tradition of blame-poetry. This rejection is not however a rejection of blame *tout court*, which has its place as the blame of the bad, just as praise is praise of the good: *qua* perpetual and professional blamer (as presented by Pindar), Archilochus is “feeding on hatreds,” but there may be a place for a less despicable form of blame as well. He can therefore display his willingness to engage with the bad, with his enemies, in a manner which suggests that he himself is taking on some of the characteristics of the blame poet of the iambic tradition: especially the use of animal simile which recalls the world of fable.

These iambic features, however, are carefully segregated and kept in their proper place. The segregation is largely expressed spatially. Thus Pindar should “flee” from slander (φεύγειν 53) and when he saw Archilochus he did so “being far off” (ἐκὰς ἑών 54). As well as being morally distinguished from his behaviour in other circumstances by virtue of its being directed towards enemies, not friends, his wolf-like chasing is located “out there” in the wild, not here in the city of festivities which has been invoked in the first few lines of the poem. This is after all a poem which likes to emphasise Syracuse and Ortygia through contrasting and focusing distance: the beginning evokes Pindar’s arrival at Ortygia from Thebes, and Hieron’s arrival from the site of victory, wherever it was, is also suggested by the “crowning” of Ortygia with garlands, suggesting the celebrations of his return. The same idea of movement between here and there is once more present in the “garlanded ship” of u.62. Subsequently, movement to

---

<sup>217</sup> Cf. again Carey 1981, Cingano in Gentili et al. 1995, ad loc.

Syracuse is taken up again with the famous description of the song as a piece of Phoenician merchandise which “is sent over the grey sea” (68).<sup>218</sup>

In this context, I wonder whether we can be sure exactly how to understand ἐκὰς ἑών (54). It presumably does to some extent express “the notion of refusal, expressed in spatial terms, which had been introduced with φεύγειν,”<sup>219</sup> which suggests “being myself a long way away from Archilochus.” This is how translators and commentators seem to take it. I wonder, however, whether we might also see it in the context of the poem’s spatial arrangement as described above, so that one might imagine the voice of the poet saying “being a long way away [sc. from here, the site of celebration, where blame has no place], I saw Archilochus...” It would suit the wolf imagery later on to have Archilochus out there where the wild things are, not here in the city, which is garlanded and victorious; as we see from 84-5, our poet can go there too, when the need arises.<sup>220</sup>

Critically, the iambic and fable-like features in *Pythian* 2 are strictly associated with people outside the group of the celebration of which the song is a part, such as the slanderers, and with the poet’s interaction with his enemies. If we are intended to think of present slanderers of the victor, this is left inexplicit. These features are both literally and metaphorically *distanced* from Hieron, from his victory, and from the present circumstance of the performance of the song.

The difference from Simonides’ epinician for Orillas, at least as far as we can tell, is strong. In that poem, it seems that the use of iambic features and interaction with the fable tradition was intimately connected with the present occasion of the song, i.e. the celebration of the victory of Orillas. As we have seen, it appears from our sources that it was in the context of describing the moment when Orillas was given the cloak which was the prize for the games in Pellene that Simonides, presumably in a simile, described the Carian fisherman and his

---

<sup>218</sup> This is a very controversial passage, but the areas of difficulty do not impinge on my present point. See Cingano in Gentili et al. 1995 ad loc. with bibliography. It is unclear whether the reference is to the present song or to another, and thus whether its being “sent” is to be understood literally or metaphorically; in either case it contributes to the same effect, by which the here-and-now of the song’s performance is enhanced by contrast through the motif of arrival from other places. The audience were probably only a minute or two from being in sight of the sea when they heard the song, and presumably saw ships coming in and out of Syracuse every day.

<sup>219</sup> Most 1985, 89.

<sup>220</sup> Others read a primarily chronological sense for ἐκὰς: cf. Cingano in Gentili et al. 1995 ad loc.

dilemma concerning the octopus. Rather than distanced, it appears that this figure of marginality and poverty was brought centre stage, and juxtaposed as closely as could be with the laudandus of the poem. The homely fable tradition, along with the figure of the poor starving fisherman, is brought right next to the laudandus in his moment of glory.

The contrast created by this juxtaposition must have been startling, even if it represented just one small part of a long song. The comparison with Pindar's second *Pythian*, where he most clearly seems to interact with fable and with the iambic tradition, seems if anything to emphasise just how surprising Simonides' use of the same tradition appears here. Simonides' use of this fable in the context of the epinician he composed for the victory of Orillas at Pellene seems to have had the effect of emphasising the contrast between wealth and poverty at a very basic level. The cloak which is the prize of the presumably wealthy victor is shown to us by this comparison less as a prize of honour than as a defence against the elements, and its value as such emphasised by a story which shows poverty in terms of the most basic lacks: of food and of warmth. By contrast, it seems to emphasise the victor's wealth not in the terms we might expect (in relation to generosity, expenditure on activities which promote κλέος, munificence, *megaloprepeia*), but rather in the most hard-headed and pragmatic ones: the assurance of warmth and food. Bizarrely, the closest comparanda seem to be found in the fragments of Hipponax, the most vigorously undignified and unaristocratic figure of all early Greek poetry. It is surely not difficult to imagine that Simonides' use of such striking means to describe and emphasise features of the meaning of wealth might have been an important factor in the development of his subsequent anecdotal reputation. Simonides can here be seen as somebody who, even in the halls of the wealthy, retains a view of wealth which is founded not on any sort of aristocratic ideology but on an almost cynical pragmatism. He looks somewhat like the Simonides of anecdote, who could define the noble as "those who have been rich for a long time," or make a pointed joke on the presence of the wise at the doors of the wealthy. A cloak from Pellene must have been perceived as a prize, an heirloom, a sign of ἀρετή and a source of pride, but it seems that in the song to celebrate it Simonides did not let his audience forget that cloaks have another, less grand but equally important function. We have only two words of this song in direct quotation, and it is of course important

to acknowledge that the part which we can discern must have been only a small part of a substantial and varied whole, but this small part is somewhere where we can see startling elements of continuity between Simonides' treatment of wealth in his own songs and important aspects of his later reputation.



## Chapter 4

### Simonides, history and κλέος: Theocritus' *Charites* or *Hieron*

#### 1. Introduction

Theocritus 16, as will be seen, is a work of particular interest with respect to the reception of Simonides in antiquity, especially insofar as that it presents us (as I propose to argue) with a Simonides who is made up both from elements in the anecdotal tradition and from aspects of his own poems. It further provides a kind of case study for how the rediscovery of more of Simonides' own poems can affect our understanding of his reception: the Simonidean elegiac fragments which we know since the publication of *P.Oxy.* 3965 have the capacity significantly to enhance our understanding of what Simonides means in the context of this fascinating treatment of themes connected with remuneration and patronage.

The poem praises Hieron II of Syracuse, whose personal reign lasted from 275/4 to 216/5 BC.<sup>1</sup> The date of the poem is usually supposed to be shortly after Hieron's assumption of power as elected autocratic *strategos* in 275/4 and before his taking the title of *basileus* in 269; the evidence for this is far from unambiguous, but on internal grounds the poem seems to celebrate Hieron's accession to power and to view his greatness largely in terms of his future achievements rather than accomplishments belonging to the past. Aspects of the rhetoric of the poem seem to point to a sense of a new beginning, which would seem especially apt in the event of Hieron's personal reign being newly commenced.<sup>2</sup>

Some modern treatments of the poem have begun with a comment that, by comparison with the bucolic poems of the earlier part of the corpus of Theocritus, *Idyll* 16 has been little studied.<sup>3</sup> This is now much less true than it

---

<sup>1</sup> On the biography of Hieron II, see Klaus Meister in *Der Neue Pauly* s.v. Hieron [2], with further references, *CAH*<sup>2</sup> VII and VIII indices s.v. "Hiero II, tyrant of Syracuse"; and see further below.

<sup>2</sup> See the introduction to Gow's commentary; Hunter 1996, 82-7, with further bibliography.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Griffiths 1979, 3 "a side of the poet [sc. his "courtly" writing, with particular reference to 16]... which has never been systematically studied;" cf. Austin 1967, 1-2.

was, and there is a substantial amount of excellent scholarship on the poem, treating if not resolving questions concerning its metapoetic content, its relation to poetry of the past (the main concern of this study) and its creation of a model of patronage and the poetic response to patronage.<sup>4</sup> In particular, interpreters have focused on the potentially bewildering variety of voices and generic models to be found in the poem, which can give the impression of incoherence or inconstancy.<sup>5</sup>

What follows does not purport to be a complete or general reading of the poem; many obvious areas of interest will be overlooked, and in particular material where I have little to add to the coverage in Hunter's book will be treated only briefly. Rather it is focused on an attempt to understand the rôle and function of the figure of Simonides in the poem. However, this question is not one which may be studied entirely in isolation, and this focus will be complemented by the advocacy of a more general position. I attempt to show that the poem, while strongly marked by an enigmatic polysemy associated with the contrast of different voices on which scholars have commented, is nevertheless capable of being read, in a manner which, it is hoped, is not too reductive, as being interpretable as a serious encomium of Hieron. This encomium is largely rooted in identifiable aspects of his personal monarchic ideology and self-presentation in the context of the history of Sicily, and it uses the example of Simonides to draw a contrast between one sort of commemoration, motivated by greed, and another, motivated by the desire to celebrate great deeds. While Theocritus' reflections upon patronage and the rôle of poetry are problematised and strange, they are by this reading nevertheless neither incoherent nor altogether aporetic.

---

<sup>4</sup> In addition to Griffiths 1979 and Austin 1967, see Gutzwiller 1983, Goldhill 1991, 280-3, and Hunter 1996, ch.3. Hunter's chapter is now the best treatment and the natural starting point for further research, and such has been forthcoming. Now see also Fantuzzi 2000, Vox 2002, in addition to articles with more specific reference which will be cited below.

<sup>5</sup> See Hunter 1996, 77. For Griffiths 1979 in particular, the poem is ultimately incoherent and disingenuous, and his account of it is an attempt to explain these features and to describe how Theocritus has concealed them: see in particular 16 ("a masterpiece of indirection"... "inconsistency"), 20 ("... why are readers so tolerant or unaware of the radical reversal of attitude within the poem?"), etc.

## 2. Simonides in Theocritus 16: an outline

As an orientation, it may be helpful to give here a brief outline of the ways in which it may be perceived that the poem interacts with the figure of Simonides; these will be discussed more fully in due course. It is convenient (simply for the sake of clarity) to divide these types of interaction into categories. Firstly, significant aspects of the poem, as has been recognised since the scholia, are at least partially derived from the anecdotal tradition concerning Simonides. In particular, as the scholia saw,<sup>6</sup> Theocritus' conception of the *charites* dwelling in a box, in the context of the desire to be remunerated for poetry, represents an allusion to a Simonidean anecdote found in several places elsewhere, where Simonides is shown refusing to compose "as a favour" by indicating two chests, one of "favours" (*charites*) and another of money: the former is empty. When, acknowledging the presence of this anecdote and further alerted by the specific mention of Simonides to be found at u.44, we read the poem while wearing, so to speak, Simonidean spectacles, we may choose to read other passages also in connection with such anecdotes. It appears that identifiable allusion to Simonidean anecdotal material is characteristic of the first part of Theocritus' poem.

Secondly, in uu.34-47, Theocritus extensively and explicitly appeals to the example of the fame provided by Simonides for his patrons in Thessaly: despite their wealth, we are told, these would have gone unremembered had it not been for Simonides' poetic activity.

Thirdly, there are places in which Theocritus' language seems to allude to passages of poems of Simonides which are available also to us; this has become especially clear since the publication of the "new Simonides" in 1992. Specifically, scholars have seen an allusion to Simonides' Plataea elegy in uu.45-6

---

<sup>6</sup> Σ Theoc. 16 arg. (p.93 col.ii.26-32 Dübner). The version of the scholia is peculiar, in that it gives Διδόντων as the content of the full box, where δοθέντων might have been expected (and has been printed as a correction; see Dübner 1878, 163): we have a box of "givers" instead of a box of "gifts." But the scholiast doubtless had in mind the circumstances of the poem, where a lack of givers is the point; and the confusion between gifts and givers seems to some extent to mirror the reciprocal sense of χάρις: "gift," but also the quality to be associated with the attitude of mind of both giver and recipient. It seems as much like a variant of a myth as like a scribal error, narrowly perceived. For a defense of the transmitted διδόντων and a critical survey of the variants in the indirect tradition see Wendel 1920, 104-5 n. 1.

of Theocritus' poem; I shall try to develop this line of argument further below.<sup>7</sup>

### 3. Theocritus 16 and Sicilian ideology: historical readings

While many aspects of the life and times of Hieron II are partially or entirely obscure to us, we are fortunate for present purposes in that we have a reasonable quantity of information which helps us to understand the ideological background against which Theocritus 16 was written, both in terms of longer lasting Sicilian traditions and the preoccupations of Hieron specifically.<sup>8</sup> We may start from his name. Hieron was named, as is common, after his grandfather;<sup>9</sup> since his father was called Hierokles, perhaps names of this root were a family tradition. We might guess that already at the time of the naming of his grandfather (perhaps during the reign of Dionysius II, 367-57?) Hieron II's ancestors on his father's side wished to present themselves as the heirs of the Deinomenid tyrants of the early fifth century, including Hieron I, the patron of Simonides, Pindar and Bacchylides. So much is conjecture: we know little about the family of Hieron II before his own time, and in any case Hieron is not an uncommon name.<sup>10</sup> The names of the subsequent generation are more conclusive. Hieron called his first son Gelon, the name of Hieron I's brother, tyrant first of Gela and then of Syracuse, and his daughter Damarete, which was the name of the first Gelon's wife (the daughter of Theron of Akragas).<sup>11</sup> It is therefore clear that Hieron wished to exploit the resonances of his name and to emphasise the connection suggested by his own name between himself and the Deinomenid brothers of the early fifth century. The same impression is borne out by a passage of Pausanias (6.12.2-4): we learn that statues of Hieron II were erected at Olympia,

<sup>7</sup> Vox 2002 is the account of the poem which most extensively draws specific connections between the expression of individual parts of Theocritus 16 and known passages of Simonides.

<sup>8</sup> Scholarship has generally made little use of this evidence, although see Griffiths 1979, 12-14, for a different assessment from that given here, and also Hans 1985, who presents some of the arguments which I attempt to take further here and to integrate into the interpretation of the poem.

<sup>9</sup> An inscription from Delphi honours Hieron II's father, whose father is also named: *FD* III.3 no. 157 (dated to 279/8 or 276/5).

<sup>10</sup> As Simon Hornblower points out to me: for *Ἱέρων* and *Ἱέρων* together, *LGPN* IIIA gives 23 men from Sicily alone, and the name is also common elsewhere in the west and in the Greek world more broadly. So it is unsafe to build much on the name of Hieron II's grandfather.

<sup>11</sup> Hieron II was pre-deceased by his son Gelon and succeeded in 215/14 by Hieronymus (another name of the *Ἱέρων*-root). It seems unclear whether this was his son or his grandson (see *Der Neue Pauly* s.v. Hieronymus (3); J. Briscoe in *CAH*<sup>2</sup> VIII.61).

immediately beside a celebrated epinician monument of Hieron I. Unfortunately the erection of these statues is not dated (they should post-date Theocritus' encomium, since Pausanias says that they were erected by Hieron's sons); we may imagine that they might have been intended to commemorate a military victory, and the purpose must in any case have been to present Hieron II to a pan-Hellenic audience as a counterpart to his earlier namesake.<sup>12</sup>

When we bear in mind that the times of Hieron II were marked by conflict with Carthaginians and Etruscans, and that prior to his becoming ruler he had already served against the Carthaginians with Pyrrhus (c.278-6), and also the evidence concerning Sicilian traditions about the early fifth century (discussed below), we may confidently follow Hieron II's most recent biographer in her description of the motivation behind this propagandistic strategy:

Gerone desiderava essere considerato re per volontà del popolo [...]. Il fatto stesso che ai primi due figli, Gelone e Damarata, avesse imposto dei nomi che ricordavano due famose figure della famiglia dei Dinomenidi, rivela che Gerone aveva inteso presentarsi come discendente diretto della più antica dinastia siracusana, rimasta viva nel ricordo della grecità siceliota per le grandi vittorie che sotto Gelone e Gerone erano state rispettivamente sui Cartaginesi e sugli Etruschi.<sup>13</sup>

For our purposes it would be helpful if we could confidently date the development of this strategy of self-presentation back as far as the probable date of Theocritus' poem. This is not possible to a high level of certainty, but nevertheless seems plausible. Firstly, as suggested above, the naming practices of Hieron's family *might* suggest that they wished to be considered as the heirs of the Deinomenids even before our Hieron's birth; secondly, it might seem to make sense *a priori* that Hieron should have wished to justify his power and present his claim to authority and popularity at the beginning of his reign in particular; and thirdly (most significantly) it seems most likely that the date of birth of Hieron's son Gelon was close in time to his assumption first of power and then of the title

---

<sup>12</sup> Hieron II was not, as far as we know, an Olympic victor in the games (his name is not recorded in Moretti 1957); however, Lehmler 2005, 87 considers the possibility that Syracusan coins with olive wreath devices might refer to an otherwise unrecorded victory.

<sup>13</sup> De Sensi Sestito 1977, 183. Cf. Lehmler 2005, 196ff.

*basileus*: Gelon became co-regent with his father at about 240, and one might therefore imagine that he was born about thirty years before, and at least that his birth dated to the earlier part of Hieron's reign.<sup>14</sup>

It therefore seems very reasonable to suppose that, whatever its precise date, Theocritus 16 was composed for a ruler who was already interested in developing a strategy of self-presentation which emphasised a perception of himself as a successor to the Deinomenid brothers of two hundred years earlier, doubtless especially in the context of their famous victories at Himera and Cumae against barbarians of the same ethnic stripe as the Carthaginian and Etruscan enemies of Hieron II. So far, therefore, we might suppose that (contrary to some scholarly opinion<sup>15</sup>) the circumstances were very promising for Theocritus. Hieron's name, his local identity as a Syracusan, his military ambitions and his own propagandising strategy all point in the same direction: towards the most distinguished and impressive models available for an encomiastic poet, i.e. to the heyday of epinician in the early fifth century, and to the great poets Simonides, Pindar and Bacchylides, all of whom produced some of their best known work for the very same Sicilian tyrants with whom Hieron was eagerly associating himself.<sup>16</sup>

Was Hieron II familiar with the poems composed for Hieron I, his brothers and allies? We have no evidence on this question, but the evidence of Theocritus' poem itself strongly suggests that he was, and that some of his court will have been. The Sicilian poems of the composers of choral lyric must have been

<sup>14</sup> Thus, on (I imagine) the same grounds, *LGPV* dates the birth of Gelon to "ca. 270". On the date of his elevation to *basileus* alongside his father, see De Sensi Sestito 1977, 125ff.

<sup>15</sup> Especially Griffiths 1979, who argues (on, as far as I can see, little evidence) that Hieron must have seemed a very unpromising patron: v. esp. 13-14 "... a dismal prospect for a patron..."; "for the moment, he offered the eulogist an abundance of things not to talk about." This latter statement is ill-phrased, but I think Griffiths means simply that Hieron had not yet achieved anything (but presumably his part in fighting alongside Pyrrhus would have offered an encomiast something, and at any rate the people of Syracuse seem to have considered him sufficiently accomplished to make him a special military dictator). Compare Kyriakou 2004, 230 n.18: "the glory of the Plataea victory would dwarf all possible achievements of the majority of Theocritus' prospective patrons." To the extent that this is true (from a *Roman* point of view, are the Punic wars generally considered just a little local difficulty?), it is true only with hindsight, and the analogy need not have seemed so much of a mismatch at the time. On the relevance of Plataea, see further below, section 4.7.

<sup>16</sup> A tradition of very difficult relations between Theocritus and Hieron II is preserved in various different versions by the scholia to Ovid *Ibis* 549, where Theocritus (or another Syracusan poet with a similar name) is said to have been put to death either as a result of having insulted Hieron or of having insulted Jupiter. In its more extended version (b in La Penna 1959), this includes detail which does not appear to have been invented to explain the Ovidian passage. cf. Griffiths 1979, 12n.13.

available on Sicily in the early third century; one might imagine that these would have been attractive to Hieron in the context of the self-presentation delineated above. Re-performance is not impossible (the occasion might have been cult of the Deinomenids, worshipped as heroes on Sicily; in any case, Hieron would have been able to organise either solo or choral performances of the old poems if he wanted to); otherwise, there must in any case have been some form of written circulation.<sup>17</sup>

This ideological background can be seen reflected in Theocritus' poem. Perhaps in general the very strong presence of Pindaric allusion in the poem, as well as the specific reference to Simonides, might itself have recalled the Deinomenids. The abundant allusion to Pindar in the poem has been long recognised;<sup>18</sup> as Hunter states, "one strategy of *Idyll* 16 is to offer Hiero II the chance to enjoy the same relationship with Theocritus that Hiero I of Syracuse enjoyed with poets, particularly Pindar,"<sup>19</sup> and again "*Idyll* 16 is a brilliant mosaic of Pindaric reminiscence."<sup>20</sup> However, I think Hunter is also right to select out Pindar's *Pythian* 1 as a particularly significant and important source-text.<sup>21</sup> Specifically, he identifies Theocritus' prayer for peace at 82-97 as alluding to *Pyth.* 1.67-75<sup>22</sup> (noting in particular u.97 ~ *Pyth.* 1.72), and his attack on the hoarding of wealth and emphasis on κλέος brought through poetry and expenditure as a "reworking" of Pindar's closing advice to Hieron (*Pyth.* 1.87-fin.).

This use of *Pyth.* 1 clearly fits in very well with the tendencies already noted in Hieron's self-portrayal: it is the poem in which Pindar most directly celebrates the Deinomenids' victories against the Carthaginians and Etruscans, at Himera and Cumae.<sup>23</sup> It also represents the earliest example of a tendency in Sicilian

<sup>17</sup> On reperformance see most recently Currie 2004, Hubbard 2004; for the Deinomenids as heroes on Sicily, Vox 2002, 203; Currie 2005, 171-2 for Gelon, and for Hieron, 3 and index s.v. "Hieron I of Syracuse, hero cult of." The cult of Hieron was abandoned in Aetna/Catana in 467 (Strabo 6.2.3), but one might suppose that when Aetna moved to the site called Inessa "and declared Hieron *oikistes*" (Strabo, loc. cit.) the cult was continued there. Cf. D. Asheri in *CAH*<sup>2</sup> V.157-8. This might or might not have continued until Theocritus' time (on the history of both Aetnas, see also T. Fischer-Hansen et al. in Hansen and Nielsen 2004, 184-6).

<sup>18</sup> Apart from Gow, see in particular Hunter 1996, 82-90 with further references.

<sup>19</sup> Hunter 1996, 83.

<sup>20</sup> Hunter 1996, 84.

<sup>21</sup> Hunter 1996, 84-7: "it is above all *Pythian* 1 which is the central Pindaric text for understanding this poem" (84).

<sup>22</sup> cf. Gow ad u.82. On allusion to Bacchylides fr.4 M. here, see below, section 4.9.

<sup>23</sup> As Chris Carey points out to me, it would also be especially apt if, as has been argued is quite possible, the poem was composed close to the time of the birth of Hieron II's son Gelon: compare the interest in Hieron I's son Deinomenes shown at *Pyth.* 1.58f, 69f.

tradition and historiography which, it will be argued below, may also be relevant to the understanding of the place of Simonides in Theocritus 16. This is the tendency to bring together the Sicilian wars against the Carthaginians and Etruscans with the contemporary wars in mainland Greece against the Persians, such that they appear almost part of the same struggle against ‘the barbarian’ (*Pyth.* 1.71-80):

λίσσομαι νεῦσον, Κρονίων, ἥμερον  
ὄφρα κατ οἶκον ὁ Φοῖνιξ ὁ Τυρσα-  
νῶν τ ἀλαλατὸς ἔχηι, ναυ-  
σίστονον ὕβριν ἰδὼν τὰν πρὸ Κύμας,

οἷα Κυρακοσίων ἀρχῶι δαμασθέντες πάθον,  
ὠκυπόρων ἀπὸ ναῶν ὃ σφιν ἐν πόν-  
τῳ βάλεθ ἀλικίαν,  
Ἑλλάδ ἐξέλκων βαρείας δουλίας. ἀρέομαι  
παρ μὲν Καλαμῖνος Ἀθηναίων χάριν  
μισθόν, ἐν Σπάρτῃ δ ἐρέω πρὸ Κιθαιρῶνος μάχαν,  
ταῖσι Μῆδῃσι κάμον ἀγυλότοξοι,  
παρὰ δὲ τὰν εὐδρον ἀκτὰν  
Ἰμέρα παίδεσσιν ὕμνον Δεινομένεος τελέσαις,  
τὸν ἐδέξαντ ἀμφ ἀρετῇ, πολεμίων ἀνδρῶν καμόντων.

Grant, I beg you, son of Kronos, that the Phoenician and the battle cry of the Etruscans remain quiet at home, having seen their ship-destroying aggression before Cumae, such experiences did they suffer when they were overcome by the leader of the Syracusans, who cast their young men from the swift ships into the sea, extracting Greece from painful slavery. At Salamis I shall earn the gratitude (*charis*) of the Athenians as payment (*misthos*), and in Sparta I shall tell of the battle in front of Cithaeron, places where the Medes with curved bow were defeated; but by the well watered banks of the Himeras I shall pay my song to the sons of Deinomenes, which they won through their achievement, their enemies being vanquished.

*Pythian* 1 dates from the victory of Hieron I in the chariot race at Delphi in 470,



but this tradition of closely connecting the Sicilian battles with the contemporary Persian wars continued until Hieron II's time and later. Thus Herodotus was aware of a tradition on Sicily in his own time, according to which the battles of Himera and Salamis occurred on the same day;<sup>24</sup> Diodorus Siculus, probably following Timaeus, tells us that the battle at Himera occurred on the same day as Thermopylae.<sup>25</sup>

We can see, therefore, that some of Theocritus' poetic strategies in the encomium for Hieron fit closely into a pattern of Sicilian attitudes to the wars of the early fifth century, and more specifically into the pattern of association of Hieron II with the Deinomenid tyrants which the former promoted.

This fairly precise connection, once established and recognised, can help us to understand better certain details of the poem. Verses 82-7 represent a prayer for Hieron's future military success:

αἶ γὰρ, Ζεῦ κύδιστε πάτερ καὶ πότι Αθάνα  
κούρη θ ἥ σὺν μητρὶ πολυκλήρων Εφυραίων  
εἴληχας μέγα ἄστυ παρ ὕδασι Λυσιμελείας,  
ἐχθροὺς ἐκ νάσοιο κακαὶ πέμψειαν ἀνάγκαι  
Καρδόνιον κατὰ κῦμα φίλων μόρον ἀγγέλλοντας  
τέκνοις ἤδ' ἀλόχοισιν, ἀριθμητοὺς ἀπὸ πολλῶν.

Ah, glorious father Zeus, and mistress Athena, and you, Maiden, who with your mother holds the great city of the rich Ephyraeans by the waters of Lysimeleia,<sup>26</sup> let harsh compulsion send our enemies from this island over the Sardinian sea, bringing news of the death of relatives to children and wives, messengers easy to count from the many who left.

The special attention to Demeter and Kore is unsurprising, as they were the objects of local cult; but it is perhaps relevant that this cult was established in Syracuse by Hieron and Gelon in 480 BC, in commemoration of the battle at

<sup>24</sup> Hdt. 7.166.

<sup>25</sup> Diodorus Siculus 11.24.1. On Diodorus' use of Timaeus here see Meister 1967, 43 (Meister compares the use of synchrony at Timaeus *FGH* 566 F 105).

<sup>26</sup> Lysimeleia was a marshy area close to Syracuse, mentioned also at Thuc. 7.53 (Gow ad loc.).

Himera.<sup>27</sup>

The lines seem to present two especially striking features. The first is the designation of the sea which the expelled enemy will cross while returning to north Africa. As Gow tells us, “the Καρδόνιον... πέλαγος is properly the sea to the West and South of Sardinia..., whereas that which the retiring Carthaginians will traverse is the Αιβυκόν, the division between the two being marked by the western extremity of Sicily.”<sup>28</sup> This inaccuracy, if such it is, is perhaps slightly surprising, since this is a passage where Theocritus is clearly taking care to “customise,” so to speak, the poem for Sicily, and one might expect him to have taken care over such things. The suggestion of Dover may point in the right direction: “Theocritus must envisage [the Carthaginians] as defeated on the north coast of Sicily; and possibly he is influenced by Pindar’s mention [sc. at *Pyth.* 1.72] of the battle off Cumae.”<sup>29</sup> If this is correct, I should prefer to suggest in any case a more purposive and deliberate mechanism than “influence.” We may note that the Pindaric passage which Theocritus has been reworking refers to the battles at Cumae and at Himera, which is located in the middle of the northern coast of Sicily, so that those sailing away from it to north Africa would sail north away from the coast and then westwards through the Sardinian sea (avoiding, naturally, the straits of Messina) before heading southwards. In either case, it can be seen that the way in which Theocritus specifies the sea to the north of Sicily, where (since Africa is south of Sicily) the south might have seemed more natural, could be considered suggestive of either of these two early fifth century battles, especially in a context where his recent use of *Pyth.* 1 already points the reader in this direction.

The second striking feature is the remainder of the same sentence, where the aftermath of the putative expulsion of the Carthaginians is presented in a vivid and pathetic manner. Those who escape will bring news of the deaths of the Carthaginians to their wives and children, and will be “countable from many:” i.e., they will be sufficiently few in number to be counted easily (we may observe the propagandistic strategy by which the Sicilian Carthaginians are perceived as if recent invaders with their families at home, like the Persians in the invasion of

---

<sup>27</sup> Diodorus Siculus 11.26.7; Currie 2005, 346 with n.12.

<sup>28</sup> Gow ad loc., where references are given.

<sup>29</sup> Dover 1971, ad loc.; the same interpretation is argued by Hans 1985, 121n.28.

the early fifth century: in fact there had of course been Carthaginians settled on Sicily for many generations before Himera, never mind before the early third century).<sup>30</sup>

Although neither the idea nor the expression is so anomalous as to need special explanation, this picture of the defeated Carthaginians seems to allude to Sicilian traditions about the aftermath of the battle of Himera. Diodorus, for the most part at least following Timaeus, gives two slightly different versions concerning survivors. At first he reports a version where none survived at all: τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον μηδὲ ἄγγελον εἰς τὴν Καρχηδόνα διασωθῆναι “in the proverbial phrase, not even a messenger survived to bring the news to Carthage.”<sup>31</sup> Soon afterwards, however, Diodorus gives a more detailed account. We are told that, after the battle of Himera, twenty warships escaped, and picked up many fugitives. Being too heavily laden, however, these were sunk in a storm, ὀλίγοι δέ τινες ἐν μικρῷ κάρφει διασωθέντες διεσάφησαν τοῖς πολίταις, εὐντομον ποιητάμενοι τὴν ἀπόφασιν, ὅτι πάντες οἱ διαβάντες εἰς τὴν Κικελίαν ἀπολώλασιν “and a few were saved in a small dinghy to enlighten their fellow-citizens, making their report in summary fashion: that all who had sailed to Sicily were dead.”<sup>32</sup> There follows a vivid account of the reactions of the families of the deceased.<sup>33</sup> This account is again believed to come from Timaeus.<sup>34</sup> It might also have been the case that Theocritus’ reference to the repopulation of “towns... which the hands of enemies entirely destroyed” (uu.88-9) would have been understood as having special reference to Himera, which was destroyed by the Carthaginians in 409 BC.<sup>35</sup>

It seems that in his picture of small numbers of survivors escaping from the north coast of Sicily to bring the news to the relatives of the fallen in Carthage,

<sup>30</sup> For the idiom, see the passages cited by Gow ad loc. For the Phoenicians on Sicily, Thuc. 6.2.6.

<sup>31</sup> Diodorus Siculus 11.23.2; the context is a comparison of Himera and Plataea.

<sup>32</sup> Diodorus Siculus 11.24.2; this passage and the previous one cited by Gow ad u.86, without comment, and apparently simply noting the motif of survivors carrying a message.

<sup>33</sup> Mourning indoors (this should be wives and mothers); then persons seeking news of their sons and brothers, which, being done of strangers outdoors, would not (in a Greek context, whether or not in Carthage) be appropriate to wives seeking husbands; then orphans bewailing their fathers.

<sup>34</sup> Meister 1967, 43 (“ein timäischer *topos*”); but, as Simon Hornblower cautions me, there is not usually a strong consensus on the proper answers to questions of *Quellenforschung* concerning Diodorus: see D.M. Lewis at *CAH*<sup>2</sup> VI, 120-4. On these features in Theocritus’ poem as Timaeus, see Hans 1985, 120-1.

<sup>35</sup> See *Der Neue Pauly* s.v. Himera, where the reference to Diodorus for the date of the battle ought to be to 13.59-62, not to the same chapters of book 11 (the error being carried over into the English translation as well). Himera was not in fact repopulated, being still deserted in Strabo’s time (6.2.6).

Theocritus makes even the details of the hoped-for victory correspond to traditions of his own time concerning the battle of Himera, thus contributing to the larger propagandistic project: as Hieron is to be the modern successor of the Deinomenids, so his battles will be almost repeat performances of theirs.<sup>36</sup>

#### 4. Simonides in Theocritus 16: the anecdotal tradition

The impression created by the above study of the relation between Theocritus 16 and the self-presentation of Hieron II is a rather unproblematic one. When we trace the way in which Theocritus co-operates with the propaganda of his *laudandus* we get a clear impression of a poem organised around praise: an encomium that, so to speak, does what it says on the tin. This impression is largely the result of the selectivity of the passages which I have treated above: it is, unsurprisingly, in the places which seem most uncomplicatedly encomiastic that Theocritus can be perceived as interacting in the way described with the ideology of Sicilian attitudes to the early fifth century and with Hieron II's use of this ideology and self-presentation. When we now return to the reception of Simonides in the poem and then the way in which this may be interpreted in the light of the propagandistic features described above, we see a more complex picture.

It was already understood by the scholia that the conceit of the earlier part of the poem is partly derived from an anecdote concerning Simonides.<sup>37</sup> The clearest version of this anecdote is at Stob. 3.10.38:

Σιμωνίδην παρακαλοῦντος τινὸς ἐγκώμιον ποιῆσαι καὶ χάριν ἔξειν λέγοντος, ἀργύριον δὲ μὴ διδόντος. "δύο" εἶπεν οὗτος "ἔχω κιβωτούς, τὴν μὲν χαρίτων, τὴν δὲ ἀργυρίου· καὶ πρὸς τὰς μὲν τῶν χαρίτων κενὴν εὐρίσκω, ὅταν ἀνοίξω, τὴν δὲ χρησίμην μόνην."

Simonides was asked to compose an encomium by somebody who said that he

<sup>36</sup> Even the picture of the countryside at peace in *uu.* 90-96, which is regularly perceived as a kind of proto-pastoral, and which Hunter 1996, 88-89 relates to the just king of Hesiod *WD* 225-47, might also be more specifically related to the ideology and interests of Hieron II, who composed a lost work on agriculture (Varro *res rusticae* 1.1.8, Columella *de re rustica* 1.1.8; see Shipley 2000, 344); as Shipley suggests, his concern was presumably both the increase of revenues and self-presentation as being concerned for the land and its people.

<sup>37</sup> On the version preserved in the scholia, see above, section 4.2.

would receive *charis*, but offered no money. “I have two chests,” said Simonides, “one of *charites* and the other of money. And going to them I find the one of *charites* empty whenever I open it, and only the other one useful.”

From the perception of *charites* (“thanks;” “instances of goodwill”) described as if tangible objects which might be stored in a container, combined with a natural development of *Charites* “the Graces,” as patrons of song and presences at the performance of song, Theocritus’ *charites* have become the poems themselves,<sup>38</sup> again perceived as concrete objects – i.e., papyrus rolls<sup>39</sup> – and they are seen as travelling to the houses of potential patrons in the hope of remuneration.

Theocritus’ creative re-imagining of the motif from Simonidean anecdote may be seen as a way in which he picks up on difficulties and tensions perceived in the patronage situation. His use of this tradition (through its association with Simonides) gives to his own professed search for patronage a sense of historical precedent, so that this tradition becomes a way of historicising the present predicament of the poet who might seek remuneration and patronage, even at the same time as this presentation of his own practice becomes a comment on the tradition itself.

Merkelbach related the movement from house to house to customs (ancient and more recent) where singers move between houses demanding remuneration for their songs with a combination of praise and threats,<sup>40</sup> and we can see that this “Bettelgedicht” tradition was in the background of the situation as described by Theocritus. One may consider this appeal to “Bettelgedichte” as itself part of the reception of Simonides in the poem, especially when the presentation of Simonides in Aristophanes’ *Birds* is borne in mind,<sup>41</sup> and again since above I have tried to show that aspects of Simonides’ own poems may have themselves contained passages with motifs such as the need for warm clothing which would have placed them in dialogue with a tradition of begging poetry, and I have considered Simonides 25 W in this context, arguing that it at least has a good

---

<sup>38</sup> See Gow ad u.6.

<sup>39</sup> On the movement from poem as performance to poem as book here, see Bing 1988, 20-1.

<sup>40</sup> Merkelbach 1952. Related themes were treated in an interesting paper presented by R. Martin at the conference “Poeti vaganti” in Cambridge, April 2005, and forthcoming in the proceedings of the same.

<sup>41</sup> See above, section 3.4.

chance of being genuinely Simonidean.<sup>42</sup> Was it in imitation of a specific, single Simonidean model that Theocritus echoed this tradition? This was the opinion of Merkelbach,<sup>43</sup> but in this respect his arguments may be found wanting. Theocritus will doubtless have known children's "trick-or-treat" songs from his own experience; he will have known such phenomena as the epigrams attributed to Homer from his awareness of literary tradition;<sup>44</sup> he will have been able to perceive an association between Simonides and "Bettelgedicht" in elements of Simonidean anecdote, already known by his time, and (unless I am mistaken) in certain aspects of Simonidean poems which I have analysed in this context above.<sup>45</sup> It is not tenable to suppose that large elements of his treatment of the theme might not have been substantially innovative or that he necessarily drew in an unmediated way on a lost Simonidean exemplar of *Bettelgedicht*.<sup>46</sup> One may note the suggestive combination of motifs, given the similar elements present elsewhere in the anecdotal tradition, and given that they are presented here in conjunction with clear allusion to a part of this tradition (i.e., the story of the two boxes), and the manner in which the perception of this tradition expands our appreciation of the variety of voices in the poem.<sup>47</sup>

The anecdote itself seems to fit into a pattern which has been identified already in other stories associating Simonides with money: Simonides is shown as a figure whose concern with money is illustrated by his ability to "translate" from the language of reciprocity, associated with gift-giving, hospitality and "favours," into the language of money. This is especially clear in the Stobaeian version cited, where the distinction operates between χάριτες and ἀργύριον (and the reference is thus specifically to coin). This distinction is perhaps more veiled where in place of ἀργύριον we have reference to gifts (as in the scholia), but the general idea is the same, with the distinction between tangible objects and intangible sentiments or dispositions. The contrast between the different perceptions of exchange is marked by the way in which one is treated as if it were

<sup>42</sup> See above, sections 3.12-3.18, esp. 3.17-3.18.

<sup>43</sup> Merkelbach 1952, 320-1.

<sup>44</sup> Merkelbach 1952, 321; cf. Hunter, 92-3.

<sup>45</sup> Above, chapter 3, part 2.

<sup>46</sup> cf. Griffiths 1979, 23 with n.37.

<sup>47</sup> cf. e.g. Hunter, 89: "this combination of mime, comedy, children's song, hymn and encomium," with reference to Merkelbach for the element "children's song;" on mime, see in particular Fantuzzi 2000, 144-5.

the other: we are invited to imagine how one could keep “goodwill” or “friendly disposition” or “reciprocal benefit” in a box, in the same way in which one could keep coined money.<sup>48</sup> The flavour seems quite different from the exalted tone and powerful encomiastic associations of the latter part of the poem, from u.66 or so onwards; the emphasis in the earlier part of the poem on the need for remuneration, organised around Theocritus’ adaptation of the Simonidean anecdote material, is likewise apparently contradicted by Theocritus’ rejection of avarice at uu.66-9. I shall develop further below the notion that we can read the poem in terms of contrast between the attitudes in these different sections.

The story of the two boxes is the most prominent element of the Simonidean anecdotal tradition in Theocritus 16, but prompted by its prominence it is natural to read other parts of the poem in a similar way. Thus, where the miserly imagined patron is shown saying θεοὶ τιμῶσιν ἀοιδούς (“the gods honour poets”) it seems natural (perhaps especially given the later emphasis on Simonides’ Thessalian patrons, on which see below) to think of the celebrated anecdote concerning the house falling down, known to us particularly from Cicero (*de oratore* 2.86) and Quintilian (11.2.11ff.), but which, as we have already seen, was known much earlier than this.<sup>49</sup> The skinflint patron here fills the rôle of the Thessalian nobleman, who told Simonides to go to the Dioskouroi for the rest of his fee. It is tempting to go further on this point: the reader who has perceived the importance of Simonidean anecdote in the poem may use this to revise the first lines:

Αἰεὶ τοῦτο Διὸς κόυραις μέλει, αἰὲν ἀοιδοῖς,  
 ὕμνῃν ἀθανάτους, ὕμνῃν ἀγαθῶν κλέα ἀνδρῶν.  
 Μοῖσαι μὲν θεὰὶ ἐντί, θεοὺς θεὰὶ ἀείδοντι·  
 ἄμμες δὲ βροτοὶ οἶδε, βροτοὺς βροτοὶ ἀείδωμεν.

This is always the concern of the daughters of Zeus, and always of poets: to hymn the immortals, and to hymn the glorious deeds of good men. The Muses are goddesses, and goddesses sing of the gods; we here are mortals, and as mortals let us sing of mortals.

<sup>48</sup> cf. Carson 1999, 19-21, for a description of the paradoxical element in the idea of a box of *charites* (but her translation of the anecdote is inaccurate and merges different sources).

<sup>49</sup> Simonides 510 *PMG*, on which see section 3.10 above; the allusion in Theocritus is suggested by Hunter 1996, 106-7, following Gow ad uu.18ff.

The addressees are reassured that Theocritus sees his rôle as the praise of mortals, apparently rather than (not “as well as” – with a slight degree of contradiction, Theocritus revises or corrects his position between the first and second distichs) gods. This gains extra force when we read on and discover the skinflint potential patrons such as are addressed in u.22: they are reassured that they will get the praise they desire, if they are willing to pay for it. If read with the Simonidean anecdote in mind, it might seem to suggest that Theocritus will not repeat Simonides’ mistake in the poem in which he spent too much time on praise of the Dioskouroi: unlike that of Simonides 510 *PMG*, his poem will concentrate on mortal customers. The more alert reader might have perceived a pun: Διὸς κούραις, not κούροις. The separation of powers which Theocritus (as far as we know, innovatively)<sup>50</sup> proposes between Muses and poets is in contrast to the interpenetration of the human and divine which was characteristic of the poem which displeased Simonides’ Thessalian patron, and in which the Dioskouroi took such interest.

Something between allusion to Simonides’ poems and allusion to the anecdotes about the poet is to be found at uu.46 and 67. In the latter place, Theocritus appears (rather contrary to the impression given by the earlier part of the poem) to be rejecting the pursuit of financial gain from his poems (uu.66-7):

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τιμὴν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων φιλότητα  
πολλῶν ἡμιόνων τε καὶ ἵππων πρόσθεν ἐλοίμαν.

But I would choose honour and people’s friendship rather than many mules and horses.

The description of wealth in terms of “mules and horses” might suggest the subversive thought that, after all, where victors in equestrian events are praised, it is the horses (or mules) who have actually done the work. More generally, “mules and horses” is not the most obvious way in which to present the idea “wealth” (previously seen in the form of the cattle and sheep of the Thessalian patrons of Simonides in uu.36-9). The lines here quoted seem to refer back to the horses of

---

<sup>50</sup> cf. Gow ad u.4.



the Thessalians in uu.46-7:

τιμὰς δὲ καὶ ὠκέες ἔλλαχον ἵπποι,  
οἳ σφισιν ἐξ ἱερῶν στεφανηφόροι ἦλθον ἀγώνων.

Also the swift horses had their share of honour, who returned garland-bearing  
from the sacred games.

The Iliadic ὠκέες ἵπποι<sup>51</sup> is evoked, but with variation (\*ἔλλαχον ὠκέες ἵπποι | would not have been impossible, and ὠκέες ἵπποι | was used by Callimachus at *H4 Delos* 169). The achievement of the horses is presented in a manner which almost seems to disassociate it from the owners, the *laudandi* of Simonides' poems.

The mules of u.67 are emphasised by the contrast between “horses” in 46 and “mules and horses” in 67, and as Hunter has suggested the reader is surely intended to think of another Simonidean anecdote. This has been discussed above:<sup>52</sup> Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1405b23 = Simonides 515 *PMG*) records the story that, asked to compose an epinician for a victor in the mule-car race, and offered only a small fee, declined, but then changed his mind when the fee was raised. The victor was Anaxilas of Rhegium, and Simonides' poem began with the only line of it we have:

χαίρετ ἀελλοπόδων θύγατρες ἵππων  
Hail, daughters of storm-footed horses!

When the price was right (or so the anecdote has it), Simonides was willing to praise also a victory in the mule-car, and to do so by praising the mules for their maternal ancestry, while conspicuously silent on the donkeys who were their fathers. Here, as with the horses of Simonides' Thessalian patrons in Theocritus, the achievement of the mules seems, peculiarly, to be considered independently of the patron. I have argued above that this anecdote is likely to originate in Sicilian tradition close to or during Simonides' own times; in any case, it will

<sup>51</sup> 10 x *Iliad*, first at 5.257; 1 x *Odyssey* (3.496).

<sup>52</sup> Above, section 3.7.

have been available to Theocritus and his audience, as it was to Aristotle.<sup>53</sup>

The main point of the allusion is surely to associate Theocritus' rejection of poetry composed purely for remuneration with a rejection of the aspect of Simonides' reputation which is most prominent in the anecdotal tradition, i.e. his avarice: Hunter comments on Simonides' position as "both a positive and a negative exemplum,"<sup>54</sup> to which point we shall return below.

## 5. Simonides in Theocritus 16: Sicily and Thessaly

The second respect mentioned above in which Theocritus here makes use of the figure of Simonides was where he explicitly commented on Simonides' rôle in providing κλέος to his Thessalian patrons (uu. 34-7).

It is not possible to determine to what extent, if any, Theocritus' poem contains allusions to the poems which Simonides composed for Hieron I of Syracuse, or for other Deinomenid patrons.<sup>55</sup> We have a testimonium to at least one song composed for Hieron (580 *PMG*),<sup>56</sup> and another poem (552 *PMG*) recounted local "myth" in the form of a story that Aetna judged between Hephaestus and Demeter when they quarrelled over possession of the land there; it is likely, though scarcely sure, that this might derive from a poem praising Hieron or one of his brothers.<sup>57</sup> There were doubtless others of which we know nothing. It might be that the expression of *aporia* at u.13 was intended to recall Simonides' epinician for Astylus (506 *PMG*).<sup>58</sup> This victor, from Croton, on certain occasions called himself Syracusan in order to please Hieron:<sup>59</sup> it is possible that Simonides' epinician might have commemorated one of these victories, in which case it

<sup>53</sup> See above, section 3.7.

<sup>54</sup> Hunter 1996, 105.

<sup>55</sup> On Simonides in Sicily, see Molyneux 1992, ch.9.

<sup>56</sup> For a reason unstated and unclear to me, Wilamowitz dismissed this testimony as a fiction (Wilamowitz 1913, 153 n.2). It might be that it troubled him that our source, Himerius (in a propemptic speech), called the song a *propemptikon*: this designation is anachronistic. I suspect, however, that (e.g.) an encomium or epinician ending with a prayer for a safe journey for Hieron would have been quite capable of resulting in the testimonium we have.

<sup>57</sup> Presumably the quarrel was resolved in favour of Demeter, given the association of the Deinomenids with the cult of the two goddesses as detailed above.

<sup>58</sup> See Gutzwiller 1993, 222-3; Vox 2002, 199-200. Simonides' aporetic question will have been immediately answered with the name of the victor (cf., e.g., Pindar *Ol.* 2.11); seen in this light, Theocritus' take has a slightly comic effect *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*: "who is such today? who will love one who speaks well? – I don't know..." The reader expected the answer "Hieron!"

<sup>59</sup> Paus. 6.13.1; cf. Maddoli et al. 1999, ad loc., Molyneux 1992, 214-220.

might have contained material concerning Hieron I which would also have been of relevance to the concerns of Hieron II. But so much is conjecture; and in any case one might have expected Theocritus rather to use material from Simonidean poems commemorating Hieron or his brothers. If Theocritus used these, he did so without marking the fact by citation as of Simonides at u.44, just as he did not cite Pindar in any part of the poem, and in the absence of the poems of Pindar we would not be able to identify his allusions to these either.<sup>60</sup>

In any case, where Theocritus explicitly cites the example of Simonides and the κλέος conveyed by his poetry, he does so not in relation to Simonides' Sicilian or Syracusan patrons (as might have seemed natural), but rather to the families whom he commemorated at the other end of the Greek world, in Thessaly.

It may help to show how striking this is when we compare a passage in which Callimachus treats Simonides both in relation to Sicily and in relation to Thessaly, and where the proper understanding of the passage historically has only very recently been clarified. In fr.64 Pf., from the third book of the *Aetia*, the speaker is the dead Simonides.<sup>61</sup> He complains that his tomb, at Akragas, was desecrated during a siege by an

ἀνὴρ κακός, εἰ τι νῦν ἀκούεις

Φοῖνικ]α πόλιος χέτλιον ἡγεμόνα·

a wicked man, if ever you heard of one Phoenix, the wicked leader of the city.

Φοῖνικ]α is a certain reading, because the story is told by Aelian (fr.63 Hercher, at Suda s.v. Τιμωνίδης, σ441 Adler): Phoenix was, we are told, an Akragantine general who, while fighting the Syracusans, had the tomb of Simonides destroyed in order to build a defensive tower; this has been related to fighting between Syracuse and Akragas in the time of the tyrant Agathocles, in the late fourth

<sup>60</sup> cf. Griffiths 1979, 27 n.47. It is crucial at all times to be cautious about retrojecting *our* areas of knowledge and ignorance on to our sources: where we have a large number of poems of Pindar, but few of Simonides, while possessing a large number of Simonidean anecdotes, it is easy to conclude (with Wilamowitz 1913, 137) that antiquity knew Pindar for his poetry and Simonides for his personality. This contrast is doubtless not altogether false, but it also reflects to us areas of our ignorance: when *we* know many anecdotes but few poems of Simonides, we are likely to reach this conclusion. As the new Simonidean material from *P.Oxy.* 3965 shows us (see below), where we find more Simonides, we also find more ways in which later authors were reading and interacting with the poems as well as the anecdotes.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. the treatment above, section 3.10.

century.<sup>62</sup> The Akragantine general Phoenix is otherwise unattested. However, the interpretation which was apparently imposed by the fragment of Aelian has now been replaced by Livrea,<sup>63</sup> who shows that Callimachus is referring not to the war between Syracuse and Akragas in the late fourth century, but to an occasion in 406 BC when the Phoenician general Hannibal besieged Akragas, and destroyed the tombs outside the city in order to build offensive ramps up to the walls.<sup>64</sup> This caused superstitious fear in his army, and there followed a plague in which Hannibal himself died. Aelian and modern scholars misread ΦΟΙΝΙΞ as a proper name instead of an ethnic, and a phantom figure of Greek onomastics<sup>65</sup> can now be removed. εἴ τι νῦν ἀκούει[ς] does not raise the question “have you heard of the general Phoenix?” but rather “can you name the Phoenician who destroyed Simonides’ tomb?” For our purpose the fragment, as it may now be understood, is of relevance inasmuch as we can now see that it puts the Sicilians in a straightforwardly good light, and the Punic barbarian in a bad one: the Akragantines had built a tomb for Simonides, “showing reverence for Zeus Xeinius,” and the Punic general, identified only by ethnic, pulled it down and came to a nasty end shortly afterwards. In Callimachus’ treatment, Simonides immediately relates this episode to the occasion when “the house at Crannon fell – alas! – upon the mighty Scopadae.” Thus the Thessalians are actually put into the same category as the barbarian, those who (showing a *lack* of respect for Zeus Xeinius) take the risk of acting in a hostile or unjust manner towards the divinely-protected Simonides, while Simonides is on the side of Sicilian Greeks against barbarians.

This helps to emphasise the extent to which Theocritus at first seems to be making a peculiar choice in using the example of Simonides’ Thessalian patrons to illustrate to Hieron II of Sicily the value of poetic commemoration. It is also suggestive of the elements in Sicilian ideology to which I have already drawn attention in relation to the Sicilian presentation of the Persian Wars: Simonides is seen as an active though posthumous participant in the struggle of Sicilian

<sup>62</sup> See Pfeiffer ad loc.

<sup>63</sup> Livrea 2006; but Livrea was in fact substantially anticipated by Robert Dyer in the online Suda s.v. Simonides at σ 441 Adler, as Alan Griffiths points out to me, where the same argument was made in a commentary dated June 2000. The site is accessed from <http://www.stoa.org/sol/> (viewed July 2006).

<sup>64</sup> Diodorus Siculus 3.86.1ff.

<sup>65</sup> LGPN III.A Φοῖνιξ (7).

Greeks against their barbarian enemy, in a way which corresponds to his commemoration of the struggles of mainland Greeks against their barbarian enemy in the Persian wars of almost a century earlier.

The lines in which Theocritus refers to the Thessalians are worth examining in some detail (22-35):

Δαιμόνιοι, τί δὲ κέρδος ὁ μυρίος ἔνδοθι χρυσός  
 κείμενος; οὐχ ἄδε πλούτου φρονέουσιν ὄνασις,  
 ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν ψυχᾷ, τὸ δὲ πού τινι δοῦναι ἀοιδῶν·  
 πολλοὺς εὖ ἔρξαι πηῶν, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ ἄλλων  
 ἀνθρώπων, αἰεὶ δὲ θεοῖς ἐπιβώμια ῥέζειν,  
 μηδὲ ξεινοδόκον κακὸν ἔμμεναι ἀλλὰ τραπέζῃ  
 μειλίζαντ ἀποπέμψαι ἐπὶν ἐθέλωντι νέεσθαι,  
 Μοισάων δὲ μάλιστα τίειν ἱεροὺς ὑποφήτας,  
 ὄφρα καὶ εἶν Αἶδαο κεκρυμμένος ἐσθλὸς ἀκούσης,  
 μηδ' ἀκλεῆς μύρηαι ἐπὶ ψυχροῦ Αχέροντος,  
 ὥς τίς μακέλαι τετυλωμένος ἔνδοθι χεῖρας  
 ἀχὴν ἐκ πατέρων πενίην ἀκτήμενα κλαίων.  
 πολλοὶ ἐν Αντιόχοιο δόμοις καὶ ἄνακτος Αλεῦα  
 ἄρμαλιν ἔμμηνον ἐμετρήσαντο πενέσται·  
 πολλοὶ δὲ Σκοπάδαισι ἐλαυνόμενοι ποτὶ κακοῦς  
 μόσχους σὺν κεραῇσι ἐμυκήσαντο βόεσσι·  
 μυρία δ' ἄμ πεδίον Κραννώιον ἐνδιάσκειν  
 ποιμένες ἔκκριτα μῆλα φιλοξείνοισι Κρεώνδαις·

Strange men, what gain is a vast amount of gold lying indoors? For the wise, this is not the profit of wealth, but rather to give to one's own self, and perhaps to some poet or other; to do good to many of one's relatives, and also to many others, always to sacrifice to the gods, not to be a bad host, but to treat a guest well at table and send him off when he wishes to go, and especially to honour the sacred prophets of the Muses, so that even hidden in Hades you may be reputed good, nor weep without fame by cold Acheron, as if somebody whose palms are calloused by the mattock, bewailing penury from his fathers, penniless poverty. Many serfs measured out their monthly ration in the houses of Antiochus and of the lord Aleuas; many calves were driven bellowing with horned cattle to the byres for the Scopadae; countless choice sheep did

shepherds pasture on the plain of Crannon for the hospitable Creontidae.

The rhetorical structure is at first sight fairly clear: Theocritus exhorts the putative miserly potential patrons to use their wealth in a generous manner, characterised by giving, and at the beginning and end of his advice he focuses specifically on giving to poets, which can provide some sort of defence against mortality in the form of the κλέος which outlasts the laudandus. Then he cites the Thessalian patrons of Simonides as an exemplum. The question arises, however: an exemplum for what, precisely? An exemplum for spending money and obtaining κλέος, certainly: but we should examine how far the analogy extends – or, perhaps equally importantly, does *not* extend – between the picture given in uu.24-33 and the presentation of the Thessalians in uu.34ff.

In the exhortation in uu.24-33, it is possible to suspect that benefit to poets is really a large part of the point (and one may note that religious festivals, as celebrated with extravagant sacrifice and sponsored by rich men, are also likely to be occasions for which poets are engaged, that poets are likely to be the guests at the tables of such men, and that rich men who spend on elaborate hospitality may well be more likely to hire poets to provide the entertainment for their guests).<sup>66</sup> This benefit, however, is presented as part of a list of ways in which the rich man may use wealth in a socially embedded way: giving to relatives and others, sacrifice, hospitality. Furthermore, the embedding of these giving-relationships within a world of social values and sentiment is emphasised by the introduction of the idea that the rich man should “give to his own soul” (u. 24 ψυχᾷ).<sup>67</sup> The sponsorship of poetic production is contextualised in a general picture of benevolent spending that is itself located in a world of social, religious and sentimental values and relationships. The passage can be perceived as interacting with various commonplaces of archaic praise poetry: Hunter compares *Pyth.* 1.90ff., in which Hieron is urged to spend for the purposes of securing his renown and praised for his hospitality,<sup>68</sup> while Gow cites other passages.<sup>69</sup> It could serve as a model for the theory of Kurke concerning the

<sup>66</sup> cf. Hunter 1996, 98-100, on similar themes in Xenophon's *Hieron*.

<sup>67</sup> As a parallel for this expression, Gow ad loc. cites Aeschylus *Persae* 841: ψυχῇ διδόντες ἡδονήν.

<sup>68</sup> Hunter 1996, 86.

<sup>69</sup> see Gow ad 22. We may consider also *Nem.* 7.17ff. (on which cf. Sbardella 2004); cf. also *Isthm.*

economics of Pindaric praise, according to which the epinician *laudandus* is encouraged by the poet to integrate himself and his wealth into an embedded economy and a *polis* community.<sup>70</sup>

The reader is then brought down with a bump and reminded (by means of contrast) of the inescapable grounding of this kind of munificence in material wealth: the status of the rich man who fails to use wealth in the right way will be like that of a poor man who worked with his own hands, as emphasised with the strikingly concrete detail of their being “calloused from the mattock.” It would be helpful to know whether this detail was influenced by passages of Simonides;<sup>71</sup> the striking collocation of wealth and poverty might make one think, for example, of the startling use in the epinician for Orillas (514 *PMG*) of the story of the Carian fisherman,<sup>72</sup> though an interest in poverty and its physical effects has been identified in any case as a characteristic of Hellenistic aesthetics.<sup>73</sup>

It is at this dramatic moment that we move to Thessaly and Simonides’ patrons there. Theocritus might initially send the reader in the wrong direction at this point: the argument’s “correct” structure would appear to have the wealthy Thessalians acting as exempla for a rich man to show the need to perpetuate κλέος through poetry, but when the couplet describing the anonymous pauper (32-3) is immediately followed by the πολλοὶ... πενέσται of 34-5, it would be natural enough to suppose that they are introduced as examples of anonymous poverty rather than as evidence of the wealth of their masters, especially since the analogy between the two is emphasised by the description of the pauper of 32-3 as poor ἐκ πατέρων. The πενέσται of Thessaly were an anomaly in the history of Greek exploitation of labour until much later times (sometimes compared by ancient authors to the helots of Sparta: Theopompus *FGH* 115 F 122, as cited by the Theocritus scholia ad 16.35): a class of serfs, neither saleable chattel slaves

---

2.37ff. The widespread approbation of ξενία in the epinician corpus is of course also a commendation of the proper use of wealth.

<sup>70</sup> Kurke 1991, *passim*; for a short summary (with regard to *Isthm.* 2), see 254-6.

<sup>71</sup> For Gow (ad 30), in his insistence on the need for poetry to preserve κλέος after death Theocritus thinks in particular of Sappho fr.55.

<sup>72</sup> See above, sections 3.19-3.20.

<sup>73</sup> Cf., e.g., Hutchinson 1988, 347: “The Hellenistic poets are interested in poverty for the bizarreness and harshness it makes possible in the poetry,” which would seem to account for this passage on an aesthetic level: but one might want to account for the use of poverty at the level of ideology as well of aesthetics. Fowler 1989, ch. 5, compares grotesquery and poverty in Hellenistic art and poetry (chiefly Herondas). Alan Griffiths points out to me the parallel at Philittas fr.10 Powell.

nor enjoying the autonomy of free people, but rather permanently attached to the land they farmed and obliged to render services to their landlord (by legal/customary compulsion rather than contract), from one generation to the next.<sup>74</sup>

In the event, of course, the point of the large number of the *πενέσται* in the context of the broader rhetorical structure is that their large numbers are evidence of the wealth of their Thessalian overlords (the numbers of serfs, cattle and sheep are subsequently summarised as *πολλὰ καὶ ὄλβια τῆνα* (u.42)). We may note, however, some ways in which contrast between the preceding, exhortative passage and the exemplum is here suggested. The property of the Thessalians is presented in the three categories just named, expressed in three couplets, *πολλοὶ... πολλοὶ... μυρία...* This would appear to parallel *πολλοὺς... πολλοὺς... αἰεὶ...* at uu.25-6, where the ‘many’ are the relatives and others who are the beneficiaries of the rich man’s generosity, and *αἰεὶ* refers to frequently repeated sacrifice. This similarity in fact points up a contrast in the presentation between exhortation and exemplum. Of the Thessalians we are told simply that they are wealthy, but not that they used their wealth in the socially embedded and positive ways which were indicated in the exemplum. Instead of the hospitable table or the distribution of sacrificial meat, we first see their dispensation of rations to their dependent serfs, where the description of the “measured rations” stresses the distance between this and any sort of giving accompanied by warmth, personal feeling or spontaneity (u.35).<sup>75</sup>

If we look at Hieron II in Sicily, again this aspect of the presentation of the Thessalians seems to emphasise contrast rather than analogy: he would not have wished to present himself as analogous to a ruler over serfs, and instead we see him as a king among his warriors (uu.80, 103).

The mention of sheep and cattle does not seem to represent a reference to sacrifice. The word *κακούς*, translated above as “byres” (as also by Gow), can refer to an enclosure of any kind, including a precinct of the gods,<sup>76</sup> but the

<sup>74</sup> *Der Neue Pauly* s.v. *Penestai* [1]; de Sainte Croix 1981, 150ff.

<sup>75</sup> In Simonidean terms, we may compare the arms-length hospitality to that of Hieron I in the anecdote related at Athenaeus 656c, where Simonides’ rations arrive in a basket; see above, section 3.8. The contrast is between “rations” and hospitality based on generosity and face-to-face contact (compare Juvenal’s treatment of the relationship between patron and client in the fifth *Satire*).

<sup>76</sup> As, e.g., at Simonides 531.6 *PMG*; *LSJ* s.v. *κηκόε*.



dative *Σκοπάδαίειν* seems to rule out the possibility that it has the latter sense here. Indeed, the way in which the Thessalians are presented as leaving behind great wealth when they die (u.42) seems to encourage the perception that they have been holding on to their wealth rather than spending it, despite their willingness to spend on commemoration by Simonides.<sup>77</sup>

In more general terms, the Thessalian patrons of Simonides would in any case seem an inappropriate exemplum for the good use of wealth outlined in the exhortation preceding their citation by Theocritus. As has been shown above, they are especially present (along with Hieron I) in the anecdotal tradition concerning Simonides,<sup>78</sup> and while it would of course have been possible for Theocritus to play down this side of the tradition we have already seen that the reverse is the case, since Theocritus in fact alludes to the most prominent of these anecdotes, the story in which the house fell down (510 *PMG*). The behaviour of the host in that anecdote is as far as could be from exemplifying hospitality or the positive use of wealth as advocated in uu.24ff. We cannot tell whether Theocritus had a clear sense in his own mind as to the identity of the patron who told Simonides to ask the Dioskouroi for the rest of his fee, or whose house it was from which the twin gods rescued the poet: it is clear from our main sources, especially Quintilian, that the tradition was considerably diverse, not to say muddled.<sup>79</sup> In any case it is also unclear how Theocritus perceives the relations between the families of Thessaly, and it may be that the confusion here is Theocritus' and not ours (unless a combination of the two): thus it seems odd to distinguish between Scopadae and Creondae, since Creon was in fact the father of Scopas.<sup>80</sup> Whether or not the reader had a specific laudandus or location in mind concerning the anecdote, (s)he is already primed, it seems to me, to read *φιλοξείνοισι Κρεώνδαϊς* in a heavily ironised manner: at this point in

<sup>77</sup> The "can't take it with you" motif would seem to emphasise the pointlessness of accumulating wealth which one cannot use after one's death, and which cannot protect one from death (*Nem.* 7.17ff.). So this may be seen as a further suggestion that the Thessalians are in fact not good instances of rich men who use their wealth well.

<sup>78</sup> See above, section 3.10.

<sup>79</sup> See above, section 3.10; and see Molyneux 1971, Slater 1972, Rawles 2005.

<sup>80</sup> See Gow ad 34-9. However, we may be confident that there was a tradition associating the anecdote with the Aleuads and need suppose neither that Ovid at *Ibis* 511 believed that Scopas was a descendant of Aleuas nor that he in fact was. The tradition according to which the patron in the anecdote was Eurypylus of Larissa, one of the sons of Aleuas, is reflected both in Quintilian, where the name has through error jumped from a list of possible patrons to a list of scholarly sources, and in the passage of Ovid. See Slater 1972, 232 and Rawles 2005, 65 with n.12.

Theocritus' poem we have already been reminded of the nature of the 'hospitality' shown to Simonides in Thessaly.<sup>81</sup> This reference to the supposed hospitality of the Creondae is the sole exception to the absence of any sense that the Thessalians might have exemplified the good use of wealth which Theocritus has been advocating, and yet seems already undermined.

So much for the possibility that the Thessalians might have represented an exemplum for the exhortation to use wealth well in a general way. We can see that, while both the initial ambiguity created by the apparent analogy between the πενίη of u.33 and the πενέσται of u.35 and the connection suggested by the repetitions πολλοὺς... πολλοὺς... (u.25) and πολλοὶ... πολλοὶ... (uu.34ff.) seem to encourage the reader to look for more parallelism between the exhortation and the exemplum, the only parallelism which is in the end present is in the fact that the Thessalians paid for the perpetuation of their κλέος by a poet.

The reader might ask, what was the context of this κλέος? In other words, for what were the Thessalians famous? Within the passage of the poem which treats them, the answer is apparently "nothing," at least as far as great deeds, κλέα ἀνδρῶν (u.2) are concerned. We are told, at length, that the Thessalians were rich, and we are told that Simonides made them "known by name" for later men (ὀνομαστοὺς u.45; on this word and allusion to Simonides' Plataea elegy, see further below); when we compare them with either the exhortative passage which precedes or with the material concerning Hieron, who will win great victories against the barbarian Carthaginians, we may wonder whether anything other than their names was known, and if so, what. Part of this has already been implicitly answered within the poem: they were known for their philistine meanness to Simonides, as exemplified in the episode where the poet was told to collect the rest of the fee from the Dioskouroi. Within uu.34-47, the section of the poem which treats the Thessalians, there is silence. Even the equestrian victories which must have provided the occasion for some of Simonides' encomiastic poems for the Thessalians are added as a sort of afterthought (uu.46-7), and as has been noted above these are described in a way which seems strangely to diassociate them from the greatness of the patrons, by stressing the horses' achievements.

---

<sup>81</sup> Callimachus (fr.64 Pl.) associated the anecdote with the Scopadae and with Crannon, here given by Theocritus as the seat of the Creondae, which should be the same family.

## 6. Theocritus' Thessalians and archaic presentations of κλέος

Hunter has commented perceptively that, in the light of a kind of equality to be found between poet and patron in Pindar, where both are seen participating in the same aristocratic social networks (*philia, xenia*), “a central strategy of Idyll 16 is to play off this ‘theory of equality’ against the more mundane realities of power and dependence.”<sup>82</sup> It seems to me that we can see in the use of the Thessalian patrons a rather analogous play on places in archaic poetry where a kind of “theory of κλέος” is suggested.<sup>83</sup>

We may consider three texts from archaic choral lyric. Here is the end of Pindar’s first Olympian ode, celebrating the victory of Hieron I in 476 (115ff.):

εἴη σέ τε τοῦτον ὕψοῦ χρόνον πατεῖν,  
ἐμέ τε τοσσάδε νικαφόροις  
ὀμιλεῖν πρόφαντον σοφαίαι καθ’ Ἑλ-  
λανας ἔόντα παντᾶι.

May it be for you to walk on high for this time, and for me to join with victors for as long as I live, being foremost in poetic skill among Greeks everywhere.<sup>84</sup>

The poet’s skill and the greatness of the laudandus are brought together. “Famous men and their deeds, if they are to be justly commemorated, demand famous poets,” writes Gerber in his commentary.<sup>85</sup> The poet implicitly reassures the patron that he has made the right choice; the fact that he can attract the best is in itself a quality being praised.<sup>86</sup>

Something recognisably of the same sort may be found at the end of Bacchylides 3 (90ff.):

---

<sup>82</sup> Hunter 1996, 97.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. the treatment of this issue in Goldhill 1991, chapter 2.

<sup>84</sup> τοσσάδε... ἔόντα is not easily understood; here I follow Gerber 1982 ad loc., for whom it means “for as long as I live,” as does τοῦτον... χρόνον (both representing a familiar type of mild euphemism, I suppose). Race in the Loeb renders “whenever they win,” which is also possible.

<sup>85</sup> Gerber 1982, 177.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Carey 2000, 172.

ἀρετᾶ[ς γε μ]ὲν οὐ μινύθει  
 βροτῶν ἅμα σ[ώμ]ατι φέγγος, ἀλλὰ  
 Μοῦσα νιν τρέφει.] Ἱέρων, σὺ δ' ὄλβου

κάλλιστ' ἐπεδ[είξ]αο θνατοῖς  
 ἄνθεα· πράξα[ντι] δ' εὖ  
 οὐ φέρει κόσμ[ον] σ[ω]-  
 πά· σὺν δ' ἀλαθ[εῖαι] καλῶν  
 καὶ μελιγλώσσου τις ὕμνησεν χάριν  
 Κηρίας ἀηδόνοσ.

The light of men's greatness does not decline with the body, but the Muse nourishes it. Hieron, you displayed to mortals the finest flowers of wealth. To the successful, silence does not bring ornament. Alongside the truthful telling of fine deeds, someone will sing also the gift of the honey-voiced Kean nightingale.

The ἀρετᾶ of the victor is almost incomplete without the song to augment, preserve and commemorate it. This need for song is expressed in terms of the relationship between ἀρετᾶ and the Muse, and by contrast with silence, but it leads to the assertion of the value of the poet's own song, and by implication to the relationship between the κλέος of the poet and that of the patron. The translation of the last clause given above follows the arguments of Maehler concerning the interpretation of the word χάριν:<sup>87</sup> this is considered to mean “friendship-gift,” “favour” (LSJ s.v. III), and refers to the song itself, ὕμνησεν being an instance of “encomiastic future” and referring to “the present performance of the ode at Syracuse.”<sup>88</sup> This is not the place, fortunately, for an examination of the concept “encomiastic future.”<sup>89</sup> We may note, however, that in the present circumstance, where the point is partially the continuity of “the light of men's greatness” through time, it is difficult to feel confident that this instance of the future tense should be prohibited from having any reference to

<sup>87</sup> Maehler 2004, ad 96-8, following Fränkel 1975, 464 n.44.

<sup>88</sup> Maehler 2004 ad 97.

<sup>89</sup> The classic “strong” statement is that of Bundy 1962, 21-2: “[the use of the future indicative] is, in fact, a conventional element of the encomiastic style. It never points beyond the ode itself, and its promise is often fulfilled by the mere pronunciation of the word.”

the future fame of Hieron and of the song, posterior to the time of first performance and indeed of any given subsequent performance.<sup>90</sup>

Likewise, while it may be appropriate to interpret χάρις as “gift” here, its primary referent being the present song, we may note that the clause in which it occurs refers to the beauty of Bacchylides’ song by means of the words μελιγλώσσου... ἀηδόνοιο,<sup>91</sup> and that singing the χάριν is paired cὺν δ’ ἀλαθείαι καλῶν, “alongside the truthful telling of fine deeds.” It is therefore hard to state that it may not *also* be read in such a way as to have χάρις operating with the beautiful qualities of Bacchylides’ poetry as its referent, so that we might acknowledge the sense (as earlier commentators) “alongside the truthful telling of fine deeds someone shall praise also the beauty of the Kean nightingale.”<sup>92</sup> Even if (as is hard to believe) the conventions of epinician poetry absolutely prohibited such a reading (rather than making the sense advocated by Maehler more natural and easier, which may perhaps have been the case), we may further note that these circumstances of generic determinism or at any rate expectation would most likely have been less strongly effective at the time of Theocritus. It would probably have been available to earlier audiences, and certainly to audiences of Theocritus time, therefore, to interpret Bacchylides as praising the power and value of his own song at the same time as praising his patron. The way in which he juxtaposes and combines the two with each other and with gnomic statements about the rôle of the Muse in preserving the ἀρετὰ[c]... φέγγος and the failure of success to achieve κόσμον where accompanied by silence makes it plausible to suppose that Hieron’s fame in particular will be to some degree dependent on the fame of Bacchylides’ poetry, or at any rate that the two will travel through time together, each needing the other. We may note, however, that Hieron’s fame is and will be, even by this

---

<sup>90</sup> To my mind, while it may refer *also* to the present performance in the manner posited by Bundy (followed by Maehler 2004 ad loc.), this future may also be considered in the class labelled by Pfeijffer 2000 as “futures expressing a general thought” (his category IIA, as a subdivision of II, “futures with a text-external reference”) (Pfeijffer 2000, 45ff.).

<sup>91</sup> ἀηδων can refer, at any rate in later poetry, to a poem as well as to a poet (see, e.g., Pfeiffer ad Call. fr.1.16), but here the latter seems vastly more likely: nightingale as poet is more common and earlier (see parallels assembled by Maehler 2004 ad loc.), and it is more natural that Κηῖας should refer to Bacchylides himself than to the song, composed for performance in Syracuse, in honour of Hieron I.

<sup>92</sup> Jebb rendered “along with thy genuine glories men shall praise also the charm of the sweet singer, the nightingale of Ceos” (Jebb 1905, 267). Campbell follows the same lines in the Loeb (*Greek Lyric IV*).

reading of the end of the poem, firmly attached also to his own actions: the gnomic statements apply specifically to those who, as the laudandus, have obtained the “light of greatness” and to the “successful” (πράξα[ντι] δ' εὖ). Bacchylides’ song will be accompanied by telling of the fine deeds of his patron.<sup>93</sup> A more difficult and stark theory of κλέος emerges if we step further back in the history of encomium to one of its most interesting and peculiar early examples.<sup>94</sup> Ibycus was the author of an encomium for Polycrates,<sup>95</sup> the tyrant at Samos, of which the latter part has been preserved on papyrus. At the end of a lengthy *praeteritio*, by which the poet declines to make the Trojan war the theme of his song, he refers to a number of Greek and Trojan participants who were especially renowned for their beauty, before this startling and rapid close (Ibycus S151 *PMGF* = *PMG*, 46-8):

τοῖς μὲν πέδα κάλλεος αἰὲν·  
καὶ σύ, Πολύκρατες, κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔξεις,  
ὥς, κατ' αἰδοῦν, καὶ ἐμὸν κλέος.  
For them is a share in beauty always.  
You too, Polycrates, shall have fame unperishing,  
as, by virtue of my song, is my fame also.

The proper punctuation and construal of this passage is controversial and difficult, and involves careful consideration. It has seemed appropriate here to confine the justification for the above interpretation to an appendix,<sup>96</sup> where the significance of the hymnic element of the rhetoric, especially the collocation καὶ σύ, is argued, and the possibility is noted that some degree of ambiguity may have been inherent in the expression from the beginning. The translation of the last line given here is, so to speak, the weakest and most neutral with regard to the point which I shall use it to make. Here as to some extent in the previous examples, it might be that we see a kind of equivalence or equality between the κλέος of the patron and that of the poet. I have translated ὥς with the colourless

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Carey 2000, 167-8, speaking of an “intimate connection between the poet’s glory and the victor’s.”

<sup>94</sup> Cf. Goldhill 1991, 116-9.

<sup>95</sup> If not Polycrates the tyrant, then another man with the same name: on the historical questions, see Hutchinson 2001, 228-235 with further bibliography.

<sup>96</sup> See below, Appendix 3.

“as”; it is (by this construal of the Greek) left uncertain what kind of relation exists between the two instances of κλέος. It is not necessary to understand that Polycrates’ fame is a consequence of Ibycus’ commemoration, although that is a conclusion which the audience is free to draw, especially since we are not here told of the great deeds or qualities which render Polycrates worthy of such praise (unless, by the alternative punctuation, we suppose that it is here stated that he will have κλέος for his beauty). As Peter Agócs has pointed out to me, ὥς could bear the meaning “to the extent that” here:<sup>97</sup> to make Polycrates’ κλέος dependent upon the poet’s is an interpretative option available to us and to the original audience. It is, of course, entirely possible that Polycrates was praised for his great deeds of one kind or another in the lost, earlier part of the poem: but regardless of the poem’s length, which is quite unknown to us, this must have been quite some distance back in the poem, since it is not represented in the portion known to us.

Especially, then, in the absence of any particular reference to the greatness or the deeds of Polycrates, it is very easy for the reader or audience to conclude that we should understand that Polycrates’ future fame will be the consequence of the fame achieved by Ibycus for his own achievements in poetry. Whether or not we ought to understand that Polycrates is being praised for his beauty, we may note that this is to some extent implicit in the way in which the poet concludes his treatment of the Trojan material with the young men famous for their beauty; the treatment of the greatest heroes, Achilles and Ajax, gives way at the climax of the Trojan section to the treatment of the most beautiful characters in the Trojan epics, who were not celebrated for their deeds. Troilus, indeed, is known for having been slain by Achilles. There is a possibility that the passage could be read not (as Bacchylides) as a suggestion that the laudandus’ great deeds will bring him perpetual κλέος through poetry, but rather that the poet himself can give the laudandus such κλέος simply by composing songs about him, regardless of his achievements or lack of them. By this type of reading, the poet’s power would become exalted above that of the laudandus; he will be less an auxiliary to the κλέος of the laudandus achieved through great deeds, augmenting it with the beauty of song and helping to ensure its preservation through time, and more the

---

<sup>97</sup> Cf. LSJ s.v. ὥς A.Ab.3, with citations from Homer on; and cf. Appendix 3, below.

provider and transmitter of such κλέος, which will result from his poetic skill and attach to the laudandus almost as a kind of side-effect. The effect would be a substantial movement in the “balance of power,” so to speak, between poet and patron; a shift with dangerous encomiastic consequences, where the notion of praising the great deeds of the laudandus threatens to disappear, and his benefit from the song becomes simply the preservation of his name as a secondary effect of the κλέος attaching to the poet himself and his skill.<sup>98</sup>

It seems that, in connection with the reflection upon an archaic “theory of equality” to which Hunter refers, Theocritus is concerned also with the encomiastically dangerous aspects of the possible interpretations of archaic “theories of κλέος” which are especially visible in the Ibycus passage which has just been discussed, but the development of which could be perceived as latent in the passages from Pindar and Bacchylides as well. Thus he seems to present Simonides’ Thessalian patrons very much after the fashion of the most “dangerous” interpretation (Theocritus’ chosen reception technique) of passages from archaic poetry such as those just cited (such passages may, of course, have included the poems of Simonides himself). The deeds and characteristics of the Thessalian laudandi of Simonides have disappeared; their names have survived by virtue of the activity of this θεῖος ἀοιδός (the adjective emphasising the crucial importance of his commemorative power).<sup>99</sup> These Thessalians in this regard present a contrast with Hieron II, whom Theocritus will celebrate for his battles against the Carthaginians, as Pindar celebrated Hieron I and his brothers for their victories against the same foes, and as (we shall see) Simonides celebrated the fighters of Plataea for their struggle against the barbarian.

Thus, on internal grounds Simonides’ commemoration of the Thessalians seems, in Theocritus’ poem, to represent a place for reflection upon certain tendencies present within archaic encomiastic poetry: the relation between his commemorative power and their κλέος presents the latter only in the form of names. Bearing in mind what has been said about the way in which Theocritus’

---

<sup>98</sup> The extent of the risk that the poem will be so read is greater if we translate, as (e.g.) Campbell in the Loeb, “you too, Polycrates, will have undying fame as song and my fame can give it;” but I have argued against this reading where ὡς κατὰ is read as governing both ἀοιδάν and ἔμὸν κλέος in Appendix 3, below.

<sup>99</sup> The choice between the readings θεῖος and δεινός is not an obvious one here, but I agree with Gow (ad loc.) and Hunter 1996, 107 n.90, in preferring the former. The corruption, in whichever direction, occurred in antiquity. See the treatment of Castelli 1996.



poem aligns itself in certain respects with the propagandising strategy of Hieron II, it is worthwhile also to consider other responses to the question “yes, but for what were these Thessalians famous?” The answer, not given within the poem, is scarcely more promising: they were famous in particular for their Medising activities during the Persian wars. Thus the Aleuads in particular are chiefly known to us – and this must reflect at least an important aspect of what was known of them in antiquity – as allies of the Great King. Herodotus records that they invited Xerxes into Greece (Hdt. 7.6), although he later excuses the Thessalians in general, on the grounds that the Medising was specifically the fault of the Aleuads (Hdt. 6.172). The “sons of Aleuas,” Thorax, Eurypylus and Thrasydeius, later appear as associates of Mardonius (Hdt. 9.58). This Eurypylus, as we have seen, was a patron of Simonides, at least according to some part of tradition;<sup>100</sup> his brother, Thorax, commissioned Pindar’s earliest dated poem, *Pyth.* 10, where the brothers are also mentioned in laudatory terms (uu.69-fin.). Once more we see that the Thessalians appear the very opposite of a model to follow or of analogous figures to the image which Hieron II would wish to project.<sup>101</sup> In a poem which supports Hieron II’s attempt to present himself as champion against the barbarians, using *Pythian* 1 with which to do so, the exempla used to illustrate the power of Simonides’ poems to preserve κλέος include Thessalians who, at the time of Hieron II’s namesake, fought on the side of the Mede.

This may seem almost perverse: Theocritus’ potential model Simonides ends up as avaricious, and as the praiser of men whose deeds do not justify the praise which he composed for them. After all, we might remember, Simonides was not only famous for his avarice or for his commemoration of these particular patrons. As well as encomia of rich men, he composed also songs which praised and commemorated the heroes of the Persian Wars, and was sufficiently renowned for this kind of commemorative activity that, as has been mentioned, epigrams on the dead of those wars were attributed to him more or less as a matter of course. There is scope for Simonides to be a model for the praise poet in a much more positive way than this: especially in the circumstances of the propagandising self-

<sup>100</sup> See above, section 4.5.

<sup>101</sup> Compare Hunter 1996, 103n.83, who points out a paradox in the way in which these Thessalians are treated in lines which echo Simonides’ elegy on Plataea; this idea of Hunter’s will be developed further below. See also Kyriakou 2004, 239 with n.35.

presentation of Hieron II and Theocritus' co-operation with his image-making, as described above. As we shall see, however, it may be argued that Theocritus himself uses this contrast between different ways of perceiving Simonides.

## 7. Simonides in Theocritus 16: allusions to elegy

Since the publication of *P.Oxy.*3965, Theocritus 16 can be perceived as a good test case for seeing the extent to which the discovery of new fragments of Simonides can alter our picture of his reception later in antiquity.<sup>102</sup> The allusion to Simonides 11.17-18 W at Theocritus 16.45-6 was already identified in the *editio princeps* of the former, and then discussed briefly by its editor, Peter Parsons, in a subsequent article.<sup>103</sup> Before we discuss this instance, however, it may be worthwhile to spend a little time looking at another apparent instance of allusion to Simonidean elegy within Theocritus 16 which has not previously been observed.

In precisely the same part of the poem where the allusion to Simonides fr.11 W has been identified, Theocritus associates Simonides with aspects of musical performance:

εἰ μὴ θεῖος ἀοιδὸς ὁ Κήιος αἰόλα φωνέων  
 βάρβιτον ἐς πολύχορδον ἐν ἀνδράσι θῆκ' ὀνομαστούς  
 ὀπλοτέρους·

[The Thessalians would have been forgotten after death,] had not the godlike poet of Keos, singing varied songs to the many-stringed *barbitos*, made them known by name among later men.

The *barbitos* is a surprise. Elegy appears regularly though probably not invariably to have been accompanied by the *aulos*,<sup>104</sup> and what evidence we have might seem to associate the *barbitos* with small-scale, sympotic and monodic melic

<sup>102</sup> This is particularly the case since the best recent treatment of the poem, Hunter 1996, while of course updated to some extent to take account of the new material, gives the impression that it was largely written beforehand, and the presence of allusions between Theocritus' poem and the new Simonidean elegy is acknowledged rather than much discussed.

<sup>103</sup> Parsons 1992a, 31; Parsons 1992b, 10-12.

<sup>104</sup> See, e.g., West 1974, 13-14, noting the caveat "it would be vain to assert that no one sang elegiacs to the lyre" (14); once one concedes that it was possible to sing elegy without *auloi* if one so chose or circumstances demanded it, the objections of Campbell (Campbell 1964) disappear.

poems rather than the choral lyric composed by Simonides. It is frequently associated with Anacreon and sometimes the Lesbian poets.<sup>105</sup> Again, both αἰόλα and πολύχορδον might seem to represent the vocabulary of the “new music” of the late fifth and fourth century, and are therefore perhaps surprising here.<sup>106</sup> Hunter comments that it is nevertheless possible that “αἰόλα φωνέων βάρβιτον ἐκ πολύχορδον [may be] indebted to a self-description by the poet,” and notes the fact that an anonymous lyric poem seems to have begun αἰόλον φων[.<sup>107</sup> The reference is to a papyrus fragment which preserves the beginnings of several poems, of which those that may be identified are by the Lesbian poets and possibly Anacreon.<sup>108</sup> This collection of monodic lyric, it seems to me, is unlikely to have contained the beginning of a poem of Simonides (though we may certainly not be sure of this; Simonides’ choral lyrics were, after all, subsequently performed monodically). However, since the publication of *P.Oxy.* 3965, another possibility arises.

*P.Oxy.* 3965 fr. 7 is given by the first editor (Peter Parsons) as follows:

] [  
 ] [  
 ] βαρβ [  
 ] του [  
 ] κ[ ]ρ [  
 ] δι [  
 ]

He comments that the traces following the second β in line 3 are suggestive of ι rather than α. A glance through the small number of possibilities for words beginning βαρβ- suggests that we should expect one or the other of these, and that, if we have not α, we should take this to be the name of the musical instrument.<sup>109</sup> West is (as regularly) more confident, putting into his text ideas found in the apparatus to the *editio princeps* (fr. 29):

] [  
 ]

<sup>105</sup> See Hunter 1996, 101; West 1992, 56-9.

<sup>106</sup> See Hunter 1996, 101.

<sup>107</sup> Hunter 1996, 101 with n.72.

<sup>108</sup> *P. Mich.* inv. 3498 recto = *SLG* S286. The papyrus was written in the second century BC.

<sup>109</sup> cf. Parsons 1992a, 39.

διωι[  
 βαρβι[τ  
 τοῦ φ[  
 κερδ[  
 διπ[λ

Caution is clearly appropriate, but we may nevertheless try to see what we may find here. The traces which have been read κερδ[ are by no means clear (on the basis of the photograph from the *P.Oxy.* website,<sup>110</sup> I would certainly have been inclined to dot ε). Nevertheless, it seems the most likely reading. For the possible combination of ideas suggested by κέρδ[ος and διπ[λ, Parsons compared Solon 13.73f., where the poet comments on the insatiability of men's desire for wealth: men who now have more than others seek twice as much. There, however, is no reference to music. We may note the combination of the following factors: a) a part of βάρβιτος in initial position;<sup>111</sup> b) its use in a context where wealth is discussed or at any rate mentioned; c) the fact that we know on independent grounds that this is a place where Theocritus has Simonidean elegy in mind in any case (below); d) that the reference to this particular instrument is *a priori* not particularly to be expected either in Simonidean elegy or in Theocritus.<sup>112</sup> For these reasons, while the need for caution should be acknowledged, it may reasonably be supposed that Theocritus is likely here to be alluding to a passage of Simonidean elegy, where the earlier poet probably treated to some extent the relation between poetry and profit (or was at least capable of being so interpreted by Theocritus with Simonides' subsequent reputation to guide him), and that it is this passage of Simonidean elegy which is represented by the meagre fragment which has just been cited.

To what extent is this an interpretable allusion, on our present state of evidence? Since, as has been pointed out and will be further discussed, this very same passage has been identified as alluding to a different passage of Simonidean elegy, it suggests to us that Theocritus' poem is very dense and rich in its allusive texture, with regard to Simonides as well as to Pindar, where we can more easily

<sup>110</sup> via [www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk](http://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk) (viewed May 2006).

<sup>111</sup> Though in neither hexameter or pentameter would this be a surprising place to put it.

<sup>112</sup> Not expected in Simonides: above; not expected in Theocritus: see Hunter 1996, 101, "the *barbitos* makes its only appearance here in major Hellenistic poetry outside the *Anthology*."

observe it. This is what one would probably have imagined anyway. It suggests that he may have used Simonidean passages which he perceived as treating the relation between poetry and money, rather than basing his use of Simonides for these purposes solely on the anecdotal tradition, though this is not an idea which can be developed very far on this sparse evidence. We may, however, make a few more conjectural observations. Firstly, in both places there appears to be an element of cross-generic reference: the *barbitos* is associated with a different kind of song/poem from either Simonides' elegy or Theocritus' hexameter poem. Was Simonides alluding to a different poet, such as his contemporary Anacreon, who is often associated with the *barbitos*? This is not impossible, though it does not seem especially likely; otherwise, he may have been looking back at a poet from the past as e.g. where he cites not only "Homer" but also Stesichorus as authorities for his account of Meleager (564 *PMG*),<sup>113</sup> and thus appearing, in a very Theocritean manner, to handle his present engagement with patronage relations by retrojecting them into the past. Theocritus would then slot himself into the story, so to speak, as the next link in the chain (we shall see that this is what he does vis-à-vis Simonides' self-positioning with respect to Homer, below). We may note, finally, that the selection of musical instrument here, as well as reflecting generic issues in the narrowly literary sense, will have functioned as an ideological marker of differences in attitudes towards wealth which were themselves partially encoded and reflected in literary genres. "If the chelys lyre served as a metaphor for citizen status and education, and the kithara denoted virtuoso professionalism, then the *barbitos* signified leisure and revelry above else," is the comment of a recent scholar of the iconographical tradition.<sup>114</sup> In its association with the East Greek tradition, it can represent the values signified by the words *habrosyne* and *tryphe*: as Alcaeus, Sappho and Anacreon themselves, it may stand for the use of wealth for private luxury and elitist enjoyment, rather than civic and public engagement.<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> See above, section 1.6. East Greek monodic lyric, as represented by both the Lesbian poets and by the contemporary Anacreon, was received with great interest in the Athens of Simonides' time, as can be perceived from the interest of the pot painters: cf. Richter 1965, i.69-72, 75-8; on the basis of his popularity on painted pottery, Anacreon has been said "to have struck the popular imagination like the young Mick Jagger" (Parsons 2001, 56; cf. Boardman and Kurtz 1986, Bundrick 2005, 84-7).

<sup>114</sup> Bundrick 2005, 21-2.

<sup>115</sup> This is discernible without the need to accept wholesale the schematic – though not for this

So much is speculation: we may note, however, that given the ‘new musical’ vocabulary and the unlikely *barbitos* this was previously a natural place in which to interpret according to an anecdotal tradition happy to indulge in anachronism and ‘Kreuzung,’ where now we can see that, while a degree of anachronism may remain, the passage is in fact marked by interaction with words of Simonides himself.

Already pointed out, and (because based on a much less fragmentary source text) more readily interpretable is another allusion identified in the very same passage of the poem. The passage of Theocritus quoted above (16.45-6) has been perceived as alluding to lines of the largest of our fragments from Simonides’ treatment of the battle of Plataea (fr.11.14-18):

... ἀγχέμαχοι Δαναοί,  
οἷσιν ἐπ’ ἀθά]νατον κέχυται κλέος ἀν[δρο]ς ἔκητι  
ὃς παρ’ ἰοπ]λοκάμων δέξατο Πιερίδ[ων]  
πᾶσαν ἀλη]θείην, καὶ ἐπώνυμον ὅπ[λοτέρ]οισιν  
ποίησ’ ἡμ]ιθέων ὠκύμορον γενεή[ν].

... the close-fighting Danaans, upon whom undying *kleos* is poured on account of that man who received all truth from the violet-haired Muses, and made the short-lived race of demigods known by name to later men.

These lines, and my correction ἀγχέμαχοι, are discussed elsewhere;<sup>116</sup> the key word ὅπ[λοτέρ]οισιν was proposed by Hutchinson on the basis of the Theocritean parallel before Parsons identified that *P.Oxy.* 2327 fr.27 col.i provided the line-ends here, and has been universally adopted. There is a question how to translate ἐπώνυμον, which does not elsewhere mean “famous;” it is not hard to perceive, as Parsons, that it does mean this here, being thus parallel to ὀνομαστός in Theocritus. Worth taking seriously, however, is the alternative sense advocated by Capra and Curti, for whom we should understand

---

reason to be rejected – division of archaic cultural values into “elitist” and “middling” traditions, where choral poetry is generally perceived as “middling” and monody “elitist,” for which see Kurke 1999, “Introduction” (following Morris 1996) and *passim*. For Kurke, Simonides is read as representing the “middling” tradition (Kurke 1999, 150-1 with n.53); it seems to me that, as usual, his *polyeideia* makes him more slippery than this would allow. The elegiac fragments 21 and 22 W might seem to share in the atmosphere of enclosed, private *habrosyne* in a manner which would not be true of much of his choral lyric and indeed some of the other elegiac material.

<sup>116</sup> See above, section 1.6, and Appendix 2.

“known by the name ‘demigods.’”<sup>117</sup> In any case, the allusion to Simonides by Theocritus has been widely recognised,<sup>118</sup> and scholars have broadly agreed on its interpretation: where Simonides validates his commemorative activity by referring back to the achievement of Homer in perpetuating the κλέος of the Achaeans at Troy, Theocritus allusively adopts the same strategy for himself vis-à-vis Simonides, before referring directly to Homer as well. Simonides is seen as an authorising presence for Theocritus’ strategy of explaining the value of poetry by reference to the success of past poets in preserving κλέος, at the same time as he is used as an example of one of these past poets. This is the argument from similarity – similarity between Simonides’ project in the Plataea elegy and Theocritus’ in the present poem.

Given the immediate context of the allusion, however, this argument from similarity seems to require supplementation, because in a number of respects the relation of the allusion to the context seems to be one of contrast. Within the Plataea elegy, the Achaeans who were commemorated by Homer are those who had defeated Troy: the fall of Troy has just been explicitly mentioned in the poem. However, in Theocritus’ poem the Simonidean rhetoric is adapted to be used in connection with Simonides’ Thessalian patrons, who, as we have noted are presented in such a way that any achievements of theirs are passed over in conspicuous silence. Further: in the Plataea elegy, as has been argued in chapter 1, the poet draws parallels between the Persian Wars and the Trojan War, and in doing so he systematically re-presents the *Iliad* to his audience in a revisionist account, made into an explicit morality tale in which Troy is punished for the wickedness of Paris. The Thessalian patrons of Simonides, on the other hand, are not known for their actions against “the barbarian:” quite the contrary, since they included some of the most notorious medisers.<sup>119</sup>

Again, notwithstanding the caution which is proper where we deal with such a small fragment, we may note that the allusion to Simonides fr.29 W, where the

<sup>117</sup> Capra and Curti 1995. We need not accept their supplementation of the verb ἄλγεα in 18 in order to agree on ἐπώνυμον: an option would also be “he made the ‘shortlived race of demigods’ known as such to later men.” See also Kowerski 2005, 101n.194 (on p.195).

<sup>118</sup> In addition to the article of Parsons already cited (Parsons 1992b), see Rutherford 2001, 45 with n.59, Aloni 2001, 87. The most extensive study of the “new Simonides” in relation to Theocritus 16 is Kyriakou 2004.

<sup>119</sup> cf. Hunter 1996, 103 n. 83: “There is perhaps particular point in referring to the Aleuadae, whose friendly relations with the Persians were well known in history, through echoes of Simonides’ poem on the Greek dead at Plataea.”

*barbitos* seems to be mentioned in conjunction with ideas to do with profit (κέρδος), seems to point in a rather different direction from the allusion to the “Plataea elegy” as represented by fr.11 W, which is not a place where the question of patronage and remuneration appears to be a factor. The *barbitos* fragment might seem to operate through similarity with Theocritus’ treatment of the Thessalians, while the Plataea elegy forms more of a contrast, inasmuch as that the victors at Plataea are perceived as praised for great deeds, whereas the Thessalians’ fame is purely a consequence of their expenditure of money on Simonides.

The play of contrasts continues when we go on with Theocritus’ list of persons whose fame has been assured by poetry: the idiosyncratic catalogue of Homeric examples begins with “the chieftains of the Lycians, the long-haired sons of Priam, Cycnus, female from his skin.” In Simonides, it is the Achaeans whose commemoration by Homer is described by the poet, not the Trojans and their allies; the sons of Priam have been named (fr.11.10), but form a contrast with the Achaeans (the contrast is between unjust and just, Barbarian and Hellene).

## 8. Contrasting presentations of κλέος in Theocritus 16

Generally, in fact, it seems that we can expand this pattern of contrast into the poem more broadly, bearing in mind the way in which it has already been shown that the passage concerning the Thessalians seemed not to fit with the ideological pattern discernible by which Theocritus in other parts of the poem can be clearly seen to affiliate himself with a pattern of self-presentation by Hieron II. Thus we may note that the associations of the use of the Plataea elegy fit perfectly with the aspirations of Hieron II: he will be a new champion against the barbarians, and will be commemorated by Theocritus as the fighters at Plataea were commemorated by Simonides. The Iliadic context of the Plataea poem is conspicuously absent from the context in which it occurs (except inasmuch as that Achilles was himself from Thessaly – but this seems in fact to emphasise the contrast between those associated with great deeds, such as Achilles and Ajax in u.74, and the Thessalians, about whose achievements Theocritus is silent). We may put it in a slightly different way: the Simonidean allusion ‘should’ give a sense which could be paraphrased as “As Homer commemorated the heroes of



the Trojan war for their great deeds against the barbarians, so Simonides praised the heroes of Plataea for theirs, and so shall I praise you for yours.” However, in fact we find the explicit allusion in the section concerning the Thessalians, where the relevant analogy does not seem to hold, and it is only later in the poem that we find the equivalent praise of Hieron, where the analogy between the different poets’ instances of commemorative poetry is properly operative (uu.73ff.).

The contrast which has been identified is discernible on several overlapping levels: in one respect, it is between praise as a commodity available according to the wealth of the patron regardless of his other qualities, and praise motivated by the great deeds which he has accomplished. Thus, at the crucial turning point in the poem, we find the following (uu.64-7, 73-5):

χαιρέτω ὅστις τοῖος, ἀνήριθμος δὲ οἱ εἶη  
ἄργυρος, αἰεὶ δὲ πλεόνων ἔχοι ἕμερος αὐτόν.  
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τιμὴν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων φιλότητα  
πολλῶν ἡμιόνων τε καὶ ἵππων πρόσθεν ἐλοίμαν

.....

ἔσσεται οὗτος ἀνὴρ ὃς ἐμεῦ κεχρήσεται ἀοιδοῦ,  
ῥέξας ἢ Ἀχιλεὺς ὅσσον μέγας ἢ βαρὺς Αἴας  
ἐν πεδίῳ Κιμόεντος, ὅθι Φρυγὸς ἠρίον Ἴλου.

Farewell to such as him [sc. the avaricious man], and may he have countless silver, and desire for more ever possess him! For my part, I shall choose the honour and friendship of men above many mules and horses

....

There will be that man, who has need of my song, having wrought such deeds as great Achilles or grim Ajax, on the plain of Simois, where is the tomb of Phrygian Ilus.

As has been described above, the curious denomination of wealth as “many mules and horses” represents an allusion to the epinician composed by Simonides for Anaxilas of Rhegium (515 *PMG*) and the anecdote concerning the avarice which Simonides displayed at the time of its commission. The avaricious attitude of Simonides, as displayed in that anecdote, is thus rejected in favour of a more disinterested form of praise, motivated by great deeds against barbarians and

compared with the greatness of the two Iliadic heroes who were “best of the Achaeans.” Now we find something which corresponds to the subject matter of the Plataea elegy in the way in which the immediate context of the allusion at uu.45-6 failed to do. In the same manner as Simonides in the Plataea elegy, Theocritus refers to the victories of these at Troy in a way which draws attention to the parallelism between the Trojan war and the eastern barbarians of later times: pre-Persian Wars sources do not call the Trojans “Phrygian,” which practice is a consequence of the identification of the Trojans of the heroic past with barbarians of the present.<sup>120</sup> Most importantly, Theocritus follows Simonides in moving from Troy straight to the concerns of the present day: after the passage quoted above, he continues thus (76-81):

ἤδη νῦν Φοίνικες ὑπ' ἡελίῳ δύνοντι  
οἰκεῦντες Λιβύας ἄκρον σφυρὸν ἐρρίγασιν·  
ἤδη βαστάζουσι Κυρακόσιοι μέγα δοῦρα,  
ἀχθόμενοι κακέεσσι βραχίονας ἰτεῖνοισιν·  
ἐν δ' αὐτοῖς Ἰέρων προτέροισ' ἴσος ἠρώεσσι  
ζώννυται, ἵππεται δὲ κόρυν σκιάουσιν ἔθειραι.

Even now, the Phoenicians who dwell beneath the setting sun in the furthest parts of Libya tremble; already Syracusans grasp the middles of their spears, weighting their arms with wicker shields. And amongst them, Hieron, the equal of the heroes of the past, girds himself and horsehair crests shadow his helmet.

προτέροισ' ἴσος ἠρώεσσι was almost superfluous, since the precise correlation between the heroes of the past and Hieron in the present day is strongly marked in other ways, first by the strong ἤδη νῦν, and then by the elaborately chiasmic arrangement, which suggests also that the Phoenicians correspond to the Trojans of old (74-81):

|                     |                         |                      |
|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| (A) Achilles & Ajax | (B) the plain of Simois | (C) Phrygian         |
| (c) Phoenician      | (b) Libya               | a) Hieron & Syracuse |

<sup>120</sup> See Hall 1988, Hall 1989, 38-9. Homer knows the Phrygians as allies of the Trojans: but Ilus was a Dardanid, and (as his name might suggest) as Trojan as you can get.

The phrase ὑπ' ἡελίῳ δύνοντι has worried some, and is explained by the scholia as motivated by the need to distinguish the Phoenicians of the West from those in Tyre; Gow comments that “it would be possible also to read a symbolic meaning into the setting sun of Carthage.” In context, however, the main point is clear: the Phoenicians are identified as being in the West because they are the western counterparts of the Trojans of the East, just as, using the Plataea elegy as an intertext, they are the western counterparts of the Persians of the early fifth century as well.

The sequence χαιρέτω... αὐτὰρ ἐγώ... has been interpreted as an allusion to Simonides' Plataea elegy (compare fr.11.19-20 W).<sup>121</sup> This is certainly a possible reading, though it is also possible to treat it as a shared usage of a *topos*. Both Simonides and Theocritus use the hymnic formula as a way of giving the impression that they are now moving to the main subject matter of the song: in Simonides' case, he is moving from the introductory hymn to Achilles to the material concerning Plataea, and in Theocritus' case he is moving to the praise of Hieron which immediately follows the quoted sections.<sup>122</sup> For the reader who is already thinking of Simonides, the use of these hymnic formulas, while their reference need not be construed as specifically Simonidean, will point towards Simonides' similar use of the same motifs, and will perhaps draw attention to the similar way in which Theocritus uses Achilles and the Trojan war as an analogue for Hieron II, where Simonides had used the same as an analogue for Pausanias of Sparta and the Greeks who fought at Plataea. As with the echo of Simonides' appeal to Homer, discussed above, the difference would be that, while Simonides appeals to Homer and the Trojan war, Theocritus' use of similar motifs suggests that he has not only Homer but also Simonides himself as a predecessor.<sup>123</sup>

Simonides as an *exemplum*, therefore, seems to stand on both sides of a divide: in his relations with the Thessalians he is associated with avarice, as with the references to the anecdotes of the two boxes and the epinician for Anaxilas of

<sup>121</sup> Rutherford 2001, 45 with n.59.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. Appendix 3, on the use of the καὶ εὖ formula at the end of Ibycus S151 *PMGF* (= 282 *PMG*). On the structure of the Plataea elegy, see above, chapter 1, especially sections 1.2 and 1.4.

<sup>123</sup> Rutherford 2001, 45 n.59, suggests that Theocritus “reapplies [the formulas χαιρε and αὐτὰρ ἐγώ] to two types of patron,” which seems to me not quite right, since u.67 appears not only to be a rejection of meanness of potential patrons but also of avarice on the part of the poet: Theocritus is making a choice about his own behaviour, and not just about his choice of patrons.

Rhegium. On the other hand, Theocritus is able to go to other elements of Simonides in order to use him as a model for disinterested praise with pan-Hellenic associations with warfare against the barbarian: the key moment where we can discern (from our incomplete knowledge) the clash between the two images is at 44-6, where the Simonides of the Plataea elegy is the object of allusion in a passage which in fact treats the Thessalians. The tension created by this clash may be seen as to some extent resolved at 64ff.: Theocritus rejects the covetous Simonides (in the form of a pointed rejection of the implied behaviour of the poet in relation to Anaxilas of Rhegium, through the allusion to the story known from Aristotle) along with the notion of the mean patron, and proceeds to treat Hieron II more directly.

The movement here can be described in terms of the already mentioned pattern of contrasts in a number of overlapping ways: a) a movement from avarice on the part of the poet to his desire to celebrate great deeds; b) a movement from patrons viewed negatively (the miserly rich) to patrons viewed positively (one who will welcome the poet and do him honour, specifically Hieron) c) a movement from less suitable Homeric models (Trojans and allies, Odyssean figures) to the most heroic and appropriate for celebrating battles against non-Greeks (Achilles and Ajax): there is an extent to which we might perceive this as a movement from Odyssean to Iliadic, or at any rate from non-Iliadic to Iliadic (see below); d) a movement from a perception of Simonides associated with his avarice and especially his relations with Thessalian patrons to poetry which (having specifically alluded to it) follows the example of his Plataea elegy by using the Trojan war as an analogue for a contemporary war against non-Greeks.

Taking his cue, therefore, from Simonides' practice in the Plataea elegy, Theocritus develops a pattern of similarity between Hieron and the greatest heroes of the *Iliad*, Achilles and Ajax. As stated, the contrast can also be expressed otherwise; in part, Theocritus presents us with a division of the idea of Simonides into two parts, but in part this distinction between positive and negative models of commemorative poetry can also be perceived as a split within the epic tradition. We may note in particular how, in uu.48-57, Theocritus, while working with the notion of κλέος conferred by the poet essentially regardless of the merit of the person commemorated, emphasises the commemoration by Homer of, first (from the point of view of the pan-Hellenising, chauvinist reading

of Homer of the Plataea elegy) the ‘wrong’ heroes: the chieftains of the Lycians, the sons of Priam, and Cynus. There then follow Odysseus and other Ithacan characters of the *Odyssey*, and Odysseus is presented not as the crafty and loyal fighter at Troy but as the hero of the wandering parts of the *Odyssey*. Later, however, we find Achilles and Ajax, better heroes to use for the idea that the poet preserves the memory of great deeds – or in any case, the sort of great deeds which form a good analogy for the praises of a king who would lead an army against a barbarian enemy, as Hieron. It may be seen, therefore, that the same general pattern of contrast can perhaps also be mapped on to a contrast based on the distinction between “Iliadic” and “Odyssean” modes of heroism which was especially associated with the question of which hero should receive the arms of Achilles: on the one hand we have Odysseus, on the other Achilles and Ajax. This is of interest partially because it shows that the reading advocated here, which has been reached through analysis of the different ways in which Theocritus uses Simonides, is one which can be seen as readily compatible with that of Sbardella, who reads similar patterns of contrast according to a privileging of Pindar’s *Nemean* 7 in the dense network of allusions contained within Theocritus 16, noting the treatment of Ajax and Odysseus, deception and poetry which is found in uu.17-31 of that song.<sup>124</sup>

## 9. Conclusions

We may begin by concentrating on the element of the poem which is our principal concern: the presentation of Simonides. We may note, first, that in the pattern of contrasts which has been described here, Simonides has a place on both sides. His presentation is thus certainly not straightforward: he represents both avarice and disinterested praise. Theocritus’ poem shows us more than that Simonides is ‘good to think with’ when it comes to questions concerning patronage and remuneration (though that is certainly the case). It also shows us that, in the present poem at any rate, the qualities which are attributes of the figure ‘Simonides’ may not be associated exclusively with the tradition of anecdotes: Theocritus’ treatment of Simonides features interaction with

---

<sup>124</sup> Sbardella 2004.

anecdotes and poems together. Nor does it seem very satisfactory to reduce this to another element in the list of overlapping contrasts which I have used as an interpretative tool above, such that the avaricious Simonides can be confined to anecdote, and the Simonides of the commemoration of great deeds confined to the poems themselves. In fact, as far as we can tell, the interlocking of poems and anecdotes seems to be too thoroughgoing for that. Surely one of the reasons for this is in fact that the anecdotes and the poems, from the point of view of Theocritus, who had access to a great amount of Simonidean poetry which we have lost, were not fully separable from each other. The anecdotal tradition did not seem, from the point of view of a learned poet in the early third century, to have developed separately from the reading of the poems (along parallel lines, so to speak) but rather was intertwined with the poems and included readings of them. Thus Theocritus' poem treats allusion to Simonidean anecdote and to Simonides' poems together: the two produce a composite 'Simonides,' but this 'Simonides' is sufficiently complex to be capable of standing on both sides of Theocritus' presentation of contrasting perceptions of the rôle of the poet in providing κλέος to paying patrons. Theocritus' 'Simonides' is both the master of commemoration who is seen especially in the traditions and poems by which he is associated with the Persian Wars, and the cynical, canny and avaricious poet who will gladly take the shilling of such patrons as the Thessalians and Syracuse's Greek enemy at the time of the Persian Wars, Anaxilas of Rhegium. He is both the provider of a vocabulary and strategy of the justification of poetry as the provider of justly earned κλέος for great deeds, and the instantiation of what happens when this strategy is ignored in favour of commemoration of the highest bidder, regardless of his achievements or lack thereof. For this reason, Theocritus 16 can be seen as a especially illustrative moment in the ancient reception of Simonides: a kind of compendium of ways of perceiving a poet who has become a complex and to some extent contradictory amalgam of conceptions, difficulties, justifications and problematisations of the rôle of the poet within the world in which he lives, and in which his followers live.

In terms of the interpretation of Theocritus 16 as a whole, how should we perceive the "pattern of contrasts" which has been outlined above? In a way, it constitutes a systematised way of observing that Theocritus presents a number of different attitudes towards the problems which he treats, which are capable of

being grouped and described according to a binary model, where one group of passages or of features of the poem is opposed to another. It is perhaps best perceived as a kind of strategy of reading, one of whose merits is that it allows us to recognise the poem as being interpretable as a real encomium of Hieron II, who will be, we may understand, a man of great deeds, and whose great deeds will attract disinterested praise, as Simonides gave to the fighters at Plataea, rather than avaricious opportunism of the sort associated with Simonides' relations with his Thessalian patrons and with Anaxilas of Rhegium. This is what we might wish to find, given the care with which, as has been described, the poem interacts with and supports the propagandistic pattern which we can discern in Hieron's self-presentation. The advantage of perceiving the poem according to the model of dichotomy which has been advocated here is therefore that it allows Theocritus to present his (frankly alarming and potentially inapposite) thoughts about the difficulties of patronage, but also to be seen as providing real praise to Hieron II. The dichotomy is not, I believe, simply a convenient fiction of mine (I claim that these contrasts are features of the text, and not simply my imports into it), but it is a way of reading which involves a degree of schematisation of the way in which the poem communicates by and through the variety of voices to which reference was made at the beginning of this treatment.

However, like all schematisations it is a better servant than master, and it is fitting here to draw attention to some of the respects in which Theocritus 16 cannot be totally described within the boundaries of the set of oppositions which has been articulated here. As an example, let us consider the prayer for peace after successful war against the Carthaginians which comes close to the end of the poem (90-98):

ἀγροὺς δ' ἐργάζονται τεθαλότας· αἱ δ' ἀνάρητοι  
 μήλων χιλιάδες βοτάναι διαπιανθεῖσαι  
 ἄμ πεδίων βληχῶντο, βόες δ' ἀγεληδὸν ἐς αὖλιν  
 ἐρχόμεναι σκιφαῖον ἐπισπεύδοιεν ὁδίταν·  
 νειοὶ δ' ἐκπονέονται ποτὶ σπόρον, ἀνίκα τέττιξ  
 ποιμένας ἐνδίοις πεφυλαγμένος ὑπόθι δένδρων  
 ἀχεῖ ἐν ἀκρεμόνεσσιν· ἀράχνια δ' εἰς ὄπλ' ἀράχναι

λεπτὰ διαστήκαιντο, βοᾶς δ' ἔτι μηδ' ὄνομ' εἴη.

ὑψηλὸν δ' Ἱέρωνι κλέος φορέοιεν ἀοιδοί...

May [their Greek former masters] till the flourishing fields, while thousands of sheep, grown fat on the pastures, bleat on the plain, and the cattle gathered in herds on their way to the stable hurry the twilight traveller home. Let the furrows be worked for the sowing-time, while the cicada sings high in the topmost branches of the trees, keeping watch over the mid-day shepherds, and let spiders stretch out their subtle webs on the weapons, and let the name of the war-cry be no longer heard. And let the singers bear the elevated fame of Hieron...

This passage alludes to the surprising hymn to peace which was found at the end of the Paean of Bacchylides represented by the overlapping fr. 22 and 4 (as such, the poem ‘completes the set’: Simonides, Pindar and Bacchylides),<sup>125</sup> while in its variety of rural scenes it recalls also the most celebrated source-text of the bucolic tradition, i.e. the shield of Achilles at *Iliad* 18.483-fin.: the present passage is a kind of ecphrasis in the optative mood. We may note that the eirenic aspects are emphasised: the shield includes a pair of lions attacking the cattle,<sup>126</sup> where the cattle here (in the evening rather than the morning) encounter only an apparently innocent traveller, whom they can speed on his way themselves without need of assistance. Again, the explicitly eirenic imagery of 96-7 is prepared for in the image of the τέττιξ... πεφυλαγμένος: the country people need no other guard. Most remarkable, however, is the wish expressed in 97: βοᾶς δ' ἔτι μηδ' ὄνομ' εἴη. “Let there be no name of ‘war-cry’” may seem a surprising statement in a poem which represents itself as the praise of a king who will be a great warrior, especially where it is followed in the next line by the idea that Hieron’s κλέος may be carried far and wide by bards, who might be expected to carry the story of his successful war-making (note the *contrast* with the Bacchylidean model, where there is no sound of the trumpet, but it is not suggested that the name “trumpet” will be forgotten, i.e. that nobody will talk about previous wars). This

<sup>125</sup> Gow ad 96. In particular, Bacchylides’ poem provides the spiders and, corresponding to the absence of battle cries in Theocritus, the absence of trumpet calls. On the startling and probably innovative encomium to Peace in this Paean, see Maehler 2004, 225-7, where he rightly comments that what we see here looks much more like what we might expect to find in Peloponnesian war literature.

<sup>126</sup> *Il.* 18.579-86.



might be passed over as simply an exuberant way of expressing the peacefulness of the scene after Hieron's fighting has been successfully completed, if it did not so clearly constitute a return to themes of the earlier part of the poem (uu.44-6, 48-50):

εἰ μὴ θεῖος ἀοιδὸς ὁ Κήιος αἰόλα φωνέων  
 βάρβιτον ἐς πολύχορδον ἐν ἀνδράσι θῆκε ὀνομαστούς  
 ὀπλοτέροις·

...

τίς δ' ἂν ἀριστῆας Λυκίων ποτέ, τίς κομόωντας  
 Πριαμίδας ἢ θῆλυν ἀπὸ χροῖας Κύκνον ἔγνω,  
 εἰ μὴ **φυλόπιδας** προτέρων ὕμνησαν ἀοιδοί;

[They would have gone unremembered,] had not the godlike poet of Keos made them known by name to later men.

...

Who would have known of the great deeds of the Lycians, and who of the long-haired sons of Priam, or Cycnus, female from his skin, if bards had not sung the battle-cries of men of the past?

The very theme of the preservation of κλέος through poetry has already been presented to us in a way where (using a different noun) the continued remembrance of wars is expressed through the repetition of battle-cries, and the fame of those who are celebrated in poetry through the preservation of names.

The lines where the peaceful countryside is described are the ones most easily seen as a kind of proto-pastoral; by any reading they form a strong contrast with the military tone of the description of Hieron among his warriors which precedes. The prayer for the forgetting of war-cries is closely and surely not coincidentally tied into this bucolic aspect of the lines by the close echo which may be observed between βόε in u.92 and βοᾶ in the same metrical position in u.97: *battle* is no part of the world of *cattle*. In the same line as the rejection of the battle-cry, we find the keyword of Callimachean aesthetics, λεπτός, applied to the meta-poetic looking weaving spiders, and the impression is that of the familiar contrast between bombastic, martial poetry and the lighter touch favoured by the new poetry of the third century. This contrast is borne out as we proceed: the “lofty

fame” (ὕψηλόν κλέος) of Hieron seems to contrast with the sound of the (very clearly metapoetic) cicada, “high up” (ὕψοθι) in the branches of the tree, and the impression is enhanced by the extent of Hieron’s fame: to the barbarian and urban setting “across the Scythian sea, and where Semiramis cemented the broad wall with tar and reigned as queen.”

This is a surprising way in which to say “everywhere.” One may be reminded of Callimachus’ association of the bombastic and false in poetry with the Euphrates (*Hymn* 2.108ff). The reader may be left with the uncomfortable feeling that the proper telling of Hieron’s martial deeds is ultimately incompatible with the eirenic vision of the peaceful circumstance which they should produce. At this point, we might wish to look carefully at the lines which follow (uu.101-3):

εἷς μὲν ἐγώ, πολλοὺς δὲ Διὸς φιλέοντι καὶ ἄλλοις  
θυγατέρες, τοῖς πᾶσι μέλοι Cικελὴν Ἀρέθοισαν  
ὕμνεϊν σὺν λαοῖσι καὶ αἰχμητὴν Ἰέρωνα.

I am one, and the daughters of Zeus love many others also; may it please them to sing of Sicilian Arethusa with her people and the spear-bearer Hieron.

In the light of the aspects of the eirenic, bucolic prayer which has preceded, how should we read this? It is certainly capable of being read as a gesture of humility.<sup>127</sup> Theocritus is not the only poet, and it will in any case be an appropriate response to Hieron’s achievements if they are commemorated by many, and not just one. Nevertheless, if we have observed the subtle ways in which Theocritus has suggested an incompatibility between the eirenic vision of the countryside and the commemoration of battle, it is available to us to read in a different way: the poet might in fact be suggesting that, once he has reached the end of his poem, he can see that in the end singing of Hieron’s triumphs is not compatible with his own, smaller-scale and more pastoral and peaceful aesthetic. Seen in this manner, the lines would be less like encomium and more like *recusatio*: finally the poet realises that praising the future military victories of Hieron will not be for him, and suggests that someone else do it (since, after all,

<sup>127</sup> See Kyriakou 2004, 235, who also compares epic models for the Muses as patrons of all singers. Kyriakou’s paraphrase assumes the reading μέλει in u.102; but she subsequently (p.243) prints μέλοι, which is surely the better reading (though both are transmitted).

there are many poets).

This is certainly not the only way in which these passages can be read; nor does it contradict or render unhelpful the way of reading I have explored above, where the poem is shown to be interpretable as an encomium that Hieron II could be pleased to hear or read. It does show that, in the variety of imagery and voices which we find in the poem, such a reading will never exhaust the possibilities for ambiguity and subtle polysemy.

## Appendix 1: Naeke's Law in Simonides' elegiacs.

Here, I set out to what extent we can see whether Simonides' elegiac hexameters conform with "Naeke's Law" (that "bucolic diaeresis," i.e. word end at the end of the fourth foot, may not be preceded by a spondaic fourth foot; or, to put it another way, that word end may not follow contracted fourth biceps<sup>1</sup>). I omit epigrams, as being a different form from extended elegiacs, and in any case mostly of doubtful attribution, and I omit fr.25 and 26 W as being also potentially epigrammatic or non-Simonidean. All numeration is according to *IEG*<sup>2</sup>.

In 43 hexameters, preserved in variously fragmentary states, one may determine whether or not the complete line contained bucolic diaeresis:

3.12, 9, 11.11, 11.13, 11.15, 11.17, 11.19, 11.21, 11.23, 11.27, 11.29, 11.31, 11.33, 11.35, 11.37, 11.39, 11.41, 14.7, 14.9, 15.1, 15.3, 16.2, 19.2, 19.4, 20.5, 20.7, 20.9, 20.11, 21.3, 21.5, 21.7, 22.1, 22.3, 22.5, 22.7, 22.9, 22.11, 22.13, 22.15, 23, 24, 64.7, 64.9.

Of these, 19.2 should be discounted, not being of Simonides' composition but a quotation from the *Iliad* (6.146), which leaves 42 hexameters. Of these 42, there are 16 in which we can see that bucolic diaeresis does not occur (i.e., the rate at which bucolic diaeresis occurs in lines where this may be determined is ca. 62%)<sup>2</sup>:

9, 11.19, 11.21, 11.31, 14.7, 14.9, 20.5, 20.11, 21.5, 21.7, 22.1, 22.5, 22.7, 22.15, 64.7, 64.9.

In the 26 lines in which we can see that bucolic diaeresis does occur, I count two in which we cannot determine from the remains of the lines whether it was preceded by dactyl or spondee: 11.27 and 11.29. There remain 24 lines in which it is possible to say a) that 'bucolic diaeresis' occurred and b) whether or not Naeke's law applies:

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. West 1981, 154-5.

<sup>2</sup> A word of caution: where only part of the end of a line survives, it may be more likely that it will be possible to say only 'this line may have contained bucolic diaeresis' or 'this line cannot have contained bucolic diaeresis', and less likely that one will be able to say 'this line certainly did contain bucolic diaeresis'. This may have caused lines in which the phenomenon did not occur to be proportionately over-represented by comparison with the results as they would have been had each line been completely preserved.

Appendix 1: Naeke's Law in Simonides' Elegies

3.12, 11.11, 11.13, 11.15, 11.17, 11.23, 11.33, 11.35, 11.37, 11.39, 11.41, 15.1, 15.3, 16.2, 19.4, 20.7, 20.9, 21.3, 22.3, 22.9, 22.11, 22.13, 23, 24.

In none of these cases is Naeke's law in fact infringed. Accordingly, while the sample size is still fairly small (only twenty-four hexameter verses where it may be determined both that 'bucolic diaeresis' occurs and whether or not Naeke's Law is observed), it would seem preferable to avoid supplementing a spondaic fourth foot before word end.

## Appendix 2: Simonides fr.11.14 W

fr.11.13-14:<sup>1</sup>

τοὶ δὲ πόλιν πέρσαντες αἰόδιμον [οἴκαδ' ἵ]κοντο  
ἔξοχοι ἥρων ἀγέμαχοι Δαναοί[

13 suppl. West (init., οἱ δὲ πόλιν iam Parsons), καὶ Τροίην Lobel, Luppe; οἴκαδ' suppl. Parsons coll. *Il.*1.19; 14 init. suppl. Capra & Curti, Τρ]ών, (φέρτατοι) ἥρων tent. Parsons. ἀγέμαχοι *P.Oxy.*3965 p.c., ἀγεμάχοι a.c.; Δαναοί[ incertum an uersus sit finis, i.e. Δαναοῖc legi possit (Parsons).

Having sacked the song-famed city, they made their homecoming, the Danaan battle leaders, outstanding among heroes.

πόλιν is preferable to Τροίην, since the adjective αἰόδιμον identifies the city as Troy through its Homeric associations: it is used once only in Homer at *Il.*6.358, where Helen explains to Hector that their bad fortune will make them a subject of song for future generations.<sup>2</sup>

ἔξοχοι ἥρων is attractive because the Homeric phrase on which it would have been based, | ἔξοχον ἥρων, is used only of Achilles by Thetis, in a memorable line of the *Iliad* repeated from her lament to the Nereids to her lament to Hephaestus (18.56 = 18.437): ἔξοχον ἥρων· ὁ δ' ἀνέδραμεν ἔρνεϊ ἱcoc. This is appropriate, since it enhances the Achillean flavour and the 'short life' motif. As he does more explicitly in u.18 by way of the word ὠκύμορον, Simonides takes a word especially associated with Achilles, his mother and his short life and reapplies it to the whole army at Troy.<sup>3</sup> Capra and Curti did not observe this, explaining only that the expression is Homeric; it considerably strengthens their case.<sup>4</sup>

As Rutherford ad loc. points out, there are some "spectacular redeployments of

---

<sup>1</sup> Numerations from *IEG*<sup>2</sup>. A text with apparatus including more recent suggestions (compiled by D. Sider) is available in Boedeker and Sider 2001. Photos with Parsons 1992a, Boedeker and Sider 2001, and on the P.Oxy. website via [www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk](http://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk).

<sup>2</sup> Lloyd-Jones 1994.

<sup>3</sup> ὠκύμορος in its passive sense ('soon to perish') is used in the *Iliad* only by Thetis of Achilles: 1.417, 18.95, 18.458, and also, in the superlative, 1.505. The active sense ('bringing rapid death') occurs once at 15.441 (of Teucer's arrows). Cf. Sbardella 2000, 6.

<sup>4</sup> Capra and Curti 1995, 28. It should also be noted that ἔξοχον ἥρων occurs on both occasions in initial position, i.e. it occupies the part of the hexameter equivalent to the first half of a pentameter; the other parallel which they cite is less strong, since there (*Il.*2.483) the phrase ἔξοχον ἥρῳc cclv | occurs at the end of the line (describing Agamemnon).

epic language” going on here.<sup>5</sup>

ἀγέμαχοι apparently caused the scribe of *P. Oxy.* 3965 (our only source here) some difficulty; he initially accentuated it wrongly, and either the same scribe or a later corrector made a deletion mark on the accent over the second alpha and replaced it on the epsilon. His difficulty is understandable and has been shared by modern scholars. The word ἀγέμαχος is unattested other than here and in Hesychius.<sup>6</sup> Hesychius glosses ἡγέμαχος (Ionic) as πολεμάρχος. Parsons confesses his bafflement at the sudden intrusion of a Doric form.<sup>7</sup> We might conjecture that Simonides uses a special Spartan word, perhaps as a response to patronage by Pausanias, but this is not very plausible: normally genre takes precedence over chauvinistic sentiment in this regard (Tyrtaeus wrote in Ionic, after all).<sup>8</sup> Pavese comes up with a variety of strategies by which to explain the transmitted text, and since his is the fullest treatment of the problem, it is quoted at length:<sup>9</sup>

Quanto ad  $\bar{a}$  panellenico (che Parsons dichiara di non poter spiegare), esso può essere spiegato come  $\bar{a}$  *impurum* in poesia attica, cf. composti con seconda componente  $\bar{a}$ -γος,  $\bar{a}$ -γέτας, p.es. Sim.105D. Ἑλλάνων ἀρχᾱγός (Pausanias), A. *Sept.* 999 ἀρχᾱγέτας, specialmente frequente in termini militari (v. Björk 66, 136-138, 291-293), oppure come  $\bar{a}$  compositazionale residuale (v. Pavese 1972, 65; Pavese 1974, 84-93), nel senso che Simonide compose l'elegia in fonetica continentale e questa fu poi attico-ionicizzata in ambiente attico (v. Pavese 1972, 61-74). Le due spiegazioni possono coincidere, in quanto la fonetica continentale fu conservata in quelle parole in cui tale fonetica era stata adottata anche dalla poesia attica (Pavese cit.). Secondo questa spiegazione, l'elegia fu prima commissionata da Spartani e recitata in ambiente laconico e fu poi attico-ionicizzata nella trasmissione in ambiente attico durante il V sec. I celebri epigrammi di Simonide per le

<sup>5</sup> Rutherford 2001, 44.

<sup>6</sup> Parsons 1992a, 30.

<sup>7</sup> Parsons 1992a, 30.

<sup>8</sup> It may be that Bacchylides sometimes ‘over-rode’ the generic expectations of melic poetry in order to exploit the Homeric resonances of some Ionic forms; v. Maehler 2003, XVIII-XIX; Irigoin in Irigoin, Duchemin and Bardollet 1993, XLIX-LIII. This phenomenon in Bacchylides was drawn to my attention by Peter Agócs. Capra 2005, 119 suggests that for Simonides’ public ἀγέμαχοι would have been ‘un aggettivo prezioso e aulico.’

<sup>9</sup> Pavese 1995, 12.

vittorie sui Persiani presentano fonetica in parte continentale, in parte ionicizzata, perché furono anch'essi composti in continentale e poi raccolti ad Atene (imparati nelle scuole e recitati nei simposi attici durante il V sec.).

A. *Sept.* 999 is an unfortunate choice of example, being almost certainly to be deleted as a gloss on the previous line.<sup>10</sup> Both Hutchinson and West (attempting to regularise the divergent usages found in Aeschylus' chaotic ms. tradition) print the transmitted verse as Ετεόκλειε ἀρχηγέτα.<sup>11</sup>

It strikes me as surprising that only *one* 'residual' Doric alpha should have survived in this way (although of course our sample size is rather small). In any case, it seems to be the case that, in elegy, genre is a more important issue than either chauvinism or *milieu* of original performance, at least with regard to Doricisms (though Atticisms may have crept in, this is Atticism of what 'should' be non-Attic Ionic forms, not Atticism of Doric forms).<sup>12</sup>

While of course we should be cautious about dealing with that which we do not understand by wishing it away, I find it highly likely that Simonides wrote ἀγγέμαχοι.<sup>13</sup> The word has a good Homeric pedigree, occurring in the *Iliad* qualifying Μυρμιδόνες (three times) and Μυκοί (once), in the nominative plural as here.<sup>14</sup> It is commonly found in association with ethnics, as in these Homeric uses and at [Hes.] *Aspis* 25. While the adjective is not found qualifying Δαναοί in what survives of archaic poetry, it is twice so used by Quintus of Smyrna, whose uses may be a reminiscence of this elegy.<sup>15</sup> It is probably to be read in a Persian wars epigram attributed to Simonides ('Simonides' 14 *FGE*) but the true authorship of this inscriptional epigram from the temple of Aphrodite on the

<sup>10</sup> See Hutchinson 1985 ad loc., West 1990, 125.

<sup>11</sup> Hutchinson 1985, West 1998; for the difficulties of choosing between α and η and the inconstancy of the ms. tradition, see West 1998, XXVff.

<sup>12</sup> cf. West 1974, 77-8: the earlier elegists (including Tyrtaeus) use Ionic proper, although in Tyrtaeus' case there are some Doric alphas, but in later elegists such as Solon this may be mixed with Atticisms. Page 1936 postulated an independent tradition of Peloponnesian elegy, accounting for the puzzling Doric forms at Eur. *Andr.* 103ff. But if this were accepted, it would account for a predominantly or largely Doric elegy, rather than an isolated Doric form. Cf. the note above concerning dialect in Bacchylides.

<sup>13</sup> The use of ἀγγέμαχων at 'Simonides' 14 *FGE* is noted by Rutherford 2001, 39. He does not appear to be suggesting an emendation. Poltera 1997, 409 and 535, 'corrects' the dialect to ἡγέμαχοι.

<sup>14</sup> The word does not occur in the *Odyssey*.

<sup>15</sup> Q.S. 4.91 (acc. pl.) and 6.600 (gen. pl.).



Acrocorinth is uncertain, and our sources differ on this word.<sup>16</sup>

The sense is unproblematic, and might be connected with the disparaging description of the archer Paris a few lines earlier in the elegy: it is more courageous to fight hand-to-hand than to arch from a safe distance. For this idea in a Persian wars context, the epigram just cited provides a parallel: the Corinthians (the epigram was in the temple of Aphrodite on the Acrocorinth) are ἀγχέμαχοι, while the Medes are described as τοξοφόροι. Regardless of authorship, this epigram may safely be regarded as composed around the same time as Simonides' elegy, and clearly shows the contrast between Hellene and Mede in terms of close-fighting/bow-fighting (with very much the same sort of pan-Hellenic chauvinist spirit which I have attributed to Simonides' account: note the juxtaposition Μήδοις Ἑλλάνων in the last line).

In this context, it may be added that the word was almost certainly used at least once in surviving archaic elegy (Archilochus 3W = Plut. *Thes.* 5.2-3):

οἱ δ' ἄβαντες ἐκείραντο πρῶτοι τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον... ὄντες  
πολεμικοὶ καὶ  
ἀγχέμαχοι  
καὶ μάλιστα δὴ πάντων εἰς χεῖρας ὠθεῖσθαι τοῖς ἐναντίοις  
μεμαθηκότες, ὥς μαρτυρεῖ καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος ἐν τούτοις·  
οὔτοι πόλλ' ἐπὶ τόξα τανύσσεται, οὐδὲ θαμειαὶ  
σφειδόναι, εὖτ' ἂν δὴ μῶλον Ἄρης συνάγῃ  
ἐν πεδίῳ· ξιφέων δὲ πολύστονον ἔσεται ἔργον·  
ταύτης γὰρ κείνοι δάμονές εἰσι μάχης  
δεσπότης Εὐβοίης δουρικλυτοί.

<sup>16</sup> Most attributions of inscriptional epigrams to Simonides are made in the third century BC or later: the literary tradition of this epigram seems to go back as far as Theopompus (*FGrH* 115F285b), who seems to be the source for Σ Pindar *Ol.* 13.32b, which preserves ἀγχεμάχων as the oldest version of the text. The attribution to Simonides probably goes back to Timaeus (*FGrH* 566F10: Simonides' name cannot have been given by Theopompus, since the scholiast on Pindar does not know it; it must therefore have come from Timaeus). cf. Page ad loc., who concludes, pessimistically, by positing a text consisting of several inscriptional epigrams circulating under Simonides' name from the latter part of the fourth century, and gradually becoming augmented by later material before it comes into the hands of Meleager, who attributes several epigrams to Simonides which must be later than the fourth century. The alternative possibility, of course, is that the *Sylloge* was compiled well into the Hellenistic period, and that Timaeus is therefore getting Simonides' name from a different source (local Corinthian tradition?), in which case Timaeus' evidence would be free of the taint of the *Sylloge* and could be regarded as likely to be true. In his introduction to 'Simonides' *FGE* 26, Page appears to contradict his comments on *FGE* 14, and expresses doubt as to whether a *Sylloge* was in circulation before the Hellenistic period.

The Abantes were the first to cut their hair short in this way... being warlike and “close-fighting” and most expert of all in advancing into hand-to-hand, as Archilochus testifies:

There won’t be many bows stretched, and there won’t be many slings, when Ares brings the struggle together on the plain, but the work of many groans will be done with the sword: that’s the kind of warfare in which they excel, the spear-famed lords of Euboea.

ἀγγέμαχοι is a poetic word and occurs only here in Plutarch; most likely this is expressed as it were in quotation marks. Plutarch is quoting a word in the text of Archilochus in front of him, and it was Archilochus who originally used the word of the Abantes. Plutarch’s next phrase (καὶ μάλιστα... μεμαθήκοτες) is his gloss on the quotation.

Returning to Simonides, the omission of one letter somewhere in transmission is paleographically unsurprising enough (the papyrus predates the widespread systematic use of rough and smooth breathings, which are supplied in only two places in the surviving parts of the book, and not on this word); if the corrector of *P.Oxy.3965* is identical with its scribe (Parsons thinks that the main scribe was responsible for some of the corrections, but is uncertain about this one), the error will already have been present in his exemplar, since it seems unlikely that the same person would have corrected the accentuation and yet not noticed the omitted letter. The presence of ἡγγέμαχος in the lexicographical tradition probably derives from another source, since Hesychius usually gives citations in the number and case in which they are found, but gives the nominative singular here (the word is not in itself unlikely). It is also possible that it is due to ‘correction’ of ἀγγέμαχοι away from the Doric form created by the corruption. If so, it is fortunate that this false ‘correction’ was not already present in our sole witness, since if the papyrus had read ἡγγέμαχοι the original corruption would probably have been undetectable.

### Appendix 3: The end of Ibycus' encomium for Polycrates

Ibycus 282 *PMG* (S151 *SLG* = *PMGF*)

The end of this poem (poem-end is indicated by *coronis* in *P.Oxy.* 1790 and followed by blank space; from the end of a roll, as can be determined by the blank space to the right of the last column and the evidence of worm-holes)<sup>1</sup> is difficult to construe and punctuate, and has been variously interpreted. Here are uu.46-fin., first in a diplomatic transcript and then divided and accentuated:

τοισμενπέδακαλλεοσαιεν·  
καισυπολύκρατεσκληοσαφθιτονεξείς  
ωσκαταοιδανκαιεμονκλεος·

τοῖς μὲν πέδα κάλλεος αἰέν·  
καὶ σύ, Πολύκρατες, κλέος ἄφθιτον ἐξεῖς,  
ὥς κατ' αἰδὸν καὶ ἔμὸν κλέος.

The passage is preceded by an account of the beauty of Zeuxippus<sup>2</sup> and Troilus; to these refers τοῖς in 46. For the metre, the first syllable of Polycrates' name should be long; we may therefore take λ as lengthening the preceding syllable, write Πο<υ>λύκρατες (as the ed. pr.), or suppose that the quantities of the fourth and fifth syllables of the line have been transposed by anacalasis and that the second syllable of the name should be counted long (the last option being surely the least likely).

There are two difficulties, of which the first is that scholars, starting from the first editors, have considered and in many cases advocated removing the punctuation of the papyrus at the end of u.46, and the second being the question how to construe the last line.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *ed. pr.* of *P.Oxy.* 1790 was by Grenfell and Hunt (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 15, 1922), with two new pieces fitted in as *P.Oxy.* 2081 (f). Re-edition with commentary at Barron 1969: the most important contribution to the interpretation of the poem. Worm-holes: Barron 1969, 119. The papyrus was written ca. 130 BC. Photograph in *P. Oxy.* vol.15 and via [www.papyrology.ac.uk](http://www.papyrology.ac.uk) (with the fr. of 2081 joined).

<sup>2</sup> As demonstrated by Barron 1961; cf. Barron 1969, 130.

<sup>3</sup> See Hutchinson 2001, 253-4, with a full bibliography at 235n.13, of which the most relevant pieces for the present discussion are Barron 1969, Gianotti 1973, Woodbury 1985. First to assert

The scribe punctuated at the end of 46, which means that πέδα must mean μέτεστι “there is a share,” and it was probably in order to make clear this interpretation that he accentuated πέδα.<sup>4</sup> In the original performance circumstances, however, the ambiguities and choices which editors and scribes resolve by devices like punctuation and accentuation were rather a matter of phrasing, and Ibycus would have taught the chorus how to sing the lines with the right emphases for the sense he wanted.<sup>5</sup> The scribe (or an earlier scribe) is expressing his non-authorial judgement, as modern editors also can, so that there is no reason to give the punctuation of the papyrus too much authority.<sup>6</sup> As punctuated on the papyrus, then, we have “for them [Zeuxippus and Troilus] is a share in beauty always. You too, Polycrates, will have unperishing fame...”

If we remove the punctuation, then πεδά is post-positive and governs τοῖς, and κλέος is accompanied by κάλλεος: “With them, you too, Polycrates, will have unperishing fame for beauty...”

It is difficult to decide with confidence between these two possibilities. Some relevant factors are the following.

Firstly, Barron defends the punctuation of the papyrus on metrical grounds, pointing out that, from eleven places where we can tell, in the first three lines of the epode we can find word end (in the “metrical” sense, i.e. word should include “word group”) at the end of the initial — in ten places.<sup>7</sup> It follows that πέδα should not form a word group with τοῖς μὲν, and therefore that it should represent μέτεστι and not a preposition governing τοῖς, which means that 46 is a clause and the punctuation of the papyrus is appropriate. This is a strong argument, since it would have been the tune (represented in part by the metre) which would have partly determined the “natural” phrasing of the words in early performances; on the other hand, this presumably admitted of some latitude.

In addition, it has been argued<sup>8</sup> that removing the punctuation removes what

---

positively that the punctuation of the papyrus was incorrect was Wilamowitz 1922, 511.

<sup>4</sup> Hutchinson 2001, 253.

<sup>5</sup> Unless he sang solo, in which case the phrasing was up to him, which for present purposes comes to the same thing.

<sup>6</sup> cf. Hutchinson 2001, 253: “since we have these lines complete, there is no reason to surrender our judgement.” It is of course possible that having the earlier part of the poem, as the scribe did and we do not, might affect the questions considered here; but it does not on the face of it appear especially likely.

<sup>7</sup> Barron 1969, 135 (the exception is 31 | χαλκάςτιδεε).

<sup>8</sup> Gianotti 1973, 407.

would otherwise appear to be a natural contrastive pair τοῖς μὲν... καὶ cú...<sup>9</sup> This is again suggestive rather than conclusive, since with Woodbury we may read μὲν as “the familiar emphatic particle... [taking on] a concluding and summarising function.”<sup>10</sup> However, Gianotti's reading is strongly encouraged, as he did not point out, by the metrical positions: where consecutive lines begin τοῖς μὲν... καὶ cú..., this seems to point towards μὲν and καὶ as a pair (especially where τοῖς is prenominal).

Woodbury argued strongly against the clause τοῖς μὲν πέδα κάλλεος αἰέν. Firstly he objects that μέτα (or πέδα) with sense μέτεστι is not known from choral lyric or from verse before the time of the Persian wars.<sup>11</sup> This is reason for caution but not conclusive, since, as Hutchinson points out, it is found at any rate in literature of the earlier fifth century.<sup>12</sup> He continues: “the meaning given here, although reminiscent of Plato, also seems not to be archaic, for the poets of the lyric, unlike Keats, do not say ‘Forever wilt thou love, and she be fair!’ and certainly do not contemplate, as Plato might, a participation in beauty as the gift of poetry.”<sup>13</sup> Rather, for Woodbury, Ibycus would have said that their κλέος for beauty lasts forever, as we have without the punctuation. The reference to Keats' famous line here is perhaps misleading, though read as a complete clause u.46 is certainly surprising in its apparent abstraction. We are on dangerous ground when we start to say that a poet of a particular period was *incapable* of a particular idea (and, one might add, Ibycus' encomium seems to be innovative and surprising anyway). I suspect that, given κλέος below, a legitimate paraphrase would be to suggest that Ibycus was here referring to the continuous element in the beauty of the two young men which was provided by the fact of their κλέος for beauty; but this is just that, a paraphrase, and the image that “for these is a share of beauty forever” remains striking, though surely not impossible. We may note that the line is not only followed but also preceded by (implicit) reference to κλέος: “Zeuxippus, to whom Greeks and Trojans compared Troilus with regard to beauty of appearance as being very alike, as if thrice-refined gold compared with orichalc.” The idea of sharing thus seems to continue the idea of their being

<sup>9</sup> μὲν... καὶ...: Denniston 1954, 374, noting his caution over Homeric examples.

<sup>10</sup> Woodbury 1985, 204, with a reference to Denniston 1954, 360.

<sup>11</sup> Woodbury 1985, 203.

<sup>12</sup> Parmenides fr. 11.4 Coxon, Aesch. *Eum.* 575: Hutchinson 2001, 253.

<sup>13</sup> Woodbury 1985, 203.

a multiplicity of beautiful objects. This talk about the beauty of the two was the beginnings of the κλέος which continues today. One might compare the αἴγλα διόκδοτος of Pindar<sup>14</sup> for the idea of an abstract conception which exists independently of the individual but then becomes his attribute: in the case of the beauty of Zeuxippus and Troilus, this beauty is then perpetual because commemorated in epic poetry.

We may conclude, therefore, that u.46 conceived of as an independent clause seems surprising but not necessarily impossible: the extent to which it seems surprising or difficult must therefore be weighed against the other factors which we might find relevant.

There is another factor, which has, I believe, so far been overlooked as being relevant to the question of how to punctuate the poem. As has been noted by Di Martino and Vox in their helpful edition with notes, καὶ cú in Greek is a rather regular way of marking a movement in the articulation of thought within a poem (or other work of literature).<sup>15</sup> In the earlier period, it is especially a standard formula of the close of a "Homeric" Hymn, one of the pieces of hexameter writing addressed to a god and often functioning as a proemium to the recital of epic proper. Here, as a sixth century example, is the end of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo (3.545-6):<sup>16</sup>

καὶ cú μὲν οὕτω χαῖρε, Διὸς καὶ Λητοῦς υἱέ·  
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ' ἀοιδῆς.

So hail to you, son of Zeus and Leto!

For my part, I shall pay attention to you and to other song.

We may notice that, precisely as in Ibycus' poem, καὶ cú introduces a final, closing address before the singer briefly turns attention to his own song in the subsequent and last verse. The hymnic formula, in both Ibycus and the hymns,

<sup>14</sup> Pindar *Pyth.* 8.96: but in Pindar, of course, ephemerality is part of the point.

<sup>15</sup> Di Martino and Vox 1996, 308-18.

<sup>16</sup> The same formulaic couplet, *mutatis mutandis*, at the ends of the following: HH 4 Hermes 579-80, HH 19 Pan 48-9, HH 28 Athena 17-18; the καὶ cú line with a different first person statement in the following line at HH 9 Artemis 7-8 (9 to be deleted, as Ilgen), HH 18 Hermes 10-11 [here West's Loeb is confused; given the papyrus, presumably it is really u.12 which he intends to omit, as in his translation]; καὶ cú... as penultimate followed by a line without first person: HH 1 Dionysus D.11-12 West (Loeb; the part from codex M), depending on which couplet should be deleted; καὶ cú... as last line: HH 14 Mother of the Gods 6; 21 Apollo 5.

has an effect of rapid closure (however we resolve the difficulties being discussed here, and regardless of what happened in the earlier part of the song, the address to Polycrates at the end seems remarkably brief, almost curt).<sup>17</sup> The interpretation of the apparent allusion to the hymn as a genre deserves attention (instead of the movement from Gods, i.e. hymn, to heroes of the past, i.e. heroic epic, we are here at a transition from heroes of the past to the present-day laudandus; there would seem to be a flavour not of "proem-in-the-middle" but "proem-at-the-end," perhaps analogous to "encomiastic future" announcing a song at the same time as performing it; in general, as well as the poem's appropriation of Homeric epic – Troy – and Hesiod – Heliconian Muses –, Ibycus completes the hexameter set with epic proemium).<sup>18</sup> For our purposes, however, we may note that the syntax of the καὶ cú clausula is entirely regular: it always introduces an independent clause. This in itself seems to me strongly to favour punctuation at the end of u.46: the numerous parallels from the ends of the hymns form a totally regular pattern for the use of the closing formula. It is conceded that Ibycus has (naturally) adapted rather than straightforwardly imported the hexameter formula, in particular in that the καί is used in a different way from in the hymnic model, where it does not mean "you as well," referring back to a previous noun or pronoun as here to τοῖς μέν, but seems to mark the singer's movement into the last stage of the hymn; but this does not seem to me to weaken the point very much. καὶ cú in verse initial position, especially where followed by the name, would have been recognisably hymnic: especially where the subsequent line semantically echoes the αὐτὰρ ἐγώ of the most formulaic closing couplet of the Homeric hymns.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>17</sup> An argument in favour of choral performance? If Ibycus had been singing this solo and somebody dropped a tray at the wrong moment, the whole point might have been lost. A chorus would have more chance of being heard, and the song would have had more chance to circulate through the practice and rehearsal of the singers.

<sup>18</sup> Another possibility would be to relate Ibycus' choice of diction here and in the poem generally to Polycrates' putative sponsorship of hexameter hymn which has been argued as a part of the genesis of the long Homeric Hymn to Apollo (3): see West's Loeb, 9-12; Janko 1982, 113-5; Burkert 1979.

<sup>19</sup> Another difference would perhaps have been that Polycrates had already been addressed in the second person in the (lost) earlier part of the song; the Homeric hexameter hymns do not regularly do this, but keep the god hymned in the third person until the end, sometimes starting with second person Muse(s). At the start of the hymn, we find exceptions (apart from HH 8 Ares, a late intruder) in HH 21 Apollo and, curiously, nos. 24 and 29, both addressed to Hestia. Most striking as an exception, however, is the long hymn 3 to Apollo. The Delian part starts conventionally with Apollo in the third person, but subsequently addresses both Leto (14ff.) and Apollo (19ff., 140ff.); the Pythian part addresses Apollo also (207ff.).

This observation adds to the weight of evidence – from metre, and from a preference to read the natural τοῖς μέν... καὶ cú... as a pair – in favour of the punctuation which we find in the papyrus. The major objection is the curious phrasing which this might seem to leave in u.46, but, as suggested, this should better be seen as surprising rather than impossible or necessarily undesirable. It is important to notice that, as will be seen more clearly below where I address the question of the last line, the style of the end of this poem is rather curt and telegraphic regardless of editorial choices, and this manner may help to account for the peculiarity of expression.

We may now consider the last line. Here the difficulty concerns whether to read κατὰ as governing both ἀοιδάν and κλέος, or merely the former. If we read it with κατὰ governing both, so that κλέος is accusative, it should give something like “you also, Polycrates, will have undying fame, by virtue of song and of my fame.” If, however, we confine κατὰ to go with ἀοιδάν only, and read κλέος as nominative, we get “you also, Polycrates, will have undying fame, as, through song, also my fame [sc. will be].”

The former reading, with κλέος accusative, is the sense given by the translation of Campbell in the Loeb, and was favoured by Barron<sup>20</sup> and Snell.<sup>21</sup> However, it is vulnerable to objection, especially as far as the use of ὥς is concerned. ὥς is not used to introduce a prepositional phrase in this manner until later literature,<sup>22</sup> and, as Hutchinson comments, it is hard to see how it could be explained here in terms of sense.<sup>23</sup> I also find it persuasive where Hutchinson argues that the repetition of κλέος is better understood if we read καί as adverbial rather than conjunctive (“my fame *also*”).

The latter reading, as favoured by Hutchinson, requires that we understand a portion of the verb to be (scarcely an unusual phenomenon); this is, however, rendered more difficult than it might be by the fact that it requires the two

<sup>20</sup> Barron 1969, 135 n.71.

<sup>21</sup> Snell 1965, 121 “soweit das am Gesang und an meinem Ruhm liegt.”

<sup>22</sup> Not before Sophocles: Hutchinson 2001, 253. In Sophocles, the use with κατὰ is not found either, but cf. e.g. *Ajax* 44, *Philoctetes* 58, both cited by Cooper 1998, ii.1456. In both of these Sophoclean cases the use of ὥς is explicable in terms of its purposive or intentional force; but it can also introduce restriction in such places (*ibid.*, ii.1456-7).

<sup>23</sup> ὥς κατὰ is not simply another way of saying κατὰ; it should carry some relation to a notion of “motive, purpose, conception” or otherwise concession or restriction: Cooper 1998, ii.1455-6. Thus, in Aristotle, ὥς κατὰ μέγεθος means “in relation to size,” “as far as size is concerned,” rather than “absolutely” (*de gen. animal.* 745b18, etc.).



corresponding clauses in 47-8 to be constructed in two different ways: not “your fame will be unperishing, as mine will be,” but “you shall have unperishing fame, as mine will be.”<sup>24</sup> This seems perhaps slightly awkward (again, symptomatic of a rather condensed style, as we find at the end of the poem by any construal), but nevertheless preferable, as avoiding the ὥς κατά construction which, as we have seen, is unattested for this early date and seems to give an undesirable sense.

The passage seems more difficult the more we look at it. It is worth considering seriously that the passage may have been ambiguous and capable of more than one type of construal from the very beginnings (e.g., if the ὥς + preposition structure were already a part of everyday speech, though not found in literature);<sup>25</sup> the fact that the scribe of the papyrus (in the second century AD) felt the need to clarify the sense of πεδᾶ through accentuation may in fact be evidence for his awareness of the problematic nature of the sense. This is partly a consequence of the rather telegraphic style which has been mentioned above: part of the curious overall effect of the end of the poem is the rapidity of the “sign-off,” so to speak, by contrast with the preceding extensive passage of *praeteritio*. Most importantly, as Peter Agocs has pointed out to me, even allowing that ὥς is to be read as introducing a clause here, as has been argued, it remains entirely possible to read it in the sense “to the extent that” (as, e.g., ὥς δύναται “as much as he can,” “to the extent that he can”).<sup>26</sup> Thus even the construal which avoids ὥς κατά as a pair nevertheless leaves available the sense “you too, Polycrates, will have unperishing, to the extent that, by virtue of song, my fame is unperishing.” It is possible to imagine that the poet was deliberately hedging his bets: to varying degrees according to the choices made on the issues discussed above, the poem may seem dangerously direct in the extent to which it suggests a relationship of dependence between the fame of the patron and that of the poet; and this aspect of the poem is powerfully enhanced by the important point of Peter Agocs just mentioned. Presumably Polycrates (even if, as is possible, a young man) would wish to be remembered not only because Ibycus had written of him, but would have wished such fame to include achievements and deeds as

<sup>24</sup> cf. Gianotti 1973, 408. It is not impossible, though I believe it has not been suggested, to understand a repetition of ἐξείς: “as you will have my fame by virtue of my song,” i.e. “my fame will be added to yours.” But this feels awkward and I shall not attempt to defend it.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Goldhill 1991, 116-19.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. LSJ s.v. ὥς A.Ab.3; citations from Homer on.

well as just a name, piggy-backing on the reputation of the poet. It is possible to suppose that, in these circumstances, the poet who wished to make a statement about the power of his own song would have chosen to do so in a manner which admitted of various interpretations.

Nevertheless, it is proper (and for some important purposes, such as translation and the production of a punctuated text, necessary) to use what linguistic and other data we can in order to try to find the construal which seems most appropriate. According to the arguments above, it is here found that the best way is the following:

τοῖς μὲν πέδα κάλλεος αἰὲν·  
καὶ σύ, Πολύκρατες, κλέος ἄφθιτον ἐξεῖς,  
ὥς, κατ' αἰοδᾶν, καὶ ἐμὸν κλέος.

For them is a share in beauty always.

You too, Polycrates, shall have fame unperishing,  
as, by virtue of my song, is my fame also.

## Bibliography

- Adkins, A.W.H. (1960), *Merit and Responsibility*, Oxford.
- Adrados, F.R. (1982), 'Neue jambische Fragmente aus archaischer und klassischer Zeit', *Philologus* 126, 157-79.
- Aloni, A. (2001), 'The Proem of Simonides' Plataea Elegy and the Circumstances of its Performance', in Boedeker and Sider 2001, 86-105.
- Anderson, J.K. (1985), *Hunting in the Ancient World*, Berkeley CA.
- Argentieri, L. (1998), 'Epigramma e libro. Morfologia delle raccolte epigrammatiche premeleagree', *ΣPE* 121, 1-20.
- Austin, C. (2002), 'Paralipomena Posidippea', *SIFC* 95 (=3rd. s. 20), 126-130.
- Austin, C. and Bastianini, G. (2002), *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt*, Milan.
- Austin, N. (1967), 'Idyll 16: Theocritus and Simonides', *TAPhA* 98, 1-21.
- Bakola, E. (2005), 'A Missed Joke in Aristophanes' *Wasps* 1265-1274', *CQ* 55, 609-13.
- Barbantani, S. (2001), *Φάτις Νικηφόρος Frammenti di elegia encomiastica nell'età delle guerre galatiche: Supplementum Hellenisticum 958 e 959*, Milan.
- Barchiesi, A. (1997), 'Otto punti su una mappa dei naufragi', *MD* 39, 209-26.
- (2001), 'Simonides and Horace on the Death of Achilles', in Boedeker and Sider 2001, 255-60.
- Barkhuizen, J.H. (1975), *Etymologising by Pindaros*, diss. Pretoria (non uidi).
- Barnes, J. (1705), *Anacreon Teius*, Cambridge.
- Barringer, J.M. (2001), *The Hunt in Ancient Greece*, Baltimore MD.
- Barron, J.P. (1961), 'The Son of Hyllis', *CR* n.s. 11, 185-7.
- (1969), 'Ibycus: to Polycrates', *BICS* 14, 119-149.
- Barth, H.-L. (1984), *Die Fragmente aus den Schriften des Grammatikers Kallistratos zu Homers Ilias und Odyssee*, Bonn (non uidi).
- Bastianini, G. and Gallazzi, C. (2001), *Posidippo di Pella, Epigrammi*, Milan (edd. with collaboration of C. Austin) (= P. Migl. Vogl. VIII 309).
- Bell, J.M. (1978), 'Κίμβιξ καὶ κοφός: Simonides in the Anecdotal Tradition', *QUCC* 28, 29-86.
- Bentley, R. (1697), *Dissertations upon the Epistles of Phalaris, Themistocles, Socrates, Euripides, and upon the Fables of Aesop*, London.
- Bergk, T. (1834), *Anacreontis Carminum Reliquiae*, Leipzig.
- Bernardini, P.A. (1984), 'La *penia* nella vicenda storico-politica di Alceo (fr. 360 e 364 V.)', in *Lirica Greca da Archiloco a Elitis: studi in onore di Filippo Maria Pontani*, Padua, 93-104.
- Bing, P. (1988), *The Well-Read Muse: present and past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic poets*, Göttingen.

- Block, E. (1985), 'Clothing Makes the Man: a pattern in the Odyssey', *TAPhA* 115, 1-11.
- Boardman, J. and Kurtz, D. (1986), 'Booners', *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum* 3, 35-70.
- Boas, M. (1905), *De Epigrammatis Simonideis*, Groningen (diss. Amsterdam).
- Boedeker, D. (2001), 'Paths to Heroization at Plataea', in Boedeker and Sider 2001, 148-63.
- Boedeker, D. and Sider, D. (2001), *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, Oxford and New York.
- Bowie, E. L. (1986), 'Early Greek Elegy: Symposium and Public Festival', *JHS* 106, 13-35.
- Bowra, C.M. (1930), *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*, Oxford.
- (1957), 'Asius and the old-fashioned Samians', *Hermes* 85, 391-401.
- (1964), *Pindar*, Oxford.
- Brandt, P. (1888), *Corpusculum poesis epicae Graecae ludibundae*, Leipzig.
- Bravi, L. (2005), 'Gli epigrammi di Simonide e il P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309', in M. Di Marco et al. (edd.), *Posidippo e gli altri: il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario*, Pisa and Rome (*Appunti Romani di Filologia* 6), 1-7.
- Bremer, J.M. (1991), 'Poets and their Patrons', in H. Hofmann and A. Harder (edd.), *Fragmenta Dramatica: Beiträge zur Interpretation der griechischen Tragikerfragmente und ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte*, Göttingen, 39-60.
- Brisson, L. (1987), *Platon: Lettres*, Paris.
- Bundrick, S. (2005), *Music and Image in Classical Athens*, Cambridge.
- Bundy, E. (1962), *Studia Pindarica I: the eleventh Olympian Ode*, Berkeley CA (*University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 18).
- Burkert, W. (1979), 'Kynaithos, Polycrates, and the Homeric Hymn to Apollo', in *Arktouros: Hellenic studies presented to Bernard M.W. Knox*, Berlin and New York, 53-62.
- (1983), *Homo Necans: the Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, Berkeley CA.
- (1985), *Greek Religion*, Oxford.
- Bury, J.B. (1892), *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar*, London.
- Cameron, A. (1995), *Callimachus and his Critics*, Princeton NJ.
- Campbell, D.A. (1964), 'Flutes and Elegiac Couplets', *JHS* 84, 63-8.
- (1967), *Greek Lyric Poetry*, London.
- Capra, A. (2004), 'Simonide e le corone di Omero (Simon. 47k Campbell = 10, 2 Lanata e fr. 11 West<sup>2</sup>)', in G. Zanetto et al. (edd.), *Momenti della ricezione omerica: Poesia arcaica e teatro*, Milan (*Quaderni di Acme* 67), 101-26.
- Capra, A. and Curti, M. (1995), 'Semidei Simonidei: Note sull'elegia di Simonide per la battaglia di Plataea', *ΣPE* 107, 27-32.

- Carey, C. (1981), *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar*, New York.
- (2000), 'The Panegyrist's Persona', in M.. Cannatà Fera and S. Grandolini (edd.), *Poesia e religione in Grecia* (Festschrift Privitera; 2 vols.), Naples, i.165-77.
- (2003), 'Ipponatte e la tradizione giambica', in F. Benedetti and S. Grandolini (edd.), *Studi di filologia e tradizione greca in memoria di Aristide Colonna*, Perugia (2 vols.), i.213-28.
- Carson, A. (1999), *The Economy of the Unlost (Reading Simonides of Keos with Paul Celan)*, Princeton NJ.
- Cartledge, P. (2002), *Sparta and Lakonia: a regional history*, London (2nd ed.).
- Castelli, C. (1996), 'Theocr. XVI 44: percorsi nella tradizione', *SIFC* 14, 61-72.
- Catenacci, C. (2005), 'Lettture pindariche', *QUCC* 81, 25-31.
- Collins, L. (1987), 'The Wrath of Paris: ethical vocabulary and ethical type in the *Iliad*', *AJP* 108, 220-232.
- Conte, G.B. (1986), *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*, Ithaca NY.
- Cooper, G.L. (III) (1998), *Attic Greek Prose Syntax*, Ann Arbor MI (2 vols.).
- Currie, B. (2004), 'Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar's Odes', in C.J. Mackie (ed.), *Oral Performance and its Context*, Leiden (Mnemosyne suppl. 248), 49-69.
- (2005), *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*, Oxford.
- D'Alessio, G.B. (1992), 'Pindaro *Peana* VIIIb (fr.52 h. Sn.-M.)', in *Proceedings of the XIXth International Congress of Papyrology*, Cairo, 353-373.
- (1995), 'Una via lontana dal cammino degli uomini (*Parm. fr.1+6 D.-K.; Pind. Ol. VI 22-27; pae. VIIb 10-20*)', *SIFC* 13, 143-181.
- Davidson, J.N. (1997), *Courtesans and Fishcakes: the Consuming Passions of Classical Athens*, London.
- Davies, M. (1981), 'The Judgement of Paris and *Iliad* Book XXIV', *JHS* 101, 56-62.
- (1991), *Sophocles Trachiniae*, Oxford.
- (2003), 'The Judgements of Paris and Solomon', *CQ* 53, 32-43.
- (2004), 'Simonides and the "Grateful Dead"', *Prometheus* 30, 275-81.
- Degani, E. (1971), 'Metafore ipponattee', in *Studi filologici e storici in onore di Vittorio di Marco*, Naples, 89-103.
- (1984), *Studi su Ipponatte*, Bari.
- (1991), *Hipponactis Testimonia et Fragmenta*, Stuttgart (Teubner).
- de Jong, I.J.F. (1987), *Narrators and Focalisers. The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*, Amsterdam.
- (1988), 'Homeric Words and Speakers: an Addendum', *JHS* 108, 188-9.
- (1997), 'Homer and Narratology', in I. Morris and B. Powell (edd.), *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden.

- (2006), 'The Homeric Narrator and his own *kleos*', *Mnemosyne* 59, 188-207.
- Denniston, J.D. (1954), *The Greek Particles*, Oxford (2nd ed.).
- de Ste. Croix, G.E.M. (1981), *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*, London.
- De Sensi Sestito, G. (1977), *Gerone II: un monarca ellenistico in Sicilia*, Palermo.
- Detienne, M. (1996), *The Masters of Truth in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge MA (French original 1967).
- Diggle, J. (2004), *Theophrastus: Characters*, Cambridge.
- Dilts, M.R. (1971), *Heraclidis Lembi: Excerpta Politiarum*, Durham NC (GRBS monograph 5).
- Di Martino, F. and Vox, O. (1996), *Lirica Graeca i: Prontuari e lirica dorica*, Bari.
- Dindorf, W. (1855), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam*, Oxford (2 vols.).
- Doty, R.E. (2001), *Xenophon on Hunting*, Lewiston NY.
- Dover, K. (1971), *Theocritus: Selected Poems*, London.
- (1972), *Aristophanic Comedy*, Berkeley CA.
- (1974), *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*, Oxford.
- Dübner, F. (1878), *Scholia in Theocritum*, Paris.
- Dunbar, N. (1995), *Aristophanes Birds*, Oxford.
- Easterling, P.E. (1974), 'Alcman 58 and Simonides 37', *PCPS* 20, 37-43.
- (1982), *Sophocles Trachiniae*, Cambridge.
- Fairweather, J. (1974), 'Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers', *Ancient Society* 5, 231-75.
- Fantuzzi, M. (2000), 'Theocritus and the "Demythologizing" of Poetry', in M. Depew and D. Obbink (edd.), *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons and Society*, Cambridge MA, 135-51.
- (2003), review of Ford 2002, *Eikasmos* 14, 492-500.
- Farnell, L.R. (1932), *The Works of Pindar*, London.
- Fenik, B. (1974), *Studies in the Odyssey*, Wiesbaden (*Hermes Einzelschrift* 30).
- Flower, M.A. (2000), 'From Simonides to Isocrates: the Fifth Century Origins of Fourth Century Panhellenism', *CA* 19, 65-101.
- Flower, M.A. and Marincola, J. (2002), *Herodotus Histories Book IX*, Cambridge.
- Ford, A. (2002), *The Origins of Criticism: literary culture and poetic theory in Classical Greece*, Princeton NJ.
- Fowler, B.H. (1989), *The Hellenistic Aesthetic*, Bristol.
- Fowler, D. (1995), 'Horace and the Aesthetics of Politics' in Stephen Harrison (ed.): *Homage to Horace*, Oxford, 1995, 248-66.
- (1997), 'On the Shoulders of Giants. Intertextuality and Classical Studies', *MD* 39, 13-34.
- Fränkel, H. (1975), *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, Oxford.

- Gantz, T. (1993), *Early Greek Myth*, Baltimore and London (2 vols.).
- Gauthier, R.A. and Jolif, J.Y. (1970), *L'Éthique à Nicomaque*, Louvain.
- Gelenczey-Mihálcz, A. (2000), 'Thoughts on Tyranny: Xenophon's *Hiero*', *Acta Ant. Hung.* 40, 113-21.
- Gentili, B. (1969), 'L'interpretazione dei lirici greci arcaici nella dimensione del nostro tempo', *QUCC* 8, 7-21.
- (1988), *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece*, Baltimore MD [It. ed. 1985].
- Gentili, B. and Prato, C. (1979-1985; 2002), *Poetae Elegiaci*, Munich (Teubner) (2 vols: second edition of vol.2 publ. 2002, 'nouis Simonidis fragmentis aucta'; volumes from the first ed. called *Poetarum Elegiacorum* etc. on title page).
- Gentili, B., Bernardini, A.B., Cingano, E. and Giannini, P. (1995), *Pindaro le Pitiche*, Milan (here abbreviated as "Gentili et al. 1995"; division of labour between these scholars is indicated on reverse of title page).
- Gerber, D.E. (1982), *Pindar's Olympian One: a commentary*, Toronto (*Phoenix* suppl. 15).
- (2002), *A Commentary on Pindar Olympian Nine*, Stuttgart (*Hermes Einzelschrift* 87).
- Gianotti, G.F. (1973), 'Mito e encomio: il carme di Ibico in onore di Policrate', *RFIC* 101, 401-410.
- Goldhill, S. (1991), *The Poet's Voice: essays on poetics and Greek literature*, Cambridge.
- (2000), review of Carson 1999, *CR* 50, 376-7.
- Gow, A.S.F. (1965), *Machon: the fragments*, Cambridge.
- Gray, V.J. (1986), 'Xenophon's *Hieron* and the Meeting of the Wise Man and Tyrant in Greek Literature', *CQ* 36, 115-23.
- Grenfell, B.P. and Hunt, A.S. (1906), *The Hibeh Papyri*, London.
- Griffin, J. (1980), *Homer on Life and Death*, Oxford.
- (1986), 'Homeric Words and Speakers', *JHS* 106, 36-57.
- Griffiths, F. (1979), *Theocritus at Court*, Leiden (*Mnemosyne* suppl. 55).
- Grimaldi, W.M.A., (1988), *Aristotle, Rhetoric II: a commentary*, New York.
- Guthrie, W.K.C. (1962-81), *A History of Greek Philosophy*, Cambridge. 6 vols.
- Gutzwiller, K. (1983), 'Charites or Hiero: Theocritus' *Idyll* 16', *Rh.M.* 126, 212-38.
- Gzella, S. (1971), 'The Problem of the Fee in Greek Choral Lyric', *Eos* 59, 189-202.
- Hall, E. (1988), 'When did the Trojans turn into Phrygians?', *ΣPE* 73, 15-18.
- (1989), *Inventing the Barbarian*, Oxford.
- Hall, J. (2002), *Hellenicity: between Ethnicity and Culture*, Chicago and London.
- Hani, J. (1972), *Phutarque: consolation à Apollonios*, Paris.

- Hans, L.-M. (1985), 'Theokrits XVI. Idyll und die Politik Hierons II. von Syrakus', *Historia* 34, 117-25.
- Hansen, M.H. and Nielsen, T.H. (eds.) (2004), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Greek Poleis*, Oxford.
- Harrison, E.L. (1970), 'Cleverness in Virgilian Imitation', *CP* 65, 241-3.
- Harrison, S. (2001), 'Simonides and Horace', in Boedeker and Sider 2001, 261-71.
- Haslam, M. (1993), review of M.L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*<sup>2</sup>, vol.II, *BMCR* 04.02.14 (<http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/1993/04.02.14.html>).
- Heath, M. (2002), *Interpreting Classical Texts*, London.
- Hinds, S. (1998), *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge.
- Heubeck, A. and Hoekstra, A. (1989), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol.II, Cambridge.
- Holwerda, D. (1987), 'Kallistratos Schüler des Aristophanes von Byzanz', *Mnemosyne* 40, 148.
- Hornblower, S. (1991), *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol.1, Oxford.
- Hubbard, T.K. (2004), 'The Dissemination of Epinician Lyric: pan-Hellenism, performance, written texts', in C.J. Mackie (ed.), *Oral Performance and its Context*, Leiden (*Mnemosyne* suppl. 248), 71-93.
- Hunter, R. (1996), *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*, Cambridge.
- Hutchinson, G.O. (1985), *Aeschylus Septem contra Thebas*, Oxford.
- (1988), *Hellenistic Poetry*, Oxford.
- (2001), *Greek Lyric Poetry: a commentary on selected larger pieces*, Oxford.
- Huxley, G. (1969), *Greek Epic Poetry*, London.
- (2001), review of Boedeker and Sider 2001, *Hermathena* 171, 69-78.
- Irigoin, J. (ed.), Duchemin, J. and Bardollet, L. (trans.) (1993), *Bacchylide: dithyrambes, épimicies, fragments*, Paris (Budé).
- Janko, R. (1982), *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns*, Cambridge.
- Jebb, R. (1905), *Bacchylides: the poems and fragments*, Cambridge.
- Kanowski, M.G. (1984), *Containers of Classical Greece: a handbook of shapes*, St. Lucia (Queensland, Australia).
- Kakridis, J. Th. (1971), "Αεὶ φιλέλλην ὁ ποιητής ?", in *ibid.*, *Homer Revisited*, Lund.
- Kelly, T. (1970), 'The Traditional Enmity between Argos and Sparta: the birth and development of a myth', *AHR* 75, 971-1003.
- Keyser, P.T. (1998), 'Orreries, the Date of [Plato] Letter ii, and Eudoros of Alexandria', *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 80, 241-67.
- King, B. (1999), 'The Rhetoric of the Victim: Odysseus in the Swineherd's Hut', *CA* 18, 74-93.



- Kirkwood, G.M. (1984), 'Blame and Envy in the Pindaric Epinician', in D.E. Gerber (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury*, Chico CA.
- Kowerski, L.M. (2005), *Simonides on the Persian Wars: A Study of the Elegiac Verses of the "New Simonides"*, New York.
- (unpublished), 'A Competition in Praise: An Allusion to Simon. Fr.11 in Theocr. *Idyll* 22.214-223'.
- Kraay, C.M. (1976), *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins*, London.
- Kraut, B.H. (2004), 'The Princeton Simonides', in J.M.S. Cowey and B. Kramer (edd.), *Paramone: Editionen und Aufsätze von Mitgliedern des Heidelberger Instituts für Papyrologie zwischen 1982 und 2004*, Leipzig.
- Kurke, L. (1991), *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*, Ithaca NY.
- (1999), *Coins, Bodies, Games and Gold: the politics of meaning in archaic Greece*, Princeton NJ.
- Kyriakou, P. (2004), 'Κλέος and Poetry in Simonides fr. 11 W<sup>2</sup> and Theocritus, Id. 16', *Rh.Mus.* 147, 221-46.
- La Penna, A. (1959), *Scholia in Ibin*, Florence.
- Lasserre, F. (1984), 'La Fable en Grèce dans la Poésie Archaïque', in F.R. Adrados (ed.), *La Fable*, Geneva (*Entretiens Hardt* 30), 61-96.
- Lefkowitz, M. (1981), *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, London.
- Lehmler, C. (2005), *Syrakus unter Agathokles und Hieron II. Die Verbindung von Kultur und Macht in einer hellenistischen Metropole*, Frankfurt.
- Leshner, J.H. (1992), *Xenophanes of Colophon: Fragments*, Toronto (*Phoenix* suppl. 30).
- Lewis, D.M. (1992), 'Mainland Greece, 479-451 B.C.', in Lewis et al. (edd.): *The Cambridge Ancient History* (second ed.), vol.5 'The Fifth Century B.C.', Cambridge, 96-120.
- Liberman, G. (2004), *Pindare: Pythiques*, Paris.
- Livrea, E. (2006), 'La tomba di Simonide da Callimaco a S. Saba', *ΣPE* 156, 53-7.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1971), *The Justice of Zeus*, Berkeley CA.
- (1973), 'Modern Interpretation of Pindar: the Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes', *JHS* 93, 109-37 (reprinted in *Greek Epic, Lyric and Tragedy: the Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones*, Oxford, 1990, 110-53).
- (1994), 'Notes on the New Simonides', *ΣPE* 101, 1-3.
- Lobel, E. (1981), 'Simonides', in *Papyri Greek and Egyptian, Edited by Various Hands, in honour of E.G. Turner on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, London, 21-3.
- Luppe, W. (1993), 'Zum neuesten Simonides: P.Oxy. 3965 Fr.1/2327 Fr.6.', *ΣPE* 99, 1-9.
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1994), 'Vergil's *Aeneid*: Subversion by Intertextuality. Catullus 66.39-40 and other examples', *G&R* 41, 187-204.

- Maddoli, G., Nafissi, M. and Saladino, V. (1999), *Pausania: Guida della Grecia: libro VI (l'Elide e Olimpia)*, Milan.
- Maehler, H. (2003), *Bacchylides Carmina cum Fragmentis*, Munich (Teubner) (11th ed.).
- (2004), *Bacchylides: a selection*, Cambridge.
- Martin, R. (1998), 'The Seven Sages as Performers of Wisdom', in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (edd.), *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*, Oxford, 108-28.
- Marrou, H.-I., *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité: I. Le monde grec*, Paris, 1981 (orig. 1965).
- Massaro, D. (1991), 'Plato e la παιδεία tirannica: per una lettura dell'"Ipparco"', *Atene e Roma* 36, 57-69.
- Meiggs, R. and Lewis, D.M. (1988), *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC*, Oxford (2nd ed.).
- Meister, K. (1967), *Die sizilische Geschichte bei Diodor von den Anfängen bis zum Tod des Agathokles: Quellenuntersuchungen zu Buch IV-XXI*, diss. Munich.
- Merkelbach, R. (1952), 'Bettelgedichte (Theokrit, Simonides und Walther von der Vogelweide)', *Rh.M.* 95, 312-27.
- Miller, M.C. (1997), *Athens and Persia in the fifth century BC: a study in cultural receptivity*, Cambridge.
- Molyneux, J.H. (1971), 'Simonides and the Dioscuri', *Phoenix* 25, 197-205.
- (1992), *Simonides: a Historical Study*, Waiconda IL.
- Momigliano, A. (1993), *The Development of Greek Biography*, Cambridge MA.
- Montiglio, S. (2005), *Wandering in Ancient Greek Culture*, Chicago.
- Moretti, L. (1957), *Olympionikai: i vincitori degli antichi agoni olimpici*, Rome.
- Morris, I. (1996), 'The Strong Principle of Equality and the Archaic Origins of Greek Democracy', in J. Ober and C. Hendrick (edd.), *Demokratia: a conversation on democracies, ancient and modern*, Princeton NJ, 19-48.
- Most, G.W. (1985), *The Measures of Praise: structure and function in Pindar's Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes*, Göttingen.
- (1994), 'Simonides' Ode to Scopas in Contexts', in I.J.F. de Jong and J.P. Sullivan (edd.), *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature*, Leiden, 127-52.
- (1996), 'Reflecting Sappho,' in E. Greene (edd.), *Re-Reading Sappho: Reception and Transmission*, Berkeley CA, 11-35.
- Muellner, L. (1976), *The Meaning of Homeric εὖχομαι Through its Formulas*, Innsbruck.
- (1990), 'The Simile of the Cranes and the Pygmies: a study of Homeric Metaphor', *HSCP* 93, 59-101.
- Nafissi, M. (1991), *La nascita del kosmos: studi sulla storia e società di Sparta*, Naples.
- Nagy, G. (1999), *The Best of the Achaeans*, Baltimore and London (2nd ed.).

- Nicholson, N. (2000), 'Pederastic Poets and Adult Patrons', *CW* 93, 235-59.
- Nisetich, F.J. (1977), 'Convention and Occasion in *Isthmian* 2', *CSCA* 10, 133-56.
- (1989), *Pindar and Homer*, Baltimore and London.
- Obbink, D. (2001), 'The Genre of Plataea: Generic Unity in the New Simonides', in Boedeker and Sider 2001, 65-85.
- Olson, S.D. (1998), *Aristophanes Peace*, Oxford.
- Page, D.L. (1936), 'The Elegiacs in Euripides' *Andromache*', in *Greek Poetry and Life* (Festschrift G. Murray), Oxford, 206-30.
- Parente, M.I. (ed., intro., comm.) and Ciani, M.G. (trans.) (2002), *Platone: Lettere*, Milan.
- Parry, A. (1972), 'Language and Characterisation in Homer', *HSCP* 76, 1-22.
- Parsons, P.J. (1992a), '3965. Simonides, *Elegies*', *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* LIX (= *Graeco-Roman Memoirs* of the Egypt Exploration Society, no.79), London, 4-50.
- (1992b), 'Poesia ellenistica: testi e contesti', *Aevum Antiquum* 5, 9-19.
- (2001), 'These Fragments We Have Shored against Our Ruin', in Boedeker and Sider 2001, 55-64.
- Paterson, D. (2003), 'A Reading', in id.: *Landing Light*, London.
- (2004), 'The Dark Art of Poetry', T.S. Eliot lecture, delivered in the Purcell Room, South Bank Centre, London, 30th October 2004, viewed August 2006 at <http://www.poetrylibrary.org.uk/news/poetryscene/?id=20>
- Pavese, C.O. (1995), 'Elegia di Simonide agli Spartiati per Plataea', *ΣPE* 107, 1-26.
- Pellizer, E. (1981), 'Simonide κίμβηξ e un nuovo trimetro di Semonide Amorgino', *QUCC* 38, 47-51.
- Pfeiffer, R. (1949-53), *Callimachus*, Oxford (2 vols.).
- (1968), *A History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford.
- Pfeijffer, I. (2000), *First Person Futures in Pindar*, Stuttgart (*Hermes Einzelschrift* 81).
- Poliakoff, M. (1982), *Studies in the Terminology of the Greek Combat Sports*, Königstein.
- Poltera, O. (1997), *Le Langage de Simonide*, Bern.
- (1998), 'Von Seleukos zu Simonides und zurück: Simon. *PMG* 540', *MH* 55, 129-30.
- (2005), 'Deliaka (*Simon. PMG* 539): Zu einer vermeintlichen Gedichtsammlung', *SIFC* (4th series) 3, 183-7.
- Privitera, G.A. (1982), *Pindaro le Istniche*, Milan.
- Puelma, M. (1996), 'Επίγραμμα – *epigramma*: Aspekte einer Wortgeschichte', *MH* 53, 123-139.
- Puleyn, S. (2000), *Homer Iliad Book One*, Oxford.

- Purcell, N. (1995), 'Eating Fish: the Paradoxes of Seafood', in J. Wilkins, D. Harvey and M. Dobson (edd.), *Food in Antiquity*, Exeter, 132-49.
- Rankin, H.D. (1975), 'Archilochus in Pindar "Pythian 2"', *Emerita* 43, 249-55.
- Rawles, R. (2005), 'Simonides and a New Papyrus in Princeton', *ΣPE* 153, 59-67.
- (forthcoming, 2006), review of Kowerski 2005, *JHS* 126.
- Redfield, J.M. (1975), *Nature and Culture in the Iliad*, Chicago.
- Reinhardt, K. (1997), 'The Judgement of Paris', in P.V. Jones and G.M. Wright, *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation*, Oxford, 170-91 (= K. Reinhardt, 'Der Parisurteil' in *ibid.*, *Tradition und Geist*, Göttingen, 1960, 16-36; orig. Frankfurt, 1938).
- Richardson, S. (1990), *The Homeric Narrator*, Nashville TN.
- Richter, G. (1965), *The Portraits of the Greeks*, London (2 vols.).
- Robertson, M. (1975), *A History of Greek Art*, Cambridge.
- Rose, V. (1886), *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*, Leipzig.
- Rosen, R.M. (1990), 'Hipponax and the Homeric Odysseus', *Eikasmos* 1, 11-25.
- Ross, S.A. (2005), 'Barbarophonos: Language and panhellenism in the *Iliad*', *CP* 100, 299-316.
- Rutherford, I.C. (2001), 'The New Simonides: Towards a Commentary', in Boedeker and Sider 2001, 33-54.
- (2002), *Pindar's Paeans: a reading of the fragments with a survey of the genre*, Oxford.
- Sbardella, L. (2000), 'Achille e gli eroi di Platea: Simonide, fr. 10-11 W<sup>2</sup>', *ΣPE* 129, 1-11.
- (2004), 'Teocrito Pindarico. Il κέρδος, la fama e la poesia omerica in *Nemea* 7.17-31 e nell' *Idillio* XVI', *Sem. Rom.* 7, 65-83.
- Schadewaldt, W. (1959), 'Kleiderdinge', *Hermes* 87, 15-32.
- Schmidt, M. (1854), *Didymi Chalcenteri grammatici Alexandrini quae supersunt omnia*, Leipzig.
- Schneidewin, F. G. (1835), *Simonidis Cei Reliquiae*, Brunswick.
- Seaford, R. (2004), *Money and the Early Greek Mind*, Cambridge.
- Segal, C. (1994), *Singers, Heroes and Gods in the Odyssey*, Ithaca NY.
- Shaw, P.-J. (2001), 'Lords of Hellas, Old Men of the Sea: The Occasion of Simonides' *Elegy on Plataea*', in Boedeker and Sider 2001, 164-81.
- Shipley, G. (2000), *The Greek World after Alexander 323-30 BC*, London.
- Sider, D. (1999), review of Carson 1999, *CW* 93, 113-4.
- (2001), '“As is the Generation of Leaves” in Homer, Simonides, Horace and Stobaeus', in Boedeker and Sider 2001, 272-88.

- (2004), 'Posidippus Old and New', in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach (edd.), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*, Washington DC, 29-41.
- (forthcoming), 'Sylloge Simonidea', in P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (edd.), *The Brill Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, Leiden.
- Silk, M. (1987), *Homer: the Iliad*, Cambridge.
- Slater, W.J. (1969), *Lexicon to Pindar*, Berlin.
- (1972), 'Simonides' House', *Phoenix* 26, 232-40.
- Snell, B. (1965), *Dichtung und Gesellschaft*, Hamburg.
- Sommerstein, A. (2005), 'A Lover of his Art: the art-form as wife and mistress in Greek poetic imagery', in E. Stafford and J. Herrin (edd.), *Personification in the Greek World: from Antiquity to Byzantium*, Aldershot, 161-71.
- Stehle, E. (2001), 'A Bard of the Iron Age and his Auxiliary Muse', in Boedeker and Sider 2001, 106-119.
- Svenbro, J. (1976), *La Parole et le Marbre: aux origines de la poétique grecque*, Lund.
- (1993), *Phrasikleia: an anthropology of reading in Ancient Greece*, Ithaca NY.
- Svensson, L. and Grant, P.J., illustrated by Mullarney, K. and Zetterström, D. (1999), *Collins Bird Guide*, London.
- Thompson, D'A. W. (1936), *A Glossary of Greek Birds*, London (2nd ed.).
- Thummer, E. (1968-9), *Pindar: Die Isthmischen Gedichte*, Heidelberg (2 vols.).
- van der Valk, M. (1953), 'Homer's Nationalistic Attitude', *Antiquité Classique* 22, 5-26.
- van Dijk, G.J. (1997), *AINOI, ΛΟΓΟΙ, ΜΥΘΟΙ: Fables in Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic Greek Literature*, Leiden (*Mnemosyne* suppl. 166).
- van Groningen, B.A. (1948), 'Simonide et les Thessaliens', *Mnemosyne* (4th series) 1, 1-7.
- van Raalte, M. (1988), 'Greek Elegiac Verse Rhythm', *Glotta* 66, 145-78.
- Verdenius, W.J. (1982), 'Pindar's Second Isthmian Ode: a commentary', *Mnemosyne* 35, 1-37.
- (1988), *Commentaries on Pindar*, vol.ii, Leiden (*Mnemosyne* suppl. 101).
- Vox, O. (2002), 'ἀγαθὸν κλέος: poeta e committente nelle *Cariti* (Theocr. 16)', *Kleos* 7, 193-209.
- Wehrli, F. (1967-9), *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, Basel (2nd ed.; 10 vols.).
- Wendel, C. (1920), *Überlieferung und Entstehung der Theokrit-Scholien*, Berlin.
- West, M.L. (1974), *Studies in Early Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Oxford and New York.
- (1981), *Greek Metre*, Oxford.
- (1990), *Studies in Aeschylus*, Oxford.
- (1992), *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford.
- (1993a), 'Simonides Redivivus', *ΣΠΕ* 98, 1-14.

- (1993b), *Greek Lyric Poetry*, Oxford.
- (1998), *Aeschyli Tragoediae cum incerti poetae Prometheus*, Stuttgart (Teubner).
- (1998-2000), *Homeri Ilias*, Stuttgart (2 vols.) (Teubner).
- (2003), *Greek Epic Fragments from the seventh to the fifth centuries BC*, Cambridge Mass. (Loeb).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von, (1913), *Sappho und Simonides: Untersuchungen über griechische Lyriker*, Berlin.
- (1922), *Pindaros*, Berlin.
- Wilhelm, A (1972), 'Simonideische Gedichte', in G. Pfohl (ed.), *Die griechische Elegie*, Darmstadt ("Wege der Forschung"), 290-322 (= *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts Wien* 2 (1899), 221-44).
- Willett, S.J. (2000), review of Carson 1999, *BMCR* 2000.02.28 (viewed August 2006 at <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/2000/2000-02-28.html>).
- Woodbury, L. (1968), 'Pindar and the Mercenary Muse', *TAPhA* 99, 527-42.
- (1985), 'Ibycus and Polycrates', *Phoenix* 39, 193-220.
- Yates, F. (1966), *The Art of Memory*, Chicago.

