

THE HYMNIC STRUCTURE OF THE NEW SIMONIDES

DIRK OBBINK

Among recent papyrological finds, a portion of identifiably Simonidean elegy preserved on papyrus from Oxyrhynchus¹ is almost without parallel in its potential for reorienting our thinking about early Greek poetry. The tale is a familiar one: a fragmentary ancient manuscript overlaps with another, previously known, but unidentified, and with two quotations in ancient authors. Out of the composite, a new poem can almost be said to exist. The cost for us is that difficulties are “raised in places where there were none.”² Plutarch, who quotes several distichs, supplies an author and subject. The two papyrus MSS (*POxy* 3965 and 2327) provide us with two different copies of the poem,³ preserving in all over one hundred completely or partially preserved lines of elegy, which uniquely combine features of Pindaric encomium, Homeric phraseology, sub-epic narrative technique, and Tyrtaean battle themes to recount and memorialize an historical event of considerable military and political importance.

For this reason the new fragments of Simonides’ poem on the battle at Plataea augment in an unexpected way our corpus of early Greek celebratory poetry. Scarcely more than five years earlier, E. L. Bowie had posited the existence of just such a class of early Greek elegy as distinct

1 Parsons 1992a.4–50 = Simonides fr. 2–85 W². More extensive restorations with interesting discussion in West 1993a. See also Haslam’s review of *IEG* 2² (Haslam 1993).

2 Lobel 1948.68.

3 As a result we know there were no less than two different copies of this book of Simonides’ poetry at Oxyrhynchus. Whether these poems were all of a single genre (e.g., elegies) or a selection from various types organized according to some other criterion remains to be determined.

from sympotic elegy.⁴ I argue that the new fragment confirms Bowie's suspicions, with a new twist: the epic elegy turns out to be introduced by a prooemial hymn to a divinity. On the other hand, such a structure (*prooimion + nomos + sphragis*), which smacks of later Hellenistic genre-crossing,⁵ turns out not to be so very alien to early Greek rhapsodic poetry, as I will try to show. First I set forth the basic structure of the poem, as far as it can be discerned from the new fragments.

I

A highly mythologizing opening masks the poem's ultimate subject at the beginning of our largest fragment of the poem (*POxy* 2327, fr. 5 + 6 + 27 col. 1 + 3965, fr. 1 + 2). At the very point at which this fragment first begins, under discussion is the funeral of Achilles: ἦ πίτυν ἐν βῆστσαις and ὑλοτόμοι τάμ[νωσιν] (lines 2–3). Patroclus is mentioned (line 7) and Achilles is being addressed; this much is certain from the parting salutation to the son of Thetis at line 19, giving rise to West's restorations of 7–8:

οὐ δή τίς σ' ἐδ]άμασσεν ἐφ[ημέριος βροτὸς αὐτός,
ἀλλ' ὑπ' Ἀπόλλ]ωνος χειρὶ [τυπεὶς ἐδάμης.

It is unclear whether this refers to the death of Achilles, or rather to that of Patroclus. In addition to the parallels cited by Parsons (1992a.29), cf. *Il.* 16.849 (the dying Patroclus to Hector): ἀλλά με μοῖρ' ὄλοὴ καὶ Λητοῦς ἔκτανεν νιός | ἀνδρῶν δ' Εὔφορβος· σὺ δέ με τρίτος ἔξεναρίζεις. But West argues on the basis of the prominence of Achilles in this section that Apollo should figure here for the death of Achilles himself. (Parsons compares *Il.* 19.416f., 22.359, noting that Achilles' death is certainly alluded to in line 18.)

In lines 10–12 Priam is named, and Paris too, as a result of whose actions the “chariot of divine justice” (θείης ἄρμα . . . δίκ[ης]) reaches its destined goal: the ἀγέμωνοι Δαναοί sack the city (13–14). At this point the

4 Bowie 1986.

5 Assuming, of course, that a “Kreuzung of genres” is the appropriate model of explanation for Hellenistic experimentation with generic form. I argue in a forthcoming study that it is not.

poet assures us of the fame which their poet conferred on these short-lived heroes (15–18), bids a fond farewell to his subject Achilles (19), and employs a transitional formula familiar from the Homeric hymns to invoke his “Muse of many names” and lead over to a new theme (20–24): the engagement at Plataea (25ff.). When the time comes there will be on the battlefield (at least in the preserved fragments) no killing and stabbing, no sacking of cities, no chariot of divine justice pursuing her allotted course: but there is no dearth of praise for heroized mortals and no lack of connection implied between the heroic death immortalized by Homer and those fallen at Plataea whom the poem memorializes.

II

τοὶ δὲ πόλι]ν πέρσαντες ἀοίδιμον [οἴκαδ' ἵ]κοντο
 φέρτατοι ἡρ]όων ἀγέμαχοι Δαναοί[,
 15 οῖσιν ἐπ' ἀθά]γατον κέχυται κλέος ἀγ[δρὸς] ἔκητι
 ὃς παρ' ιοπ]λοκάμων δέξατο Πιερίδ[ων
 πᾶσαν ἀλη]θείην, καὶ ἐπώνυμον ὄπ[λοτέρ]οισιν
 ποίησ' ἡμ]ιθέων ὠκύμορον γενεή[ν.
 ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲ]ν νῦν χαῖρε, θεᾶς ἐρικυ[δέος νιέ
 20 κούρης εἰν]αλίου Νηρέος· αὐτάρ ἐγῳ
 κικλήισκω] σ' ἐπίκουρον ἐμοί, π[ολυάνυμ]ε μοῦσα,
 εἴ πέρ γ' ἀν]θρώπων εὐχομένω[ν μέλεαι·
 ἔντυνο]ν καὶ τόνδ[ε μελ]ίφρονα κ[όσμον ἀο]ιδῆς
 25 ἡμετ]έρης, ἵνα τις [μνή]σεται ὑ[στερον αὖ
 ἀνδρῶ]ν, οἵ Σπάρτ[η]

And after they sacked the city into infamy, for home
 did the illustrious leading Greek heroes set forth.
 15 On their heads is shed undying fame by the power of a
 man
 who received from the violet-tressed Pierides
 all truthfulness, who made a lasting name, among those to
 come,
 for the generation of demigods, swift to its doom.
 But fare ye well now, brave son of goddess,
 20 daughter of sea-deep Nereus. And I
 implore you as my ally, O Muse of many names:
 if ever indeed you heeded mortals at their prayers,

furnish too this pleasing arrangement for a song
 of mine, that one might recollect more recent
 25 men, who at Sparta . . .

First, the structure of the ode: the new fragment is remarkable for the extent to which it reveals within a fairly brief compass the organization of the elegy and its articulation of forms of address:

- 1) An opening mythological hymn (or *prooimion*) in which a divinity or hero is apostrophized and directly addressed gives way, in the course of
- 2) a traditional hymnic conclusion and medial address to a divinity, to
- 3) discursive reflection upon and narration of contemporary events and persons, including:
- 3a) a listing or catalogue of participants by city.⁶

This organization appears to be unique among the surviving corpus of archaic elegy, though 1 and 2 are well exemplified in early hymn, encomium, paean, and epinician (e.g., Pindar), and 3 might have been expected from some strands of archaic elegy (e.g., Tyrtaeus), while the encomiastic catalogue style of 3 is probably a borrowing or imitation (if those are the right words) of epic.⁷

Still, the resulting effect is reminiscent of nothing so much as archaic hymnody, in particular the transitional lines 10–21: $\alpha\dot{\nu}\tau\dot{\alpha}\rho\ \dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$, for instance, exemplified at *Hom. Hymn. Apoll.* 545f., exactly at the transition from the “Delian” to the “Pythian” part of the hymn: $\kappa\alpha\dot{\iota}\ \sigma\dot{\nu}\ \mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu\ o\ddot{\nu}\tau\omega\ \chi\alpha\dot{\iota}\rho\epsilon$, $\Delta\dot{\iota}\dot{\delta}\kappa\alpha\dot{\iota}\ \Lambda\eta\tau\dot{\alpha}\nu\ \nu\dot{\iota}\epsilon\cdot\ |\ \alpha\dot{\nu}\tau\dot{\alpha}\rho\ \dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\ \kappa\alpha\dot{\iota}\ \sigma\dot{\epsilon}\iota\ \kappa\alpha\dot{\iota}\ \ddot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta\varsigma\ \mu\eta\varsigma\sigma\mu\ \dot{\alpha}\dot{\iota}\dot{\delta}\eta\varsigma$. W. Kranz maintained⁸ that this formula represented the rhapsode’s transition from hymn to epic recitation, a thesis which seems to fit the present elegy even better than the *Hymn to Apollo*. As Parsons notes, in later poetry, the opening hymnic “proem” could be omitted and the formula

6 It is unclear whether this is meant to be a static catalogue or a narration of an action, i.e., the march to Plataea. Boeckeler 1995 discusses the passage.

7 Compare reminiscences of epic theme and diction in Mimnermus fr. 13–13a W. Like Simonides’ Plataea poem, the *Iliad*’s Catalogue of Ships similarly requires a mid-poem reinvocation of the Muse.

8 Kranz 1961.11f.

αὐτὸρ ἐγώ made to serve as the beginning of a poem (Xenoph. 7 W) or, with the following recitation truncated, it could signal the end of a book (Callim. fr. 112.8 Pf.) or of a poem (cf. Posidippus 705.21 SH).⁹ For Simonides, however, in Parson's words (1992a.32), "the formula of closing leads on to a formula of beginning, the invocation of the Muse. But there is no clear divide: the formulae are integrated, both in syntax and in line-structure."

What exactly, then, preceded this transition in Simonides' elegy? How did the poem begin? *POxy* 2327, fr. 6, which overlaps with the new and more extensive 3965, fr. 1 + 2, is the top of a column, while 2327, fr. 5 (i.e., lines 1–4 in West's edition), dealing identifiably with a heroic death, is a column's foot. Therefore lines 5ff. were preceded in the poem by at least one column, consisting of at least 24 and perhaps as many as 36 lines (by Parsons' careful estimates, 1992a.33). Though certainty is impossible here, it would be apt to see the poem as having a brief prooemium of, say, 20–40 lines (of which the last 18 are preserved), in which Achilles, or Achilles and Thetis (named in 19), perhaps together with the Muses (who are perhaps reinvoked rather than introduced at lines 20–24), were addressed in a suitably hymnic or threnodic manner. Achilles was certainly central in this section. That would explain, as Parsons notes, why "Simonides gave Patroclus a substantial niche even in this short-order view of the Trojan War." Yet the action is telescoped, the transition sudden: lines 11–12 sum up the cause of the war, 13–14 its conclusion. However this may be, the fact that the poet also addresses his Muse directly in line 21 is not at odds with this hypothesis; and the parting salutation to Achilles as Thetis' son in 19 implies that they have been the main subjects of the poet's attentions in the preceding section, a mortal and an immortal foil each for the poet's subjects in the following section: poetic immortality conferred on martial valor.

The appeal to a succession of addressees is, in fact, fairly consonant with what we know about early didactic, encomiastic, and paraenetic forms of rhapsodic composition.¹⁰ It is well exemplified in archaic

9 And see Lloyd-Jones 1990 [1963].185f. Additional correspondences between the new Simonides fragments and Posidippus are enumerated by Gigante 1994.

10 The hymnic parody of the rhapsodic theogony at Aristoph. *Aves* 676–736, for example, has a "first poem" (676–84) in glyconics which exhorts the Nightingale to introduce the theogony proper, followed by an anapaestic prelude (685–92) beginning ὅγε δή and addressed directly to "feeble mortals" (ὄνδρες ὀμωνόβιοι). Hesiod in the *Theogony* begins "from the Muses" (who themselves address ποιμένες ὄγρευλοι at 26–28), exhorts

hymnody, in which even addresses or admonitions to the poet's mortal hearers may appear among a succession of invocations of divinities.¹¹ Hesiod's *Works and Days*, for instance, begins by addressing the Muses, names Perses at line 10, addresses him by name in the second person at line 27 and frequently thereafter. So also Pindar in *Pythian* 1: Hieron is named at line 32 and addressed directly from 85–100, but the poem also invokes by direct address Zeus (29, 67), Apollo (39), and the Muse (58). Also instructive is a comparison with Empedocles, who (apart from all controversy about the status of his poems as individual works), moved in the same poem from address to his mortal apprentice Pausanias (B1 DK) to a formal invocation of his personal rhapsodic muse Calliopeia (B131 DK):¹²

εἰ γὰρ ἐφημερίων ἔνεκέν τινος, ἀμβροτε Μοῦσα,
ἥμετέρας μελέτας ⟨άδε τοι⟩ διὰ φροντίδος ἐλθεῖν,
εὐχομένῳ νῦν αὖτε παρίστασο, Καλλιόπεια,
ἀμφὶ θεῶν μακάρων ἀγαθὸν λόγον ἐμφαίνοντι.

If for the sake of any one of mortal men, immortal Muse,
it pleased you that our cares came to your attention,
now once more, Calliopeia, answer my prayer and stand by
as a worthy account of the blessed gods is being unfolded.¹³

A comparison with Lucretius' imitation of Empedocles' procedure is also instructive:¹⁴ in *De rerum natura* Lucretius' addressee Memmius is

himself at 36 (τόνη), and directly addresses the Muses only at 104–15, imploring them to sing the theogony proper that follows. On addresses to gods in the middle of poems see also Miller 1986.57–65.

11 According to Bundy 1972.83, the composers of the *Homeric Hymns* “do not in general display awareness of auditors other than the god,” but he adds: “although such hymnal announcements as ὕστοματι are addressed not to the god but to an audience waiting to hear his name, and such concluding prayers . . . doubtless express concern for the pleasure of a critical audience as well as for that of the god.” So also at *Hom. Hymn. Apoll.* 3.172f. the rhapsode reveals in his address to the Delian maidens his concern for critical reputation among humans; in *Hymn.* 6 the singer's prayer to the god for victory in the contest presumes a critical audience of human judges (cf. *Hymn.* 30.18, 31.17, 11.5, 2.494; *Callim. Hymn. Apoll.* 4 and 17, *Hymn. Iov.* 5–9).

12 Cf. Hesiod *Theogony* 68–79, with the etymology ὅτι καλῆ.

13 Transl. Wright 1981.

14 Sedley 1989 argues further that, like Lucretius' poem, Empedocles' Περὶ φύσεως began with a hymn invoking Aphrodite.

named eleven times in the poem, but the first 49 lines of book 1 are addressed directly to Venus. While book 3 opens with an address to Epicurus, in book 6 an invocation of the Muses appears at lines 92–95.

We know that Empedocles' invocation of the Muses did not fall at the beginning of its poem (*εἰ γὰρ* in B131 line 1 cannot be inceptive).¹⁵ It is a similar structure of invocation that we find in the new Simonides fragment, where the Muse is invoked in the middle of the poem. Further comparison is revealing. In a recent article, Mark Edwards concludes from the tense of *ἐμφαίνοντι* in line 4 that Empedocles is already in the process of revealing this *λόγος* and must also therefore be “the sole composer of the poem.” On these grounds he concludes further that Empedocles’ invocations of the Muse can not therefore “describe ‘Pierian inspiration.’”¹⁶

In the same way, Simonides might seem at first sight to invoke his Muse in the middle of his poem, only to demote her to the position of mere helper, *ἐπίκουρος* (21), rather than speaker of his poem, at the conclusion of the opening mythological hymn.¹⁷ As will become clear, I do not think this interpretation can be sustained (either for Empedocles or Simonides). Edwards, for instance, ignores the evidence of Empedocles B4 in which the Muse has already been asked to validate the persuasive elements of the poem, and B131 (see below) in which she is asked to send a pure stream of discourse through the poet’s mouth. For the new Simonides fragment, Empedocles B4, at any rate, confirms that the assistance of the Muse may be required even in the middle of a poem. The delayed request for the Muse to *ἀστέρας εἰπεῖν* at Aratus *Phaen.* 16–18 may be usefully compared. As in the introduction to the Catalogue of Ships at *Il.* 2.484–93, internal reinvocations of the Muse such as these seem to mark the transition to a different type of poetry/discourse.

If we are correct in suspecting that the first section of our fragment (perhaps the first in the elegy) began with a direct address to Thetis (or Thetis and Achilles), it would be interesting to know what suggested to the poet the theme (or name?) of Achilles in the first place, and in particular the topic of Achilles’ death, for the composition of this particular elegy: whether, for example, because the real or imagined context for the composition or its performance was perhaps a festival or other celebration

15 Desperately emending to *εἰκ ἄρ* in order to effect such a beginning is Gallavotti 1973–74.

16 Edwards 1991.288 n. 20.

17 This possibility was first suggested to me by Eva Stehle (though I should not hold her to it now). Cf. further her contribution to this volume.

at one of several cult centers devoted to Achilles in Sparta, or as Parsons suggests, in Thessaly—or whether it was rather the kind of cultic honors offered to divinized heroes in sub-Homeric epic and tragedy that suggested to the poet a connection between the death of Achilles and an encomiastic occasion memorializing those brave individuals who participated and perished in a famous battle of recent memory.

Still more remarkable may be the almost inescapable reference to Homer himself (15–18) as responsible, as a result of his direct link with the divine patronesses of poetry, for shedding the *kleos* of immortality on those heroes of a lost age, invoked in the proem, who were fated to know a swift doom and young death. In the case of Achilles, the immortality conferred by that *kleos* is even assimilated to something like the status enjoyed by his divine and paradigmatically youthful Nereid mother Thetis (19–20). Simonides immediately turns, in the familiar form of the cletic prayer with historical exemplum,¹⁸ to invoke his own Muse (21, π[ολυώνυμ]ε Μοῦσα). He thereby agonistically distances himself from Homer, at the same time as he implies an analogy between:

- 1) What the Greeks of epic did in rites of burial and funeral cult for Achilles;
- 2) What Homer did in his divinely inspired poems for the heroes of the *Iliad*; and
- 3) What Simonides himself does in the present elegy for the near-contemporary subjects of the section which follows.

In fact the connection between these three is drawn so close in the comparison as almost to be equated outright.

18 As also exemplified in Empedocles B131 (quoted above), where Diels thought that ἐλθεῖν in line 2 referred to the Muse's prior assistance to the poet on a known historical occasion. This occasion, he concluded, must have been the performance of Empedocles' Περὶ φύσεως, and accordingly he placed B131 among the fragments he thought were called Καθαρμοί. But line 22 of the new Simonides fragment, εἴ πέρ γ' ἀν]θρώπον εὐχομένο[ν μέλεαι, shows this clearly to be a conventional device of rhapsodic invocation: it is purely generic and refers to no specific prior event; rather the idea is that the validity of the poet's vow and claim will be borne out and tested in the course of his current poetic production.

III

The fulcrum of Simonides' poem may well have resided in the transition, introduced by the transitional formula *αὐτὸρ ἐγώ*, between the hymnic, mythological *prooimion* with its Homeric themes and reminiscences, on the one hand, and the historical section (from a very different opera indeed). The identical formula *αὐτὸρ ἐγώ* also occurs at the opening of Empedocles B35 (I quote only the first half of the fragment):

αὐτὸρ ἐγώ παλίνορσος ἐλεύσομαι ἐς πόρον ὅμνων,
τὸν πρότερον κατέλεξα, λόγου λόγον ἔξοχετεύων
κείνον· ἐπεὶ νεῖκος μὲν ἐνέρτατον ἵκετο βένθος
δίνης, ἐν δὲ μέσῃ φιλότης στροφάλιγγι γένηται,
5 ἐν τῇ δὲ τάδε πάντα συνέρχεται ἐν μόνον εἶναι,
οὐκ ἄφαρ, ἀλλὰ θελημὰ συνιστάμεν' ἄλλοθεν ἄλλα.
τῶν δέ τε μισγομένων χεῖτ' ἔθνεα μυρία θνητῶν·

But I shall return again to the course of my songs,
that I previously described, channeling that account
from another. When strife reached the lowest depth
of the eddy, and love is in the middle of the whirl,
5 in her¹⁹ all these come together to be one alone,
not suddenly, but each combining from a different place.
And as they coupled, innumerable tribes of mortals poured
forth;

Although the fragment as quoted by Simplicius contains no direct address, we may assume that the formula *αὐτὸρ ἐγώ* indicates, just as in the new Simonides fragment, the rhapsode's transition from one section of his poem to another. We may conclude further that the type of discourse and the form of address contained in the preceding passage were distinctly different, more mythological, and less specifically didactic.²⁰ The transitional formula *αὐτὸρ ἐγώ* thus marks the movement between an introductory section of the poem and the narrative of the poet's subject matter proper.

19 Or “there” (Inwood), since *ἐν τῇ* can mean either.

20 I.e., from a hymnic *prooimion*, in which B115, B6, and B26 might be included as containing introductory material. B26 apparently contains the *λόγος* from which Empedocles “draws off” this new one (so Wright 1981 ad loc.).

When Empedocles identifies the source of his previous discourse as ὕμνοι (line 1), he clearly harks back to what must have been an introductory hymnic address to a divinity²¹ or to the address in the preserved invocation of the Muse in B3 and/or B131.

So also in the case of Simonides: the transition $\alpha\dot{\nu}\tau\dot{\alpha}\rho\ \dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ is preceded by the invocation of the poet's personal rhapsodic Muse, thereby specifying the generic affinities of the poet's opening discourse. This would yield for lyric and elegy the pattern *prooimion + nomos*,²² a structure which Koller and Nagy think underlies the Homeric Hymn form.²³ The epic *prooimion* was only one of a number of types differentiated by genre. It was always addressed to a divinity, as far as we can tell. In this way it seems to have served to contextualize the performance within a public festival. In lyric, the functions of the *prooimion* were more diverse,²⁴ but they centered on relating the occasion of the poem's praise to the figure of the poet. In Simonides' Plataea poem, the form of the prooemial hymn appears to have been closest to that of epic, while its function approximates the *prooimion* of lyric.²⁵

In addition to the pattern *prooimion + nomos*, we have reason, based on the emulation and allusion in Timotheus' *Persai*,²⁶ to suppose that the structure of Simonides' hymnic Plataea poem included a third section (*sphragis*) at the end. We are entitled to ask whether any of the other fragments preserved in *POxy* 3965 and 2327 come from that. An obvious answer will be found later in the papyrus MS in the famous fragment on the generation of leaves (fr. 19–20).²⁷ As in fr. 11, the poet there similarly lays

21 Aphrodite/Philotēs, if Sedley 1989 is right, probably with some mention of her contrasting principle Neikos. $\pi\acute{o}\rho\omega\ \acute{u}\mu\nu\omega\omega$ means not “path” of song, as it is sometimes rendered, but “source” in the sense of “watercourse,” as shown by Becker 1937.148ff.

22 For $\alpha\dot{\nu}\tau\dot{\alpha}\rho\ \dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ introducing a *nomos*, cf. the last line of Callimachus' *Aitia* 4 (vόμον must be read paroxytone with Kapsomenos). I owe this point, together with the observations on the *nomos* part of Simonides' poem and other advice, to Ian Rutherford.

23 Koller 1956.159–206, Nagy 1990.355f.

24 See, for example, Pindar *O.* 10, and the forthcoming study of its *prooimion* by Aloni.

25 A point kindly communicated to me by Antonio Aloni. See Aloni 1990 (1992).

26 Discussed by Rutherford in this volume.

27 See David Sider's contribution to this volume for a more cautious appraisal. I see no internal papyrological grounds for assuming that the fragments of *POxy* 3965 and 2327 come from different poems rather than from structurally different parts of the same poem, viz. the poem on the Battle of Plataea. We may assume that this poem ranged widely over a range of themes appropriate to its context of praise and performance. L. Koenen points out to me that $\alpha\dot{\nu}\tau\dot{\alpha}\rho\ \dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ in fr. 11 already invites the reader to think that the poem will end and a new (kind of) poem begin—but in fact it does not. That frs. 19 + 20 (“leaves”) and 22

claim to his unique authorship of the poem, and secures his poem against tampering and rhapsodic expansion at the end, by means of a ranked comparison with Homer.

In Simonides' Plataea poem, the transitional formula $\alpha\dot{\nu}\tau\dot{\alpha}\rho\ \dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ in fr. 11 heralds a new discourse, one in which "the old heroes move into the hymn, new heroes occupy the narrative" (Parsons 1994.122). The whole effort is cast in elegiacs, perhaps in as little as two hundred lines. A hymn in elegiacs is certainly no surprise.²⁸ But "miniaturization, crossing of genres—wouldn't we be tempted to call that Hellenistic?" (Parsons 1994.122) if the poem had not been securely identified²⁹ by an ancient author as Simonidean? We are once again struck by the recovery of primitive models where later poets would have seemed to be innovating. One wonders: how many generic boundaries (if we could be sure they then existed) might Simonides have been prepared to cross in the same poem? As Michael Haslam noted (1993.134, confessing that he would "still have rather have had a dirge"): "If this does not tell us how we would have guessed Simonidean elegy would look, all the more valuable to know how it does look."

Christ Church, Oxford

("journey and drinking party") contain sympotic themes that require them to have come from different poems simply begs the question. The claim that these two papyrus rolls contained other elegies as well depends solely on the alleged identification of a fragment from the $\dot{\eta}\ \dot{\epsilon}\pi'\ \dot{\alpha}\rho\tau\dot{\epsilon}\mu\dot{\iota}\sigma\dot{\iota}\phi\ \dot{\nu}\alpha\dot{\nu}\mu\alpha\dot{\chi}\iota\alpha\ \delta\iota'\ \dot{\epsilon}\dot{\lambda}\epsilon\dot{\gamma}\epsilon\dot{\iota}\alpha\dot{\zeta}\iota\zeta$ (*Suda*, s.v. Σιμωνίδης), namely Simonides 3 W², where the restoration in line 5 of the names Ζήτην καὶ] Κάλαξ[ν and their connection with Herod. 7.189 seems to rest on the flimsiest of evidence. My view that the Plataea poem as a single poem occupied each of these papyrus rolls is based on the assumption that the list of Simonides' works in the *Suda* entry gives titles of works, each of which will have occupied at least one papyrus roll.

28 For other Callimachean antecedents see Cameron 1995.147–50. Early on: Xenophanes' and Theognis' sympotic invocations.

29 Plutarch *De Herod. malign.* 42 872d = Simonides 15 W².