

THE NEW SIMONIDES: TOWARDS A COMMENTARY*

IAN RUTHERFORD

THE TEXT

The main sources are two papyri from Oxyrhynchus, both probably to be dated to the second century A.D. These are *POxy* 2327 and *POxy* 3965, which overlap with each other in two places. Simonidean authorship is established by two coincidences with passages of poetry otherwise attributed to Simonides by Plutarch and Stobaeus. The scribe of *POxy* 2327 is the same as that of *POxy* 2430, a collection of fragments of the Simonidean paeans and *epinikia* and perhaps other genres in lyric metres.¹

The papyri contained elegiac poems, some apparently military or historical in theme, others sympotic. It looks as if *POxy* 3965 represents a roll entirely devoted to elegiacs; the roll from which *POxy* 2327 comes may also have been all elegiacs, but if *POxy* 2327 is not wholly distinct from *POxy* 2430, it contained lyric poems as well. In the Hellenistic edition of Simonides, the principle of classification must have been in part by perceived genre, with sections for *threnoi*, dithyrambs, *enkomia*, *epinikia*, and paeans, perhaps *kateukhai* (537 PMG), and a miscellaneous category of *summikta* (540 PMG). The arrangement might have been one genre per

* I'd like to thank the organiser, panelists, and members of the audience at the Atlanta APA meeting, as well as people who attended an informal talk I gave on this subject at Harvard in March of 1995, particularly Prof. C. P. Jones and Prof. C. Watkins, and a special thank-you also to Alessandro Barchiesi and C. Sourvinou-Inwood.

1 Overlaps: in 11 W²/13 W² and in 22 W²; coincidences with Simonides: in 15 W² and 20 W²; scribe of *POxy* 2327 and 2430: Lobel 1981.

book-roll, though that would depend on the number of poems assigned to each genre.² The *Suda* also says that there were epigrams, perhaps the so-called *Sylloge Simonidea*.³ How the elegiac poems were arranged is unclear. The *Suda* refers only to titles—the *Xerxou Naumakhia* and the *Ep' Artemisioi Naumakhia*. These and other poems might have been long enough to fill a whole book-roll on their own, but it seems more likely that they were at most a couple of hundred lines long, and that they were grouped in a book, or books, of elegies. Perhaps there were separate book-rolls for, say, historical and sympotic elegies. The epigrams, if they were included, perhaps formed a short appendix of a few hundred lines at the end of one of the books of elegies.⁴ The arrangement in the edition(s) represented in the papyri does not necessarily correspond to the arrangement in the Hellenistic edition, since a large papyrus, with tall columns of 40 lines, might have absorbed several Hellenistic books. One such large roll perhaps contained longer elegiac fragments, one contained lyrics.

Should we think of an anthology? That might be suggested by the fact that the overlaps between the two papyri are so great. It might be thought that the odds of this sort of coincidence are reduced if we postulate that the texts come from anthologies; there would be fewer poems in circulation, and the chance of more than one papyrus contributing to the same poem increases. However, the same result can be obtained if we postulate merely that some sections of the full editions were more popular than others; the elegies of Simonides might have been more popular than, say, his lyric *threnoi*.⁵

The papyrus is furnished with short scholia supplying variant readings (*diorthoses*), some from the Hellenistic commentators Apion and Nicanor.⁶ There are no signs of longer scholia. No beginnings or endings of poems are preserved, with the exception of *POxy* 2327, fr. 7 = 34 W², a small fragment with a marginal coronis and (perhaps) the last letter of a

2 See Rutherford 1990.201–02.

3 *Sylloge Simonidea*: see Page 1981.122–23, also Cameron 1993.1–2.

4 No fragment in either papyrus seem to correspond to epigrams, but the possibility should be borne in mind.

5 Parsons 1992a.

6 *POxy* 2327: fr. 2a, 10 (21 W²) (Apion); fr. 19 (46 W²) (Apion; also Nicanor?); fr. 31 (6 W²) (Apion); *POxy* 3965: fr. 2.11(11 W².32) (Apion and Nicanor) (α^{π} \aleph = Apion and Nicanor); fr. 18 (64 W² [Apion]).

marginal title;⁷ otherwise, we have no information about employment of titles in either papyrus. Sigla in *POxy* 2327 include χ (marking points in the text deemed to be of special interest) and an inverted U sign (of indeterminate meaning).⁸

To the inconvenience of the scholar, the fragments of Simonides are divided among a number of modern collections. For the elegiac fragments, we have West, *IEG* II² (= *W*²); for the lyric fragments, the standard text is *Poetici Melici Graeci* (PMG); and for the epigrams, Simonidean and Pseudo-Simonidean, we have Page's *Further Greek Epigrams* (FGE). In some cases, the same testimony appears in both *Poetici Melici Graeci* and *Further Greek Epigrams*. Campbell's Loeb (C) follows the enumeration of *Poetici Melici Graeci* and *Further Greek Epigrams*, but for the elegiac fragments, its model is West's first edition, having been completed just before the publication of the new fragments. Campbell also includes a collection of useful testimonia. A comprehensive survey of Simonides is a *desideratum*; it was last attempted by Schneidewin, whose book is still in some respects useful after 160 years.

MILITARY FRAGMENTS

The Naumakhia

The situation is still not resolved beyond doubt. There are five pieces of information:

a) A list of Simonidean works in the *Suda* (printed in West 1992.114; 532, 536 PMG) includes ἡ Καμβύσου καὶ Δαρείου βασιλεία, (ἡ) Ξέρξου ναυμαχία and ἡ ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίῳ ναυμαχία, said to be δι' ἐλεγείας, and ἡ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι (ναυμαχία), said to be μελικῶς. West (1992.114) suggests that ἡ Καμβύσου καὶ Δαρείου βασιλεία and (ἡ) Ξέρξου ναυμαχία are corrupt, and that the original text specified Simonides' lifetime as having covered the reigns of Cambyses and Darius and the sea battle(s) of Xerxes.

7 There seems to be a slightly increased space between the two lines, so perhaps there could have been an interlinear title.

8 For the latter, see McNamee 1992.46, with 14, 32; is it a form of antisigma, which introduces textual revisions?

b) The story of Oreithuia, Boreas, and the birth of Zetes and Kalais is attributed to “The Naumakhia” by Σ Ap. Rhod. 1. 211–15, who claims that the story of the rape of Oreithuia from Brilessus was narrated there (reprinted under 3 W²; 534 PMG);⁹ it is assumed that this must be the poem on the battle of Artemisium, since the Athenians were supposed to have invoked Boreas and Oreithuia before the Persian shipwreck (Hdt. 7.189); but it might also have been (ἡ) Ξέρξου ναυμαχία, which could have included descriptions of both battles.

c) Two lyric fragments from the ἐπ’ Ἀρτεμισίῳ ναυμαχία are cited by Priscian, 533 PMG (not in West).

d) 3 W² (= POxy 3965, fr. 20) has been interpreted to show that Kalais, the brother of Zetes and son of Boreas and Oreithuia, was mentioned in an elegiac poem by Simonides (see below).

e) 7 W² (= POxy 2327, fr. 6) seems to be an elegiac fragment describing a sea battle, and it has been thought that it suits Salamis better than Artemisium (see below).

Before the discovery of d), it was common to trust c) and hence disbelieve a), which could be emended, e.g., so that the Artemisium poem was in lyric and the Salamis poem in elegiacs (was it the same as (ἡ) Ξέρξου ναυμαχία ?), or in some other way. And this hypothesis suited e).¹⁰ Now that we have d), it looks as if the *Suda* might be right after all.

But in that case, what do we make of c)? Were there two such poems on Artemisium, one elegiac, one lyric, perhaps performed in different contexts? But that does not fully solve the problem that the *Suda* and Priscian seem to know poems in different metres as “the” Artemisium poem. Is Priscian mistaken? Alternatively, perhaps the *Suda* is wrong, and the Artemisium poem was in lyric. In that case, perhaps the Salamis poem was after all in elegiacs, and 3 W² may come from there. Perhaps Simonides described the battle of Artemisium again before proceeding to Salamis. Alternatively, perhaps he described a sea battle in the Plataea poem (perhaps the battle of Mycale after the description of the land battle).

Another possibility is that in the Hellenistic edition the title “(ἡ) Ἀρτεμισίῳ ναυμαχία” was applied to a sequence of at least two compositions in different metres. Some inscriptions contain texts in different metres, for example an inscription of Isyllus from Epidauros, which

9 For the tradition, see Simon 1967.

10 Cf., e.g., Molyneux 1992.160.

contains several poems, one in trochaics (A), two in hexameters (B, F), one in prose (D), one section in elegiacs (C1-2), and one in lyric metre (E).¹¹ Simonides may well have composed poems in different forms to commemorate the same victory.¹² Perhaps they were grouped together.¹³ Yet another possibility is that the composition as a whole was called (ἡ) Ξέρξου ναυμαχία, and that it had two sections, one on Artemisium (in elegiacs?), one on Salamis (in lyrics?), and that Priscian misapplies to the whole of it the title of part of it.

I see no way of resolving this issue. The publication of the new papyrus has increased the probability that the Artemisium poem was in elegiacs, but there is still room for doubt.

Fragments Attributed to the Artemisium Poem by West

1 W² (Σ Ap. Rhod. 1.583–42): the reference to Skiathos may come from this poem, but plenty of other contexts are possible also. We know of sacred delegations between Skiathos and Delphi (Sokolowski 1962, n. 16), so perhaps he mentioned it in a paean.

2 W² (POxy 3965, fr. 13): ἐμαχ[makes it likely this is from a battle-description, but it is not certain that the fragment comes from the Artemisium poem.

3 W² (POxy 3965, fr. 20): in line 5, the name Kalais (as in Καλαίς) is reconstructed on the basis of] KA'ΛAI·[, where the dot over the letter before the bracket could be from a diaeresis over an iota marking that it belongs to an independent syllable. In line 11, the κόρη could be Oreithuia, as West says, if Kalais was mentioned earlier on; otherwise Thetis, or another Nereid. In lines 12ff. West 1992.3 argues for the presence of the old man of the sea, presumably prophesying.

4 W² (POxy 3965, fr. 12): this could well come from a description of a sea battle: we catch a reference to dry land, something about a harbour, and perhaps Boreas (?). In line 4, West suggests there

11 Powell 1925.

12 He may have written “Simon.” 24 FGE, which commemorates the battle of Artemisium.

13 David Sider suggests that the classification *summikta* (see above) might have referred to mixed groups of poems of this sort.

might be a reference to the diver Skyllias of Skione, mentioned by Herodotus (8.8).

A side issue is that Himerius in two passages connects the wind with Simonides, suggesting that the wind as invoked by Simonides might accompany the procession at the Athenian Panathenaia (47.14 and 12.32–33; 535 PMG). The natural interpretation is that these references come from the Artemisium poem, the battle in which Boreas played a major part.¹⁴ Bowra objected that the wind mentioned by Himerius was gentle, and took it to refer to Zephyrus and Salamis (cf. Hdt. 8.96.2); Podlecki 1968.265–66, following other scholars, reasserted the case for the Artemisium poem.¹⁵ Whichever the battle, it could still be inferred from Himerius *Or.* 47 that Simonides invoked the wind in the context of the Panathenaia, and that the poem was a *prosodion* accompanying the sacred ship, perhaps in lyric metre. But such an inference would be a mistake: the context of Himerius' speech is the Panathenaia, and the speaker links with it the wind that he knows has an Athenian connection.

Fragments Attributed by West to the Salamis Poem¹⁶

8 W² (= 625 PMG, *Eleg.* 2 C) and **9 W²** (= *Eleg.* 3 C) could come from anywhere, not necessarily a poem on a sea battle. **5 W²** (= *Eleg.* 1 C) and *Vita Pindari Ambros.* i.2.21 Dr. (= 536 PMG [note] = Pindar, fr. 272) show that Simonides mentioned the battle of Salamis, but tell us nothing of the form.¹⁷ **6–7 W²** (= *POxy* 2327, fr. 31) are taken by Barigazzi 1963.64 and (tentatively) Podlecki 1968.268 as referring to Salamis, partly because of the trumpet (line 4), which has a parallel in Aeschylus' account of the battle (*Pers.* 395ff.). But there are other possibilities; for example, it could come from an account of Mycale in the Plataea poem.

14 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1913.206–08, Molyneux 1992.162.

15 Bowra 1961.343–44; passages discussed in Cuffari 1983.80ff.

16 West in his text thinks both were in elegiacs; in his article (1993a.2–3), he changes his mind, and concludes that the Salamis poem was probably in lyrics.

17 According to *Vita Pindari Ambros.* i.2.21 Dr. it is an indication that Simonides and Pindar were of the same generation that Simonides described the battle of Salamis and Pindar the kingdom of Kadmos; can τῆς Κάδμου βασιλείας be right here? Some think this is a fifth-century Kadmos (Herodotus 7.165); I suspect rather τῆς Καμβύσου βασιλείας (Boeckh).

Podlecki believes in a Salamis elegy, and suggested that it included the following two texts: 1) first, the “Democritus Epigram” (“Simon.” 19 FGE = 65 D = Plutarch *de Herod. malign.* 36.869c), in which a certain Democritus is praised for having been the third to attack the Persians at Salamis.¹⁸ However, this text could equally well be a self-contained epigram (Page attributes it to an anonymous Naxian); the detail that Democritus was “third” might seem to fit better in the context of a longer narrative, but the explicit reference to Salamis seems to suit an epigram better (why would such a reference be necessary in a longer narrative, where the location of the victory would have been obvious from the context?).¹⁹ 2) An epigram concerning Athens, 86 W² = *Eleg.* 9 C: (. . . εἰκόσ . . .) εἰ δ’ ἄρα τιμήσαι, θύγατερ Διός, ὅστις ἄριστος ἢ δῆμος Ἀθηναίων ἐξετέλεσσε μόνος²⁰ (“But if [it is right] to honour the best, daughter of Zeus, the people of Athens performed it alone”), according to Σ to Aristophanes *Pax* 736ff. derived ἐκ τῶν ἐλεγείων, and positioned by West 1992 as fr. 86 and grouped under “Incertum an ex epigrammatis.”²¹ This might have come from an elegy in which the Athenians are singled out for praise. The “daughter of Zeus” is probably the Muse, as Podlecki 1968.270–71 points out, and hence it seems likely that these were the first lines of a poem. Salamis is obviously a possibility. Could it perhaps have been the Artemesium poem? Or was it some entirely unrelated poem, something like the Eion elegy (“Simon.” 40 [c] FGE)? Other scholars have taken the lines as referring to the Athenian victory at Marathon.²²

If the Salamis poem was lyric rather than elegiac, it may be worth reviving Schneidewin’s suggestion (1835.9) that it is the source of 571 PMG, a line in which a group of women complain about being imprisoned by an island: ἵσχει δέ με πορφυρέας ἀλὸς ἀμφιταρασσομένας ὀρυμαγδός (“I am restrained by the crash of the dark sea raging around”).

18 Podlecki 1968.268, not mentioned by West, also discussed by Gentili 1968.44.

19 Molyneux 1992.189–90.

20 ἐξετέλεσσε is Hartung’s emendation for ἐξετέλεσα.

21 The terms ἐπίγραμμα and ἐλεγείων were clearly confusable: cf. West 1974.3–4, *Life of Aeschylus* on the Marathon *elegeion* = Test. 15 C.

22 Barigazzi 1963.74, Molyneux 1992.150.

The Plataea Poem

Structure and scope. Apparently a hymn to Achilles followed by a narrative. Can we think of this as analogous to a citharodic proem preceding a recital of Homer? or perhaps to a prooemium introducing a nome?²³ Perhaps the narrative was followed by a *sphragis*, as we find one in the analogous *Persai* of Timotheus. The most reasonable interpretation is that the narrative was concerned with only the battle of Plataea, although there is no independent attestation of a Simonidean poem on this theme. We cannot rule out the possibility that the sea battle at Mycale, which was supposed to have happened on the same day, was mentioned also, perhaps as a sort of coda. In theory, the Achilles section might have been preceded by an account of earlier events, such as the battle of Artemisium. But against that is the invocation of the Muse that precedes the account of the battle of Plataea, which belongs early on in the poem.

Place of performance. The poem was probably performed as part of a festival, rather than at a *sumposion*, although reperformance at a *sumposion* would be a possibility.²⁴ The main contender is Plataea itself, and particularly the Eleutheria festival, where the battle was commemorated every fourth year with great pomp, as Plutarch describes, and as is attested in a number of inscriptions; however, many authorities think that the Eleutheria festival dates only from the late fourth century.²⁵ On the other hand, we cannot prove that a primitive Eleutheria was not held in the years immediately following the battle. And, at the very least, we know that there was some sort of dedication immediately afterwards.²⁶ However, some other panhellenic centre is a possibility also: perhaps Aegina, the home of Achilles' grandfather, Aeacus, whose mythology had a strong panhellenic dimension. Another possibility is Sparta (cf. Pindar *Pyth.* 1.77), particularly the temple of Achilles at which ephebes sacrificed, mentioned by Pausanias,

23 *Prooimion* followed by *nomos*: Koller 1956, Nagy 1990.355; *prooimion* followed by recitation of Homer: Pindar *Nem.* 2, Kranz 1961.1ff. (= 1967.32ff.).

24 West 1993a.5 supports the *sumposion*.

25 The *locus classicus* is Plutarch *Aristides* 21; also Thucydides 3.58.4. See Parsons 1992a. 6, Haslam 1993.135, Boedeker 1995, Aloni 1994.19. Sceptical: Raaflaub 1985.126–27; Étienne and Piérart 1975, referring to an important inscription honouring Glaucon at the Eleutheria; Robertson 1986, referring to *IG II²* 2086, *IG II²* 2788 and other inscriptions; W. C. West 1977.

26 See Thucydides 2.71.2, 3.58.4.

3.20.8.²⁷ Yet another is Delphi, the most natural of all venues for a panhellenic celebration.

Origin of the poem. There are two issues: A) Does it show bias in favour of some one state or states? Herodotus presents the battle as a panhellenic effort. He begins his narrative with Athenian messengers coming to request Spartan help, and he describes how the Athenians cross over from Salamis to join the expedition, and how they take a major part in the battle. Contrast this with Aeschylus *Persai* 817, where Darius describes blood shed at Plataea, Δωρίδος λόγχης ὑπο (“by Dorian spear”); so too Pindar in *Pyth.* 1.77 imagines himself describing the “victory before Cithaeron” in Sparta, implying that Plataea was a battle the Spartans had the major role in. *Prima facie*, the Simonidean version seems to stress the Spartan contribution as well. Aloni stresses the conspicuous references to the Spartans at 11.25, as well as (perhaps) in 13 W². He also thinks (as I do) that the Athenians probably do not join the battle in 11.40. There are three ways of interpreting these data: a) Simonides’ perspective was biased toward Sparta, b) his perspective was panhellenic, but reflected the major role played by Sparta in the battle, or c) our fragments are not representative of the poem as a whole, and the Athenians played a greater role elsewhere. By definition, c) is unprovable. Boedeker (1995.224–25) argues for b); the existence of the catalogue (15–16 W²) shows that Sparta was not the focus, though in the end the argument must depend partly on the reasoning that since Herodotus and other sources present Plataea as a panhellenic effort, Simonides must have done so also; a special connection with Corinth might seem possible in view of 15–16 W², but Plutarch explicitly says that the poem was not performed in Corinth. Aloni argues strongly for a), and suggests that there was a special connection with the Spartan general Pausanias, who is linked with Simonides in secondary sources.²⁸ The stress on the punishment of Paris in 11.11–12 might indicate a Spartan focus.²⁹ The Doric form ἀγέμαχοι in line 14 could also suggest a Spartan context.³⁰

27 See Parsons 1992a.32.

28 “Simon.” 17(a) FGE; Molyneux 1992.198 and 209, n.103, citing Plato *Epist.* 2.311a (Test. 17 C); Plutarch *Consol.* 6 (105a); Aelian *VH* 9. 41.

29 Suggested by Prof. C. P. Jones.

30 Cf. ἀγχεμάχων in “Simon.” 14 FGE. We should at least consider the possibility that, e.g., μνάσεται might be the true supplement in line 24. Cf. also the variation Παισσανίης/ Παισσανίας in line 34, and a similar one in 14.4 W².

B) Was it commissioned, or was it the winning entry in a competition? Aloni asserts that the poem was commissioned by the Spartans. Boedeker suggests first that the poem might have been commissioned by a group of states organising the festival or, second, that it may have been the result of a competition, basing this on the tradition that Aeschylus and Simonides competed to write an ἐλεγείον (elegy? or epigram?) in honour of those who died at Marathon, as well as on the well-established practice of having poetic competitions at funeral games.³¹ But a hypothesis of a poetry competition might also account for a Spartan bias, since the poem may have been a Spartan entry in a poetry competition also. A further refinement is suggested by the fact that a feature of the later Eleutheria was a ritualised debate between the Spartans and the Athenians about who had the right to lead the procession.³² If the later Eleutheria continued features of the earlier festival, the possibility arises that the Spartans had won such a debate, and then had the poem commissioned.

Genre. Few poems in commemoration of military victories survive, but we do have Pindar *Paeon* 2, which celebrates a victory won by Abderites over a local Thracian enemy; this is a triadic lyric poem, probably performed in procession. Another poem comparable in some respects is Timotheus' *Persai*, which describes the battle at Salamis in astrochic lyric style. This was a *nomos*, apparently a solo form.

Simonides used the elegiac metre for the Plataea poem, as well as the Artemisium poem (see above), and perhaps even an elegy on Marathon (cf. 86 W², quoted above). There were antecedents: the *Smyrneis* of Mimnermus (which, unlike the poems of Simonides, was composed long after the victory it celebrated), Tyrtaeus' *Politeia* (or *Eunomia*), Semonides of Amorgos' *Arkhaiologia Samiôn*, Xenophanes' poem on the foundation of Colophon, and Ion's on the foundation of Chios.³³

It is difficult to say what the implications of choosing elegiac

31 See Boedeker 1995; *Vita Aeschyli* 8 (TrGF 3.33f.), cited by West before 86 W², p. 136. Cf. Introduction above, n. 6.

32 See Robertson 1986.

33 Narrative poems: Bowie 1986.27ff., Aloni 1994.12. Deborah Boedeker suggests to me that the two generations of Muses (the first daughters of Ouranos, the second daughters of Zeus) attested for the *Smyrneis* of Mimnermus (fr. 13 W) might reflect a two-part structure similar to that of the Plataea poem (see below), with the older generation controlling mythical time, and the younger generation presiding over the accomplishments of mortal men.

metre were. The poem shows that Simonides takes the heroic narrative of Homer as his ultimate model; Stehle in this volume suggests that the choice of metre was a way of expressing a difference from Homeric epic.³⁴ If the elegy had an association with mourning early on, that would be relevant to the choice of this form for composition of a poem one of whose functions was to commemorate the war-dead; unfortunately, it is by no means certain that this association predates the late fifth century.³⁵ Even if an association with lamentation is anachronistic, there may be a link with commemorative epigrams in elegiac metre, at least some of which are known to have been composed by Simonides.³⁶ A text which bridges the two forms is the pseudo-Simonidean “Eion epigram” (40 FGE), commemorating the Athenian expedition to Eion in Thrace in 475 B.C.E., a poem of 14 lines, which was divided into three sections and distributed between the bases of three statues, almost as if it were three independent epigrams.³⁷

Section 1: Introduction

From *χαίρει* in line 19, it seems that Achilles is probably the addressee of the first part of the poem and, furthermore, that he is addressed as an immortal, since it would be used only of someone who attained special status after death, as indeed Achilles was usually deemed to have done.³⁸ How does Simonides envisage Achilles? In one fragment, he seems to think of him living on the Islands of the Blessed with Medea (558 PMG), but Simonides’ presentation of him may have varied from one poem to another.

How the poem began we do not know. The poet could have told of the early career of Achilles, or, looking further back, the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, or even the genealogy of the Aiakidai.

34 Pigres, *IEG* II².95 (*Suda* 4.127.24), is supposed to have attempted to rewrite Homer, inserting a pentameter after every hexameter.

35 See West 1974.6–8; that association is challenged by Bowie 1986.22ff., who thinks that it is based on a pseudo-etymology from *ἔλεγω* which became current in the period 415–08 B.C.E.

36 Some of the parallels in phraseology between pseudo-Simonidean epigrams and the Plataea elegy are striking, e.g., *δούλιον ἦμαρ* in 11.25 W² with “Simon.” 20(a).4, 16.1 FGE. But such argumentation is to some extent circular, since the epigrams have been used in reconstructing and supplementing the elegy.

37 Aeschines 3.187, who cites it, in fact seems to put the three parts together in the wrong order. For the text and further discussion, see Boedeker in this volume.

38 For *χαίρει* implying higher status after death: Sourvinou-Inwood 1995.199ff.

10 W²: an address to Achilles. West puts it before 11 W², but perhaps the poet returned to Achilles at the end, as Pindar begins and ends *Paean 2* with references to Abderus. The rest is obscure. In line 2, the poet is less likely concerned with the father and forefather of Achilles than with Achilles as the father and forefather, so that the starting point might have been someone who was a descendant of Achilles. In line 3, West suggests that some form of Μηθώνη should be read, but the relationship between any of the places that had this name and Achilles is mysterious. In line 4, “our labours” could be the labours of the poet, or perhaps the performers.³⁹

11 W². This fragment is assembled from *POxy 3965*, fr. 1 (= lines 9–23) and fr. 2 (lines 22–45), along with *POxy 2327*, fr. 5 (lines 1–4? [bottom of a column]), fr. 6 (line 5–14 [top of a column]), and fr. 27 (right ends of lines 13–29). The successes of editors in supplementing the text should not blind the reader to the fact that less than half of the total width of the column survives. The basic thought is: Achilles, you were killed by Apollo. But (Athena and Hera caused the downfall of Troy?) because of Paris, so that the chariot of justice overtook him. The Greeks returned home, to be immortalised in song by Homer. Farewell, Achilles.

Lines 1–4 = *POxy 2327*, fr. 5, placed here by West. If the reference is to the death of Achilles, the narrative is curiously circular, with the description of the death in lines 1–4 and the identification of the killer in lines 7–8. Lloyd-Jones 1994.1 doubts this arrangement, suggesting that the fragment might have come later on from the account of the death of Mardonius or Masistius. Barchiesi (this volume) tries to corroborate West’s hypothesis, arguing from the fact that Achilles is compared to a pine in other sources, though one should bear in mind, as Barchiesi notes, how readily this imagery would have suggested itself, whatever the background.

If lines 1–4 describe the death of Achilles, lines 5–6 presumably describe his burial. Otherwise, they might describe the events preceding the death, perhaps giving his motivation (e.g., fighting on behalf of Patroclus).

At or before line 11, the focus shifts from Apollo’s killing of

39 There is a parallel for μελέτη in this sense at Empedocles B131.2 (an invocation of the Muse). See Obbink 1993.64–70.

Achilles to divine and/or human vengeance on Paris. It is not clear which section lines 9–10 belong to. West thinks they point forward, describing Athena and Hera destroying Troy “angered at the sons of Priam, because of wicked Alexander.” Luppe 1993 thinks they point back, resuming Apollo’s action against Achilles, “gratifying the sons (son?) of Priam” (χ[αριζ]όμ[εν—suggested by Parsons), and he suggests that a new thought starts asynchronously with line 11 (ὑβριν or θάρσος). The second alternative has the difficulty of being highly abrupt.

In line 12, ἄρμα has the unexpected variant τέρμα superscribed in *POxy* 2327. The reconstruction θείης (ἰθείης?) ἄρμα (τέρμα) . . . δίκης is attractive (e.g., “the chariot [supremacy?⁴⁰] of justice brings down Paris”), but we cannot be certain that δίκ[η] was not the subject (e.g., “justice smashes the chariot [supremacy?] of arrogance”). The “chariot of justice” is a unique image in Greek,⁴¹ though it has Indo-European antecedents.⁴² For the verb καθεῖλε a good parallel is provided by Aeschylus *Ag.* 398: φῶτ’ ἄδικον καταρρεῖ (θεός). . . . Since the following lines show that the chorus are thinking of Paris, it seems likely that there is a reminiscence of the Plataea poem here.⁴³ West (apparatus) boldly suggests that the true verb was something like (ἐ)κίχανε (with καθεῖλε perhaps intruding from line 9), a hypothesis which allows for both variants (i.e., “The chariot of justice finds Paris” or “Paris finds the limit of justice”).

After that, the narrative closes with reference to the return of the victorious Greeks from Troy and a description of Homer, who was inspired by the Muses to sing their praises. There is a difficult textual problem here. Parsons originally supposed Simonides to have said that Homer made

40 The sense would presumably be “supreme justice” (cf. LSJ s.v. τέρμα II 4).

41 In a satyr-drama (Aeschylus *TrGF* 281a.12–13), Zeus sends off justice to travel round the world, but there is no reference to a vehicle. The slightly different image of a ruler driving the chariot of justice is found in a late epigram, *A.P.* 9.779.4: Δίκης θρόνον ἠντιοχέουον (“driving the chariot of the throne of Justice”) used of the Roman emperor; also Himerius *Or.* 36.11: πέμψομεν αὐτὸν τὸν μέγαν τῆς δίκης ἠντιοχον (“Let us send him, the great charioteer of justice”); these are cited by Robert 1948.98, a reference for which I am grateful to Prof. C. P. Jones.

42 The theme of the “chariot of justice” is Indo-European; in the *Rig Veda* the concept *rta* is symbolised by a chariot, e.g., at 2.33.3: see Lüders 1959.457–61, Wagner 1970.14; it also occurs in the Old Irish *Audacht Morainn*, § 22: Kelly 1976.33–34, Watkins 1979, id. 1995.16. I am indebted to Calvert Watkins for these references.

43 Prof. C. Watkins brilliantly points to an emendation by Blomfield, who suggested φῶτα δίκαια instead of φῶτ’ ἄδικον, supplying a subject for καταρρεῖ. In view of the likely restoration of the Plataea poem, it seems that this could well be right.

(ποιησ᾽) the short-lived race of demigods (ἡμίθεοι) famous to future generations, alluding to Hesiod's fourth age, that of the demigods who fought at Thebes and Troy. Their fame, as C. Sourvinou-Inwood suggests to me, would contrast with the third generation, who were νόνημοι (*Op.* 154). One difficulty with this reconstruction is that the word ἐπώνυμον does not otherwise mean "famous."⁴⁴ More recently, Capra and Curti suggested that the lines could equally well be supplemented to mean: Homer sang (ᾄεισε) to future generations the race named after (ἐπώνυμον) the demigods, which would seem to be an exact allusion to *Op.* 159–60 where Hesiod describes the fourth race as "a divine race of hero men who are called demigods" (ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων θεῖον γένος, οἳ καλέονται ἡμίθεοι).⁴⁵ This reconstruction is highly suggestive. Would it imply that, for Simonides, Homer composed in knowledge of, and so later than, Hesiod?⁴⁶ Would it carry the subversive implication that the heroes of the battle of Plataea correspond in some respects to the unhappy men of Hesiod's fifth generation? Or would it imply rather that after the iron age of Hesiod's day, the defeat of the Persians inaugurates a new age more like that of the ἡμίθεοι?

Besides the allusion to Hesiod, these lines show some spectacular redeployments of Homeric language. In line 13, αἰδίμιον is a literary adjective, and also a self-referential one, in so far as it is poems like that of Simonides that make Troy "singable."⁴⁷ In line 18, the word ἡμίθεοι is specially chosen not just for its Hesiodic associations, but because it recalls the one occurrence of this word in the *Iliad* (12.23), where the poet looks back on the Trojan war from the vantage point of the future, as Simonides does here.⁴⁸ In the same line Simonides applies the adjective ὠκύμορος to the race of heroes, redeploying the epithet that Homer had used of Achilles. The long-lasting fame provided by epic poetry compensates for the brevity of their lives.

44 For ἐπώνυμος in the sense of "famous," Lloyd-Jones 1994.2 compares the hypothetical ὄνημοι at Quintus Smyrnaeus 8.452 and 12.220.

45 Capra and Curti 1995.

46 Belief in the priority of Hesiod is explicitly attributed to Simonides in the Vatican Appendix, 217 Sternbach (=k) in Campbell 1991.367), according to which Simonides said that Hesiod planted the mythologies of gods and heroes, while Homer plaited from them the garlands of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

47 Lloyd-Jones 1994.1 refers to *Il.* 6.357–58; see also Stehle and Clay in this volume.

48 Parsons 1992a.31, Nagy 1979.159–61.

In line 19, *χαίρε* represents a hymnic close, followed by the formula of closure or transition: *αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ* (see above). The use of *χαίρε* for Achilles may also recall its use to address the dead Patroclus in Homer, *Il.* 23.19–20 and 179–80. The indirect way of referring to Achilles (“son of the daughter of Nereus”) is echoed by Euripides at *IT* 217: τῷ τᾶς Νήρεως κούρας.⁴⁹

There is a close parallel with sections of Theocritus *Id.* 16. In this poem, Theocritus justifies the practice of writing praise-poetry on commission by citing the example of the relationship between Simonides and his Thessalian patrons,⁵⁰ and in lines 44ff. he says that Simonides’ Thessalian patrons would never have been remembered: . . . εἰ μὴ θεῖος ἀοιδὸς ὁ Κήϊος αἰόλα φωνέων | βάρβιτον ἐς πολύχορδον ἐν ἀνδράσι θῆκ’ ὀνομαστούς | ὀπλοτέροις (“if the divine Cean singer, sounding varied notes on the many-stringed lyre, had not made them famous among younger men.”). The key parallel is *ὀπλοτέροις*, noticed by Hutchinson, and these lines can be thought of as an allusion to the Plataea poem. The structure of Theocritus *Id.* 16 as a whole resembles that of the Plataea poem, with an earlier section discussing earlier praise-poetry (Simonides and the Thessalians), and a latter hinting at the possibilities of contemporary praise (the military exploits of Hiero), thus replicating what Simonides does for himself *vis-à-vis* Homer.⁵¹

49 Thanks to Arianna Trail for this parallel.

50 See Merkelbach 1952, Parsons 1992b.

51 There may be another allusion to it shortly afterwards in lines 64–66, where Theocritus dismisses a covetous patron and describes the ideal patron-poet relationship he wants: *χαιρέτω* ὅστις τοῖος, ἀνήριθμος δέ οἱ εἶη | ἄργυρος, αἰεὶ δὲ πλεόνων ἔχοι ἕμερος αὐτόν· | *αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ* τίμην τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων φιλότητα | πολλῶν ἡμιόνων τε καὶ ἵππων πρόσθεν ἐλοίμην (“Farewell to such as he; and countless silver may he have, and desire of more ever possess him. But I would prefer fame and friendship of men to wealth in mules and horses”). Simonides had applied the formulas *χαίρε* and *αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ* to older and newer forms of praise-poetry; Theocritus reapplies them to two types of patrons, a neat adaptation considering Simonides’ reputation for venality. The redeployment reminds us that the concerns of Theocritus are very different from those of Simonides. Perhaps one can go further and argue that *Id.* 16 is a highly critical reading of Simonides’ self-aggrandising self-presentation in the Plataea poem, offering a more realistic description of the mechanism of poetic patronage. To put it another way, the implication of the Simonides poem is that great exploits need the poet, whereas Theocritus turns it round and presents himself as a indigent praise-poet in need of great exploits to eulogise. On these lines, see now Hunter 1996.103–05.

Section 2: Narration

Help me, Muse, preserve the memory of the Spartans who defended freedom, who left Sparta with Castor and Pollux, led by Pausanias. They reached Corinth and Megara (and Eleusis, where the Athenians joined them?). (13 W²) . . . the two sides faced each other in battle formation. (14 W²) . . . a prophecy about the battle.

In line 21, κικλήσκω could begin a poem without a preceding proem. The speaking subject is presumably primarily the poet.⁵² ἐπίκουρον is a military metaphor; Simonides imagines his situation as a poet as analogous to that of a fighter in a battle and he calls on the Muse to assist him. The Muse is thus a mercenary in the military sense (contrast with the traditional view that Simonides' Muse was mercenary in the sense that she sold herself for money, an ἐργάτις [Pindar *Isth.* 2.6.]).⁵³ Simonides thus makes some contribution himself and is superior to Homer, who relied entirely on the Muses.

Just as Simonides invokes the Muse as ἐπίκουρος, so in the *Persai*, Timotheus invoking Apollo called him ἐπίκουρος (202ff.). Like the invocation in Simonides, that in Timotheus comes at a point of transition, in this case the transition from the main narrative part of the song to the *sphragis*. Just as Simonides invokes the Muse to help him in his song, so Timotheus calls on Apollo as inspirer of his song to help him because he has been abused by the Spartans, who disapprove of his new music, unfairly, since he is the continuer of an ancient tradition of music; Timotheus follows Simonides in invoking the Muse as a poetic helper, but the help he wants is in respect of his status as a poet, not in respect of the theme or organisation of the song.

In line 23, ἔντυνο]γ] is the word used in the introduction of the Sirens' song at Homer *Od.* 12.183 (also noted by Stehle in this volume; unfortunately, the supplement is less than certain). κ[όσμον ἄο]ιδῆς (if

52 Cf. the late epigram in Cougny 1890.4.54: νῖα πάλαι φθίμενον, πάλιν ἄμβροτον, Ἀπόλλωνος, | κικλήσκω λοιβαῖσι μολεῖν ἐπίκουρον ἐμαῖσιν.

53 For passages, see Test. 22 C; this pattern is reversed in Pindar *Ol.* 13.96–97: Μοῖσαις γὰρ ἀγλαοθρόνοις ἐκὼν Ὀλιγαίθιδαισὶν τ' ἔβαν ἐπίκουρος (“I have come willingly as a helper for the Muses with their glorious thrones and for the Oligaiithidai”). Cf. Stehle in this volume.

right)⁵⁴ seems at first sight unremarkable, but it is thrown into relief when set against κόσμον . . . ἐπέων at Parmenides B8.52 (cf. διόκοσμον at 60), used of the part of Parmenides' poem that covers the deceptive world of mortals, and contrasted with the truthful presentation of the real world of being, which precedes. The relationship between the two parts of Simonides' poem is in some respects analogous and perhaps one poem has influenced the other in the use of the expression κόσμον; which might have influenced which could be determined only if we knew when Parmenides published his poem.⁵⁵ In line 24, the idea that someone will remember is reminiscent of the eulogy for those who fell at Thermopylae (531 PMG). Compare also the reflections on the durability of Homeric poetry in 21 W². In an epigram or elegy (89 W²), Simonides is supposed to have praised himself for his excellence in respect of μνήμη (see below on the *sphragis*).⁵⁶

In line 25, the word Σπάρτη is a key reason for thinking that the Spartans had a special interest in the composition or performance of the poem. In line 29, the Spartans leave with the Tyndarids and Menelaus (Castor and Pollux are also mentioned in 70 W²).⁵⁷ As Parsons 1992a.35 notes, the practice here is different from that implied in Herodotus 5.75, according to which only one king and one Tyndarid accompanied the army. The primary concern of Simonides was perhaps not so much to articulate Spartan military practices as to produce a narrative which would be impressive at the panhellenic level. Is it a coincidence that Menelaus and the Tyndarids are three deities who would have a particular interest in recovering Helen?

In line 36, the Spartan army reaches the Isthmus,⁵⁸ and in line 37, Megara.⁵⁹ In line 40, it probably reached the area of Eleusis, an important way-station, especially in view of the role that Demeter plays in the Herodotean narrative (cf. 17 W²). In line 41, Parsons thought that this might be where the Athenians join the Spartans, as in Herodotus. But it is difficult to find a supplement that suits the idea that they came over from Salamis.

54 Capra and Curti 1995.31 argue for]ρδῆς and suggest κ[όλλοπα χο]ρδῆς, allowing that fr. 1 and fr. 2 (line beginning and line end) need not have been correctly aligned at this point.

55 See Stehle, to whom I am indebted; thanks also to Sumi Furiya on this point.

56 See Goldhill 1988; for memory, cf. also 646 PMG.

57 The same collocation appears in Oenomaus fr. 10.13 Hammerstaedt (Lloyd-Jones 1994.3).

58 West 1993a.14 suggests that the line should be supplemented on the assumption that the Isthmus is the location of the gates of the Peloponnese, following Bacchylides 1.13ff.

59 With the city of Nisus: cf. "Simon." 16 FGE, in honour of the Megarians: ὀμόλω ἀμόλις | Νισαίων.

ἐξε[λαθέν]τες is inappropriate, because the Athenians were not driven out of Salamis, but came over voluntarily. Perhaps the intransitive ἐξε[λάσων]τες (“sallying forth”) could describe the Athenian contingent, but this would be an odd way to refer to a sea-crossing. More likely, as West believes, a transitive ἐξε[λάσων]τες describes the Spartans driving the Medes out of the land of Pandion (used of the Greeks driving the Persians out in “Simon.” 15.3 FGE). But this hypothesis removes the evidence for the Athenians joining the expedition here, and thus for one point of contact between Herodotus and Simonides.

In line 42, West 1992.7 reads μόντιος, and connects it with the Iamid Teisamenos, who figures prominently in Herodotus’ narrative. Simonidean interest in prophets may be independently indicated by the epigram in honour of Megistias (“Simon.” 6 FGE = Hdt. 7.228.3). And cf. 13 W² below. In line 43 West thinks we might have a reference to the early skirmish described between Masistius and the Greeks (Hdt. 9.22–23).

12 W² (POxy 2327, fr. 30 + fr. 18). A small fragment tentatively assigned to the same column as 13 W².

13 W² (POxy 2327, fr. 27 col. ii). This was in the column immediately following 11 W², and therefore about 10 lines on from line 45. The sequence of hexameter/pentameter is not certain, since the papyrus does not indent or otherwise distinguish the pentameter lines.

One side “becomes visible”; εἰσῶποι δ’ ἐγένοντο νεῶν is used by Homer, *Il.* 15.653, at the point where the retreating Greeks catch sight of their own ships. Barigazzi 1963.74 takes this as referring to the moment when the Spartans viewed the battlefield at Marathon (Hdt. 6.108); for the existence of a Simonidean elegy in honour of Marathon, he depended on 86 W² (see above), which can be interpreted in different ways. West 1993a.7 more reasonably takes the fragment to refer to the Greek descent to the Asopus plain described in Herodotus 9.19.3. But the fragment might just as easily come from later on in the battle.

Section 3: The Prophecy

14 W² (POxy 3965, fr. 21). West 1993a.8 restores like this: a) he connects lines 3–6 with the prophecy of Teisamenos in Herodotus 9.36 that if the Greeks crossed the river Asopus they would fail,

whereas if they stayed on this side of it they would win a great victory; b) in lines 7–8 he finds an extension of the prophecy: someone, perhaps Ares, will drive the Medes out of Asia (= Ionia), with the permission of Zeus; c) in lines 9–10, Ares stretches a foundation under Delos, providing a symbolic basis for the Athenian Empire.

Of these, c) is a long shot; κρηπίδα might be metaphorical, as in κρηπίδ' ἔλευθερίας in Pindar, fr. 77.⁶⁰ b) is more reasonable, though far from certain.⁶¹ Point a) must be right. It is also worth pointing out that even if the prophecy itself is the same as the one in Herodotus, the prophet may be different; a divine speaker (like Nereus in 3.12 W²) would seem more appropriate in a poem. Interestingly, the one direct speech in Pindar *Paean* 2 is a prophecy delivered by Hecate. It seems that prophecy was a standard and expected feature of poems describing battles.

Section 4: Catalogue

15–16 W² (= *Eleg.* 10–11 C) are two fragments cited by Plutarch in *On the Malice of Herodotus*; 16 W overlaps with POxy 3965, fr. 5.⁶²

Plutarch quotes these lines as evidence that Herodotus has, by contrast, maligned the Corinthians. Simonides' praise of the Corinthians here would contrast with another fragment in which he is said to have angered them by stating that Troy was not angry with Corinth, referring to the Corinthian ancestry of Glaucus, son of Hippolochus (572 PMG). The epigram, "Simon." 11 FGE, in honour of the Corinthians who died at Salamis (in local dialect), is probably not Simonidean.⁶³

60 Rea, cited in Parsons 1992a.42; Aloni 1994.21 n. 38, is also sceptical of West's reconstruction here. We find κακῶν κρηπίς in Aeschylus' description of the battle at *Persai* 814–15, though the reading is disputed.

61 West finds a problem in the fact that Asia is where the Persians originate in "Simon." 24 FGE, so that if the Persians are being driven out of Asia here, they are being driven from their own home. But a fifth-century Greek might well have imagined defeated Persians being driven out of Asia back to their homeland in southern Iran, far to the southeast.

62 Luppe 1994.22ff. considers and rejects the possibility that]πολυ[in 16.4 W² might correspond to πολυπίδακα in 15.1 W², implying that Plutarch has inverted the order of the fragments.

63 On this, see Boegehold 1965. Corinthian also is the context of "Simon," 14 FGE, on which see Brown 1991.

These lines probably come from a general catalogue of the forces, comparable to the one in Herodotus. By including a catalogue, Simonides was following Homeric practice; poems such as the *Smyrneis* of Mimnermus may also have contained catalogues.

15 W². Simonides distinguishes Ephyre and Corinth. What is the significance of the two names? On one level, Ephyre is perceived as the older name, just as Ephyre, daughter of Oceanus, occupies an early point in the mythological history of the city, whereas Korinthos, son of Marathon, occupies a comparatively late stage, as does Glaucus, son of Sisyphus. On another level, the difference may be geographical: Ephyre “with its many fountains” seems to be the citadel (the epithet *πολύπιδαξ* is the one that Homer had used of Ida [*Il.* 8.47 etc.]), whereas the *Κορίνθιον ἄστυ* may be the city as a whole.⁶⁴ Elsewhere Simonides may have provided a genealogy for Ephyre (596 PMG).⁶⁵

16 W². *Prima facie*, the sun in the sky is represented as witness of the valour of the combatants, and it is referred to by the kenning: “esteemed gold in the sky.”⁶⁶ Similar is 87 W² (= *Eleg.* 12 C): *ξεινοδόκων δ’ ἄριστος ὁ χρυσὸς ἐν αἰθέρι λάμπων* where *ξεινοδόκος* is supposed to have the unusual sense of “witness,” though it is not clear whether the witness is the sun or gold. For the sun to be a witness is a common idea,⁶⁷ for it to be a witness of a battle is rarer (though cf. Sophocles *Ant.* 100ff.). Perhaps it is relevant that Helios played an important part in Corinthian genealogical traditions and had a cult there.⁶⁸ However, although sense can be made of the fragments, it must be admitted that the thought

64 Schneidewin 1835.83. On the two terms, see *Σ Il.* 6.152; Steph. Byz. *Ethn.* 290.9ff., 300.20ff., 374.1. Huxley 1969.61–62, believes that it was only Eumelus who applied the obscure Homeric name Ephyre to Corinth.

65 The testimony is uncertain; Bernabé 1987.108 (on Eumelus fr. 1) and Davies 1988.97 (on Eumelus fr. 1B) doubt it.

66 See Waern 1951.84, 123; a different kenning for the sun is found at Aesch. *Suppl.* 212.

67 It also occurs in the Homeric formula *ὄς πάντ’ ἐφορᾷς καὶ πάντ’ ἐπακούεις* (*Il.* 3.277, *Od.* 11.109); also Aesch. *Cho.* 986–87, *Prom.* 91, and a few times in Euripides.

68 Helios was awarded the city over Poseidon by Briareus (Pausanias 2.1.6), and he was the father of Aloeus and Aietes (Eumelus fr. 3 Bernabé = fr. 2 Davies); cult of Helios at Corinth: Pausanias 2.4.6.

is awkward.⁶⁹ On these grounds, Luppe 1994 suggests that at least two lines may be lost between πόνων and χρυσοῦ, and that χρυσοῦ τιμήεντος ἐν αἰθέρι is an attribute of something literally made of gold, such as golden weapons taken from the Persians.

Unassigned

17 W². Demeter (?) is important in the narrative of Herodotus, figuring in the battle of Plataea and that of Mycale, as West 1993a.9 suggests (Hdt. 9.57, 62, 65, 69, 101); Boedeker (in this volume) finds this the most explicit indication of Simonidean influence on Herodotus' account. In line 3, φῆ also seems to occur as the first word in line 21. This pattern is also found in "Simon." 74 FGE, which begins: φῆ ποτε Πρωτόμαχος, where Protomachus laments his father slain in battle. The sense may have been: "(someone) said that two . . ." ⁷⁰ We have no idea who is speaking; it might be a prophet. The dramatic use of speeches in a description of a battle is illustrated by the *Persai* of Timotheus. In line 7, ῥύσιον could perhaps refer to reprisals taken by Demeter for violations committed by the Persians around the temple of Demeter at Eleusis.

18 W². ἐκυδα[ιtv-: a word that suggests a military context; cf. "Simon." 9 FGE ("Virtue glorifies and immortalises the fallen"), 64 FGE ("glorified her city").

Section 5: sphragis (?)

The poem may well have had a final *sphragis* section, in which the poet discusses his art, like the *Persai* of Timotheus, which is concerned with poetry.⁷¹ Could the "leaves" fragment have come here (the idea of mourning the dead would lead into a meditation on the mutability of life, especially the warrior's life, since the Homeric "leaves" fragment evokes

69 Schneidewin 1835.83 suggested that Simonides called the sun "esteemed gold" in order to defuse the criticism of people who accused him of making money, but that seems far-fetched.

70 Cf. Ap. Rhod. 3.495: φῆ δὲ δύο πεδίων τὸ Ἀρήιον ἀμφινέμεσθαι | ταύρω χαλκόποδε . . .

71 I thank Jenny Strauss Clay for a discussion of this fragment.

the idea of death in war); or perhaps the epigram or elegiac fragment 89 W², in which Simonides praises himself for skill at “memory”? He claims to be 80 years old in this fragment; if he were born in about 556, he would have been 77 when the Battle of Plataea took place, and perhaps 80, or almost 80, by the time the poem was commissioned or otherwise composed.

SYMPOTIC FRAGMENTS

Several passages of poetry to which the two papyri contribute seem to have been sympotic in character. The sympotic poems from which these come are generally regarded as a) distinct from the military/historical elegies, and b) different in character; but these distinctions may be in part bogus, especially if any of the military/historical elegies were performed at *sumposia*.⁷²

The leaves (fr. 19–20 W²)

The two fragments are transmitted by Stobaeus as one unit; *POxy* 3965, fr. 26 overlaps with the second half of Stobaeus’ passage, also supplying scraps of four preceding lines and of seven following ones. The thought is:

19 W². Homer said that men are like leaves, and men should heed the message.

20 W². While men are young, they do not think they will grow old. Learning this, enjoy life. But consider the word of Homer, which outlasts time, and contrast it with the ephemeral words people utter everyday.⁷³

West considers reversing the transmitted order of 19–20 W², but, as Sider shows, there is no reason to do this: Homer is cited at the start for what he says about mutability, and at the end as an example of something that defies it. The fragments are attributed to “Simonides” by Stobaeus, but had sometimes been assigned to Semonides of Amorgos (by Bergk and

72 For the possibility that 19–20 W² come from the *sphragis* of the Plataea poem, see immediately above. So there is a faint chance that 21 W² could come from a similar context (perhaps the theme of justice there [l. 4] echoes 11.12 W²).

73 For the restoration of lines 17–19, see West 1993a.

others). West's conclusion that Simonides was the author was nicely confirmed by the fragment.⁷⁴ Hubbard points out that even now we cannot be sure that confusion between Simonides and Semonides had not taken place by the Hellenistic period. However, other sections of the poem now lost to us might have contained clear signs of authorship.

20 W² is parallel to 531 PMG, the eulogy for those who died at Themopylae (οὐθ' ὁ πανδαμάτωρ ἀμαυρώσει χρόνος). A contrast can be drawn with the poem on the statue on the tomb of Midas and the epigram of Cleombrotus (581 PMG), where Simonides mocked the idea that anything could last for ever.⁷⁵ In spirit it seems to represent the opposite point of view, though it is not strictly inconsistent with 19–20 W², since the poem of Homer is not a physical object, like a stone, or an inscription.

A wish to be somewhere else (21–22 W²)

21 W² (*POxy* 2327, fr. 1 + 2(a) col. i). West tentatively posits the start of a poem at line 3; the only evidence for this is the sense, though the asyndeton supports this somewhat.⁷⁶ Barigazzi 1963.65 thought the context was military, and saw it as a *recusatio* to list all the names of the fallen, reading ψυχῶν; this was challenged already by Podlecki 1968 and West 1993a rightly interprets the fragment as erotic. The poet announces that he can no longer be a faithful companion to his soul,⁷⁷ and that he has respected justice, though with pain, since the end of his boyhood and the onset of adolescence. The sexual awakening that took place at this time is symbolised by colourful imagery: ivory skin is darkened by burgeoning hair, and it is as if white snow melts away, revealing verdant grass (an image that, as West suggests, may have inspired Horace *Odes* 4.7),⁷⁸ and that West also connects with an epigram in the *Theognidea* (1345–50), in which the poet addresses a “Simonides” and praises homosexuality.

74 Cf. West 1974.180.

75 This “philosophical” aspect of the programme of Simonides is brought out by Austin 1967.

76 There is no sign of a gap between the lines in the papyrus here, as there is in *POxy* 2327, fr. 7.

77 In his article, West favours ψυχῆ, whereas his text has the vocative ψυχί, but the vocative is too short for the space.

78 For allusions in Horace, see also Barchiesi in this volume and forthcoming.

22 W² (*POxy* 2327, fr. 3 + fr. 2(a) col. ii + (b) + fr. 4 + *POxy* 3965, fr. 27). The poet describes a journey, apparently to an island (1–8), where he meets Ekhekratides, probably to be identified with the late Thessalian ruler, father of Antiochus and husband of Dyseris (9–10). (Simonides wrote a *Threnos* for the son: 528 PMG.)⁷⁹ He imagines himself being rejuvenated (11–12), having sex with a male, reclining as if in a *sumposion*,⁸⁰ and singing, so that the situation described mirrors the performance-context of the poem.

Parsons 1992a.46 reasons that the journey might be a) real, b) escapist, or c) *post mortem*. The problem with a) is the rejuvenation implied in line 14. For b), there are plenty of parallels: Parsons compared the “imagery of elsewhere” odes in Greek tragedy,⁸¹ in particular Euripides *Hipp.* 732ff., where the chorus wish they could fly away to the island of the Hesperides, or *Bacch.* 403ff., where the chorus want to fly off to Cyprus, where they will consort with Eros. Not much different is the mood of Horace *Epode* 16, where the poet imagines leaving contemporary Rome and sailing to the islands to the West. Rejuvenation could perhaps have been mentioned in such “escapist” texts.

The difference in this case is that the poet imagines himself meeting Ekhekratides on the island. On first consideration, this factor would not seem to require that Ekhekratides is dead. Perhaps he is in Thessaly, and Simonides somewhere else, and Simonides imagines both of them journeying independently to a magic island and being rejuvenated. But the situation is simpler if we assume that Ekhekratides is already there, i.e., he has already died, and Simonides imagines himself making a voyage to join him. This is basically the conclusion reached by West. I would add that there exists a parallel for song in the Islands of the Blessed in Philostratus’ description of Achilles and Helen playing music there.⁸² This is, then, a sort of *post mortem* journey (c), although for the purpose of the

79 See Molyneux 1992.127ff. West also suggests that the name Ekhekratides could be restored in 14.16 W². Early on, before the name Ekhekratides was restored (i.e., before *POxy* 2327, fr. 27 was added at the left), it seemed that these might actually be the Islands of the Blessed, and Ἰδην might be Peleides, which would suit the emphasis on Achilles in the other fragments very well. However, the position of fr. 27 seems certain.

80 κεκλιμένος recalls Archilochus fr. 2 W; cf. Bowie 1986.18.

81 Padel 1974.

82 *Heroicus* 54; 72.7ff. de Lannoy.

poem, Simonides and Ekhekratides are not dead but rather still alive, perhaps even immortal. It is worth considering the possibility that it draws on a traditional belief that the poet is someone who can contact the dead, rather as Pindar represents himself as sending songs to the underworld.⁸³

How did the poet describe himself getting to the Islands of the Blessed? Perhaps by being mysteriously wafted after death. But it is also possible that he imagined himself setting sail in this life. Perhaps he began with the well-established image of the *sumposion* as a ship at sea; he then imagined setting sail.⁸⁴ West may be right in his suggestion that the lines immediately preceding the description of the island (1–3) are part of a propemptic frame.

Richard Hunter has argued for a more complex structure, similar to that of the *Propemptikon* in Theocritus *Id.* 7.61ff., where the singer imagines his beloved travelling to an island, and himself celebrating independently.⁸⁵ The beloved might be featured in lines 1–8 (ἵκοιτο), and the singer in 9ff., or the beloved might be featured in lines 1–12 (λάβοι), and the singer in 13ff. But the idea of a real party is made less likely by the fact that φαρκίδαας in line 14 is likely to mean “wrinkles” (Hunter suggests the word might have the unattested sense of some sort of food), so the context is probably one of rejuvenation, and the hypothesis of a real-life journey seems ruled out.

If elegiac poetry has a special connection with mourning, the fragment might reflect this factor; however, the evidence for this is slight in the classical period.⁸⁶ Nevertheless, it exemplifies well-established themes of symposiastic poetry. As we saw, it was customary for symposiasts to pretend that they were at sea. Furthermore, *sumposia* were occasions for the commemoration of the dead: one thinks of the Attic *skolion* to Harmodius and Aristogeiton, in which they are imagined dwelling in the Islands of the Blessed (894 PMG), and Aristotle’s controversial poem in commemoration of Hermias (842 PMG), which was probably performed at a *sumposion*.⁸⁷

Can 21 W² be connected with 22 W², which came in the next

83 Segal 1985.

84 Slater 1976, Bowie 1986.17.

85 Hunter 1993.

86 See above.

87 On the Hermias poem, see Rutherford 1996. The Egyptians honoured the dead at *sumposia* according to Herodotus 2.78 and Plutarch *de Iside et Osiride* 17, 357e; also Athenaeus 620a, Pausanias 9.29.3.

column? West 1993a.12 argues that the fragments are from distinct poems, though consecutive ones. Parsons, however, had suggested that there might be a connection, arguing that the poet might have passed from a description of his sexual awakening to expressing the desire for rejuvenation and continued sexual activity in the Islands of the Blessed.⁸⁸

The remaining fragments classified by West as sympotic tell us little. **23–26 W²** are fragments transmitted by manuscript paradosis. **25 W²** is a strange fragment about snow; **26 W²**, from Chamaeleon, seems to be drawn from a poem about a *lagôos*. **27–33 W²** are papyrus fragments. **27 W²**, from the top of a column, may make reference to stomachs; **31 W²**, a negligible fragment, is the subject of an extremely ambitious reconstruction by West in his apparatus; **33 W²** is a mess: we catch a trace of a paean (line 1), a donkey (line 6), baskets (line 9), Kupris (line 15; cf. 72 W²); but it seems impossible to put these elements together into any sort of whole.

OTHER FRAGMENTS

34–85 W² are papyrus fragments too small or obscure to be definitely classed as either military or sympotic. **86–92 W²** are literary fragments, which West judges could derive from epigrams or elegies. **34–57 W²** are the remaining fragments of *POxy* 2327; **58–85 W²** the remaining fragments of *POxy* 3965. **34 W²** is a small fragment, apparently from the end of one poem and the beginning of another, with a marginal coronis and (probably) title. Reference to horses in **35 W²** might justify putting it with the Plataea poem. If **59.5 W²** can be supplemented $\phi\acute{o}\rho\mu\gamma\zeta$, as Parsons 1992a.39 suggests, that might indicate it should be placed with the sympotic fragments. **70 W²** refers to Castor and Pollux, which can be compared with 11.31 W², but sympotic contexts should be imagined for them also; one thinks in particular of the tradition that the Tyndarids saved Simonides from death at a banquet in Crannon (510 PMG).

University of Reading

⁸⁸ Parsons 1992a.49: “I can never be a cautious wallflower. Even now, in old age, I long for love and wine. Hasten the day, when I recover my youth in the symposium of the Blest.” Mace forthcoming treats 22 W² as a separate poem.