SIMONIDES AND THE DIOSCURI[1]

J. H. Molyneux

The story of how the Dioscuri miraculously rescued the poet Simonides from death in a collapsing banqueting hall occurs frequently in ancient literature. It has been discussed by a number of modern scholars;[2] but I believe that there are still some gaps to be filled, especially in the evaluation of the following passage of Quintilian, which is our most important source.

Quint. Inst. 11.2.11–16 (ii 644–645 Winterbottom)

11. Artem autem memoriae primus ostendisse dicitur Simonides, cuius uulgata fabula est: cum pugili coronato carmen, quale componi uictoribus solet, mercede pacta scripsisset, abnegatam ei pecuniae partem quod more poetis frequentissimo degressus in laudes Castoris ac Pollucis exierat: quapropter partem ab iis petere quorum facta
12. celebrasset iubebatur. Et persoluerunt, ut traditum est: nam cum esset grande conuiuium in honorem eiusdem uictoriae atque adhibitus ei cenae Simonides, nuntio est excitus, quod eum duo iuuenes equis aduecti desiderare maiorem in modum dicebantur. Et illos
13. quidem non inuenit, fuisse tamen gratos erga se deos exitu comperit. Nam uix eo ultra limen egresso triclinium illud supra conuiuas corruit, atque ita confudit ut non ora modo oppressorum sed membra etiam omnia requirentes ad sepulturam propinqui nulla nota possent discernere. Tum Simonides dicitur memor ordinis quo quisque discubuerat corpora

---

[1]The present article is a revised extract from a doctoral thesis of the University of Sheffield, research on which was aided by grants, here gratefully acknowledged, from the Research Fund of the University of Sheffield. I should like to express my thanks to Professor D. L. Page for his kindness in reading a version of this article and giving me the benefit of his comments; but this acknowledgement does not constitute a claim that he would agree with all I have said.

[2]There are full discussions by F. G. Schneidewin (*Simonidis Cei carminum reliquiae* [Brunsvigae 1835] xi–xvi) and W. J. Oates (*The Influence of Simonides of Ceos Upon Horace* [Princeton 1932] 2–4, 7–12). D. L. Page (*Poetae Melici Graeci* [Oxford 1962] 243–244, on Simon. fr. 5/510) offers some salient points for the guidance of his readers; but the scope of his book precludes a full-length discussion. These three works are cited henceforth by the author's name only.

Mention of the story of Simonides' rescue, or of related matters, is also made by the following scholars; but although I report the views of some of them on one particularly contentious point (see below, n. 22), their discussions are on the whole too brief for me to feel that my account either seriously conflicts with them or is greatly indebted to them: P. Buttmann, *Mythologus* 2 (Berlin 1829) 271 n.; T. Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* 3[4] (Leipzig 1882) 389; G. S. Farnell, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (London 1891) 199; Maas, *RE* 3 A 1 (1927) *s.v.* "Simonides" no.2, 186.66–187.3 (where for *jenem Lied des Skopas* read ... *des Simonides*); Swoboda, *RE* 3 A 1 (1927) *s.v.* "Skopadai" 568.59–569.14; L. A. Stella, *RivFilClass* 24 (1946) 12; V. d'Agostino, *RivStudClass* 1 (1952–1953) 125–127; C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*[2] (Oxford 1961) 312.

14. suis reddidisse. Est autem magna inter auctores dissensio Glaucone Carystio an Leocrati an Agatharcho an Scopae scriptum sit id carmen, et Pharsali fuerit haec domus, ut ipse quodam loco significare Simonides uidetur utque Apollodorus et Eratosthenes et Euphorion et Larissaeus Eurypylus tradiderunt, an Crannone, ut Apollas et Callimachus,[3] *quem*
15. secutus Cicero hanc famam latius fudit. Scopam nobilem Thessalum perisse in eo conuiuio constat, adicitur sororis eius filius, putant et ortos plerosque ab alio Scopa qui maior
16. aetate fuerit. Quamquam mihi totum de Tyndaridis fabulosum uidetur, neque omnino huius rei meminit umquam poeta ipse, profecto non taciturus de tanta sua gloria.

Versions of the story, or allusions to it, are found in the following authors: Callim. fr. 64.1–14 Pfeiffer; Cic. *De Or.* 2.351–353; Ov. *Ib.* 511–512; Val. Max. 1.8. Ext. 7 (pp. 52 f. Kempf); Phaedr. 4.25.4 ff.; Alciphron 3.32.2 (p. 98 Schepers); Aristid. 50.36 (2. 434–435 Keil; 1. 512 Dind.); Ael. frs. 63 (= Suda *s.v.* Σιμωνίδης 441), 78 Hercher; Libanius *Or.* 5.53 (1. 1 p. 320 Foerster). Cf. also Stob. *Ecl.* 4.41.62 (5. 946 Hense), Simon. fr. 16/521 Page.

Quintilian's account, at first sight well-balanced and cautious, is soon seen to be confused and contradictory. The unwary reader, approaching the passage without forewarning of the difficulties, would naturally understand Quintilian as follows:

A victorious boxer, for whom Simonides had written a victory-ode, refused Simonides his full fee on the ground that he had digressed excessively in praise of Castor and Pollux. In honour of the same victory and no doubt very shortly afterwards, but nevertheless on a different occasion from that of the refusal of the fee (*cum esset . . . conuiuium, . . . adhibitus ei cenae Simonides*, Quint. 11.2.12), a feast was held; at this feast all the banqueters were killed by the collapse of the hall, except Simonides, who was rescued by some fortunate chance or by "divine intervention." The boxer, who had insulted Simonides by refusing his full fee, was presumably one of the victims. Quintilian's authorities dispute the identity of the victorious patron; some say that it was Glaucus of Carystus who commissioned the ode and refused the fee and perished in the hall, others that it was Leocrates or Agatharchus or Scopas who suffered this fate. Disagreement as to the place of the disaster is more limited; only Pharsalus and Crannon are mentioned. The reader may notice with some surprise that the accounts are confined to Crannon, the seat of the Scopads, and Pharsalus, which was not perhaps beyond their sphere of influence;[4] he may try to imagine a victory-celebration held in

[3]Winterbottom prints *Apollas* †*Calimachus*†. Radermacher, in his Teubner edition, accepts the emendation *Apollas Callimachius*. Others prefer a version meaning "Apollas and Callimachus" (cf. Callim. fr. 64.11–14, quoted below, n. 20): e.g., *Apollas Callimachus⟨que⟩* (found as a correction in one ms.) *FGrHist* 241 F 34, 244 F 67 (but in 266 F 6 "Apollas Callimach⟨i⟩us (?)"); or *Apollas ⟨et⟩ Callimachus* (Bentley's emendation) Callim. fr. 64 Pfeiffer, Simon. fr. 5/510 Page.

[4]See Swoboda, *op. cit.* (above, n. 2) 567.66–568.12.

Thessaly by Glaucus of Carystus[5] (or Leocrates[6] or Agatharchus[7]), feeling by now some misgivings but not yet the utter perplexity which comes with Quintilian's next sentence (11.2.15), where we are told that according to all authorities *Scopas* perished at the banquet. At this point, either the reader will conclude that according to some of Quintilian's authorities Scopas, the Thessalian ruler, was a guest at a banquet given (*in Thessaly*) by Glaucus of Carystus (or Leocrates or Agatharchus) and that Scopas perished with his host; or he will regard this solution as a *reductio ad absurdum* and feel he has been misled by Quintilian.

We shall adopt the latter course. In the first place, it is intrinsically improbable that so dramatically startling a story as the collapse of a hall and the death of the occupants should have been "floating," attached by different authors to different persons. Secondly, disagreement as to the place of the disaster is confined to two places, both of which have some demonstrable connection with Scopas. Finally, Quintilian states unequivocally (11.2.15) that Scopas perished in the disaster *with many of his family*. Whatever story Quintilian found attached in his sources to the names of Glaucus, Leocrates, or Agatharchus, surely cannot have included the death of any of them in a ruined banqueting hall.

It is agreed (*constat*) that Scopas perished thus. But Quintilian's authorities disagree as to whether the ode which earned for Simonides the gratitude of the Dioscuri was addressed to Scopas or to one of three other patrons. It seems clear that in the versions which mentioned Glaucus, Leocrates, or Agatharchus, the two occasions, the celebration at which the fee was refused, and the feast at which Simonides' host perished, were completely distinct; it was supposed that the Dioscuri had noted with gratitude Simonides' praise of them, and that on a subsequent occasion they proved their gratitude when Simonides was threatened with catastrophe in the hall of another patron, Scopas.[8]

There existed, then, in Quintilian's sources, two distinct accounts: one,

[5]The famous boxer and patron of Simonides (*RE* 7 1[1910] *s.v.* "Glaucos" no. 33; Simon. fr. 4/509 Page).

[6]Leocrates may be the Leocrates of the Simonidean epigram 101 Diehl (150 Bergk), who again may be the Athenian general Leocrates (cf. Obst, *RE* 12 2 [1925] *s.v.* "Leokrates" no. 1, 2001.45–57).

[7]Agatharchus cannot be identified.

[8]Ed. Meyer (*Theopomps Hellenika* [Halle 1909] 241, n. 3) rightly interprets Quintilian as meaning that the identity of the patron killed in the collapse of his hall was established, and that the only point in dispute was whether Simonides owed his rescue from Scopas' hall to praise of the Dioscuri in an ode for Glaucus, Leocrates, Agatharchus, or Scopas himself; similarly, H. J. Rose's remark (*CR* 47 [1933] 166), "it was not sure which of them [*sc.* the four odes] the deities found so acceptable," suggests that he does not think Quintilian was in doubt about the identity of the unfortunate patron. But it was not part of the purpose of either Meyer or Rose to analyse or criticise Quintilian's account in detail.

in which the song that saved Simonides had been addressed on some earlier occasion to a victorious boxer, and a second, in which Scopas was not only the victim of the disaster, but also the host to whom the poem praising the Dioscuri had been addressed. This second version is told as a complete and consistent story by Cicero (*loc. cit.* [above, 198]). A garbled combination of these versions is offered by Phaedrus (*loc. cit.* [above, 198]); his *cuidam pyctae*[9] (line 5) seems to indicate doubt in his mind about the identity of the boxer-patron to whom the ode praising the Dioscuri was addressed (this uncertainty is derived no doubt from the disagreement of his sources). He then implies (*ibid.* lines 6–29 *passim*) that the boxer-patron and the victim of the disaster are one and the same person; and, therefore, that he was in doubt about the identity of the *victim*. This doubt would surely have been resolved for him by a proper study of his sources; for all the sources known to Quintilian, and so presumably to Phaedrus, named Scopas as the victim. Quintilian's account appears at first to follow the same lines as that of Phaedrus—to imply that the patron who refused the fee and the host who perished were one and the same person, and that his identity was a matter of doubt. But a moment later we are told (Quint. 11.2.15) that there is no doubt that it was Scopas who perished; and we conclude that Quintilian's meaning is not what it first appeared to be, that his intention is to record two quite different versions of the story, and that he has reported them in a most awkward and confusing manner.[10] The alternative hypothesis, that the confused narration represents a real confusion of mind and that Quintilian understood or remembered his authorities so ill that all that remained to him was the highly improbable version outlined above (199), is even less flattering to Quintilian, and I should prefer to reject it.[11]

[9] *Simonides idem ille, de quo rettuli,*
victori laudem cuidam pyctae ut scriberet,
certo condixit pretio . . . [Phaedr. 4.25.4–6]

[10]The view that there was some dispute in antiquity about the identity of the patron who perished (a view which is at first suggested by Quintilian's presentation but which I regard as incorrect) is held by A. S. F. Gow (*Theocritus* 2 [Cambridge 1950] 310, on Theoc. 16.19), and apparently by Oates. Oates seems to assume (11) that some of Quintilian's authorities, and Quintilian himself, thought that *a boxer* may have been the victim of the disaster. Quintilian "refuses to say that the house which fell was that of Scopas" (Oates, *ibid.*); yet "Quintilian regarded as fixed" the fact "that a Scopas perished in the catastrophe." I think that these two statements can be reconciled only if we attribute to Quintilian the improbable version of the story outlined above (199); as I have already indicated, I should prefer to say that Quintilian's *presentation* is misleading.

[11]Although I should greatly have preferred the role of defending an ancient author against modern criticism to that of drawing attention to what I allege to be deficiencies in his account, I believe that some criticism of Quintilian is inevitable here. I was unable to suggest why Quintilian should have been guilty of this lapse; but Professor D. A. Campbell suggests to me that he has imperfectly co-ordinated the two distinct sections

How much fact lies behind these several versions? We can begin this enquiry from Simonides' own works; for we learn, from Favorinus as quoted by Stobaeus, that in a poem of which the dirge Simon. 16/521 Page is almost certainly a fragment,[12] Simonides lamented the mass-destruction of the family of the Scopads. Quintilian, too, implies that Simonides made mention of the disaster in his poetry,[13] and he is perhaps referring to the dirge quoted by Stobaeus.[14] We can take it as proved, then, that the Scopads perished in the manner described, and that Simonides lamented their fate. In all probability the disaster occurred at Pharsalus; at least, Simonides' own works contained a reference which could be interpreted thus.[15] It seems best to regard the collapse of the hall as a pure accident.[16]

---

of his account, viz. the dramatic narration (paragraphs 11–13), which adequately serves his purpose of illustrating Simonides' mnemonic art, and the "learned footnote" (paragraphs 14–16), in which he cites his sources and notes their points of disagreement.

[12]Favorinus *ap.* Stob. *Ecl.* 4.41.62 (5. 946 Hense):

> Φαβωρίνου.
> ἄνθρωπος ἐὼν μή ποτε φάσῃς ὅ τι γίνεται [αὔριον],
> μηδ' ἄνδρα ἰδὼν ὄλβιον ὅσσον χρόνον ἔσσεται.

ἀλλὰ μηδὲ οἶκον. ὥσπερ ἀμέλει ὁ ποιητὴς διεξέρχεται τὴν τῶν Σκοπαδῶν ἀθρόαν ἀπώλειαν.

Elsewhere (*Ecl.* 4.41.9), under the heading Σιμωνίδου Θρήνων, Stobaeus quotes a fuller version of the fragment ἄνθρωπος ἐὼν κτλ. It seems very probable, though it is not entirely certain, that Favorinus, in the words ὁ ποιητὴς διεξέρχεται κτλ., is referring to the Simonidean poem from which he has just quoted, not to some other poem of Simonides (cf. n. 14 below); and if this is so, the poem describing the destruction of the Scopads is identified (from Stobaeus' title at 4.41.9) as a dirge. Some scholars explicitly acknowledge this slight uncertainty (e.g., Bowra, *op. cit.* [above, n. 2] 325; W. J. H. F. Kegel, *Simonides* [Groningen 1962] 47 f.; others do not (e.g., Schneidewin, in his commentary on this fragment [= fr. 46 Schneid.]).

[13]Quint. 11.2.14: . . . *Pharsali . . . ut . . . quodam loco significare Simonides uidetur . . . an Crannone. . . .* We cannot tell in what way Simonides' reference to Pharsalus was obscure (*uidetur*).

[14]So Page p. 243, item (i). This dirge is the only Simonidean poem known to us which suggests itself as Quintilian's source. It is, however, possible that Simonides mentioned the disaster in some other poem also, perhaps an epigram similar to Simon. 67, 77 Diehl, which concern Simonides' own life and career (though they are not ascribed to him with certainty).

[15]See above, n. 13. Quintilian seems to imply that he had himself seen and studied the relevant passage of Simonides. Those of Quintilian's authorities who placed the disaster at Pharsalus (Apollodorus, Eratosthenes, Euphorion, Larissaeus Eurypylus: Quint. 11.2.14) may also have derived their information from Simonides' own works, though we cannot be sure that each did so independently (e.g., for Apollodorus' probable dependence on Eratosthenes for some of Simonides' biographical data see *FGrHist* II C-BD 749). The location of the disaster at Crannon by Apollas and Callimachus (Quint., *ibid.*: see above, n. 3) may simply be due to the fact that Crannon was the chief seat of the Scopads (see above, n. 4).

[16]I am not inclined to accept the theory, which is held by Schneidewin (xv) (cf.

The presence of Simonides at the fatal banquet, and his own fortunate escape, cannot actually be traced to his own poems;[17] this part of the story may or may not have been included in the dirge on the Scopads. There is no reliable criterion by which to ascertain whether this part of the story is true; we can only balance probabilities. Either the story of Simonides' own escape is a fiction, based solely on the fact that he had at one time stayed with the Scopads and was subsequently commissioned by the survivors to lament the disaster; or the story has a basis of truth in that Simonides did, by some kind of lucky accident, escape a calamity that befell his hosts, even though some elements in the story (probably the split-second timing of his escape and certainly the supernatural intervention) were later embellishments. I prefer the second alternative.

Whether or not Simonides mentioned his escape, Quintilian (11.2.16) tells us quite definitely that the poet did not attribute his rescue to the divine intervention of the Dioscuri[18] (or indeed, I think, to divine intervention at all).[19] We might have guessed otherwise from the lines of Callimachus,[20] who makes the dead Simonides, reproaching the Acragantine general Phoenix for destroying his tomb, declare that Phoenix had shown no awe of the Dioscuri who of old rescued Simonides from the Scopads' fate. It might be that Callimachus possessed a poem of Simonides, which was unknown to Quintilian, alluding to the intervention of the Dioscuri; but more likely Callimachus is using the effective device of putting into Simonides' own mouth the substance of a legend which had grown up around him.

For whether Simonides' escape was due to pure chance, or to the contrivance of conspirators who did not wish the undeserving poet to share their victims' fate, the legend that his escape was brought about by divine intervention was certainly well-established by the time of Callimachus. Some such legend was indeed almost an inevitable consequence of Simonides' fortunate escape; the rescue of the poet (*σοφὸς*

Oates 14, n. 35), that the collapse of the hall was due to a political plot by conspirators who managed to rescue Simonides from the fate they had contrived for his hosts.

[17]Page p. 244, item (iv). Page thinks it probable, however, that Simonides did narrate these events.

[18]Page p. 243, item (iii).

[19]Oates (11 f.) understands Quintilian's phrase *neque omnino huius rei meminit umquam poeta ipse* (11.2.16) to mean merely that the poet did not name any particular divinity as his rescuer; but it would more naturally mean that he said nothing at all about divine intervention.

[20]*Loc. cit.* (above, 198) lines 11–14:

οὐδ' ὑμ]έας, Πολύδευκες, ὑπέτρεσεν, οἳ με μελά[θ]ρου
μέλλο]ντος πίπτειν ἐκτὸς ἔθεσθέ κοτε
δαιτυμ]όνων ἄπο μοῦνον, ὅτε Κραννώνιος [αἰ]αῖ
ὤ]λισ[θ]ε[ν μεγ]άλο[υς] οἶκος ἐπὶ [Σ]κ[ο]πάδ[α]ς.

καὶ θεῖος ἀνήρ, Pl. *Resp.* 331 e) would not have been allowed to stand for long to the credit of pure chance.[21] The unanimous agreement on the Dioscuri as the divine agents, and the active and personal role assigned to them by the legend, suggests that there was some good reason why they should have favoured the poet; and a poem praising the Dioscuri would have been an obvious guess even without the testimony of our authors.

I think we may conclude from Quintilian (11.2.14: *est autem magna inter auctores dissensio . . .*, etc.) that there existed at least four odes[22] containing praise of the Dioscuri, composed by Simonides at various unspecified intervals before his escape. Quintilian's authorities, when telling the legend, quoted now this ode, now that, as the one which had won the gods' favour and subsequently led to the poet's deliverance. Among these odes was one for Scopas, which provided the neatest version of the story; the occasion of the ode which won the gods' favour, and the occasion on which they proved their gratitude, are now at the very least in honour of the same patron, or better still in honour of the same victory (so Phaedrus and Quintilian), or are even one and the same (so Cicero). So neat and coherent is Cicero's version that it was probably not the earliest one; if the stories of the praise of the Dioscuri and their manifestation of gratitude had been so neatly dovetailed at the beginning of the tradition, it is unlikely that they would have been separated and the gods' gratitude attributed to an earlier poem for a different patron. On the other hand, it is entirely natural that early versions in which the two occasions were distinct should have given way to the neater version which is found in Cicero and which dominates Quintilian's ill-arranged presentation.

I have left to the last, as the most puzzling feature of the legend, the story of the refusal of the fee. How did it become part of the legend? I feel fairly certain that it cannot have been true of Scopas; had Simonides

[21]It is usual to compare the stories of the rescue of Arion and the detection of Ibycus' murderers (Schneidewin xiv; K. Lehrs, *Populäre Aufsätze*[2] [Leipzig 1875] 385 f.).

[22]Quintilian, I believe, means that there were four odes (one for each of the four patrons named) all containing praise of the Dioscuri (so Schneidewin xiii–xiv; Bergk, *loc. cit.* [above, n. 2]; Rose, *loc. cit.* [above, n. 8]), not that there was one such ode for an unidentified patron (so Maas, *loc. cit.* [above, n. 2]); Bowra, *loc. cit.* [above, n. 2]; Page p. 243f.). On the former assumption it is easier to understand how the names of Glaucus, Leocrates, and Agatharchus won a firm place in the story. The latter assumption seems to require the explanation, which I find less natural, that one ode (or fragments of one ode) survived, mentioning a boxing contest and praising the Dioscuri but omitting the name of the patron; and that this ode was variously ascribed to Glaucus, Leocrates, or Agatharchus as boxers for whom Simonides was known to have written. (B. A. van Groningen, however, who is among those who think that Quintilian is referring to only one ode, believes that the ode had already been lost by the third century B.C. [*Mnemosyne* 4.1 (1948) 6–7].)

received such an insult from the Scopads, he would not have lamented them in the dirge he is known to have written.[23]

The anecdote of the refused fee no doubt belonged, at some time, to an ode containing praise of the Dioscuri and written by Simonides for a *boxer*,[24] whether Glaucus, Leocrates, or Agatharchus: cf. *cuidam pyctae, pugili coronato*,[25] early in the accounts of Phaedrus (line 5) and Quintilian (11.2.11) (see above, n. 9 and 197). The incident could then have been transferred to Scopas and become part of that version in which the gods' gratitude was prompted by an ode *for Scopas*, the fusion of the stories being seen in Cicero's account. Clearly we have a still more pointed and attractive story if the same incident brought both deliverance to Simonides for a poem of praise and retribution to Scopas for an impious insult. We cannot say when the story of the refusal of the fee was attached to Scopas; it forms an essential part of Cicero's account, but Callimachus, who makes Simonides lament the Scopads (see above, n. 20), presumably knew of no such story concerning Scopas.[26]

There would be, then, an obvious motive for transferring the anecdote from a boxer to Scopas; and we may guess with some probability that the story originally concerned a boxer, though there is no means of telling whether it has any basis of truth. It is less easy to see why the anecdote should have been transferred the other way, from Scopas to a boxer.[27]

We have assumed that there existed an ode to Scopas, in which the Dioscuri were praised. It is very probable that the ode in question was an epinician. We conclude from Quintilian that Simonides praised the Dioscuri in odes for boxers (Glaucus, Leocrates, Agatharchus), presumably because they (or Polydeuces alone) could be regarded as the patrons

[23]Schneidewin xiv f.

[24]Page p. 244, sub-paragraph (i).

[25]We may conclude from these phrases that Leocrates and Agatharchus, like Glaucus, were boxers; cf. Schneidewin xvi and Oates 9, n. 25.

[26]I assume that Cicero "followed Callimachus" (Quint. 11.2.14) only in naming Crannon as the scene of the disaster.

[27]Schneidewin and Oates assume that the anecdote was transferred from Scopas to a boxer, but I am not convinced by their explanations. Schneidewin (xiii–xvi) explains the origin of the "boxer" version by suggesting that late and unreliable authors, when discussing the legend, had merely looked for any odes containing praise of the Dioscuri in order to identify the patron concerned, and had wrongly attached the story (which really concerned Scopas) to certain boxers for whom such odes existed. Oates (9, n. 28) suggests that "the boxer theory arose from the story that in the poem praise was rendered to the Dioscuri, since nothing could be more fit than a victorious boxer's sharing praise with Pollux." Oates seems to mean that the whole anecdote (the victory-song, the refusal of the fee, and the annihilation of the victor and his family) was transferred en bloc from Scopas to various boxers solely for the reason that Polydeuces might be regarded as the patron-deity of boxers.

of boxing.[28] Scopas, ruler of Crannon, is perhaps unlikely to have taken part in boxing contests; but the twins could also be regarded as riders, and their praise would be appropriate to an epinician for a chariot victory. Simonides is known (from Theoc. 16.34–47; cf. schol. on 16.44) to have written such epinicians for the Scopads and other Thessalian houses, and it would be a probable guess that our ode was one of these.

UNIVERSITIES OF SHEFFIELD AND VICTORIA, B.C.

[28]Polydeuces is *πὺξ ἀγαθός* in *Il.* 3.237 and *Od.* 11.300 (in these places Castor is mentioned as a rider). Later both are represented as riders (*Hymn. Hom.* 17.5, 33.18; Pind. *Pyth.* 1.66; Eur. *IA* 1153 f.); but Castor, it seems, never becomes a boxer with Polydeuces.