

SIMONIDES' HOUSE

W. J. SLATER

Die Geschichte des Unwahren zu verfolgen kann wol nicht ganz ohne Interesse sein. K. Lehrs

THE AIM OF THIS PAPER is to try to clarify some of the legends concerning Simonides' life, especially the famous story concerning his rescue by the Dioscuri; this will I hope raise some elementary points of methodology concerning ancient lives.

The major source for the story of the Dioscuri is Quintilian, *Inst.* 11.2.12, and the key sentence he adds for his authority is, in Winterbottom's text:

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 Eurypylos tradiderunt, an Crannone, ut Apollas †Calimachus†, quem secutus Cicero hanc famam latius fudit.

This text will not do. As Jacoby shows,¹ Larissaeus Eurypylus is not a historian but one of the Thessalian Aleuadai, brother (Hdt. 9.58) of Hippokleas, for whom Pindar composed *Pyth.* 10. The name does not therefore belong, in all probability, to the question of the list of authorities but to the list of athletes which precedes it. The well known scholastic use of *et* (translating the greek *καί*²) joining together the name of the direct and indirect source makes it perfectly reasonable to accept Wendel's³ view that Apollodorus was the source for the views of Euphorion in his *περὶ Ἀλεονάδων* and Eratosthenes' *Chronographia*. But if Euphorion's book was about the Aleuadai, why should he mention the incident concerning Skopas at Crannon or Pharsalos? We expect him to be in the company of Aleuadai at Larissa, and in Quintilian's text we do in fact find Euphorion connected with an Aleuad, so that we should suppose that Apollodorus quoted Euphorion's work on the Aleuadai in which was mentioned the athlete Eurypylos of Larissa. Quintilian nowhere else mentions Apollodorus, and his statement *ut ipse quodam loco significare uidetur* is probably borrowed along with the rest of his half-

¹*PW* s.v. Eurypylos, no. 16, with litt. There is another Eurypylos in Athenaeus, 9.508 f.

²This usage may arise from a use of *καί* = i.e. (Lehrs, *Pindarscholien* [Leipzig 1873] 21); Professor W. Bühler refers me to Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos* [Leipzig 1906] 140.

³C. Wendel, *Überlieferung und Entstehung der Theokritscholien*, Abh. Ges. Wiss. Gött., Phil.-hist. Klasse, N.F. 17.2 (Berlin 1920) 104 f.

digested learning from an intermediate source—I suggest an anecdotal source such as Valerius Maximus concerning *exempla* for *memoria*.⁴ I postulate that the very corrupt passage in Quintilian was already distorted by compression in his notes.

The corruption of details makes it impossible for us to engage in speculation as to (a) the name of the person to whom the poem was dedicated and (b) where the house did actually collapse. We do however know that there was no consensus of opinion on most details in antiquity, i.e., that there was no firm evidence, and that there was a consensus on the one point of the death of Skopas. No one mentions the story before Callimachus (fr. 63 Pf.), but one person who would have almost certainly been the source for Callimachus was the peripatetic Chamaileon in his *περί Σιμωνίδου*.⁵ Tales of the *chreia* variety about Simonides were extremely popular in the fourth century⁶ and presumably earlier, and these along with dubious epigrams and riddles formed the main sources for Chamaileon's biographic elaborations. For example, his two anecdotes of the usual Hieron-Simonides type at Athenaeus 659d are related solely to illustrate the point that Simonides is a "skinflint" (*κίμβιξ*, from Xenophanes 21B21 D–K *Vorsokr.*).⁶

On the other hand we may believe with Jacoby⁷ that Eratosthenes' investigations were based directly on the poems of Simonides; in view of that great scholar's skepticism, extreme in antiquity,⁸ about Homer's historicity or his contempt for the romanticizing Alexander historians,⁹ it would be only reasonable for him to avoid the popular biographies. What then made him comment on the Dioscuri story? The connection with Apollodorus suggests that he saw in Simonides' poems a chance to fix a chronological point, probably the death of Skopas. Obviously he

⁴The form of Quintilian's note makes a direct consultation of Simonides highly improbable; cf. the notorious borrowing in Suidas s.v. Hesychios. Reflexion on the methods of Roman rhetoricians (cf. below on Favorinus) would in any case rule out such an idea. Molyneux, *Phoenix* 25 (1971) 197 ff., is so unsatisfactory on this as on other points that I avoid criticism. On the *exempla* collections available to the early Roman orators, see C. Bosch, *Die Quellen des Valerius Maximus* (Diss. Heidelberg 1929), with Volkmann's criticisms in *PW* 8A col. 103; and H. Kornhardt, *Exemplum* (Diss. Göttingen 1936) 85 ff.

⁵Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles* 9² (1969) frs. 33–35 = Steffen, *Chamaileonis Fragmenta* (Warsaw 1963) frs. 30–32.

⁶E.g., Arist. *Rh.* 1391a8; 1405b24; fr. 83R (showing peripatetic interest). A great number are collected in Xenophon's *Hieron*, whence they reappear in Stobaeus; there are more in *Gnomologicum Vaticanum*², ed. Sternbach (Berlin 1963), nos. 510–514, with parallels; cf. Wehrli, *op. cit.* (above, n. 5) 83, for other litt., and *PHib.* 17.

⁷Commentary on *FGrH* 244F67.

⁸Mehmel, *Antike und Abendland* 4 (1954) 16 ff.

⁹Jacoby on *FGrH* 241F28. The best example however of his demolition of biographic fiction is Cic. *Att.* 6.1.18, which is mentioned by Lehrs, *Populäre Aufsätze* (Leipzig 1875) 397.

failed, and so shall we. There was no poem definitely dealing with his death in the collapse of a house, or there would have been no dispute about its addressee. But Eratosthenes' system of dating by Olympian and Pythian victories would have led him to examine the equation of the death of a Skopad with the celebration of a victory in order to obtain a fixed date for Thessalian chronology. This was not probably his own idea but his criticism of an earlier idea of such synchronisms, such as we know Aristotle to have entertained.¹⁰ At any rate we have found a probable explanation for the fourth century attempt to link an epinikian with another ode or inscription of Simonides.

But at the same time we see that Quintilian's story of the escape of Simonides incorporates four separate elements, viz. (a) the lengthy digression in Simonides' song which provoked the victor; (b) the question of his demanding ready money;¹¹ (c) his fabulous memory; (d) the poet saved by his piety from a house (shipwreck). All of these are literary or ethical motifs¹² that we can easily trace, and in part account for.

(a) The reason for the victor's anger is said to have been the excessive praise devoted to the myth of the Dioscuri. The cause of this statement, as is now recognized,¹³ was the Alexandrian scholars' incomprehension of the function of the myth in early poetry. For this failure to appreciate the organic quality of the myth they tended to blame the poet, cf. schol. Pind. *Nem.* 4.35: Σιμωνίδης παρεκβάσει χρήσθαι εἶωθεν. There was an ode with a Dioscuri myth whose relevance they did not see; therefore some scholar called it a gross impudence to the victor. The further conclusion, that the victor would not pay for such an ode, was facilitated by

(b) Simonides' well known meanness. It was taken for granted by Chamaileon because it was already part of the stock abuse of Athenian comedy, for whom the poet was an *exemplum* of avarice.¹⁴ Xenophanes' (21B21, from schol. Ar. *Pax* 697) accusation of "skinflint," if it was certainly directed at Simonides, stems, if not from *μικροψυχία* towards successful poets (21A22), then from his well known dislike of athletes and

¹⁰It should not be thought surprising that Eratosthenes could possibly have contradicted Aristotle's synchronism, and that Apollodorus should have reported this contradiction. Cicero *Att.* 6. 1. 18 reports Eratosthenes' rejection of Duris. Polemic was the handmaid of Alexandrian scholarship; cf. *FGrH* 244F32b, 244F63, etc.

¹¹Cf. the story of the two boxes, Wendel, *op. cit.* (above, n. 3) 104¹; Sternbach, *Gnom. Vat.* on no. 513.

¹²I hesitate to use the word *topoi* in view of Veit, *DVJS* 39 (1963) 143.

¹³Especially in the excellent work of A. Köhnken, *Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar* (Berlin 1970), basing his criticism on earlier work. That the long tradition of Alexandrian scholarship is not yet dead may be illustrated from the otherwise useful book of D. West, *Reading Horace* (Edinburgh 1967) 87: "they (Pindar's poems) are notable for their mythological digressions . . . with carefully engineered transitions."

¹⁴Testimonia in Pfeiffer on Callimachus, fr. 222; cf. Woodbury, *TAPA* 99 (1968) 527 ff.; Eustathius, *Proem. Pind.* 3 p. 286 Dr.

their poetic champions. We may be sure that Simonides was no more entitled to that reputation than Pindar¹⁵ and others at whom the same charge was levelled. The charge grew out of a democratic contempt for those who had made a profitable calling out of the great tyrants of Sicily, Athens (cf. Pl. *Hipparch.* 228c), and Thessaly, but also because of the disproportionate praise they appeared to lavish on wealth in an age when it was becoming intellectually respectable to praise poverty.¹⁶ The fact that Simonides was a school authority for popular ethics was sufficient to preserve his reputation for wisdom but not enough to preserve him from popular malice as expressed by the comic poets in an age when he had little appeal to the young or the intelligentsia.¹⁷ But Simonides was the *exemplum* for avarice rather than Pindar because the passage Pind. *Isthm.* 2.6 ἀ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδὴς πω τότ' ἦν οὐδ' ἐργάτις was notoriously taken to be a jibe at Simonides. So the scholiast takes it, and this is clearly Callimachus' interpretation (fr. 222 Pf.). Thus the story of Simonides' avarice is justified by an *ad hoc* interpretation.

(c) Simonides was a *πρῶτος εὐπένης*,¹⁸ in Alexandrian anthropology, of mnemonics and the Ionic vowel system. The later professional rhetoricians were scarcely prepared to swallow a story that a choral poet, born about one hundred years before Hippias of Elis, wrote a theory of mnemonics,¹⁹ but it was nonetheless one of the best known details of the poet's life in antiquity. The story comes this time from Alexandrian learning and not comedy, as the emphasis on the *πρῶτος εὐπένης* shows. The clue comes from the Simonides biography in *POxy.* 1800 fr. 1 col. 2.36 ff. (2nd cent. A.D.), where we read in line 40 (immediately after a life

¹⁵By a coincidence in Pindar's one epinikian for a Thessalian, *Pyth.* 10, the scholia also accuse him of a *parekbasis*.

¹⁶Passages collected in W. Meyer, *Laudes Inopiae* (Diss. Göttingen 1915); cf. Bühler, *Beiträge zur Erklärung der Schrift vom Erhabenen* (Göttingen 1964) 18.

¹⁷*Ar. Nub.* 1356; cf. 967. Plato was particularly opposed to several aspects of the epinikian: *Lysis* 205c (cf. Trenkner, *The Greek Novella* [Cambridge 1958] 19), *Thet.* 174e; see in general Haedicke, *Die Gedanken der Griechen über Familienherkunft* (Halle 1937) 10 ff. O. Gigon, *Kommentar zum zweiten Buch von Xenophons Memorabilia* (Basel 1956) 57–58, rightly posits a close relationship between sophistic and earlier poetry.

¹⁸*Marm. Par. FGh* 239A54; Callimachus, fr. 63 Pf. 9–10, tells us that this information stood on Simonides' gravestone (at Akragas?), which had been sacrilegiously destroyed. Therefore there was no gravestone, but only a grave epitaph. This sounds like Chamaileon again, for no *vita* was complete without the requisite epitaph (Leo, *Die Gr.-Röm. Biographie* [Leipzig 1901] 33; Dahlmann, *Varron* (Entretiens Hardt 9 [Geneva 1962]) 20; and Varro, *De Poetis*, Abh. Ak. Mainz, 1962 no. 10, p. 65 f.). For the concept of the First Discoverer see Thraede, *RhM* 105 (1962) 158 ff., Nisbet-Hubbard on Horace, *Odes* 1.3.12; Leo, *op. cit.* 105, mentions Chamaileon in this connection. Simonides was also an improver on the lyre, according to Suidas, which also (*FGh* 8T1) reports a descendant of the same name who wrote Discoveries.

¹⁹Further details in H. Blum, *Die Antike Mnemotechnik* (Spudasmata 15 [1969]) 41 ff., who assembles previous speculations.

of Sappho mentioning Chamaileon): *τινες δ' αὐτῷ τὴν τῶν μνημονικῶν εὖρεσιν προστιθέασιν. καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ που τοῦτο φαίνει διὰ τῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων . . .*

Here then was the source for the attribution, and Hunt *ad loc.* refers us to Simonides fr. 146B⁴, "which is presumably the epigram referred to." Aelius Aristides, who quotes it, adds that Simonides definitely made it up about himself. Schneidewin thought it genuine, Kaibel thought it a fiction concocted by an unknown person using the Parian marble. It runs:

*μνήμην δ' οὐτινά φημι Σιμωνίδῃ ἰσοφαρίζειν
ὀγδωκοντάτεται παιδί Λεωπρέπῃως.*

Now ancient scholarship had good reason to date the age of Simonides from the victory he won in Athens at the age of eighty; this reason was probably fr. 147 B⁴, a dedicatory epigram from a victory at Athens. On this basis was composed fr. 146, clearly²⁰ not by Simonides, in which *κῶδος ἔσπετο Σιμωνίδῃ* of fr. 147 became "unequalled memory." *Μνήμη*, which was intended in the passive sense (Hdt. 1.144.1, etc.), became misinterpreted in an active sense, Simonides acquired a marvellous memory at the age of eighty,²¹ and was eventually credited with a memory-developing system. We need not object that our source for the epigram is late, since I am not claiming that it is genuine, merely that it antedates the epitaph culled from a biography on which Callimachus claims to be relying; i.e., it goes no further back than the late fourth century.²² The development of the legend is motivated by a desire to illustrate rhetorical *memoria*.²³

(d) The dangers of sea and land are a rhetorical antithesis for the Greeks and Romans,²⁴ and this is why Valerius Maximus, who tells the story of Simonides' escape from the house in 1.7.3, exclaims when he comes to relate his escape from shipwreck in 1.8.7: *Quid hac felicitate locupletius, quam nec mare nec terra saeviens extinguere voluit?* The shipwreck story is a later parallel, apparently frequently employed by Stoics.²⁵ Wilamowitz²⁶ correctly links the folk-motif of the grateful dead to the sort of grave epitaph we find in Callimachus *ep.* 58 Pf., and the spurious

²⁰See A. Hauvette, *Epigrammes de Simonide* (Paris 1896) 140.

²¹The testimonia cited by Blum show that it was his memory rather than his mnemonics that started the legend.

²²The parallel with D. Young's striking piece of analysis in *TAPA* 101 (1970) 633 ff. will be obvious.

²³I may add that the story of the capture of Akragas (?) at the point where Simonides' tombstone was built into the wall (Callimachus fr. 63 Pf.) belongs to the Aiakos motif of Pindar, *Ol.* 8.45, *Il.* 6.433, Euphorion, fr. 54 Powell.

²⁴Nisbet-Hubbard on Horace, *Odes* 1.28.17; cf. Kemmer, *Die Polare Ausdrucksweise* (Würzburg 1903) 160 ff.

²⁵Cic. *Div.* 1.56, with Pease's note. Perhaps from Posidonius or Chrysippus' *De Somniis*. Pease notes the Socratic parallels.

²⁶*De tribus carm. lat.* in *Kleine Schriften* 2 (Berlin 1971) 225.

Simonidean epigrams (*Anth. Pal.* 7.77 and 716) may be the origin of this story.²⁷

We return to the ill-fated house whence Simonides escaped. The story is pre-Callimachean, but was not on the alleged gravestone. Eratosthenes' interest suggests a critical question in the text of Simonides himself. But first we have to clear another speculation away. Molyneux, *loc. cit.* (n. 4) 201 f., compares the two citations of the same passage from Simonides' *Threnoi* (*PMG* 521), one of which comes indirectly from Favorinus, and concludes that the sentence appended to the quotation by Favorinus concerning the fall of the Skopadai is derived by him from his reading of the remainder of the poem which he had in front of him. Nothing could be more unlikely. The quotation is a most common *topos*²⁸ of consolation (originally from Solon [*Hdt.* 7.46.3]), and a sophist like Favorinus took it from the same place as we find it, a florilegium with chapter headings like those of Stobaeus; he added the hoary story of the house of Simonides (from a handbook like that of Valerius Maximus) to produce an *a fortiori* argument of the "outdoing" type so beloved of rhetoricians.²⁹ There is therefore no good evidence for believing that the death of Skopas was mentioned in *Threnos* 521 *PMG*.³⁰

It is inherently unlikely that the fall of a *conclave* or ἀνδρῶν or *triclinium* could destroy the whole of a dining-party, let alone dismember them. Even if one ignores the practical considerations advanced by Theophrastus *Hist. Pl.* 5.6.1, I find nothing to convince me that the woodwork of Greek houses in Thessaly in the sixth century was so dangerous. However, since the improbability of this natural tragedy seems not to worry historians,³¹ we shall try another approach. Tales of Piety Rewarded, Immunity from disaster as a reward for piety, or Impiety Punished are

²⁷Ps.-Libanius, *Prog.* 8.42.5 F puts Simonides in Tarentum; Wilamowitz, *loc. cit.* (above, n. 26), comments: *haec progymnasmatorum exempla per multa saecula in rhetorum ludis trita sunt*. Molyneux, *loc. cit.* (above, n. 4), however, claims: "it is intrinsically improbable that so dramatically startling a story as the collapse of a hall . . . should have been floating, attached by different authors to different persons." In fact the very story he is talking about is attached to Pindar by Solinus, 1.120. My pupil Miss Janet Fairweather demonstrates the frequency of such floating stories in her thesis on Biographical Topoi.

²⁸Kassel, *Konsollationsliteratur* (Zetemata 4 [Munich 1958]) 65; Nisbet-Hubbard on Horace, *Odes* 1.9.13.

²⁹E. R. Curtius, *Europäische Literatur*³ (Bern 1961) 171 ff.; a *fortiori* argument is of course a favourite of Homer. Those who believe that Favorinus consulted Simonides in order to add the final sentence will not be convinced by my general argument, but they should be aware that no ancient author is fonder of *exempla*; cf. *PW* Supp. 6 col. 66, esp. 69.

³⁰Bergk *PLG*⁴ confidently connects frs. 32 and 33, as does Lesky, *G. d. Gr. Lit.*² (Bern 1963) 213. Page keeps apart *PMG* 16 and 24.

³¹*PW* 3A s.v. Skopadai (Swoboda); Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* 1².2.202.

among the commonest type of folk motifs.³² The story of Melampus, old enough to be known to the poet of the *Odyssey*, was a splendid example of piety rescued from a collapsing roof, with an added revenge motif.³³ Oddly enough, the best parallel is the closest in time, for Herodotus 6.27 reports that only one child out of one hundred and twenty survived the collapse of a school in Chios about 496 B.C. He emphasizes that this was a signal portent to the Chians, which they neglected to their cost, since the divinity always sends warnings of approaching doom. Herodotus "interprets the traditional logoi in terms of the dogmas of archaic philosophy."³⁴ There is reasonable doubt here whether he is reporting history or a traditional logos. At any rate that the story of Simonides' house served the same ethical purpose is clear from Callimachus fr. 63 and especially Aelian fr. 63 H *περὶ πονοίας*. Another reworking of the Simonides story must have been due to the peripatetic Phaineas of Eresos, fr. 140 W², who managed to bend the story of Skopas, a *fortunatum hominem et nobilem*, according to Cic. *Orat.* 86.352, till he was a hybristic tyrant (the title of the book was *Τυράννων ἀναρπῆσεις ἐκ τιμωρίας*) and presumably deserved to have his house fall upon him.³⁵ We conclude that the "uplifting" story of the collapsing house—and so of the revenge of Simonides—was at least as old as the school of Aristotle.

At this point, since we have no further evidence to examine, I propose a speculation. Somewhere Simonides sang of the fall of a house,³⁶ and this was taken literally, and brought into connection with an epinikian victory in order to extract a fixed chronology for a noble family. Whether or not anyone was ever killed by a collapsing house is a question that depends on our reliance on the capacity of ancient scholars to make sensible decisions from the evidence available; and we are no longer at liberty to do this. A puzzle remains: why are the ill-fated Thessalians always pictured at their dinner, for the ancients knew that an epinikian or a *threnos* was not sung in symposia? Here too we can point to a possible misconception of the convention of the symposium as a foil for gloomy mortality.³⁷ Speculation is rendered permissible by (a) the similar nature of the other motifs we have discovered in the ancient account and (b) the

³²Stith Thompson, *An Index of Folk Motifs*, nos. Q20, Q150, Q220 respectively.

³³*FGrH* 3F33, mentioned by W. Schmid, *G. d. Gr. Lit.* 1.1.508⁶. Further examples are Joseph. *Bῆ* 1.17.4 (a good parallel to Herodotos), and especially Cic. *Div.* 1.26, where a *conclave* collapses. Tacitus, *Ann.* 14.11, reports a roof falling on Agrippina, which is according to Dawson (*CJ* 114 [1969] 253) a "farrago of lies."

³⁴Trenkner, *op. cit.* (above, n. 17) 24; cf. Aly, *Volksmärchen . . . bei Herodot* (Göttingen 1921) Index s.v. *Der einzig Überlebende*.

³⁵Wehrli, *op. cit.* (above, n. 5) 32, attributes the tendencies of the book to Arist. *Pol.* 1311a31 ff.

³⁶Consider the ambiguity of *oikos* in Pind. *Parth.* 1.17. Deaths of whole families (*Isthm.* 4.17) are acceptable material for epinikians.

³⁷Nisbet-Hubbard on Horace, *Odes* 1.4.18.

fact that we know that this motif itself fits into a traditional ethical pattern, which we know to be common in both folk tales and ethically oriented biography. Under the circumstances it seems very unwise to accept any part of Quintilian's account as historical truth.

The ancient *vita* was not constructed on the same principles as historical writings or with the same purpose. Plut. *Alex.* 1.664 says specifically: οὔτε γὰρ ἱστορίας γράφομεν ἀλλὰ βίους.³⁸ In another passage connected with the first by the painting metaphor³⁹ he talks of the difficulty ἀνδρὸς ἐπιδείξειν βίην. Again, at a point where the language hints at Arist. *Poet.* 9. 1451bl, he draws a distinction between πραγματικὴ ἱστορία and what he himself is doing, which is according to Nicias 1. 524a οὐ τὴν ἄχρηστον ἀθροίζων ἱστορίαν ἀλλὰ τὴν πρὸς κατανόησιν ἥθους καὶ τρόπου (i.e., χρήσιμον).⁴⁰ The main objection that the genuine historian made to *vitae* was that they tended towards encomia and ἐπιδεικτικοὶ λόγοι. Polybius, quoting Timaeus (12.28a: *FGrH* 566F7) in a metaphor going back to Ephorus (*FGrH* 70F111), makes the picture clear: οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ βουλόμενος αὔξειν τὴν ἱστορίαν πρῶτον μὲν τηλικαύτην εἶναι φησι διαφορὰν τῆς ἱστορίας πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιδεικτικούς λόγους ἡλίκην ἔχει τὰ κατ' ἀλήθειαν ὥκοδομημένα (cf. Cic. *Orat.* 2.62: *ne quid falsi . . . exaedificatio*; Lucian, *Hist. consc.* 33) καὶ κατεσκευασμένα τῶν ταῖς σκηνογραφίαις φαινομένων τόπων καὶ διαθέσεων. Plutarch, then, seems to have acknowledged like others the epideictic element (τὸ τεργνόν καὶ μυθῶδες) in his *vitae*.⁴¹ Polybius 10.21 specifically contrasts his own encomiastic life of Philopoemen with his historical treatment of him. It was to be understood, then, in antiquity that there was a basic difference between *vitae* and *historia* in the treatment of τὸ ἀληθές, so that criticism of them for lack of verity is itself unhistorical.⁴² There were of course degrees of verity, but it is safe to say that distorting tendencies are more apparent in the lives of poets and philosophers than in the lives of political figures.

Speusippus, who was presumably one of the great intellectuals of his day, claimed divine ancestry for his uncle, with his tongue firmly in his cheek.⁴³ What would he think of those who took the details of ancient

³⁸Quoted by Gomme, *Commentary on Thucydides* 1 (Oxford 1945) 55.

³⁹G. Avenarius, *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung* (Meisenheim 1956) 133.

⁴⁰Cf. Cato M. 7.3, 340a; J. R. Hamilton, *Plutarch's Alexander* (Oxford 1969) xxxviii³, and the invaluable references of Avenarius, *op. cit.* (above, n. 39) 22 ff.

⁴¹In general v. Walbank, "History and Tragedy," *Historia* 9 (1960) 216 ff., with further litt. I hope to return to this question in another place.

⁴²Wilamowitz, *Antigonos von Karystos* (Berlin 1881) 53: *ein lügenhaftes Libell gegen die sittliche Integrität der geistigen Heroen der Nation . . . exemplifies how the Geistesgeschichte of Germany and England failed to understand the rules of the biographic genre. A paradigmatic instance for the curious is M. L. Clarke's review of Nisbet-Hubbard's Commentary in CR n.s. 21 (1971) 206.*

⁴³Pointed out to me by Miss Fairweather; compare the annoyance of Wilamowitz, *Platon*⁵ (1959) 1.572³.

biography seriously, or were outraged by the indifference of the *vitae* to the facts of history?

The method I have followed in this paper is not new. Lehrs, who knew more about scholiastic habits than any English speaker save perhaps Gaisford, once wrote a paper on a similar theme; it is often quoted and seldom read.⁴⁴ One of the examples he gives is that of Simonides' house. His general conclusion (407) is as follows:

Die Art, dass jeder seinen Autor für sich betrachtet und aus der Überlieferung über ihn mit vermeintlicher Kritik das Wahre herausfinden will; wobei der Grundsatz befolgt wird, auf den man sich wol gar etwas zu Gute thut, alles für wahr gelten zu lassen, was allenfalls unter allenfalls vernünftigen Geschöpfen so einzeln betrachtet noch denkbar wäre,—ist wahrhaft unerträglich.

It still is.⁴⁵

McMASTER UNIVERSITY, HAMILTON

⁴⁴Lehrs cites the bigamy of Socrates as the most striking example of ancient fiction. Here too he has had little effect.

⁴⁵I am greatly indebted to Professor G. M. Paul for his help and criticism. I should add that I noticed too late for inclusion in this article the remarks of J. Fontenrose, *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 1 (1968) 102, on the "falling-roof theme" in relation to early Olympic victors.