

A FOOTNOTE IN THE HISTORY OF GREEK EPITAPHS: SIMONIDES 146 BERGK

SIMON GOLDHILL

μνήμην δ' οὐτινά φημι Σιμωνίδη ἰσοφαρίζειν
ὄγδωκονταέτι, παιδί Λεωπρέπεος.¹

THIS EPIGRAM has rarely been discussed by scholars, and usually only with regard to its authenticity² and place in the history of *Mnemotechnik*. Wilamowitz following Kaibel calls it "eine ganz erbärmliche Nachahmung,"³ but offers no argument for this stinging judgment. It is included among Simonides' fragments by Bergk and Edmonds and West (the last under the rubric *incertum an ex epigrammatis*). Boas' general thesis on the transmission of Simonides precludes final certainty on authenticity, but he gives

¹I cite here Bergk's and West's text (fr. 14); see below, n. 25. I call this fragment an epigram throughout, although its original form of production is unknown. (It is perhaps unnecessary to say that although the fragment has the form of an epitaph—hence the title of this article—I do not believe it likely to have been an inscribed verse for a monument, on which type of poetry most of the discussions of authenticity have focused.) F. Schneidewin, *Simonidis Cei carminum reliquiae* (Brunswick 1835) 193–194 (fr. 204), believes it to be part of a longer poem. He fails to say why, but it may be assumed that his reason is the δέ in the first line, which implies some continuation or some preceding lines. Perhaps when μνήμην rather than μνήμη is read (as it is by West and Bergk), δέ should be deleted? (If μνήμη is read, δέ is of course necessary to avoid hiatus.) Certainly, Schneidewin's suggestion has received little support from later scholars. There are no suggestions as to how the poem if it had further lines would have continued (or how this couplet would have been led up to).

²The question of the authenticity of the verses transmitted under the name of Simonides has a long and vexed history. Some epigrams (for example, those written on events after the death of Simonides) are certainly wrongly attributed. No adequate criteria of authenticity have been found for the remaining verses. Despite the work of C. M. Bowra, *Early Greek Elegists* (London 1938) 183 ff., G. Christ, *Simonidesstudien* (Freiburg 1941), W. Kegel, *Simonides* (Groningen 1962), D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (London 1967), D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge 1981), and many detailed studies of individual fragments, notably the Scopas fragment, it is difficult not to agree with H. Wade-Gery, "Classical Epigrams and Epitaphs," *JHS* 53 (1933) 71–104, when he writes (71, n. 1): "The 'Simonides Question' has not seriously advanced since M. Boas' elaborate *torso* . . ." (see below, n. 4). Some of Wade-Gery's assertions in this article are well criticized by F. Jacoby, "Some Athenian Epigrams from the Persian Wars," *Hesperia* 14 (1945) 157–211. Both these scholars are concerned primarily with public inscriptions, and their remarks largely overlook the question of the less "formal" fragments, and their transmission. On this see M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin 1974) 1–21, who perhaps underestimates the possible importance of Chamaeleon.

³*Sappho und Simonides* (Berlin 1913) 205. G. Kaibel, "Quaestiones Simonideae," *RhM* 28 (1873) 436–460. Kaibel (454) believes the epigram was written by someone with access to (what has become) *Marmor Par. FGrHist* 239 A. See below, n. 5.

these lines a cautious approval.⁴ Blum in his investigation of ancient mnemonic techniques is uncertain whether it is authentic or written very shortly after Simonides' death, but regards it as the origin of the extensive series of anecdotes about Simonides' invention of a mnemonic system.⁵ Slater,⁶ who has the most detailed discussion, takes Blum's argument further. First, he declares the poem "clearly not by Simonides." Second, he assumes that the epigram, written no earlier than the fourth century, was later misunderstood, so that what was praise of Simonides' fame (μνήμη in the sense of memory as a record) became praise of Simonides' memory (that is, memory as a mental faculty). Third, Hellenistic writers invented the stories of Simonides' mnemonic system (anachronistically endowing the poet with a sophistic invention): "μνήμη, which was intended in the passive sense . . . became misinterpreted in an active sense, Simonides acquired a marvellous memory at the age of eighty, and was eventually credited with a memory-developing system" (236). To this hypothesis Slater adds: "The development of the legend is motivated by a desire to illustrate rhetorical *memoria*" (*ibid.*).

Anachronistic and inventive reading of this sort is certainly part and parcel of Hellenistic scholarly technique, and the attribution of poems to the most famous exponent of a genre, as well as imitation of early authors, is also well known,⁷ but there are at least two specific, major difficulties with Slater's reconstruction *ex silentio*. First, for his statement about the clear inauthenticity of the lines (on which his argument stands) Slater merely refers the reader, without comment, to the work of Hauvette. Hauvette, however, offers only one argument for inauthenticity, namely, the fact that the second line of the epigram is used in another dedication by Simonides (147 Bergk, 77 Diehl, 28 Page), assumed to be authentic.⁸ "Il ne nous paraît pas possible

⁴M. Boas, *De epigrammatis Simonideis* (Groningen 1905) 92–94, 111.

⁵H. Blum, *Die antike Mnemotechnik* (Hildesheim 1969, Spudasmata 15) 41–46. The stories about Simonides' memory and his mnemonic system start early: see *Marmor Par. FGrHist* 239 A 54; Call. fr. 64 Pfeiffer; most extensively told in Cicero *De or.* 2.86.351–354; see also *inter alia* Cicero *Tusc.* 1.24.59; Quint. *Inst.* 11.2.11; Pliny *HN* 7.24.89; Aelian *Hist. anim.* 6.10; Amm. Marcell. 16.5.8.

⁶W. Slater, "Simonides' House," *Phoenix* 26 (1972) 232–240.

⁷For a good general introduction to the problems of the transmission of epigrams and elegy see West (above, n. 2) 1–21, who notes (2) both that "in time the practice developed of composing fictitious epigrams," and that "by 300 B.C. the imitators are hard at work."

⁸This epigram was accepted as authentic by scholars until L. Stella, "Studi simonidei," *RFIC* 24 (1946) 1–24, especially 5–9. D. L. Page (above, n. 2) *ad loc.* agrees on only one of Stella's reasons for inauthenticity, namely, that the reference to the *choregos* as Ξεινοφίλου δέ τις υἱὸς Ἀριστείδης is too dismissive to be a genuine fifth-century dedication. No satisfactory emendation has been suggested for this very strange use of τις (for which I know no adequate parallel in a late or an early dedicatory epigram). It need not, however, be thought of as necessarily "off-hand and . . . insulting," as Page claims. The parallels adduced by Page (and by Nisbet and Hubbard at Hor. *Carm.* 2.11.18 for *quis* similarly used) are commands to slaves, e.g., "Let someone (i.e., any servant) come . . .," where indeed the use is dismissive in its avoidance of a

que dans deux pièces composées dans la même année le poète se soit ainsi répété.”⁹ This judgment may appear to be based more on the Romantic connection of originality and poetic worth (that can so distort Victorian studies of Homer) than on the complex questions of tradition, originality, and repetition that are (now considered to be) a crucial area of investigation in early Greek poetry.¹⁰ Furthermore, not only are there to my knowledge no linguistic arguments that have been—or can be—brought against these lines, but also, and most importantly, Hauvette fails to consider the *context* of the repetition—beyond his apparent belief that if two pieces are composed in the same year repetition is less conceivable in the work of a poet. Yet if 147 B. is a grand dedication on the occasion of a victory in choral competition, 146 B. is a piece of a quite different nature. This difference, it will be seen, is relevant to understanding the repetition.¹¹ It would seem, then, that when Slater asserts clear inauthenticity he is repeating a judgment of an earlier scholar which is itself far from being a certain or clear demonstration. It is unlikely that certainty will ever be achieved on such questions of Simonidean authenticity—which makes a cautious investigation of the possibilities all the more necessary.

Second, and more importantly, Slater’s claim that *μνήμην* is to be read in a passive sense needs further consideration, particularly with regard to the extensive tradition of epigram and specifically epitaph composition. For the passive sense of *μνήμη*, Slater cites only “Hdt. 1.144.1, etc” (which should presumably be Hdt. 4.114.1). In this passage, and in the others cited by LSJ after Herodotus under this heading, *μνήμη* means “memory” in the sense of

specific act of naming. Here, the use of the proper name and the term *νόος* makes these parallels wholly inadequate. *τις*, of course, can also be used both as an adjective and as a pronoun in a far from dismissive manner, as at Pindar *Pyth.* 8.95 (on which see, e.g., P. Giannini, “Qualcuno e nessuno in Pind. *Pyth.* 8.95,” *QUCC* 40 [1982] 69–76); *Nem.* 1.13; *Ol.* 8.25; *Pyth.* 3.63, but again I have found no parallel for this use with a proper name. I have no solution to this expression, but remain unconvinced that its bizarreness is sufficient proof of necessary lateness and inauthenticity. It seems strange to me for *any* period of Greek. If, however, this epigram is a late Hellenistic imitation—a possibility not considered by Slater—and if 146 Bergk is an (even later) imitation of 147 Bergk, it is difficult to see how 146 Bergk could be the origin of the (relatively early) stories of Simonides’ powers of memory, as Slater and others claim. Indeed it could perhaps even be argued that 147 is a late imitation that has plundered a line from the earlier 146!

⁹A. Hauvette, *De l'authenticité des épigrammes de Simonide* (Paris 1896) 140. Hauvette allows only 21 authentic epigrams, on principles as rigid as Kaibel (criticized already by Boas [above, n. 4] 6).

¹⁰See, e.g., the different and more sophisticated approaches to doublets in Theognis provided by A. Peretti, *Teognide nella tradizione gnomologica* (Pisa 1952); West (above, n. 2) 44–55; T. Figuera and G. Nagy, eds., *Theognis of Megara* (Baltimore 1984), esp. chapter 2 (for further bibliography and discussion of the question of genre and repetition).

¹¹On the different contexts for the production of elegy and epigram see West (above, n. 2) 14–18.

“remembrance,” “that which is recollected” (which is not the equivalent of κῶδος, as Slater glosses it). With this translation, it is indeed difficult to see what the specific point of Simonides’ age in the second line might be (except as an extremely ignorant imitation of 147 B.). Van Buren, moreover, goes so far as to call μνήμη the “equivalent” of μνήμα “as signifying the monument with its epitaph.”¹² This assertion is not borne out by the evidence. Peek collects over two hundred inscriptions in the form μνήμα (σῆμα) τόδ’ ἐστὶν τοῦ δεινός and μνήμα (σῆμα) τόδ’ ἔστησεν (ἔστησα) ὁ δεινὰ τῷ δεινί (ἐμοί)—Friedländer and Hoffleit rightly call this use of μνήμα a formula of epitaphs.¹³ In many of Peek’s examples, the word μνήμα is the first word in the line or epigram. The word μνήμη, however, occurs in only nine verses, none of which is securely datable to before the second century B.C. (and five of which are dated by Peek to the second century A.D. or later).¹⁴ In eight of these nine occurrences μνήμη is used in the phrase μνήμης χάριν or μνήμης εἵνεκα, which means “for the sake of remembrance,” and a word for the monument (e.g., σῆμα Peek 251, στήλη Peek 215, τύμβος Peek 209, 239, 243, τάφος Peek 239, 242) is usually also used to distinguish the monument and its purpose.¹⁵ Peek also collects nearly two thousand further epitaphs and funerary inscriptions. The word μνήμη occurs only occasionally. The majority of examples are in the form μνήμης χάριν/εἵνεκα/ἕκατ.¹⁶ Others distinguish the memorial (τύμβος, λίθος, etc.) from the “memory” to be left.¹⁷ Others clearly indicate the common passive sense of μνήμη, that is, the “memory,” “remembrance,” of a particular virtue, or a more general “memory” left behind, where, for example, a husband is said to have μνήμην ἐν στέρνοισιν of his wife,¹⁸ or where citizens or φίλοι (particularly husbands

¹²A. W. Van Buren, “Inscriptions from Rome,” *AJP* 48 (1927) 18–28, at 19.

¹³W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften* 1 (Berlin 1955) nos. 52–285. See also P. Friedländer and B. Hoffleit, *Epigrammata. Greek Inscriptions in Verse from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1948) nos. 8, 61a, 61b, 100, 160; cf. 32, 81, 99, and 7, 27, 29, 60, 69, 84, 97, 98, 136, 139, 140 (inscriptions with numbers below 60 are hexameters only). Friedländer and Hoffleit has been superseded in most respects by Hansen. See below, n. 19.

¹⁴Peek nos. 123 (third century A.D.), 193 (second century A.D.), 197 (second/third century B.C.), 209 (second/third century B.C.), 215 (third century A.D.), 239 (restored, third century A.D.), 242 (first/second century B.C.), 243 (second century A.D.), 251 (second/third century B.C.).

¹⁵μνήμης χάριν: Peek nos. 193, 209, 239, 242, 243, 251; μνήμης εἵνεκα: Peek nos. 197, 215. The only exception is Peek 123, dated to the third century A.D. or later, which contains a metrical error or lacuna also (printed here with Peek’s addition):

Ζευξιδάμου τάφος οὗτος, ὃν ἤρπασε Μοῖρα κελαινή: |
τὸν δὲ τίτλον μνήμης Βᾶ [τή] μνήτηρ ἀνέθηκεν.

¹⁶Peek nos. 669, 783, 815, 971, 1082, 1110, 1216, 1363, 1524, 1595, 1885.

¹⁷Peek nos. 405, 443, 565, 2026.

¹⁸Peek no. 1164. Although μνήμης χάριν/εἵνεκα/ἕκατ occurs in the first place in Peek 209, 215, 669, this inscription of the second/third century B.C. is the only occasion apart from

and wives) are said to cherish a memory of the departed.¹⁹ Twice, the relation between the expressions for the tomb and *μνήμη* is less clear and perhaps a sense of “memorial” could be claimed, though in neither case is it essential; in both cases there are several qualifying terms that refer to the physical tomb; both are dated by Peek to the second or third century B.C.²⁰ There is one inscription from Rome where Moretti translates *μνήμη* by “*μνημείον*, *monumentum*.”²¹ He adds “*Romae rarius*,” and offers only one possible parallel from a prose inscription of the fourth century A.D. where he translates *τὴν διὰ παντός μνήμην* as “*monumentum aeternum*,” but since this phrase is conjoined with an expression for the memorial itself, *λάρνακα*, it may be unnecessary to translate it otherwise than “this remembrance for all time.”²² The expression “*Romae rarius*” perhaps implies that *μνήμη* in the sense “*monumentum*” is common elsewhere. I have found only two possible examples in any period of funerary verse inscriptions in Greek, namely, Peek 338 (*μνήμην ἔστησε(ν)*) and Peek 1669 (*μνήμην ἔστησαν*). Peek 338 is a pair of badly scanning hexameters from the Bosphoros recording the death of a daughter. It is undatable, but Peek suggests it may be as early as the fourth century B.C. Peek 1669 is from Phrygia, dated to the second or third century B.C., also in badly scanning hexameters. LSJ also offers two examples of *μνήμη* = “memorial” from prose of the fourth century B.C., but in

Simonides 146 Bergk where *μνήμην* occurs first word in an epigram, designed for or imitative of a grave dedication.

¹⁹Peek nos. 1196, 1392, 1415, 1491, 1706, 1764, 1782, 1874, 1879, 2087, 2088, 1306a. To weep “in memory” (?) (*κλαίουσιν μνήμη*) 1509. See also P. Hansen, *Carmina epigraphica graeca* (Berlin 1983) no. 97. He also lists nineteen occasions where *μνήμα* is the first word of an epigram in the expected and usual sense.

²⁰962 *ἱερὴ δέ με δακρ[ύ]σασα / γαῖα φίλῃ | τῷδ' ἀμφιχύτῃ | ὑπὸ σήματι κεύθει· / μνήμη ἐν | θανάτῳ στήλης*, and 2032 *ἣ κεῖται τύμβῳ μνήμην αἰῶνος ἔχουσα*. Cf. 1040 *μνήμην κὰν θανάτῳ τοῦτο φέρουσι γέρας* (of a gladiator's victims); and G. Peek, “Zwei Grabepigramme aus Makedonien,” *Hermes* 92 (1964) 498–502, where he corrects the original publication (G. Bakalakes, *Proanaskaphikes ereunes ste Thrake* [Saloniki 1958] 79 f.) of a possibly late-fifth- or early-fourth-century inscription to read (501–502): *Ἀντικράτης μ' ἔστησ' Ἐκάταιο σῆμα γυναικί / Ἡραίνην(ι) μνήμην Ἀνταγόρο θυγατρί*.

²¹
 ὁ τῆς σοφίης μελωδός, ἔντεχνος | λύρης,
 ὁ τοῦνομα Ἀμμωνι, ἔης ποιεῖ· νῦν εἰ νέκυς,
 κεῖσαι τάφῳ, ἄλλ' ἄλλος ἀνθρώποις σκιά,
 ἐν τῇδε μνήμῃ, ἣν δέδωκαν φίλτατοι
 Παῦλος | Πρόκλα τε . . .

L. Moretti, *Inscriptiones graecae urbis Romae* 3 (Rome 1979) no. 1154, first published by Van Buren (above, n. 12) 19. Neither dates it, although Peek (no. 1523) suggests second/third century A.D.

²²Moretti (above, n. 21) no. 306. *Αἰλίᾳ Ματρώνῃ τῇ ἀμειμήτῃ συμβίῳ τὴν μουσόπλαστον λάρνακα καὶ Κοκκίῳ Βεννιανῷ κρατίστῳ τῷ ποθεινοτάτῳ υἱῷ Κοκκῆϊος Ἰουλιανὸς Συνέσιος, κράτιστος δουκηνάριος, Ἀντοχεὺς τῶν πρὸς Δάφνην, τὴν διὰ παντός μνήμην ἐποίησατο*.

both cases it is the addition of specific terms to indicate written preservation that justifies the more concrete connotation.²³

It is clear, then, from this very extensive body of evidence that *μνήμη*, while it occurs in epitaphs in the sense of “memory,” “that which is recalled,” is only very rarely indeed found as the direct, unqualified object of dedication, as “memorial.” Apart from the two late Roman examples (Peek 123, 1523 [Moretti 1154]), there are only two, difficult to date, poorly composed inscriptions from the edges of the Greek world. *μνήμη*, then, which only very rarely occurs in the emphatic position of first word in the dedication, cannot be regarded as “the equivalent” of *μνήμα*, which often stands first word in an epitaph; in usage and sense, the two terms are quite different. If someone other than Simonides composed 146 B. with the intention ascribed to him by Slater, it was composed in a manner surprisingly at odds with the idiom of Greek funerary inscriptions and epigrams, a highly conventional genre.

It is noticeable that Slater does not discuss the provenance of these lines, except to note the lateness of the source. They are quoted by Aristides in his speech *Περὶ τοῦ παραφθέγματος*, which is a work ostensibly produced in order to justify himself against certain detractors for having praised himself in passing in a speech at Athens.²⁴ Aristides lists various poets’ remarks of self-praise in passing, among which are included the lines in question. There are several noteworthy features of Aristides’ discussion. He quotes the first line as an example of (apparently immature) self-praise that could not have come from another, and he takes for granted the *σωφροσύνη* of Simonides:

ἀλλὰ τὴν γε τοῦ Σιμωνίδου σωφροσύνην οἶσθα . . . οὗτος τοῖνυν ἀνὴρ φανεῖται σοὶ καὶ αὐτὸς μειρακίουμένος καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον δὴ τοῦτο ἐπὶ γῆραος σὺδῶ γενόμενος τῆς ἀλαζονείας. ἐτόλμισε γοῦν εἰπεῖν· “μνήμην δ’ οὐτινὰ φημι Σιμωνίδῃ ἰσοφαρίζειν.” ταυτὶ γὰρ οὐχ ἕτερος δὴ πού περὶ τοῦ Σιμωνίδου λέγει, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς εἰς ἑαυτὸν πεποίηκεν.²⁵

There is no indication here from what sort of a composition Aristides considers Simonides’ line to be. Aristides’ speech is on the subject of self-praise in passing, and in this section and elsewhere in his writing he quotes freely from a range of authors and genres. There is, of course, no need to assume that it must be a formal inscription or dedication.

With fine rhetoric Aristides then cites a second line, which, he says, is added so that no-one *could* mistake the first as the arrogance of foppery

²³Plat. *Leg.* 741c (γράψαντες δ’ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς θήσουσι κυπαριττίας μνήμας εἰς τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον κατεγεγραμμένας), and Arist. *Rhet.* 1.5.9, 1361a, where in a list of the signs of honour (τιμή) he includes *μνήμαι ἐν μέτροις καὶ ἀνευ μέτρων*. Neither of these is an adequate parallel for the use of *μνήμη* without qualification to mean memorial.

²⁴Aristides *Or.* 28.59 ff.

²⁵The majority of the mss read *μνήμη*, a reading kept by Keil and Dindorf in their editions of Aristides. West (fr. 14) and Bergk read *μνήμην*, the minority reading, which seems preferable.

and youth: ἵνα δὲ μὴ δόξη νέος ὦν ἔτι καὶ ὠραϊζόμενος λέγειν ταῦτα, προστίθουσιν· “ὀγδωκοντάτει παιδί Λεωπρέπης.” It is extremely rare for a couplet to be quoted by later writers in separate lines this way,²⁶ and the point of this needs to be considered. For Aristides seems to see the second line as an addition for a specific and marked rhetorical purpose, and while we may not wish to follow Aristides’ own (rhetorical) exegesis, the subtle construction of the epigram, which is not discussed by any of the critics mentioned above, needs some explication.

φημί occurs in epitaphs and other dedications to inscribe a declaratory force in the verses—what is sometimes called an “illocutionary utterance.”²⁷ So, to take my examples from Simonides, fr. 34 Page (141 B., 106 D.) reads:

φημί Γέλων’ Ἰέρωνα Πολύζηλον Θρασύβουλον,
παῖδας Δεινομένους, τοὺς τρίποδας θέμεναι.

φημί marks the performative aspect of the dedication: “*I declare that . . .*”

The first person is also often used by Simonides, as it is by other epigrammatists, for a personification of the dead individual, particularly with the verb κείμεναι. (See, e.g., Simonides 8 P. [100 B., 118 D.]; 12 P. [97 B., 95 D.]; 22b P. [92 B., 92 D.]; 37 P. [167 B., 99 D.]; 78 P. [127 B., 138 D.]; cf., e.g., 16 P. [107 B., 96 D.]; 11 P. [96 B., 90 D.]; 29 P. [152 B., 148 D.].) The first person is also used for the personification of the memorial itself (see, e.g., 82 P. [118 B., 132 D.]).²⁸ These functions of the first-person utterance in dedications overlap as the poet declares his own praise. The first-person declaration typical of epitaphs and dedications takes on a different force when the writer of the epigram is lauding himself.

The identification of the poet by name and father’s name (as well as here the special detail of age) is also recognizable as the typical formulation of dedicatory epigrams (even if the second line did not also occur in 28 P. [147 B., 77 D.]). In the (self-)praise of μνήμη, however, the detail of the age of the child of Leoprepes may take on a further point (though not necessarily, as Aristides suggests, merely that he is old enough to know what he is talking about). None the less, “memory,” which is how all critics, ancient and modern, apart from Slater, seem to take μνήμη, may seem a surprising

²⁶Plato quotes two portions of Simonides’ scolia to Scopas in order to point out a contradiction in the poem (*Prot.* 339a ff.); he also quotes often from different places in Homer. This is quite different, however, from what appears to be a recognition of the rhetorical construction of an elegiac couplet where the pentameter adds to, qualifies, or even undercuts the hexameter. On which see Ovid’s *recusatio*: *Am.* 1.1 *passim*, especially 1–4, 27–28.

²⁷J. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford 1962); J. Searle, *Speech Acts* (Cambridge 1969).

²⁸West (above, n. 2) 2 writes of early inscriptions: “The poet suppresses his own personality; verbs in the first person regularly have the inscribed object or the deceased party as their subject, while those in the second person apply to whoever reads the inscription.”

faculty to immortalize in the memorial of verse. Indeed, Slater may be right to point to the possibility of misunderstanding this word, which occurs nowhere else in the extant fragments of Simonides. For *μνήμην*, especially as first word in the couplet, echoes another particularly common feature of epitaphs and dedications, namely, the use of the word *μνήμα* to refer to the monument to which the lines are fixed (as discussed above). Indeed Simonides 6 P. (94 B., 83 D.), 26b P. (not included by Bergk or Diehl), and 39 P. (vol. 3, p. 516 B.) all begin with the word *μνήμα* (*μνᾶμ'* 39 P.). It also occurs as first word of the last couplet of 73 P. (123 B., 134 D.), and in the last couplet of 12 P. (where it is consigned to the apparatus) and in 17 P. (138 B., 105 D.). Simonides memorializes his memory in an epigram which puns on his own expertise in funerary dedications. He sets up his memory as if it were a memorial. The poem is not merely self-praise, but self-praise that proceeds through the self-mocking of parodic citation. So the grandeur of the dedicatory epigram that marks his victory of 477/6 in Athens (28 P. [152 B., 148 D.]) as an eighty-year-old man becomes an old man's boast of an extraordinary memory.

Praise of a patron requires a complex rhetorical awareness of the limitations and distinctions of flattery and understatement. So, here too, self-praise is fenced with a (defensive) rhetoric of self-depreciation, as the glorification is tempered first by the surprising object of self-praise, that is, memory; second, by the pun on the language of memorializing dedications; third, by the different use of the self-identification that also occurs in Simonides' victory dedication (28 P.). The fragments that have come down to us under the name of Simonides include dedications which address the poet himself in the second person (27 P. [145 B., 79 D.]),²⁹ and epigrams which for the sake of humour manipulate the conventions of the dedicatory epigram (e.g., 37 P. [167 B., 99 D.]). The variety and fragmentary nature of this corpus make it unwise to declare the epigram 146 B. "clearly not by Simonides," especially without any consideration of its meaning, function, or possible context. While it may tell us little of Simonides' place in the history of mnemonic systems, this couplet is at least a *παράφθεγμα* which may tell us something of the range of possibilities for the composition and technique of early Greek epigrams. It constitutes a further demonstration of Gentili's remark that in Simonides one finds a dominant figure in the development of "epigrammi o brevi poesie prevalentemente in distici elegiaci che non dovevano servire come iscrizioni, nelle quali la battuta spiritosa, l'ironia, la trovata brillante e giocosa, il giuoco allusivo, l'arte di improvvisare nell'occasione di un convito (ἀντισχεδιάζειν) un distico epigrafico fittizio costit-

²⁹Hauvette (above, n. 9) 139–140 declares this fragment to be inauthentic because such an address seems "inexplicable dans une dédicace réelle."

uivano il carattere dominante del contenuto e del tono.”³⁰ It is within such a framework that the composition and transmission of these lines may be best understood, despite the uncertainty about authenticity which always dogs Simonidean epigrams.³¹

KING'S COLLEGE
CAMBRIDGE CB2 1ST

³⁰B. Gentili, “Epigramma ed Elegia,” *L'epigramme grecque* (Vandoeuvres-Genève 1968, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens . . . 14) 46; for another interesting view of the variety and range of early elegy and epigram, see West (above, n. 2) 14–18.

³¹Thanks to Professor M. D. Reeve and John Henderson who offered valuable comments on a draft of this paper.