

## INTRODUCTION

### Simonides Lyricus: A Proem

*Peter Agócs and Lucia Prauscello*

Simonides the son of Leoprepes of Ceos was perhaps the most famous Greek choral song composer and poet of the late sixth and early fifth centuries BCE. His Panhellenic notoriety, both as an artist and as a personality, survived for centuries after his death, and seems at times to have surpassed that of Pindar, Bacchylides or even Aeschylus, men who according to tradition were his slightly younger contemporaries.<sup>1</sup> His memory has long outlasted the very texts of his poems. He was born on Ceos, a small ethnically Ionian island that lies on the northern edge of the Cycladic chain in close proximity to Attica, and that (by the early fifth century) had strong cultural and political ties to its powerful neighbour. In the poet's lifetime, Ceos was still divided into several autonomous polities (Ioulis, the poet's home town, Carthaia, Coressos and Poieessa), but also had a strong and increasingly institutionalised sense of a collective island identity.<sup>2</sup> In the second half of the fifth century, Ceos became famous as the birthplace of Prodicus the sophist; in the late archaic period, however, it was home to a remarkable local tradition of song composers. Pindar, in a paean composed probably for panhellenic performance on Delos, makes his chorus of Ceans praise their motherland in just these terms (Pind. *Pae.* 4.21–4 = fr. 52d M = D4 Rutherford).<sup>3</sup>

- <sup>1</sup> For the main ancient sources for Simonides' dates, life, works and 'inventions', see TT 1–20 Campbell and Poltera 2008: 44–75; for the inventions, see also Ucciardello (p. 000) and Poltera (p. 000) below. Simonides' (and Bacchylides') rivalry with Pindar is a frequently recurring theme in the Pindar scholia (see e.g. Σ. Pind. Ol. 2.157a, 158a–d, i.99 Dr. and also Dr.'s indices).
- <sup>2</sup> On the political and social structures and culture of Ceos (modern Cea) in the early fifth century, see Hansen and Nielsen 2004: 747–51; Rutherford 2001b: 283–4 n. 1 (listing other pieces of choral song with Ceian connections) and Lewis 1962; on choral culture at Ceos, see Fearn 2011. Molyneux 1992 remains the standard study for the life and chronology of Simonides, although it is frequently speculative and hampered (as Stehle 1995 argues) by its over-literal use of anecdotal material and by its reliance on the epigrammatic tradition.
- <sup>3</sup> On *καὶ μοῖσαν παρέχων ἄλις*, see Rutherford 2001b: 286 n. 17 (the connection between athletics and song points directly to epinician poetry: cf. Cassio 1972). Pindar's praise has been interpreted as grudging rather than fulsome (see esp. Wilamowitz 1922: 325), but the Homeric examples in LSJ s.v. ἄλις 1 point in the other direction.

ἦτοι καὶ ἐγὼ σ[κόπ]ελον ναίων δια-  
 γινώσκομαι μὲν ἀρεταῖς ἀέθλων  
 Ἑλλανίσιν, γινώσκ[ο]μα[ι] δὲ καὶ  
 μοῖσαν παρέχω γ' ἄλις.

Truly I too, though I dwell upon a rock, I am known far and wide for Hellenic victories in the games; just so, I am also known for providing the Muse in plenty.

It is first of all Simonides and his nephew Bacchylides – his closest contemporaries, and in many cases his rivals for the favour of the same international patrons – to whom the Theban poet probably refers here, although he is surely also pointing to long-established local traditions of song.<sup>4</sup> Simonides' connections to song culture – its ancient traditions, genres and institutions, as well as its most modern manifestations – and to the radical and innovative paths of thought taken by the Presocratics and the sophists, are both relevant to the ways in which his life and art have been understood by modern scholarship in relation to his own time and to the long history of the poet's afterlife and reception.

In later Greek memory, from the fourth century BCE onward, Simonides was both an important poet, and a sage or 'wise man' whose apophthegms responded, often with bitter irony and humour, to certain social and cultural faultlines (particularly those of inequality and class) that the traditional ideologies of song, with their entrenched notions of social distinction, propriety and inherited value, tended naturally to obscure. He is remembered as a client and companion to many of the great tyrants and political personalities of the age. His place among the defining figures and celebrities of late sixth- and early fifth-century BCE culture (both in mainland Hellas and in the cities of Magna Graecia and Sicily) is attested through the vitality of the folklore – those traditions of biographical anecdote, 'wise sayings', riddles, *jeux d'esprit* and so on – that built up, soon after his death and perhaps already even in his lifetime, around both the man and the poetic persona he seems to have developed in his songs. In this anecdotal tradition, which demonstrably had acquired its essential outlines already by the time of Aristophanes, Simonides addresses us from a place of ambiguity. He is simultaneously an outsider able to comment on social life in its unfairness and absurdity (especially in a court society with its finely measured hierarchies of wealth, status and dependency, where the 'favourite', whatever his momentary influence and power, is constantly subject to an all-pervasive sense of insecurity), and a consummate 'insider': a courtier

<sup>4</sup> See Rutherford 2001b: 286 n. 17, 283 n. 2 and 284 n. 6 on the evidence for choral music culture in Carthage, where Simonides' activities as a *chorodidaskalos*, and the existence of a *choroigeion* ('choral school' or 'school'), are attested in a passage of Athenaeus (10.456c–57a = T108 Poltera) that relates a riddle supposedly composed by the poet. This ultimately derives from Chamaeleon of Heracleia Pontica (c. 350–275 BCE), the pupil of Aristotle to whose anecdote-collections we owe much of what we know about the biographical traditions surrounding the archaic and early classical poets.

and master-craftsman of social memory who claimed to carve out with his songs a place for his patrons' achievements in the tradition of living poetic *kleos*, even as he subtly subverted and questioned the ideological underpinnings of that fame so laboriously conferred. Remembered as a practitioner of the pre-philosophical wisdom associated with the so-called 'Seven Sages' (men like Thales, Bias, Pittacus and Solon), who, as an elder contemporary of Pindar and Aeschylus, nevertheless moved in the same circles and enjoyed the patronage of many of the same great men as they, Simonides became, in memory at least, an important transitional figure. Through his texts he assumed this status within the early history of what we have come to call 'Greek poetry', but also (mainly through the forms his figure and myth assumed in the anecdotal tradition) in the intellectual and social developments that not long ago still passed under the name of the 'fifth-century enlightenment'. That is to say, Simonides, at least in the modern intellectual history of classical Greece, became a kind of precursor of (and symbol for) the critique of traditional wisdom and absolute standards in morality and religion that reached its apogee in personalities such as Euripides and Socrates. This movement naturally combined itself with a new focus on rhetoric and the power of language to create and thus distort reality: notions embodied in the teaching of the sophists.<sup>5</sup>

Money (Marx's universal solvent) was creating new and radically different forms of economic life that were gradually replacing the traditional 'embedded' social relations of patronage and dependency. Simonides seems to have become a magnet for the anxieties that accompanied Greek society's developing consciousness of these processes, which undermined the sincerity of deeply held ethical positions, and of poetry itself and the fame (*kleos*) it transmitted.<sup>6</sup> Poetic praise was, after all, one of the most important social institutions and currencies in the old-style embedded economy. But could a paid praise-poet ever be an honest witness to his patron's glory? Simonides was also consistently associated with the poetics of praise, commemoration and mourning, and with the development of new forms of Panhellenic consciousness in the aftermath of victory over Persia in 480/479 BCE. Many of the epigrams commemorating the fallen of the Hellenes' Persian Wars were eventually ascribed to him, and he also composed some of the most famous commemorative lyric and elegiac poetry to emerge in the immediate aftermath of that conflict: songs that, even in their fragmentary state, show the poet's thoughtful engagement with the entire tradition of *kleos*-song stretching back to Homer.

- <sup>5</sup> Perhaps the most powerful statements of this view of Simonides' historical importance (significantly less popular in today's atmosphere of hostility to grand historicist schemes, but arguably prefigured e.g. in Plato's *Protagoras*) are Fränkel 1973 and Svenbro 1976; see also the more poetic and impressionistic picture presented in Carson 1999. On Simonides' relation to the sophists see especially Hunter and Ford in this volume.
- <sup>6</sup> On this aspect of Simonides in Greek cultural memory, see Gzella 1971, Svenbro 1976, Bell 1978, Carson 1999 and Rawles 2018 (esp. 155–225).

The tradition that he ‘invented’ epinician poetry is less secure, despite its having been a commonplace even recently in histories of that genre.<sup>7</sup> The conventional link evident in his poetry between the poet and Mnemosyne mother of the Muses is present perhaps most strongly in the legend, familiar from the later rhetorical tradition, that Simonides ‘invented’ the *ars memoriae*, the ‘artificial memory’ based on striking memory-images visualised in particular locations. This form of memory-training remained central to the rhetorician’s toolkit in the age of Cicero and Quintilian, and enjoyed an astonishingly diverse and complex cultural afterlife in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, down to the baroque intricacies of Giordano Bruno’s mnemonic system and beyond.<sup>8</sup> Like earlier famous poets of the tradition, he was also supposed to have ‘invented’ numerous culturally significant *heurēmata* or ‘innovations’: letters of the alphabet; various forms of musical and metrical expression, and so on.<sup>9</sup> And in the tradition of his post-classical ancient reception, Simonides belongs to the lost utopia of choral *paideia* and the song culture explored, often with visibly reactionary overtones, by Plato and his successors such as Aristoxenus,<sup>10</sup> while simultaneously foreshadowing the very different intellectual world of the philosophers. This tension between ‘old’ and ‘new’, tradition and innovation, has exercised a deep hold over modern scholarship on Simonides as well.<sup>11</sup>

Paradoxically for a poet whose work and fictive biography so insistently evoked the themes of memory and fame, the study of Simonides’ life and works is hampered today by the fact that almost nothing of his once apparently massive poetic oeuvre has survived intact. One must, in any study of archaic and classical Greek lyric poets, begin from the premise that the texts we have – as fragments of canonised song-works that made it through the Alexandrian bottleneck in written form – represent only the tip of a much larger iceberg of lost oral and written song. This is especially true of a poet like Simonides, whose work survives only in fragments, but whose importance in the culture is attested by a profuse anecdotal tradition. He presents a particularly important and suggestive instance of a major poet and cultural figure whose work, once a firm part of lyric’s authoritative Hellenistic and Roman canon, endures only in the form of fragments and largely imaginary figments and fictions. He thereby forces us – whether as literary historians, textual critics or ordinary readers – to consider how we ourselves choose to engage with the different forms of cultural detritus that survive in the general seawreck of so much lost ancient literature, and how we

<sup>7</sup> On Simonides’ place in the early history of epinician, see Rawles 2012, with bibliography.

<sup>8</sup> See e.g. Yates 1966 and (for the ancient sources) TT80–5 Poltera.

<sup>9</sup> See TF8, 78 and 79 Poltera and T1 Campbell.

<sup>10</sup> See esp. DAlessio this volume.

<sup>11</sup> This is perhaps most evident in the ongoing debates about the structure and meaning of the so-called ‘Scopas ode’ (S42 PMG = 260 Poltera), on which see the chapters of Ford and Hunter below.

read the surviving scraps of a fragmentary lyric poet against the fragments (real or metaphorical) of his broader tradition.

Simonides' lyric fragments have come to us by different routes, each of which poses its own particular problems and opportunities. First, we have a handful of longer poems (or rather fragments) preserved in the indirect tradition (that is to say: quoted for various reasons and in different ways in later prose authors), with (or more rarely without) a direct ascription to Simonides. In none of these cases can one be certain one is dealing with a complete poem. In fact, we probably have no single fully preserved ode of Simonides in any lyric genre. None of these longer fragments betray anything about their intended circumstances or occasions of performance, nor can they be placed with much confidence in the typology or system of choral lyric genres that seems to have defined the structure of Simonides' oeuvre at least from the third century BCE onward. An outline of that system (notionally perhaps a map of the poet's 'Alexandrian edition?') is preserved in textually corrupt form in the tenth-century Byzantine *Suda* lexicon.<sup>12</sup> Then there is a larger corpus of smaller ancient quotations (the longest no more than three or four verses, and the vast majority consisting of a few or even single words) from odes ascribed to Simonides. These come from a wide range of sources and quotation-contexts (the earliest come from comedies of Aristophanes, while the majority derive from scholiasts, lexicographers, metrical writers and Athenaeus). Third, we have the most recent body of material: the direct tradition of Simonides recovered from fragments of actual ancient papyrus book-rolls (almost all from the excavations at Oxyrhynchus, modern el-Bahnasa, in Egypt directed by Grenfell and Hunt at the turn of the nineteenth century, and dating to the first–second centuries CE).<sup>13</sup> Except for one relatively substantial fragment (S41 *PMG* = 256 Poltera) that has several almost complete lines, the papyri of Simonides' choral lyric odes are generally small (most comprise only a few letters, all are poorly preserved, and most need supplementation even to be construed). The papyrus discoveries, assigned with mounting confidence to the poet by successive editors, have increased the number of Simonides' known melic fragments fourfold, even if they have not much enlarged the quantity of interpretable text. They have, however, confirmed and extended our knowledge of the poet's ancient tradition in other ways. The identifiable fragments seem to belong mostly to epinicians (victory odes) or paeans. Except in rare cases where a papyrus fragment overlaps or extends a text known already from the ancient indirect tradition – the 'New Simonides' papyrus *P.Oxy.* 3965 published in 1992 by Peter Parsons, which contains a substantial

<sup>12</sup> On the *Suda* list (T1 Campbell = TT2–3 Poltera), which is thought to reflect at least partially the structure of Simonides' Alexandrian edition, see Ucciardello (pp.000–00) below and Obbink 2001: 76–81.

<sup>13</sup> On Simonides' papyri, see Ucciardello 2007 and id. (pp. 46–7) below.

portion of the poet's elegy commemorating the battle of Plataea, was one such instance<sup>14</sup> – arguments for Simonidean authorship remain conjectural, and grounds for attribution are often weaker than a given fragment's confident inclusion in *PMG* or another modern edition of the poet's works might suggest.<sup>15</sup> The same applies to the genre-classification of particular fragments in modern editions. Finally, the ancient sources (including scholiasts to Aristophanes, Pindar and other authors; Aristotle, historians and writers in a wide variety of other genres) contain testimonia to particular Simonidean odes. Some of these are quite direct, others vaguer: whether they reflect direct acquaintance with a given poetic text is not always verifiable. Quite a few stories about Simonides' relations with his patrons refer to or imply the existence or content of a particular lost ode or group of odes. These sources are valuable for what they can tell us about the content of particular Simonidean books, and also potentially for identifying papyrus fragments of lost poems, but these traditions again need to be handled with caution.

We know next to nothing about the transmission and publication of Simonides' works before about the third century BCE, when he was incorporated into the canon of the *prattomenoi*, the 'nine lyric poets' of the Alexandrian Museum.<sup>16</sup> But it is clear that his fame in Antiquity was based to a great extent on his lyric poems, particularly his epinicians and *thrēnoi*.<sup>17</sup> A substantial body of epigrams – both the famous poems commemorating men who fell in battle against Xerxes' invading armies, and a variety of curious incidental pieces – has survived separately in the textual tradition of the *Greek Anthology*,<sup>18</sup> while the recent papyrus discoveries that go by the name of the 'New Simonides' have given us a clearer notion of the poet's work in the genres of sympotic and commemorative elegy.<sup>19</sup> It is now clear that Simonides was perhaps the most versatile Panhellenic star poet of the age. The three large divisions (epigrams, elegies and *melica*) that structure our understanding of the poet's oeuvre have each been treated somewhat differently by modern scholarship. The epigrams – the largest body of non-fragmentary material attributed to the poet – were from the second half of the nineteenth century subjected

<sup>14</sup> For these elegiac fragments, see Sim. fr. 10–18 W<sup>2</sup> and the essays in Boedeker and Sider 2001; also Kowerski 2005, Mayer 2007 and Rawles 2018: 77–105.

<sup>15</sup> On attributing authorship, see Ucciardello 2007 and id. (this volume); see also D'Alessio (this volume).

<sup>16</sup> Wilamowitz 1900 remains fundamental; for an up-to-date survey on the process of canon formation of the lyric poets, see now Hadjimichael 2019.

<sup>17</sup> On the ancient reception of Simonides' poetry, see especially Carey, Ford and Hunter below.

<sup>18</sup> On Simonides' epigrams, see Page, *FGE* and Sider 2007, Bravi 2006 and 2018 and Petrovic 2007, as well as the chapters of Sider and Athanassaki below.

<sup>19</sup> See n. 14 above.

to intense scrutiny and suspicion.<sup>20</sup> The shadow that fell across their authenticity meant that, although they have always been important in their own right, and as sources for the poet's life,<sup>21</sup> there have been few attempts to connect them with the lyric fragments or elegies – even if (as Sider argues below) one might do more in terms of looking for connections between these bodies of work. As for the elegies, until 1992 only a handful of Simonidean fragments had survived in the indirect tradition: the publication then of the 'New Simonides' papyri, with their manifold revelations about the poet's style, engagement with the epic and lyric traditions, and his handling of complex historical and mythical themes, has naturally diverted attention away from the lyric fragments towards these exciting recent discoveries. This was one of the reasons why we undertook this volume in the first place: to try to lure scholarly attention back to Simonides' *melica*, which formed the centre of his oeuvre in ancient times.

Those scraps of Simonidean text (choral lyric, epigram and elegy) that remain, together with the extensive tradition of anecdotes about him and apophthegms ('wise sayings', jokes and riddles) ascribed to him, have certainly never been more intensely studied than they are today. They are the object of vigorous research aimed at reconstructing and interpreting surviving texts, filling lacunae in our knowledge of the poet's work and (when possible) his life and influence, establishing the true extent of his surviving oeuvre through analysis of unattributed fragments, and reconsidering when necessary the authorship of attributed ones. More generally, this is about using the whole range of sources, within a framework of research defined by larger cultural developments that were, in Simonides' lifetime, transforming the status and function of poetry as a medium of social ideology and truth, and along with it the figure of the intellectual in society. This means using Simonides' texts and testimonia, as well as the biographical and anecdotal traditions that developed both symbiotically with, and separately from, both, as a means by which to explore historical and intellectual contexts of use, and the transmission and reception-history of poetic (or song-) texts, whether performed or written, in early classical Greece.

The chapters in the present book aim to identify some major themes in, and approaches to, the poet's life, tradition and oeuvre that have emerged in the course of this ongoing work of reconstruction, contextualisation and interpretation. As often in this kind of research, they engage frequently in conjectural and hypothetical arguments, and sometimes take a polemical tack at variance with well-established lines and axioms

<sup>20</sup> Page (*FGE*) famously argued that the entire corpus was spurious, with one possible exception (6 *FGE*, the epigram for Megistias). Sider 2007 and below is prepared to entertain the possibility that Simonides himself may have assembled an epigram-collection in his own lifetime; Petrovic 2007: 280 argues that Simonidean authorship can be argued with varying levels of probability for at least seven poems.

<sup>21</sup> Molyneux 1992 makes particularly heavy use of them.

of research. Most began as papers given at a conference ('Simonides Lyricus') held in Cambridge in September 2011, with generous support from the University's Faculty of Classics and the British Academy.<sup>22</sup> The organisers felt that the publication of Orlando Poltera's 2008 edition of the lyric fragments (*Simonides Lyricus: Testimonia und Fragmente*) – the first full commentary on the poet's melic texts to be completed since F. W. Schneidewin's in 1835 – and the preparation of an English-language edition with commentary of Simonides' epigrams by David Sider<sup>23</sup> had made this an auspicious moment to revisit Simonides' lyric poetry, and also to reconsider what we have lost in the light of what is still, or can be, known. Since the conference, several major new papers and monographs about Simonides have appeared, some of which combine the study of lyric and other fragments with a close appreciation of the biographical traditions. Richard Rawles' 2018 book *Simonides the Poet*, one of the most recent and interesting of these, offers a complex reconsideration not just of Simonides' texts, but of the stories promulgated about him. The essays in this book are more diffuse, but together they follow a similar line. They raise questions not only about Simonides' texts and their (and the poet's) wider reception, but also consider problems of attribution. They also they think hard about what it means (in terms of aims, approaches and methods) to study fragmentary lyric.

This book falls into three parts, each of which corresponds to one of the three central themes identified above: text, interpretation and anecdotal tradition. Part I ('Simonides' Songs: Transmission and Authorship') consists of two chapters that discuss the text and questions of attribution, concentrating on cases where a given fragment or set of fragments known either from a twentieth-century papyrus find or from the indirect tradition might or might not be ascribed to Simonides. Poltera's 2008 edition offers a revised text of, and detailed commentary to, the choral lyric fragments commonly ascribed to Simonides. However, a large number of fragments in the Simonidean *dubia* or in the *adespota* of Page's old but not yet superseded editions (*PMG* and *SLG*) can and should be re-examined in the hope that new light may be cast on questions of content and interpretation, and also potentially that of authorship. Lacking a clear authorial attribution, these so-called *adespota* are largely neglected by scholars. Even today, forty years after Foucault's 1969 'What is an Author?', people still behave as though an anonymous or authorless text is not worth reading from a literary or literary-historical point of view.

<sup>22</sup> Two papers given at the conference are, to the editors' regret, not included here: the first, by Ettore Cingano and Dirk Obbink, awaits the publication of certain new Simonidean fragments in a forthcoming volume of *POxy*, while the findings of Richard Rawles' paper 'Thus Homer and Stesichorus sang to the peoples: Simonides and his sources' have now appeared in print as part of ch. 1 of Rawles 2018. The editors are grateful to Chris Carey and Lucia Athanassaki for kindly offering us the papers included in this book.

<sup>23</sup> Sider's edition of the elegies and epigrams was already in press when the manuscript of this volume was submitted for consideration in July 2019.

Giuseppe Ucciardello's chapter ('More Simonides among the *fragmenta lyrica adespota*? A Survey of the Fragments and a Case Study: *P.Strass. inv. 1406–9*') brings its author's expertise in papyrology and the textual tradition of the early Greek lyric poets to bear on this extensive corpus of fragments of archaic and classical lyric verse – much of it from papyri, but some also from the indirect tradition – that have not yet been ascribed by modern editors to any particular author in a way that satisfies everyone. Ucciardello is himself currently engaged in a long-term project to edit and comment on the entire corpus of lyric *adespota*. Here, he uses Simonides as a test case for wider problems of identifying and attributing fragmentary ancient lyric texts. The extent to which the attribution and classification of even some quite well-known fragments of Greek lyric poetry is still an open question is obvious from the fact that Poltera in his recent edition not only shifts certain important Simonidean fragments from the places assigned to them by Page, but also defends Simonides' authorship of an important song-fragment that most recent editors have assigned to Pindar even as he disputes the poet's authorship of certain others.

After a brief survey of the evidence for Simonides' lyric corpus in antiquity and for the ancient edition of his works, and after enumerating the available Simonidean papyri, Ucciardello's chapter provides a *catalogue raisonné* of the entire corpus of lyric *adespota* fragments. First he examines the papyri, then texts from the ancient indirect tradition that have been or could potentially be connected to Simonides (including commentaries and metrical manuals from the Hellenistic and Roman periods surviving on papyrus), recording provenances and dates, describing what can be known (or has been supposed) about the poetic content and genre of these often exiguous fragments, and listing the various authorship proposals that have been made. In the second half of the paper, he focuses in on a single case: a set of four small papyrus fragments in Strasbourg (*P.Strass. inv. 1406–9*). These were first published in 1937 by Bruno Snell and identified by him, erroneously, as containing small scraps of a lost epinician of Simonides. In fact, as Ucciardello demonstrates, the papyrus contains fragments of a brief philosophical text of the Hadrianic period that bears the title *The Life and Opinions of Secundus the Silent Philosopher*. It is little known today but much read in the Middle Ages, when it was translated from Greek into Latin, Arabic and Armenian as well as various European vernacular languages. We may thus have lost some tiny fragments of Simonidean epinician, but we have gained insight into the early history of an admittedly quite obscure philosophical text. In all, Ucciardello's chapter reminds us of the problems involved in identifying and attributing anonymous fragments and of the role played even in our own time by such attributions of authorship in identifying and canonising previously unstudied texts and opening them up to scholarly interest.

The second chapter, by Giambattista D'Alessio ('Dancing with the Dogs: Mimetic Dance and the Hyporcheme (on Pind. fr. \*107 M = Simonides 255 Poltera)'), combines consideration of authorship attribution with the equally intractable problems that surround editorial assignment of fragments from the direct and indirect traditions of a poet to particular melic genres. D'Alessio, who is currently working on an edition with commentary of the fragments of Pindar, has chosen to focus on a celebrated text that consists of two small fragments (eight and three verses respectively) from the indirect tradition that, transmitted anonymously in the ancient sources, has been ascribed since the nineteenth century by different editors to Simonides, Bacchylides and Pindar. The Simonidean attribution, defended first by Schneidewin but neglected since the late nineteenth century, was revived by Poltera in his 2008 edition of the poet. For most of the twentieth century, the fragment was attributed to Pindar largely on the authority of Wilamowitz. The poem, pieces of which survive as quotations in Athenaeus, Eustathius, and most importantly in the last of Plutarch's *Table Talks* (9.15, 747a–48d), is identified by Plutarch, our most comprehensive and detailed witness, as a hyporcheme or 'song for dancing'. Plutarch uses this fragment of a hyporchematic song-text as a starting point for a complex and difficult discussion of dance as a kind of 'language', of the relation of dance to verbal art, and of representation in general (in the *ut pictura poesis* mode): as he describes it, the ode presents a mimetic performance in which the singers urge themselves to imitate a fast-moving racehorse or the winding path of a Laconian hunting dog on the track of a fleeing deer. On the basis of this account, with its emphasis on the interdependence of dance-movements, music and the action portrayed and on the way the text duplicates and enacts the visual elements of a total ongoing performance, this fragment has become, in modern scholarship as for Plutarch, a test case for the genre of the hyporcheme: a genre of choral lyric song poorly attested in the surviving texts, but with which early fifth-century audiences were apparently quite familiar. *Hyporchēmata* seem to have been based on strongly mimetic (and perhaps quite athletic) dance performances by a chorus. What exactly this mimesis involved is of course still largely an open question. Later ancient authorities (notably Athenaeus and the Hellenistic scholia to Pindar) link the terms 'hyporcheme' and 'hyporchematic' to the *pyrrhikē* (the dance in armour), to the *kordax* dance of Attic comedy and to the *sikinnis*, the energetic dance of hunting satyrs in Attic satyr-plays, as well as to the pantomimes of Hellenistic and Roman theatre. Plutarch, or the authority from whom he takes the fragment (who D'Alessio argues was probably none other than Aristoxenus, the Peripatetic theorist and historian of music), seems to see in the subordination of dance to libretto enacted in our passage a reflection of the original purity of the hyporchematic genre as practised in what Plato called the 'correct music' (ὀρθή μουσική) of the fifth-century city: a divinely inspired goodness, purity and nobility that, following Plato's line on 'theatrocracy' and

the Athenian 'New Music', he argues has been lost in the extreme, degraded and vulgar spectacles of the contemporary theatre (in this case, the primary referent is of course the theatrical culture of Aristoxenus, writing in the late fourth century BCE). Plutarch's view of dance and its vulgarisation thus telescopes the viewpoint of the imperial Greek author commenting on the pantomime and dance-culture of his own day with the cultural polemic of Aristoxenus, his fourth-century source, whose thought reflects the particular influence of Plato's thought.

After discussing and rejecting various other possibilities, D'Alessio asserts a new attribution for the fragment. It is not, he argues, the work of Pindar, Bacchylides or Simonides, but rather of Pratinas of Phleious, the dramatic poet active in Athens c. 500 BCE and noted in the later tradition for his *hyporchemes* and satyr-plays. A famous fragment (*PMG* 708) ascribed to Pratinas by Athenaeus and identified as a *hyporcheme* is today recognised as a choral ode from a satyr-drama: the fragment ascribed most recently by Poltera to Simonides, with its metatheatrical reference to music, singing and dance (closely paralleled in *PMG* 708), its apparent mention of a 'contest' and its enactment of a hunt – a mimetic or dramatic setting that seems best to suit the dramatic ambience of a satyr-play – may well, therefore, represent another such song. If D'Alessio's arguments are correct, we have lost one of our best examples of a fifth-century choral lyric *hyporchēma*. His findings substantially alter our picture of the fragment itself, of its place in the history Greek thinking about music and dance, and of the *hyporchematic* genre as a whole.

The five essays in Part II ('Genres and Contexts of Performance, Patronage and Reception') all deal with different aspects of the surviving corpus of the historical Simonides, and with what can be known about the poet's life and poetry. Orlando Poltera's chapter ('Simonides: A Kind of Janus? Biographical Tradition and Poetical Reality') engages with the question of Simonides' chronology, much debated in earlier scholarship on the poet, as well as with broader questions of periodisation and the biography. The traditional date of the poet's birth and death (556–467 BCE), familiar at least to the Alexandrian grammarians, makes him more than a generation older than his closest fifth-century rivals Pindar and Bacchylides, and a contemporary of Anacreon and Ibycus: some sources, including Plato, place him at the sixth-century tyrants' courts of Polycrates on Samos and of the sons of Peisistratus in Athens. In addition, Simonides is not infrequently treated in the later tradition as a 'wise man' of sixth-century type, and sometimes even listed among the 'Seven Sages'. Arguing that the external evidence for Simonides' activity in the sixth century BCE is sparse and dubious, that none of his extant fragments need be securely dated before 500, that almost all the epigrams celebrating the achievements of the Greeks during the two Persian invasions of 490 (Darius) and 480/479 (Xerxes) were ascribed to this poet, and that his elegiac and lyric fragments

(those at least whose date can be conjectured) all seem to belong to the first quarter of the fifth century BCE, Poltera then tries to substantiate this general picture of Simonides' 'lateness' with an argument about diction. Simonides' language and poetic manner, Poltera claims, as well as his use of certain characteristic praise-poetry metaphors, best fit the choral lyric *koinē* of the poets active in the first half of the fifth century BCE, even as they seem somewhat too 'modern' for the last third of the sixth. Third, Poltera argues that Simonides' lifespan, as inferred from the later tradition – according to which his birth coincided suspiciously with the death of Stesichorus, supposedly his most important model, and his death with that of Hieron I of Syracuse, his most famous patron – seems based on typical methods of chronological synchronism employed by ancient writers of biography. It is thus potentially arbitrary and unconvincing as evidence in comparison with the linguistic and contextual data of the texts themselves. Nor on Poltera's account do the anecdotal traditions and testimonia about the poet's life provide any really convincing evidence that locates him in the world of the sixth-century tyrants. For Poltera, Simonides thus becomes a more or less exact contemporary of Pindar, similar in his themes, manner and concerns; he should no longer be seen as a poet of the earlier age who enjoyed an extraordinary late flowering in the immediate aftermath of the Persian Wars. If Poltera's arguments are correct, Simonides' later date and the rewriting of literary history that it entails also automatically disqualifies many elements of the Simonidean biographical tradition as purely legendary accretions.

From questions of dating and periodisation we turn to genre-poetics. In his contribution entitled 'Simonides *lyricus elegiacus epigrammaticus*', David Sider examines the relationship of Simonides' 'lyric poetry' to the other genres in which he was (or was claimed to have been) poetically active: his epigrams and elegies, and also the amusing but not easily classifiable metrical jokes and riddles ascribed to the poet in the anecdotal and biographical traditions. The Simonidean authorship of these shorter poems or fragments, some of which survive in Hellenistic epigram-collections, has in modern times always been treated as doubtful: they are thus most often handled in strict separation from the surviving fragments of the poet's lyric poetry or elegies. The distinction between 'lyric' and 'elegiac' Simonides has become especially problematic since the rediscovery and publication in 1992 of the poet's so-called 'Plataea elegy' (the remains of a lengthy commemorative poem rich in Homeric allusion and dedicated to the Greek warriors who fought in that famous battle against the Persians in late summer 479) and its associated fragments (which include some tantalising fragments of what looks like sympotic or erotic elegy).

Sider argues here that the traces of the poet's activity in the three 'genres' of 'lyric', 'epigram' and 'elegy' should be handled more as part of a unified personal oeuvre rather than as three distinct bodies of poetic work. He sets out several reasons for such a

position. First, he looks historically at the categories themselves. Although as categories 'lyric' and 'elegy' are not difficult to distinguish on metrical, performance and sometimes even thematic grounds, the distinction between *poets* active in these genres was not quite as self-evident to people living in classical and even Hellenistic Greece. Although they did occasionally distinguish between the genres and metres in which the archaic poets composed, ancient Greeks did not generally distinguish between poets of 'lyric', 'epigram' or 'elegy'. Indeed, the synonymous labels *lyrikos* and *melikos* seem to be quite late, perhaps Hellenistic in origin. Sider adds that Simonides systematically dismantled what small boundaries existed between these largely imaginary 'genres'. Some verses in elegiac couplets transmitted to us as epigrams in Hellenistic poetry collections not only belonged originally to elegies (something that has long been noted in particular cases), but Simonides also took advantage of the shared metre of epigram and elegy to insert *faux*-inscriptional epigrams into longer narrative elegies of a personal character that were meant for recitation among friends at symposia: a context where, we know, personal references and *ad hominem* poetic sparring were quite normal. Sider argues, for example, that the so-called 'epigram' on the poet Timocreon of Rhodes (FGE 37) is best explained in this way, since there is evidence that Timocreon himself engaged in bitter and amusing personal invective at symposia. Likewise, the two epigrams voiced by the ghost of a shipwrecked sailor whom Simonides supposedly interred after finding his unburied body on the seashore (his piety then saving him from the shipwreck that killed the other travellers on the voyage) could, Sider argues, have belonged to a longer narrative elegy that told the story transmitted in the anecdote, perhaps in the poet's persona and private voice. In this way, a substantial corpus of material in the biographical tradition that is often treated as spurious or pseudo-Simonidean can in fact be restored to the poet's oeuvre as belonging to lost longer compositions of a personal or anecdotal nature. This in turn might have consequences for our understanding of the Simonidean anecdotal tradition. The chapter concludes by examining a largely ignored lyric fragment that is assigned twice with some certainty to Simonides by the prose text that contains it, in which the poet declares himself ready, on Sider's account, to 'carve his musical metres in stone' ([μέ]τρον δ(ια)γλύπτω) – an image drawn clearly from the practice of inscribing poetic texts ('epigrams').<sup>24</sup> Although spoken most likely in a lost lyric ode, the words, on this interpretation, would refer metaphorically either to the poet's entire oeuvre, or to his work as an epigrammatist. It is no arbitrary metaphor: Simonides seems at least once to have described himself in a lyric poem as Simonides *epigrammaticus*, and represented the act of composing a song in terms more appropriate to carving words in stone. In this way,

<sup>24</sup> This text (*P.Berol.* 9571v: see Ucciardello's piece here, pp. 000–00 no. 18, for details and bibliography) is not in Page's or Poltera's texts of Simonides, nor can it be found among the fragments ascribed to him in a TLG search.

Sider pleads for the essential unity of Simonides' oeuvre in the poet's own mind, and asks us to consider the implications of this both for our texts and for what we choose to accept as authentic Simonides from the anecdotal and epigrammatic tradition.

The volume's next two contributions examine Simonides' work in particular lyric or melic genres. Chris Carey's essay '*Maestius lacrimis Simonideis: The thrēnoi* of Simonides' examines the fragments of Simonides' threnodies, a genre in which, as the Catullan title of the chapter suggests, he attained great fame in antiquity.<sup>25</sup> The *thrēnos* ('dirge') was a well-established form of public song already when the *Iliad*, which contains the earliest description of it (24.720–2), was composed. It is there distinguished as a song performed by professional singers (*oidoi*) from the improvised laments recited over Hector's corpse by the women of his and Priam's household, or in later Greek societies by hired mourners, which laments (*gooi*) have many traits in common with the elaborate songs of grief (*mirologia*) sung by female mourners in traditional peasant cultures of modern Greece, South Italy and elsewhere in the Mediterranean.<sup>26</sup> The history of the 'professional' *thrēnos* is largely obscure down to Simonides' time, but several remarkable fragments of his and Pindar's *thrēnoi* survive: meditations on fate and mortality that are among the most beautiful fragments of their extant poetry, and that have long been read and anthologised. Poltera's edition has on various grounds significantly reduced the number of poetic fragments thought to belong to Simonides' *thrēnoi* from the high point reached in Page's *PMG*. Carey discusses the remaining small fragments in detail, and (through a comparison with the structure and form of Pindar's epinicians and also the surviving fragments of the Theban poet's comparable odes, as well as with the rhetorical tropes of later oratory, especially the Athenian *epitaphios logos*) conjectures what Simonides' *thrēnoi*, as poems of praise, mourning and consolation, may have looked like in their original completeness, and how they may have differed in their poetic strategy and poetic and emotional effects from Pindar's similar songs, placing a particular emphasis on the poetic use of myth, *gnōmai*, and other tropes and themes of consolation and remembrance. He also considers the likely processes of commissioning, performance and transmission that defined the life-cycle of a threnodic song on its way from commissioning to performance, entextualisation and transmission through reperformance or textual diffusion. As with the victory ode and other similar genres of commissioned or transactional praise in early fifth-century choral poetry, four essential factors – poetic tradition, the patron's desires, audience expectation and the poet's own creative autonomy – defined the space in which threnodic poets worked. Negotiation within this framework allowed for the creation of radically different poetic styles within the same fundamental typology of generic form, genre-typology or frame:

<sup>25</sup> Cat. 38.8 = T27 Poltera.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. (among others) Reiner 1938, Alexiou 2002, De Martino 2008 and Suter 2008.

personal poetic ‘brands’ that represented particular solutions to problems raised by the needs of the immediate moment, and also ensured the later, long-term reperformability of the songs in what was still a living performance-tradition.

If Simonides’ *thrēnoi*, as published today by Poltera, present us with a diminished but still coherent body of powerful poetry, his *Kateukhai* – mentioned both in the poet’s *Suda* life and in two other sources (PMG 537 and 538) – are an almost total enigma. It is not even clear whether the title *Kateukhai* refers to a whole Alexandrian book of song-texts or to a group of odes within another book; nor is it at all clear what the content of the songs themselves may have been. The title could refer either to *Prayers* or to *Curses*: modern commentators tend to argue that the *Kateukhai* must have belonged among Simonides’ ritual songs and contained mythical narratives. In his chapter ‘Simonides, Anius and Athens: PMG 537 = 301 Poltera (*Kateukhai*)’, Ian Rutherford reviews the evidence for Simonides’ *Kateukhai*, arguing that our sparse surviving fragments form part of a lyric composition that gave thanks for Greek victories over the Persians in 490 or 480/479 BCE, praising the role of Athens in the struggle at a time when that city was claiming for itself the leadership of future Greek wars with Persia through its control of the Delian League. A scholion to Homer’s *Odyssey* (6.164 = PMG 537) implies that Simonides’ *Kateukhai* may have told the myth of the embassy of Menelaus and Odysseus to Anius, king of Delos (this was one of several such versions of Anius’ myth in epic and other poetry). Another source mentions a Simonidean dithyramb (the *Memnon*) that belonged to a set of poems collectively called *Deliaca* (‘Delian songs’); these are also mentioned by Strabo (PMG 539 = °351 Poltera). The *Odyssey* scholiast’s mention of the embassy to Anius is apparently an early attestation of the story that Anius king of Delos and his miracle-working daughters the Oinotropoi (or ‘Oinotrophoi’) provided the Greek army with wine, bread and oil during their ten-year siege of Troy, or (in a version attested only later) that the Greeks tried to force them to do so and found themselves rejected. Anius was worshipped on Delos at a shrine called the *archēgesion*, which seems to have received a new peribolos wall in the years after 480–470 BCE. The *Kateukhai*, Rutherford argues, may have been hymns or ‘prayers’ performed immediately before a sacrifice. They may not have filled a whole book in the ancient edition of Simonides (about the structure and categorisations of which we are in any case not well informed), but rather constituted a distinct group within Simonides’ sacred poems, perhaps a group with Delian connections (hence *Deliaca*). Rutherford prefers this explanation to an alternative recently proposed by Filippomaria Pontani, according to whom *Kateukhai* (‘Prayers’) was the title of a single narrative dithyramb, motivated possibly by Athenian claims under Peisistratus’ tyranny to leadership of the Ionian cities, which was performed, perhaps on Delos, as part of a cult-ritual for Apollo or Dionysus and told the story of Anius and his daughters. Anius was in most versions of the myth the grandson

of Dionysus and Ariadne and the son of Apollo. There are, however, reasons for thinking that an alternative genealogy in circulation by the fifth century BCE made him the grandson of Theseus; and there is some evidence for Athenian involvement on Delos from the time of Peisistratus onward. Anius and his brother Sounios belong among the mythical progenitors who connected Athens with the wider Ionian world. Simonides may have emphasised some such variant of the myth in his Anius ode.

Certainly the Delian themes foregrounded in that poem, probably intended for first performance on the island as part of a ritual programme of communal prayers for different Greek cities, would have appealed to Athenians, the state that enjoyed the closest ties to Delos in this period. Rutherford suggests that the ‘prayer’, as a dithyramb or possibly a cult-hymn addressed to Delian Apollo (Anius’ father) that may have coincided with the remodelling of Anius’ sanctuary after 480 BCE, could have dated to the decade after the Greeks’ victory over Xerxes. If so, it would have been performed on behalf of Athens and her allies in the League. The myth of Anius and his daughters would have been an appropriate exemplum for such a poem because, just as Apollo, his prophet Anius and Delos had once benefited Greece during a war with Trojan barbarians, so Athens was now setting herself up as the defender of Greece against Persia: ‘a modern version of the Trojan War’. Rutherford’s conjectural reconstruction enables us to see a little more of a lost choral ode of Simonides, and presents a reasonable reconstruction of what one, at least, of the poet’s *Kateukhai* may have looked like.

The final chapter of Part II is by Kathryn Morgan, whose essay continues the work begun in her 2015 book *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century BC*, which presents a detailed reading of Pindar’s victory odes for Hieron in their historical and cultural context, placing special emphasis on the tensions that surrounded praise of monarchy, leaders and individual achievement on the Panhellenic stage in the decade and a half that followed the Hellenic coalition’s defeat of Xerxes’ forces on sea and land. In this chapter, she studies Simonides’ activity as a poet of praise and commemoration in the years immediately following that war, demonstrating through a sensitive reading of the poet’s rhetoric the difficulty of praising the individual character and excellence (ἀρετή) of leaders in the context of a city-state culture like those of Athens or Sparta, which naturally (though somewhat differently) tended to emphasise the value of collective achievement and sacrifice – a tendency that reaches its apogee later in the Athenian *epitaphios logos*, with its blending of the individual faces of the fallen into a communal portrait of valour and self-sacrifice for shared institutions and values.

Beginning with a discussion of the complexities of ‘Panhellenism’ in this period, Morgan argues that this tension between individual and collective *aretē* was at least as important as the tension between the Panhellenic and the local – that is to say, between

the achievements and courage of the Hellenes as a collectivity, and the competitive performances of individual city-states: Sparta, Athens, Corinth or Aegina – which has become a central theme and subject of contention, for example, in recent scholarly responses to Simonides' Plataea elegy (fr. 11 W<sup>2</sup>). In that elegy, the heroism of the Spartans is finely and ambiguously balanced against that of the Hellenes, and the leadership of Pausanias, the Spartan regent who commanded the coalition armies at Plataea, is starkly distinguished from the collective valour of the Spartiate army he led. Morgan studies several important examples of Simonides' poetry of military commemoration and praise, starting with the famous encomiastic fragment for Leonidas and the three hundred Spartans killed at Thermopylae (PMG 531 = 261 Poltera). She considers first the implications of Poltera's editorial refashioning of the text, and re-examines the possible occasions and performance contexts of the fragment. In particular, she argues that Poltera's reconstruction of the fragment is wrong in certain crucial respects, that the poem does in fact praise Leonidas as Spartan commander and king at Thermopylae, as distinct from the footsoldiers who died there, and that the ode, as an encomium in a loose sense, was at least as much a commemoration of his individual excellence as an act of collective Spartan praise and self-praise.

Next, Morgan examines what remains of Simonides' ode on the Battle of Salamis (PMG 536 = 252 Poltera), arguing that later sources, particularly Plutarch's *Life of Themistocles*, clearly attest the existence of such a poem: a mixed encomium that combined celebration of collective Athenian glory with individual praise of the battle's victorious commander and strategist Themistocles. Taking the late testimonia as her starting point, she examines the evidence for the poem and for the life of Themistocles after Salamis, interpreting his eventual ostracism, exile and death in Persia as an example of the political tensions created by overambitious praise of a successful leader, and by Themistocles' own self-assertion within an Athenian political culture defined by a strongly collectivist mentality, which saw exaggerated individual self-promotion as a sign of tyrannical aspirations.

Finally, Morgan turns to Pausanias and the Plataea elegy (fr. 11 W<sup>2</sup>), examining the latter poem in the light of Pausanias' own career and eventual death on grounds of Medism and ambition to tyranny. Interpretations of Simonides' elegy have tended to follow one of two options: first, that the poem is more Sparta-centred, either as an encomium of the Spartiates more generally or of Pausanias himself, or alternatively that it is intended as a Panhellenic political statement in which praise of Sparta and the victorious general are carefully subordinated to a sense of collective Greek achievement. Through a careful critique of existing readings of the poem's Homerising rhetoric, and by revisiting the various performance contexts proposed for Simonides' elegy, Morgan concludes that, as a piece of encomiastic rhetoric that belonged to the same

historical context, it reflects the same problems, dangers, opportunities and priorities as the Thermopylae and Salamis odes. In the end, Simonides' political poetry reflects the political and cultural tensions of the period in which it was made.

Simonides' reputation for wisdom and his place in the intellectual history of Greece were well established themes in the poet's biographical and anecdotal tradition by the early decades of the fourth century, when Plato in his *Protagoras* portrayed him as a kind of proto-sophist. The three essays in Part III ('Simonides σοφός: The Early Reception and the Birth of a Poet-Philosopher?') focus first on the sources of this reputation for σοφία, and then on its effect on the poet's image as it is presented in the prose writings of Plato and Xenophon. This in turn involves an examination of certain of Simonides' poems – most notably the so-called 'Scopas ode' (PMG 542 = 260 Poltera), the text on which Protagoras and Socrates, the protagonists of Plato's fictionalised dialogue, exercise their ingenuity as textual exegetes – but also of the ways in which anecdotal traditions surrounding the lives of the archaic and classical Greek poets developed over time: sometimes out of fruitful biographical misreadings of the poems themselves, and sometimes in other ways. In the first of these chapters, Andrew Ford ('The Wisdom of Simonides: σοφός και θεῖος ἀνὴρ') assesses the fifth-century evidence for Simonides' reputation as a sage. The chapter's title, while quoting Plato, also consciously refers to J. M. Bell's 1978 fundamental study ('Κίμβιξ και σοφός': 'skinflint and sage') of 'Simonides in the anecdotal tradition'. Bell was strong on the 'skinflint' side of Simonides' reception, tracking the theme back to early misappropriations and misunderstandings of lyric passages in which the poet – in a trope that is common enough in Pindar's epinician odes – represented his praise of victors as a 'debt' (χρέος) owed to his *laudandi*. But Bell himself allowed that 'the matter of his *sophia* deserves fuller treatment than can be given it here'.<sup>27</sup> Ford's essay first examines the biographical tradition's portrayal of the poet's *sophia*, before comparing Simonides' own poetic practice to the sources for his early reception. One of the most important questions he raises is why it was that Simonides became a kind of honorary 'eighth sage' – a figure modelled to some extent on such older archaic paradigms of the intellectual such as Thales, Bias, Pittacus or Solon – while Pindar, a poet equally unstinting in his rhetorical performances of wisdom, was not remembered in this way. Another similarly important question is why it is Simonides rather than Pindar or any other poet whom Plato's *Protagoras* chooses as his exemplary practitioner of the ancient 'secret' art of sophistry he claims prefigured his own overt and highly lucrative educational craft (Pl. *Prot.* 316d–17c).

<sup>27</sup> Bell 1978: 77.

Ford suggests that one may thus question Bell's finding that Simonides was 'a typical *sophos*'.<sup>28</sup> To explain Simonides' *sophia*, Bell collected a set of statements drawn from the fragments, anecdotes and *apophthegmata* ascribed to the poet that chime with the sophisticated thinking of the early fifth century and prefigure the demystifying relativism, irony and anthropocentric realism of the later sophists. Ford argues that this kind of evidence is never sufficient in itself, since one must always wonder how far these progressive-sounding ideas might only be elegant-sounding variations on traditional proverbs and wisdom-themes. After a close discussion of the cultural, social and educational context of Plato's citation in the *Protagoras* of Simonides (*PMG* 542 = 260 Poltera), and having defined Simonides' (and his lyric rivals') place in education and the sophistic curriculum in particular (the ability to discuss complex and difficult lyric poetry being a mark of high culture), Ford presents a number of other ways in which the poet prefigured or contributed to the development of the fifth-century intellectual revolution. Among these factors are Simonides' attitude to language, the range of genres he used (the formal and thematic variety and versatility of his poetry bears comparison with what we know of the poetic activities of later fifth-century prose-writing sophists such as Hippias of Elis, Euenus of Paros and the notorious Critias of Athens), his innovative poetic diction (especially his use of epithets), and his general self-presentation (including the way he represents the role of the musical arts in his songs). In particular, he brings out the 'Gorgianic' qualities of Simonides' Thermopylae fragment (*PMG* 531 = 261 Poltera), asserting the continuities linking the choral poet's mode of praise and commemoration with its oratorical descendants in the Athenian *epitaphios logos*. On this basis, Ford argues that Simonides' extraordinarily long-lived reputation for wisdom cannot be accounted for solely on the level of poetic content, or by the degree to which his poetic work foreshadowed certain fifth- and fourth-century philosophical themes. It is primarily a story about the reputation and reception of the poet's work in the decades after his death. His formal and thematic ingenuity, as reflected in the diversity and poetic flair of his texts, played an important role in fostering the myth of Simonides the *sophos*. His was a specifically *poetic* wisdom which, being broad, adaptive, up to date and resourceful, offered a model to the prose experiments of the sophists. It was this remarkable facility with styles of performing wisdom, and the sophists' to make a precursor of him, that made Simonides worthy, in the ironic view of Plato's Socrates (*Rep.* 1.331e), not only of the epithet *sophos* ('wise'), but also of the more restricted and traditional term of praise *theios* ('godlike').

In the following chapter, 'Clever about Verses? Simonides and the "Scopas Ode" (*PMG* 542 = 260 Poltera)', Richard Hunter raises a number of important questions

<sup>28</sup> Bell 1978: 81.

about the context and interpretation of the Simonidean text analysed by Protagoras and Socrates in the course of Plato's eponymous dialogue: questions to do with poem itself, and with the Platonic passage as an example of Simonidean reception. He argues that this poem, an unconventional and for some even shocking encomium dedicated to the Thessalian aristocrat Scopas of Crannon, continues to fascinate not only because we have so little of Simonides' lyric output, but also because attitudes to this text, and to the contradiction between 'being' and 'becoming' good that Socrates alleges stands at its heart, can serve as an excellent test of critical attitudes and how they have changed and hardened over the last 150 years of classical scholarship.

There is no evidence that anyone in antiquity read or knew the poem except through the citation and discussion of it in Plato's *Protagoras*. The latter is a rare and perhaps unique example in the ancient record of a systematic critical reading designed to 'exhaust' the meaning of a poetic text as closely as possible. Hunter first considers the way in which Protagoras introduces the Simonidean poem within the dialogue, with regard both to the expectations it provokes, and to its relation to the general philosophical question under discussion (the teachability of 'virtue'). What can these tell us about the poem and the sophistic epideictic methods and critical techniques enacted first by Protagoras, and then extensively redefined by Socrates over the dialogue's course? Hunter then inventories the critical methods and techniques on display in Socrates' long account of the 'Scopas ode', showing how these sometimes foreshadow the techniques of Hellenistic and later criticism in surprising ways. He also revisits and discusses the explicit links Plato creates between his own congregation of clever sophists and the Banquet of the archaic σοφοί or 'sages', setting his dialogue, as an *agōn* of wits, self-consciously in a long-lived tradition of such contestation, and pitting his protagonists not only against each other but against the 'sages' of the past.

The next section of Hunter's chapter discusses the constitution and interpretation of Simonides' text itself. The problems here are partly caused by the fact that we cannot know how much of the original poem Socrates quotes, or indeed whether the parts he cites are in the correct original order. Hunter compares the modern editorial consensus (which goes back essentially to Wilamowitz) as represented in Poltera, which posits a lacuna in the text's first stanza, with the recent proposals (2008) of Adam Beresford, who argues – following an earlier suggestion by Blass – that, far from missing out a section, Socrates has given us the complete text of Simonides' poem *sans* lacuna, which can be restored by recourse to transposition. Hunter uses the debate between Beresford and his critics (particularly Manuwald 2010) to bring out, through a critique of certain specific points in the reconstruction, two central if implicit problems in *any* restoration of a text. First, how far can we go in arbitrarily reordering the *paradosis* to create coherence? Second, how far can one go in importing external hypotheses about

the structure and argument of lost portions of a text? Then there is the question of the addressee: Protagoras tells us that the ode was addressed to ‘Scopas the son of Kreon, the Thessalian’, but there is no trace of any such apostrophe in the extant text as Socrates presents it. A familiar anecdote preserved by Plutarch, according to which Simonides mocked his Thessalian patrons for being ‘too uncultured to be deceived by me’, raises the possibility here of Protagorean sarcasm or Platonic irony.<sup>29</sup> Finally, Hunter discusses Socrates’ famous account of the poem’s genesis and beginning (Pl. *Prot.* 343d–e), which assumes a Simonides who, desiring to make his own name for ‘wisdom’ by competitively besting an established ‘sage’ in an eristic *agōn*, attacked Pittacus’ proverb ‘it is difficult to be good’. He focuses on the μέν at the start of Simonides’ poem (ἄνδρ’ ἀγαθὸν μέν ἀλαθέως γενέσθαι | χάλειπὸν ..., 1–2), demonstrating that Socrates’ assumption that it implies something must have preceded it – the very axiom of Pittacus against which Simonides is arguing – reveals a familiarity with grammatical views reflected in later discussions of the correct and clear use of particles in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* and the *Rhetoric to Alexander*, as well as with the emphasis of these texts on the obscurity of poetic language in comparison to the clarity of prose. Far from imagining (as Beresford suggests) a face-to-face battle between Simonides and Pittacus, Socrates rather struggles to find linguistic forms adequate to express what Hunter calls ‘a really quite sophisticated idea of how language refers in the abstract, *away from* particular performance contexts in the “real world”’. For him, Simonides’ lyric utterance always, whenever and wherever it is performed, automatically evokes for its audience the wise saying of Pittacus as well, who will ‘assume’ the latter as part of their reading of the Simonidean text. For Hunter, this is ‘a(nother) very important hermeneutic moment’ that looks forward to ‘modern debate about intertextuality ... and about the parameters of allusion’.<sup>30</sup>

The third section of Hunter’s paper then collects passages from the archaic wisdom-elegy of the *corpus Theognideum* that most closely resemble Simonides’ poem: texts that, perhaps somewhat earlier than *PMG* 542, may help to illuminate it precisely because they belong to the archaic culture of sympotic song performance that some have argued might constitute the best available background to Simonides’ poem. Simonides shares many themes and key terms of value and social distinction with Theognis, but uses them at times differently; the underlying relativism of his ethical position seems, however, to be ‘anticipated’ in the elegist. Hunter then assesses the reasons why Plato, despite showing an awareness of Theognis’ relevance to the question of virtue’s teachability in a passage of his *Meno* (95c9–96a5), largely neglects the ‘wisdom’ of the elegists, instead choosing in the *Protagoras* to privilege that of Simonides as an authoritative voice of philosophical

<sup>29</sup> Plut. *De aud. poet.* 15c.

<sup>30</sup> See Hunter, pp. 000–00 below.

*sophia* encoded in poetry. Finally, in an appendix, Hunter discusses Pindar's possible use of Simonides' 'Scopas ode' in the famous and much-discussed proem of his second *Isthmian*.

In the book's final chapter, 'Simonides in Athens: Memories of Choral Agonistic Excellence in Plato's *Protagoras*, Xenophon's *Hieron* and the 'Simonidean' Epigrams XXVII and XXVIII *FGE*', Lucia Athanassaki discusses an underexplored fourth-century portrait of Simonides. This is Xenophon's representation of the poet in his philosophical dialogue *Hieron*, both as a reflection of Athenian traditions about the poet, and as a mark of Xenophon's engagement with Plato's *Protagoras*. The figure of Simonides the 'skinflint and sophist' here combines with that of the consummate celebrity poet and courtier, a friend of tyrants and statesmen as much at home in Hieron's Syracusan court as he was in democratic Athens. She argues that, despite the dialogue's Sicilian setting, Xenophon's Simonides speaks as someone whose outlook has been shaped by the Athenian musical and political scene. In this sense, Xenophon's portrait is an early link in the chain of tradition that focused on Simonides' phenomenal success in Athens: a set of sources that includes references in Aristophanes' *Wasps* (l. 1410) and *Birds* (l. 919), Platonic and pseudo-Platonic accounts, and the pseudo-Simonidean epigrams XXVII and XXVIII *FGE*. Through a reading of Simonides' fictional dialogue with Hieron, and of Xenophon's views (for which the poet is a mouthpiece) on choral training and its social and political effects, themes to which that author returned in other works (i.e. in the *Memorabilia*, the *Oeconomicus* and the *Hipparchicus*), Athanassaki argues first that unlike some of the poet's other representations (including that by Plato in *Protagoras*), Xenophon's *Hieron* is carefully staged so as to preclude any perception of Simonides as a parasite. The egalitarian relationship between the poet and wise adviser and his tyrant-patron is foregrounded in the opening, and is a continuous theme throughout the whole of the dialogue. A consequence of their equality is the absence here of the familiar traditions about the poet's remuneration for his services with 'gifts' (δῶρα) and 'pay' (μισθοί) by his patrons, including the Syracusan tyrant. Simonides' advice on expenditure, namely that Hieron should spend his wealth unstintingly on festivals and contests, awarding rich prizes to citizens competing in *mousikoi agōnes* – which is an Athenian version, focussed on public festival culture, of the similar counsel given to Hieron by Pindar at *Pythian* 1.90 – contradicts the tradition of the poet's avarice, which can be securely dated by a reference in Aristophanes' *Peace* (l. 697) to the late fifth century BCE. Finally, Xenophon's Simonides draws on his experience as an accomplished choral master in Athenian competitions to offer a new political model of an ideal monarchy founded on the idea of constant social competition. The new political model that Simonides advocates here begins from the idea of the ruler as *agōnothetēs*, which is essentially a reconfiguration and fusion of the distinct roles played in the Athenian choral and musical competitions by the eponymous archon and the *khoregoi*. From the point of view of Xenophon's politics,

Simonides' choregic model is at once a tacit rejection of a system of patronage focused on fostering the glory of an individual *laudandus* and favoured by tyrants and other magnates, and an improvement on the Athenian competitive model of *khoregia* where powerful individuals such as Alcibiades could win popularity and influence and thereby pursue tyrannical aspirations. Comparison of Simonides' model with Xenophon's views on choral training elsewhere in the corpus of his writings shows that the poet in the *Hieron* becomes a mouthpiece for the historian's reflections on, and misgivings about, both the traditional forms of patronage favoured by tyrants, and the potential political abuses of the institution of *khoregia* in classical Athens. After revisiting the evidence for prizes for victorious *khorodidaskaloi* at the musical contests in Athens, arguing that while the prizes themselves were generally small, the social capital accumulated there could assist a poet's Panhellenic career, Athanassaki compares Plato's rather more restrained reflections on Simonides as a choral master in the *Protagoras*, where the philosopher, through his narrator Socrates, pervasively associates the somewhat dubious figure of the famous sophist with that of a *khorodidaskalos*, to Xenophon's more effusive approach, reflecting on the reasons why the two authors produced such different portraits of the poet.

It is our, and our contributors', hope that this volume will add to our understanding of Simonides' poetry and his place in ancient culture, and also stimulate new work on this fascinating and provocative figure of ancient Greek literary and cultural history.