

DIMITRIOS YATROMANOLAKIS

SIMONIDES FR. ELEG. 22 W<sup>2</sup>: TO SING OR TO MOURN?

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 120 (1998) 1–11

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



SIMONIDES FR. ELEG. 22 W<sup>2</sup>: TO SING OR TO MOURN?\*

In 1992 Peter Parsons<sup>1</sup> admirably edited P.Oxy. LIX 3965 fr. 27 and joined it<sup>2</sup> with P.Oxy. 2327 fr. 2(a) col. ii, 2(b), 3 and 4, which had been published by Edgar Lobel in 1954<sup>3</sup>. In the same year (1992) Martin West reedited the combined text proposed by Parsons in the second edition of his *Iambi et Elegi Graeci* (= *IEG*<sup>2</sup>, Simon. fr. 22); and, as appears from the supplements in his text and from his “Simonides Redivivus”<sup>4</sup>, West did not diverge from Parsons’ basic reconstruction and interpretation of the fragment.

In this paper I propose a different view of how this fragment may be reconstructed. The text as it has come down to us is badly preserved and only broadly comprehensible; nevertheless an attempt to recover its likely content is probably justified. First I quote the combined text given by Parsons (pp. 46–47) in his *editio princeps*. An *apparatus criticus* is also provided with both the supplements and conjectures adopted in the text as edited by Parsons (= P.) and West (= W.), and the supplements and emendations reported in Parsons’ notes (= P<sup>a</sup>) and West’s *apparatus criticus* in the *IEG*<sup>2</sup> (= W<sup>a</sup>).

]..ἰσι θαλάσσης [	
]ουσαπορον· [	
]μενος ἔνθα περανα[	
]	
]οιμι κελευθο[	5
]ν κόσμ[ο]ν ἰο[στ]εφάνων	
] ἔδος πολύδενδρον ἰκο[	
ε.[....]ευα.[ ]α νῆσον, ἄγαλμα .[	
κα[....]εχε.[....]δην ξανθότρ[ι]χ	
ο.[.....].ν χειῖρα λάβοι.[	10
οφρα.ε.[.].[...].ντος ἀπὸ χροδὸς αν[	
λείβει δ' ἐγ <sup>κ</sup> βλ[εφάρ]ων ἱμερόεντα [πόθον	
καί κενε.[.....].δος ἐν ἄνθε[	
κεκλιμένος λευκ[.]. φαρκίδας ἐκ.[	
χαιτη[.]ν χαριε[ ]α νεοβλαστ[	15
.[.....] εὐανθέα πλε[ξ	
μο[ ] δ' ἱμερόεντα λιγὸν .[	

\* I should like to thank Drs R.A. Coles and J.R. Rea of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, for letting me examine the originals several times. I should also like to express my gratitude to Prof. G. Nagy, Dr D. Obbink, and Dr C. Sourvinou-Inwood, who discussed thoroughly with me the views propounded here and made incisive suggestions. At different stages Drs A.M. Bowie, R.A. Coles, N. Gonis, P. Roilos and I.C. Rutherford offered advice, which improved the proposed reconstruction in many ways. I owe a special debt to Prof. P.J. Parsons, for his insightful suggestions, unstinting interest and encouragement. This paper is offered to Prof. Ioanna Yatromanolaki, για τη Στέλλα.

<sup>1</sup> The following bibliography is cited by author’s name only: P.J. Parsons, “3965. Simonides, *Elegies*”, in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. LIX, London 1992, pp. 4ff., M.L. West, “Simonides Redivivus”, *ZPE* 98 (1993), pp. 1–14, R. Hunter, “One party or two?: Simonides 22 West<sup>2</sup>”, *ZPE* 98 (1993), pp. 11–14, S. Mace, “Utopian and Erotic Fusion in a New Elegy by Simonides (22 W<sup>2</sup>)”, *ZPE* 113 (1996), pp. 233–247, M. Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, Cambridge 1974, J.H. Molyneux, *Simonides. A Historical Study*, Wauconda, Illinois 1992. I am most grateful to Prof. Sarah Mace for very kindly allowing me to read her paper in advance of publication.

<sup>2</sup> The link had been partly proposed by Lobel; see Parsons, p. 5. Parsons offered the invaluable suggestion that the combination of 2327 fr. 4 with fr. 1–2 col. ii is plausible because of the satisfactory sense it produces (Parsons, pp. 46–49).

<sup>3</sup> “2327. Early Elegiacs”, in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. XXII, London 1954, pp. 67ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. also M.L. West, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, Oxford 1993, p. 171.

ἀρτι[επέα] νωμῶν γλωσσσαν α[  
[  
τῶνδε[  
π  
ευκομ.[

20

1 -οῖσι et v.l. -οῖο Lobel, ῥο|θῖ|οῖσι vel ῥο|θῖ|οῖο θαλ- P<sup>a</sup> 2 φέ|ρουσα W<sup>a</sup> 3 περάνα[ς Lobel, περάνα[ι W<sup>a</sup> 5-7 κόσμ[ο]ν ἰοσ[τ]εφάνων Lobel, πρήσσ[ο]ιμι κέλευθο[ν, | φόρτον ἄγων Μουσέω]ν κόσμ[ο]ν ἰοσ[τ]εφάνων | [εὐαγέων δ' ἀνδρῶν ἐς] ἔδος... W<sup>a</sup>, ἰκο[ί]μην W. 8 εσ[....] εὐαέα P<sup>a</sup>, prob. W., εὐαγ[έ]α West ap. P<sup>a</sup> ἄγαλμα β[ί]ου W. 9 κα[ί κεν] Ἐχεκ[ρατί]δην ξανθότρ[ιχα P<sup>a</sup>, prob. W., post haec τοῖσδε γεραιοῖς W<sup>a</sup> 10 ὄφ[θαλμοῖσιν ἰδ]ῶν W., λάβοι vel λάβοιμ[ι] tent. P<sup>a</sup>, post λάβοιμ[ι] (W.) φίλην vel πάλιν W<sup>a</sup> 11 ἄν[θινον ὄζει P<sup>a</sup>, ὄφρα νέο[ν] χ[α]ρίε[ν]τος ἀπὸ χροῶς ἄν[θ]ος W., post haec ἀεῖη vel ἔλοι με W<sup>a</sup> 12 λείβοι emend. W., βλ[εφάρ]ων W. et P., πόθον P. et W. 13 καί κεν ἐγ[ώ] (ν) P<sup>a</sup>, ἄσπο|ῦδος vel ὁ φρο|ῦδος P<sup>a</sup>, ἐν ἄνθε[ι] vel ἄνθε[σι] (ν) P<sup>a</sup>, καί κεν ἐγ[ώ] μετὰ πα[ι]δὸς ἐν ἄνθε[σιν] ἀβρὰ πάθοιμι W. 14 ἐκπ[ροφυγῶν P<sup>a</sup>, ἐκτ[ὸς] ἐλῶν W. 15 χαίτη[σι]ν W., χαρίε[ν]τα P<sup>a</sup> et W., νεοβλάστ[οῖσιν] ἔλαια P<sup>a</sup>, νεοβλάστ[οῖο] κυπέρου vel -οῖ' ἐλιχρύσου W<sup>a</sup> 16 π[οικίλον] W<sup>a</sup>, πλε[κτὸν] P<sup>a</sup>, πλε[ξάμενος] στέφανον W. 17 μο[λπη]ς)...λιγύν.[ ... οἶμον P<sup>a</sup>, Μο[ύσαις] vel μο[λπαῖς] et post λιγύν π[ροχέοι]μι κεν οἶμον W<sup>a</sup> 18 ἀρτι[επέα] tent. Lobel, prob. W., ἀ[πὸ στόματος] W. 21 εὔπομ[π] W.

While admitting that “the content is very conjectural” (p. 7), Parsons proceeded to offer a tentative overall interpretation of the fragment: the aged Simonides longs to travel across the sea to the Island of the Blest (ll. 1–8), there to see once more the dead Echekratidas – the father of a Thessalian patron of Simonides (see Simon. fr. 528 *PMG*)<sup>5</sup> – (ll. 9 ff.), join him in a symposium, and recover his lost youth (ll. 13 ff.).<sup>6</sup> According to this reconstruction, the whole fragment is about longing for the kind of rejuvenation which could be attained in the Island of the Blest<sup>7</sup>. West saw the fragment from the same perspective (pp. 12–14), but modified Parsons’ interpretation at certain points: the fragment is being

<sup>5</sup> For Echekratidas, see below, p. 4 f.

<sup>6</sup> On the notion of rejuvenation, Parsons is cautious (p. 49): “I have found no evidence that the Blest were rejuvenated; the idea itself seems natural enough, given that conditions in Elysium parallel those of the Golden Age, where old age had no place (M. Davies, *Prom.* 1 (1987) 265ff.: Hes., *Op.* 113f.)”. Mace (p. 241 and n. 54) adduces Ar. *Ran.* 345 (γόνυ πάλλεται γερόντων) as evidence for the concept of rejuvenation (of the blessed dead); the general context of the Aristophanic line quoted suggests this idea (see ll. 346–7 ἀποσείονται δὲ λύπας χρονίου τ' ἐτῶν παλαιῶν ἐνιαυτούς). The fact that Simonides referred in his poetry to a rejuvenation of Jason by Medea (fr. 548 *PMG* Φερεκύδης δὲ καὶ Σιμωνίδης φασὶν ὡς ἢ Μήδεια ἀνεψήσασα τὸν Ἰάσονα νέον ποιήσειε), has little bearing on our issue. For the motif of rejuvenation by skin-sloughing, see Henderson’s comment on *Lys.* 670–1.

<sup>7</sup> The fragment does not explicitly refer, but only, perhaps, alludes, to the Island (or Isles) of the Blest. Although these Isles were imagined to be very fertile (see e.g. Hes. *Op.* 170 ff. καὶ τοῖ μὲν ναίουσιν ... | ἐν μακάρων νήσοισι ... | ὄλβιοι ἥρωες, τοῖσιν μελιθεῖα καρπὸν | τρὶς ἔτεος θάλλοντα φέρει ζεῖδωρος ἄρουρα), other real or utopian islands can have been so (for Utopias in Greek literature, including the Isles of the Blest, see Mace, pp. 236–237 and the bibliography she cites in n. 23). The word εὐαέα in l. 8 is very much to the point in the context of the Isles of the Blest (εὐαέα would perhaps be even more apposite in such a context; see Mace, p. 238: “this feature is particularly pronounced in underworld settings where there is praeternatural illumination ...”); so also is the description of the flowery place where the man is reclining (cf. the parallels that Mace produces, p. 239). For all that, if we accept that Echekratidas, whose name has been reconstructed in our fragment (safely, as far as I can see), is the Thessalian ruler and father of Antiochus, “there is no obvious island on which his hand might be shaken – unless indeed on the Island of the Blest” (Parsons, p. 47). In my view, though Echekratidas could be argued to be a totally different person, not connected with the historical person at all (cf. P. Maas’ view about Ibyc. S151 Davies, that the Polycrates who appears in l. 47 has nothing to do with the famous tyrant of Samos, but is just a young man, homonymous with the tyrant [in *PhW* 42 (1922), col. 578; reported also by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros*, Berlin 1922, p. 511]; thus the aforementioned fragment should be classified in the genre of παιδικὰ or παιδεία), it would be difficult to accept such a coincidence, in view of the existence of this name in the tradition about the life of Simonides (see below); besides, despite W.A. Percy III’s contention that Simonides may have written pederastic verses (*Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece*, Urbana / Chicago 1996, p. 169), it is worth noting that, in contrast to other poets, no ancient testimony about Simonides’ life and oeuvre mentions explicitly that he did so (note that in Apul. *Apol.* 9 Helm, which is not mentioned by Percy, *Cius* may refer to Bacchylides: see Helm’s app. crit., and Snell–Maehler’s app. crit. on Bacchylides’ ἐρωτικά [p. 91]. In Simon. fr. 27. 5 W<sup>2</sup>, the context can only be extremely conjectural; even the reconstruction of line 5, π[α]λῖδ’ ἐρατὸν σ[ ] is questionable.

addressed to Echecratidas' living son Antiochus (or to other members of that noble Thessalian house), and belongs to the 'genre' of *propemptikon* (cf. εὔπομπ[ in line 21)<sup>8</sup>.

As far as I know, there are two other contributions to the interpretation of the fragment in question<sup>9</sup>, those recently made by Richard Hunter and Sarah Mace. Hunter takes as his starting-point Theoc. 7. 61–71, where the αἰπόλος Lycidas sings a *propemptikon* for Ageanax's voyage to Mytilene and describes the rustic festivity which he will hold on Ageanax's safe arrival at the island<sup>10</sup>. As Hunter construes the fragment<sup>11</sup>, there are two alternatives that this may accommodate: "either a wish for X's safe journey to the island and a description of the party X will hold on arrival, followed by the corresponding party which the poet will hold (vv. 13ff.); or a wish for X's safe journey to the island (vv. 1–8), followed by the celebratory party which the poet will hold (vv. 9ff.)"<sup>12</sup>. Thus, according to Hunter, the poetic persona refers to a journey that is going to be undertaken by another person, and imagines the party (or rather the two parties) that will be held in the future.

In his *editio princeps*, Parsons considered three possibilities for the nature of the journey described in the fragment: it "might be (a) real; (b) escapist, on the pattern of Eur. *Hipp.* 732 ff., where the chorus long to fly away to the Island of the Hesperides; (c) post mortem, as Posidippus SH 705. 22" (p. 46). While the first possibility is argued for by Hunter, the second one is further explored in a detailed study by Mace. She sees in lines 7ff. a description of a utopian landscape, which the poetic persona wishes to reach in order to consort with a male companion, who is the object of his admiration and desire. In Mace's view, the fragment is unique in its fusion of utopian and erotic themes: the speaker expresses his imaginary wish to travel to an idyllic island, where he will be rejuvenated<sup>13</sup>, and attain physical contact with the young Echecratidas. But she also suggests that the Echecratidas of fr. 22 W<sup>2</sup> cannot be identified with the father of Antiochus, but with a hypothetical Echecratidas, son of Antiochus, who was named so after his grandfather<sup>14</sup>; the fragment is thus an erotic encomium of Echecratidas' desirability, and its occasion was possibly one of those private gatherings at which erotic and encomiastic poetry was frequently recited and sung<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> According to West, the frame of the Elysian visit is a voyage to be undertaken by Antiochus: "from wishing his noble Thessalian patron godspeed, Simonides turned aside for a few moments to describe the voyage he personally would like to make . . ." (p. 13).

<sup>9</sup> There is also a concise review of the scholarship written so far (January 1997) on this fragment, with further suggestive remarks, by Ian Rutherford ("The New Simonides: Towards a Commentary", *Arethusa* 29 (1996), pp. 190–192).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. also his *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*, Cambridge 1996, p. 26.

<sup>11</sup> Among others, the following two textual suggestions are put forward: ἰκο[ίμην in l. 7 to be changed into ἴκο[ιτο, and, perhaps (p. 14, n. 11), λάβοιμι in l. 10 into λάβοι μ[.

<sup>12</sup> It seems that Hunter's interpretation may not take fully into consideration ll. 9–12, where, according to himself, some kind of amorous colouring occurs (see p. 14, n. 12 of his article); it is not clear how X, as soon as he reaches the island of his destination, is involved in "amatory" handholding (λάβοι in l. 10) with a male figure called, perhaps, Echecratidas (or, alternatively, how the poet, as his party starts, leads off (λάβοιμι in l. 10) with the expression of his love interest in that lad), unless we assume that the fragment is a kind of *propemptikon* for Echecratidas who is away, and whom the poetic 'I' is waiting for to come to his island.

<sup>13</sup> If l. 14 in any way supports the theory of rejuvenation (see n. 6 above, and p. 8 below), then, in addition to those supplements proposed by Parsons and West, see Koenen's ἐκ π[άλι δύς or ἐκ τ[ότε δύς (in Mace, p. 241 and n. 53); I would be inclined to propose ἐκ τ[ανύσας, which would also fit that context (cf. *AP* 11. 408. 2 οὐδὲ παρειάων ἐκτανύσεις ῥυτίδας, which is a striking parallel).

<sup>14</sup> Although Mace's argument that the island mentioned in l. 8 could be a utopian locale is possible, it forces her to suppose that the poetic persona wishes to have an "erotic" encounter with a young Echecratidas (the known Echecratidas, the father of Antiochus, would have been elderly during Simonides' sojourn in Thessaly [see n. 27]), and hence leads to the "creation" of an entirely new Echecratidas (for whose existence there is no evidence), the grandson of the known Echecratidas. I should mention that, although it has been suggested that the Echecratidas mentioned by Thuc. 1. 111. 1, king of the Thessalians and father of Orestes (whom the Athenians tried to restore from exile in 457 BC), could be the grandson of Echecratidas, the father of Antiochus (see Molyneux, p. 127, and n. 78), this link is not confirmed by any evidence either.

<sup>15</sup> I.e., "a party hosted by Antiochus (father of the honorand) with Echecratidas himself present in the company of family members and a circle of intimates to appreciate the compliment" (Mace, p. 247).

In what follows, I suggest a new line of interpretation of this fragmentary text. Yet, despite the fact that the proposed reconstruction provides a probable occasional and performative context and takes into account some indirectly attested evidence about Simonides' songs of mourning, it should be considered tentative, given the state of the papyrus.

What is the evidence that in fr. 22 W<sup>2</sup> the person speaking is male? As far as I can see, none. The poetic persona could well be that of a young or an old man, but could just as plausibly be a *woman*. As long as we do not have any supplementary papyrus scrap of the same fragment which would provide traces for the gender of the poetic 'I', we cannot be certain in this respect<sup>16</sup>. Is there any textual evidence which could lead us to a tentative identification of the person speaking? Parsons supplements line 9 as follows: κα[ί κεν] Ἐχεκ[ρατί]δην. However conjectural this may be, it is indeed very difficult to think of another supplement which would fit both the space in the papyrus, and the internal structure of the line in general; besides, the name 'Echecratidas' is somehow connected with the literary life of Simonides. According to the Schol. Theoc. 16. 34–35 Wendel (= Simon. fr. 528 *PMG*), ὁ ... Ἀντίοχος Ἐχεκρατίδου καὶ Δυσήριδος υἱὸς ἦν, ὡς φησι Σιμωνίδης. The name of Echecratidas' wife, Dyseris<sup>17</sup>, possibly<sup>18</sup> appears again in an epigram from the Palatine Anthology (6. 136) attributed to Anacreon. But, most importantly, Aelius Aristides, shortly after 161 A.D.<sup>19</sup>, in the proem of an oration he delivered to honour the death of one of his pupils (31. 2 Keil = Simon. fr. 528 *PMG*), juxtaposes Dyseris' name with that of Simonides<sup>20</sup>, and stresses the great grief she felt over her dead Antiochus: ποῖος ταῦτα Σιμωνίδης θρηνήσει, [...] ποῖα δὲ Δύσηρις Θεεταλὴ τοσοῦτο πένθος ἐπένησεν ἐπ' Ἀντιόχῳ τελευτήσαντι; And we know from another scholion on Theocritus (16. 44 Wendel = Simon. fr. 529 *PMG*) that Simonides τοῖς προειρημένοις ἐνδόξοις ἀνδράσι τῶν Θεσσαλῶν [sc. Antiochus, Aleuas, and the Scopadai<sup>21</sup>] ἐπινικίους ἔγραψε καὶ θρήνους.

From several testimonies about Simonides, it appears that for a long time after his death he was widely renowned for his threnodic poetry. Catullus begs for a little word of comfort "more lugubrious than the tears of Simonides" (38. 8), reflecting the celebrity of Simonides' threnodic poetry in antiquity (see also Hor. *Carm.* 2. 1. 37–38). Moreover, Quintilian (10. 1. 64) speaks about Simonides' *praecipua* ... *virtus*, that "lies in the power to excite pity, so much so that some prefer him in this respect to all writers of the genre<sup>22</sup>" (cf. Dion. Hal. *Imit.* 6. 205 U.–R.).

<sup>16</sup> There is no way either to confirm or reject the hypothesis that our fragment constitutes part of a long piece, whose beginning might have been fr. 21 W<sup>2</sup>, so that the general idea which permeated the whole song could, in broad outline, be: "I can never be a cautious wallflower. Even now, in old age, I long for love and wine. Hasten the day, when I recover my youth in the symposium of the Blest" (Parsons, p. 49; cf. p. 7 of his edition). For an estimation of the number of lines that stood between Simon. fr. 22 W<sup>2</sup> and fr. 21 W<sup>2</sup>, see the references in Mace, p. 234, n. 5.

<sup>17</sup> We know almost nothing about her; for Dyseris' doubtful identification with the sister of the Thessalian noble Scopas (famous mainly from Simonides' songs about the whole family of the Scopadai), and, consequently, the identification of Antiochus with the son of Scopas' sister who was one of the victims in the mass destruction of the Scopadai (in a collapse of a banqueting hall; Simon. fr. 510 and 521 *PMG*), see Molyneux, p. 125–126. There is some evidence for a probable relation between the Scopadai and the Echecratidai (through marriage?): see Molyneux, pp. 122, 128–129 and 134ff.).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Molyneux, p. 127.

<sup>19</sup> See C. A. Behr, *P. Aelius Aristides. The Complete Works*, vol. II. orat. XVII–LIII, Leiden 1981, p. 393 (notes to XXXI).

<sup>20</sup> Aelius Aristides also mentions – in the same context – Pindar and, perhaps, Stesichorus (see Keil's app. crit.: "τίς χορὸς] Στησίχορος ci. Taylor ad Lysiam p. 686; Stesichorum naenias (θρήνους) non composuisse monet Wil.") as examples of poets famous for their *threnoi* (for Stesichorus' laments see M. Cannatà Fera, *Pindarus. Threnorum Fragmenta*, Rome 1990, pp. 17–18). However, it should be stressed that there is no evidence for Pindar's (let alone Stesichorus') connection with the Echecratidai, nor, moreover, that he wrote laments for any of them. As a consequence, Gow's comment on Theoc. 16. 34–39 ("the inference that his death was the subject of a θρήνος by Simonides or Pindar is plausible") appears inaccurate.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Molyneux, pp. 118, and 121 and n. 27.

<sup>22</sup> The translation is by D. A. Campbell (*Greek Lyric, III*, Cambridge, Mass./London 1991, test. 41). On the "pathetic" style of Simonides' poetry, see Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 2.1.38, and P. A. Rosenmeyer, "Simonides' Danae Fragment Reconsidered", *Arethusa* 24 (1991), pp. 5–6.

Who is the speaker in our fragment? I am inclined to believe that, in view of the tradition that Simonides composed a *threnos* for Dyseris' son Antiochus, and since the Cean poet was well known for his threnodic poetry, the text preserved in P.Oxy. 2327 (fr. 2(a) col. ii+2(b)+3+4) and 3965 (fr. 27) may be part of a song sung by a woman<sup>23</sup> (or by another performer on her behalf<sup>24</sup>); thus, our fragment, which refers to one's desire to undertake a (apparently imaginary) journey in order to reach Echekratidas on an island not anyhow connected with his historical background, may, with some plausibility, be a threnodic piece sung by Dyseris<sup>25</sup> – not, as far as its fragmentary nature allows to see, for her son Antiochus<sup>26</sup>, but for her husband Echekratidas, as Parsons' likely supplement Ἐχεκ[ρατί]δην in l. 9 suggests<sup>27</sup>. The relationships between the poet and the family of his patron Antiochus (i.e. the Echekratidai) are adequately attested<sup>28</sup>, and the hypothesis of a threnodic song composed by Simonides for the wife of Echekratidas seems a tempting one to follow. It is true that the song of mourning that tradition attributes to Dyseris was delivered for her son Antiochus, and not for her husband Echekratidas, and this fact may create some resistance to the idea put forward above. However, we should perhaps allow that our fragment may have been a threnodic song delivered for Antiochus, the son, and that it may also have contained references to his dead father; in that case, Dyseris, in the song about the loss of her son, expresses her desire to see Echekratidas, and, arguably, her wish that

<sup>23</sup> For other examples of a female voice as the poetic persona in male poetry, see Alc. fr. 10 V., Thgn. 257–260, 579–582, 861–864 W., and, perhaps, Anacr. fr. 385 PMG.

<sup>24</sup> My suggestion that this fragment is a threnodic song delivered by a woman refers only to the gender of the poetic 'I' in the fragment, and by no means excludes the equally possible case of this composition being performed by a professional mourner (either male or female), or by Simonides himself. For the nature and function of *mimesis* in the context of the performance of archaic Greek poetry (with much illuminating comparative material from other cultural traditions), see the recent book by G. Nagy, *Poetry as Performance. Homer and Beyond*, Cambridge 1996, ch. 1–4 ["Mimesis and the making of identity in poetic performance"].

<sup>25</sup> See n. 24 above. That the singing of lament is mostly – but not exclusively – intended to be performed by women is evident not only in Greek tradition, but also in most traditions the world over. See, highly selectively, W. Cavanagh and C. Mee, "Mourning before and after the Dark Age", in *Klados. Essays in honour of J.N. Coldstream*, ed. C. Morris, London 1995, pp. 46–47; G. Ahlberg, *Prothesis and Ekphora in Greek Geometric Art*, Göteborg 1971, mainly pp. 77–83; Alexiou *passim* and p. 212, n. 107; D.C. Kurtz, "Vases for the Dead, an Attic Selection, 750–400 B.C.", in *Ancient Greek and Related Pottery*, ed. H.A.G. Brijder, Amsterdam 1984, pp. 315–318, 321–328; H.A. Shapiro, "The Iconography of Mourning in Athenian Art", *AJA* 95 (1991), pp. 634–637, 646–647, 650–651; N.C. Seremetakis, *The Last Word: Women, Death and Divination in Inner Mani*, Chicago 1991 (an important ethnography on the subject); R. Finnegan, *Oral Literature in Africa*, Oxford 1970 [Nairobi 1976] pp. 147–166; R. Huntington and P. Metcalf, *Celebrations of Death. The Anthropology of Mortuary Ritual*, Cambridge 1991, p. 54–55; A. Knudsen, "Men Killed for Women's Songs", *Culture and History* 3 (1988), pp. 79–97; G. Kligman, *The Wedding of the Dead. Ritual, Poetics, and Popular Culture in Transylvania*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1988, pp. 153–155 and 150–214 *passim*; E.L. Johnson, "Grieving for the Dead, Grieving for the Living: Funeral Laments of Hakka Women", in J.L. Watson and E.S. Rawski (eds.), *Death Ritual in Late Imperial and Modern China*, Berkeley/Los Angeles 1988, pp. 135–162. For "male tears" in Greek archaic and classical literature, see C. Segal, *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow. Art, Gender, and Commemoration in Alcestis, Hippolytus and Hecuba*, Durham, NC/London 1993, pp. 63–67 and bibliography cited at the endnotes of p. 248.

<sup>26</sup> But, see n. 29 below.

<sup>27</sup> The evidence for the history of Thessaly of the sixth and fifth centuries is very meagre, and historians usually confine themselves to assumptions and conjectures (see, apart from the bibliography cited by Molyneux in ch. 6 of his book, *CAH*<sup>2</sup> vol. 3, part 3, pp. 294ff., P. Carlier, *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*, Strasbourg 1984, pp. 412–417, S. Hornblower, *The Greek World 479–323 BC*, revised ed., London/New York 1991, pp. 80–81, and B. Helly, *L'État thessalien. Aleuas le Roux, les tétrades et les tagoi*, Lyon 1995, pp. 104–107 [on the Echekratidai]). For an approximate dating of Simonides' Thessalian period, with a discussion of the most important earlier views, see Molyneux, pp. 132–138 (for his view on L.A. Stella's revised dating of Simonides [c. 532–450, in contrast to the traditional dating c. 556–468], see *passim*, but especially pp. 339–345). After scrutinizing all the existing evidence about Antiochus' *tageia*, Molyneux argues that "[Antiochus'] whole period of office must be placed somewhere between 510 and 498" (p. 135). In default of sufficient evidence for most of the Thessalian rulers, it would be venturesome and, perhaps, pointless to give here an approximate date for Echekratidas' death (note, however, that if this song is in fact addressed to Antiochus [see below, pp. 5–6], his death can be placed around 500 BC).

<sup>28</sup> See also Molyneux, pp. 127–129. For Simonides' connections with other Thessalian patrons, see Molyneux, ch. 6, pp. 117–145, who discusses much of the previous bibliography.

Antiochus have a safe journey to that εὐσεβῶν χώρον (Pi. fr. 129 Maehler) and join his father<sup>29</sup>. Here I give a reconstructed form of the text under consideration. There follow brief notes mainly on the adopted *exempli gratia* supplements which are different from those supplied by West in *IEG*<sup>2</sup> (and/or Parsons), and on some difficulties that arise from West's text; at the end, I consider some interesting implications which ensue from construing the fragment in the manner proposed here. It should be stated that my main aim is not to provide the reader with a different text for Simon. fr. 22 W<sup>2</sup>, but rather to offer a new approach towards the understanding of this fraction of song.

]..οιο θαλάσσης  
 ]ρουσα πόρον·  
 ]μενος ἔνθα περανα[  
 ]  
 ]οιμι κέλευθο[ 5  
 ]ν κόσμ[ο]ν ἰο[στ]εφάνων  
 ] ἔδος πολύδενδρον ἰκο[ίμην  
 εσ[....]εὐαέα<sup>30</sup> νῆσον, ἄγαλμα β[<sup>31</sup>  
 κα[ί κεν] Ἐχεκ[ρατί]δην ξανθότρ[ιχα κείνον ἰδοῦσα  
 ὀφ[θαλμοῖσι φίλ]ον χεῖρα λάβοιμ[ι πάλιν 10  
 οφρα.ε.[.] χ[αρίε]ντος ἀπὸ χροδς αν[  
 λείβει δ' ἐκ βλ[εφάρ]ων ἱμερόεντα [ .  
 καί κεν ἐπ[-<sup>ῶ</sup>]υδος ἐν ἄνθε[σι(ν) ἠδέσιν εἴη  
 κεκλιμένος λευκῶς<sup>32</sup> φαρκίδας ἐκ.[  
 χαίτη[ισι]ν χαρίε[ντ]α νεοβλάστ[ 15  
 .[ ] εὐανθέα πλε[ξάμενος στέφανον·  
 μο[.....] δ' ἱμερόεντα λιγὺν .[  
 ἄρτι[επέα] νωμῶν γλῶσσαν α[  
 [ ] 20  
 τῶνδε .[  
 εὐπομπ[

2–3 The ending -ρουσα, which West takes to refer to a ship (see his app. crit. “navis? fort. φέ]ρουσα”), might instead lend support to the proposed presence of a woman's voice in the fragment (and constitute the only textual reference to her?). However, note that the following word could be either πόρον or ἄπορον (the latter, perhaps, would reflect the obstacles that one would encounter in finding a way to meet the deceased man, an idea that would be at home in a threnodic song). As ]μενος ἔνθα περανα[ stands in 1.3, it could be reconstructed in many different ways; a likely restoration seems

<sup>29</sup> It remains an open question whether l. 12 could be exclusively taken as alluding to a conjugal relationship. If λείβει δ' ἐκ βλ[εφάρων] ἱμερόεντα[ could be used to express affectionate, not sensual, feelings, and φαρκίδας in l. 14 was governed by a verb (or a verbal expression) meaning “to avoid” (i.e. “X, dying in his youth, avoided seeing wrinkles on his face, that is, he did not experience that sign of ageing”), then the reconstructed threnodic song could refer to the deceased Antiochus only (Echecratides might be a patronymic), and be identified with the song of mourning to which Aristeides alludes. I owe much of this idea to Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood. Additionally, Gregory Nagy has drawn my attention to the information given by D. Roussel, that the name ‘Alcmeonides’ was both a personal name and a patronymic (*Tribu et cité. Études sur les groupes sociaux dans les cités grecques aux époques archaïque et classique*, Paris 1976, p. 62). To my mind, this is an attractive possibility, but, in what follows, I constantly use the name ‘Echecratidas’ as referring to the husband of Dyseris, in order to avoid confusion, and, thus, I consider only the alternative view that Echecratidas might here be evoked in the context of Dyseris' mourning for Antiochus.

<sup>30</sup> εὐαγ[έ]α also is possible (see n. 7, and comment on l. 8 below).

<sup>31</sup> Or κ[.] .

<sup>32</sup> Or λευκ[ο]ίς, cf. Parsons, p. 48, Hunter, p. 13, and Mace, pp. 241–242.

hardly possible, since the semantic function of ἔνθα is here vague, and ]μενος might even constitute the last part of the genitive of a noun.

5 Tentatively, I consider that here the reconstructed female voice is posing a “rhetorical” question, such as πῶς κεν ῥηϊδίην τάχα νῦν εὔρ]οιμι κέλευθο[v<sup>33</sup>, expressing her grief. This kind of question is very often found in ritual laments (Alexiou, pp. 161–165)<sup>34</sup>. Besides, such a construction might justify the use of the potential optative, since this mood can denote wish, after the interrogative πῶς or τίς (especially in tragedy, see Kühner–Gerth, I, p. 235). All the same, it should be pointed out that in all other cases in the fragment where a potential optative is used, the notion of “wish” is not obligatory, since one might suggest that the whole fragment in a way constitutes the apodosis of an implied conditional clause that may have been expressed in some form earlier in the poem (for example, εἰ+opt. – ἄν+opt., “remote future”): that is to say, that there could possibly be a sentence like “If I were to manage to reach him in the place he has now gone, I would [...]”, mainly followed by images of, and thoughts about, an imaginary trip to that island (the mood arguably remaining the same in the narrative that follows).

8 I adopt Parsons’ emendation of εὐαγ[.]α into εὐάξα (see, however, M.W. Haslam [*BMCR* 4 (1993), p. 135]: “I do not see why εὐαγάα should not stand”).

9–10 I have changed West’s [ιδ]ῶν (l. 10) into [... ἰδοῦσα] (l. 9). The ῥφ[θαλμοῖσι] in l. 10 seems almost certain. Dr Revel Coles confirms that the traces after omicron in P.Oxy.2327, fr. 2(a) col.ii.3 support the decipherment of a dotted phi. For the ending -ον in φίλ]ον, see Parsons, *ibid.*: “[]ον or ]ῶν”. West’s tentative πάλιν after λάβοιμ[ι (μ is the best candidate here) may not raise any important objections.

11–12 The decipherment of the beginning of l. 11 is uncertain. ὄφρα or ὄφρ’ α-? Or neither of these (see Parsons, p. 47 “φρ likely, although only their feet remain”)? νέϛ[v] is a mere conjecture (“after α, ‘parts of uprights suggesting ν or π’, then perhaps the base and the end of the cross-bar of ε, but I do not think other rounded letters excluded, then to the right of a damaged patch a trace in the form of a small λ, ‘prima facie χ’”, Parsons, *loc.cit.*). Even χ[αρίε]ντος may be considered somewhat doubtful (in view of χαρίε[ντ]α in l. 15?, cf. however ἡμερόεντα in ll. 12 and 17). The construction and the general meaning of ll. 11–12 are also vague (note that P.Oxy. 2327 fr. 2(a) col. ii provides the variant reading λείπει for the beginning of the line). West’s emendation λείβοι in l. 12 is not supported by anything in the text (why not λείβη?). A conjectural supplement such as ἄν[θος] is taken as the subject of l. 11, but in l. 12 the subject changes abruptly (West translates: “so that his lovely skin’s young bloom [should breathe on me], | and he’d distil sweet longing from his eyes” [*Greek Lyric Poetry*, Oxford 1993, p. 171]. Apart from this retrospective transition, which may not be unparalleled<sup>35</sup>, it should be noted that the epithet ἡμερόεις<sup>36</sup> could here allude to the feelings of longing that the dead would reciprocate to the loved *persona loquens* who imaginarily visits him.

13 ἐν ἄνθε[σι(ν) ἡδέσιν εἴη replaces West’s ἐν ἄνθε[σιν ἄβρὰ πάθοιμι (for ἄνθεσι(ν) ἡδέσιν cf. *Cypr.* fr. 4. 4–5 Bernabé = Davies [note that Bernabé differs from Davies in the punctuation of these two lines]). The letter after KAIKENE can be either Π or Γ (ἔπ[ειτα]?, which occurs in early elegiac and

<sup>33</sup> Cf. ῥηϊδίη (sc. οἶμος) in Hes. *Op.* 292.

<sup>34</sup> Such a threnodic ἀναφώνησις seems to have occurred in a poem by Simonides himself, some phrases of which have been preserved in a commentary on Simonides edited by E. Lobel (P.Oxy. XXV 2434 fr. 1(a) + (b) + 2 = Simon. fr. 608. 1(a) + (b) + 2 *PMG*): see l. 28 τίς ἄμφατις ἔσται (and cf. l. 17 in both Page’s and Campbell’s edition [*Greek Lyric III*, Cambridge, Mass./London 1991]).

<sup>35</sup> It seems so me that West’s reconstruction here presupposes that either such an abrupt change of subject is acceptable, or that there is a synecdochic relation between ἀπὸ χροῶς ἄν[θος] and Echekratidas. But could we postulate – or adhere to – either of these ideas in restoring the fragmentary lines 11–12?

<sup>36</sup> For ἡμερόεις in lamentatory context, see, e.g., the Homeric πᾶσιν δ’ ἡμερόεις ὑπέδν γόος (*Od.* 10. 398), and [Moschus]’ *Megara*: ... τὰ δὲ οἱ θαλερώτερα δάκρυα μῆλων | κόλπων ἐς ἡμερόεντα κατὰ βλεφάρων ἐχέοντο | μνησαμένη τέκνων τε καὶ ὧν μετέπειτα τοκήων (4. 56–58).

iambic poetry). Generally, it is hard to fill in the gaps of the line and, especially, to find a supplement for ἰϋδος (see Parsons, p. 48, for his attractive suggestion ὁ φροῦδος, which would fit a threnodic context). West's μετὰ πα]ιδός seems improbable, mainly in view of the unexpected difficulties it creates for the general meaning of the line (see the interpretation offered by West, p. 13: “μετὰ πα]ιδός: Echekratidas? Perhaps rather an unspecified couching-companion”, and cf. the objections raised by Hunter, p. 14, n. 12, Haslam [*BMCR* 4 (1993), loc. cit., and Mace, p. 245). Moreover, as far as the traces in both papyrus fragments (P.Oxy. 2327 fr. 4. 6 and 3965 fr. 27. 8) are concerned, I find it very difficult to read iota before ΔOC (cf. Parsons, p. 45: “rather flattened top and stem of upsilon”).

14 A difficult line, since its end, which could help us to understand the exact function of φαρκίδας, is lost. For the poor “literary” attestation of that word, see Parsons, pp. 45–46. Note that φ is not entirely certain: in P.Oxy. 2327 fr. 4. 7 the trace of the top of the upright could not exclude a letter such as ψ (in 3965 fr. 27. 9 there is only a “short horizontal trace at mid-level” [Parsons, p. 45]). Hunter speculates that φαρκίδας may not mean “wrinkles”, but rather be an unattested word “for food of some kind” (p. 13). Nevertheless, if the appropriate meaning of φαρκίδας is “wrinkles” here, then it might in context mean that the man [is sloughing off or covering?] his wrinkles by weaving and wearing wreaths over his head<sup>37</sup>. After ἐκ.[ all is uncertain.

20–21 Does εὔπομπ[ suggest a wish that the dead man may have a safe journey to his new home in the afterlife? Be that as it may, it is not easy to decide whether these two lines, which have been preserved in a detached fragment (= P.Oxy. 2327 fr. 2(b)) that Lobel joined with P.Oxy. 2327 fr. 2(a) col. ii on the basis of the fibres, belong to that fragment (see Parsons' warning, p. 48).

If fr. 22 W<sup>2</sup> is a part of a threnodic song<sup>38</sup> delivered by a woman (or possibly a professional mourner<sup>39</sup>), then the proposed reconstruction may be an approximation to the truth. Among the analogies in motifs and expression that this fragment could have with songs of mourning preserved in Greek literature and beyond<sup>40</sup>, the general theme of the longing that a living person feels to see and even touch a dead loved one seems the most striking one to be discussed here. This thematic motif seems to occur first in Homer (*Il.* 23. 62ff.): Achilles meets his loved friend Patroclus *in his dream*, and the first thought that comes to his mind is to embrace him (97ff.)<sup>41</sup>. In the *Odyssey* (20. 61–65, 79–81), Penelope's wish to die to see Odysseus in the afterworld is most telling: Ἄρτεμι ... αἴθε μοι ἦδη | ἰὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι βαλοῦσ' ἐκ θυμὸν ἔλοιο | αὐτίκα νῦν, ἢ ἔπειτά μ' ἀναρπάξασα θύελλα | οἴχοιτο προφέρουσα κατ' ἠερόεντα κέλευθα, | ἐν προχοῆς δὲ βάλοι ἀψορροῦ Ὀκεανοῖο. | [...] ὥς ἔμ' αἰστώσειαν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες, | ἢ ἐμ' εὔπλοκαμος βάλοι Ἄρτεμις, ὄφρ' Ὀδυσῆα | ὄσσομένη καὶ γαῖαν ὑπο στυγερῆν ἀφικοίμην<sup>42</sup>. In Greek tragedy the motif occurs with some further ramifications. In Euripides' *Alcestis*,

<sup>37</sup> In such a case, the supplements considered in n. 13 would turn out to be unimaginative.

<sup>38</sup> This also suggests an established context of performance.

<sup>39</sup> See, further, n. 24 above.

<sup>40</sup> One of them is the woman's reference to the hands of the dead; cf. e.g. Eur. *Tr.* 1178f., where Hecuba mourns over the dead body of Astyanax.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. the remarks of M.W. Edwards (“The Conventions of a Homeric Funeral”, in *Studies in Honour of T.B.L. Webster* I, ed. J.H. Betts et al., Bristol 1986) on the purpose of the episode of Patroclus' ghost in Book 23 of the *Iliad*: “Perhaps present in his [sc. the poet's] mind (at least subconsciously) are the themes of fruitless reunion with a loved one after death (cf. Anticleia, Elpenor), the prediction to a living man of his own death [...], and perhaps even the hero's visit to the underworld to reclaim a lost friend (Heracles, Theseus, Orpheus, Gilgamesh)” (p. 91, n. 18).

<sup>42</sup> In my view, there is no compelling reason why ὄσσομένη in l. 81 should not be taken literally in this context. Following LSJ<sup>9</sup>, J. Russo (among others) is inclined to take its meaning as equivalent to that of ὄσσομενος ... ἐνὶ φρεσί, used of Telemachus (in a very different context) at *Od.* 1. 115; according to Russo, “Penelope wishes to die with an image of Odysseus in her mind's eye” (*A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. III: Books XVII–XXIV, Oxford 1992, p. 113). However, in an earlier insightful article, Russo himself has construed *Il.* 80–81 as follows: “... her fervent wish to be dead so she can meet Odysseus under earth” (“Interview and aftermath: Dream, fantasy, and intuition in *Odyssey* 19 and 20”, *AJPh* 103 (1982), p. 7, n. 9). It seems questionable whether the former meaning should be opted for here, all the more since the

after the burial of Alcestis, Admetus and the Chorus sing a lament on their way back home. ζηλῶ φθιμένους, Admetus declares, κείνων ἔραμαι, | κείν' ἐπιθυμῶ δώματα ναίειν (Il. 866–867), and after the reiteration of many cries of grief by Admetus in the first strophe, the Chorus concludes: τὸ μήποτ' εἰσιδεῖν φιλίας ἀλόχου | πρόσωπον σ' ἔσαντα λυπρόν (Il. 876–877)<sup>43</sup>. Finally, in the first antistrophe he exclaims: τί μ' ἐκόλυσας ῥῖψαι τύμβου | τάφρον ἐς κοίλην καὶ μετ' ἐκείνης | τῆς μέγ' ἀρίστης κεῖσθαι φθιμένον; (Il. 897–899). This extreme longing to be united with the dead reappears in Euripides' *Supplices*, where Evadne leaps into the flaming tomb of her husband Kapaneus<sup>44</sup>. Generally, the few examples given here for the aforementioned motif, while by no means representative of the number of cases where this occurs, are probably enough to provide a literary context within which our fragment could be considered.

According to the reconstruction proposed here, the woman who may constitute the 'I' in our fragment expresses her wish to travel across the sea<sup>45</sup>, and her longing to meet her dead husband<sup>46</sup> [again], even in the afterlife, which is imagined as a fertile and beautiful island, perhaps the Island of the Blest or Elysium (Parsons, p. 49)<sup>47</sup>. Possibly in the context of her mourning for Antiochus<sup>48</sup>, she describes an imaginary visit there, her encounter with handsome Echekratidas, his possible involvement in a banqueting scene. There is perhaps some reason to believe that this woman may be identified with Dyseris, the wife of the Thessalian ruler Echekratidas, since, according to the testimony quoted above, she delivered a lament, composed by Simonides, on the death of her son Antiochus; the connections of Simonides with several ruling families in Thessaly are adequately attested<sup>49</sup>, and indeed he is known to have composed laments for some of them (see Schol. Theoc. 16. 44 quoted above). Finally, as regards the “symposiastic” scene in the afterworld, two main observations will suffice: a) nowhere in the fragment is there any indication that what is described in ll. 13ff. should be identified with a proper (archaic or classical) male symposion: it would be safer if we took it as an imaginary banqueting scene. b) Even if the fragment referred to a proper symposion in the underworld, this would not be unparalleled: banquet scenes in afterlife<sup>50</sup> are frequently depicted on the so-called *Totenmahl* reliefs<sup>51</sup>.

---

participle is dependent on a verb of motion (ἀφικοίμην), and can, therefore, be viewed as assuming the function of a final participle; cf., e.g., Eur. *Supp.* 120 τοῦτους θανόντας ἦλθον ἔξαιτῶν πόλιν, and Collard's comment on Eur. *Supp.* 63–64.

<sup>43</sup> Note that σ' ἔσαντα in l. 877 is an emendation by Wilamowitz (the MSS have ἄντα).

<sup>44</sup> See also Euripides' *Protesilaos*, where Laodameia makes a statue of her dead husband Protesilaos and hides it into her room, but when her father Akastos finds out the truth and orders the statue to be burnt, she throws herself into the blaze (see further T.B.L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides*, London 1967, pp. 97–98).

<sup>45</sup> For a detailed analysis of the first six lines of the fragment, see Mace, pp. 234–236. Mace suggests that in ll. 1–4 the speaker refers to a paradigmatic voyage undertaken most probably by a hero, who, according to the tradition, “was translated to an idyllic existence after death” (e.g. Menelaus, Achilles, Peleus, etc.) (Mace, p. 235). Mace's proposal depends on her remark that κέλευθος ... could be indefinite (‘a journey’) and, thus, initiate a new phase of the discourse” (p. 235; cf. also West, p. 13, who suspects that ll. 1–3 “are not part of the Elysian visit – Simonides will hardly have spent seven lines getting from his embarkation to the mention of his destination – but of its frame: a voyage to be undertaken by Antiochus, or whoever the poem was addressed to”). Since this part of the fragment is highly fragmentary, any argument which could be advanced about it is destined to be mere conjecture. In my view, we should take ll. 1–6 as simply referring to the speaker's imaginary journey (in this context, ἰο[στ]εφάνων probably refers to the Nereids (or the Oceanid Nymphs) [“the sea, the glory of the Nereids”, Parsons, p. 45]; the meaning then would be “... through the glory of the Nereids (their dwelling) I would arrive at an abode rich in trees, that airy island ...” [?]).

<sup>46</sup> However, cf. p. 6, n. 29 above.

<sup>47</sup> For a concise history of Elysium and the Isles of the Blest (including the White Island), with further bibliography, see the forthcoming entry *Elysion* in *Der Neue Pauly* by C. Sourvinou-Inwood; see also her ‘Reading’ *Greek Death: To the End of the Classical Period*, Oxford 1995, pp. 32–56.

<sup>48</sup> See pp. 5–6.

<sup>49</sup> See n. 28 above.

<sup>50</sup> For some “symposiastic” scenes in blessed underworld settings, see Mace, p. 239.

<sup>51</sup> See, generally, H. von Fritze, “Zu den griechischen Totenmahlreliefs”, *AM* 21 (1896), pp. 347–366, R. Thönges-Stringaris, “Das griechische Totenmahl”, *AM* 80 (1965), pp. 1–99, J.-M. Dentzer, *Le Motif du banquet couché dans le Proche-Orient et le monde grec du VII<sup>ème</sup> au IV<sup>ème</sup> siècle avant J.-C.*, Paris 1982, pp. 11–13 and ch. vii, R. Garland, *The*

The male “symposiasts” recline on their *kline*, while their female consorts sit beside them or stand<sup>52</sup>. In the νεκρόδειπνα (or *Totenmahle*) the *kline* is presented more as a symposion couch (and not as a deathbed)<sup>53</sup>. A man who is possibly a hero is shown feasting<sup>54</sup>; and even a cupbearer may appear<sup>55</sup>. Although it has been suggested that these reliefs depict the ordinary dead, it is more likely that they are heroes: in this case, the image of the symposion could articulate the notion of heroization, an image of the hero, and thus function as an image of blessed afterlife. To conclude, there is nothing unlikely in the banqueting scene described in our fragment being metaphorically accommodated in a lament. This image is in accordance with the more general consolatory theme of a blessed afterlife which would be expected to occur in the genre of threnodic poetry<sup>56</sup>.

What are the main corollaries if Simon. fr. 22 W<sup>2</sup> is indeed a threnodic song? For a start, it is the very first example of a rather personal threnodic poem composed by Simonides<sup>57</sup>. The context of our poem possibly differs from that of the fragmentary laments generally attributed to the poet (fr. 520–525 PMG)<sup>58</sup>. Certainly, in this fragment there is no ecstatic manifestation of grief, such as that found in laments in Greek tragedy, but the fragment seems also to be devoid of the reflective, consolatory and gnomic mood which characterises Pindar’s *threnoi*<sup>59</sup>. It is a refined and restrained song of mourning, though perhaps indicative of that passion for which Simonides’ threnodic songs were famous in antiquity. The reconstructed female ‘I’ arguably longs to meet Echecratidas in the afterworld, see his hair, touch his hand – in general, show him her feelings thus provoking his mutual emotions<sup>60</sup>. She probably likes to know that her dear Echecratidas does not feel grieved in the afterworld, that he entertains himself by reclining, weaving wreaths, and singing. So far as the fragment permits us to see, she is not dwelling on recollections of the past, but rather pondering the nature of the island where the man is now living. In her threnodic song she transforms her wish to an imaginary reality, and carefully draws, with her song, pictures of fantasy which appear true.

Second, the song reconstructed above has been composed in elegiac metre. This may support the existence of a genre of threnodic elegy: the ἔλεγχος in the meaning “sung lament” that the ancients attributed to it may now be more closely associated with the elegiac metre, since the proposed reconstruction suggests that around the end of the sixth or the beginning of the fifth century, if not earlier, threnodic songs were composed in this metre. Furthermore, Pausanias’ testimony<sup>61</sup> about the Arcadian

---

*Greek Way of Death*, Ithaca 1985, pp. 70–71, O. Murray, “Death and the symposion”, *A.I.O.N. (sez. di archeologia e storia antica)* 10 (1988), pp. 243–247 (who mainly adopts the arguments propounded by Dentzer), and J. Larson, *Greek Heroine Cults*, Madison, Wisconsin 1995, pp. 43–50. For banquets of the dead in Greek and Egyptian literature, see E. Vermeule, *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1979, pp. 72–74.

<sup>52</sup> For the position of the body of both sexes in the depiction of such symptic scenes, see Dentzer, op. cit., pp. 347–350.

<sup>53</sup> J. Boardman, “Symposion Furniture”, in *Symptotica. A symposium on the Symposion*, ed. O. Murray, Oxford 1990, p. 128.

<sup>54</sup> Drink is usually stressed more than food, see E. Vermeule, op. cit., pp. 57–58.

<sup>55</sup> See Boardman, loc. cit.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*, Baltimore/London 1979, pp. 171–172.

<sup>57</sup> Cf., however, n. 34 above.

<sup>58</sup> For Simonides’ laments, see E. Reiner, *Die rituelle Totenklage der Griechen*, Stuttgart/Berlin 1938, pp. 72–82, A.E. Harvey, “The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry”, *CQ* n.s. 5 (1955), pp. 68ff., Alexiou, pp. 103–105 and 132, and Cannatà Fera, op. cit., pp. 23–27. I intend to discuss in detail elsewhere the fragments that have come down to us under the title Σιμωνίδου Θρήνων and those which have conventionally been considered as *threnoi*.

<sup>59</sup> See Alexiou, pp. 103–104 (cf. also Cannatà Fera, op. cit., p. 30–31).

<sup>60</sup> If we assume that in l. 12 there was a reference to ἡμερόεις πόθος. But it is doubtful whether πόθον should be taken as the only possible supplement after ἡμερόεντα.

<sup>61</sup> Paus. 10. 7. 4–6 (3. 101 Rocha-Pereira) τῆς δὲ τεσσαρακοστῆς ὀλυμπιάδος καὶ ὀγδοῆς ... ταύτης ἔτει τρίτῳ ἄθλα ἔθεσαν οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες κιθαρωδίας ..., προσέθεσαν δὲ καὶ αὐλωδίας ἀγώνισμα καὶ αὐλῶν ἀνηγορευθήσαν δὲ νικῶντες ..., καὶ αὐλωδὸς Ἀρκᾶς Ἐχέμβροτος ... [...] δευτέρᾳ δὲ πυθιάδι ... αὐλωδίαν τε ((τό)τε Dindorf) κατέλυσαν,

Echembrotos, whose mournful songs (*elegeia*), accompanied by the *aulos*, were known in antiquity, should perhaps be taken as more authoritative, and not utterly dismissed as “worthless as evidence for the nature of early elegy”<sup>62</sup>. As Alexiou and West, among others, have maintained<sup>63</sup>, this and some further evidence suggest that, at an early stage, a kind of threnodic elegy had existed, and that “elegoi were presumably performed at funerals”<sup>64</sup>. As a consequence of that, the elegiac lament of Euripides’ *Andromache* may have its origin in those sung laments that the tradition ascribes to the early Greeks<sup>65</sup>.

It might be objected that Simon. fr. 22 W<sup>2</sup> is preserved in so mutilated a state that no clue can be found to its content. However, the possibility, at least, remains open that this fragment was a threnodic song composed by an author renowned for his capacity to excite passion through his *threnoi*.

Exeter College, Oxford

Dimitrios Yatromanolakis

ZPE 122 (1998) 5

### ADDENDUM (ZPE 120 [1998] 3 ANM. 13)

Die Ergänzung ἐκτ[ανύσας war mit derselben Parallelstelle bereits in Band 114 (1996) 24–26 von H. Bernsdorff vorgeschlagen und begründet worden.

---

καταγρόντες οὐκ εἶναι τὸ ἄκουσμα εὐφημον· ἢ γὰρ ἀλύφδια μέλη τε ἦν ἀλύων τὰ σκυθρωπότεα καὶ ἐλεγεία (θρήνοι) προσαδόμενα τοῖς ἀλύοις. μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι καὶ τοῦ Ἐχεμβρότου τὸ ἀνάθημα ...

<sup>62</sup> E.L. Bowie, “Early Greek elegy, symposium and public festival”, *JHS* 106 (1986), p. 23. On the general contention of Bowie’s article that there is no compelling evidence for the existence of threnodic elegy in the archaic period, see the important note by D.M. Lewis [“Bowie on Elegy: A Footnote”, *JHS* 107 (1987), p. 188], where he draws attention to two sixth-century epigraphical texts whose first person is an anonymous mourner who expresses feelings about the dead; Lewis concludes: “I cannot help thinking ... that the existence on stone of two sixth-century texts of lamentation goes some way to breaking down the dividing-line between the funerary epigram and a hypothetical threnodic elegy and offers more support for the existence of the latter than Bowie is prepared to allow”. For a recent, concise discussion of threnodic elegy, see B. Gentili, *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the Fifth Century*, transl. T. Cole, Baltimore/London 1988, pp. 32–34. Note that Fowler (*The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies*, Toronto/Buffalo/London 1987, pp. 87–88) holds that Echembrotos and Sakadas’ ἔλεγχοι (or ἐλεγεία) were probably “fairly stylized formal laments sung to the aulos at musical contests”, and that, although these laments may not have been originally composed in the elegiac metre, they were regularly composed in this metre by the fifth century. For the view that the association of the words ἔλεγχος and ἐλεγείον cannot be shown to be of any significance for the origin of elegy, see, recently, Fowler, op. cit., and G. Lambin, “Ἐλεγχος et ἐλεγείον”, *RPh* 62 (1988), pp. 69–77 (who proposes that the word ἐλεγείον comes from the form \*ἐλικεῖον – or \*ἐλικήτιον – which can be associated with such words as ἔλιγμα, ἐλίκη, ἔλιξ, ἐλίττω, etc. and is “l’équivalent du latin *versus* (cf. *vertere*), une ‘ligne qui tourne [dans l’écriture boustroφιδόν]”). For a discussion of the terms ἐλεγείον, ἐλεγεία and ἔλεγχος, and the circumstances of performing threnodic elegies, see K. Bartol, *Greek Elegy and Iambus. Studies in Ancient Literary Sources*, Poznań 1993, pp. 18–30, and 53–54 (the latter partly based on Bowie’s views).

<sup>63</sup> Alexiou, p. 104, and M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin/New York 1974, pp. 4–5 (see also M.L. West, *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford 1992, p. 337).

<sup>64</sup> West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, p. 13. E.L. Bowie, op. cit., pp. 22–27 has argued against this view. Some of his arguments may be open to question in the light of my reconstruction of Simon. fr. 22 W<sup>2</sup> (however, whatever the case might be, I would not agree with his view that μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι ... in the passage by Pausanias quoted above explains Pausanias’ characterisation of ἀλύφδια (p.23)).

<sup>65</sup> Based mainly on the passage by Pausanias quoted and this Euripidean lament composed in elegiac metre, D.L. Page (“The Elegiacs in Euripides’ *Andromache*”, in *Greek Poetry and Life. Essays presented to Gilbert Murray*, Oxford 1936, pp. 206–230; followed by C.M. Bowra, *CQ* 32 (1938), pp. 80–88 = *Problems in Greek Poetry*, Oxford 1953, pp. 93–107), held that laments in elegiac form were probably composed in the archaic period, but the existing evidence supported only a hypothesis which connected the elegiac lament of *Andromache* (*Andr.* 103–116) with a kind of lamentary elegy that flourished in the northern Peloponnese in the seventh and sixth centuries and was represented by poets such as Echembrotos and Sakadas. Such a connection may not seem necessary, if my main argument about Simon. fr. 22 W<sup>2</sup> is accepted.