The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Simonidea

H. W. Garrod

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 16 / Issue 3-4 / July 1922, pp 113 - 123

DOI: 10.1017/S000983880000269X, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S000983880000269X

How to cite this article:

H. W. Garrod (1922). Simonidea. The Classical Quarterly, 16, pp 113-123 doi:10.1017/S000983880000269X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

JULY AND OCTOBER, 1922.

SIMONIDEA.

(Continued from p. 76.)

IN what has preceded I have travelled a good deal beyond Simonides. But I have done so in order to illustrate the fact that the remains of ancient lyric cannot be interpreted in isolation. I come back now to the extant fragments of Simonides.

The theme of 'falling ionics' is, as I have already indicated, notoriously perilous. The heavy hand of the author of *Isyllus* has been laid upon the 32nd Fragment :

ἄνθρωπος ὧν μήποτε φήσῃς ὅτι γίνεται αὔριον
μηδ' ἄνδρ' ἰδὼν ὄλβιον ὅσσον χρόνον ἔσσειται.
ὥκεῖα γὰρ οὐδὲ τανυπτερύγου
μυίας οὕτως [ἀ] μετὰστασις.

4 á seclusi.

That I have given this fragment correctly I feel no confidence. I do, however, feel confident that the changes proposed by Wilamowitz are demonstrably false. Reading ἔων (with some MSS.) and (with some MSS.) omitting αὔριον in line 1, and in line 2 reading ἄνδρα (ἄνδρ' Bergk) and ἔσσεται (ἔσσειται Stobaei codex B : ἔσ(σ)εται cett.), he rewrites 3 and 4 thus :

οὕτω γὰρ οὐδὲ τανυπτερύγου μυίας
ὥκεῖα μετὰστασις.

He would then have it that these lines are in ionics *a maiore*. I will concede to him that lines 1 and 2 are conceivable catalectic tetrameters in major ionics. But where in Greek literature will Wilamowitz find an example of *catalectic* tetrameters in this metre? I can recall no example of it, nor is the form mentioned by Hephaestion. A *possible* example of such tetrameters is furnished by the Palaikastro *Hymn of the Curetes*. But this is a post-Aristotelian composition (preserved in an inscription of the second century B.C.). In any case, its ionic tetrameters catalectic, if ionic they are to be called, are catalectic with a different catalexis to that of Wilamowitz' lines. But, apart from this, I think it difficult to persuade anyone familiar with the history of Greek lyric that Simonides could anywhere have employed major ionic

measures. To this I will come back. Here I am chiefly concerned with defending the text of line 3. It is not difficult, and I have the gods on my side. The fact is that the Ate which attends even a genial Hybris was waiting for Wilamowitz amid the dustbins of Oxyrhynchus. If Wilamowitz will turn to *Ox. Pap.*, Vol. VIII., p. 103, No. 1087, col. 1, lines 30 sqq., he will find this among some anonymous Homeric scholia :

τὸ τανυπτέρυ[γος· ἔνθ]εν Σιμωνίδης· ὥκεια γὰρ οὐδὲ τα[νυπτέρυ]γον μυίας.¹

I admit that ill-luck could go no further than that Egypt should give us nothing of Simonides worth having, and serve up just this scrap to refute a great man.²

In this fragment, as I have printed it, the first line is an iambo-choriambic tetrameter. I daresay the same is true of the second; but I don't feel called upon to give a name either to this line or to Sophocles, *O.T.* 880 :

πάλαι πάλαισμα μήποτε λύσαι θεὸν αἰτοῦμαι.

But if anyone likes to call the Sophoclean and the Simonidean line by one and the same name, I am not going to quarrel with him over the defect of a short syllable in the latter. In the Simonidean line, I do not see how an editor can hesitate between the MS. variants *ἔσσειται* and *ἔσ(σ)εται*.³ Which is more likely to have come into the text by accident? Line 3 is an anapaestic dimeter: the same name must serve for line 4. But I confess that that line leaves me still uneasy.

I have suggested that it was inconceivable that Simonides should employ major ionic measures. Let me make the matter quite plain. Nowhere else does Simonides use major ionics. Nowhere does any one of the *nouem lyrici* employ this metre, save only Sappho (Alcaeus 38 belongs, as Wilamowitz has pointed out, not to Alcaeus, but to Sappho).⁴ The tragedians do not employ this metre, nor does Aristophanes. It was used by Sappho, by Praxilla, by Telesilla—three women—of whom I would not wish to speak ill, though I cannot feel that the whitewash of *Sappho u. Simonides* has made Sappho either whiter or more plausible or more interesting. The major ionic was employed only by these three women and the Magnesians and their disciples.⁵ Whether on account of Sappho, or from some other cause, it acquired early, and retained always, an ill-repute. Pindar, Simonides, Bacchylides, the Athenian dramatists, and the writers of the New Dithyramb, uphold a tradition which heavily discountenanced this measure. It is not allowed even to Anacreon.

¹ For the form *τανυπτέρυγος* (the word is not elsewhere found) compare *κνανοπτέρυγος* in Cercidas (*Ox. Pap.* 1082, p. 33, line 6). Wilamowitz, I now find, has discovered the Scholion.

² I note a like malice of fortune in connexion with a statement in *Sappho u. Simonides*, p. 81. Wilamowitz there lays it down that *ἐς* for *εἰς* is an impossible form in an Aeolic poet. Among some recent Egyptian rubbish I can find for him, if he has not found it already, a *certain* example

of *ἐς* (where *εἰς* would not scan) in a very good Aeolic poet indeed.

³ If Wilamowitz had written *ἔσσειται*, his line would have been one to which a metrical parallel could have been found in the *Curetes Hymn*.

⁴ I observe, in passing, that in Mr. Edmonds' *Lyra Graeca* it still appears, without comment, among the fragments of Alcaeus.

⁵ And perhaps the author of the *Hymn of Curetes*.

(Praxilla and Telesilla represent a centrifugal Peloponnesian tradition.) It found, however, a home later in Magnesia, where a particular variety of major ionics was made famous by Cleomachus. From Magnesia came also Simus, who, with Lysis, preceded Sotades in the composition of 'Sotadeans' (Athen. 620d, Strabo 641). *Sappho und Simoden*, Sappho and the disciples of Simus—these are the practitioners in major ionics. But Simonides, no.

Of minor ionic verse a fragment lies hid, I think, in Simonides 54 :

οο - φοινίκεον ἰστίον πεφυρμένον ὑγρῷ
τρυγὸς ἄνθει περίφαντον.

2 περίφαντον scripsi : ἐριθάλλου codd.

The ill-attested reading *τρυγὸς* in 2 is surely, as against the well-attested *πρινὸς*, the true reading. *τρυγὸς* = 'ferruginis,' as Nicander, *Alexiph.* 51, *τρυξ σιδηρέα*. Catullus 64, 227, had *τρυγὸς* in his text, and understood it—'carbasus obscurata . . . ferrugine Hibera.' See also Cercidas 4, 3, Bergk, *δυσεκνίπτω τρυγί*. Both Simonides 54 and the fragment following deal with the story of Theseus; and it is possible that 51 also,

ἴσχει με πορφυρέας ἄλδς ἀμφιταρασσομένας ὀρυμαγδός,

belongs to the same poem, and is part of the lament of Ariadne. Compare Catullus 64, 178 sqq. :

gurgite lato
discernens ponti truculentum diuidit aequor . . .
nec patet egressus pelagi cingentibus undis.

See, however, the many parallels in Ellis' note *ad loc.* I do not know why Ellis and others say that Catullus follows a different story, in respect of the sail, from that of Simonides. I see no real discrepancy.

In Frag. 71 I seem to myself to discover hidden iambics :

≡ τίς γὰρ ἄδωνᾶς ἄτερ<θε> θνατῶν
βίος ποθεινὸς ἢ ποία τυραννίς ;
τᾶς δ' ἄτερ οὐδὲ θεῶν ζαλωτὸς αἰών.

In line 1 the change indicated by <> is very slight, and restores to Simonides a metre much affected by Alcman (see Alcman 1,¹ 4, 6, 7, 74, 75). Of the metre of this fragment Mr. Weir Smyth says in oracular fashion that it is 'logaoedic rather than dactylo-epitrite.' So is

ἱατταταιᾶξ τῶν κακῶν ἱαττά

—only Providence has hid these things from the simple. If the third line is not dactylo-epitrite there are no dactylo-epitrites. It is the line known to the ancients as the *encomiologicum Stesichoreum*, and is found in Stesichorus 50, 2 :

† μάλα τοι† μάλιστα
παιγμοσύνας φιλέει μολπᾶς τ' Ἀπόλλων·
κάδεα δὲ στοναχάς τ' Αἴδας λάχεν,

¹ Alcman I. should, I believe, be written :
Μοῖσ' ἄγε, Μοῖσα λιγέει,

πολυμμελές, αἰεναοιδέ, μέλος
νεοχμὸν ἄρχε παρσένοις αἰείδεν.

where, in line 3, I have written *λάχεν* for *ἐλάχεν*; and the line is then an enhoplian trimeter, is dactylo-epitritic (*Αἶδας*, disyllabic, as *Αἶδα* in Pindar, *Pyth.* IV. 44).

A Simonidean fragment which has a reasonable title to the name dactylo-epitrite is 23 :

λευκᾶς καθύπερθε γαλάνας
 εὐπρόσωποι σφας παρείσαν ναῖας ἔρωτες
 κλαῖδος χαραξιπόντου δαιμονίαν ἐς ὕβριν.

2 παρείσαν scripsi (3 pl. pf. indic.): παρήσαν codd. ἔρωτες ναῖας codd. : transposui.

The construction is *παρείσαν σφᾶς καθύπερθε γαλάνας ἐς δαιμονίαν ὕβριν εὐπρόσωποι ἔρωτες ναῖας κλαῖδος χαραξιπόντου*—and both this fact and the metre necessitate the transposition suggested in line 2: for the ithyphallic clausula in 2 compare 57, 6. Wilamowitz (*Sappho u. Simonides*, p. 129) offers an interpretation that is all his own, taking *κλαῖδος χαραξιπόντου* as meaning, not a ship, but the mole of a harbour!

Fragments 4, 10, and 40 have already illustrated the manner in which Simonides employs the Alcaic decasyllable and hendecasyllable in the midst of anapaestic measures. I would call attention now to a fragment (18) which has been preserved to us conjointly by Athenaeus, the Pindaric scholia, and Tzetzes, and in which we may detect fragments of what look like Alcaic stanzas. Our three sources for this piece offer a great number of variants, which I need not here record in detail. I will content myself with printing the fragment as I think it should be given, noticing the MS. record only where the reading I offer is found in none of our three authorities.

δίδωτι δ' εὖ τοι Ἑρμᾶς ἐναγώνιος
 Μαίας ὀρείας εὐπλοκάμοιο παῖς

 ἔτικτε δ' Ἄτλας ἑπτὰ ἰοπλόκ[αμ]ων
 φίλαν θυγατρῶν ἔξοχ' αἰ Πιε-
 λειάδες οὐράνιαι καλέονται.

1 εὖ τοι scripsi: ευτες codd. (the crasis is less harsh than *κωλύει αἰδώς* in Alcaeus 55, or *ὠράνω αἰθέρος* in Sappho 1. 4 ἔξοχ' dedi: τὴν ἔξοχον εἶδος codd. The corruption began with someone who did not perceive that *φίλαν* (*φιλᾶν* edd.) went with *ἔξοχα θυγατρῶν*. 5 Πειλειάδες post καλέονται codd.

I think it just possible that other Alcaic fragments lurk in 65 and 66. These are given thus in Bergk, who, no doubt correctly, regards them as belonging to one and the same poem :

65 ὁ δ' αὖ θάνατος κίχῃ καὶ τὸν φυγόμαχον
 66 ἔστι καὶ σιγᾶς ἀκίνδυνον γέρας.

Both fragments are translated by Horace in one and the same ode (III. ii. 14, 25) :

mors et fugacem persequitur uirum
 est et fideli tuta silentio | merces,

an *Alcaic* ode; and I would suggest that 66 stood, in Horace's text, thus :

<ἀλλ> ἔστι καὶ σιγᾶς ἀκίνδυνον γέρας - ο ο - ο - -.

And if that be so, we should perhaps in 65 restore

- θάνατος κίχε καὶ φυγαίχμαν.

φυγόμαχον, to my mind, suits the style of Simonides very ill. But the attempt to restore these mere scraps and half-lines is necessarily temerarious, and, I daresay, no proper occupation of serious scholarship.

The rest of this paper will be occupied with the attempted restoration of a number of fragments in which the rhythms are principally glyconic and choriambic. Among them will be the two longest and most famous of extant Simonidean pieces, 37 and 5. In respect of these two I feel an extreme diffidence; and I should leave them alone if it were not that the text which I offer stands in closer relation to the MS. tradition than that of the current editions. It will be observed that in 5 I have twice fallen back upon the *obelus desperationis*. Wilamowitz has wisely warned us that it is not unlikely that Plato has preserved this piece for us in a form which at more than one point does not do more than paraphrase Simonides.

Fragments 44 and 45 may be called 'glyconic,' but they illustrate characteristically the fusion of quadrasyllabic and trisyllabic measures:

44. ἔνθα
 χερνίβεσσιν ἀρύεται
 Μοισᾶν καλλικόμεν ὑπένερθεν ἄγνον ὕδωρ.
45. ἀγνὰ ᾽πίσκοπε, Κλειοῖ,
 χερνίβων, πολύλιστον ᾶ,
 χρυσεόπεπλ', εὐῶδες <ἔξ>
 ἀμβροσίων ἕεις μυχῶν ἐραννὸν ὕδωρ.

This seems to me to be the true division of lines sadly mangled in the editions. In 45, 2, the MSS. have πολύλιστον ἀραιὸν τέ ἐστιν. I have excised the last three words as arising out of a gloss upon πολύλιστον. In 3 the MSS. have χρυσόπεπλον. In 4 ἕεις is Bergk's correction of the MSS. ἐκ. Hiller's version begins:

ἀγνὰ ἐπίσκοπε, Κλειοῖ, χερνίβων.

Sweet bells jangled out of tune, surely!

37. Str. 1 λάρνακι <δ'> ἐν δαιδαλέᾳ <πλέοντας>
 2 ἄνεμός τέ νιν πνέων
 3 κινήθεισά τε λίμνα
 4 δειματ<ο>ῖ· ἦ ῥ' οὐτ' ἀδιάντη σ<φ>ῖ παρείας·
 5 ἀμφί τε Περσῇ βάλεν
 6 φίλαν χέρ', εἰπέ τ'· <ῖ>ῶ,
 7 τέκος, οἶον ἔχω πόνον, οὐδ' αἶεις
 8 γαλαθηνῶ δ' ἥθει κνώσσεις ἐν ἀτερπέϊ δό[v]ρατι,

Ant. 1 χαλκεογόμφω <γ'>· ἀένυκτι δ' ἀμπνεῖς
 2 κυανέφ [τε] δνόφω σταλείς 10
 3 †αὐλέαν† <καθ>ὑπερθεν
 4 -οο- -οο- -οο- -
 5 -οο- -οο-
 6 τεᾶν κομᾶν βαθεῖαν.
 7 παρίοντος κύματος οὐκ ἀλέγεις 15
 8 οὐδ' ἀνέμου [φθόγγον] πορφυρέα κείμενος ἐν χλανίδι οο,

Epod. πρόσωπον καλόν. εἰ δέ τοι
 δεινὸν τό γε δεινὸν ἦν,
 καί κεν ἐμῶν ῥηματ<ι>ων
 λεπτὸν ὑπείχες οὔας. 20
 κέλομ' εὔδε, βρέφος, εὐδέτω δὲ πόντος,
 εὐδέτω ἄμετρον κακόν,
 μετα<ι>βο[υ]λία δέ τις φανεί-
 η, πάτερ, ἐκ σέο, Ζεῦ.
 ὅττι δὲ θαρραλέον ἔπος 25
 εὔχομαι ἢ νόσφι δίκας, σύγγνωθί μοι.

<> = supplenda : [] = delenda. 2 νιν Wilamowitz ; μῆν codd. 4 ἦρ' [εἶπεν] scripsi : ἔριπε(ν) codd. παρειάς scripsi : παρειαῖς codd. 7 οὐδ' αἰεῖς Koch : σὺ δ' αὐταῖς (αὐτε εἰς) codd. 9 ἀένυκτι δ' ἀμπνεῖς scripsi : δεινυκτι λαμπεῖ codd. 24 Ζεῦ ante πάτερ codd. : traieci.

No one who compares my three lines of *apparatus criticus* with the 150 odd lines in Bergk will think that I have dealt with the text of this poem in any but a conservative spirit. By assuming a lacuna after 11, I have given to the piece strophe, antistrophe, and epode. The one thing about it of which we can be certain from Dionysius is that it did exhibit this threefold structure. The metres of the strophe are choriambic trimeter, minor ionic dimeter, Pherecratean, choriambic dimeter + adonius, choriambic dimeter, iambic dimeter, anapaestic dimeter, two choriambic dimeters. The rhythms of the epode are throughout glyconic (iambo-choriambic), presenting no difficulty.

In line 4, δειματ<ο>ί, I have given to Simonides a verb which is used by Aeschylus, and may belong also to the older lyric—the scholiast to Pindar, *Ol.* I. 91, has δειματοῦσθαι καὶ καταπτήσσειν, of Tantalus : and the words look like a quotation. [I will not press into the service Pindar, *Frag.* 189, Christ, *Schol. Arist. Vesph.* 306 παρὰ τὸ Πινδαρικόν. πανδείματοι μὲν ὑπὲρ πόντιον Ἑλλας πόρον, where the word πανδείματοι, though tampered with by all the commentators (τὰν δείματο Hermann : παρὰ τὸ Πινδαρικόν παράδειγμα · τοὶ μὲν Wilamowitz), may quite well be sound—πανδείματοι seems rightly restored by Wachsmuth in *Adespota*, Bergk 140, 4 (πανδείμαντοι codd.)]

In the same line I have supposed ἔριπε(ν) (ἤριπεν edd.) to have originated in ἦρ', mistakenly glossed by εἶπεν. Line 16 remains defective by οο at the end. It had occurred to me to fill the gap with ψόφον for [φθόγγον]; but the order of words is then very strained, and I think that φθόγγον is the insertion

of someone puzzled by ἀλέγεις with the genitive. In 11 I have not attempted to emend the *vox nihili* αὐλέαν.

5. Ant. 1 ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἀλαθέως γενέσθαι χαλεπὸν
2 χερσίν τε καὶ ποσὶ καὶ νόφ
3 τετράγωνον ἄνευ ψόγου τετυγμένον
· · · · ·

Desiderantur uersus vi. antistrophae et vii. epodi.

- Str. 1 οὐδέ μοι ἐμμελέως τὸ Πιττάκειον νέμεται ·
2 καίτοι σοφοῦ παρὰ φωτὸς εἰρ- 5
3 ημένον · χαλεπὸν φάτ' ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι.
4 θεὸς ἂν μόνος τοῦτ' ἔχοι γέρας, ἄνδρα δ' οὐκ
5 ἔστι μὴ κακὸν ἔμμεναι
6 ὃν ἂν ἀμάχανος συμφορὰ καθέλῃ.
7 πράξας γὰρ εὖ πᾶς ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός, κακὸς δ' 10
8 εἰ κακῶς ἔπει πλείστον δὲ καὶ ἄριστοι†
9 <τ>οὺς κε [οἱ] θεοὶ φιλῶσι.

- Ant. 1 τοῦνεκεν οὔ ποτ' ἐγὼ τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι δυνατόν
2 διζήμενος κενεὰν ἐς ἄ-
3 πρακτον ἐλπίδα μοῖραν αἰῶνος βαλέω 15
4 πανάμωμον ἀνθρώπου εὐρυέδους ὅσοι
5 καρπὸν αἰνύμεθα χθονός.
6 ἔπειθ' ὕμιν εὐρὼν ἀπαγγελέω.
7 πάντας δ' ἐπαίνημ' [καὶ φιλέω] ἐκὼν ὅτις ἔρδῃ†
8 μὴδὲν αἰσχρὸν · ἀνάγκη δ' 20
9 οὐδὲ θεοὶ μάχονται.

- Epod. οὐ φιλόμωμός εἰμ'. ἐμοί γ'
ἐξαρκεῖ μέσος ὅστις ἦ
μηδ' ἄγαν ἀπάλαμνος, εἰ-
δώς γ' ὄνασίπολιν δίκαν, 25
ὕγις ἀνὴρ. οὐ νιν ἐγὼ μωμήσομαι.
τῶν γὰρ ἡλιθίων ἀπείρων γενέθλα.
πάντα τοι καλὰ τοῖσιν αἰσχρὰ μὴ μέμικται.

19 ὅτις] ὅστις codd. 23 ἐξαρκεῖ δς ἂν μέσος ἦ codd. Plat. 346d (μὴ κακὸς pro μέσος 346c).

There are troubles here which I have not attempted to heal. But apart from lines 7 and 8 str. the metre presents little difficulty. The first verse of strophe and antistrophe is an ionic tetrameter. Editors commonly divide after γενέσθαι (Πιττάκειον), giving a Phalaecian hendecasyllable. That is only another way of saying what some of the ancients said—that the Phalaecian hendecasyllable is an ionic trimeter. This method of dividing is worth noticing, if only because it reminds us that this poem of Simonides coincides rhythmically in its opening words (down to γενέσθαι) with the favourite verse of Athenian drinking songs in the fifth century: ἐν μύρτου κλαδί τὸ ξίφος

surges up from a native source and makes a throw to the top of manly achievement' does not involve a greater confusion of metaphor than is permissible in heroic lyric; and the alteration of text is the least possible. (An alternative would be to read *ἀνδρεία*, making this the subject of *δίκη*.)

I began this paper with Simonides' well-known tribute (Frag. 53) to his great predecessor in lyric, Stesichorus. I may perhaps be allowed to end it by bringing that fragment into connexion with one of the newer fragments of Pindar, Schroeder 140b (*Ox. Pap.* III. 15-16, 408b):

51. νον ἐγὼ
 ὀργίους α
 αὐξ
 Αἰολ[εὺς δὲ Δωρίαν
 55. ἰὼν [κέλευθον ὕμνων.
 ἀοιδ[αν δὲ κ]αὶ ἀρμονίαν
 αὐ[λοῖς ἐπ]εφρά[σσατο] τῶ[ν γε Λο-
 κρῶν τις οἷ τ' ἀργίλοφον
 παρ Ζεφυρίου κολώναν
 60. ν[αῖοντ' ὑπὲρ] Αὔσονιά[ς ἄκρας,
 λι[παρὰ πόλ]ις, ἄνθ[ηκε δ' ἀοιδᾶν
 οἶον [δ]χημα λυγ[υφθόγγων τὸν ἀ-
 κεσ[φ]ό[ρ]ον παιήο[να,
 Ἄπόλλωνί τε καὶ [Χαρί-
 65. τεσσιν] ἄρμενον. ἐγὼ[μὲν κλύων
 παῦρα μελιζομέν[ου, τέχναν
 [γλῶ]σσαργον ἀμφέπω[ν,
 [ἐρεθίζ]ομαι πρὸς αὐτὰ[ν
 [άλις]υ δελφῖνος ὑπ[όκρισιν,
 70. τὸν ἀκύμονος ἐν πόντου πελάγε[σσ]ι[ν] αὐλῶν
 ἐκίνησ' ἐρατὸν μέλος.

The piece is part of a paeon for the Epizephyrian Locrians (though Schroeder, Diehl, and Sir J. Sandys leave it in the class of *Adela*). There is no other meaning in the reference in lines 56-65 to the paeon of the unnamed Locrian; and the rhythms point in the same direction. The rhythm of 65 is unmistakably paeonic; and in 57, 59, 69 we have a rhythm which figures notably in the other Pindaric paeans (3 anapaests+an apparent iambus: called by modern metricians, against all ancient authority, a logaoedic anapaestic dimeter). This rhythm appears twice in the strophe, and twice in the epode, of the fourth paeon. It appears in the second paeon in company, as here, with glyconic verses, and, again as here, with anapaestic dimeters. It is found also in the sixth and ninth paeans. In the Epinician odes it is very rare. I have already spoken of the metre of 70-71. For the rest, 54 is like 63, a Euripideum; 55, an iambic dimeter; 56, 59, 66 may be called '(chor)iambic dimeters'; 61 is (indifferently) an ionic trimeter or an anapaestic dimeter;

62 is a dactylic tetrameter ; 64, a Pherecretean ; 67, an iambus ischiorrhogicus ; 68, an ionic dimeter.

54-55. I have attempted to fill the lacuna from Schol. Pind. *Pyth.* II. 128a : Αἰολίδεσσι· Βοιωταῖαις· ἐκέϊθεν γὰρ ὁ Πίνδαρος. τοιοῦτόν ἐστι καὶ τὸ ἐτέρῳθι λεγόμενον· Αἰολεύς (ἔβαινε) Δωρίαν κέλευθον ὕμνων.

ἔβαινε has always been suspect ; for Pindar is speaking of himself : ἔβαινον Hartung.

57. Accepting Schroeder's αὐλοῖς, I have made the line metrical by writing ἐπεφράσσατο where other editors write ἐπεφράσατο, and by inserting γε after τῶν. (Grenfell and Hunt say that five letters are missing between τω and -κρῶν ; but editors do not believe them, and, inserting only three, destroy the metre.

61. ἄνθηκε δὲ is due to Grenfell and Hunt : I have added αἰοιδᾶν : (λιπαρᾶν αἰοιδᾶν Diehl in 62 for λιγ : but (quite apart from the fact that the Papyrus offers λιγ) λιπαρᾶν is quite intolerable after λιπαρὰ πόλις (which Diehl accepts from Grenfell and Hunt in 61). ἐρατᾶν ὄχημ' αἰοιδᾶν Frag. 124.

62-63. λιγ[υφθόγγων τὸν ἀ]κεσ[φ]ό[ρ]ον is my own conjecture. The φ of ἀκεσφόρον is the only letter not allowed for in the Papyrus by Grenfell and Hunt, and may easily have been lost before the ο following. Other suggested restorations involve tampering with κεσ in 63 (λιγναχὲς Diehl), and involve either οἶον παιήονα or οἶον or ὄλον—the last two meaningless, and the first impossible owing to οἶον ὄχημα in the line preceding.

64-71. I have printed no correction not already generally accepted, save πελάγεσσιν, for the πελάγει of Plutarch's MSS., in 69 : see above, p. 76. In 68 I have followed Grenfell and Hunt in retaining πρὸς αὐτὰ[ν of the Papyrus, which Schroeder, Diehl, and Sandys alter to πρὸς αἰοιδᾶν, on the strength of Plutarch's πρὸς ᾠδὴν. But Plutarch's πρὸς ᾠδὴν (if it be his) is merely, I think, an interpretation of Pindar's πρὸς αὐτὰν ὑπόκρισιν. Pindar says that the minstrelsy of the unnamed Locrian provokes him 'to just the lumbering responsive motion of the dolphin.' That δελφίνος ὑπόκρισιν can stand for δελφίνος δίκηνη = 'like the dolphin,' I refuse to believe until somebody furnishes a parallel. Yet this strange Greek is swallowed by the editors apparently both of Pindar and of Plutarch without protest.

Who is the unnamed Locrian ? Everybody seems agreed upon Xenocrates—whom we used to call Xenocritus,¹ until we learnt better from Wilamowitz. No doubt Xenocrates meant more to Pindar than he means to us. Yet I have always wanted here a reference to some greater man. No doubt, Pindar is out to flatter the Locrians, and Xenocrates is possible. But was there no other Locrian who might better have served his turn ? Who, after all, is the great lyrist to whom in their style and art both Simonides and Pindar look back ?

οὕτω γὰρ Ὅμηρος ἡδὲ Στασίχορος ἔεισε λαοῖς,

says Simonides. And Stesichorus was a Locrian. Following Plato, it is true, we are in the habit of speaking of him as Stesichorus of Himera. But,

¹ Mr. Edmonds (*Lyra Graeca*) still gives Xenocritus without comment.

as with Homer dead, so with the dead Stesichorus: more than one town contended for him 'through which the living poet begged his bread.' Wilamowitz has recently collected (*Sappho und Simonides*, pp. 233 sqq.) the ancient evidence for the Locrian nationality of Stesichorus; and to Stesichorus, I would suggest, Pindar in this paean refers. If so, the piece becomes our earliest and best evidence for 'Stesichorus the Locrian.' And similarly in *Ol. X. 14*,

μέλει τέ σφισι Καλλιόπα,

the compliment must be taken as directed to Stesichorus. The reference in our fragment will be the same as that in 'Plutarch,' *De Musica* 12, where the musical *καινοτομία Στησιχόρειος* is spoken of—a reference the detail of which I will not attempt to penetrate. I will only add that 'Plutarch's' statement (for which he vouches the authority of Glaucus) that 'Thaletas was prior in time to Xenocrates' (*De Musica* 10) seems to me in itself to make it somewhat unlikely that Pindar in our fragment can be referring to Xenocrates.

H. W. GARROD.

MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD.