CHAPTER 1

Early epinician: Ibycus and Simonides

Richard Rawles

'The study of Pindar', wrote Bundy in 1962, 'must become a study of genre.'[1] Rather than appealing to the supposed historico-biographical data which earlier critics of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries used to try to explain perceived anomalies in Pindaric epinicians,[2] the interpreter would inhabit an epinician textual world, in order better to understand individual aspects of Pindar's work within a broader generic picture. As the very nature of the present collection shows, we are now accustomed to think about and study epinician poetry as a genre. Yet, in comparison with students of other kinds of poetry, scholars of epinician have often been disinclined to examine genre in a diachronic perspective, instead concentrating on a system of cross-references *internal* to the corpus of Pindaric and (usually to a lesser degree) Bacchylidean epinician. Only to a limited degree has the appeal to genre been realised in movement away from a synchronic treatment of Pindaric epinician, and even reference to Bacchylides is found rather more sporadically.

Reasons may be found for this. While Bacchylides has been well served by papyri, the several pieces I shall discuss here by the earlier poets Ibycus and Simonides are preserved only in short quotations and on papyri whose fragmentary state makes discussion perilous. If we might be in danger of forgetting that 'What we do not know of epinikian poetry would fill many unwritten volumes',[3] a glance at the fragments of Ibycus and Simonides will soon remind us. So discussion of Pindar and Bacchylides in the light of their predecessors can look like *obscurum per obscurius*, while study of these predecessors in their own right is confined to a small number of

Thanks for encouragement, suggestions and the removal of errors are due to the anonymous readers of Cambridge University Press, to Giuseppe Ucciardello and to my fellow editors; remaining deficiencies are my own.

[1] Bundy 1986: 92.
[2] On the history of Pindaric scholarship, see Young 1970; Lloyd-Jones 1973 and 1982.
[3] Lowe 2007: 167.

fragmentary texts. Again, the segregation of Pindaric criticism from work on the other poets could partly be a consequence of Pindar's own lack of explicit reference to the work of the other epinician poets.[4] All the same, this neglect is unfortunate. The fragments of early epinician are of interest in their own right, and should be of interest to the scholar of Pindar and Bacchylides as well.

We do not know when or how epinician poetry started.[5] But perhaps the fault lies in the questions. They can be refined in two ways. First, when did praise-poetry begin to be composed so as to focus especially on athletic victories? Second, when did the victors in athletic contests start to arrange the commemoration of their victories by commissioning special songs for the occasion? This second definition implies a specially organised occasion for the performance of the song, which cannot have been immediately after the victory, since time must be allowed for the poet to compose it first, and for the poet or another to rehearse a chorus to sing it (but the general point applies even if early epinician was not choral). Even in Pindar and Bacchylides, the gap will have been shorter for a few of the briefest poems, such as *Olympian* 11, Bacchylides 2, etc.[6] Before epinician existed by this relatively constricted definition, songs of a more traditional kind were probably performed: we have evidence for these from Pindar and his scholia.[7] Pindar associated one such song with Archilochus (*Ol.* 9.1–4):

> Τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος
> φωνᾶεν Ὀλυμπίᾳ,
> καλλίνικος ὁ τριπλόος κεχλαδώς
> ἄρκεσε Κρόνιον παρ᾽ ὄχθον ἀγεμονεῦσαι
> κωμάζοντι φίλοις Ἐφαρμόστῳ σὺν ἑταίροις·

[4] True of epinician but less so of other genres, perhaps: *pae.* 4.22 (D4 Rutherford) is praise of Ceos for its abundance of song, which would have reminded the audience of Simonides and Bacchylides. See below on the 'song of Archilochus' at *Ol.* 9 init. One might also add e.g. fr. 140b, of uncertain genre, which compares the chorus' song to Xenocritus of Locri, a poet of the late seventh and early sixth centuries active in Sparta. The scholia are of course keen to interpret some Pindaric passages as expressive of antagonistic relations with Simonides and/or Bacchylides (see Σ *Ol.* 2.157a–158d (I: 99 Dr.), Σ *Ol.* 9.74b (I: 285 Dr.), etc.), and they have sometimes been followed by modern scholars. But this was the kind of biographical interpretation of Pindar that Bundy was trying to get away from. Simonides referred explicitly to earlier poets, and not only early epic: 564 *PMG*.

[5] For an important recent approach to the origins of epinician, see Thomas 2007.

[6] See Gelzer 1985.

[7] I doubt whether *Nem.* 8.50–1 can be taken as evidence for Pindar's awareness of the antiquity of epinician as a genre; for a more positive view of this passage as evidence that Pindar must have believed that epinician was considerably older than he was, see Barron 1984: 21. Cf. Thomas 2007: 146 and Agócs (this volume, pp. 213–16).

The song of Archilochus, sounding at Olympia, the threefold-swelling *kallinikos*, was sufficient beside the hill of Kronos for Epharmostos to lead in celebrating with his dear companions.

Here Pindar describes the immediate reaction to Epharmostus' victory: a performance by Epharmostus' *komos* at the site of the victory. The present song is a later, more considered and individualised matter.[8] The scholia and others give the text of 'Archilochus' song' (Archilochus *fr. spurium* 324 W):

> τήνελλα καλλίνικε
> χαῖρε ἄναξ Ἡράκλεις,
> αὐτός τε καὶόλαος, αἰχμητὰ δύω.
>
> Hurrah, fair-victor!
> Hail, Lord Herakles,
> you and Iolaos, spearmen both!

τήνελλα is supposed to have imitated the sound of a lyre. The song does not appear to have been personalised for the victor, even to the extent of 'Happy Birthday', where at least a name is inserted: rather, as when he listens to a formal epinician with a mythical narrative section, he and his companions must infer the connection between the victorious Heracles and Iolaus and his own victory. If the Καστόρειον, to which Pindar refers elsewhere,[9] apparently specifically associated with equestrian events, is a way of designating epinician by reference to a similar sort of traditional song, it is interesting that each of these apparently traditional ways of saluting a victor assimilates him to a heroic figure who is accompanied by another. In the first instance, Iolaus is mentioned along with Heracles, and in the second Castor is presumably seen in company with his twin. As Heracles is praised, he is placed in an important social relationship. Might one say that this most primitive kind of epinician song already to some extent enacts the 'reintegrative' function which has been perceived by scholars[10] as characteristic of fully fledged epinician, as found in Pindar and Bacchylides?

[8] Cf. Morgan 1993: 3–4; Kurke 1988: 103–6.
[9] *Pyth.* 2.69, *Isth.* 1.16. See Carey 1981a *ad Pyth.* 2.69; Giannini in Gentili *et al.* 1995 *ad Pyth.* 2.69–71. For the theory (based on the apparent prominence of the Dioscuri in the poem apparently reflected in Simonides 511 and on the references to the *Kastoreion* in Pindar) that epinician in general was derived from hymns to gods and heroes, see Fränkel 1975: 434–5, and cf. Currie 2005: 408 n.3.
[10] See (e.g.) Kurke 1991: e.g. 6–7 (and *passim*).

In any case, this sort of traditional material is fully distinguishable from epinician in a fuller sense, according to the definitions suggested above. By these definitions, the beginnings of epinician 'proper' are invisible to us. It is not impossible that Stesichorus composed songs which, if we had more material, we might call epinician.[11] But the earliest likely (and to some degree substantial) evidence of poems which might fit the bill comes in certain fragments of Ibycus whose date is not securely known, but can be placed approximately around the middle of the sixth century. The case was first made by John Barron in 1984.[12] His argument that *P.Oxy.* 2735 (*S*166–219) represented fragments of Ibycus, and not of Stesichorus, is convincing.[13] The longest fragment is the following (*S*166 = *P.Oxy.* 2735, fr. 1, as supplemented in Campbell's Loeb):

epode

]τερεν̣[
]ε̣απ̣α̣[
]δ[ ]αριω[
]δ̣.ακ̣τ̣ον ἔχῳ[
ὑπ᾽ α]ὐ̣λητῆρος ἀείδο[ν
]ά̣βρὰ π[α]ν̣τῶς [
πό]θ̣ος οἷά τ᾽ ἔρωτ̣ος [

[11] Burnett 1985: 171 n.2 refers to 'fragments from Stesichorus that seem to come from formal victory odes' citing 512 *PMG*, which is an epinician fragment of Simonides and has nothing to do with Stesichorus (cf. Hornblower 2004: 22 n.71). Burnett may have intended to refer to Sim. 564 *PMG* (~ Stes. 179 *PMG*); but there is no reason to count this as epinician. Evidence for encomiastic poetry by Stesichorus is better sought at Ath. 13.601a (Stes. 276a *PMG* = Stes. TB23 *PMGF*), where Stesichorus is identified as οὐ μετρίως ἐρωτικός and as the author of erotic songs known as παίδεια [Welcker: παιδιὰ *mss*] καὶ παιδικά. This might refer to praise songs with a strong erotic component, as we find in Ibycus (below), which might include songs concerned with athletic victory. Since Burnett wrote, the publication of *P.Oxy.* 3876 has thrown up another possible candidate for Stesichorean encomiastic writing and perhaps even epinician (Stes. 222a *PMGF* frr. 35–6): fr. 35 has an encomiastic (and erotic) look to it, while marginal scholia preserved in fr. 36 *may* preserve the words νίκη 'victory' and Πυθοῖ 'at Pytho' (but alternatives include]τινι κη[and, if the letters]πυθοιμ[do not represent a part of πυνθάνομαι, Pytho could be named in a different context). See Garner 1994: 37–8 and Schade 2003: 47–8 and 79. In both cases it is possible (in the former case, I would say likely) that the supposedly erotic Stesichorus has here fallen victim to the ancients' difficulty in distinguishing him from Ibycus (cf. Barron 1984: 24 n.30; Cingano 1990: 204–5 and *passim*). I am grateful to G. Ucciardello for pointing out to me the possible significance of the fragments from *P.Oxy.* 3876.

[12] Barron 1984; see also Jenner 1986, Hornblower 2004: 21–2. Ucciardello 2001 argues that we might read *P.Oxy.* 2636 as a commentary on Ibycean epinician.

[13] Barron 1984: 20; cf. already Page 1969: 71. Lobel 1968: 9 (the *editio princeps*), followed by West 1969, had argued for Stesichorus.

strophe

-ο]ιο κατ᾽ αἶσαν ὡ̣[
]ατον τέλος ἀσφ[
]α δύνασις· κράτ[ος
] ὑ̣ψοι μέγα δαί-
μονες] π̣ολὺν ὄλβον ἐδώκ[αν
οἷς κ᾽ ἐθ]έλωσιν ἔχεν, τοῖς δ᾽ α[ὐ
βουλα]ῖσι Μοιρᾶν·

antistrophe

] Τυνδαρίδ[αι]σι λ̣αγ̣ε̣[τ-
] .ι σάλπιγγος ὅκ᾽ ἐν κε[
Κάστορί] θ᾽ ἱπποδάμωι καὶ π̣ρ̣[ὺξ ἀγαθῶι Πολυδεύκει
]ες ἀντιθέοι
]νοπάονες· οἷσιν εσ̣[
]ε̣ῖ̣ μεγάλα χρύσαιγις [
]κ̣αδέ̣ᾳ·

epode

καὶ τὸ] μ̣ὲν οὐ φατόν ἐστιν ε[
]ων τεκέεσσι· σὲ δ᾽ αὖ [
οὐρανόθ]εν καταδέρκεται ᾰ̣[έλιος
]τα κάλλιστον ἐπιχ̣θ̣[ονίων
ἀθανάτ]ο̣ις ἐναλ[ί]γκιον εἶδο̣[ς
]ς ἄλλος οὐτῶς []..[
οὔτ᾽] ἀν᾽ Ἰάονας οὔτ̣.[

strophe

κ]υδιάνειραν α[ἰ]ὲν̣[
Λακ]ε̣δαίμονα ναίο[υσι(ν)
].ς τε χοροῖς ἵππο̣[ισί τε
]ᾶν βαθὺν Εὐ-
ρώταν, περ]ί̣ τ̣᾽ ἀμφί τε θαῦμα[
] ἄλσεα λαχνάεντ᾽ ἐλ̣[ατᾶν
κά]πους·

antistrophe

ἔνθα παλαι]μοσύναι τε καὶ δρ[όμοι
ταχ]υ̣τᾶτ᾽ ἐς ἀγῶν᾽ ἐπασ[κ
]ν πατέρων ἰδήρα[τ-
]νια
]γε θεῶν̣ [π]άρ̣᾽, ἔστι δὲ[
]ἔσσα̣[μένα] Θέμις κα[
] [

They sang with the aulete . . . luxury indeed . . . desire as of love . . .

properly . . . secure (?) end . . . power; . . . great might . . . the gods give great wealth to those who they wish to have it, but to the others . . . according to the will of the Fates.

. . . to the Tyndarids . . . of the trumpet . . . to horse-taming Kastor and Polydeuces, good at boxing . . . godlike (heroes?) . . . accomplices; to them great (Athena) of the golden aegis . . .

. . . and that is not to be spoken . . . children . . . but on you the sun looks down from the sky as on the most beautiful of those on the earth, one like the gods in appearance . . . no other so . . . among Ionians or . . .

. . . those who dwell in Sparta, always famed for men, with . . . choruses and horses . . . deep Eurotas . . . around a wonderful sight . . . the shaggy groves of fir trees and the orchards

There in wrestling and in running . . . speed for the contest . . . of fathers . . . beautiful to watch . . . from the gods, and there is . . . Themis, wearing . . .

We begin with a mythical part featuring the Dioscuri. (If we read ἀείδον (5) as a first person, perhaps this was preceded by a recollection of past celebrations.)[14] Luxury and prosperity are described, and this leads to a gnomic part which concerns the instability of wealth and good fortune, which the gods give, but also take away. Then probably 'preparations for war' (West); and, intriguingly and importantly for our purposes, a 'break-off' at lines 22–3. With the suggestion that something cannot or should not be spoken, we move from mythical narrative to explicit praise. The analogy with the Polycrates fragment (Ibycus *S*151), pointed out by West (who thought with the present fragment that he was speaking of Stesichorus), is compelling,[15] although the *praeteritio* is less striking and remarkable here than in the other poem, since there the description of what will not be told continues for several lines, whereas here the break-off is rapid and followed immediately by non-mythological material. The praise which follows the break-off is erotic in flavour: the sun looks down upon the *laudandus* as on the most beautiful person on earth (as, we understand, the sun is the most splendid of stars: cf. Pind. *Ol.* 1.5). He is 'like the gods in appearance'. Praise

[14] It is hard to be confident about how the apparent sympotic flavour of these lines (see Cavallini 1993: 40–4) might relate to performance contexts. The tense of ἀείδο[ν (if correctly supplemented) would seem to differentiate these lines from most of the passages usefully collected by Cavallini. This seems likely to be sympotic celebration either on some previous celebration, or retrojected into the world of myth.

[15] West 1969: 147.

of Sparta follows, and then (still within this praise) a reference to athletic events which makes us think of epinician: wrestling, running and speed for the contest. The text given above prints ἐπαϛ[κ (West): practising speed. But Lobel had suggested ἐπ' Ἄϛ[ωπ-, a reference to the river Asopus in the territory of Sicyon. We know from Pindar (*Nem.* 9.9) that there were games in Sicyon; for Barron, not implausibly, this is a likely place for a mid-sixth-century Spartan to be found competing.[16] Caution is necessary: we have no secure demonstration that the reference to athletic contests is not a general element in the praise of Sparta (compare v. 31: Sparta is good at horses and choruses). If we suppose that the probable 'wrestling and running' of v. 36 and the contest of v. 37 are more specifically to be associated with the *laudandus*, i.e. that they refer to his or his family's achievements, how closely we associate this fragment with epinician is largely a question of definition. The poem does not appear to be explicitly connected with *one* victory, as is the common way with Pindar and Bacchylides, for we have two different events mentioned together.[17] The last part might present the familiar idea that athletic success depends both upon inherited excellence (πατέρων) and the aid of the gods (θεῶν [π]άρ'): but then again it equally well might not.[18]

The use of mythical material concerning the Dioscuri (perhaps specifically associated with their athletic abilities within the text, as in Lobel's supplement to v. 17, printed above) might have been especially appropriate in early epinician,[19] but of course is not very surprising in a poem praising a Spartan.

Perhaps whether to call this Epinician-with-a-capital-E is not the most interesting question that may be asked of this fragment. In any case, it appears to be praise-poetry in honour of a Spartan *laudandus* which makes athletic success part of the point of its praise, and as such should be considered at least a part of the prehistory of epinician poetry.[20] We may doubt the validity of dividing praise of this date into 'epinician' (songs celebrating athletic victories specifically – *how* specifically?) and

[16] Barron 1984: 21.
[17] The *laudandus* might have been a pentathlete, however, or the fragment might involve a list of victories associated with the victor's family.
[18] A good parallel would be *Pyth.* 5.73–6, as Cavallini points out (Cavallini 1993: 63).
[19] Cf. Sim. 509, 510 *PMG*; also *Isth.* 1, *Nem.* 10; on the Καστόρειον, see above.
[20] If this should be counted epinician, it is our only example for a Spartan victor: see Hornblower 2004: 235–43. The pederastic erotic emphasis might be seen as a Spartan feature, except that it seems to be visible so much in other fragments of Ibycus where there is no reason to suppose a Spartan connection. All of this being said, Professor Carey suggests to me that perhaps the mention of the Ionians might lead one to suppose that Ionians and Spartans are two terms of a polar expression: perhaps the poem was not so specifically Spartan in focus.

'encomium' (or whatever else we choose to call other praise songs).[21] We find here a tendency to eroticise the *laudandus*: a theme treated briefly by Pindar on several occasions in epinician, but which he seems to indulge at length only in non-epinician praise. We may suppose that this was a key element in Ibycean praise, as is both visible from the fragments and suggested by his ancient reception.[22] Pindar once (in an epinician context) associated this erotic element with the poets of the past, even though it is visible in his own encomiastic practice.[23]

General assessment of the style and content of *S*166 is obviously risky. Especially if 17 is correctly supplemented (Lobel), there may be a close interaction with hexameter tradition and narrative which one might think of as more characteristic of Bacchylides than of Pindar: as in the Polycrates fragment, there may have been a piquant epic-with-a-big-twist flavour, inviting intertextual reading.[24]

These are murky waters, and other possible instances of epinician song in Ibycus are more obscure still. Barron considered as possible epinicians two poems commented on in *P.Oxy*. 2637, *S*220–1. Here we see the end of a commentary on one, followed by the title Καλλ[ί]ας, and then the beginning of commentary on a second poem which the commentator identifies by this personal name. The first poem is likely to be praise: the commentator's note on]̣ν χαλεπὸν[(lines 9–10) is ε]ὔκολόν φησιν, 'he says that he has a mild temperament'. If so, this appears to be praise which again has an athletic element. Later (lines 20ff.) there is discussion by the commentator of 'feet in the athletic contest' and of a victor. Barron comments on the poem *Kallias* that Hellenistic poetry books often group poems by theme, so that if the preceding poem contained athletic material, then *Kallias* might also have done so.[25] But we know next to nothing about how the Hellenistic edition of Ibycus was organised, to the extent that it was organised at all (quoting authors use book numbers, as with Alcman

[21] On lyric genres and their names, see Harvey 1955; Cingano 2003 (in connection with the question of choral/monodic performance which I here ignore); Lowe 2007; Carey 2009.

[22] In Pindar, see especially fr. 123; in epinician, *Ol*. 10.99–106, *Pyth*. 6 init. (see Kurke 1990), *Pyth*. 9.97–103, *Isth*. 2 init., *Nem*. 8 init., etc. Ibycus testimonia (*PMGF*): TA1, TB1–5, cf. Ath. 13.601a–b. There is a danger of circularity: fragments which could on other grounds be either Stesichorus or Ibycus get attributed to Ibycus if they contain erotic material. On erotic praise see Lasserre 1974, and more recently Kurke 1990, Carey 2000: 171 n.12, Nicholson 2000 and Rawles 2011.

[23] *Isth*. 2.1–5.

[24] Lobel's supplement to 17 is based on *Il*. 3.237 and *Od*. 11.300. On intertextuality in Ibycus, see Barron 1984: 14–19 and 1969 (*contra* Page 1951); this way of seeing the Polycrates fragment is now broadly accepted (see e.g. Hutchinson 2001 with further bibliography).

[25] Barron 1984: 20.

and Sappho, rather than classifications of genre or occasion).[26] Nor does it signify much that Lobel rightly went to epinician to seek parallels for the naming of a poem according to the nominative of the name of its *laudandus*. He pointed to the practice found a number of times in the scholia to Pindar, where the comment on a particular poem ends with τέλος and the name of the *laudandus* in the genitive case, 'The end of Arkesilaos' or the like, as if the title of the poem were *Arkesilaos*.[27] This is simply a reflection of the fact that, of early praise-poetry more generally, only epinician has survived for us in such a way as to allow judgements of this kind. Who can say whether an epinician was more likely to carry a title 'Hieron' or 'Arkesilaos' or similar than a non-epinician poem of praise such as the ancient scholars gathered into Pindar's *encomia*? The difficulty here is greater than with *S*166; it looks on the face of it as if at least the poem for an unknown victor (i.e. *S*220) featured praise for athletic achievement.

Kallias is nevertheless interesting, for it seems to address a background assumption that praise can be morally controversial. The lines (*S*221 *P. Oxy.* 2367 fr. 1(a), 32–42 *PMGF*), presumably early in the poem, which the commentator first singled out for comment were the following:

αἰὲν ἐμοὶ πόνος οὗτος εἴη·
αἰ δέ τις βροτῶν μ' ἐνίπτει
νόσφιν

glosses

ἐγὼν δ' ἔτι μ[είζο]ν' αὔχαν
τίθεμαι περὶ τούτων·

glosses

Let this task ever be mine. And if some mortal takes me aside and reproves me . . .

. . . and I make an even greater boast about these matters:

This seems to suggest an atmosphere where praise-poetry might (at any rate in some places and among some people) have seemed to need a defence.[28]

[26] '. . . the poems of Ibycus . . . seem to have been subject to no discernible organising principle at all': Lowe 2007: 170.

[27] The example of Arkesilaos is the one used by Lobel in *ed. pr.*: Σ *Pyth.* 4 fin. (II: 170, 16 Dr.). Cf. Barron 1984: 21.

[28] Could Ibyc. 310 *PMGF* indicate an acknowledgement of the same kind of moral anxiety? δέδοικα μή τι πὰρ θεοῖς| ἀμβλακὼν τιμὰν πρὸς ἀνθρώπων ἀμείψω 'I am afraid lest I do some wrong by the gods when I give requital of glory in the presence of men.' (But this is not the only possible translation; Campbell in the Loeb gives 'I am afraid that it may be in exchange for some sin before the gods that I get honour from men.')

This treatment of possible Ibycean epinicia, though incomplete, at least shows that, while much here is uncertain, it was sometimes the case that Ibycus' panegyrics included praise associated with athletics. In the most substantial passage which may be considered in this light, *S*166, perhaps the most remarkable feature is the strength of the eroticisation of the praise of the *laudandus*. One of the effects of this must have been to achieve an effect of personal engagement by poet and/or chorus, to counter the possibly artificial and over-rehearsed appearance of choral performance and the possibility that the poet himself might be seen as professionally interested, and therefore insincere.[29]

SIMONIDES

With Simonides' epinicians, we are on surer ground. That he did compose epinicians is not disputed. Eight books of victory odes are attested in late sources. The Alexandrian scholars classified these by athletic discipline, rather than (as in Pindar) the place where the victory was achieved.[30] Nevertheless, we know them only from fragments: a fair number of quotation fragments and parts of papyrus finds, which do not offer large stretches of comprehensible text.[31] The earliest datable epinician apart from Ibycus is often said to be Simonides' song for Glaucus of Carystus (509 *PMG*). This victory was probably won in 520 BC or not long afterwards.[32] It seems in any case reasonable to suppose *a priori* that Simonides' earliest epinicians would have been composed during the last decades of the sixth century. While we may still think of this as 'early epinician' in the sense that Simonides' date of birth was appreciably earlier than Pindar's or Bacchylides', the careers of all three overlapped (the earliest datable ode of Pindar is *Pythian* 10, of 498 BC, and Bacchylides' earliest works date from about the same time or perhaps a bit later).[33] Undated poems of Simonides are as likely to come

[29] Cf. Nicholson 2000, Rawles 2011. On the impact of professionalism see further below.

[30] See Obbink 2001: 75–7, Lowe 2007: 175.

[31] Quotation fragments classified as epinician by Page in *PMG*: 506–10, 512–18. From the papyri, 511 *PMG* (*P.Oxy.* 2431) is epinician, and 519 (*P.Oxy.* 2430) provides numerous scraps of both epinicians and paeans, mostly in a very fragmentary state. Of later discoveries, *S*319–86 (*P.Oxy.* 2623) and *S*387–442 (*P.Oxy.* 2624) are likely to be Simonidean. The former surely contained epinician (see frr. 21–2 = *S*339–40) and the latter may have done.

[32] The date is not, unfortunately, certain: see Rose 1933, Fontenrose 1968: 99–103. In my judgement Fontenrose is unduly dismissive of the value of Lucian's testimony, and gives too much value to Quintilian's, which is demonstrably muddled anyway: see Slater 1972 (and Rawles 2005: 65). See also Molyneux 1992: 33–42, with further references. We need not doubt that the poem was by Simonides.

[33] There is no reason to disbelieve the tradition (*Suda* β59 *s.v.* Βακχυλίδης, 1: 449 Adler; Strab. 10.5.6 = Bacchylides T1 and 2 in Campbell's Loeb) that Bacchylides was Simonides' nephew, except that