To Praise, Not to Bury: Simonides fr. 531P
Author(s): Deborah Steiner
Source: *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 49, No. 2 (1999), pp. 383-395
Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/639864
Accessed: 23-10-2019 13:11 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms

Cambridge University Press, The Classical Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Quarterly*

Classical Quarterly **49.2** 383–395 (1999) *Printed in Great Britain*

TO PRAISE, NOT TO BURY: SIMONIDES fr. 531P

Unresolved questions surround Simonides fr. 531, which eulogizes the Greeks who fell at Thermopylae. To what genre do these lines belong, what were the original conditions of their performance, and does Diodorus Siculus, who preserves the fragment, transmit just an extract (as seems most likely) or the complete piece?[1] Commentators even differ as to where Simonides' lines began: for some the words τῶν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις θανόντων form part of the original composition, for others they conclude Diodorus' prose introduction.[2] In my reading of the fragment, I aim to address some of these puzzles by focusing chiefly on issues that allow for greater certainty: the structure and sentiments of the lines, and the cohesion between the song's contents and the conventions found in near contemporary commemorations of men fallen in battle on their country or polis' behalf. As the comparative material will suggest, Diodorus' designation of the lines as an encomion, something 'properly' delivered in praise of living men, should perhaps not be dismissed out of hand. Simonides' words may have been embedded within a composition as much designed for the purpose of praising, exhorting and inspiring the living as for memorializing the dead.

I. FROM EPITAPH TO ENCOMION

Simonides, I want to begin by suggesting, structures his lines and their conceits with a particular aim in mind: through the course of his remarks, the poet seeks to direct his audience's attention away from the material remains of the dead and the grave which houses them, and does so by deploying the monument and the standard contents of the epigram it would bear as comparanda and foil for his own verbal commemoration.[3] The fragment's dismissive use of the burial site does more than express the absence of individuals whose own physical remains lie interred in a grave far removed from those who now evoke their deed.[4] By calling attention to the song's divorce from the tangible marker, the poet more centrally turns that fact of distance to his own advantage, and makes the replacement of the monument by the lyric tribute mirror the change in state that the dead have undergone:[5] while the grave and its inscription together continue to assert the presence of the dead, the song chooses to view the men of Thermopylae only in terms of their disembodied and deracinated glory and renown.

---

[1] For treatment of these issues, C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*^{2} (Oxford, 1961), 345, recapitulating his more prolonged discussion in 'Simonides on the fallen of Thermopylae', *CPh* 28 (1933), 277–81; A. E. Harvey, 'The classification of Greek lyric poetry', *CQ* 5 (1955), 157–75, at 163–4; A. J. Podlecki, 'Simonides: 480', *Historia* 17 (1968), 257–75, at 258–9, 262. Note too N. Loraux, *The Invention of Athens. The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*, trans. A. Sheridan (Cambridge, MA, 1986), 44. Diodorus' mode of citation suggests an extract; the phrase ἐν ὧι λέγει seems to indicate his familiarity with more of the poem than he actually cites.

[2] For the argument that the phrase did not form part of the original lines, see M. L. West, 'Prose in Simonides', *CR* 17 (1967), 133 and 'Melica', *CQ* 20 (1970), 205–15, at 210; for refutation of his view, D. L. Page, 'Poetry and prose: Simonides, *P.M.G* 531, Ibycus 298', *CR* 21 (1971), 317–18, at 317.

[3] That Simonides was well versed in the conventions of the epitaphic form, his own position as perhaps the pre-eminent composer of grave epigrams of his age guarantees. For this see A. Carson, 'Writing on the world: Simonides, exactitude and Paul Celan', *Arion* 4 (1996), 1–26, at 1. As M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin, 1974), 20 notes, there was probably a whole book of epigrams eventually collected under Simonides' name. The poet also more broadly shows himself concerned with the relations between his activity and that of the artisan who works in stone, clay, or paint; indeed, it has become something of a commonplace of recent discussions to describe Simonides as a composer who reflects on the 'materiality' of his own product. For this see, J. Svenbro, *La parole et le marbre. Aux origines de la poétique grecque* (Lund, 1976), 141–93; M. Detienne, *Les maîtres de vérité dans la grèce archaïque* (Paris, 1967), 108; A. Carson, 'Simonides painter', in R. Hexter and D. Selden (edd.), *Innovations of Antiquity* (London, 1992), 51–64.

This larger thought pattern informing the composition suggests that the phrase τῶν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις θανόντων formed part of Simonides' original design: by situating the dead at Thermopylae the song already declares the present act of commemoration far removed from the site of the burial. Although equivalent localizations appear in some epitaphs,[6] most of those belonging to the archaic and early classical period follow what Sir Denys Page calls the 'general rule' that the inscription has no need to state the name of the battlefield; the reader knows full well where he is standing as he views the tomb, and a simple τῇδε may suffice by way of indicator.[7] Only where the war memorial exists independent of the grave, or, as in the case of the Athenian dead, the ashes have been repatriated,[8] does the epigram include the name of the spot where the warriors fell. Still more eloquent of absence and a missing piece is the bare τῶν which Simonides selects to introduce his subjects. As a composer of epitaphs, he would regularly open with a pronoun,[9] often in the genitive case, to evoke the men whose death in battle the inscribed monument recalls; but in every other instance that pronoun takes the form of a demonstrative, affirming the 'presentness' of the warriors at the site of the grave, and their tight association with the inscribed stone which marks the remains.[10] The epitaph for the Lokrians who died at Thermopylae (*GVI* 6) begins τούσδε and *GVI* 11 (again attributed to Simonides) has τῶνδε as its opening term.[11] The rule also holds good for the inscriptions commemorating the warriors whose ashes the Athenians, departing from the Greek practice of burial on the field of battle, brought home and placed in the δημόσιον σῆμα in the Kerameikos: *CEG* 6 and 10 begin by naming the distant site of the battle, and then introduce the dead with the emphatic οἵδε.

---

[4] Hdt. 7.228 records that no corpses were removed from Thermopylae after the encounter.

[5] See H. Fränkel, *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, trans. M. Hadas and J. Willis (New York, 1973), 320–1 for a very different account of the transformation effected by the song: in his reading 'physical death is transfigured into moral life'.

[6] For example, *GVI* 1, 23; *FGE* 21. For these inscriptions, I have used the collections of W. Peek, *Griechische Versinschriften I; Grab-Epigramme* (Berlin, 1955), hereafter *GVI* with his numbers, P. A. Hansen, *Carmina epigraphica graeca saeculorum viii–v a Chr. n.*, *Texte und Kommentare xii* (Berlin and New York, 1983), hereafter *CEG* with his numbers, and D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1981), hereafter *FGE* with his numbers. For further discussion of the inscriptions, W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War* vol. 4 (Berkeley, 1984), 153–208; note too F. Jacoby, 'Some Athenian epigrams from the Persian wars', *Hesperia* 14 (1945), 157–207; C. W. Clairmont, *Gravestone and Epigram. Greek Memorials from the Archaic and Classical Period* (Mainz, 1970); more recently, C. W. Clairmont, *Patrios Nomos: Public Burial in Athens during the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.*, BAR International Series 161 (Oxford, 1983).

[7] For this 'general rule', and discussion of exceptions to it, see *FGE*, 189–90.

[8] On this practice, see F. Jacoby, 'Patrios nomos: state burial in Athens and the public cemetery in the Kerameikos', *JHS* 64 (1944), 37–66; also D. Kurtz and J. Boardman, *Greek Burial Customs* (London, 1971), 246–7 and 257, Loraux (n. 1), 18–19.

[9] As *FGE*, 222 observes, such pronouns are characteristic of epitaphs at places of burial.

[10] West (n. 2, 1967), 133, in an attempt to improve on what he sees as the prosaic nature of the opening line, suggests that at the original beginning of fr. 531 there may have stood τῶνδε.

[11] Other examples include *GVI* 10, 13, 21; *CEG* 6, 8, 10.

Glances towards the displaced monument continue through the remainder of the lines. As a recent discussion by Sourvinou-Inwood documents, the epitaph's mention of the marker that it accompanies, or of the fact of burial at that particular spot, forms one of the most constant features of the genre, and characterizes both public and private inscriptions of the archaic and early classical period.[12] On the *polyandreion* housing the dead at the Euripos in 507/6 (*GVI* 1 = Sim. 2P), the inscription names the σῆμα that marks the grave, and Simonides' composition for the seer Megistias who died at Thermopylae opens μνῆμα τόδε (*FGE* 6 = Sim. 6P).[13] More elaborate is the poem, again assigned to Simonides by the *Greek Anthology* (7.258), that stands on the tomb of those who fell at the Eurymedon in 468 (*GVI* 13 = Sim. 46P): it describes the monument as a μνῆμα of the fallen.[14] Fragment 531 seemingly observes the epitaphic rule. Line 3 speaks of the τάφος, and the σηκός in line 6 seemingly describes a burial area, one of a particularly exalted kind appropriate to the status of the semi-heroized dead;[15] accompanied by ὅδε, it corresponds to the epitaphs' own repeated use of τόδε to introduce the σῆμα or μνῆμα to which they belong.

But just as Simonides marked both person and place as absent in his opening line, so too he includes the monument only to deny it the 'presentness' that contemporary inscribed epitaphs take pains to affirm.[16] When the looked-for τάφος does appear, it forms part of the assertion that this grave serves as, or, more curiously, has been replaced by an altar. So too the ἐντάφιον rapidly loses the material character it seems to possess: no sooner does Simonides introduce the term than he strips it of physicality, proclaiming it miraculously untouched by mould and time. And finally the σηκός, whose pronoun begins by announcing its presence before the audience, undergoes an equivalent change in state. Where the opening of line six evokes the literal dwelling place of the dead (ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν ὅδε σηκός), and so parallels statements in epitaphs where the grave monument or burial site describes itself as possessor of the persons of the deceased,[17] the ending of the line redefines the nature of the inhabitant and moves from the physical to the immaterial sphere: unlike the conventional σῆμα that 'takes' or 'holds' the corpses of the dead, this σηκός has *chosen* the disembodied εὐδοξία that the dead have earned.

Close to this transmutation is the effect achieved by the conceit which ends the lines transmitted by Diodorus. Perhaps with a glance towards the epitaphic convention that has the dead directly address their audience, to whom they describe their exploits and their fate,[18] the final clause introduces the figure of Leonidas as witness to (μαρτυρεῖ) the statements already made. But the general's evidence takes a curious form. Where the Eurymedon dead whose epitaph Simonides composes have left behind (ἔλιπον) the μνῆμα that is the tangible memorial (*GVI* 13), Leonidas' analogous κόσμος that he has bequeathed (λελοιπώς) finds its materiality undercut by the second element in the series: κλέος is the sounding glory that can exist quite divorced from the visible monument, and which from epic poetry on enjoys precisely the audibility and mobility denied to the rooted stone.[19]

---

[12] C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *'Reading' Greek Death* (Oxford, 1996), 147–51; as the author points out, if the grave itself does not feature in the account, then the epitaph obliquely alludes to it with a reference to the fact of burial (e.g. 'here lies A' or 'A laid B here'). For the 'co-dependency' between the monument and inscription, see the remarks by A. E. Raubitschek, 'Das Denkmal-Epigram', in *L'épigramme grecque*. Fondation Hardt. Entretiens 14 (Vandoeuvres and Geneva, 1967 [1968]), 1–26.

[13] For instances where the lines describe the fact of burial or the fallen as occupying this particular site, see, among others, *GVI* 4, 8; *CEG* 131.

[14] For discussion of the occasion, see *FGE*, 168–71 (but for doubts on the authenticity of the lines, Pritchett [n. 6], 177–8). For the very similar formulation, see *CEG* 6 which refers to the μνῆμα that the dead have acquired.

[15] For the heroization of the war dead, see Loraux (n. 1), 28–30, 38–42, and R. Stupperich, *Staatsbegräbnis und Privatgrabmal im klassischen Athen* (Diss. Münster, 1977), 65–6. The sources describe how rituals suitable to heroes were conducted on behalf of those who died in the battles at Marathon and Plataea; for these see Paus. 1.32.4, Thuc. 3.58, and Plut. *Aristid.* 21. Paus. 3.12.9 speaks of the ἱερόν or shrine dedicated to two soldiers who died and were buried at Thermopylae back in Sparta. Euripides uses the term σηκός of Semele's grave (*Ba.* 11). Note too Paus. 1.17.6, Diod. 1.22.2, *AP* 7.570, 8.118.

[16] On the 'presentness' of the inscription and monument, see J. Svenbro, *Phrasikleia: Anthropologie de la lecture en grèce ancienne* (Paris, 1988), 51–2.

[17] For example, *GVI* 1 and 10; *CEG* 131.

The verbal renown that results from poetic commemoration of individuals and their deeds is, of course, the lines' principal concern, and the property that Simonides introduces in place of the physical marker. The third line of the composition already signals the *quid pro quo*. Even as the brief phrases spell out the rule more tacitly observed by fifth-century public epigrams—in distinction to inscriptions on private tombs, the words on *polyandreia* must admit only circumscribed references to the grief occasioned by the warriors' death, and temper allusions to their sorrowful end with focus on praise and glorification[20]—they use the trope of substitution to describe another act of exchange going on.[21] The terms that Simonides selects for replacement, τάφος, γόοι, and οἶκτος (this the emotion that would accompany the definitive moment of separation that the deceaseds' consignment to the grave involved), all recall the original funerary rituals,[22] while two of the novel elements, μνᾶστις and ἔπαινος, look instead to the song of praise that is presently being sung. The word that ends the line unmistakably refers to a verbal eulogy, but μνᾶστις or remembrance also regularly releases speech.[23] The displacement of the tomb by an altar coincides with these other changes taking place: the βωμός stands free of the intimate associations with the fact of death that the τάφος involves, and may have a more symbolic than literal quality: in delivering his act of praise, the poet is making an offering such as an altar might bear.[24]

---

[18] As Jacoby (n. 6), 172 observes, for both private and public epitaphs, the fifth-century composer had a variety of possible speakers. He might endow the monument itself with powers of expression, and, as in the first of the two epitaphs for the men who fell at Potidaea (*CEG* 10), make it announce itself the σῆμα or μνῆμα of the dead. Or the voice might belong to the community that does the burying, which speaks with regret, pride, and praise of those whom it inters. But particularly frequent in the extant public inscriptions is the phenomenon of the speaking dead. Examples of the dead speaking include *GVI* 1, 8, 28; *CEG* 131; *FGE* 16. See too the further examples cited in S. Goldhill, 'A footnote in the history of Greek epitaphs: Simonides 146 Bergk', *Phoenix* 42 (1988), 189–97, at 195.

[19] The Pindaric parallels that commentators cite demonstrate the changes Simonides has rung on the conventional form. In both *O.* 9.98–9 and *O.* 13.108, it is the actual structure that does the witnessing.

[20] For elaboration of this point, see Sourvinou-Inwood (n. 12), 192; Loraux (n. 1), 44–51, 54–6; Stupperich (n. 15), 14. In her treatment, Loraux calls the prohibition against bewailing the dead and the focus on their eternal renown 'a strictly civic prescription that was universal throughout Greek poleis' (44). For a more nuanced view, which focuses on the mixture of lamentation and praise included in the inscriptions on *polyandreia* and other memorials, see A. Stecher, *Inschriftliche Grabgedichte auf Krieger und Athleten: Eine Studie zu griechischen Wertprädikationen* (Innsbruck, 1981), 28–36. The epitaphs' combination of 'moderate expressions of grief and considerable praise' (M. Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* [Cambridge, 1974], 108) prompted the hesitation of later compilers seeking to classify pieces which sometimes appear as eulogistic ἐλεγεῖα, and sometimes as ἐπικήδεια. On this latter category, see B. Gentili, 'Epigramma ed elegia', in *L' épigramme grecque*, Fondation Hardt. Entretiens 14 (Vandoeuvres and Geneva, 1967 [1968]), 39–81, at 44–6; Loraux (n. 1), 54–5. I return to this issue in the second part of the discussion.

[21] The use of πρό is particularly curious here, and commentators regularly gloss it with ἀντί, which is the conventional term in the funerary epitaph (see Sim. 106B, 116D). For discussion, D. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Bristol, 1982) and E. Degani and G. Burzacchini (edd.), *Lirici greci* (Florence, 1977).

[22] Inscriptions both public and private make frequent reference to the actual raising up of the tomb: e.g. *GVI* 1; *CEG* 14, 53, 117, 139, 143, with discussion in J. Day, 'Rituals in stone: early Greek grave epigrams and monuments', *JHS* 109 (1989), 16–28, at 23–7; according to his

With this declaration that a verbal eulogy has taken the place of the material monument and funerary lamentations performed in its midst, the poet then elaborates on the conceit. The expression ἐντάφιον τοιοῦτον, as Podlecki points out,[25] must hark back to something that has gone before, but the only possible referent is the praise generated by the death of the warrior, and the lines that the present-day singer performs. Whether we read the ἐντάφιον as a shroud or an offering,[26] the product's resistance to mould and time demonstrates the superiority of the memorial created by the song; unlike a material funeral-gift or 'winding sheet' (articles that once again both look back to the rites of burial),[27] Simonides' praise effectively withstands the damage that the elements can do. Particularly pointed is the expression οὔτε . . . ἀμαυρώσει which declares the invulnerability of this ἐντάφιον. When used of sound, the verb can describe the way in which a noise fades away;[28] where the 'voice' built into the inscription on the tomb may become inaudible for want of a passer-by to pronounce the words of praise, the musical ἐντάφιον goes on sounding loud and clear for all future time. But more commonly the same term refers to a loss of visibility and the process whereby phenomena grow dull,[29] and here Simonides appropriates for his 'monument' the same luminous quality that the grave marker more commonly assigns itself. Just as Achilles' tomb appears τηλαυγές (*Od.* 24.82), and a late fifth-century stele uses the same expression to describe its own eye-catching appeal (*CEG* 93), so too the praise that Simonides utters possesses the brilliance and clarity that dispel the darkness which silence and oblivion both share.[30]

These claims find confirmation, and fresh statement, in the remainder of the fragment. The σηκός must be no actual building but, as the ὅδε suggests, the metaphorical structure that the singer has been setting up all along.[31] The occupant of this

---

argument, references to this and other aspects of the actual funerary ritual involve a re-enactment of that original event. γόων is itself an emendation of the manuscript reading προγόνων, independently proposed at the end of the eighteenth century by Eichstädt and Ilgen and adopted by most editors since. Hermann proposed πρὸ χοῶν, and was followed by Edmonds.

[23] This reading would counter commentators' worry about the lack of parallelism between sobbing, one a vocalization, and μνᾶστις, a mental state (see Fränkel [n. 5], 320, n. 30 for one attempt to explain it away).

[24] Cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 106. Several Greek inscriptions do refer to the tomb as a βωμός (see R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin epitaphs* [Urbana, 1942], 131), but these all long postdate Simonides' piece.

[25] Podlecki (n. 1), 261.

[26] For the debate concerning the meaning of the term, see Podlecki (n. 1), 261.

[27] See *CEG* 159 for an explicit evocation of the *ekphora* in an epitaph.

[28] LSJ s.v. Perhaps as an extension of this meaning, the adjectival form can describe something obscure or unknown.

[29] As adjective, the term can mean blind or sightless, observing the Greek rule that seeing and being seen form two sides to a single coin. Sappho fr. 55 LP suggestively applies the term to the shades of the dead in Hades.

[30] These are sentiments endlessly repeated in Pindar, e.g. *P.* 6.14, *P.* 8.96–7, *P.* 9.89–90, *N.* 7.12–13. On darkness, silence, and forgetfulness as interlinked, see Detienne (n. 3), 22–3.

[31] As West (n. 2, 1970), 211, briefly observes: 'ὅδε σηκός need not refer to the physical tomb

precinct corresponds to its own immaterial character: in place of the corpse, bones, or ashes that the *polyandreion* might house, the σηκός receives the disembodied εὐδοξία that is the stuff of speech and song. The witnessing that Leonidas performs rehearses the same gesture one last time: his testimony does not refer back to the physical monument in the way that epitaphs spoken by the dead so frequently do, but instead points us towards something that looks very like the song we have just heard. Joining the eye-pleasing qualities of physical monuments to the eternal audibility that is the prerogative of poetic praise, the ornament and κλέος combine to constitute the λόγος generated by the deed that Leonidas and his fellow fighters performed.[32]

If all this seems familiar stuff, then so it probably should. Encomiastic poets, and Pindar above all, repeatedly declare the symbiosis of the noble act and its celebration in song, and are masters at contrasting the ephemeral or bounded nature of man-made structures—statues, temples, and grave stones among them—with the superior durability and praise-diffusing qualities of their compositions.[33] A treasure-house of song suffers no damage from the winter rains and winds as actual buildings do, but in an eternally 'clear light' its porch will lastingly proclaim the athlete's chariot victory (Pind. *P.* 6.7–14); the ἀθάνατον . . . ἄγαλμα of the Muses which Bacchylides evokes (9.11) possesses the same invincible and unending commemorative efficacy, and a substance quite unlike that of manufactured goods.[34] But Simonides does more than merely reflect on and promote the claims of his own poetic medium. By using the monument as negative paradigm for his work's powers, he has made his lines carry through the transformation they describe: their turn away from the grave and funerary ritual, and introduction of the standard tropes of praise earn those fallen at Thermopylae unending life in the form of song. Through the course of the composition, we hear this victory over death taking place. The heavy θανόντων terminating the opening line that Diodorus cites gives way beneath repeated assertions of renown, and the fragment ends on the counternote which denies what it began by affirming: no death but κλέος instead. Leonidas himself stands as paradigm for the other warriors, and for the power of the sounding tribute to restore the individual to life: though one of the fallen, his act of witness effectively defies mortality, and he shares in the imperishability (ἀέναον) that his glory has attained.[35]

II. THE CIVIC DIMENSION

To ground the reading I have offered so far, I want to place Simonides' lines within the context of some other archaic and classical commemorations of those who died

---

any more than ἐντάφιον τοιοῦτον refers to the physical shroud. It refers rather to the metaphorical heroon . . . at which praise and remembrance take the place of lamentation.'

[32] Cf. Pindar's use of the word in *N.* 2.8 where the designation of the *laudandus* as a κόσμον signals his new status as a creation of the song.

[33] For example, Pind. *P.* 6.7–17, *N.* 4.80–1, *N.* 5.1–5, *N.* 8.43–6. See too Simonides' own use of the notion of the ephemerality of man-made structures in fr. 581 which offers an interesting pendant to 531; here much more explicitly the poet challenges the claims of the inscribed stone as he takes issue with Kleoboulos' epitaph on Midas' tomb, and declares the monument unable to withstand the destructive powers of natural and human forces. The anecdotal tradition contains a reflection of Simonides' apparent mistrust of the durability of grave monuments. Suidas reports that his own tomb was pulled down by the Agrigentine general Phoenix in the war with Syracuse, who had no respect 'for the writing thereon which declared that beneath lay the son of Leoprepes of Ceos'.

[34] Note how Bacchylides declares the object ἀχειρές, not the product of human workmanship.

[35] A point made rather differently in Carson (n. 3, 1992), 56.

fighting for their city or country, and to propose that the move that I see as central to fr. 531—the substitution of the word of praise for the monument and funerary rites memorializing the dead—may be a more general element in some of these texts' design. As a notion which recurs in a variety of commemorative forms, the conceit suggests itself as one possible response to the particular challenge posed by the death of the citizen soldier.

I begin in reverse chronology, with a text that borrows extensively from the language and themes of Simonides' song, and that can serve as a commentary on and elucidator of the earlier piece. A common discourse broadcasting a civic or pan-Hellenic funerary ideology links fr. 531 to the ἐπιτάφιος λόγος which Thucydides' Pericles delivers to his Athenian audience.[36] In both texts we encounter many of the 'buzz words' that already in the late archaic age surrounded the citizen who died fighting on behalf of his polis or country, and both include references to the way in which a man must behave in order to achieve this most glorious end.[37] But the most exact echoes occur in a passage where Pericles reckons with what Loraux calls 'the inhibiting presence of the funerary monument' on which the attention of his audience would be fixed,[38] and looks to replace the material ἔργον with words possessing a still greater visibility and efficacy. Speaking of those who have fallen in battle, the statesman remarks: 'For giving their bodies to the commonwealth they received, each for himself, praise that does not grow old, and the most conspicuous tomb, not the one in which they lie, but the one in which their ever-remembered δόξα is left behind at the appropriate time of every word and deed' (2.43.2). Not only do ἔπαινος, τάφος, and δόξα recall Simonides' choice of terms, but the sentiments and motifs no less tightly cohere. Just as the poet had substituted his ever-fresh eulogy for the monument (in this earlier instance removed in time and place), prey to attack from the passing years and obscuring mould, so now the orator describes his eternally youthful ἔπαινος as the second, and more conspicuous, grave that the Athenians have won;[39] the δόξα he goes on to locate in this verbal structure corresponds to the εὐδοξία featured by Simonides, and to the glorious repute that Leonidas also left behind. Pericles may even match the antecedent on one further count: if the ἔργον of his phrase refers to the rites regularly performed on behalf of the dead,[40] then the verbal τάφος has become the prompt for the commemorative rituals that would normally occur in the presence of the tomb.

---

[36] Several discussions of fr. 531 (e.g. Bowra [n. 1, 1961], 347–8; West [n. 2, 1970], 211) refer in passing to Pericles' funeral oration, but none does more than note the continuity in sentiment. While concentrating on the parallels between the two texts, I do not wish to mask the discontinuities; as Loraux (n. 1), 58–60 emphasizes, the period of the Persian wars is not that of Athens of the 460s which probably saw the beginning of the πάτριος νόμος cited by Thucydides. For the earlier period, an 'ethos of the aristeia' persists alongside the celebration of the anonymous citizen as fighter in the communal battle line, and like Herodotus in his account of events at Thermopylae, Simonides makes place for the extraordinary individual whose behaviour can stand paradigm for the rest. Note too J.-P. Vernant, *Figures, idoles, masques* (Paris, 1990), 56.

[37] Among the many parallels, both refer to the concept of the ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός and his ἀρετή (Sim. 531.6 and 8; Thuc. 2.35.1, 42.2–3); notions of εὐτυχία, κλέος, and εὐδοξία also punctuate both, and each work replaces inappropriate lamentation with praise (Thuc. 2.44.1).

[38] Loraux (n. 1), 235.

[39] Does the eternal youthfulness of the verbal monument perhaps correspond to the notion that warriors who die in their youthful prime (an element included in *GVI* 13, *CEG* 4, 6) escape the ravages of old age, and possess an eternal beauty? For this, see J.-P. Vernant, 'La belle mort et le cadavre outragé', in G. Gnoli and J.-P. Vernant (edd.), *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes* (Cambridge, 1982), 45–76. Note too the visual assertiveness lent to speech by the term ἐπισημότατον which grants the address the virtues the displaced σῆμα might more properly claim.

In a renewed statement and expansion of the same theme, Pericles continues: 'for the whole earth is the grave of illustrious men, and not only does the inscription on the stelae mark it in their own land, but even in that not belonging to them there dwells permanently the unwritten μνήμη of their γνώμη (thinking/intention) rather than of their deed' (2.43.3).[41] While the introduction of the γνώμη pushes the process of abstraction further than Simonides had gone, the earlier part of the remark recapitulates the motif of the poet's song. Just as Simonides' lines rendered the epitaph on the monument redundant through their incorporation and transformation of its conceits, so here the eulogist more directly confronts the inscription on the stele and goes on to replace its localized nature with a phenomenon that observes no such limitations. The expression ἄγραφος μνήμη alerts the listener to the substitution that the speaker effects: μνήμη puns on the term μνῆμα so regularly used for the monument in contemporary inscriptions, referring here to the very different 'remembrance' that verbal eulogies constitute and generate,[42] while the 'unwritten' quality of this record looks back to the letters carved on the stone that the orator is in the very process of displacing. Once again the notion of the metaphoric tomb's indweller remains the same. Simonides' poetic σηκός chooses εὐδοξία for its 'sacristan',[43] while the ubiquitous τάφος that Pericles' remarks construct plays host to the immaterial spirit inspiring the fighters' glorious death.

But why these explicit or implicit confrontations with the inscribed tomb, and endeavours to replace it with 'epitaphs' and 'monuments' of a different kind? If Simonides employs a stratagem that makes a virtue of the absence of the grave, and of his audience's separation from the site where the fallen lie, then Pericles labours under no such constraint. According to one possible reading, competition with a rival commemorative mode underlies the topos both singer and speaker employ as each looks to promote the powers of his verbal artistry, and to downgrade the physical marker of the grave which, whether present or absent, threatens to occupy the listener's thoughts.[44] But other texts articulating the same ideology of the citizen's noble death point to a second explanation, and suggest that the eulogists' simultaneous acknowledgement and depreciation of the monument may have as much to do with that structure's double and antithetical functions. While the tomb undeniably forms a critical part of the γέρας that is owing to the fallen,[45] and continues to serve as the symbol for the persona of the deceased and the chief prompt for remembrance and praise,[46] it may also present too stark a reminder of the unhappy fact of death, and so risk undermining the central message that public commemorations of the citizen-fighter are bound to proclaim: that the imperishable memory of the warrior's valour negates his loss of life. As Pericles' words indicate, the σῆμα comes burdened with a second handicap: its localized, rooted nature restricts the diffusion of the fighters' renown. Both the powers and limitations of the grave, I suggest, determine the agenda for those employed to eulogize the fallen.

---

[40] So H. R. Immerwahr, 'Ergon. History as monument in Herodotus and Thucydides', *AJPh* 81 (1960), 261–90, at 287. However, the phrase could also mean 'on every recurrent occasion that calls for word and action'.

[41] See Immerwahr (n. 40), 287 for discussion of the sense of the term ἔργον here. Note too the comments of Loraux (n. 1), 28–9 on the passage.

[42] For a comparable play on the μνήμη/μνῆμα distinction in Sim. 146B, see Goldhill (n. 18), esp. 192.

[43] The term is suggested by West (n. 2,1970), 211.

[44] Loraux (n. 1), 231–5 offers invaluable discussion of the place of λόγος in the funeral oration, and its tacit struggle with the ἔργα—both the physical monument and the deeds of the fighters—of which it speaks. While Pericles confronts the physical monument, we should also recall that behind him stands the figure of Thucydides, no less concerned with constructing his own verbal monument, or κτῆμα ἐς αἰεί (1.22.4).

[45] And explicitly describes itself as such in *CEG* 40; cf. *Il.* 16.457. For discussion of the term, see H. Häusle, *Einfache und frühe Formen des griechischen Epigrams* (Innsbruck, 1979), 123–5.

[46] For the tomb's function as generator for praise, see *Il.* 7.89–91; *Od.* 24.93–4.

According to the messages on private as well as public tombs, it is the very fact of the grave mound, marker, or monument that instigates remembrance, and here the inscription merely inherits the role that memorials to the dead already possessed in pre-alphabetic times.[47] But even as it works to preserve memory of the deceased, the grave also seems regularly to unleash sentiments of grief and sorrow. Among the most common themes that appear in the epitaphs of the archaic and early classical age are invitations to the passer-by to feel pity for the dead and to give audible expression to his feelings of sorrow at his or her often untimely end while in the act of observing the monument.[48] The viewer should 'halt and show pity beside the marker of Kroisos' (*CEG* 27), and the individual whose mind is bent on other things is moved to grief after 'having looked on the σῆμα of Thrason' (*CEG* 28; cf. *CEG* 51, 159); mourning regularly accompanies the setting up of the monument as recorded in the inscriptions (e.g. *CEG* 14, 117, 139), and the reader who pronounces the epitaph as he contemplates the grave repeats that original act of lamentation.[49] While the epitaphs also frequently involve an enumeration of the virtues of the deceased, these celebrations of worth often appear intimately bound up with the regret and longing that the site inspires:[50] the virtues of Tettichos, 'a good man, who perished in war and lost his fresh youthfulness', come bracketed by expressions of sorrow (οἰκτίρας . . . ἀποδυράμενοι, *CEG* 13), and the mother of one Diokleas erects a monument 'lamenting greatly that he died prematurely, a good man' (*CEG* 117).[51]

As noted earlier, the epitaphs composed for citizen soldiers distinguish themselves from these private inscriptions by the much more restricted scope granted such lamentatory motifs: ruling tears, mourning, and sorrow largely out of court, civic commemorations may come no closer to sentiments of grief and regret than are expressed in the verb ποθεῖ (*CEG* 10 and 104).[52] For the transformation that the funerary monument undergoes on these occasions, the treatment of the grave marker in the more strictly encomiastic genre of Pindar's victory odes can supply a paradigm: here we see most plainly how the poet both claims and demonstrates the power of the praise-granting word to transmute the grief-inducing artefact into a source of celebration and renown. Where the living *laudandus* finds his glory reified in the variety of commemorative objects that are 'fashioned' by the poet's song, for the dead who figure in his odes Pindar builds metaphoric grave monuments, but ones of a novel, and properly encomiastic kind. At *N.* 4.80–1, the *laudator* glances from his chief subject Timasarchos to acknowledge the victory won by his uncle Kallikles, now a dweller 'beside Acheron'. For him the poet proposes raising a stele 'whiter' (i.e. more brilliant) than Parian marble, and the reference to the lustre-shedding quality of gold and song that immediately follows on ('for even as gold, being refined, shows all radiance, so song on behalf of worthy deeds makes a man equal in blessings to kings') prompts the audience to extend the praise-diffusing powers of poetry to the marble stele and the gold, and the luminosity and durability of the material objects to the sounding tribute. Pindar rings a similar change on the grave marker introduced at *N.* 8.47.[53] First acknowledging his inability to call the youthful athlete Deinias' father Megas back to life, he then goes on to rob death of its sting by inserting in place of the conventional grave a *λίθον Μοισαῖον*, a monument to Megas' agonistic exploits: 'For your clan and for the Chariadae it is easy to raise a stone of the Muses, thanks to the feet of two, twice glorious.'[54] No sooner has Pindar reimagined the *σῆμα* as a song than the brief darkness of lines 44–5 disappears in a concluding assertion of the efficacy of praise: 'I rejoice in sounding forth the *κόμπος* suited to the deed.'

---

[47] So Sourvinou-Inwood (n. 12), 120.

[48] For a full list of examples, see Sourvinou-Inwood (n. 12), 174, n. 277.

[49] On this point, see Day (n. 22), 24–7.

[50] Here I differ from Day (n. 22), who, in order to demonstrate the close links between encomiastic strategies and the design of epitaphs, privileges the epitaphs' praise function over all else. While some inscriptions do dwell exclusively on the merits of the deceased (e.g. *CEG* 16, 19), at least an equal number mingle praise with lament, or focus principally on the sorrow caused by the death.

[51] Indeed, the praise earned by the dead may be predicated on the fact of sorrow; the greater the degree and extent of the affliction caused by his demise, the more outstanding must have been the merits of the individual while he lived (for this, see Sourvinou-Inwood [n. 12], 171).

[52] For the equivalent transformation of πόθος into κλέος in the funeral oration, see Vernant (n. 36, 1990), 53.

But nowhere do funerary rites and the grave monument undergo a more striking metamorphosis than in *Isthmian* 8, as the poet once again prepares to close his composition. Citing the exemplary hero Achilles, he recalls the *threnos* performed by the Muses alongside the warrior's 'funeral pyre and tomb', and then moves forward in time to praise Nikokles, a dead relative of his *laudandus*:

> so the gods too thought it right to give a good mortal [i.e. Achilles], even after death, to the goddesses' song. In the present time as well, this holds true, as the Muses' chariot rushes to celebrate the *μνᾶμα* of Nikokles the boxer. Celebrate him, who won the Dorian parsley in the Isthmian valley, for in the past the man defeated local competitors, driving them into confusion with inescapable hand. (59–65)

Twice the poet has rehearsed the same move, transforming the grief surrounding Achilles' funeral (succinctly evoked through reference to the pyre, grave, and *threnos*) into the Muses' hymn of praise, and then conflating the grave marker of Nikokles with the musical monument that this latter-day singer includes in his song. That praise not sorrow is the proper response to this structure the terms *κελαδῆσαι* and *γεραίρετε* make clear, and future witnesses to the poetic *μνᾶμα* will themselves reiterate the glorifying message that Pindar has 'inscribed'.

If the epinician poet uses the monumentalizing powers of his art to redefine the nature of the grave, transmuting grief into celebration, then are those commissioned to eulogize the war dead in song and inscription bound to effect an equivalent change? On a number of occasions, I suggest, we witness corresponding attempts by 'war poets' to reorientate the monument, to free it from its associations with lamentation and sorrow, and/or to emphasize its role as catalyst for praise. Tyrtaeus' lines on the paradigmatic Spartan soldier already point the way. After evoking the fall of the *ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός* on the battlefield, Tyrtaeus shifts his focus to the city where old and young all grieve (*ὀλοφύρονται*) for the dead and feel the *πόθος* generated by longing for what is absent (9.27–8 Prato).[55] In closest proximity to the grief stands the τύμβος set up on the dead man's behalf, itself a natural focus for the mourning just cited in the song. But several elements mitigate these 'uncivic' sensations. Alongside the mound the fallen's descendants appear, standing as conspicuous (ἀρίσημοι 29) 'monuments' of an emphatically living kind, and visible proof of one of the two forms of continued life that the dead can enjoy.[56] The second form then follows rapidly on: neither the fighter's κλέος nor his name—both audible commemorations of the deceased—will ever die, and despite his residence below the earth, he will be ἀθάνατος (31–2), blessed with the immortality that the celebration of his deed in speech and poetry can grant.[57] The elegy has effectively silenced the earlier cries of grief with the unending sound of praise.

---

[53] Note the remarks in W. Mullen, *Choreia. Pindar and Dance* (Princeton, 1982), 73 on the conceit's placement near the end of the song.

[54] The term *ἐλαφρόν* chosen by Pindar to describe the 'ease' with which he sets up his monument may include a reference to the more cumbersome quality of the literal stone.

But no less pertinent to my argument is the treatment that the grave receives within some of the epigrams inscribed on the *polyandreia* or cenotaphs erected for a city's dead. In several instances, the text appears to reckon with the potentially sorrowful associations of its own physical support and frame, and even to expand on its own too localized character. So the lines on the *polyandreion* raised after the battle at the Eurymedon in 468 (*GVI* 13 = Sim. 46P) acknowledge the marker on which they are incised, but the concluding turn of phrase transforms the literal grave into the more symbolic 'fairest monument (μνῆμα) of ἀρετή' that the dead have left behind, focusing thoughts on the survival of the more abstract memory of the fallen that a passer-by might carry away with him after viewing the tomb.[58] In another composition (*FGE* 47), mistakenly attributed by the lemma in the *Greek Anthology* again to the fighters at the Eurymedon,[59] Simonides begins by graphically evoking Ares' furious destruction of the bodies of the men ('in the chests of these men once wild Ares washed his long-pointed arrows'), and then goes on to cite the objects that stand in place of the once-living warriors (ἀντὶ δ᾽ ἀκοντοδόκων ἀνδρῶν μναμεῖα θανόντων). While the ἀντί of the phrase exactly follows epitaphic convention, the term μναμεῖα stands outside the epigram writer's regular repertoire; it rarely describes an actual tomb, but more usually means a remembrance or record, either physical or mental, and one that can belong to abstract as well as to concrete things.[60] The modulation of the grave into memory implicit in the choice of term seems to prompt a second change, this time in the condition of the dead. If we preserve the original manuscript reading, the final couplet declares that 'in place of the javelin-holding men memorials of the dead—soulless ensouled—this dust hides'.[61] The μναμεῖα positioned at the midpoint between the two halves of the phrase supply the means by which the dead recover their lost ψυχαί.[62]

---

[55] 'Everyone laments him, the young and the old, and through painful regret, the whole city goes into mourning.' See particularly *CEG* 14, 43, 159 for the use of similar terms.

[56] The adjective that Tyrtaeus applies to the children may look back to the grave, retroactively investing it with the descendants' own living presence; note Homer's use of the prefix ἀρι- to describe conspicuous physical σήματα at *Il.* 2.318, 13.244, 23.326.

[57] Tyrtaeus has already signalled the importance of the poet's role in this process in the opening line of the song, and his emphasis on poetic renown is entirely in keeping with the Spartan outlook: the Spartans apparently made a sacrifice to the Muses before going into combat, and when asked the meaning of their act, they would reply that it was in order that their exploits might receive 'good λόγοι' (Plut. *Mor.* 221a).

[58] Cf. *CEG* 6 which is almost identical in structure; also *CEG* 155. The term μνῆμα may be used in similar ways to direct thought to the virtues of the dead, rather than to the sorrowful quality of his demise, in private inscriptions; see particularly *CEG* 32, 62, 96.

[59] For discussion, and questions of authenticity, see *FGE*, 272–3 and Pritchett (n. 6), 77–8.

[60] LSJ s.v.

[61] For this reading, and Bergk's emendation which reads ἔμψυχ᾽ ἀψύχων—whereby the dead have replaced the living—see Carson (n. 3, 1996), 22–3, whose translation I use here.

By including the monument in their accounts, both Simonides and Pericles (and Pindar too) match the stratagems and ends visible in inscriptions contemporary with their words. Those who achieve a noble death require a conspicuous monument, one whose 'presentness' and eye-catching qualities the eulogist can match only by casting his own speech or song as a second such artefact. But like the inscribed marker itself, this new structure must not concentrate an audience's thoughts on the deadness of the dead; instead it should redirect them towards the warriors' imperishable glory, and prompt a suitable reaction of pride and praise. Each in their different ways, Simonides' poem and Thucydides' address call attention to the enterprise in which they are engaged; the song through repeated juxtapositions of physical structures and burial rites with the alternative 'matter' of the poet's encomion, and the historian through his move from the opening description of the funerary ritual—the *prothesis*, *ekphora*, preparation of the σῆμα, and lament at the grave—to the ἔπαινος that he has the orator construct.[63] Pericles' closing remarks, like the conclusion of this portion of Simonides' lines (and Pindar's γεραίρετε), suggest that the statesman has satisfied his brief. With the verbal τάφος and unwritten μνήμη now occupying the place of the δημόσιον σῆμα, he declares consolation of the survivors redundant, and moves to his final exhortation instead (2.44.1).

The notion common to Simonides, Pericles, and the epigrams not only highlights the particular demands that public celebrations of the war dead would have made, but might also help illuminate certain of the puzzles surrounding fr. 531 to which I referred earlier. Each commentator on the lines assigns them to a different genre, variously naming them a skolion, a hymn (part of a song composed to commemorate the sea fight at Artemision according to Bergk), or a *threnos*,[64] and each visualizes a different setting for their delivery. Bowra imagines the lines performed at a shrine in Sparta dedicated to the fallen, and included as part of some kind of cult enacted on the warriors' behalf,[65] while Podlecki prefers a less public milieu, and conjectures that the poem was designed 'not for official use at a hypothetical state festival, but for more private singing, possibly in the men's messes at Sparta'.[66] A third reading declares the fragment not a celebration of the dead of Thermopylae, but a piece more exclusively devoted to memorializing Leonidas, whose name it withholds until the end.[67] While neither Diodorus' introductory remarks nor the terms used by Simonides allow us to pinpoint the occasion with certainty, the continuities between the poet's language and conceits and those found in other texts featuring celebrations of the war dead suggest an appropriate frame. Common to the different passages I have cited is not only the use of the fallen by way of glorious and inspiring exemplum, but also a focus on the living, and on the rewards that fighting on their city's behalf grants those who survive.[68] Might Simonides' piece have continued with a similar turn from remembrance of the dead to a celebration of the living victors, and might the lines have been embedded within a larger song performed on the occasion of a civic or national celebration after the final defeat of the Persian enemy?[69]

---

[62] For a later use of the same turnabout, there is the epitaph included on the *polyandreion* of the Athenians who died at Potidaea in 432 (*CEG* 10); here the memorial (μνῆμα again) which the fallen have won is ἀθάνατον (1) and an enduring witness to the ἀρετή which they purchased in glorifying (εὐκλ[έ]ισαν 9) their country. Cf. Tyrtaeus 9.24 with C. Prato, *Tyrtaeus* (Rome, 1968), 133.

[63] A form of praise that, as many point out, moves even further from the fact of death by dwelling not on the fighters but on the still present city for whom they died.

[64] For these different possibilities, and the difficulties each classification raises, see Bowra (n. 1, 1933), 277; Harvey (n. 1), 163; Podlecki (n. 1), 262; Loraux (n. 1), 44.

[65] Bowra (n. 1, 1933,) and, in more understated form, id. (n. 1, 1961). Page (n. 2, 1971) follows Bowra's account.

[66] Podlecki (n. 1), 258–62, who refutes Bowra's arguments for a public cult.

[67] W. J. H. F. Kegel, *Simonides* (Groningen, 1962), 28–37. However, the observations of Loraux (n. 1) and Vernant (n. 36, 1990) effectively counter this view.

Columbia University, New York DEBORAH STEINER
dts8@columbia.edu

---

[68] So particularly Tyrt. 9.35–42. Pericles' address more broadly dwells on the surviving citizens and future fighters as it celebrates the delights of life in Athens. By their very nature the grave epigrams do not concern themselves with the surviving fighters, but many do incorporate the living, and the lessons they may derive from their exemplary compatriots, in their conceits.

[69] In his unpublished discussion of the fragment, which he kindly showed to me, Alan Griffiths reaches a similar conclusion, but by a very different route.