

AS IS THE GENERATION OF LEAVES IN HOMER, SIMONIDES, HORACE, AND STOBAIOS

DAVID SIDER

Stobaios 4.34.28 (Σιμωνίδου) comprises fr. 19 (ms. S) + 20.5–12 (mss. SMA) W² (i.e., ms. S presents X + Y as one continuous passage).

19 W² Stobaios

ἐν δὲ τὸ κάλλιστον Χίος ἔειπεν ἀνὴρ·
 “οἴη περ φύλλων γενεή, τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν.”
 παῦροί μιν θνητῶν οὔασι δεξάμενοι
 5 στέρνοις ἐγκατέθεντο· πάρεστι γὰρ ἐλπίς ἐκάστω
 ἀνδρῶν ἢ τε νέων στήθεσιν ἐμφύεται.

20 W² POxy 3965, fr. 26; Stobaios

] . ι θ ο [
] γ τ [. . .] . [
 τυτ]θὸν ἐπὶ χρό[von
] . . [.] ω παρμεν. [
 5 θνητῶ]ν δ' ὄλφρα τις] ἄνθος ἔχει πολυήρατον ἥβης,
 κοῦφο]ν ἔχω]ν θυμὸν πόλλ' ἀτέλεσ]τα νοεῖ·
 οὔ]τε γὰρ ἐλπιδ' ἔχ]ει γηρασέμεν] οὔτε θανεῖσθαι,
 οὐδ' ὑ]γίης ὅτ]λαν ἦ φ]ροντίδ' ἔχει κ]αμάτου.
 νή]πιοι οἷς ταύ]τῃ] κείται νόος ο]λὺδὲ ἴσασιν
 10 ὥς χρό]νος ἔλ]σθ' ἥβη]ς καὶ βιότοι' ὀλ]ίγος
 θνη]τοῖς· ἀλλὰ [σὺ] ταῦτα μαθὼν [βιότου ποτὶ τέρμα
 ψυχῇ τῶν] ἀγαθῶν τλῆθι χα[ριζόμενος

- ~ ~ -]φράζευ δὲ παλα[ιότερου λόγον ἀνδρός·
 ἡ λήθην] γλώσσης ἔκφυγ' Ὅμη[ρος ~ ~
 15 (.)]πα . δαμα[
 (.)]ω ψυδρῆς ε[
 (.)] ἐν θαλίῃσι[
 . . .]ι ἐϋστρέπτων [
 20]ων ἔνθα καὶ [ἔνθα
] . . [] . [

(Unattributed readings are owed to West)

19 1 τι Hecker 2 = *Il.* 6.146 (τοιήδε S) 3 μὴν Hermann
 20 3 τυτθόν e.g. Parsons 4 ὀπίσ]ω e.g. Parsons fin. of vel ε[5 εχε[ι
Π ἔχη Stob. πολυηράτου Wil. 8 οὐδ' Stob. οὐθ' Hartung 9 νηπίοισι
 vel νηπίοις Stob. (correxerat Camerarius) 10 βιοτοι' *Π* (coniecerat
 Cam.) βιότου Stob. 13 vel παλα[ιγενέος West παλα[ιωτέρων Parsons
 14 ἔκφυγ' Ὅμηρος Parsons ῥῆμα δὲ πᾶν] . . . ἔκφυγ' ὃ μὴ ν[όμιμον Parsons
 15 ὕ]παρ e.g. Parsons παγδαμάτωρ West, sed v non legendum 18 ὦν
 sscr. ὄι

Translation:

19 The man from Chios said one thing best: “As is the generation of leaves, so is the generation of men.” Few men hearing this take it to heart. For in each man there is hope which grows in the heart of the young.

20 . . . for a short time . . . abide . . . As long as a mortal has the desirable bloom of youth with a light spirit he thinks many unaccomplished deeds. For he has no expectation that he will grow old or die, nor when healthy does he think about illness. Fools are they whose thoughts are thus! Nor do they know that the time of youth and life is short for mortals. But you, learning this at the end of your life, endure, delighting in good things in your soul . . . Consider [the account of the man of] old. Homer escaped [the forgetting of his words] . . . false . . . in feasts . . . well-plaited . . . here and [there] . . .

Glaukos, asked his identity on the battlefield by Diomedes, responds with one of Homer's most famous similes (*Il.* 6.146–49):

οἷε περ φύλλων γενεή, τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν.
 φύλλα τὰ μὲν τ' ἄνεμος χαμάδις χέει, ἄλλα δὲ θ' ὕλη
 τηλεθώσα φύει, ἕαρος δ' ἐπιγίγνεται ὥρη·
 ὥς ἀνδρῶν γενεή ἢ μὲν φύει, ἢ δ' ἀπολήγει.

Just as is the generation of leaves, so also is that of men.
 Some leaves the wind spills to the ground, but others the
 burgeoning wood grows anew, and the springtime comes again.
 Thus one generation of men grows, another passes away.

Poets have alluded to this simile from the very beginning. The first to do so may in fact be Homer himself: later in the *Iliad*, Apollo tells Poseidon that he will not fight with him for the sake of mortals (*Il.* 21.464–66):

δειλῶν, οἷ φύλλοισιν εἰκότες ἄλλοτε μὲν τε
 ζαφλεγέες τελέθουσιν, ἀρούρης καρπὸν ἔδοντες
 ἄλλοτε δὲ φθινύθουσιν ἀκήριοι.

... wretched, who like leaves at one time burgeon in their
 glory, enjoying the fruit of the land, but at a later time
 lifelessly pass away.

This later passage surely echoes the earlier. As Richardson notes, there is a nice contrast between Book 6, where Diomedes says that he would not fight Glaukos if he is a god, and Book 21, where Apollo refuses to fight another god for the sake of mortals.¹

Later classical authors who clearly allude to this simile are Mimnermos, Simonides, Pindar, Bakchylides, Aristophanes, Vergil, and Horace.² We shall look more closely at these echoes in due course, but the author we must look at first is Simonides, whose poem containing a citation of *Il.* 6.146,³ known to us from its inclusion in Stobaios' *omnium-gatherum*,

- 1 Richardson 1993.93, who also notes that Plutarch *Mor.* 104e-f quotes the two passages together. Richardson is here following Leaf 1900–02 (“an obvious reminiscence,” *ad* 21.464ff.), who, however, thought the latter passage was composed by a poet other than that of the Diomedes-Glaukos passage; but this generation of Leafish criticism has largely passed away. Fränkel 1921.41 n. 1 considers both *Iliad* passages exempla of a common *Typus*. Cf. also Griffith 1975.76f., von Weber 1955.60–62.
- 2 The word “allude” comprehends actual citation as well as more oblique ways of recalling an earlier poem. Cf. Pasquali 1968.275, Conte 1986.24f.
- 3 That Simonides quotes Homer was doubted by Davison 1955, who applies his admirable acumen to argue that (i) since the line in question is gnomic, and (ii) since Homer uses γένεῃ both before and after the simile to mean “birth, pedigree,” and within the simile to mean “generation,” Homer therefore borrowed (and “misused”) the simile from elsewhere, and that Simonides may not be referring to Homer as the Man from Chios. Even if we grant that Greeks would have even noticed that γένεῃ was used in two senses, this is a

now appears as one of the two literary passages which allow us firmly to identify him as the author of *POxy* 3965 (and hence *POxy* 2327 as well). The overlap between Stobaios and the papyrus does more, however, than merely establish Simonidean authorship; it also has a surprise.

Before the publication of the papyrus in 1992, we possessed, or thought that we did, a continuous 13-line elegiac poem which seemed to be nearly complete. Only the fact that its first line is the pentameter reveals that the beginning is lacking,⁴ but most people seemed content to imagine that only one hexameter line was missing.⁵ Stobaios' line 13 was reasonably taken to end the poem. (Stobaios' line numbers, which long were traditional, will be cited in the form St. 13; otherwise line numbers are those of fr. 19 and 20 in West's new ordering of the fragments.)

The papyrus, however, puts Stobaios' selection in a new setting which demands that we rethink this whole question of the origin of St. 1–

perverse conclusion: would anyone reading Simonides think that he was referring to anything other than this famous passage? It is, furthermore, now disproved by Simon. fr. 20.14 W²: 'Ομηρ[.

- 4 The δέ can be deceptive; cf. Denniston 1954.172f. Athenaios 602b-c (text in West *IEG* s.v. Dionysius Chalcus) says that Apollo (in a Delphic oracle, 327 PW) and the elegies of Dionysios Khalkous occasionally begin with the pentameter; cf. Smith 1901.183f., Korzeniewski 1968.39f. Surely, though, if Simonides had done so, he would have been named alongside, or instead of, the far less famous Dionysios. It should be noted, however, that if the papyrus had confirmed that the poem did in fact begin with a pentameter, we could trot out as comparanda some few other verses where Simonides toys with traditional metrics: (i) *Epigram* 1 FGE breaks the name 'Ἀριστο- | γείτων between hexameter and pentameter; (ii) *Epigram* 52 adds an iambic trimeter to an elegiac distich; (iii) *Elegy* 92 W² comprises a hexameter followed by a trochaic tetrameter containing the same words as the hexameter in a different order. Because of these quirky verses I am tempted to claim for Simonides *Adespota elegiaca* 20 W², ἡμεῖς δ' εἰς Ἑλλης πόντον ἀπεπλόομεν, where the word Hellespont is broken by the pentameter's midline caesura into its original form, Helle's pontos. (Bergk attributed the line, which is anonymous in Aphthonios, to Kallimachos, who has the similarly formed pentameter: ἱερά, νῦν δὲ Διοσκοουρίδεω γεγενῆ, fr. 384a Pf.) Aside from (iii), which seems to have a humorous intent, these deviations involve proper names, which is not the case with the leaves poem.

Note too that Stobaios begins his citation of Mimnermos 5 W with a pentameter, where we know from another citation that at least three lines preceded, which Stobaios omitted probably because they contained a first-person singular; cf. Campbell 1984.55.

- 5 A substitute for which was supplied by Joachim Camerarius: οὐδὲν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι μένει χρῆμ' ἔμπεδον αἰεῖ. Note that his μένει . . . αἰεῖ, and hence the thought of the entire line, is vindicated by the papyrus' attestation of some form of παραμένειν. Note too that this line and the two conjectures of Camerarius 1550.81f. in the apparatus were finally correctly credited to him by West 1972.114. Earlier editors had credited them to Ursinus 1568.167. (I thank Fred Schreiber for locating these early editions for me.)

13. More precisely, St. 6–13 is preceded in *POxy* 3965 by traces of four lines which are inconsistent with St. 2–5 (and with Camerarius' "v. 1"; see above, n. 5), and is followed by traces of eight lines which allow for the possibility that Simonides' poem did not end at St. 13. What then is the relationship between St. 1–5 (which West in his second edition now calls fr. 19 and which I shall refer to as X), and St. 6–13 (which now equal vv. 5–12 of fr. 20 W² and which I shall call Y)? Did Simonides' poem end with Y, or does what follows in the papyrus continue the poem? What does the new material surrounding Y (if we conclude that it is all part of the same poem), tell us about the larger context from which Stobaios selected his verses?

We begin, however, with a brief argument for what I have so far taken for granted, namely that Simonides of Ceos is the author of the poem which quotes Homer's simile on the generation of leaves; for although we are now using the poem to establish that Simonides is the author of the papyri, many recent scholars have argued for placing the poem among the works of Semonides of Amorgos.⁶ This is not an altogether unreasonable assumption, for the Amorgine is in fact called Σιμωνίδης in all our ms. sources but Choiroboskos ap. *Etym. Gen. et Magn.* 713.17, who distinguishes between the iambographer Σημωνίδης and the lyric poet Σιμωνίδης.⁷ And one source, the *Suda* s.v. Σιμωνίδης, says of the Amorgine that ἔργαψε

6 First Bergk, followed by, e.g., Diehl and Wilamowitz, who says simply, "An der Identität des Verfassers lässt schon die innere Übereinstimmung keinen Zweifel. . . . Und die Form ist des Keers unwürdig" (Wilamowitz 1913.273 n. 3). Others have rejected the attribution to Semonides without being willing to grant it to Simonides; e.g., Fränkel 1962.237 n. 14, who suggests that the poem comes from a grave epigram which, like many another, was attributed to the poet of Ceos. For a brief review of the controversy, cf. Lloyd-Jones 1975.97 (who tends to agree with Fränkel), West 1974.179f. All arguments up until the present have been based on subjective criteria of style, which are all the more unreliable given the small sampling of elegy on which to base a judgement. Davison 1955.130 was properly cautious when he said that scholars should not deny the poem to Simonides "until we are much better informed than we are at present about the style of Simonides' elegies." Oates' (1932.84–90) marshalling of the external evidence demonstrates that Simonidean authorship should never have been doubted.

7 Text in the testimony to Semonides in West *IEG*. It should be pointed out, however, that a first-century B.C. papyrus of Philodemos refers to the iambographer as Σημωνίδης: *De Poet.* Tr.C, *PHerc* 1074 fr. f, col. III.5 ed. Sbordone. An error of iotacism, although not totally impossible, is nonetheless unlikely, as in his survey of scribal errors in the Herculaneum papyri Crönert 1903 nowhere records alteration of iota and eta. When, moreover, Philodemos refers to the Cean the papyri have Σιμ-. This strongly suggests that Choiroboskos' distinction is a real one, and that in the preiotacist texts available to the Alexandrians (and to Philodemos) the two authors were easily and correctly kept distinct.

ἔλεγείαν ἐν βιβλίοις β', so that any elegy ascribed simply to Simonides could, *prima facie*, be by either poet, especially since Choiroboskos' distinction may be false, deriving from a later spelling variation owed entirely to iotacism.⁸ Given this state of affairs, it remains just barely possible, as is argued by T. K. Hubbard in this volume, that the Oxyrhynchus papyrus contains a poem falsely ascribed to Simonides by the Alexandrian editor, and that the poem can still be safely listed among those of Semonides. There are, it should be noted, no elegiac verses which can be surely ascribed to the Amorgine, although if he did write a history of Samos, it was likely to have been written in elegiacs. (See the introduction to this volume.) There is, nonetheless, little reason to doubt the bona fides of the Alexandrian editor who produced the book which is the archetype for both *POxy* 2327 and *POxy* 3965. Our starting point, accordingly, will be that at least Y was written by Simonides of Ceos. As we proceed, furthermore, it will be seen how comfortably the poem sits with Simonides' poetic practice elsewhere, especially his frequent allusion to other poets.

What, though, of X (St. 1–5), which the papyrus now shows not to have immediately preceded Y, as it does in Stobaios? Or rather, as it does in one ms. of Stobaios, for the new publication alerts us to a hitherto minor and neglected point of manuscript transmission: of the three Stobaeian mss. reported to contain this poem (X+Y), only one, S, representing the best family, contains all thirteen lines; the other two, M and A, from the lesser family, omit the first five lines.⁹ Not much could have been made of this earlier because S and MA often diverge from each other (M and A rarely do). In particular, they frequently differ in their lemmata (with either S or MA lacking the proper heading). And either S or MA occasionally lacks passages found in the other. (A third frequent type of divergence, when their selections are found in a different order, does not concern us here.) Given this state of the mss., it was thus not only safe but also reasonable for editors to follow S and print its reading as one poem, or at any rate a continuous selection, from Simonides or Semonides—as did all editors until West in his second edition.

8 Cf. Severyns 1938.118, although *LGPN* 1–2 records several epigraphic instances of the name Σημωνίδης. (An unmistakable error on Stobaios' part [3.33.5] occurs when he ascribes Simonides 582 PMG to Athenodoros; cf. Hense 1916.2566.)

9 **S**: Vindob. cod. philos. et philol. gr. lxvii, saec. xi ineuntis. **M**: Escorial. LXXXX (Σ II 14), cod. Mendozae, saec. xii ineuntis. **A**: Paris. cod. gr. 1984 saec. xiv. Cf. Wachsmuth 1884.vol.1, pp. xxx–xxxii; Hense 1916.2550–54. For a stemma, see *IEG* 1.x.

What then is the relationship between X and Y? Several possibilities suggest themselves. The first, and most obvious, is that X and Y derive from the same poem of Simonides and were excerpted in this order, each selection originally having had its own heading, or lemma. The first heading would be the one we have, Σιμωνίδου, “by Simonides.” The second, in accord with Stobaios’ usual practice, would have been ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, “in the same (work).”¹⁰ That is, according to this reconstruction, the exemplar for SMA had (i) Σιμωνίδου followed by X and (ii) ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ followed by Y. Thereafter, in the MA family, the eye of the scribe would have jumped from the first lemma to the text following the next lemma; whereas in S the second heading dropped out with the result that two passages were run together as one.

Each of the steps I have outlined has parallels and near parallels elsewhere in Stobaios. For example Stob. 4.8.4, where, after the lemma Εὐριπίδου Ἥλέκτρα, SMA offer two unknown verses (= Eur. fr. 850 N²). If, as is likely, these two lines are also Euripidean (as are the three previous selections and the two following), this would be another passage in Stobaios (this time in the common exemplar for SMA) where the scribe jumped from a lemma to the text following the next lemma. Or consider Stob. 4.10.20–21, where in SMA the one lemma τοῦ αὐτοῦ (sc. Εὐριπίδου) Ἀνδρομάχης is followed by two verses from the *Andromache* (764f.) plus two unknown iambic verses (= Adesp. 537 TrGF). Here we have a parallel for two distinct texts run together under one heading after the second lemma (perhaps Εὐριπίδου—Hense suspects that the lines come from Euripides’ *Andromeda*) was lost.¹¹

10 It will be useful to have before us the standard types of lemmata found in Stobaios (and in similar collections). The author’s name appears in the genitive (far less often in the nominative), either alone or accompanied by the work (or type of work = book, e.g., Προσωδίων), which is given (i) in the dative (with or without ἐν), (ii) in the genitive (with or without ἐκ/ἐξ), or (iii) (least often) in the nominative. When two or more successive selections are from a different work of the same author, the second (and any following) lemma either repeats the author’s name or is τοῦ αὐτοῦ, along with the name of the work (e.g., τοῦ αὐτοῦ Δικτύι). It should also be noted that even when S and MA agree on the author and work they do not always agree on the details of identification as given above; Hense 1916.2565–67.

11 In looking for typical errors of the sort we seem to have in the Simonides passage, I have, for reasons of space, limited myself to the poetic passages in Book 4. A wider search could well turn up even more interesting parallels. Cf. also 4.4.3–4, 7.8–9, 8.10–13, 9.4–5, 13.1–2. For a survey of typical scribal errors in Stobaios (similar to Douglas Young’s surveys of the mss. of Pindar and Aeschylus, and hence not helpful for this article), see Hernández

But for a closer parallel to the state of the mss. in the Simonides selection(s), consider the way S and MA diverge in quoting from a text we can control: Bakkhylides.

Stob. 4.34 (περὶ τοῦ βίου, ὅτι βραχὺς καὶ εὐτελής καὶ φροντίδων ἀνόμεστος):¹²

- 24 Βακχυλίδου Προσοδίων (MA)
 πάντεσσι θνατοῖσι δαίμων ἐπέταξε πόνους ἄλλοισιν
 ἄλλους. (SMA) [fr.13 Sn]
- 25 Τοῦ αὐτοῦ (SMA) Ἐπινίκων (MA)
 οὐ γάρ τις ἐπιχθονίων πάντα γ' εὐδαίμων ἔφρ.
 (SMA) [5.54]
- 26 Ἐν ταύτῳ (MA)
 θνατοῖσι μὴ φῦναι φέριστον, μηδ' ἀελίου προσιδεῖν
 φέγγος [5.160],
 ὄλβιος δ' οὐδεὶς βροτῶν πάντα χρόνον
 [fr.54] (SMA)¹³

That is, ms. S, (i) by omitting the lemma for selection 24, runs it together quite impossibly with the previous selection, an elegiac couplet of Solon (14 W); and, more interestingly for our purposes, (ii) runs together Bakkhylides 5.54 and 5.160 under one heading as if they were continuous. (MA keep the two verses distinct.) And S and MA together add to 5.160 another (probably Bakkhylidean) tag as though it followed immediately, which it most definitely does not. Clearly another heading before ὄλβιος κτλ, probably τοῦ αὐτοῦ, was missing in the exemplar of SMA.

These selections from Bakkhylides also raise the possibility that X and Y may come from two separate poems of Simonides. The second lemma, that is, could have been τοῦ αὐτοῦ. Perhaps we can discount this possibility on the grounds that it is unlikely for Stobaios to have collated

Muñoz 1989. As in the *Greek Anthology*, errors of attribution arise and multiply as passages are copied from one anthology to another; for Euripides, cf. Zuntz 1972.44–46.

12 Each chapter in Stobaios gathers passages illustrative of a particular topos. Some others from Book 4 are: περὶ ναυτιλίας καὶ ναυαγίου (17), περὶ δεσποτῶν καὶ δούλων (19), γαμικὰ ἀγγέλματα (23), περὶ τῶν παρ' ἀξίαν εὐτυχούντων (43).

13 Somewhat similar is Stob. 4.1.2–3, where, although in SMA the lemma Εὐριπίδου Φαέθοντι is followed by six verses, the fragmentary codex Claromontanus, containing the beginnings of the last three of these lines, shows that they were not preceded by the first three. Cf. Diggle 1970.33f., 60f.

selections from two poems, each of which mentioned Homer and the shortness of human life (cf. fr. 20.14 W²: "Ομηρ[ος]). (Below we shall briefly consider the relationship between fr. 19 + 20W² and fr. 11 W².) Moreover, since both X and Y seem to have been written in response to Mimnermos (see below), it would be neater to imagine that they came from but one poem. This same consideration also rules out any suggestion that (although possible in terms of the mechanical errors found in the mss. of Stobaios) Y was written by a poet other than Simonides.

There is a third possible relationship between X and Y; that they come from the same poem, but in reverse order, as has been suggested by West.¹⁴ This cannot be disproved, for in some few places elsewhere, where we can control the text, Stobaios does invert the order. At 4.29.36–37, e.g., he quotes Eur. *El.* 550f. immediately before 369f. and at 4.6.1–2 he quotes *Il.* 2.204f. before 196f.¹⁵ West bases his argument in large part on his own reconstruction of the lines following Y, which suggests to him that X would better follow than precede. But it is surely risky, if not methodologically questionable, to derive a sense of how the poem (whose overall length we do not know), might have gone on the basis of one extract and then on the basis of the two extracts to decide that their position should be altered; all the more risky since Stobaios more often keeps to the correct order.

We conclude, therefore, that Simonides 19 and 20 W² derive, in this order, from but one poem of Simonides. Stobaios, as he did with the Bakkhylides excerpts and elsewhere, extracted from a longer poem only those lines illustrative of his current rubric. As Hense 1916.2584 has shown, he also omits or even alters personal names in the vocative or first-person references in order to enhance the general or gnomic nature of the selection. Our Simonides extracts, for example, appear under the rubric

14 West 1993a.10f., who credits Parsons 1992a.43 with having first put forward this idea, although all the latter says is, "It is tempting to think that MA represent the original extract, S a secondary conflation of two extracts on similar themes," without specifying where he thinks X came from. More tersely on p. 6, Parsons says "the new context shows that lines 1–5 of the [Stobaean] quotation did not originally belong." Gigante 1994.61 agrees with West.

15 Similarly, *Il.* 21.463–66 and 17.466f. are quoted out of order at 4.34.46f. Diggle 1970 (see above, n. 13) reconstructs Euripides' *Phaethon* so that Stob. 4.1.3 precedes 4.1.2. (Although he discusses the readings of Stobaios' text in detail, Diggle does not justify having inverted Stobaios' order.) There are also cases of Stobaios quoting Theognis out of ms. order, but the Theognidean corpus, clearly not a continuous work, invites this kind of disruption. Furthermore, Stobaios' source for Theognis probably contained the separate poems in another order; cf. van Groningen 1966.443–45.

περὶ τοῦ βίου, ὅτι βραχὺς καὶ εὐτελής καὶ φροντίδων ἀνάμεστος, which may be loosely translated as, “life is solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.” Stobaios omitted, it seems, a passage in which something is said to “abide” (20.4, *παρμεν*[, which can only come from *παραμένω*). The previous line, which is reasonably restored *τυτ*θὼν ἐπὶ χρό[νον, may be part of a contrasting thought or, if part of the same clause, may have been negated. That is, while one may say that something remains for a short time (using *μένω*), *παραμένω*, which means “last a long time” sits ill with the phrase “for a short time.” Moreover, it is hard to see why Stobaios would omit this couplet if it too spoke of things lasting but a short time. One reason could be that it is something other than human life—his rubric—that does not last long. Thus Stobaios has done more than select, he has, no doubt unintentionally, produced in effect a new poem—and not a bad one—on the shortness of human life. Only the fact that it begins with the pentameter line could have signaled its incompleteness (see above).

In other words, Simonides’ reference to the shortness of human life was probably set in a larger context where it was contrasted with something else which *does* last. The contrast begins with *φράζευ δέ*, “but consider” (20.13), and must carry over at least to the next line which says that Homer escaped something having to do with *γλώσσα*, his words. West’s reconstruction of v.14, ἧ λήθην] γλώσσης ἔκφυγ’ Ὀμηρ[ος, is not compelling, and his restoration of *πανδαμάτωρ* for the next line, attractive as it is for his and my understanding of the overall sense, cannot stand up to close scrutiny of the papyrus.¹⁶ Nonetheless, what little we can read does suggest that Homer, that is, his poetry, provides the desired contrast with ephemeral human life. We can probably go further and suggest that Simonides, not satisfied with granting this power to Homer alone, claimed, implicitly or explicitly, some of this for himself; that is, his poems too will continue to be sung during festive occasions (20.17).

Whether or not this self-comparison with Homer is itself embedded in a larger context (see below), it should not be forgotten that

16 This was first pointed out by Haslam 1993.135. Cf. West’s translation of these lines: “Ponder the [saying of a man] of old—for Homer’s tongue escaped [oblivion]; all conquering Time has spared him, never dimmed his name, and never found his testimony false. . . . in festivity. . . . well-turned [arguments (?)]” (West 1993b.171). Apart from *πανδαμάτωρ* being ruled out by the tracings, I doubt that Simonides would have repeated the adjective with *χρόνος*; cf. Simonides 531.5 PMG, printed below. (Bakkhylides 13.205 also has *πανδαμάτωρ χρόνος*; Homer limits the adjective to *ὑπνος*.)

Simonides succeeds another poet who recalls the generation of leaves simile, Mimnermos 2 W:

ἡμεῖς δ' οἶά τε φύλλα φύει πολυάνθεμος ὥρη
 ἔαρος, ὅτ' αἶψ' ἀνγῆς αὔξεται ἡελίου,
 τοῖς ἵκελοι πῆχυνον ἐπὶ χρόνον ἄνθεσιν ἥβης
 τερπόμεθα, πρὸς θεῶν εἰδότες οὔτε κακὸν
 οὔτ' ἀγαθόν· Κῆρες δὲ παρεστήκασι μέλαιναι,
 ἡ μὲν ἔχουσα τέλος γήραος ἀργαλέου,
 ἡ δ' ἐτέρη θανάτοιο· μίνυνθα δὲ γίνεται ἥβης
 καρπὸς, ὅσον τ' ἐπὶ γῆν κίδναται ἡέλιος.
 αὐτὰρ ἐπὶν δὴ τοῦτο τέλος παραμείψεται ὥρης,
 αὐτίκα δὴ τεθνάναι βέλτιον ἢ βίωτος.
 πολλὰ γὰρ ἐν θυμῷ κακὰ γίνεται· ἄλλοτε οἶκος
 τρυχοῦται, πενίης δ' ἔργ' ὀδυνηρὰ πέλει·
 ἄλλος δ' αὖ παίδων ἐπιδύεται, ὧν τε μάλιστα
 ἰμείρων κατὰ γῆς ἔρχεται εἰς Ἀίδην·
 ἄλλος νοῦσον ἔχει θυμοφθόρον· οὐδέ τις ἐστὶν
 ἀνθρώπων ᾧ Ζεὺς μὴ κακὰ πολλὰ διδοί.

Since this passage is transmitted by Stobaios, indeed in 4.34, the chapter on the worthlessness of human life that also includes the Simonides poem, it may well be that it too has been wrenched from a larger, and no longer recoverable, context.¹⁷ More sure, however, is the likelihood that Simonides alludes to this poem as he does to Homer.¹⁸ This was argued by Hubbard 1994 (who, however, argues for Semonidean authorship), in part because “Semonides’ [sic] παῦροί μιν θνητῶν οὔασι δεξάμενοι | στέρνοις ἐγκατέθεντο (lines 3–4) clearly implies that the Homeric line he has just

17 West 1992 in his app. crit. suggests that this passage “paullo post [Mimnermi] fr. 12 locare possis,” but this latter poem on the daily voyage of the sun does not seem to me to fit well with fr. 2. Far closer in thought and language are fr. 1 (τίς δὲ βίος) and 3–7. The differences between Homer and Mimnermos which are detailed below lead Allen 1993.41 to doubt whether Mimnermos intends a Homeric allusion; similarly Fowler 1987.32f., Lardinois 1995.234–36. I disagree with Allen and Fowler but without further argument, since for my purposes it will be enough to show that Simonides thought that Mimnermos was alluding to Homer (which may in fact be taken as an argument that this is indeed what Mimnermos was doing). With Mimnermos cf. Job 14.

18 When it could be argued that it was Semonides rather than Simonides who wrote the poem, the possibility existed that Mimnermos wrote afterwards and in response to the former; so, e.g., Babut 1971. See further Hubbard in this volume, Allen 1993.41f.

quoted is a tag frequently heard and bandied about, but seldom understood in its full implications” (p. 192). That Simonides responds to Mimnermos now receives further support from *POxy* 3965’s [τυτ]θὸν ἐπὶ χρό[νον], which recalls Mimnermos’ πῆχυτον ἐπὶ χρόνον.

Mimnermos, and indeed everybody who compares men to leaves, rings changes on the Homeric model. Where Glaukos dispassionately describes the passing away of one generation to make room for the next, Mimnermos rather gloomily focuses on the withering and death half of the simile: not even the memory of youth can bring joy to an old man; rather, even youth is spoiled, at least in retrospect, because of its brief span and its nescience of what is to come. “Nothing lasts,” while not explicitly stated by Mimnermos, is easily inferred. Simonides’ use of the verb παραμένειν is far more easily seen as a response to Mimnermos’ rather than to Homer’s use of the simile.¹⁹ And Homer, as was suggested above, provides a counterexample to Mimnermos in that poetry (Homer’s if not Mimnermos’) can not only itself last, it can provide a kind of immortality to its heroes. Mimnermos’ poem having no heroes, there is nothing for the poet to record for later ages. Simonides’ version thus rejects Mimnermos and returns to Homer for a more positive message.

Nor would this be the only time Simonides alludes to Mimnermos, as *Mimn.* 1 W, τίς δὲ βίος, τί δὲ τερπνὸν, ἄτερ χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης, clearly lies behind Simonides 584 PMG, τίς γὰρ ἀδονᾶς ἄτερ θνατῶν βίος ποθεινὸς ἢ ποία τυραννίς; τᾶσδε ἄτερ οὐδὲ θεῶν ζηλωτὸς αἰὼν. Since Athenaios, who cites this passage, gives full credit to Simonides for the thought, there was presumably no overt mention of Mimnermos in this poem, but the allusion, which seems obvious to us, may have escaped Athenaios’ notice.²⁰ It should also be noted that Simonides names or clearly

19 Although of course all but explicit in Homer is that the ὕλη, the “stock” of mankind endures, a point well brought out by Morpurgo 1927, whose article, although it gives short shrift to Simonides, offers a useful brief survey of the generation-of-leaves topos. On Mimnermos, see also Griffith 1975 and Garner 1990.3–8, who notes that vv. 5–7 allude to the passage where Achilles speaks of his double fate (9.410f.):

μήτηρ γάρ τέ μέ φησι θεὰ Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα
διχθαδίας κῆρας φερέμεν θανάτοιο τέλοςδε.

20 And we should note in this context that Simonides is credited with having twice compared Homer and Hesiod: (i) *Gnom. Vat.* 514 Sternbach = T 47(j) Campbell: Ἡσίοδον μὲν αἰ Μοῦσαι, Ὀμηρον δὲ αἰ Χάριτες ἐτέκνωσαν, and (ii) *App. Vat.* 217 Sternbach = T 47(k) Campbell: Σιμωνίδης τὸν Ἡσίοδον κηπουρὸν ἔλεγε, τὸν δὲ Ὀμηρον στεφανηπλόκον, τὸν μὲν ὡς φυτεύσαντα τὰς περὶ θεῶν καὶ ἡρώων μυθολογίας, τὸν δὲ ὡς ἐξ αὐτῶν

echoes other predecessors: (i) Pittakos in 542 PMG; note esp. 11ff.: οὐδέ μοι ἐμμελέως τὸ Πιττάκειον | νέμεται, καίτοι σοφοῦ παρὰ φωτὸς εἰρημένον· χαλεπὸν φάτ' ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι; (ii) Stesichoros and Homer are named in Simonides' *Europa* (564 PMG). Vv. 1–3 are a variation of Stesichoros' *The Funeral Games of Pelias* (cf. Stes. 179 PMG); v. 4: οὕτω γὰρ Ὅμηρος ἤδ' Ὀμηροῦ ἄεισε λαοῖς; (iii) Hesiod *WD* 289–92 on the difficulty of obtaining *arete* is alluded to in 579 PMG: ἔστι τις λόγος | τὰν Ἀρετὰν ναίειν δυσσάμβάτοισ' ἐπὶ πέτραις, κτλ.; (iv) Kleoboulos' infamous Midas epigram comes in for criticism in 581 PMG: τίς κεν αἰνήσειε νόφ' πίσυνοσ Λίνδου ναέταν Κλεόβουλον. . . . μωροῦ | φωτὸς ἄδε βουλά.

There can be no doubt therefore that in his own poem (fr. 19–20 W²) Simonides sets Homer against Mimnermos, aligning himself with the former. This pugnacious poet of intertextuality²¹ disagrees with Mimnermos' use of only half of the leaves simile (there is no replacement of leaves in Mimnermos), arguing that there are indeed things which endure: there are, for example, and in direct contradiction to Mimnermos, delights for the soul even when one is old. And the scrappy reference after Y to Homer and feasts allows us to infer that participants at one of these delights may be listening to the accounts of heroes, Homer's account, and perhaps Simonides' as well. The retelling of these stories, in turn, grants to Diomedes, Glaukos, and others an enduring glory beyond their own mortal lives. As Sarpedon says to Glaukos, through their battle prowess they attain a near divine status as their glory is proclaimed during feasts in Lykia (ἔδρη τε κρέασίν τε ἰδὲ πλείοις δεπάεσσιν, *Il.* 12.311; cf. fr. 20.17 ἐν θαλίῃσι). Sarpedon, it is true, says nothing here about the glory of heroes continuing after death, but Helen does, using the same adjective αἰόδιμος which Simonides does at fr. 11.13.²² Cf. also Simon. 531 PMG:

τῶν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις θανόντων
εὐκλεῆς μὲν ἅ τύχα, καλὸς δ' ὁ πότμος,
βωμὸς δ' ὁ τάφος, πρὸ γόων δὲ μνᾶστις, ὁ δ'

συμπλέξαντα τὸν Ἰλιάδος καὶ Ὀδυσσεΐας στέφανον. These are most likely the usual biographical falsehoods laid bare for us by Lefkowitz 1981 (pp. 49–56 on Simonides), but hiding behind them may be a passage in Simonides' poetry where his two predecessors were more artfully set alongside one another.

21 For discussion of intertextuality in classical poetry, cf. Conte 1986.23–31, Bonanno 1990.11–40. von Weber 1955.65 also uses Simonides' habit of citing others as evidence to suggest that he was the author of the leaves elegy.

22 Cf. Lloyd-Jones 1994.1.

οἶκτος ἔπαινος·
 ἐντάφιον δὲ τοιοῦτον οὐτ' εὐρὼς
 οὔθ' ὁ πανδαμάτωρ ἀμαυρώσει χρόνος.

Moreover, by quoting rather than paraphrasing a line from the generation of leaves simile Simonides illustrates not only that the glory of heroes endures, but also that the poetry which details their bravery does as well. Or, more to the point, the immortality of heroes is entailed in the immortality of the poems narrating their deeds. Men's *doxa* does not die with them; rather, it ἔσχατον δύεται κατὰ γῆς (Simonides 594 PMG).

Simonides and Mimnermos were followed by others who allude to and ring changes on Homer's simile; most can be dealt with briefly in the appendix, but the papyrus now shows us that Horace's use of this simile is more complex and interesting than we could have known from Stobaios' citation alone. In addition to *O.* 4.7 (*Diffugere nives*), which subtly brings to mind both the change of seasons implied in Homer's simile and man's ignorance of the future as found in Simonides,²³ Horace's *Ars Poetica* quite overtly echoes Homer's leaf simile. Placed within the relevant context, it is as follows:

et nova fictaque nuper habebunt verba fidem, si
 Graeco fonte cadent parce detorta. quid autem
 Caecilio Plautoque dabit Romanus ademptum
 Vergilio Varioque? ego cur, acquirere pauca
 si possum, invideor, cum lingua Catonis et Enni
 sermonem patrium ditaverit et nova rerum
 nomina protulerit? licuit semperque licebit
 signatum praesente nota producere nomen.

23 Cf. Cataudella 1927–28, who compares *O.* 4.7.19f., *cuncta manus avidas fugient heredis amico quae dederis animo*, with the last line of Stobaios' selection; Oates 1932.16.76–90. Oates' survey of Simonides' influence on Horace remains essential, but see also Bonanno 1990 passim (see her index), Gigante 1994, Barchiesi forthcoming and in this volume. Among earlier works, cf. Arnold 1891.101f., Christ 1941.40–45. Furthermore, in addition to the individual passages discussed by these authors, Horace's practice of beginning poems with "mottoes" taken from earlier poets may also reflect Simonidean influence, although it can also be found in Theokritos 29 and Catullus 56; cf. Norden 1909.371, Conte 1986.25.

*ut silvae foliis pronos²⁴ mutantur in annos,
 prima cadunt: ita verborum vetus interit aetas,
 et iuvenum ritu florent modo nata vigentque.
 debemur morti nos nostraque; . . . (vv.52–63)*
*. . . mortalia facta peribunt,
 nedum sermonum stet honos et gratia vivax.
 multa renascentur quae iam cecidere, cadentque
 quae nunc sunt in honore vocabula, si volet usus,
 quem penes arbitrium est et ius et norma loquendi. (vv.68–72)*

Brink 1971.147, as well as other commentators, has compared Horace directly to Homer, adducing Simonides, Mimnermos, et al. solely as parallels. Note, though, that Horace uses the simile to compare the generation of leaves, not, as Homer does, to that of men, but, rather, to the age/generation of words. A closer rendering of Homer would not of course be appropriate to the context of the *Ars Poetica*; whereas words, especially the words allowed or disallowed to the poet, are the particular subject of this didactic poem. Horace, it appears, wants the poet to be able to say something new while maintaining the good taste appropriate to art. A prudent use of new words, drawn from a *Graecus fons*, should be permitted, just as it was to his predecessors Caecilius, Plautus, Cato, and Ennius. The old, in other words, supplies the new.

Now in illustration comes our simile, which quite clearly derives from a Greek *fons*, but which, equally clearly, is employed to make a different point. For it is not merely the “stock” of mankind which lasts through the generations, but also the living and mutating *usus* of language (v. 72): the older generation of words passes away like that of leaves; newer words take their place like the young of humans. Thus, Horace’s complex simile, which interjects a comparison with leaves into that of leaves and men, differs from Homer’s original. It thus not only describes, it also illustrates Horace’s general point in this passage about the prudent modification of Greek examples.

But Horace’s adaptation of Homer to the realm of poetry, as we now see in the papyrus, is not altogether new. Simonides too contrasted the

24 Brink 1971.149 does not convince me that *pronos* is corrupt. It appears, rather, to be an extension of the word’s application to heavenly markers of passing time such as the sun (or day) or season-marking constellations like Orion (OLD s.v. 5 b). The years, that is, fall to earth like leaves.

generation of leaves with, it seems, the permanence of poetry. But, as Horace goes on immediately to say, “we and all that we have owe a debt to death,” *debemur morti nos nostraque* (v. 63). In his adaptation of the leaves simile, Horace thus presents us with an oblique criticism of Simonides’ adaptation and he signals this by directly translating a phrase from an epigram which he knew under Simonides’ name: θανάτῳ πάντες ὀφειλόμεθα.²⁵ As Brink 1971.150 points out, of the several possible parallels for “owing” something to death, only Simonides has the first-person plural—to which Horace adds *nostraque* in an “adroit zeugma,” which “extends the comparison from man to his works” (Brink *ibid.*). Horace thus signals both his debt to and his difference from Simonides. *Nedum sermonum stet honos et gratia vivax* (AP 69). No poem is immortal. And, more to Horace’s immediate point, his application of Simonides’ application of Homer’s simile of leaves fits perfectly into Horace’s context as he exemplifies his teachings about the way a Latin author should use his Greek predecessors.²⁶ A further but not unwelcome complication: since Simonides, as we have seen, in alluding to the line from Homer, criticizes Mimnermos for his allusion to the generation of leaves simile, Horace would thus be setting himself in the family of poets who trace their family tree back to Homer. To put this another way, Horace all but declares that he himself, Simonides, and the Latin poets he names in this passage (and doubtless others as well) cannot be understood fully unless one recognizes the precise poetic tradition in which they have placed themselves.

One final point: what kind of poem did Simonides write? If there was not much more than we have in fr. 19–20, West may be correct to regard it as a sympotic elegy. But the similarities between the leaves poem

25 “Simonides” *Epigram* 79 FGE; A.P. 10.105 Σιμωνίδου, Π1 ἄδηλον. Page may be right in denying authorship to Simonides, but all that is necessary for my purpose is that Horace saw the epigram under his name either in a *Sylloge Simonidea* (there may have been more than one), or in Meleager’s *Stephanos*; cf. Page 1981.119–23, Cameron 1993.1–2, 270–72. (The collection of epigrams ascribed to Simonides contains what may be a four-line excerpt from one of his battle elegies: *Epigram* 19(a) FGE.)

Similarly, Wilamowitz 1893–94, modified by Oates 1932.63f., argues for an influence on Horace *O.* 1.28 of “Simonides” *Epigram* 67 FGE.

26 One further, unrelated, Simonidean allusion in the *Ars*: *ut pictura poesis* (361); cf. Plut. *Mor.* 346f (= T 47(b) Campbell). Less certain: in his survey of the various genres of Greek poetry Horace categorizes the epinicia by contest, *et pugilem victorem et equum certamine primum* (84), which is how the Alexandrians arranged those of Simonides, unlike the two other famous writers of epinicia, Pindar and Bakchylides. I owe this observation to Alessandro Barchiesi.

and *Elegy* 11, the Plataea elegy, namely the references both to man's mortality and the immortality granted by Homer to the heroes who had died in battle, allow for the possibility that the passage containing the leaves simile, which makes this same point, also was part of this battle elegy. Despite the excellent arguments for public performance brought forward by Aloni 1994 and forthcoming and by Boedeker (1995 and in this volume), perhaps we should not absolutely rule out the possibility of sympotic performance. Just as fr. 10–11 have presented us with a new mix of genres (see Obbink in this volume, esp. n. 27), we should allow, at least at this early stage of our understanding of the new material, that a long poem performed either in private or in public could praise warriors and their poets, and then (after who knows what else) pass on to criticism of poets who have failed to understand the value of this kind of poetry (viz. Mimnermos). And if Homer could insert the leaves simile into a battle narrative, so too (as Deborah Boedeker observes) could Simonides, who clearly puts himself forward as Homer *redivivus*. Furthermore, if fr. 19–20 belong to the Plataea poem, Theokritos' allusion to Simonides' alluding in fr. 11 to Homer would be echoed by Horace's allusion to this same poem of Simonides, again where he alludes to Homer on the immortality granted by poetry.²⁷ Horace's allusion to and use of his predecessors accordingly becomes all the more complex.

We have seen that Simonides actually names writers with whom he disagrees, Pittakos and Kleoboulos (and perhaps Hesiod). It does not seem unreasonable that here he not only names but also addresses Mimnermos, and that the second-person address of fr. 20.11–13 was clearly directed to him. Simonides would thus be closely following Solon, who also took Mimnermos to task for having prayed for death at age 60 (fr. 6 W). Rather, Solon says, addressing him by his patronymic in the second person (fr. 20.3–4 W),

καὶ μεταποιήσον Λιγιστάδῃ, ὦδε δ' ἄειδε·
“ὀγδωκονταέτη μοῖρα κίχῃ θανάτου.”

Conceivably West is correct to supply Mimnermos' own words (ἐξῆκονταέτη μοῖρα κίχῃ θανάτου) in Solon's poem, which would make the parallel

27 Theokr. 16.42–47 and Simon. 11.11–14 W²; cf. Parsons 1992b.10–13, Lloyd-Jones 1994.2, Clay in this volume, Barchiesi forthcoming.

with Simon. fr. 19–20 even closer.²⁸ Simonides goes further than Solon, however, in criticizing not only Mimnermos' poems concerning old age and death, but also his very understanding of the nature and power of poetry, which has the power to transcend the mortality which so dejects Mimnermos, and hence to be a source of joy for those warriors and poets whose fame will outlive them.

APPENDIX

In addition to the passages in Homer, Mimnermos, Simonides, and Horace given above in the course of the article, the following poets also allude to Homer's simile. The accompanying bibliographical notes make no claim to be comprehensive. For references to this simile in prose, see Criatore 1994.

A "Mousaios." According to Clem. *Strom.* 6.738, Homer "rewrote" (μεταγράφει) the following verses of Mousaios (B 5 DK = A 2 Colli):

ὥς δ' αὐτως καὶ φύλλα φύει ζείδωρος ἄρουρα·
ἄλλα μὲν ἐν μελίῃσιν ἀποφθίνει, ἄλλα δὲ φύει·
ὥς δὲ καὶ ἀνθρώπων γενεὴ καὶ φύλον ἐλίσσει.

The rewriting of course goes the other way; cf. M. L. West, *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford 1983) 39–44.

B Pindar (i): *POxy* 32 (1967) 2622.12–13 = fr. 346 Sn.-M.

αὐτίκα νιν φθιμένων [ψυχὰί Lobel
]τρέφεται καὶ ὅς' ἐν πόντῳ [

28 See Obbink in this volume on the succession of addressees in 10–11 W². Note also Sappho 137, where Sappho addresses Alkaios about his hesitancy to speak of a shameful action. Aristotle quotes the fragment, prefacing it with Alkaios' own words in such a way that it seems possible that Sappho incorporated his verses into her own poem. Page 1955.107–09 considers only the possibilities that Alkaios' poem, known to Sappho's audience, was altogether distinct from Sappho's poem, i.e., that Sappho would expect her audience to recall his lines, or that the words given Alkaios were composed by Sappho as part of a poem in the form of a dialogue. In any case, we have one poet addressing and criticizing another, but not, perhaps, on the subject of the other's poetry.

Euenos thrice in his elegies addresses a Simonides who may well be our poet (West 1993a.13f.), but these short passages do not allow us to see how the particular Simonides addressed is in any way relevant to the point being made (Euenos fr. 8a-c W = Theogn. 467–96, 667–82, 1341–50). See Rutherford on Simon. 21 W².

H. Lloyd-Jones, “Heracles at Eleusis: P.Oxy. 2622 and PSI 3891,” *Maia* 19 (1967) 206–29, esp. 215 (repr. in *Academic Papers* 1 [Oxford 1990], ch.11), following Lobel, argues that this fragment of Pindar, set in the Underworld, like the passages of Bakkhylides (below, D) and Vergil (F), compared souls to leaves.

C Pindar (ii): *Ol.* 12.13–16.

υἱὲ Φιλάνορος, ἦτοι καὶ τεὰ κεν
ἐνδομάχας ἅτ' ἀλέκτωρ συγγόνῳ παρ' ἐστίᾳ
ἀκλεῆς τιμὰ κατεφυλλορόησεν ποδῶν,
εἰ μὴ στάσις ἀντιάνειρα Κνωσίας σ' ἄμερσε πάτρας.

Cf. F. J. Nisetich, “The Leaves of Triumph and Mortality: Transformation of a Traditional Image in Pindar’s *Olympian* 12,” *TAPA* 107 (1977) 235–64, esp. 259f.

D Bakkhylides 5.63–67.

ἔνθα δυστάνων βροτῶν
ψυχὰς ἐδάη (sc. Ἡρακλῆς) παρὰ Κωκυτοῦ ῥεέθροις,
οἷά τε φύλλ' ἄνεμος
Ἴδας ἀνὰ μηλοβότους
πρῶνας ἀργηστὰς δονεῖ.

While maintaining Homer’s comparison of souls to leaves, Bakkhylides cleverly changes the emphasis from the impermanence of living leaves to the weightlessness and passivity of dead leaves buffeted by the wind. Cf. M. Lefkowitz, “Bacchylides Ode 5: Imitation and Originality,” *HSCP* 73 (1969) 45–96, who notes that “Bacchylides’ specific designation of the locale of his simile as ‘sheep-nourishing hills of Ida’ further brings to mind the scene of the *Iliad* and the beginnings in the mountains’s quiet pastures of the Trojan War’s destruction” (66).

E Empedokles B 17.3 DK.

δοιὴ δὲ θνητῶν γένεσις, δοιὴ δ' ἀπόλειψις.

Cf. Obbink 1993.85.

F Aristophanes *Birds* 685.

ἄνδρες ἀμαυρόβιοι, φύλλων γενεᾷ προσόμοιοι.

G Vergil *Aen.* 6.309f.

quam multa in silvis autumni frigore primo
lapsa cadunt folia.

As a reference to dead souls, this cannot help but recall Homer's simile, but Vergil assimilates it to the usually distinct image of the *multitude* of leaves, which is not a part of Glaukos' simile; cf., e.g., *Il.* 2.468: μυρίοι, ὅσσα τε φύλλα καὶ ἄνθηα γίγνεται ὥρη. *Apoll. Rh.* 4.216f.: ἢ ὅσα φύλλα χαμᾶζε περικλαδέος πέσεν ὕλης ἰφυλλοχόῳ ἐνὶ μηνί.

Fordham University