

THE PEDERASTIC ELEGIES AND THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE THEOGNIDEA

1. INTRODUCTION

It has long been a matter of scholarly consensus that the elegiac collection that comes to us under the name Theognis is not entirely by Theognis, or by any one poet; instead, it is a multi-author collection of Archaic elegy. There are, broadly speaking, two current theories about the composition of this collection. According to one view, propounded by, among others, West and Bowie,¹ a core section of the collection, consisting of lines 19–254 and other, shorter passages spread throughout,² is by the poet Theognis and is hence often referred to as ‘the Theognis blocks’; the rest of the collection derives from multi-author anthologies of Archaic elegy. According to the other, propounded principally in the volume *Theognis of Megara*,³ the elegies of the collection derive from an oral tradition of sympotic poetry local to the city of Megara. On this argument, the poetic voice of Theognis is a traditional role taken on by aristocratic Megarians at the symposium; Nagy even suggests that ‘Theognis’ is not the name of an actual, biographical poet but a *sprechender Name* (as scholars on both sides of the debate suggest may be the case for the *eromenos*/addressee most often named in the collection, Kynos – a name that, according to Hesychius, means ‘bastard’).⁴

However, although there are two widely different theories on this point in the scholarly community, there is little direct debate between the two schools. Indeed, there has been no response from either side to its opponents’ most successful argument. The anthologists (as I will call the school of West and Bowie) provide a plausible account (or several similar plausible accounts) of the creation of the collection as it currently stands. There has been, as far as I know, no counter-argument from the oralist side (as I will call the other school): they give no account of the way in which their oral tradition was collected and transmitted. The oralists do, however, present substantial evidence (although at times this is as much assumption as argument) that the elegies of the collection share a political

¹ M.L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin, 1974), 40–71, and ‘Theognis’, *OCD*³, 1503; E. Bowie, ‘The Theognidea: a step towards a collection of fragments?’, in G. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments/Fragmente Sammeln* (Göttingen, 1997), 53–66.

² According to West (n. 1), at 41, these are: 319–72, 539–54, 805–22, 1171–84b. See further discussion in R. Lane Fox, ‘Theognis: an alternative to democracy’, in R. Brock and S. Hodkinson (edd.), *Alternatives to Athens: Varieties of Political Organization and Community in Ancient Greece* (Oxford, 2000), 35–51, at 36; also H. van Wees, ‘Megara’s Mafiosi: timocracy and violence in Theognis’, in Brock and Hodkinson (see above), 52–67, at 52, n. 2, where he attributes 11–14 and 429–28 to Theognis as well.

³ G. Nagy and T. Figueira (edd.), *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis* (Baltimore, MD, 1985).

⁴ For Theognis, see G. Nagy, ‘A poet’s vision of his city’, in Nagy and Figueira (n. 3), 22–81, at 30–1 and 56; for Kynos, see for instance, *ibid.*, at 54, and Lane Fox (n. 2), at 40.

and cultural ideology. The anthologist view does not provide an explanation for this ideological consistency, or an argument against it.

Lane Fox and van Wees, both of whom accept the anthologist argument, have discussed the ideology of the so-called Theognis blocks. Yet neither considers the relation of the other elegies in the collection to this ideology.⁵ If, however, the oralists are right, and the whole collection shares the same ideology, then the anthologist theory can only survive by explaining why it does so. They could, for instance, argue that this is merely the general ideology of all Archaic elegy, or, alternatively, that the collection's ideological consistency is the result of its editor's/editors' point of view. In any case, some explanation is needed.

In this article, through an examination of man/youth relations in the Theognidean elegies, both pederastic and not (or not explicitly) pederastic, I will show that the collection has a consistent ideology, as the oralists claim, at least in this regard. Indeed, I will argue that the elegies of other known elegists or elegiac traditions⁶ that are (as all parties agree) embedded in the collection, are precisely exceptions that prove the rule: their erotic ideologies are different from that of the collection at large, and they thereby provide internal proof that the collection in general – except these verses – shares an ideology. They also show that the two explanations for this consistency mooted above are inadequate. The shared ideology of the Theognidea is distinct from that of other Archaic elegists, and the editor(s) of the collection, who included poems from other, ideologically different authors/traditions in their collection, did not have a specific ideological bent (at least as regards the erotic). Instead, I argue that the collection's consistency shows that the Theognidea, although they may well have been compiled in a way like that proposed by the anthologists, derive largely from some specific tradition within Archaic elegy – whether that is a local Megarian tradition, as the oralists argue, or (to cite another possible explanation) a Panhellenic 'Theognidean' subgenre of elegy.

Before I proceed, there are two issues that must be addressed: the status of the pederastic elegies within the collection, and my use of the term 'ideology'. Most of the pederastic elegies in the collection are in the so-called Book 2, and it was at one time standard to dismiss them as later or somehow spurious additions to the collection.⁷ All sides of the current debate agree, however, that they are original to the collection: indeed, both external and internal evidence suggests that they were originally spread throughout the collection and were separated out of it, rather than added on to it. While the two books are separated in manuscript A of the early tenth century A.D., the article on Theognis in the *Suda* – compiled later in the same century – says that ἐν μέσῳ τούτων παρεσπαρμέναι μιάραι καὶ

⁵ See n. 2. Van Wees (n. 2), although he gives the question no detailed consideration, does nod in its direction at 52. n. 2, by saying that 'none of these [the verses not attributed to the historical Theognis] would pose a problem for my arguments'.

⁶ See A. Lardinois, 'Have we Solon's verses?', in J. Block and A. Lardinois (edd.), *Solon of Athens: New Historical and Philological Approaches* (Leiden, 2000), 15–35, for the argument that the elegies attributed to Solon, too, are better viewed as belonging to a tradition of Solonic verse, rather than to the author Solon's corpus. Lardinois does not consider the erotic poems of 'Solon' that appear, in versions different from those in other sources, in the Theognidea, but if one accepts the possibility that not all poems attributed to Solon were actually by the historic Solon, then the attribution of these poems, which have no marked connection to his political-poetic persona, is certainly open to question.

⁷ See for instance H.I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity* (Madison, WI, 1956), 36.

παιδικοὶ ἔρωτες καὶ ἄλλα ὅσα ὁ ἐνάρητος ἀποστρέφεται βίος ('among these are spread defiling things and pederastic loves, and other things which the virtuous life refuses'). It is possible that this refers to the few explicit pederastic elegies in the current Book 1, but it seems more likely that the author of this comment knew an earlier version of the collection with more pederastic material, most likely the elegies now in Book 2, spread among the elegies of Book 1.⁸

The internal evidence is also suggestive. Four couplets appear in both books,⁹ suggesting that the two derive from a common source. The presence of pederastic elegies in Book 1 (along with the inclusion in Book 2 of a number that are not certainly pederastic)¹⁰ shows furthermore that the collection from which Book 1 derives did not exclude explicitly pederastic poems and could originally have contained the elegies of Book 2. Finally, as Vetta says in the introduction to his edition of Book 2, key features such as 'performance conditions, compositional structures, paideutic motifs' in Book 2 'are in perfect conformity with those of the first book'.¹¹

I want, however, to emphasize that this article is not about the status of the poems in Book 2; this question has been adequately resolved. My concern is with the relation of the explicitly pederastic elegies to the rest of the collection. I consider in the former category all the explicitly pederastic elegies, both those recognized as such by the editor who separated the two books and those that he left in Book 1; in the latter category, I include all the not or not explicitly pederastic elegies, including those that appear in Book 2. It may be that this division into explicitly and not explicitly pederastic is anachronistic: to an Archaic Greek listener/reader, any sympotic elegy addressed to a younger male may have had pederastic overtones. It is, however, impossible for a modern reader to know whether this was the case, and I thus maintain that if it allows me to trace a pattern of consistency and inconsistency in the collection, this division is valid, or at least valuable for heuristic purposes.

By ideology, I mean simply the view that a poet or tradition takes or the version that he/she/it presents of customs or issues that are the focus of attention in his/her/its culture. In this case, I will be concerned not with the topic of much previous work on the Theognidea's ideology, class relations,¹² but rather with the poems' view/version of the relations between older and younger males that were so central to Greek culture, to the symposium and to the Theognidea in particular. My argument is that the view/version of these relations presented in the pederastic

⁸ So West 1974 (n. 1), 43–5. The article on Theognis, like the other biographical articles in the *Suda*, derives from an epitome of Hesychius, but this remark is clearly Christian in tone and therefore must be an addition of the epitomator. West dates the epitome to the ninth century, presumably in an attempt to place it chronologically before the division of the Books in manuscript A. This is, however, unnecessary: it is also possible that the epitome was done after manuscript A was made but that the epitomator knew older or more traditional manuscripts.

⁹ 1238a–b = 1151–2; 1278a–b = 1101–2; 1278c–d = 949–50; 1318a–b = 1106–7 (with two slight variations).

¹⁰ See M. Vetta, *Theognis: Elegiarum Liber Secundus* (Rome, 1980), xiii, for lists and discussion.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, xi.

¹² See Lane Fox (n. 2) and van Wees (n. 2); also I. Morris, 'The strong principle of equality and the Archaic origin of Greek democracy', in C. Hedrick and J. Ober (edd.), *Demokratia: A Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern* (Princeton, NJ, 1996), 19–48, at 27 and 36; and I. Morris, *Archaeology and Cultural History: Words and Things in Iron Age Greece* (Oxford, 2000), 161.

elegies is generally consistent with that in the non-pederastic or not explicitly pederastic elegies in the collection, and in particular with that of the poems in the so-called Theognis blocks. There are, of course, explicitly erotic themes in the pederastic elegies that do not occur elsewhere, but even those elegies containing a high concentration of these explicitly erotic themes maintain strong lexical and thematic (and hence ideological) links to the general Theognidean view/version of man/youth relations. This view/version is similar to that presented in many well-known Greek texts and might be considered a 'standard' Greek view/version. There were, however, other views/versions in Archaic Greek culture; indeed, as I have argued elsewhere, while these relations were not 'problematized' in the Archaic period in the sense in which they are in our Classical Athenian sources, they are the subject of contrasting ideological constructions in Archaic poetry.¹³ There is, in fact, good evidence for this within the Theognidea, in the elegies from non-Theognidean authors/traditions that are embedded in the collection: these – and, within the collection, these alone – present views/versions of man/youth relations in marked contrast to the Theognidean norm.

2. MAN/YOUTH RELATIONS: PEDAGOGICAL AND POLITICAL

Two poems might be thought to be of particular relevance to my argument. One is 1353–6; this is the only poem in Book 2 that West attributes to Theognis.¹⁴ The other is 237–54, the only possible example of an explicitly pederastic poem in the so-called Theognis blocks. 1353–6 is, however, of little use for my argument: although it is in Book 2, it is about desire in general, rather than specifically desire for younger males. 237–54 is more important. There is little of significance for my argument in the first eight distichs: their theme – the capacity of the poet's verse to immortalize his addressee – is not typical of either the collection's erotic or its non-erotic elegies. The last distich (253–4), however, contains much of interest:

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ὀλίγησ παρὰ σεῦ οὐ τυγχάνω αἰδοῦς,
ἀλλ' ὥσπερ μικρὸν παῖδα λόγοις μ' ἀπατᾷς.

And yet I do not get even a little respect from you,
But instead you deceive me with words as if I were a little child.

These lines contain several of the key themes of the pederastic elegies: exchange between man and youth, the youth's betrayal of the man, and the reversal of power roles between them. They also use vocabulary that, although (as we will see below) it appears in both erotic and political contexts, is typical of the pederastic elegies: *apatao/apate* (deceive/deceit) and *aidos* (respect). Indeed, this is so close to the pederastic elegies that one could claim that this distich in itself collapses the distinction between the Theognis blocks and the elegies of Book 2. As, however, the themes of these lines – excepting betrayal – are among those

¹³ A. Lear, 'Anacreon's "Self": an alternative role model for the Archaic elite male?', *AJP* 129 (2008), 47–76.

¹⁴ West 1974 (n. 1), at 43.

that appear predominantly or exclusively in the pederastic elegies, I will return to them in section 3, when I discuss this group of themes.

I start my argument instead with the view/version of man/youth relations generally presented in the Theognis blocks, and the strong parallels that exist between this and the view/version in the pederastic elegies. Unlike my broader argument, what I have to say in this section will, I believe, strike the reader acquainted with the Theognidea and/or scholarship on them as unsurprising. Indeed, what could be less surprising than the statement that the man/youth (or poet/addressee) relationship in the Theognis block, or in Book 1 in general, is principally pedagogical? The adult/poet addresses the youth/addressee in order to instruct him in such topics – if they may be regarded as separate from each other – as ethics (see for instance 211–12 on moderation), politics (see 53–68 on the changing political order and 73–4 for advice on how to conduct oneself in it) and philosophy (see the fatalism of 129–30). Indeed, the arranger of the Theognis block has placed a programmatic statement of the poet's pedagogical role in a key position. The first elegy (19–26), although addressed to the youth Kynos, concerns the poet: it announces his name and his claim to his poems. The second (27–38) is, then, the first that concerns itself principally with the youth/addressee, and it begins with the following (27–8):¹⁵

σοὶ δ' ἐγὼ εὖ φρονέων ὑποθήσομαι, οἰάπερ αὐτός,
Κύνν', ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγαθῶν παῖς ἔτ' ἐὼν ἔμαθον.

Wishing you well, I will teach you the things,
Kynos, that I learned as a child from the noble.

It will also strike the informed reader as self-evident that loyalty is a particularly important theme in the adult/poet/teacher's instruction: the base (*oizuroi*, *deiloi*, *kakoi*) have no loyalty (65–6), the loyal man is valuable (77–8) and rare (74, 79–80), and so on. However, the message is not on the whole merely that loyalty is good but that the youth/addressee/pupil should be loyal to the adult/poet/teacher and his friends/allies. Indeed an attentive reading of the elegy quoted above (27–38) will show that the themes of pedagogy and factional loyalty are almost inseparable. Here is the rest of the elegy (29–38):

πέπνυσο, μηδ' αἰσχροῖσιν ἐπ' ἔργμασι μηδ' ἀδίκουσιν
τιμὰς μηδ' ἀρετὰς ἔλκεο μηδ' ἄφενος.
ταῦτα μὲν οὕτως ἴσθι· κακοῖσι δὲ μὴ προσομίλει
ἀνδράσιν, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔχσο·
καὶ μετὰ τοῖσιν πῖνε καὶ ἔσθιε, καὶ μετὰ τοῖσιν
ἵζε, καὶ ἄνδανε τοῖς, ὧν μεγάλη δύναμις.
ἐσθλῶν μὲν γὰρ ἅπ' ἐσθλὰ μαθήσεαι· ἦν δὲ κακοῖσι
συμμίσγης, ἀπολείς καὶ τὸν ἐόντα νόον.
ταῦτα μαθὼν ἀγαθοῖσιν ὀμίλει, καὶ ποτε φήσεις
εὖ συμβουλευεῖν τοῖσι φίλοισιν ἐμέ.

Be wise, and do not with shameful and unjust deeds
Take honour, success or wealth.

¹⁵ See also the variant on these lines at 1049–50 (from Book 1 but not the Theognis blocks):
σοὶ δ' ἐγὼ οἶά τε παιδὶ πατὴρ ὑποθήσομαι αὐτός / ἐσθλά ... ('As a father to his son, I
myself will teach you / noble things ...').

Know this: do not spend your time with the base,
 But always stay with the noble;
 And drink with them and eat and sit with them,
 And be pleasing to those who have the greatest power.
 For you will learn good things from the good, while if you frequent
 The base, you will ruin even the sense that you have.
 Learn this, and frequent the noble, and some day you will say
 That I give good counsel to my friends.

Only the first two lines consist of ethical precepts. The rest of the 'lesson' concerns loyalty to the *agathoi*, the noble (presumably both socially and morally), and it is apparent that the speaker belongs to this group, as they are the teachers that he recommends while in the same breath praising his own teaching. Group loyalty is, in fact, both the main material of instruction ('learn this' at 37) and the suggested learning methodology ('you will learn good things from the good' at 35). Indeed, the poet recommends it so often that his repetitions almost trip over each other: in 37, he tells his addressee to learn what he has recommended in the preceding lines – loyalty – and then, for good measure, tells him again to 'frequent the noble'. Thus the instruction that he proposes consists largely of membership in his socio-political group: the youth/addressee/pupil must learn *to* be loyal to this group in order to learn *by* being loyal to it.

Several scholars have pointed out that these themes are also typical of the pederastic elegies. Indeed, one could argue that pederastic relations and factional bonds – or at least those involving senior and junior factional members – are as indistinguishable for the poets of the Theognidea as factional induction and pedagogy are. Edmunds notes this when he says that in 1311–18 (cited below) 'the pederastic relationship is homologized with another kind of relationship, namely, friendship (*philia*)'.¹⁶ Donlan puts it this way:

a very large number of verses in the collection are concerned with friendship – political, personal, and erotic. There is little discernible difference in language, theme, and tone among what appear to the modern observer as quite different forms of the friendship bond.¹⁷

One way to investigate this 'homology' is through an analysis of the collection's vocabulary. The following is a list of key concepts and words associated with the friendship theme.¹⁸ There are several words (nouns and adjectives) used to denote or describe a loyal friend (or *eromenos*):¹⁹ *philos* (friend, lover, also relative), *hetairos* (pal/comrade), *pistos* (trustworthy) and, less commonly, *pisunos* (also trustworthy). Key expressions for the activity of being a loyal friend are *phileo* (to like, love) and *eu erdo* (to benefit). Words for the services or affection that one receives from a loyal friend are: *philia*, *philotes* (both meaning friendship, love; related to

¹⁶ L. Edmunds, 'Foucault and Theognis', *CML* 8.2 (1988), 79–91, at 83.

¹⁷ W. Donlan, '*Pistos philos hetairos*', in Nagy and Figueira (n. 3), 223–44, at 224. See *ibid.*, 225, for a list of poems on the 'friendship' theme. Note that several subcategories include poems from Book 2 (line numbers above 1230).

¹⁸ For line numbers, see discussion below.

¹⁹ Our evidence for the terms *erastes* and *eromenos* for adult lover and beloved boy/youth is generally from the Classical period (though see Ibycus 282A fr. 16); however, these have become the standard terms in English-language scholarship, and I know of no strong objection to their use in this context.

philos), *aidos* (respect), *pistis* (trust, related to *pistos*), *charis* (favour or gratitude, also sometimes sexual, as in the English expression ‘favours’) and *agatha* (good things, favours). Verbs for the negative version of the friendship relation, betrayal – probably the most important theme in the collection – are: *apatao* and *exapatao* (to deceive), *klepto* (to cheat), *hamartano* (to lose, with an object such as *philotes*), *lanthano* (to get away with something), *parerchomai* (to slip by) and *prodidomi* (to betray). Adjectives for the betrayer are *dolios* (tricky) and *apistos* (untrustworthy, from *pistos*); words for the act of betrayal are *dolos* (trickiness, related to *dolios*), *apate* (deceit, related to *apatao*) and *hamartole* (misdeed, related to *hamartano*).

Most of these are used of erotic relations in the Theognidea in just the same way as they are used of non-erotic ones (or ones that are not explicitly erotic). The three words in Donlan’s title, ‘*Pistos philos hetairos*’, appear so constantly in the collection that it would be otiose to list their usages. All three, however, appear together both in clearly erotic and clearly political contexts. In 209, the poet complains that an exile has no ‘*philos kai pistos hetairos*’ (loyal and trustworthy comrade): clearly this refers to political or emotional but not erotic betrayal, as the allies/friends of whose disloyalty he complains are presumably not in exile with him. In 1311–18, the words appear again:

Οὐ μ’ ἔλαθες κλέψας, ὦ παῖ – καὶ γάρ σε δίδωμαι –²⁰
 τοῦτοις οἷσπερ νῦν ἄρθμος ἦδὲ φίλος
 ἔπλευ, ἐμὴν δὲ μεθήκας ἀτίμητον φιλότητα.
 οὐ μὲν δὴ τοῦτοις γ’ ἦσθα φίλος πρότερον,
 ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ ἐκ πάντων σ’ ἐδόκουν θήσεσθαι ἐταῖρον
 πιστόν. καὶ δὴ νῦν ἄλλον ἔχειςθαι φίλον,
 ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν εὖ ἔρδων κείμεν· σὲ δὲ μήτις ἀπάντων
 ἀνθρώπων ἔσσορὼν παιδοφιλεῖν ἐθέλοι.

You haven’t got away with cheating me, boy – for I am after you –
 With those men whose close friend you now are,
 Having dropped my friendship without regard.
 You weren’t friends with them before:
 It was I who thought I could make you my trusty
 Comrade – but now you have another friend,
 And I, for all the kindnesses I’ve done you, am thrown over.²¹ Let no man,
 Seeing you, desire to love a boy.

On their own, the lines in which these terms appear do not seem any more erotic than 209. Yet they certainly are: here a *pistos hetairos* is a lover. This is suggested by the phrase ὦ παῖ (‘O boy’, 1311), which is generally used in erotic poems in the Theognidea. The last lines of the elegy, moreover, make it certain: the relationship of speaker to addressee is referred to by the compound verb, *paidophilein*, ‘to love a boy’.²²

²⁰ I follow Vetta (n. 10), 94, in retaining the manuscript reading δίδωμαι, but there is no difference in sense between the proposals of various editors (see for instance West 1974 [n. 1], 167), so this is not a material issue for this article.

²¹ As Vetta (n. 10), 97, points out, the metaphor derives from sport: the rejected lover lies on the ground like a defeated wrestler or boxer. This may point to a connection between pederasty and the gymnasium that is otherwise largely absent from the Theognidea (though see 1335–6).

²² Vetta (n. 10), 96, argues that the last two lines are a separate poem; see also Edmunds (n. 16), 83. Yet ἀλλά only appears at the start of one elegy within the collection (341–50), where it begins a prayer, and in prayers ἀλλά has a meaning quite distinct from its usual adversative

The other terms in the list are equally ambivalent. The phrase *eu erdo* appears in a poem about political alliances (or at least with no erotic markers) at 105, but at 1317 it is used for the *erastes*' favours to the *eromenos*, and it also occurs twice in this sense/context in 1263–6. Similarly, *dolos* and *apate* are political at 67, while *dolos* and *apatao* are erotic at 1285 (cited below); *hamartano* is political at 109, erotic at 1361.

The homology between political and sexual loyalty is apparent at other levels as well. For instance, as Edmunds points out, in 1311–18, it is not a single person for whom the boy has left the poet but a plural (τούτοις, 'these men', 1312); indeed, as Edmunds says, 'the fact is that Kyrnos has gone over to another lover, but the most upsetting thing is that he has gone over to another group ... another aristocratic faction'.²³ The *eromenos* in the Theognidea is in a relationship both with the *erastes* and with his *philoi*; the pederastic relationship in these poems is *déjà toujours* a political one.

That pederasty is also linked to pedagogy in the Theognidea may also be called self-evident. Already Marrou, although he viewed Book 2 as 'apocryphal' and therefore considered only Book 1 as 'Theognis', saw the relation between these themes: 'there is no doubt that the education which these elegies impart was inspired and colored by the passion of love'.²⁴ What has not previously been noted is the fact that several elegies emphasize the three themes simultaneously. 1271–2 provides an example:

ὦ παῖ, μαργοσύνης ἀπὸ μὲν νόον ὤλεσας ἐσθλόν,
αἰσχύνῃ δὲ φίλοις ἡμετέροις ἐγένου.

O boy, by promiscuity you have ruined your noble mind,
And become a disgrace to our friends.²⁵

Here, as in 1311–18, we see an erotic relation fully embedded in a political one. The boy's crime is sexual disloyalty; none the less, it is a disgrace not to his lover alone but to their *philoi* – to a group, just as the boy in 1311–18 left his lover for a group. The result in this case is not only socio-political disgrace, however: the poet's lexical choices connect it with the theme of pedagogy as well. The boy has ruined his *noos* (mind, good sense). This is what the poet of 27–38 warns the boy that he will do if he spends his time with the base; that is, if he fails to participate in the recommended programme of learning loyalty through practising loyalty. In the Theognidea, the promiscuous boy not only betrays both his lover and their *philoi* – in addition, he flunks school. Thus at times the pederastic elegies view or present the man/youth relationship as simultaneously erotic, political and pedagogical.

one (see J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2nd edition revised by K.J. Dover [Oxford, 1950], 15). In its more common adversative sense, it only appears at the beginning of lines within poems (e.g. 316) and it probably does so here as well.

²³ Edmunds (n. 16), 84–5.

²⁴ Marrou (n. 7), 32.

²⁵ With Vetta (n. 10), 70, I accept Bekker's emendation of the MS. reading *μεν* to *μέν*, on the basis of the presence of a correlative *δέ* in the following line. So also D. Gerber (ed.), *Greek Elegiac Poetry* (Cambridge, 1999), 368.

3. OTHER THEMES OF THE PEDERASTIC ELEGIES

None the less, certain characteristics distinguish the explicitly pederastic elegies. For instance, thirteen of the erotic elegies – including almost all of those discussed in this section – are addressed to an unnamed *pais*,²⁶ while none of the other elegies use this form of address. Furthermore, there are several themes that appear predominantly or exclusively in the pederastic elegies (two of which, as the reader will recall, appear in lines 253–4). Indeed, there may be many such themes, but I have identified four: the exchange of *charis* (favours) between *erastes* and *eromenos*, the brief desirability of the *eromenos*, erotic pursuit and the erotic subjugation of the *erastes*. These themes are less frequently discussed in the scholarship on the Theognidea than the themes of pedagogy and factional loyalty;²⁷ yet they occur frequently in the explicitly pederastic elegies, both separately and in various combinations. Indeed, one could say that at times these themes form a nexus of interlocking erotic themes. What is interesting, however, is that, even in those poems where this thematic nexus predominates, the poets often use vocabulary typical of the ‘friendship’ theme in the Theognidea and not of non-Theognidean erotic poetry. Thus in these poems, as in the explicitly pederastic elegies quoted above (1271–2, 1311–18), the pederastic relation is linked lexically and thematically to the political/pedagogical man/youth relations of the Theognis blocks.

1329–34 provides the most striking blend of erotic and political/pedagogical vocabulary and themes:

σοί τε διδόντ' ἔτι καλόν, ἐμοί τ' οὐκ αἰσχρὸν ἐρῶντι
αἰτεῖν. ἀλλὰ γονέων λίσσομαι ἤμετέρων
αἶδεο μ' ὦ παῖ < > διδοῦς χάριν, εἴ ποτε καὶ σὺ
ἕξεις Κυπρογενοῦς δῶρον ἵστεφάνου
χρηίζων καὶ ἐπ' ἄλλον ἐλεύσεαι· ἀλλὰ σε δαίμων
δοίη τῶν αὐτῶν ἀντιτυχεῖν ἐπέων.

It is still a fine thing for you to give and not disgraceful for me,
Who love you, to ask. But I beg you in the name of ... parents,
Show me respect, boy, by granting me your favours, if ever you too
Will desire the gift of violet-crowned Aphrodite, the Cyprus-born,
And go after another; may the god grant
That you meet with the same response.

This poem begins by presenting the pederastic relationship it proposes as ethically praiseworthy.²⁸ The word *kalos* in 1329 refers not to erotic beauty but to seemliness, and it contrasts with *aischros*, which appears twice in the Theognis blocks (86, 546) and is closely related to *aischune* (shame), which, as we saw above

²⁶ The phrase ὦ παῖ ('O boy') appears at 1235, 1259, 1263, 1271, 1283, 1295, 1299, 1311, 1327 and 1351, along with variations at 1249 (παῖ), 1281, (ὦ καλὲ παῖ, 'O beautiful boy') and 1365 (ὦ παῖδων κάλλιστε, 'O most beautiful of boys').

²⁷ See, however, Edmunds (n. 16), 81–2, on the *erastes*' subjugation, and J. Lewis, 'Eros and the polis in Theognis Book II', in Nagy and Figueira (n. 3), 197–221, at 214–19, on the theme of pursuit.

²⁸ There is no consensus as to whether the preceding distich (1327–8) is part of this poem or not; see Vetta (n. 10), 106, for discussion. I do not intend by omitting these lines to take a stand on this issue; I have not included them here simply because they add nothing to my argument.

in reference to 1271–2, connects in the Theognidea's lexical field to the culture of political factions. Furthermore, the use of this terminology blends the poem's erotic message with a pedagogical one: it not only asks the boy to participate in a sexual relationship but also instructs him in the ethics of such relationships (which are apparently appropriate while he is still at an appropriate age). The poet then emphasizes the network of obligations that surrounds the pederastic relationship by pleading 'in the name of ... parents': although textual difficulties make it unclear to whose parents he is referring (or in combination with what or whom he mentions them),²⁹ this none the less suggests that the relationship is one between groups – factions and/or families – as well as individuals. The poet then refers to the behaviour/attitude that he desires from the boy with the typical 'friendship' word *aideomai* (respect). The form of 'respect' that the poet desires, however, is sexual: the boy should respect him by 'granting him a favour' – or, as I have suggested above, 'granting him his favours'. The *charis* theme is then followed by two other 'purely' erotic themes, the gifts of Aphrodite and the short period of a boy's desirability. The elegy also includes the theme of the poet/*erastes*' subjugation: in 1330, the poet pleads with his addressee/*eromenos*, as he does in such elegies on the subjugation theme as 1235–8. Thus the poem contains a blend of the 'friendship' theme and 'purely' erotic themes; indeed, as 1331 shows, the two can combine in a single verbal expression.

Other elegies focus more exclusively on the erotic themes; yet even these are linked by lexical choices to the political/pedagogical. The first four lines of 1299–1304, for instance, are replete with images of pursuit and flight; its last two lines turn to the theme of the brief duration of youthful beauty, and, in 1303, the use of the word *charis* brings in the theme of exchange. In 1305–10, in contrast, the themes of erotic pursuit and exchange are absent; the theme of the *eromenos*' brief desirability mixes instead with the theme of erotic subjugation. Even these poems, however, share key vocabulary and attitudes with poems on political/pedagogical themes. The final word of 1305–10, *kakotes* (baseness, bad behaviour) – with which the poem defines the behaviour of both its addressee and his hypothetical future *eromenoi* – appears in the Theognis blocks at 1176; the *eromenos*' quality of being *margos* (greedy, lewd, promiscuous), of which the poet complains at 1301, also causes the boy to lose his good sense and become a shame to his *philoï* at 1271 (cited above).

Finally, even 1283–94, a poem that dedicates eight of its twelve lines to an extended metaphor underlining the theme of pursuit and flight, has surprising lexical links to the 'friendship' theme:

ὦ παῖ, μή μ' ἀδίκηι – ἔτι σοι κατὰθύμιος εἶναι
 βούλομαι – εὐφροσύνη τοῦτο συνεῖς ἀγαθῇ
 οὐ γάρ τοί με δόλω παρελεύσεαι οὐδ' ἀπατήσεις·
 νικήσας γάρ ἔχεις τὸ πλεον ἐξοπίσω.
 ἀλλὰ σ' ἐγὼ τρώσω φεύγοντά με, ὥς ποτέ φασιν

²⁹ I share Vetta's (n. 10, at 107) distrust of the MS. reading *ἡμετέρων*. There are no parallels for a Greek begging for something in the name of his own parents. It is possible that the word *γονεῖς* here means 'ancestors' and that *ἡμέτεροι* is not a poetic word for 'my' but a prosaic 'our', i.e. that the *erastes* invokes *joint* ancestors of his and his *eromenos*'. However, there are also no parallels, to my knowledge, for a Greek begging for something in the name of shared ancestors. It seems instead more likely, as Vetta argues, at 108, that the text is corrupt and 'covers a second guaranteeing element, such as ἡδ' ἑτάρων (see *Odyssey* 15.261)'.

Ἰασίου κούρην παρθένον Ἰασίην,
 ὥραίην περ ἑοῦσαν, ἀναινομένην γάμον ἀνδρῶν
 φεύγειν· ζῶσαμένη δ' ἔργ' ἀτέλεστα τέλει
 πατρός νοσφισθεῖσα δόμων ξανθὴ Ἀταλάντη·
 ὥχετο δ' ὑψηλὰς εἰς κορυφὰς ὀρέων
 φεύγουσ' ἱμερόεντα γάμον, χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης
 δῶρα· τέλος δ' ἔγνω καὶ μάλ' ἀναινομένην.

Don't treat me unjustly, boy – I still want to please you –
 But listen to this with a cheerful spirit.
 For you won't get around me with tricks or fool me.
 You have won and will have the advantage from now on,
 But I will wound you if you flee from me, as they say
 The daughter of Iasios, the virgin Iasia,
 Although she was in bloom, refused men
 And fled. Putting on her girdle, blonde Atalanta
 Accomplished useless tasks, far from her father's house.
 She went to the high peaks of the mountains,
 Fleeing desirable marriage, the gift of golden Aphrodite.
 But in the end she came to know it, for all her refusal.

Discussion of this poem focusses on the mythic paradigm, unusual in the Theognidea (though see 1345–50), and the erotic themes it reinforces.³⁰ Despite, however, the opening address to an unnamed *pais* – typical of the explicitly erotic elegies – the first four lines contain several key words from the vocabulary of the 'friendship' theme. The opening command *μή μ' ἀδίκει* casts the relationship between the lovers as an obligation, and connects to the theme of *dike/adikia*, common in the Theognis blocks; in 1285, the poet uses typical terms for the betrayal of a 'friendship', *dolos* and *apatao*.³¹

Moreover, the poet tells the Atalanta story in a way that correlates surprisingly well with the 'friendship' theme. He does not portray Atalanta as simply fleeing from a sexual relationship.³² Instead, he emphasizes the fact that Atalanta has left her father's house (1291) – the appropriate place for a maiden – to flee not

³⁰ See, for instance, Lewis (n. 27), 216. *Pace* Lewis, however, the metaphor of the hunt – as opposed to that of pursuit – is suggested here only by the word *τρώσω* (I will wound you), which may refer to the theme of the *erastes*' revenge (see 1279–82) as much as to hunting (so Vetta [n. 10], 82).

³¹ The argument has been made that the Archaic erotic poets believed in a general obligation to return love. See M.G. Bonnano, 'Osservazioni sul tema della giusta reciprocità amorosa da Saffo ai comici', *QUCC* 16 (1973), 110–20, who argues that the obligation exists not only within an established relationship but in general (see also G.A. Privitera, 'La rete di Afrodite', *QUCC* 4 [1967], 7–58, and B. Gentili, 'Il "letto insaziato" di Medea e il tema dell'*Adikia* a Livello Amoroso dei Lirici [Saffo, Teognide] e nella *Medea* di Euripide', *SCO* 21 [1972], 60–72, in particular 63–6). The only actual evidence presented for this view is the lack of reference, in Sappho 1, to an established relation between Sappho and the girl whom she loves. As Vetta (n. 10), 77–8, points out, however, there is such an indication here in the word *ἔτι* ('still', 1283): at least in this case, the obligation is toward an *erastes* with whom the *eromenos* has a previous relationship; thus the *eromenos*' *adikia* corresponds to a modern concept of romantic betrayal.

³² It has been proposed that this elegy presents a pastiche of contrasting versions of the story of Atalanta, one in which Atalanta is a huntress – and therefore comparable to the *erastes* in this poem – and one in which she is a swift runner – and therefore comparable to the *eromenos*. See Vetta (n. 10), 80–2, for discussion of this theory. In any case, while the poet's lexical choices may refer to the story of Atalanta the huntress, the story that this poem tells is that of Atalanta the swift runner.

rape but marriage (*gamos*, repeated at 1289 and 1293), which she is eventually constrained to accept. Thus, while the mythic parallel portrays the *eromenos* as a fleeing object of pursuit, it simultaneously suggests that the pederastic relationship is analogous to marriage and places it within the realm of family obligations (cf. 1330, cited above) – and even piety, as marriage here is said to be ‘the gift(s) of golden Aphrodite’. It thus reinforces (at least in part) the view of the pederastic relationship as a pro-social obligation suggested by the use of the ‘friendship’ terms *dolos* and *apatao*.

Thus, although there is a group of erotic themes that appears predominantly or exclusively in the pederastic elegies, the elegies combine these themes with themes and vocabulary that are typical of the Theognis blocks and the Theognidea in general and not on the whole typical of non-Theognidean erotic poetry. Therefore, while the explicitly erotic poems also have erotic concerns that they do not share with the not (or not explicitly) pederastic elegies, one can say that the Theognidea in general present a view/version of man/youth relations that is consistent in important ways.

4. INTERNAL CONTRADICTIONS

There are, however, elegies in the Theognidea that present contrasting views/versions of man/youth relations. Such an argument might raise a sceptical reader’s suspicions: if one claims that a group is consistent and then finds oneself forced to exclude certain items in the group as inconsistent, then perhaps the purported consistency is illusory. The Theognidea are, however, an inconsistent group in key ways: in particular, there are embedded in the collection poems that elsewhere are attributed to known (or named) poets other than Theognis, as well as other poems that for various reasons seem to be by other poets. Interestingly, it is precisely several of these poems that present views/versions of pederastic relations that conflict with the general Theognidean one. On this basis, I argue that these internal inconsistencies confirm the consistency of the Theognidean ideology and its significance for the collection’s authorship: they show that some other Archaic elegists had different erotic ideologies and that the Theognidean collection, excepting these alien poems embedded in it, has an at least partially consistent erotic ideology of its own.

There are six poems that might bear discussion under this heading: 719–28, 993–1002, 949–54 (and the repetition of 949–50 at 1278c–d), 1063–8, 1253–4 and 1255–6. I will, however, leave 949–54, 1063–8 and 1255–6 out of consideration. 949–54 is only at most elusively erotic: unlike the other erotica in the collection (if it is to be understood erotically), it does not directly address an *eromenos* or pederastic themes. While it also does not contain any ‘friendship’ vocabulary, its poet’s praise of his own self-restraint seems consonant with the ideology of the Theognidea in general. 1063–8, on the other hand, is clearly sexual: it refers explicitly to sexual pleasure with an ‘age-mate’. It is uncertain, however, whether this age-mate is male or female. Moreover, even if it refers to a male, the relationship in question is not pederastic: age difference is a marked element of pederastic relations both in Greek culture in general and in the Theognidea in particular. Finally, 1255–6 is clearly composed as a response to 1253–4 and presents a view/version

of pederasty very similar to that of 1253–4.³³ I will therefore focus on 719–28, 993–1002 and 1253–4.

Two of these poems, 719–28 and 1253–4, are attributed to Solon. Before turning to them, I will consider 993–1002, which also has a questionable relationship to the Theognidean tradition: the repetition of address to Kyrnos or to an unnamed *pais* is a marked characteristic of the tradition; there are only a few poems addressed to other names, and only this poem is addressed to Akademos, suggesting that it derives from a different author or tradition.³⁴ The poem also presents an attitude toward desirable boys very different from that of the Theognidea at large. The poet suggests (993) a singing contest to another poet and proposes as a prize (994) a *παῖς καλὸν ἄνθος ἔχων* ('boy in beautiful bloom'). This proposal treats the boy and his beauty as an object of barter – a stark contrast to the other boys of the collection, who dispose of their own favours and expect to be begged for them. It is possible that this refers to a slave-boy, a category of boy otherwise not present in the collection; in any case it refers to a boy who is in some sense socially inferior to the poet. One could argue that the poem merely refers to an aspect of sexual life not central to the other pederastic love-poems of the collection. Value-systems are marked, however, not only by their expressed values but also by those things that they include in and exclude from the realm of reference, and the general absence of sex with social inferiors from the Theognidea contributes to their idealized representation of pederasty as political and pedagogical in focus. Thus, while one could argue that this poem does not present a different view/version of elite pederasty – the relations between elite men and elite boys – it does present a different option for the satisfaction of the elite man's pederastic desires and therefore a different sexual ideology.

Two pederastic poems (23 and 25) are attributed to Solon, and one more poem (24) attributed to him mentions erotic relations with boys in a way that correlates with the view that the two other poems suggest. One of the two former and the latter (23 and 24) occur in the Theognidea in the following versions, as 1253–4 and 719–28.³⁵

Ὀλβιος, ᾧ παῖδες τε φίλοι καὶ μώνυχες ἵπποι
θηρευταί τε κύνες καὶ ξένοι ἀλλοδαποί.

Happy is he who has beloved boys and single-hoofed horses,
Hunting dogs and a guest-friend in a foreign land.

Ἰσὸν τοι πλουτοῦσιν, ὅτῳ πολὺς ἄργυρός ἐστιν
καὶ χρυσὸς καὶ γῆς πυροφόρου πεδία
ἵπποι θ' ἡμίονοί τε, καὶ ᾧ τὰ δέοντα πάρεστι,
γαστρί τε καὶ πλευραῖς καὶ ποσὶν ἄβρά παθεῖν,
παιδός τ' ἥδ' ἐ γυναικός, ὅταν καὶ τῶν ἀφίκεται
ᾠρη, σὺν δ' ἥβη γίνεται ἄρμολα.

³³ On respension in sympotic poetry in general, see Vetta (n. 10), xxvii–xxxi, and M. Vetta, 'Identificazione di un caso di catena simposiale nel *Corpus teognideo*', in B. Gentili et al. (edd.), *Lirica greca da Archiloco a Elitis: Studi in onore di Filippo Maria Pontani, Studi Bizantini e Neogreci* 14 (Padua, 1984); on this pair of distichs as an example, see Vetta (n. 10), 58–62.

³⁴ See, however, Vetta (n. 10), 121–3, for discussion of the three poems addressed to Simonides.

³⁵ I omit lines 725–8 as irrelevant to my point. On the attribution of these poems to Solon and the reuse of 23 in the Theognidea, see Vetta (n. 10), 58–60.

Equally rich is the man who has much silver
 And gold and fields of wheat-bearing land
 And horses and mules, and the man who has only the necessities,
 Soft comfort for his stomach, sides, and feet,
 From a woman or a boy, when the season comes
 For this, and youth at the proper time.

There are some difficulties in interpreting each of these poems. Plato's Socrates, at *Lysis* 212d–213a, employs the first as if the adjective *philoí* modified all of the nouns in the relative clause and as if its sense were not 'beloved' but 'loving'. This, however, is unlikely. The fact that there is an adjective modifying each of the last three nouns strongly suggests that *philoí* modifies only *paides*, and the interpretation of *philoí* as 'loving' finds no support in Archaic monodic poetry. 'Socrates' seems to have – perhaps intentionally or even playfully – misinterpreted the poem for the purposes of his argument. He also seems to take the word *paides* to mean 'children' rather than 'boys' – which is also unlikely. The overwhelming majority of uses of *pais* in Archaic elegy mean 'boy'; further, as horses and dogs and guest-friends are characteristics of the elite male (as in vase-painting, where dogs often appear in scenes of elite activities), *paides* almost certainly refers to *eromenoi*, in that these are also a marker of the elite male.³⁶ Indeed – although I risk making a circular argument – I would argue that these three other class-markers show us not only that these *paides* are *eromenoi* but also what the value of these *eromenoi* is, in the view of this poem: they too are a class marker, they are among the things that make an aristocrat fortunate. As with 993–1002, one could argue that this merely presents a different aspect of the pederastic relation from the other Theognidea: in this poem, an adult speaks for an audience of other adults rather than addressing a boy whom he wants to seduce. Yet there is hardly a point of contact here with the view/version of pederasty presented elsewhere in the Theognidea. The political and pedagogical themes are absent, and the poem does not mention courtship any more than it does teaching or factional induction. The boys in this poem are not presented as potential future comrades but as objects on a par with horses and dogs (if also with guest-friends). Indeed, given Solon's reputation as a sage, it is surprising how much overlap there is between the view/version of pederasty presented in these lines (like that in Solon 25) and the model found in Anacreon's poetry – a model that, as I have argued elsewhere, contrasts sharply with the Theognidean model. In both Anacreon and Solon, the *eromenos* is presented principally as a sex object, and the pedagogical element so prominent in the Theognidean model is absent.³⁷

Interestingly, 24.5–6 also presents a parallel to the Anacreontic view/version of pederasty, in that Anacreon's poetic persona is markedly bisexual.³⁸ Both text and meaning of these lines are uncertain. Two things are, however, crystal clear. Once more, boys are presented as sex objects, and in this case they are objects analogous to women (l. 5): *παιδός τ' ἥδ' ἐ γυναικός* ('from a boy or a woman'). Again, this presents a strong contrast to the rest of the Theognidea, which emphasizes pederastic erotic relations almost to the exclusion of heterosexual ones. Indeed women appear as the object of any kind of erotic or marital feeling only four times in

³⁶ See Vetta (n. 10), 60–1, with whom I agree on all these points.

³⁷ Lear (n. 13), especially 50.

³⁸ Ibid., 50 and 61–5.

the collection (aside from the poem under discussion),³⁹ and the dispraise implied by this near-omission is confirmed by the only poem that compares the two types of love-object, 1367–8:

παῖδός τοι χάρις ἐστὶ γυναικὶ δὲ πιστὸς ἑταῖρος
οὐδείς, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τὸν παρόντα φιλεῖ.

A boy shows gratitude; a woman has no loyal companion.
She always loves the one who is at hand.

Interestingly, women are dispraised precisely for failing to participate in what one might call Theognidean values: they neither give nor receive the loyalty that is (to return to our discussion of lines 27–38) both method and matter in the collection's politico-pedagogical system. Uninterested in fairness, the Theognidean poet does not point out that a woman would have no chance to learn or practice this value: in Archaic Greece, she would be excluded from both education and politics. The kind of relationship that the Theognidea envision between adult/*erastes*/mentor and youth/*eromenos*/pupil – political, pedagogical and erotic – could not, in Archaic Greece, obtain between men and women. Between men and women, only the erotic part could exist. To present women and boys, therefore, as analogous sources of pleasure, is to treat boys as only a source of pleasure – a view/version of man/youth relations strikingly different from the Theognidean norm.

Thus these three poems by other authors or traditions present views or versions of the pederastic relationship distinct from that of the other Theognidea. They thereby suggest that the Theognidea, excepting these embedded poems, have an erotic ideology distinct from that of other Archaic elegies.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Thus an analysis of the view(s)/version(s) of man/boy relations in the Theognidea seems to suggest that the Theognidea have a relatively consistent cultural ideology, at least with respect to this key issue in Archaic culture. There are lexical and thematic links between the explicitly pederastic elegies' view(s)/version(s) and those of the not or not explicitly pederastic elegies, including those of the so-called 'Theognis blocks'. These views/versions of man/boy relations are, furthermore, not only relatively consistent but also different from those of other elegiac authors and traditions – even from those of the elegies in the Theognidea that are or seem to be by named authors other than Theognis or from other traditions. The Theognidea (excluding the non-Theognidean poems embedded in them) present man/boy relations as focussing on pedagogy and factional loyalty. The explicitly pederastic elegies often mix their more explicitly erotic vocabulary and themes with the political/pedagogical themes of the not or not explicitly pederastic elegies. Even those of the erotic elegies that focus heavily on erotic themes have surprising lexical and thematic links with the political/pedagogical rhetoric of the other Theognidea. The elegies that seem to be by named authors other than Theognis or from other

³⁹ See 261–6, 457–60, 1225–6 and 1367–8 (cited below in text). In 579–80, the poet adopts a female 'voice' to address an erotic theme; this may also be the case in 257–60 and 861–4; see F. Ferrari (ed.), *Theognide, Elegie* (Milan, 1989), 115 and 216–17, for discussion.

traditions do not share in this view/version of man/boy relations. The explicitly erotic elegies among these make no reference to political loyalty or pedagogy; rather they either focus on sexual relations with social inferiors or present the *eromenoi* to whom they refer as sex objects rather than as future comrades.

This analysis therefore tends to support what I have called the oralist school against what I have called the anthologist school on one key point: the Theognidea outside the 'Theognis blocks' do not seem to derive merely from a general anthology or anthologies of Archaic elegy, but rather from some one tradition within Archaic elegy – a tradition that shares vocabulary, themes and ideological attitudes with the 'Theognis blocks'. Thus, in the end (as I indicated at the beginning), this article constitutes a challenge to the anthologists to enter into the question of the nature of that tradition – and ultimately to both sides of the debate to consider how such a tradition might have been collected, before coming down to us (after various transformations, as the anthologists argue) under the name Theognis.

Pomona College

ANDREW LEAR
andrewlear2@gmail.com