

EARLY GREEK ELEGY, SYMPOSIUM AND PUBLIC FESTIVAL

I. INTRODUCTION

THIS paper is chiefly concerned with the circumstances in which early Greek elegy was performed. Section II argues that for our extant shorter poems only performance at symposia is securely attested. Section III examines the related questions of the meaning of *elegos* and the performance of elegies at funerals. Finally (IV) I try to establish the existence of longer elegiac poems intended for performance at public festivals.*

First, however, some general points. Although elegy was one of the major genres in the archaic period, our understanding of it is much less sure than of hexameter epic. We have an excellent modern edition by M. L. West, and another in progress by B. Gentili and C. Prato. Many central questions have been clearly formulated and convincingly answered by West in the volume accompanying his edition, and much work has recently been done on sympotic poetry of the archaic period.¹ Yet many uncertainties remain. Some arise because the total number of lines surviving cannot exceed about 3000, of which only some 1400 come to us in a direct manuscript tradition. Interpretation of these 1400 lines is partly complicated by the fact that only some of them can belong to the sixth century BC Megarian poet, Theognis, to whom they are ascribed in the manuscripts.² But greater uncertainty is imported by the fact that only a few of these, and even fewer of the other lines which we owe to quotation in later authors or to epigraphic and papyrus finds, can be demonstrated to form complete poems.³ One consequence is that inferences from what is being said in extant lines to the circumstances in which the poem as a whole was intended to be performed become more than usually precarious. Another is that we do not know the characteristic length of an elegiac poem.

* Parts of this paper have been heard as lectures at the Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington; the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, London; Columbia University, New York; Yale University; Dartmouth College, New Hampshire; and Wellesley College, Mass. I am grateful to the many scholars who offered suggestions and criticisms on these occasions, to the generations of pupils who have engaged in helpful discussion, and to the *Journal's* referees.

¹ Editions: M. L. West, *Iambi et elegi graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, 2 vols (Oxford 1971-2) and *Theognidis et Phocylidis fragmenta* (Berlin/New York 1978); B. Gentili and C. Prato, *Poetarum elegiacorum testimonia et fragmenta* (Leipzig 1979). For a bibliography of editions, commentaries and discussions up to 1977 (for elegy in general, and for Callinus, Tyrtaeus, Mimnermus, Solon and Xenophanes) see Gentili-Prato xiv-xliv. For commentary on Archilochus see G. Tarditi, *Archiloco* (Rome 1968); on Theognis B. A. van Groningen, *Theognis: le premier livre* (Amsterdam 1966) and M. Vetta, *Teognide, libro secondo* (Rome 1980). Important discussion of the genre and of individual passages is to be found in M. L. West, *Studies in Greek elegy and iambus* (Berlin/New York 1974) (hereafter '*Studies*').

The basic study of sympotic poetry remains R. Reitzenstein, *Epigram und Skolion* (Giessen 1893). Note also B. Gentili, 'Epigramma ed elegia', *Fond. Hardt* xiv (1968) 39-41; G. Giangrande, 'Sympotic literature and epigram', *ibid.* 91-174; O. Tsagarakis, *Self-expression in early Greek lyric, elegiac and iambic poetry*, Palingenesia xi

(Wiesbaden 1977)—based on his 1966 Munich dissertation *Die Subjectivität in der griechischen Lyrik*; W. Rösler, *Dichter und Gruppe* (Munich 1980) and reviewing Tsagarakis (*op. cit.*) in *Gnomon* lxxx (1980) 609-16; A. Aloni, *Le muse di Archiloco* (Copenhagen 1981); M. Vetta, *Poesia e simposio nella Grecia antica* (Rome/Bari 1983)—a collection of essays with introduction by Vetta and a reprint of his 'Un capitolo di storia di poesia simposiale (per l'esegesi di Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1222-48)', *Dialoghi di archeologia* ix-x (1977) 242-66; A. P. Burnett, *Three archaic poets* (London 1983). The above are cited by author's name only. See also *Sympotica*, ed. O. Murray (forthcoming: papers of a symposium on the *symposium* held in Oxford in 1984). References to fragments of the elegists are to West's edition.

² On Theognis see West 65-71.

³ In his edition West signals 10 complete poems in the Theognidea: 39-52; 183-92; 257-60; 263-66; 373-400 (with some *lacunae*); 467-96; 511-22; 667-82; 861-4; 959-62. I doubt 263-6, but would tentatively add 757-64; 1231-4; 1387-90. Outside the Theognidea West accepts another 9, but of these only Solon 13 is of any length (76 lines); Simonides 6 and Sophocles 4 veer towards epigram; and the riddles of Cleobulina 1 and 2, and *sententiae* of Demodocus 2, 3, 4 and 5 belong to distinctive classes of poetry. West would consider adding Archilochus 5 and 13: 5 I doubt, but 13 may (with Solon 13) be our only guide to the shape of an early elegy outside the Theognidea.

Some features of the genre, however, are less uncertain. Elegy's metrical form relates it to hexameter epic, but no evidence proves it to be a more recent genre. Not surprisingly for a dactylic metre, it shares much vocabulary with epic, but it is only supposition that elegy is invariably the borrower and epic the lender.⁴ Its earliest known exponents flourished in the middle of the seventh century—Callinus at Ephesus, Archilochus on Paros and Thasos, and Mimnermus in Colophon or Smyrna: but the fact that in Laconia their contemporary Tyrtaeus used Ionic dialect demonstrates that by then the genre had flourished for some time.⁵

These poets' best known poems, or fragments of poems, are short pieces of exhortation, personal comment and reflection. The various ways these can shade into each other are admirably analysed by West in his *Studies*, 14–18. There is much overlap of theme with both lyric and iambic poetry: but elegy's tone never falls so low as iambic's sometimes does. This may stem partly from its relation to hexameter epic, but also from its more formal manner of delivery. For it is clear that archaic elegy was not spoken or recited but *sung*;⁶ and indeed despite David Campbell's arguments⁷ the evidence suggests to me that on almost all occasions it was accompanied by the *aulos*. I later look at some possible counter-examples. But for the moment consider one consequence of the metrical scheme and of the manner of performance that distinguishes elegy from lyric poetry. The singer of elegy *may* be a gifted *aulos*-player, but *need* not be: for if the accompaniment is to come from a wind-instrument, that instrument must be played by another. All the elegist must do is compose words within a regularly repeated metre and sing them to a tune that is presumably, like the couplet's metre, simple and repeated. Composition will have been aided by the stock of themes and phrases already in use in epic and elegy. This makes fewer demands than composing monody in metres of varying complexity for singing to the accompaniment of a stringed instrument played by the singer: the gap between talented amateur and virtuoso performer will be narrower. So too the gap between the man who entertains by composing a new song on a traditional theme, using traditional blocks of language, and the man who sings a much-loved song composed by another singer. Singing elegy, therefore, like singing Attic *skolia*, is a pastime in which several members of a group can participate. To strike a sympathetic response a song will tend to identify the singer with that group rather than set him apart from it. Moreover, a singer may expect a successful song to be demanded from himself on another occasion, or to be sung by an *hetairos* when he is absent or even dead.

This may partly explain a tendency to exclude features suitable only for the occasion of first performance. Thus only one major elegist introduces his own name into his elegiac poetry—Theognis, when he is attempting to secure poetic immortality for himself and a correct ascription to himself of his songs (19–26). The element he expected to secure his authorship was, I believe, the address to his boy-friend Cyrnus.⁸ But Theognis' technique of regularly addressing songs to a named individual, although it tells an informed audience that the songs are his, does not tie their content so closely to Theognis as would the regular use of his own name. Contemporaries will have had little difficulty in singing a song addressed to Cyrnus; they might, however, have felt some oddity in singing Sappho *fr.* 1, with its give-away τίς σ', ὦ Ψάπφ', ἀδικήει; or reciting such lines as Hipponax *fr.* 32.4 W δὸς χλαῖναν Ἰππώνακτι . . .

⁴ For discussion of the metrical form *cf.* West 9–10; *id.*, *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982) 35–46. For a subtler view of the implications of shared vocabulary *cf.* Aloni 80 ff. 102 ff.

⁵ K. J. Dover, 'The poetry of Archilochus', *Fond. Hardt* x (1964) 190–4, unfortunately misinterpreted by D. A. Campbell, *Greek lyric poetry* (London and New York 1967) 169.

⁶ West 13–14.

⁷ D. A. Campbell, 'Flutes and elegiac couplets', *JHS* lxxxiv (1964) 63–8, followed by T. G. Rosenmeyer,

'Elegiac and elegos', *Cal. Stud. Class. Ant.* i (1968) 217–31, whose arguments against the singing of early elegy do not persuade me (nor, apparently, J. Herington, *Poetry into drama* [Berkeley/Los Angeles 1985] whose balanced discussion [31–6] and clear statement of the evidence [192–3] I only saw when this paper was in final draft). Neither Campbell nor Rosenmeyer satisfactorily explains Theognis 239 ff.

⁸ But these lines' interpretation is much disputed. See van Groningen; Campbell (n. 7) 347–9; West 149 f.

As a corollary the pronoun *ego* must be handled with care when it appears in such couplets as Archilochus 1W

εἶμι δ' ἐγὼ θεράπων μὲν Ἐνυαλίῳ ἄνακτος
καὶ Μουσέων ἔρατὸν δῶρον ἐπιστάμενος.⁹

One reaction to the *ego* has been to see self-assertion and personal commitment. But the *ego* tells us nothing about Archilochus that may not apply equally to the *hetairoi* who were his audience. Like him, Aesimides, Pericles and Glaucus were warrior-citizens: each could take up this song and identify with the *ego* who was a servant of the lord of war; any person who sang the couplet would thereby be validating the claim to be skilled in the gift of the Muses.

Just as first-person statements do not offer immediate access to the person of the poet, so too allusions to supposed circumstances of a song are not a reliable guide to its actual context of performance. To that I now turn.

II. CIRCUMSTANCES OF PERFORMANCE

One elegiac passage describes a context of performance unambiguously, Theognis 237–43. The context is the symposium. Theognis predicts that Cyrnus will be present at all feasts and banquets, lying in many men's mouths, and says 'with clear-voiced *auliskoi* young men will sing of you fairly and clearly in decorous manner'. It is legitimate to supplement this with the many descriptions of and allusions to sympotic contexts scattered throughout elegy¹⁰ and thus build up a picture of sympotic song that involves praise, *gnomai*, reflection, banter, games in which one song capped another, and so on. Allusions also show such song continuing during the *komos* that could follow a banquet.¹¹

But when we try to exploit content to delineate other possible circumstances of performance there are serious difficulties. West listed eight sets of circumstances in which he thought the performance of elegy could be discerned¹²—of these eight the ordinary civilian symposium was third, and the *komos* fourth. But the other six have only a precarious title to existence. Like Reitzenstein, West first considered martial elegy, represented in the seventh century certainly by Tyrtaeus and Callinus, perhaps also by Mimnermus and Archilochus.¹³ I discuss elsewhere¹⁴ the external evidence for the performance of elegy at Sparta and the inferences that may be drawn from the surviving pieces of Tyrtaeus and Callinus, and do no more than summarise my conclusions here. The well-known texts of Philochorus and Lycurgus¹⁵ describe the same practice, which they specifically associate with times when the Spartan army was on campaign: Tyrtaeus' elegies were sung after a banquet in the king's *skene*, and the participants were a select group analogous to the aristocratic *neoi* who were the characteristic symposiasts in Ionian cities. More individuals may have been involved than in symposia elsewhere, but the context is clearly

⁹ For a careful discussion, perhaps reading too much into these few words, see Aloni 31–48. I do not attempt to give a bibliography of the many discussions of the 'I' in personal poetry: see however most recently W. Rösler, 'Personale reale o personale poetica', *Quad. Urb. Cult. Class.* xix (1985) 131–44.

¹⁰ West 11–12: *contra* Campbell (n. 7) 64, Rosenmeyer (n. 7) 221 n. 23.

¹¹ West 12.

¹² *Ibid.* 10–13.

¹³ For Mimnermus 14 see below section IV; for an apparently exhortatory scrap of Archilochus, W. Peek, *ZPE* lix (1985) 13–22.

¹⁴ *Sympotica* (forthcoming, cf. n. 1)

¹⁵ Φιλόχορος δὲ φησιν κρατήσαντας Λακεδαι-

μονίους Μεσσηνίων διὰ τὴν Τυρταίου στρατηγίαν ἐν ταῖς στρατείαις ἔθος ποιήσασθαι, ἀνδειπνοποιήσωνται καὶ παιωνίωσιν, ἄδειν καθ' ἓνα <τὰ> Τυρταίου. κρίνειν δὲ τὸν πολέμαρχον καὶ ἄθλον διδόναι τῷ νικῶντι κρέας.

Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 216 = Athenaeus xiv 29, 630F;

καὶ περὶ τοὺς ἄλλους οὐδένα λόγον ἔχοντες περὶ τούτου οὕτω σφόδρα ἐσπουδάκασιν, ὥστε νόμον ἔθεντο, ὅταν ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις ἐκστρατευόμενοι ᾧσι, καλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως σκηνὴν ἀκουσομένους τῶν Τυρταίου ποιημάτων ἅπαντας, νομίζοντες οὕτως ἀν' αὐτοὺς μάλιστα πρὸ τῆς πατρίδος ἐθέλειν ἀποθνήσκειν.

Lycurgus, in *Leocr.* 107.

related to a symposium, and there is no warrant for supposing that such singing *closely* preceded battle (as e.g. West, *Studies* 2, 10) or took the place of a speech of exhortation (as Reitzenstein 45 n. 1). Martial exhortation was simply a sub-species of exhortatory elegy, and Callinus *fr.* 1 establishes that in Ionia it could be directed at symposiasts.

A second and very different sort of military context for which West argued is described by him as 'a less formal military setting: the soldier is on watch with his companions'. There are indeed a number of poems which *could* have been composed with such an occasion in mind,¹⁶ but there is only one which can be claimed to offer direct evidence for it, viz. Archilochus *fr.* 4 W. I print the extant lines in West's text:

φρα[
 ξεινοί[
 δεῖπνον δ' ου[
 οὔτ' ἐμοὶ ὠσαῖ[
 ἀλλ' ἄγε σὺν κώθωνι θοῆς διὰ σέλματα νηός 5
 φοῖτα καὶ κοίλων πώματ' ἄφελκε κάδων,
 ἄγρην δ' οἶνον ἐρυθρὸν ἀπὸ τρυγός· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμεῖς
 νηφόμεν ἐν φυλακῇ τῆδε δυνησόμεθα. 8

At line 5 ff. the poet bids his addressee circulate along the benches of a ship and drink deeply: he gives as a reason the company's inability to remain sober in this spell of guard-duty.

Should we conclude that Archilochus sang this song for the first time while on guard by a beached ship? If so I am tempted to suggest that the reason we have no more of the song is that the singer's throat was cut by a Thracian guerrilla: for real guard-duty is not effective if punctuated by drunken song. But is it real guard-duty? I think it far more probable that Archilochus is evoking a situation with which his audience was all too familiar but which they could thank the gods was not their actual situation while they sang.

All cultures have songs in which the singer ascribes to himself (or herself) the personality or situation of another.¹⁷ Well-known English songs of this sort are 'I am the man, the very fat man, who waters the workers' beer' or 'I am a bachelor, I live with my son and I work at the weavers' trade'. Some clear examples of such songs in our elegiac remains are pieces in the Theognidea where the feminines show that the singer either is or purports to be female.¹⁸ Possibly, as some hold, these songs were actually composed and sung by women. But we know no Ionian equivalent of the symposium where women might have sung such songs; at least one of the songs (Theogn. 257–60) presents a known male view of females;¹⁹ and although girls were present at symposia to play the *aulos* and perform other services it is hard to imagine them playing a full and equal part of the sort that singing elegy implies. We also have a couple of lyric fragments of Alcaeus and Anacreon²⁰ (Alc. 10 LP, Anacreon 40 = 385P) which are certainly not

¹⁶ West 11 suggests Archilochus 1, 2 and 5. It is not clear to me whether he is also suggesting Theogn. 887–8 and 1043.

¹⁷ Cf. Dover (n. 5) 205 ff.; Rösler (n. 9). Some good points (amid much obscurity) emerge from Tsagarakis' discussion, especially his introduction (1–9).

¹⁸ ἵππος ἐγὼ καλὴ καὶ ἀεθλίη, ἀλλὰ κάκιστον
 ἄνδρα φέρω, καὶ μοι τοῦτ' ἀνηρότατον.
 πολλάκι δὴ μέλλησα διαρρήξασα χαλινὸν
 φεύγειν ὠσαμένη τὸν κακὸν ἡνίοχον.

Theogn. 257–60
 ἐχθαίρω κακὸν ἄνδρα, καλυψαμένη δὲ πάρειμι,
 σμικρῆς ὄρνιθος κοῦφον ἔχοντα νόον·

ibid. 579–80
 οἱ με φίλοι προδιδοῦσι καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλουσι τι δοῦναι
 ἀνδρῶν φαινομένων· ἀλλ' ἐγὼ αὐτομάτη
 ἔσπερήν τ' ἔξειμι καὶ ὀρθρήν αὐτίς ἔσειμι,

ἦμος ἀλεκτρονῶν φθόγγος ἐγειρομένων.

ibid. 861–4.

I am not persuaded by the theory that 257–60 should follow 261–6 and be taken as the utterance of the girl (Q. Cataudella, *Riv. cult. class. e. med.* i [1960] 7–20 = *Intorno ai lirici greci* [Rome 1972] 120–38; J. A. Davison, *CR* ix [1959] 1–5 = *From Archilochus to Pindar* [London 1968] 281–8): but even were it correct, it would explain only one of the Theognidean passages.

¹⁹ Cf. Anacreon 417P. Male sexual partners could also be seen as horses, cf. Theogn. 1249–52, 1267–70, with Vetta *ad locc.*

²⁰ ἔμε δεῖλαν, ἔ]με παῖσ[αν κακοτάτων πεδέχοισαν
 Alcaeus 10LP
 ἐκ ποταμοῦ ἴπανέρχομαι πάντα φέρουσα λαμπρά
 Anacreon 385P

composed by women, and which are no more likely to be sung by women than the Theognidean pieces. Taken together the songs are better seen as evidence for male symposiasts entertaining each other by taking on—in song at least—a female role.

Evocation of a *situation* not present is found in Alcaeus *fr.* 6. This well-known song is alleged by Heraclitus in his work on Homeric allegories to be allegorical, and most moderns follow him. I do not, but cannot argue the case here. However, our choice does not lie between taking it as an allegory or saying that it is actually sung by Alcaeus on a storm-tossed ship—the disjunction that Page prescribed with masterly rhetoric, condemning²¹ the very view I would adopt, that

Alcaeus recited after the storm, describing as present what in fact was past, portraying as impending, and of uncertain outcome, events which had been determined long ago. The danger is over; Alcaeus recreates it as if it were yet to be suffered. To define a procedure so futile, and so discordant with the practice of ancient poets at any period, is alone enough to condemn it beyond belief.

Presumably Page did not think Aeschylus' composition of the *Persae* equally futile. The analogy is not so remote as it might seem, for what he ignores is the dramatic element in non-dramatic poetry. For me a third interpretation is possible: that Alcaeus in *fr.* 6 recalls in the company of *hetairoi* an experience he had shared with them or with men they knew.

So too Archilochus *fr.* 4 can be taken as a song which evokes in the symposium a situation all too familiar to the symposiasts. Its interpretation might be easier if the papyrus which gave us fragments of the first four lines had been undamaged: as it is we can detect guests or hospitality (line 2: ξεινοί) and a banquet (line 3: δεῖπνον), but we cannot tell whether Archilochus is complaining that neither are available to him (as West suggests) or whether he starts with a reference to a dinner party which he proceeds to describe as if it were taking place aboard ship. If the latter, then the reference to 'guard-duty' in line 8 creates a bridge between the envisaged and the real situation: remote as that situation is from guard-duty, it can with relish be described as a 'sort of' guard duty.²² For the demonstrative adjective meaning 'this sort of' rather than 'this' in early elegy cf. Tyrtaeus *fr.* 12. 13–14

ἦδ' ἄρετή, τόδ' ἄεθλον ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἄριστον
κάλλιστόν τε φέρειν γίνεται ἀνδρὶ νέω.

'This sort of prize is the fairest for a man to win'.

The similarity between the unpleasant routine of rowing a warship and the pleasant ritual of

²¹ Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford 1955) 185. The allegorical interpretation is generally accepted, e.g. by Rösler 126–34, Burnett 150–3. That neither Archilochus' nor Alcaeus' song was composed or sung on a real ship was observed briefly by W. J. Slater in his stimulating and suggestive paper 'Symposium at sea', *HSI ClPh* lxxx (1976) 161–70. This was published only after I had reached my own view of the poems, and I do not here reproduce the abundant evidence that he marshals for a persistent habit of describing sympotic activity in nautical terms. The support Slater's arguments offer to my case is all the greater because Archilochus 4 was not one of his primary witnesses but was only introduced allusively (168).

²² Burnett 39 also sees the occasion as 'pretended', taking it to be 'a storm at sea', but does not discuss *phylake*. D. E. Gerber, in a judicious discussion, 'Archilochus, *fr.* 4 West: a commentary', *Ill. Class. Stud.* vi 1 (1981) 1–11, suggests (11 n. 6) that the poem 'was recited at some convivial gathering' but may have been composed (or presented by Archilochus as composed) while he was on watch. Vetta xiv–xv saw the importance of ξεινοί and δεῖπνον but thought the occasion military, after a victory, and that Archilochus

transposes to it the atmosphere of the symposium. No discussion of the problem in Campbell (n. 5), Aloni or A. J. Podlecki, *The early Greek poets and their times* (Vancouver 1984). West 11 supposed the ship to be beached; Gerber 3 argued that it is anchored. The imitation of this poem by Synesius in *epist.* 32 Hercher = 45 Garzya, demonstrated by A. Garzya, 'Una variazione Archilochea in Sinesio', *Maia* x (1958) 66–71, repr. with additions in id., *Studi sulla lirica greca* (Florence 1963) 161–9, may indicate that Archilochus' ship was at sea rather than beached (though Garzya does not seriously consider the latter possibility) but it cannot tell us that the song was actually first sung on a ship, only that this is the situation Archilochus evoked in the poem, *pace* R. G. M. Nisbet, 'Horace's Epodes and history', *Poetry and politics in the age of Augustus*, edd. A. J. Woodman and D. A. West (Cambridge 1984) 200 n. 62. Nisbet's suggestion that it is engaged in a blockade may overestimate the capacity of pentekonters: Garzya himself wanted to dilute the sense of φυλακῆ to 'sorvegliar di notte' (n. 12), doubtless because he was attracted by the notion that the ship was a merchant vessel carrying wine (surely ruled out by θοῆς line 5).

the symposium also struck a later elegiac poet, Dionysius Chalcus. Dionysius refers to the 'rowing of the tongue' involved in giving an old friend a good send-off and says (*fr.* 4. 4–5W)

δεξιότης τε λόγου
Φαίακος Μουσῶν ἐρέτας ἐπὶ σέλματα πέμπει.

the skilled words of Phaiax
send the Muses' rowers to their benches.

In another song, or another part of the same song, he uses the same images slightly differently; symposiasts are

καὶ τινες οἶνον ἄγοντες ἐν εἰρεσίᾳ Διονύσου,
συμποσίου ναῦται καὶ κυλίκων ἐρέται . . .

bringing wine in the rowing of Dionysus,
sailors of the symposium and oarsmen of cups (*fr.* 5W)

There is of course a difference between what Dionysius is doing and what I am suggesting for Archilochus. Dionysius is simply choosing and following through a metaphor, whereas in my view Archilochus is inviting his listeners to see their environment as if it were another with which, as a group of *hetairoi*, they were all familiar. Both he and they are required not to assume different personalities but to imagine themselves in a different context. Consumption of Ismaric wine would doubtless assist the illusion. Recall Timaeus' story about a symposium at Acragas: the drinkers convinced themselves they were aboard ship (they were not) and in order to lighten the vessel began to throw furniture out of the window; they persisted in their delusion even when the magistrates had been called.²³

If the above arguments do not show that the song might have been composed for singing in a symposium, then it is worth asking whether we are to believe that only the first occasion of performance involved guard-duty by a beached ship, or that all subsequent occasions on which the song was sung in the archaic period were of the same sort. If that improbable conclusion is rejected, then we must give ourselves good reasons why the song was appropriate to a sympotic context on subsequent performances but not on its first.²⁴

A final point on this poem's intended context of performance. Archilochus *fr.* 2 has been argued to come from the same poem as *fr.* 4:²⁵ *fr.* 2 is quoted by Synesius in the context of guard-duty although there is nothing about guard-duty in what he actually quotes, and an allusion to both *fr.* 2 and 4 in successive lines of Theocritus²⁶ can be argued to support the link of *fr.* 2 and 4. If we accept that link, then we should note that the last word of *fr.* 2, *κεκλιμένος*, might be taken as an allusion to reclining at a symposium.²⁷

West's fifth context is 'some kind of public meeting'. The evidence comes entirely from fragments of Solon and their interpretation by later writers who quote them, and in particular the quotation of the first two lines of the Salamis poem. According to Plutarch and Polyaeus, Solon decided to circumvent a prohibition on political discussion of the recovery of Salamis by

²³ On Dionysius Chalcus (with discussion of his penchant for strained metaphor) cf. A. Garzya, *Riv. Fil. Class.* xxx (1952) 193–207, repr. in *Studi* (n. 22) 91–102. It is tempting to see Dionysius' σέλματα as a reference to the κλίνειν of symposiasts (or are we to imagine some symposia as involving seated, not reclining participants?): if so, then Archilochus' σέλματα could also so allude. For the story from Timaeus see Athenaeus ii 5, 37 B-D (= *FGrH* 566 F 149). For discussion of these and many other instances of sympotic activity viewed in nautical terms see Slater (n. 21).

²⁴ I see no grounds for drawing a sharp distinction between the extent to which a song might evoke a

situation that was not actual in its *first* and in subsequent performances.

²⁵ B. Gentili, *RFIC* xciii (1965) 129–34; F. Bossi, *Quad. Urb. Cult. Class.* xxxiv (1980) 23–7.

²⁶ Theoc. 7. 65–6:
τὸν πτελεατικὸν οἶνον ἀπὸ κρατῆρος ἀφξῶ
πᾶρ πυρὶ κεκλιμένος, κύαμον δέ τις ἐν πυρὶ φρυξεί.
Note also τρύγα in line 70, cf. τρυγὸς in Archilochus 4.6.

²⁷ So H. D. Rankin, *Emerita* xl (1972) 469–74. A simple gesture would suffice to convey to the audience that the singer was simultaneously reclining on a couch and leaning on his spear.

feigning madness and rushing into the agora wearing a hat in order to recite from the herald's stone a poem beginning

αὐτὸς κῆρυξ ἦλθον ἀφ' ἡμερτῆς Σαλαμῖνος,
κόσμον ἐπέων τῷδ' ἄντ' ἀγορῆς θέμενος.

(Solon *fr.* 1. 1–2)²⁸

The story existed in some form close to this by the time of Demosthenes, who refers to the prohibition and knows about the hat.²⁹ But this does not demonstrate the story's historicity, since it is precisely for the earliest stage of the development of a tradition about archaic Greece that a reliable source and a plausible explanation for transmission are the most difficult to suggest. Fifth- and fourth-century Athenians knew many anecdotes attaching to various laws and poems of Solon, but few are accepted by modern scholars. Our anecdote was probably developed to explain the puzzling imagery of the couplet which Plutarch quotes: κῆρυξ gave rise to the location at the herald's stone, ἄντ' ἀγορῆς seemed to confirm the location in the agora and may even have sown the seed of the idea of a prohibition on normal political speech. The idea of madness may have been suggested, as occurred independently to Mary Lefkowitz, by Solon's reference to his μανίη in *fr.* 10W,³⁰ and was doubtless abetted by the fact that reciting elegies in the agora was not normal behaviour: only a Solon really or feignedly mad would so conduct himself.

However the story grew up, it is improbable as an explanation of *fr.* 1. 1–2W. There are textual problems in line 2. But despite these it is clear that Solon is saying 'I am come bearing tidings from lovely Salamis, setting forth an arrangement of verses in song instead of making—as a real herald does—a public speech.' Solon proclaims himself a herald in the same sense that Archilochus in *fr.* 1 proclaims himself a θεράπων or the singer of Theognis 257 proclaims himself a mare—a metaphorical sense. That will not have eluded his first audience, and it will have seen how the κῆρυξ image in line 1 is picked up by ἄντ' ἀγορῆς in line 2. But then it was not so starved of biographical detail about Solon as its inventive posterity. It will have seen that Solon is adopting a stance we know from other early elegies, that of a returning traveller.³¹ Whether Solon *had* just come from Salamis or whether his hearers believed so we cannot know. But these hearers need be none other than his companions at a symposium, upper-class *neoi* who were a future archon's natural drinking companions and had heard him sing less political songs like *fr.* 26W:

ἔργα δὲ Κυπρωγενοῦς νῦν μοι φίλα καὶ Διονύσου
καὶ Μουσέων, ἃ τίθησ' ἀνδράσιιν εὐφροσύνας.

²⁸ The full text of Plutarch, *Solon* 8.2 (=Solon 1) runs: ἔσκηψατο μὲν ἕκστασιν τῶν λογισμῶν, καὶ λόγος εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας διεδόθη παρακινήτικῶς ἔχειν αὐτόν. ἔλεγεία δὲ κρύφα συνθεῖς καὶ μελετήσας ὥστε λέγειν ἀπὸ στόματος, ἐξεπήδησεν εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἄφνω, πιλίδιον περιθέμενος, ὄχλου δὲ πολλοῦ συνδραμόντος ἀναβάς ἐπὶ τὸν τοῦ κήρυκος λίθον ἐν ᾧδῃ διεξῆλθε τὴν ἔλεγείαν, ἧς ἔστιν ἀρχή· . . . cf. Polyaeus i 20.1; Diogenes Laertius i 46 (where Solon actually has a herald read out his poem!).

²⁹ The allusions in Demosthenes are at 19.252 (the prohibition and Solon's performance of the elegies) and 255 (the πιλίδιον—I owe this point to B. M. W. Knox). Note that whereas Plutarch and Diogenes Laertius talk as if the elegy were recited or read, Demosthenes and Polyaeus know that the elegies were sung (ᾄδε).

³⁰ M. R. Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek poets* (London 1981) 40 with n. 3. I doubt, however, if the

erection of a statue of Solon by the Salaminians can be connected with a misunderstanding of ἄντ' ἀγορῆς to mean 'before the market place', as she suggests. *Fr.* 10 is quoted by Diogenes Laertius in connection with an anecdote that seems to be a doublet of the Salamis story, concocted to explain the term μανίην. The hypothesis that in the *Salamis* Solon put his words into the mouth of a fictitious character (Podlecki [n. 22] 123) is neither necessary nor helpful. More useful (but accepting the ancient tradition) G. Tedeschi, 'Solone e lo spazio della comunicazione elegiaca', *Quad. Urb. cult. class.* x (1982) 41 ff.

³¹ Cf. Theogn. 783–8, beginning, ἦλθον μὲν γὰρ ἔγωγε καὶ εἰς Σικελίην ποτε γαίαν. This form of poem is the corollary of the *prosphonetikon*, such as we find in Archilochus 24, Alcaeus 350 LP: cf. F. Cairns, *Generic composition in Greek and Roman poetry* (Edinburgh 1972) 18 ff.; D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson, *Menander Rhetor* (Oxford 1981) 328 f.

West also suggested other fragments of Solon to be from addresses in the agora. As, however, he observed 'he cannot have used the herald gimmick for all of these poems, but if a weekday recitation in the agora was acceptable in principle, there was no need to'. The problem with thus extending the category beyond *fr.* 1 is that the story on which the agora-interpretation of *fr.* 1 is based implies that weekday recitation in the agora was *not* acceptable in principle, and that only somebody behaving oddly would get away with an elegiac performance.

Nor do the fragments in question support the extension. *Fr.* 4 describes the ills that afflict Athens as the result of Δυσνομή (5–29) and then praises Εὐνομή (32–9): between these sections Solon says

ταῦτα διδάξαι θυμὸς Ἀθηναίους με κελεύει

This my heart bids me teach the Athenians (4. 30W)

Now the message of the poem is indeed aimed at the citizen body as a whole. But there is no direct address, such as in Archilochus' tetrameter (*fr.* 109W)

ὦ λιπερνήτες πολῖται, τὰμὰ δὴ συνιέτε
ρήματα

O god-forsaken citizens, take heed of my words.

Nothing in our text of *fr.* 4W precludes its intended audience being Solon's political *hetairoi*, from whom the message was meant to percolate horizontally and vertically through Athenian society.³² *Frr.* 4a and 4c are different. It is not correct to say, as West does,³³ that in *fr.* 4a Solon 'addressed different sections of the community in turn'. The description offered of the poem's content by the author of the *Athenaion Politeia* is that Solon 'fights and disputes on behalf of each group against the other'.³⁴ In what way? In *fr.* 4c, almost certainly from the same poem, we have an address to the rich, beginning 'But you must quiet your mighty spirit in your hearts, you who have thrust to excess of many good things, and set your great mind on moderate goals'.³⁵ This cannot be part of an argument that Solon addresses directly to the rich in his own person—if it had been, it might be possible to hold that the rich were addressed as part of a large political audience. But the phrase 'on behalf of each group' (ὑπὲρ ἑκατέρων) is as important as the phrase 'to each group' (πρὸς ἑκατέρους). In *fr.* 4c the appeal for restraint already quoted is balanced by an assertion in the first person plural 'For we shall not endure it, nor shall this be right for you' (*cf.* n. 35): here the 'we' shows Solon identifying with the μέσοι—to which, despite Aristotle, it is very hard to believe that he belonged.³⁶ This suggests an elegy in which, probably within an expository framework where Solon *did* speak in his own person, one set of sentiments was encapsulated as the views of the rich addressed to the μέσοι and another as the views of the μέσοι addressed to the rich. It will have been this framework (presumably of the form 'the rich could well say to the μέσοι' and 'the μέσοι could well say to the rich') that made it clear to the author of the *Athenaion Politeia* what was happening. The poem as a whole from which our fragments come need have been addressed neither to the rich nor to the μέσοι, nor somehow to both groups.³⁷

It is quite another matter to entertain the possibility, as West does, that Solon's elegies are in

³² At least as far down Athenian society as elegy was sung—a question unanswerable in the present state of our evidence. West 16 postulates a similar process, *cf.* Reitzenstein 49 n. 1. For a similar argument that 4c is addressed to Solon's *hetairoi* (but identifying ἡμεῖς with Solon's group) *cf.* Vetta xvii.

³³ 12.

³⁴ τὴν ἐλεγείαν . . . ἐν ἣ πρὸς ἑκατέρους ὑπὲρ ἑκατέρων μάχεται καὶ διαμφισβητεῖ, *Athenaion Politeia* 5 = Solon 4a.

³⁵ *Ibid.* = Solon 4c:

ἡμεῖς δ' ἡσυχάσαντες ἐνὶ φρεσὶ καρτερόν ἦτορ,
οἱ πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐς κόρον [ἦ]λάσατε,
ἐν μετρίοισι τίθεσθε μέγαν νόον· οὔτε γὰρ ἡμεῖς
πεισόμεθ', οὔθ' ὑμῖν ἄρτια τα[ῦ]τ' ἔσεται.

³⁶ Aristotle *Pol.* 1296a18.

³⁷ We have a fragment of another poem in which Solon put a speech into another's mouth, 33. The introduction of two speakers was already part of Archilochus' technique, *cf.* 23, 172–81, 196A.

some sense publications of prose speeches delivered to audiences in the agora. That might well be. But we must still ask 'To whom were the *elegies* addressed?', and we need not doubt that it could have been to a symposium.

West suggested three further contexts. One need not detain us long. On the basis of Theognidea 263–6 he proposed 'delivery of a quickly improvised, entertaining piece in a place with a view of a public fountain—e.g. in a *lesche*'.³⁸ The lines run as follows:

ψυχρόν που παρὰ τῆδε φίλοι πίνουσι τοκῆς,
ὡς θαμά θ' ὑδρεύει καί με γοῶσα φέρει,
ἔνθα μέσην περὶ παῖδα λαβὼν ἄγκῶν' ἐφίλησα
δειρήν, ἡ δὲ τέρεν φθέγγετ' ἀπὸ στόματος.

The 4 lines are not easy. They follow a couplet which unites the themes of drinking and love, correctly judged by West to be a different song (or the beginning of one).³⁹ However, 263–4 belong ill with 265–6, as West's translation betrays:

The parents at this girl's house must be drinking cold water—so often she returns to the well, and cries for me as she carries, where I caught her about the waist and kissed her neck as she squealed.

What is the antecedent of *where*? In West's English it is 'the well'. But there is no 'well' in the Greek, only the verb ὑδρεύει, hence no easy antecedent for ἔνθα. So I suspect 265–6 are from a different poem, an erotic narrative:⁴⁰ what happened before we cannot tell, what happened after we might guess. That leaves 263–4 to be understood on their own. They imply that a girl is bringing water for the singer and his companions, and does so more often than she need: in jest the explanation is offered that she has been taught to serve water cold—then the real reason emerges in the phrase γοῶσα φέρει or ἀφορᾷ: she wants to have as much contact as she can with the singer. As in 265–6, we cannot know how the song continued. But without the link to 265–6 and the bogus antecedent to ἔνθα there is no need to postulate a public fountain as the *mise-en-scène*. The song can be sung where songs most often were sung—where men were drinking, and water as well as wine was needed. Girls ministering liquids appear in sympotic scenes on vases: one would expect them to be slaves, but they might be drawn from the free poor, like *artopolides*, and that would make a reference to the girl's parents more intelligible.⁴¹ Again we lack evidence of contexts of performance outside the symposium.

For his seventh category West actually offers no supporting evidence at all. 'Elegoi were presumably performed at funerals.' There is of course a good reason why no evidence is cited here. It is that (as far as I know) no such evidence exists. No doubt West was influenced in his proposal of this category by the view that a significant proportion of early elegy was lamentatory, and to that view I shortly turn.

Before doing so let me sum up my conclusions. With one exception (discussed in section IV) only the symposium and the κῶμος are securely established as contexts of performance of elegy in the archaic period. Other proposed contexts—troops marshalled to enter battle, soldiers on guard duty, political assemblies, small gatherings in sight of a public fountain—are inadequately supported by the texts cited.

³⁸ 12–13.

³⁹ For discussion, Davison and Cataudella (cited n. 18); van Groningen *ad loc.*, 452 ff.; West 152.

⁴⁰ West 18 may thus be too rigorous in suggesting that elegy is never used for sexual narratives and fantasies. Theogn. 993 ff. comes close to sexual fantasy. For such songs in other genres cf. Archilochus 196A; Ar. *Acharn.* 271–5.

⁴¹ For girls ministering at symposia cf. Theogn. 1002, perhaps also 1211 ff. The girl in 1211 ff. is certainly

servile, but the context not certainly sympotic; at 1002 the context is sympotic, and that the girl is Laconian probably shows she is a slave. For vases cf. E. Langlotz, *Griechische Vasen in Würzburg* (Munich 1932) no. 483 fig. 152 (=B. Fehr, *Orientalische und griechische Gelage* [Bonn 1971] no. 409 cf. p. 101); J. Boardman, *Athenian black figure vases* (London 1974) 210; id., *Athenian red figure vases* (London 1975) 219; F. Lissarague in *Sympotica*.

III. THE MEANING OF *ELEGOS* AND THE CASE FOR EARLY LAMENTATORY ELEGY

That a significant proportion of early Greek elegy was lamentatory is a necessary condition for two propositions: (a) that in the archaic period *elegos* actually meant 'lament' and (b) that elegy was performed at funerals. All our evidence, however, suggests that little or no early Greek elegy was lamentatory.⁴²

Our surviving fragments include a few which 'might be described as laments'. But on closer examination these turn out to be from poems whose primary character was consolatory and not threnodic.⁴³ Two of the poems are by Archilochus. From one, composed on the death of his sister's husband at sea, Plutarch indeed quotes a couplet and describes Archilochus' activity as θρηνῶν, and had the papyrus which supplements it been more generous we might have been able to test that description. As it is, neither Plutarch's couplet nor the papyrus demonstrates that this section of the poem was threnodic,⁴⁴ and we must be influenced by the other lines from the same poem quoted by Plutarch later in the same work:

οὔτε τι γὰρ κλαίων ἰήσομαι, οὔτε κάκιον
θῆσω τερπωλᾶς καὶ θαλίας ἐφέπτων.
(fr. 11W)⁴⁵

for neither shall I effect any healing by weeping, nor shall I make things worse by attending merry-making and banquets.

Both Archilochus' lines and Plutarch's remarks about his intention to combat grief by wine and entertainment indicate a self-consolatory posture, and indeed especially suit a poem intended for a sympotic occasion. Similar encouragement not to lament concludes the lines addressed to Pericles:⁴⁶

κῆδεα μὲν στονόεντα Περικλέες οὔτε τις ἀστῶν
μεμφόμενος θαλῆς τέρπεται οὐδὲ πόλις·
τοίους γὰρ κατὰ κῦμα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης
ἔκλυσεν, οἶδαλέους δ' ἄμφ' ὀδύνης ἔχομεν
πνεύμονας. ἀλλὰ θεοὶ γὰρ ἀνηκέστοισι κακοῖσιν
ᾧ φίλ' ἐπὶ κρατερὴν τλημοσύνην ἔθεσαν
φάρμακον. ἄλλοτε ἄλλος ἔχει τόδε. νῦν μὲν ἐς ἡμέας
ἐτράπεθ', αἱματόεν δ' ἔλκος ἀναστένομεν,
ἐξαῦτις δ' ἐτέρους ἐπαμείψεται. ἀλλὰ τάχιστα
τλῆτε, γυναικεῖον πένθος ἀπωσάμενοι.

(fr. 13)

Lines 3–10 are clear enough: splendid men have perished, we feel deep grief, but the gods have given us the power of endurance to cope with such situations⁴⁷—situations which affect everybody sometime: so let us put up with it and stop womanly grief. Lines 1–2 are ambiguous,

⁴² Even the association of *aulos* music with mourning is first documented by vases for the sixth century and literary testimony for the fifth, cf. E. Reiner, *Die rituelle Totenklage bei den Griechen* (Tübingen 1983) 67–70. Homer does not mention the *aulos* at *Il.* xxiv 720.

⁴³ For arguments leading to the same conclusion, Gentili 59–63.

⁴⁴ Plut. *quomodo aud. poet.* 6 = *Mor.* 23b (= Archilochus 9, 10–11): ὅταν δὲ τὸν ἄνδρα τῆς ἀδελφῆς ἠφανισμένον ἐν θαλάττῃ καὶ μὴ τυχόντα νομίμου ταφῆς θρηνῶν λέγει μετριώτερον ἂν τὴν συμφορὰν ἐνεγκεῖν

εἰ κείνου κεφαλὴν καὶ χαριέντα μέλεα
Ἥφαιστος καθαροῖσιν ἐν εἵμασιν ἀμπεπονθήθη,
τὸ πῦρ οὔτως, οὐ τὸν θεὸν προσηγόρευσε.

⁴⁵ *Id.* 12 = *Mor.* 33ab (= Archilochus 11).

⁴⁶ Archilochus 13 (perhaps complete).

⁴⁷ For analysis of the ways 1–2 may be interpreted see J. C. Kamerbeek, 'Archilochea', *Mnem.* xiv (1961) 1 ff. Burnett (46), 'Pericles, our wailing grief will not be blamed by any burgher at his feast', gives too little weight to the main verb τέρπεται.

but coherence with 3–10 requires us to choose the third of the possibilities reviewed by Kamerbeek: ‘It is not because they impugn lamentatory grief that any of the citizens or the citizen body as a whole will engage in banquets.’ If that is indeed how these lines should be understood, then again (as in *fr.* 11) Archilochus moves from recognition of a cause for grief to rejection of lamentation, and in doing so implies that banqueting is also of immediate concern.

These are our only early candidates for lamentatory elegy. From the fifth century three more are offered. A couplet ascribed to Simonides is reasonably characterised as consolatory by Campbell and Page, and the verb οἰκτίρω ‘I pity’, is surely insufficient to establish it as threnodic.⁴⁸ Consolation is also explicitly attested by Plutarch as the purpose of Archelaus’ poem addressed to Cimon on the death of Isodice,⁴⁹ as it is of Antimachos’ *Lyde* by the *Consolatio ad Apollonium*.⁵⁰

The surviving fragments, then, do not support existence of a genre of lamentatory elegy. Nor does our other testimony. Too much reliance has been placed upon Pausanias’ statement that the suspension of aulodic competitions at the Pythian games of 582 BC was due to the lugubrious quality of elegy sung to the *aulos*:⁵¹

καὶ αὐλωδίαν <τό>τε κατέλυσαν, καταγνόντες οὐκ εἶναι τὸ ἄκουσμα εὐφημον. ἡ γὰρ αὐλωδία μέλη τε ἦν αὐλῶν τὰ σκυθρωπότατα καὶ ἔλεγεια {θῆρηνοι} προσαδόμενα τοῖς αὐλοῖς. μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι καὶ τοῦ Ἐχεμβρότου τὸ ἀνάθημα, τρίπους χαλκοῦς ἀνατεθεῖς τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ τῷ ἐν Θήβαις, ἐπίγραμμα δὲ ὁ τρίπους εἶχεν·

Ἐχέμβροτος Ἄρκας
θῆκε τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ
νικήσας τόδ’ ἄγαλμ’ Ἀμφικτυόνων ἐν ἀέθλοις,
Ἕλλησι δ’ αἰείδων
μέλεα καὶ ἔλεγους.

Yet when Pausanias backs up this statement by citing the dedicatory epigram of Echembrotus, victor in the aulodic competition of 586 BC, the epigram in no way supports his characterisation of *aulodia*, although by associating *elegoi* with the tunes that Echembrotus sang it perhaps betrays how Pausanias reached his conclusion. To Pausanias, as to the Hellenistic and Graeco–Roman world as a whole, *elegoi* were by definition—and perhaps etymology—mournful (see below pp. 24–5). That Echembrotus sang elegies therefore demonstrated that his performance accompanied by the *aulos* was lamentatory. The text is worthless as evidence for the nature of early elegy. Of course, as West pointed out, Pausanias cannot have known why the competition took place in 586 but not thereafter—all he or his sources can have had were victor-lists.⁵² It is therefore surprising that West attributes ‘a kind of lament’ to Echembrotus in his Pythian victory of 586 despite rejecting Pausanias’ explanation. One might indeed question whether lamentatory poetry was a suitable subject for competition at all. Perhaps it was. But Pausanias cannot be taken as evidence that either Echembrotus’ songs or early elegies in general were lamentatory.

Pausanias, taken at face value, was naturally a key witness in Page’s argument⁵³ for a lost Peloponnesian tradition of lamentatory elegy. His other major witness was Andromache, who

⁴⁸ Campbell 396; D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge 1981) 295 (denying that it is a complete poem); *contra* Gentili 62–3, seeing it as an elegiac epigram comparable to a *skolion*.

⁴⁹ Plut. *Cim.* 4.10 (= Archelaus 1): καὶ δυσφορήσας ἀποθανούσης, εἴ τι δεῖ τεκμαίρεσθαι ταῖς γεγραμμέναις ἐπὶ παρηγορίᾳ τοῦ πένθους ἐλεγείαις πρὸς αὐτόν . . .

⁵⁰ Ps. Plut. *Consolatio ad Apollonium* 106b (= Antimachos 7): ἀποθανούσης γὰρ τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτῷ Λύδης, πρὸς ἣν φιλοστόργως εἶχε, παραμύθιον τῆς λύπης αὐτῷ ἐποίησε τὴν ἐλεγείαν τὴν καλου-

μένην Λύδην, ἐξαριθμησάμενος τὰς ἡρωικὰς συμφοράς, τοῖς ἄλλοτριῶσι κακοῖς ἐλάττω τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ποιῶν λύπην.

⁵¹ Pausanias x 7.5–6. West’s interpretation (in his edition s.n. ‘Echembrotus’) of Pausanias’ date as 586 is right as against Rosenmeyer’s (above n. 7) of 582.

⁵² West 5. The list of *Pythionikai* had been drawn up by Aristotle and Callisthenes, cf. R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* i (Oxford 1968) 79–80.

⁵³ D. L. Page ‘The elegiacs in Euripides’ *Andromache*’ in *Greek Poetry and Life* (Essays presented to Gilbert Murray) 206–30.

and Graeco-Roman periods⁵⁷. It is significant, I think, that all our fifth-century uses are clustered in the seven or eight years following 415 BC: Euripides *Troades* 119 in 415, Aristophanes *Birds* 217 in 415/4, Euripides *Helen* 185 in 412, *Orestes* 968 (restored by conjecture) in 408, with *Hypsipyle* 1 iii 9 probably in 409 or 407 and *Iphigenia in Tauris* within the period 413–408. The word *elegos* was apparently in vogue, at least with Euripides (which in itself might suffice to explain its use, with the same meaning, by Aristophanes). I suggest that one reason for the sudden focus of attention on the word *elegos* in these years was that one of Euripides' contemporaries with an interest in etymology and the history of music advanced the theory that *elegos* ought to mean 'lament', presumably adducing the fact that (by the late fifth century) the elegiac couplet was regularly used for sepulchral epigrams and the further hypothesis that *elegos* was to be derived from ἔλεγεῖν. That etymology, along with others equally improbable, was current in the Graeco-Roman period, and the late fifth century is as likely a time as any for it to have been launched.⁵⁸ Plato's *Cratylus* shows how far the etymological approach could be taken, and it seems clear that Prodicus, and likely that Hippias, played this intellectual game, as of course did another child of the sophistic age, Herodotus.⁵⁹ Hippias also had an interest in music and rhythm.⁶⁰ I conjecture that either Hippias or somebody of similar interests proposed that *elegos* ought to be lamentatory.

If this hypothesis is correct, then only in the decade or so before 415 was *elegos* given the sense 'sung lament'. If the term *elegos* was also associated with the elegiac metre by the 420s (as will shortly be seen likely) Euripides' use of that metre for Andromache's lament shows that the theory was current by that play's date (c. 425).⁶¹

What did it mean to earlier generations? Here we must examine the relation between the terms ἔλεγος, ἔλεγεία and the metrical term ἔλεγείον.

As West has pointed out, the term ἔλεγείον must be derived from ἔλεγος (as ἱαμβεῖον is derived from ἱαμβος) since the other noun from which ἔλεγείον might be derived, ἔλεγεία, seems to be a later coinage, not found before the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia*.⁶² Ἐλεγείον appears first about the end of the fifth century. The earliest use is either Critias *fr.* 4.5—where it clearly has the metrical sense 'elegiac couplet'—or in Pherecrates *fr.* 153.7K, from the *Chiron*, where the plural means 'a sequence of elegiac couplets' or 'an elegiac poem'.⁶³ Critias' poem was composed before 404/3, when he died; the date of Pherecrates' *Chiron* is disputed, some scholars putting it as early as 418, others after 410.⁶⁴ Ἐλεγείον is used about the same time by Thucydides i 132.2–3 to mean 'elegiac couplet', and by Ion of Samos to mean a poem of two couplets and a pentameter.⁶⁵ It may be right to infer⁶⁶ from Herodotus' failure to use the term

⁵⁷ In the sense lament, Ap. Rhod. ii 782; Lucilius, *Anth. Pal.* xi 135.3; Hadrian in W. Peek, *Griechische Versinschriften* 2050.5; in the metrical sense 'a poem in elegiacs', Callim. *fr.* 7.13; Apollonidas *epigr.* 26 (= *Anth. Pal.* x 19) 5; Meleager *epigr.* 1 (= *Anth. Pal.* iv.1) 36; Pollianus, *Anth. Pal.* xi 130.3; G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca* 1000.

⁵⁸ *Etym. Magn.* 326.46 = 935 Gaisford s.v. 'ἔλεγος'. θρήνος ὁ τοῖς τεθνεῶσιν ἐπιλεγόμενος· εἴρηται δὲ παρὰ τὸ ἔλεγεῖν ἐν τοῖς τάφοις. Cf. Suda ii 241 no. 774A s.v. 'ἔλεγος'. θρήνος. ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔλεγεῖν. ἢ οἱ πρὸς τὸν αὐλὸν ἄδόμενοι θρήνοι and Marius Plotius Sacerdos, *Gramm. Lat.* vi 509.31 Keil: elegiacum metrum dictum est quod esse sonat interiectionem flautis.

⁵⁹ Cf. R. Pfeiffer (n. 52) 61–2.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* 53–4.

⁶¹ For the date c. 425 see Euripides, *Andromache*, ed. P. T. Stevens (Oxford 1971) 19.

⁶² 2–3; cf. already Dover (n. 5) 187 ff.

⁶³ Critias 4:

καὶ νῦν Κλεινίου υἱὸν Ἀθηναῖον στεφανώσω
Ἄλκιβιάδην νέοισιν ὑμνήσας τρόποις·
οὐ γὰρ πῶς ἦν τοῦνομ' ἐφαρμόζειν ἔλεγείω

νῦν δ' ἐν ἱαμβεῖω κείσεται οὐκ ἀμέτρως.
Pherecrates *fr.* 153. 6–7:

ὁ δ' ἄχθεται αὐτὸς ὁ θύων
τῷ κατακωλύοντι καὶ εὐθύς ἔλεξ' ἔλεγεία.

⁶⁴ Geissler, *Die Chronologie der altattischen Komödie* (Berlin 1925) wanted a late date because he believed Philoxenos to be mentioned in *fr.* 145 Edmonds quoted by Ps. Plut. *de mus.*; so too Koerte in *RE* xix.2 (1938) 1989–90 (at earliest 410 BC). But as Edmonds insisted Philoxenos is not named, and his date of 418 BC (*Fragments of Attic Comedy* i [Leiden 1957] 263 n. a on *fr.* 145) better suits a dramatist not otherwise attested after 415 BC.

⁶⁵ Thuc. i 132.2–3 (Pausanias on the tripod dedicated at Delphi) ἠξίωσεν ἐπιγράψασθαι αὐτὸς ἰδίᾳ τὸ ἔλεγείον τόδε . . . τὸ μὲν οὖν ἔλεγείον οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐξεκόλασαν . . . Ion of Samos in ML 95(c) line 5: ἐχσάμου ἀμφιρύτου τεῦξε ἔλεγείον: Ἴων. West 20 n. 30 suggests a date of 404 BC but Meiggs and Lewis (291) think it may have been composed (as it was certainly inscribed) in the fourth century.

⁶⁶ As West 7 n. 8.

ἔλεγείον at v 113.2 that it was not available to him when he composed that passage (420s?) but such arguments from silence are precarious. Taken together, however, the uses show that ἔλεγείον had been coined by the last decade of the fifth century, and suggest that the coinage may have been recent.

Now, as West argued, the metrical term ἔλεγείον could only have been coined from ἔλεγος if (I quote) '(a) the metre was characteristic of ἔλεγοι, though not necessarily the sole metre used for them, and (b) there was no other named genre of which it was more characteristic'. Since West believed that in the early period ἔλεγος meant 'sung lament' but at the same time recognised that little extant elegy was lamentatory, he concluded that the metre (elegiac couplets) was named after that sub-species of elegy, lamentatory elegy, which did have a name (in his view, ἔλεγος). As a necessary corollary of this view West also argued that elegiac poetry as a whole was not known by a collective name (if it had been, that name would of course have been taken as the basis of the metrical term coined to denote the metre used invariably for that poetry).⁶⁷

There are a number of oddities in this position. First, the man who coined ἔλεγείον chose not simply a sub-species of elegy that (as we have seen above) seems to have played very little, if any, part in elegiac poetry as a whole, but a form of song which (if ἔλεγος really meant 'sung lament') seems to be much better attested as a lyric than an elegiac genre. To a fifth-century Greek a term meaning 'the metrical unit characteristic of sung lament' would be much more likely to suggest lyric *threnoi* than elegiac compositions.⁶⁸ Of course we could postulate that a particular sort of sung lament was designated by ἔλεγος but in our present state of knowledge the only feature that *might* have marked off such lament from lyric *threnoi* is precisely the use of the elegiac couplet. The second oddity is the necessary insistence that there was no collective name for what we know as elegiac poetry. This is strange given the number of features common to all or most of that poetry—the paraenetic stance, the association with the symposium, the regular if not invariable accompaniment by the *aulos*: is it plausible to suppose that archaic Greeks did not perceive this body of song as a unity and give it a collective name? West's explanation⁶⁹ that it was not known by a collective name because it had no single occasion or function seems to me inadequate on two grounds: first, as I have tried to show earlier in this paper, elegy did have a single occasion, the symposium; second, it is not true to say, as he does, that it was always the occasion in archaic Greece that conferred a name: one of the examples he gives of an early generic term, σκόλιον, refers not to the *occasion* but to the manner of performance of the songs.

The meaning for ἔλεγος which best meets the conditions required by the coining of the term ἔλεγείον is in fact precisely what we mean by 'elegy'. Of the two grounds on which West rejects this meaning for ἔλεγος I have already offered an explanation for (b), *viz.* 'wherever ἔλεγος is used in the fifth century it has the very distinct meaning "lament"'. More substantial is the first ground that (a) 'none of these poems is ever so called, either by its author or by anyone else—the only terms applied to them, until they become ἔλεγεία, are the very general ones ἔπη . . . ὄοιδή . . . ποιήσις'. Of course, if Echembrotus is talking about songs whose metrical form was elegiac when he uses the term ἔλεγοι we have one exception. But it is merely puzzling that our elegiac fragments nowhere use the term ἔλεγος. Our extant *skolia* have only two instances of the term σκόλιον, one in Pindar,⁷⁰ one a pun in an Attic *skolion*.⁷¹ The fact that other writers do not use the term ἔλεγος of elegiac poetry is not hard to account for. Before the last decade of the fifth century none but Herodotus mentions elegy by any name, and by then two important developments had taken place: ἔλεγείον had been coined, and was soon used to describe elegiac poetry, obviating recourse to the term ἔλεγος, and that term ἔλεγος had been

⁶⁷ Ibid. 6–7.

⁶⁸ On *threnoi* cf. A. E. Harvey, 'The classification of Greek lyric poetry' CQ v (1955) 168–172; M. Alexiou, *The ritual lament in the Greek tradition* (Cambridge 1974) 11 ff.

⁶⁹ 7.

⁷⁰ Fr. 122.14.

⁷¹ PMG 890.4—perhaps not even an allusion to the term *skolion*—εὐθὺν χρῆ τὸν ἑταῖρον ἔμμεν καὶ μὴ σκολιὰ φρονεῖν.

given the sense 'sung lament', with the consequence that it could no longer be used unambiguously as a general descriptive term.⁷² That Herodotus at v 113.2 described Solon's composition as ἐν ἔπτεισι may partly be due to Solon's own use of that phrase in the poem (*cf.* his use of ἐπέων in *fr.* 1.2), but is in any case fragile support for the view that ἔλεγος was not available to describe elegiac poetry in general.

Our evidence, therefore, is best explained by supposing that ἔλεγος did mean what we mean by elegy. Another related hypothesis is also worth considering, *viz.* that it meant 'a song sung to the *aulos*'. Although other sorts of song were indeed sung to the *aulos*, the proportion of *aulos*-accompanied song that was in the elegiac metre was probably sufficient to meet the first condition for the coining of the term (that the metre was characteristic of ἔλεγχοι, though not necessarily the sole metre used for them).⁷³ The etymology of ἔλεγος might then be traced to the root ELEGN found in Armenian in a range of words meaning 'reed', 'cane', 'pipe';⁷⁴ if correctly, then when the *aulos*, like most musical instruments, came to the Greeks from the East, it brought with it a term for song it accompanied which gave the Greeks their word ἔλεγος.⁷⁵ This notion receives some support from the association of the *aulos*-player Olympus with Mysia, of the *aulos* itself with Phrygia, and in particular of Marsyas and his legendary contest with Apollo with the upper Maeander valley.⁷⁶

On the evidence available, we cannot choose between the hypothesis that ἔλεγος in archaic Greece meant 'a song sung to the *aulos* (in general)' and that it meant 'the sort of song, usually accompanied by the *aulos*, that was sung chiefly at symposia'. But I hope I have shown that either explains the phenomena better than the view that ἔλεγος meant 'sung lament'.

IV. ELEGIES PERFORMED AT PUBLIC FESTIVALS

West's eighth context of performance is indeed well established, *viz.* 'in aulodic competitions at public festivals'. Apart from the *elegoi* with which Echembrotus won at the Pythia of 586 BC (*cf.* above, section III) we are told by the pseudo-Plutarch *de musica* 1134a⁷⁷ that elegies set to music were attested by the record of the Panathenaic musical competition. Few scholars have asked what sort of elegies these might be. To me the evidence suggests that in the archaic period there was a genre of narrative elegy quite different in scale from songs for symposia, and that it was this that was performed at public festivals.

West doubted that elegy was used for pure narrative, and thought that Mimnermus' *Smyrneis* and Simonides' *Salamis* 'cannot quite be regarded as containing narrative for its own sake as an epic does'. His reason was that 'the subjects of these two poems were both taken from recent history' and that 'in Mimnermus' case there may well have been a moral for the present':

⁷² For cases where it nevertheless was so used see n. 57.

⁷³ The *aulos* was used to accompany a wide range of choral song and dance, *cf.* H. Huchzermeyer, *Aulos und Kithara in der griechischen Musik bis zum Ausgang der Klassischen Zeit* (Emsdetten 1931) 23–5, 38 ff.; Webster, *The Greek chorus* (London 1970) *passim*. Its use to accompany solo performances is not so well attested, *cf.* Huchzermeyer 25 f., 55 n. 222.

⁷⁴ *Cf.* Huchzermeyer (n. 73) 13 with n. 54; C. M. Bowra, *Early Greek elegists* (Cambridge Mass. 1935) 6. The Armenian link is treated as doubtful by A. Schere, 'Die Sprache des Archilochos', *Fond. Hardt* x (1964) 90 and P. Chantraine, *Dict. et. de la langue grecque* (Paris 1968–7) 334 s.v. ἔλεγος, but neither rejects it, and both admit the possibility of a borrowing from Phrygian, *cf.* H. Hommel, *Rh. Mus.* lxxxviii (1939) 194. Martin West has suggested to me that the Armenian vowel *e* in *elegn*

always derives from a diphthong, so that only with difficulty can it be related to the Greek *ε*. But (as I am informed by Prof. C. J. F. Dowsett, to whom I am grateful for this help) whereas in *elegn* the first *e* is short, the second long, both *es* are short in its (irregular) genitive *elegan*, the adjectival *elegneay*, and one form of the diminutive *elegnik*. The irregularities lead Prof. Dowsett to suspect that *elegn* is a loanword in Armenian.

⁷⁵ For the hypothesis that the (developed) *aulos* came from Phrygia *cf.* Huchzermeyer (n. 73) 35–7.

⁷⁶ For Olympus *cf.* n. 56. For Marsyas e.g. Herodotus vii 26; Xen. *Anab.* i 2.8; Paus. ii 7.9.

⁷⁷ 1134a: ἐν ἀρχῇ γὰρ ἔλεγεία μεμελοποιημένα οἱ αὐλωδοὶ ἤδον· τοῦτο δὲ δηλοῖ ἡ τῶν Παναθηναίων ἀναγραφὴ ἢ περὶ τοῦ μουσικοῦ ἀγῶνος (though *cf.* Rosenmeyer's scepticism, above n. 54).

hence he concluded 'if so, it is akin to martial or political hortatory elegy, and might be imagined sung in similar circumstances'.⁷⁸

Our evidence, however, indicates poems that dealt with the distant, not only with the recent past, too long to fit comfortably in a sympotic context or even in the sort of exhortatory situation suggested. Let us first consider the seventh-century material.

Mimnermus' *Smyrneis* is indeed a strong candidate. I accept West's reconstruction of Mimnermus' *oeuvre*⁷⁹ as consisting (at least for the Hellenistic period) of two books, referred to by the titles *Nanno* (at least six times) and *Smyrneis* (once). It is difficult not to conclude that *Nanno* is the title of one book, *Smyrneis* of the other, and West made a strong case for *Nanno* being a collection of short poems. In that case Callimachus' contrast between αἱ κατὰ λεπτόν [ρήσιες] and ἡ μεγάλη γυνή in his *Aetia prologue* (*fr.* i 11–12) will have been between *Nanno* and the *Smyrneis*. In defending his preference for short poetry over long Callimachus must appeal to common ground—his case would gain little support from a proposition that his readers universally held to be false. Thus the poem which he cites as (manifestly) better must be the one more popular in antiquity: and that was *Nanno*, as both quotations and the allusion by Hermesianax demonstrate. *Nanno*, therefore, could be described as 'utterances in a slender mould', the *Smyrneis* as 'the tall lady'.⁸⁰ There is a touch of Callimachean wit here that should have prevented scholars identifying *Nanno* as 'the tall lady', since the personal name 'Nanno' must hint at the sense of the noun νᾶνος meaning 'dwarf'.⁸¹ That the *Smyrneis* on the other hand should be called 'the tall lady' has a twofold attraction. First, it was a long poem. Second, the city of Smyrna took its name from an Amazon.⁸² Such a recondite allusion is entirely in Callimachus' manner: mythology presented Amazons as tough, well-built ladies, and educated readers would know that one such had given her name to Smyrna at its foundation.

If this is Callimachus' allusion we have a clue to the nature of the *Smyrneis*: for it suggests that at some point it treated the city's foundation. This should not cause surprise. The form of the title

⁷⁸ 13. By contrast C. M. Bowra, 'Xenophanes, *fr.* 3' *CQ* xl (1944) 119–26 (repr. as 'Xenophanes on the luxury of Colophon' in *On Greek margins* [Oxford 1970] 109–21) *ad fin.* recognised the variety in scale and character of early elegy and suggested that Mimnermus' *Smyrneis* might have parallels in the work of Semonides, Panyassis and Xenophanes. F. Jacoby 'Some remarks on Ion of Chios', *CQ* xli (1947) 4 n. 6 (= *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung* [Leiden 1956] 149 n. 27) notes that Semonides may have written a verse *ktisis* and that Panyassis certainly did, but he regards the work ascribed by Diogenes Laertius to Xenophanes as a forgery, *cf.* n. 99.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.* 74. Two books are attested by Porphyrio on Horace *Epist.* ii 2.21: Mimnermus duos libros luculent(is vers)ibus scripsit.

⁸⁰ Call. *Aet.* *fr.* i 11–12: τοῖν δὲ δυοῖν Μίμνερμος ὅτι γλυκύς, αἱ κατὰ λεπτόν

[ρήσιες] ἡ μεγάλη δ' οὐκ ἐδίδαξε γυνή. A. Colonna, 'Mimnermo e Callimaco', *Athenaeum* xxx (1952) 191–5 was the first to set out a case for seeing the *Smyrneis* as Mimnermus' tall lady, following an idea of F. Della Corte, 'La Nanno di Mimnermo', *Atti dell' Acc. Ligur.* iii (1943) 1–11. He saw that the *Smyrneis* should be a *ktisis* poem like that of Xenophanes (n. 100), although he may go too far in suggesting that Smyrna actually claimed *foundation* by an Amazon on the basis of Strabo xii 550C: εἶη γὰρ ἂν λέγων τὴν ὑπὸ τῶν Αἰολέων καὶ Ἰώνων οἰκισθεῖσαν ὕστερον, πρότερον δ' ὑπὸ Ἀμαζόνων· καὶ ἑπωνύμους πόλεις τινὰς εἶναι φασί, καὶ γὰρ Ἐφεσον καὶ Σμύρναν καὶ Κύμην καὶ Μύριναν. Given the more complex story

told by Strabo at xiii 633–4 (n. 82) οἰκισθεῖσαν here may mean no more than 'settled'.

⁸¹ Alan Cameron has suggested to me that there is equal wit in alluding to the personal name Nanno with its dwarf-overtones by the expression 'tall lady'. That leaves unexplained the appropriateness of referring to the *Smyrneis* by the phrase αἱ κατὰ λεπτόν [ρήσιες].

⁸² The story as told by Strabo xiv 633–4C is complicated. Ephesus was originally called Smyrna, after an Amazon who captured it, and there was still a part of Ephesus in Strabo's day called Smyrna. The inhabitants of this part of Ephesus marched on the later site of (Old) Smyrna, ejected the Leleges who were its occupants, and after later expulsion themselves by Aeolians recovered it with the help of Colophonians. How much of this goes back to an early source is debatable—it does not tally with Herodotus i 150, *cf.* Podlecki (n. 21) 58, and for full discussion see Klügmann, 'Ueber die Amazonen in den Sagen der kleinasiatische Städte', *Philol.* xxx (1870) 524–56. I am not persuaded by the sceptical *argumenta e silentio* of P. Devambez, 'Les Amazones et l'Orient', *RA* (1976) 265–80, that Amazons were first associated with foundation of Asia Minor cities in the mid-fifth century: we have too few vases and monuments to make them compelling, and Devambez has to play down Pindar's reference (*ap.* Paus. vii 2.7, *fr.* 174 Snell-Maehler) and leave unexplained that of Hecataeus F 226 (cited 275 n. 1) which secures the association for the end of the sixth century. A seventh-century poet could have given the Amazon Smyrna some coverage in his *ktisis*, and Callimachus traded on this allusively.

Smyrneis evokes epic and its predominantly mythological subject matter, though we should not impose on archaic Greece a post-Herodotean, far less a modern, dichotomy between myth and history. So a poem on Smyrna should not limit itself to recent conflicts, although these too were almost certainly treated: Pausanias talks of elegies on a battle between the Smyrnaeans and Gyges with a *prooemium* in which Mimnermus distinguished two sets of Muses, and this is very probably a reference to the *Smyrneis*.⁸³ The citation of a couplet by a commentator on Antimachus (our only evidence of the title *Smyrneis*) also indicates the use of speeches.⁸⁴ We should infer a substantial narrative, long enough to acquire a title of epic form, to be introduced by an invocation to the Muses,⁸⁵ and to be allocated a separate book in the Hellenistic period. It probably concentrated on recent conflicts with Lydia—otherwise Pausanias' description would be odd—but also dealt with Smyrna's foundation.

It is tempting to allocate *fr.* 14 to this poem: Mimnermus recalls a warrior who distinguished himself in fighting the Lydians and of whom he had heard from *proteroi*, and he contrasts his qualities with some other qualities:

οὐ μὲν δὴ κείνου γε μένος καὶ ἀγήνορα θυμὸν
τοῖον ἔμεο προτέρων πεύθομαι, οἳ μιν ἴδον
Λυδῶν ἵππομάχων πυκινὰς κλονέοντα φάλαγγας
Ἔρμιον ἄμ πεδίον . . .

Not such, do I learn from my elders, was that man's might and proud spirit—elders who saw him routing the serried phalanxes of Lydian cavalry across the plain of the Hermus. . .

(*fr.* 14.1–4)

It is easy to assume, given our knowledge of exhortatory elegy, that the contrast is with the spirit of Mimnermus' contemporaries.⁸⁶ If that assumption is correct, then either this indeed comes from a short exhortatory elegy, and not from the *Smyrneis*, or the *Smyrneis* did involve comparisons with the present world. Such comparisons might have been exhortatory, though they need not have been: on the epic model of heroes lifting weights such as would defeat men οἰοὶ νῦν βροτοὶ εἰσιν,⁸⁷ Mimnermus may have made a general remark of the form 'Nowadays we are all too often faint-hearted in the face of the Lydians'. But even a comparison with contemporary spirit need not be involved. The narrative could have run: 'Then x and his *hetairoi* were hard pressed: his *hetairoi* began to panic and retreat; not such . . .' Such a sequence, familiar in epic *aristeiai*, would not be out of place in a narrative with many epic touches.⁸⁸

If *fr.* 13 is from the *Smyrneis*, then, this need not show that the poem was exhortatory. It may, however, show how an elegist dealing with recent history might adopt a different stance from a hexameter poet handling the distant or mythical past. The poet can introduce himself as a source of information, albeit at second hand, and can offer evaluations of action as his own: we can only guess how far this is attributable to the different associations of elegy and how far to the simple fact of dealing with recent history.⁸⁹

One other fragment (9) must be mentioned. Strabo attributes to *Nanno* six lines on the colonisation of Asia Minor by emigrés from Pylos who apparently settled initially at Colophon

⁸³ Paus. ix 29.4 = Mimnermus 13.

⁸⁴ P. Univ. Mediolan. 17 col. ii 26 (p. 83 Wyss): σ[υνάγει]ν δμω[ῆ]ις ἐνδέξεται (Antim. *fr.* 180)· ἀντι τοῦ ἐπ[ι]τ[ῆ] ἀξηι Μίμνε[ρ]μ[ος] δι' ἐν τῆι Σμυρνηίδι (= Mimnermus *fr.* 13a)

ὡς οἱ παρ βασιλῆος, ἐπε[ί] ῥ' ἐ[ν]εδέξατο μῦθον,

ἧ[ῖ]αν κοίλη[ι]ς ἀ[σπ]ίσι φραξάμενοι.

⁸⁵ Solon 13, also opening with an invocation to the Muses, is a poem of only 76 lines. But the invocation is not a standard poetic call for inspiration—Solon adapts that motif and prays to the Muses to give him *olbos*.

⁸⁶ J. M. Cook, *Charisterion eis A. K. Orlandon* i (1965) 148–52, cf. West 74, Podlecki (n. 21) 60 (who leaves the question open).

⁸⁷ For the motif οἰοὶ νῦν βροτοὶ εἰσιν cf. Griffin, below pp. 37–8.

⁸⁸ It is also possible that the whole fragment is from a speech within a battle narrative: note the similarity to Agamemnon's *speech* to Diomedes, *Il.* iv 370 ff. (cited by Campbell).

⁸⁹ We do not have enough hexameter poetry attempting the same task (e.g. Eumelus?) to act as a control on our few remains of this sort of elegy.

and finally at Smyrna⁹⁰—just what we might expect from early sections of the *Smyrneis*. That Strabo's manuscripts are not to be blamed for the ascription to *Nanno* seems certain, since a little earlier Strabo had also ascribed the colonisation of Colophon by Andraemon of Pylos to *Nanno* (*fr.* 10). Unless we are to say that the *Smyrneis* was part of *Nanno* (a hypothesis ruled out by evidence already cited) we might explain Strabo's citation in two ways. (i) *Nanno* may have included short poems whose subjects overlapped with that of the *Smyrneis*—compare the shared material in Ovid's *Amores* and *Ars amatoria*. (ii) Strabo may have misremembered or misascribed his quotation: it would be easy to suppose that a passage of Mimnermus was from *Nanno* since that was the poem for which he was famous, and Strabo could be attempting to give a more precise provenance for a passage he found attributed simply to Mimnermus.

Two of Mimnermus' rough contemporaries also seem to have composed long narrative elegies. One is Tyrtaeus. The Suda entry on Tyrtaeus distinguishes three groups of poetry: a πολιτεία, ὑποθήκαι δι' ἐλεγείας and μέλη πολεμιστήρια. The *Politeia* thus seems to be separate both from the *war songs* (presumably anapaestic) and the exhortatory elegies.⁹¹ That it had a title (not of course Tyrtaeus') argues some length. The Suda title is too close to one known from Aristotle and Strabo, *Eunomia*, to refer to a different poem. From Aristotle's citation⁹² we know that it gave information about the conditions in Laconia created by a Messenian war,⁹³ so it is tempting to ascribe to it the narrative fragments 5–7 describing Theopompus' ultimate victory in the first Messenian war and the conditions imposed upon the defeated Messenians. Tyrtaeus, like modern historians, will have seen the close connection between Sparta's bellicose relations with her neighbours and the development of her political system. Thus there is no oddity in a poem which said enough about politics to acquire the title *Eunomia/Politeia* but which also treated Sparta's war with Messenia. The political developments narrated almost certainly included the visit of Theopompus and Polydorus to Delphi and their return with an oracle giving advice (apparently) on Sparta's constitution (*fr.* 4). If all these attributions are accepted, Tyrtaeus dealt at some length with both military and political events of Theopompus' reign. It is only modern hypothesis that any of this poetry either was overtly exhortatory or even covertly recommended particular courses of action to contemporaries. What is to be noted is how (as in Mimnermus) we find foreshadowed procedures of fifth-century prose historiography: attention is given to chronology—Tyrtaeus' war was in the time of 'our grandfathers'—and the war is given a length in years (twenty).⁹⁴

The *Politeia/Eunomia* may not have dealt only with recent history. The four lines quoted by Strabo, augmented by fragments of twelve more on an Oxyrhynchus papyrus, tell how 'we' left windy Erineon and came to the Peloponnese (*fr.* 2W). One fragmentary line (*fr.* 2.10) has the expression πειθώμεθα, 'let us obey'. Does this establish the poem as a whole as exhortatory? Of course Tyrtaeus may be speaking in his own person here: this would then be evidence that the *Eunomia* included exhortation to contemporaries. But we may equally be dealing with a speech.

⁹⁰ Strabo xiv 634 = Mimnermus 9. These lines do not obviously support Strabo, but cohere better with Herodotus i 150. The phrase ἀργαλῆς ὕβριος ἡγεμόνες seems odd in Mimnermus' own mouth: is this too from a speech within narrative? (So already Gentili 67, following Tsagarakis' 1966 dissertation arguing from the implication of the first person plural: but *cf.* n. 95.)

⁹¹ Suda iv 610.5A: Τυρταῖος Ἀρχεμβρότου, Λάκων ἢ Μιλήσιος, ἐλεγοποιός καὶ αὐλητής. . . ἔγραψε πολιτείαν Λακεδαιμονίοις καὶ ὑποθήκας δι' ἐλεγείας καὶ μέλη πολεμιστήρια, βιβλία ε'. It is possible, but unlikely, that δι' ἐλεγείας is to be taken with both πολιτείαν and ὑποθήκας.

⁹² Aristotle *Pol.* 1306b36 (= Tyrtaeus 1): συνέβη δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἐν Λακεδαίμονι, ὑπὸ τὸν Μεσσηνιακὸν πόλεμον· δῆλον δὲ {καὶ τοῦτο} ἐκ τῆς Τυρταίου

ποιήσεως τῆς καλουμένης Εὐνομίας. *Cf.* Strabo viii 362C = (Tyrtaeus 2).

⁹³ The phrase ὑπὸ τὸν Μεσσηνιακὸν πόλεμον in Aristotle is easier to refer to the first (eighth century) war than to that of the mid-seventh century (which Aristotle could be classifying as an ἀπόστασις rather than πόλεμος). But some take the reference to be to the seventh-century war and Tyrtaeus' own time, e.g. P. A. Cartledge, *Sparta and Lakonia* (London 1979) 127 (putting the *stasis* after Hysiae, 669 BC), 134; O. Murray, *Early Greece* (Hassocks 1980) 163. Podlecki (n. 21) 104–5 does not make it clear which war he thinks is in question.

⁹⁴ The round number of 20 arouses suspicion. But that it is a conventional figure does not make it less interesting that Tyrtaeus should give it at all.

Speeches figured in Mimnermus' *Smyrneis*, and Tyrtaeus' report of Apollo's oracle resembles a speech, though indirect forms are used. *Fr.* 2 could be a speech made by one of the founding generation of Spartans, which would give the first person plurals their full force.⁹⁵ It could also, of course, be a speech made by a Spartan leader faced with a crisis at any stage in Spartan history. At least a context in the early years of the Heraclid settlement in the Peloponnese is possible.⁹⁶

The third seventh-century narrative elegist is Semonides of Amorgos. He figures in two *Suda* notices, once where he should be, under the name Simonides, once in the entry on Simmias of Rhodes.⁹⁷ That under Simonides tells us he wrote an ἔλεγεία in two books, and ἱαμβοί. The other credits him with ἱαμβοί and various other works, and an ἀρχαιολογία of the Samians. The most economical reconstruction is that the early history of Samos is the same as the ἔλεγεία in two books.⁹⁸ If that is correct, it tells us something about length and subject-matter. The poem was too long for a single Hellenistic papyrus roll—i.e. it must have gone over *c.* 2000 lines; and with the title ἀρχαιολογία it must have dealt with Samos' foundation and early history. No doubt that interested Semonides as founder of a Samian colony, Amorgos—and he may have treated it in his poem, as Jacoby conjectured—but in no sense is this exhortatory poetry.

The specific attribution of an ἀρχαιολογία to Semonides may strengthen the case for believing that Mimnermus' *Smyrneis* dealt with Smyrna's foundation and Tyrtaeus *fr.* 2 came in an account of early Sparta. The scale of Semonides' poem in turn receives some corroboration from a late sixth-century work. According to Diogenes Laertius, Xenophanes wrote a 'foundation of Colophon and the colonisation of Elea in Italy in 2000 ἔπη'. This has been taken to be in hexameters,⁹⁹ but this does not follow from ἔπη, a term regularly used by the early

⁹⁵ Cf. Tsagarakis 23 with n. 9: but we cannot insist, as he does, that 'if the poet follows traditional usage', the first person plural requires us to take the speaker as a participant in the event. Podlecki (n. 21) 103 gives the *Eunomia/Politeia* a similar shape, but takes the exhortation of 2 to be from a 'patriotic exhortation' and seems to treat the whole poem as exhortatory.

⁹⁶ It is possible that some or all of fragments 19–23a are from battle scenes in the *Eunomia* rather than from exhortatory elegies—their assignation to the latter category is based on future first person plural (19.11, 12; 20.15) and third person plural verbs (19.16, 18, 20; 23.13; 23a.20), but the specific references to enemies (Messeniens 23.6; Arcadians and Argives 23a.15) find no parallel in the manifestly exhortatory poems, and the reference to the three Dorian tribes as fighting separately (19.8) causes problems if the context is Sparta of the mid-seventh century: cf. Podlecki (n. 21) 97 (himself opting for the seventh century). That all are from speeches set within a battle narrative is of course improbable, but some may be.

⁹⁷ *Suda* iv 363.1A Σιμωνίδης. Κρίνεω, Ἀμοργί-νος, ἱαμβογράφος. ἔγραψεν ἔλεγείαν ἐν βιβλίοις β', ἱάμβους. γέγονε δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς μετὰ ῥ' καὶ ὕ' ἔτη τῶν Τρωικῶν. ἔγραψεν ἱάμβους πρῶτος αὐτὸς κατὰ τινάς; and 360.7 τῆς Ἀμοργοῦ ἐστάλῃ καὶ αὐτὸς ἡγεμίων ὑπὸ Σαμίων. ἔκτισε δὲ Ἀμοργὸν εἰς τρεῖς πόλεις, Μινώσαν, Αἰγιαλόν, Ἀρκεσίην. γέγονε δὲ μετὰ υς' (υφ' Ε) ἔτη τῶν Τρωικῶν. καὶ ἔγραψε κατὰ τινάς πρῶτος ἱάμβους, καὶ ἄλλα διάφορα, ἀρχαιολογίαν τε τῶν Σαμίων. On the problem of Semonides' date and works see now E. Pellizer, 'Sulla cronologia, la vita e l'opera di Semonide Amorgino', *Quad. Urb. Cult. Class.* xiv (1983) 17–28.

⁹⁸ It is conceivable that the *archaiologia* was a forgery, or that one or both books of elegiac poetry consisted of short elegies. But that so much as one, far less two books of short elegies by Semonides were circulating in antiquity is improbable given that the remains of only

one elegiac poem are known to us, and that is more often ascribed to Simonides of Ceos than to the poet of Amorgos. The identity of the *archaiologia* with the two books of elegies, taken as certain by Bowra (n. 78) 120, is more cautiously treated as a guess that may well be right by H. Lloyd-Jones, *Females of the species* (Park Ridge 1975). Jacoby had been characteristically sceptical (*FGH* III B [Leiden 1955] Kommentar, Notes to p. 456, n. 8a) about the equation of the *archaiologia* with the elegy, but begs a number of questions when (456) he says it 'scheint sich speziell auf die kolonisation von Amorgos bezogen zu haben. Der titel ist sicher spät und deckt vielleicht nicht mehr als eine elegie etwa vom umfang von Tyrtaios' *Eunomia* oder Solons *Salamis*'.

⁹⁹ D. L. ix 20: ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ Κολοφῶνος κτίσιν καὶ τὸν εἰς Ἑλέαν τῆς Ἰταλίας ἀποικισμὸν ἔπη δισχίλια. The work is taken to be in hexameters by Campbell 332; H. Fraenkel, 'Xenophanesstudien', *Hermes* lx (1925) 174–5 (although Fraenkel saw the analogy with Panyassis' *Ionica*). If what has been suggested above about the content of Mimnermus' and Tyrtaeus' poetry is correct Xenophanes was not innovating in giving 'dem Epos einen modernen Inhalt'. Jacoby (n. 78) was persuaded by the suggestion of E. Hiller 'Die literarische Tätigkeit der sieben Weisen', *Rh. Mus.* xxxiii (1878) 518–29, that the ascription by Diogenes Laertius of a 2000 line work to Xenophanes was due, like that of works of specified length to the seven sages by Diogenes, to the mendacious *περὶ ποιητῶν* of Lobon of Argos (2nd cent. BC?: cf. M. L. West, *The Orphic poems* [Oxford 1983] 60 n. 85); Hiller's suggestion was also accepted by W. Croenert, 'De Lobone Argivo', *Χάριτες Leo* (Berlin 1911) 123–45. However, poetic activity, both in hexameters and in elegiacs, is securely attested for Xenophanes, and this could be a reliable tradition deriving from the *pinakes* of Callimachus (which Lobon is thought to have been spoofing).

elegists of their own work.¹⁰⁰ All Xenophanes' surviving hexameters (where context is clear) are philosophical. Amongst his extant elegy, however, is a passage on affectation of Lydian luxury by the Colophonians 'while they were free of hateful tyranny': it could be from a reflective sympotic elegy, but fits well into an account of Colophon's recent history, before its capture by Harpagus in 545 or 540 BC. I conjecture the 2000-line work to have been elegiac, in the tradition of Mimnermus. It is impossible to tell whether the parts on Colophon and on Elea were distinct (reflected in two books?), or somehow linked, e.g. by the participation of Xenophanes in the settlement of Elea.¹⁰¹ If *fr.* 8 came from this poem too—and this statement of Xenophanes' age and career might have more point in the introduction to a long narrative than in a reflective sympotic song—then its composition fell around 484/478 BC. The title of the Colophonian section—κτίσις—shows that foundation (and, presumably, early history) was a major theme.

About the same time in Halicarnassus—probably between the Persian wars and 455 BC—the poet Panyassis composed an 'Ionian history, in pentameters, dealing with Codrus, Neleus and the Ionian colonies, in 7000 lines'. A wholly pentametric poem would be bizarre at this date, and most correctly take this to be elegiac. Panyassis' choice of elegiacs for local history, while he used hexameters for his mythographic work on the Panhellenic hero Heracles, helps to show how well established this genre now was. Moreover it was evidently a more ambitious work than its predecessors: not one or two cities, but the whole Ionian settlement, and hence a larger scale. Sadly only three fragments have been identified, all conjecturally, and only one with what might be his actual words.¹⁰²

Against this background it becomes more difficult to be sure what sort of poem Simonides' *Sea battle at Salamis* was. It might be an elegy of modest length that, like Solon's *Salamis*, acquired a title because it was popular and had an easily identifiable subject rather than because it ran to epic length. But it may have been adapting the *ktisis* genre to the latest chapter in Greeks' struggles with their eastern neighbours.¹⁰³

Finally Ion of Chios merits consideration. He composed a *ktisis* of Chios, which some have taken to be an elegiac poem. Von Blumenthal and Jacoby, however, argued that it was a prose work, and although each of the three arguments used can be challenged, they may be right.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁰ Bowra (n. 78) 121 had already noted that the term ἔπη did not prevent this being an elegiac poem. For early elegists' use of the term *epe* to describe their work cf. West 7. For a second century AD use meaning no more than 'lines of writing' (LSJ) cf. Lucian *de hist. conscr.* 28. For a contested use cf. n. 112.

¹⁰¹ Elea was occupied not by Colophonians but by Phocaeans, Herodotus i 167, but Xenophanes may have left Colophon when it was captured by Harpagus (*id.* 169: 545 or 540 BC) and his movements thereafter are uncertain. *Fr.* 8 claims 67 years of wandering which started at the age of 25. For a discussion of the chronology of his life and work cf. P. Steinmetz, 'Xenophanesstudien', *Rh. Mus.* cix (1966) 13–73, esp. sec. I *Zur Datierung* 13–34.

¹⁰² E.g. Bowra (n. 78) 120, H. Fraenkel (n. 99) 174. See V. J. Matthews, *Panyassis of Halikarnassos* (Leiden 1974) 11–19 (chronology and life) 26–31 (the *Ionica*) for full discussion: he attributes *fr.* 24, 25 and 29 to the *Ionica*, but at no point discusses how the Alexandrians might have divided the 7000 lines into books. Panyassis is not, however, mentioned in West's edition or *Studies*.

¹⁰³ For Simonides' *Salamis* see West's edition ii 112–13.

¹⁰⁴ See A. von Blumenthal, *Ion von Chios* (Stuttgart and Berlin 1939); F. Jacoby (n. 78) 4–7. The arguments are (1) The work is cited among Ion's prose works in the

list given by the scholiast on Ar. *Pax* 835. But this scholion is clearly conflating more than one source, and its phraseology does not prove that the *ktisis* was grouped with the prose works: ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ κωμῳδίας καὶ ἐπιγράμματα καὶ παιᾶνας καὶ ὕμνους καὶ σκόλια καὶ ἐγκώμια καὶ ἔλεγεία, καὶ καταλογάδην τὸν πρεσβευτικὸν λεγόμενον, ὃν νόθον ἀξιουσί τινες, καὶ οὐχὶ αὐτοῦ. φέρεται δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ κτίσις καὶ κοσμολογικὸς καὶ ὑπομνήματα· καὶ ἄλλα τινά. (2) It is called a συγγραφή by Paus. vii 4.8: this certainly suggests a prose work, but the term συγγραφεύς is occasionally found of writers of verse works, e.g. Dio Pr. 12.5 συγγραφέας ἡδίστους ἐμμέτρων καὶ ἀμέτρων λόγων. (3) The only extant verbatim fragment is in prose, *fr.* 19, from Etym. Magn. and Orion s.v. 'λόγχας'. λόγχας τὰς μερίδας Ἴωνες λέγουσιν. Ἴων ἐν Χίῳ κτίσει· ἐκ τῆς Τέω λόγχης λόγχας ποιεῖ πεντήκοντα. The MSS offer ποιεῖν, which was corrected to ποιεῖ ν' by Gaisford (1615 = 569.34). But the present tense ποιεῖ is not appropriate to a historical narrative (other fragments of Ion's works show no penchant to the historic present), and we ought to consider πόρε πεντήκοντα which would be easy palaeographically. If Ion wrote πόρε, then he wrote a hexameter:

ἐκ τῆς Τέω λόγχης λόγχας πόρε πεντήκοντα

Certainly the mid-fifth century is a likely date for the demise of the genre. By the third quarter prose writers were composing histories both of individual *poleis* and of the Greek conflict with *barbaroi*, and the advantages of the medium were apparent.

Even without Ion, however, enough testimony has been gathered to suggest that a genre of narrative elegy dealing with local history already flourished in the seventh century (Mimnermus, Tyrtaeus, Semonides) and was still being practised into the fifth (Xenophanes, Panyassis). These poems' length makes them unlikely candidates for singing in symposia: how could each participant make his due contribution of song when one performer required time for a thousand lines or more?¹⁰⁵ Their scale is appropriate, however, to competitive performance at a public festival. If the hymn with which Hesiod won at the games of Amphidamas was indeed the *Theogony*,¹⁰⁶ then a thousand-line poem was already appropriate in the eighth century. Our next testimony to the length of poems for public performance does not indeed relate (as far as we know) to a competition: but it may be relevant that Stesichorus' narrative lyric poems sometimes approached (*Geryoneis*), and at least once must have exceeded (*Oresteia*), 2000 lines. Our next example of competitive poetry whose length is secure, the *Persae* of Aeschylus (472 BC), is 1077 lines, and is but one of four plays produced by one competitor. With so few data generalisations are hazardous. But evidently a *Smyrneis* or *Eunomia* of around 1000 lines would not have been out of place in public competitions of the seventh century—perhaps even an *Early history of Samos* twice that length. By the fifth century still longer works would be acceptable, such as Xenophanes' 2000 lines. Panyassis' 7000 lines might be too long—if it too was composed for competition, it may have been built of units each relating to a different city or group of cities.

Subject-matter also fitted this narrative elegy for public competition: whereas reflective elegy often advertised the life-style and prejudices of the aristocracy (e.g. Theognis and much of the Theognidea) these poems celebrated the common ancestry and achievements of the city.¹⁰⁷

If both the existence of this genre and of elegiac competitions at festivals are admitted, then they surely go together. There was also, it appears, some form of local history composed in hexameters,¹⁰⁸ but we have too little of either genre to see whether they duplicated each other or whether they approached the material in different ways and with different purposes. We might guess from the fragments of Tyrtaeus and from Mimnermus *fr.* 14 that elegy brought to the narrative of city history some of the emphasis on personal views and recollections that marked its sympotic variants. It might also be that one reason for the elegiac genre's development was precisely the growth of public festivals and the search by *aulodoi* for appropriate material to display their skill and their medium's potential, perhaps emulating singers who accompanied themselves on stringed instruments.

(with Τέω). For πόρε in this *sedes* cf. *Il.* i 72; vii 146; ix 663; x 546; xv 441; xvi 690; xxii 472; xxiii 92; *Od.* iv 130; v 321, 372; vi 228; x 394, 494; xi 282. For πεντήκοντα at the end of a hexameter *Il.* ii 719; v 786; xi 679; *Od.* ix 35, 48; xvi 247.

If the text of *fr.* 19 were secure, the matter would be clear: unfortunately it is not, but the possibility of a verse *ktisis* must be kept open. If the *ktisis* was in verse, then the pentameter quoted by Plutarch *Thes.* 20.2 (= *Ion fr.* 29) could belong to it:

(Chios) τὸν ποτε Θεσείδης ἔκτισεν Οἰνοπίων

Jacoby thinks the line indicates an allusive reference and 'shows clearly that the elegy . . . did not narrate the foundation of Chios at length'. That seems to go too far. So summary a reference would not be out of place in an opening sequence (which in turn would be more likely to be known to Plutarch or his source).

¹⁰⁵ Ancient testimony on sympotic practice gives an important place to equality (or at least comparability) of

contributions. Note that in the literary elaboration of Plato's *Symposium* the longest speech (that of Socrates) occupies less than 400 lines of the OCT.

¹⁰⁶ As proposed by Wade-Gery and supported with several arguments by M. L. West, *Hesiod. Theogony* (Oxford 1966) 44–5.

¹⁰⁷ W. Rösler has argued (in a paper forthcoming in *Sympotica*) that some of the fragments I have been considering (Tyrtaeus 2, 4 and 5; Mimnermus 9 and 14) belong to a sort of sympotic elegy that focussed on the past achievements of the community. Although that is a satisfactory explanation of these fragments, the additional evidence I adduced seems to me to favour rather my reconstruction.

¹⁰⁸ E.g. Eumelus' *Korinthiaca*: surviving fragments (in Kinkel) relate only to the 'mythical' period. For Eumelus' date cf. R. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the hymns* (Cambridge 1982) 231–3. Martin West suggests to me that Asius and Hegesinous' *Atthis* (Kinkel *ep. gr. fr.* 208) may be added.

I offer one final suggestion about the content of narrative elegy, more tentative than those above. It would be odd if poetry performed at public festivals entirely eschewed myth. That it did not may follow from some ambiguous testimony about Archilochus.

Plato grouped Archilochus with Homer and Hesiod as a narrator of myth.¹⁰⁹ Nor can all of his narrations of myth have been short. Dio of Prusa observes that some critics thought he was talking nonsense (ληρεῖν) in giving a long speech to Deianeira at the very point when Nessus was trying to rape her—a speech long enough for her to recall her wooing by Achelous and Heracles' response on that occasion, and long enough to let Nessus accomplish his evil purpose.¹¹⁰ We know too that he recounted myths about Pyrrhus son of Achilles and about the daughters of Danaus, but for these we have no indications of scale.¹¹¹ They might have been *exempla* to illustrate Archilochus' own situation, an explanation that ill fits the Nessus incident, but possible. Notopoulos interpreted the evidence as showing that Archilochus composed hexameter poetry.¹¹² Given his other output that seems much less likely than composition of narrative elegy.

V. CONCLUSIONS

If the reasoning offered has been correct, two important features of elegiac poetry have been established. First, in its shorter form it was so closely associated with the symposium that no clear evidence remains to attest any other context of performance: such other contexts there may have been, but they must be treated as entirely conjectural, and they cannot have been a regular circumstance of performance if no clear hint of them has been transmitted in our poetry or in other texts. Second, alongside the well-known and relatively well-preserved genre of sympotic elegy, poets of the archaic period used the form to compose substantial narratives of their city's history, narratives that in some respects resembled hexameter epic, but that may also have had features symptomatic of their form's relationship to 'personal' poetry. These narratives were intended for performance in competition at public festivals.

The two contexts of archaic elegy's performance are not so distant from each other as might appear. The symposium is a social institution in which groups within the city strengthened their mutual bonds and expressed their identity as a group—and their difference from other groups—in a context which involved both ritual and relaxation. Many sympotic games are competitive, and their playing must have had consequences for the standing of individuals within the group. The public festival is an institution where the city as a whole defined its corporate identity and paraded its internal structure—likewise with a blend of ritual and relaxation. In many festivals

¹⁰⁹ Plato *Ion* 532a–b—ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν σὺ φῆς καὶ Ὅμηρον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ποιητάς, ἐν οἷς καὶ Ἡσίοδος καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος ἐστίν, περὶ γε τῶν αὐτῶν λέγειν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁμοίως, ἀλλὰ τὸν μὲν εὖ γε, τοὺς δὲ χεῖρον;—ΙΩΝ. Καὶ ἀληθῆ λέγω.—ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν, εἴπερ τὸν εὖ λέγοντα γινώσκεις, καὶ τοὺς χεῖρον λέγοντας γινώσκεις ἄν ὅτι χεῖρον λέγουσιν.—ΙΩΝ. Ἔοικέν γε. — I do not think we can infer from this passage (as does Podlecki [n. 21] 52) that Archilochus' poetry was actually part of Ion's repertoire as a rhapsode.

¹¹⁰ Dio Pr. Ix.1 (= Archilochus 286): φασὶ γὰρ οἱ μὲν τὸν Ἀρχίλοχον ληρεῖν ποιοῦντα τὴν Δηιάνειραν ἐν τῷ βιάζεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Κενταύρου πρὸς τὸν Ἡρακλέα ῥαψωδοῦσαν, ἀναμιμνήσκουσαν τῆς τοῦ Ἀχελῶνος μνηστείας καὶ τῶν τότε γενομένων, ὥστε πολλὴν σχολὴν εἶναι τῷ Νέσσῳ ὅτι ἐβούλετο πράξαι. Cf. fr. 287–9: narrative of the deeds of Heracles would be appropriate entertainment

at a festival associated with Heracles, whose cult was later important in Thasos (as noted by Podlecki [n. 21] 520).

¹¹¹ Archilochus 304, 305.

¹¹² J. A. Notopoulos, 'Archilochus, the aoidos', *TAPhA* xcivii (1966) 311–15. One text he cites that might seem to point to hexameter poetry (as indeed he takes it) is Theocritus *epig.* 21.5–6 (of Archilochus): ὦς ἔμμελής τ' ἐγένετο κῆπιδέξιος ἔπεά τε ποιεῖν πρὸς λύραν τ' αἰεῖν. But ἔπεα can denote any dactylic verse.

Note that we have no evidence for historical narrative in Archilochean elegiacs of the sort I argue to be represented by the *Smyrneis* and *Eunomia*. For recent history Archilochus seems to have created poems of considerable length in trochaic tetrameters, to judge from the scale of treatment and continuous narrative implied by the surviving (largely epigraphic) excerpts (88–106, and some perhaps of 107–15).

competition was a central feature.¹¹³ It is not therefore surprising that these should be the twin contexts of elegiac performance. I would guess that the fashion of song in elegiac metre accompanied by the *aulos* was developed first by aristocratic symposiasts along with other habits borrowed or adapted from the luxury-providing east, and only later found a place in festivals. But other reconstructions are possible. As to survival, it is easy to understand how the songs fitted for post-prandial entertainment were transmitted for as long as such entertainment included elegy—that would secure their transmission at least to the end of the fifth century. The survival of a 1000–2000 line poem composed for a competition would be more hazardous: on the assumption that such competitions were annual, or in some cases quinquennial, there would be a continual production of poems whose length and subject-matter fitted them only for their place of first performance. In some festivals the aulodic competition may have been suspended (as it was at the Pythia from 582 BC) as the works of lyric poets gained ground. It is understandable that the meagre remnants that have come down to us should be drawn almost entirely from sympotic elegy and should afford us only tantalising glimpses of its big sister.

E. L. BOWIE

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

¹¹³ For a discussion of the relation between public banquets and symposia cf. P. Schmitt Pantel 'Repas sacrificiel et *symposion*: deux modèles de banquets civiques' in *Symptica*.