

Fighting in the Shadow of Epic

The Motivations of Soldiers in Early Greek Lyric
Poetry

Timothy Holt

Lincoln College

DPhil Thesis

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my Supervisor Dr. Richard Rutherford for the countless hours he spent guiding me through this project. He constantly challenged my ideas and helped me improve this work and the many academic skills involved in the process. I would also like to thank my parents for believing in me to help make this dream a reality. Finally, and most importantly, I thank my wife, Sarah, for supporting me through the highs and lows of this endeavour and for joining me on this adventure.

Abstract

This thesis explores the theme of the motivation of soldiers in Greek lyric poetry while holding it up against the backdrop of epic. The motivation of soldiers expressed in lyric poetry depicts a complex system that demanded cohesion across various spheres in life. This system was designed to create and maintain social, communal, and political cohesion as well as cohesion in the ranks. The lyric poems reveal a mutually beneficial relationship between citizen and polis whereby the citizens were willing to fight and potentially die on behalf of the state, and in return they received prominence and rewards within the community. It is no coincidence that these themes were so common in a genre that was popular at the same time as the polis and citizen army were both developing.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations	5
Chapter 1: Introduction	6
1. Opening Remarks.....	6
a) Motivation.....	7
b) Cohesion	10
c) Why Lyric Poetry?	13
2. Relative Chronology	16
3. Chapter Overview	23
4. Definition of Terms.....	26
a) Lyric Poetry	27
b) Exhortative Elegy	28
c) Moral Tableau.....	28
Chapter 2: The Performance of Exhortative Elegy.....	30
1. Martial Elegy in a Private Context.....	31
a) A Brief History of Scholarship	32
b) Exhortative Elegy's Audience – The véoi	35
c) Performance Contexts of Tyrtaeus (and Homer).....	37
d) The use of (κατά)κειμαι in Other Sources	46
e) Exhortative Elegy & Public Assembly: Thucydides 1.68-71 and Callinus 1	50
f) Exhortative Elegy & Public Assembly: Demosthenes and Callinus 1.....	53
g) Elegy as a Medium for Rhetoric	56
2. Callinus Reconsidered	58
Conclusion	64
Chapter 3: Defense of Family and Home	66
1. Homer on the Defense of Family and Home	67
2. Contemporary Lyric Expressions of Defending Family and Home	71
a) Tyrtaeus	71
b) Callinus	78
c) Alcaeus.....	80
d) Solon.....	82
3. Predatory Gains.....	88
a) Problems of Spoils and Booty in Lyric.....	88
b) Evidence for Spoils in Epic	89

c) Evidence for Spoils in Lyric	91
d) Large Scale Predatory Gains: Sparta and Messenia	93
e) Comparing Epic and Lyric Depictions	96
4. Epigrams	97
a) In Defence of Freedom	98
b) In Defence of the Polis	102
c) Greek Nationality.....	103
Conclusion	107
Chapter 4: Mutual Benefit: Citizen and Polis	109
1. Repercussions for Negative Behaviour.....	110
a) Idle Behaviour.....	112
b) Collective Flight from Battle	117
c) Individual Flight from Battle	122
d) Managing Fear	136
e) The Role of Old vs. Young in Battle	142
2. Rewards for Positive Behaviour	150
a) Positive Rewards.....	151
b) Tyrtaeus and ἀρετή	156
c) Repercussions vs. Rewards.....	162
3. The Treatment of the War-Dead	165
a) The War-Dead in Epic	166
b) The War-Dead in Elegy	170
c) Commemorative Poetry	175
Conclusion	182
Chapter 5: Gods and Heroes on the Battlefield	185
1. Divine Intervention in Homer	189
a) Indirect Intervention	190
b) Direct Intervention.....	195
2. Divine Intervention in Lyric	200
a) Gods on the Battlefield	200
b) Gods and Heroes.....	212
Conclusion	220
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	222
Bibliography	229

Abbreviations

ABSA: The Annual of the British School at Athens
AC: L'antiquité classique
AClass: Acta classica
AFC: Anales de filología clásica
AJPh: American Journal of Philology
BASOR: Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
BICS: Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies
CB: The Classical Bulletin
ClAnt: Classical Antiquity
CPh: Classical Philology
CQ: Classical Quarterly
CR: Classical Review
CW: Classical World
DHA: Dialogues d'histoire ancienne
G&R: Greece and Rome
GRBS: Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies
HSPH: Harvard Studies in Classical Philology
ICS: Illinois Classical Studies
JAOS: Journal of the American Oriental Society
JHS: Journal of Hellenic Studies
LF: Listy filologické
MD: Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici
MH: Museum Helveticum
PCPhS: Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society
P.Oxy.: *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*
PP: La Parola del passato
QUCC: Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica
RFIC: Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica
RhM: Rheinisches Museum für Philologie
RPh: Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes
RSC: Rivista di studi classici
SIFC: Studi italiani di filologia classica
TAPhA: Transactions of the American Philological Association
WS: Wiener Studien
ZPE: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Chapter 1: Introduction

1. Opening Remarks

My interest in Greek lyric poetry began during my undergraduate career when I was made aware of the wealth of poets who were extremely influential throughout antiquity, but whose work is mostly lost to us. I sought a way to read and understand the meagre remains of these poets' works in a new light. After reading some of the relevant scholarship, I quickly realised that the majority of it focused on analysing the works of one poet at a time. This is a very sensible approach to handling a mass of fragments that are only connected by the fact that they were composed by the same poet and not necessarily by subject matter. This scholarship has produced many important texts¹ and genre-based commentaries.² While all of this scholarship is fundamental to the growth of studying the genre, there has been relatively little work analysing these poems and fragments with a thematic approach. Perhaps the best known work in this regard is Campbell's *The Golden Lyre*, which examines these poems in relation to eight different themes.³ Although warfare is not ignored in this important work, it does not receive the attention of a single focused chapter even though it features prominently in the genre. It was with this observation that I began my research.

Martial themes pervade almost every poet who belongs to the lyric tradition. There are the exhortative elegies of Callinus and Tyrtaeus, the martial elegies of Archilochus, the civil war and exile poetry of Alcaeus, the lyric re-telling of mythological stories of Stesichorus, and the

¹ Unless otherwise stated, the editions I will be using are as follows: West (1998) for elegy and iambic, Voigt (1971) for Sappho and Alcaeus, Davies (1991) for Stesichorus and Ibycus, Page (1962) for Simonides, Snell and Maehler (1987) for Pindar, Snell and Maehler (1970) for Bacchylides.

² There are too many to list all here, but a selective few are: Campbell (1967), Adkins (1985), and Hutchinson (2001).

³ Campbell (1983). The eight themes discussed by Campbell are: love, wine, athletics, politics, friends and enemies, gods and heroes, life and death, and poetry and music. He does discuss many of the poems that will feature in my research, but never on their relationship specifically to the theme of warfare.

Plataean elegies of Simonides, to name but a few. The different perspectives of this theme are as varied as the poets and metres of the lyric genre. After trying to narrow my focus of how I would approach analysing the theme of warfare across the lyric genre, I soon realised that one of the most pervasive aspects was the idea of motivation. This itself is a complex subject and can be approached by a poet in many different ways. This research is not only concerned with how particular poets would motivate their audiences to martial endeavours, but how the poets describe the different motivations that already exist in their society. The notion of motivation is an interesting subject itself (*i.e.* Why do we do the things we do?), but the idea becomes even more interesting when concerned with battle and war. What motivates somebody to risk their life in an attempt to kill the person standing against them? It is an absolutely vicious act, more so in ancient society. I will argue in this thesis that the motivation of soldiers in lyric poetry is ultimately concerned with establishing and maintaining social, communal, and political cohesion as well as cohesion in the ranks. Not only do these values drive the soldiers to fight on behalf of the community, but the act of fighting (and dying) is part of the process that helps disseminate and maintain these values across society.

a) Motivation

The concept of motivation is multifaceted and can thus be difficult to define satisfactorily. As J. Jung notes, “motivation” must include “desires, wishes, plans, goals, intents, impulses, and purposes”, but linked to these concepts are “emotions”, which include “fear, hate, and anger as well as pleasure, humor, joy, excitement, and boredom.” The distinction between these different states is not always possible, but at a high level when we refer to motivation, we refer to the “causes or reasons that underlie a given behavior”.⁴ Although this may help us frame

⁴ Jung (1978) 4.

our reference when we discuss motivation, we must examine how these various states come together to compel an individual to do something they might not otherwise do, such as risk their lives in the frontlines of battle. Atkinson and Raynor note two fundamental questions when discussing motivation “(a) What are the various components or determinants of the strength of an inclination or tendency to engage in a particular activity? (b) How is conflict among mutually incompatible inclinations, or tendencies, resolved and expressed in the various measurable aspects of an individual’s activity?”.⁵ When a society asks some of its members to walk into a situation where surely some of them will die, perhaps even most of them, the components or determinants of the strength of that inclination must be powerful and agreed upon by all members of that society. In this work I will explore how the motivations for soldiers to enter battle are complex and involve establishing and maintaining social, communal, political cohesion as well as cohesion in the ranks. At times some of these different motivations may come into conflict with each other. We shall see that some of the lyric poets, Tyrtaeus in particular, provide tactics to help soldiers stay focused in battle and avoid individual flight.

The theory of achievement motivation pioneered by Atkinson is particularly useful for studying the motivation of soldiers. This theory suggests that motivation is the product of expectancy, incentive, and motive. For the purposes of this theory ‘expectancy’ is defined as “a cognitive anticipation usually aroused by cues in a situation, that performance of some act will be followed by a particular consequence”, ‘incentive’ is defined as “the relative attractiveness of a specific goal that is offered in a situation, or the relative unattractiveness of an event that might occur as a consequence of some act”, and finally, motive is defined as “a disposition to strive for

⁵ Atkinson and Raynor (1978) 1.

a certain kind of satisfaction in the attainment of a certain class of incentives.”⁶ This current work should not be understood as a study of the motivation of soldiers in lyric poetry through the lens of the theory of achievement motivation. However, Atkinson’s terminology does provide a useful frame of reference when analysing this topic.

The notion of expectancy is critical when establishing a mutually accepted system of rewards and punishments designed to encourage and maintain cohesion across several spheres. This idea will arise throughout this work because if a soldier had no reasonable expectation that their sacrifice would be rewarded, then the entire system would fall apart. I will examine passages by both Callinus and Tyrtaeus that describe a special status awarded to soldiers that fight on behalf of the state. Similarly, there are passages establishing that one generation fights to protect the polis and then the next generation fights to protect the previous generation as well the one that proceeds it. There is a cyclical nature to this arrangement and it is contingent on the notion of expectancy. A public memorial will also establish expectancy that sacrifice will be honoured even in death. Just as the polis honours the sacrifice, so too will it honour the next generation’s sacrifice. This will never form a dominant motivation for a soldier to fight, but the cyclical nature of these acts establishes a dependable system of reasonable expectancy that survives across generations.

The dual nature of incentive is explored in detail in this work, particularly in Chapter 4. I will explore passages that describe the attractiveness or unattractiveness of achieving certain goals. Not only do the lyric poets want to make these goals attractive, but they also want to provide direction to help soldiers achieve these goals. There is perhaps no passage more succinct in describing the dual nature of incentive than the opening lines Tyrtaeus 10 where he contrasts

⁶ Atkinson (1957) 359-60.

the splendid nature of a soldier dying in the front ranks: τεθνάμεναι γὰρ καλὸν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι πεσόντα / ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν περὶ ἧ πατρίδι μαρνάμενον (10.1-2) with the wretched nature of the defeated soldier (or perhaps a soldier who abandoned battle/his polis) who wanders with his family as beggars τὴν δ' αὐτοῦ προλιπόντα πόλιν καὶ πίνοντας ἀγροὺς / πτωχεύειν πάντων ἔστ' ἀνηρότατον (10.3-4). This is a passage I will analyse from several perspectives throughout this work, so I will not go into more detail here, but I believe it is helpful to illustrate the dual nature of incentive, the attractiveness of one option and the unattractiveness of another option.

Atkinson's notion of motive is less visible in lyric poetry because a soldier's disposition and his satisfaction in attaining incentives are not overtly described in the poetry. The perspective of many of the poems considered in this work can be seen as striving to establish and maintain expectancy and incentive in order to instill motive for its audience. Since the poems do not describe the soldier's reaction to the poetry, we are less informed about motive as defined by Atkinson. However, we can infer that since expectancy and incentive are present, they are in part designed to establish motive for the audience. If all three of these concepts are in balance, then the cohesion across the various spheres (social, communal, political, and in the ranks) is achieved.

b) Cohesion

Since this thesis will look at how the different spheres of a soldier's life help motivate him to fight, it is worthwhile to look at the different types of cohesion that will be discussed in this research (social, communal, political, in the ranks). It is important to note that these different spheres should not be considered as independent of each other; the different roles in our lives rarely are. In fact, it should be clear that there is a close interrelationship between these different spheres. I do not use them as a means to segregate or categorise different types of motivation in

poems, but rather to bring nuance to the complex topic of motivation by highlighting the interconnectivity of the different roles of a soldier. There will be times when these different roles will complement each other, but other times where they compete with each other. One of the goals of this research is to explore how poets manipulate these different spheres in order to promote the values of social, communal, political cohesion as well as cohesion in the ranks.

Social cohesion involves the dynamics that exist between males and females, young and old. Since the poetry discussed in the work is centred on warfare, the bulk of the discussion will detail male roles in society. Warfare was the job of the male citizens and the poems will not need to draw specific attention to warfare as being a specifically defined male role since it is understood by all members of the audience. In order to establish and maintain social cohesion, the males must work together, fight against a common enemy, and achieve victory. If they are unsuccessful, then social cohesion will fall apart. Some of the poems discussed will touch upon female roles as they relate to the overall social cohesion. Tyrtaeus describes how men will marvel at the sight of the ideal soldier, and women are noted as feeling desire for him (10.28-9). This suggests a subtext that the physical desire for a man is partially dependent on his splendid nature associated with his prowess in battle. This relationship makes up part of the social cohesion described in these poems. Thus, social cohesion involves the interconnectivity of socially designated roles of individuals. Social cohesion also extends to the family. A common nuance in lyric is the role of fathers defending sons and subsequently those sons defending their elderly fathers (as well as their mothers, wives, and children). If a son is not able to protect his father as his father had defended him, the social cohesion breaks. Although the son may not be successful in battle, there is the expectation that he fight courageously. Tyrtaeus paints a picture of a soldier who is not successful in battle and the resulting disorder it brings to his life and his

family's lives (10.3ff.). Social cohesion is an important aspect of motivation of warfare in lyric poetry as it pertains to male and female, young and old, as well as dynamics within the family.

When we consider the idea of communal cohesion, we will see that it is closely related to social cohesion. While with social cohesion the emphasis was on individuals and their interconnectivity with other individuals each with their own socially designated roles, communal cohesion refers to the cohesion that exists when everybody in the community comes together for a specific purpose regardless of their respective roles within society. The idea of communal mourning is perhaps the most significant ritual that relates to communal cohesion. Not only is it significant that soldiers honour their fallen comrades, but even greater is the ability for the younger generation to honour the current generation's prime fighting soldiers. The young learn to respect the sacrifice soldiers make on the battlefield and understand that they too will be asked to make the same sacrifice. This process also teaches them that the subsequent generation will also honour their sacrifice just as they are now honouring fallen soldiers. If this communal cohesion breaks down it can have disastrous effects on the community. Elegies accompanying grave monuments are the most poignant examples of poems relating to communal cohesion, but we also see Tyrtaeus comment on the importance of this process (12.27ff.).

For the most part political cohesion will be the least overt form of cohesion expressed in lyric poetry. There will always be the subtext that soldiers going out to battle are citizens of the polis and are fighting to achieve goals established by the polis and thus forms part of a soldier's motivation to fight. A united fighting force suggests a certain level of political cohesion. Typically we do not see these ideas overtly stated in lyric poetry, which is one of the reasons why these poems lent themselves so well to re-performance. There are a few poems that do touch upon political cohesion, although they express the discord that results when political cohesion

breaks down. Thus, we will examine poems of Alcaeus who speaks with the voice of a citizen exiled through civil war. We will also see Solon's plea to the Athenians to capture Salamis. Generally speaking, political cohesion will not be a regularly featured aspect of the present discussion, but the reader should keep in mind that political undertones are present.

Cohesion in the ranks is the most vital to the safety and success of the soldier in battle. Solidarity in the ranks is clearly of the utmost importance when the dominant system of warfare is the hoplite phalanx. We do not get the sense in lyric poetry that soldiers needed to be convinced of this fact. Instead, its relation to motivation takes the form of motivating soldiers how to fight appropriately in battle, how to leverage their common plight to achieve success, and how to ensure they remain focused mentally and physically in battle formation. Tyrtaeus is the poet who will make the most overt guidance with respect to cohesion in the ranks. He will not only outline the importance of this type of cohesion, but also provide practical advice on how to achieve it.

c) Why Lyric Poetry?

One of the most defining features of Greek lyric is its ability to express the thoughts, cares, and feelings of the poets (or their personae) to the audience. Homer may describe countless battles and other martial scenes, but we never gain much knowledge of what he, the man and the poet, thinks about his subject matter.⁷ The lyric poets are free to express these ideas as much as they want. Even if we are to assume that the poets speak through the voice of a persona, we can reasonably assume that their expressions are legitimate and coherent in their

⁷ Homer can describe μάχη as ἀλεγεινή (e.g. *Il.* 18.248, 19.46, 20.43) and πόλεμος as στυγερός (e.g. *Il.* 4.240, 6.330) or δῆϊος (e.g. *Il.* 5.117, 7.119=174) and Zeus considers Ares ἔχθιστος...θεῶν (*Il.* 5.890). On the other hand he can also describe μάχη as κυδιάνειρα (e.g. *Il.* 4.225, 14.155, 24.391). West (1978) 144, n. on 15 comments that "the prevailing Homeric and later Greek attitude is that war is an evil." Given the collaborative process involved in the development of epic poetry it would be very difficult for the modern audience to discern the individual poet's voice from that of the tradition.

own society, even if they do not reflect the poet's personal views. The poets are not likely to produce work that is unintelligible or inconceivable to themselves or their audience, although they may deliberately try to subvert standard contemporary sentiments for a particular effect. These poems allow the modern audience to understand how certain people felt about these complex issues through their own words. In the study which follows I adhere to this method of deriving an expression of personal experience. Since these are the first recorded expressions of the Greeks on this matter, they are also the first in Western civilisation.⁸ With that being said, I will not make the case that the current discussion on motivation should speak for any other culture or any other period in time. Yet, in the back of our minds, we should be aware that these ideas could have had an impact on the development of political and social thought over the following centuries.

The majority of the lyric poets lived during the 7th and 6th centuries BC, which conveniently aligns with two major cultural and political developments in the Greek world: the development of the polis and of the hoplite army (with the introduction of coinage being a possible third). These were perhaps the two most important institutions along with colonisation for spreading and maintaining Greek culture.⁹ The Greek world became populated with numerous poleis that each stood as distinct political units with defined territory that could be contested by neighbours. Citizens were gradually allowed more control and power in the political

⁸ Hanson (2000) argues that our modern culture and civilisation, which owes so much to the Greeks, has a distinct approach to warfare.

⁹ Although colonisation was the most important of these developments to spread Greek culture further abroad, it is not as well reflected in lyric poetry discussing motivation and warfare and will consequently be less featured in this thesis. With that being said, Archilochus was a colonist and I will discuss how that may have played a role in shaping some of the thoughts expressed in his poems.

process which inevitably led to a greater sense of patriotism.¹⁰ At the same time the primary tactics of warfare shifted to the hoplite model where every citizen who could afford the appropriate armour could perform an equal role in combat.¹¹ Moreover, the tactics were designed to be successful only when every soldier had complete confidence and trust in the soldiers next to him. The development of the polis and the hoplite army led to a greater social, communal, and political cohesion as well as cohesion in the ranks, while simultaneously increasing the importance and power of the individual citizen in both the political and martial spheres. It is this increasing role of the individual in politics and warfare that makes the analysis of the motivations of soldiers in Greek lyric poetry, a genre that can reflect personal sentiments of the individual, a compelling study.

Since some of the earliest lyric poets are relatively close in time to Homer a careful analysis of similar themes between epic and lyric will prove a rewarding approach.¹² On one level, this study will be able to obtain a broader understanding of the Greek view of motivation with respect to warfare, complex as it may be. By analysing different styles of poetry, which depict a high degree of variation, we are able to gain a more comprehensive picture of what motivated the Greeks to risk their lives on the battlefield. Epic typically describes lone heroes fighting bravely in battle. Although this style of fighting clashes with hoplite warfare, it is how bravery is defined in epic that will be most relevant to our topic. In part, this study will analyse how lyric poets adapted epic notions of bravery, but placed them in a context that fitted their own

¹⁰ For sources on the Greek polis, see Welwei (1983), Hansen and Raaflaub (1995), Hansen and Raaflaub (1996), Nielsen (1997), Mitchell and Rhodes (1997), Flensted-Jensen (2000), Welwei (2000), Nielsen (2002), and Hansen (2006) with bibliography.

¹¹ For more information on hoplites, see Snodgrass (1964), Lazenby (1991), van Wees (2004) 47-60, Rawlings (2007) 81-103, Schwartz (2009), Krentz (2010) 44-60, Lacey (2011) 138-42, and Crowley (2012).

¹² Graziosi and Haubold (2009) 96 note the advantage of contrasting epic and elegy as a starting point. They also note that contrary to models of the development of Greek poetry that were common in the mid-20th century, “epic and lyric poetry mutually influenced and defined one another in the course of time.”

society. On another level, by analysing how each genre treats a similar subject, we gain a better understanding of the distinct traits of each respective genre. This approach allows us to better understand the nature of each genre and, when possible, the traits and tendencies of the respective poets. Although I will occasionally touch upon the *Odyssey* in this work, most of my use of epic will focus on the *Iliad*. Given the martial nature of the latter, this should not be too surprising to the reader.

2. Relative Chronology

While there are many lyric poets active during the archaic period, some of them will not be considered in this work because they simply did not write about martial themes (*e.g.* Anacreon and Alcman), or if they did, they did not do so in a way that is relevant to the more specific theme of motivation that is central to this research (*e.g.* Theognis, who treats politics and the city but not warfare). My original intent with this work was to limit the chronological scope to the 7th-6th centuries. There is an obvious advantage with examining a group of poets in a smaller chronological context. This approach would not only allow us to have a more concentrated sample of a particular period, but also allow for a more precise group of poetry closer in time to the epic poetry of Homer. My main concern in broadening the scope to include the 5th century is that the reader might expect or desire a fuller analysis of these themes in the later period in which they are also major preoccupations of drama and historiography. While I do not ignore these other genres when they seem most relevant to the discussion, to broaden the investigation to include them fully would be impossible within the restrictions of a thesis of this kind. It is with this same understanding that I consider the poetry of Pindar and Bacchylides. I do include some of their poems in the relevant discussions, but I consider their works to be at the far end of the discussion and not the central focal point. Thus, the lyric poets considered are:

Archilochus, Callinus, Tyrtaeus, Mimnermus, Alcaeus, Stesichorus, Solon, Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides.

In order to assess accurately the relationships between the works of the various poets in the lyric genre, it is crucial first to determine a relative chronology for the poets. This is a much simpler process for the later poets such as Alcaeus, Simonides, and Pindar, whose works can be tied to specific historical events. However, the earlier poets Archilochus, Callinus, and Tyrtaeus are more difficult to place in a relative chronology. Although there are hints of historical events in each of these poets' works, our knowledge of those events is plagued with uncertainty. Adding further to these complications is where Homer fits in with regard to these poets. Homer was generally assumed to have been the first of the known Greek poets whose work has survived, but there have been some new arguments and evidence that suggest that the issue is much more complex. The dating of Homer has been discussed by many scholars and I will not re-examine the complex web of evidence, but simply point the reader in the directions of other works. As for Archilochus, Callinus, and Tyrtaeus, I will briefly examine the evidence for their dating since they are likely to be less familiar to the reader.

There is perhaps no issue more fiercely contested in Homeric scholarship than when were the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* composed. The question itself is highly problematic because the poems belong to an oral tradition that endured for centuries.¹³ For the most part what we possess is simply the culmination of that tradition. Further complicating the matter is the evidence for interpolations introduced by later poets. There tend to be two main camps of thought: those who place the composition of the *Iliad* in the later 8th century and those who place it in the 7th century.

¹³ Page (1959) 218-96 examines the evidence for Mycenaean elements in the *Iliad*.

Page and Kirk offer a summary of evidence for placing the poems in the 8th century BC.¹⁴ West provides a summary of the main arguments and evidence for pushing the date of the composition of the *Iliad* forward into the first half of the 7th century.¹⁵ West has since re-examined the evidence and comes to the conclusion that the poem was composed “probably between 680 and 640.”¹⁶ Clearly this debate is still far from resolved.

There is very little evidence for dating Callinus. One of his fragments refers to the coming threat of the Cimmerians: νῦν δ’ ἐπὶ Κιμμερίων στρατὸς ἔρχεται ὀβριμοεργῶν (5). Strabo quotes this fragment and associates it with the fall of Sardis, which is dated to 652 according to the records of Assurbanipal (14.1.40).¹⁷ This provides us with reasonable cause to place Callinus in the mid-7th century, although we have no idea whether this was earlier in his career or later. Strabo also mentions that Callinus wrote about the Magnesians in their prosperity, whereas Archilochus wrote about them after their destruction (20) and reasons that the former must have been the earlier of the two (14.1.40), an argument supported by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 1.131.7-8). Gerber correctly points out that there may only have been a short period of time between the two poets.¹⁸ Furthermore, we do not know how late in their respective careers each poem was written. It is possible that Callinus wrote his poem early in his career and Archilochus wrote his late, which would place Archilochus earlier in a relative chronology.

¹⁴ Page (1955) 146-8, Kirk (1962) 287. Janko (1982) 228-31 provides tables of data taken from linguistic analysis and offers a composition date of 750-725, although the dates suggested are not intended to be definitive or absolute. Burgess (2001) 52-3 points out the danger of assuming the rate of change is constant, to which Janko (2012) has recently replied (among other counter-arguments to his original work).

¹⁵ West (1995). Some of the scholars he cites are Burkert (1976), who examines the possibility that the wealthy Egyptian Thebes of book 9 in the *Iliad* refers to the 25th dynasty in the later 7th-early 6th centuries, van Wees (1994a), van Wees (1994b), and van Wees (1988), who examines the style of fighting depicted in the *Iliad* and compares it to known historical practices, and Lorimer (1950) who examines the archaeological evidence in comparison to the depictions of objects in Homer.

¹⁶ West (2011) 19.

¹⁷ Campbell (1967) 161.

¹⁸ Gerber (1999) 95.

Pausanias tells us that Callinus knew of Homer and attributed the *Thebaid* to him (9.9.5). We should always be careful about such late sources providing specific details about events of centuries past, but if Pausanias was indeed referring to the Ephesian poet, we might assume that he had access to some or all of Callinus' work.¹⁹ Given West's latest arguments trying to push the date of Homer forward, it is possible that Callinus could have been a contemporary of Homer. Thus, we must feel content in placing Callinus in the mid-7th century, although we must be willing to accept a margin of error of about a generation.

When attempting to determine a relative date for Tyrtaeus, we must first deal with the cloudy details surrounding the Messenian Wars. Tyrtaeus mentions the wars and their outcome in a few of his fragments: Messene was first captured by the Spartans under King Theopompus in a campaign that lasted 20 years (5), and the Messenians were subjected to harsh treatment after their defeat (6, 7).²⁰ According to Strabo Tyrtaeus composed other poems, now lost, which located the second war in his own lifetime (8.4.10). As he still is today, Tyrtaeus was one of the most important sources for the Messenian Wars in Ancient Greece. Even in antiquity this was very problematic because historians were forced to draw details out of his poems that were not necessarily meant to be taken literally, and yet the difficulties are further compounded today as

¹⁹ Scott (1921) 22 calls into question whether Pausanias was referring to our Callinus at all, and posits that "it is unlikely that Callinus ever wrote any literary discussion, so even if all the manuscripts had the name Callinus, it would then be necessary to prove that the Callinus intended was the poet of Ephesus." While these are fair points to make, we do not need to assume that Callinus would have made this statement in a literary discussion, for such references to Homer have been made in poetry elsewhere, such as Simonides' Plataea Elegy, in which he alludes to Homer. On the other hand any reference by Callinus to Homer and the *Thebaid* must have been much more specific for Pausanias to make this statement. Davison (1968) 81-2 cautions that this quotation of Pausanias depends on two emendations. Even if they are correct, and this is generally regarded to be the case, at best Pausanias' reference is consistent with the other evidence to suggest that Callinus followed Homer.

²⁰ Cartledge (2002) 102 discusses the length of the war, stating "the figure is suspect as being twice the length of the Trojan War. There is no reason, however, for doubting that the war was a long drawn out affair nor that (not for the last time) the final resistance centred on the low mountain bastion of Ithome." Although I am not as suspicious about the war being twice the length of the Trojan War, I do believe Cartledge is right that we need not doubt that the war was long.

we possess so little of the Tyrtaean corpus.²¹ Despite these problems modern scholars have sifted through the evidence attempting to reach reliable conclusions on the dating of the Messenian Wars and consequently Tyrtaeus himself. Parker places the first war in the early 7th century, 690-670 BC, and tentatively places the second war between 635-600 BC.²² Whether Tyrtaeus was a young poet at the start of the second war or already a senior member of the community is impossible to say, although it may be telling that he speaks with the voice of a veteran in his poetry.

The dating of Archilochus is made slightly easier by two datable references he makes in his poetry: the first is to Gyges the king of Lydia (19) and the second to a solar eclipse datable to either 711 or 648 BC (122).²³ Upon reviewing all of the evidence available to us, Jacoby tentatively comes to the conclusion that Archilochus lived between 680-640 BC, and notes “the Gyges poem retains its value as the fundamental evidence, being in all probability not composed in the beginning of the king’s reign; the possibility that it was composed after the king’s death cannot be wholly excluded.”²⁴ More recent scholarship has shown that, according to the inscriptions of Assurbanipal, Gyges died later than 652, the date which was thought firm by many including Jacoby, and possibly as late as 644 BC.²⁵ This does not change Jacoby’s chronology in any significant way, but it does allow us to expand the window of Archilochus’ floruit by a decade or so. Thus, Archilochus has a fairly solid window of the middle decades in

²¹ Bowie (2001) 47 while discussing fragment 5 rightly observes that “we cannot be sure that its context was one of narrative rather than exhortation.” Considering the fact that this fragment was assembled from three different ancient sources (Paus. 4.6.5 for lines 1-2, Schol. Plat. *Leg* 629a for line 3, and Strabo 6.3.3 for lines 4-8), our understanding of its context is almost non-existent. Our interpretation of these lines could completely change depending on whether this was an exhortative poem rather than a narrative.

²² Parker (1991) 42.

²³ Given the other historical evidence tied to Archilochus, the 648 date is more favourable. This poem, which seems to be the only recorded reference to this eclipse, is named “The Archilochus Eclipse” by NASA. <http://eclipse.gsfc.nasa.gov/SEhistory/SEhistory.html>. Accessed on November 11th, 2012.

²⁴ Jacoby (1941) 109. Brown (1997) 43 ff. re-examines the evidence and does not feel compelled to alter the dates.

²⁵ Cogan and Tadmor (1977), Spalinger (1978). On the other hand, Lavelle (2002) reviews the evidence and argues that Archilochus was likely active at least a decade earlier than the mid-7th century.

the 7th century and there is some on-going debate whether he falls on the earlier side or the later side.

As for how all of these poets align chronologically, the evidence suggests that the careers of Archilochus and Callinus overlapped in the mid-7th century. Tyrtaeus was the latest of the three, but he may have followed the other two by as little as a decade or two. The Suda states that Mimnermus had his floruit in the 37th Olympiad [632-28] (M 1077), which would make him a direct contemporary of Tyrtaeus if we accept that Tyrtaeus was active early in the second Messenian War.²⁶ Since there is a greater discrepancy with the dating of Homer among scholars, we must come to a less satisfactory conclusion. On one view of the chronology, Homer is clearly a predecessor to all of the other poets analysed in this research, and on the other view, Homer was a direct contemporary if not slightly later than some of the poets in question. Even if Homer was a contemporary to some of these poets, there is no direct evidence that they knew each other's work or had a direct influence on each other. For the sake of argument we must accept the possibility that Homer was a likely near-contemporary to all of the early poets in question; but we can feel confident that although they may not have known each other's work, they would have at least been intimately familiar with each other's traditions.

The careers of the remaining poets discussed in this work have relative dates that are less uncertain, although in some cases the external sources such as Eusebius and the Suda are hardly reliable.²⁷ Strabo tells us that Alcaeus wrote of his brother Antimenidas fighting as an ally of the Babylonians (13.2.3). Hutchinson reasons that this was probably before the death of Nebuchadnezzar II in 562 BC and later than 605 BC and comments that Alcaeus' reference to

²⁶ Gerber (1997) 108-9 notes that these dates are generally accepted.

²⁷ Mosshammer (1979) 84-112 addresses the difficulties in interpreting early Greek chronography.

Babylon and Ascalon (48.10-11) should be dated no later than 582 BC.²⁸ The Suda puts him in the 42nd Olympiad [612-608 BC] (Σ 107). Truthfully none of this evidence is overwhelmingly sound, but we must make the most of what we possess. Since the latter two sources provide a set of dates that are the least consistent with the other evidence, we should place less credence in them. Thus, we can reason that Alcaeus can be dated to the early decades of the 6th century.

The Suda dates the birth of Stesichorus to the 37th Olympiad [632-28 BC] and his death to the 56th [556-552 BC] (Σ 1095). Campbell observes that this timeframe coincides with other details about his life including the fact that Simonides speaks about Stesichorus in the past tense.²⁹ Hutchinson cautiously takes the agnostic view.³⁰ West examines the meagre evidence and argues that Stesichorus was not active before 560 and was likely active in 560-540 BC, which makes the Suda's date for his death inaccurate.³¹ The Suda places Solon's floruit in the 47th Olympiad [592-588] (Σ 776), which is close to his archonship.³² As for Simonides the Suda offers two different birth dates: the 56th Olympiad [556-552 BC] or the 62nd Olympiad [532-528 BC] (Σ 439).³³ Regardless of his exact birth date, we do know that he wrote poems commemorating the events of the Persian Wars (531 commemorates Leonidas, 532-536 point to a poem about Artemisium, and the Plataean elegy adds a fresh example). Pindar's earliest datable poem is *Pythian* 10 (498 BC) and his last is *Pythian* 8 (446 BC).³⁴ The earliest known poem by Bacchylides is 13 (485 or 483 BC) and the latest is 6 (452 BC).³⁵ In some cases there are

²⁸ Hutchinson (2001) 187.

²⁹ Campbell (1991) 3. Robbins (1997) 234-5 comments that these dates "are generally accepted as not unlikely and would put his long working life almost wholly within the sixth century."

³⁰ Hutchinson (2001) 116-7.

³¹ West (1971) 302-6.

³² There are two possible dates provided by the Suda, but Gerber (1997) 113 flatly rejects the latter date as "manifestly wrong".

³³ Stella (1946) argues that the later date is correct. Molyneux (1992) makes the generally accepted argument that we should follow the earlier dating.

³⁴ Race (1997) 366, 336 respectively.

³⁵ Campbell (1992) 189, 155 respectively.

discrepancies with the exact dates of these poets, but in terms of a relative chronology we have a fairly clear picture.

3. Chapter Overview

I will now provide a brief summary of the four main chapters in this work. **Chapter 2: The Performance of Exhortative Elegy** will focus on the setting of the performance and the audience. As I will argue throughout this thesis that the motivation of soldiers in lyric poetry is ultimately concerned with establishing and maintaining social, communal, political cohesion as well as cohesion in the ranks, it will first be important to establish that the performance of martial elegy could take place in a public setting and perhaps even favoured such a setting. Consensus seems to place the performance of this sub-genre, like most sub-genres of elegy, strictly in the symposium. Although some reasoned arguments have been made to place it in the symposium, much of the evidence can be interpreted in more than one way, making the possibility of it being placed in a public performance a tenable hypothesis. A public setting is instrumental in establishing cohesion throughout the polis. Not only does the physical act of attending a performance together foster communal bonds, but it is where the community can learn and reinforce these ideals together. A public setting in this context can also have a powerful effect on members of the community who do not live up to communal expectations. A disapproving gaze from one's neighbours can be a powerful tool in creating exclusion and isolation when attending a performance of this type. In this chapter I not only seek to re-examine the evidence, but also offer some new arguments and make a greater attempt at interpreting the poems as complete units performed in a public setting. I am not only concerned with making the case for a public performance context of exhortative elegy, but also that we can learn more about

the Archaic Greek communal focus of the motivation for war when we interpret these poems in this context.

In **Chapter 3: Defense of Family and Home** I begin with the idea that the community begins with the home. Poems that describe motivations relating to the defense of family and home ultimately have the defense of the community at heart. While the defense of Troy may be the chief example of this theme in Greek literature, it is also a common theme in lyric poetry. Tyrtaeus emphasises the family as a means to illustrate the impact a soldier's actions have on them and by extension the community at large. Alcaeus has a different perspective; he is someone isolated and deprived of his possessions by his community split by civil war. Poetry that promotes and values the motivation to defend family and property frames the discussion to emphasise the community in terms most personal to the individual soldier. When this act occurs across the community at large, it harmonises the micro level of the familial unit with the macro level community. The family is a sub-unit of the community and thus fighting to protect the family is ultimately fighting to protect the community. I then analyse this topic from the reverse perspective; using predatory gains as a motivation for warfare. It will become clear in this discussion that contrary to the frequent depiction of predatory gains in epic, such acts are minimised in lyric poetry at a personal level, although still exist at communal level. This is a natural shift in a body of poetry that seeks to cast the importance of the individual only as he or she pertains to the community. The motivation for warfare is linked to communal cohesion at every level. I conclude this chapter by taking a step back and looking at this theme from a higher level. If the family is a sub-unit of the polis, is there any sense that the polis is a sub-unit of a greater community? The epigrams attributed to Simonides have many examples of poems extolling the virtues of dying in defense of the polis, but also in defense of freedom, which is

perhaps equally powerful. As a final point to this discussion I explore if there is any trace of an overarching Greek nationality contained within these poems.

In **Chapter 4: Mutual Benefit: Citizen and Polis** I examine passages that describe the reciprocal relationship that exists between the soldiers and the state whereby the state requires its male citizen population to fight and potentially die on its behalf, while in return the soldiers receive certain benefits from the community. I examine passages outlining repercussions for soldiers neglecting their role in society as well as passages describing the rewards for soldiers that take up their socially designated roles. I will explore why the former is more heavily represented in the sources and what this tells us about motivation and the relationship between citizen and polis. Since these passages are ultimately about motivation with respect to relationships in the community, we will see different examples of social, communal, political cohesion as well as cohesion in the ranks. This allows us to explore roles related to gender and age and how the community as a whole honours sacrifice. The lyric poets do not simply describe the nature of these roles, but how soldiers can meet the expectations placed on them by the community. The concept of death on the battlefield is ever present when discussing the motivation to fight. How the community treats the war-dead has a profound impact on the community at large. Not only do the families and comrades of the deceased get a chance to pay respect for the sacrifice, but it also reinforces to the community that just as they now honour the current war-dead, the same too will happen should a soldier die on the battlefield in the future. The act of memorial itself is an instance of communal cohesion, but it also ensures communal cohesion in the future.

The lyric depiction of gods motivating soldiers will be the focus of **Chapter 5: Gods and Heroes on the Battlefield**. This motif of divine intervention is manipulated in many different

ways in epic, and in this chapter I am interested in how the lyric poets exploit this same motif to create new effects. There are two different ways poets tend to reinvent this motif: they either depict a style of intervention between god and soldier similar to what one would find in epic, but recast it in a new setting or company of mortals, or they create new ways for the gods to intervene on the mortal battlefield. I am interested in both of these scenarios and how they relate to the epic depiction of this motif. It is perhaps in this chapter that we are best able to witness the freedom and flexibility of the lyric poets in recasting epic motifs in new forms. There are several dynamics with how this topic relates to the motivation of soldiers. The characters within a poem are being directly motivated by the gods. This is true of the Homeric heroes, but as we shall see, the lyric poets are able to decrease the epic distance, the temporal distance existing between subject matter and audience, by having the gods intervene in battles much closer to their audience, perhaps even contemporary battles. Thus, it is not simply a case of the gods motivating a hero from a bygone era, but a recent or current member of one's polis. This casts soldiers as role models to the community at large. This concept will continue to evolve until a hero from the remote past can play a similar role as the gods did in Homer. Thus, we will have poems that depict soldiers being motivated by divine agents and in turn, these poems motivate and inspire the audience with exempla of bravery. We will even see how poets can finely attune the divine agents to ones most applicable to the community.

4. Definition of Terms

In order to proceed, it is important that I define certain terms to the reader for the sake of clarity.

a) Lyric Poetry

There are generally two different ways of understanding the term ‘lyric poetry’. The comprehensive definition incorporates all genres of poetry in use during the 7th and 6th centuries BC except for epic. For this purpose didactic or theogonic poetry in hexameters, as represented by Hesiod and the Hesiodic corpus, is normally categorised as ‘epic’. This view allows for many different categories of poetry to fall under the umbrella of ‘lyric’, which can embrace a wide range of metres and types of poem, as well as a variety of performance contexts, whether by individual singer or choruses.³⁶ The restrictive view excludes the sub-genres of elegy and iambic as distinct genres. Throughout this research I will use the comprehensive definition. The main argument for doing so is that the restricted definition strikes me as an artificial constraint placed on the work of the poets who would not likely have defined themselves in this way. Moreover, these limitations tend to separate poets because of the sheer chance that some genres of their poetry survive while others do not. Tyrtaeus tends to be viewed as an elegist simply because only fragments of his elegies survive. The Suda attributes to him both elegies and melic poetry (τ 1205). If we accept this as true, then surely Tyrtaeus would not have defined himself as an ‘elegiac poet’ or a ‘melic poet’, but purely a ‘poet’ who makes use of many genres (as opposed to the epic bard). Similarly Simonides, for one, composed both lyric in the stricter sense and elegiacs. Since the term ‘poet’ is too imprecise, we must settle on something more specific, but perhaps not entirely satisfying. As Budelmann states, the term lyric is “an anachronistic but convenient term referring to all the poetry under discussion.”³⁷ It is with this understanding that I will use the term ‘lyric poetry’, with the comprehensive definition in mind, and not feel constrained by discussing the relevant sub-genres when appropriate.

³⁶ For discussions on generic subdivision ancient and modern, see Harvey (1955), Davies (1988), Carey (2009) with bibliography, and Battezzato (2009).

³⁷ Budelmann (2009) 3.

b) Exhortative Elegy

There is one further definition of a sub-genre that I must make clear in order to proceed: exhortative elegy. The elegies of Archilochus, Tyrtaeus, and Callinus can all be understood as martial elegies. They each write about various aspects of warfare while using elegiac couplets. However, there is a distinction to be made between any elegy with a martial theme and the exhortative poetry of Callinus 1 and Tyrtaeus 10-12. The latter are primarily concerned with communicating directly with the audience, which I will argue in the next chapter can be public and of considerable size, and with promoting certain ideals. The martial elegies of Archilochus, some of which contain references to drinking and/or the symposium, on the other hand, tend to be more akin to social commentary and descriptions of warfare, and do not directly engage with or address the audience. Not all of the elegies of Tyrtaeus are exhortative and several seem to belong in a group with those of Archilochus (*e.g.* Tyrt. 19, 23). When discussing Callinus 1 and Tyrtaeus 10-12, I deliberately use the term exhortative elegy to signify them as poems belonging to a distinct sub-genre. To be sure, the epigrams attributed to Simonides are as distinct from exhortative elegies as are Archilochus' martial elegies.³⁸

c) Moral Tableau

The more I examined the exhortative elegies of Callinus and Tyrtaeus, the more I started noticing a particular poetic device used by both poets. At various points in their elegies the poets employ short but highly evocative and impersonal 3rd person narratives to emphasise a point be it positive or negative, which I designate as moral tableaux. Since these exhortative elegies tend to be short, certainly so when compared to epic, the poet is limited in terms of including dialogue.

³⁸ Discussion of the epigrams attributed to Simonides will occur when appropriate. I will state here and elsewhere that I am not concerned with the matter of authorship. The poet's name is largely irrelevant to the discussion. I am more concerned with what is said in the epigrams so long as they are relatively contemporary to each other.

The use of speech in elegy is rare, and there is no evidence that elegies of this length were able to incorporate characters and have them converse through dialogue. The epic bard has such flexibility and is able to have his characters express their thoughts on any number of issues and have other characters react to those utterances. Due to the limitation of the genre, the exhortative poet must employ different tactics. The moral tableau is particularly effective in exhortative elegy because it allows the audience members to empathise with the unnamed 3rd person figure and imagine themselves in that position. Thus, in Tyrtaeus 10, when the poet uses a moral tableau to depict an unnamed soldier living as a vagabond wandering with his family because he has failed in his social and martial commitments, the audience members are able to envisage themselves and their families in that position. Suddenly the individual audience members are able to make a direct, emotional connection to the message delivered by the poet. Had Tyrtaeus painted this same scene with a specific and named character, there would have been a greater distance between the figure in the poem and the audience member. Thus, the moral tableau is not only an inventive way of depicting emotional scenes without using specific characters, it is also effective in relaying that message to the intended audience members and provides flexibility for re-performance.

Chapter 2: The Performance of Exhortative Elegy

The focus of this chapter will be on the performance of exhortative martial elegy. I will argue that when examining motivation in this type of poetry, the setting and audience can enhance and add weight to the themes present in the poems. I will further argue that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that there are a variety of performance contexts where this type of poetry could be performed, the most important of which for the purposes of this discussion are large public performances because these poems often employ themes of shame and nemesis, two concepts largely rooted in the community both in terms of execution (*i.e.* how a community member responds to a situation and how their fellow citizens perceive their response) and in terms of education (*i.e.* how these concepts can be explored in poetry in order to depict exemplary citizen models to the citizen body at large). There are only three poems that I comfortably fit into this category (Callinus 1 and Tyrtaeus 10 and 11), and a further two that are possible, but debateable (Tyrtaeus 12 and Solon's Salamis fr. 1-3). The chief distinctions between these two categories are that the former make a direct address in the vocative to the audience; (ὦ νέοι, Callinus 1.2, Tyrtaeus 10.15, 11.10), they make extensive use of 2nd person plural imperatives, and do not make references to the poet or his persona. I tentatively place the second group apart because they do not address the audience in the vocative and in both the poet makes use of the 1st person singular. The distinctions are important since we need to be aware of the potential impact of the poet's persona on our interpretation of the poems. The instillation of the ideals through the public performance of these poems function in tandem with the ideas and ideals largely shared and part of their inheritance from epic.

In this chapter I will first look at the argument for the sympotic performance of martial elegy and discuss some problems I perceive therein, while examining some new evidence from epic and lyric when appropriate. Based on the conclusions of these examinations I will provide a reading of the opening lines of Callinus 1 from the perspective of large public performance as a model to understand how the performance context can impact our understanding of the poems and how the relationships between poet, poem, and audience affect social, communal, and political cohesion as well as cohesion in the ranks.

1. Martial Elegy in a Private Context

In order to understand what contexts would be appropriate for the performance of martial elegy, it will be helpful to examine Callinus 1 as a model for analysing this sub-genre and its performance contexts, which can then be applied to other poems in the same sub-genre. Callinus 1 is a natural choice for this approach since it is shorter and yet succinct, it addresses its audience in the vocative and 2nd person plural imperatives, which are two qualities that allow for different interpretations of performance contexts (and can shape our understanding of a poem when performed in different contexts), and it encompasses many of the ideas that will be explored throughout this dissertation relating to motivation (*e.g.* positive and negative reinforcement, civic values, protection of state, etc.). Furthermore, it has also been the poem most often discussed by modern scholars concerning the performance of martial elegy.

This section will seek to address several important questions. Firstly, does the verb *κατάκεισθαι* in Callinus need to refer specifically to lying on a couch at the symposium? If it does not, can our knowledge of other sources suggest different contexts? This does not imply that we should exclude the symposium, only that we ought to consider other contexts as well. I will first provide an overview of differing opinions in scholarship on the subject and note that

recent scholarship heavily favours the symposium only model by applying the interpretation of Callinus 1 to similar poems in the sub-genre. In order to engage with this scholarship I will then examine what our sources tell us about Callinus' addressees, the νέοι. From there I will examine uses of the verb *κατάκειμαι* in other sources to better inform our understanding of how Callinus uses the word. I will then consider some intriguing parallels from the speeches Thucydides and Demosthenes in order to understand the practicality of interpreting Callinus' arguments from the perspective of a large public performance. All of these steps are critical to achieve because not only will they inform us about the relationship between poem and audience (including the addressees) with regard to important cultural concepts such as shame and nemesis, but also help us understand how Callinus develops his argument throughout the poem in effort to motivate and educate his audience to adopt the appropriate behaviour. This last point can have the dual effect of correcting the behaviour of youth who may have erred in their way while re-enforcing important social values across the community at large. It is important to lay this groundwork now since the role of public performance plays in shaping our understating of exhortative elegy is a formative backbone to many of my arguments in subsequent chapters.

a) A Brief History of Scholarship

Until recently there has been a variety of opinions on the performance setting of exhortative elegies. Much of the discussion has centred on interpretations of Callinus 1 and whether or not we ought to place it in a sympotic setting or some other more public setting. Fränkel takes Callinus 1 as an exhortation, noticing similarities between it and Homer (*Il.* 2.797; 4.371).¹ Campbell, in response to Reitzenstein² and Bowra³ who argue for a sympotic setting,

¹ Fränkel (1951) 171. For the English translation, see Fränkel (1975) 153.

² Reitzenstein (1893) 46.

³ Bowra (1960) 42-3.

argues that we need not believe “that the scene is convivial and that the men are lying idly at a feast’.”⁴ Although Campbell is clear that he does not follow Reitzenstein and Bowra, he unfortunately does not provide any theories of his own on the performance context. Verdenius, following Fränkel, compares this passage to Homer (*Il.* 5.782-3).⁵ West takes a more detailed approach than his predecessors and offers eight different occasions at which he believes elegy (*n.b.* not only exhortative elegy) could have been performed, citing specific texts for each: there is about to be a battle, a less formal military setting, the ordinary civilian symposium, the κῶμος, a public meeting, quickly-improvised pieces in public, funerals, and aulodic competitions.⁶ Bowie places longer narrative based elegies, of which there are a few examples (*e.g.* Mimnermus’ *Smyrneis*), in a public festival setting.⁷

For over the past quarter century the general consensus on the performance of the sub-genre of exhortative elegy has placed it, along with most types of elegy, exclusively in the symposium. Scholars such as Tedeschi, Bowie, and Murray have been the most vocal in advancing this theory.⁸ Bowie disregards the idea that Callinus 1 was performed before a battle or that it was performed in a public assembly since the charge of idleness would be insulting to the audience of either setting. While I agree with this assessment of the former, the latter is worthy of further debate. Ultimately he favours interpreting the verb κατάκεισθε of line 1 in a literal sense (*i.e.* the youth are physically lying down and not lying idle in a more general sense) and notes:

⁴ Campbell (1967) 163, n. on 1.

⁵ Verdenius (1972) 2.

⁶ West (1974) 10-3.

⁷ Bowie (1986).

⁸ Bowie (1986); Tedeschi (1978); Bowie (1990); and Murray (1991) are widely recognised as the most influential scholars arguing in favour of this theory, although they do follow Reitzenstein and Bowra.

Although there may have been other contexts of relaxation at which elegies are sung, in the absence of positive evidence for such contexts we ought to have little hesitation in opting for the one where we do know that *neoi* (addressed in Callinus' second line) gathered together and sang elegies, the *symposion*.⁹

Current scholarship regards Bowie's arguments as the authoritative source on the performance of elegy (including exhortative martial elegy), placing it squarely in a sympotic context.¹⁰ Irwin in her publication on archaic poetry, which, in part, "seeks to defamiliarise the genre of martial exhortation poetry, to help us unlearn what we think we know about this poetry and its historical significance," accepts the symposium model without re-examining the evidence herself.¹¹ Aloni states "the use of the verb *κατάκεισθαι* ('lie') at line 1 is clear evidence of the sympotic context of this elegy."¹² Cazzato emphatically states "that martial elegy, like all shorter elegy, belonged to (some form of) the symposium has become a matter of scholarly orthodoxy since Ewen Bowie formulated his powerful arguments to this effect."¹³ Scholarship has moved past debating the issue and regrettably accepts it as fact.¹⁴ While I agree that the symposium was of tremendous importance to the performance of elegy, I disagree that we should envision the symposium as the only suitable context for the performance of exhortative martial elegy. Furthermore, by limiting the scope only to the symposium, we ignore (and perhaps trivialise) the rhetorical quality of the poetry.

⁹ Bowie (1990) 223.

¹⁰ Pellizer (1990) 180.

¹¹ Irwin (2005) 18.

¹² Aloni (2009) 171.

¹³ Cazzato (2014).

¹⁴ Lulli (2016) 203ff. stands out as an example of recent scholarship that is content to place elegy in a variety of performance contexts. Thus, Archilochus's elegies could have been performed in large, public performances (*e.g.* at festivals), Tyrtaeus would have been performed in the *syssitia*, and Solon could have performed before the Agora. Lulli is careful to note that some of the evidence is debateable, but her interpretation is plausible in every case. Unfortunately, Lulli's views currently appear to be in the minority. We need not envision that these elegies *only* would have been performed in these contexts, only that it was possible they could have been. We can then take the next logical step and study what effects the public performance of these poems would have had on the audience.

b) Exhortative Elegy's Audience – The νέοι

Since the role of the νέοι is the focus of the poem, it is worthwhile examining the evidence for who they were in order to better understand this poem and the theories about its performance context. They fight for their country, children, and wives; γῆς πέρι καὶ παίδων κουριδίης τ' ἀλόχου (1.7). Tyrtaeus has the νέοι as the central audience for his poem (11.10), and here too they are men of fighting age. Tyrtaeus makes a further comment about νέοι that it is a shameful thing for them to let the older men fight up front and die while they themselves hide from battle (10.21-2), thus differentiating them from the older men that are still capable of fighting. Homer uses the word to describe men of fighting age (*Il.* 11.503). Antinous uses it to describe Telemachus as a νέος πάϊς (*Od.* 4.665). Telemachus is clearly an adult of at least twenty years of age and so in this example, it is meant to have an insulting and belittling tone when coupled with πάϊς. For Solon, men were in their prime of physical prowess when they were between the ages of twenty-two and twenty-eight (19.7-8), but it was not until they were of the ages between twenty-nine and thirty-five that they sought out wives and children (27.9-10). Xenophon's Charicles is a bit more restrictive, describing young men as those under thirty years old (*X. Mem.* 1.2.35). The difference between Solon and Xenophon could either reflect the perception of the word by the writer or a slight change in meaning over the two centuries separating the men. Of course, the difference could also be that Solon was expressing his creative license to show the change and advancement of a man's life through 7 year groupings. Thus, it seems that the νέοι in Callinus were in their twenties and early thirties.¹⁵ These men were the prime defenders of the city.

¹⁵ Verdenius (1972) 345 suggests that we could assume the νέοι to be anyone under the age of fifty on the basis that in Tyrtaeus, they are contrasted with the older soldiers who have grey hair. Verdenius seems to select arbitrarily fifty as the age when one begins to turn grey. Perhaps Verdenius was fortunate enough in life, but fifty seems like an

The approximate ages of the νέοι also agree with some statements of Plato and Aristotle about the ideal ages for one to begin drinking, which is an important element of the symposium. Plato comments that men under the age of eighteen should not drink at all while men under thirty should only drink in moderation (*Lg.* 666 a-b). Aristotle says that boys ought not to attend iambic and comic performances before they are of the age to recline and drink (*Pol.* 7.1336b). We must not depend too much on these comments because the fact that Plato and Aristotle believed in such an age restriction does not mean that it was practised regularly in the 4th century, let alone the 7th century during the life of Callinus, but it is convenient that these details all seem to agree.

We must also consider the number of guests that might reasonably be expected to attend a symposium. Although there were exceptions to this general rule, the typical dining room came in two different sizes; one that could hold seven couches and one that could hold eleven.¹⁶ Both of these styles of rooms are found in the archaic period. The typical use of these couches was that each one was occupied by one adult male guest, while an adolescent sat nearby; however, in the classical period there are representations on Attic black and red-figure pottery where both the adult male and the adolescent are sitting together.¹⁷ If we consider Callinus 1 in a sympotic setting, it could have consisted of the νέοι as the primary addressees, while the adolescents, who were not of fighting age, could have listened as an exercise in virtue.

In Plato's *Symposium*, there were eight participants who were main characters in the narrative including Alcibiades, who showed up late. However, there were others mentioned

extraordinarily high age for men to turn grey. Furthermore, even if men were fortunate enough to live to the ideal age of seventy, according to Solon, that would mean that people ought to be considered young for roughly seventy percent of their life. This is difficult to accept. Instead, we should follow the guideline depicted in all of the ancient sources and stick with an age in the late twenties or early thirties.

¹⁶ McCartney (1934) examines the use of the term κλίνη as a unit of measurement. See also Bergquist (1990) 37 and Murray (2009) 511-2.

¹⁷ Boardman (1990) 126; Bremmer (1990) 142.

twice although not by name (180C, 218B). Similarly, in Xenophon's *Symposium*, there were 10 participants including Philip who showed up late. In both of these classical examples, the number of guests at a symposium is rather small and seems to support the archaeological evidence. Athenaeus' symposium has twenty-three participants including Athenaeus himself and the host Larensis, roughly twice the size of Plato's and Xenophon's. Since Athenaeus wrote in the late second or early third century AD, we should not be concerned that his symposium is significantly bigger than the classical examples.¹⁸ What we can gather from these details is that the audience at a typical symposium was rather small. If we are to envision Callinus rousing up the younger soldiers while at a symposium, he would have had to do it to less than a dozen at a time. This hardly seems the medium to convey such a powerful message to the fighting populace as a whole. Furthermore, his use of *véoi* suggests some level of authority over his audience. This leads us to envision a private gathering composed of a dozen younger members of society and one older attendee, who is there to scold them.¹⁹ This does not preclude this type of poem from being performed in a symposium, but if this were the only performance context for this poem, it would make transmission more burdensome.

c) Performance Contexts of Tyrtaeus (and Homer)

Now that we have a better understanding of Callinus' addresses, it will be helpful to examine what the external sources tell us about the performance settings of the poems of Tyrtaeus in order to provide more context for how we ought to read Callinus. We are fortunate to have some ancient evidence on the function and performance context of his poetry; however it is all considerably later than Tyrtaeus. There is a dilemma involved in that these sources seem

¹⁸ Olson (2006) vii.

¹⁹ Schmitt-Pantel (1997) 46-2 compares the social dynamics of communal dining at a public sacrifice and the symposium.

plausible when we read Tyrtaeus, and so we might be tempted to believe them, but on the other hand, these sources may have fabricated these ideas by reading his poetry and not from any legitimate external sources. This does not disprove the sources, but is a reminder that we must be conscious of these perils when consulting them. The *Suda* (iv.610.5 Adler) identifies two distinct forms of martial poetry attributed to Tyrtaeus, ὑποθήκας δι' ἐλεγείας, καὶ μέλη πολεμιστήρια. Gerber places fragments 10-12 and 18-23a in the former category while noting that no examples of the latter survive.²⁰ Since ὑποθήκας is translated as instructions or advice, this statement obviously fits what little we possess of Tyrtaeus' elegies. Lycurgus mentions that Tyrtaeus composed the poems ὧν ἀκούοντες παιδεύονται πρὸς ἀνδρείαν (*Leocr.* 106), again stressing the instructional role of his poetry. Diodorus Siculus asserts that the teachings of Tyrtaeus were successful since under his leadership the Spartans were ready to die if victory was not possible (8.27.1-2). This last statement smacks of fabrication, but it is still reasonable to surmise that Tyrtaeus' poetry may have played a role in the development of the Spartan army as well as assisted with maintaining cohesion in society.

Philochorus, writing in the 4th-3rd century BC, states that while on campaign the Spartans would sing Tyrtaeus' songs after dinner and the best performance, as deemed by the polemarch acting as judge, would be awarded a prize of meat (Ath. 630f = Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F16). The detail that his poems were performed on campaign is noteworthy because it confirms that the poetry of Tyrtaeus played an important function to the Spartans while in the city and on campaign. Thus, a variation of performance contexts seems reasonable. Furthermore, the competitive element of this performance context coupled with the prize of food, lends itself to descriptions of symposia, but on campaign.

²⁰ Gerber (1999) 25 makes reference to frs. 856-57 *PMG* as examples of this type of poetry but notes that their spurious nature restricts him from identifying them as concrete examples of Tyrtaeus.

Lycurgus, writing in the 4th century BC states that during times of war everyone was called to the king's tent to listen to Tyrtaeus' elegies so that they would be willing to die for Sparta (Lycurg. in *Leocr.* 106). Bowie makes the intriguing observation that Lycurgus' ἅπαντας could refer to Xenophon's οἱ περὶ δαμοσίαν, who are described as μάντεις καὶ ἰατροὶ καὶ αὐληταὶ καὶ οἱ τοῦ στρατοῦ ἄρχοντες (Xen. *Lac.* 13.7) and that we should envision this as a sympotic setting.²¹ Certainly there is a tradition of these roles accompanying soldiers on campaign.²² However, with the exception of the military commanders, these are hardly the roles for whom the need to learn and absorb the ideals within Tyrtaeus' poetry was most critical. There is certainly no reason why men in these roles should not have listened to Tyrtaeus' poetry, only that the values expressed therein were crucial for maintaining Spartan discipline and needed to be heard across the entire citizen body. This can be inferred by Lycurgus' note that the Spartans listened to these poems so that they would be willing to die; the prophets, doctors, and flute players were not the front line soldiers.²³ Whether or not Lycurgus intended the word ἅπαντας to incorporate only this small subsection of all those marching on campaign is difficult to confirm. Certainly if such a restricted performance and audience did occur on campaign, it does not preclude that performances of the same poems occurred across all members of the army. Of course, if ἅπαντας was intended to include a more expansive audience, then it would more easily allow for the dissemination of Tyrtaeus' poetry.

It is worthwhile examining the Spartan institution of the syssitia because it allows for the dissemination of Tyrtaeus' poetry at a granular level. Plutarch in his *Life of Lycurgus* provides

²¹ Bowie (1990) 224-8.

²² Calchas joins the Greeks at Troy (*Il.* 1.68-100). For an overview of historical examples, see Pritchett (1979) 47-90. Likewise, Thucydides notes that the Spartans marched to flutes (5.70) in battle and this detail is mirrored in Plutarch (Lyc. 21). Pritchett (1971) notes the contribution of music for maintaining the unbroken phalanx and creating terror for the oncoming enemy.

²³ c.f. Tyrtaeus 10.1-2 τεθνάμεναι γὰρ καλὸν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι πεσόντα / ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν περὶ ἧ πατρίδι μαρνάμενον.

several noteworthy details about this institution. He notes that Lycurgus' intention for instituting the syssition to fight against luxury and greed (*Lyc.*10.1).²⁴ He specifically refers to lying on expensive couches and being fed luxury food by servants as activity to avoid. Whether tackling this specific problem was the intent or the effect of the institution of the syssitia is clearly difficult to say, but the fact that tradition records this effect taking place is noteworthy. Plutarch also notes the Spartan word for the syssitia was *phiditia*, which he attributed either to the sense of comradeship gained from the common dining or because the institution was meant to encourage thrift (*Lyc.* 12.1). In addition to the roughly 15 men who attended the syssition, boys were invited to receive education (*Lyc.* 12.2-4). It is here that the performance of poems likely took place given the content of Tyrtaeus' poems. In Plato's *Laws* Clinias describes the Cretan syssitia as being instituted because it made sense that since soldiers always dine together while on campaign, they should also do so at home (*Lg.* 625c-e). Thus it is reasonable that the performances of poetry would occur in the private messes at home and while on campaign, which would maintain cohesion in the community as well as in the ranks.

At first glance the syssition shares much in common with the symposium. It is a small gathering of people who share a meal and recite poetry. Scholars typically view the syssition as an institution that developed from the symposium.²⁵ Despite the commonalities between these two institutions, there are several important distinctions. Members of the syssition were elected at the age of twenty and maintained their position for life.²⁶ Furthermore, members were drawn from all social levels of Spartan citizens and were not restricted to being members of the elite

²⁴ Herodotus too attributes the institution of the syssitia to Lycurgus (1.65.5).

²⁵ See Hodkinson (2009) and Scott (2010) 177.

²⁶ Cartledge (2004) 70-1.

invited by the host.²⁷ The emphasis was on food, not wine; members were required to provide a monthly quota of food.²⁸ Thus, it is about sustenance and cohesion rather than extravagance. As Rabinowitz puts it “the syssition is public, moderate, harmonious, de-emphasises drinking and builds civic values; the symposion is private, excessive, fractious, celebrates wine and gives rise to elitist, anti-polis conspiracies”.²⁹ Not only did the syssition have a social function, but it also directly related to the formation of the army.³⁰ This is an institution that at its core promotes the values of social and communal cohesion as well as cohesion within the ranks. The buildings where the syssitia were held were civic structures located along the Hyakinthian way.³¹ This brings up another fundamental difference between the syssition and the symposium; the syssition was not a private gathering in the strictest sense. The doors may have been closed to non-members, but it is a civic institution that allowed for the performance and re-performance of poetry that expressed common civic values relating to social and communal cohesion and would have been recited in each syssition.

Pausanias provides further detail about the performance of Tyrtaeus’ poetry by noting that ὁ δὲ ἀφικόμενος ἰδίᾳ τε τοῖς ἐν τέλει καὶ συνάγων ὁπόσους τύχοι καὶ τὰ ἐλεγεία καὶ τὰ ἔπη σφίσι τὰ ἀνάπαιστα ᾗδεν (4.15.6). That there were two distinct audiences and settings for the performance of his elegies is important to note. There is nothing overt in his extant elegies that confirms this statement. He does address the hoplites in 10 and 11, and even the light-armed soldiers in 11, which suggests a more varied audience than Xenophon’s οἱ περὶ δαμοσίαν. In 12 he addresses no one and we could speculate that this is a sign of a smaller performance piece, although such a claim would be tenuous. The fact that in the poem 11 those who can afford the

²⁷ Hodkinson (2000) 217.

²⁸ Hodkinson (2000) 218.

²⁹ Rabinowitz (2009) 113.

³⁰ Hodkinson (2009) 448.

³¹ Cartledge (2001) 44.

best armour and those who are not able to afford the full hoplite panoply are individually addressed suggests that the audience was expansive across the entire Spartan citizen body. The Spartan syssition could have been one venue where soldiers of different status could have attended the same performance. However, Pausanias' statement that Tyrtaeus gathered as many people as he could for some of his performances suggests a much wider audience (perhaps even a public gathering at a civic festival). The smaller performances of Tyrtaeus could likely be in a sympotic setting, with the kings and other high ranking officials (perhaps in similar fashion to Philochorus' description) or the syssition, while the larger performances were for the majority of soldiers *en masse* (perhaps aligned with Lycurgus' description depending on your interpretation of ἅπαντας). Thus, we possess no evidence that can irrefutably deny Pausanias' statement and given the nature of Tyrtaeus' poetry and the likeliness of repeat performances, we should conclude that Pausanias' statement is reasonable.

Athenaeus provides a few important details: the Spartans had marching songs called ἐνόπλια, they marched in rhythm to the poetry of Tyrtaeus, which was recalled from memory, and they established a competition of reciting his poetry after dinner while on campaign (14.630f). From these details we can infer that there were indeed 'performances' of his poetry by soldiers dressed in arms.³² Thus, in this context the soldiers can neither be envisioned as sitting at a symposium (or at the syssition) nor standing or sitting in a large-scale public performance, but

³² Herington (1985) 33 notes of Tyrtaeus that "those who wish to imagine what it felt like to be a Greek hoplite waiting in the line for the enemy to attack will find no more vivid or terrifying descriptions than those in fr. 10.15-32W, 11.21-34, 12.10-22". Such poems can hardly have been chanted by the soldiers on the . He then goes on to describe the difficulties marking to elegy would cause a soldier given its rhythm. While I do agree with Herington's assessment of the vivid nature of Tyrtaeus' poetry, I cannot agree with his view of marching to elegy. Because of the very simple 1-2 beat of every elegiac foot (i.e. long-long, or long-short-short) the elegiac couplet is quite simple to recite while marching so long as the reciter obeys the very natural rule that the right foot comes down on the first beat of the foot (the 1st long) and the left foot comes down on the second beat (the 2nd long or 1st short). One might think that the two identical patterns that occur in the second line of a couplet might cause confusion, but since there is still an even number of beats (10), there is always a resolution and the right foot can comfortably begin the hexameter line of the next couplet. Truly, there is no easier metre to march to except for the consistent dactylic hexameter of epic, which was obviously not performed in this manner.

instead this poetry is performed while on the move. The soldiers may have been marching in the same company as their syssition, but the performance takes on a considerably different tone when the soldiers are marching toward their confrontation (or at least their camp). The recitation of poems extolling the virtues of fighting alongside your comrades and maintaining discipline all for the good of the state augment the ideals in those poems when soldiers perform them beside their comrades as they travel to battle (or at least march on campaign).

The sources demonstrate a considerable amount of variety in the performance settings of Tyrtaeus' poetry. They can be performed in the polis, both in intimate settings with the nobility and before large-scale audiences. They can also be performed in the Spartan syssition, an institution that favours solidarity amongst a tight-knit group of soldiers. They can also be performed while on campaign and there is evidence that the campaign settings could incorporate smaller, intimate settings as well as large-scale performances (depending on one's reading of ἄπαντας). The poems could also be performed while on the march, which can heighten the sense of comradeship since the common goal is likely more present in the minds of soldiers when they are engaged in the act of meeting the enemy. The poems themselves address members of different status (even in the same poem), which suggests some level of broad appeal. Overall the evidence suggests that the variation in performance settings was a regular occurrence. One may be able to note that much of this ancient testimony comes from sources much later than Tyrtaeus (save for the content of Tyrtaeus' poems), but there is no overwhelming evidence that any of these particular settings were not possible. Regardless of the specific context of the performance of Tyrtaeus' poems they always seem aligned with the goal of educating the citizen body at every level and ensuring that the Spartan ideals and discipline are disseminated throughout the population in order to produce an army fully prepared to fight efficiently and prepared to

surrender their lives for the good of the state. The variety of performance contexts allows for the ongoing maintenance of social, communal, and political cohesion, as well as cohesion in the ranks.

Some of the performance contexts associated with Tyrtaeus have similarities to those of epic poetry and it is thus worthwhile to examine briefly what the sources say about the performance of Homer. There are two chief bodies of literature that describe the performance of epic poetry: what the poets say themselves and what the historical sources of subsequent centuries say about contemporary performances.

There are a few instances of poetic recitations in Homer performed in private or semi-private settings, all of which could be described as Homeric representations of epic poetry.³³ Demodocus performs at a private banquet among the Phaeacian nobles at the house of Alcinous (*Od.* 8.65ff., 499ff.). Demodocus sits on a chair placed amongst the guests already seated at the table and Odysseus is similarly seated when he recounts his adventures (*Od.* 8.472). It is clear from the order of events that food and drink come first, and it is only when appetites are satisfied that the entertainment occurs (*Od.* 8.485-6). The bard Phemius performs in a similar setting at Ithaca although there is less scope for formality and courtesy amongst the Suitors (*Od.* 1.325ff.). This perversion of how things ought to be done is a well planted foil at the beginning of the poem in order to contrast with the well-ordered society of the Phaeacians. Nevertheless the performance takes place at an aristocrat's home, and food and wine are both emphasised. The small audience, the feast of dinner and wine, the performance of poetry all point to a sympotic-like setting, but also share qualities with Philochorus' description of the performance of Tyrtaeus.

³³ There is not universal agreement on this topic. See Thalmann (1984) 113-84 for discussion.

There is a brief scene in the *Iliad*, albeit much less formalised, where Achilles sings the glorious deeds of men to Patroclus (*Il.* 9.185-91). Considering this scene occurs at a military camp while on campaign, the lack of formality we see elsewhere in epic is not surprising. Patroclus is described as sitting and waiting for the exact moment that Achilles will conclude his story (*Il.* 9.190-1). It is this apparent order of performance that Nagy refers to as *relay mnemonics*, a term to describe how in formalised performances of epic poetry one bard would complete his section of the poem (however it may be divided) and the subsequent bard would be expected to continue the story with relative ease.³⁴ The recitation of poetry while on campaign anticipates the various descriptions of the performance of Tyrtaeus while on campaign. The performance of poetry should be understood as a regular occurrence during a soldier's campaign. That Achilles sings about κλέα ἀνδρῶν, a concept that lies at the core of the Homeric warrior's ethos, is significant when considering the Tyrtaean parallel. A Spartan on campaign who recites the poetry of Tyrtaeus would be equally vocalising expressions that are central to the soldier's ethos. Thus, it is natural for a soldier on campaign to sing about why they fight.

The evidence for the performance of epic poetry in the fifth and following centuries suggests a strikingly different performance model. As Nagy states, "it cannot be emphasised enough that the compositions were developed to the point where they came to defy the traditional format of their performance."³⁵ Lycurgus tells us that the Athenians institutionalised the performance of Homer at every Panathenaea (Lycurg. *in Leocr.* 102). In the *Hipparchus*, Socrates states that it was Hipparchus who institutionalised this practice (Plat. *Hipparch.* 228b), although this has often been doubted. Isocrates notes the custom of distinguishing Homer for both musical contests and educating the youth. (Isoc. 4.159). Perhaps the best evidence for the

³⁴ Nagy (2002) 16-8. See also Diogenes Laertius 1.2.57.

³⁵ Nagy (1979) 20.

performance of Homer in the fifth century and beyond comes from Plato's *Ion*, in which the titular bard discusses the performance of Homer with Socrates. It is clear that rhapsodic contests occurred regularly in the time of Ion and continued regularly until at least the 4th century.³⁶ The rhapsode has just returned from Epidaurus after competing in a contest and is now preparing to compete again at the Panathenaea (Plat. *Ion* 530a). These are contests not just for the recitation of Homer, but Hesiod and Archilochus as well, and very likely other poets. Perhaps the most dramatic shift in performance contexts is the detail that the audience at the Panathenaea could be as big as 20,000 (Plat. *Ion*. 535d). Clearly a performance of this nature would have a drastically different tone from the private and intimate settings described by Homer in the halls of Alcinous. Indeed, it seems as though the scenes in Homer describing the performance of poetry are more akin to the symposium, a setting which would later become out of fashion for any large scale, formalised epic performance.

d) The use of (κατά)κειμαι in Other Sources

Now that we have reviewed the evidence for the performance of Tyrtaeus and Homer, both of which provide some context for the performance of Callinus, it will be important to examine the uses of the verb κατάκειμαι since the interpretation of it has played such a crucial role in recent scholarship's placement of this poem solely in the symposium. Tedeschi has taken a similar approach but ignored several relevant examples that ought to be considered.³⁷

Achilles is often described as lying down in the *Iliad* as a way drawing attention to his withdrawal from combat with the verb κείμαι. In a passage in book 2 Homer twice describes

³⁶ West (2010) examines ancient evidence for rhapsodic contests and notes that the popularity of the contests seems to have dwindled after the 4th century when it became more common to read the poems rather than listen to them. See also West (2011) and Anderson (2011). Graziosi (2002) 21-40 examines the earliest evidence for the word rhapsode in order to understand the distinction between bard and rhapsode with a view to understanding the role of the rhapsode.

³⁷ Tedeschi (1978).

Achilles as lying down to describe his absence from battle (*Il.* 2.681-94). Homer notes the Myrmidons have no one to guide them into battle because Achilles lies by the ships. This passage sets the tone for how impactful Achilles' absence truly is since there are 50 ships of Greeks left leaderless and unable to achieve their goals and fight at Troy. Whether or not Achilles is actually lying down is not important to the passage, it is the fact that he is withdrawn from combat. By describing Achilles as lying down he is using economical phrasing to describe Achilles' absence and imply all of the negative ramifications of his refusal to fight. In book 7 Ajax challenges Hector to a one-on-one duel (*Il.* 7.226-32). He contrasts Achilles lying down in his ship with the many brave Greeks willing to stand against him. The fact that Achilles is physically lying down is not the important element of the contrast, it is absence from combat that differentiates him from the brave Greeks ready to fight. Thus, Achilles lying down acts as a foil to the Greeks who are standing against the Trojans.

In book 18 Hera sends the messenger Iris to urge Achilles to rise up and defend Patroclus' corpse from the Trojans by employing similar imagery of lying down and standing up. She uses several imperatives such as ὄρσεο (*Il.* 18.170) and ἐπάμυνον (*Il.* 18.171) before imploring him to rise up and lie there no more ἀλλ' ἄνα μηδ' ἔτι κεῖσο (*Il.* 18.178). Achilles may be physically lying down when she approaches him, but it is not his prostrate position that she urges him to correct so much as his withdrawal from battle. Thus, we have a higher authority rousing up an individual who was sitting out from battle and who needs to defend those whom he should have been defending (or at least fighting alongside) in the first place. The overall tone of this passage mirrors the tone of Callinus 1.

Certainly not all descriptions of warriors lying down in the *Iliad* conjure images being withdrawn from battle and subverting a heroic ethos. There are several examples of wounded

warriors described as lying down (*Il.* 11.654, 825-6, 16.24). They are obviously no longer in battle, but are absent because of their bravery. In an interesting subversion of this motif Tyrtaeus too uses the verb *κατάκειμαι* of a corpse lying on the battlefield (11.19). Although it is physically lying on the ground, it is used to describe a soldier who has shirked his duty and fled the battle. This soldier is lying down because he has turned his back on his peers. He may have been brave enough to enter combat, but his unwillingness to stand firm alongside his peers, a theme repeatedly emphasised by Tyrtaeus, results in a death mired in futility since it did not occur on behalf of defending his polis but on account of his failure to comply with the Spartan ideal.

In a passage of the *Anabasis* Xenophon twice uses the verb *κατάκειμαι* with a distinct meaning of lying down instead of being militarily active (*X.An.* 3.1.13-14). The association between lying down and enjoying peace is made explicit in the latter example: *ἀλλὰ κατακείμεθα ὥσπερ ἐξὸν ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν* (*X.An.* 3.1.14). This passage is an intriguing example for those wishing to interpret Callinus 1 in a metaphorical sense, although, as Tedeschi has pointed out, there is a great amount of time separating Callinus and Xenophon, and we should be careful in using the latter as direct evidence for reading the former.³⁸

A fragment of Euripides' *Erechtheus* contains a use of *κεῖμαι* that is positive in terms of peace rather than the negative sense conveyed in Callinus.³⁹ It reads *κείσθω δόρυ μοι μίτον ἀμφιπλέκειν ἀράχλαις* (fr. 369.1). This verse is sung by the chorus as they wish for peace.⁴⁰ The

³⁸ Tedeschi (1978) argues that since there is such a gap between Callinus and Xenophon, we should not consider *κατάκειμαι* metaphorically. He would have expected other metaphorical uses of *κατάκειμαι* in between, thus arguing that such a connotation only began in the 4th century. This is obviously a precarious position to take when we lack so much of the intervening literature, and, as I will attempt to demonstrate, there were at least a pair of relevant 5th century uses of the verb.

³⁹ The play involves the story of Eumolpus, a Thracian invader, who desires to take Athens during the reign of Erechtheus. After consulting Delphi, Erechtheus discovers that if he sacrifices one of his daughters on the battlefield, victory will be his. In the end, Erechtheus and all three of his daughters lose their lives.

⁴⁰ Plutarch quotes this line in his *Life of Nicias* (9.5). This fact has led some scholars to believe that the play was produced during the Athenian-Spartan truce in 423-2 with a performance date likely at the Dionysia of 422,

line is significant for the verb *κεῖμαι* is used to express a lack of battle and war, just as in Callinus 1, but in this case the desired absence of battle is positive. In Callinus, the absence of battle is negative for it demonstrates a lack of bravery and desire for battle despite the presence of war. It creates a reaction of nemesis in the audience. The tone of the Euripidean passages speaks on behalf of a community tired of war and longing for peace. Thus, they wish to put down their spears and never have to pick them up again. It is true that in this case, *κεῖμαι* literally does mean to lie down and the chorus of men literally do want their weapons to lie down, but the act of laying down one's spear is also an obvious metaphor for peace.⁴¹ It is this second meaning that is the most important point of the line. In contrast, the tone in Callinus 1 suggests a community struck with nemesis at the thought of some of their young men neglecting their duty.

It is clear from the above passages that the verbs *κεῖμαι* and *κατάκειμαι*, while regularly used to convey the sense of someone or something lying down, can shape the tone of the passage in varying ways depending on the context. The fact that someone is described as lying down is rarely the important part of the passage; it is their absence from combat, which itself can stir up connotations of neglecting one's duty and role in society. The act of lying down is an economic phrasing used to describe the withdrawal from combat. This even suggests that we need not assume a poet intends his audience to imagine the person physically lying down, only that they are not fighting. If we apply this same understanding of the verb to Callinus 1, we need not imagine the *véoi* as physically lying down, only lying down from their duty. Thus, the sympotic context that has been assumed by scholars appears to be less certain. This does not imply that it could not have been performed at a symposium, only that it need not have been, which allows for

although we cannot be certain; see Collard and Cropp (2008) 366. Also, according to Collard and Crop, the metrical evidence suggests a date around 421-10. For more on the dating of this play, see Calder (1969).

⁴¹ This imagery echoes that of Hector when he contemplates leaning his shield and spear on a rampart and giving Helen back to the Greeks (*Il.* 22.111-22). For the imagery cf. Ibycus 286.6-7 'for me ἔρος is κατάκοιτις at no season'.

its consideration in other performance settings, such as a larger communal gathering, more reasonable.

e) Exhortative Elegy & Public Assembly: Thucydides 1.68-71 and Callinus 1

Another alternative for the performance of this poem, a possibility raised by both West and Bowie, is some kind of public assembly. Given the martial nature of the poem and the persuasive tone, the likeliest scenario would be a public meeting debating whether war ought to be undertaken or, if it will be undertaken, how the city will prepare. Since we are lacking such details concerning these types of debates in 7th century Ephesus, we must examine the next best example: the debate at Sparta concerning the Peloponnesian War in 431 as described by Thucydides. Although we must be careful when comparing sources which are over 200 years apart, Thucydides will provide a useful parallel for Callinus 1 since some of the positions taken by his speech givers are analogous to those taken in Callinus. In such a comparison, the voice in Callinus 1 is comparable to that of the Corinthians, who feel that war is the only option in view of the situation they face.

The Corinthians begin their speech in a similar manner to Callinus 1, with a criticism aimed directly at those whom they wish to persuade, the Spartans (1.68-69.1).⁴² In this case the criticism is centred on the Spartans allowing Athens to become so strong, aided partially by the Spartan unwillingness to act.⁴³ The Corinthians put the blame solely on Sparta; καὶ τῶνδε ὑμεῖς ἄττοι (1.69.1). This tactic is similar for both Callinus and the Corinthians; make the people whom you wish to persuade realise that they have done something wrong and try to correct their

⁴² For more on Thucydides' speeches, see Hornblower (1987) 45-72 and Pelling (2009).

⁴³ Connor (1984) 39 notes "the Corinthian delegates are represented as concerned less with attacking the Athenians than with chastising the Spartans for their slowness to act and reluctance to take firm measures against the expansion of Athenian power." Connor is correct in his analysis, but the approach is not as original as he would have it, for such tactics were certainly employed by Homer, and I would argue by Callinus too.

behaviour. It is only when this realisation has occurred that those intended to be persuaded can open themselves up to the suggestion of a new course of action.⁴⁴ The Corinthians conclude their introduction by questioning why they are even debating war and not simply preparing for it (1.69.2). The implication is that war is already upon them and that they would spend their time in a more prudent manner if they would face reality, quit the debate, and prepare for war. This provides a parallel to line four in Callinus where he explicitly states that war grips the entire land.

Later in the speech, the Corinthians describe the character of the Athenians. They note that they are willing to sacrifice themselves for their country; ἔτι δὲ τοῖς μὲν σώμασιν ἀλλοτριωτάτοις ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως χρῶνται (1.70.6). This reminder accomplishes several things; it describes the Athenians, who are the enemy, as acting in an ideal manner, it invites the contrast with how the Spartans act, and it then questions why the Spartans would act in this way.⁴⁵ This passage parallels Callinus' where he outlines the three main priorities worth protecting: the land, children, and wife (1.7). We need not assume that Thucydides was imitating Callinus, but that both were calling upon common themes and methods of inspiration, while employing similar rhetorical strategies. Callinus begins the line with γῆς; it is the most important of the three since the latter two are simply smaller elements within the sphere of the first. In truth, the entire speech by the Corinthians argues that their land and way of life are in jeopardy because of the Athenians' abuse of power and the Spartans' refusal to correct the situation.

⁴⁴ Immerwahr (1973) 24 points out that "the first speech of the Corinthians (1.68-71) and the Athenian speech at Sparta (1.73-78) have in common the purpose of frightening the Spartans; the Corinthians hope to frighten them into war, the Athenians into refraining from war."

⁴⁵ Gomme (1945) 231, n. on 6 comments "The Athenians, just as much as the Spartans, will obey the orders of the state, whatever they are, τοῖς σώμασιν; with their bodies they are simply the servants of the state. Unlike the Spartans, however, they do not suppress the development of the mind, to keep it subordinate to the state; they recognize the value of personality; each man develops his own to the utmost, and they believe that the state benefits by this - every citizen can thereby contribute more to the whole life of the state."

The Corinthians end their speech noting that the Spartans hang back, διαμέλλετε (1.71.1), commenting on how the Spartans are idle even though they are in a position to make change but unfortunately do not rise up to meet the occasion.⁴⁶ They then call for the Spartan procrastination to end (1.71.4). This demand concludes the argument that has been developing throughout their entire speech, that the Spartans are not accepting the present situation and its inherent dangers, and consequently, are not prepared to deal with them. This again parallels the introduction of Callinus which employs a rhetorical device to illustrate the need for action and the appropriate course of action. These lines lead into the rest of the poem where, by the end of it, the audience should come to the conclusion that they must pick up arms and fight because it is the right thing to do given their present circumstances. The pro-war Corinthians argue in the same manner. They take the device one step further than Callinus by blatantly calling for a cessation of their audience's current behaviour and an adoption of a new course of action, whereas Callinus describes the shame they ought to be feeling and the nemesis of their neighbours. Thus, Callinus is more subtle in that he describes their conduct as disgraceful and wants them to come to the conclusion that they must change their ways.

The general similarities between Callinus 1 and the speech of the Corinthians are quite striking. They both take a pro-war stance on the debate, not because they are simply bellicose, but because, in their opinion, it is the right course of action in light of the situation at hand. They achieve this effect by using a series of rhetorical devices intended initially to arouse shame in their audience by pointing out that their inactivity has caused grief, and then to convince them that they must change their ways. Such similarities cannot be considered outright proof that

⁴⁶ Edmunds (1975) 92 draws from the Corinthian speech the notion that “for a city at peace, unchanged customs are best; but for a city in Sparta’s position, threatened by Athens, technical innovation is necessary.” Callinus also emphasises this point by depicting the young men’s conduct in both peace and war. The point of the speech is to bring about this change.

Callinus 1 was indeed performed at a public debate concerning war, but it does suggest that such a debate would have included many similar arguments, so much so, that we ought not to rule out it as a distinct possibility as Bowie has done.⁴⁷

f) Exhortative Elegy & Public Assembly: Demosthenes and Callinus 1

The speeches of Demosthenes also provide some insight into debates concerning the declaration of war, for he touches upon many of the same issues addressed in the opening lines of Callinus. A prominent theme found in the deliberative speeches of Demosthenes is a warning against idleness when war is at hand. He warns that the idle man has no right to call on either friends or gods for help; οὐκ ἔνι δ' αὐτὸν ἀργοῦντ' οὐδὲ τοῖς φίλοις ἐπιτάττειν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τι ποιεῖν, μή τί γε δὴ τοῖς θεοῖς (*Ol.* 2.23). Demosthenes later blames their situation on an unwillingness to act rather than a lack of understanding (*Ol.* 3.3). He even reminds his audience of how, even though they voted to send a large force, they only sent a much smaller one, and even then pulled it back when they thought help was no longer needed (*Ol.* 3.4-5). Although the examples of Demosthenes go further in detail and clearly show a more refined sense of rhetorical skill than anything found in Callinus, the contempt toward idleness and blaming it for the present danger are common to both.

As an orator Demosthenes utilises rhetorical questions to emphasise points integral to his argument. He asks the Athenian audience, τίνα γὰρ χρόνον ἢ τίνα καιρόν, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τοῦ παρόντος βελτίω ζητεῖτε; ἢ πόθ' ἃ δεῖ πράξετ', εἰ μὴ νῦν; (*Ol.* 3.16). His emphasis on the notion of 'no time better than the present' illustrates the immediacy of the danger at hand, but also allows him to criticise their previous unwillingness to act in order to encourage and motivate

⁴⁷ Bowie (1990) 223 argues that their participation in public debate would make the charge of idleness inappropriate. Attending a public meeting and risking one's life on the battlefield do not make for an apt comparison.

them to act now. In another passage, he asks similar questions to the Athenians, πότε οὖν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, πόθ' ἂν χρὴ πράξετε; ἐπειδὴν τί γένηται; ἐπειδὴν νῆ Δί' ἀνάγκη τις ἦ. νῦν δὲ τί χρὴ τὰ γινόμεν' ἡγεῖσθαι; (*Ph.* 1.10). Again, there is an emphasis on a lack of action by questioning when the men with the power will decide to do their duty and act responsibly. Both of these passages are similar in nature to the opening four lines of Callinus. The series of rapid questions emphasises the point that the previous action, or lack thereof, has caused the present situation, and only a complete reversal of these attitudes can remedy that situation.

Another prominent topic in Demosthenes' speeches is the idea of deliberation versus action. In the third *Olynthiac* he notes that resolutions are meaningless if they are not followed by action and follows this thought by citing precedents where decisions have not been accompanied by action and have resulted in failure (*Ol.* 3.14-5). Demosthenes, like Callinus, favours acting in the present, over future deliberation. Demosthenes is also quick to remind the Athenians that it is Philip's willingness to act when the time is appropriate that allows him to succeed (*Ol.* 2.23). He even seems to bemoan the fact that the Athenians are still deliberating a point which should have been settled long ago (*Ph.* 1.1). He observes that their present evils arise as a direct consequence of their previous unwillingness to act (*Ph.* 1.2). Demosthenes finishes this speech by noting that more disaster will surely arise if the Athenians are not prepared to face reality and perform their duty (*Ph.* 1.50). This again parallels Callinus when he reminds the young men that war grips the entire land (1.4).

Demosthenes also questions whether the Athenians feel shame in refusing to act when it is appropriate; εἴτ' οὐκ αἰσχύνεσθε, εἰ μὴδ' ἂν πάθοιτ' ἄν, εἰ δύναιτ' ἐκεῖνος, ταῦτα ποιῆσαι καιρὸν ἔχοντες οὐ τολμήσετε; (*Ol.* 1.24). This question embodies the essence of the opening four lines of Callinus 1. That it is also posed as a rhetorical question makes the comparison more

compelling. The focus on shame rooted in the failure to do one's duty is significant in both, although Callinus expresses the shame the *véoi* ought to be feeling and the nemesis of their neighbours. Since the subject in Demosthenes is Athens, a city with a rich and proud history of fighting against all odds in favour of protecting their homeland, it is probably fair to assume that the shame is twofold. On the one hand, the Athenians should feel shame because they are not living up to the high military standards set by their ancestors, and on the other hand, they are seen by others as idle, which would result in nemesis, when they should be leading the charge.

Thus, when we look at the passages of Demosthenes where he argues in favour of war, we find many similarities with the opening lines of Callinus 1. In both there is a general sense of disgust towards idleness when duty is neglected, which can be interpreted as nemesis. This idleness can result from too much deliberation and not enough action, which is detrimental to the state. The unwillingness to act in the face of danger is a source of shame. Also, both men effectively use rhetorical questions as a means to convey their message. The guilt and shame are much stronger when men are forced to ask themselves these questions that have inevitable answers. From these passages, we need not come to the conclusion that Demosthenes read Callinus, and from him knew how to motivate men to face a coming war, but rather, we should feel more comfortable with the probability that Callinus 1 was originally performed in some sort of public context. There is also the sense that, considering the more highly developed form of rhetoric in Demosthenes, the arguments found in Demosthenes are the culmination of centuries of a continuously developing rhetorical skill set that began in epic and survived in the poetry of Callinus and the speeches of Thucydides.

g) Elegy as a Medium for Rhetoric

I have until now avoided the final important question in this study: why would a poet perform a highly stylised piece of rhetoric in poetry before his audience instead of in prose? This may prove to be a difficult question to answer, but there are luckily some clues that might help guide us. We do know that the Greeks attributed the earliest poetry, and hence literature, to Homer and Hesiod. Furthermore, the *Iliad* in particular contains many exhortative speeches in a martial context. We see Odysseus encouraging the Greeks to remain at Troy (*Il.* 2.190-7), Hector rebuking his brother for holding back in fighting (*Il.* 3.39-57), and Agamemnon exhorting his soldiers and enticing them with spoils (*Il.* 4.234-9). While we cannot go so far as to say that the earliest exhortative speeches are found in Homer, we can safely say that epic contains some relatively simple examples, at least in comparison to the highly stylised rhetoric of the 4th century, of this type of rhetorical speech. Considering our current understanding of the oral tradition, of which Homer was a part, we can surmise that there was some tradition of exhortative speeches in epic well before Homer, who subsequently inherited these rhetorical devices. All of this indicates that exhortative speeches and poetry have a close relationship in early Greek thought.

The relationship between poetry and rhetoric may be closer than one might assume. Walker challenges the assumption that the highly-developed rhetoric of later centuries predominantly originated in the political and legal assembly and that epideictic rhetoric played only a small role in the development of later rhetoric.⁴⁸ He begins by examining Hesiod's portrayal of the *basileus* who uses *epea* to give advice. He later challenges our pre-conceived notions about speech in Homer:

⁴⁸ Walker (2000).

Modern readers tend to assume that, although the speeches in Homer are rendered in hexameter verse, we are to imagine the speakers as always speaking “prose.” But this assumption is grounded in no real evidence and simply reflects our sense of the normal in contemporary culture. Instead, it seems more likely that Homer’s ever-sententious speakers do indeed reflect the pattern that Hesiod describes and that ethnologists observe in oral or “traditional” societies worldwide – and that they range between plain talk and epideictic registers.⁴⁹

If Walker’s argument is correct, then the original question of “why would a poet perform a highly stylised piece of rhetoric in poetry before his audience instead of in prose” is anachronistic based upon our pre-conceived notions of the distinct roles of poetry and prose.⁵⁰

When we consider the close relationship between epic and elegy, it seems a smooth transition to move from the epic rhetorical speeches in a narrative to elegiac rhetorical speeches delivered in a civic context.⁵¹ Thus, a close relationship between early rhetoric and poetry as well as epic and elegy could point toward a vision of archaic Greece where the performance of elegy in a public or civic role would be natural.

It is also worth considering the effect that such a performance would have on civic debate. When looking at the function of performance Schechner speaks of the efficacy-entertainment braid and observes that “no performance is pure efficacy or pure entertainment.”⁵² Stehle takes this idea further and speaks of the *psychological efficacy*, which “suggests that a performance aims to persuade an audience to do something or feel in a certain way that has

⁴⁹ Walker (2000) 14. Walker (7) contrasts *pragmatikon* and the *epideiktikon*. He categorises the former as “civic discourse: speeches of accusation and defense in courts of law; and speeches proposing, supporting, or opposing laws or resolutions in political assemblies.” He categorises the latter as “more amorphous and inclusive, though it was generally identified with discourse delivered outside judicial and legislative forums, such as speeches performed at festivals and ceremonial or symposiastic occasions, and it was typically conceived as the discourse of praise and blame.”

⁵⁰ In her attempt at defining ‘poetry’ Finnegan (1977) 24-8 notes that in some societies the boundaries between ‘prose’ and ‘poetry’ is nearly, if not entirely, indistinguishable.

⁵¹ Dover (1964) 183-94 discusses elegy’s metrical similarities with epic, but notes the linguistic variation between the two genres. Bowie (1986) 14 also comments on the metrical relation between the two genres and states that we have no direct evidence of which genre came first. Barnes (1995) contrasts the metrical variation in the hexameter lines of epic and elegiac and comments that the elegists did not view the hexameter as a unit distinct from the pentameter. West (2011) 385, n. on 71-6 argues that the poet of the *Iliad* adapted a piece of martial elegy into epic, either Tyrtaeus 10.21-30 or something similar to it.

⁵² Schechner (2003) 130. The efficacy-entertainment braid visualises any performance as being in a spectrum with efficacy and entertainment as the poles along a continuum.

practical consequences.”⁵³ If we apply Schechner’s model to a performance of Callinus 1, we must assume that Callinus aims for the efficacious end of the spectrum, and yet we cannot discount the hypothesis that his elegy would have some entertainment value even in a political context. Stehle’s notion of psychological efficacy aligns with my interpretation of Callinus 1 because, as I have been arguing, the persuasive element is the most powerful aspect of this poem. The use of elegy in this context could have added a sophisticated tone to a public appeal. It may have been natural or even expected in this context. We need not imagine that the elegy would comprise the entire argument. It is possible that it served as a highly-charged and poignant opening to a debate stating the speaker’s position and central points, or just as likely, a powerful résumé of a speech. We should not be at all surprised by the combined usage of poetry and prose in a political and rhetorical setting, for Lycurgus illustrates that the orator can freely move between the two styles when it suits his purpose (*in Leocr.* 107). That this passage is the one that provides for us Tyrtaeus 10 is extremely telling of the compatibility of exhortative elegy and prose rhetoric.

2. Callinus Reconsidered

I have now examined the addresses of Callinus’ audience, what the sources for the performance of other military exhortative elegy say about its performance contexts, how other sources use the word *κατάκειμαι* and what this could mean for Callinus 1, and how the types and methods of arguments expressed in Callinus share considerable overlap with political speeches of Thucydides and Demosthenes. The picture is now clear that we should understand a wide variety of performance contexts for the military exhortative elegy including large-scale public performances. I now want to analyse Callinus 1 in this type of performance context to establish a

⁵³ Stehle (1997) 19.

model that can be used for the interpretation of similar passages throughout this thesis. This process will reveal how the performances of these poems have great impact on the motivational qualities of the poems with respect to social, communal, and political cohesion as well as cohesion within the ranks.

Callinus 1 touches upon themes of shame, nemesis, and providing a path toward redemption, which are articulated through a series of rhetorical devices.⁵⁴ The general tone of the poem is persuasive with a structure deliberately composed in distinct sections; (1) rhetorical questions referring to the current state of mind of the soldiers (1.1-4), (2) a reminder of what they are fighting for (1.6-8)⁵⁵, (3) a reminder that death will come, and it can either be glorious or shameful depending upon the manner of death (1.8-15), (4) the rewards and consequences for those who fight or do not fight respectively (1.16-21). The biting introduction of the poem suggests that the correction of behaviour is one important aspect of the poem. However, the descriptions of behaviour to emulate and to avoid demonstrate that a re-enforcement of ideals is available to the audience at large.

Since I have established that Callinus 1 could have been performed before a large scale group of people and the arguments he makes are similar to historical examples performed before a public assembly in the 5th and 4th centuries, I now want to provide an overview of how a large-scale public performance would impact the words in the performance, both for the addresses and for the audience at large. I will pay special attention to the opening four lines because it is here where these traits will be most apparent since they directly address certain members of the

⁵⁴ Redfield (1975) 115 succinctly defines nemesis as “the moral disapproval of others”. In this section Redfield contrasts the characters of Hector and Paris, the former who feels shame, and the latter who does not feel shame nor is affected by nemesis. Scodel (2008) 19-20 notes that “people feel *aidōs* about behaviour to which they themselves would respond with *nemesis*.”

⁵⁵ I leave out line 5 in this breakdown since we lack the line immediately preceding it, and are not entirely sure how many lines came before it. The meaning of line 5 could vary depending on these factors.

audience. A more thorough analysis of different sections of the poem will occur elsewhere in this dissertation when most appropriate to the subject of a chapter.

The opening questions asks *μέχρις τέο κατάκεισθε*; ‘For how long are you going to lie idle?’ (1.1). As I have already argued there is plenty of evidence to suggest that the verb *κατάκεισθε* can be interpreted in a figurative sense. In fact, there are enough examples from Homer and other elegy to suggest that we need not envision anybody lying down in any physical sense. This verb can be used to describe people who are distancing themselves from combat and thus not fulfilling one of their principle duties to their society. Ultimately, this is a person who is not swayed by some of the key motivational forces at work in their society. If this poem was performed before a public assembly, it is possible that Callinus was either directly addressing a particular group of young men who are refusing to fight, or perhaps addressing the “youth of the day” in a general sense. However, this first question leaves the addressee vague. This causes the effect of everyone questioning their own position and will leave some confident in their answer that they are not “lying down”.

The second question is *κότ’ ἄλκιμον ἔξετε θυμόν ὧ νέοι*; ‘When will you have a brave heart, young men?’ (1.1-2). The young men are not displaying the usual signs of bravery. This is a precarious position for the men who have been assigned the task of defending the city to find themselves. Callinus asks this question because, ideally, they would already have a brave heart. He uses the future to imply that they have not shown any signs of doing so in the past and he is not convinced it will occur any time soon, but hopes to reverse this trend with his words. With this phrasing Callinus intensifies his line of questioning and also clarifies his addressees. These questions are meant to invoke shame in the *νέοι* by incredulously challenging their commitment to the polis and their manhood. That a member of the community is able to ask these questions

should result in an automatic feeling of shame for those being addressed and is in response to the speaker's nemesis. It further enhances the tension between those who are fulfilling their roles and those who are not.

The final question is: οὐδ' αἰδεῖσθ' ἀμφιπερικτίονας / ὧδε λίην μεθιέντες 'Do you feel no shame before your neighbours that you slack too much in this way?' (1.2-3). It is here where the tension among audience members hits its climax. Instead of hinting at the shame the νέοι ought to be feeling, Callinus brings this shame to the forefront by using the verb αἰδέομαι.⁵⁶ However, his word placement lends itself to further tension since he couples αἰδέομαι with ἀμφιπερικτίονας. That the young men ought to feel shame does not appear in doubt. The neighbours would if they were in that position, which suggests the concept of nemesis. Thus, Callinus is able to make a direct appeal to their sense of shame while subtly suggesting that the remainder of the audience should be feeling nemesis.

The impact of this tension would be very different depending on the performance context of this poem. In a sympotic context the tension would be severe amongst a dozen men; the inescapable gaze between those who ought to be feeling shame and those who are afflicted with nemesis would be intense, so much so that this contentious mood would seem to go against the spirit of a symposium.⁵⁷ Of course if this was a poem meant to be in jest or a theatrical reimagining, then perceived tension would all be part of the ruse. However, this interpretation would trivialise the rhetorical argument and building of tension created by Callinus in these lines. Considering that after the first four lines he speaks in generalised statements with 3rd

⁵⁶ Cairns (1993) 48ff. comments on the inhibitory natures of αἰδώς. Clearly αἰδώς has not restrained the behaviour of Callinus' audience. This breakdown of social norms puzzles and perhaps frustrates the poet.

⁵⁷ There are several references in literature to the unsuitability of themes of violence and warfare in this context. In his description of the ideal symposium Xenophanes states that tales of warfare are unsuitable (1.22-3). Anacreon calls for moderation in drinking lest they adopt barbaric practices (356). Athenaeus too describes his symposium as κατὰ τὸν Κολοφώνιον Ξενοφάνη πλήρες ὃν πάσης θυμηδίας (11.462.c).

person imperatives, it would be jarring to move from using the vocative and 2nd person plural questions if that direct address was not intended for certain members of the audience. A sympotic poem could have been successful staying entirely in the 3rd person. If we consider the alternative, a performance in a large-scale public assembly, then Callinus' building of tension is easier to explain. He could be addressing any particular group of νέοι who are not fulfilling their duty. The dramatic nature of the accusation that is layered in nemesis could be heightened by the poet physically pointing at certain individuals. Those feeling nemesis could affix their gaze directly onto those eliciting this reaction, which would further increase the tension in the room and hopefully trigger the sense of shame the νέοι ought to be feeling. When Callinus asks if the νέοι do not feel shame before their neighbours, they would be compelled to look at their neighbours and answer that question (or perhaps shuffle their feet and stare at the ground when the shame finally sets in).

If we were to take the phrase ὧδε λίην μεθιέντες to imply a sympotic context, we are left trying to explain how Callinus would have the moral authority to chastise the local youths for spending all of their time at symposia, while at the same time delivering this reprimanding message at a symposium himself. However, if this poem is meant to be in jest, then this could all be part of the joke. The alternative suggests that Callinus is actually criticizing their indifference to politics and war. The word μεθίημι takes on the meaning of slacking in war in both Homer (*Il.* 4.240, 13.97, *et al.*) and Tyrtaeus (12.44). The latter example is particularly relevant for he, like Callinus, uses it as a foil for proper conduct. Furthermore, nowhere in Homer does μεθίημι take on the meaning of relaxing in a leisurely manner. Given the martial context of this poem we should read λίην μεθιέντες as μεθιέντες ἐν πολέμῳ. This interpretation harmonises with the previous rhetorical questions and makes the subsequent statement hit with ominous weight.

After these questions he poignantly emphasises his concern: ἐν εἰρήνῃ δὲ δοκεῖτε ἧσθαι, ἀτὰρ πόλεμος γαῖαν ἅπασαν ἔχει ‘In peace you seem to linger, but war grips the entire land’ (1.3-4). Callinus uses the verb ἧμαι, which can take on the literal meaning of sitting, but often means to be idle. Achilles uses this verb of himself when he describes himself as not helping his companions; ἀλλ’ ἧμαι παρὰ νηυσὶν ἐτώσιον ἄχθος ἀρούρης (*Il.* 18.104). The charge of idleness is explicit in Achilles’ phrasing and seems intended with Callinus’ statement. The blunt statement that war grips the entire land brings forth the immediacy of the situation, while casting the νέοι as being out of touch with reality. Their actions are simply not appropriate given the danger of their present situation. This line is perhaps the most difficult to rectify in a sympotic context. If war is truly imminent, why would this discussion occur in a leisurely environment? While the case for a playful poem performed in a sympotic context could be made for the three rhetorical questions that begin the poem, a playful interpretation is less obvious with this statement. However, if we place this in an assembly, this statement is more fitting to the occasion, especially if this is performed during a debate about the present war (whatever war that may be). The shame that ought to be felt by some and the nemesis felt by the rest gain some context; not only are the νέοι not behaving correctly, this is the precisely the moment when their proper adherence to their social guidelines is most needed. The assembly is the first place where the νέοι can begin to correct their behaviour.

One may question why Callinus would want to begin his persuasive rhetoric with such a biting critique of his addressees. The use of insult to correct improper conduct (especially related to war) does occur in epic.⁵⁸ Hector berates Paris repeatedly after he shrinks back from fighting

⁵⁸ In Tyrtaeus 11 we see the opposite strategy where the poet use emboldening language to lift the morale of his audience: ἀλλ’, Ἡρακλῆος γὰρ ἀνικητοῦ γένος ἐστέ, / θαρσεῖτ’ οὐπω Ζεὺς ἀνέχεται λοξὸν ἔχει (11.1-2). The inclusion of ἀνικητος, the imperative θαρσεῖτε, and the phrase stating that Zeus does not yet hold a slanted neck all

Menelaus (*Il.* 3.38-57).⁵⁹ The continuous barrage of insults finally causes Paris to break down and forces him to see the error of his ways, which he acknowledges: Ἔκτορ, ἐπεὶ με κατ' αἴσαν ἐνείκεσας οὐδ' ὑπὲρ αἴσαν (*Il.* 3.59).⁶⁰ Perhaps more relevant to Callinus is Sarpedon's rebuke of Hector for his conduct in battle, for he uses a series of rhetorical questions and insults along with a few words of encouragement in order to persuade him (*Il.* 5.472-92). Callinus is clearly aware, like Homer, how effective these tools of persuasion could be.

After the first four lines in this poem, we are unfortunately left with a lacuna before moving into the rest of the poem which takes a decidedly different tone. The rest of the poem is about offering a path to redemption. Callinus abandons the accusatory tone of 2nd personal plural verbs and mostly speaks in 3rd person imperatives and uses moral tableaux in order to show the way forward. While the rhetorical questions provide a justification for the nemesis felt amongst some of the audience members, the rest of the poem is concerned with education and reaffirming values within the community.

Conclusion

It is clear from the above discussion that the analysis of performance contexts of martial elegy is highly problematic. The poems themselves are often fragmentary or are quotations, leaving us unsure if they are complete or not. The ancient evidence for the performance of exhortative elegy is often spurious. All of these problems compound to make the opinion of modern scholarship quite diverse. As I have demonstrated, the modern opinions tend toward the extremes, especially the prevalent view that all exhortative elegies were performed in a sympotic

seemed designed to lift the morale of the audience. Thus, poets are able to apply various strategies to create different effects on the audience depending on the context.

⁵⁹ Hector similarly insults Paris in battle (*Il.* 13.765ff.).

⁶⁰ Redfield (1975) 113-4 notes how Hector and Paris are often portrayed as opposites; the former is the worthy son, the latter is the unworthy son. Redfield notes that this speech in particular draws attention to their differences.

context. Such blanket statements are often dangerous and may easily over-simplify the picture. At the beginning of this chapter I asked whether we need to read Callinus' use of the verb *κατάκεισθαι* as a reference to lying down at a symposium and if we do, whether we need to assume that Callinus is making a direct reference to the performance of his poem. It should be clear that there is enough evidence to suggest that a metaphorical reading of the verb independent of the symposium is perfectly reasonable. Furthermore, if we are to assume sympotic undertones in Callinus, it is only to enhance the general metaphor that his audience is neglecting their duty. What seems equally clear is that a reading of this poem as self-referential to its performance at a symposium ignores much of the rest of the text and often would be counter-intuitive, if not counter-productive, in relation to the other ideas expressed in the poem. I realise that my argument may be controversial to those who whole-heartedly accept the symposium-only model of elegiac performance. I may not be able to convince them entirely, but I would feel satisfied if I have at least compelled them to reconsider the evidence.

Chapter 3: Defense of Family and Home

The desire or need to protect family and home has motivated innumerable soldiers throughout human history to risk their lives in combat.¹ The same is true for the soldiers of archaic and classical Greece and, not surprisingly, this is reflected in the lyric tradition. In this chapter I will analyse the portrayal of the defense of family and home in the lyric tradition, as well as the subsequent punishment that may occur if a soldier either fails or is unable to fulfill these duties. Since the defense of family and home is so critical to the Trojan War, I will begin this chapter by analysing relevant passages from Homer. The contemporary depiction of this theme is natural to the martial elegies of Callinus and Tyrtaeus, whose chief concern is to motivate their soldier audience to fight for the polis. I will give special attention to the first half of Tyrtaeus 10, which makes explicit use of this theme for specific rhetorical purpose. These themes are also represented in poems by Solon and Alcaeus. I then look at the reverse side of this theme: predatory gains as a motivation for warfare. While this is a common occurrence in Homer, it is markedly less so in lyric poetry. I will argue that such motivations are not present in part because they run counter to the ideals of social, communal, and political cohesion as well as cohesion within the ranks since they occur on an individual level. The situation is different when at a state level. Poems expressing these values offer a contrast to those considered in the rest of this chapter and provide a more balanced view of this theme as a whole. I will end this chapter with a brief look at some epigrams from the classical period in order to see the development of this concept as a part of the supposed growth of pan-Hellenism in this era. I am chiefly interested in how poets expressed this theme countless times, but for entirely different purposes.

¹ I use the term “home” in order to provide a neutral term that could include concepts such as property and territory while avoiding any cultural bias.

1. Homer on the Defense of Family and Home

The motivation to protect one's own family and home is woven throughout Greek epic. The primary motivation for the declaration of the Trojan War was Menelaus' desire to reclaim his wife. Even though there is an element of revenge on the part of Menelaus and the Greeks, that revenge stems from the loss of Helen, and the resulting shame and humiliation.² While Menelaus did not lose Helen as a consequence of warfare, the loss was a motivation powerful enough to initiate a large-scale war. The shame and humiliation of being unable to protect his wife lie at the core of this conflict.³ Helen was a beautiful prize taken from Menelaus; he was simultaneously despoiled and denied the glory of battle.⁴ We may also consider the loss of Chryseis and Briseis in the opening book of the *Iliad* to understand how emotionally-fuelled such a loss can be. Of course, this was not a loss through direct warfare, but the loss of property was similarly felt by Agamemnon and Achilles. These losses, having made such a powerful impact on the Greek heroes, could compel 1000 ships to sail against Troy and force the greatest Greek

² Herodotus stresses the frequency and impact of the abduction of women in early Greek myth as a direct motivation for combat, citing frequent abductions such as Io, Europa, Medea, and Helen. According to Herodotus, the Persians believe the desire to seek revenge over the loss of women is an entirely Greek convention foreign to the Persians: τὸ μὲν νυν ἀρπάζειν γυναῖκας ἀνδρῶν ἀδίκων νομίζειν ἔργον εἶναι, τὸ δὲ ἀρπασθεισέων σπουδὴν ποιήσασθαι τιμωρέειν ἀνοήτων, τὸ δὲ μηδεμίαν ὥρην ἔχειν ἀρπασθεισέων σωφρόνων· δῆλα γὰρ δὴ ὅτι, εἰ μὴ αὐταὶ ἐβούλοντο, οὐκ ἂν ἠρπάζοντο. σφέας μὲν δὴ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας λέγουσι Πέρσαι ἀρπαζομένων τῶν γυναικῶν λόγον οὐδένα ποιήσασθαι, Ἕλληνας δὲ Λακεδαιμονίης εἵνεκεν γυναικὸς στόλον μέγαν συναγεῖραι καὶ ἔπειτα ἐλθόντας ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην τὴν Πριάμου δύναμιν κατελεῖν (1.4). Asheri, Lloyd et al. (2007) 74 note that "all the elements in this series of events are drawn from Greek mythology; but whereas in the original versions of the myths the responsibility ultimately rests with the gods, this version is rationalized and politicized, and could serve as the narrative or probatory part of a Greek 'sophistic' apologetic speech composed in favour of Asia and based on the legal criteria of Greek international law or customs of retribution." Priam confirms the placement of the blame for the war not on Helen, but on the gods (*Il.* 3.164). The poet of the *Cypria* employs overdetermination as well placing blame on the beauty contest as well as Paris' seduction. This series of escalating abductions as a motivation for war was possibly parodied in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* 516-29, though this has been questioned: for a different view see e.g. Pelling (2000) 151-5. For similar parodies, see How and Wells (1912) p. 55, n. on 4. Neville (1977) compares in detail Homer's version of the events with those of Herodotus.

³ Proclus states that, in the *Cypria*, Menelaus was away in Crete when Paris and Helen left Sparta, and Apollodorus provides the detail that he was attending to his grandfather's funeral (*Apollod. Epit.* 3.3). Thus, it was not that Menelaus did not fight sufficiently on behalf of his wife, but that he did not even have the chance to do so. Euripides provides a different interpretation of the events by having Helen partially blame Menelaus' negligence for leaving Paris in his home while he went to Crete and states that Paris came with Aphrodite at this side (*Tro.* 940-4).

⁴ Diomedes criticises Aphrodite for leading women away without warfare (*Il.* 5.349).

champion to do the unthinkable and withdraw from combat. The message is clear; such a motivation is undeniably powerful.

Menelaus, upon slaying the Trojan Peisander, gives a speech detailing his rage and disgust over the abduction of his wife and possessions (*Il.* 13.620-39). He refers to the Trojans as wicked bitches because they brought shame on him: ἐμὲ λωβήσασθε, κακαὶ κύνες (*Il.* 13.623).⁵ This statement highlights the close interdependence of dishonour and shame, for the Trojans dishonoured Menelaus by taking away his wife, but Menelaus feels a sense of shame because he could not prevent the abduction. He then reiterates the crime committed by noting that they recklessly led away his wife and many possessions: οἳ μὲν κουριδίην ἄλοχον καὶ κτήματα πολλὰ / μὰν οἷχεσθ' ἀνάγοντες, ἐπεὶ φιλέεσθε παρ' αὐτῇ (*Il.* 13.626-7).⁶ That Menelaus delivers this speech at the death of a Trojan foreshadows the destruction of Troy as a direct consequence of the Greeks' revenge over the abduction of Helen.

The dialogue between Hector and Andromache in book 6 highlights the many, often conflicting, motivations weighing on the Trojans (*Il.* 6.392-481). Hector is prince and heir apparent, key defender of the city, dutiful husband and father, and also a brother and son. All of these roles pull him in different directions and motivate him ultimately to leave the walls of the city and initiate combat. That this scene takes place at the Scaean gates, a location on the edge of home and battlefield, is a powerful visual representation of Hector's conflicting values and

⁵ Janko (1992) 122-3 comments "his speech is full not of 'hatred and bitterness' against the Trojans (Willcock), but of grief and indignation based on his sense of injustice. He is also bewildered that, far from making reparations, they are compounding their offence by fighting on, and – stranger yet – that they enjoy the apparent connivance of Zeus." While I do agree with Janko's interpretation, I do not believe his "grief and indignation" is incompatible with from the interpretation of Willcock (1999) p. 219, n. on 620-39. Menelaus calls them wicked bitches because they dishonoured him. It is difficult not to sense any hatred contained within his vitriol.

⁶ Herodotus has Proteus rebuke Paris in similar terms calling him κάκιστε ἀνδρῶν and noting three different crimes: seducing the wife of his host, taking her with him, and finally taking other possessions as well (2.115). Harrison (1997) 190 notes, "his crime, an infringement of the obligations of guest-friendship, is perceived as being committed against Menelaus rather than Helen herself." Such a conclusion should not be surprising considering the patriarchal nature of Greek society. It is also noteworthy that Herodotus removes any trace of divine motivation in this account.

motivations.⁷ The scene begins with Andromache stressing the imminent threat to Hector, herself, and Astyanax; she has already lost the rest of her family at the hands of the Greeks and soon the Greeks will take all that remains (*Il.* 6.406-28). Hector is everything to her: Ἐκτορ, ἀτὰρ σύ μοί ἐσσι πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ / ἥδ' ἐ κασίγνητος, σὺ δέ μοι θαλερὸς παρακοίτης (*Il.* 6.429-30). She then asks him to stay back so that she will not become a widow and her son an orphan: μὴ παῖδ' ὀρφανικὸν θήης χήρην τε γυναῖκα (*Il.* 6.432). Although Hector's motivation is vocalised by Andromache, she purposefully channels Hector's role as a husband and father, appealing to his own personal obligation to protect his family and home. That Andromache provides this argument in her attempt to sway her husband reflects the weight of this motivation.

Hector begins his response by acknowledging that everything that she has just said is a concern to him (*Il.* 6.440), but there are other concerns that are also affecting his motivation.⁸ He bluntly states there are various social pressures that compel him to step onto the battlefield (*e.g.* the shame of being seen not fighting, the pursuit of glory, etc.). Redfield notes “the conflict between personal loyalty and collective loyalty is an element of the generic situation of the warrior.”⁹ There is no one in the *Iliad* for whom this conflict is more overtly expressed. This scene with Hector and Andromache is the high point of this conflict. Hector is approaching a crisis point where all his roles in society are colliding and the only possible outcome is the destruction of each of them. He wants to be near his wife and protect her, but he must also fight outside the city gates; the front ranks are where he is meant to be. However, he even goes so far as to state that the safety and well-being of the Trojan people, including his parents, siblings and

⁷ Arthur (1981) 22, 33.

⁸ Clay (2008) comments on the tension that can exist between two groups when their priorities and perspectives do not align when she analyses the roles of gods and men in Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women*. Such tension can also colour each one's perspective of the other.

⁹ Redfield (1975) 123-4. He furthers “Hector does not have the privilege of dying that his community may live; the burden on him is much greater than that. When he dies, his community will fall with him.”

fellow warriors, are not nearly as much of a concern as is that of his wife (*Il.* 6.450-65).¹⁰ But ultimately Hector knows that Troy is doomed to fall, prompting him to admit that his greatest fear is to imagine Andromache being carried off as a spoil of war at the hands of his victor. He describes this potential future in pathetic terms noting she will have lost her day of freedom, ἐλεύθερον ἥμαρ (*Il.* 6. 455), will be weeping, δακρυόεσσαν (*Il.* 6.455), would have to work the loom of *another*, πρὸς ἄλλης ἱστὸν ὑφαίνοις (*Il.* 6.456), and will have to do much against her will, πόλλ' ἀεκαζομένη (*Il.* 6.458).¹¹ This pitiable scene, described in such vivid details, demonstrates just how hideous a nightmare this potential outcome is for Hector. Most troubling of all is that someone will remind Andromache that she must live as a slave even though she was married to a man who should have been able to ward off her day of slavery: σοὶ δ' αὖ νέον ἔσσεται ἄλγος / χήτει τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν δούλιον ἥμαρ (*Il.* 6.462-3).¹² Hector concludes his response by noting that he would rather be dead than live to see this outcome. Of course, this outcome could only ever come about in a world where he is already dead.

Although the struggle to balance motivations derived from a heroic code and those from a sense of duty to protect family beleaguer Hector and Andromache in this scene, these motivations are ultimately linked. The Homeric warrior is obsessively concerned with increasing glory through the pursuit of spoils, be they inanimate objects or human trophies. Conversely, the need to preserve what has already been acquired protects against a decrease in status. Hector, as

¹⁰ Kirk (1990) p. 221, n. on 450 rejects the use of objective genitive here noting “Translators like Lattimore, Rieu and Fitzgerald were right to reject the idea; it is the future sufferings of the Trojans that mean less to him than Andromache’s.” Graziosi and Haubold (2010) 208, n. on 450 support this view.

¹¹ Graziosi and Haubold (2010) 209, n. on 454-63 note “Overt references to forced sex are avoided, but that particular threat is implied by πόλλ' ἀεκαζομένη.”

¹² Hector expresses a similar sentiment when pondering the idea of fleeing from Achilles (*Il.* 22.104-7). Williams (1993) 82 comments that “Hector was indeed afraid that someone inferior to him would be able to criticise him, but that was because he thought the criticism would be true, and the fact that such a person could make it would only make things worse.” For similar passages, see Wilson (1979) 1-15 who examines many examples throughout Greek literature, and Finglass (2007) 404.

a defender of the city, does not stand to gain any significant new spoils from fighting; he can only defend what is already his. The only new glory he can obtain is through a meaningful death on the battlefield. Since his instinct tells him that the victory will ultimately lie with the Greeks, his death on the battlefield is the only way he can ensure any new glory. This does not mean that the protection of his family is not a powerful motivation; it is, but it is not a realistic outcome.¹³

The characters of Menelaus and Hector effectively illustrate the various emotions and reactions felt over the actual and potential loss of one's family through abduction, ultimately identifying it as an extremely powerful and persuasive motivation for war. Menelaus expresses his disgust at his enemy for taking Helen and at the same time comments on his accrual of dishonour in the community and his own personal shame at not being able to protect his domain. Hector's reconciliation of the various motivations facing him is more complicated. He openly acknowledges that protecting his family is an important consideration and yet his heroic code pulls him to the front ranks of the battle. While this may be where he is most effective in combat, it is also where he is in most danger. The general air of doom hanging over him suggests that the ultimate goal of defending Troy (and his family), is futile. Thus, the only way he can come to grips with his heroic code is to seek a glorious death in battle.

2. Contemporary Lyric Expressions of Defending Family and Home

a) Tyrtaeus

Tyrtaeus is perhaps the most vocal lyric poet on the subject of fighting to protect family and home. He spends the first half of poem 10 drawing a richly detailed moral tableau, which examines various aspects of this theme. However, the poem itself is not concerned with arguing

¹³ Before Hector withdraws inside the city walls, Helenus urges him and Aeneas to rally the troops to prevent the Greeks from taking their women as spoils of war (*Il.* 6.81-2).

for the supremacy of defending the family unit over any other motivation. Tyrtaeus instead draws upon these ideas in order to establish an emotional appeal to his soldier audience in order to make them more willing to fight as a cohesive unit by appealing to shared values of social and communal cohesion. The poet wisely selects a topic that is relevant to every soldier, speaking to them on an individual level, but then brings them together to accept and exemplify the Spartan discipline. This position is not one that can be discerned by examining isolated couplets, but is only apparent when looking at the poem as a whole.

He begins by expressing just how important these matters are; they are worth dying for them.¹⁴ If a man dies while defending what is his, it is a splendid thing: *τεθνάμεναι γὰρ καλὸν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι πεσόντα / ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν περὶ ἧι πατρίδι μαρνάμενον* (10.1-2). The focus is on the defence of the *πατρίς*, a general term encompassing both polis and family and by extension his personal property, a fact made clear in the antithetical second couplet: *τὴν δ' αὐτοῦ προλιπόντα πόλιν καὶ πίονας ἀγροὺς / πτωχεύειν πάντων ἔστ' ἀνιηρότατον* (10.3-4). He expresses the dual nature of the *πατρίς* as being the city and fields, both his public life, including his duty to the city, and his private life, including his land, home, and by extension his family, thus alluding to the fact that the loss of one's *πατρίς* results in the loss or marginalisation of his two chief roles in society. Thus, a death in defence of these spheres is a noble death.

¹⁴ There has been some debate about whether this is the beginning of the poem because of the *γὰρ* in the first line. Buchholz (1864) 10 argues “Das Gedicht ist kein Fragment, sondern ein organisch gegliedertes Ganzes.” Although Jacoby (1918) 12-9 argues for this poem to be divided into two separate poems, he does see the first poem beginning at line 1. Denniston (1954) 68-9 discusses the anticipatory *γὰρ*, which “instead of following the clause which it explains, precedes it, or is inserted parenthetically within it.” Verdenius (1969) 337-8, n. on 1 also believes the line is the beginning of this poem noting that the *γὰρ* “refers forward to 13. The motivation is resumed by *εἰ* (11), just as in Hom. *ρ* 78-83.” However, the *γὰρ* in line 1 has led others to believe that Lycurgus is not quoting from the beginning of the poem such as van Groningen (1958) 126, and Gerber (1970) 72, n. on 1. I believe the poem as we have it does work and could be complete on its own. Regardless of this debate, it seems likely that Lycurgus began quoting here because it is at least the beginning of a new thought, if not the beginning of a poem outright. Therefore, at best we have a complete poem, and at worst we have a complete thought expressed and quoted in a fragment.

There are similar utterances in the *Iliad*, such as when Hector speaks in reference to the defence of Troy: εἷς οἰωνὸς ἄριστος ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ πάτρης (*Il.* 12.243), and οὐ οἱ ἀεικὲς ἀμυνομένῳ περὶ πάτρης / τεθνάμεν· ἄλλ' ἄλοχός τε σὸν καὶ παῖδες ὀπίσσω, / καὶ οἶκος καὶ κλῆρος ἀκήρατος (*Il.* 15.496-8). In the latter example the term πατρίς is defined as including the soldier's wife, children, house, and possessions.¹⁵ Hainsworth observes that “generals must appeal to the self-interest of their men, not only to an altruistic sense of social obligation” and further notes “those claims rank lower than his sense of honour and shame.”¹⁶ The picture is markedly different with Tyrtaeus, who places emphasis on the wretchedness of not being able to protect one's family and home, and thus not enjoying the greater benefits of the polis, meanwhile leaving the individual honour of the soldier notably absent. For Tyrtaeus the action that makes a man both καλός and ἀγαθός is the protection of family and state,¹⁷ while the sense of honour and shame, which are so essential to the ethos of the Homeric warrior, are marginalised if not completely disregarded. This is a clear modification of the Homeric sense of heroic duty. However, due to recent scholarship that has blurred the temporal boundary between Homer and Tyrtaeus (see Chapter 1 section 2) it is difficult to discern whether Tyrtaeus is innovative in this regard and therefore consciously and directly modifying the Homeric worldview or if he is being reactive to an ethical change that occurred during the seventh century.¹⁸ Considering there is not likely to be a large chronological divide between Homer and Tyrtaeus, this could very well be a

¹⁵ Priam confirms his son's motivation after his death; τὸν σὺ πρόην κτεῖνας ἀμυνομένον περὶ πάτρης / Ἑκτορα (*Il.* 24.500-1).

¹⁶ Hainsworth (1993) 343, n. on 12.243. As we have already seen from Hector and Andromache's exchange in book 6, the warrior's sense of honour and shame does not need to be mutually exclusive from his desire to protect his family.

¹⁷ The text describes death on defence of the homeland as καλός of an ἀγαθός man. In my argument I make the small leap in logic that the man becomes ἀγαθός by completing a deed that is καλός such as when he dies defending his family and city.

¹⁸ Snell (1961) 13 comments on such ideas, noting “once they had been expressed by poets, such new ideas could rapidly become public property and stamp their image on the social behavior of the entire community.” This is certainly a valid point. Regardless of how involved Tyrtaeus was in developing these ideas, his poetry was clearly instrumental in spreading them throughout his society.

conscious decision on the part of Tyrtaeus. This argument is strengthened by the fact that we know Tyrtaeus was deeply familiar with the epic genre, and consequently its perception of humanity's place in the world.¹⁹ At the very least Tyrtaeus was aware of this dramatic shift in thought and perhaps instrumental in the development as well.

Tyrtaeus adopts a tragic tone in these two couplets; the soldier who achieves the positive result, protecting his fatherland, gives up his life, whereas the soldier who obtains the negative result, losing his home, is still alive, thus emphasising the dichotomy of dying hero and living coward. The message is clear: it is better to be dead with a safe homeland, than it is to be alive without a homeland. We should not assume that Tyrtaeus is advocating that his audience display anti-social behaviour and needlessly throw their lives away, but rather that he wants them to fight with bravery to the point that they would be willing to die.²⁰ He also wants them to understand that the alternative is a miserable existence. The defeated soldier wanders about with his family because he no longer possesses any land and has relinquished his political role as a citizen, *πλαζόμενον σὺν μητρὶ φίλῃ καὶ πατρὶ γέροντι / παισὶ τε σὺν μικροῖς κουριδίῃ τ' ἀλόχοι*. (10.5-6).²¹ Tyrtaeus is clear that the protection of the polis is paramount, but his detailed description of the family unit in these lines suggests they play a large role in what makes the polis important and thus their defense is an integral part of what makes dying for the *πατρίς* so meaningful. The polis also provides a more stable environment for the family to thrive. This wandering man continues to live his life, yet tragically, he has lost many of the things that make life worth living.

¹⁹ Snell (1969).

²⁰ I will discuss the topic of displaying anti-social behaviour by throwing one's life away in battle in more detail in the following chapter.

²¹ Agenor speaks of defending these very qualities when addressing Achilles, describing his chief motivations for fighting: *ἐν γάρ οἱ πολέες τε καὶ ἄλκιμοι ἄνδρες εἰμέν, / οἳ καὶ πρόσθε φίλων τοκέων ἀλόχων τε καὶ υἱῶν / Ἴλιον εἰρυόμεσθα* (*Il.* 21.586-8).

True, he still has his family alive and at his side, but without the means to support them, he is failing at his only remaining role in life, being the head of the family.

Tyrtaeus makes every effort to illustrate how horrendous this outcome is and emphasise that it is the soldier's responsibility to protect his family and polis and ultimately to avoid this fate. He identifies the soldier's mother, father, wife, and children all as victims of the soldier's failure, and yet they are also a reminder to the soldier of his own personal failures. Whether that failure is the result of cowardice or a failure of tactics or skill is left unsaid. Tyrtaeus enhances the pathos by assigning an adjective to each family member; his mother is dear, his father is old, his children are small, and his wife is wedded. There is an additional tragic layer to the condition of the elderly father, for he is a man who presumably fought and successfully defended his property in the past, whereas his son has not been able to live up to the standard established by his father.²² Tyrtaeus is clearly enhancing the pathos of this scene in order to add weight to the motivation to defend the homeland and invite empathy for his soldier audience. Thus, this scene details the difficulties involved when social and communal cohesion collapse.

Priam and the destruction of Troy represent one of the most supreme examples of this concept. Early in the *Iliad* Priam recounts his old fighting days to Helen (*Il.* 3.182-90). In the penultimate scene of the poem Achilles describes the former, vast extent of Priam's domain, which stands in contrast to what we know will soon become of it (*Il.* 24.543-8). He emphasises Priam's former prosperity and superiority in both wealth and sons (*Il.* 24.543-6). The epic

²² Plutarch describes a performance that takes place at festivals involving 3 choirs of males: the elders, those of fighting age, and young boys not yet of fighting age. The first group sing ἄμμες πόκ' ἡμες ἄλκιμοι νεανῖαι, the second group sing ἄμμες δὲ γ' εἰμὲν αἱ δὲ λῆς, ἀνγάσδεο, and the third group sing ἄμμες δὲ γ' ἐσσόμεσθα πολλῶ κάπρονες (Plut. *Lyc.* 21.2). This three tiered performance suggests a mutual respect between the different generations fueled by an acknowledgement that each group will make sacrifices for the other two groups, who will each benefit from these sacrifices at different times in their lives. The elderly man in Tyrtaeus will not be able to perform this poem with his son any longer. The chain is broken.

Achilles places the blame squarely on the shoulders of the gods, whereas Tyrtaeus, without expressly saying so, places the blame on the soldiers themselves. We see here an important divergence between the epic and elegiac genres. In epic much of the blame for the unfolding of events is placed on the gods. Frequently there is overdetermination and both humans and gods are to blame, but the gods play an essential role. Tyrtaeus, on the other hand, stresses the responsibility of the individual, as is characteristic of this type of elegy.²³ There is no mention of the gods; the Tyrtaean soldier is responsible for his own fate, and stands far apart from his epic counterpart. It is essential for the Tyrtaean soldier to accept his roles in society and the responsibilities they bear in order to be his most effective.

Tyrtaeus continues the moral tableau by describing this life of wandering, noting that such a man becomes hated to others (ἐχθρός), and has both need (χρησιμότης) and poverty (πενία) (10.7-8).²⁴ These three concepts all help further build up the pitiable nature of this defeated soldier.²⁵ Tyrtaeus does not describe the emotions of the soldier himself, but instead draws a devastating picture of a potential future. We again see a generic difference between the

²³ This is not to say that Tyrtaeus does not have the option of crediting the gods with the unfolding of events, but that he deliberately avoids it in this poem. He recognises Zeus as giving Sparta to the Dorians (1.13-4). The early Spartans obeyed the oracles of Pytho given by Apollo in establishing their governance (4). Neither are the gods absent from Tyrtaeus' poems on warfare. In another poem he comforts the Spartans by claiming that Zeus does not yet face away from the Spartans. There are also allusions to Athena on the battlefield (23a), and Ares' involvement in battle (19). It is clear from the meagre fragments we possess that Tyrtaeus was a religious man and made a connection between the gods and warfare, but in this poem he purposely leaves them aside in order to convey the importance of the individual soldier to the army as a whole.

²⁴ The poems attributed to Theognis make numerous references to the bitter nature of poverty. In the corpus are such expressions as 'it is better to be dead than poor' (181-2) and poverty and the poor are hated (267-70; 619-22).

²⁵ Archilochus calls upon similar language to describe the change of fate that can befall a person: καὶ βίου χρήμητι πλανᾶται καὶ νόου παρήγορος (Archil. 130.5). Unfortunately the text is incomplete and the context remains uncertain. This poem does make use of language often associated with the battlefield and death. The description of a man lying on the black earth has some strong overtones of a fallen soldier (cf. Tyrtaeus 11.19 κατακείμενος ἐν κονίῃσι). For similar Homeric phrasings, see the use of κείμαι signifying either an injured warrior (*Il.* 5.467) or a slain soldier (*Il.* 13.414, 16.541, 17.92). As for descriptions of black earth and its association with death, it can either be used to describe rich earth (*Il.* 2.699; 17.416) or earth blackened with blood from combat (15.715; 20.494). Although Homer uses all of the same elements of this phrasing as Archilochus, nowhere does he do so all together. Archilochus' description of a man well planted who is overturned again recalls battle imagery (cf. *Il.* 12.458; Tyrt. 10.31=11.21 εὖ διαβὰς. See MacQueen (1984) 456, Brown (1985) 358, and Gerber (1970) 74, n. on 31-2 for commentary on the meaning of εὖ διαβὰς.

options of the epic and lyric poets. The epic poet can vocalise the emotions of his characters and their reactions to events in speech. We only need to consider the raw emotion contained within Menelaus' speech upon his slaying of Peisander (*Il.* 13.620-39) to see how effective speech can be for the epic poet in describing a character's reaction and response to the loss of family and home and to the men who took them from him. The elegist Tyrtaeus is limited in this regard due to the length of his poems, although this may not necessarily be a concern to him.²⁶ His poem seeks to motivate his audience to fight with zeal and he is better able to achieve this goal, not by utilising characters of a heroic past as exempla, but by depicting an unnamed contemporary soldier suffering poverty and hostility. This approach allows each member of the audience to empathise with the soldier and picture his own family members suffering. The elegiac audience is thus able to form a deeper emotional connection to the soldier in the poem because they can empathise with him directly and consequently are more willing to accept the most integral aspect of the poem, that they must be willing to surrender their lives in defence of the homeland.

Tyrtaeus continues describing the devastating impact such acts will have on his public image, and in the 7th couplet he resumes the positive message of his poem: θυμῶι γῆς πέρι τῆσδε μαχόμεθα καὶ περὶ παίδων / θνήσκωμεν ψυχέων μηκέτι φειδόμενοι (10.13-4). Although Tyrtaeus speaks in similar terms in the opening lines the emphasis shifts in this couplet. The soldier dying for his homeland in lines 1-2 is a single, unnamed individual, acting as a foil for the gut-wrenching depiction of the vagrant soldier and his family in the subsequent lines. In lines 13-4 the subject of the poem shifts from this unnamed, hypothetical soldier to every citizen of

²⁶ Speech in elegy is rare amongst the extant fragments. Solon seems to have composed an elegy depicting the positions of both the wealthy and the poor as a speech (4c). In this fragment he uses both 1st and 2nd person pronouns, which suggest a back and forth dialogue between both parties. Mimnermus 14 could also be an example of direct speech, but we lack the context to make any definitive statements. Bowie (1986) 27-35 discusses the evidence for long elegies (over 1000 lines) that detail foundation stories of various archaic cities and speculates that the elegiac genre may allow for a more personal history than epic.

fighting age present in the audience at the performance of this poem. Tyrtaeus spends the first 12 lines depicting a dim, dark, and hypothetical, yet clearly possible, reality, which the soldiers are reluctantly able to imagine as a possible future for themselves. The transition from third-person to first-person poignantly shifts the audience's perspective from picturing an imaginary, hypothetical situation to the reality of their own lives. Tyrtaeus began by motivating his individual audience members but concludes this section by motivating an army to work together for a common goal, the defense of the πατρίς.

In the following lines Tyrtaeus makes another transition in subject and addresses his audience of soldiers in the 2nd person.²⁷ Tyrtaeus presents himself in the role of commander and issues direct orders to his audience. In truth Tyrtaeus has been utilising this role throughout the poem, but only now makes it overt so that the audience can more easily absorb his instructions. The poet effectively employs a tactic of creating empathy and emotional concern in the opening 14 lines so that he can make his audience more willing to accept his direct instruction in the following lines. Tyrtaeus stresses unity in the ranks with the soldiers standing by each other: παρ' ἀλλήλοισι μένοντες (10.15) and not fleeing: μὴ καταλείποντες φεύγετε (10.20). Now that the soldiers have considered why each one individually should fight, Tyrtaeus urges them to fight together. Each cog is willing and eager to do its own part and consequently the military machine functions more effectively.²⁸

b) Callinus

There is less that survives on the subject of protecting one's family and home in the works of Callinus. What does survive is similar in nature to Tyrtaeus. In his only surviving, near-

²⁷ Although this poem used to be separated after line 12 by scholars, it is now generally seen as one poem, for instance in West (1998) and Gerber (1999). For the argument on the debate, see Barigazzi (1951) 102-15.

²⁸ Recall that Lycurgus quotes this poem when describing the soldiers νομίζοντες οὕτως ἂν αὐτοὺς μάλιστα πρὸ τῆς πατρίδος ἐθέλιν ἀποθνήσκειν (*in Leocr.* 107).

complete poem he says τιμῆν τε γάρ ἐστι καὶ ἀγλαὸν ἀνδρὶ μάχεσθαι / γῆς πέρι καὶ παίδων κουριδίης τ' ἀλόχου / δυσμενέσιν (1.6-8). Callinus is more concise than Tyrtaeus, naming his wife and children, and not his parents. Callinus uses the more neutral γῆ rather than the πατρίς used by Tyrtaeus. Although both words can be used more or less interchangeably, πατρίς has a definitively more emotional tone.²⁹

The difference between Callinus 1 and Tyrtaeus 10 in this regard may simply be due to their respective uses of the motivation to protect family and home. Tyrtaeus emphasises the family to illustrate the negative effects of the defeated soldier on them, consequently impassioning his audience and making them more willing to accept the Spartan discipline. In contrast, Callinus focuses on the inevitability of death and reasons that it is better to die doing what is right, and as a consequence our lives gain more value. Before this statement Callinus urges a dying soldier to cast one last spear, which allows him to fulfill his role in society to the very end (1.5), and he follows it by describing the undramatic event of a man dying at home (1.14-5). Tyrtaeus and Callinus both appeal to the same motivation, and although their ultimate goal is to inspire their audience to fight, they both achieve different effects. One has a more pedagogical approach, while the other is more persuasive.

There is another interesting point of contrast between these two passages of Callinus and Tyrtaeus; both use a pair of adjectives to describe the act of dying for one's family and city. In Tyrtaeus they are καλός and ἀγαθός, translated as fair and good, whereas Callinus chooses τιμήεις and ἀγλαός, honourable and splendid. Both sets of adjectives are unambiguously positive, and yet τιμήεις and ἀγλαός represent a richer vocabulary choice than καλός and

²⁹ As noted in the previous section the πατρίς encompasses family, land, polis; both the soldier's private life and his public life.

ἀγαθός.³⁰ While the general sense of the two pairs of adjectives is the same, to describe the soldier and his actions as the pinnacle of excellence, Callinus chooses words much rarer and more stylistically elevated. There may not be any intended difference between the two descriptions, as each poet had to take metrical context into account, but the differences are striking, especially if we accept Adkins' interpretation of Callinus that "his intention is to endow such fighting with all the desirable connotations and emotive charge possessed by the adjectives."³¹

c) Alcaeus

Alcaeus provides us with his personal perspective on the motivation to protect one's family and home for, due to the political turmoil facing Mytilene during his lifetime, he faced these hardships first-hand (Str. 13.2.3; ps-Acro. on Hor. *Carm.* 2.13.28). He depicts the misery facing the man who has lost everything and is sent into exile (130b). We need not assume that he is necessarily depicting himself (although his use of ἔγω makes it a possibility), but at least someone who has gone through a similar situation. If Alcaeus is not describing his own personal experiences, then he is describing those of a persona with whom he is very familiar. It is reasonable to suggest that he paints a sympathetic portrayal of a person in this situation and conceivable that he did so in order to rally his audience against those that deprived him of home.

³⁰ According to LSJ ἀγαθός can be used in many ways, but generally it has the sense of well-born or aristocratic, brave, or capable. The association with bravery exists because "courage was attributed to Chiefs and Nobles". καλός generally has the sense of beauty involved and can also refer to nobility or honour. It can be used for both men and gods. ἀγλαός has the initial use of splendid or shining in reference to objects, and takes a similar role for people, being translated as beautiful, famous, or noble. τιμῆεις has the sense of honoured or esteemed, and can be applied to both men and gods.

³¹ Adkins (1985) 62-3 notes "in Homer these adjectives are applied to what is desirable because it enhances one's status, glory, or material well-being...The Greeks before Troy were fighting for τιμή - for status-enhancing material goods. Defenders of a city are likely to gain little material τιμή. They are more concerned with material loss, the loss of all their τιμή, if the city is captured. The desire to avoid such loss might appear to be sufficient motive; but both Callinus and Tyrtaeus find these warriors of their respective cities insufficiently active and effective. In this situation Callinus employs a strikingly novel usage: to the act of fighting for one's land and one's family he applies two adjectives - ἀγλαόν and τιμῆεν - which have not been used before to denote fighting but which have very desirable connotations and a high emotive charge, derived from what they have customarily been used to denote."

Alcaeus' position is unique among the extant lyric poets who deal with this theme because he lost his property through civil warfare.³² In the first line he bluntly refers to himself as a wretch, ὁ τάλαις ἔγω (130b.1), a word that conveys both his unfortunate situation as well as a reflection of his self-esteem. He then laments his absence from city life ζῶω μοῖραν ἔχων ἀγροῖωτίκην / ἡμέρων ἀγόρας ἄκουσαι (130b.2-3).³³ Alcaeus then emphasises the severity of the loss by declaring that his lost possessions belonged not only to his father, but his father's father, τὰ πάτηρ καὶ πάτερος πάτηρ (130b.5), illustrating that he has failed where his ancestors did not. He has experienced the breakdown of social, communal, and political cohesion. Thus, Alcaeus, like Tyrtaeus, laments the loss of two important roles of the male citizen in his society, the civic and the familial.³⁴ Tyrtaeus appeals for his audience to empathise with hypothetical emotion, and Alcaeus describes the actual emotion of one having already lost.

Although Alcaeus describes a similar situation to Tyrtaeus 10, there are many striking dissimilarities. Alcaeus describes the reality of being deprived through civil strife. He did not lose his possessions to some external invader or raider, but thanks to his fellow citizens on the opposing side of the Mytilenean conflict. The hypothetical nature of Tyrtaeus' couplets stands in contrast to the specificity of Alcaeus' situation. Tyrtaeus speaks in theoretical terms to arouse empathy in his large-scale and impersonal audience. Alcaeus, on the other hand, offers a sobering reflection on the fate of a man deprived of his livelihood. Although he too may have interest in galvanising his audience against a common enemy, that enemy is specific, as is his audience. Nowhere is this personal approach more evident than in Alcaeus' use of the first-

³² For Mytilenean history during this period including the internal struggles of the city, see Page (1955) 149-243, Andrewes (1956) 92-9, Burn (1960) 226-46, Mosshammer (1979) 246-54, and Osborne (1996) 189-97.

³³ Hutchinson (2001) 207 comments that ἀγροῖωτίκην that it "falls with disgust; it is helped by its length, its position, and its separation from μοῖραν, to which the listener at first attaches a grander sense."

³⁴ As mentioned above, Tyrtaeus draws upon similarly evocative descriptions of a defeated soldier who wanders the land in poverty with his family at his side. I noted that the fact that his father is still with him adds weight to the pathos since presumably his father had successfully defended his homeland in the past.

person throughout the poem. Alcaeus seeks to convey personal feelings and reactions to his predicament.³⁵ Conceivably performed at a symposium before a group of peers, this poem makes personal connections with the audience because they naturally care for the poet and empathise with his position and may indeed share his misfortune.³⁶ Thus, two poets employ a similar theme, but due to differing performance contexts and dissimilar audiences, they are able to achieve varying aims through different executions of that theme.

d) Solon

Solon's *Salamis* also touches upon themes of defending territory, although it is not the polis of Athens, but the titular nearby island. Although the poem is said to have been 100 lines (Plut. *Sol.* 8.1-3), only eight of them survive today in three different quotations. The poem was composed during a war between Athens and Megara.³⁷ According to Plutarch the war dragged on for so long that the Athenians passed a law forbidding any further discussion on Athens' claims to Salamis. This was not pleasing to some and so Solon wrote this poem and went to the agora, pretending to be mad, and performed it wearing a woollen cap standing from the herald's stone.³⁸ As the story goes Solon was able to subvert the laws that restricted speaking about Salamis and still persuade others to pick up the fight and eventually lay claim to Salamis. At face value we have an elegy that represents itself as speaking on behalf of certain people who are determined to reclaim lost property, while convincing others that they should join them in this endeavour. This

³⁵ Although we should never assume that the lyric "I" refers directly to the poet, I believe in this case, where we have a poem about the harshness of exile written by a poet whom we know to have spent time in exile, it is reasonable to assume that Alcaeus is reflecting on his own personal circumstances. At the very least Alcaeus is able to channel his thoughts and reflections about exile and express them through the voice of another. For the voice of Alcaeus in his poetry, see Yatromanolakis (2009) 211-3.

³⁶ Alcaeus and his audience may have been united not only in their common struggle in defeat, but also in the betrayal by some of the allies, which led to their defeat. In a related poem Alcaeus describes the oath and then speaks of the oathbreakers in disgust (129.17-24). The breaking of this oath may have led to his position in 130. The fractured base stands in contrast to Tyrtaeus' ideal picture of a cohesive and unified army.

³⁷ For more on the war between Athens and Megara, see Legon (1981) 122-31 and Taylor (1997) 21-47.

³⁸ For analysis on the implications of the cap with further bibliography, see Noussia-Fantuzzi (2001) 203-4.

represents a scenario where social and political cohesion has been fractured. If we put any credence in Plutarch's story, Solon is attempting to re-solidify cohesion.

Before making any judgement on the validity of Plutarch's story, we must examine the fragments.³⁹ The first couplet is quoted by Plutarch:

αὐτὸς κῆρυξ ἦλθον ἀφ' ἡμερτῆς Σαλαμῖνος,
κόσμον ἐπέων ᾠοῖδ' ἄντ' ἀγορῆς θέμενος
(1)

Diogenes Laertius in his work *Lives of the Philosophers* quotes two other fragments:

εἶην δὲ τότε' ἐγὼ Φολεγάνδριος ἢ Σικινήτης
ἀντί γ' Ἀθηναίου πατρίδ' ἀμειψάμενος·
αἶψα γὰρ ἂν φάτις ἦδε μετ' ἀνθρώποισι γένοιτο·
“Ἀττικὸς οὗτος ἀνὴρ, τῶν Σαλαμιναφετέων”
(2)

He includes these fragments in his *Life of Solon* as examples of verses that the Athenians found especially appealing. Diogenes also presents the next fragment:

³⁹ A mistrust of Plutarch's understanding of the historical context of the poem would not be unwarranted given that many of the details of his version of the events are found directly in the poem (e.g. Solon as a herald, the agora, the woolen hat). For those who tend not to believe this story, see Lefkowitz (1981) 40, who notes “the circumstances of performance were inferred wrongly from his poetry”, Bowie (1986) 18-21, and Anhalt (1993) 122. Equally there are some who would believe at least some of the details; see West (1974) 12, Henderson (1982) 24f., who emphasises the importance of poetry in a mostly illiterate society, comparing it to “modern-day mass media,” Tedeschi (1982) 41-4, Vox (1984) 31, Herington (1985) 34, who accepts the details that this poem was likely performed publicly before a crowd in the agora, Kurke (1999) 26, n. 64, who believes this poem was likely performed in some civic context, and Fredal (2006) 39-40. Furthermore, there are some who remain on the fence, acknowledging the possibility that it was performed in public or in a symposium; Stehle (1997) 61-3 comments “the very fact that Solon's proposal was cast as poetry suggests that he was drawing on the consensual basis of local poetry as part of his effort to reach people before they rejected the course he was proposing. If it was performed in public, the poem is in a sense an abuse of the function of local poetry. On the other hand, if it was sung as a symposium poem after the fact, then it would stage the performer as one whose individual prestige outweighs the pressure of conventional public opinion.” Mülke (2002) 74-5 weighs both sides equally before leaning toward the symposium. Irwin (2006) 41-3 sees either option as a transgression on the part of Solon, for on the one hand “the singing in the agora of this exhortation elegy suggests then a travesty of performance context. In using the term ὄχλος ('throng') for the target of this exhortation, Plutarch emphasises, somewhat derogatorily, the general audience of this exhortation: they are not the φίλοι of the symposium”, but on the other hand “the story surrounding the Salamis portrays Solon as participating in the conventions of martial exhortation elegy, but also transgressing the boundaries of its appropriate context and audience, literal or metaphorical. But if the poem was only ever composed for sympotic performance, then as a reading of the poem the story suggests the poem transgressed the boundaries of content- that is, in some sense bringing Plutarch's *ochlos* into the symposium.”

ἴομεν ἐς Σαλαμῖνα μαχησόμενοι περὶ νήσου
ἡμερτῆς χαλεπόν τ' αἶσχος ἀπωσόμενοι.
(3)

The tone of the third fragment is reminiscent some elegies of Tyrtaeus, which feature a final positive, all-inclusive, personal exhortation used to round up the freshly persuaded mob (c.f. Tyrt. 10.31-2, 12.43-4).

The two fragments preserved by Diogenes offer examples of Solon's persuasive arguments. Fragment 2 is steeped in insult and criticism, a rhetorical device we have examined in several poems across different genres.⁴⁰ Solon states he would rather change his native country from Athens to Pholegandrus or Sicinus. This statement obviously has a two-fold effect; first, there is always a certain sting involved when someone wishes to cast off their native country in this manner, and it is a statement only justified when a serious betrayal has taken place, and second, the desire to adopt as a native land two such insignificant islands as Pholegandrus⁴¹ or Sicinus⁴² intensifies the rhetorical effect. Solon justifies the insult by stating that if he were to remain Athenian, he would be a Σαλαμιναφέτης, an abandoner of Salamis.⁴³ Thus Solon attacks Athens on political, economic, and militaristic grounds. Obviously we cannot think anachronistically and presuppose their fifth-century glory, but that Solon makes these specific attacks might point toward the seed of such imperial attitudes. By not fulfilling their potential,

⁴⁰ Note the similar use of insult and abuse used in areas of persuasion. We have already seen examples of this in Homer, Callinus, Thucydides, and Lycurgus.

⁴¹ Pholegandrus and its people are so obscure that the only other mention of them in the ancient sources is found in a passing reference made by Strabo while discussing the island of Ios. His only comment on the island is that Ἄρατος σιδηρεῖν ὀνομάζει διὰ τὴν τραχύτητα (Str. 10.5.1). So, not only is it a seemingly unimportant and remote island, it does not even seem to be appealing.

⁴² Sicinus is obscure in the ancient sources; it is only mentioned when geographers name the various islands of the Cyclades (Scyl. 48.4; Str. 10.5.1). It used to be called Oivoῖνη apparently due to its many vineyards, so it does emerge as a slightly more attractive environment (Xenag. fr. 12.1). Since many aspects of Solon's poems have political undertones, it may be that he chose these islands because they are politically and economically unimportant as well.

⁴³ Taylor (1997) 25-6 analyses the different possibilities of interpreting this word including the idea that Athens never had any prior claim to the island and that this word "may well be only propaganda, and his campaign the assumption, not the resumption, of war with Megara over the island."

they are in a sense betraying themselves. Thus, according to Solon's argument, it would be better to be a citizen of some unimportant city that was never destined for greatness than to be from a city that has so much potential and never utilises it. The final fragment continues along the same line. This statement again has a two-pronged approach to persuasion;⁴⁴ it offers a reward, the beautiful island, and it seeks to remove a negative attribute, the burden of shame acquired through their previous inaction or inability to prevail.

Whether or not we are persuaded by the accuracy of Plutarch's version of events and place the performance of this poem in a historical context or we read the poem as a dramatized reconstruction of events, the persona of the speaker in the poem clearly takes a persuasive tone beyond an exhortation to fight bravely. Legon suggests that the greatest support for taking up arms to reclaim Salamis were those expelled Salamis by the Megarians.⁴⁵ Diogenes Laertius (1.45) and Diodorus Siculus (9.1) both suggest that Solon was a native Salaminian himself. Plutarch specifically says that Solon represented the voice of many of the youth; καὶ τῶν νέων ὁρῶν πολλοὺς δεομένους ἀρχῆς ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον (*Sol.* 8.1). Thus, we may have elegy that speaks on behalf, or at least represents itself as speaking on behalf, of νέοι who have already lost one battle (and their homeland) and are now eager to pick up arms and reclaim what was taken from them.

There are different aspects of this poem that share common themes, motifs, and rhetorical devices with each of the other three poets' poems discussed in this section. Solon, like Tyrtaeus, employs a sense of shame and isolation at doing what is perceived as the wrong course of action,

⁴⁴ This is a similar rhetorical device found in Tyrtaeus (10.15-30) and Callinus (1.12-21).

⁴⁵ Legon (1981) 123. This seems a reasonable assumption. If we take this assumption along with the details provided by Plutarch, we can surmise that Solon spoke on behalf of the men in the prime of their fighting age who had been expelled from Salamis. Diogenes Laertius (1.45) and Diodorus Siculus (9.1) both claim that Solon was a Salaminian by birth, in which case, Solon would have been representing his own people with his voice, but addressing both exiled Salaminians and native Athenians .

while emphasising a sense of reward and unity by correcting their behaviour. By describing himself in the singular as an abandoner of Salamis, he creates the sense of isolation at the individual that would turn his back on Salamis. Tyrtaeus created a similar sense of isolation by employing a morale tableau. Solon jettisons the unnamed 3rd person aspect of the morale tableau and instead identifies himself (or his persona) in the position of isolation. Since this poem is seemingly for a specific context, the self-identification is appropriate. He casts himself as the leader of the pro-Salaminian movement thereby compelling his peers to see the wrong in his potential action (*i.e.* abandoning Salamis) and encouraging his peers to choose a different course of action (*i.e.* fighting to reclaim Salamis). The third person exhortative statement in fragment 3 sheds the isolation of the individual who would abandon Salamis and instead casts everyone together as a unified force fighting for a common goal.

The use of personal attack to illustrate negative behaviour in Solon recalls the opening lines of Callinus. Whereas Callinus was interested in chastising the *véoi* for their actual misbehaviour, Solon critiques a version of himself who contemplates a potential future action. By portraying himself as the lightning rod of criticism for a potential action, he is able to unify his supporters who would fervently reject such a potential future, while simultaneously casting shame upon his critics who are seriously contemplating a course of inaction. The overall effect is to portray a unified group of supporters who are willing to do what is right and fight for the sake of Salamis, while casting his critics as isolated and vulnerable and enticing them to join the unified cause.

Due to the fact that the majority of this poem is lost to us we are left in the dark about how directly Solon engaged with the audience of the poem. That Plutarch was convinced Solon spoke on behalf the expelled Salaminian *véoi* suggests that such a reference may have been in

some of the missing lines. Given the rhetorical structure of the fragments that survive, it is reasonable to surmise that one of the chief elements of the complete poem was to portray a persuasive tone. Whom then was Solon trying to persuade? It is possible that Solon's main addressees were the νέοι of Athens. The prime fighters of Salamis would need to depend on them if they were to mount a counter attack. An appeal to cast them as being on the wrong side of the situation would be fitting in light of similar approaches in Tyrtaeus and Callinus. Alternatively, Solon may have been focused on the Athenian decision makers who apparently sought to suppress any further discussion on the matter. Certainly the Athenian νέοι would have been part of this group, but it would have also included elder statesmen. A third possibility is that Solon was levying his criticism against any Salaminians who were tired of war and not willing to take up arms in defense of their homeland. The charge of being τῶν Σαλαμιναφετέων would have carried additional weight because they were the individuals most connected to Salamis and who knew everything they had given up. Ultimately, Solon may have been considering all three groups in his poem. Anyone who was not willing to take up arms in defense of Salamis was seen as being on the wrong side of the debate.

Solon's *Salamis* also shares a similar context to the Alcaeus discussed in this section. Both poems portray from the point of view of one expelled from their land. The key difference is that Solon portrays those expelled by a foreign invader while Alcaeus portrays those expelled by fellow citizens. Perhaps indicative of their respective sub-genres, both poets reflect on this situation differently. Solon employs elegy in order to use rhetorical devices and take a persuasive approach Alcaeus laments his situation and expresses frustration at this current state of affairs.

It is worth noting that our interpretation of this poem in the context of understanding the motivation to defend family and home may not be greatly affected by whether or not Solon

actually stood in the agora and delivered this poem in an effort to persuade those around him or if he wrote this poem as a reflection of the attitudes of the time that was best expressed in a sympotic setting. Solon touches upon themes that were easily understood by those living in the 6th century B.C. A proactive poem that was meant to persuade the people of the day to adopt a policy that was regarded as fundamentally the correct approach is just as valuable for our understanding of our topic as retrospective poem performed after the events in question that was meant to portray the thoughts, feelings, and reactions of certain groups of the day.

3. Predatory Gains

a) Problems of Spoils and Booty in Lyric

Considering the number of archaic lyric poems that examine the various dynamics of protecting family and home, there is a surprising dearth of poetry that examines the issue from the other side, that of the attacking force seeking to acquire economic advantage as a motivation for warfare.⁴⁶ In the first volume of his monumental series on Greek warfare Pritchett lists all known instances of booty before and after the Persian Wars.⁴⁷ It is telling that his earliest examples begin with Homer and are immediately followed by examples from Herodotus. Of course, Pritchett is more concerned with historical examples of booty rather than hypothetical ones we might expect to see in Tyrtaeus. However, when Pritchett returned to the issue of booty in the fifth volume of the series, the lyric poets of archaic Greece were still absent due to the

⁴⁶ I am tempted to include Archilochus 23 in this category, but unfortunately it is fragmentary and many interpretations are highly debated. It speaks of conquering a domain and ruling over it with dominance (23.17-21). Scholars have debated how many poems are present, where they may break off, how many speakers are present within the poem, the gender of the speakers, and whether they were historical figures or fictional. For more on these emendations and competing interpretations, see Lobel (1954), Page (1961) 69, Tarditi (1968) 90-2, and Clay (1986), who provides an excellent overview of previous arguments and proposes an interesting interpretation. Since the problems of this text are at this time unresolved, I am hesitant to make any firm conclusions about its relation to spoils in lyric.

⁴⁷ Pritchett (1971) 53-84.

indisputable fact that very little of their surviving poetry deals with this theme. In the fifth volume Pritchett examines the topic exhaustively.⁴⁸ He provides a list of all the Greek words that can be translated as booty and their uses in literature including σύλη, λεία including dialectical deviations, ῥύσιον and its cognate ῥυσιάζω, συλάω and its cognates, σκυῖλα, λαφυρα, ἔναρα, and ὠφέλεια. There are only nine examples of any of these words found in the body of poets examined in this research and those nine examples only come from four poets: Alcaeus, Theognis, Bacchylides, and Pindar. This means that none of the surviving poetry of Tyrtaeus, Callinus, Archilochus, Simonides, Stesichorus, Solon, or Ibycus contains these words.⁴⁹ Considering these poets often examine motivations for fighting in their poetry, such a fact may at first be surprising. We are of course working with the unfortunate reality that the majority of these poets' work does not survive and thus we cannot make any firm conclusions about the importance of this theme to the poets based on this small sample size. Regardless, I believe we can still examine the general trend of these poets and consider the implications of the paucity of such fragments in relation to other motivations for war as well as the abundant use of this theme in epic.

b) Evidence for Spoils in Epic

Before examining the lyric use of spoils it will be helpful to examine the epic background on this theme. It is immediately obvious to a modern reader of the *Iliad* that the acquisition and distribution of spoils is crucial to the Homeric warrior ethos. The central conflict of the poem develops from an argument over the redistribution of spoils, taking Briseis, a slave-girl captured on a previous campaign, away from Achilles and placing her into the hands of Agamemnon.

⁴⁸ Pritchett (1991) 68-541.

⁴⁹ I disregard the few examples of ἐναρίζω and ἐξεναρίζω, two verbs that can mean to strip arms, when they are used in the general sense of "to kill" or "to slay" (cf. Pind. *N.* 6.52, Bacchyl. 5.145) and do not describe the act of despoiling.

Agamemnon tries to resolve his conflict with Achilles by offering him abundantly more spoils than he lost (*Il.* 9.121-61). Furthermore, Agamemnon is explicit that the war began over the Trojans' wrongdoing, but the Greeks will happily lead away their wives and children once they are victorious (*Il.* 4.234-9). The pursuit of spoils was not the catalyst for war, but it remains a potent motivation for the Greeks.

Throughout the many combat scenes in the poem victorious warriors leap upon the vanquished corpses and strip their armour. The acquisition of spoils is as natural and common to Homeric warriors as putting on their own armour. When Meriones requires a new spear after breaking his in combat, his companion Idomeneus advises him to take one of the many which he acquired from defeated Trojans (*Il.* 13.248-73). As Ready observes, "toiling and risking their lives on the front ranks earns them the right to despoil their foes."⁵⁰ Furthermore, the acquisition of spoils is not simply a matter of accruing wealth for wealth's sake. Donlan discusses the acquisition of wealth and notes that it "was not promoted by greed: such a motivation belongs to market economies. The possession of great wealth was a conspicuous sign of success - visible proof of prowess and leadership."⁵¹ Thus, for the Homeric warrior the acquisition of spoils is fuelled by an individualistic desire to stand out from one's peers. However, the warriors can use these desires to motivate their peers. Agamemnon offers Teucer a gift before others if he shoots Hector with an arrow (*Il.* 8.281-91). Teucer replies that he is already heavily motivated, but Agamemnon's offer has increased his desire for success (*Il.* 8.292-9). The Homeric spoils are, at their core, a means to distinguish oneself from one's peers.

⁵⁰ Ready (2007) 18. In his in-depth study on spoils in Homer, Ready makes a great effort to distinguish the importance of individual acquisition versus public redistribution of spoils.

⁵¹ Donlan (1980) 4.

c) Evidence for Spoils in Lyric

Returning to lyric, the earliest lyric use of vocabulary relating to spoils comes from Alcaeus. In the same poem he twice uses words denoting plunder in descriptions of Athena. He refers to her as Ἀθανάας πολυλάϊδος (298.9) and ἃ θεῶν θανάτοι]σι θεοσύλαισι πάντων αἶνο]τάτα μακάρων πέφυκε (298.17-9). The former establishes Athena as a generous goddess, one who provides much booty, while the latter establishes Athena as goddess who punishes sacrilege. The context of this scene is Ajax raping Cassandra at the statue of Athena. That Athena is both a provider of booty and a punisher of those who take what they should not is significant in this scene. However, since this is a retelling of a scene from epic, these examples tell us very little about predatory gains as a motivation in archaic Greece. Theognis uses σύλαω (341-50), but unfortunately this passage does not offer us any insight into booty as a motivation for war, for the poet's persona merely informs the audience that other men robbed him of his possessions: τίσις δ' οὐ φαίνεται ἡμῖν / ἀνδρῶν, οἳ τὰμὰ χρήματ' ἔχουσι βίῃ / συλήσαντες (345-7). We know nothing of why they took his possessions or the general context. Instead, the couplet entices the audience to feel sympathy for the deprived individual and provide a social commentary on the baseness prevalent in his polis. Bacchylides twice makes use of this vocabulary, but again, neither case offers us much help in understanding spoils and booty as a motivation for war. In one of his paeans he uses the verb συλάω in a metaphor which has sleep pillaged from one's eyes (fr. 4.75-8). Only slightly more helpful is his use of λαΐς, which Heracles was in the process of sacrificing to various gods (16.14-22). He obtained the spoils when he sacked Oechalia,⁵² but the primary motivation for sacking the city was revenge on Eurytus.⁵³ Considering the exceptional

⁵² Haubold (2008) notes the frequent stories of Heracles sacking cities in Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* and comments that these actions coupled with his casting as a lover of women "informs the manner of his demise."

⁵³ Apollodorus gives a complete account of Eurytus cheating Heracles out of his prize in an archery competition and Heracles' subsequent revenge (2.6.1-2.7.8). Details of this story are also found in Homer (*Od.* 21.13-38), Sophocles

nature of Heracles' character, it is difficult to discern the importance of spoils as a motivation for the common archaic soldier. In Olympian 9 Pindar describes Epharmostus being taken from a younger class of competitors and made to fight against older men: συλαθεὶς ἀγενείων (O. 9.89). Although Pindar is being colourful with his language, he does not illuminate us on the present discussion. He uses συλάω in Pythian 12, in which Perseus beheads Medusa (P. 12.16). In this case Pindar makes a clever use of the word as it describes both the act of killing Medusa and taking her head as a prize. Thus, the act and the reward are one and the same. Pindar also describes spoils in an episode involving Heracles sacking Elis (O. 10.23-45). As in the similar Bacchylides episode Pindar describes Heracles taking spoils at the end of the conflict and using them as an offering to the gods. They are clearly not his primary goal, but are part of the process of sacking a city. Finally, Pindar uses the verb ἀποσυλάω, which can mean "to strip arms from", to describe Pelias usurping the throne from Jason's father (P. 4.110), but the context does not suggest what we would typically describe as taking spoils.

As we can see from the preceding survey, we possess very little lyric poetry that describes the plundering of spoils and what we do have speaks very little of spoils as a motivation for combat. The theme is practically non-existent and there are only a few scant examples of words meaning 'spoils' or 'to acquire spoils'. We do know of other examples that do not survive, for instance, Pausanias tells us that Stesichorus spoke of captured women in his *Sack of Troy* (10.26.1). Given the subject matter of this poem, we might expect any reference to spoils as a motivation to mirror the poem's epic counterparts. It may be the case that through chance we have lost a greater proportion of poetry that dealt with this theme than other martial

(*Trachiniae* 248ff. and 351ff), and Diodorus Siculus (4.31-7). The tradition shows a certain degree of flexibility among the sources. Sophocles has the messenger make clear that the primary motivation was taking the girl Iole. It is clear that spoils could be the primary motivation for Heracles, but they did not have to be.

ones. On the other hand, it is entirely possible that this was simply not an aspect of war that interested the lyric poets. It may be significant that of the few examples we do have of an overt reference to spoils and booty from the perspective of the taker, all of them come from some form of mythological narrative. Stesichorus may have had more of an opportunity to expand upon this theme due to his longer narratives than Pindar and Bacchylides, who only make passing references.

d) Large Scale Predatory Gains: Sparta and Messenia

Although Tyrtaeus does not write about personal spoils of the common soldier, he does briefly refer to the grand-scale predatory gains made by the Spartan polis when they conquered Messenia.⁵⁴ This topic is worth considering alongside the more typical spoils of the common soldier because the critical point of distinction is the scale of the gains. Whether it is one soldier prying the armour off a fallen opponent or an entire city-state conquering and enslaving another, the basic motivation is the same, improving one's economic situation or social status by reducing another's through martial exploits. In Tyrtaeus 5 he recalls the initial seizure of the Messenians:

ἡμετέρῳ βασιλῆϊ, θεοῖσι φίλῳ Θεοπόμπῳ,
 ὃν διὰ Μεσσήνην εἵλομεν εὐρύχορον,
 Μεσσήνην ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἀροῦν, ἀγαθὸν δὲ φυτεύειν·
 ἀμφ' αὐτὴν δ' ἐμάχοντ' ἐννέα καὶ δέκ' ἔτη
 νωλεμέως αἰεὶ ταλασίφρονα θυμὸν ἔχοντες
 αἰχμηταὶ πατέρων ἡμετέρων πατέρες·
 εἰκοστῷ δ' οἱ μὲν κατὰ πίονα ἔργα λιπόντες
 φεῦγον Ἰθωμαίων ἐκ μεγάλων ὀρέων.

⁵⁴ For Sparta and the Helots, see Toynbee (1969) 180-2, 195-203, 221-39, Clauss (1983) 109-15, MacDowell (1986) 31-7, Hunt (1998) 13-9, and Cartledge (2002) 138-53.

Tyrtaeus is vague whether this was the goal of the war when he uses the phrase ἀμφ' αὐτὴν δ' ἐμάχοντ' (5.4).⁵⁵ This could simply mean that they fought around this land of Messenia, but it could equally mean that they fought specifically for the purpose of acquiring this land.

If we are to read Tyrtaeus with the understanding that the Spartans fought for the land, the question remains whether or not they fought to enslave the population as well. There is some division among modern scholars on the claims of the ancient sources.⁵⁶ Finley argues that the helots' relationship to the Spartans was one of debt-bondage, although it is unclear if he envisions this as the cause of helotry or the outcome.⁵⁷ Luraghi is generally sceptical of what he calls "the modern *vulgata*" of the enslavement of the Messenians.⁵⁸ He tentatively puts forth the idea that they may have succumbed to debt-bondage in a similar fashion to the Athenians before the intervention of Solon.⁵⁹ Both of these theories would suggest that the motivation for warfare was to retain or collect what was owed to the Spartans. In other words, they were not motivated

⁵⁵ It is worth noting here that this fragment only exists in its current form as modern reconstruction. Lines 1-2 come from a quotation of Pausanias (4.6.5), line 3 comes from a scholiast of Plato (Schol. Plat. *Leg.* 629a), and lines 4-8 from Strabo (6.3.3). I believe this reconstruction to be a logical one and should remain. Even if Tyrtaeus did not compose these verses in precisely this order, we can feel relatively certain that he did at least compose them in some form.

⁵⁶ In the 4th century Isocrates claims that the Spartans conquered Messenia in revenge for the Messenians slaying Cresphontes⁵⁶ (*Archid.* 22-5).⁵⁶ Ephorus relates a version of events of early Messenia and Cresphontes, who subsequently angered both Messenians and Spartans (*FGrHist* 70 F 116 = Strab. 8.4.7). Nicolaus of Damascus echoes similar sentiments and links these events to Spartan domination (*FGrHist* 70 F 34). Contrarily, Pausanias states that the initial catalyst for war occurred when Messenian men raped Spartan maidens and killed their king Teleclus, who reigned in the mid-8th century (7.4.1-3). He also notes a second *casus belli* when the Messenian Polychares sought revenge against the Spartan Euaephnus for selling his cattle without permission and subsequently murdering his son (7.4.4-8). Pausanias adds that the Messenians alleged that the Spartans invented these stories and conspired against them because they were covetous of their land (7.5.3). Although there is some obvious variety in the ancient accounts, there is a persistent claim that the war broke out over a Messenian wrongdoing, which is likely indicative of Spartan efforts to legitimate their conquests.

⁵⁷ Finley (1980) 71.

⁵⁸ Luraghi (2003) 135 notes "what I call the modern *vulgata* on the conquest of the land and enslavement of its inhabitants by the Dorian Spartans, is not based on the ancient sources, but rather on an idiosyncratic selection of details taken from some of them. This does not mean that it is wrong, but only, that it cannot claim for itself the authority enjoyed among classicists by anything written in Greek." Luraghi follows Patterson (1982) 112, who states in regard to ancient slavery "although there are frequent references to enslavement, there is not a single unambiguous case of the mass of the free members of a conquered people being successfully enslaved in situ. The closest the ancient world came to such a situation was Spartan helotry."

⁵⁹ Luraghi (2002) 240-1.

to add to their resources specifically, but rather to collect what they perceived as their due. While we may lack any decisive contemporary evidence of the Spartans conquering and enslaving their neighbours, van Wees makes the compelling argument that “Sparta’s conquest of Messenia was no anomaly, but merely the most spectacular and best attested instance of a form of imperialism characteristic of archaic Greece.”⁶⁰ Cartledge argues that the origin of warfare between Sparta and Messenia “was triggered by relative overpopulation in the Eurotas valley.”⁶¹ Both of these theories suggest that the conquest of Messenia was largely motivated by a need or desire to increase the resources of the Spartan state. These latter views may reflect the traditional view of the origins of this conflict, but that is only because the traditional view adheres to the evidence (such as it is) more easily than other theories.

Returning to Tyrtaeus and his phrase ἀμφ' αὐτήν, the evidence suggests that he does mean that the Spartans initiated warfare because of their desire for Messenian land. Considering that the engagement took place on Messenian land, it is likely that Tyrtaeus cleverly implies both meanings of the phrase; the Spartans fought for the land, by the land. Elsewhere Tyrtaeus describes the excellent quality of Messenian land: Μεσσήνην ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἀροῦν, ἀγαθὸν δὲ φυτεύειν (5.3). This statement not only validates the state’s desire to gain by conquest, but also allows the Spartans to boast about their victory by flaunting the splendid nature of their prize. The latter point also provides a moral boost for the soldiers of Tyrtaeus’ day, who are fighting to defend their previous gains some two generations later. They still hold the excellent land, and are

⁶⁰ van Wees (2003) 72 continues “In large parts of northern Greece (Thessaly, Locris and Phocis), most of the Peloponnese (Sicyon, Argos, Corinth, Epidauros and Elis, as well as Sparta and Messenia), all of Crete, and parts of the colonial world (Syracuse, Byzantium, Hereclea, and Cyrene) communities succeeded in reducing their Greek or barbarian neighbours to the status of serfs or *perioikoi*.” van Wees argues against models of archaic warfare presented by scholars such as Pritchett (1972) 147-89, Ober (1985) 32-8, and Hanson (1995) 221-89, who see it as agonal and ritualistic. Kennell (2010) 39-42 prefers a model of conquest as the *casus belli*.

⁶¹ Cartledge (2002) 100. Elsewhere Cartledge (2004) 28 envisions that the war “was probably a series of raids and border skirmishes, rather than a concerted invasion.”

simultaneously reminded of the achievements of their ancestors and warned that they must not relinquish these spoils lest they disgrace those ancestors. Thus, the initial war would have been motivated by the need for new resources, while the second war would have been motivated by the need to retain previously acquired possessions and to honour the past deeds of an earlier generation.

e) Comparing Epic and Lyric Depictions

As I have discussed above, the addition of spoils was essential for the Homeric warrior to maintain and advance his relative position vis-à-vis his peers. The warrior ethos demanded a selfish and self-advancing attitude at the expense of others. Simply put, spoils are a tangible and quantifiable expression of a warrior's relative status in his society. I have also noted the relative dearth of similar conceptions in lyric. While this may be due to a loss of such poetry, there may be a simpler and more interesting reason: such views run contrary to the central motivations expressed by the lyric poets, especially in the exhortative elegies of Tyrtaeus and Callinus. It seems reasonable to expect that during the formative years of the polis and hoplite warfare such individualistic expressions of selfish gains would clash with the developing ideals that stress the cohesiveness of the soldiers and their society, whether those ideals had any significant bearing in practice or not. Tyrtaeus implores his audience with first-person plural imperatives to fight and die as a unified group; *μαχώμεθα* (10.13), *θνήσκωμεν* (10.14), and subsequently adopts the persona of commander and gives orders in 2nd person plural imperatives; *μάχεσθε παρ' ἀλλήλοισι μένοντες* (10.15). If Tyrtaeus were to include orders to seek individual rewards in battle, the integrity of his poetry would be compromised. Furthermore, the depictions of Homeric heroes leaping upon their recently defeated foes to strip them of their armour could not translate to hoplite warfare where the cohesiveness of the phalanx must be maintained throughout the

battle. Hoplite warfare, even if it was only in its infancy, required a strict discipline in the ranks and Homeric style despoiling would break that discipline.

It is also interesting that the only depiction of predatory gains relatively contemporary to the poet (*i.e.* relatively close to the poet's own day as opposed to stories of brave heroes from long ago) occurs when the Spartan state conquers its neighbours. Although the individual Spartans all benefit from the conquest, the helots are technically state property and it is the state that distributes them to the individuals. Again, this may be a matter of chance survival, but this type of predatory gains is congruent to the ideals expressed by Tyrtaeus. State level predatory gains help to establish and maintain cohesion.

Perhaps the most significant distinction between spoils in Homer and lyric is that personal and political gains were not mutually exclusive in Homer, whereas the idea of personal profit runs counter to the central themes of the poetry of Tyrtaeus and others. The Greeks at Troy could fight the Trojans over the initial grievance at the abduction of Helen, but they could also continually increase their own glory through gaining spoils in combat. The martial elegists are more concerned with group unity in defence of the polis. Although Tyrtaeus can exploit the individual soldier's personal desire to protect his family, he does so to make him more willing to fight with courage and discipline as a member of the state army.

4. Epigrams

This present section will look further ahead in history than the majority of the poems discussed in this research to the epigrams attributed to Simonides.⁶² The early fifth century was witness to a unique coalition of Greek poleis reluctantly banding together to fend off the

⁶² Page (1981) with bibliography is highly sceptical of the attribution of these epigrams to Simonides.

invading Persians and some of the poetry written as epigrams for the war-dead touch upon several variations of themes raised in this chapter. That the Greeks were compelled to come together despite their differences and were motivated to protect something common to them all is comparable to the individual soldier wanting to protect his family or an army wanting to protect their polis, but on a grander scale. The epigrams in question still hint at the motivation of protecting family and home as we saw with earlier elegy, but they also contain an expanded vocabulary. The Greeks not only fight for their polis, but they also fight for freedom and for Greece. This section will conclude with a brief review of the notion of Greek nationality in order to consider whether we should read references to the defence of Greece and freedom as a genuine motivation compelling the soldiers to fight in the actual battles or whether they were the result of propaganda in the following decades. At the outset of this discussion we should be cognisant that any perceived motivating factors portrayed in epigrams may not necessarily reflect the actual motivation of the soldiers at the time of fighting but reflect how the soldiers (and their poleis) wished to be perceived in subsequent years after the fighting. Thus, in the confines of this chapter the epigrams may be better understood as textual expressions of motivation.

a) In Defence of Freedom

One of the longer epigrams has the Megarian war-dead cite the protection of both Megara and Greece as their chief motivation: Ἑλλάδι καὶ Μεγαρεῦσιν ἐλεύθερον ἄμαρ ἀέξειν / ἰέμενοι θανάτου μοῖραν ἐδεξάμεθα (XVI.1-2).⁶³ The focus on freedom sets the tone for the rest of the

⁶³ The authenticity of this epigram and its association to the Simonidean corpus has been contested. See Podlecki (1973) 24-7 for arguments in favour of Simonides' authorship. However, Campbell (1991) 533 thinks it is doubtful but calls notice to a scholiast on Theocritus who mentions Simonides praising the Megarians (Schol. Theocr. 12.27-33bc). In contrast, Page (1981) 214 claims that "the ascription to Simonides must, as usual, be dismissed as fictitious, but the question remains whether this epigram represents a text actually inscribed on a monument at Megara in or about 479 B.C.", and later concludes that "there is nothing in the vocabulary, phrasing, or metre incompatible with the early fifth century." Wilhelm (1972) 321 favours only the first couplet as authentic. Wade-Gery (1933) 96 denies the authorship of Simonides, but accepts the chronological authenticity of the first couplet,

epigram.⁶⁴ The inclusion of both Megara and Greece is significant, if we take it at face value, as it reveals a considerable development in the Greek psyche concerning what is worth defending compared to their archaic ancestors.⁶⁵ While they still consider themselves the protectors of their polis, they now include all of Greece in the geographical territory that is worth dying to protect. Since the Megarians claim they protected the freedom of Greece, it suggests that it was not only their territory that was at stake, but their political and cultural lives (*i.e.* factors that contribute to making them Greek) as well. This is a remarkable transition when we consider how the early elegists strove to persuade their audience to fight for their polis. Although the Megarian epigram does not express any national unity in the modern sense, this change in attitude reflects an admission that the cultural traits that the Greeks held in common were worth defending just as much as the domestic and political ones. While we need not conclude that such Pan-Hellenic ideas were prevalent on a state-to-state and soldier-to-soldier basis, the fact that such thoughts could be expressed is significant itself even though we may question whether or not these thoughts were a true motivation expressed at the time of battle. The remainder of the epigram lists all of the battles where the Megarians died for the sake of their homeland. Compared to many of the other epigrams, which are usually only one or two couplets, this one goes into particular detail concerning these various battles of the Megarians. This list is salient for it emphasises in dramatic fashion all of the places and the extent to which the Megarians were

further adding that he is not willing to discount the rest of the epigram as well. For an overview of the Megarian battles in the Persian Wars including the likely number of war-dead, see Petrovic (2007) 197 ff.

⁶⁴ Pelling (2006a) 80-1 makes an interesting comparison between Nestor's speech in the *Doloneia* (Il. 10.173-4) and Dionysius the Phocaeen in Herodotus (6.11.1-2). Pelling concludes "And if what lay on each edge for Homer's Nestor was 'life' and 'grim death', for Herodotus' Dionysius 'to be free' or 'to be slaves, and runaway slaves at that', that too captures something important: freedom is indeed to matter to the Greek as much as life itself." This epigram perfectly sums up this notion that life and freedom are equally important and the sacrifice of one's life is justifiable in the defence of freedom.

⁶⁵ Although the position of Ἑλλάς as the first word in the epigram is striking at first glance, we should not read too much into the position of Ἑλλάς before Μεγαρεῦς since, metrically speaking, the latter could simply not have been placed in the opening position.

willing to go to defend what they deemed appropriate. However, we must be conscious of the fact that this is what the Megarians wanted said about themselves *after* the fighting had concluded and does not necessarily indicate that they felt this way during the fighting.

A similar notion of preserving freedom is expressed in another epigram attributed to Simonides, this time represented as a defence against slavery: Ἑλλάδος εὐρυχόρου σωτῆρες τόνδ' ἀνέθηκαν / δουλοσύνης στυγεράς ῥυσάμενοι πόλιας (XVIIb).⁶⁶ Like the Megarian epigram discussed above, this one contains both a Pan-Hellenic notion, Ἑλλάδος εὐρυχόρου σωτῆρες, and a more local or polis-related notion in that slavery was warded off from the cities. Thucydides informs us that the monument which bore this inscription also contained the names of all the states that helped defend against the Persians in the war (1.132).⁶⁷ This clearly defines which poleis fought not only for themselves, but for all of Greece, but perhaps just as important, it also isolates those that did not. Thus it highlights those who fought for cohesion and leaves out those who did not. The expression of unity over defending a common goal has developed significantly over the centuries. What was once a matter of arousing a group of common citizens to fight for the polis now takes the form of a group of common poleis fighting for the land which bore them and their political and cultural freedom. However, the important distinction between these two concepts is that whatever unity existed at the end of the Persian Wars between the poleis, which was born from a desire to protect what was common between them, was fleeting

⁶⁶ This epigram is quoted by Diodorus Siculus (11.33.2). Along with its counterpart XVIIa, this epigram originally came from a dedication at Delphi after the end of the Persian Wars in 479 BC. Page (1981) 217 suggests that it “is a commonplace epigram; there is nothing in it incompatible with the early date.” Its attribution to Simonides, put forth by Schneidewin (1835) 182, and its legitimacy as an epigram from Plataea, which is supported by Weber (1929) 45-6, are both generally regarded as doubtful; see Jacoby (1945) 159 n. 11 who says “the alleged epitaphs for the men who fell at Marathon and Plataea are hardly even dubious and certainly not contemporary” and 185, n. 107, and Oldfather (1946) 212. Petrovic (2007) 268 notes that the 3 centuries between the destruction of the tripod and Diodorus as problematic.

⁶⁷ The inscription contains a list of 31 poleis, see Meiggs and Lewis (1988) 57-60 with bibliography and Fornara (1977) 59.

and did not provide any lasting political unity like that which occurred in the individual poleis during the archaic period.⁶⁸

It is significant that references to defending freedom and warding off slavery figure so prominently in these epigrams, for they mark a drastic departure from the motivations expressed in Homer some two centuries before. Cunliffe cites only four occasions where the word ἐλεύθερος appears in the works of Homer.⁶⁹ Three of those uses appear in the phrase ἐλεύθερον ἥμαρ (*Il.* 6.455, 16.831, 20.193). In all three cases the phrase is used in relation to taking women away as spoils, and twice the phrase is uttered by the defender (*Il.* 6.455, 16.831) and once by the attacker (*Il.* 20.193). The fourth instance involves the phrase κρητῆρα στήσασθαι ἐλεύθερον ἐν μεγάροισιν (*Il.* 6.528).⁷⁰ In contrast Herodotus makes extensive use of the noun throughout his work. In Homer the phrase is generally used in opposition to slavery, but Herodotus is able to incorporate some subtle nuances. Powell observes 36 uses of the word. It can be used to describe freeborn people in opposition to slavery in a manner similar to Homer (4.95, 5.92^η, 6.58, *et al.*), independent states (1.6, 3.65, 4.136, *et al.*), and states either freely-governed or in opposition to tyranny (3.125, 5.64, 7.103, *et al.*).⁷¹ The theme of fighting to protect freedom is clearly dominant in Herodotus, and reflects the severity of the threat facing the Greeks in the early fifth century and how they came to understand the importance of the war in the following decades. The prevalence of this theme in the epigrams attributed to this period likewise reflects this same threat and isolates it as the most critical motivation for the Greeks to fight against the Persians; if they did not, they would have lost their freedom, and consequently much of what defines them as Greeks. The Homeric warriors did not generally face this dilemma, although

⁶⁸ Internal unity was not always strong, see Lintott (1982) and Gehrke (1985).

⁶⁹ Cunliffe (1924) 124, 181. See also Snell (1991) 529-30.

⁷⁰ Kirk (1990) 228, n. on 527-8 notes this is a “celebratory feast, in a unique figurative phrasing.”

⁷¹ Powell (1960).

Hector does express some of the fears from the Trojan perspective. It is true that Homeric warriors fought for *kleos* and the acquisition of spoils would inevitably increase their *kleos*, but that is only ever on a personal level. The fear of losing their freedom and cultural identity (as they imagined would have happened under Persian domination) would have made a much more significant impact on their lives both on a personal level and a broader, cultural level. From Homer to Herodotus and the Persian War epigrams, the textual expression of the motivation to defend freedom evolves from a secondary aspect to seemingly the most critical motivation compelling Greeks to fight.

b) In Defence of the Polis

Although the early fifth century brought about an alliance conceived for a tactical advantage, any perceived notion of fighting for the greater good (*i.e.* Greece) did not necessarily supersede any patriotic allegiance which citizens felt toward their own polis, as the Athenians demonstrate in the following epigram: παῖδες Ἀθηναίων Περσῶν στρατὸν ἐξολέσαντες / ἤρκεσαν ἀργαλήν πατρίδι δουλосύνην (XVIII).⁷² The opening line makes use of chiasmus, placing the Athenians and Persians in direct conflict, and setting the tone of victors against defeated, while the pentameter stresses the bitter nature of slavery being warded off from Athens.⁷³ There is a familial tone to this passage conveyed with the use of παῖδες and πατρίς, which together emphasise the cohesiveness of kinship fighting against a common threat and touches upon language used by Tyrtaeus almost two centuries earlier when writing about this same theme. Page notes two other epigrams, XXIV and XII, where the Athenians and Corinthians “claim exclusive credit” for the victories at Artemisium and Salamis respectively.

⁷² This epigram survives in the *Palatine Anthology* (7.257) and its attribution to Simonides has generally been regarded as spurious; see Preger (1891) 225; Jacoby (1945) 185 n. 107.

⁷³ For more on the Athenian abandonment of their city see Herodotus 8.41 and for the Persian destruction of the Acropolis see 8.53.

He then surmises that “this couplet may refer to some battle in the war against Xerxes, exaggerating the part played by the Athenians.”⁷⁴ The absence of any Pan-Hellenic expression in this epigram is merely a sign that the Athenians still felt a greater allegiance to their own polis.⁷⁵ Considering the development of the Athenians’ role as ‘protector’ of the Greek world in the following decades, it would also be in their interest to promote and even exaggerate their role in warding off the Persians. In a different epigram the Athenians do not express a Pan-Hellenic notion, but rather distinguish themselves as protectors of Greece: Ἑλλήνων προμαχοῦντες Ἀθηναῖοι Μαραθῶνι / χρυσοφόρων Μήδων ἐστόρεσαν δύναμιν (XXI).⁷⁶ These two epigrams symbolise both the patriotic sense the Athenians felt toward their own polis and a growing confidence in their position as leaders of the Greek world against a common Persian adversary, a confidence that they gained through their successes in the Persian Wars.

c) Greek Nationality

If we only had these few epigrams discussed above and did not know the developments that occurred during the Classical and Hellenistic periods, we might be tempted to suppose that the various Greek poleis were uniting into a national force similar to the modern nation. Of course, we do know how the decades and centuries following the Persian Wars unfolded and that the concept of political nationhood never entered the picture in any meaningful way. The Pan-Hellenic expressions in epigrams appear to be anomalies rather than the beginning of a new Greek world order. We must consider whether the soldiers who fought at Plataea and

⁷⁴ Page (1981) 230.

⁷⁵ In an attempt at defining Panhellenism Perlman (1976) 4 argues that “it is not the component of common unity which is paramount in the history of these terms, but the antithesis between the Greeks and other nations, especially, between the Greek and the Persians, between the Greeks and the barbarians.” Mitchell (2007) 1 describes Panhellenism as “political and is intimately connected to the self-conscious Hellenic community. Panhellenism created community, not only by providing limits for it, but also by providing it with a shared, at least a ‘joined-up’ present, and the prospect of a common future.”

⁷⁶ This epigram is quoted by Lycurgus (*in Leocr.* 109).

Thermopylae were actually motivated to fight for all of Greece or whether they were simply fighting for their own polis alongside other soldiers who were fighting on behalf of their respective poleis.

Herodotus tells us that, in the lead-up to the battle of Marathon, the Athenians pleaded with the Spartans for aid. Their request was not composed of any Pan-Hellenic notion, but rather, simply an appeal to protect Athens: Ἀθηναῖοι ὑμέων δέονται σφίσι βοηθῆσαι καὶ μὴ περιδεῖν πόλιν ἀρχαιοτάτην ἐν τοῖσι Ἑλλήσι δουλοσύνη περιπεσοῦσαν πρὸς ἀνδρῶν βαρβάρων (6.106). Prior to the battle itself, the Athenian general Miltiades argues for attack instead of delay and offers two possible outcomes: ἢ καταδουλῶσαι Ἀθήνας ἢ ἐλευθέρας ποιήσαντα (6.109). He makes no requests to his fellow Athenians that they fight on behalf of Greece, but only Athens. When the Hellenic League first meets, their first order of business is to reconcile any ongoing hostilities:⁷⁷ καταλλάσσεσθαι τάς τε ἔχθρας καὶ τοὺς κατ' ἀλλήλους ἐόντας πολέμους (7.145).⁷⁸ These are allies out of necessity and convenience; there is no notion of unity beyond this immediate threat.

Prior to the battle of Salamis, many allies favoured engaging the enemy at the Isthmus of Corinth (8.49), whereas the Athenians favoured Salamis (8.57). These are signs of a clear divide with each polis seeking the best solution for defending their own territory. The Greeks did not unite in order to protect as much of Greece as they could, but only because they knew they were stronger if they fought together. There did not seem to be any genuine concern for the kinsmen who had already lost their territory. The Corinthian Adeimantus blatantly tells Themistocles that

⁷⁷ Brunt (1953) offers a detailed summary with bibliography and analysis of what decisions were made at the first meeting, which members were there, and the League's association with the Peloponnesian and Delian Leagues. For a more recent discussion see Rhodes (1992) 34-40.

⁷⁸ Herodotus specifically mentions the hostility between Athens and Aegina. Stadter (2006) 251 writes: "the path was tortuous, but is exemplary for how Herodotus saw hostility among the Greek cities as yielding to a short-lived unity, and even required for Greek success."

his opinion does not count since he no longer holds any territory (8.61). However, at a later meeting of the League, Themistocles argues that fighting at Salamis will save Greece: Ἐν σοὶ νῦν ἔστι σῶσαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα (8.60). Themistocles subsequently charges that if Eurybiades does not heed to his plan, it will be at Greece's peril: εἰ δὲ μή, ἀνατρέψει τὴν Ἑλλάδα (8.62).⁷⁹ Herodotus tells us that Eurybiades only relented when he feared the Athenians would migrate to Sicily (8.63). Herodotus depicts a scene where the Spartans were clearly concerned about protecting their own domain, and shows that it was only out of a fear of a potential tactical disadvantage that they decided to engage the enemy at Salamis. Similarly, the Athenian threat to leave for Sicily suggests their primary concern was for Athens and not Greece.⁸⁰ Although, to be fair, Athens was not receiving any support from their supposed allies and any meagre Pan-Hellenic thoughts that may have been aroused by the Hellenic League were quickly dissipating. Thus, if we reconsider Themistocles' Pan-Hellenic suggestions, we need not read them as confirmation that the Greeks fought to protect Greece, but rather that Themistocles was appealing to the Spartans' desire to appear as supreme benefactors to their kin. Regardless, these appeals were not successful, and it was the thought of a tactical disadvantage that made the Spartans relent.

Although the Greeks never united into a powerful Pan-Hellenic state, they did come together to ward off an outside threat.⁸¹ They obviously felt that there was something that united them in other ways that also separated them from the Persians. In the often quoted passage when

⁷⁹ How and Wells (1912) 255, n. on 60a note that ἐν σοί “recalls the address of Miltiades to Callimachus.” In both cases the speaker places the burden of decision on the addressee, but in the former case the emphasis is on helping Athens specifically, while in the latter the emphasis is on Greece.

⁸⁰ Pelling (2006b) 112 notes that this threat “shows the truth in Themistocles' original fears that fragmentation would be the danger – but only because the Athenians themselves bring the fear so close to realisation.” These fears reflect strategic thinking rather than any unified Greek front.

⁸¹ Morgan (1991) argues that we ought to view the Greek *ethne* in terms of nationhood. She states that “*ethne* were therefore structured around an ideal of nationhood rather than any particular federal constitution or concept of citizenship.”

discussing Greek nationhood, the Athenians cite the bonds that link the Greeks: αὐτίς δὲ τὸ Ἑλληνικόν, ἐὼν ὁμαιμόν τε καὶ ὁμόγλωσσον, καὶ θεῶν ἰδρύματά τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι ἡθεὰ τε ὁμότροπα (8.144).⁸² While this may seem a comprehensive list of what unites the Greeks on a cultural level, Finley observes that

what Herodotus failed to include is equally noteworthy. Their common Hellenism made it unthinkable that Athenians should join Persians against Greeks; it never prevented Greeks (including Athenians) from fighting or enslaving Greeks and from employing foreign mercenaries in the attempt. Nor was there the faintest intimation that a single governmental structure was either necessary or desirable. In other words, being a Greek meant a great deal to Herodotus, intellectually, spiritually, morally, but it had no political content apart from the one point of not assisting non-Greeks to defeat and subjugate Greeks.⁸³

Finley's point is salient; despite everything that the Greeks shared in common culturally, they never shared a common political goal of pan-Hellenism.⁸⁴ Their alliance was based on mutual advantage and only truly united them on the battlefield. As Walbank succinctly puts it, "the idea of a Greek nation is alien to the thought of most Greeks at most periods throughout Greek history."⁸⁵

When looking back at the initial epigrams discussed in this section it is difficult to read them and feel confident that any Pan-Hellenic notions were truly expressed by the soldiers at the time of the battles and provided a significant motivation for the war. It seems much more likely that they were largely motivated to defend their own territory, but knowing the severity of the threat facing them, they would be at a momentous tactical disadvantage if they did not join

⁸² Hall (1989) 4 identifies many of these traits as distinguishing features noted by modern social scientists. She notes "the criteria in determining ethnic self-consciousness vary widely from one ethnic group to another; social scientists most frequently cite physiological similarity, and shared geographical origin, ancestors, culture, mode of production, religion, values, political institutions or values."

⁸³ Finley (1971) 120-1.

⁸⁴ Hall (2002) 205-20 discusses some late (but isolated) 5th and 4th century expressions of pan-Hellenism; see also Isaac (2004) 111-4.

⁸⁵ Walbank (1951) 59. In this important paper, Walbank summarises with bibliography and analyses the various interpretations of Greek nationhood. To illustrate how difficult this theme is and how contemporary politics can shape the historian's interpretation, this paper is equally a philosophical inquiry into the role of the historian. A half century later Walbank (2000) revisited this topic with a view to understanding and explaining Achaean identity before the advent of the polis.

together. However, considering the impetus of the competitive spirit between poleis, it should be no surprise that the survivors may have seen the benefit in promoting their own polis as having played a significant role in the war. Furthermore, any notion of a polis fighting to defend the freedom of Greece is much more likely the product of poetic romanticism from an age confident in the Greek victory over the Persians rather than a genuine motivation expressed at the time of war.

Conclusion

It should be no surprise that a concept so widespread as the defence and protection of family and home is well attested in the epic and lyric poetry of archaic Greece, two genres in which warfare plays an integral role. Some of the earliest Greek poetry utilises this theme in the central conflict between Greeks and Trojans. The lyric poets also include contemporary expressions of this motivation such as Tyrtaeus, who contrasts the living coward and the dead hero, or Callinus, who emphasises this theme from the perspective of the invaded. The lyric poets do not simply develop this theme because they feel it is inherently interesting or worthy of their time (and words), it is also socially functional. The motivation to defend family and home is not only about protecting others. At the heart of it is the desire to protect oneself. The cohesion can only exist if individuals come together; everyone must buy into the system. We often see interrelated themes of familial loyalty and duty. The family unit is symbolic of one of the adult Greek male's chief roles in society. If he cannot defend them, he surrenders a part of himself and loses status in society. The lyric poets (especially Tyrtaeus) use this theme to create an emotional appeal to the audience. The poets do not discuss these themes because they are wholeheartedly interested in the family dynamic with regard to motivation, but because the urge to protect them is fundamental to Greek social structure. It is central to all aspects of cohesion. Thus, the poets

employ these themes in order to connect with their audience on an individual level and use that as a catalyst to make them more sympathetic to their overall message.

Whether it is a matter of chance survival or not, we see very little in regard to the inverse perspective of this motivation in lyric poetry; the desire to gain spoils at the expense of the defeated foes. As I have argued, the absence of this selfish motivation should not necessarily surprise us at a time when military poetry sought to promote and express unity in the polis and in the phalanxes. It is also possible that the desire to acquire is less compelling than to defend what one already has. Continuing the same line of thought, the only overt reference to predatory gains occurs at the state level when Sparta conquered the Messenians. The defensive aspect of this theme continues in Greek poetry to the time of the Persian Wars when seemingly Pan-Hellenic thoughts are expressed. Considering the lack of political unity as well as the subjugation of Greek states by their supposed compatriots that occurred in the following decades after the Persian Wars, we should be cautious in regarding any Pan-Hellenic motivations as dominant concerns to those directly fighting the Persians. Any unity provided by shared social and cultural ties was fleeting once the initial threat of the Persians dissipated. The subsequent epigrams erected at grave monuments of the war-dead likely reflect either an ideal that was never fully realised, or the desire to distinguish individual poleis from others as the protectors of Greece, thus displaying the competitive nature of the Greek ethos.

Chapter 4: Mutual Benefit: Citizen and Polis

In this chapter I will look at the expectations imposed by the polis on the soldiers and the repercussions and rewards for meeting those expectations. The martial elegists are particularly concerned with addressing these motifs. In their exhortative poems they outline socially designated responses to success or failure in meeting these expectations, as a means to motivate their audience to make the preferred decisions. This system of repercussions and rewards should be understood as a reciprocal relationship of mutual benefit that exists between citizen and polis. I will compare these poems to epic and other lyric representations of this theme in an effort to understand better how poets working in different genres employ these motifs. I will first look at the repercussions of soldiers neglecting their role, and then consider the rewards received by the soldiers for fulfilling their obligations to the polis including a discussion on why the former is more commonly represented in the surviving sources than the latter. I will conclude the chapter by looking at the polis' treatment of the soldiers who died protecting its interests. The memorialising qualities of this poetry not only allow the community to pay honours to fallen soldiers, but also establish a system of trust, expectations, and heroism that are all essential in developing and maintaining communal cohesion. This chapter is largely rooted in the community – what the community expects of their soldiers, how the community admonishes or rewards soldiers for meeting or not meeting its expectations, and how they communicate their expectations.

When the community asks its soldiers to fight, it asks them to walk a fine line between bravery and recklessness. The polis needs their soldiers to fight bravely so that they can win the present engagement. However, the polis will also need their soldiers to fight bravely in the

future, so the polis cannot incite recklessness that leads to unnecessary death in their community. The more bravely a soldier fights, the more likely he is to die. If a soldier fights with overconfidence (*i.e.* too bravely), then he potentially creates multiple dangers in the immediate moment of battle (*e.g.* he can create a hole in the phalanx that needs to be filled. If he is one of the stronger fighters, then he could put his fellow soldiers at risk by yielding one of their better fighters to the enemy). If the soldier's recklessness leads to a defeat, then his actions can lead to further violence and disparagement in the polis if the enemy chooses to push so far as to despoil the polis itself. Thus, the outcome of the risk not only affects the soldier himself, but also his fellow soldiers, his family, and his entire polis. However, the reverse is also true. If he is able to provide a tactical advantage in war, then those potential losses could be potential gains for everyone. The poets who promote the mutual benefit that exists between citizen and polis also need to balance this fine line. They want to promote the idea of a soldier fighting bravely so that they can bring a benefit to the polis, but at the same time, they do not want to promote reckless behaviour that will ultimately bring disadvantage to the community. Tyrtaeus may say that it is a splendid thing to die for your country (certainly in opposition to living as a vagrant without a community), but ultimately he wants a soldier to fight bravely, achieve victory, and live to fight another day. How the poets and the community walk this line will be central to this chapter.

1. Repercussions for Negative Behaviour

In this first section I will look at lyric representations of the polis' reaction and the ensuing repercussions that follow a soldier not adhering to their obligations as part of mutually beneficial relationship between citizen and polis. The main offense a soldier can commit is not to fight. This can either take the form of not joining battle, which is best depicted by Callinus, or deserting the battlefield once combat has commenced. The lyric poets reveal the complexities

involved in deserting the battlefield and it is for this reason that I will first examine collective flight from battle before discussing individual flight from battle. Although both are actions to be avoided, I will argue that the poets depict individual flight from battle as decidedly worse. Furthermore, I will look at how the lyric audience is instructed in resisting the urge to flee. Finally, I will examine the role of old versus young in battle, for Tyrtaeus presents these themes as intertwined.

Since these themes are intrinsically tied to the relationship between citizen and polis, the concept of a public performance of many of these poems is crucial to understanding the effect of these motifs employed by the poets and how it relates to motivation. At the heart of this subject is the Greek concept of *nemesis*. Williams defines *nemesis* as “the reaction in Homer to someone who has done something that shame should have prevented.”¹ Scodel defines it as “justified anger caused by a violation of social norms” and notes that “people feel *aidōs* about behaviour to which they themselves would respond with *nemesis*.”² A particular polis’ conceptualisation of *nemesis* is defined, enhanced, and reinforced at public gatherings that call attention to the particular qualities and deeds that warrant it. When Tyrtaeus depicts a moral tableau of a soldier neglecting one of his chief duties in society, he specifically channels the audience’s sense of *nemesis* in order to educate and motivate his audience to adhere to the rules of society. Furthermore, because the audience collectively reacts with *nemesis* to these scenes, they strengthen the communal bonds by emphasising what they share in common. This no doubt had a positive effect on cohesion in the ranks as well.

¹ Williams (1993) 80. Lidell & Scott note that νέμεσις is not used of the gods in Homer. Tyrtaeus uses the adjective νεμεσητός to describe the sight of a young soldier fleeing while an elder soldier lies dying on the battlefield. There is no connotation of divine retribution that later becomes a common understanding of the word. Given the relative proximity in time between Homer and the martial elegists, we need not assume any divine quality to the word in early elegy. It is with this understanding of *nemesis* in mind that I use the word.

² Scodel (2008) 19-20.

a) Idle Behaviour

The opening four lines of Callinus' only surviving poem of any significant length focus on the negative aspects of shirking one's duty. They express a sense of disgust articulated by a senior member of the community concerning the soldiers of prime fighting age neglecting their responsibility to the community even though war is at hand.³

μέχρις τέο κατάκεισθε; κότ' ἄλκιμον ἔξετε θυμόν,
ὧ νέοι, οὐδ' αἰδεῖσθ' ἀμφιπερικτίονας
ὧδε λίην μεθιέντες; ἐν εἰρήνῃ δὲ δοκεῖτε
ῆσθαι, ἀτὰρ πόλεμος γαῖαν ἅπασαν ἔχει
(1.1-4)⁴

Callinus succinctly summarises all of the negative attitudes toward these idle citizens. The poet laments the young men's lazy and idle nature, doubts that they have any courage, and questions their commitment to the community and whether they even feel shame concerning their misconduct. He concludes these lines by denouncing their negligence and slothful behaviour in times of peace as a means of anticipating their deplorable conduct during war time.⁵ This is especially concerning because this is precisely the time when the youth should exemplify the highest calibre of character. The most provocative question in these lines is in regard to feeling

³ For discussion on νέοι, see chapter 2, Section 1b.

⁴ It should be noted that at this point there is a lacuna in the poem consisting of at least one hexameter line. This is unfortunately how it survives in Stobaeus (4.10.12). Whatever the number of missing lines, we know that it must be an odd number of lines are missing. Bergk (1915) 4 argues for many missing lines, postulating that they described the various disasters that plague the land and people. This seems a reasonable interpretation since it would be a natural qualifier for the abrupt statement in line 4. Adkins (1985) 58 follows Bergk's suggestion of many lines; he thinks of three, but does not believe Bergk is correct with his description of disasters. As Adkins puts it, "I suspect the disappearance of a striking extended figure of speech rather than a résumé of the course of the war or a mere description of present woes." Bergk and Adkins each make valid points and the truth may lie somewhere in between these two viewpoints. Bergk's hypothesis does allow for a natural transition between line 4 and 5; however, his list of disasters would hardly make for an easy transition to what we consider line 5. It is here where Adkins' hypothesis makes most sense. To be sure line 4 does not need a follow-up list of disasters since it is already a powerful statement on its own, but the force of the statement would be much more powerful and dramatic if such a list did occur, even if it only consisted of a few lines. Centuries later we see an epigram attributed to Simonides that provides a list describing the different theatres of war of the Megarians (XVI). Campbell (1967) 164 sees the lacuna as a small gap, but does not provide an estimate of however many lines. Gerber (1999) 21 supposes there is probably more than one line missing.

⁵ The first four lines that we have are so powerful as an introduction that there is a good chance this is how the poem began. I shall also look below at some passages of the *Iliad* that might give more credibility to this idea.

shame before one's neighbours. The poet has already implied that their conduct is reprehensible, but it is here that he clarifies his earlier emotional response, designating their behaviour as shameful. Callinus makes a clever use of a negative rhetorical question inviting the reader to agree at once that they should feel shame.⁶ At the same, he depicts a persona who reacts with nemesis because the νέοι are clearly behaving in a manner that would make the speaker feel *aidōs*.

Perhaps more damning is the idea that if the young men should feel shame before their neighbours because they are not observing proper conduct, then this shame is intensified by the implication that the neighbours have demonstrated proper conduct on behalf of the citizens on previous occasions.⁷ The *aidōs* the ἀμφιπερικτίονες would have felt had they not fought on previous occasions compelled them to perform their duty. So too did the thought of having their peers react with nemesis upon seeing them acting inappropriately.⁸ If this poem was performed in a public setting and the νέοι and ἀμφιπερικτίονες were both present, then the νέοι would have felt the weight of their neighbours' gaze bearing down on them in the crowd. Callinus' words may have been effective in their own right, but it was the response they elicited from various factions in the crowd that bore the strength of his argument. The young men presumably must owe their safety up to this point in life in part to their neighbours of a previous generation and their current safety to their neighbours of the current generation. By not fighting at this current

⁶ Verdenius (1972) 2 refers to this as an "indignant question" comparing it to Ar. *Eq.* 1302, which, according to the scholia, is a line taken from Euripides' *Alcmaeon* (TrGF 5.F 66).

⁷ As I have discussed in the previous chapter, Tyrtaeus exploited the tragic nature of this concept by describing a defeated soldier who is compelled to wander with family. I noted that the inclusion of the aged father was especially tragic for he must have been successful in combat on previous occasions.

⁸ We must conclude that the neighbours of appropriate fighting age and the poet's persona are willing to fulfill their civic duty by fighting or have done so in the past; otherwise, this statement, and ultimately the whole introduction loses all weight and effectiveness. In the *Iliad* Nestor scolds the Greeks when none of them will fight Hector early in the poem (*Il.* 7.124-60). He concludes this scolding by stating that if he were younger, he would face Hector (*Il.* 7-157-8).

time, to the point where chastisement is seemingly used as a last resort, the youth are simply ignoring their most critical role in society. Thus, behind all of these questions lurk even deeper ones: if the young men are not accepting and fulfilling their most essential duty to the city, what good are they? In their present state, the answer to this question is clearly “none”. However, by the end of the poem Callinus will have sought to repair the break in cohesion by attempting to persuade them to change their ways.

This shame of men hanging back from combat occurs periodically in the *Iliad*. When Menelaus discovers that none of the Greeks will go out to face Hector in combat he is outraged and dumbfounded;

ἦ μὲν δὴ λώβῃ τάδε γ' ἔσσεται αἰνόθεν αἰνῶς
εἰ μὴ τις Δαναῶν νῦν Ἑκτορος ἀντίος εἴσιν.
ἀλλ' ὅμεις μὲν πάντες ὕδωρ καὶ γαῖα γένοισθε
ἥμενοι αὖθι ἕκαστοι ἀκήριοι ἀκλεὲς αὐτῶς·
(*Il.* 7.97-100)

Menelaus explodes in a tirade directed at every soldier before him. The first line of this passage has three different words detailing the shame and horror of this predicament, while the fourth line attributes their idle behaviour to a lack of glory and spirit, thus signifying a lack of responsibilities.⁹

Callinus adopts a similar tone when chastising the young men in his audience. Although these two passages share very little in regard to vocabulary, the tone of combined disgust and shock at their fellow soldiers is strikingly similar. In this restricted setting, away from the additional social pressures and responsibilities of life back home, the shame is only expressed

⁹ ἀκήριος generally has the meaning ‘lifeless’ or ‘spiritless’ (cf. *Il.* 5.812; 11.392), but Cunliffe (1924) 16 notes two occasions where it takes on the meaning ‘unharm’d’ (*Od.* 12.98; 23.328). The more common translation of ‘spiritless’ makes most sense with the tone of Menelaus’ rant, although by extension of their lack of courage, the men could also be understood as being ‘unharm’d’. See also Snell (1955) 413-4. Kirk (1990) 247, n. on 99-100 comments that “αὐτῶς intensifies: ‘in an utterly inglorious way’”.

within the group of soldiers by the enraged Menelaus. These warriors form a temporary community and there is no sense that Menelaus is speaking on anyone else's behalf, although there is the understanding that they should each be feeling such outrage. Conversely, Hector claims that he would feel an intense shame if he shirked his military duties μάλ' αἰνῶς / αἰδέομαι Τρῶας καὶ Τρωάδας (*Il.* 6.441-2).¹⁰ He anticipates the Trojan men and women would react to the shirking of his duties with nemesis. The inclusion of both men and women indicates that the nemesis is felt not only from the perspective of soldiers unified under a common plight, but in relation to the community as a whole. As a member of the invaded polis, Callinus is in a similar position to Hector and so we should interpret a similar sense of greater communal shame in the phrase οὐδ' αἰδεῖσθ' ἀμφοπερικτίονας. Thus, through the manipulation of tone and context Callinus shrouds his addresses in a veil of disgrace in the hope of forcing them to re-evaluate their own conduct and role in society.

Early in the *Iliad* Sarpedon makes a scathing critique of Hector and his conduct in battle (*Il.* 5.472-92).¹¹ While this passage does not admit a direct comparison with Callinus, since Lycia was more akin to an international neighbour rather than Callinus' ἀμφοπερικτίονας, it captures the motivations and emotions of those who sacrifice themselves for the benefit of others. Sarpedon begins by insulting the Trojans and their captain by stating that Hector's former boasts were empty and that his men cower like dogs (*Il.* 5.472-6). He intensifies his reproach by noting that his own Lycian men fight, and then lists everything they have left unguarded back at home in order to help the Trojans (*Il.* 5.477-84). Sarpedon follows this up with a direct criticism of

¹⁰ Hector faces conflicting priorities and motivations that collide throughout the narrative, which cause a tension that is only resolved in Hector's final moments. Clay (2002) contrasts this scene with Hector's behaviour in book 22. Hector's thoughts and actions may appear contradictory at times, but that is only because he has not yet accepted his death. He will only accept his death when he realises that the gods have abandoned him.

¹¹ Haubold (2000) 87 notes that Sarpedon identified the core problem for Hector. "Someone who defends the people, according to Sarpedon, also defends his women and the city. When they are ranked like this there is no conflict between the different tasks. It is when we change the order of things that the problems begin."

Hector claiming τὴν δ' ἔστηκας, ἀτὰρ οὐδ' ἄλλοισι κελεύεις / λαοῖσιν μενέμεν καὶ ἀμυνέμεναι ὄρεσσι (*Il.* 5.485-6).¹² Sarpedon's tone is one of complete bewilderment. He essentially accuses them of having their priorities upside-down. The Trojans are not actively engaging in combat and protecting their own families, and neither is their bravest hero. To make matters worse the Lycians have left their own families vulnerable in order to protect the families of men who are not fighting. The exceptional behaviour of the Lycians sharply contrasts with the inaction of the Trojans.¹³

Although there is no strong linguistic connection between these two passages, the tone is similar (*i.e.* Callinus and the Lycians both express disgust at another party for their failure to act accordingly). As I have discussed in the previous chapter, the epic poet has much more freedom and opportunity to employ speeches, thus vividly communicating a character's emotions, than the martial elegists Callinus and Tyrtaeus, whose exhortative elegies are considerably briefer and consequently less flexible. Callinus' rhetorical questions recall Sarpedon's barrage of insults and his catalogue of inexcusable grievances. Whereas Sarpedon bluntly states Hector's offences, Callinus forces his audience to contemplate the answers for themselves. When comparing these two passages, we see both Callinus and Sarpedon expressing similar sentiments, but each requiring subtly different means to achieve their goal. This variation is partly due to the difference in relationship between speaker and audience. Hector is the commander of the Trojan

¹² Fenik (1968) 49-52 mentions some interesting aspects of this example, noting it as the first example of many of the "rebuke pattern". The pattern is as follows: "Hector or Aeneas is rebuked for withholding himself from the combat. Most often the speaker is a Lycian ally or Apollo in human guise. The words have their effect, the Trojan advances, either charging or, as here, stiffening the ranks. The fight then either comes to a standstill or, more often, the Trojans are repulsed. Aias always appears in the counter action." He later notes that the one critical element that separates the "rebuke scene" from other similar scenes is that in the others "nobody is upbraided." It is interesting that Homer places so much emphasis on the initial insult, and it may be that Callinus adopts this rhetorical model in order to persuade his audience more efficiently.

¹³ This is another dichotomy of warriors similar to Tyrtaeus' depiction of the deceased hero and the living coward (10.1-4). The warrior from abroad fights on behalf of a warrior at home, who himself does not fight.

forces, and so Sarpedon rebukes his superior on the battlefield. Callinus addresses a group of fellow citizens in a civic setting. Although this variation is an important one, it is significant that both parties express their frustration and nemesis through reproach.

b) Collective Flight from Battle

I would now like to turn away from Callinus' contempt for those unwilling to take part in combat in order to analyze poetry that involves soldiers fleeing from combat. In this section I will look at depictions of large-scale flight from battle before examining instances of solitary flight from battle in the following section. It is important to understand the distinction between collective and individual flight so that we can understand how poets employ these motifs in their poems. This will then provide insight into how a poet utilises a particular motif to motivate his audience with different effect. As we shall see collective flight from battle is consistent with values that praise cohesion. If the army flees, they do so together. This will contrast with episodes of an individual soldier fleeing from battle because he breaks the cohesion.

The language at the beginning of Tyrtaeus 11 suggests a poem aimed at reinvigorating soldiers after a defeat. The imperative θαρσεῖτε, the reminder of their connection to Heracles, and the reassurance that Zeus still favours them all point to such an interpretation (11.1-2). Furthermore, the following lines are a reminder of how well-trained and experienced the Spartans are in combat. The tone suggests that their current predicament will only be a minor setback and that they are too formidable to remain in this position. Tyrtaeus then adds the following couplet:

καὶ μετὰ φευγόντων τε διωκόντων τ' ἐγέ<νε>σθε,
ὦ νέοι, ἀμφοτέρων δ' ἐς κόρον ἠλάσατε.
(11.9-10)

Tyrtaeus displays a striking sense of honesty in this couplet, for he recognises and blatantly admits that soldiers will both pursue and be pursued throughout the course of their lives. Furthermore, these results have occurred more than once in the lives of *young* soldiers. Leaving aside stalemates and Pyrrhic victories it goes without saying that there had to be a winning and losing side during each military encounter. The odds were that a man over the course of his adult life, having experienced many military encounters, had to have a fair share of both winning and losing; no army could be perpetually victorious.¹⁴ We should not be surprised that soldiers often fled from battle, for the Greeks simply fought in too many wars for this not to be a legitimate outcome. However, it is perhaps sobering to the modern audience that a poet who is concerned with encouraging young soldiers in battle is so candid about the less idealistic aspects of warfare.

It is more difficult to find comparable examples in the *Iliad* of widespread flight from battle since the battle scenes tend to be viewed from the perspective of two or three warriors at a time rather than the army as a whole. However, there are a few scenes where warriors discuss as a group the possibility of flight. While the majority of these dialogues do not make for a perfect comparison with Tyrtaeus 11 since he speaks of general trends of past behaviour and the Homeric warriors speak of a specific instance in the present, Agamemnon does have a few words that are relevant. He states:

αἰσχροὺν γὰρ τόδε γ' ἐστὶ καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι
μὰ ψ οὔτω τοιόνδε τοσόνδε τε λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν
ἄπρηκτον πόλεμον πολεμίζειν ἡδὲ μάχεσθαι
ἀνδράσι παυροτέροισι, τέλος δ' οὔ πώ τι πέφανται
(*Il.* 2.119-22)

¹⁴ Sidebottom (2004) 85 states that “estimates put average casualties at about 5 per cent for the winners, and 14 per cent for the losers.” For other estimates including specific losses from certain battles, see Krentz (1985) and Strauss (1986) 179. These figures would help explain how young men could have experienced many occurrences of victory and defeat.

According to this statement the potential flight of the Greeks would still be a matter of shame, not simply because they have deserted the war, but because they have fought in a war and yet have nothing to show for their effort.¹⁵ This is not simply a loss in battle, but a loss in potential gains. The situation in Tyrtaeus is less complex since the tone suggests a performance after a defeat and a poem designed to uplift morale across the army. Since Tyrtaeus does not allude to a specific defeat, the poem is flexible enough that it can be performed on multiple occasions and serve different contexts. On a general level this allows his audience to reflect on the nature of victory and defeat and rationalise their actions in past battles, both positive and negative. At the same time, if this poem were performed soon after a defeat, Tyrtaeus minimises its severity by noting that all soldiers both flee and pursue. This invites the audience to conclude that since they have fled this time, they will likely pursue the next time. Although not an ideal situation, it is understandable in the context of a soldier's lifetime filled with frequent battles. Moreover, the acceptability appears tied to the soldiers fleeing en masse; the solidarity in the ranks remains.

Archilochus's Telephus fragment also employs the theme of widespread flight from battle.

εἰ δὲ] . [. . . .] . [.] . . θεοῦ κρατερῆ[ς ὑπ' ἀνάγκης
οὐ χρή ἀν]αλ[κείη]ν καὶ κακότητα λέγει[ν].
π]ήμ[α]τ' ἐῖ[ε] μεθα δ[ή]α φυγεῖν φεύγειν δέ τις ὥρη·
καὶ ποτ[ε] μ]οῦνος ἐὼν Τήλεφος Ἀρκα[σίδης]
Ἄργείων ἐφόβησε πολὺν στρατ[όν],
(P.Oxy. 4708.2-6)¹⁶

The fragment begins by stating that it is acceptable to flee when under the compulsion of a god and then offers a fast paced narration of the story of Telephus fighting the Greeks who

¹⁵ Cairns (1993) 59-6 notes that the neuter singular, αἰσχρόν, occurs only three times in the *Iliad*, (*Il.* 2.298; 21.436-8), and all three examples are “referring to one narrow area of activity, that of return from a military enterprise with nothing to show for it.” He then states that it “describes a situation in which martial prestige is at stake, and characterizes it as liable to excite the disapproval of others.”

¹⁶ For the *editio princeps*, see Obbink (2005), and see Obbink (2006) for further refinements, which I include above.

accidentally came to his land.¹⁷ Obbink offers a few possible interpretations of this poem including “the supremacy of Moira”, “the horrors of battle”, as a mythological exemplum related to a contemporary event, or as a parallel to Archilochus’ ῥίψασπις fragment, which I will discuss in the following section.¹⁸ While these suggestions all have merit, Obbink later convincingly argues that this piece is a mythological exemplum relating to a contemporary event. He states “I think it will be clear that in fr. 1 the poet is defending himself and his comrades for having taken to flight in a battle, and pleading that sometimes this is unavoidable.”¹⁹ The gnomic statement followed by the aorist first person plural [ἐῴμεθα] suggests the poet is directly addressing the audience and involving them, thus making a connection between the audience and the accompanying story. Such correlations between mythic figures and audience are common in other types of poetry, such as the epinician, but are not common in elegy.

There are a number of reasons why Archilochus would want to mount a defence of his actions with this particular exemplum. The most obvious reason is that whenever one can draw a direct connection between the epic heroes and contemporary figures, the latter receive honour and glory by association. In this case the poet, or his persona, and members of the audience are cast in the same light as the Greeks at Troy. Moreover, this is an honour even though the poet does not cite the Greeks at their most splendid. The fact that the poet carefully selects an episode where even the famed heroes of epic had to flee suggests the actions of his contemporary subjects are equally excusable on the same grounds. Swift notes the complexity of this exemplum. Even though there is the suggestion that flight in this particular case is acceptable,

¹⁷ This episode is found in the *Cypria* (Apollod. *Epit.* 3.17-8), see West (2003) 73, and Hesiod’s *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 165 M-W). See also West (2013a).

¹⁸ Obbink (2005) 21.

¹⁹ Obbink (2006) 7. Bowie (2010) 150-1 argues that this poem does not need to be regarded as an *exemplum* and could function as a standalone narrative.

much of this episode relates the aristeia of Telephus.²⁰ In her words “the paradigm serves to undercut the moral rather than reinforce it”. Archilochus’ audience would be quite familiar with this story and know that the Greeks eventually made it to Troy and were successful, and they will be as well. He may have ended the poem pointing to the possibility of this outcome as a morale-heightening finale and an emphatic conclusion to his argument. Thus, this poem has similar qualities to Tyrtaeus 11, which aims to embolden a defeated group of soldiers by emphasising that they will live to fight another day. There may even be within this story the suggestion that too much aggression when faced with a tactical disadvantage, something that could be considered brave, may not be in the best interests of the soldiers or the state. If the Greeks kept fighting when victory seemed improbable, they would have been denied their future glories at Troy.²¹ Archilochus may have intended this interpretation as well. While Tyrtaeus makes no excuse for his audience as Archilochus does, both poets publicly acknowledge the acceptability of collective flight in certain circumstances.

There may also be a further subtlety to Archilochus’ decision to use this particular myth; he may have felt that his contemporaries should not have been fighting that particular battle. In the latter half of the fragment he makes multiple references to the folly and futility of the Greeks’ attack: βλαφθέντες (16), ἀφραδίῃ (19), and μάτην (21).²² If we are to consider the epic parallels of this poem and make direct associations with Archilochus’ audience, then we must consider the relevance of all elements in the narrative.²³ Swift plausibly suggests that the Telephus passage

²⁰ Swift (2012) 145.

²¹ Shay (1994) 90-1 describes how a soldier who has gone berserk cares not for his own safety, the safety of his peers, or future engagements. This type of anti-social behaviour described by Shay and perhaps hinted at by Archilochus would have the ability to prevent future success.

²² It should be noted that, while βλαφθέντες looks secure in the text, ἀφραδίῃ and μάτην are conjectural. See Obbink (2006) 4 for relevant notes.

²³ For a modern discussion on the link between Homeric language and Archilochus’ elegies, see Nicolosi (2016).

was chosen specifically to demonstrate a battle fought for the wrong reasons.²⁴ As I have been arguing throughout this work, the elegiac poet, when writing shorter elegies, has to be economical with his vocabulary.²⁵ He has much less freedom to include superfluous details than the epic poet, and so we ought to consider the possibility that Archilochus deliberately emphasises the folly as well as the heroic qualities of the Greeks with specific intent. Thus, this poem could be implying that “we were compelled to abandon this battle on account of a god working against us, but we never should have been there in the first place.”²⁶ If we consider Swift’s note that the *aristeia* of Telephus is a prominent feature of this poem that emphasises the enemy’s prowess, there may even be that sense that not only should they not have been there, but that their folly put themselves in danger and simultaneously awarded the enemy glory in battle. Soldiers need to weigh the risks involved in each battle. If they believe their commander has not weighed the risks accurately, then there is the greater chance for flight. Furthermore, if they continued in an engagement that would result in their deaths, they would not be able to fight in future battles, which would ultimately put the protection of the state in jeopardy.

c) Individual Flight from Battle

In contrast to the few lyric examples of widespread flight from battle, which are excused or tolerated, the depictions of individuals running from battle are met with reproach. Callinus is

²⁴ Swift (2012) 153.

²⁵ The shorter elegies considered in this research tend to be exhortative elegies. Such a description is more difficult to apply to this poem. Regardless, this poem as we have it is brief and may be almost complete. Thus, the same principles of economy of space apply. For the length of this poem, see West (2006).

²⁶ There is some Homeric precedent for deliberately avoiding battle with a god. Diomedes urges his men to keep fighting, but to avoid Hector for Ares fights at his side (*Il.* 5.601-6). He later converses with Athena and comments that that this decision was not made out of fear (*Il.* 5.815-24). While the difference between these two passages is that Diomedes does not urge his men to flee from battle, but simply to avoid battle with certain figures, the gulf is not so great since warriors at Troy had the luxury to choose their battle, whereas soldiers contemporary to Archilochus would have been much more constrained.

not so much concerned with denouncing the act of fleeing from battle, but rather the consequences tied to the soldier's fate:

πολλάκι δηϊοτῆτα φυγῶν καὶ δοῦπον ἀκόντων
ἔρχεται, ἐν δ' οἴκῳ μοῖρα κίχεν θανάτου,
ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν οὐκ ἔμψυξ δῆμῳ φίλος οὐδὲ ποθεινός
(1.14-16)²⁷

Callinus begins these lines with the adverb πολλάκι, which indicates that it is an accepted fact that men often flee from battle regardless of whether it is an acceptable outcome.²⁸ He then bluntly states that death will come to a man whether it happens on the battlefield or in his home after having fled from battle. The message is fairly clear that death is an inevitable fact of life and should not be feared.²⁹ Once the audience accepts this truth, they should come to the logical conclusion that it is better to die on the battlefield as a hero than at home as a coward.³⁰ Furthermore, although the soldier who escapes still has his life, he is a disgrace to the community and stands in opposition to the successful soldier. This parallels Tyrtaeus' juxtaposition of the living coward and the dying hero in poem 10. However, Callinus portrays the coward as living continuously at home and so his poem lacks the personal touch of Tyrtaeus' soldier wandering with his family, but it does take on a more civic approach since the soldier lives at home with his fellow citizens and presumably must endure the civic consequences of his past misgivings including confronting his peers' reaction of nemesis. This approach also follows the theme he

²⁷ Simonides expressed a similar notion: ὁ δ' αὖ θάνατος κίχε καὶ τὸν φυγόμαχον (524), which was translated by Horace: *mors et fugacem persequitur virum* (*Carm.* 3.2.14).

²⁸ Campbell (1967) 166 argues that "14-15 amplify 12-13 by providing an example. Homer frequently has asyndeton when a sentence explains or amplifies the previous one." Verdenius (1972) 6 counters Campbell's point by arguing that "asyndeton does not introduce an amplification but has explanatory force." Considering that Campbell seems to use amplification and explanation almost interchangeably, Verdenius' point seems rather pedantic. Surely lines 14-15 are indeed amplifying lines 12-13 by explaining a real-world outcome, acting as a sort of gnomic statement.

²⁹ For an examination of the various uses of μοῖρα, see Dietrich (1965) 194-231.

³⁰ The preceding lines implore a dying soldier to make one last throw of his spear (1.5). Adkins (1985) 60 remarks that Callinus "is opposing the view that it is better to be a live mouse than a dead lion, but this does not require him to hold that it is better to be a dead lion than a live one."

established at the start of the poem of young men living in a society and not adhering to its social code.

Homer too explores the complexities of staying on the battlefield through monologues spoken by his characters. Odysseus declares that running in fear would be a great evil, μέγα μὲν κακόν, but being killed in battle would be more miserable, τὸ δὲ ῥίγιον (*Il.* 11.404-5). Ultimately Odysseus knows this debate is futile because he lives by a certain code that guides his action:³¹

ἀλλὰ τίη μοι ταῦτα φίλος διελέξατο θυμός;
οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι κακοὶ μὲν ἀποίχονται πολέμοιο,
ὃς δέ κ' ἀριστεύῃσι μάχῃ ἔνι, τὸν δὲ μάλα χρεὼ
ἑστάμεναι κρατερῶς, ἢ τ' ἔβλητ' ἢ τ' ἔβαλ' ἄλλον.
(*Il.* 11.407-10)

The formula is quite simple; the wicked flee from battle while the brave stay and fight regardless of the consequences. That Homer voices these seemingly unheroic thoughts through a hero as brave as Odysseus rather than a character like the despicable Thersites is significant. The Homeric warrior knows that he must dismiss these wicked thoughts, which explains why Odysseus ponders these questions, but the fact that he thinks them signifies that these thoughts are natural and common.³² Agenor too asks himself this question on the battlefield, but it is in

³¹ Finley (1954) 126 makes the bold claim that “the heroic code was complete and unambiguous, so much so that neither poet nor his characters ever had occasion to debate it.” Taplin (1992) 50 counters this assertion, “What does some particular one deserve *tīmē* for and how much? Who should grant it? What form should it take? Much of the *Iliad* is, in my view, spent on disputing just such questions as these, issues of just desserts, approval, disapproval, credit, and blame.” On the surface it appears that these two scholars are having a dialogue, but in the end I believe they are discussing two different points. The Homeric heroes do know what types of activities win *τιμή* and which do not. There are very few disputes about this in the *Iliad*, as Finley states. However, Taplin is right that the Homeric heroes do spend a lot of time debating how much each is owed, but these types of debates are quite natural in a world where each man wants more *τιμή* than everyone else. I believe these debates work within the heroic code and do not disprove it.

³² Snell (1946) 13-29 argues that Homer understands man as a group of related, yet independent organs that together do not make up a consistent whole that we would recognise as “the self.” For the English translation see Snell (1953) Ch. 1. Dodds (1951) 16 echoes Snell noting “for the Homeric man the *thumos* tends not to be felt as part of the self: it commonly appears as an independent inner voice.” Sharples (1983) argues against these viewpoints, specifically that the different organs are entirely independent. Gaskin (1990) echoes Sharples and convincingly argues against Snell’s interpretation of Homer’s understanding of man.

regard to the best plan for escape from a duel with Achilles (*Il.* 21.553-70).³³ Even though he contemplates some extremely cowardly options, he knows that in the end he must fight Achilles. Thus, Agenor considers some very real and detailed possibilities for how to escape, but ultimately knows that it would be wrong to act upon them.³⁴ Even the bravest of Trojans, Hector, has a similar internal debate as he prepares to face Achilles. He states the best course of action at the start of his soliloquy:

ἐμοὶ δὲ τότ' ἄν πολὺ κέρδιον εἴη
 ἄντην ἢ Ἀχιλλῆα κατακτείναντα νέεσθαι,
 ἢ ἐκεν αὐτῷ ὀλέσθαι ἐὺκλειῶς πρὸ πόλλης.
 (*Il.* 22.108-10)

Even though he knows what the proper course for action is, he still contemplates conceding total victory to Achilles and relinquishing all stolen property to the Greeks in order to avoid the fight and his possible death. Regardless of how seriously he contemplates this thought, this extreme example reflects the irrationality that can arise in these types of situations.³⁵ All three of these examples illustrate the very natural response for a warrior to feel when they face death. Although these are thoughts likely felt by every soldier, they are not expressed aloud to one's companions but only exist in soliloquy.³⁶ It is one matter to think these thoughts, but it would be bad to

³³ Richardson (1993) 99, n. on 550-70 notes "Agenor's soliloquy follows directly after the reference to Apollo inspiring him with courage (547). As elsewhere in Homer, divine influence does not prevent a hero from having to make his own decision, and here we have a clear insight into the process by which he does so." I believe these two type-scenes, a god inspiring a hero with courage and a hero having an internal debate, coupled together with the supreme cowardice of Agenor's debate in comparison to other similar internal debates, only help to cast him in an even more cowardly light. Even with the god's inspiration he still has such cowardly thoughts. How would he have reacted to his situation if Apollo had not breathed courage into him?

³⁴ Scully (1984) 15 suggests that "the soliloquy (and to a lesser extent the narrative) form of inner thought may result in renewed heroic activity, but because the inner debates also imply hesitation, they record a momentary weakening, or questioning, of heroic temper." I believe his interpretation is correct, although I do not believe that Homer includes them solely to depict the heroes in a cowardly light so much as to portray a more honest depiction of warfare. These men may be ready to throw down their lives for the sake of glory and honour, but that does not mean that they do not value their lives. They would prefer to see another day.

³⁵ As I have already discussed above, Hector has been struggling with conflicting emotions and motivations throughout the majority of the poem. He will only see clarity when it is too late.

³⁶ These type scenes are discussed in more detail in Fenik (1968) 96-8 and Fenik (1978). He discusses a fourth speech (*Il.* 17.91ff.) that belongs to this group of type-scenes which I will discuss below.

vocalise them publically, and worse to act upon them.³⁷ Conversely, Callinus prefers to emphasise the inevitability of death rather than a specific warrior ethic, and juxtapose the splendid nature of death on the battlefield and the uneventful and mundane nature of death at home. When a soldier ignores the inevitable and neglects his social duties, he becomes the target of *nemesis* by those around him.

Tyrtaeus takes a much more severe approach than Callinus and expressly chastises individuals fleeing from battle:

οὐδείς ἄν ποτε ταῦτα λέγων ἀνύσειεν ἕκαστα,
ὅσσ', ἦν αἰσχροῦ πάθη, γίνεται ἀνδρὶ κακά·
ἀργαλέον γὰρ ὀπισθε μετάφρενον ἔστι δαΐζειν
ἀνδρὸς φεύγοντος δηΐῳ ἐν πολέμῳ·
αἰσχροῦ δ' ἔστι νέκυς κατακείμενος ἐν κονίῃσι
νῶτον ὀπισθ' αἰχμῇ δουρὸς ἐληλάμενος
(11.15-20)

Tyrtaeus deliberately contrasts the position of strength that exists when soldiers are cohesive in the ranks with the isolation and insecurity of the soldier that flees. The poet is explicit that bad things will come to the man who acts shamefully and flees by painting a gruesome moral tableau. This device is crucial for the poet who composes short exhortative elegies to depict a highly emotional scene without free use of direct speech. The corpse is αἰσχροῦ and the scene itself is ἀργαλέον.³⁸ The narrator's perspective is instrumental in conveying the level of disgust at the sight of the dead soldier. This performs two functions: it educates the younger members of the audience about the nature of shame and shameful conduct, which adhere to a previously

³⁷ Such sentiments are rare in both epic and lyric, but we only need to think of the ancient reaction to Archilochus' ῥίψασπις poem to see the difference between how these thoughts can be expressed in the two genres. This poem will be discussed in more detail below.

³⁸ Campbell (1967) 173, n. on 17 follows Ahrens (1891) in substituting ἀργαλέον for the manuscript's ἀργαλέον. He interprets that "it is attractive to pierce from behind the back of a fleeing man." I find the emendation or the reasoning difficult to accept. Tyrtaeus twice uses αἰσχροῦ in the surrounding lines, and ἀργαλέον helps colour the scene. His point in these lines is to depict the disgusting image of a soldier run through because he fled from battle. Campbell's interpretation would impose a positive element in the midst of shameful acts. It does not make any rhetorical sense.

agreed-upon definition established by the community, and it reinforces these ideals to the senior members of the audience. Although at the performance of the poem the perspective belongs to the narrator, within the tableau it belongs to a soldier who has remained in battle and upheld his commitment and duty. Due to the nature of this scene, Tyrtaeus allows the audience to empathise with the narrator's perspective and envision and inflame their own disgust at this sight. When the audience members are allowed to make this personal connection with the poetry, each member is better able to internalise its message. Thus, the soldier adopts and fosters the standards established by the community. It is also important to note that Tyrtaeus deliberately contrasts this despicable image of the individual who has fled with the more tolerable image of mass flight and pursuit earlier in the poem (11.9-10).

We get a similar perspective from Diomedes as he sees Odysseus rushing back to the Greek ships. He asks him *πῇ φεύγεις μετὰ νῶτα βαλὼν κακὸς ὥς ἐν ὁμίλῳ; / μή τίς τοι φεύγοντι μεταφρένω ἐν δόρῳ πῆξῃ* (*Il.* 8.94-5). While Homer and Tyrtaeus employ similar vocabulary, we do not need to assume that either had the other in mind, but rather that both are working against the background of the same tradition. This passage allows us to see Diomedes in a more creditable light because, after seeing Odysseus run off, he simply returns to the fighting, thus exemplifying the heroic ideal, while in Tyrtaeus we see a much more detailed, grim, and vivid picture. Tyrtaeus uses this image to illustrate to his audience the reality of battle and the response of the community when a soldier neglects his socially designated role. It is a valuable method of reinforcing proper conduct while the soldiers are at rest. The exhortative elegist wants his audience to listen to his poem and have the description of the soldier lying in the dust as an image to avoid at all costs, whereas the epic poet does not require his audience to internalise these ideals, but instead he manipulates them in order to provide depth of character. The

communal aspect of Tyrtaeus' army and poetry is further heightened by the fact that each soldier aligns himself with these ideals as well as his fellow soldiers.

A more vivid example of Homer manipulating these concepts to give more depth to his characters occurs in book 5 of the *Iliad*. There are two brief scenes only a few hundred lines apart that illustrate how two soldiers can respond to the same situation in completely different manners. When Pandarus and Aeneas face Diomedes, his chariot driver, Sthenelus, urges him to avoid this fight since he is numerically outmatched. Diomedes quickly responds:

μή τι φόβον δ' ἀγόρευ', ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ σὲ πεισέμεν οἶω.
οὐ γάρ μοι γενναῖον ἄλυσκάζοντι μάχεσθαι
οὐδὲ καταπτώσσειν· ἔτι μοι μένος ἔμπεδόν ἐστιν
(*Il.* 5.252-4)

For Diomedes the answer is simple since it would be ignoble of him to turn away from the fight even though he is at a two-to-one disadvantage. He subsequently slays Pandarus, albeit with Athena's help, and nearly defeats Aeneas until Aphrodite intervenes and saves his life.³⁹ Soon after this point in the narrative Aeneas finds himself at a two-to-one disadvantage with Menelaus and Antilochus standing against him. In contrast to Diomedes' previous response, he chooses not to hold his ground: Αἰνείας δ' οὐ μεῖνε θεός περ ἐὼν πολέμιστής (*Il.* 5.571). He does not contemplate the ethics of his actions, nor does the narrator.⁴⁰ It is no coincidence that Aeneas is found on both sides of the same situation only a few hundred lines apart and responds in a much less heroic manner than Diomedes. Homer manipulates these two scenarios not only to illustrate the heroism of Diomedes and marginalise the heroism of Aeneas, but also to show that two

³⁹ I will discuss these instances of direct divine intervention in the following chapter.

⁴⁰ Kirk (1990) 117, n. on 570-2 states "for a warrior's retreat when his opponent is reinforced cf. Hektor at 17.128ff.; there is nothing unheroic about it." I disagree with Kirk's interpretation. The mere fact that a hero does something does not automatically signify it as a heroic act. Hector is one of the most admirable characters in the entire poem and yet he commits a most unheroic act when he continually runs from Achilles and only faces him when he is tricked by Athena. I find it hard to justify Kirk's point when these two similar examples occur so close together in the narrative and show Aeneas on both sides of the situation, and yet he responds in the opposite way from Diomedes.

people facing adversity will react in completely different ways to the same situation.⁴¹ If we consider this epic passage in light of Tyrtaeus, we see a clear example of how the epic poet and exhortative elegist differ greatly in their approach and utilisation of the material. The epic poet can develop complex juxtapositions over the course of several hundred lines in order to add depth and authenticity to his characters. Due to restrictions of space, the exhortative elegist has no such luxury. Instead, he employs moral tableaux in order to convey social ideals to his audience in a succinct manner.

Archilochus too wrote short vivid scenes that manipulate themes such as flight from battle, although he seems more inclined to write in the first person as the following example illustrates.

ἀσπίδι μὲν Σαῖων τις ἀγάλλεται, ἦν παρὰ θάμνῳι,
ἔντος ἀμώμητον, κάλλιπον οὐκ ἐθέλων·
αὐτὸν δ' ἐξεσάωσα. τί μοι μέλει ἀσπὶς ἐκείνη;
ἔρρέτω· ἐξαῦτις κτήσομαι οὐ κακίῳ.
(5.1-4)

His famous ῥίψασπις poem is a highly evocative and provocative piece that subverts cultural values displayed in epic and other elegy.⁴² If taken at face value, this poem depicts a soldier who is more concerned with his own safety than heroic status. This on its own is not scandalous, but when coupled with the fact that he insouciantly dismisses his shield, the tool most critical to the developing hoplite battle tactics, the tone suggests a soldier who is more concerned with his own safety than his fellow soldier's, which would have also been provocative in a pre-phalanx world.

⁴¹ Richardson (1980) 272-5 analyses the scholia's interpretation of the different portrayals of Greeks and Trojans, while discussing whether Homer purposefully portrayed the Greeks in a better light for the audience's sake.

⁴² Other examples of this theme are in Alcaeus 428, Anacreon 381b, and Horace *Od.* 2.7.9-10. Aristophanes made frequent use of this theme to mock the politician Cleonymus (*Kn.* 1369-72; *Cl.* 353-4; *Wasps* 15-27, 592, 823; *Peace* 444-6, 679-80; *Birds* 290, 1470-81). For an analysis of the Aristophanic passages with bibliography, see Storey (1989). Archilochus apparently composed more than one poem on this theme: see Kerkecker (1996) and Robertson (1999) 64-71.

The degree to which this effect is felt is largely dependent on how evolved hoplite tactics were in Archilochus' time. However, when compared to the heavy emphasis on social and military cohesiveness found in the exhortative elegies of Tyrtaeus, the provocative nature of this poem is easy to comprehend.⁴³

The 5th century writer Critias, accepting the poem as biographical fact, states: εἰ μὴ παρ' αὐτοῦ μαθόντες, οὔτε ὅτι λάγνος καὶ ὕβριστής, καὶ τὸ ἔτι τούτων αἴσχιον, ὅτι τὴν ἀσπίδα ἀπέβαλεν (Critias 88 B 44 D-K).⁴⁴ Plutarch reports that the Spartans banished Archilochus from their land for writing this poem since it promoted ideals counter to the Spartan heroic code (*Mor.* 239B.5-12). Considering how little concrete evidence survives for the lives of early archaic poets, we need put little credence in this tale, but it is at least credible that this was the type of reaction later writers assumed he would have met had he gone to Sparta.⁴⁵ The 2nd century AD

⁴³ Fränkel (1951) 153 compares this fragment to Homer (*Il.* 9.408-9) and notes "Der Achilleus der Ilias spielt nur mit der Vorstellung daß ihm das Leben lieber sein könnte als die Ehre; Archilochos wägt ernstlich den Wert des Lebens gegen einen überspannten Ehrbegriff ab." For the English translation, see Fränkel (1975) 137. Adkins (1985) 51 brings up the point that this poem may have come from a time when fully realised hoplite tactics had not yet come into being, and so the poem would seem worse to later generations who only understand fighting in terms of the phalanx. However, the very idea of whether this poem engages with the heroic ideal has come into question. Gerber (1970) 15 comments that "Archilochus merely says he 'left it beside a bush,' and this implies he was not in possession of it when he was presumably surprised by the enemy." Rankin (1974) 197 posits that "Archilochus criticizes the rigidity of Archaic Greek interpretation of the Homeric warrior's ethos. His words support the idea of the heroic man as a person who, if temporarily defeated, will yet fight again." Anderson (2008) 259 takes this even further and suggests that "the poet did not throw his shield down to run away, but he laid it aside expecting to return for it after he finished his business in the bush."

⁴⁴ Tsagarakis (1977) 17 comments that "this means of course that Critias considered self-expression to be autobiographical material, and this is a narrow and unacceptable view." Dover (1964) 212 suggests of Archilochus in general that "the poet's own standpoint is only one among the standpoints which he adopted in the composition of poetry."

⁴⁵ An interesting suggestion has been made by Theunissen who prefers to see fragments 2 and 5 of Archilochus forming part of a larger poem. There would have to be some lines missing that could connect the two fragments. If this were true, it would provide an interesting contrast between shield and spear. As he notes, "le mépris dans lequel le bon soldat semble tenir son arme défensive, le prix qu'il attache au contraire à son arme offensive, s'expliquent l'un par l'autre dans le développement de ce poème: on se débarrasse sans scrupule de l'accessoire bouclier qu'on aura tout loisir de remplacer au cours des péripéties du prochain combat, mais on ne quitte jamais sa lance, source de puissance sur les biens de ce monde." Thus, he prefers to see this as a larger poem about the contrast between the offensive spear and the defensive shield. It is an interesting theory, but unfortunately there is not any evidence to warrant the amalgamation of these two poems. Also, one would expect to have heard about this contrast from other ancient sources. Surely the tales of the Spartan reaction might not have been quite so harsh to Archilochus if the loss of the shield was explained in these terms. While it may be going too far to link these poems physically, it is

writer Sextus Empiricus introduces the first three lines as a complementary tale to a story about a Spartan mother who tells her son to come back from war either with the shield or on it; ‘τέκνον, ἢ ταύταν ἢ ἐπὶ ταύταν’ (S.E. *P.*3.216.4). It is not difficult to see why archaic audiences, taking this poem at face value, could have reacted with *nemesis* at the promotion of ideals favouring individual safety over group cohesion.

The thoughts expressed in Archilochus’ *rhapsaspis* poem, when taken literally, contradict the basic heroic code found in epic. A few passages illustrate how at odds this poem is with epic’s notion of martial valour. As Sarpedon lies at death’s door he calls to his fellow Lycian, Glaucus, asking him to protect his armour once he is dead. In no uncertain terms Sarpedon states:

σοὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ ἔπειτα κατηφείη καὶ ὄνειδος
ἔσσομαι ἥματα πάντα διαμπερές, εἴ κέ μ’ Ἀχαιοὶ
τεύχεα συλήσωσι νεῶν ἐν ἀγῶνι πεσόντα.
(*Il.* 16.498-500)

It is explicit that a failure to protect the armour of Sarpedon would be a cause of shame and reproach for Glaucus. The respect for the armour and the symbolism it represents are so vital that comrades must protect the armour of their deceased, which is in part to deny *τιμή* to the opposing side while simultaneously preventing their peers reacting with *nemesis*. Menelaus echoes similar thoughts about the fallen Patroclus:

ὦ μοι ἐγὼν εἰ μὲν κε λίπω κάτα τεύχεα καλὰ
Πάτροκλόν θ’, ὃς κεῖται ἐμῆς ἔνεκ’ ἐνθάδε τιμῆς,
μή τίς μοι Δαναῶν νεμεσῆσεται ὅς κεν ἴδῃται.
(*Il.* 17.91-3)⁴⁶

possible to see the two ideas as smaller parts of the whole in the military psyche of Archilochus. He values his spear as a powerful tool, but will never trade his life for his shield.

⁴⁶ Cairns (1993) 52 notes “Menelaus has two alternatives; either he can leave behind the arms and body of Patroclus and risk the *nemesis* of his fellows, or he can give in to the *aidōs* which the thought of their disapproval arouses in him and remain where he is, in spite of the danger. *Aidōs*, then, foresees and seeks to forestall *nemesis*.” Scodel (2008) 12-20 further defines these terms noting “*Aidōs* is inhibitory shame, and to experience it is ‘to picture oneself as losing honour’; *aidōs* internalizes *timē*, but also links manifest *timē* with more subtle social pressures, including

Menelaus already knows the solution to this dilemma before he voices it. If he abandons Patroclus and his armour, it will be shameful, and more so if he is seen abandoning them. The additional emphasis on how his peers, who represent a microcosm of life back home, will react signifies the pressure and influence conveyed by those around him. As we have already seen the epic poet can express such thoughts in speech, although he reserves the most shameful ponderings for soliloquy. While Tyrtaeus might approach this motif with a moral tableau, Archilochus takes a different approach. He voices these thoughts in the 1st person, which gives the impression that they are his own thoughts, or at the least the thoughts of his persona. He takes the succinct storytelling of elegy and the direct connection of poet and audience, but phrases it in a style more akin to soliloquy that can be found in epic. Considering the meagre evidence that suggests that Archilochus came a generation before Tyrtaeus, this poem may represent an intermediary stage between the epic poetry of Homer and the exhortative elegies of Tyrtaeus. Thus, Archilochus contributed to the development of the rapidity of elegiac narrative, but maintained certain epic elements, and then Tyrtaeus took the intimate qualities of elegy in regard to poet and audience and adapted them to a type of exhortative elegy that emphasises communal cohesion in the polis as well as in the army.

In the sphere of lyric poetry, themes of running from battle are not confined to elegy alone. In the *Geryoneis* Stesichorus depicts a scene in which the titular character debates with another character, probably Menoites, on the nature of fight or flight (15).⁴⁷ Unfortunately much of this fragment is missing and we must rely on the admirable supplements by Davies and

kleos (as 'reputation'). *Aidōs* and *nemesis*, justified anger caused by a violation of social norms, are reflexive emotions - people feel *aidōs* about behaviour to which they themselves would respond with *nemesis*." Williams (1993) 80 comments: "The reaction in Homer to someone who has done something that shame should have prevented is *nemesis*, a reaction that can be understood, according to the context, as ranging from shock, contempt, and malice to righteous rage and indignation."

⁴⁷ Barrett (2007) 6-13 notes the presence of Menoites in Apollodorus (2.106-109) and deduces that Stesichorus is likely the source of this character.

Finglass, as well as Page and Barrett.⁴⁸ From what remains we can gather that Geryon has a debate about whether he is immortal or not and how that will affect his decision to fight Heracles.⁴⁹ The first half of the debate is fragmentary and depicts Geryon's assessment of his plight should he be immortal:

αἰ μὲν γὰρ[ρ γένος ἄθάνατος πέλο-
μαι καὶ ἀγή[ραος ὥστε βίου πεδέχειν
ἐν Ὀλύμπ[οι

(15.8-10)

To Geryon the possibility of his immortality suggests that he should avoid combat with Heracles and suffer any reproaches because he will ultimately live for eternity among the gods.⁵⁰ He would have no need to share the mortal desire to die splendidly.

On the other hand, Geryon has a completely different outlook on the situation should he be mortal:

αἰ δ' ὃ φί[λε χρὴ στυγερὸν μ' ἐπὶ γῆ-
ρας [ίκ]έσθαι,
ζώ[ει]ν τ' ἐν ἐ[φαμερίοις ἀπάνευ-
θε θ[ε]ῶν μακάρων,
νῦν μοι πολὺ κά[λλιόν ἐστι παθῆν
ὃ το μὀρσιμ[ον ἢ θάνατον προφυγῆν

καὶ ὀνειδέ[α παισὶ φίλοισι
καὶ παντὶ γέ[νει κατασχευέμεν ἐξ-
οπίσω Χρυσ[άο]ρο[ς υ]ῖον

(15.16-24)

⁴⁸ Davies and Finglass (2014) provide the most recent edition of the Stesichorean corpus. Appropriately, their text relies almost exclusively on the text as it survives in the papyrus with little supplement. For the sake of quoting a more fleshed out, although less certain passage, I quote Page's supplements, but will examine their commentary or Barrett's where appropriate to do so. Since their numbering system supersedes previous ones, I do maintain them here.

⁴⁹ This story comes from Heracles' 10th Labour (Apollod. 2.5.10). Heracles comes to the island of Geryon to steal his cattle and kills the herdsman Eurytion, his guard dog Orthus, and Geryon himself.

⁵⁰ Davies and Finglass (2014) 271 ff. provide insight to similar passages from Homer and Pindar. They compare this passage to Sarpedon's speech in the *Iliad* (Il. 12.322-8) and note that "For Sarpedon, the prospect of eternal life was an impossibility, raised only to emphasise the reality of imminent death." They also note that Pindar adapts the Iliadic passage (N, 10.83-8). They note that Polydeuces "has a real choice between immortality and (semi-)mortality (hence the two conditionals), and chooses the latter to save his brother." They then outlines (with bibliography) the various interpretations put forth by scholars as to the effect adapting the Homeric passage has for Geryon's situation.

Geryon's primary concern should he be mortal is that if he will age and die an old man, then he would rather die now protecting his property and preserving his family's good name thereafter.⁵¹ It is understandable that he need not be concerned with his family's reputation if he is immortal since that alone will overcome any shame occurring from not fighting Heracles, but the idea that he would not care for lost property is perhaps more perplexing. His emphasis on the disgrace his family would feel should he not defend his property is reminiscent of Tyrtaeus (12.29-30).⁵² In contrast to Geryon, who focuses on the negative repercussions, Tyrtaeus emphasises the positive benefits a soldier's family will receive when the soldier fights bravely.⁵³ That Geryon did fight Heracles suggests that he is indeed a mortal (19).

A series of fragments from the same poem depict Geryon's mother, Callirrhoe, in a dialogue trying to convince her son not to fight Heracles. Although we do not possess the entire speech, there are enough clues in what survives to suggest such a context.⁵⁴ Barrett compares Callirrhoe's appeal ἀλλὰ σε Γ]αρυόνα γωνάζομα[ι / αἶ ποκ' ἐμ]όν τιν μαζ[όν] ἐ[πέσχεθεν (17.4-5) to Hecuba's request for Hector not to fight; εἴ ποτέ τοι λαθικηδέα μαζόν ἐπέσχον (*Il.* 22.83).⁵⁵ If these emendations are correct we should assume that Stesichorus deliberately echoes this

⁵¹ That Geryon did fight is evident from other fragments (19) as well as the surviving myth in Apollodorus. There are also various surviving vase-paintings that depict this fight scene. As West (1971) 306 comments that, "Many of the themes of Stesichorus' poems were popular subjects in seventh- and sixth-century art. But as they must all have been current in epic poetry before him, it is in principle unlikely that we shall be able to establish direct influence of his poetry on vase-painting or vice versa. It would be well to refrain from bringing them into the argument until some incontrovertible connection is made out." However, Robertson (1969) 213 notes that such evidence does exist: "The winging of the giant is found only in the Chalcidian pictures and Stesichorus. That this detail was derived by the vase-painter from the poet it would be perverse to doubt; and I think it a reasonable hypothesis that the general character of the new type of representation derives likewise from Stesichorus' *Geryoneis*."

⁵² I will discuss this fragment further at a later point in the chapter.

⁵³ There may be a direct connection between these two passages since the earliest known use of the phrase γένος ἐξοπίσω comes from Tyrtaeus (12.30). Stesichorus' use of this phrase may indicate he is echoing Tyrtaeus, but the possibility remains that both poets echo a lost work. On a different note, we must recall that Tyrtaeus does not always depict the positive outcomes (cf. 10.1-10).

⁵⁴ e.g. πείθει τέκνον (16.7), ἐγὼν [μελέ]α καὶ ἀλασ- / τοτόκος κ]αὶ ἄλ[ασ]τα παθοῖσα (17.2-3), ἄγ' ὑποσχέσιος μεμναμένος ἄ[ν]- / περ ὑπέστας] /Γαρυόνα θ[αν]άτου (18.6-8).

⁵⁵ Barrett (2007)16.

important scene from the *Iliad*.⁵⁶ Davies and Finglass note that this scene “adds to the pathos of his situation by humanising him: the audience is encouraged to think of the monster’s tender infancy.”⁵⁷ The allusion to Hector is apt not only because he was the defender of his land from an invading Greek hero, but because the allusion also foreshadows Geryon’s death. One could speculate that Stesichorus would have enhanced this by echoing Andromache’s appeal in book 6 and Priam’s appeal in book 22. Hector replies to Andromache that he would bring shame to the Trojans: αἰδέομαι Τρῶας καὶ Τρωάδας (*Il.* 6.442) and later Priam challenges this notion by making his withdrawal the salvation of the Trojans: ἀλλ’ εἰσέρχαιο τεῖχος ἐμὸν τέκος, ὄφρα σωσῆς / Τρῶας καὶ Τρωάς (*Il.* 22.56-7).⁵⁸ He is more important to them alive, which sets up the conflicting nature of the warrior defending his land. If he throws his life away, he is not able to defend his family. However, if he does not fight, he cannot protect them. In this situation, it is not uncommon for the warrior to choose death so long as it is glorious. Since we do know that Geryon was concerned about the shame of his children and future generations (15.22), it would be fitting if Callirrhoe also claimed that Geryon’s withdrawal from combat would be to his children’s benefit, thus making the allusion to Hector and his family more complete.

There is one exception in epic to the notion that individual flight from battle is dishonourable: when the injured leave the battlefield. Nestor, the wise advisor, bluntly states: οὐ γάρ πως βεβλημένον ἐστὶ μάχεσθαι (*Il.* 14.63). In the Homeric style of one-to-one combat this seems more reasonable, but it is much more problematic for the hoplite warfare of Tyrtaeus

⁵⁶ Such a direct parallel is certainly expected of a man described by Longinus as Ὀμηρικώτατος (*de subl.* 13.3). Kelley (2015) compares several Homeric passages to passages of Stesichorus. He observes that “Stesichorus had access to more than just a general knowledge of the poems, almost certainly to a written text, but also that the nature of interaction is closer to the developed intertextuality of a later age.” Although not the main point of his argument, Carey (2015) 61 suggests that it is reasonable that “Stesichorus knew something like our Homer.”

⁵⁷ Davies and Finglass (2014) 279.

⁵⁸ Hector’s anti-social behaviour has parallels to description of soldiers going berserk in Shay (1994) 77-99. Geryon too shows a lack of compassion for his mother’s pleas.

where the removal of one exposes another. The tight formation of the phalanx would make it nearly impossible for any but the back rows to escape. This would compel the remaining soldiers to adapt to their weakened position and face a greater risk of death or flee themselves. Even when the injured heroes departed from combat at Troy, they did not flee as soon as they were injured. Agamemnon continues fighting after he has been wounded until he has done all he can (*Il.* 11.264-83); so too does Odysseus (*Il.* 14.434-88).⁵⁹ The wounded hoplite had little choice but to keep fighting and hope for a quick victory.⁶⁰

d) Managing Fear

Although the poets of exhortative elegy discharge reproaches at the individuals that flee, they also offer basic advice on how to overcome their fear and fight more bravely, and prevent soldiers from fleeing in the first place. Tyrtaeus orders the audience to put flight out of their mind, describing it as shameful.

ὦ νέοι, ἀλλὰ μάχεσθε παρ' ἀλλήλοισι μένοντες,
μηδὲ φυγῆς αἰσχροῆς ἄρχετε μηδὲ φόβου,
ἀλλὰ μέγαν ποιεῖσθε καὶ ἄλκιμον ἐν φρεσὶ θυμόν
μηδὲ φιλοψυχεῖτ' ἀνδράσι μαρνάμενοι
(10.15-8)

⁵⁹ Hainsworth (1993) 255, n. on 11.269-72 makes the interesting observation that “Agamemnon (and still less those gallant men, Diomedes and Odysseus, later) does not cry out or groan, unlike the Trojan Deiphobos in similar circumstances (13.538).” This observation heightens the sense of heroism with Agamemnon in a scene where he is already illustrating how one continues to follow proper conduct even when facing difficult circumstances.

⁶⁰ There are a few stories in Herodotus describing the result of Spartans avoiding battle at Thermopylae (Hdt. 7.229-32). Two Spartans, Eurytus and Aristodemus, were sent home due to injury. On the way home they debated whether they should continue their journey home or return to battle. They failed to agree and Eurytus returned to die in battle while Aristodemus did not. Herodotus believes that for the Spartans the most shameful aspect of this story is that one of the two returned to battle while the other did not. Had they both continued home or both returned to battle, they would have acted nobly. As a result, Aristodemus was shamed upon returning home; no one would speak to him or give him any help. As an epilogue to this story, Aristodemus was recognized as the bravest Spartan at the battle of Plataea in an attempt to redeem himself. (Hdt. 9.71). While he was honoured for his bravery, he gained less credit since the motivation for the heroic behaviour was to redeem previous dishonour rather than to win fresh honour in the present battle. It is important that past dishonours can be redeemed by future bravery even though that future bravery will be considered an inferior form of bravery.

There is nothing in this passage that disagrees with the ideas he conveys in poem 11 discussed above. These two couplets follow the pattern of positive advice in the hexameter, followed by behaviour to avoid in the pentameter, all of which are conveyed with second-person plural imperatives. The first couplet calls for solidarity in battle; the soldiers must stand together as a group, and are then urged to avoid flight and panic. In the second couplet Tyrtaeus calls for the soldiers to fortify their disposition and forbids them to love life. The first imperative in line 15 is obviously addressed to all of the soldiers as a cohesive unit. However, the imperative used in line 16, although clearly plural and addressed to the group, speaks to each soldier individually since every man is responsible for his own self-control over panic so that he does not spread it to those around him and cause a general rout. It is for this reason that Tyrtaeus then commands the soldiers to make their hearts brave, as a method of pre-empting any potential panic.⁶¹ As for line 18 I will return to it shortly.

Ultimately, the most critical element of the first three lines is the dichotomy between flight and panic, which are αἰσχροῦς, and their desired remedy, a heart that is both μέγας and ἄλκιμος.⁶² The soldier must avoid the former by adhering to the latter. Tyrtaeus draws attention

⁶¹ There is a scene between Hector and Paris that exemplifies the notion of fear of combat and the potential death that follows and the shame that accompanies it. Paris is afraid to fight Menelaus causing Hector to scold him at length, which then prompts him to correct his behaviour (*Il.* 3.30-75). Kirk (1985) 270, n. on 32 comments that Paris' initial response to Menelaus: ἄψ δ' ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο κῆρ' ἄλεείνων (*Il.* 3.32) "does not usually imply any cowardice, but rather a sensible response to overwhelming odds." When looking at other uses of this phrase (*Il.* 11.585; 13.566, 596, 648; 14.408; 16.817) Kirk's assessment seems quite reasonable. However, considering that these two characters lie at the heart of the initial conflict for the entire war and in view of Hector's scathing speech towards Paris after his initial cowering, there can be no doubt that this line irrefutably reeks of cowardice.

⁶² αἰσχροῦς in Homer takes on some subtle variations in relation to the traditional definition of 'shameful' and 'disgraceful'. It is used numerous times as a direct insult (*Il.* 3.38; 6.325; 13.768; 24.238). More interesting is that it is twice used to denote a withdrawal from warfare without obtaining the desired result (*Il.* 2.119, 298). In the former example Agamemnon decries such actions because the Greeks should be able to conquer the Trojans and a withdrawal would signify their lack of resolve (*Il.* 2.110-41). In the latter example Odysseus, although understanding of the impatience of an army absent for 9 years, urges his fellow soldiers to resist the temptation to depart, for those 9 years will be in vain if they leave empty-handed and without any material gain. Such a reading of αἰσχροῦς in Tyrtaeus would add a subtlety to the passage, for it would imply that the audience should be able to conquer their foes and that it would be shameful if they were defeated due to their impatience and lack of resolve. While μέγας can be used in a variety of ways in Homer, it does not carry any special connotations for the present

to these opposing ideas by using a chiasmus-like effect where the first line has two nouns that are relatively similar, if not interchangeable, and an adjective that, although grammatically is unable to describe φόβος, in terms of sense, could apply to both. This is countered with a line that has one noun and two adjectives that are relatively similar.

While the ideas in lines 15-17 may not be surprising to a modern audience, line 18, which asks the soldiers not to love life while in combat, is more striking. If the soldiers are not emotionally attached to their lives (or at least preoccupied with saving them), they do not fear losing them and can focus on winning the battle and not losing their lives. As I discussed in the previous chapter, one of the most critical motivations for soldiers is to protect their families and city. However, it is precisely these motivations that Tyrtaeus implores the soldiers to put out of their minds in order to overcome their fear. By clearing their minds of all the reasons that brought them to the battlefield, the soldiers are not faced with distractions and can fight with their attention focused squarely on the task at hand. These two couplets constitute a different phase in the poem. After having drawn the audience's sympathetic attention to the protection of the family and state, Tyrtaeus now instructs them in the ways to achieve their aims. Thus, we see that this poem is not only about motivating his audience, but educating them as well. This poem encapsulates aspects of social, communal, and political cohesion as well as cohesion in the ranks. Tyrtaeus first appeals to his audience's sense of duty and uses that to make them more susceptible to instruction.

discussion; ἄλκιμος, on the other hand, does. While ἄλκιμος is typically used to describe a brave warrior (*Il.* 6.437; 12.349; 17.429; et al.), Agamemnon uses it to urge his men to make their hearts brave (*Il.* 5.529). Homer and Tyrtaeus are obviously working from the same tradition since they describe the same thought and use ἄλκιμον in the same 4th foot, but there is variation in that Homer uses ἥτορ and Tyrtaeus uses θύμος. These passages are further connected by Agamemnon's call for his soldiers to fight together to minimise losses in battle (*Il.* 5.30-2), and yet both poets express these similar thoughts in largely different vocabulary. Such variation could be attributed to a conscious decision by one poet to distinguish his genre from the other.

Tyrtaeus has been weaving together several different layers of motivation in this poem. He begins by calling attention to the dichotomy between dying hero and the living coward. The former brings benefit to his society, the latter only brings burden. Tyrtaeus is clearly encouraging his audience to accept the former. This dichotomy also represents the mutually beneficial relationship that exists between citizen and polis; each provides for the other. Having established the importance of this relationship, Tyrtaeus makes the bold claim that in order to satisfy sufficiently the citizen's role in the relationship, they must free themselves of the distraction of that relationship and focus solely on the enemy that stands before them. He asks them to prioritise death in the defense of the polis above all else. Of course, there is a further truth lying behind these words; Tyrtaeus does not actually want his audience members to die in battle, he only wants them to be willing to die so that they may fight more bravely and ultimately be more successful in achieving their goal.

Tyrtaeus touches upon similar themes in poem 11, where he writes μηδ' ἀνδρῶν πληθὺν δειμαίνετε, μηδὲ φοβεῖσθε, / ἰθὺς δ' ἐς προμάχους ἀσπίδ' ἀνὴρ ἔχέτω (11.3-4). Instead of encouraging his audience to gain courage by standing amongst their own group in poem 10, he advises them not to fear the group of men coming at them but to face them with zeal. Furthermore, he makes a more dramatic appeal to embrace death: ἐχθρὴν μὲν ψυχὴν θέμενος, θανάτου δὲ μελαίνας / κῆρας <ὁμῶς> αὐγαῖς ἠελίοιο φίλας (11.5-6). This demand is darker than poem 10, for rather than avoiding a love of life, his audience should actively love the death spirits.⁶³ This evokes a much stronger emotion for it illustrates a deeper acceptance of death as a

⁶³ Fränkel (1951) 177 observes that Tyrtaeus creates a rational resolution of this paradox and notes “wer in der Schlacht sein Leben wegwirft, hat am meisten Aussicht es zu behalten; und wer flieht um es zu retten, wird es am ehesten verlieren.” For the English translation, see Fränkel (1975) 155.

possible outcome.⁶⁴ Once the soldiers accept their own mortality and the possibility of death, they will have conquered their fear well before they conquer the enemy.

Similarly, Callinus calls for the soldier to charge straight forward: ἀλλά τις ἰθὺς ἴτω / ἔγχος ἀνασχόμενος καὶ ὑπ' ἀσπίδος ἄλκιμον ἦτορ / ἔλσας, τὸ πρῶτον μειγνυμένου πολέμου (1.9-11). Although this passage does not specifically refer to this as a remedy for fear, it does come in the midst of a passage dealing with the inevitability of death, which is an obvious root of fear on the battlefield.⁶⁵ The poet dares the soldier to engage in battle with the utmost confidence since death will come at a time fated without our knowledge.⁶⁶ If the Fates have spun that a soldier will die in battle, he cannot alter that fact and so he might as well fight with all his might.⁶⁷

On the surface Tyrtaeus' and Callinus' thoughts on the willingness to surrender life on the battlefield seem fairly similar. The demand is severe, but it is essential in order to achieve success. However, there are subtleties in their language that suggest a greater difference between the two poets. Tyrtaeus adopts a much grimmer tone, especially with the negative use of the verb φιλοψυχέω (10.18).⁶⁸ He demands the soldiers forget who they are and what they love. Although

⁶⁴ Schwartz (2009) 118 notes "this theme is developed systematically and often in unpleasant graphic detail, and it mirrors the phalanx ethos perfectly: to keep one's place at all times, even at the cost of losing one's *own* life, so as not to jeopardise the entire army."

⁶⁵ Hector attempts to comfort Andromache by calling attention to the inevitability of death (*Il.* 6.486-9). Death will come to the brave and the coward; there is no use in hiding from it.

⁶⁶ Sarpdeon relates similar thoughts to Glaucus νῦν δ' ἔμπης γὰρ κῆρες ἐφeskτᾶσιν θανάτοιο / μυρίαί, ἃς οὐκ ἔστι φυγεῖν βροτὸν οὐδ' ὑπαλύξαι, / ἴομεν ἢ τῷ εὖχος ὀρέξομεν ἢ τις ἡμῖν (*Il.* 12.326-8). Hainsworth (1993) 354, n. 328 comments that "Homer does not pretend that any form of death is 'sweet' and his heroes do not 'demand the strife'; they enter it from a sense that it is their duty." This interpretation applies to Callinus as well, for he deliberately contrasts the mundane death at home in order to make death on the battlefield more palatable. Hector too speaks about the inevitability of fate for the warrior on the battlefield (*Il.* 6.487-9). Graziosi and Haubold (2010) 220, n. on 485-93 note of this scene "it is precisely because all mortals must die, and cannot escape fate, that they must behave well and do their duty."

⁶⁷ West (2007) 379-85 places the Greek conception of the Fates in the wider Indo-European context.

⁶⁸ According to LSJ the primary meaning of φιλοψυχέω is "love one's life", but it does gain the sense of being "cowardly or faint-hearted". The verb, not found in Homer, is used a few times by Euripides. In the *Hecuba* Odysseus questions whether it is better to fight or love life since the dead are not properly honoured: πότρεα μαχοῦμεθ' ἢ φιλοψυχῆσομεν, / τὸν καθ'αυτὸν ὀρώντες οὐ τιμώμενον; (*Hec.* 315-6). Euripides clearly contrasts the act of fighting with loving life. In the *Heracleidae* the maiden twice uses this verb: first, to designate the actions of

these are the precise motivations that led them to the battlefield, once there, they become distractions.⁶⁹ He enhances the darkness of this thought in poem 11 where he demands that the soldiers become intimate with the very notion of death (11.5-6). By asking them to love death as if it were the rays of the sun, he is asking them to turn their perspective on life upside-down in order to sacrifice themselves for victory.⁷⁰ There are merits to this viewpoint for one could understand the notion of battle as subversion of daily life, war as a polar opposite to peace. Therefore, in order to live another day in a peaceful manner, the soldier must turn his priorities upside-down in battle. It is in the same way that the soldier must love death as he normally would love the sun. This simile is strengthened by the fact that the death shades are black while the rays of the sun are bright. Ironically he demands that the soldier give up, at least for a day, many of the personal motivations that drove him onto the battlefield in the first place, the attributes that make him human and help reinforce the bonds between citizen and polis.⁷¹

In contrast to the grim demands of Tyrtaeus, Callinus offers a much more positive approach to the fear of death. He refers to the inevitability of death as dictated by the gods, which is something that cannot be changed and therefore should not be feared (1.8-15).⁷² Death will come when it is fated and mortals are powerless to change that fact. Thus, the soldier ought to fight as bravely as possible since his death is pre-determined. Callinus urges the soldier to face

one who has not fought even though there was need, and second, with a negative as a synonym for being cowardly (*Heracl.* 517-8, 533-4). Although by the 5th century the word has a sense of cowardice, it clearly cannot have that sense in Tyrtaeus. When Euripides uses the word it is in contrast to the act of fighting, but Tyrtaeus specifically uses it in the context of fighting. Even though Tyrtaeus uses it in a negative imperative, the phrase would not make sense if we understood it according to Euripides' use of the verb, and so we should read it in the literal sense of not loving life.

⁶⁹ Recall that this poem begins with a moral tableau depicting a defeated soldier wandering with his family. These motivations will be ever present in the minds of the audience who are now being asked not to love life.

⁷⁰ Adkins (1985) 80 suggests that "What he is saying would be startling at any time and is quite new in seventh-century Greece."

⁷¹ Hanson (2000) 36-7 stresses the hoplite system as one that is meant for a quick resolution to conflict.

⁷² Campbell (1967) 165, n. on 12 comments the Homeric precedent of not avoiding battle since death is predetermined. He specifically refers to two passages (*Il.* 6.487 ff, 12.322 ff.). Of the latter he notes "the idea that a soldier who survives battle does not thereby escape old age or death, and it is this idea that Callinus elaborates here."

the battle head-on by asking him to go straight forward and be in the front ranks with brandished spear. It is important that he does not ask the soldier to give up anything that makes him human or deprive him of the qualities that mark the soldier as an individual, as Tyrtaeus does, but instead he asks that the soldier give his best until the end. It is worth noting that Callinus is addressing a group who are refusing to fight and need to be convinced, whereas Tyrtaeus addresses a group of soldiers who from the context appear ready to fight, but in need of some words of encouragement. Callinus is trying to persuade his audience that they must accept the principles of the mutually beneficial relationship. Tyrtaeus' audience has already accepted them. Consequently, Callinus would have been less successful if he made such a dark case for the need to fight in the first place. Tyrtaeus, on the other hand, has an audience willing to fight and so he can be more direct in his approach. Despite the varying degrees of willingness to fight, war is at hand for both contemporary audiences.⁷³

e) The Role of Old vs. Young in Battle

Although the roles of the old and young in battle are not intrinsically related to issues such as flight from battle and fear, Tyrtaeus manipulates all of these themes to elucidate his position on improper conduct in war with a vivid moral tableau.

⁷³ In Callinus' case he is possibly referring to a war with the Cimmerians also mentioned in fragment 5: νῦν δ' ἐπὶ Κιμμερίων στρατὸς ὀβριμοεργῶν. These invasions saw the widespread destruction of Sardis during the first half of the 7th century BC. For more on Sardis and its destruction, see Hanfmann (1965) 13; Hanfmann (1966) 10; Hanfmann (1967) 32-3; Pedley (1972) 21; Ivantchik (1993) 97. Tyrtaeus addresses his soldier during the 2nd Messenian War mentioned in several of his other poems. For more on these wars and their dates, see: Cartledge (2002) 100 ff.; Parker (1991) 25-47; Shaw (1999) 278.

τοὺς δὲ παλαιότερους, ὧν οὐκέτι γούνατ' ἐλαφρά,
 μὴ καταλείποντες φεύγετε, τοὺς γεραιούς.
 αἰσχροὺν γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο, μετὰ προμάχοισι πεσόντα
 κεῖσθαι πρόσθε νέων ἄνδρα παλαιότερον,
 ἤδη λευκὸν ἔχοντα κάρη πολιόν τε γένειον,
 θυμὸν ἀποπνείοντ' ἄλκιμον ἐν κονίῃ,
 αἱματόεντ' αἰδοῖα φίλαις ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντα
 αἰσχρὰ τὰ γ' ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νεμεσητὸν ἰδεῖν
 καὶ χροὰ γυμνωθέντα·

(10.19-27)

Tyrtaeus first addresses the issue by giving a direct order to the younger soldiers that they should never abandon the veteran soldiers.⁷⁴ This further promotes the ever-important theme of solidarity in the ranks, but opens up deeper themes about the relationship between the younger and older soldiers. The younger soldiers are physically the most capable men in the community and should therefore bear the brunt of the attack; at the same time they must never abandon their elders, for ultimately they would be abandoning the men who fought on their behalf when they were younger and unable to do so.⁷⁵ It is not sufficient for the younger soldiers to join the ranks, they must lead them. By providing this distinction Tyrtaeus not only instructs his audience on their proper role in combat, but their role in society as well. Tyrtaeus makes the scene more pitiable by noting that the older men are no longer nimble in the knees, which is a clear sign that they have left behind their prime fighting years, and places them in direct contrast with the younger soldiers whose legs can carry them safely from battle. The older men have already fought on many occasions on behalf of their community and it should be the young who lead the charge.⁷⁶ If, however, it is the young leaving their elders to fight, the natural order is lost and

⁷⁴ Recall that Tyrtaeus addresses the νέοι in line 15 and they clearly stand in contrast to the παλαιότεροι and γεραιοί. Gerber (1970) 74 n. on 20 comments that γεραιούς “conveys a sense of dignity and respect παλαιότερους does not.” This is similar to the distinction in English between elders and people that are older.

⁷⁵ This motif also occurs in Callinus (1.1-4) and Tyrtaeus (10.1-6).

⁷⁶ Pritchett (1985) 39 observes that “clearly, both young and elder warriors die ἐν προμάχοις. Moreover, the “ugly and vexatious” aspect of the young man is when he “retreats and leaves his elders to bear the burden,” allowing them to die in front of him. Since the commandments are addressed to young and old alike, the opportunity exists for all hoplites to be among the promachoi.” Although the older soldiers would no doubt have been present at a large

their roles are subverted. Furthermore, the community will face greater peril in the years ahead, for the experienced veterans have died in battle while the younger soldiers remain inexperienced and will have become more skilled in escape than combat.

Tyrtaeus places great emphasis on this point, for he follows this command with the longest description of death on the battlefield found in his extant poetry. The gruesome nature of the six lines describing an old man lying dead on the battlefield while the young soldiers flee is extremely poignant, and greatly emphasises the shamefulness involved. While death scenes of this length are not uncommon in epic, where the poet has unencumbered freedom to depict ornately detailed deaths, the elegist, when composing exhortative poetry, has a greater need for being terse.⁷⁷ As he often does, Tyrtaeus utilises a moral tableau consisting of unspecified soldiers to articulate his point more effectively to the entire audience. He illustrates the grievous state of the old man and his valiant spirit persevering to the end in dramatic detail; he has white hair and a grey beard, he lies in the dust gasping out his last breath, he clutches his bloody genitals, and his skin is exposed and naked. In contrast to all of this, the young men are described with only one word, νέοι. It is this whole sight, both the dead man and the fleeing soldiers, which the poet describes as αἰσχρόν and νεμεσητόν. By calling public attention to a scene that should conjure *nemesis* in the audience members, Tyrtaeus inspires his audience to avoid this activity and consequently fight more bravely.

public performance of this poetry, Tyrtaeus specifically addresses the younger soldiers and contrasts them with the veterans. While I cannot deny that Tyrtaeus explicitly states that the elder soldiers can fight up front, his point is that the younger soldiers are acting shamefully when they allow this to happen. Thus, the hypothetical young soldiers of Tyrtaeus who abandon their elders are guilty of two misdeeds; they were not brave enough to fight willingly among the front ranks, and they abandoned the elders who fought in their place. Also, it is unlikely that Tyrtaeus is depicting a scene of younger soldiers fleeing from the front ranks, for such a move would be impossible once the front ranks were engaged with the enemy. Furthermore, the phrase πρόσθε νέων makes it clear that the older soldiers are dying in front of the younger soldiers (i.e. they were in front of them before the younger soldiers began fleeing).

⁷⁷ The first Trojan death at the hand of a Greek in the *Iliad* takes 6 lines (*Il.* 4.457-62). Friedrich (1956) and Morrison (1999) analyse the variation and manipulation of death scenes in Homer.

Priam similarly draws a contrast between the deaths of the young and old in combat. He states:

νέῳ δέ τε πάντ' ἐπέοικεν
ἄρῃ κταμένῳ δεδαϊγμένῳ ὃξέϊ χαλκῷ
κεῖσθαι· πάντα δὲ καλὰ θανόντι περ ὅτι φανήη·
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ πολίον τε κάρη πολίον τε γένειον
αἰδῶ τ' αἰσχύνωσι κύνες κταμένοιο γέροντος,
τοῦτο δὴ οἴκτιστον πέλεται δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν.
(*Il.* 22.71-6)⁷⁸

Priam makes these statements in a speech to Hector before his battle with Achilles as a way of showing that Priam's fate will be worse than Hector's, for at least Hector will die nobly in battle in the prime of his youth, while Priam's death will be a wretched sight.⁷⁹ In Priam's eyes the shame does not come from a lack of bravery, but rather from the corpse's age, unseemliness, and a brutal death away from the battlefield. Tyrtaeus adapts the same motif by using the vivid and shameful description of the old man, but instead of contrasting it with the seemly death of the brave warrior, he contrasts it with the repulsive image of a young soldier running away. The most important effect of the differing use of this motif is that Tyrtaeus places the emphasis of shame not on the old man lying dead but on the soldier who runs away.⁸⁰ Whereas in Homer the old corpse was unseemly and pitiful because of its ugly appearance in contrast to the splendid nature of the young man dying in combat, in Tyrtaeus the shame comes from the fact that the old man was left alone to fight amongst the front ranks while the young soldiers run away in fear.

⁷⁸ Richardson (1993) 114, n. on 73 contrasts this passage with Tyrtaeus and notes "κεῖσθαι is added somewhat awkwardly."

⁷⁹ Vernant (1982) explores the topic of beautiful death (or a glorious death in battle). Hector knows he will die, but the glory and splendid nature of his death are yet to be determined. Achilles will deprive him of a beautiful death, but the gods will eventually restore his due. In describing the different competing aspects of the soul Plato tells the story of Leontius, who walks by the corpses of publicly executed criminals (*Plat. Rep.* 439e-440a). Leontius is conflicted; he has a desire to see the corpses, yet initially feels repulsed by the idea. In the end his base desires prevail and he looks at the bodies more closely. For an interpretation of this passage with bibliography, see Liebert (2013).

⁸⁰ Bowra (1960) 54-5 compares these two passages, but does not appreciate the effect it has on the poem. He argues that, "the details, however impressive, are not absolutely relevant."

Furthermore, Tyrtaeus uses the motif to lead into the advantages of the good soldier (10.27-30), thus providing a further contrast within his own poem between the shameful soldier who flees the battlefield and the splendid sight of the one who performs his duties.

Although linguistically these two passages are connected, the question of priority has been debated. Besides the similar use of αἰσχύνω in Homer and its cognate αἰσχρός in Tyrtaeus, the latter also uses two line endings identical or very similar to those of Homer. The Homeric κάρη πολίων τε γένειον (*Il.* 22.74) is duplicated by Tyrtaeus (10.24) and the Homeric νέω δέ τε πάντ' ἐπέοικεν (*Il.* 22.71) is almost identical to Tyrtaeus' νέοισι δέ πάντ' ἐπέοικεν (10.27). Wilamowitz and Dover both believe that Tyrtaeus transmuted the epic predecessor into elegiacs.⁸¹ Contrarily, West argues that Tyrtaeus may have inspired the Homeric passage. He argues:

In *Il.* the antithesis breaks down: the fine young corpse (irrelevant to Priam's argument) is still juxtaposed with an old man with white hair and beard and lacerated genitals, but he is not a warrior fallen in the front line but Priam himself, who has not fought in the field and will not be wounded by a spear...⁸²

West's argument is difficult to accept. In the Iliadic passage Priam, an old man, laments how his death will not be splendid because it will not be in combat, although it will still come at the end of a spear (*Il.* 22.67-8). Priam will be mutilated without any of the glory of combat. West's suggestion that Priam's inclusion of the young corpse is irrelevant is also difficult to accept, for Priam deliberately contrasts how he envisions himself dying with the death of his many sons (*Il.* 22.62). Furthermore, even though Priam attempts to convince his son not to fight, it is likely that he knows he will not be successful, and so he is ultimately contrasting his own fate with Hector's. There is a tragic quality in this thought because initially Hector will have an unseemly

⁸¹ Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1966) 95ff. and Dover (1964) 190 ff.

⁸² West (2011) 385, n. on 71-6.

death. It will only be through divine intervention that his death will be restored to its proper splendid nature. The splendid young corpse and the shameful old corpse are extremely relevant when contrasted in this context. Contrary to both of these views Fowler argues that there is “no conclusive force in any argument for the priority of either passage. The change in emphasis is very easy: in Homer, it is that an old man’s violent death is piteous; in Tyrtaeus, that his death in battle is disgraceful.”⁸³ Although Fowler may be correct that there is no overwhelming evidence for the priority of either passage, I believe his interpretation does not go far enough. The passages are connected through their similar depiction of an old man dying, but the change in emphasis occurs between each poet’s depiction of the young soldiers alongside them.

Nestor gives an account of the roles of young and old in battle and describes the ideal scenario, which stands in contrast to Tyrtaeus’ shameful scene.

ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥς ἵππεῦσι μετέσσομαι ἡδὲ κελεύσω
 βουλῇ καὶ μύθοισι· τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ γερόντων.
 αἰχμᾶς δ' αἰχμάσσουσι νεώτεροι, οἳ περ ἐμεῖο
 ὀπλότεροι γεγάασι πεποίθασιν τε βίηφιν.
 (Il. 4.322-5)

In Nestor’s opinion the roles of the young and the old are clearly divided: the old offer counsel and play a minimal role in battle, while the young fight in the front ranks in a lead role.⁸⁴ Tactically this makes sense, for the youngest, and presumably the fittest, utilise their strength to overcome the enemy while the veterans, a group with a presumably smaller population due to

⁸³ Fowler (1987) 31.

⁸⁴ Nestor’s role among the chariots is largely instructional. Greenhalgh (1973) 7-18 analyses the use of chariots in Homer.

age and years of combat, use their knowledge to guide and teach the young.⁸⁵ Although the combat tactics are different, Tyrtaeus advocates a similar deployment of the young and old.

Hanson offers a different reading of these lines of Tyrtaeus. He believes that "Tyrtaios had confirmed that those well past thirty were not confined to rearguard duty or camp guards, but rather often expected to serve right up in the front ranks, and on occasion, as the cutting edge of the collision."⁸⁶ I believe he has missed Tyrtaeus' point completely. Tyrtaeus specifically draws negative attention towards those who do not follow proper conduct and abandon their elders. The shame is two-fold, for not only is it shameful that the young run away while the elders die, but the elders should not have been in that position in the first place. Fighting in the front lines is the role of the young, not the old and Nestor's discussion on the matter suggests that such a distribution is not entirely due to tactics, but socially defined roles, which have been developed through the subtleties of the mutually beneficial relationship between citizen and polis.

In *Pythian* 6, an ode to the charioteer Xenocrates and his son Thrasybulus, Pindar relates the episode of Antilochus saving his father's life on the battlefield at Troy.⁸⁷ This passage is particularly illuminating as it touches upon several themes discussed not only in this chapter, but in previous chapters as well. Antilochus embodies the pinnacle of filial piety when he confronts the oncoming Memnon and sacrifices himself to save his father. Thus, he is acting in defense of family and consequently will die in his father's place, a theme which enhances the pathos of the loss in battle. On a different note, Antilochus obeys the social consensus that young men should

⁸⁵ Yamagata (1993) draws some interesting parallels between Homer and the medieval Japanese *The Tale of Heike* concerning the roles of the young and old.

⁸⁶ Hanson (2000) 91.

⁸⁷ Bowra (1964) 107 comments on the parallel between the two younger analogues that Thrasybulus "conforms admirably to Pindar's theories of aristocratic birth and manners, and though the parallel with Antilochus might suggest that he is ready for the risks and sacrifices of war, we cannot press this too hard." The latter aspect tends to be ignored by other scholars, but Bowra is right in speculating that there may be some military aspect, of which the details are now lost to us.

fight up front of their elders. There are various levels of positive motivation weighing upon Antilochus, and his proper conduct in adhering to them designates him as a symbol bravery and glory.

ἔγεντο καὶ πρότερον Ἀντίλοχος βιατὰς
νόημα τοῦτο φέρων,
ὃς ὑπερέφθιτο πατρός, ἐναρίμβροτον
ἀναμείναις στράταρχον Αἰθιοπῶν
Μέμνονα. Νεστόρειον γὰρ ἵππος ἄρμ' ἐπέδα
Πάριος ἐκ βελέων δαΐχθεις· ὁ δ' ἔφεπεν
κραταιὸν ἔγχος·
Μεσσανίου δὲ γέροντος
δονηθεῖσα φρὴν βόασε παῖδα ὄν,
χαιμαίπετὲς δ' ἄρ' ἔπος οὐκ ἀπέριψεν· αὐτοῦ
μένων δ' ὁ θεῖος ἀνὴρ
πρίατο μὲν θανάτοιο κομιδὰν πατρός,
ἐδόκησέν τε τῶν πάλαι γενεᾷ
ὀπλοτέροισιν ἔργον πελώριον τελέσαις
ὑπατος ἀμφὶ τοκεῦσιν ἔμμεν πρὸς ἀρετάν.
(P. 6.28-43)

Since filial piety is one of the major themes explored by Pindar in this ode, the passage sheds light on the roles of old and young.⁸⁸ At its core this myth extols the virtues of younger soldiers fighting on behalf of veteran soldiers.⁸⁹ In contrast to Tyrtaeus' hypothetical, unnamed characters Pindar utilizes specific characters directly from epic.⁹⁰ The difference in approach is due to the different goals of the poets. Tyrtaeus is never concerned about specific sons protecting their fathers by occupying the front ranks of battle; he is interested in *all* of the sons of the polis protecting *all* of the fathers, which will consequently strengthen solidarity in the community and the army. Although the epinician is a form of public poetry and has a communal audience, Pindar

⁸⁸ Along with the theme of filial piety Schein (1987) 243 observes that the other central theme to the ode is "ordering of a world of disorder." Schein well shows the unity of the poem by paying special attention to the language, metre, and themes.

⁸⁹ Pindar emphasises the sacrifice itself by using the hapax ὑπερφθίνομαι.

⁹⁰ Aspects of this story are also found in other sources that probably derive from a version of the *Aethiopis* (Il. 8.80-7; Od. 4.187-8; Xen. Cyn. 1.14; Apollod. Epit. 5.3). See also West (2013a) 145-6.

makes specific use of Nestor and Antilochus so that he can draw an analogy with the subjects of his praise, Xenocrates and Thrasybulus.⁹¹ Although most scholarship tends to focus on the connection between Antilochus and Thrasybulus, there is also the obvious connection between Nestor and Xenocrates.⁹² Pindar notes that Nestor was riding a chariot when he was in danger, a detail that not only corresponds with Nestor's ideal roles of the young and old in battle (*Il.* 4.322-5), but also harmonises with the addressee Xenocrates, who is being praised for winning a chariot competition, even if he was not the driver.⁹³ Thus, Pindar manipulates the dichotomy of young and old in battle to cast both addressees, the father and son, in epic light, while also remaining faithful to the original source material.⁹⁴

2. Rewards for Positive Behaviour

While there is an abundance of material in the extant lyric corpus covering the polis' understanding of negative conduct in warfare and its accompanying repercussions, there is less on the matter of positive conduct and the accompanying rewards. It is possible that the disparity between these two ideas is in part attributed to accident of transmission. While this may be part of the explanation, the remaining evidence does suggest more practical reasons. As discussed at the start of this chapter, there are some situations where death might be preferable to living. There is perhaps no better lyric representation of this than the opening lines of Tyrtaeus 10. The poet only requires two lines to communicate the honourable nature of the man dying up front in battle. In contrast, he spends twelve lines stressing the woes that await the man who wanders

⁹¹ Shapiro (1988) highlights the connections between the poem, its vocabulary, and the setting at Delphi.

⁹² Farnell (1930) 159, n. on 28 comments that "the comparison of Antilochos to Thrasuboulos has been thought far-fetched and exaggerated. But if Thrasuboulos really had a reputation for filial duty, the comparison is as relevant as most of those drawn from mythology in the epinician odes." See also Kurke (1990) with bibliography.

⁹³ Nagy (1990) 206-14 make interesting and elaborate connections between *Pythian* 6 and *Iliad* 23.

⁹⁴ Being faithful to previous source material was not always a concern to Pindar. Bowra (1964) 54-61 argues that Pindar consciously changes details about gods that present them as immoral beings. But in this case some of the traditional elements of the story make it a more compelling comparison. A similar argument is put forth by Huxley (1975) 14-22.

defeated with his family. Tyrtaeus implies that death would have been preferable for that defeated soldier. At the same time, the polis is not interested in promoting anti-social behaviour that encourages its soldiers to throw away their lives recklessly. Those soldiers are needed to fight another day. As discussed in the previous chapter the pursuit of spoils does not appear to have been a compelling motivation in lyric and it may have been beneficial for the poets to suppress those elements in their poems. Similarly, when describing the relationship between soldier and polis, the poets are able to communicate more efficiently when focusing on the repercussions of negligence rather than the rewards for adherence. This is not to say that the lyric poets ignored the rewards, as I shall discuss relevant poems in this section, but that they perhaps recognised their argument was stronger when the main emphasis was on the negative consequences rather than the positive.

While it is interesting to speculate on why there is such a disparity in surviving poetry between these two motifs, it is even more important to understand how the lyric poets make use of the positive rewards in the overall structure of their poems, what rhetorical effect they have on the audience, and what are the specific promises made by the state to offer incentive in the mutually beneficial relationship. I will first look at some of the positive rewards that are described in elegy and then look at Tyrtaeus' understanding of ἀρετή, which can be understood as a means of achieving glory in battle and receiving rewards.

a) Positive Rewards

Whereas Callinus begins poem 1 depicting the community's outrage at the young men for their improper conduct, at the conclusion he makes a dramatic shift and emphasises the rewards that await those who fulfill their part of the mutually beneficial relationship.

τὸν δ' ὀλίγος στενάχει καὶ μέγας, ἦν τι πάθῃ·
 λαῶι γὰρ σύμπαντι πόθος κρατερόφρονος ἀνδρὸς
 θνήσκοντος, ζώων δ' ἄξιος ἡμιθέων·
 ὥσπερ γάρ μιν πύργον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῶσιν·
 ἔρδει γὰρ πολλῶν ἄξια μῶνος ἐών.
 (1.17-21)

Callinus states that both the small and the big lament death, and a look at Homer's use of ὀλίγος and μέγας would suggest that Callinus is referring to physical size (*i.e.* everyone from small children to full-grown adults).⁹⁵ The emphasis is on the community as a whole and seeks to foster social cohesion. The younger members of the community look up to the prime fighters as not only heroes to admire, but also models to emulate. Such an arrangement establishes and maintains the social order for future generations and ensures the success of the polis. The adult members of the community respect the soldier's sacrifice because they are currently making the same sacrifice themselves or have done so in the past. The cohesion of the polis is further accentuated by the phrase λαῶι σύμπαντι, a phrase that captures the spirit of many of the themes discussed in this chapter (*e.g.* mutually beneficial relationships, social, communal, and military cohesion, etc.). It is important to recognise the contrast Callinus makes between the social divide that exists at the start of the poem when certain members of the community are not fulfilling their obligations and the political and social unity that exists at the end of the poem when a soldier fulfills his obligation to the state. If Callinus is successful, he will have taken his audience on a journey from the isolation of one who refuses to accept his role in the mutually beneficial relationship to a well-regarded member of the community who has accepted his role, is willing to sacrifice himself for the community, and consequently received his proper due.

⁹⁵ Although we might be inclined to suggest that ὀλίγος and μέγας refer to stature in the community, there is no strong evidence to assume such an interpretation given other 7th century uses of the substantive adjectives.

Callinus is careful not only to include the honours bestowed on the deceased soldier⁹⁶ but also to state clearly that the victorious soldier will receive positive benefits from the community while he is still living, for in life he is honoured as a demigod. While he does not list any specific rewards, he does acknowledge that the people will recognise the soldier's valiant spirit and treat him with the utmost respect while still living.⁹⁷ Thus, the soldier knows that there will be immediate positive consequences for him following his victory beyond the immediate inter-political gains achieved through the battle itself. Callinus uses a powerful simile in order to convey the people's attitude toward him. He stands like a tower, which has the obvious connotation of military protection, but also suggests he stands in prominence as a role model for the community.⁹⁸ The poet flatters the soldier further by noting that his deeds are worthy of many men. Clearly Callinus recognises the importance of these positive factors for the soldier and he concludes the poem with such an uplifting ending to boost the audience's morale. In contrast to the start of the poem where he directly addresses certain members of their audience in the 2nd person plural and chastises them for specific misdeeds, the rewards are presented from the perspective of an unnamed 3rd person soldier in a moral tableau. Thus, he wants them to

⁹⁶ The honours bestowed on the war-dead will be discussed in section 3 of this chapter. It is important that the community promotes the benefits and honours that await the soldier (both alive and dead). By bringing the polis together for this aim, there is a heightened sense of communal cohesion. That this process repeats on a regular basis ensures that the communal cohesion endures from one generation to the next. It is an ongoing process in which every member of the community can take part at every stage of their lives.

⁹⁷ van Wees (2007) 286 notes "A Greek's 'honour' (*timê*) was both his social status and the respect for his status shown by others. Communities no less than individuals had a place in ranking-order of honour and demanded the appropriate level of deference from others."

⁹⁸ LSJ list πύργος as a tower in the primary meaning, but it emphasises that the tower is one attached to a city wall and in the plural can even be translated as "city-walls" or "ramparts with their towers" (e.g. *Il.* 7.338). In addition Cunliffe (1924) 353 notes that it can also refer to "a body of troops formed in line." See also *Lfgre* 3 1660-2. Thus, this word has always had a military connotation, and even as early as Homer it could be used to describe soldiers. Regardless of the exact meaning in Callinus, the emphasis is clearly on the defensive nature of the tower, signifying the people's understanding of the soldier as their primary line of defence. Thus, this simile praises at the soldier commemorating him for his hard work, but it also clearly specifies to the soldier his crucial role within the community.

understand specifically what they have done wrong, but then allow them to contemplate ‘the good soldier’ so that they can personalise the experience of receiving rewards themselves.

Tyrtaeus echoes Callinus when he speaks of the entire polis recognising and honouring the victorious soldier.

εἰ δὲ φύγηι μὲν κῆρα τανηλεγέος θανάτοιο,
νικήσας δ' αἰχμῆς ἀγλαὸν εὖχος ἔλλι,
πάντῃς μιν τιμῶσιν, ὁμῶς νέοι ἢ δὲ παλαιοί
(12.35-7)

Whereas Callinus emphasises the size of the people honouring the victorious soldier, Tyrtaeus describes them by their age. Although the νέοι can refer to young people in general, as I argued in Chapter 2, in martial elegy it is used specifically to refer to the young soldiers of prime fighting age.⁹⁹ Thus, when the νέοι honour the victorious soldier, they are in fact honouring their direct peers, which reaffirms the solidarity among the ranks. However, the inclusion of the παλαιοί, who were the last generation’s νέοι, indicates that the veterans too honour the νέοι. These men understand the sacrifice the νέοι make like no others. When taken together, these two groups also emphasise the cohesiveness of the community. Not only is there social cohesion among relative peers who have a shared experience, but also across generational lines.

The rewards owed to the victorious soldier do not expire with his youth, but carry on into old age.

γηράσκων δ' ἀστοῖσι μεταπρέπει, οὐδέ τις αὐτὸν
βλάπτειν οὔτ' αἰδοῦς οὔτε δίκης ἐθέλει,
πάντες δ' ἐν θώκοισιν ὁμῶς νέοι οἳ τε κατ' αὐτὸν
εἴκουσ' ἐκ χώρας οἳ τε παλαιότεροι.
(12.39-42)

⁹⁹ See Section 1b.

The present participle γηράσκων suggests that the honours received endure for a lifetime. The detail that the soldier is distinguished among the citizens emphasises his crucial role in society and recalls Callinus referring to the soldier as a tower before the people. Tyrtaeus again stresses the civic unity by including both the νέοι (*i.e.* the soldiers of prime fighting age of the next generation) and the παλαιότεροι (*i.e.* the soldiers of prime fighting age from the previous generation). It is clear that Tyrtaeus deliberately associates the bonding between fellow soldiers with the greater social cohesion that exists across the polis.

In a different poem Tyrtaeus redefines the social group admiring the victorious soldiers not on the basis of age, but of sex.

νέοισι δὲ πάντ' ἐπέοικεν
ὄφρ' ἐρατῆς ἥβης ἀγλαὸν ἄνθος ἔχη,
ἀνδράσι μὲν θηητὸς ἰδεῖν, ἐρατὸς δὲ γυναιξὶ
ζωὸς ἐὼν, καλὸς δ' ἐν προμάχοισι πεσών.
(10.27-30)

As he has throughout the entire poem, Tyrtaeus addresses the younger soldiers of prime fighting age.¹⁰⁰ When he is alive the soldier is regarded in flattering terms: he is admired by men and loved by women.¹⁰¹ The inclusion of women is important. We may interpret the women's desire for this type of man as reflective of a man's hopes and expectations of how woman should behave, or it could be a confirmation and re-enforcement of women's desires who are present in the audience. If there was a civic public performance that allowed for the latter, we may be seeing an even greater recognition of the communal cohesion so often stressed in Tyrtaean poetry. Thus, not only would men and women be present at the performance, but they are each

¹⁰⁰ Recall that this passage comes immediately after Tyrtaeus has instructed the audience in how shameful it is to abandon the older soldiers in the front lines. Now that he has told them what not to do, he will tell them of the personal gains each will make when they fulfill their obligations.

¹⁰¹ The Tyrtaean soldier who exemplifies proper conduct can be understood as the ancient equivalent of James Bond; women want him and men want to be him.

playing a role in the mutually beneficial relationship. This does not suggest that women were equal partners, but recognises that their role was not insignificant. These lines are the closest that Tyrtaeus comes to appealing to the individual soldier's personal desires, yet these rewards are available for everyone in their class of fighters, and so the sense of cohesion remains intact. That Tyrtaeus should generalise these soldiers for the special treatment they receive from the community should come as no surprise since the community requires them to put themselves at greatest risk and depends on them the most for its self-preservation. It is also significant that none of the rewards discussed by Callinus and Tyrtaeus are material in nature. These elegiac poets do not make promises of predatory gains as a means to incentivise. Instead, the rewards constitute status and relationships within the community; social cohesion is emphasised as the ideal standard at all times.

b) Tyrtaeus and ἀρετή

In addition to informing the audience about the types of rewards they should expect to receive for adhering to the social contract, Tyrtaeus is also concerned with educating them on how best to fulfill their obligations. This should be seen as the reverse side of managing fear. The first section of his longest extant poem consists of an extensive priamel that describes many different conceptions of ἀρετή and relevant mythological exempla, all of which he subordinates to his own martial notion of ἀρετή.¹⁰² It is important to analyse each ἀρετή in some detail in order to better understand how Tyrtaeus builds his argument that his ἀρετή is supreme as a means to understanding how he will motivate his audience to strive for excellence. Thus,

¹⁰² A poem attributed to Simonides lists a hierarchy of the most important things in life, some of which are concepts marginalised by Tyrtaeus. It reads ὀγιάειν μὲν ἄριστον ἀνδρὶ θνητῷ / δεύτερον δὲ φῦλιν καλὸν γενέσθαι, / τὸ δὲ τρίτον πλοῦτεν ἀδόλως, / τέτατον δὲ ἡβᾶν μετὰ τῶν φίλων (651). The motif of creating a hierarchy of what is best in life was popular in many genres in the archaic and classical periods (e.g. Plat. *Gorg.* 451 ff., Aristot. *Nic. Eth.* 1099a). Dodds (1959) 200-1 lists the many uses of this motif. He also observes that in Plato's *Laws* this poem is revisited and notes these categories "are best only for the man who is spiritually healthy; otherwise they can add to his secret misery."

running, wrestling, physical strength, speed, beauty, wealth, regality, eloquence, and fame without courage are all great qualities, but none compare to a soldier fulfilling his obligation to the community.

It is first worth examining each of the mythological figures and their relevant ἀρεταί in comparison to the skills required of a soldier in combat, so that we can understand Tyrtaeus' concept of ἀρετή.¹⁰³ Through the use of chiasmus Tyrtaeus first describes two different abilities, running and wrestling, which are exemplified by the Cyclopes and the North Wind.

οὔτ' ἄν μνησαίμην οὔτ' ἐν λόγῳ ἄνδρα τιθεῖν
οὔτε ποδῶν ἀρετῆς οὔτε παλαιμοσύνης,
οὐδ' εἰ Κυκλώπων μὲν ἔχοι μέγεθός τε βίην τε,
νικώη δὲ θεῶν Θρηϊκίον Βορέην
(12.1-4).

Wrestling is not something generally associated with the Cyclopes, but certainly their immense strength is familiar: Polyphemus can easily remove the door-stone from his cave entrance while Odysseus and his crew cannot (*Od.* 9.302-13). In Hesiod the chief characteristic of the Cyclopes is their craftsmanship as the makers of Zeus' lightning bolt (*Th.* 139-46). Given the varying depictions of the Cyclopes by the two epic poets, it is more likely that Tyrtaeus describes Cyclopes in terms closer to Homer than Hesiod. We have no evidence that Tyrtaeus knows any variant Cyclopean myth involving wrestling, and so he may have followed the basic logic that the biggest and strongest men are the best wrestlers and the Cyclopes are the biggest, therefore the Cyclopes are the best wrestlers. In terms of combat, physical strength is not only required,

¹⁰³ I refer in this discussion to Shey (1976), in which he makes a very detailed analysis on the entire poem with a special emphasis on the priamel and how it relates to the rest of the poem. Ultimately his argument concerning the priamel is that "in every instance, the mythological characters of the priamel possess aretai which cause harm to themselves or others, or which are unable to save them from harm, unhappiness, or bad reputation." While his detailed analysis of each myth is very informative and useful in conjunction with the present discussion, ultimately there are some instances where his argument does not hold up as well as others, which then calls into question his entire approach. I will discuss these throughout the present discussion.

but essential. So much of hoplite combat simply involved one side trying to overwhelm the opposing side with their physical strength.¹⁰⁴ We need not assume that Tyrtaeus disregards this trait, but rather that the warrior who possesses strength alone, as exemplified by the Cyclopes, does not adhere to Tyrtaeus' vision of the ideal soldier and ἀρετή.¹⁰⁵ The notion of winning a foot-race with the North Wind is equally interesting. There are no known myths involving Boreas in a foot-race, but when Homer mentions him it is usually with regard to speed (*Il.* 20.219-29; 23.344-8).¹⁰⁶ Speed is another quality that the hoplite warrior cannot do without. Although it was not essential once combat was initiated, in later years there was always a sprint in battle formation at the outset of battle where speed and rhythm were essential in striking the first blow.¹⁰⁷ As in the Cyclopean example we must assume that Tyrtaeus does not devalue the role of speed of foot in warfare, but that this attribute, on its own, is an inferior ἀρετή.

¹⁰⁴ Hanson (2000) 56 suggests that "most modern estimates of the weight of hoplite equipment range from fifty to seventy pounds for the panoply of greaves, shield, breastplate, helmet, spear, and sword- an incredible burden to endure for the ancient infantryman, who himself probably weighed no more than some 150 pounds." Hanson further states: (157) "the function of those to the rear, presumably ranks four through eight, was literally to push their comrades forward, and for those in front there was, consequently, really no choice but to complete their run. If they hesitated or gave in to any natural or physical collision, they would nevertheless be shoved onward – or else trampled by successive waves piling against their backs from the rear."

¹⁰⁵ Shey (1976) 9 comments that Polyphemus is ultimately harmed by his own strength since he uses it to eat Odysseus' comrades. This is true, but I would lay blame on his gluttony and folly as well as the Cyclopes' inability to come together effectively as a community as the root causes of Polyphemus' downfall.

¹⁰⁶ Shey (1976) 9 refers to the myth of the abduction of Oreithyia by Boreas (Ovid. *Met.* 6.682-722). In this tale Boreas uses his speed to acquire the object of his desire, the maiden Oreithyia. As Shey notes, "Ovid's account of the abduction of Oreithyia catches the natural savagery of Boreas' character". This may be true, but one cannot deny that Boreas uses his ἀρετή as defined by Tyrtaeus to his full advantage. The marriage is successful and Oreithyia bears the twins Zetes and Calais, two of the Argonauts. This is one detail where Shey's argument is less effective for Boreas' ἀρετή only brings him positive benefits and thus he cannot be included in the category of individuals who come to harm through their own ἀρετή.

¹⁰⁷ Hanson (2000) 135-51 discusses at great length the importance and difficulties encountered while trying to advance troops in unison at a high speed up to the initial impact of battle. Santosuosso (1997) 14 cautions that the Spartans "marched slowly toward the enemy, in step with the music of flutes, until they clashed into the opposing phalanx". Even if they did march at this slower rhythm, it is difficult to imagine that they kept this slow pace all the way to the initial clash of battle. Herodotus mentions that the Athenians at Marathon were the first to charge at a run against their attackers, although he also says that they were the first Greeks who could hear the name "Mede" and not be overcome with fear, which sounds exaggerated on his part (6.112). Billows (2010) 215 supports Herodotus' claim, but van Wees (2004) 172, 180 argues that this practice was in use well before this battle.

While the first two ἀρεταί lie solely in the realm of physical fitness, the remainder are further removed from warfare. The third quality is that of natural beauty exemplified by Tithonus: οὐδ' εἰ Τιθωνοῖο φύην χαριέστερος εἶη (12.5). Although beauty has connections with bravery, prowess in battle, and ultimately death in battle (*cf.* Archil. 114, Tyrtaeus 10.1-2, *Il.* 22.71-3), that connotation is not explicitly connected with Tithonus. He is best known for captivating the heart of Eos, who then asked Zeus to grant Tithonus immortality but forgot to ask for eternal youth (*Hymn to Aphrodite* 218-38; *Il.* 11.1; Hes. *Th.* 984). While natural beauty plays no role in the throng of battle, we must recall Archilochus 114 where he rejects the general who pays attention to personal aesthetics, preferring one who is less attractive, but courageous. In a similar regard the Catalogue of Ships lists Nireus, who is the most handsome man after Achilles, but yet is described as ἀλαπαδνός (*Il.* 2.673-5).¹⁰⁸ It seems that Tyrtaeus views beauty as no guarantee of success in battle. The next ἀρετή in the priamel is wealth, exemplified by both Midas and Cinyras: πλουτοίη δὲ Μίδεω καὶ Κινύρεω μάλιον (12.6).¹⁰⁹ Midas is famously known for being able to turn anything he touches into gold (*Hyg. Fab.* 191).¹¹⁰ His legendary aspects are not specifically mentioned in the earlier sources, but some less fanciful aspects of Midas are recorded by Herodotus (1.14.2, 45.1; 8.138.1). Cinyras, a king of Cyprus, is not known among

¹⁰⁸ Herodotus cites a few occasions where physical prowess and beauty are linked. While leading an army against the Scythians, Darius admired the Tearus river so much that he erected a stele that referred to Darius as ἀνὴρ ἄριστός τε καὶ κάλλιστος πάντων ἀνθρώπων (*Hdt.* 4.91). Philip of Croton was an Olympic victor and the best looking Greek, qualities which caused the Egestans to erect a hero-shrine in his honour (*Hdt.* 5.47). At the battle of Plataea a certain Callicrates was ἀνὴρ κάλλιστος ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον τῶν τότε Ἑλλήνων (*Hdt.* 9.72). Harrison (2002) 563 notes of Callicrates, “his real qualification appears to have been his heroic looks: as the Greek terms for bravery suggest, the line between acknowledged courage and aristocratic reputation was a grey one.”

¹⁰⁹ It is with these two examples of Midas and Cinyras that Jaeger (1960) 118 was able to call into question scholars who wanted to move Tyrtaeus' poems into the 5th century noting, “In ein peloponnesisches Gedicht passen Adrastos und Pelops besonders gut, und welchen Sinn hätte die Anführung der königlichen Arete in einer beliebigen ionischen Stadt mit demokratischer Verfassung oder im Athen des 5. Jahrhunderts, wo doch sämtliche Tugenden, die der Dichter nennt, als ganz reale Konkurrenz der Tapferkeit gemeint sind.”

¹¹⁰ There is one tale that describes how Midas was not able to eat because his food turned to gold, although this appears to a detail known only in the Roman period. In this context Shey's argument is more effective.

the ancient sources as an example of being extremely wealthy, although he does give Agamemnon a very elaborately decorated corselet (*Il.* 11.19-28).¹¹¹

The next ἀρετή discussed is regality exemplified by Pelops: οὐδ' εἰ Τανταλίδεω Πέλοπος βασιλεύτερος εἶη (12.7). He was handed the royal sceptre by Hermes according to the will of Zeus (*Il.* 2.100-5; Paus. 9.40.11). While regality incorporates many qualities, leadership is the most crucial with regard to battle. However, it can also involve other qualities such as justice and resolution, which are concepts that are more difficult to place into a direct military context. Yet, we must assume that Tyrtaeus wants to include all of the connotations associated with regality and not just leadership in battle, for otherwise, he could have chosen a legendary figure that was known specifically for his prowess as a general such as Agamemnon. The final quality mentioned by Tyrtaeus is persuasion through words, as epitomised by Adrastus: γλῶσσαν δ' Ἀδρήστου μελιχόγηρυν ἔχοι (12.8).¹¹² He is most famously known for convincing the original Seven to march against Thebes (Apollod. 3.6-7; Hygin. *Fab.* 69, 70).¹¹³ He seems to be a carefully selected exemplum since his persuasive abilities are best known for assembling and leading men to war. Thus, like strength and speed, eloquence may be an important skill, but on its own it is not a sufficient skill for the good soldier.

At the end of the priamel, Tyrtaeus subordinates all of the aforementioned ἀρεταί to his vision of the ideal ἀρετή of the soldier, which consists of two different elements: the ability to endure the sight of the horrors of battle and the ability to lunge at his opponent (12.11-2). The

¹¹¹ Shey (1976) 10 refers to a passage of Ovid (*Met.* 10.298ff.) where Cinyras' daughter Myrrha falls in love with her father, which ultimately leads to his death. Shey's argument unravels here because his wealth seems to have no impact on his downfall.

¹¹² Del Grande (1956) 69-70 argues for the authenticity of this passage partly on the grounds that the poet chooses to use Adrastus as opposed to Nestor a figure more famously known for his wise words since the latter was Messenian, Sparta's enemy at the time.

¹¹³ Pindar has Adrastus give a funeral speech for the deceased Amphiaraus (*O.* 6.12ff.).

first quality is undeniably one of mental endurance. It is not likely that anyone can mentally prepare themselves adequately for the shock of participating in their first battle and the traumatising sights that accompany it. Thus, when a soldier can overcome this shock he has achieved the first aspect of Tyrtaeus' ἀρετή. Shay describes the innocence of the American soldiers who went to Vietnam and the shock they received upon seeing or committing acts of extreme violence. He notes "without an accurate conception of danger we cannot comprehend war and cannot properly value the moral structure of the army. We must grasp what is at stake: lethal danger and the fear of it."¹¹⁴ Tyrtaeus recognises the shock of war and highly values the soldier that could endure such a sight and not be held back by it. The second aspect looks *prima facie* to be a matter of physical endurance; the description merely talks of lunging at the enemy. If we consider the two qualities that comprise Tyrtaeus' ἀρετή together, we can better understand the essence of his ἀρετή. For Tyrtaeus excellence is achieved not only by enduring the horrors of combat, but by conquering them and being able to use that to your advantage to overcome the enemy. It is the ability to act without hesitation. Ultimately, both qualities that comprise the ἀρετή of Tyrtaeus are rooted in mental endurance.¹¹⁵ While some of the attributes listed by Tyrtaeus in the priamel are certainly desirable qualities for the soldier, they are ineffective if the soldier does not possess the mental faculties to put them to use effectively.

Now that Tyrtaeus has constructed the ideal model for the soldier in combat by specifying the exact qualities that make up the best soldier, he provides the motivation for the soldier to want to achieve this excellence.

ἦδ' ἀρετή, τόδ' ἄεθλον ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἄριστον

¹¹⁴ Shay (1994) 10. Shay later describes (p. 33) how "combat trauma destroys the capacity for social trust".

¹¹⁵ Later in the poem Tyrtaeus lists four activities a soldier can do to achieve success: hold the front lines against the enemy, forget the idea of flight, show his bravery, and encourage his fellow soldiers standing beside him (12.16-9). These four concepts all pertain to mental endurance.

κάλλιστόν τε φέρειν γίνεται ἀνδρὶ νέωι.
(12.13-4)

Tyrtaeus inspires the audience by declaring that the achievement of excellence is both the goal and the reward, and consequently it becomes their reason for living.¹¹⁶ He follows this line by stating ξυνὸν δ' ἐσθλὸν τοῦτο πόλῃ τε παντί τε δήμῳ (12.15), a phrase linked to Callinus' use of λαῶ σύμπαντι (1.18). Although Tyrtaeus formerly spoke in regard to a single soldier, he now explains that this ἀρετή benefits everybody and therefore it is the goal and reward for the entire polis, thus exemplifying the spirit of the mutually beneficial relationship between citizen and state. By adopting this ἀρετή as the ideal to uphold the entire community becomes bound together. Each soldier holds himself to this standard and consequently holds his neighbour to the same standard. There is communal cohesion and both the state and the people stand to gain from this commitment. Thus, Tyrtaeus glorifies the soldier who risks his life to achieve success on the battlefield and outlines the benefits of committing to the mutually beneficial relationship with the state, which marks a change from some of his other poetry where he seems more inclined to outline the negative aspects of not fulfilling one's obligations.

c) Repercussions vs. Rewards

After reviewing the different repercussions for negative behaviour and rewards for positive behaviour as well as the various tactics described for avoiding the former and striving for the latter, it is clear that the repercussions for negative behaviour are more greatly emphasised by the poets and represent a more important core value for the motivation of soldiers. While this could be in part due to the chances of transmission, the sources that do

¹¹⁶ Simonides wrote a poem on the struggle to attain ἀρετή (579). He describes ἀρετή as dwelling on a place unreachable for most mortals and only those who reach the peak of ἀνδρεία are able to achieve it.

survive suggest that there are significant cultural and political values that ascribe the negative aspects as more important to the concept of motivation.

In the *Iliad* we see two examples of prominent characters for whom there is no adequate compensation for death, but death is preferable to living. Hector understands and admits to Andromache that his death will leave her and their son a widow and orphan; these thoughts weigh on his mind (*Il.* 6.431-41). His motivation to protect his family is strong, but there are other factors pulling him in different directions. He also admits that Troy is doomed to fall and he does not want to see his wife enslaved by the Greeks. He would rather be dead than endure the sight and sounds of such an ordeal (*Il.* 6. 464-5). He also states that he would feel great shame if he were seen holding back by the Trojan men and women (*Il.* 6. 441-2), a sentiment he echoes before finally confronting Achilles with the knowledge that his doom is upon him (*Il.* 22.105). Clay notes that the situation in book 22 is inverted from that in book 6.¹¹⁷ Whereas in book 6 he was in the city and was reasoning that he must go back to the fighting to join his comrades, in book 22 he stands alone outside the city and his family have already stressed that his survival is integral to the safety of the city.¹¹⁸ On one level Hector feels compelled to fight lest he be judged by his community; however, there is also the sense that his actions may in fact be letting his community down.

Andromache ultimately blames Hector's death on ἀγηνωρίας ἀλεγεινῆς (*Il.* 22.457). Graziosi and Haubold argue that ἀγηνωρία should be understood as "excessive manliness" and that Andromache understands Hector's ἀγηνωρία as reflective of him moving into anti-social behaviour that has negative consequences for the entire community including his family.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁷ Clay (2002) 10.

¹¹⁸ Priam implores him to come back in the city (*Il.* 22. 38-76) as does Hecuba (*Il.* 22.82-9).

¹¹⁹ Graziosi and Haubold (2003) 62, 69-71.

Although Hector may initially feel compelled to fight for the sake of Troy and its people, his ἄγνηνopia gets the better of him and pushes him toward anti-social behaviour that in fact jeopardises the community. He is thus seen as contributing to the downfall of the community he wishes to save.

Achilles faces a similar evaluation of his life in light of the death of Patroclus. He states that he loved Patroclus above all others (*Il.* 18.81-2). He is so stricken that he wishes his parents had never wed and consequently he had never been born (*Il.* 18.86-7). He goes so far as to say that the only motivation he has to continue living is to slay Hector and declares that he is prepared to die when this task is completed (*Il.* 18.90-9). As the narrative progresses he refuses to eat and drink, thus signifying his retreat from the actions of a living man (*Il.* 19.307ff.) and as he prepares to enter battle he fully admits that his death is fated (*Il.* 19.420-3). Achilles wishes he were dead, but before he can accept his own death, he must take vengeance and kill Hector. He also accepts that once he kills Hector, he is ready to die. As with Hector there are situations where life is not worth living and a death in battle is preferable, especially when that death results in glory or fulfills final wishes.

Tyrtaeus is aware of the dilemma of conflicting motivations that weigh upon a soldier in the opening lines of poem 10 where he contrasts the splendid nature of a soldier dying in the front ranks with the wretched sight of a man abandoning his city and home and wandering with his vagrant family (10.1-6). In his view it would have been better if this individual had died in battle. There are some situations where death is preferable to living. This is clearly an important point for Tyrtaeus to make at the opening of the poem. However, he wants to motivate soldiers to fight bravely, he does not want them marching off to their deaths in vain. He needs to promote bravery and solidarity in the ranks, not recklessness and antisocial behaviour. Thus, he must be

careful in how he constructs his poems so that he encourages his audience to achieve the pinnacle of bravery without transgressing the boundary of acting recklessly and putting the safety and protection of the state at risk.

The types of rewards promised in Callinus and Tyrtaeus are rooted in the community. They emphasise status in the community while assuring cohesion in the ranks and in the polis. It is for this reason that they deliberately avoid describing personal, material rewards for their soldiers. Motivation derived from personal gain is unlikely to encourage soldiers to achieve the pinnacle of bravery since the focus would be on what they can gain, not what they can achieve. The rewards focused on the community are what allow the poets to keep their audience from overstepping the bounds of heroism and adopting reckless and antisocial behaviour. It is no coincidence too that the promise of rewards typically come in the final lines of the poem (cf. Callinus 1, Tyrtaeus 10 and 12). The poets entice the audience members, who have already been instructed to accept death on the battlefield, to contemplate their lives after the fighting has ceased. Their vision of life after battle is one of prestige and is firmly planted in the community. Tyrtaeus wants to push his audience to the brink of fighting as bravely as possible without pushing them over the edge. The promise of rewards that are rooted in the community is what keeps his audience from crossing that boundary.

3. The Treatment of the War-Dead

Thus far the discussion in this chapter has centered on the rewards and repercussions awaiting the soldier who has returned from combat for his adherence to or neglect of his socially designated obligations. Such widespread use of this theme in martial poetry among the lyric poets reflects its importance to the genre. However, there are some examples from this period that depict contemporary society's continual respect and honour for the soldier who commits the

ultimate sacrifice in battle. Public mourning strengthens social bonds across all members of society. On a general level citizens honour the sacrifice of their fellow citizens in battle. On a more personal level family members see their fellow citizens mourning their dearly departed. The act of publicly paid honours unites the mourners through a shared common experience. There are important aspects among the soldier class as well. They may experience an emotional reaction to a comrade's death on the battlefield, but the public honours allow them the opportunity to reflect on the loss after they have been removed from the chaos of battle. The shared experience of providing public honours to a fallen soldier unites the surviving soldiers through their recognition of a mutual struggle. Furthermore, public mourning also provides assurance to a soldier that just as the community bestows honours on his fallen comrade, so too will the community should he die in battle. In the remaining section of this chapter I will focus on how the lyric poets utilise the theme of the treatment of the dead as a method of demonstrating further communal cohesion. I will first look at the Homeric representation of this theme before examining it in the poetry of Tyrtaeus and Archilochus as well as a few examples from grave epigrams.

a) The War-Dead in Epic

Although death is everywhere in the *Iliad* and there is a myriad of detailed scenes of combatants dying, there are relatively few funerals that illustrate the epic conception of the treatment of the dead. Often at the moment of death the audience is told of the ferocious manner in which Greek and Trojan heroes attempt to plunder armour from the corpses as war trophies. However, the deaths and subsequent burials of Patroclus and Hector afford us some perspective of funeral practices in epic.

Prior to the funerals of Patroclus and Hector there are only a few passing references to a warrior's wishes and expectations about how he will be treated by his people upon his death in combat. When Hector makes the proposition that the Trojans and Greeks settle the war with a duel, he proposes that the winner may strip the armour from the corpse, but must subsequently return the corpse to his people for proper burial (*Il.* 7.67-91). There is an emphasis on the respectful return of the body, not only for the deceased's sake, but also those surviving him: σῶμα δὲ οἴκαδ' ἐμὸν δόμεναι πάλιν, ὄφρα πυρός με / Τρῶες καὶ Τρώων ἄλοχοι λελάχωσι θανόντα (*Il.* 7.79-80). This arrangement carefully ensures respect for the dead body and does not deprive the victor of his spoils. Hector makes these same conditions for both sides, which suggests that these are the ideal terms, but the fact that he must express these conditions suggests that they are not standard.¹²⁰ Hera alludes to a similar notion when advising Zeus about his desire to keep Sarpedon alive. She says: ἐνθά ἐ ταρχύσουσι κασίγνητοί τε ἔται τε τύμβῳ τε στήλῃ τε· τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων (*Il.* 16.456-7).¹²¹ This illustrates how important it was for both the deceased and their family and kinsmen that the body should be buried. The idea that burial is actually a gift or reward for the deceased is particularly compelling, for it serves two purposes: it is a respectful way to send off a loved one, but even more practically, it allows safe passage to the afterlife. It is for this reason that the ghost of Patroclus comes to visit Achilles in his sleep (*Il.* 23.69-92) and the ghost of Elpenor confronts Odysseus when he first comes into contact with the

¹²⁰ A reading of the battle scenes in the *Iliad* confirms this suggestion. Kirk (1990) 242, n. on 67-91 comments that "the later part, in which he sets out the details of returning the loser's body, is especially an obsession from bk 22 on." One would imagine that this thought is true for every combatant, but is clearly emphasised in the poem to a greater degree with Hector because it will be the eventual return of his corpse and subsequent burial that will mark the end of the narrative of this poem. At the moment of his death he makes one final plea to Achilles for a proper burial in vain (*Il.* 22.338-42).

¹²¹ Morris (1989) 151-4 confirms the practice described by Homer of a grave marker placed atop a mound was contemporary with the composition of this poem. There is much evidence for this practice in Athens between 900-700 BC, limited to the elite; however, after 700 BC there is evidence for this practice across the Greek world and expanded to a larger body of people. According to Cunliffe (1924) 77 γέρας almost always has the sense in Homer of a gift awarded for the sake of showing honour. See also Snell (1991) 134-6.

Underworld (*Od.* 10.51-83). Thus, the concept of burial in Homer has elements of paying respect to the dead, but also an overtly religious significance concerning passage into the afterlife.¹²²

The portrayal of Patroclus' funeral, while containing some traditional elements, is atypical because Achilles feels such a great suffering from the loss that he goes beyond normal conventions. In addition to Patroclus' corpse the Greeks also add sheep, oil, honey, horses, dogs, and twelve Trojan youths to the funeral pyre (*Il.* 23.161-83).¹²³ While offerings like oil and honey were regular in Geometric burials, animal sacrifice was reserved only for the elite and was a practice belonging to the Bronze Age.¹²⁴ However, some excavations at sites like Salamis and Lefkandi from the 11th-9th centuries BC reveal horse burials.¹²⁵ The human sacrifice clearly represents the most atypical element in this scene.¹²⁶ Before building the pyre the Greeks take part in a communal feast (*Il.* 23.26-34). It is at the feast that Achilles refuses to wash himself with water until the burial of Patroclus is complete (*Il.* 23.43-53). This is another example of Achilles' intense emotional reaction to the death of Patroclus conveyed through Achilles'

¹²² Garland (1985) 21-37 details the intricacies of the three main stages of the funeral: the *prothesis*, *ekphora*, and the deposition. Luce (1975) 94-9 interestingly observes that, despite its prevalent use in the *Iliad*, cremation was quite rare in the Bronze Age with Athens seemingly being the earliest adopter of this custom. See also Antonaccio (2011) and Griffin (2011) with bibliography.

¹²³ Richardson (1993) 188-9, n. on 166-76 comments that "the most striking aspect of the funeral of Patroklos is that all these elements, the slaughter of horses, dogs and human captives, are unique in the Homeric poems. The poet, it seems, is trying to portray a funeral of a special kind, and the excesses of destruction in which Akhilleus indulges are above all a demonstration of his intense grief." Richardson's assessment of this passage is surely correct. Just as Achilles surpasses all of the Greeks in combat, his emotional response to the loss of his greatest companion is more deeply felt and his expression of that emotion is accordingly intensified.

¹²⁴ Kurtz and Boardman (1971) 186-7. Stengel (1910) 183 describes the presence of honey as twofold "der süße Honig, dem man eine besänftigende Kraft beimaß (μέλι-μειλίχιος), war Unterweltsgöttern und Toten gleich angenehm."

¹²⁵ Karageorghis (1967) 9 ff. and Karageorghis (1969) 27ff. provide illustrations of the excavations and details of the intricate work on the horses' decorations. See also Popham, Touloupa et al. (1982) 171. Vermeule (1979) 59-60 observes that "the tradition behind the scene was different, a reflection of an old Indo-European custom which seems to have nearly faded out in Mycenaean Greece, where horses were probably expensive, and which intended the warrior's life-long companion to be with him in death, a mark of dignity, leadership and affection. It was a sign of individual grandeur, a continuation of kingly rank and of the favourite endeavors of life, to be buried with a chariot and team as one had lived on the battlefield."

¹²⁶ For a detailed account of the practice of human sacrifice in the Mycenaean civilisation, see Andronikos (1968) 82-4. He believes that the practice ultimately entered Mycenaean culture through contact with Cyprus.

subversion of normal customs. Finally, the mourners also cut off some of their hair (*Il.* 23.135-51). The communal feast should foster the communal cohesion and solidarity among warriors, but for Achilles it is a sign of his further distancing from society.¹²⁷

While Achilles shows the utmost respect for the corpse of Patroclus, he is as disrespectful as possible with Hector's corpse.¹²⁸ His unusual treatment of Hector's corpse provides and exemplum of improper conduct. As soon as Achilles has defeated his foe, Hector begs him to return his corpse for proper burial. Achilles is still so enraged with Hector that he tells him no such thing will happen and it will be the dogs and birds who feast on the corpse itself (*Il.* 22.352-4). The complete lack of respect continues when his fellow Greeks stand beside Hector and stab his corpse (*Il.* 22.371-5).¹²⁹ There is no other purpose here than savage mutilation. Moreover, Achilles takes the concept of disgracing the corpse to an entirely new level when he fastens Hector's corpse to a chariot and drags it through the dirt before Troy for all of his family and

¹²⁷ While the funeral itself tends to depict the mourning of Patroclus from the perspective of his closest comrades, there are earlier brief descriptions of the Greek host mourning the loss of Patroclus (*Il.* 18.314ff.). We see similar glimpses from the Trojan perspective as well (*Il.* 24.704ff.). Although both of these scenes depict aspects of communal mourning, those closest to the deceased, Achilles and Hector's family respectively, dominate the emotional response. There is a further hint of how the Trojans as a community mourn for their loved ones lost on the battlefield when the Trojan women ask Hector about their husbands, sons, brothers, and neighbours (*Il.* 6.237-41). The *Odyssey* affords us a few insights from the Greek perspective. Nestor recounts to Telemachus some of the horrors that were experienced at Troy (*Od.* 3.102 ff.). Eupheithes offers the perspective of those who never went to Troy, but saw their sons leave and never return (*Od.* 24.426 ff.). Although he speaks with disgust toward Odysseus about the war, much of his anger can be attributed to recent events on Ithaca. A similar tone is expressed by the chorus in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (*Ag.* 437-51). In an earlier episode Nestor calls for a public gathering in honour of all of the Greeks who have fallen at Troy and advises the Greeks to bring the corpses back near their ships and build a giant pyre for the dead (*Il.* 7.331-8). Nestor's proposal and the mass funeral itself are both void of any emotional response from the Greeks, and so we are never enlightened as to their reaction to the event.

¹²⁸ Shapiro (2006) 120 when comparing Sophocles' depiction of Creon in *Antigone* comments that "both Achilles and Creon are guilty of overstepping the bounds of appropriate behavior for mortals, by presuming to give burial to one hero and deny to another the rites that are due to every mortal in the eyes of the gods, regardless of the circumstances of his death." It is fitting in the *Iliad* that Achilles is the one to act in such a way, for, as with everything he does, he acts with a more inflamed passion than the rest of the heroes.

¹²⁹ Griffin (1980) 47 comments that "it is natural to think that underlying this we see the superstition at work, that so many wounds will ensure that Hector in death is really dead (as an Assyrian might put it, to make him more dead than he was before); but Homer will not bring such horrors to the surface, and the scene as we have it draws a great part of its pathos and effectiveness from the heroic contrast of the impassive corpse of Hector and the small malevolence of those who ran from him in life and can only face him when he is safely dead."

kinsmen to see (*Il.* 22.395-413).¹³⁰ There is a great tragedy in this scene for in normal circumstances Hector's family would have been able to see Hector's corpse near at hand and mourn him accordingly, but instead they must view him from a distance being treated in an excessively shameful manner.

Perhaps the most telling sign that Achilles' treatment of Hector's corpse exceeds any socially accepted conduct is that the gods feel compelled to protect his corpse and lessen the humiliation. Aphrodite repels some hungry dogs and anoints him in oil that prevents further damage to his skin despite Achilles' best efforts, and Apollo envelops him in a dark cloud so that the sun cannot damage his body (*Il.* 23.184-91). After Patroclus' funeral Achilles resumes his disgraceful treatment of Hector's corpse and Apollo again needs to protect his corpse from further decay (*Il.* 24.14-21). It is fitting that Achilles' inhumane handling of Hector's cadaver can only be counteracted with divine intervention, for he transgresses conventional boundaries so far that only those who permanently live beyond those boundaries can counteract him. This outrageous conduct eventually distresses the gods so much that they debate whether they should remove the body to receive proper burial, a scene that eventually leads to Priam's supplication of Achilles and the eventual return of the body.

b) The War-Dead in Elegy

In the first half of poem 12 Tyrtaeus explains why his notion of ἀρετή is the best and then identifies battle techniques that will lead to excellence for the audience. He follows this up by articulating the state's reaction and response to a soldier who commits the ultimate sacrifice.

αὐτὸς δ' ἐν προμάχοισι πεσὼν φίλον ὤλεσε θυμόν,
ἄστυ τε καὶ λαὸς καὶ πατέρ' εὐκλείσας,

¹³⁰ Segal (1971) 41-2 notes the similarity between this passage and the death of Sarpedon. He also observes that it appropriately has echoes of Patroclus' death.

πολλά διὰ στέρνοιο καὶ ἀσπίδος ὀμφαλοέσσης
 καὶ διὰ θώρηκος πρόσθεν ἐληλάμενος.
 τὸν δ' ὀλοφύρονται μὲν ὁμῶς νέοι ἡδὲ γέροντες,
 ἀργαλέωι δὲ πόθωι πᾶσα κέκηδε πόλις,
 καὶ τύμβος καὶ παῖδες ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀρίσημοι
 καὶ παίδων παῖδες καὶ γένος ἐξοπίσω·
 οὐδέ ποτε κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀπόλλυται οὐδ' ὄνομ' αὐτοῦ,
 ἀλλ' ὑπὸ γῆς περ ἐὼν γίνεται ἀθάνατος,
 ὅντιν' ἀριστεύοντα μένοντά τε μαρνάμενόν τε
 γῆς πέρι καὶ παίδων θοῦρος Ἄρης ὀλέσῃ.
 (12.23-34)

Tyrtaeus depicts two different, carefully arranged groups to illustrate the impact the soldier's death will have on the polis. The first group contains the city, people, and the warrior's father, which are arranged in ascending order from the least personal to the most personal.¹³¹ As Tyrtaeus has done elsewhere, he creates an additional tragic layer by including the father, for he is someone who fought on behalf of the polis and survived, in part to protect his son, but now must watch as his son dies protecting him. This dynamic suggests that the continual and guaranteed succession of honouring fallen soldiers is sacrosanct. It also stresses social and communal cohesion because each element is a fundamental core of the preceding elements. Tyrtaeus parallels the first group, to whom the soldier brings honour, with the second group, who gain prominence in the community through direct lineage. The second list consists of his tomb, children, grandchildren, and family thereafter, which follows the reverse order of the first group by starting with the most personal and ending with the most distant. The audience of soldiers are made to understand that their sacrifice is respected and honoured at the political, social, and familial level, which creates and fosters a sense of solidarity across all spheres of life. While this is true for the soldier himself, the polis makes a commitment to uphold this respect for his

¹³¹ In a different poem Tyrtaeus succinctly summarises this thought: τεθνάμεναι γὰρ καλὸν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι πεσόντα / ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν περὶ ἧι πατρίδι μαρνάμενον (10.1-2). For the good man, death in defence of homeland is splendid. The careful choice *πατρίς* encompasses both a familial sense and a territorial sense.

descendants as well. Although this passage seeks to establish the entire range of honours the deceased soldier will receive, it also subtly reminds the audience of the many aspects of the community that they defend on the battlefield.

The placement of this episode within the poem as a whole is rhetorically deliberate. After the priamel, which consists of 12 lines, Tyrtaeus describes the benefits attained by the people through the actions of the good soldier, which takes a further 10 lines.¹³² In the subsequent section he outlines the glory received and the honours bestowed by the state, which Tyrtaeus catalogues in 12 lines. In the concluding section Tyrtaeus describes in 10 lines the rewards allotted to the victorious, and still breathing, soldier when he returns to the community. Thus, a central feature of this poem is outlining the dynamics that exist within the mutually beneficial relationship between citizen and polis in 7th century Sparta. The soldier is informed about what is expected of him and how he can best achieve his goals, and in return he is made to understand how the polis will compensate him, both in life and in death. Such a rhetorical device has the advantage of educating the young about social mores and reinforcing them among the more senior members of the community. The public performance of this poem echoes the physical act of bestowing public honours on fallen soldiers. By reminding the audience about the necessity and ritualistic natures of these acts, Tyrtaeus invites the audience to reflect on their own memories of such events. Thus, Tyrtaeus uses poetry to call attention to these customs, but in doing so evokes past memories in his audience of their own personal connections with these customs, thereby making the performance of the poem an extension of those customs.

¹³² Faraone (2006) 34-46 argues for this poem to be analysed as 4 distinct stanzas. Although there are some merits to his analysis, which reveal Tyrtaeus to be a more thoughtful poet than some would allow, Faraone's argument depends upon restructuring the poem and discarding lines that do not acquiesce with his argument.

In the extant corpus, apart from lines 23-34 in poem 12, Tyrtaeus tends to focus on the glory of the living soldier rather than the dead. This suggests a few characteristics of his poetry. First, Tyrtaeus, acting as a motivator on behalf of the state, does not want to spend too much time dwelling on the subject of death. He cannot avoid it, nor should he, but is more effective when he discusses the positive effects of fighting, or the negative effects of not fighting. It is only natural that his audience would prefer to think about successes in future battles and not dwell on death. Furthermore, when Tyrtaeus does incorporate the polis' treatment of the dead soldiers, he emphasises both the large scale mourning by the state, and the more personal mourning by the family. In essence, when a soldier dies in battle protecting the needs of the state, the entire city mourns just as the family does, which emphasises the cohesiveness of the state by casting the polis as an extension of the family.

Homer and Tyrtaeus both treat the theme of the treatment of the dead, but due to the nature of their respective genres and audiences, they take different approaches. Although there are passing references in the *Iliad* to communal mourning, most of these scenes are dominated by the personal relationships between individuals: Achilles and Patroclus, or Hector and his family. It is here that exhortative elegy marks a contrast with epic, the highly-developed characters of epic have no place or space therein.¹³³ Tyrtaeus does not employ individual characters with definitive qualities, but nameless figures that allow for a broader appeal to his audience. Tyrtaeus often creates moral tableaux to depict appropriate or inappropriate situations in order to establish

¹³³ Graziosi and Haubold (2005) 125 when noting a contrast between Hesiod and Homer's portrayal of the heroes and their relationship with death write as follows "the Homeric narrator, by contrast, concentrates not on what remains after death, but what is lost. His prime focus is not the structure of the universe but the suffering of individual characters." Aspects of this contrast also apply to Homer and Tyrtaeus. There is the difference in focus between individual characters in Homer and the more generic figures in martial elegy. Even more striking is that Tyrtaeus equally focuses on what is lost through fighting; the lives of the soldiers, but also what new result develops because of the soldier's sacrifice (*i.e.* not what was lost or remains, but what is gained). It is essential for Tyrtaeus to demonstrate this reciprocal nature between city and soldier in order for his motivational rhetoric to succeed.

and maintain social and moral codes. When Tyrtaeus describes the old man dying in the front ranks, he includes many vivid touches concerning the pain and suffering to produce an emotional response, whereas in poem 12 the vividness comes from the extensive list of people affected by the soldier's sacrifice.

While Tyrtaeus stresses the respect and honour paid to the soldier's death, Archilochus gives a very different impression.

οὔτις αἰδοῖος μετ' ἀστῶν οὐδὲ περίφημος θανὼν
γίνεται· χάριν δὲ μᾶλλον τοῦ ζοοῦ διώκομεν
<οἱ> ζοοί, κάκιστα δ' αἰεὶ τῷι θανόντι γίνεται.
(133.1-3)

Archilochus speaks with a tone antithetical to that of Tyrtaeus, even if that tone is only intended to be taken in jest. Although Archilochus does not specify a death on the battlefield in this fragment, that context is likely since we would not expect the average person dying of natural causes to be either revered or famous. There are a number of ways we can read this poem. It is possible that Archilochus is expressing society's need for soldiers to keep living in order to continue fighting (*i.e.* the dead are no longer useful to us). However, the fact that Archilochus emphasises the lack of respect for the dead makes this interpretation less attractive. Archilochus, either through his own voice or that of a persona, may be consciously subverting expressions found in contemporary life or poetry in order to mock those who propagate such ideas to dismiss the notion of social collectivity and responsibility. This could take the form of a direct attack on poets themselves or members of their audience who found themselves particularly swayed by such civic sentiments. Is it possible that Archilochus, a new colonist to the recently settled colony of Thasos, is having difficulty fitting in as an important member of a collective society and this poem is an expression of that difficulty? Perhaps he does not feel adequately attached to

the community to the point where he would willingly lay down his life for it. This could suggest that without an appropriate level of communal cohesion, the benefits of a supposedly reciprocal relationship between citizen and state are not felt. Consequently the soldier may be less willing to die on behalf of the state. If the polis will not live up to its end of the bargain, why should Archilochus? Alternatively, this fragment could represent Archilochus at his most honest and this poem could be seen as a deliberate contradiction of these notions because they do not reflect reality. If we take this interpretation further we might be tempted to speculate whether Archilochus composed this poem about a specific event, perhaps a friend whose death did not receive the appropriate and promised accolades.¹³⁴ Such an interpretation would place this fragment in opposition to poets like Tyrtaeus, who writes in order to create and sustain a lofty ideal, whereas Archilochus speaks with the voice of the disgruntled cynic who believes that the reality does not live up to the ideal.¹³⁵ Shay equates the Greek concept of *themis* with the common slang in Vietnam “what’s right”.¹³⁶ A violation of “what’s right” could have severe and lasting impacts on the soldier’s psyche. The cynical tone of the Archilochus passage suggests that the poet views this treatment of the dead as a violation of “what’s right”.

c) Commemorative Poetry

Epigrams accompanying grave mounds provide a natural medium for the city to express their thoughts and feelings about the war-dead, and the epigrams attributed to Simonides are no

¹³⁴ Dover (1964) 205-6 notes “his words are not in any serious sense contributions to theology or sociology, but the kind of things we say to relieve our feelings even when different situations, only a short time before, have evoked the opposite feelings.”

¹³⁵ The potential cynicism of this passage is reminiscent of Parry (1956), who argues that Achilles in Book 9 vocalises “the awful distance between appearance and reality; between what Achilles expected and what he got; between the truth that society imposes on men and what Achilles has seen to be true for himself.” Parry’s interpretation of Achilles in this scene has been countered by Edwards (1987) 231-6, who argues that Achilles’ response to the three ambassadors is primarily based upon his disdain for Agamemnon and it is not meant to be seen as a rejection of his society. While Parry’s methodology, which relies on the economy of oral theory, does not apply to Archilochus, his interpretation of Achilles is perhaps better applied to Archilochus in this passage.

¹³⁶ Shay (1994) 5ff. The term “what’s right” could mean different things to different people, but it typically involves the perception of being treated unfairly or needlessly or carelessly being exposed to risk.

exception.¹³⁷ Some of these epigrams not only relate details about the burials themselves, but also about the attitudes of the living in regard to the sacrifice made by the dead. Epigram is worth considering on its own merits because, even though it is composed in elegiac couplets and features similar themes, it is not performance poetry, but commemorative, although one could argue that every time someone reads the poem, they partake in a private performance of the poem and share in the cultural expression of the epigram.¹³⁸ The content has a very specific purpose in honouring the war-dead (*i.e.* it is performed after death rather than before battle). Fundamentally a grave or honorific epigram is a visual representation of the honours bestowed on the deceased. When such an honour is awarded by the state, it confirms the social cohesion that was such an important characteristic of exhortative elegy. The erecting of the monument itself is an act that ensures the proper respect is paid to a soldier while allowing the community to take part in the commemorative process. Within reasonable limits the monument will stand the test of time and communicate textual expressions of commemoration for future generations. It is no coincidence that when Tyrtaeus described all those who gained honour from a soldier's death he began with the tomb and moved outward to include family and subsequent generations (12.29-30). Not only do soldiers who fought alongside the deceased participate in the act of memorialisation, but they also take comfort that should they ever die in battle, they too will be memorialised, thus securing communal and military cohesion through the ranks and across generations. This can also become a physical symbol of heroism that grows and fosters a sense

¹³⁷ I want to reiterate that I am not concerned with the argument as to whether Simonides actually wrote the epigrams himself, only with the moral outlook expressed therein. I have excluded the epigrams that would have been relevant to the current discussions and were attributed to him by the ancient sources but have since been proven to be later than the mid-5th century (e.g. XLVII). With that being said, Higbie (2010) 186 puts it best: "Homer was the poet of the Trojan Wars and Simonides became the poet of the Persian Wars in the decades after Xerxes' army was driven from Greece." The existence of these monuments and the accompanying epigrams are far more interesting, especially in regard to the present discussion, than the question of authorship.

¹³⁸ Day (2010) 14 argues that "epigram and dedication presented the act of offering in ways that generated its continual reperformance in people's responses to them."

of heroism and bravery amongst younger soldiers of future generations in a similar vein to Homeric epic. While Tyrtaeus was concerned with reinforcing the promise that a soldier's sacrifice will be respected by the community, the epigrams are the physical embodiment that fulfils the promise.

An epigram apparently concerning an Athenian victory over Chalcis in 507/6 expresses such an attitude:

Δίρφυος ἐδμήθημεν ὑπὸ πτυχί, σῆμα δ' ἐφ' ἡμῖν
ἐγγύθεν Εὐρίπου δημοσία κέχυται
οὐκ ἀδίκως, ἐρατὴν γὰρ ἀπωλέσαμεν νεότητα
τρηχεῖαν πολέμου δεξάμενοι νεφέλην.
(II)¹³⁹

This epigram is explicit as to the polis' responsibility for this burial mound and the inscription itself. The phrase οὐκ ἀδίκως is particularly striking, for it reaffirms that the state's fulfillment of the mutually beneficial relationship is an accepted custom. The soldiers give up their lives for the good of the city and consequently the city provides them with recompense, including a state-sponsored monument. The fact that this is a socially accepted custom suggests that there is a continuation of practice, which borders on the ritualistic.¹⁴⁰ One generation sacrifices for its own generation as well as for the preceding and subsequent generations. The focus on losing youth suggests they are losing men in their prime, who are making sacrifice for all others. Thus, the polis can also be seen as making a sacrifice because it has sacrificed its most valuable assets. This connects the family of the deceased with the greater community who all share the loss of men in their prime. Therefore the public display of affection for the young soldiers harmonises the familial and communal mourning of the soldier, but equally commemorates the sacrifice.

¹³⁹ Herodotus describes the events leading up to this battle and its aftermath (5.74-7).

¹⁴⁰ The ritualistic qualities of remembrance are hinted at more explicitly in Simonides 531 (discussed below).

There is also some evidence that this tomb was erected for the losing Euboeans, which would indicate that the outcome of the battle is irrelevant in regard to the state's responsibilities.¹⁴¹ Thus, the soldiers fulfill their obligations by participating in battle, not necessarily by being successful in battle. All of these nuances can be seen as the fulfillment of the type of promises made by Tyrtaeus.

An epigram possibly in honour of the dead at Thermopylae or Plataea also speaks of the relationship between the sacrifice of the soldier and glory.

ἄσβεστον κλέος οἶδε φίλῃ περὶ πατρίδι θέντες
κύανεον θανάτου ἀμφεβάλοντο νέφος·
οὐδὲ τεθνᾶσι θανόντες, ἐπεὶ σφ' ἀρετὴ καθύπερθε
κυδαίνουσ' ἀνάγει δώματος ἐξ Ἀίδεω
(IX)

The language in this epigram suggests a similar notion to Tyrtaeus: αὐτὸς δ' ἐν προμάχοισι πεσὼν φίλον ὤλεσε θυμόν, / ἄστυ τε καὶ λαοὺς καὶ πατέρ' εὐκλείσας (12.23-4) in which the actions of the soldiers, including their willingness to die on behalf of the polis, bring honour to the polis. Although not explicitly stated, the fact that this monument and epigram exist implies that the polis repays the sacrifice. Furthermore, this epigram recalls some epic motifs in that the deceased gain a type of immortality achieved through their fame even though they are dead.¹⁴²

Not only does this language elevate the status of the deceased to the level of epic heroes, but it

¹⁴¹ Page (1981) 190 comments that “no other public epitaph for men fallen in battle states that they were ‘overpowered.’” He later states “if this epitaph refers to the events of 507/6 B.C., the men commemorated will be the Euboeans, not (as is commonly supposed) the victorious Athenians.” While Page is correct about the candid nature of this epigram, it could be said that any soldier who died in battle was ‘overpowered’ by his enemy, for that is why he is dead. Page may indeed be correct, and it would make for an interesting epigram if he is, but the admission of being overpowered does not outright indicate the Euboean perspective. Campbell (1991) 521 remains non-committal.

¹⁴² The most famous example of this concept is Achilles’ double-pronged fate. He can either fight at Troy, die, and receive immortal glory, or depart, live to an old age, and have no glory (*Il.* 9.412-6). Tyrtaeus seems to have made this transition from epic character to contemporary soldier, although the immortality is perhaps implied rather than explicitly stated (12.29-30). Sappho argues for a similar type of immortality achieved through poetry (55, 58). Perhaps the most famous version of this latter theme comes from Horace (*Carm.* 3.30).

also casts them as role models akin to the Homeric heroes. The difference is that this is a group of men from one polis who all gain this status, not a series of typically individual heroes from all corners of the Greek world.¹⁴³ The community can look upon these deceased soldiers with the same reverence that individual poleis could look upon the individual heroes (*e.g.* Menelaus-Sparta, Odysseus-Ithaca). The city can boast of producing so many men with heroic status. Furthermore, the next generation can look upon them with reverence and the knowledge that such heroic men came from their polis. The deceased become the ultimate role models for the next generation, not only providing a sense of pride that the soldiers have for their own community, but also in setting high standards that must be upheld to continue fostering that sense of pride. Thus, the epigram is able to continue the memorialising qualities of epic by conferring an immortal status to brave soldiers who died on behalf of the state. However, the epigram does not require an oral poet to transmit such honours or even a bard to perform the memorialisation. What once required a highly skilled poet to perform can now be a cultural experience shared by the community. This is true not only at the erection of a monument, but for future generations who read the epigram.

Simonides speaks in similar terms in an epigram associated with the Persian Wars (XXa). In this epigram his use of κλέος ἄφθιτον recalls Achilles' fate,¹⁴⁴ but he is able to apply it to both soldiers and sailors.¹⁴⁵ A variation of this is found in an epigram from either Thermopylae

¹⁴³ This concept will be discussed in more detail on the following chapter in relation to the 'new' Simonides.

¹⁴⁴ Achilles' fate will grant him κλέος ἄφθιτον (*Il.* 9.413). In Homer the adjective ἄφθιτος is always connected to divinity in some way. It can describe Agamemnon's sceptre, which was given to his family by Zeus (*Il.* 2.46, 186), a god's house (*Il.* 13.22; 18.370), or a god's chariot (*Il.* 5.724).

¹⁴⁵ Jacoby (1945) 166-7 thought that this inscription and XXb were both in dedication to the war-dead from Marathon. Pritchett (1960) 166-8 provides an in-depth analysis of why this must be referring to Salamis and not to Marathon. Following Pritchett, Page (1981) 219-20 remains confident that this inscription commemorates the Athenian war-dead at the battle of Salamis, although it could be for the entire war. Barron (1990) also argues for Salamis. Petrovic (2007) 167 argues that it should be understood as commemorating the entire war. See also Meiggs and Lewis (1988) 54-7 with bibliography.

or Plataea written from the perspective of the war-dead that claims they lie in ageless eulogy: κείμεθ' ἀγηράντῳ χρώμενοι εὐλογίῃ (VIII.4).¹⁴⁶ Thus, these epigrams demonstrate the reciprocity between polis and soldier: the polis continues to survive on account of the soldiers' sacrifice and the renown of the soldiers endures on account of the commitment of the polis.

One final poem worth considering in this section is Simonides' encomium to the dead at Thermopylae.¹⁴⁷ Although this is not an epigram, it does describe the importance of monuments to the war-dead and is worth considering alongside them.

τῶν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις θανόντων
 εὐκλεῆς μὲν ἂ τύχα, καλὸς δ' ὁ πότμος,
 βωμὸς δ' ὁ τάφος, πρὸ γόων δὲ μνᾶστις, ὁ δ' οἶκτος ἔπαινος·
 ἐντάφιον δὲ τοιοῦτον οὔτ' εὐρὼς
 οὔθ' ὁ πανδαμάτωρ ἀμαυρώσει χρόνος.
 ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν ὅδε σηκὸς οἰκέταν εὐδοξίαν
 Ἑλλάδος εἴλετο· μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ Λεωνίδας,
 Σπάρτας βασιλεὺς, ἀρετᾶς μέγαν λελοιπῶς
 κόσμον ἀέναόν τε κλέος.
 (531)

There is a subtle change in the way that Simonides uses εὐκλεῆς and καλός from an earlier poet like Tyrtaeus, who uses these words to describe the act of dying itself (cf. 12.24 and 10.1, 30 respectively). Simonides links them with the dead men's collective fortune and fate, which have a more expansive and enduring quality to them.¹⁴⁸ It is no longer their bravest moment (*i.e.* the act of dying) that is splendid, but their entire existence including their life, death and the memory

¹⁴⁶ Campbell (1991) 527 suggests that this is possibly from the dead at Thermopylae, but in his opinion is more likely an epigram for the Athenians at Plataea.

¹⁴⁷ This poem survives to use thanks to quotation by Diodorus Siculus, who refers to it as an encomium (11.11.6). However, Bowra (1933) argues it is a hymn sung to the dead at Sparta. This theory is rejected by Podlecki (1968) 258-62 and West (1975) 309.

¹⁴⁸ Smyth (1963) 308 observes that “τύχα is the opportunity for winning κλέος offered them at Thermopylai.” LSJ note that in Homer πότμος is always related to an evil destiny and death, but later takes on more positive connotations and becomes closer in meaning to τύχα. Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 141 notes, “The grave monument as the sign of the deceased provided a concrete material form for the deceased's persona which functioned not only as a focus for his memory but also as a material object that lent itself to symbolic manipulation, that could, for example, receive offerings and other ritual attentions ‘on behalf’ of the deceased.”

of them preserved by others. Simonides stresses the importance of others remembering them; their tomb is now an altar, which signifies a ritualistic quality to remembrance and makes the entire act much more an act of memorialisation than memory.¹⁴⁹ Steiner notes that the language seeks to steer the audience away from focusing on the grief over the loss of life toward “the warrior’s imperishable glory, and prompt a suitable reaction of pride and praise.”¹⁵⁰ This shift puts “focus on the living, and the rewards that fighting on their city’s behalf grants those who survive.”¹⁵¹ Thus, the transformation sows cohesion across the community. The fallen soldiers are remembered for the greatness they bring to the community and cast them as supreme role models. Also of note in this poem is the specific mentioning of Leonidas.¹⁵² This stands in contrast to Tyrtaeus who chooses not to name specific soldiers because he wants his exhortation to be effective for his entire audience.¹⁵³ Obviously Simonides writes this poem looking back and reflecting on the acts of the dead, which allows him to single out specific soldiers. As with the epigrams discussed above, this poem offers the proof of the type of promises made by Tyrtaeus. That these poems exist informs the audience that their sacrifice too will receive the appropriate accolades and confirms the long-lasting solidarity of the mutually beneficial relationship.¹⁵⁴

¹⁴⁹ At Thermopylae the dead were buried where they died (Hdt. 7.228), as were the dead at Marathon (Thuc. 2.34) and Plataea (Hdt. 9.85).

¹⁵⁰ Steiner (1999) 394.

¹⁵¹ Steiner (1999) 395.

¹⁵² Pausanias states that there are annual speeches and contests limited to Spartan participants that take place at the tombs of the general Pausanias and Leonidas. Clearly the ritualistic aspects described by Simonides endured.

¹⁵³ Similarly the authors of funeral orations do not normally introduce the names of individuals; cf. Thuc. 2.35ff., Lys. 2.1 ὃ παρόντες ἐπὶ τῷδε τῷ τάφῳ, and Dem. 60.1 ἐπειδὴ τοὺς ἐν τῷδε τῷ τάφῳ κειμένους.

¹⁵⁴ Along similar lines Derderian (2001) 97 argues “The existence of monuments erected by the kin and the δῆμος together and their parallel between familial and civic reciprocity reveals an increasing negotiation between individual and collective significance of death, dictated by the durability of the monument beyond the immediate generation and social setting.”

Ultimately, it is not only the content of the poems that is relevant to the present discussion, but the existence of these poems that were inscribed on public monuments or were performed in public rituals. These poems employ similar tone and language to their epic and elegiac predecessors from two centuries earlier. These types of poems perform two distinct functions: first, they allow the polis to honour the dead for the sacrifices they made, and second, they foster the cohesiveness of the community by visibly demonstrating that the future sacrifice of soldiers still alive will be honoured by those who survive them.¹⁵⁵ They too will be honoured just as they are now honouring those who have died.

Conclusion

The concept of mutual benefit between citizen and polis is regularly portrayed in archaic martial poetry in order to create, foster, and maintain a sense of cohesiveness and community in the polis. There is a *quid pro quo* between the polis and the men who go out to fight and risk their lives. The polis and everyone living within its boundaries receive the benefits of the protection of what they already possess and in some cases the possibility of fresh acquisitions of land and loot, while the soldiers receive a distinguished role in the community while alive and communal honours after their death. The archaic poets manipulate these motifs by reminding their audiences of the positive rewards that await the soldiers who fulfill their obligations to the state and the negative repercussions that await those who neglect their socially designated roles.

By analysing how the different lyric poets, especially the exhortative elegists, exploit these themes in relation to each other as well as with epic, we gain a greater understanding of the poetic techniques of their respective genres. The epic poet has ample freedom to exploit and

¹⁵⁵ Day (2010) 26-84 argues that many monuments with inscriptions were specifically situated and oriented so that those passing by could read the inscriptions with ease.

explore these motifs through a vast array of characters who respond to similar situations in dissimilar fashions. The ability to vocalise speech affords the epic poet the ability to create elaborately detailed responses to situations charged with emotion. The exhortative elegists compose on a smaller scale, without the use of embedded direct speech, and instead must depend on short, vivid scenes to convey similar thoughts. Tyrtaeus creates moral tableaux in order to make the ideas contained therein immediately accessible to every member of his audience. He allows them to empathise with these unnamed characters so that they can personalise and internalise the lessons found within his poetry, both the positive exempla to emulate and the negative exempla to avoid.

This system of mutual benefit is fundamental in motivating not only the contemporary generation of soldiers, but also those of future generations. The performance of this poetry provides opportunity to reinforce communally accepted roles and responsibilities among the more senior audience members while providing education to the younger audience members. Although Callinus addresses the *véoi* in his poem, the content of the poem is valuable to the community at large. An important feature of this system is not simply to dictate what is right or wrong, but to provide guidance on how to meet the expectations of the community. Tyrtaeus provides guidance on managing fear and on achieving excellence in battle. The motivating power of this poetry extends to the epigrams accompanying grave monuments. The foremost *raison d'être* of these poems is to pay honour to soldiers dying on behalf of the community. However, the memorialisation process is rooted in the community and has ramifications for future generations of soldiers. That a young soldier (or even a young child) can partake in the memorialising process solidifies the conviction that the community will equally pay honours should he fall in battle later in life. Furthermore, these poems tend to highlight the heroic

qualities of the fallen soldiers, thus providing a local role model of high esteem for future generations.

Chapter 5: Gods and Heroes on the Battlefield

The focus of this chapter will be on the lyric representation of divine motivation on the battlefield, its relationship with epic, and how the poets can employ this theme not only to depict the motivation of the characters in their poems, but also motivate their audience with tales of divinely aided heroics.¹ There are many variations of divine motivation in the martial sphere including gods encouraging their favourite mortals from the periphery of battle, gods fighting at the side of mortals, and gods rescuing them from certain death. I begin this chapter by examining the different depictions of divine intervention in Homer. This approach is beneficial because it will allow us to appreciate the subtlety with which the epic poet can manipulate this motif, and it will provide us with many examples of divine intervention where the context is certain both in the individual scenes themselves and in the narrative as a whole. Analysing Homer's use of these themes will set the tone for how to interpret how the lyric poets employ and adapt these themes in novel ways. I will then look at this motif in the elegiac fragments of Tyrtaeus, Archilochus, Mimnermus, and Simonides. These four poets provide a convenient group to discuss because not only are the relevant fragments in the same sub-genre (elegy), but when we examine them chronologically, we can trace the development and poetic variation of this motif over an extended period of time. Although the development may not have been as conveniently linear as the surviving sources may make it seem, analysis of these sources will allow us to view the development and ascertain its effect on the audience's reception. I will also examine some examples from Pindar and Bacchylides where the poems survive in full.

¹ Since this chapter's focus is on divine motivation, I will not discuss epiphanies, of which Pritchett (1979) 11-46 discusses a broad range in the military sphere. For discussion on epiphanies occurring with statues of gods, see Austin (1964) 89-90, and Versnel (1987) 46ff. See also the recently published Petridou (2016).

There are two different levels of motivation that we can observe and analyse when looking at the portrayal of divine motivation in poetry. On one level there is the motivation that is directly provided by the god to a character in the narrative. The character receives some type of motivation from a god and they are consequently more willing or better able to fight. On another level there is a motivating factor for the audience that listens to the poems detailing such marvelous tales of warriors from a bygone era who engage with the gods and receive their direct or indirect aid. How the audience responds to the presentation of these themes is equally important to the study of divine intervention and its relationship with the overall topic of motivation. As we have seen in the last chapter the lyric poets were concerned with pointing out the positive rewards that a soldier will receive from the community when he does his duty. The soldier is placed in a position of esteem and becomes a model for the next generation to emulate. The Homeric heroes too provide such an exemplary model and their relationship with the gods is what distinguishes them most from the contemporary audiences of the epic and lyric poets. The Homeric heroes were able to talk with the gods, fight alongside the gods, and even be rescued by the gods because they occupied a position of status unobtainable for the contemporary lyric audience. That their position allowed them to receive divine aid only further increased their elevated status.

Hesiod describes five different ages of man: Golden, Silver, Bronze, Heroic, and Iron (*Op.*109-201). His audience belongs to the Iron Age, but human characters described in epic belong to the Heroic Age. They are divided not only by temporal distance, but lifestyle and character as well. Although warfare was a central theme to the Heroic Age, Hesiod describes a blissful existence after death on the Isles of the Blest. In contrast, the Iron Age is one filled with

toil and sorrow. Hesiod even refers to people from the Heroic Age as ἡμίθεοι (*Op.* 160).² Ford notes that ἡμίθεοι “is the word one uses in speaking of heroes from a distance, contemplating the heroic age retrospectively as something apart, utterly remote in time.”³ Nagy notes that when describing Homeric warriors “ἥρωες is the appropriate word in epic, ἡμίθεοι is more appropriate to a style of expression that looks beyond epic.”⁴ Thus, later audiences looked upon the heroes of the *Iliad* as being remote in both time and stature.

There are various indications in epic that the heroes were stronger than men in Homer’s audience. Homer describes Hector as picking up a large stone and carrying it, adding that the two strongest men in a community from his contemporary audience could not easily lift the same stone (*Il.* 12.445-9). The Homeric heroes are noticeably stronger and therefore held as the pinnacle of humanity. Every soldier should strive to be like the Homeric heroes, but they are aware that the heroes are from a different age. Redfield refers to this as epic distance.⁵ There is even the sense in Homer that the generation of warriors fighting at Troy are inferior to the previous generation. Nestor notes that when he was younger, he fought against men that would easily overwhelm the generation fighting at Troy (*Il.* 1.266-72). Tlepolemus, the son of Heracles, mocks Sarpedon for being inferior to the previous generations of men who claim divine parentage from Zeus (*Il.* 5.633-46). The world of the *Iliad*, although a world held in reverence by later generations, is a world that is starting to decline. Each generation is seen as weaker and less capable than the last. From this perspective it is no wonder that several centuries later the men of Homer’s audience will be notably weaker.

² Homer only uses this word once (*Il.* 12.22-3). This is a scene taking place after the Trojan War when Apollo and Poseidon redirect water to take down the walls of the Greek camp.

³ Ford (1992) 149.

⁴ Nagy (1979) 160. ἡμίθεος is only used once in Homer (12.23).

⁵ Redfield (1975) 35-9 notes the many ways in which the Homeric heroes differ from Homer’s audience. They use different weapons, encounter monsters, have relationships with the gods, etc.

While the destruction caused by the war at Troy was one of the factors that led to the end of the Heroic Age, so too was the gulf growing between gods and mortals. As Clay notes “the Homeric poems and the *Catalogue* implicitly acknowledge a second factor in the passing of the heroic age; as the gods cease mating with mortals, the generation of new heroes likewise ceases.”⁶ Thus, it is not only that there was a dearth of relationships existing between gods and mortals that separated men from the Heroic Age and Iron Age, it is in part because of the severed relationships between gods and mortals that ushered in the Iron Age. This too plays a role in why men are weaker; the divine parentage in family lines is weaker. As we shall see in this chapter, the lyric poets develop novel ways of portraying divine motivation in part to associate their soldier audience with the gods. They do not need to develop stories of renewed sexual relationships with the gods for that would involve singling out certain individuals as superior, which would run counter to the developing notion of cohesion in the community and in the ranks. Instead they are able to make the association with the gods (and the previous Homeric heroes who fight alongside the gods) by having the gods support their contemporary soldiers on the battlefield.

After reviewing different uses of divine intervention in Homer, we will look at how the lyric poets employ and adapt these same themes but to new effect. The most dramatic shift is closing the vast divide that existed between poet and subject matter. What was once a matter of centuries will be shrunk down to a generation or even events contemporary with the poet. By depicting soldiers having similar relationships with the gods as the Homeric heroes did, the poets will be able to draw a direct comparison between contemporary soldiers and those of myth. This

⁶ Clay (1989) 169. Clay also notes that the *Hymn to Aphrodite* is a poem about the schism between gods and mortals. See also Graziosi and Haubold (2005) 34-43, 122-5 who support Clay’s assessment of the relationship between Homer, Hesiod, and the Homeric Hymns with respect to what they coin “the history of the cosmos.” For a criticism of Clay’s interpretation of the *Hymn to Aphrodite*, see Parker (1991) 15, n.13 and Faulkner (2008) 10-8.

process also allows the poet to raise the stature of soldiers in the community in a similar vein as those they depict receiving positive rewards from the community. These soldiers will be able to inspire future generations in the same way as the Homeric heroes. The significant difference is that future generations may have known some of those soldiers personally.

There is a certain amount of civic pride to be gained by hearing poems about soldiers in one's polis fighting alongside the gods. Coupled with this aspect is the increased sense of communal cohesion gained by listening to poems extolling the glorious achievements of the polis' soldiers. When the community holds soldiers in such high esteem, the confidence of the soldiers is emboldened. There is the sense that the gods were previously on their side and will be on their side in the future. Consider the opening lines of Tyrtaeus 11 ἀλλ', Ἡρακλῆος γὰρ ἀνικῆτου γένος ἐστέ, / θαρσεῖτ'· οὐπω Ζεὺς ἀνχένα λοξὸν ἔχει (11.1-2). Even though the context suggests that this poem speaks about a recent defeat, Tyrtaeus emphasises the Spartans' descent from Heracles, a hero turned god, as well as the divine favour of Zeus. The sense of civic pride, community, superiority, self-confidence, and divine favour are all embedded within these two lines. These will be the central themes of this chapter.

1. Divine Intervention in Homer

The intricate relationships between the gods and men are apparent throughout the narrative of the *Iliad*, and divine motivation is perhaps the most diverse aspect of those relationships.⁷ The most useful method for analysing divine appearances on the battlefield in Homer in the present discussion is to examine them in terms of how direct a role the gods play in the combat. Not only is this useful for analysing how divine motivation works in Homer, but it

⁷ For more general information and interpretations on the gods in Homer and their relation to religion see Murray (1911) 279-82; Nilsson (1925) 134-79; Bowra (1930) 215-33; Otto (1947); Thalmann (1984) 78-112; Burkert (1985) 119-25; Winterbottom (1989); Kirk (1990) 1-15; Kearns (2004); and Versnel (2011) 163-79.

will also provide a useful model for analysing lyric where the context is not always as secure. There is a large spectrum that ranges from an indirect role such as when Zeus urges on Sarpedon against the Greeks (*Il.* 12.290-3) to a more direct role such as when Aphrodite protects Aeneas and carries him away from the fighting (*Il.* 5.311-8).⁸ I designate the former as indirect because Zeus does not appear on the battlefield and consequently does not physically intervene. However, in the latter Aphrodite is not only present on the battlefield, but actively engages in and alters the outcome of the battle. In both cases, the intention is that the god aids one of the combatants, providing them with a distinct advantage, and consequently harms the other. Typically the divine aid is given to a specific hero of esteemed status. Perhaps this distinction is best explained by Athena when responding to Zeus' demand that the gods refrain from joining the mortals in combat. She states: ἀλλ' ἤτοι πολέμου μὲν ἀφεξόμεθ' ὥς σὺ κελεύεις;/ βουλὴν δ' Ἀργείοις ὑποθησόμεθ' ἣ τις ὀνήσει (*Il.* 8.35-6). Since Zeus consents to her wishes, it is clear the immortals view this distinction as significant. In this section I do not intend to provide a comprehensive list of divine interventions in the *Iliad*, but rather to present the spectrum of this motif with some pertinent examples.

a) Indirect Intervention

The most indirect role gods play in combat is when they provide encouragement for a particular warrior. Apollo in the likeness of the herald Periphas appears before Aeneas and delivers a short speech that instills self-confidence in the hero and relates Zeus' desire for a Trojan victory over the Greeks (*Il.* 17. 327-32). Aeneas recognises that a god is present and uses this information to encourage his fellow Trojans by noting how shameful it is that they retreat

⁸ Zeus is first cited as the cause for Sarpedon's onslaught, but later in the same passage we discover that Sarpedon's θυμός also drives him on (*Il.* 12.307). This dual motivation, also known as over-determination, occurs quite frequently in Homer, both on and off the battlefield, and is discussed by Dodds (1951) and Lesky (1958) 87-95.

while a god stands nearby to encourage them. The mere presence of the god offers sufficient motivation for the warriors, but the knowledge of Zeus' favour towards them heightens the experience. Although Apollo states that Aeneas must have more confidence in his own ability, he does not do so in any negative terms. On the other hand, when he subsequently speaks to Hector, he scolds him outright for being afraid of the inferior Menelaus (*Il.* 17.586-90). The effect of the short speech is immediate: τὸν δ' ἄχεος νεφέλη ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα (*Il.* 17.591).⁹ Apollo later provides further motivation to Aeneas by reasoning that he should be a more effective warrior than Achilles since Aeneas was born of a greater goddess than Achilles (*Il.* 20.104-9). He reinforces Aeneas' consciousness of his divine heritage and gives him strength: ἔμπνευσε μένος μέγα ποιμένι λαῶν (*Il.* 20.110). In all of these cases a god, coincidentally Apollo in all three examples, has made a profound impact on the events of the battlefield and the narrative as a whole. The god's presence is clearly felt and yet in none of these cases does the god physically intervene in battle, but instead appeals to each warrior in whatever manner would be most effective to motivate them in combat, be it a positive or negative appeal.¹⁰

One of the most significant cases of a god playing a strictly indirect role yet still having a profound impact on the outcome of battle occurs when Athena ignites Diomedes into a fury, prompting his *aristeia* (*Il.* 5.1-8). While Athena will eventually play a more direct role, she initially grants him strength and daring in order to make him stand out and win glory: δῶκε μένος καὶ θάρσος, ἵν' ἔκδηλος μετὰ πᾶσιν / Ἀργείοισι γένοιτο ἰδὲ κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἄροιτο (*Il.* 5.2-

⁹ Edwards (1991) 119, n. on 588-91 comments that "the rebuke includes the report of a friend's death. For exceptional emphasis the name of Podes is held back until after the news of the loss of a friend and the capture of his body." While it is true that the death of his friend upsets Hector, there is also a strong sense of shame felt that he could not protect the body of his friend. Apollo's goal is not to send Hector into a state of grief, but to make him fight victoriously.

¹⁰ It is clear from the narrative that in all three cases the god's intervention is successful in persuading the hero to attack the opposing side. Aeneas kills Leiocritus (*Il.* 17.344-5), Hector kills several Greeks (*Il.* 17.597-625), and Aeneas is willing to face Achilles, but Hera persuades Poseidon to intervene and remove Aeneas from the battlefield before he can engage Achilles (*Il.* 20.111ff.).

3).¹¹ She then blurs the boundaries that separate gods and mortals by setting his shield and helmet on fire, which elevates his status among all of the warriors on the battlefield. This aspect is heightened by the fact that she lets Diomedes see the gods in their true form. As Kirk observes, “a deity filling a hero with special strength is a common Iliadic motif, similar to that by which a whole army is inspired.”¹² While the common occurrence of this motif is undeniable, this particular example is made more unusual when she applies the fire to his armour.¹³ By providing strength to the warrior, she is raising his innate talent to a higher level. However, the inclusion of the burning armour, a feat never achievable in a strictly human sphere, elevates the warrior to a status between the human and the divine.¹⁴ The impact of her divine intervention is considerable and will last throughout the book as Diomedes continually cuts down his opponents.

The encouragement does not need to involve any direct dialogue in the narrative, such as when Apollo urges on Agenor (*Il.* 21.544-9), yet elsewhere in the narrative the god’s encouragement can be detailed, such as when Poseidon encourages the two Ajaxes, assesses the current situation, and suggests specific tactics to the warriors (*Il.* 13.47-58).¹⁵ In the first example there is no indication that Agenor himself is even aware that Apollo, or any god, has intervened, whereas in the second case Poseidon’s presence is immediately recognised. He first appears in the guise of Calchas, offers his advice, and then physically touches the two men, making their limbs light. He then reveals his divinity by launching into flight. The two Ajaxes immediately

¹¹ Fenik (1968) 10 notes “Athena’s action has a special importance for E. She helps Diomedes twice more within the same book, and each time this initiates a new and important phase of the action – E 121 and 793.”

¹² Kirk (1990) 53, n. on 2-3.

¹³ Whitman (1958) 128-53 provides an extensive analysis of the various uses of fire in the *Iliad*.

¹⁴ When Athena inflames Diomedes, she seems temporarily to raise him above the other heroes at Troy. She provides a similar service for Achilles when he rejoins the battle, not only cloaking him in the aegis but also igniting a flame from his head (*Il.* 18.203-14). The fact that Diomedes is elevated in the same manner as Achilles, the greatest warrior on both sides of the war, further denotes Athena’s affinity with him and his heightened status among the Greeks.

¹⁵ In both cases the god’s intervention is successful. Agenor, after some deliberation, is willing to face Achilles (*Il.* 21.550ff.). Apollo will intervene again before Achilles can slay Agenor. The Ajaxes will lead their men into battle (*Il.* 13.125ff.).

recognise the presence of the god and his effect on their bodies. Locrian Ajax says his heart is now more eager to make war: καὶ δ' ἐμοὶ αὐτῷ θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισι / μᾶλλον ἐφορμᾶται πολεμίζειν ἢ δὲ μάχεσθαι (*Il.* 13.73-4), and Telamonian Ajax feels so roused that he would eagerly fight Hector (*Il.* 13.77-80). While Agenor is unsure about the source of his inspiration, the audience is aware of Apollo's involvement.¹⁶ On the other hand in the case of the Ajaxes, both the audience and the warriors are aware of the divine inspiration and its effects.¹⁷ Furthermore, it is implied that since Poseidon has increased their spirit (θυμὸς) to fight, they must have already exhibited a certain amount of desire for combat beforehand, resulting in two different motivations, both the human and the divine. The divine inspiration is so powerful that it increases the human motivation, allowing one to enhance the other.

Gods can also intervene by dissuading mortals from fighting such as when Athena advises Achilles not to kill Agamemnon (*Il.* 1.188-222). Athena has two arguments to dissuade him: Hera loves both men and wants to see neither come to harm and Athena promises he will be paid back thrice-fold. Ultimately neither argument is particularly effective, and it is the fact that the goddesses advise him otherwise that deters the angered warrior: ὥς γὰρ ἄμεινον· / ὅς κε θεοῖς ἐπιτείθεται μάλα τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ (*Il.* 1.217-8). Thus, the goddess' presence is the greatest motivating factor for Achilles and consequently the audience's perception of Achilles is favourably coloured by her and Hera's desire to steer him toward the appropriate course of

¹⁶ This is related to the concept of Jørgensen's Law, formulated by Jørgensen (1904), which is succinctly summarised by de Jong (2001) xv as when “characters, lacking the omniscience of the narrator, often ascribe divine interventions to Ζεὺς (in general), to an unspecified god (δαίμων, θεός, θεοί), or to the wrong god.” The narrator and the audience are aware of Apollo's direct role, but Agenor is not. The audience does not know to what Agenor attributes this phenomenon. See also: Schwabl (1954).

¹⁷ After Poseidon has finished rousing up the hearts of the Ajaxes, he proceeds to stir up the remaining Greeks nearby. He uses noticeably different tactics when dealing with the masses, bringing up images of cowardice and weak leadership. At the end of the speech there is no hint that his audience suspected any divine involvement. There is no mention of a θυμὸς, but instead a more generic phrase: Ὡς ῥα κελευτιῶν γαίηοχος ὥρσεν Ἀχαιοῦς (13.125). Odysseus takes a similar approach of addressing his audience quite differently depending on whether they are elite warriors or lesser fighters (*Il.* 2.188-206).

action. This scene has been interpreted in a variety of ways by scholars. Kirk suggests that the divine intervention “may be little more than *façon de parler*.”¹⁸ This interpretation implies that Achilles is simply having an internal debate about slaying Agamemnon and his sudden change of opinion is of his own volition. Thus, there is no goddess present and her inclusion is only a figure of speech. Kirk’s interpretation would be more credible if the conversation were not so elaborate and was replaced with the narrator stating that “some god persuaded him otherwise.” While the epic poet often strives for intricate and ornate descriptions, if we accept this scene as merely a *façon de parler*, we would similarly need to reconsider many other encounters between mortals and immortals. Such an approach would quickly cast Kirk’s interpretation in doubt. Furthermore, Achilles was in the act of drawing his sword, indicating that his mind was made up before the goddess intervened. Redfield prefers to see Athena as an actual character distinct from the audience’s understanding of Athena, the cult figure. He argues:

The arrival of Athena is a completely literal event *within the poem* – an event as literal as, for instance, a visit by Menelaus to Agamemnon. Such literalism, I suggest, is acceptable to the audience because they understand that they are being shown, not the Athena of cult, but the Athena of epic. Such divine visitations are the sort of thing that happens to heroes, and in poetry.¹⁹

Redfield’s interpretation of the gods in epic is less problematic than Kirk’s, for he considers them as characters of equal value to the narrative as the mortal actors, regardless of their position within the cosmos. To the epic poet, acting as narrator, the dialogue of mortal and immortal is as literal as that of mortal and mortal, and the same can be said for that of immortal and immortal. Regardless of Athena’s relationship to the audience, it is clear that Homer manipulates this motif

¹⁸ Kirk (1974) 292.

¹⁹ Redfield (1975) 77. In contrast, Griffin (1980) 144-50 prefers to see the gods as literal characters working within a narrative, but does not see them as distinct from their cult personae, which he defends by noting the countless instances of mortals offering sacrifices and prayers to the gods. There are a few passages where gods return to their own sanctuaries. Athena is associated with her sanctuary at Troy (*Il.* 6.297-311), she travels to the Erechtheion in Athens (*Od.* 7.80-1), and Aphrodite returns to her sanctuary on Cyprus (*Od.* 8.362-3).

by having Athena dissuade a hero from committing violence, an act he would otherwise be inclined to perform and one which she might persuade him to do in a different scenario.

b) Direct Intervention

When the gods begin to have a more direct role on the battlefield there tends to be a greater impact on the ebb and flow of battle, and consequently on the narrative itself. One of the most common types of direct intervention occurs when gods protect mortals in combat. When the Trojan Socus stabs Odysseus' shield with his spear, Athena does not allow it to pierce his skin: οὐδ' ἔτ' ἔασε / Παλλὰς Ἀθηναίη μυχθήμεναι ἔγκασι φωτός (*Il.* 11.437-8). The phrasing is ambiguous whether the audience is to imagine Athena physically blocking the spear, or doing so with her divine will. In another battle scene Teucer hits Sarpedon with an arrow and Zeus wards off death from his son: ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς κῆρας ἄμυνε / παιδὸς ἐοῦ (*Il.* 12.402-3). These two examples differ slightly in that Athena protects Odysseus from being hurt in the first place, whereas Zeus only intervenes once Sarpedon has been hit. Similar scenes occur elsewhere including Poseidon protecting Antilochus (*Il.* 13.560-5) and Athena protecting Diomedes from Ares (*Il.* 5.826-34).²⁰ These examples exceed those discussed above because the gods make a direct impact on the outcome of battle and on the psyche of the warrior. One only needs to consider the positive effect a god has on a favoured warrior when they stand nearby to realise the immense psychological impact a god has on a warrior when they physically protect him. The warrior is also distinguished by having a god intervene directly on his behalf, which elevates him above his peers in the narrative and also in relation to the audience members listening to the poem.

²⁰ In a variation of this motif Aphrodite and Apollo each protect the corpse of Hector, warding off decay (*Il.* 23.184-7; 24.18-21).

Divine intervention is not limited to defensive aspects of warfare, for the gods also lead their favoured mortals against their foes and fight alongside them. Ares leads the Trojans on the battlefield at the side of Hector, an act which boosts the confidence of the Trojans (*Il.* 5.699-702).²¹ Although the Greeks were aware that Ares was fighting alongside the Trojans, Homer notes that they did not turn to run away but kept fighting while eventually being pushed backwards. Thus, Homer can simultaneously increase the prestige of Hector whose battle companion is the god of war, while casting the overwhelmed Greeks in a positive light since they continued to fight even when up against a god. The poet lists a series of Greek deaths, specifically mentioning that they fall at the hands of both Hector and Ares: Ἐνθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ' ὕστατον ἐξενάριξαν / Ἑκτώρ τε Πριάμοιο πάϊς καὶ χάλκεος Ἄρης; (*Il.* 5.703-4). In reaction to this Athena provides more support to Diomedes, urging him on until he stabs Ares with his spear. This thrust comes from both man and goddess (*Il.* 5.855-7).²² Thus, the fighting escalates above gods against humans to the point of gods against gods.

Perhaps the most striking occurrence of a god aiding a mortal fighting a foe, and certainly one of the most important in terms of the narrative, occurs when Apollo helps in the defeat of Patroclus. He first blocks Patroclus' attempt at scaling the wall:

²¹ Archilochus wrote a poem that describes Ares as being the force that brings two opposing sides against each other in combat (3.2-3). In this passage Ares is a metonym for war. Homer frequently uses the name of Ares as a substitution for words meaning war and battle (cf. *Il.* 2.381, 385; 3.132; 9.532; 13.630; 19.142; 21.112). In one instance he uses it not to describe war itself, but rather the wounds sustained in battle, describing the place between the navel and genitals as the worst place to be struck: ἔνθα μάλιστα / γίγνεται Ἄρης ἀλεγεινὸς οἷζυροῖσι βροτοῖσιν (*Il.* 13.568-9).

²² Lesky (1961) 27 makes a comparison between this scene and that of Hector fighting beside the Greek ships (*Il.* 15.694-5). Of the latter he notes the ambiguity of whether or not the audience was meant to envision Zeus' presence. We would not generally expect Zeus' direct presence on the battlefield, but the phrasing τὸν δὲ Ζεὺς ὥσεν ὀπισθε / χειρὶ μάλα μεγάλῃ suggests some proximity. However, Janko (1992) 304, n. 693-5 notes that ὥρσεν, which is appears in papyrus, "smooths this metaphor for Zeus' power and is apt."

τρις μὲν ἐπ' ἀγκῶνος βῆ τείχεος ὑψηλοῖο
 Πάτροκλος, τρις δ' αὐτὸν ἀπεστυφείλιξεν Ἀπόλλων
 χεῖρεσσ' ἀθανάτησι φαεινὴν ἀσπίδα νύσσων
 (Il. 16.702-4)²³

At this point Patroclus is completely helpless in the face of the god, a point made clearer when Apollo addresses him with this message.

χάζεο διογενὲς Πατρόκλεες· οὗ νύ τοι αἶσα
 σῶ ὑπὸ δουρὶ πόλιν πέρθαι Τρώων ἀγερώχων,
 οὐδ' ὑπ' Ἀχιλλῆος, ὅς περ σέο πολλὸν ἀμείνων.
 (Il. 16.707-9)

The divine aid reaches its peak when Apollo sneaks up behind Patroclus, strikes him in the back and shoulders, and then removes his helmet, exposing him to the fatal attack (Il. 16.786-96). Although Apollo does not strike the deathblow, which is left for Euphorbus and Hector, he does leave the Greek so exposed and weak that his death is assured.²⁴ This represents the turning point in the narrative and the single most important event since the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles. Once Achilles rejoins the war, the tide of battle changes, and the deaths that subsequently occur are linked to Apollo's actions.²⁵ That such a critical event occurs at the combined hands of mortal and immortal marks the importance of this motif to the epic poet.

Gods in Homer can go beyond fighting alongside their favoured mortal and physically remove them from battlefield. When a god protects a mortal in combat or fights at his side, the

²³ There are two other instances in the *Iliad* of a triple repulsion: 5.436 and 20.445. Fenik (1968) 212-3 observes that "in the first, Diomedes tries three times to slay Aeneas who is being rescued by Apollo. On the fourth try the god warns him away as he warns Patroclus here. In Y Achilles tries to slay Hector who is also being rescued by Apollo. Like Diomedes, he attacks three times in vain and shouts insults on the fourth attempt. In E Diomedes withdraws after the god's warning the way Patroclus does here (710). Our passage is therefore fully typical, although it is surprising to find that Patroclus suddenly at the walls of Troy. But this is only the first of several measures taken by the poet in this last section of II to increase the impact and splendour of Patroclus' final hour." This is the same pattern used when Odysseus tries to embrace the shade of his deceased mother (*Od.* 11.206-7).

²⁴ Athena plays a similarly crucial, but not decisive role in the death of Hector (*Il.* 22.224ff.).

²⁵ Griffin (1980) 153 comments, "What makes this passage powerful is, first, the silent approach of the god, hidden from mortal eyes, his arrival meaning death for the hero, 'like a god' though he is. Second, it is the contrast between the effortless gestures of Apollo, a blow with the flat of the hand and its shattering effect upon Patroclus. We see vividly the gulf in power that separates even a mighty man from a god."

hero understands that his actions are divinely sanctioned, which in turn gives him confidence. If a god saves a mortal from death on the battlefield, the hero is motivated by this act because he understands that the gods want him to fight another day. In terms of the narrative the warrior's status is elevated above that of his peers since he is visibly distinguished by the gods through a physical act that can only be performed by a god. Furthermore, the audience of the poem recognises the hero's elevated status. Thus, divine rescue is an important aspect of divine motivation since it has a positive effect on the warrior as well as his peer's and the audience's perception of the hero.

Although there are only a few occurrences of divine rescue in the *Iliad*, there is still some poetic variety in the execution. Hephaestus saves Idaeus by protecting him and concealing him in darkness: ἀλλ' Ἥφαιστος ἔρυτο, σάωσε δὲ νυκτὶ καλύψας (*Il.* 5.23). He does not remove Idaeus from battle but enables him to escape more easily (*Il.* 5.27-8). The language is clear that this act saved him. Aphrodite shields Aeneas with her robe and attempts to carry him off the battlefield: ἥ μὲν ἔδον φίλον υἱὸν ὑπεξέφερεν πολέμοιο (*Il.* 5.311-8).²⁶ Her attempt is thwarted by Diomedes and her task must be completed by Apollo. The poet does not explain how Aeneas' companions perceive this phenomenon. On the one hand he is shown extreme favour by his goddess mother, an act that reaffirms his elevated status, but on the other hand he escapes from the battlefield. Although it may not have been his decision, the warrior escapes from danger, which is otherwise abhorred by the Homeric hero.²⁷ When Aphrodite removes Paris from battle earlier in the narrative, the audience is given a little more explanation. She brings him to his bedroom and

²⁶ Kirk (1962) 344-5 interprets these scenes of divine intervention as diversions from the usual flow of battle.

²⁷ It seems that Virgil noticed the complexity of such a situation and included a similar scenario when Juno brings Turnus away from the fighting to safety (*Virg. Aen.* 10.611-88). Virgil includes a follow-up speech providing the rescued hero's reaction to his predicament. Turnus is angered that he has been taken away and cannot accompany his men in combat. This argument falls in line with what we would have expected a Homeric hero to make, but is conspicuously absent from the *Iliad*.

sends for his wife (*Il.* 3.380-4). When Helen scolds Paris for leaving the fight he falsely retorts that he only lost because Athena helped Menelaus. Furthermore, he suppresses Aphrodite's role in his escape, even though Helen is conscious of it. We are also given a brief glimpse of those left behind. No one on the battlefield can explain his absence and Agamemnon declares his absence a victory for Menelaus (*Il.* 3.464-50).²⁸ Near the end of the poem Poseidon, a god who generally helps the Greeks at Troy, comes to the aid of the Trojan Aeneas. He first blinds Achilles, then picks up Aeneas and carries him far off from the combat: Αἰνεΐαν δ' ἔσσευεν ἀπὸ χθονὸς ὑψόσ' αἰείρας (*Il.* 20.325). When the scene returns to Achilles we see a warrior astonished by the sudden disappearance of his prey and yet brimming with confidence because Aeneas fled from the confrontation (*Il.* 20.344-52). He recognises the god's favour toward Aeneas but claims victory since he remains on the battlefield while his opponent has seemingly escaped.

The epic poet also has creative license to combine both direct and indirect intervention in the same scenario. When Athena persuades Pandarus to shoot an arrow at Menelaus, the audience is witness to the tremendous impact divine intervention can have on the narrative (*Il.* 4.85-104). Appearing in the likeness of Laodocus, Athena provides an assortment of incentives in order to persuade the Trojan archer, promising him gratitude (χάρις), glory (κῦδος), and splendid gifts (ἀγλαὰ δῶρα). She cleverly advises him to pray to Apollo, which provides not only the semblance of divine authority, but the authority of a god other than herself.²⁹ Only the audience is made aware of her full deceit when, after convincing Pandarus to shoot, she promptly appears before Menelaus and prevents the shot from taking his life. The poet draws special emphasis to this by comparing her to a mother who brushes a fly away from her child's face (*Il.*

²⁸ The narrator explains that the Trojans would not have hidden Paris since they feel hatred toward him (*Il.* 3.453-4). Elsewhere the Trojan Idaeus expresses his resentment of Paris, wishing he had died before this catastrophe erupted (*Il.* 7.385-97).

²⁹ Apollo is the natural choice for both an archer and a Trojan. Nevertheless, this detail increases Athena's deceit.

4.130-1). The violence would surely have intensified had Pandarus' arrow slain his target. Thus, the same god can intervene on both sides of the battlefield, simultaneously convincing one combatant to make an ill-conceived choice, and defending the other.

2. Divine Intervention in Lyric

a) Gods on the Battlefield

The fragment containing Archilochus' Telephus poem (*P. Oxy.* 4708 fr. 1) describes Telephus repelling a horde of Greeks who have been accidentally washed up on the Mysian shore instead of on the Trojan shore. As discussed in the last chapter, this poem is best understood as an excuse for the flight of some soldiers contemporary to Archilochus with a mythic exemplum offering evidence that the soldiers' behaviour is excusable. The fragment trails off with a reference to Heracles urging on his son, Telephus, to victory.³⁰ Although problems of chronology occur throughout Greek mythology, it is safe to place Heracles at least a generation before the Trojan War, and so his presence in this poem must be explained as divine intervention.³¹ The context and language suggests a similar situation to any other god inciting a favoured mortal in combat found in epic. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this divine intervention is the detail that Telephus fought with the intention of delighting his father, *πατρὶ χαριζόμενος* (*P. Oxy.* 4708 fr. 1.25). Only occasionally in epic does a warrior recognise that a divine entity aids him. Telephus clearly recognises his deified father's presence, which would not be unusual in epic, but he seems to want to repay his father's aid by seizing the special opportunity afforded to him, which does not seem to occur in epic. This special relationship may

³⁰ West (2006) 17 suggests that this episode would have concluded shortly after this passage. This is a reasonable assessment considering that a stop in the narrative at this point would harmonise well with the contemporary events that Archilochus describes. If the story went much further, the thread connecting the contemporary events and the mythic exemplum would become tangled.

³¹ Obbink (2006) 8-9.

be due to the fact that they are not simply god and hero, but father and son. Furthermore, this passage highlights the strength of this type of motivation since it compels an individual to ward off the Greek forces. Thus, this passage proves that not only could an early elegist manipulate a motif so commonly used in epic, but he could do so in order to make a point about contemporary events.

The inscription of Sosthenes, which details the life and deeds of Archilochus and includes some fragments of his poetry, contains a few examples of divine intervention in a martial context.³² The inscription is fragmentary in places, but there are enough details to suggest that the descriptions of battles are contemporary to Archilochus.³³ In one passage, Athena urges on the hearts of the army: τῶν δ' Ἀθηναίη μάχῃ / ἴλαος παρασταθεῖσα παῖς ἐρικτύπου Διὸς / καρδίην ὥρινεν (94.1-3). The language suggests that the audience is to imagine the goddess standing beside the army and there is no reason to suppose this is a figure of speech (cf. *Il.* 12.290 ff.).³⁴ The lack of context denies us knowledge of why Athena favours these men or how directly she is involved in the battle. There is no indication that Archilochus includes any speech for Athena encouraging the soldiers. The poem is highly fragmentary at this point, so if there was a speech, it has not survived. Homer could describe a god urging on a mortal without providing the actual words, and so the absence of speech should not surprise us (cf. *Il.* 5.8; 21.544-9).

In a subsequent fragment of this poem Athena is again present with men defending their homeland: παῖς] Ἀθηναίη Διὸς / ἀμφ[ί] δ' ὕψ[η]λός ἐπ' ἀλξείης ἤρ]κεσαν πρὸ π[α]τρίη[ς] (98.7-8).

³² Chaniotis (1988) 57-68.

³³ There are references to Thasos, the Thracians, and Archilochus' friend Glaucus, who appears in some of his other poems (93a, 96). Although Archilochus may not have been a witness to the events he describes, it is likely that they occurred during his own lifetime. The inscription of Sosthenes states that the poems were arranged on the columns in chronological order according to archon.

³⁴ Zeus urges on Sarpedon against the Greeks (*Il.* 12.290 ff.). In this passage Homer uses ὄρνυμι whereas Archilochus uses ὀρίνω. Furthermore, Zeus urges on Sarpedon directly and Archilochus has Athena incite the warrior's καρδία. Although there is no sense that Zeus stands beside Sarpedon, there is no ambiguity with Athena in Archilochus since the poet uses παρασταθεῖσα.

Given the less fragmentary example of Athena acting directly to encourage the troops in the previous example, we can be more confident that she is playing a similar role in this context. That Athena appears twice in related fragments of Archilochus in a martial role is significant. Her repeated appearance increases the likelihood that the audience is indeed meant to envision her on the battlefield aiding one particular side against the other. Otherwise, we would have to interpret at least one of the instances as a figure of speech, which seems unlikely when the two examples are so close together. Furthermore, the language suggests that Athena plays a similar role as she does in epic, but instead of appearing in a setting based in the remote, mythic past, she appears on the contemporary battlefield. This is different from the Telephus passage, which describes a story of gods and heroes as a mythic exemplum pertaining to contemporary events, for now the poet imagines a goddess appearing on the contemporary battlefield, although Archilochus does describe some unknown god acting against them (*P. Oxy.* 4708 fr. 1.2). Archilochus appears to enhance the historical battle with Homeric overtones in order to increase the importance and prestige of the actors in that battle. As for Athena, we do not know whom she helps or how, but one wonders whether Archilochus would have been so bold as to have composed a poem where he is the recipient of goodwill from a divine benefactor, perhaps even seeing himself as a modern Odysseus. This significantly affects the audience's reception of this poem. They no longer need to look back to a mythic past in order to see an example of a divinely aided hero for they have a hero who is a living part of their community. Furthermore, if Archilochus was part of this battle, then he increases his stature in the community and becomes the representative shining light of his community along with his peers, but since he is also the poet he draws a direct comparison between his poetry and Homer's. Thus, he casts himself as a

warrior on par with Odysseus and a poet on par with Homer. The community sees him as a warrior and a poet to emulate.

Tyrtaeus describes Athena appearing on the battlefield where the Spartans are fighting against Argives and Arcadians, who are possibly fighting alongside the Messenians.³⁵ She is twice mentioned in fragment 23a, but the context is uncertain. In the first instance her name is in the nominative γλαυκῶπις θυ[γ]άτηρ αἰγιόχ[οιο Διός with a direct object of βέλε' ἄγρ[ια in the preceding line (23a.10-11). The verb is missing, which makes interpreting her role in this passage more difficult, but if we consider Homeric parallels, we may conjecture that she deflects the missiles.³⁶ She appears seven lines later followed by a reference to people killing all of the Spartans that are fleeing: πάντ[ας] μὲν κτενέουσ[ι / Σπα]ρτητέων ὅποσιν[ς / ἐξ]οπίσω φεύγοντας (23a. 20-2). Athena's role in the battle in this second example is less clear: παρ' Ἀθηναίης γλαυκώπιδος (23a. 18). The preposition παρά with the genitive indicates that the men are acting near her or receiving something from her, which is slightly different from her role in Archilochus. The fact that her name occurs twice in eight lines suggests that the audience is to imagine Athena directly on the battlefield, affecting the outcome of battle.³⁷ Her conduct would be immediately familiar to an audience well versed in epic tales.

³⁵ The Messenians appear in fragment 23 while the Arcadians and Argives appear in 23a. There is some external evidence to suggest that some of the opposition could be the Argives and Arcadians, who are both mentioned by Strabo as being allies of the Messenians during the 2nd Messenian War (8.4.10). If 23a is a Tyrtaean description of these events, we must assume that the Spartans suffered at least some setbacks as they tried to re-conquer the Messenians. This alliance has been questioned by Tausend (1993) 197-201.

³⁶ cf. βελέων ἀπερύκοι (*Il.* 4.542) and ἦ τοι πρόσθε σῆλα βέλος ἔχευε κῆρ ἄμυνεν (*Il.* 4.129). In both cases Athena is the goddess preventing the missiles. Gerber (1999) 71 suggests 'checks' in his translation for this passage.

³⁷ In another fragment Tyrtaeus makes a reference to men listening to Apollo; Φοῖβον ἀκούσαντες (4.1). While this is clearly a reference to the Delphic oracle, the phrasing does suggest that the men were listening to the god, albeit through a Pythian intermediary. This belief suggests that contact between gods and men is possible and with that in mind, the notion that Tyrtaeus could have viewed Athena on the battlefield amongst the soldiers on some level gains some credence.

Since these couplets are so fragmentary we do not know on which side Athena stands. The battle narrative continues, suggesting that the attackers will kill all of the Spartans who are fleeing. Such a grim fate would not be expected if Athena aided the Spartans unless there was a god on the opposing side as well. Given the frequency of these types of scenes in Homer, such an interpretation is possible. Alternatively, Tyrtaeus may have incorporated Athena into the poem as a companion to the Spartan enemy in order to explain a Spartan defeat. This would enable the Spartans to boast that they would have defeated the enemy single-handedly if only a god did not stand against them. We have already seen that Archilochus makes a similar claim (*P.Oxy.* 4708 1.2).³⁸ In the *Iliad* Homer states that the Greeks would have sacked Troy if only Apollo had not stood in Patroclus' way (*Il.* 16.698-701). The Spartans were not claiming a major victory by boasting that they defeated their enemy even though Athena stood beside them, since some of the Spartans are described as fleeing. The 'excuse for defeat' hypothesis is most fitting because it allows the poet to provide a vivid description of the defeat of his own people and the audience's while deflecting criticism since they fled from a god. Thus, the Spartans did not just flee from the Argives and Arcadians, but from Athena.³⁹

Athena's name also occurs in martial context in a poem of Mimnermus, who describes a brave warrior from a previous generation. After describing the warrior fighting the Lydians, Mimnermus notes: τοῦ μὲν ἄρ' οὐ ποτε πάμπαν ἐμέμψατο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη / δριμύ μένος κραδίης (14.5-6). The nature of Athena's role in this poem is the least certain of the three lyric poets so far discussed. The verb μέμφομαι, is only found five times in Homer (always in the compound ἐπιμέμφομαι) and translates to 'blame' or 'find fault with'. None of these uses have a martial

³⁸ See Chapter 4 section 1b pp. 118-21.

³⁹ In book 5 of the *Iliad* Diomedes advises his men to avoid fighting Hector because Ares fights at his side (*Il.* 5.601-6).

tone, but instead are civic or ritualistic (*Il.* 1.65, 93; 2.225; *Od.* 16.97, 115). If we follow West's text, the meaning of this passage is fairly clear; Athena, observing either from afar or on the battlefield, praises this warrior's battle prowess. No indication survives that Athena physically helps the warrior; rather, she offers moral support. However, we may lack a passage that indicates a more direct involvement on her part.⁴⁰ Recently West has drawn a parallel between this passage and one from the *Iliad* involving Diomedes and Athena (*Il.* 4.372-5).⁴¹ He observes that both passages contain a warrior being scolded by Athena by being compared unfavourably to a warrior of the previous generation. The similarity in motif is striking, but the method of conveying the message is dissimilar since the epic Athena rebukes Diomedes in speech while the elegiac Athena is only described as not finding fault with the unnamed warrior from the previous generation.⁴² However, a similarity in motif with a variation of execution is not an uncommon distinction between these two genres.

A major distinction between this poem and epic is the source of the poet's knowledge. Mimnermus has learnt this story from his elders, who saw this man with their own eyes (14.1-4), whereas the epic poet derives his knowledge from the Muses. The language and subject matter recall a glorified past that was closer to the poet than Troy was to Homer. Homer had to rely on the Muses in part to provide him with knowledge of a remote past, whereas Mimnermus could acquire his details from eye-witness accounts. As Richardson observes, "the Muses are the goddesses of narrative, the repositories of story knowledge, who give the narrator the ability to

⁴⁰ Bowie (1986) 29-30 is tempted to allocate this fragment to the *Smyrneis*, a poem of considerable length.

⁴¹ West (2011) 231.

⁴² Page (1961) 68 provides an alternate reading by changing change the μὲν in line 5 to a κεν so that the line reads τοῦ κεν ἄρ' οὐ ποτε πάμπαν ἐμέμψατο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη. He then interprets that "nobody knew, or even pretended to know, what Athene did in fact think of his courage; the question was, and is regularly so put, what she is likely to have thought of it." To support his argument he provides two Homeric parallels (*Il.* 13.127-8; 17.398-9).

peer into the world of the story.”⁴³ In Mimnermus the elders play a similar, albeit human, role. However, we must be careful not to take this interpretation too far since we lack much of the context for this passage. If this does come from a longer narrative that included characters and dialogue (*i.e.* an elegy of significant length and a scope more akin to epic), then the 1st person of the speaker would belong to a character inside a narrative and not that of the poet/persona. Such a scenario would be similar to dialogue in epic, in which case the elders providing the source of another character’s knowledge would be more natural (cf. Nestor *Il.* 7.124-60). However, there is no explicit and irrefutable evidence that such a scenario is found in this poem. On the other hand, if the persona is that of the poet and not a character working within a greater narrative, then the distinction between the Muses and the elders stands.

There is a further subtlety in Mimnermus’ approach, for he creates a distinction between the glorified past of the hero, and the less heroic world he witnesses. When there is a larger chronological divide between a greater heroic past and a less heroic present there is less stigma attached to the moral decline. However, when the divide is only one or two generations the disgrace is intensified.⁴⁴ Allen comments that Athena’s presence further intensifies this divide:

Mimnermus knew what Smyrna’s patron goddess thought of that hero’s courage when her city had been threatened by the Lydians of an earlier day; and now, it must be inferred, he knows that Athena does indeed find fault with the Smyrnaeans’ fighting spirit, when her city and her temple again are in peril.⁴⁵

⁴³ Richardson (1990) 178. For more on the Muses as providers of information for the epic poets, see: Minton (1960), Nagy (1979) 16-8, Detienne (1996) 35-52.

⁴⁴ This is a frequent motif in epic. Nestor states that the men of the previous generation were far superior to those of the current generation (*Il.* 1.254-74). He does not say this to insult the Greeks, but to help them understand that better men than them have listened to his advice in the past and so should they now. Even though no insult was intended, the fact remains that the current generation of heroes pales in comparison to the former generation. Hesiod elaborately depicts the difference between the Heroic age and the present Iron Age (*WD* 157-201). It is likely that Mimnermus deliberately manipulates this epic motif in order to add more weight to his criticism. For more Homeric descriptions of former generations being superior to contemporary generations, see *Il.* 5.302-4; 12.381-3, 445-50; 20.285-7.

⁴⁵ Allen (1981) 207.

Thus, in this poem Mimnermus is not only able to recall the past with a heightened sense of glory, but also to criticise his contemporary society and question whether it can deal with challenges in the same way.

If we compare these three passages by three different poets, there are some obvious similarities. First of all, Athena occurs in all three passages. Her inclusion seems natural in Mimnermus, for Smyrna had a large temple dedicated to Athena. Interestingly, her physical presence on the battlefield of Mimnermus is less secure than that of Archilochus and Tyrtaeus. Less clear is why she is specifically mentioned by Archilochus and Tyrtaeus. She plays a prominent role as divine agent in Homer, and so her presence in place of other deities would not be unexpected in elegy. Another point of interest about these three examples is that they all seem to take this element that is so characteristic of the world of epic, and adapt it to fit their own world. This helps to foster a sense of community by creating a new series of heroes for the current generation that will also set a high standard for generations to come, which all helps to maintain communal cohesion. The lyric poets do not feel constrained in limiting the glory of heroes and their encounters with gods to a distant past. In fact, they consciously bring that glory forward to the benefit of the community. Archilochus and Tyrtaeus are able to bring the miraculous interaction between mortals and immortals into contemporary events. Mimnermus would have been able to do the same, but it serves the purpose of his poem to describe this miraculous event in a more recent past.

The lyric poets did not limit themselves to portraying these relationships solely on the contemporary battlefield. Pindar and Bacchylides included divine intervention on the mythic battlefield. Pindar manipulates the motif of divine intervention by having Zeus perform two

different roles in *Nemean 9*, which details the myth of the Seven against Thebes. As the Seven prepare to leave home and set out for Thebes Zeus attempts to deter them:

καί ποτ' ἐς ἑπταπύλους Θήβας ἄγαγον στρατὸν ἀνδρῶν αἰσιᾶν
οὐ κατ' ὀρνίχων ὁδόν· οὐδὲ Κρονίων ἄστεροπὰν ἐλελίξαις οἴκοθεν μαργουμένους
στείχειν ἐπώτρυν', ἀλλὰ φείσασθαι κελεύθου.
(*N.* 9.18-20)

While gods generally appear on the battlefield to encourage their favourites, Zeus uses his powers to *prevent* mortals from setting out to meet certain disaster long before they face danger.⁴⁶ A god attempting to dissuade a mortal from violence is reminiscent of Athena appearing before Achilles to dissuade him from attacking Agamemnon (*Il.* 1.188-222). In both cases, if the god is successful, their intervention will have a profound impact on the narrative. While Athena was successful in compelling Achilles not to attack Agamemnon, Zeus is not. Instead of issuing advice that is immediately adopted by the mortal, Zeus leaves the decision up to the mortals who foolishly ignore this portent.⁴⁷

Pindar has Zeus intervene a second time in this poem, although the approach is novel and unexpected. When Amphiaraus is in flight, Zeus protects him by striking the earth with a thunderbolt and concealing him before the Theban defender Periclymenus can strike him in the back with a spear (*N.* 9.24-6).⁴⁸ This act can be interpreted in a couple of ways. Currie argues that in this passage and two others (*O.* 6.14; *N.* 10.8-9), Amphiaraus avoids death.⁴⁹ However, it is

⁴⁶ Simonides describes Castor, Polydeuces, and Menelaus accompanying the Spartans from the outset of campaign (discussed below).

⁴⁷ The Seven make the mistake that Achilles does not when he is offered advice by Athena (*Il.* 1.216-8).

⁴⁸ For a summary of the myth of Amphiaraus prior to Pindar, see Braswell (1998) 27-41.

⁴⁹ Currie (2005) 42 cites this passage along with two others (*O.* 6.14; *N.* 10.8-9) as evidence that Amphiaraus evades death. None of these passages explicitly state that he avoided death, but rather that he avoided a shameful death for there is no shame in being struck down by a god, but there is much shame in dying with a spear in your back. Pindar also has Amphiaraus deliver a quick overview of the battle of the Epigoni (*P.* 8.38-55). However, there is no indication that Amphiaraus is present in any physical form. He looks, ἰδών, and speaks, εἶπε. Apollodorus states that not only did Zeus inter Amphiaraus, but he actually made him immortal: Ζεὺς ἀθάνατον αὐτὸν ἐποίησεν (3.77).

equally possible that Zeus kills him when he covers him in earth since Pindar remains ambiguous about the fate of Amphiaraus in all three passages. The most revealing passage is *Nemean* 9 in which Pindar states the motive behind Zeus' act; he covers him so that he can avoid the shame of being pierced in the back.⁵⁰ There is no mention of a desire to save his life.⁵¹ Thus, Zeus was no longer preoccupied with protecting the life of Amphiaraus, but only with preserving his honour. Zeus tried once already to save Amphiaraus by sending a portent before the outset of the campaign. When Amphiaraus ignored this sign, he sealed his fate.⁵² It is evident from these two examples that Pindar is manipulating the epic motif of divine rescue by keeping the core component of salvation, while completely subverting the method. Zeus is able to save Amphiaraus by killing him. We must be careful not to attribute too much to Pindar when we lack a complete version of the cyclic *Thebaid*, but it is at least likely that Pindar deliberately juxtaposes these two aspects of the story in order to emphasise the exceptionality of Amphiaraus and the importance of a death with one's honour still intact.⁵³ By killing Amphiaraus in this manner he preserves his nobility of character and consequently the audience of the poem does not need to hold him in low esteem. After all, he is still the warrior that receives aid from Zeus.

Bacchylides' poem about Croesus preparing to burn himself on a pyre (3.53-61) incorporates two examples of divine intervention. Croesus sits in his palace as the Persians sack the city. He is a defeated commander with no desire for a life of captivity. His only option is to

While there is no indication in Pindar that Zeus went as far in his divine aid, such a scenario would explain his interment and subsequent appearance at the battle of the Epigoni. For more on these sources, see Gantz (1993) 518-9.

⁵⁰ Tyrtaeus describes the shameful sight of a corpse lying in the field with a spear in his back in a moral tableau (11.17-20).

⁵¹ Bury (1890) 164 and Nisetich (1980) 274 understand Zeus' act as killing Amphiaraus.

⁵² Bacchylides has Amphiaraus try to persuade the seven not to go forth (9.15-20).

⁵³ Hubbard (1992) 102 asserts that this must have been part of the epic cycle, although no fragments survive with these details. There are very few surviving fragments that involve Amphiaraus in the *Thebaid*, but according to a scholiast, Pindar is responsible for quoting one of them (*O.* 6.17). See also Davies (2015) 121-8 for Amphiaraus.

burn himself on a pyre along with his family. This passage is a particularly noteworthy variation of this motif because not one but two gods intervene to prevent Croesus' death. First Zeus pours rain onto the pyre, extinguishing the flame (3.53-6)⁵⁴ and then Apollo swoops in and physically removes him from the pyre and brings him and his family to the land of the Hyperboreans (3.58-61).⁵⁵ Apollo's act is remarkable compared to others we have seen, for he does not remove one person, but an entire family, and he does not simply move them out of harm's way, but transports them to a paradise.⁵⁶ The physical act of Aphrodite removing Paris from his duel with Menelaus provides the closest epic parallel, but the comforts of Paris' bed and Helen's arms pale in comparison to the land of the Hyperboreans. Bacchylides aggrandises and enhances every aspect of this motif. Considering this tale appears in an epinician to Hieron, the figure to whom Croesus is compared, the spectacular nature of this scene serves the poet's eulogistic purpose.⁵⁷

Herodotus tells the same story about Croesus on the pyre, but includes some different details (1.86-7). The most obvious difference between the two versions is that Croesus does not

⁵⁴ Zeus does not use his tempestuous powers to rescue anyone in Homer, but he does use them to water the plants of the Cyclopes (*Od.* 9.111). A Paestan red-figure bell-krater signed by Python, c. 330 BC depicts Alcmena on a pyre being saved by Zeus' rain. For more on this vase, see Simon (2004) 118ff.

⁵⁵ Pausanias tells us that Stesichorus, in his Ἰλίου πέρσις, had Apollo take Hecuba to Lycia (10.27.2=Stesich. 109 F-D). Cairns (2010) 67 speculates that "the motif of Croesus' translation was inspired by Stesichorus' account of the rescue of Hecuba by Apollo, who conveyed her to Lycia (a *bona fide* historical country, but, like the land of the Hyperboreans, a favourite haunt of Apollo)."

⁵⁶ Zieliński (1927) 605 maintains that a fragmentary passage of Archilochus suggests a scene involving Hermes rescuing someone. He argues that this Archilochian passage is the antecedent for Horace's *sed me per hostis Mercurius celer / denso paventem sustulit aere* (*Hor. Carm.* 2.7.13-4). Due to the scant evidence available it is difficult to assess this passage in relation to the present discussion on divine intervention at its effect on characters and audience.

⁵⁷ Burnett (1985) 71 notes "the episode shows a Croesus who has submitted to a divine decision made manifest in contest and, having lost his wealth, has taken his life and kingliness – all he has left – and made of them a final conspicuous offering to the powers that rule him. His action recapitulates others that have been characteristic of his life, and it provokes an instantaneous reversal from disfavour to miraculous benefaction on the part of heaven." This is an important point as it highlights a crucial difference between this scene and others similar to it; Croesus first asks for divine aid. Whenever these scenes occur in Homer, often the recipient of the divine aid is not even aware that a god has provided a service. However, in this case, Croesus openly calls for the gods. Fearn (2007) 46 observes in this poem and in poem 5 that "the relation between the thoughts, outlooks, and actions of victors on the one hand and of mythical protagonists on the other are not straightforward." S. West (2003) 419 interprets as follows: "Piety finds its reward; a story of catastrophe is transposed and given an ending beyond all expectation. The myth shows how, in the face of death, Apollo looks after his own. To Hiero, who dies the following year and was already seriously ill in 470 when Pindar composed *Pythian* 1, the message had a peculiar relevance."

go up on the pyre willingly, but in fetters and under order of Cyrus, and not with his family, but with 14 unnamed boys.⁵⁸ Instead of making Croesus a heroic figure ready to place himself at the gods' mercy, he becomes a pathetic figure at the mercy of his greatest human foe.⁵⁹ As the story unfolds Croesus recounts Solon's words about counting one's fortunes only at the end of life, which prompts Cyrus to order his guards to rescue those on the pyre.⁶⁰ When that fails, Croesus makes a prayer to Apollo for rescue. This cry for rescue again weakens the character of Croesus, who, in Bacchylides' version, does not ask for salvation, but asks the gods in anger why this fortune has befallen him (3.37-9).⁶¹ Bacchylides' Croesus is almost defiant to the gods, but Herodotus has him submissive to everyone. In Herodotus Croesus is saved by divine intervention, although it is not explicitly stated until later in the story by the Delphic oracle (1.91). In fact, the gods are not mentioned again in the narrative until the Lydians go to Delphi on behalf of Croesus. Instead we are told that an otherwise clear day suddenly became cloudy and rainy, putting out the fire.⁶² However, as Harrison puts it, "prayers answered, like oracles fulfilled, constitute proof of divine intervention."⁶³ It is likely that Bacchylides took these details from some earlier source.⁶⁴ Whether Bacchylides invented the detail about Zeus remains open.⁶⁵

⁵⁸ For more on the possible sources of these two divergent stories, see Maehler (2004) 80-3 and Cairns (2010) 66-7. How and Wells (1912) 86 note that an amphora at the Louvre dating roughly to 500 B.C. depicting Croesus preparing for self-sacrifice is proof that "the authority of this tradition is therefore slightly the older." For a picture of the vase, see Boardman (1988) 174, fig. 230a.

⁵⁹ Segal (1971) 47 notes "Herodotus is concerned with the spiritual agony of a man who witnesses his captor's change of judgement, yet realizes that it may be too late."

⁶⁰ Pelling (2006c) analyses the dialogue between Croesus and Cyrus and its effect on the audience.

⁶¹ The Herodotean Croesus does ask the Pythian priestess these questions later in the narrative, but the impact of the questions is diminished when they are not asked in the face of death on the pyre.

⁶² Fehling (1989) 206-7 argues that Bacchylides must have been Herodotus' source for this episode, but that Herodotus deliberately suppressed the more fantastical elements in order to rationalise the events. Burkert (1985) argues that Bacchylides and Herodotus work from the same tradition, but each reflect a different iteration in a long line of developments.

⁶³ Harrison (2000) 76. This may be true, but it is still noteworthy that Herodotus, as narrator, does not state that the prayer was fulfilled; he only says that a sudden rain put out the fire. This detail is only explicitly revealed by the priestess, a character in the narrative.

⁶⁴ Beazley (1955) 308-9, describing fragments of a hydria that depict the scene of a man on a pyre, asks "in what circumstances can a Greek flute-player be seen in the company of Orientals on a solemn occasion?" In response to this question, Page (1962) hypothesises a trilogy that begins with the story of Gyges and end with the death of

Regardless, these details bring this story to a sphere closer to epic, but also increase the heroic status of Croesus, and consequently also that of Hieron.

b) Gods and Heroes

Simonides in his Plataea elegy draws upon many epic motifs and manipulates them to create some interesting variations that blur the two genres of epic and elegy. This section will examine the various epic allusions in order to provide context for Homeric heroes who appear beside the Spartan army in a manner similar to gods appearing on the Homeric battlefield. Fragment 11W, the largest surviving section of the Plataea elegy (*P. Oxy.* 3965), includes a display of the sheer destructive power of the gods.⁶⁶ Simonides depicts the relative ease with which Apollo takes down Achilles, an act hitherto impossible for any Trojan (11.7-8).⁶⁷ It is a curious choice that Simonides has Apollo use his hand, when epic tradition alleges that Apollo and Paris together killed Achilles with a bow.⁶⁸ The detail about his hand creates a closer parallel to Apollo's role in the death of Patroclus in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 16.703-4), and distances the poem from

Croesus, linking this scene on the hydria with *P.Oxy* 2382, a fragment of tragedy involving Gyges. Snell (1973) agrees with this theory. The theory is generally not upheld as the Gyges play is seen as Hellenistic; see Hall (1989) 65, n.37 with bibliography.

⁶⁵ Hutchinson (2001) 346 n. on *Il.* 55-6 comments that "one can hardly be confident that Bacchylides has himself added the god of Olympia here."

⁶⁶ West (1993) 1-14=West (2013b) 111-28. Many aspects of these fragments are discussed at great length in this work including West's restoration and translation of this particular fragment. In this volume West has expanded upon the various proposed emendations found in *IEG*². The *editio princeps* was published by Parsons (1992).

⁶⁷ In the appendix found in Sider (2001) 27-9 West's restoration includes a description of Achilles as a man, whom no other mortal could kill. West also supplies details about Hera's and Athena's role in the destruction of Troy. Although these are reasonable supplements, I purposefully do not discuss them in this section because there is much less certainty of their inclusion in the text.

⁶⁸ Hector foretells that Paris and Apollo will kill Achilles (*Il.* 22.359-60). Proclus states that Achilles is killed by Paris and Apollo, and Apollodorus adds the detail that they shoot him with an arrow; see West (2003) 113. There are references in tragedy to Apollo acting alone (*Soph. Phil.* 334-5) as well as Paris acting alone (*Eur. Hec.* 387-8; *Andr.* 655). For a comprehensive list of the variations of this myth, see Gantz (1993) 625-6. Burgess (1995) argues that the detail about Paris and Apollo shooting Achilles with an arrow is likely traditional and is possibly pre-Homeric, but this does not imply that the 'imperfect invulnerability' of Achilles' heel dates back to such an early time. In Simonides' *Plataea Elegy* (discussed in the following section) Apollo is the one responsible for the death of Achilles. Hyginus has Apollo take the shape of Paris and shoot Achilles (107). Pindar details the death of both Achilles and Neoptolemus at the hands of Apollo (*Pae.* 6.89-120). Rutherford (2001) 312 notes that Achilles' death in this poem has Iliadic resonances. Nagy (1979) 121 notes this poem's cultic aspects: "antagonism between hero and god in myth corresponds to the ritual requirements of symbiosis between hero and god in cult."

the rest of the Epic Cycle. The fact that Simonides' conception so closely resembles Homer's may be a deliberate decision and pertinent to the following discussion.

Simonides also draws a parallel between epic and elegy by directly citing a Muse. Furthermore, he seems to make an allusion to Homer by noting how he too called upon the Muses.

ὅς παρ' ἰοπ]λοκάμων δέξατο Πιερίδ[ων
πᾶσαν ἀλη]θείην, καὶ ἐπώνυμον ὅπ[λοτέρ]οισιν
ποίησ' ἡμ]ιθέων ὠκύμορον γενεή[ν.
(11.16-8)

The association between the Muses and epic poetry is natural; less common is the invocation of a Muse in elegy. Simonides does not only address his Muse, he invokes her as an ally; *κυκλήσκω*] σ' ἐπικούρον ἐμοῖ, π[ολυώνυμ]ε Μοῦσα (11.21).⁶⁹ Ian Rutherford argues that:

ἐπικούρον is a military metaphor; Simonides imagines his situation as a poet as analogous to that of a fighter in a battle, and he calls on the Muse to assist him. The Muse is thus a mercenary in the military sense (contrast with the traditional view that Simonides' Muse was a mercenary in the sense that she sold herself for money, an ἐργάτις [Pindar, *Isth.* 2.6]). Simonides thus makes some contribution himself, and is superior to Homer, who relied entirely on the Muses.⁷⁰

While Ian Rutherford's analysis of the Muse as an ally is stimulating, his conclusion that Simonides invokes her in an attempt to claim superiority over Homer is debatable. We need not conclude that Homer was an inferior poet because he needed more help, but rather that he received a greater gift from the Muses. Thus, one could argue that Homer received an abundance of divine favour whereas Simonides received considerably less. Divine aid for the heroes of epic is a mark of distinction and a hero is not esteemed less because he receives more favour from a deity.⁷¹ The same reasoning could be true for both poets. Simonides may in fact be casting

⁶⁹ This notion of a god acting as an ally in lyric has a parallel in Sappho who calls upon Aphrodite to be her σύμμαχος (1.28). While the vocabulary certainly has military connotations, in this case, the battlefield is love itself.

⁷⁰ Rutherford (2001) 45-6.

⁷¹ Odysseus and his family are regularly aided by Athena, but it is not suggested that his heroism is marginalised but the abundance of aid.

himself as a hero of epic that is accompanied by a god. Perhaps it is best not to interpret this passage as an argument about poetic superiority, but rather as a confirmation of the high esteem of both poets. As Richard Rutherford comments:

Myth provided the means for the writer to elevate himself as well as his subject. By comparing his theme (sometimes explicitly) with those of Homer or other distinguished poets, he enhanced his own status... From Trojan war to Persian war, from heroic Greeks battling Trojans to fifth-century Greeks battling Persians, from Achilles to Pausanias (regent of Sparta and general at the battle of Plataea) - the analogies are firm and clear, with also an unspoken analogy between Homer, the poet who 'received from the Muses all truth' and Simonides himself who calls on the Muse for aid with 'my song' 'also'. Eternal fame is promised for both subjects.⁷²

This latter interpretation may prove the more rewarding of the two.⁷³ Thus, through subtle manipulation of epic motifs, Simonides compares himself to the epic poet *par excellence* as well as the heroes of that genre that receive divine favour and distinction among their peers.⁷⁴

As the poem progresses Simonides depicts a scene of the Spartan army departing for Plataea accompanied by three great Spartan heroes: the Tyndarids Castor and Polydeuces, and Menelaus (11.29-34).⁷⁵ Although this is not divine intervention in the strictest sense because the heroes are not gods, but some manifestation of men from the heroic age, this relationship between soldiers and higher beings immediately recalls the epic companionship between warriors and gods.⁷⁶ Before introducing this section of the poem Simonides refers to the

⁷² Rutherford (2005) 175-6.

⁷³ There is also a very practical reason why Homer employed the Muses to a much greater extent than Simonides; the temporal distance between poet and subject matter was much greater for Homer than Simonides. Aloni (2001) 95 states "Homer could not have been a witness to the events at Troy and therefore relied entirely on the Muses for the truth of his account; Simonides, on the other hand, did witness the Greek war against the Persians and so needs the Muse's help only to guarantee the ability of his poetry to render the truth and thus confer lasting fame on those who took part in the events narrated."

⁷⁴ Clay (2001) 183 argues that "by exaggerating Homer's accomplishments, Simonides can rhetorically magnify his own. As Homer granted immortal fame to the heroes, so too will Simonides to the Plataean heroes he celebrates."

⁷⁵ The Dioscuri also appear as divine saviours in a non-martial sphere when they are called to rescue sailors in a poem of Alcaeus (34).

⁷⁶ Although Castor and Polydeuces shared immortality, a peculiar relationship in itself, they clearly differ from the Olympian gods. In the *Odyssey* the twins are known to spend equal time between life and death (*Od.* 11.300-4), but the *Iliad* only speaks of them as being buried in their homeland (*Il.* 3.243-4). A fragment of Hesiod refers to both of them as the sons of Zeus (24 M-W). Pindar has them rotate their days between Therapna and Olympus (*P.* 11.61-4)

characters at Troy as ἡμίθεοι (11.18).⁷⁷ As noted above this is a term specifically used to look back upon characters from a previous time. However, when describing the Tyndarids and Menelaus, he specifically refers to them as ἥρωες (11.31), which was noted above as the term epic uses to describe heroes in the present action. Simonides deliberately pulls the Homeric warriors from the far past to the present; from ἡμίθεοι to ἥρωες. They may not belong to the Olympian pantheon, but they do exist on a plain superior to the army setting out against the Persians.⁷⁸ Regardless of their cosmic position, they seem to play a similar role for the Spartans at Plataea as the gods do for the heroes at Troy; they march at their side.⁷⁹ However, since we lack a battle narrative, we do not know if the heroes played an indirect role by encouraging the Spartans from the edge of battle, or whether they actively engaged the Persians.

Simonides makes a further significant distinction: these three figures accompany the Spartans from the outset of the campaign (11.29). Whenever the gods help mortals in a military context in Homer, they only appear at the precise moment of their action. As Redfield notes, “their interventions are erratic and personal.”⁸⁰ The Homeric gods do not need to support the side on which a hero fights, although they can, but only the individual hero.⁸¹ There is quite a

and elsewhere describes in more detail how the twins came into this peculiar arrangement (*N.* 10.49-91). A highly fragmentary poem of Alcman refers to their deep sleep (7). Menelaus was born a mortal but never died and instead lived for eternity in the Elysian Fields (*Od.* 4.561-70). Regardless of the status of the three figures in myth, it is clear from the text that Simonides represents them as heroes (ἥρωες) in this poem (11.31). See also Gantz (1993) 327-8.

⁷⁷ As Burkert (1985) 205 comments that “in Homeric terms heroes and gods form two quite separate groups, even though they share the nature of Stronger Ones in relation to men. The wall which separates them is impermeable: no god is a hero, and no hero becomes a god; only Dionysos and Heracles were able to defy this principle.” Pindar refers to Heracles as a ἥρως θεός, while both Herodotus (2.44) and Pausanias (2.10.1) note that he is worshipped as both a god and a hero.

⁷⁸ Surveying the history of heroes helping out in battle in Attica Kearns (1989) 46 notes as the earliest historical instance the occasion when Solon called upon the Salaminian heroes Periphemus and Cychreus (*Plut. Sol.* 9). Unfortunately the source is so late that there are hundreds of years between the event and the record of the event where such supernatural elements could have been inserted into the tale. Nevertheless, this does point to the possibility that Simonides’ use of the heroes in this way, while perhaps not his own invention, was a relatively fresh idea in his time.

⁷⁹ Oedipus may have played a protective role for Athens (*S.O.C.* 1524-34). Kearns (1989) 50-2 discusses this passage in more detail.

⁸⁰ Redfield (1975) 76.

⁸¹ e.g. Poseidon saving Aeneas (*Il.* 20.325).

different effect when the Spartans are supported by their semi-divine companions from the very outset of the campaign, for it implies that the heroes support the Spartan state and want to ensure its success. That it is the state they support and consequently its army is an indication that the cohesive ambitions expressed in the poetry of Tyrtaeus have solidified by the early 5th century. There is an additional effect created by the presence of the heroes: they increase the prestige of the Spartan regent Pausanias, who leads them along with the army.⁸² This solidifies the heroes as allies of the Spartan army and places Pausanias at the head of an esteemed group.

There is some ambiguity about Achilles' role in the poem.⁸³ Obbink outlines four different, although not mutually exclusive, interpretations of his presence in the poem and specifically in this role: "Achilles is the archetypal mortal divinity/divinized mortal," "he has a special relationship to the laudandus or commissioner of the poem," "the real or imagined context for the composition or its performance was a festival or other celebration at one of the several cult centers devoted to Achilles," or "the kind of cultic honors offered to divinized heroes in sub-Homeric epic and tragedy that suggested to the poet a connection between the death of Achilles and an encomiastic occasion memorializing those brave individuals who participated and perished in a famous battle of recent memory."⁸⁴ The fourth suggestion is particularly intriguing because it would coincide with the many epic allusions made by Simonides whereby he blurs the lines between epic and elegy in order to compare himself, his poetry, and his subjects to their epic parallels. This creates a profound association between the bravery, glory, and sacrifice of Achilles and those who died at Plataea.⁸⁵ However, this approach forces us to

⁸² Hornblower (2001) examines the possibility that the Dioscuri were only images of the heroes carried by the army. He ultimately rejects this idea.

⁸³ Stehle (2001) 106-7 examines his role in regards to structure of the poem.

⁸⁴ Obbink (2001) 72. For an overview of the potential references to hero cult in Homer, see Currie (2005) 47-57.

⁸⁵ Michelakis (2002) 5 makes an interesting case for the cultic association arguing that "Simonides also depicts Achilles as a cult hero by engaging with both religious discourse and the panhellenic narratives of Homeric poetry. By doing so, Simonides uses Achilles to blur the distinctions between poetic and cultic immortalisation, and

consider how far we should push the analogy. What of those who killed Achilles/the Plataean war-dead? Was Simonides' audience to envision a connection between Apollo and the Persians? There is no need to imagine Apollo helping the Persians directly. It would be more fitting to interpret the two entities as comparable in terms of strength, certainly not in absolute terms, but perhaps in relative ones. Such an association may have been the reason Simonides draws attention to Apollo's role in Achilles' death.

The epic parallels, or more specifically the Homeric/Iliadic parallels created by Simonides are undeniable. He deliberately strives to create Homeric connections wherever possible. He is willing to distance himself from tradition and have Apollo kill Achilles, not with his characteristic bow, but with his hands, a change that echoes Apollo's role in the death of Patroclus in the *Iliad*. Simonides is willing to make an allusion to Homer and his invocation of the Muses in order to cast himself as equal to Homer and an ally to the divine Muses, thus making himself the poetic equivalent of the heroes Homer describes. Furthermore, he casts Castor, Polydeuces, and Menelaus, heroes who all share a special connection with Sparta, as seemingly divine actors aiding the Spartans as they depart for battle. It is likely deliberate that all three of these heroes have a connection with immortality, a trait that works effectively with regard to Simonides' eulogistic purposes. The nature of the relationship between the heroes and soldiers on the battlefield is unclear, but considering the other epic parallels in this poem, it is reasonable to assume that it took on a similar character to that of gods and heroes in Homer. This is something that we have not seen in any of his lyric predecessors. This shift from Pan-Hellenic

therefore to facilitate the heroisation of the war dead through different and complementary modes of commemoration. In fact, this may also be the reason why Achilles, although presented as the mythological equivalent of the war dead at Plataea, does not seem to be explicitly associated in the poem with the localised cult practices of an area such as Sparta or Thessaly." As appealing as this interpretation is I am hesitant to make any firm conclusions on the potential cultic aspects of this poem. As Nobili (2011) 27 observes "we cannot confidently state for which occasion the poem was composed."

gods to localized heroes creates two effects on the poem. First, it allows the poet to choose figures that are more personal to the specific polis being discussed, as opposed to the gods, who may have direct affiliations with a particular polis, but are also shared across the entire Greek community.⁸⁶ Second, it allows the men who died at Plataea not long ago to be compared not to gods far removed from the plain of mortals, but to a group of deified or divinely honoured heroes.⁸⁷ This relationship memorialises the soldiers who fought on campaign by elevating them to a higher level, which in turn casts them as role models for future generations, thereby augmenting and reinforcing cohesion in the ranks and by extension in the community as a whole. Thus, by manipulating the motif of divine intervention Simonides is able to redefine the relationship between the poet, the dead who are being commemorated, and the audience while simultaneously bridging the gap between epic and elegy, Homer and Simonides.

Simonides' emphasis on the heroic rather than the divine contrasts with Herodotus' depiction of the battle of Plataea. Amidst the confusion before the outbreak of fighting, while the Persians were shooting arrows at the Spartans, the general Pausanias looked toward a temple of Hera and prayed that they would not be defeated (9.61).⁸⁸ Herodotus does not tell us whether Pausanias believed the goddess provided support or not, but he does mention that Pausanias was victorious near the temple of Hera, which could imply causation, though the historian remains non-committal (9.69). Since we lack any description of the battle of Plataea by Simonides, we cannot know if Hera made some kind of appearance there as well, but it may have suited his purpose to leave her out of his version.

⁸⁶ Nagy (1979) 115-6 discusses this same point in his argument that hero cults were contemporary with Homer and that he deliberately suppressed them because of the pan-Hellenic nature of the poems. This same argument applies for the polis-specific nature of Simonides' elegy, or at least this passage of his elegy.

⁸⁷ Lloyd-Jones (1994) 1 brings up this point when discussing the prominence of Achilles in the poem.

⁸⁸ Flower and Marincola (2002) 215, n.61.3 note that "given the extensive evidence for their piety, there is no reason to doubt H's account."

Herodotus provides further miraculous details when he states that after the battle of Plataea, no Persian dead were found on the sacred grounds of Demeter (9.65).⁸⁹ Herodotus speculates that Demeter punished the Persians for setting fire to her temple at Eleusis. Such a direct intervention by the goddess in mortal warfare recalls the grandeur of battles in epic, but Herodotus describes the battle to an audience, many of whom had witnessed the events themselves. Mikalson observes that in Herodotus' narrative "it seems that these gods were interested primarily in protecting their own sanctuaries and punishing the Persians for the violation of those places. There is no indication that they 'were protecting' devoted worshippers or favouring Greeks because they were Greek."⁹⁰ This provides a further contrast with epic, which consistently portrays the gods aiding their favoured mortals, and yet the familiarity of this motif is striking. There is some scant evidence that Simonides may have included a scene involving Demeter at this battle. Boedeker observes that fragment 17W of the new Simonides (*P. Oxy.* 3965 fr. 19) contains a reference to Demeter, but the fragment is so incomplete that an understanding of the context of this passage is unobtainable.⁹¹ Such an inclusion would perhaps increase the possibility of Hera's presence in a missing passage of Simonides' poem and the likelihood of Simonides' direct influence on Herodotus' account of the battle. For the sake of speculation, there are two alternatives to consider. Would Simonides have had Demeter protecting Greeks in combat? Such a relationship would be more consistent with the common epic relationship of immortals and mortals on the battlefield. Conversely, would Simonides have depicted Demeter only protecting her sanctuary? This approach would give us more evidence

⁸⁹ Scullion (2006) 198 notes the rarity of Herodotus naming a god in his own voice. He states "the easiest explanation is that both here and in the controversial case of Heracles Herodotus is marking and excusing speculation about a named divinity undertaken on his own narrative initiative."

⁹⁰ Mikalson (2002) 189. This static representation of the gods, who only protect their sacred territory, contrasts with the Spartan heroes, who march out with the army at the outset of the campaign.

⁹¹ Boedeker (2007) 67.

that Herodotus was even more dependent on Simonides' account. Of course, these speculations could only be satisfied by the discovery of more textual evidence.

Conclusion

The presence of gods on the battlefield is a powerful motif of both the epic and lyric poet. Not only can it play a part in narrative, but it can also illuminate special relationships existing between characters. This extends beyond how characters perceive each other in a poem to how the audience of the poem understands the characters. Achilles holds special status in the *Iliad*, partly because of his special relationship with some of the gods. Moreover, Homer's audience holds him in such high esteem because he has these special relationships.⁹² He becomes a role model for future generations, thus confirming the importance of this topic to the overall growth of military and social cohesion. A common source of inspiration unites the soldiers and by extension the polis. The lyric poets know the importance and power of this motif and foster the sense of cohesion within their respective communities. The early elegists could recreate contemporary battles with gods fighting in support of armies with whom the poet was familiar. Simonides adapts this motif further and has heroes specifically linked to the subject of his praise in order to have 'heroic intervention.' Pindar can have Zeus 'save' a mortal by killing him. Thus, their soldiers are models to follow, but they can also have special relationships with the gods, setting them on par with the Homeric heroes. Eventually they can even have special relationships with version of the heroes most relevant to their polis. All of this will lead to a greater esteem of the soldier, increase their stature in the community, and create a sense of commitment and mutual respect within the community. In many ways the lyric depiction of the gods on the battlefield is a response to epic distance. The variability and inventiveness of the genre allow the

⁹² West (2013a) 156. Achilles will later become a figure of cult.

poets either to close epic distance or remap it by building similar relationships with heroes from the past. Thus, the lyric use of divine motivation is intrinsically linked to the running theme of military and social cohesion that is found throughout this genre's poems about the motivation of the soldier.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

The topic of motivation in warfare is clearly a complex topic. At the heart of it we may ask why a person would be willing to fight and potentially die on behalf of the state. The picture that is revealed when exploring this topic in Greek lyric poetry shows that the motivation to fight is intrinsically linked to relationships within the community. Soldiers did not simply fight because the state asked them to fight. It was a socially expected duty. The study of this topic in lyric poetry reveals a complex web of relationships that exist between all members of the community. The motivation to fight was not relevant only to the soldiers in battle; it involved everyone (everyone was a participant in the process). There were many elements that weighed on the soldier, but they were all ultimately concerned with developing and maintaining social, communal, and political cohesion as well as cohesion within the ranks. These different elements did not only combine to motivate the soldier to step onto the battlefield, but the act of his fighting helped perpetuate cohesion in these different spheres and ensure that the next generation of soldiers would be equally willing to fight. It is clear from many of the poems explored in this dissertation that these ideals were not always maintained, but one of the functions of this poetry was to correct behaviour and promote cohesion.

The performance context of these poems played a significant role in establishing the community's expectations. The symposium was a common performance setting for poetry in the archaic period. It was a private setting and its audience was composed of the elite in society. While this performance context was one possible setting for martial exhortative elegy, I have argued that the content of the poems and the rhetorical style were more natural in a public setting be it a large-scale civic gathering or in the *syssition*. Callinus makes a criticism of the *véoi* by noting that they should be feeling shame at their inaction. This criticism is triggered by *nemesis*,

since the voice in the poem would have felt shame if they were in the position of the νέοι. The weight of the criticism is much heavier when the νέοι can see the gaze of their neighbours standing in the crowd. The dramatic effect would be severely weakened if this poem were only ever performed in a sympotic setting. Callinus' criticism is ultimately linked to a breakdown in the political, social, and communal cohesion. The poet calls attention to this discord in order to remedy the situation and return to a state of cohesion. This is made clear by the end of the poem when he depicts a soldier who has performed his duty and is considered an important and well respected member of society. The performance context can help us shed light on our understanding of a poem and we stand to gain a greater insight when we have a less restricted view of what types of performance were available to a given poem.

The lyric poets discuss aspects of defending family and home and this topic is inherently linked to social and communal cohesion. Tyrtaeus calls attention to the necessity of defending the homeland, but places the emphasis on what life would be like should they not successfully defend it (10.1-14). The impact is felt not only by the soldier, but by his entire family, which in turn can marginalise his roles in life. Callinus too is concerned with defending the homeland, but for him the threat is much more immediate, for, as he says, πόλεμος γαῖαν ἅπασαν ἔχει (1.4). Alcaeus expresses the solitude and isolation that can occur from exile after defeat in a civil struggle (130b). His voice speaks as someone who has experienced the consequences of political, communal, and social cohesion that has broken down. Solon also speaks from a similar perspective. His poem purports to reconcile different perspectives and return to a state of cohesion so that the Athenians can pull together and reclaim Salamis. Since the family unit is such an important pillar in the structure of the community, its defense provides a formidable motivation for a society that seeks to create and maintain cohesion across all spheres of life.

The motivation to benefit from predatory gains is largely absent from lyric poetry of this period, which stands in contrast to the world of epic where predatory gains were the fundamental system for advancing one's status. This should not be a surprise when analysing a society in a poetic genre that was focused on creating and maintain social, communal, and political cohesion as well as cohesion in the ranks. The personal advancement of the common soldier through predatory gains would have created a discord that runs counter to the values expressed in lyric poetry. This is not to say that a soldier could not have acquired possessions through warfare in this period, only that the lyric poets suppressed these elements in their poems so as not to clash with the civic values that were so essential to the motivation to fight. The only exception we see to this is when Tyrtaeus references predatory gains at the state level. The Spartan control over the Messenians was an advantage for all members of Spartan society. These gains do not clash with values concerning cohesion because everyone gains from them. In fact, the state level predatory gains provide a motivation that enhances cohesion and is consistent with the core values expressed elsewhere in the lyric poetry from the period.

The epigrams from era of the Persian Wars also provide insight into the topic of defending the homeland. Epigrams could be steeped in language that speaks of defending freedom or Greece at large, but the core values are ultimately concerned with maintaining social and political cohesion. What sets these textual expressions apart from other examples found in lyric poetry is that the scope of cohesion is greatly expanded to include all of Greece. One polis fighting at the side of another polis against a common enemy seeks to create cohesion at the military level but on a much grander scale. If we analysed these expressions in a vacuum, we might be tempted to suggest that the Greeks were considering greater political cohesion as well,

but it is clear from the events of the following decades that such ambitions were never seriously considered.

The concept of mutual benefit in ancient society is also important to the topic of motivation and cohesion. The surviving poems of Tyrtaeus tend to focus on the negative aspects of this topic. He openly chastises individuals that would flee from combat (11.15-20). This approach promotes both unity between soldier and polis (*i.e.* soldiers must remain dedicated to the polis and fight to protect it) and unity in the ranks (*i.e.* soldiers must have faith that their fellow comrades will stand by them). Callinus too is critical of individual flight from battle, but he, unlike Tyrtaeus, does not express the shamefulness of the act, but rather the futility (1.14-16). Death comes to everybody, so we might as well die in battle rather than at home in solitude. Archilochus subverts the moral code found in epic and declares that his life is worth more than his shield. Stesichorus manipulates this concept in his *Geryoneis* by having his titular character contemplate the ambiguity of his mortality (15). If he is immortal, then he has no need to fight Heracles, for immortals, by nature, are splendid creatures and do not need to prove themselves in combat to attain glory. However, if he is mortal, then he would rather die fighting for the just cause of protecting his family and home. Stesichorus is clearly working with a model of the heroic code more akin to Homer than that of Tyrtaeus.

Collective flight from battle does not seem to be as widely repudiated as individual flight. Since the act of collective flight represents an act of cohesion in the ranks, the suggestion that it is tolerable to the ancient audience is consistent with the values of social, communal, and political cohesion as well as cohesion in the ranks. Tyrtaeus acknowledges that there will be soldiers on both sides of the situation as fleers and pursuers (11.9-10). Archilochus argues that collective flight is acceptable when under compulsion of a god, citing the Greeks' arrival upon

the Mysian shore (*P. Oxy.* 4708). Although the idea of collective flight occurs in this literature, it is never made clear whether the audience is to understand it as the result of widespread panic or a tactical defeat.

Although many of these poets depict the negative consequences of not performing one's duty to the state, they are also careful to include some positive rewards that await the successful soldier. The rewards are not often tangible, financial rewards, but rather increased stature within the community. Callinus promotes the idea that the entire community will equally mourn the loss of such a soldier and hold him in high esteem while he lives (11.17-21). Tyrtaeus writes in similar terms expressing the admiration of both the young and old, male and female (12.35-42, 10.27-30). This further promotes the notion of unity found in many of his exhortative poems; unity within the ranks and unity with the polis. The positive rewards are what keep the soldiers from stepping onto the wrong side of the line that separates bravery and anti-social behaviour. As an epilogue to this discussion I argued that the epigrams accompanying grave monuments should be considered the fulfilment of the promises made by Tyrtaeus to the dead soldier. Paying due respect to a fallen soldier is important in its own right, but it also ensures that future generations understand that they in turn will also be honoured for their sacrifice. Social and communal cohesion are critical to this topic.

Divine intervention provides an interesting perspective on the topic of motivation. Its use in epic is to single out individual warriors from their peers and provide them with the means to excel in combat. This theme is important to this study for two reasons. The characters within the narrative are personally motivated when gods intervene on their behalf and the audience is inspired by grandiose tales of heroes from a bygone era. Epic heroes that are aided by the gods represent the pinnacle of bravery and excellence in combat. Their greatness casts them as a role

model to be emulated by all soldiers. The lyric poets adapt this theme but place the divine intervention in a contemporary (or near contemporary) context, thereby closing the gap left from epic distance and remaining consistent with values relating to cohesion across the various spheres in life. The impact caused by this shift is significant for the study of motivation. Members of a polis no longer needed to look back in time for divinely aided role models for their role models were living members of their own community. This has direct implications for establishing and maintaining communal cohesion and helped ensure that that this system could endure across generations. Simonides adapts this motif even further by replacing the Pan-Hellenic gods with heroes from the age of epic that were connected to Sparta. Although we lack passages that describe specifically how these heroes assisted the Spartans on the battlefield, we do know they were depicted as marching out with the Spartans from the outset of the campaign. If we look at epic and other lyric parallels, it would not surprise us if these heroes were depicted as playing a direct role in combat. The inclusion of semi divine heroes acting as motivators to the Spartan army enhances the social, communal, and political as well as cohesion in the ranks since they are so finely tuned to the specific polis. This establishes the soldiers that fought in these battles as reaching a new pinnacle of excellence in fighting and casts them as role models to inspire future generations.

When a polis asked its male citizens to fight and be willing to die on its behalf, it was clearly asking for a lot; and yet, this happened year after year in ancient Greece. The motivation of soldiers expressed in lyric poetry involved a complex system that demanded cohesion across various spheres in life. This system was designed to create and maintain social, communal, and political cohesion as well as cohesion in the ranks. These concepts are all linked to each other because every person was linked to each other in the community. Their survival relied on

soldiers fighting on behalf of everybody. This system of motivation that strove for cohesion ensured that soldiers were prepared for battle and willing to sacrifice their lives if needed. However, it did not preach that soldiers needlessly throw their lives away because their survival was critical for future success. The lyric poets reveal some interesting qualities of this system. Not only is this system responsible for motivating soldiers to fight, but the very act of their fighting is an essential part of the process that helps ensure that future soldiers will carry on with this system and maintain it. This was essential for a culture that featured various poleis at war with each other year after year.

Bibliography

Adkins, A. W. H. (1985), *Poetic Craft in the Early Greek Elegists* (Chicago).

Ahrens, H. L. (1891), 'Über die Mischung der Dialekte in der griechischen Lyrik', in H. L. Ahrens (ed.), *Kleine Schriften I* (Hannover), 157-181.

Allen, A. (1981), 'Mimnermus and Athena', *Maia* 33: 207-208.

Aloni, A. (2001), 'The Proem of Simonides' Plataea Elegy and the Circumstances of Its Performance', in D. Boedeker and D. Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides* (Oxford), 86-105.

Aloni, A. (2009), 'Elegy - Forms, Functions and Communication', in F. Budelmann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge), 168-188.

Anderson, C. A. (2008), 'Archilochus, His Lost Shield, and the Heroic Ideal', *Phoenix* 62: 255-260.

Anderson, Ø. (2011), 'Homeridae', in M. Finkelberg (ed.), *The Homer Encyclopedia* (Oxford), 1-2.

Andrewes, A. (1956), *The Greek Tyrants* (London).

Andronikos, M. (1968), *Totenkult* (Göttingen).

Anhalt, E. K. (1993), *Solon the Singer* (Lanham).

Antonaccio, C. M. (2011), 'Burial Customs', in M. Finkelberg (ed.), *The Homer Encyclopedia* (Oxford), 1-2.

Arthur, M. B. (1981), 'The Divided World of *Iliad* VI', *Women's Studies: An inter-disciplinary journal* 8: 21-46.

Asheri, D., A. Lloyd, et al. (2007), *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV* (Oxford).

Atkinson, J. W. (1957), 'Motivational Determinants of Risk-Taking Behavior', *Psychological Review* 64: 359-372.

Atkinson, J. W. and J. O. Raynor (1978), *Personality, Motivation, and Achievement* (Washington).

Austin, R. G. (1964), *Aeneidos: liber secundus* (Oxford).

Barigazzi, A. (1951), 'Contributo al vero Tirteo', *PP* 6: 102-115.

Barnes, H. R. (1995), 'The Structure of Elegiac Hexameter: A Comparison of the Structure of Elegiac and Stichic Hexameter Verse', in M. Fantuzzi and R. Pretagostini (eds.), *Struttura e Storia dell' Esametro Greco* (Rome), 135-161.

Barrett, W. S. (2007), *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, & Textual Criticism* (Oxford).

Barron, J. P. (1990), 'All for Salamis', in E. M. Craik (ed.), *Owls to Athens: Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* (Oxford), 133-141.

Battezzato, L. (2009), 'Metre and Music', in F. Budelmann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge), 130-146.

Beazley, J. D. (1955), 'Hydria-Fragments in Corinth', *Hesperia* 24: 305-319.

Bergk, T. (1915), *Poetae elegiaci et iambographi* (Leipzig).

Bergquist, B. (1990), 'Symptotic Space: A Functional Aspect of Greek Dining-Rooms', in O. Murray (ed.), *Symptotica: A Symposium on the Symposion* (Oxford), 135-148.

Billows, R. A. (2010), *Marathon* (New York).

Boardman, J. (ed.), (1988), *The Cambridge Ancient History: Plates to Volume IV* (Cambridge).

Boardman, J. (1990), 'Symposium Furniture', in O. Murray (ed.), *Symptotica: A Symposium on the Symposion* (Oxford), 122-131.

Boedeker, D. (2007), 'The View from Eleusis: Demeter in the Persian Wars', in E. Bridges, E. Hall and P. J. Rhodes (eds.), *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars* (Oxford), 65-82.

- Bowie, E. (1986), 'Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival', *JHS* 106: 13-35.
- Bowie, E. (1990), 'Miles Ludens? The Problem of Martial Exhortation in Early Greek Elegy', in O. Murray (ed.), *Symptotica: A Symposium on the Symposion* (Oxford), 221-229.
- Bowie, E. (2001), 'Ancestors of Historiography in Early Greek Elegiac and Iambic Poetry?', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford),
- Bowie, E. (2010), 'Historical Narrative in Archaic and Early Classical Greek Elegy', in D. Konstan and K. A. Raafaub (ed.), *Epic and History* (Oxford), 145-166.
- Bowra, C. M. (1930), *Tradition and Design in the Iliad* (Oxford).
- Bowra, C. M. (1933), 'Simonides on the Fallen of Thermopylae', *CPh* 28: 277-281.
- Bowra, C. M. (1960), *Early Greek Elegists* (Cambridge).
- Bowra, C. M. (1964), *Pindar* (Oxford).
- Braswell, B. K. (1998), *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine* (Berlin).
- Bremmer, J. A. (1990), 'Adolescents, Symposion, and Pederasty', in O. Murray (ed.), *Symptotica: A Symposium on the Symposion* (Oxford), 135-148.
- Brown, C. (1985), 'The "Correct" Understanding of Eu Diabas: A Reply', *AJPh* 106: 356-359.
- Brown, C. (1997), 'Iambos', in D. E. Gerber (ed.), *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* (Leiden), 11-88.
- Brunt, P. A. (1953), 'The Hellenic League against Persia', *Historia* 2: 135-163.
- Buchholz, E. (1864), *Anthologie aus den Lyrikern der Griechen* (Leipzig).
- Budermann, F. (2009), 'Introducing Greek Lyric', in F. Budermann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge), 1-18.

- Burgess, J. S. (1995), 'Achilles' Heel: The Death of Achilles in Ancient Myth', *ClAnt* 14: 217-244.
- Burgess, J. S. (2001), *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* (Baltimore).
- Burkert, W. (1976), 'Das hunderttorige Theben und die Datierung der Ilias', *WS* 89: 5-21.
- Burkert, W. (1985), 'Das Ende des Kroisos', in C. Schäublin (ed.), *Catalepton: Festschrift für Bernhard Wyss zum 80* (Basel), 4-15.
- Burkert, W. (1985), *Greek Religion* (Cambridge, MA).
- Burn, A. R. (1960), *The Lyric Age of Greece* (London).
- Burnett, A. P. (1985), *The Art of Bacchylides* (London).
- Bury, J. (1890), *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (Belfast).
- Cairns, D. L. (1993), *Aidōs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature* (Oxford).
- Cairns, D. L. (2010), *Bacchylides: Five Epinician Odes* (Cambridge).
- Calder, W. H. (1969), 'The Date of Euripides' *Erectheus*', *GRBS* 10: 147-156.
- Campbell, D. A. (1967), *Greek Lyric Poetry* (London).
- Campbell, D. A. (1983), *The Golden Lyre: The Themes of the Greek Lyric Poets* (London).
- Campbell, D. A. (1991), *Greek Lyric III* (Cambridge, MA).
- Campbell, D. A. (1992), *Greek Lyric IV* (Cambridge, MA).
- Carey, C. (2009), 'Genre, Occasion and Performance', in F. Budelmann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge), 21-38.

Carey, C. (2015), 'Stesichorus and the Epic Cycle', in P. Finglass and A. Kelley (eds.), *Stesichorus in Context* (Cambridge), 45-62.

Cartledge, P. (2001), *Spartan Reflections* (Berkeley).

Cartledge, P. (2002), *Sparta and Lakonia - A Regional History 1300-362 BC* (London).

Cartledge, P. (2004), *The Spartans* (New York).

Cazzato, V. (2014), 'Reclining with Callinus and Tyrtaeus', *CHS Research Bulletin* 2: 1-11.

Chaniotis, A. (1988), *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften* (Stuttgart).

Clauss, M. (1983), *Sparta: eine Einführung in seine Geschichte und Zivilisation* (Munich).

Clay, J. S. (1986), 'Archilochus and Gyges: An Interpretation of Fr. 23 West', *QUCC* 24: 7-17.

Clay, J. S. (1989), *The Politics of Olympus* (Princeton).

Clay, J. S. (2001), 'The New Simonides and Homer's Hemitheoi', in D. Boedeker and D. Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides* (Oxford), 182-184.

Clay, J. S. (2002), 'Dying is Hard to Do', *Colby Quarterly* 38: 7-16.

Clay, J. S. (2008), 'The Beginning and End of the Catalogue of Women and its Relation to Hesiod', in R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Cambridge), 25-34.

Cogan, M. and H. Tadmor (1977), 'Gyges and Assurbanipal: A Study in Literary Transmission', *Orientalia* 46: 65-86.

Collard, C. and M. Cropp (2008), *Euripides 7: Fragments* (Cambridge, MA).

Connor, W. R. (1984), *Thucydides* (Princeton).

Crowley, J. (2012), *The Psychology of the Athenian Hoplite* (Cambridge).

- Cunliffe, R. J. (1924), *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect* (London).
- Currie, B. (2005), *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford).
- Davies, M. (1988), 'Monody, Choral Lyric, and the Tyranny of the Hand-Book', *CQ* 38: 52-64.
- Davies, M. (1991), *Poetarum melicorum Graecorum fragmenta Vol. 1* (Oxford).
- Davies, M. (2015), *The Theban Epics* (Cambridge, MA).
- Davies, M. and P. Finglass (2014), *Stesichorus: The Poems* (Cambridge).
- Davison, J. A. (1968), *From Archilochus to Pindar* (London).
- Day, J. W. (2010), *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication* (Cambridge).
- de Jong, I. J. F. (2001), *A Narratological Commentary of the Odyssey* (Cambridge).
- Del Grande, C. (1956), *Filologia minore* (Milan).
- Denniston, J. D. (1954), *The Greek Particles 2nd ed.* (Oxford).
- Derderian, K. (2001), *Leaving Words to Remember: Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy* (Leiden).
- Detienne, M. (1996), *The Masters of Truth in Archaic Greece* (New York).
- Dietrich, B. C. (1965), *Death, Fate and the Gods* (London).
- Dodds, E. R. (1951), *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley).
- Dodds, E. R. (1959), *Plato Gorgias* (Oxford).
- Donlan, W. (1980), *The Aristocratic Ideal in Ancient Greece* (Lawrence, KA).

- Dover, K. (1964), 'The Poetry of Archilochus', *Fondation Hardt* 10: 181-222.
- Edmunds, L. (1975), *Chance and Intelligence in Thucydides* (Cambridge, MA).
- Edwards, M. W. (1987), *Homer: Poet of the Iliad* (Baltimore).
- Edwards, M. W. (1991), *The Iliad: A Commentary Volume V: Books 17-20* (Cambridge).
- Faraone, C. (2006), 'Stanzaic Structure and Responion in the Elegiac Poetry of Tyrtaeus', *Mnemosyne* 59: 19-52.
- Farnell, L. R. (1930), *Pindar: A Commentary* (Amsterdam).
- Faulkner, A. (2008), *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: Introduction, Text, and Commentary* (Oxford).
- Fearn, D. (2007), *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition* (Oxford).
- Fehling, D. (1989) *Herodotus and His Sources*, Translated by F. Cairns (Leeds).
- Fenik, B. (1968), *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad* (Wiesbaden).
- Fenik, B. (1978), 'Stylization and Variety: Four Monologues in the Iliad', in B. Fenik (ed.), *Homer: Tradition and Invention* (Leiden), 68-90.
- Finglass, P. (2007), *Sophocles Electra* (Cambridge).
- Finley, M. I. (1954), *The World of Odysseus* (New York).
- Finley, M. I. (1971), *The Use and Abuse of History* (New York).
- Finley, M. I. (1980), *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology* (London).
- Finnegan, R. (1977), *Oral Poetry: Its Nature, Significance and Social Context* (Cambridge).

- Flensted-Jensen, P. (ed.), (2000), *Further Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart).
- Flower, M. and J. Marincola (2002), *Herodotus: Histories Book IX* (Cambridge).
- Ford, A. (1992), *Homer: The Poetry of the Past* (Ithaca).
- Fornara, C. W. (1977), *Archaic Times to the End of the Peloponnesian War* (Baltimore).
- Fowler, R. L. (1987), *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies* (Toronto).
- Fränkel, H. (1951), *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (New York).
- Fränkel, H. (1975), *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, trans. by M. Hadas and J. Willis (Oxford).
- Fredal, J. (2006), *Rhetorical Action in Ancient Athens* (Carbondale).
- Friedrich, W.-H. (1956), *Verwundung und Tod in der Ilias: homerische Darstellungsweisen* (Göttingen).
- Gantz, T. (1993), *Early Greek Myth* (Baltimore).
- Garland, R. (1985), *The Greek Way of Death* (London).
- Gaskin, R. (1990), 'Do Homeric Heroes Make Real Decisions?', *CQ* 40: 1-15.
- Gehrke, H.-J. (1985), *Stasis* (Munich).
- Gerber, D. E. (1970), *Euterpe* (Amsterdam).
- Gerber, D. E. (1997), 'Elegy', in D. E. Gerber (ed.), *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* (Leiden), 89-132.
- Gerber, D. E. (1999), *Greek Elegiac Poetry* (Cambridge, MA).

- Gerber, D. E. (1999), *Greek Iambic Poetry* (Cambridge, MA).
- Gomme, A. W. (1945), *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides: Volume 1* (Oxford).
- Graziosi, B. (2002), *Inventing Homer* (Cambridge).
- Graziosi, B. and J. Haubold (2003), 'Homeric Masculinity: ΗΝΟΡΕΗ and ΑΓΗΝΟΡΕΗ ', *JHS* 123: 60-76.
- Graziosi, B. and J. Haubold (2005), *Homer: The Resonance of Epic* (London).
- Graziosi, B. and J. Haubold (2009), 'Greek Lyric and Early Greek Literary History', in F. Budelmann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge), 95-113.
- Graziosi, B. and J. Haubold (2010), *Homer: Iliad Book 6* (Cambridge).
- Greenhalgh, P. A. L. (1973), *Early Greek Warfare* (Cambridge).
- Griffin, J. (1980), *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford).
- Griffin, J. (2011), 'Death', in M. Finkelberg (ed.), *The Homer Encyclopedia* (Oxford), 1.
- Hainsworth, B. (1993), *The Iliad: A Commentary Volume III: Books 9-12* (Cambridge).
- Hall, E. (1989), *Inventing the Barbarian* (Oxford).
- Hall, J. M. (2002), *Hellenicity* (Chicago).
- Hanfmann, G. M. A. (1965), 'The Seventh Campaign at Sardis (1964)', *BASOR* 177: 2-37.
- Hanfmann, G. M. A. (1966), 'The Eighth Campaign at Sardis (1965)', *BASOR* 182: 2-54.
- Hanfmann, G. M. A. (1967), 'The Ninth Campaign at Sardis (1966)', *BASOR* 186: 17-52.

- Hansen, M. H. (2006), *Polis: An Introduction to the Ancient Greek City-State* (Oxford).
- Hansen, M. H. and K. A. Raaflaub (eds.), (1995), *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart).
- Hansen, M. H. and K. A. Raaflaub (eds.), (1996), *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart).
- Hanson, V. D. (1995), *The Other Greeks* (New York).
- Hanson, V. D. (2000), *The Western Way of War* (Berkeley).
- Harrison, T. (1997), 'Herodotus and the Ancient Greek Idea of Rape', in S. Deacy and K. F. Pierce (eds.), *Rape in Antiquity* (London),
- Harrison, T. (2000), *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Harrison, T. (2002), 'The Persian Invasions', in E. J. Bakker, I. J. F. De Jong and H. van Wees (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden), 551-578.
- Harvey, A. E. (1955), 'The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry', *CQ* 5: 157-175.
- Haubold, J. (2000), *Homer's People* (Cambridge).
- Haubold, J. (2008), 'Heracles in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women', in R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Cambridge), 85-98.
- Henderson, W. J. (1982), 'The Nature and Function of Solon's Poetry: Fr.3 Diehl, 4 West', *AClass* 25: 21-33.
- Herington, J. (1985), *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition* (Berkeley).
- Higbie, C. (2010), 'Epigrams on the Persian Wars: Monuments, Memory, and Politics', in M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic (eds.), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge), 183-201.

Hodkinson, S. (2000), *Property and Wealth in Classical Sparta* (Swansea).

Hodkinson, S. (2009), 'Was Sparta an Exceptional Polis?', in S. Hodkinson (ed.), *Sparta: Comparative Approaches* (Swansea), 417-472.

Hornblower, S. (1987), *Thucydides* (London).

Hornblower, S. (2001), 'Epic and Epiphanies', in D. Boedeker and D. Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides* (Oxford), 135-147.

How, W. W. and J. Wells (1912), *A Commentary on Herodotus Volume I: Books 1-4* (Oxford).

How, W. W. and J. Wells (1912), *A Commentary on Herodotus Volume II: Books 5-9* (Oxford).

Hubbard, T. K. (1992), 'Remaking Myth and Rewriting History: Cult Tradition in Pindar's Ninth Nemean', *HSPH* 94: 77-111.

Hunt, P. (1998), *Slaves, Warfare, and Ideology in the Greek Historians* (Cambridge).

Hutchinson, G. O. (2001), *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces* (Oxford).

Huxley, G. L. (1975), *Pindar's Vision of the Past* (Belfast).

Immerwahr, H. R. (1973), 'Pathology of Power and the Speeches in Thucydides', in P. A. Stadter (ed.), *The Speeches in Thucydides* (Charlotte), 16-31.

Irwin, E. (2005), *Solon and Early Greek Poetry* (Cambridge).

Irwin, E. (2006), 'The Transgressive Elegy of Solon?', in J. H. Blok and A. P. M. H. Lardinois (eds.), *Solon of Athens: New Historical and Philological Approaches* (Leiden), 36-78.

Isaac, B. (2004), *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (Princeton).

Ivantchik, A. I. (1993), *Les Cimmériens au Proche-Orient* (Saint-Paul Fribourg).

- Jacoby, F. (1918), 'Studien zu den älteren griechischen Elegikern', *Hermes* 53: 1-44.
- Jacoby, F. (1941), 'The Date of Archilochus', *CQ* 35: 97-109.
- Jacoby, F. (1945), 'Some Athenian Epigrams from the Persian Wars', *Hesperia* 14: 157-211.
- Jaeger, W. (1960), *Tyrtaios über die wahre arete* (Rome).
- Janko, R. (1982), *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* (Cambridge).
- Janko, R. (1992), *The Iliad: A Commentary Volume IV: Books 13-16* (Cambridge).
- Janko, R. (2012), 'πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν ἀείδειν: Relative Chronology and the Literary History of the Early Greek Epos', in Ø. Anderson and A. T. T. Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Cambridge), 20-43.
- Jørgensen, O. (1904), 'Das Auftreten der Goetter in den Buechern ι-μ der Odyssee', *Hermes* 39: 357-382.
- Jung, J. (1978), *Understanding Human Motivation* (New York).
- Karageorghis, V. (1967), *Excavations in the Necropolis of Salamis* (Nicosia).
- Karageorghis, V. (1969), *Salamis in Cyprus* (Norwich).
- Kearns, E. (1989), *The Heroes of Attica* (London).
- Kearns, E. (2004), 'The Gods in the Homeric Epics', in R. L. Fowler (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion To Homer* (Cambridge),
- Kelley, A. (2015), 'Stesichorus' Homer', in P. Finglass and A. Kelley (eds.), *Stesichorus in Context* (Cambridge), 21-44.
- Kennell, N. M. (2010), *Spartans: A New History* (Oxford).
- Kerkecker, A. (1996), 'Archilochus Fr. 139 West: Another ΠΙΨΑΣΙΙΙΣ- Poem?', *ZPE* 111: 26.

- Kirk, G. S. (1962), *The Songs of Homer* (Cambridge).
- Kirk, G. S. (1974), *The Nature of Greek Myths* (Harmondsworth).
- Kirk, G. S. (1985), *The Iliad: A Commentary Volume I: Books 1-4* (Cambridge).
- Kirk, G. S. (1990), *The Iliad: A Commentary Volume II: Books 5-8* (Cambridge).
- Krentz, P. (1985), 'Casualties in Hoplite Battles', *GRBS* 26: 13-20.
- Krentz, P. (2010), *The Battle of Marathon* (New Haven).
- Kurke, L. (1990), 'Pindar's Sixth Pythian and the Tradition of Advice Poetry', *TAPhA* 120: 85-107.
- Kurke, L. (1999), *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece* (Princeton).
- Kurtz, D. C. and J. Boardman (1971), *Greek Burial Customs* (Ithaca).
- Lacey, J. (2011), *The First Clash* (New York).
- Lavelle, B. M. (2002), 'The Apollodoran Date for Archilochus', *CPh* 97: 344-351.
- Lazenby, J. F. (1991), 'The Killing Zone', in V. D. Hanson (ed.), *Hoplites: The Classical Greek Battle Experience* (London), 87-109.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. (1981), *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (London).
- Legon, R. P. (1981), *Megara: The Political History of a Greek City-State to 336 B.C.* (Ithaca).
- Lesky, A. (1958), *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (Bern).
- Lesky, A. (1961), *Göttliche und menschliche Motivation im homerischen Epos* (Heidelberg).

Liebert, R. S. (2013), 'Pity and Disgust in Plato's *Republic*: The Case of Leontius', *CPh* 108: 179-201.

Lintott, A. (1982), *Violence, Civil Strife and Revolution in the Classical City 750-330 BC* (London).

Lloyd-Jones, H. (1994), 'Notes on the New Simonides', *ZPE* 101: 1-3.

Lobel, E. (1954), '2310. Archilochus, Iambic Trimeters', *P. Oxy* 22: 3-11.

Lorimer, H. L. (1950), *Homer and the Monuments* (London).

Luce, J. V. (1975), *Homer and the Heroic Age* (London).

Lulli, L. (2016), 'Elegy and Epic: A Complex Relationship', in L. A. Swift and C. Carey (eds.), *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches* (Oxford), 193-209.

Luraghi, N. (2002), 'Helotic Slavery Reconsidered', in A. Powell and S. Hodkinson (eds.), *Sparta: Beyond the Mirage* (London),

Luraghi, N. (2003), 'The Imaginary Conquest of the Helots', in N. Luraghi and S. E. Alcock (eds.), *Helots and their Masters in Laconia and Messenia* (Washington), 109-141.

MacDowell, D. M. (1986), *Spartan Law* (Edinburgh).

MacQueen, B. D. (1984), 'On The Correct Understanding of Eu Diabas', *AJPh* 105: 453-457.

Maehler, H. (2004), *Bacchylides: A Selection* (Cambridge).

McCartney, E. S. (1934), 'The Couch as a Unit of Measurement', *CPh* 29: 30-35.

Meiggs, R. and D. Lewis (1988), *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford).

Michelakis, P. (2002), *Achilles in Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge).

Mikalson, J. D. (2002), 'Religion in Herodotus', in E. J. Bakker, I. J. F. de Jong and H. van Wees (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden), 187-198.

Minton, W. M. (1960), 'Homer's Invocation of the Muses: Traditional Patterns', *TAPhA* 91: 292-309.

Mitchell, L. (2007), *Panhellenism and the Barbarian* (Swansea).

Mitchell, L. and P. J. Rhodes (eds.), (1997), *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece* (London).

Molyneux, J. H. (1992), *Simonides: A Historical Study* (Wauconda).

Morgan, C. (1991), 'Ethnicity and Early Greek States: Historical and Material Perspectives', *PCPhS* 37: 131-163.

Morris, I. (1989), *Burial and Ancient Society* (Cambridge).

Morrison, J. V. (1999), 'Homeric Darkness: Patterns and Manipulations of Death Scenes in the 'Iliad'', *Hermes* 127: 129-144.

Mosshammer, A. A. (1979), *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg).

Mülke, C. (2002), *Solons politische Elegien und Iamben* (Munich).

Murray, G. (1911), *The Rise of the Greek Epic* (Oxford).

Murray, O. (1991), 'War and the Symposium', in W. J. Slater (ed.), *Dining in a Classical Context* (Ann Arbor), 83-103.

Murray, O. (2009), 'The Culture of the Symposium', in K. A. Raaflaub and H. van Wees (eds.), *A Companion to Archaic Greece* (Oxford), 508-523.

Nagy, G. (1979), *The Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore).

- Nagy, G. (1990), *Pindar's Homer* (Baltimore).
- Nagy, G. (2002), *Plato's Rhapsody and Homer's Music* (Washington, D.C.).
- Neville, J. W. (1977), 'Herodotus on the Trojan War', *G&R* 24: 3-12.
- Nicolosi, A. (2016), 'Archilochus' Elegiac Fragments: Textual and Exegetical Notes', in L. A. Swift and C. Carey (eds.), *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches* (Oxford), 174-189.
- Nielsen, T. H. (ed.), (1997), *Yet More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart).
- Nielsen, T. H. (ed.), (2002), *Even More Studies on the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart).
- Nilsson, M. P. (1925), *A History of Greek Religion* (Oxford).
- Nisetich, F. J. (1980), *Pindar's Victory Songs* (Baltimore).
- Nobili, C. (2011), 'Threnodic Elegy in Sparta', *GRBS* 51: 26-48.
- Noussia-Fantuzzi, M. (2001), *Solone: Frammenti dell' Opera Poetica* (Milan).
- Obbink, D. (2001), 'The Genre of Plataea: Generic Unity in the New Simonides', in D. Boedeker and D. Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides* (Oxford), 65-85.
- Obbink, D. (2005), 'P. Oxy. 4708', *P. Oxy* 69: 18-42.
- Obbink, D. (2006), 'A New Archilochus Poem', *ZPE* 156: 1-9.
- Ober, J. (1985), *Fortress Attica* (Leiden).
- Oldfather, C. H. (1946), *Diodorus of Siculus Vol. 4* (Cambridge, MA).
- Olson, S. D. (2006), *Athenaeus Books I-III.106.e* (Cambridge, MA).
- Osborne, R. (1996), *Greece in the Making* (London).

Otto, W. F. (1947), *Die Götter Griechenlands: das Bild des Göttlichen im Spiegel des griechischen Geistes* (Frankfurt).

Page, D. (1955), *The Homeric Odyssey* (Oxford).

Page, D. (1955), *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford).

Page, D. (1959), *History and the Homeric Iliad* (Berkeley).

Page, D. (1961), 'Various Conjectures', *PCPhS* 187: 68-69.

Page, D. (1962), 'An Early Tragedy on the Fall of Croesus?', *PCPhS* 188: 47-49.

Page, D. (1981), *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge).

Page, D. L. (ed.), (1962), *Poetae melici Graeci* (Oxford).

Parker, R. (1991), 'The 'Hymn to Demeter' and the 'Homeric Hymns'', *G&R* 38: 1-17.

Parker, V. (1991), 'The Dates of the Messenian Wars', *Chiron* 21: 25-47.

Parry, A. (1956), 'The Language of Achilles', *TAPhA* 87: 1-7.

Parsons, P. J. (1992), '3965. Simonides, *Elegies*', *P. Oxy.* 59: 4-50.

Patterson, O. (1982), *Slavery and Social Death* (Cambridge, MA).

Pedley, J. G. (1972), *Ancient Literary Sources on Sardis* (Cambridge, MA).

Pelling, C. (2000), *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian* (London).

Pelling, C. (2006a), 'Homer and Herodotus', in M. Clarke, B. Currie and R. O. A. M. Lyne (eds.), *Epic Interactions* (Oxford), 75-104.

Pelling, C. (2006b), 'Speech and Narrative in the Histories', in C. Dewald and J. Marincola (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge), 103-121.

Pelling, C. (2006c), 'Educating Croesus: Talking and Learning in Herodotus' Lydian Logos', *Cl Ant* 25: 141-177.

Pelling, C. (2009), 'Thucydides' Speeches', in J. S. Rusten (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Thucydides* (Oxford), 176-187.

Pellizer, E. (1990), 'Outlines of Morphology of Symptotic Entertainment', in O. Murray (ed.), *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion* (Oxford),

Perlman, S. (1976), 'Panhellenism, the Polis and Imperialism', *Historia* 25: 1-30.

Petridou, G. (2016), *Divine Epiphany in Greek Literature and Culture* (Oxford).

Petrovic, A. (2007), *Kommentar zu den simonideischen Versinschriften* (Leiden).

Podlecki, A. (1968), 'Simonides: 480', *Historia* 17: 257-275.

Podlecki, A. (1973), 'Epigraphica Simonidea', *Epigraphica* 35: 24-39.

Popham, M., E. Touloupa, et al. (1982), 'The Hero of Lefkandi', *Antiquity* 56: 169-174.

Powell, J. E. (1960), *A Lexicon to Herodotus*² (Hildesheim).

Preger, T. (1891), *Inscriptiones Graecae metricae* (Leipzig).

Pritchett, W. K. (1960), *Marathon* (Berkeley).

Pritchett, W. K. (1971), *The Greek State at War Part I* (Berkeley).

Pritchett, W. K. (1972), *The Greek State at War Part II* (Berkeley).

Pritchett, W. K. (1979), *The Greek State at War Part III* (Berkeley).

Pritchett, W. K. (1985), *The Greek State at War Part IV* (Berkeley).

Pritchett, W. K. (1991), *The Greek State at War Part V* (Berkeley).

Rabinowitz, A. (2009), 'Drinking from the Same Cup: Sparta and Late Archaic Commensality', in S. Hodkinson (ed.), *Sparta: Comparative Approaches* (Swansea), 113-191.

Race, W. H. (1997), *Pindar I* (Cambridge, MA).

Rankin, H. D. (1974), 'Archilochus, frg. 6D (13 L/B; 8T)', *LF* 98: 193-198.

Rawlings, L. (2007), *The Ancient Greeks at War* (Manchester).

Ready, J. L. (2007), 'Toil and Trouble: Acquisition of Spoils in the Iliad', *TAPhA* 137: 3-43.

Redfield, J. M. (1975), *Nature and Culture in the Iliad* (Chicago).

Reitzenstein, R. (1893), *Epigramm und Skolion* (Giessen).

Rhodes, P. J. (1992), 'The Delian League to 449 B.C.', in D. M. Lewis, J. Boardman, J. K. Davies and M. Ostwald (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History Volume V* (Cambridge), 34-61.

Richardson, N. (1980), 'Literary Criticism in the Exegetical Scholia to the Iliad: A Sketch', *CQ* 30: 265-287.

Richardson, N. (1993), *The Iliad: A Commentary Volume VI: Books 21-24* (Cambridge).

Richardson, S. (1990), *The Homeric Narrator* (Nashville).

Robbins, E. (1997), 'Public Poetry', in D. E. Gerber (ed.), *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* (Leiden), 221-287.

Robertson, G. I. C. (1999), *Evaluative Language in Greek Lyric and Elegiac Poetry and Inscribed Epigram to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.E* (D.Phil Thesis, Oxford).

- Robertson, M. (1969), 'Geryoneis: Stesichorus and the Vase-Painters', *CQ* 19: 207-221.
- Rutherford, I. (2001), 'The New Simonides: Toward a Commentary', in D. Boedeker and D. Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides* (Oxford), 33-54.
- Rutherford, I. (2001), *Pindar's Paeans* (Oxford).
- Rutherford, R. B. (2005), *Classical Literature: A Concise History* (Oxford).
- Santosuosso, A. (1997), *Soldiers, Citizens, and the Symbols of War* (Boulder, CO).
- Schechner, R. (2003), *Performance Theory* (New York).
- Schein, S. L. (1987), 'Unity and Meaning in Pindar's Sixth Pythian Ode', *Metis* 2: 235-247.
- Schmitt-Pantel, P. S. (1997), *La cité au banquet* (Paris).
- Schneidewin, F. G. (1835), *Simonidis Cei carminum reliquiae* (Brunsvigae).
- Schwabl, H. (1954), 'Zur Selbständigkeit des Menschen bei Homer', *WS* 67: 46-64.
- Schwartz, A. (2009), *Reinstating the Hoplite* (Stuttgart).
- Scodel, R. (2008), *Epic Facework* (Swanswea).
- Scott, A. (2010), 'Laconian Black-Figure Pottery and Spartan Elite Consumption', in A. Powell and S. Hodkinson (eds.), *Sparta: The Body Politic* (Swansea), 165-181.
- Scott, J. A. (1921), 'Homer as the Poet of the Thebais', *CPh* 16: 20-26.
- Scullion, S. (2006), 'Herodotus and Greek Religion', in C. Dewald and J. Marincola (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge), 192-208.
- Scully, S. (1984), 'The Language of Achilles', *TAPhA* 114: 11-27.

Segal, C. (1971), 'Croesus on the Pyre: Herodotus and Bacchylides', *WS* 84: 39-51.

Segal, C. (1971), *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the Iliad* (Leiden).

Shapiro, H. A. (2006), 'The Wrath of Creon: Withholding Burial in Homer and Sophocles', *Helios* 33S: 119-134.

Shapiro, K. D. (1988), "Ὑμνων θεσσαυρός: Pindar's Sixth Pythian Ode and the Treasury of the Siphnians at Delphi", *MH* 45: 1-5.

Sharples, R. W. (1983), 'But Why Has My Spirit Spoken with Me Thus?': Homeric Decision-Making', *G&R* 30: 1-7.

Shaw, P. J. (1999), 'Olympiad Chronography and 'Early' Spartan History', in S. Hodkinson and A. Powell (eds.), *Sparta: New Perspectives* (London), 273-309.

Shay, J. (1994), *Achilles in Vietnam* (New York).

Shey, H. J. (1976), 'Tyrtaeus and the Art of Propaganda', *Arethusa* 9: 5-28.

Sidebottom, H. (2004), *Ancient Warfare: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford).

Sider, D. (2001), 'Fragments 1-22 W', in D. Boedeker and D. Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides* (Oxford), 13-29.

Simon, E. (2004), 'The Paestan Painter Astreas', in C. Marconi (ed.), *Greek Vases: Images, Contexts, and Controversies* (Leiden), 113-122.

Smyth, H. W. (1963), *Greek Melic Poets* (New York).

Snell, B. (1946), *Die Entdeckung des Geistes: Studien zur Entstehung des europäischen Denkens bei den Griechen* (Hamburg).

Snell, B. (1953), *The Discovery of the Mind* (Oxford).

Snell, B. (ed.), (1955), *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos Band 1* (Göttingen).

- Snell, B. (1961), *Poetry and Society* (Bloomington).
- Snell, B. (1969), *Tyrtaios und die Sprache des Epos* (Göttingen).
- Snell, B. (1973), 'Gyges und Kroisos als Tragödien-Figuren', *ZPE* 12: 197-205.
- Snell, B. (ed.), (1991), *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos Band 2* (Göttingen).
- Snell, B. and H. Maehler (eds.), (1970), *Bacchylidis Carmina cum fragmentis* (Leipzig).
- Snell, B. and H. Maehler (eds.), (1987), *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis* (Leipzig).
- Snodgrass, A. (1964), *Early Greek Armour and Weapons* (Edinburgh).
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1995), *'Reading' Greek Death to the End of the Classical Period* (Oxford).
- Spalinger, A. J. (1978), 'The Date of the Death of Gyges and Its Historical Implications', *JAOS* 98: 400-409.
- Stadter, P. A. (2006), 'Herodotus and the Cities of Mainland Greece', in C. Dewald and J. Marincola (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge), 242-256.
- Stehle, E. (1997), *Performace and Gender in Ancient Greece* (Princeton).
- Stehle, E. (2001), 'A Bard of the Iron Age and His Auxiliary Muse', in D. Boedeker and D. Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides* (Oxford), 106-119.
- Steiner, D. (1999), 'To Praise, Not to Bury: Simonides fr. 531P', *CQ* 49: 383-395.
- Stella, L. A. (1946), 'Studi simonidei', *RFIC* 1946: 1-24.
- Stengel, P. (1910), *Opferbräuche der Griechen* (Leipzig).
- Storey, I. C. (1989), 'The 'Blameless Shield' of Kleonymos', *RhM* 132: 247-261.

Strauss, B. S. (1986), *Athens after the Peloponnesian War* (Ithaca).

Swift, L. A. (2012), 'Archilochus the 'Anti-Hero'? Heroism, Flight and Values in Homer and the New Archilochus Fragment (P. Oxy LXIX 4708)', *JHS* 132: 139-155.

Taplin, O. (1992), *Homeric Soundings* (Oxford).

Tarditi, G. (1968), *Archilochus: Fragmenta* (Roma).

Tausend, K. (1993), 'Argos und der Tyrtaiospyrus P. Oxy. 3316', *Tyche* 8: 197-201.

Taylor, M. C. (1997), *Salamis and the Salaminioi* (Amsterdam).

Tedeschi, G. (1978), 'L'elegia parenetica-guerriera e il simposio: a proposito del fr. 1 W di Callino', *RSC* 26: 203-209.

Tedeschi, G. (1982), 'Solone e lo spazio della comunicazione elegiaca', *QUCC* 39: 33-46.

Thalmann, W. G. (1984), *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Baltimore).

Toynbee, A. (1969), *Some Problems of Greek History* (London).

Tsagarakis, O. (1977), *Self-Expression in Early Greek Lyric Elegiac and Iambic Poetry* (Wiesbaden).

van Groningen, B. A. (1958), *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque* (Amsterdam).

van Wees, H. (1988), 'Kings in Combat: Battles and Heroes in the Iliad', *CQ* 38: 1-24.

van Wees, H. (1994a), 'The Homeric Way of War: The 'Iliad' and the Hoplite Phalanx (I)', *G&R* 41: 1-18.

van Wees, H. (1994b), 'The Homeric Way of War: The 'Iliad' and the Hoplite Phalanx (II)', *G&R* 41: 131-155.

van Wees, H. (2003), 'Conquerors and Serfs', in N. Luraghi and S. E. Alcock (eds.), *Helots and their Masters in Laconia and Messenia* 33-80.

van Wees, H. (2004), *Greek Warfare: Myths and Realities* (London).

van Wees, H. (2007), 'War and Society', in P. A. G. Sabin, H. van Wees and M. Whitby (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare Volume 1* (Cambridge), 273-299.

Verdenius, W. J. (1969), 'Tyrtaeus 6-7 D: A Commentary', *Mnemosyne* 22: 337-355.

Verdenius, W. J. (1972), 'Callinus Fr. 1: A Commentary', *Mnemosyne* 25: 1-8.

Vermeule, E. (1979), *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Poetry and Art* (Berkeley).

Vernant, J.-P. (1982), 'La belle mort et le cadavre outragé', in G. Gnioli and J.-P. Vernant (eds.), *La mort, les morts dans la sociétés anciennes* (Cambridge), 45-76.

Versnel, H. S. (1987), 'What Did Ancient Man See When He Saw a God? Some Reflections on Greco-Roman Epiphany', in D. van der Plas (ed.), *Effigies Dei: Essays on the History of Religions* (Leiden), 42-55.

Versnel, H. S. (2011), *Coping with the Gods: Wayward Readings in Greek Theology* (Leiden).

Voigt, E.-M. (1971), *Sappho et Alcaeus* (Amsterdam).

Vox, O. (1984), *Solone autoritratto* (Padua).

Wade-Gery, H. T. (1933), 'Classical Epigrams and Epitaphs: A Study of the Kimonian Age', *JHS* 53: 71-104.

Walbank, F. W. (1951), 'The Problem of Greek Nationality', *Phoenix* 5: 41-60.

Walbank, F. W. (2000), 'Hellenes and Achaians: 'Greek Nationality' Revisited', in P. Flensted-Jensen (ed.), *Further Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart), 19-33.

- Walker, J. (2000), *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity* (Oxford).
- Weber, L. (1929), 'Zum athenischen Staatsfriedhof', *Philologus* 84: 35-50.
- Welwei, K.-W. (1983), *Die griechische Polis* (Stuttgart).
- Welwei, K.-W. (ed.), (2000), *Polis und Archē* (Stuttgart).
- West, M. L. (1971), 'Stesichorus', *CQ* 21: 302-314.
- West, M. L. (1974), *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin).
- West, M. L. (1975), 'Some Lyric Fragments Reconsidered', *CQ* 25: 307-309.
- West, M. L. (1978), *Hesiod: Works & Days* (Oxford).
- West, M. L. (1993), 'Simonides Redivivus', *ZPE* 98: 1-14.
- West, M. L. (1995), 'The Date of the *Iliad*', *MH* 52: 203-219.
- West, M. L. (1998), *Iambi et elegi Graeci* (Oxford).
- West, M. L. (2003), *Greek Epic Fragments* (Cambridge, MA).
- West, M. L. (2006), 'Archilochus and Telephus', *ZPE* 156: 11-17.
- West, M. L. (2007), *Indo-European Poetry and Myth* (Oxford).
- West, M. L. (2010), 'Rhapsodes at Festivals', *ZPE* 173: 1-13.
- West, M. L. (2011), 'Echoes of Hesiod and Elegy in the *Iliad*', in M. L. West (ed.), *Hellenica Volume I: Epic* (Oxford), 209-232.
- West, M. L. (2011), *The Making of the Iliad* (Oxford).

West, M. L. (2011), 'Rhapsodes', in M. Finkelberg (ed.), *The Homer Encyclopedia* (Oxford), 1-2.

West, M. L. (2013a), *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics* (Oxford).

West, M. L. (2013b), *Hellenica II* (Oxford).

West, S. (2003), 'Croesus' Second Reprieve and Other Tales of the Persian Court', *CQ N.S.* 53: 416-437.

Whitman, C. H. (1958), *Homer and the Heroic Tradition* (Cambridge, M.A.).

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. (1966), *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin).

Wilhelm, A. (1972), 'Simonideische Gedichte', in G. Pfohl (ed.), *Die griechische Elegie* (Darmstadt),

Willcock, M. M. (1999), *The Iliad: Books 13-24* (Bristol).

Williams, B. (1993), *Shame and Necessity* (Berkeley).

Wilson, J. R. (1979), 'KAI KE TIΣ ΩΔ' EPEEI: An Homeric Device in Greek Literature', *ICS* 4: 1-15.

Winterbottom, M. (1989), 'Speaking of the Gods', *G&R* 36: 33-41.

Yamagata, N. (1993), 'Young and Old in Homer and in "Heike Monogatari"', *G&R* 40: 1-10.

Yatromanolakis, D. (2009), 'Alcaeus and Sappho', in F. Budelmann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge), 204-226.

Zieliński, T. (1927), 'Abiecta non bene parmula...', in A. Gemelli (ed.), *Raccolta di scritti in onore di Felice Ramorino* (Milan), 603-610.