STANZAIC STRUCTURE AND RESPONSION IN THE ELEGIAC POETRY OF TYRTAEUS

BY

CHRISTOPHER A. FARAONE

ABSTRACT

This study seeks to revive, defend and further illustrate the suggestion of Weil (1862) (adopted by Rossi (1953/4)) that the longer fragments of Tyrtaeus (nos. 10-12 in West 1992) were composed in five-couplet units (Weil called them 'strophes' but I prefer 'stanzas') that either alternate between exhortation and meditation (e.g. 10.1-30 or 11.1-20) or contrast, for example, the defensive and offensive modes of hoplite warfare (11.21-38), men skilled and unskilled in warfare (12.1-20) or the differing honors that await those war-heroes who die on the battlefield and those who return home alive (12.21-30 and 35-44). These units, moreover, often display a kind of responsion (similar to that found in ancient Greek choral poetry), which allows the poet to draw attention to the stanzaic architecture of the poem and emphasize parallels and contrasts between the individual stanzas. Weil's theory, moreover, provides us with evidence of later re-performances of these poems, especially Tyrtaeus 12, where the transmitted text shows clear signs of a subsequent performance (perhaps in classical Athens as the Platonic paraphrases in the *Laws* suggest) by a poet who was ignorant or careless of the earlier archaic practice.

Although the three major fragments of Tyrtaeus (nos. 10-12) provide us with some of the longest continuous verse of any early elegiac poet,[1]) scholars have generally used them more for evidence about the history of Greek ideas, warfare, society, or politics,[2]) than

1) They are each between 30 and 45 lines long and add up to 111 verses. Solon 4 (39 lines) and 13 (76 lines) have a few more verses, but the former has three lacunas that disrupt the continuity of sense and poetic construction and the coherence of the latter has been questioned, especially the final fourteen lines. The earliest section of the *Theognidea* (19-72, the so-called 'Cyrnus Book') would be the only other comparable collection.

2) For the usefulness of the content of elegy in the study of early Greek ideas, see, e.g., Adkins 1972 and Fränkel 1975; of military history, e.g. Snodgrass 1964, 181-2 and Adkins 1985, 77-8; of political and social history, e.g. Murray 1993, 124-36 and 159-80; and most recently even the history of organized crime: van Wees 1999.

for insight into the poetic form of early elegy. Indeed, elegiac poetics, if it is commented upon at all, is usually assumed to be derivative of or dependent upon epic, on the grounds that the basic compositional unit of elegy (the couplet) and its Ionic dialect are closely related to the hexametrical verse and poetic dialect of epic.[3]) This tendency of modern scholars is, moreover, exaggerated in the case of Tyrtaeus, because of his perceived proximity to epic: chronologically he is one of the earliest elegiac poets, and the military content of his poems allows for much easier comparisons, especially with a war-poem like the *Iliad*.[4])

In recent years, however, scholars have begun to re-examine the formal features of elegy and to underscore some of the ways it differs from epic. Dover, for example, has stressed some important linguistic variations in early elegiac poetry: (i) it lacks many of the particles or paired particles that are characteristic of epic; and (ii) it seems to be unfamiliar with the *digamma*—an absence that is striking in the case of Tyrtaeus, who ignores it entirely even though his native Doric regularly acknowledges it.[5]) More recently there has been interesting work on the elegiac metrics and formulas,[6]) and Bowie (reviving the work of Reitzenstein) has led the way in refining and simplifying our understanding of the performance of early elegy, which now seems to have taken two basic forms, the singing of shorter elegiac compositions at the symposium and the recitation of much longer narrative poems in a more public setting.[7]) Elegy, moreover, has benefited from inquiries into the re-performance of archaic

3) Adkins (1985, 21-3) summarizes this approach.

4) Typical is Jaeger 1966, 107: "The poems of Tyrtaeus in language, meter and mood are Homeric through and through". See also Jacoby 1918, 19-31, Dawson 1966, 50-8, Snell 1969, or Adkins 1985, 87-92. This is, in fact, a very old tradition, going back at least as far as Horace's *Ars Poetica* 410, who identifies the two poets collectively as those 'whose verses made the souls of men sharp in battle'. See Verrall 1896, 269.

5) See Dover 1967, 183-4 and 190-4, who concludes that Tyrtaeus inherits elegy as an Ionic vernacular form, which draws to some degree on epic material and phraseology (p. 193).

6) See van Raalte 1988 for meter and for formulae Greenberg 1985, who concludes (p. 260): "elegy is not derived from the hexameter . . . It has its own rules."

7) For recent consensus see e.g. Herington 1985, 31-9, Bowie 1986, Bartol 1993, 51-7, and Gerber 1997. Slings (2000, 5-10) points out how this recent work is deeply indebted to Reitzenstein 1893, 45-85.

poetry in the classical period and the poetic traditions that evolve as a result. Herington, for example, has discussed the re-performance of Solon and Tyrtaeus in late-classical Athens, while Nagy has suggested that 'Theognis', like 'Homer' or the 'Anacreon' of the *Anacreonta*, represents a long poetic tradition or 'persona' in the guise of which the extant poems in the *Theognidea* were composed by a series of different Megarian symposiasts over a long period of time.[8]) Another important feature of these new approaches is the emphasis on the musicality of elegy, which was performed in archaic times, at least, to the tune of the *aulos*.[9]) All of these trends are, I suggest, part of a larger movement to re-imagine early elegy as a melic genre with its own unique poetics, rather than a stichic one that stands in the shadow of epic.

In the present environment the time is right to revive a much older theory about the poetics of early elegy, one that stresses a unique structuring device of the genre and offers important insights into the three longer fragments of Tyrtaeus. Henri Weil, around the time of the American Civil War, suggested that many of the early elegists organized their poems into 'strophes' that occasionally display a kind of responsion similar to that found in ancient Greek choral poetry.[10]) Although his contemporaries quickly and rightly rejected the main argument of his study—that Solon 13 was primarily composed of four-couplet 'strophes'—they paid scant attention to some of his other, passing observations.[11]) Weil's brief four-and-a-half page treatment of Tyrtaeus 10-12, in particular, was extremely insightful: he described (without argument) two persistent features of all three fragments: (i) they seem to be composed in regular five-couplet 'strophes'; and (ii) verbal repetitions highlight the 'strophic' structure of the poem and create a formal responsion, which, like metrical responsion in choral poetry, draws attention to

8) Herington 1985, 48-50 and Nagy 1985.

9) See, e.g., West 1974, 13-4 and Bowie 1986, 13-21. Gerber (1997, 96-8) provides a general overview.

10) Weil 1862. His ideas were rejected by subsequent editors and pointedly refuted by Clemm (1883). Linforth (1919, 242-4) provides a concise overview of the controversy.

11) Weil (1862) devotes the first eight pages of his thirteen-page study to Solon 13, a page and a half to Xenophanes 1 and 2 and the rest to Tyrtaeus.

important thematic parallels and contrasts. As we shall see below, both of these observations about the architecture of the longer Tyrtaean fragments can, in fact, be defended and augmented in ways that can tell us much about the unique poetic design of early elegy.

Weil's thesis about five-couplet 'strophes' in Tyrtaeus was (as far as I can tell) roundly ignored for nearly a century until Rossi, in a lengthy and detailed study confirmed that the first thirty lines of Tyrtaeus 10 were indeed composed as three clearly marked five-couplet units. In addition he noted that the first and last of these units were 'discursive' in nature, while the middle one exhorted the audience to action.[12]) Rossi, however, was concerned solely with proving the unity of Tyrtaeus 10 and made no effort to generalize his findings to the poet's two other longer fragments. In this essay, then, by building on Weil's identification of responding compositional units and on Rossi's insight into how the poet uses these units to organize his poems rhetorically, I aim to show that Tyrtaeus composed all three of the longer fragments by five-couplet stanzas[13]) that either alternate between exhortation and meditation (Tyrtaeus 10.1-30 and 11.1-20), or contrast, for example, the defensive and offensive modes of hoplite warfare (11.21-38), men skilled and unskilled in warfare (12.1-20) or the differing honors that await those war-heroes who die on the battlefield and those who return home alive (12.21-30 and 35-44). His use of triple responsions, moreover, reveals an even grander level of poetic organization beyond the binary relationships of successive stanzas and it suggests how the poet may have organized stanzas into larger groups of three or more.

Because of their formal stanzaic structure, the longer fragments of Tyrtaeus also provide us with helpful information about the complicated survival of archaic elegy, first by sympotic re-performance in the classical period and later in written form in various collections or anthologies, such as the *Theognidea* or the Hellenistic anthologies

12) Rossi 1953/4, 414-5: "i primi 30 versi si lasciano disporre in tre gruppi di 10 versi ciascuno; il gruppo centrale contiene una serie di esortazioni all'azione, i due laterali ciascuno una tesi e un'antitesi di carattere discorsivo".

13) To avoid the misleading connotation of triadic structure invoked by Weil's term 'strophe', I use 'stanza' throughout to refer to the uniformly sized units of metrically equivalent verses, just as scholars are accustomed to speak of the units of Greek monodic poetry as, e.g., a Sapphic stanza.

that Stobaeus used as a source for his own *florilegium*.[14]) In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries scholars, concerned as they were about the authenticity of parts or all of the Tyrtaean corpus, used a variety of criteria for ferreting out later additions or 'doublets', arguing or assuming that such phenomena were generated by scribes.[15]) In what follows, however, I hope to show how the underlying stanzaic structure of these fragments allows us to identify these later interpolations or alterations more easily, and in some cases to suggest—especially when these versions are paraphrased by Plato or quoted by Lycurgus—that some of these modifications may in fact date to the classical period and are the result of oral re-performance rather than scribal intervention.

Tyrtaeus 10 and 11.1-10: Alternating Stanzas[16])

The work of Weil and Rossi on the stanzaic and rhetorical structure of the first thirty lines of Tyrtaeus 10 can be illustrated and summarized as follows:[17])

(i) *Meditation* introduced by γάρ (uses third-person or singular subjects with indicative verbs only)

τεθνάμεναι γὰρ καλὸν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι πεσόντα
ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν περὶ ᾗ πατρίδι μαρνάμενον,
τὴν δ' αὐτοῦ προλιπόντα πόλιν καὶ πίονας ἀγροὺς
πτωχεύειν πάντων ἔστ' ἀνιηρότατον,
πλαζόμενον σὺν μητρὶ φίλῃ καὶ πατρὶ γέροντι
παισί τε σὺν μικροῖς κουριδίῃ τ' ἀλόχῳ.
ἐχθρὸς μὲν γὰρ τοῖσι μετέσσεται οὕς κεν ἵκηται,
χρησμοσύνῃ τ' εἴκων καὶ στυγερῇ πενίῃ,
αἰσχύνει τε γένος, κατὰ δ' ἀγλαὸν εἶδος ἐλέγχει,
πᾶσα δ' ἀτιμίη καὶ κακότης ἕπεται.

14) See e.g. Young 1964, 311-2 and Herington 1985, 48-50, for the re-performance of Tyrtaeus in Sparta and Athens, and Rösler 1980, 87-9 and Collins 2005, 110-34 for the re-performance of 'Theognis'. Allen (1993, 59-60) suggests that the version of Mimnermus 5 recorded at *Theognidea* 1020-2 represents a later re-performance of the Mimnerman poem. See West 1974, 40-61 and Bowie 1997 for the later scribal traditions of the *Theognidea*.

15) See e.g. Wilamowitz 1900, 97-8.

16) The first half of this section summarizes parts of Faraone 2005b.

17) Of the fragments of Greek elegy I use the text and translation of Gerber (1999) throughout, except where noted.

'It is a fine thing for a brave man to die when he has fallen among the front ranks while fighting for his homeland, and it is the most painful thing of all to leave one's city and rich fields for a beggar's life, wandering about with his dear mother and aged father, with small children and wedded wife. For giving way to need and hateful poverty, he will be treated with hostility by whomever he meets, he brings disgrace on his line, belies his splendid form, and every indignity and evil attend him.'

(ii) *Exhortation* (uses plural hortative subjunctives and plural imperatives only)

εἰ δ' οὕτως ἀνδρός τοι ἀλωμένου οὐδεμί' ὥρη
γίνεται οὔτ' αἰδὼς οὔτ' ὀπίσω γένεος,
θυμῷ γῆς πέρι τῆσδε μαχώμεθα καὶ περὶ παίδων
θνήσκωμεν ψυχέων μηκέτι φειδόμενοι.
ὦ νέοι, ἀλλὰ μάχεσθε παρ' ἀλλήλοισι μένοντες,
μηδὲ φυγῆς αἰσχρῆς ἄρχετε μηδὲ φόβου,
ἀλλὰ μέγαν ποιεῖσθε καὶ ἄλκιμον ἐν φρεσὶ θυμόν,
μηδὲ φιλοψυχεῖτ' ἀνδράσι μαρνάμενοι·
τοὺς δὲ παλαιοτέρους, ὧν οὐκέτι γούνατ' ἐλαφρά,
μὴ καταλείποντες φεύγετε, τοὺς γεραιούς.

'But if there is no regard or respect for a man who wanders thus, nor yet for his family after him, let us fight with spirit for this land and let us die for our children, no longer sparing our lives. Come, you young men, stand fast at one another's side and fight, and do not start shameful flight or panic, but make the spirit in your heart strong and valiant, and do not be in love of life when you are fighting men. Do not abandon and run away from elders, whose knees are no longer nimble, men revered.'

(iii) *Meditation* introduced by γάρ (uses third-person or singular subjects with indicative verbs only)

αἰσχρὸν 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 τά γ' ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νεμεσητὸν ἰδεῖν—
καὶ χρόα γυμνωθέντα· νέοισι δὲ πάντ' ἐπέοικεν,
ὅφρ' ἐρατῆς ἥβης ἀγλαὸν ἄνθος ἔχῃ,
ἀνδράσι μὲν θηητὸς ἰδεῖν, ἐρατὸς δὲ γυναιξὶ
ζωὸς ἐών, καλὸς δ' ἐν προμάχοισι πεσών.

'For this brings shame, when an older man lies fallen among the front ranks with the young behind him, his head already white and his beard grey, breathing out his valiant spirit in the dust, clutching in his hands his bloodied genitals—this is a shameful sight and brings indignation to behold—his body naked. But for the young everything is seemly, as long as he has the splendid prime of lovely youth; while alive, men marvel at the sight of him and women feel desire, and when he has fallen among the front ranks, he is fair.'

We can see how in this stretch of thirty lines there is a complete change in linguistic mode every five-couplets: in the first and third stanzas the poet describes and evaluates in strong moral terms the behavior of a generic soldier, whereas in the intervening stanza he uses this kind of evaluation to justify his exhortation to the best kind of behavior (paraphrase): "if this is so, then let us fight!" Note also that just as Tyrtaeus marks the first verse of the two meditative stanzas with a γάρ, he seems to use the particle τοι (line 11) at the start of his stanza of exhortation to signal the change in focus away from abstract or generic speculation to the reality of the audience at hand.[18])

Weil also noted how the last line of the third stanza, recalls both the first line of the same stanza as well as the very first line of the fragment:

τεθνάμεναι γὰρ καλὸν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι πεσόντα (1)
αἰσχρὸν γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο, μετὰ προμάχοισι πεσόντα (21)
ζωὸς ἐών, καλὸς δ' ἐν προμάχοισι πεσών. (30)

In the past scholars noted how the final iteration in line 30 "constitutes the conclusion of, if not quite an argument, the movement of Tyrtaeus' thought",[19]) but they have not fully appreciated how these repetitions highlight the structure of the fragment—they appear only at stanzaic boundaries—and how they emphasize important differences in their moral evaluation: it is a fine thing, Tyrtaeus asserts, when brave men (line 1) and young men (line 30) fall fighting in the front ranks, but a shameful thing when elderly warriors (21-2) fall in the same position, while the young hang back. Elegiac responsion

18) See Denniston 1954, 537-8 and Verdenius 1969 on the force of τοι here.
19) Adkins 1977, 96; see also Weil 1862, 11 and Rossi 1953/4, 415.

in Tyrtaeus 10, therefore, serves two important functions: similar line-endings articulate the persistent architecture of the fragment by calling attention to the beginnings and endings of individual stanzas, while at the same time the very different evaluative terms in the first half of the responding verses (καλόν . . . αἰσχρόν . . . καλός) highlight the great moral differences between these choices.

Is it the case, then, that the first thirty lines constitute a complete three-stanza elegiac poem? Perhaps, but there remains one difficulty. According to our primary source for this fragment—the manuscripts of the fourth-century Athenian orator Lycurgus (*Against Leocrates* 107)—Tyrtaeus 10 continues on with a single couplet:

> ἀλλά τις εὖ διαβὰς μενέτω ποσὶν ἀμφοτέροισι
> στηριχθεὶς ἐπὶ γῆς, χεῖλος ὀδοῦσι δακών.
>
> 'Come, let everyone stand fast, with legs set well apart and
> both feet fixed firmly on the ground, biting his lip with his teeth.'

These words would seem to introduce yet another round of exhortation, but some editors, beginning with Brunck, have traditionally dismissed them as a scribal intrusion or mistake, since an identical couplet also appears in Tyrtaeus 11.21-2, where it does, in fact, introduce a much longer unit of exhortation (see below). Others have suggested to the contrary, however, that this final couplet provides a fitting peroration for an elegiac poem of this sort, which ideally should end with a final call to battle.[20])

The stanzaic structures outlined above clearly isolate the final couplet in an awkward manner, and at first glance they might encourage us to follow Brunck's lead and excise lines 31-2. This final couplet is not, however, so easily dismissed since it has not one, but two perfectly good fourth-century Athenian witnesses: in addition to Lycurgus, Plato seems to have known a version of this fragment that included these two final verses.[21]) If, then, we accept the fact that in the fourth century both Lycurgus and Plato knew a version of the poem that contained verses 31-2, and the fact that

20) For a detailed survey of both sides of the argument, see Prato 1968, 100-1.

21) Verdenius (1969, 348) points out that Plato paraphrases fragment 10—albeit in condensed fashion—at *Laws* 630b: διαβάντες δ' εὖ καὶ μαχόμενοι ἐθέλοντες ἀποθνήσκειν (Tyrtaeus 10.31 εὖ διαβὰς; and 10.13-4 μαχώμεθα καὶ . . . / θνήσκωμεν ψυχέων μηκέτι φειδόμενοι).

the preceding lines were artfully composed as three stanzas that alternate between meditation and exhortation, I suggest that we can add a third hypothesis to the two debated by scholars: the thirty-two line fragment quoted in the manuscripts of Lycurgus is incomplete and Tyrtaeus 10 was, in fact, originally composed as a series of at least *four* five-couplet stanzas, articulated by the regular alternation of stanzas of equal length, but of different linguistic type and rhetorical purpose:[22])

[10 lines]	Meditation introduced by γάρ (indicative verbs; singular participles)
[10 lines]	Exhortation to battle introduced by τοι (hortative subjunctives/imperatives; plural participles)
[10 lines]	Meditation introduced by γάρ (indicative verbs; singular participles)
[10 lines?]	Exhortation to battle introduced by ἀλλά (τις + third person singular imperative; singular participles)

We should also entertain the possibility that the first thirty lines of this fragment may have been followed by the stanza that now stands near the end of the received version of Tyrtaeus 11 and begins with a verse that is identical to lines 31-2 (see below). In short, we may possess fragments of two different poems that shared the same stanza.

In the first twenty lines of Fragment 11, Tyrtaeus once again uses the boundary between five-couplet stanzas to shift from one linguistic mode to another. In this fragment he begins by directly addressing an audience of Spartan soldiers (1-10):[23])

ἀλλ', Ἡρακλῆος γὰρ ἀνικήτου γένος ἐστέ,
θαρσεῖτ'—οὔπω Ζεὺς αὐχένα λοξὸν ἔχει—
μηδ' ἀνδρῶν πληθὺν δειμαίνετε, μηδὲ φοβεῖσθε,
ἰθὺς δ' ἐς προμάχους ἀσπίδ' ἀνὴρ ἐχέτω,
ἐχθρὴν μὲν ψυχὴν θέμενος, θανάτου δὲ μελαίνας 5

22) Rossi 1953/4, 414-5 (quoted in note 12). In Faraone 2005b, I also point out that the piling up of vivid participles in the final couplet (31-2)—'with legs set well apart' (εὖ διαβάς), 'firmly fixed' (στηριχθείς), and 'biting' (δακών)—clearly continues Tyrtaeus' practice throughout this fragment of deploying densely and prominently placed participles, here (as in the second stanza) closely linked with an imperative verb.

23) Weil 1862, 11-2.

κῆρας <ὁμῶς> αὐγαῖς ἠελίοιο φίλας.
ἴστε γὰρ ὡς Ἄρεος πολυδακρύου ἔργ' ἀΐδηλα,
εὖ δ' ὀργὴν ἐδάητ' ἀργαλέου πολέμου,
καὶ μετὰ φευγόντων τε διωκόντων τ' ἐγένεσθε
ὦ νέοι, ἀμφοτέρων δ' ἐς κόρον ἠλάσατε. 10

'Come, take courage, for your stock is from unconquered Heracles—not yet does Zeus hold his neck aslant—and do not fear throngs of men or run in flight, but let a man hold his shield straight toward the front ranks, despising life and loving the black death-spirits no less than the rays of the sun. You know how destructive the deeds of woeful Ares are, you have learned well the nature of grim war, you have been with the pursuers and the pursued, you young men, and you have had more than your fill of both.'

This initial stanza is an exhortation introduced by ἀλλά and it falls into two parts: the first three couplets contain a stream of imperatives, nearly all of which encourage the appropriate martial spirit or mental attitude of the young men, rather than reiterate (as we saw in fragment 10) the details of hoplite warfare: 'be brave', Tyrtaeus implores in this stanza, 'hate life', 'love death' and so on. The reasons for this somewhat abstract approach are, however, given in the final two couplets, where the poet continues to use second-person plural verbs to acknowledge that these men already know all about the grim realities of war and have, in fact, experienced both victory and defeat many times.

Although only half of these first ten verses actually exhort—lines 1 and 7-10 use the indicative throughout—this stanza is nonetheless knit together by its consistent attention to the performative context: a series of eight second-person plural verbs which exclusively address or describe the audience of young Spartan men.[24]) The stanza is, moreover, framed with presumably specific references to their particular circumstances (paraphrase): 'Since (γάρ) you are of Herakles' race (1) . . . since (γάρ) you know (i.e. personally) the horrors of military rout from both perspectives (8-10)'. Note also how these framing γὰρ-clauses are formulated in similar fashion,

24) Of the eight verbs, two appear at the start of the line (lines 2 and 6), four at the end (1, 3, 9, and 10), one after the midline break (3) and one before it (8). The third-person imperative at the end of line 4 (ἐχέτω) should also be added to this list, since in martial elegy and elsewhere it is the functional equivalent of the second-person plural imperative.

using the names and lengthy epithets of Herakles and Ares, which both appear in the genitive and in each case straddle the mid-line caesura (1 Ἡρακλῆος γὰρ ἀνικήτου γένος ἐστέ and 7 ἴστε γὰρ ὡς Ἄρεος πολυδακρύου ἔργ' ἀΐδηλα).

But as in Tyrtaeus 10, the boundaries of this individual stanza are best illuminated by the stark contrast with the stanza that follows, where Tyrtaeus changes gears entirely and—in a meditation once again introduced by γάρ—he examines the moral choice between alternatives, just as he does in the two meditative stanzas in Tyrtaeus 10. The switch to third-person verbs shifts our attention away from the specific performance before a Spartan audience 'of the stock of unconquered Herakles' to a generic description of any man involved in any war (lines 11.11-20):[25])

οἳ μὲν γὰρ τολμῶσι παρ' ἀλλήλοισι μένοντες
ἔς τ' αὐτοσχεδίην καὶ προμάχους ἰέναι,
παυρότεροι θνήσκουσι, σαοῦσι δὲ λαὸν ὀπίσσω·
τρεσσάντων δ' ἀνδρῶν πᾶσ' ἀπόλωλ' ἀρετή.
οὐδεὶς ἄν ποτε ταῦτα λέγων ἀνύσειεν ἕκαστα,
ὅσσ', ἢν αἰσχρὰ πάθῃ, γίνεται ἀνδρὶ κακά·
ἀργαλέον γὰρ ὄπισθε μετάφρενόν ἐστι δαΐζειν
ἀνδρὸς φεύγοντος δηΐῳ ἐν πολέμῳ·
αἰσχρὸς δ' ἐστὶ νέκυς κατακείμενος ἐν κονίῃσι
νῶτον ὄπισθ' αἰχμῇ δουρὸς ἐληλάμενος.

'Those who dare to stand fast at one another's side and to advance towards the front ranks in hand-to-hand conflict, they die in fewer numbers and they keep safe the troops behind them; but when men run away, all esteem is lost. No one could sum up in words each and every evil that befalls a man, if he suffers disgrace. For to pierce a man behind the shoulder blades as he flees in deadly combat is gruesome, and a corpse lying in the dust, with the point of a spear driven through his back from behind, is shameful sight.'

In this second stanza Tyrtaeus sets up a formal contrast in the first three couplets between those (11 οἳ μέν) who stand fast in the battle line, and others (14 τρεσσάντων δ' ἀνδρῶν) who break the hoplite line and flee.[26]) The same comparison is then expressed differently in the final two couplets, which seem to reiterate again

25) Aside from Bowra (1969, 56-7) and Fowler (1987, 81), few scholars have discussed these lines as a discrete unit.

26) Fowler 1987, 82.

the contrast—described at the end of the previous section (lines 9-10)—between fleeing and pursuing a rout. This stanza also displays an effective bit of ring-composition: the spondaic genitive phrase that takes up the first half of the fourth pentameter (18 ἀνδρὸς φεύγοντος) echoes darkly the sense, words and prosody of the first half of the second pentameter (14 τρεσσάντων δ' ἀνδρῶν).

Tyrtaeus 11 ends with nine couplets that revert entirely to exhortation. I print them—for reasons that will quickly become clear—as a four-couplet unit followed by a five-couplet stanza (11.21-38):[27]

ἀλλά τις εὖ διαβὰς μενέτω ποσὶν ἀμφοτέροισι
στηριχθεὶς ἐπὶ γῆς, χεῖλος ὀδοῦσι δακών,
μηρούς τε κνήμας τε κάτω καὶ στέρνα καὶ ὤμους
ἀσπίδος εὐρείης γαστρὶ καλυψάμενος·
δεξιτερῇ δ' ἐν χειρὶ τινασσέτω ὄβριμον ἔγχος,
κινείτω δὲ λόφον δεινὸν ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς·
ἔρδων δ' ὄβριμα ἔργα διδασκέσθω πολεμίζειν,
μηδ' ἐκτὸς βελέων ἑστάτω ἀσπίδ' ἔχων,

ἀλλά τις ἐγγὺς ἰὼν αὐτοσχεδὸν ἔγχει μακρῷ
ἢ ξίφει οὐτάζων δήϊον ἄνδρ' ἐλέτω,
καὶ πόδα πὰρ ποδὶ θεὶς καὶ ἐπ' ἀσπίδος ἀσπίδ' ἐρείσας,
ἐν δὲ λόφον τε λόφῳ καὶ κυνέην κυνέῃ
καὶ στέρνον στέρνῳ πεπλημένος ἀνδρὶ μαχέσθω,
ἢ ξίφεος κώπην ἢ δόρυ μακρὸν ἑλών.
ὑμεῖς δ', ὦ γυμνῆτες, ὑπ' ἀσπίδος ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος
πτώσσοντες μεγάλοις βάλλετε χερμαδίοις
δούρασί τε ξεστοῖσιν ἀκοντίζοντες ἐς αὐτούς,
τοῖσι πανόπλοισιν πλησίον ἱστάμενοι.

'Come, let everyone stand fast, with legs set well apart and both feet fixed firmly on the ground, biting his lip with his teeth, and covering thighs, shins below, chest, and shoulders with the belly of his broad shield; in his right hand let him brandish a mighty spear and let him shake the plumed crest above his head in a fearsome manner. By doing mighty deeds let him learn how to fight and let him not stand—he has a shield—outside the range of missiles,

but coming to close quarters let him strike the enemy, hitting him with long spear or sword; and also, with foot placed alongside foot and shield pressed against shield, let everyone draw near, crest to crest, helmet to helmet, and breast to breast, and fight against a man,

27) Fowler (1987, 81) suggests that the ἀλλά in line 21 starts a new section.

> seizing the hilt of his sword or his long spear. You light-armed men, as you crouch beneath a shield on either side, let fly with huge rocks and hurl your smooth javelins at them, standing close to those in full armor.'

Most editors do not recognize the break that I have marked in the text after line 28, and they suggest instead that the poem continues on into line 29 with a mere pause for a comma.[28]) At the turn of the century, however, some scholars intuited textual problems here. Wilamowitz, for example, believed that these two sections (21-8 and 29-38) were doublets of one another, since both mention a complete set of battle gear: shield, helmet, crest, and spear.[29]) This is a potentially attractive suggestion, as it might explain why the fragment does not continue the pattern of stanza-by-stanza alternation between exhortation and meditation that we saw in Tyrtaeus 10 and the first half of Tyrtaeus 11.

If, however, we set aside for the moment the problem that the first unit (lines 21-8) contains only four couplets, we can, I think, identify a different kind of stanzaic structure in the final part of this poem by noting a pattern of interaction between these two units. I limit myself to two observations, one about content and another about responsion. Although throughout lines 21-38 Tyrtaeus exhorts young men to battle, there is one important difference in the content of his advice. In the first four couplets (21-8) he advises them how to withstand an attack from the enemy, for example: by standing firm 'with legs set well apart and both feet fixed firmly on the ground', by covering themselves with their shields and by shaking their spears and helmet-crests vigorously. He emphasizes his concern for a strong defensive posture, moreover, by exhorting them twice to use their shield (24 and 28) and by beginning and ending the section with pleas regarding the static position of each soldier: 'let him wait' (μενέτω) and 'let him not stand (μὴ ἑστάτω) beyond the range of missiles'. In the second section of this exhortation (29-38), however, Tyrtaeus advises the warriors to approach the enemy aggressively and kill them by stabbing with their spears and swords and by pressing their full bodies against them. Likewise he urges the light-armed troops in the last two couplets to take the offensive

28) E.g., Gerber 1970, Adkins 1972, and West 1992, all *ad loc.*
29) Wilamowitz 1900, 114.

and hurl their stones and javelins. Now there is no waiting or covering up with the shield: the poet strenuously urges all to move forward and attack.

One might object, of course, that in the general mayhem of battle these differences between defensive and offensive warfare are too subtle, but Tyrtaeus has, in fact, prepared us for this distinction by an intricate series of responsions between the opening couplets of the last three stanzas:

οἳ μὲν γὰρ τολμῶσι παρ' ἀλλήλοισι μένοντες
ἔς τ' αὐτοσχεδίην καὶ προμάχους ἰέναι, (11-2)

ἀλλά τις εὖ διαβὰς μενέτω ποσὶν ἀμφοτέροισι
στηριχθεὶς ἐπὶ γῆς, χείλος ὀδοῦσι δακών, (21-2)

ἀλλά τις ἐγγὺς ἰὼν αὐτοσχεδὸν ἔγχεϊ μακρῶι
ἢ ξίφει οὐτάζων δήϊον ἄνδρ' ἐλέτω, (29-30)

In the first couplet of the second stanza (the meditative one), Tyrtaeus sums up the behavior of the hypothetically best fighters as (11-2) 'those who dare to stand fast (μένοντες) at one another's side and to advance towards the front ranks in hand-to-hand conflict (ἔς τ' αὐτοσχεδίην καὶ προμάχους ἰέναι)'. This distinction between waiting and plunging into battle may puzzle the modern reader, but it summarizes neatly the difficult discipline of hoplite battle: the individual soldier must never break the line in which he is stationed, because the shield in his left hand protects not only his own body but also that of the soldier to his left. Tyrtaeus, therefore, in his compact description at the start of the second stanza (11.11-2) urges two different but equally important modes of fighting: at times the soldier must wait bravely in proper formation and withstand the assaults against the line, but at other times he must move forward and attack aggressively.

In the second half of Tyrtaeus 11, the poet clearly recalls these dual strategies of hoplite fighting, because he devotes one stanza of the ensuing exhortation to defensive techniques and another to offensive ones. He underscores the logical organization of these last two stanzas by placing in parallel construction the words μενέτω (11.21) and the phrase ἰὼν αὐτοσχεδόν (11.29) prominently in the first lines of each, so that they echo (as shown above) the vocabulary

used at the start of the second stanza (11.11-2). The close verbal responsion at the beginning of these same couplets (ἀλλά τις εὖ and ἀλλά τις ἐγ-) further emphasizes this division of military labor into two different but equally important categories, for (as we have seen) elegiac responsion performs two basic tasks: the repetition of words or phrases in the same line-position helps to mark the beginnings and ends of stanzas, but it also allows the poet to highlight differences by placing contrasting words in other positions in responding verses. Thus we noticed earlier in Fragment 10 that Tyrtaeus places the adjectives καλόν and αἰσχρόν in the first half of closely responding hexameters to emphasize the deep contrast between them:

τεθνάμεναι γὰρ καλὸν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι πεσόντα (1)
αἰσχρὸν γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο, μετὰ προμάχοισι πεσόντα (21)

He does the same thing here in Fragment 11 by placing the two different military actions, 'waiting' (21 μενέτω) and 'charging into hand to hand combat' (29 ἰὼν αὐτοσχεδὸν) at midline directly after the nearly identical opening words of the hexameters.

I suggest, therefore, that in the first half of Tyrtaeus 11 the poet uses the same architecture of alternating stanzas that he deploys in Tyrtaeus 10, but that when he swings into his third stanza (this one of exhortation), he decides, for the reasons discussed above, to double the length of it to reflect his dual perspectives on hoplite combat:

[10 lines] Exhortation to the right attitude (introduced by ἀλλά)
(second-person plural verbs focused on immediate performance)
[10 lines] Meditation introduced by γάρ
(third-person indicative verbs).
[8 lines] Exhortation to defense (introduced by ἀλλά)
(τις + third-person singular imperative)
[10 lines] Exhortation to attack (introduced by ἀλλά)
(τις + third-person singular imperative and then second-person plural imperative)

If I am correct in my analysis here, the third stanza (transmitted in the manuscripts of Stobaeus as four couplets) is missing a couplet, not an uncommon hazard for the survival of elegiac poems composed, like Tyrtaeus 11, in end-stopped couplets—especially in a section of the poem that provides a repetitive catalogue of wartime

actions.[30]) There was, in fact, a similar loss in Solon 27, the well known catalogue of the ten stages of human life, where thanks to a regular pattern of composition, that allots a single couplet to each stage of life, we can see that the couplet that originally discussed the eighth stage has gone missing.[31]) But clearly the most powerful argument for assuming a lacuna here rests on the fact that Tyrtaeus uses the five-couplet stanza (as we have seen) throughout Fragments 10 and 11, and (as we shall see presently) in Fragment 12 as well. In the specific case of Tyrtaeus 11, moreover, where we can trace the wider architecture of the fragment with its careful responsion at the start of the final three stanzas, we are in an even better position to see where an individual couplet has indeed dropped out—much as we can identify a lacunose passage of choral lyric by noting where the metrical responsion between strophe and antistrophe breaks down in the transmitted text.

Tyrtaeus 12

The longest of the poet's extant fragments displays the persistent use of the five-couplet stanza in a manner quite similar to Tyrtaeus 10 and 11, but it differs significantly from them since it is—with the exception of the very last couplet—devoted entirely to reflection.[32]) In this way it seems more like a fragment of Solon or the *Theognidea* than of early martial elegy, and in fact until fairly

30) Adkins (1985, 78) notes that this fragment has an exceedingly high percentage of end-stopped lines (27 out of 38).

31) In Faraone 2005a, I suggest that the missing couplet in Solon 27 is probably the result of a scribal mistake and subsequent repair. If I am correct, the couplet was lost and the loss repaired fairly early, since the transmitted text appears in the manuscripts of both Philo of Alexandria (*de opif. mundi* 104) and Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* 6.144.3), suggesting that the latest this error could have occurred (in this apparently 'Alexandrian' recension) is before the date of the former. Another good example of complete couplet missing from a poem without any trace is in a five-couplet epigram of Leonidas of Tarentum, the last three couplets of which are all end-stopped and begin with the same verb in the same form: the middle couplet has completely disappeared in the Palatine recension, a fact that would have been lost on us entirely were the full text not preserved in the Planudian. For discussion, see Gow & Page 1965, Leonidas no. 11 *ad loc.*

32) There is little agreement among scholars on the organization of this poem. Jaeger (1966, 122-5), for example, divides it into equal halves of twenty-two lines each, and then subdivides the second half into two sections: 23-34 and 35-42, and

recently some scholars doubted its authorship and argued that all or parts of it were composed in the classical age. Although the idea that Tyrtaeus composed an entirely meditative elegy is unproblematic, let me suggest that this old controversy about the authenticity of some sections of Tyrtaeus 12, with its emphasis on stylistic inconsistencies, may have been generated by evidence in the fragment for two or more distinct moments of performance, and that the stanzaic structure of the fragment may provide us with a more satisfying method for locating and discussing such inconsistencies.

Weil noted that the first twenty lines of Tyrtaeus 12 were composed as two stanzas distinguished primarily on the grounds of theme and formal structure:[33])

οὔτ' ἄν μνησαίμην οὔτ' ἐν λόγῳ ἄνδρα τιθείμην
οὔτε ποδῶν ἀρετῆς οὔτε παλαιμοσύνης,
οὐδ' εἰ Κυκλώπων μὲν ἔχοι μέγεθός τε βίην τε,
νικῴη δὲ θέων Θρηΐκιον Βορέην,
οὐδ' εἰ Τιθωνοῖο φυὴν χαριέστερος εἴη,
πλουτοίη δὲ Μίδεω καὶ Κινύρεω μάλιον,
οὐδ' εἰ Ταντταλίδεω Πέλοπος βασιλεύτερος εἴη,
γλῶσσαν δ' Ἀδρήστου μειλιχόγηρυν ἔχοι,
οὐδ' εἰ πᾶσαν ἔχοι δόξαν πλὴν θούριδος ἀλκῆς·
οὐ γὰρ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γίνεται ἐν πολέμῳ

εἰ μὴ τετλαίη μὲν ὁρῶν φόνον αἱματόεντα,
καὶ δηίων ὀρέγοιτ' ἐγγύθεν ἱστάμενος.

Fowler (1987, 82) sees four sections: 1-12, 13-20, 21-34 and 35-44 (the last is a five-couplet stanza that I discuss below).

33) The fragment is preserved in Stobaeus in two sections: verses 1-14 appear in 4.10.1 and the remainder in 4.10.6. Plato quotes and/or paraphrases lines 1-12 in two places: *Laws* 629a-630b and 660e-661a. See Gerber 1970, 75 for bibliography and the current agreement on its authenticity. As is my usual diagnostic practice, I print these lines as two elegiac stanzas, recognizing that they are syntactically joined at the hip, so to speak, a point that I discuss below. As far as I can tell, Weil alone (1862, 9-10) saw the systematic use of the five-folder in this long fragment, although other scholars seem to have intuited part of it. Jaeger and Fowler, for example, although they both divide the poem up quite differently (see note 32 above), nonetheless discuss lines 1-10 as if they were a discrete unit: Jaeger (1966, 119) observes that lines 1-10 are "a series of anaphoras whose irresistible crescendo does not come until line 10"—he is followed here by Tarditi (1982, 62)—and Fowler (1987, 82) notes to "the strict symmetry of the first ten lines". Both Race (1982, 57-9) and Adkins (1985, 74) refer to these lines as a complete *Priamel* (for which see note 36 below).

ἥδ' ἀρετή, τόδ' ἄεθλον ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἄριστον
κάλλιστόν τε φέρειν γίνεται ἀνδρὶ νέῳ.
ξυνὸν δ' ἐσθλὸν τοῦτο πόληί τε παντί τε δήμῳ, 15
ὅστις ἀνὴρ διαβὰς ἐν προμάχοισι μένῃ
νωλεμέως, αἰσχρῆς δὲ φυγῆς ἐπὶ πάγχυ λάθηται,
ψυχὴν καὶ θυμὸν τλήμονα παρθέμενος,
θαρσύνῃ δ' ἔπεσιν τὸν πλησίον ἄνδρα παρεστώς·
οὗτος ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γίνεται ἐν πολέμῳ. 20

'I would not mention or take account of a man for his prowess in running or in wrestling, not even if he had the size and strength of the Cyclopes and outstripped Thracian Boreas in the race, nor if he were more handsome than Tithonus in form and richer than Midas and Cinyras, nor if he were more kingly then Pelops, son of Tantalus, and had a tongue that spoke as winningly as Adrastus, nor if he had a reputation for everything save furious valor. For no man is good in war

unless he can endure the sight of bloody slaughter and, standing close, can lunge at the enemy. This is excellence, this the best human prize and the fairest for a young man to win. This is a common benefit for the state and all the people, whenever a man with firm stance among the front ranks never ceases to hold his ground, is utterly unmindful of shameful flight, risking his life and displaying a steadfast spirit, and standing by the man next to him speaks encouragingly. This man is good in war.'

These stanzas contrast two different kinds of men: the first describes those who are greatly gifted, but fall short of the excellence necessary for war, whereas the second focuses—with the exception of the first couplet (a problem to which I will return)—on the best kind of fighting man. The contrast between these two sections, moreover, is signaled clearly (as Weil noted) by the kind of formal responsion we have seen before in Tyrtaeus 10 and 11:[34])

οὐ γὰρ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γίνεται ἐν πολέμῳ (10)
οὗτος ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γίνεται ἐν πολέμῳ. (20)

As in the other cases of elegiac responsion discussed above, the nearly identical ending of the two verses serves well to highlight

34) Weil 1862, 9. Other commentators also note the parallel language: Jaeger (1966, 125-6), for instance, calls it "a beautiful archaic feature" and Fowler (1987, 82) remarks on the "verbal echo". Fränkel (1975, 339 n. 8) notes that the first twenty lines of the poem are divided into two equal parts, which end in similar declarations at lines 10 and 20.

their differences: they refer to diametrically opposed kinds of men.

In addition to their diverse content, the poet creates a striking formal contrast between these two stanzas by composing the first as an independently coherent catalogue of skills or attributes that the poet dismisses. I have shown elsewhere how a number of elegiac catalogues, including this one at the start of Tyrtaeus 12, are composed as discrete five-couplet stanzas.[35]) The final couplet here, moreover, turns this catalogue into a *Priamel*, when it sums up the list of skills by rejecting them all as insufficient: 'not even if he had a reputation for everything except furious valor'.[36]) What we expect in the final pentameter of this stanzaic catalogue, then, is some kind of explanation for this opinion, e.g.: 'for *such* a man is not good in war', an expectation that is doubly warranted by the wording of the responding final pentameter of the next stanza (20), which as we saw makes the opposite claim: 'For *this* (οὗτος) man is good in war'.

But in fact the fragment, as it has been transmitted, provides no summary statement at all and the syntax of line 10 spills over into the conditional apodosis at the start of the second stanza. This necessary overrun of the stanzaic boundary is, in fact, unparalleled among the longer fragments of Tyrtaeus, but Weil found nothing amiss here, because he modeled his idea of the repeating five-couplet unit on the strophe of choral poetry, where sentences sometimes do bridge strophaic boundaries.[37]) Additional oddities in the second stanza suggest, however, that the boundary between these two stanzas has been obscured by a later re-performance. The content of the first couplet (lines 11-2: endurance of the sight of slaughter and lunging at the enemy), for instance, fits well at the start of a stanza devoted to a description of the man who is good at war, but only if we ignore the negation μή in line 11. And in the standard interpretation of the stanza (as illustrated by the text and translation of Gerber given above) the apparent contrast between the deictic

35) Faraone 2005a.

36) Race (1982, 57-9) discusses lines 1-9, which he treats as a discrete unit. He calls it "one of the best known *priamels*".

37) Weil (1868, 10), who points out that Pindar often runs a grammatical construction over the junction between two strophes, citing as an example the overrun boundary between the first strophe and antistrophe of *Pythian* 4.

pronouns in line 13 (ἥδ' . . . τόδ') and the following τοῦτο in line 15 is ignored. The μέν in line 11, moreover, is usually explained as an early example of μέν . . . καί (12), but such a construction is uncertain in Homer and extremely rare in early elegy.[38])

If, however, we ignore the particle μή in line 11 and the period that modern editors place at the end of line 12, a neat chiastic structure emerges for the second stanza, one that contrasts (with the δέ in line 15 answering the μέν in line 11) the personal glory that a young man gains for himself as an individual (ἀνδρὶ νέῳ at the end of line 14) with the common good that he provides to the entire state (πόληΐ τε παντί τε δήμῳ at the end of line 15). I suggest that the syntax of this hypothetical and presumably earlier version of the second stanza was probably organized as follows:

Protasis A: 'If, on the one hand (μέν), he can endure the sight (of slaughter) and standing close lunge at the enemy . . .'

Apodosis A: 'then, this is bravery, this is a prize (ἥδ' ἀρετή, τόδ' ἄεθλον) . . . best for a young man'

Apodosis B: 'but on the other hand (δέ), this thing (τοῦτο, i.e. another thing, to be contrasted with the preceding ἥδ' . . . τόδ') is a common good (ξυνὸν ἐσθλὸν) for both the city and the people,'

Protasis B: 'if someone stands fast among the fore-fighters (ὅστις ἀνὴρ διαβὰς ἐν προμάχοισι μένῃ).'

In this stanza Tyrtaeus uses precisely the same contrast (between offensive and defensive warfare) and some of the same language that we saw earlier in the balanced responsion of the pair of stanzas at the end of Fragment 11.[39]) In this reconstructed version of Tyrtaeus 12.11-20, then, the poet contrasts the personal glory of charging—presumably single-handed—into battle against the enemy, with the communal virtue of holding one's place in the traditional

38) See *ad loc.* Campbell 1967, Prato 1968 and Gerber 1970, who all cite Denniston 1954, 374. But Denniston himself is diffident about the early use.

39) Thus the type of fighter who provides a common good for the city is described in Tyrtaeus 12 as: ὅστις ἀνὴρ διαβὰς ἐν προμάχοισι μένηι (recall how Tyrtaeus 11.21 introduces the defensive fighter: ἀλλά τις εὖ διαβὰς μενέτω), and the one who gains glory for himself as δηίων ὀρέγοιτ' ἐγγύθεν ἱστάμενος (recall the offensive fighter in Tyrtaeus 11.29: ἀλλά τις ἐγγὺς ἰὼν αὐτοσχεδὸν . . . δήϊον ἄνδρ' ἐλέτω).

hoplite formation and thereby preserving the collective safety of the army and the city.

In fact we see a similar, albeit longer, construction (μὲν . . . τ' . . . καὶ . . ., then δ') at the start of another Tyrtaean stanza that was discussed earlier (11.11-4):

οἳ μὲν γὰρ τολμῶσι παρ' ἀλλήλοισι μένοντες
ἔς τ' αὐτοσχεδίην καὶ προμάχους ἰέναι,
παυρότεροι θνήσκουσι, σαοῦσι δὲ λαὸν ὀπίσσω·
τρεσσάντων δ' ἀνδρῶν πᾶσ' ἀπόλωλ' ἀρετή.

'Those who dare to stand fast at one another's side and to advance towards the front ranks in hand-to-hand conflict, they die in fewer numbers and they keep safe the troops behind them; but when men run away, all esteem is lost.'

Here, as at the start of the hypothetical version of the second stanza of Tyrtaeus 12, 'those who dare' (οἳ μὲν γὰρ τολμῶσι, cf. 12.11 εἰ . . . τετλαίη μὲν) are contrasted with the frightened men in line 14 (τρεσσάντων δ' ἀνδρῶν). There are two other places in the longer fragments of Tyrtaeus, where the poet achieves a similar result, by beginning a new stanza with the apodosis of a condition that fills a single couplet, that is: precisely the construction I propose above for the second stanza of Tyrtaeus 12:

εἰ δ' οὕτως ἀνδρός τοι ἀλωμένου οὐδεμί' ὤρη
γίνεται οὔτ' αἰδὼς οὔτ' ὀπίσω γένεος,
θυμῷ γῆς πέρι τῆσδε μαχώμεθα . . . (Tyrtaeus 10.11-3)

'But if there is no regard or respect for a man who wanders thus, nor yet for his family after him, let us fight . . .'

εἰ δὲ φύγῃ μὲν κῆρα τανηλεγέος θανάτοιο,
νικήσας δ' αἰχμῆς ἀγλαὸν εὖχος ἕλῃ,
πάντες μιν τιμῶσιν . . . (Tyrtaeus 12.35-7)

'And if he escapes the doom of death that brings long sorrow and by his victory makes good his spear's splendid boast, he is honored by all . . .'

I shall discuss the second example below in more detail, but for the present I stress that within the rather small Tyrtaean corpus we find two good parallels for a stanza beginning with a conditional apodosis—framed in a single couplet—followed by its main sentence. But there are none for a sentence overrunning a stanzaic boundary, as the received text of Tyrtaeus 12 demands after line 10.

This putative earlier design of Tyrtaeus 12 makes much better sense of the μέν . . . δέ construction and the contrasting pronouns (ἥδ' . . . τόδ' followed by τοῦτο), and also takes into account the change in construction and content between the two stanzas. The first stanza is a complete *Priamel* dense with mythological allusions to the Cyclopes, Boreas, Tithonus, and others. It is artfully constructed and were it stripped of its final couplet, we might not even have known that it was part of a martial elegy. This stanza seems, in short, to be a set-piece of sorts and one wonders whether another poet in a different context might just as easily have ended it with a reference to love-making or wine-drinking instead of warfare.[40] The second stanza of Tyrtaeus 12, on the other hand, seems to be typical of martial elegy, with its detailed references to hoplite warfare and the Tyrtaean distinction between a soldier's offensive and defensive capabilities. I should stress here, however, that since Plato clearly knew a version of the fragment that overran the stanzaic boundary between lines 10 and 11,[41] this putative earlier version of the second stanza was probably not altered by scribal lapse, but rather by the creativity of some re-performer, who perhaps recalled the gist of the first two stanzas from memory (he preserves, for example, the responsion at lines 10 and 20), but without full appreciation of the stanzaic boundary after line 10.

In the second half of Tyrtaeus 12 we encounter more evidence for this kind of re-performance. The poet continues to describe the excellent fighter and the fame that accrues to him, but this praise is structured in three distinct sections, the first and last of which seem to be complete five-couplet stanzas (12. 21-44):[42]

40) Faraone 2005a, where I also suggest that Solon 13.33-42 also preserves traces of an earlier stanziac 'set-piece'—a five-couplet *Priamel* praising the vocation of the elegiac poet—but that the poet retools it as an introduction to a much longer catalogue (lines 43-62).

41) Plato twice paraphrases or quotes lines from Tyrtaeus 12.1-10 and then offers a close paraphrase of lines 11-2 as Stobaeus reports them, once in the plural οἳ μὴ τολμήσωσιν μὲν ὀρᾶν φόνον αἱματόεντα, / καὶ δηίων ὀρέγοιντ' ἐγγύθεν ἱστάμενοι (*Laws* 629e) and once in the singular δηίων τοιοῦτος ὢν [= the just man] ὀρέγοιτ' ἐγγύθεν ἱστάμενος, ἄδικος δὲ ὢν μήτε τολμῷ ὀρῶν φόνον αἱματόεντα (*Laws* 660e).

42) Although they both divide up the fragment differently, Jaeger (1966, 22-3) does agree that line 35 begins a new section and Fowler (1987, 82) thinks that the second half of the poem begins at line 21.

αἶψα δὲ δυσμενέων ἀνδρῶν ἔτρεψε φάλαγγας
τρηχείας· σπουδῇ δ' ἔσχεθε κῦμα μάχης,
αὐτὸς δ' ἐν προμάχοισι πεσὼν φίλον ὤλεσε θυμόν,
ἄστυ τε καὶ λαοὺς καὶ πατέρ' εὐκλεΐσας,
πολλὰ διὰ στέρνοιο καὶ ἀσπίδος ὁμφαλοέσσης
καὶ διὰ θώρηκος πρόσθεν ἐληλάμενος.
τὸν δ' ὀλοφύρονται μὲν ὁμῶς νέοι ἠδὲ 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.

εἰ δὲ φύγῃ μὲν κῆρα τανηλεγέος θανάτοιο,
νικήσας δ' αἰχμῆς ἀγλαὸν εὖχος ἕλῃ,
πάντες μιν τιμῶσιν, ὁμῶς νέοι ἠδὲ παλαιοί,
πολλὰ δὲ τερπνὰ παθὼν ἔρχεται εἰς Ἀΐδην,
γηράσκων δ' ἀστοῖσι μεταπρέπει, οὐδέ τις αὐτὸν
βλάπτειν οὔτ' αἰδοῦς οὔτε δίκης ἐθέλει,
πάντες δ' ἐν θώκοισιν ὁμῶς νέοι οἵ τε κατ' αὐτὸν
εἴκουσ' ἐκ χώρης οἵ τε παλαιότεροι.
ταύτης νῦν τις ἀνὴρ ἀρετῆς εἰς ἄκρον ἱκέσθαι
πειράσθω θυμῷ μὴ μεθιεὶς πολέμου.

'He quickly routs the bristling ranks of the enemy and by his zeal stems the tide of battle. And if he falls among the front ranks, pierced many times through his breast and bossed shield and corselet from the front, he loses his own dear life but brings glory to his city, to his people, and to his father. Young and old alike mourn him, all the city is distressed by the painful loss, and his tomb and children are pointed out among the people, and his children's children and his line after them.

Never do his name and good fame perish, but even though he is beneath the earth he is immortal, whoever it is that furious Ares slays as he displays his prowess by standing fast and fighting for land and children.

And if he escapes the doom of death that brings long sorrow and by his victory makes good his spear's splendid boast, he is honored by all, young and old alike, and many are the joys he experiences before he goes to Hades, and in his old age he stands out among the townsmen; no one seeks to deprive him of respect and his just rights, but all men at the benches yield their place to him, the young, those of

his own age, and the elders. Let everyone strive now with all his heart to reach the pinnacle of this excellence, with no slackening in war.'

If for the moment we ignore the four-line section in the middle, we find a contrastive pair of five-couplet stanzas, which describe the honors of the heroic warrior in two different scenarios.[43]) In the first, the citizens mourn the soldier who falls fighting bravely on the field of battle (21-6) and honors his children and tomb (27-30), whereas in the second, they honor and give deference even until his old age (37-42) to the brave warrior who returns home alive (35-6). Tyrtaeus then ends the second stanza with the only exhortation in the entire fragment (43-4): 'let each man try to reach the pinnacle of *this* excellence'.

Tyrtaeus enhances the parallel themes of these final two stanzas of the fragment by the elaborate triple responsion of a similar half-hexameter, which describes the actions of 'the young and old alike', a common Greek periphrasis for 'everyone':

τὸν δ' ὀλοφύρονται μὲν ὁμῶς νέοι ἠδὲ γέροντες (27)
πάντες μιν τιμῶσιν, ὁμῶς νέοι ἠδὲ παλαιοί (37)
πάντες δ' ἐν θώκοισιν ὁμῶς νέοι οἵ τε κατ' αὐτὸν
εἴκουσ' ἐκ χώρης οἵ τε παλαιότεροι. (41-2)

Some scholars have suggested that these repetitions were signs of inferior poetry or scribal doublets,[44]) but their regular placement in the stanzaic architecture of the fragment suggests otherwise. Indeed, the third repetition at line 41 performs a similar kind of double duty that we saw in the repetition of the phrase ἐνὶ προμάχοισι πεσόντα in lines 1, 21, and 30 of Tyrtaeus 10: the repetition creates an echoing ring-composition between the second and fourth couplets of its own stanza (37 πάντες μιν τιμῶσιν, ὁμῶς νέοι) and fourth (41 πάντες δ' ἐν θώκοισιν ὁμῶς νέοι), but in the wider context

43) So Fowler (1987, 82).

44) Van Groningen (1966, 354-6), for example, believed that the transmitted text preserves and conflates two different versions of the end of the poem. Jaeger (1966, 126-7) on the other hand defends the triple repetition with a parallel from *Iliad* 24, and Bowra (1969, 51-2), explains them as signs of Tyrtaeus' variations on a "standard formula".

of the paired stanzas, it also looks back to line 27, with which it stands in perfect parallel: each is the fourth hexameter in its own stanza. This triple responsion, moreover, throws into relief the significant words in the first half of each verse, which directly contrast the different treatment of the heroic soldiers: they mourn those who die in battle (27 τὸν δ' ὀλοφύρονται), whereas they honor and yield place to those who survive (37 πάντες μιν τιμῶσιν and 41 ἐν θώκοισιν . . . εἴκουσ'). Tyrtaeus avoids, however, the potential monotony of this third and final repetition by extending it into the pentameter and expanding the reference to three groups instead of two.[45])

But how, then, do we explain this quatrain (31-4) that I have isolated above between these two stanzas?

οὐδέ ποτε κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀπόλλυται οὐδ' ὄνομ' αὐτοῦ,
ἀλλ' ὑπὸ γῆς περ ἐὼν γίνεται ἀθάνατος,
ὄντιν' ἀριστεύοντα μένοντά τε μαρνάμενόν τε
γῆς πέρι καὶ παίδων θοῦρος Ἄρης ὀλέσῃ.

Since the verses can be removed from Tyrtaeus 12 without the slightest disruption to the syntax or logic of the surrounding verses, Weil simply dismissed them without argument as an interpolation from another poem,[46]) but in the later, turn-of-the-century controversy over the authenticity of Tyrtaeus 12, these lines were, in fact, suspected by some as a later fifth-century insertion into an original archaic composition.[47]) Indeed, the high-flown rhetoric ('neither is his fame or name destroyed . . .') and the idea of *post mortem* deification ('he is immortal') are typical of the epinician odes of Pindar,[48]) per-

45) There are, moreover, some broader parallels in the fragment between the second and fourth stanzas: both begin with similarly shaped conditional protases bounded by a single couplet (12.11 εἰ . . . τετλαίη μὲν . . . καί and 12.35 εἰ δὲ φύγῃ μὲν . . . δέ) and end with a single couplet that summarizes the content of the stanza with a prominently placed pronominal adjective: οὗτος ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γίνεται ἐν πολέμῳ (12.20) and ταύτης νῦν τις ἀνὴρ ἀρετῆς εἰς ἄκρον ἱκέσθαι / πειράσθω (12.43).

46) Weil 1862, 10.

47) See, e.g., Jacoby 1918, 35-6

48) See Faraone 2002 for Pindar's use of the idea that κλέος can conquer death. Day (1989, 24 n. 61) notes how Pindar sometimes 'quotes' epigrams or epitaphic *topoi* in his epinician odes.

haps, or the epitaphs of Simonides,[49]) but otherwise unparalleled in the extant military elegy of the archaic period, which instead promises personal honor and civic or familial safety as a reward for bravery. The language here is, in fact, that of eulogy, not elegy, and close parallels with the vocabulary[50]) and form[51]) of sixth- and fifth-century epitaphs suggest that these two couplets reflect the work of a poet of the classical period, who at the end of the third stanza added a fairly standard form of elegiac epitaph while re-performing this presumably well-known poem of Tyrtaeus.

But regardless of the source of the extraneous quatrain at lines 31-4, my argument rests ultimately on the analysis of the wider stanzaic architecture of Tyrtaeus 12, which in its earlier manifestation could not have included the quatrain, any more than it could have included the present version of lines 10-2, which (as we have observed) overruns the boundary between the first and second stanzas and in so doing unsettles what I perceive as the original syntax and balanced composition of the second stanza. The structure of this earlier version of the fragment can be summarized as follows:

[10 lines]	*Priamel* and disparagement of various non-fighters
[10 lines]	Description and praise of the ideal fighter that begins with a conditional apodosis: 'but if he dares to . . .'

49) Simonides *Epigram* no. 9 (Page), for example, ends 'by dying they did not die, since Arete by granting them *kudos*, leads them up from Hades'. The word ἀθάνατος in elegy always refers to the gods, except in this passage; see the index in West 1992 s.v. Loraux (1986, 113-5) shows that the immortality-theme in Athenian epitaphs is a *topos* of the post-Persian War period. Jaeger (1966, 135-6), in fact, concedes the similarities with the epigram for the Athenians who died at Potidaea, but claims that the fifth-century poet is imitating Tyrtaeus.

50) A sixth-century Corcyrean tombstone (*IG* 9.1.868), for instance, describes how 'Ares destroyed this man as he fought . . . and as he displayed the highest valor' (τόνδε ὤλεσεν Ἄρης / βαρνάμενον . . . / ἀριστεύοντα); see Friedländer 1948, 29-30 for bibliography and discussion. An Acarnanian epitaph of similar date speaks of Procleidas, who died 'while fighting for his own land' (περὶ τᾶς αὐτῶ γᾶς . . . βαρνάμενος)—Acarnania: *IG* 9.1.521 = Friedlander 1948, no. 64. Note that βαρνάμενος is the Doric form of μαρνάμενος found in Tyrtaeus, who composes in the Ionic dialect.

51) Note the use of the 'laudatory relative clause' at Tyrtaeus 12.33-4, which Day (1989, 18-9) describes as a "distinct linguistic feature of encomium". As an example, he cites and discusses in detail another Athenian epitaph for a man named Croesus 'whom rushing Ares once destroyed among the fore-fighters' (ὃν ποτ' ἐνὶ προμάχοις ὤλεσε θοῦρος Ἄρης), which can be compared with Tyrtaeus' ὄντιν' ἀριστεύοντα . . . / . . . θοῦρος Ἄρης ὀλέσῃ. For text and discussion, see Friedländer 1948, no. 82.

[10 lines]	Description of honors given to dead warrior
[4 lines]	Generic epitaph (a later addition)
[10 lines]	Description of honors given to living warrior, that begins with a conditional apodosis: 'but if he escapes to . . .'

Whereas Tyrtaeus 10 and 11.1-20 were composed in paired stanzas that alternate between exhortation and meditation (the latter usually introduced by γάρ), this fragment is entirely meditative (save the final couplet) and is carefully structured as a pair of diptychs, the first of which contrasts two kinds of fighters (the bad and the good) and the second two kinds of glory that the city awards its warriors.

There are signs, moreover, that Tyrtaeus designed these four stanzas as a single poem or as a coherent section of a larger poem. The final couplet, for example, contains the only exhortation in the fragment but seems to sum up its entire content (44):

> ταύτης νῦν τις ἀνὴρ ἀρετῆς εἰς ἄκρον ἱκέσθαι
> πειράσθω θυμῷ μὴ μεθιεὶς πολέμου.
>
> 'Let everyone strive now with all his heart to reach the pinnacle of this excellence, with no slackening in war.'

The mention of 'this excellence' (ταύτης . . . ἀρετῆς) clearly recalls the very first line of the fragment, where the poet lists the types of ἀρεταί he rejects: 'I would not mention or take account of a man for his ἀρετή in running or in wrestling, not even if . . .'. The emphatic placement of the pronominal adjective ταύτης at the very start of this couplet, moreover, echoes the very last verse (a pentameter) of the first contrastive pair (12.10): οὗτος ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γίνεται ἐν πολέμῳ ('*This* man is good in war'). At the end of each of the contrastive pairs, therefore, the poet singles out 'this man' as a model warrior and the pinnacle of 'this excellence' as goal for every man in his audience. Note also that the final word in three of the four stanzas in this fragment is πολέμος, 'war' (10 γίνεται ἐν πολέμῳ, 20 γίνεται ἐν πολέμῳ, and 44 μὴ μεθιεὶς πολέμου), a word that is significantly placed within the structure of the fragment, since it appears at regular intervals at the end of these three stanzas, but nowhere else in the fragment.

The persistent stanzaic architecture of Tyrtaeus 12 allows us to see, moreover, that the 'mistakes' in the extant version of the fragment all occur at the internal boundary that divides the two stanzas of

a contrastive pair: (i) between the first and second stanzas (lines 10-2), where the final sentence of the first stanza overruns the boundary; and (ii) at the juncture of the second pair of stanzas, where a generic epitaph seems to intrude. I suggest that neither deviation is a case of scribal misbehavior or error, but rather evidence for at least two performances of Tyrtaeus 12, an earlier one by a presumably archaic poet who sang a poem of at least four stanzas arranged in contrastive pairs, and a later performance by another talented poet, who seems less aware of or interested in the constraints of stanzaic composition. Because the first 'error' also shows up twice in the Platonic paraphrase of the poem and because the second seems so strongly influenced by the high-flown rhetoric of late fifth-century epitaphs, it does not seem imprudent to date these modifications to a re-performance of the late-fifth or fourth century. This second poet is not to be despised. He places the extraneous quatrain neatly at the boundary between two stanzas and appropriately after the mention of the warrior's tomb, cleverly producing a generic epitaph by placing the genitive pronoun αὐτοῦ in the first line, where one usually finds the name of the deceased in the genitive case.

Conclusion

It would seem, then, that Weil's thesis about the persistent use of responding five-couplet stanzas in the longer fragments of Tyrtaeus has far more merit than his contemporaries recognized. Tyrtaeus indeed uses these stanzas either to articulate an alternating pattern of advice and rumination, or to organize even longer stretches of verse into pairs of contrastive stanzas that explore important differences, for example, between defensive and offensive warfare or the ways that a city honors its war heroes. And whether he uses alternating stanzas of a different linguistic type or contrastive pairs of the same type, Tyrtaeus seems to differentiate each new stanza from the one that precedes it. But the poet also uses responsion to call attention to poetic structures that go beyond the simple binary relationship of two successive stanzas. This is most obvious in the cases of triple responsion. In Tyrtaeus 10, for instance, he repeats the phrase 'fallen among the fore-fighters' to call attention to thematic

parallels between the meditative first and third stanzas of the fragment, and with the final repetition he provides a satisfying sense of closure to the entire three-stanza sequence. The architecture of Tyrtaeus 12 with its two interlocked sets of responsions is perhaps even more complicated: the thrice echoing phrase 'the young and old alike' in the final two stanzas and the repetition of the word 'war' at the very end of the first, second and last stanzas, serve to knit all four stanzas together. Tyrtaeus 11, however, seems to present the most sophisticated case, in that its logic is based not on the paratactic organization evident in the other two fragments, but rather on a kind of hypotactic arrangement, in which the poet first separates hoplite warfare into its two constitutive parts, the defensive 'waiting' and the offensive 'going into hand-to-hand battle', and then explores this dichotomy in two additional stanzas, which exhort the audience first to the defensive arts of war and then to the offensive. In short: an earlier, presumably archaic poet composed all three of these longer fragments in responding five-couplet stanzas, and the sometimes complicated fashion in which he organizes and articulates these stanzas provides us with important vantage points, from which we can appreciate a unique kind of elegiac poetics—one that should, I hope, encourage modern scholars to bring elegy out of the shadow of epic and to examine it more closely as a formally rich and structurally complicated genre in its own right.

We can, moreover, use these archaic structures and their attendant responsions as guidelines for isolating later additions or discovering omissions in the received text. Weil blamed scribes for two of the three obvious violations of stanzaic composition discussed above: the lost couplet in the third stanza of Tyrtaeus 11 and the 'interpolation' of the quatrain in between the final two stanzas of Tyrtaeus 12. His assumption of scribal misbehavior is, of course, typical of his times, and indeed nearly a half-century later, in the aftermath of the powerful arguments of Schwartz and Verrall that *all* of the fragments in Tyrtaean corpus were forgeries, Wilamowitz and others made similar suggestions to provide a middle ground between the factions: they hypothesized the existence of a fourth-century BCE Athenian manuscript of the Tyrtaean corpus, which contained—like the Hesiodic corpus and the *Theognidea*—authentic

archaic poems side-by-side with later interpolations and doublets.[52] The assumption pursued here of a chronologically composite text has much in common with that of Weil and Wilamowitz, but only if we dismiss their anxiety about 'authenticity' and replace their notion of an Ur-text (fixed in classical times) with more current notions of a fluid tradition of archaic oral performance and then classical re-performance.[53]

Throughout this study I have suggested that the received texts of the longer fragments of Tyrtaeus, when examined in the light of their stanzaic structures, sometimes reveal different moments of performance, a hypothetically more orderly and therefore presumably earlier version that closely follows the 'rules' for stanzaic construction, and the less orderly and presumably later version that now survives in the textual tradition. At the heart of this formulation lies the assumption that knowledge or at least appreciation of an originally archaic feature of elegy (the responding stanza) weakens over time. There seems to be, however, a range of causes for the degeneration of this archaic original. The apparent loss of a couplet from the third stanza of Tyrtaeus 11, for example, could have been the result of either a scribal or an oral mistake, and because we do not have any pre-Hellenistic evidence for the text (it is preserved only in Stobaeus) it is natural to suspect (as Weil did) that the anthologist himself or the scribes that copied his manuscripts are to blame.[54] In the case of the quatrain inserted between the final two stanzas of Tyrtaeus 12, I suggested above that we also have unambiguous evidence for a later change, since it stands completely outside of the stanzaic architecture of the fragment. And because it is redolent of the language of fifth-century eulogy, I have followed the suggestion of Jacoby and others that the addition was made during the classical period, although probably not as the result of scribal tampering

52) Wilamowitz 1900, 96-118, esp. 96-7 and Jacoby 1918.

53) Indeed, current notions of the creation of both the *Hesiodea* and the *Theognidea*—i.e. the comparanda of Wilamowitz and Jacoby—have in recent years argued that oral performance over time rather than scribal intervention is the source of the composite nature of these texts, see, e.g., Nagy 1990, 36-47 for the former and Nagy 1985 for the latter.

54) For recent and growing concern about the accuracy of excerption and attribution in Stobaeus' *Florilegium*, see Campbell 1984 and Sider 2001, 272-80.

with the fifth-century manuscript of Tyrtaeus' poems, but rather during a fifth-century re-performance of the fragment.

Most interesting, perhaps, is the case of the overrun stanza in the first half of Tyrtaeus 12, where the poet ignores the stanzaic boundary but nonetheless retains the contrastive content of the two stanzas and their responding final pentameters ('. . . he is not good/good in war'). Guided by stanzaic structure, I have reconstructed a hypothetically earlier version, which preserves the stanzaic boundary, expresses more succinctly the contrast between the two stanzas, and makes better sense of the overall syntax of the second stanza. Here, because there seems to be a more rigidly stanzaic and perhaps poetically superior version, and because later in the same fragment we see another clear case of diachronic change with the inserted quatrain, I have suggested that this hypothetical version is an earlier one and that the surviving text stems from a later re-performance of the poem. Unlike the case of the inserted quatrain, however, this later re-performance shows enough deference to stanzaic structure and responsion to merit, perhaps, a more subtle designation as a 'multiform of a performance tradition'.[55] In this case it would be impossible to say which of the two performances reflected in the received text is the 'original', 'prior', or even 'superior' composition. It is easy enough to imagine that both versions may have co-existed in the repertoire of Tyrtaean performance in the classical period and even earlier, but because we do not have (among the ten complete stanzas described and analyzed in this essay) another example of an overrun stanzaic boundary in the Tyrtaean corpus, we cannot tell if the more creative and innovative of the elegiac poets were themselves beginning to push at the boundaries of the stanzas even in the archaic period. (Weil noted that Pindar sometimes overruns strophic boundaries in his choral poetry, but in fact one can see this practice much earlier in the archaic poets of Lesbos, who overrun stanzaic boundaries, e.g., Sappho Fr. 1.) But regardless of whether we explain this tension between the surviving text and its underlying stanzaic structure as evidence for mounting carelessness of these structural components or as an imaginative and creative tension with an implied traditional model, Weil's theory of responding elegiac stanzas

55) Nagy 1996, 151-2.

adds enormously to our knowledge of both the synchronic form of early Greek elegy and the diachronic variations it encompassed.[56])

University of Chicago, Department of Classics
1010 East 59th Street
CHICAGO, IL 60637
cf12@midway.uchicago.edu

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adkins, A.W.H. 1972. *Moral Values and Political Behavior in Ancient Greece* (New York)
——. 1977. *Callinus 1 and Tyrtaeus 10 as Poetry*, HSCP 81, 59-97
——. 1985. *Poetic Craft in the Early Greek Elegists* (Chicago)
Allen, A. 1993. *The Fragments of Mimnermus* (Stuttgart)
Bartol, K. 1993. *Greek Elegy and Iambus: Studies in Literary Sources* (Poznán)
Bowie, E.L. 1986. *Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival*, JHS 106, 13-35
——. 1997. *The Theognidea: A Step Towards a Collection of Fragments?*, in: Most, G.W. (ed.) *Collecting Fragments/Fragmente sammeln* (Göttingen), 53-66
Bowra, C.M. 1969. *Early Greek Elegists* (New York)
Campbell, D. 1967. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry* (Bristol)
——. 1984. *Stobaeus and Early Greek Lyric Poetry*, in: Gerber, D.E. (ed.) *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honor of L. Woodbury* (Chico), 51-7
Clemm, W. 1883. *Zu den griechischen Elegikern*, Jahrb. für Class. Phil. 127, 1-18
Collins, D. 2005. *Master of the Game: Competition and Performance in Greek Poetry* (Cambridge, MA)
Dawson, C.M. 1966. *Spoudaiogeloion: Random Thoughts on Occasional Poems*, YCS 19, 39-76
Day, J. 1989. *Rituals in Stone: Early Greek Epigrams and Monuments*, JHS 109, 16-28
Denniston, J.D. ²1954. *Greek Particles* (Oxford)
Dover, K.J. 1967. *The Poetry of Archilochus*, in: *Archiloque*, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique, Fondation Hardt 10 (Geneva), 181-222
Faraone, C.A. 2002. *A Drink from the Daughters of Mnemosyne: Poetry, Eschatology and Memory at the End of Pindar's* Isthmian *6*, in: Miller, J.F., Damon, C., Myers, K.S. (eds.) *Vertis in usum: Studies in Honor of Edward Courtney* (Munich), 259-70

56) This essay is part of a much longer ongoing study (Faraone, in progress), in which I argue that the five-couplet stanza was a regular structural device in the earliest elegists as well as in certain places in Callimachus' oeuvre, where he seems to imitate archaic practice, e.g. in the prologue to the *Aitia* and the introduction to his *Hymn to Athena*. My Chicago colleagues Danielle Allen, James Redfield, Laura Slatkin, Peter White, and David Wray read early and tentative versions of this larger study and offered penetrating but encouraging comments. Deborah Boedeker, Edward Courtney, Mark Edwards, Douglas Gerber, Jim Marks, David Sansone, David Sider, Greg Thalmann, and Mark Usher all provided helpful criticism of subsequent drafts. Each of them, in one way or another, has helped to make this extract better.

——. 2005a. *Catalogues, Priamels and Stanzaic Structure in Early Greek Elegy*, TAPA 135, 249-65
——. 2005b. *Exhortation and Meditation: Alternating Stanzas as a Structural Device in Early Greek Elegy*, CP 100, 317-36
——. in progress. *The Elegiac Stanza in Greek Poetry from Callinus to Callimachus*
Fowler, R.L. 1987. *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies* (Toronto)
Fränkel, H. 1975. *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy* (Oxford) (tr. M. Hadas and J. Willis)
Friedländer, P. 1948. *Epigrammata: Greek Inscriptions in Verse from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars* (Berkeley)
Gerber, D.E. 1970. *Euterpe: An Anthology of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry* (Amsterdam)
——. 1997. *Elegy*, in: Gerber, D.E. (ed.) *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* (Leiden), 91-132
——. 1999. *Greek Elegiac Poetry* (Cambridge, MA)
Gow, A.S.F., Page, D. 1965. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge)
van Groningen, B.A. 1958. *La composition littéraire archaique grecque* (Amsterdam)
Greenberg, N. 1985. *Appendix: Language, Meter and Sense in Theognis*, in: Figueira, T.J., Nagy, G. (eds.) *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis* (Baltimore), 245-60
Herington, J. 1985. *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition* (Berkeley)
Jacoby, F. 1918. *Studien zu den älteren griechischen Elegikern*, Hermes 53, 1-44 and 262-307
Jaeger, W. 1966. *Tyrtaeus on True Arete*, in: id., *Five Essays* (Montreal), 103-42 (tr. A.M. Fiske)
Linforth, I.M. 1919. *Solon the Athenian* (New York)
Loraux, N. 1986. *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City* (Cambridge, MA)
Murray, O. 1993. *Early Greece* (Cambridge, MA)
Nagy, G. 1985. *Theognis and Megara: A Poet's Vision of his City*, in: Figueira, T.J., Nagy, G. (eds.) *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis* (Baltimore), 22-81
——. 1990. *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Ithaca)
——. 1996. *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond* (Cambridge)
Prato, C. 1968. *Tirteo* (Rome)
Race, W.H. 1982. *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* (Leiden)
van Raalte, M. 1988. *Greek Elegiac Verse Rhythm*, Glotta 66, 145-78
Reitzenstein, R. 1893. *Epigramm und Skolion* (Giessen)
Rösler, W. 1980. *Dichter und Gruppe: Eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historischen Funktion früher griechischer Lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios* (Munich)
Rossi, F. 1953/4. *Studi su Tirteo*, AIV 112, 369-437
Sider, D. 2001. *"As is the Generation of Leaves" in Homer, Simonides, Horace and Stobaeus*, in: Boedeker, D., Sider, D. (eds.) *The New Simonides* (Oxford), 272-88
Slings, S.R. 2000. *Symposium: Speech and Ideology: Two Hermeneutical Issues in Early Greek Lyric, with Special Reference to Mimnermus* (Amsterdam)
Snell, B. 1969. *Tyrtaios und die Sprache des Epos* (Göttingen)
Snodgrass, A. 1964. *Early Greek Armour and Weapons from the End of the Bronze Age to 600 BC* (Edinburgh)
Schwartz, E. 1899. *Tyrtaeus*, Hermes 34, 428-68
Tarditi, G. 1982. *Parenesi e areté nel corpus Tirtaico*, RFIC 110, 257-76
Verdenius, W.J. 1969. *Tyrtaeus 6-7 D*, Mnemosyne 22, 337-55
Verrall, A.W. 1896. *Tyrtaeus: A Graeco-Roman Tradition*, CR 10, 269-77

van Wees, H. 1999. *The Mafia of Early Greece: Violent Exploitation in the Seventh and Sixth Centuries BC*, in: Hopwood, K. (ed.) *Organised Crime in Antiquity* (London), 1-51
Weil, H. 1862. *Über Spuren strophischen Composition bei den alten griechischen Elegikern*, RhM 17, 1-13
West, M.L. 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin)
——. ²1992. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati* (Oxford)
Wilamowitz, U. 1900. *Textgeschichte der griechichen Lyriker* (Berlin)
Young, D. 1976. *Theognis* (Leipzig)