very likely to belong to an ancient strand of the poetic or narrative tradition – the tale may indeed be ὠγύγιος[16] – but Homeric epic is careful to minimize folktale elements and avoids the beast-fable altogether.[17] Accordingly, phrases such as γῆρας ἀποξύσας stand in epic texts without elaboration.[18] We must be grateful to the Alexandrian poet Nicander for preserving the fable that seeks to explain the image.[19]

University of Western Ontario CHRISTOPHER G. BROWN
pindar@uwo.ca
doi:10.1017/S0009838814000068

[16] W. Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* (Cambridge, MA, 1992), 123–4, draws attention to the affinities between Nicander's story and a passage in the *Epic of Gilgamesh* (9.263–96), suggesting that the story is derived from oral narrative traditions with roots in the ancient Near East; see also West (n. 14), 118.

[17] 'In der Tat, Tierfabeln sind ihm [sc. Homer] fremd', observes Meuli (n. 10), 73 = 2.739. See also his *Odyssee und Argonautica* (Berlin, 1921), 9–10 = *Ges. Schr.* 2.599–600, on the avoidance of beast-fable in Homeric epic; L. Kurke, *Aesopic Conversations* (Princeton, NJ, 2011), 3–4. Of course, the influence of folktales in epic can be detected, especially in the *Odyssey*, but it is regularly assimilated to the tone and character of epic: see Davies (n. 12), 71 with n. 34.

[18] Passages such as *Il.* 3.33–7, 12.200–7, and 22.93–7 show that Homeric epic can treat snakes in detail.

[19] This seems to reflect Alexandrian interest in exploring a wider range of literary registers: cf. the prominent Aesopic fable in Callimachus' Second Iambus (fr. 192 Pf.). It is suggestive to note that Callimachus' fable may also have concerned perpetual youth and old age: see Philo, *Conf. Ling.* 6 (printed by Pfeiffer, vol. 2, p. 117) with the discussion of B. Acosta-Hughes, *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition* (Berkeley, CA, 2002), 178–82.

COWERING *GUMNĒTES*: A NOTE ON TYRTAEUS FR. 11.35–8 W*

The extended exhortation of Tyrtaeus fr. 11 W urges the audience to take up their shield and spears and fight in a defensive fashion, 'placing foot against foot, leaning chest on chest' (v. 31). The overt message of the poem is clear: do not shirk nor run away, but rather stand firm and fight. Within the poem, Tyrtaeus weaves a more subtle message, describing a hoplite group which derives its defining characteristics through possession of a stalwart, 'passive' courage and a shield with a 'belly' (v. 24).[1] The cohesion that this poem calls for and reproduces through its use of the second person plural and description of close, hoplite fighting, however, is disrupted by the last four lines of the poem, which form a jarring address that sit uneasily alongside the remainder of the poem. In West's text they read:

ὑμεῖς δ', ὦ γυμνῆτες, ὑπ' ἀσπίδος ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος
πτώσσοντες μεγάλοις βάλλετε χερμαδίοις
δούρασί τε ξεστοῖσιν ἀκοντίζοντες ἐς αὐτούς,
τοῖσι πανόπλοισιν πλησίον ἱστάμενοι. (vv. 35–8)[2]

* I would like to thank Prof. Robert Fowler, the anonymous reader, and the editor of *CQ* for their help and comments on earlier versions of this note.

[1] The term 'passive courage' to describe that shown by the hoplite is taken from J.E. Lendon, *Soldiers and Ghosts: A History of Battle in Classical Antiquity* (New Haven, CT, 2005).

[2] M.L. West (ed.), *Iambi et Elegi Graeci: Ante Alexandrum Cantati*, Vol. 2 (Oxford, 1992²). The translation is my own.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000391 Published online by Cambridge University Press

But you, light-armoured men, throw your great boulders, cowering here and there under a shield and hurling your polished spears against the enemy, as you stand near to the fully armoured men.[3]

Fr. 11 W opens by reminding the audience that they are the '*genos* of unconquerable Heracles' (vv. 1–2); v. 35 seems to call on another group, one that is not a part of the *genos*.[4] West's rendition presents two problems, one with respect to the verb πτώσσω, the other with the apparent status of the γυμνῆτες. Both of these problems can be removed by an emendation proposed by Hartung in 1859, which also has the positive advantage of producing a coherent passage with a clear function in the poem's rhetoric.[5]

West's text follows MSS SMA with Dindorf's correction of πανοπλιοισι(ν) to πάνοπλοισιν (v. 38). He retains the reading of πλησίον over the alternative of ἐγγύθεν from the BP MSS.[6] As it stands, the τε in v. 37 joins the participles πτώσσοντες (v. 36) and ἀκοντίζοντες (v. 38), both of which then become dependent on βάλλετε (v. 36). Thus πτώσσοντες becomes part of the poet's command to the γυμνῆτες – 'throw great boulders, while cowering and hurling javelins' (vv. 36–7). The problem with this reading is that the γυμνῆτες are actually told to be cowardly within a piece of martial exhortation which elsewhere urges men not to run but to stand among the πρόμαχοι (vv. 11–34, esp. 21–34). Though some translators take πτώσσοντες neutrally as 'crouch', Tyrtaeus' strong intertext with Homer negates this possibility unless we allow special pleading.[7] In both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, πτώσσω is negative, denoting trembling or cowering out of fear; in the *Iliad* it is a reproach on heroes' behaviour, when they stand near the back instead of among the πρόμαχοι (4.340, 371: καταπτώσσοντες; 5.634), and in the *Odyssey* it is used for the behaviour of a beggar before his social betters (17.227, 18.363).[8] πτώσσοντες cannot be neutral, but must instead comment on the reproachful behaviour of the γυμνῆτες. Though some scholars have thought that the γυμνῆτες are not a part of the notional Heraclidae addressed at the beginning of the poem (v. 1) and that πτώσσοντες flags this out-group status of the γυμνῆτες, this view raises some difficult questions.[9] One

[3] I have translated ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος as 'here and there' as opposed to Gerber's 'on either side' (*Greek Elegiac Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries* B.C. [Cambridge, MA, 1999], 57) because of the Homeric parallels. The phrase occurs in the *Odyssey* with the verb φοιτάω to depict movement to and from no particular direction (*Od.* 9.401, 10.119, 11.42, 24.415). The *Iliad* uses ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος to denote spatial configurations; the sense here is of a stationary group with no specific configuration. The men involved are standing or sitting intermixed around or near a dominant hero (*Il.* 2.75, 9.311, 9.671, 13.551; see also *Od.* 9.493, 10.442, 12.392, 18.231). I have decided, therefore, to follow the Homeric usage and translate ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος so that it refers to a general, indiscriminate location near the πάνοπλοι and not to a specific location on either side of the πάνοπλοι.

[4] E. Irwin, *Solon and Early Greek Poetry: The Politics of Exhortation* (Cambridge, 2005), 37–40, 294, is particularly firm on the separation of Heraclids and γυμνῆτες.

[5] J.A. Hartung, *Die griechischen Elegiker, I* (Leipzig, 1859), 40. D. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry* (London, 1982), 176 n. 37, notes that the final couplet is 'clumsily attached to the previous sentence' and suggests that those who wish to remove it 'may be right'; Hartung's emendation, however, is preferable.

[6] See e.g. R.F.P. Brunck, *Ἠθικὴ ποίησις sive gnomici poetae Graeci: ad optimorum exemplarium fidem emendavit* (Strassburg, 1784), 61, and C. Prato, *Tirteo: Introduzione, testo critico, testimonianze e commento* (Roma, 1968), app. crit. for fr. 8.38.

[7] See Gerber (n. 3), 57, for a neutral translation of πτώσσοντες.

[8] πτώσσω is also used in both poems for similes, comparing the subject to some sort of cowardly animal (*Il.* 5.476, 21.14; *Od.* 22.304).

[9] See in particular on this point Irwin (n. 4), 291–6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000391 Published online by Cambridge University Press

may wonder why they are introduced in the first place, especially if they are told to be craven. And what purpose does it serve to draw attention to this group of social outcasts, thus diminishing the unity of the fighting forces, in a poem which seeks to create martial cohesion?[10]

Hartung, however, suggests that we read ξυστοῖσί τ' ('and javelins') instead of ξεστοῖσίν (polished [spears]) in line 37.[11] He argues for this emendation by comparing Tyrtaeus' lines with the description of a battle in the *Cyropaedia*, where Xenophon offers a list of weapons: ἔνθα δὴ δεινὴ μάχη ἦν καὶ δοράτων καὶ ξυστῶν καὶ μαχαιρῶν ('there, then, was a terrible battle with spears, javelins, and daggers'; 7.1.33).[12] Though Xenophon's text is later, it still gives us a parallel listing of two types of spears and a third weapon. *P. Oxy.* 3316 reveals a further parallel within Tyrtaeus' own work: fragment 23a also links ξυστός and ἀκοντίζω – πολλοὶ δὲ ξυστοῖσιν ἀκοντισσ[('and many will throw (?) javelins'; v. 12), with a possible reading of ἀκοντισσ[ουσι(ν) for the broken line.[13] By replacing ξεστοῖσίν with ξυστοῖσί τ', the double τε can now connect two nouns – δούρασι and ξυστοῖσι – instead of two participles, and we are no longer required to take πτώσσοντες with βάλλετε.[14] Instead we are able to align it with γυμνῆτες and insert a comma after πτώσσοντες, so that the text now reads:

ὑμεῖς δ', ὦ γυμνῆτες, ὑπ' ἀσπίδος ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος
πτώσσοντες, μεγάλοις βάλλετε χερμαδίοις
δούρασί τε ξυστοῖσι τ' ἀκοντίζοντες ἐς αὐτούς,
τοῖσι πανόπλοισιν πλησίον ἱστάμενοι (vv. 35–8)

But you, light-armoured men, though cowering here and there behind your shields, throw great stones while hurling spears and javelins at the enemy, as you stand near to the fully armoured men.

The participle πτώσσοντες is now part of the address to the γυμνῆτες and identifies an aspect of their current behaviour: they are cowering behind their shields. They are then given a positive instruction, appropriate to their role and standing.[15] The γυμνῆτες are part of the larger group, and have a well-defined function, which they are now exhorted to perform. While they are cowering at present, they must nevertheless throw their rocks

[10] Even in the formulation of Irwin (n. 4), 49–51, whereby exhortative elegy facilitates aristocratic role-playing as Homeric heroes, the command to cower while fighting does not make sense.

[11] Hartung (n. 5), 40. He expands upon T. Bergk's proposed emendation, which suggests ξυστοῖσιν for ξεστοῖσιν (*Poetae Lyrici Graeci, teriis curis: Pars II: Poetas Elegiacos et iambographos continens* [Leipzig, 1866], 401).

[12] Hartung (n. 5), 40. The probable cause of the corruption is that ξεστός is a common word in Homer, particularly in the *Odyssey*. Though no MS shows a corruption of ξυστός to ξεστός, MS G for *Od.* 1.138 shows a reverse corruption, from ξεστός to ξυστός (A. Adler, *Suidae Lexicon iii* [Leipzig, 1933], o 251 p. 527). While the variant cannot be correct, as the line contains the formula παρὰ δὲ ξεστὴν ἐτάνυσσε τράπεζαν (also appearing at *Od.* 7.174, 10.370, 15.137, and 17.93), it does show that the two words are similar enough in both spelling and meaning to be confused.

[13] See West (n. 2), app. crit. for fr. 23a.12.

[14] This also removes the need to translate ἀκοντίζοντες as an imperative if we wish to take πτώσσοντες with γυμνῆτες with West's text.

[15] The combination of πτώσσοντες and the command to fight through βάλλετε may parallel the earlier statement that the νέοι had fled the battlefield, though now they are prepared to stand fast (vv. 9–10). If so, this parallel continues to include but demarcate the γυμνῆτες, as, while the νέοι now stand ready, the γυμνῆτες cower. Yet the γυμνῆτες have not fled, and so they remain a part of the group, unlike the τρέσσαντες in v. 14 who are brought in as the out-group to define the in-group. I am grateful to the anonymous reader for *CQ* for the suggestion of this parallel.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000391 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and hurl their javelins; the participle both introduces their shameful behaviour and dismisses it with the introduction of the main verb.

They are still, however, of lesser status than the πάνοπλοι, a textual hierarchy that matches visual and spatial hierarchy within the phalanx itself. Though we are accustomed to the image of the equalizing, bronze phalanx, van Wees has argued that even in the Classical period not all hoplites bore the same level of armament: the wealthy, 'leisure-class' hoplites wore the full panoply, while the 'working-class' hoplites wore as much armour as they could afford, providing they had a shield and spear.[16] The amount of armour worn was a status symbol as much as a means of protection. The relationship between the γυμνῆτες and πάνοπλοι in fr. 11 parallels that between van Wees's leisure- and working-class hoplites; the πάνοπλοι and leisure-class hoplites hold the front ranks (the πρόμαχοι of vv. 4 and 12) while the γυμνῆτες and working-class hoplites form the supportive mass, 'standing near' (πλησίον ἱστάμενοι, v. 38) to the πάνοπλοι. The spatial and social hierarchies visible in the phalanx formation are thus replicated in the text: the fully armoured πάνοπλοι are the πρόμαχοι; the men holding the front ranks are those mentioned first and form the focus of the bulk of the poem. The γυμνῆτες come second, the mass of the phalanx that has met the basic requirements for membership in the warrior-elite group of the phalanx. Their behaviour prevents them from being full members; they cower, while the πάνοπλοι stand. The γυμνῆτες, however, have not fled and are thus still members of the group, included (albeit in a denigratory fashion) by the address, not ostracized.

Though one might expect a direct command on the model of 'do not cower, but fight', considering Tyrtaeus' fairly blunt style, in the *Iliad* (κατα-)πτώσσοντες often forms part of an address to another hero along with a form of τίς/τί, an elliptical address designed to serve as a command to stop shirking and to fight. *Iliad* 4.340 has τί καταπτώσσοντες ('why do you cower in the back?') and v. 371 in the same book τίπτε πτώσσεις ('Why do you cower?'), while 5.633–4 reads τίς τοι ἀνάγκη | πτώσσειν ('Why must you cower?'). Of the four negative exhortations that include (κατα-)πτώσσω, only Nestor's extended address to the heroes in Book 7 does not include a form of τίς/τί (πτώσσοντας in v. 129). There appears to be a pattern, whereby one hero demands why another hero hangs back and then shames the latter into fighting through an extended commentary on his father or behaviour (*Il.* 4.338–48, 370–400; 5.633–46). Tyrtaeus' address to the γυμνῆτες modifies this to fit the condensed address of exhortative elegy; instead of a question and digression on their fathers or past behaviour, the γυμνῆτες are qualified by πτώσσοντες and told to fight anyway. The basic form is still the same though: a participle of πτώσσω introduces an exhortation to fight, whether framed through persuasion or a command.

Hartung's emendation therefore allows us to take πτώσσοντες directly with γυμνῆτες and to place it within the Homeric model where πτώσσω introduces an exhortation to fight. Such a formulation makes the γυμνῆτες a part of the addressed audience, one distinguished but not ostracized, and maintains the cohesion of the address and the world of the poem better. Fr. 11 is notionally equalizing; though in actuality it maintains a hierarchy between the better-armed elites who held the honourable front ranks and the less well armed (including the γυμνῆτες), the poem does not advertise this hierarchy, but avoids it until the address to the γυμνῆτες in vv. 35–8. If πτώσσοντες must go with

[16] H. van Wees, *Greek Warfare: Myths and Realities* (London, 2004), 48–52. See also V.D. Hanson, *The Western Way of War: Infantry Battle in Classical Greece* (London, 1989), 58–9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000391 Published online by Cambridge University Press

βάλλετε, the address makes no sense; why are the γυμνῆτες introduced at all, if they are ordered to be cowards while fighting? Rather, by qualifying γυμνῆτες with πτώσσοντες, Tyrtaeus urges the addressees to fight even though they are cowering, to stand up and fight as the πάνοπλοι and the remainder of the addressed audience are imagined as doing. Each party within the larger, unified group thus has its proper role to play. In the rhetoric of the poem, such a reading is clearly preferable to one which breaks the addressees into groups of insiders and outsiders.

University of Bristol JESSICA M. ROMNEY
cljmr@bris.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838814000391

AESCHYLUS, *SEPTEM CONTRA THEBAS* 780–7

The starting point of this brief discussion is the emendation in line 782 of Aeschylus' *Septem* proposed by M.L. West in his 1990 Teubner edition.[1] In the fifth strophe of the second stasimon, the chorus recollects the misfortunes that struck Oedipus when he finally discovered the truth about his marriage. This severely corrupt passage, whose original meaning was lost at an early stage of transmission, runs as follows:

ἐπεὶ δ' ἀρτίφρων ἐγένετο [στρ. ε]
μέλεος ἀθλίων γάμων,
ἐπ' ἄλγει δυσφορῶν 780
μαινομέναι κραδίαι
δίδυμα κάκ' ἐτέλεσεν
πατροφόνωι χερὶ τῶν
†κρεισσοτέκνων δ' ὀμμάτων† ἐπλάγχθη.

τέκνοις δ' †ἀραίας† ἐφῆκεν [ἀντ. ε]
ἐπίκοτος τροφᾶς, αἰαί, 786
πικρογλώσσους ἀράς.

782 δίδυμ' ἃ West 784 κρεισσοτέκνων M^2PKQ^1Tr κρείσσω τέκνων rell. κυρσοτέκνων Herm. δ' ὀμμάτων HaQTr δ' ἀπ' ὀμμάτων rell. δωμάτων Schütz χρυσοτέχνων πωμάτων Verrall κρεισσοτέρων γνωμάτων West 785 ἀθλίας Prien ἀρχαίας Wil.

But when the miserable man became aware of his wretched marriage, vexed with pain in his frenzied heart, he committed double evil: with his parricidal hand †he wandered from his eyes, dearer than children†. But upon his sons he put bitter-tongued curses, angry on account of his †accursed† sustenance.

782 δίδυμα κάκ' The standard interpretation takes the δίδυμα κακά committed by Oedipus as relating, first, to his self-inflicted blinding (for this is what the expression 'he wandered from his eyes' in 784 presumably stands for) and, second, to his putting a curse on his sons, referred to in the first lines of the antistrophe (785–7). This, however, is counterintuitive, for the 'double evil' that is habitually associated with Oedipus is, rather, his twofold guilt of patricide and incest. The matter was given due attention by West, who wrote in this connection:

[1] For the discussion see M.L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart, 1990), 116–18.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000391 Published online by Cambridge University Press