

# Alcman's *Partheneion I* Reconsidered

Thomas G. Rosenmeyer

## I

VERY SOON after the publication in 1863 of Alcman's Louvre *Partheneion*<sup>1</sup> it became apparent to the scholars who tried to interpret it that there were elements in the composition of the poem which suggested that it might have been performed by a group divided into two half-choruses. This was the view expressed,

<sup>1</sup> Hereafter referred to as *Partheneion I*. The following abbreviated references will be used: AHRENS: H. L. Ahrens, "Das alkmanische partheneion des papyrus," *Philologus* 27 (1868) 241–85; 577–629. BOWRA 1936: C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry from Alcman to Simonides* (Oxford 1936). BOWRA 1961: C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry from Alcman to Simonides*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1961). BOWRA 1964: C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964). BURNETT: A. P. Burnett, "The Race with the Pleiades" *CP* 59 (1964) 30–4. DAVISON: J. A. Davison, "Alcman's Partheneion," *Hermes* 73 (1938) 440–58. DIELS: H. Diels, "Alkmans Partheneion," *Hermes* 31 (1896) 339–74. D'ERRICO: A. d'Errico, "Il Partenio di Alcmane," *Annali FacLettFilos, Università di Napoli* 7 (1957) 5–38. FARINA: A. Farina, *Studi sul Partenio di Alcmane* (Napoli 1950). GARZYA: A. Garzya ed., *Alcmane, I Frammenti* (Napoli 1954). VAN GRONINGEN: B. A. van Groningen, "The Enigma of Alcman's Partheneion," *Mnemosyne* SER. III, 3 (1935–36) 241–61. JANNI: P. Janni, "Interpretazioni di Alcmane," *RFIS* 40 (1962) 180–5. JURENKA 1896: H. Jurenka, "Der aegyptische Papyrus des Alkman," *SAWW* 135 (1896) 1–35. JURENKA 1897: H. Jurenka, "Epilegomena zu Alkmans Partheneion," *Philologus* 56 (1897) 399–405. KUKULA: R. C. Kukula, "Alkmans Partheneion," *Philologus* 66 (1907) 202–30. MARZULLO: B. Marzullo, "Il Primo Partenio di Alcmane," *Philologus* 108 (1964) 174–210. PAGE 1937: D. L. Page, "The Chorus of Alcman's Partheneion," *CQ* 31 (1937) 94–101. PAGE 1951: D. L. Page ed., *Alcman: The Partheneion* (Oxford 1951). *Partheneion II*: Alcman fr.3 PMG (POxy. 2387). PEEK: W. Peek, "Das neue Alkman-Partheneion," *Philologus* 104 (1960) 163–80. SCHEIDWEILER: F. Scheidweiler, "Zu Alkmans Partheneion," *RhM* 93 (1950) 242–9. SCHWENN: F. Schwenn, "Zu Alkmans grossem Partheneion-Fragment," *RhM* 86 (1937) 289–315. SCHWYZER: E. Schwyzer/A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik II* (München 1950). STOESSL: F. Stoessl, "Leben und Dichtung im Sparta des siebenten Jahrhunderts," in *Eumusia Howald* (1947) 92–114. WILAMOWITZ: U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Der Chor der Hagesichora," *Hermes* 32 (1897) 251–63.

For bibliographies concerning the work done on *Parth. I*, see van Groningen and Page 1951. I hasten to add that Page's work is the most authoritative available. If in the body of this paper I venture to disagree with Page's interpretation on more than one occasion, I do so because his edition is a convenient starting point, which is to say that without it, this paper would not have been written. I need not labor the point that anyone who tries his luck with Alcman is immeasurably in Professor Page's debt.

The following items came to my attention after this essay was completed: A. Garzya, *Studi sulla lirica greca da Alcmane al primo impero* (Messina 1963) 13–46; A. F. Garvie, "A Note on the Deity of Alcman's *Partheneion*," *CQ* 15 (1965) 185–7; M. L. West, "Alcmanica," *CQ* 15 (1965) 188–202; G. Devereux, "The Kolaxaian Horse of Alcman's *Partheneion*," *CQ* 15 (1965) 176–84; G. Devereux, "Homer's Wild She-Mules," *JHS* 85 (1965) 29–32; G. Devereux,

though somewhat warily, by Hermann Diels (373–4), following up the hints of G. Hermann, H. L. Ahrens and W. von Christ, among others. Diels admitted that the poem itself offers no conclusive evidence in support of any one specific division. His own proposal was, in the end, that very likely half-chorus A sang the first four lines of each strophe, half-chorus B the second four lines and the whole chorus the remaining six lines.

Other scholars have proposed different divisions.<sup>2</sup> Blass<sup>3</sup> thought that each strophe was sung by one member of the chorus; according to Wilamowitz<sup>4</sup> the mythical part was sung by the whole chorus, whereas the latter half of the song was produced by a single soloist. Even van Groningen (259), who criticizes Blass and Wilamowitz for the implausibility of their schemes, concludes that “the first part . . . is sung by the chorus and its leader together. Afterwards (with vs. 36) the leader separates and the other maidens continue to sing alone.”

The fullest criticism of the attempts to analyze *Partheneion I* into anything but a monochoral ode is that of Denys Page.<sup>5</sup> He has three principal objections to dividing the poem into half-choruses or any other sub-elements: (1) to judge from the papyrus, which is full of lectional signs but carries no paragraphi indicating change of singer, the Alexandrians had no knowledge of any such division; (2) various arguments from the text which have been used to demonstrate division, especially the argument from the supposed contrast between [ἐ]γὼν μὲν and ἐγὼ[ν] δὲ at 85–7, can be shown to be inadequate; and (3) the divisions proposed make for irregularities unparalleled elsewhere in Greek choral literature.

Page's refutations, especially those under (2) and (3), seem to me eminently just. The schemes of division proposed, particularly by Sheppard<sup>6</sup> and Stoessl, are marvels of disorder; their erratic nature

---

“The Eneian Horse of Alkman's *Partheneion*,” *Hermes* 94 (1966) 129–34. I refer to the suggestions of Garvie and Devereux in the text. Garzya's chapter is largely a restatement of his 1954 position. West's analysis differs so sharply from mine that I have thought it better not to allow a discussion of it to add to the polemical burden of the paper.

<sup>2</sup> For details, cf. the summary of Page 1951.57ff. In addition to the three British scholars singled out for criticism by Page (Sheppard, Bury and Bowra) it may be useful to mention Stoessl, whose scheme is perhaps even more venturesome than those of the others.

<sup>3</sup> F. Blass, in *RhM* 40 (1885) 22.

<sup>4</sup> Wilamowitz 262; cf. also Scheidweiler.

<sup>5</sup> Page 1937; cf. also Page 1951.59ff. In the earlier study Page demolishes the evidence of his opponents regarding irregular divisions between speakers and singers in Attic drama.

<sup>6</sup> J. T. Sheppard, “The *Partheneion* of Alkman,” *Essays and Studies Presented to Sir William Ridgeway* (Cambridge [Eng.] 1913) 124–35.

completely rules out the lyrical response one might expect from singing half-choruses. Moreover, arguments from the text have usually been based on a mistaken understanding of the function of the first person singular in choral poetry.<sup>7</sup> It is not surprising that even Bowra, originally a supporter of the idea of division, has now relinquished it in the second edition of his *Greek Lyric Poetry*. Bowra (1961.64) continues to think that it would be preferable if an arrangement in terms of half-choruses could be worked out but admits that “there is no need to think that Alcman does this, and indeed it is difficult to arrange the semi-choirs in any way that will win acceptance.” Other scholars who argue against half-choruses are Schwenn (311), Davison (445 n.3), Farina (55–64), Lesky,<sup>8</sup> and Garzya (38). Some of them, as for instance Lesky, renounce the idea of half-choruses with patent regret.<sup>9</sup> Page himself (1951.48) shows his uneasiness by suggesting that, though the girls sang together as one chorus, they may have divided into two groups for the sake of the dancing.<sup>10</sup> Garzya (38) too is willing to opt for this compromise.

One of the reasons why some scholars continue to feel a certain nostalgia for the idea of half-choruses is a text which appears in Page 1951.13 as scholion VIII. It is written against col. ii lines 14–15 (= *Partheneion* 1.48–9) and appears to make a distinction between the followers of Agido and the followers of Hagesichora:

αἰὲτῆ Ἀγιδότουτ . . . .  
 ὅτα αἰὲτῆ Ἀγησιχό.

With Page, except for the reading of π̄,<sup>11</sup> this may be read as follows:  
 αἰ (π(αρά) τ(ῆι) Ἀγιδό(ι) τοῦτ[ο . . . .] ὅτα αἰ (π(αρά) τ(ῆι) Ἀγησιχό(ραι)

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *infra* n.34. That Page’s opposition to the proposed schemes is, in part, based on what seems to me a questionable premise—viz. that “most of the lines are obviously sung by persons on the side of Hagesichora”—does not, therefore, affect the justice of the case against them.

<sup>8</sup> A. Lesky, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*<sup>2</sup> (Bern 1963) 173.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, “Der Inhalt legt dies an manchen Stellen nahe . . . Man wird es der dialogischen Haltung einzelner Partien zum Trotz wohl einem Chore belassen müssen.” He accepts the strength of Page’s argument (3).

<sup>10</sup> For other cases of dancing half-choruses, see *Ar. Eq.* 242f and *Av.* 353, discussed below, p.356. It is of some interest that with regard to *Parth. II* Page is in considerably more doubt about the arrangement of the singing; at *CR* 9 (1959) 16 he says: “I do not understand the arrangements here: I do not believe that these lines” (viz. 1–9) “can be sung by the whole choir . . . but what is the alternative?”

<sup>11</sup> According to F. G. Kenyon, *The Palaeography of Greek Papyri* (Oxford 1899) 155, the evidence from the papyrus of Aristotle’s *AthPol* and from the Anonymi Lond. *Iatrica* shows that πρὸς (and περί) tended to be written π̄, while π̄ is to be read as παρά.

If we assume that the note was meant to cover vv.49–50, we may then say that the scholion appears to register a change of performers between the last line of strophe 4 and the beginning of strophe 5. The scholion should be read in conjunction with scholion v, which stands opposite v.36 and appears to indicate the beginning of a passage in praise of Agido:

..( . ) ἄγιδους . . . . .

On this I am inclined to follow Blass and Diels, both of whom read traces of ἀρχή before what appears in the text of Page.<sup>12</sup> Now it is true that the scholia are to be used with much circumspection; they can be wrong, as is most probably true of the explanation of Πεληάδες v.60. I happen to think that scholia viii and v are entirely correct; on the other hand scholion vii, opposite v.43, which appears to say something about Hagesichora, is at least out of place, if not entirely mistaken. But there is just enough in these comments, pitifully fragmentary as they are, to indicate that there may be a case for the existence of some kind of dramatic exchange.<sup>13</sup>

The ancient evidence, though slight and garbled,<sup>14</sup> encourages us not to surrender the notion of διχορία without a struggle. The only scholar who, to my knowledge, has proposed a scheme of division which satisfies the implied conditions of Page's criticism (3) is d'Errico.<sup>15</sup> His contribution does not appear to have become widely known. Briefly, d'Errico divides the chorus into two half-choruses of ten girls each, one led by Hagesichora and one led by Agido. That

<sup>12</sup> It must be admitted that our faith in Diels' judgement in this matter is somewhat shaken by his statement, p.135, that he follows the traditional explanation, "die auch der Scholiast zu teilen scheint," that ἄγιδους in the scholion is to be taken as a subjective genitive. There is no telling how the scholiast felt about this; for myself I have little doubt that the genitive is objective.

<sup>13</sup> Marzullo 197 launches a vigorous attack on Page and Bowra for disregarding the evidence of the scholia, which, according to M., are mostly reliable. As it turns out, M. himself pays little enough attention to the scholia in the matter of assessing the relative importance of Agido and Hagesichora. He radically minimizes Agido's role in the proceedings.

<sup>14</sup> But cf. Pollux's reference to Tyrtaeus and Laconian choral division, immediately after his general statement about half-choruses (4.107, p.233 line 6 Bethe). The latter runs: ὁπόταν γὰρ ὁ χορός εἰς δύο μέρη τμηθῆι, τὸ μὲν πρῶγμα καλεῖται διχορία, ἑκατέρα δ' ἡ μοῖρα ἡμιχόριον, ἃ δ' ἀντάιδουσαν, ἀντιχόρια. Pollux's purely formal definition is safer than the further distinction introduced by Conradt; cf. infra n.103. I suspect that Hephaestion *De signis* 4.74 Consb., with its curious notice of metrical changes within fourteen-strophe poems by Alcman, is faultily abstracted from a larger discussion of choral division.

<sup>15</sup> d'Errico 24ff. I did not become acquainted with this study until the bulk of my article was already written.

Agido is a χοραγός is, he feels, stated in v.44;<sup>16</sup> that Hagesichora is also a χοραγός is clear from her name and has of course never been doubted by anyone. d'Errico assigns the singing of the odd-numbered strophes to the half-chorus of Hagesichora, and the even-numbered strophes to the half-chorus led by Agido. That is to say, strophes 4, 6 and 8 are Agido's, strophes 5 and 7 are Hagesichora's. d'Errico derives his proof of the dramatic division of the poem from φασεῖς 73, which according to him conveys the general idea of: "You will not be able to say that you have gone to a good school, as we have"; and from ἦ οὐχ ὄρηις; 50, which he regards as addressed by Hagesichora's girls to those of Agido. Some of d'Errico's detailed suggestions seem to me to lack support, nor am I sure that he has not glossed over some of the difficulties inherent in any position taken on the poem. But on the whole, as I hope to show, his scheme makes good sense.

It appears to me that there are certain analogies, both structural and psychological, between *Partheneion I* and pastoral contests which may help to strengthen the case for choral division. I should like to discuss some of these analogies at some length before returning to the specific problems of the text of Alcman.

## II

The question why Theocritus wrote his pastorals in the Doric dialect has no single answer. His Syracusan origins are obviously relevant, but they cannot provide the whole answer, since his use of various dialects testifies to a formal virtuosity which seems to have little to do with the accident of birth.<sup>17</sup> Stark<sup>18</sup> suggests that Ibycus had considerable influence on the creation of the Hellenistic pastoral. He does not give his reasons for the suggestion, other than to refer generally to "Zitaten und Bemerkungen bei Literarkritikern und Grammatikern." Similarly van Groningen (242) hints that there are

<sup>16</sup> d'Errico cites the support of C. del Grande in *ΦΟΡΜΙΓΞ*<sup>3</sup> (Napoli 1959) 84, who there corrects his earlier view, *ΤΡΑΓΩΔΙΑ* (Napoli 1952) 16 and 296, that the line refers to Hagesichora.

<sup>17</sup> It is widely assumed that Theocritus' choice of Doric has something to do with his dependence on Sophron. But the *Anecdota Estense* (Prolegom. p.12 Wendel) makes the point that Theocritus' Doric is different from that of Sophron; and in fact Theocritus' debt to Sophron has been greatly exaggerated. His pastorals are *not* mimes, and even his so-called city mimes owe less to Sophron than to other models, in spite of the scholiast's note, p.305 Wendel. Cf. A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus II* (Cambridge [Eng.] 1950) 34-5 and 265.

<sup>18</sup> R. Stark, "Theocritea," *Maia* 15 (1936) 366 n.14.

parallels between Alcman and Theocritus and that these parallels have often been drawn. In actual fact, there has been very little detailed attention to the possible connections between Theocritus' pastorals and the archaic choral lyric, especially Alcman.<sup>19</sup>

In his description of Sparta, Pausanias (3.15) comments on the heroön of Cynisca, daughter of Archidamus, near the Platanistas; she was the first woman to raise horses and to win a victory at Olympia with a chariot. Nearby, Pausanias continues, is a monument to Alcman, who wrote songs "whose charm was not at all diminished by the fact that they were written in the Laconian tongue, an unattractive dialect": *ὦι ποιήσαντι ἄισματα οὐδὲν ἐς ἡδονὴν αὐτῶν ἐλυμῆνατο τῶν Λακῶνων ἢ γλῶσσα, ἥκιστα παρεχομένη τὸ εὐφωνον*. Then there are the precincts of Helen and Heracles; the former near the tomb of Alcman, the latter close to the wall. What follows is a discussion of the quarrel between Heracles and the sons of Hippocoön. Thus in one and the same passage we have talk of the Platanistas, a woman who has to do with horses, Alcman, Helen and the

<sup>19</sup> Direct evidence that Theocritus knew and imitated Alcman is nil. We know that Alcman was studied in the Hellenistic age, when Sosibius the Laconian (to be distinguished from other Sosibii active in Alexandria during the first half of the third century B.C.) wrote a *Περὶ Ἀλκμᾶνος*, fr.6 *FGrHist* III B p.595; although Jacoby (*FGrHist* III B 2 pp.635-7) may have put his dates lower than the evidence requires. In fact, knowledge of Alcman can be traced through the fifth and fourth centuries; cf. *FGrHist* III B 2 p.648. Later Alexander Polyhistor wrote a geographical commentary on Alcman: frgg. 95 and 96, *FGrHist* III A 273. When the Alexandrians established a canon of the nine lyricists, Alcman was included (see Wilamowitz, *Die Textgeschichte der griech. Lyriker* [Berlin 1900] 16ff); for the judgement of the literary historians, cf. "sweet Alcman" in *AP* 9.571.2 and *θηλυμελείς Ἀλκμᾶνος ἀηδόνες AP* 9.184.9. There is therefore no reason to doubt that Theocritus was acquainted with Alcman's work, even though he did not imitate his dialect in every detail (Wilamowitz, *op.cit.* 53). The attempt of W. Schmidt (*Gesch.gr.Lit.* I [München 1929] 466 n.8) to demonstrate imitations of Alcman in Theocritus and Apollonius Rhodius was unsuccessful. But two of Theocritus' glosses point if not to Alcman at least to Doric choral poetry. They both, *ἀίτης* and *εἴσπηλος*, occur in *Id.* 12, a curious little poem in which Theocritus somewhat approaches the learned manner of Callimachus. The schol. pp.249f Wendel reports that *ἀίτης* is dialectal and compares its use by Alcman to refer to *τὰς ἐπεράστους κόρας*, fr.34 PMG (the reading *κόρας* is superior to the alternative *χορδάς*); cf. also the *Suda* pp.63, 66 Adler and *Et.Mag.* 43.31 Gaisf. We cannot tell whether *εἴσπηλος*, which Theocritus says is from Amyclae, was part of the same poem of Alcman; cf. Callim. fr.68 Pf. The two forms are discussed together in *Et.Mag.* 43.31 Gaisf., Eust. 732.24 on *Il.* 9.6, 1500.27 on *Od.* 4.362 and 1547.18 on *Od.* 5.480; R. B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought*<sup>2</sup> (Cambridge [Eng.] 1954) 199 n.14, attempts to link them etymologically and semantically. Ph.-E. Legrand, *Étude sur Théocrite* (Paris 1898) 256, has a catalogue of poetic words in Theocritus worth investigating for their origins. Especially interesting, because they point to the Doric choral lyric as well as to Homer, are *δασπλήτης* (2.14), cf. *Od.* 15.234, Simon. fr.522.1 PMG, Lyc. 1452; and *ταῦσίως* (25.229), cf. *Od.* 3.316, 15.13, *h.Hom.Ap.* 362, Alcman fr.112 PMG, Bacchyl. 5.81. Finally, according to Gustav Schlatter, *Theokrit und Kallimachos* (Zürich 1941) 50-1, *χαός* (*Id.* 7.5) may be a borrowing from Alcman. But the scholiast merely calls it a Spartan word.

Hippocoöntids. Kaibel<sup>20</sup> maintained that Theocritus' *Epithalamium for Helen* (*Idyll 18*), in which the Platanistas is prominently featured, is an imitation of Sappho and that it permits us to get an idea of Sappho's epithalamia. That was before the publication of Sappho fr. 44 LP, the Hector and Andromache papyrus. Kaibel is hard put to it to explain why the poem is in Doric rather than Aeolic. His explanation: the subject of Helen and the singing of the girls in Sparta called for Doric. He does not consider the possibility that the model might be Alcman, in spite of his recognition that this or that phrase has its analogue in Alcman; for example, he compares *Idyll 18.30* with *Partheneion 1.45ff.*<sup>21</sup> The *Epithalamium for Helen* is not a pastoral, but its echoes of Spartan choral lyric are of some significance in this context.

According to an old and demonstrably mistaken Peripatetic tradition, the pastoral originated from girls' performances in honor of Artemis Caryatis or some other Laconian or Arcadian fertility divinity.<sup>22</sup> The theory may have recommended itself to begin with because of the recognition that Laconian partheneia in honor of Artemis had points of resemblance with the pastoral. It is salutary to remember how little we know about the partheneion as a literary type.<sup>23</sup> The evidence for Pindar's *Partheneia* was assembled by Boeckh more than a century ago;<sup>24</sup> later discussions have had very little to add to his magisterial treatment. Färber<sup>25</sup> advances the suggestion that we must distinguish between *παρθένια* and *παρθενεΐα*; the latter are songs *about* girls, or addressed *to* girls, while the former are songs sung *by* girls. In this he follows the Suda.<sup>26</sup> But this kind of accentual distinction

<sup>20</sup> G. Kaibel, "Theokrits *EAENHΣ EΠITHAΛAMION*" *Hermes* 27 (1892) 249–59, esp. 253.

<sup>21</sup> Theon, hypoth. *Idyll 18* (p.331 Wendel), says that some things are taken from Stesichorus' *Helen*. But it appears that Theon was thinking of the details of the legend rather than of the poetic treatment. In Theocritus' epithalamium the chorus is said to be singing as one group: *ἄειδον δ' ἅμα πᾶσαι ἐς ἓν μέλος ἐγκροτέουσαι | ποσσι περιπλέκτους* (vv.7–8). The reading *ἅμα* is that of the pap.; but even the reading of the codd., *ἄρα*, would not affect the sense, except that *ἅμα* introduces a note of emphasis, as if Theocritus were stressing that on this occasion the song was monochoral. That epithalamia *could* be amoebean is shown by Ar. *Pax* 1332ff and Catullus 62. We do not know what Alcman's practice was; all we know is that he was much admired for his wedding songs; cf. Leonidas, *AP* 7.19.1.

<sup>22</sup> Paus. 3.10.8; 4.16.5; Theoc. *Proleg.* pp.2, 8 Wendel. The tradition has been thoroughly demolished by E. Cremonesi, "Rapporti tra le origini della poesia bucolica e della poesia comica nella tradizione peripatetica," *Dioniso* 21 (1958) 109–22.

<sup>23</sup> RE has no entry under this heading.

<sup>24</sup> A. Boeckh, *Pindari Opera quae supersunt* II.2 (Leipzig 1821) 589–95.

<sup>25</sup> H. Färber, *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike* (Diss. München 1936) 39.

<sup>26</sup> s.v. *παρθενεΐα*; cf. schol. Ar. *Ra.* 918 Duebner.

is unparalleled in the ancient discussion of poetic genres and should probably be chalked up to a confusion in the transmission. Proclus, probably following Didymus, says that partheneia mix praise of gods and men, and this is borne out in the extant examples in Alcman and Pindar.<sup>27</sup> Another tradition, that the partheneia were accompanied by *αὔλοί*, does not seem to be based on firm evidence but rather derives from the discussion of which we have an instance in Athenaeus 4.176f, where, among several varieties of *αὐλός*, a *παρθένιος αὐλός*, as well as a *παιδικός* and an *ἀνδρείος αὐλός*, is mentioned.<sup>28</sup>

The most notable ancient reference to partheneia is in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *De Demosthene* 39 (= *De or. vet.* 1073–4). Speaking of the *ἀρχαία καὶ αὐστηρὰ ἀρμονία*, with its lack of connectives, its swift changes of syntax, its anacolutha, and its want of logical coherence, Dionysius says that all of Aeschylus is a case in point, and all of Pindar, *except* for the *Partheneia* and some other poems that require a treatment similar to that of the *Partheneia*; but that even in them there is an *εὐγενεία* and a *σεμνότης* which preserve the ancient patina. Dionysius' remark about the comparatively less austere quality of Pindaric partheneia deals with *ἀρμονία*, *i.e.*, with syntax and logical structure, rather than with mood. But Plutarch, in a passage to which Ahrens (246) drew attention,<sup>29</sup> clearly thought that partheneia were less solemn than other kinds of poems; Plato, he says, preferred the Dorian mode because of its *σεμνότης*, though he must have realized that Alcman and Pindar and Simonides and Bacchylides wrote many partheneia in Doric. Ahrens comments: "Die Worte *οὐκ ἡγνόει—ἐρωτικά* wollen offenbar sagen, dass den Partheneia . . . das *σεμνόν* nicht zukommt."<sup>30</sup> And indeed one suspects that Dionysius could not have used the term *σεμνότης* in his comments unless he also was thinking of matters which strictly speaking do not come under the heading of *ἀρμονία*.

With respect to one of the two Pindaric partheneia which have come

<sup>27</sup> Proclus, *Chr.* 319B32ff (ed. Severyns 1.2 [1938] 211ff). Cf. Ahrens 246ff.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. also Pollux 4.81.

<sup>29</sup> Plu. *De mus.* ch. 17, 1136EF. The question of authorship does not concern us here.

<sup>30</sup> Plu. *De mus.* 1136F: *οὐκ ἡγνόει δ' (sc. Plato) ὅτι πολλὰ Δώρια παρθένεια . . . Ἀλκμᾶνι καὶ Πινδάρῳ καὶ Σιμωνίδῃ καὶ Βακχυλίδῃ πεποιήται, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ προσόδια καὶ παιᾶνες, καὶ μέντοι ὅτι καὶ τραγικοὶ οἰκτοὶ ποτε ἐπὶ τοῦ Δωρίου τρόπου ἐμελωιδήθησαν καὶ τινα ἐρωτικά.* Thus Plutarch and Dionysius tell against the view of Mrs. Burnett, p.30, that scholars have been wrong to make a pretty and playful poem out of a solemn one. She attempts to "clear the air of 'Sapphic intimacy', while restoring to Alcman's choral ode the public solemnity of a major Laconian occasion."

down on any scale (fr.94b Snell), Bowra (1964.363) comments that "Pindar makes the girls use words appropriate to their age and sex and, as Dionysius sees, adopts a simpler and easier style. He is conscious that he is making concessions; for he makes the girls sing . . .

I must think maidenly thoughts  
And utter them with my tongue."

One may wonder whether this does full justice to the complexities of Dionysius' use of the term *ἄρμονία*,<sup>31</sup> but the point about the difference in tone must be right. Bowra continues: "Since the poem is a *δαφνηφορικόν* and belongs to a special ceremony, this may be why Pindar treats it in this exceptional way, since he does not follow this method in all his Maiden-songs. Yet this dramatic device of making the girls speak for and about themselves is already present in Alcman and comes from an ancient tradition, which Pindar is at full liberty to follow. Certainly this poem catches something of Alcman's lightness and gaiety when it speaks of the maidens' dress (5), or garlands (9), or the calming effect of their song (11–15), or their affection for their family (26–27), or their pride in its achievements (31ff)."<sup>32</sup>

Bowra, then, takes it for granted (1) that some Pindaric *partheneia*, perhaps especially the *δαφνηφορικά*, were more lighthearted than others, and that this lightheartedness was a function of their dramatic nature: they featured young girls singing for and about themselves; and (2) that this girlish gaiety is to be found also, and more typically, in Alcman's *Partheneia*.<sup>33</sup> Bowra's remark about the dramatic difference between *partheneia* and other poems is just, but we can go further than that. As Mary Lefkowitz has shown,<sup>34</sup> we must make a fairly radical distinction between Pindar's *Epinicians* on the one hand and his *Paeans* and *Partheneia* on the other. In the *Epinicians* there are few—

<sup>31</sup> Cf. also U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 435.

<sup>32</sup> It should be noted that the particular expressions which Bowra instances as characteristic of the Alcmanic gaiety are very close to some of the principal features of bucolic cheerfulness, with the important exception of family pride. For Alcman's attention to (rustic?) food, cf. *infra* n.43.

<sup>33</sup> For drama and liveliness, see also the scrap of a Hellenistic "partheneion" in *Collectanea Alexandrina* ed. J. U. Powell (Oxford 1925) 193.

<sup>34</sup> Mary R. Lefkowitz, "TO KAI ETΩ: The First Person in Pindar," *HSCP* 67 (1963) 177–253. Perhaps Miss Lefkowitz's results are a little too tidy; also, perhaps, she does not sufficiently explore the question whether two statements of the same type may have entirely different functions in the light of the thematic context in which they appear. But the larger findings of her inquiry seem to me justified and important.

according to Miss Lefkowitz, no—choral statements; that is to say, the poetic ego, the *persona*, is singular, and roughly identical with the poet. In the *Partheneia*, on the other hand, the ego is never that of the poet but always that of the person or persons, or perhaps better, the characters performing the dance-song. Thus Bowra's contention that in fr.94a Snell, Pindar is speaking for himself, must be amended. The masculines (e.g., *φιλέων* v.11) are comparable to the occasional masculines in the female choruses of drama,<sup>35</sup> rather than to the occasions when Alcman refers to himself by name, as in fr.95 PMG.<sup>36</sup>

Anyone who comes afresh to the remains of Pindar's *Partheneia* is immediately struck by the frequency of references to Pan in them. We are reminded of Philostratus, *Imagines* 2.12, an ecphrasis of Pindar: the picture is full of bees, Pan and dancing. Partly this prominence of Pan is an accident of transmission; several of the notices come from the scholia to Theocritus. In fact Pan appears to have been less conspicuous in the two regular books of *Partheneia* than in the book of *κεχωρισμένα παρθενείνα*.<sup>37</sup> Pindar's most celebrated address to Pan, fr.95 Snell, occurred in that book; it is a hymn to Pan and the Mother of the Gods, to whom Pindar was indebted, we are told, as the result of a religious experience.<sup>38</sup> Whatever the truth of that

<sup>35</sup> Cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, on Eur. *Hipp.* 1103ff, in *Aischylos-Interpretationen* (Berlin 1914) 195.

<sup>36</sup> Marzullo 187–8 contends that in *Parth.* 1.39 *ἐγὼν δ' αἶδω* must be the poet speaking in his own person, avowing that, for a man to be *εὐφρων*, he had better not engage in the irresponsible ventures of which the myth of the Leucippids is an example, but he must sing of Agido.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. *Vita Pindari Ambrosiana*, ed Drachmann, vol. I p.3: *παρθενίων β', φέρεται δὲ καὶ γ' ὁ ἐπιγράφεται κεχωρισμένων παρθενίων*.

<sup>38</sup> For details, see Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 270–2 and Bowra 1964.49–50. For a passage which presumably may tell us something about the spirit and the color of hymns to Pan and the Mother, see Ar. *Aves* 737ff. But E. Fraenkel's inferences, *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes* (Roma 1962) 209–11, seem to me too precise. Rather, Phrynichus has written music which is very much like certain rustic songs in honor of the two divinities. For Pan as the 'dog' of the Mother, Wilamowitz compares Call. *Hymni* 4.228. For the joint hymning of the Mother and Pan by nocturnal girls' choruses (surely not "night after night" as Lattimore translates), cf. *Pyth.* 3.77–9. Pindar pictures the girls as singing *παρ' ἑμὸν πρόθυρον*; one wonders whether this is not the source of the tradition that Pindar had a chapel in front of his house dedicated to the joint service of Pan and the Mother and that his own daughters were among the celebrants. Bowra feels that the opening line of fr.95 Snell is so close to that of an Attic skolion, fr.887 PMG, "that Pindar must surely have picked up something from it, and his poem may not be very far in date from his visit to Athens c. 474 B.C." I would rather explain the similarity between the two passages as evidence of the fact that these *partheneia* had something about them in diction and mood which put them close to the lively, unsolemn, amoebian skolia. The utilization of formal similarities for the purpose of comparative dating is always hazardous.

tradition,<sup>39</sup> it is surely significant that when Pindar writes about Pan, the pastoral divinity, it is in the form of partheneia. It is impossible at this distance to determine whether the partheneia of the third book differed substantially from those of the other two books, and how. Nor can we tell precisely how the *δαφνηφορικά* differed from regular partheneia.<sup>40</sup> If fr.104b Snell is from a *δαφνηφορικόν*, one cannot help being struck by its similarity to Alcman fr.56 PMG, which is surely from a partheneion also. The rustic color, the joy in food and physical satisfaction, as well as the gaiety, put us in mind of Aristophanes in his more gentle moments and of Theocritus.

The world conjured up in Alcman's partheneia is one of intimacy and good fellowship. Colin Edmonson<sup>41</sup> has published a roof-tile bearing women's names, connected with the worship of Apollo and Hyacinthus at Amyclae. He thinks that this and other similar catalogues of names, of which there are a number of examples in Spartan inscriptions, may have had a ritual purpose. The fact that in this instance the names are written on a roof-tile rather suggests a less formal occasion. It is easy to imagine a situation in which the girls, excited by their association in some venture, perhaps in a ceremony, or by the recollection of it, decided to record this association, more or less in the manner of modern school girls who write their names into year books or club records. In any case, the coincidence of these graffiti on the one hand and the list of girls' names in *Partheneion* 1.70–7 is evident.<sup>42</sup> The spirit of the lines is one of playful raillery, of teasing. To find similar examples of youthful exuberance, of young people closely known to one another and emphasizing their bond through banter as well as declarations of affection, we must skip several centuries until we come to the Socratic circle, and, later, the minuscule world of the pastoral singers.

Some parts of the Dorian choral tradition, then, especially the partheneia (and perhaps also some of the paeans), point forward to the Hellenistic pastoral in several ways: a greater gaiety by comparison with the more solemn songs of cult and veneration; an interest in the

<sup>39</sup> It is no longer fashionable to shrug it off as unconcernedly as Gildersleeve did in his *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (New York 1885) xiii.

<sup>40</sup> Proclus, *Chr.* 320f (Severyns [*supra* n.27] 211–32); L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar* II (London 1932) 425–7. I have not been able to use F. Sbordone, "Partenii pindarici e dafneforie tebane," *Athenaeum* 18 (1940) 26–50.

<sup>41</sup> C. N. Edmonson, "A Graffito from Amyklai," *Hesperia* 28 (1959) 162–4.

<sup>42</sup> For a detailed analysis of *Parth.* 1.70–7, see p.347 below.

data of nature, and food;<sup>43</sup> an emphasis on intimacy; and, though this must remain a statement without proof, a certain impersonal quality whereby, in this type of choral lyric, the poet allows his characters to sing without obtruding his own ego, a procedure which is quite distinct from other kinds of archaic lyric poetry, choral or non-choral, and which in poetry is found again primarily in drama and in the Theocritean pastoral.

### III

One of the many difficult problems concerning *Partheneion I* is determining the concrete situation which we are to envisage for its performance. It is generally held that the poem differs from, say, the odes of Attic drama in that it involves an act of worship, with an offering brought to the goddess. But there are significant differences of scholarly opinion concerning the identity of the goddess, the nature of the gift, the time of the service,<sup>44</sup> the precise role played by Agido and Hagesichora, and the relevance of the legend told in the first half of the song.

It may be useful to remind ourselves that the proof of the ritual status of the hymn is extremely slight. It hinges on v.61, *φάρος φεροίσας*. Now whatever the meaning of the phrase and of the larger sentence of which it is a part,<sup>45</sup> it is hardly sufficient to persuade us that we are

<sup>43</sup> For food in Alcman, cf. Bowra 1961.66–9, and frgg. 17, 19, 20, 42, 96 PMG. In fr.95 Alcman refers to himself as a furnisher of food; for the question whether Alcman himself could be a participant in a partheneion, cf. p.338 below. Fr.56 remains something of a mystery; somebody is addressing a girl who is supposed to have made a cheese from lion's milk in a golden bucket on many past occasions. Apparently the festival has something to do with Hermes, but also with other gods. The offering is to be compared to the *κριβανωτοί* of fr.94. The suggestion of Willem den Boer, *Laconian Studies* (Amsterdam 1954) 264, that the reference is to a mythic parallel with the Spartan ordeal of cheese stealing (cf. Plu. *Lyc.* 17.5–18.2) seems to me to rest on little evidence and to be intrinsically unlikely because of the feminine construction. As for a feeling for nature, the main exhibit is the much disputed fr.89. Whether it is by Alcman or not (negatively H. F. Fraenkel, "Eine Stileigenheit der frühgriechischen Literatur," GGN 1924, pp.83–4 n.4; cf. also his *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* [APA PhilMon 13, New York 1951] 229 n.19; P. Maas, *Greek Metre* transl. Lloyd-Jones [New York 1962] 9; but see the protest of R. Pfeiffer in *Hermes* 87 [1959] 5 n.1), the fact that the ancients could ascribe the lines to Alcman tells us much about the kind of poetry associated with his name. Cf. also fr.60, with its intriguing combination of two plants favored by Theocritus, *ἐλίχρυσος* and *κύπειρος*.

<sup>44</sup> Wilamowitz 255, against the majority of his colleagues, insisted that the song was sung in broad daylight. For the details of the scholarly debate concerning the points mentioned, cf. Page 1951 *passim*.

<sup>45</sup> See the discussion below, pp.343ff. The suggestion of M. West, "Alcmanica," CQ 15 (1965) 198, to read *φαφος* for *φαρος* is unworthy of its brilliant author.

dealing with a hymn sung as part of an official cult ritual. Even if the offering of the *φάρος* (or *φᾶρος*) was part of a cult in Sparta, rather than a dedication by victors in a singing contest, the fact that the girls here sing of carrying such an implement does not immediately signify that the song is part of a ritual, primarily calculated to please or move or in some other way affect the disposition of the deity. When Archilochus says of himself in fragments 76 and 77 D. that he is a leader of the paeon or that he knows how to perform the dithyramb of Dionysus, we know from the meter that he is not doing anything of the sort. Similarly, when a tragic or comic chorus addresses a prayer or offers gifts to a god we are not invited to think that we are participating in an act of worship in the ordinary sense of the word. The Attic stage, not to mention the Callimachean hymn, teaches us that it is possible to have a poetic reality which has many of the earmarks of a cult reality but which is designed to impress as poetry, even as entertainment, without practical relevance to the relation between man and his god.<sup>46</sup>

The poem itself, therefore, does not help us very far in determining the conditions under which it, or any partheneion by Alcman, would be performed. But there are three ancient passages which mention Spartan women's festivals in terms which may be pertinent.<sup>47</sup> Plutarch refers to a *παννυχὶς ἐορτή* in which the women feasted with the girls, with some of the chief ladies by themselves in the large *ἀνδρών*. Pausanias speaks of a group of women called Dionysiades who engage in a racing contest which was first instituted by command from Delphi. Athenaeus has an account of the Hyacinthia, which goes back to the *Laconica* of Polycrates. All three passages contain elements which throw light on the possible conditions of *Partheneion I*, as scholars working on Alcman have long known. Athenaeus' report is particularly intriguing. During the three-day Hyacinthia, we are told, there are at first no paeans to the gods, nor do the celebrants wear garlands or eat bread. But after this initial mourning period the spirit changes. There are songs to the gods and performances by boys on *κιθάραι* and *αὐλοί*. Others ride on horseback through the *θέατρον*. The girls also have their fun; some are conveyed on

<sup>46</sup> P. D. Arnott, *Greek Scenic Conventions in the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford 1962) 53ff, reminds us that true sacrifices are not permitted on the stage and that the central altar has no ritual standing.

<sup>47</sup> Plu. *Mor.* 775D, Paus. 3.13.5, Ath. 4.17.139C-F. Cf. Diels 369-71.

decorated *κάναθρα* (wicker carts), others race with teams of horses. Everybody turns out and views the spectacle. Other writers confirm that the Hyacinthia also featured women's choruses and contests.<sup>48</sup>

The importance of these reports has often been noted. In *Partheneion I*, also, there is a reference to racing (59), and the many equine touches in the poem gain added significance if we assume that the horse race is closely connected with the performance of the poem itself. It is worth emphasizing further that Athenaeus' account stresses the spectacle and the fun rather than the solemnity of the occasion. The performances, or some of them, take place in the *θέατρον*. Now it would be anachronistic to assume that Alcman's partheneia were performed in a theater, before a group of interested but detached spectators who had paid to witness the spectacle. Still it would be fair to regard *Partheneion I* as a performance of sorts, a poem written for entertainment and possibly elevation but not for the purpose of worship.<sup>49</sup> It is difficult to conceive of a cult exercise that would not be allergic to the praise (and chaffing) of persons which fills at least half of the poem. If the hymn were part of a religious ceremony, the encomia lavished on Hagesichora and Agido might well make the goddess impatient. By the same token, banter along the path of a procession is one thing;<sup>50</sup> but banter written into a cult hymn is a logical absurdity.

I am, therefore, inclined to think that the poem constitutes a performance, much along the lines of the choral hymns performed in the theater of Athens. Bruno Snell's remarks on the metrics of

<sup>48</sup> See Eur. *Hel.* 1465ff; Philostr. *Vit.Soph.* 2.12. For further accounts of women's races, see Page 1951.56.

<sup>49</sup> One wonders whether there are any securely attested cases of noted writers contributing hymns to be sung in the public worship of an established divinity. Cf. the doubts raised about Sophocles' paean to Asclepius by J. H. Oliver, "The Serapion Monument and the Paean of Sophocles," *Hesperia* 5 (1936) 91-122. Oliver thinks that Philostratus (*VA* 3.17) attributed to Sophocles the famous (and anonymous) paean to Apollo of which a copy has been found in Cenchreae. It is my own feeling that Sophocles' paean and the Delphic paean which Aeschylus was asked to write (Porph. *De abst.* 2.18) were designed as *προίμια*, analogous in status to the Homeric Hymns, dedications to the god; songs that could be and surely were performed in honor of the god, but were not intended to replace or rival the traditional hymns which formed the musical part of the service proper and served the community regularly to revalidate their relations with the god.

<sup>50</sup> For *γεφυρισμός* along the path of a cult procession, cf. Hesychius s.v. *γεφυρίς* and *γεφυρισταί*; also Strabo 9.400. See also schol. Ar. *Plut.* 1014, with its reference to women chaffing each other from carts; the notice retains its value even if the scholiast is mistaken about the festival in question, as is held by L. A. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin 1932) 73-4.

*Partheneion I*,<sup>51</sup> viz. that in some ways it anticipates some of the practices of Attic drama, may throw additional light on the relationship. Saying that *Partheneion I* is likely to have been a performance rather than a ritual song does not obviate the need to find out about the formal addressee, the nature of the gift, and so forth. On the whole, I should think, the weight of the evidence favors the majority view that the goddess addressed is Artemis, rather than Helen, or Eileithuia, or one of the other divinities that have been suggested.<sup>52</sup> I also think it likely that the performance took place at night. Fortunately these matters are beyond the immediate scope of this paper. The essential point is that on the evidence available we are not required to think of *Partheneion I* as constituting part of a religious ceremony. Only with this firmly in mind can we give fair consideration to the next question, which is whether there was a rival chorus.

Let us, for the purposes of this analysis, distinguish between 'agonistic' and 'amoebean'. The former designates the external rivalry of a chorus with another chorus, presumably for the acquisition of a prize or some other distinction. The latter refers to the internal rivalry and jockeying for position between members of the same chorus, especially between two half-choruses. In the first edition of his *Lyric Poetry* Bowra supposed that both situations exist in *Partheneion I*; and I hope to show that Bowra's initial instincts were right. His assumption of an agonistic situation continues to hold the field.<sup>53</sup> It has, for better or worse, been held by a number of scholars, including Diels (361), Kukula,<sup>54</sup> Page (1951.57), and Garzya (68 and note), though the latter's language is sufficiently hesitant to have suggested to Harvey<sup>55</sup> that he found no evidence in the poem for the existence of a rival chorus. Among the critics who deny the existence of a rival chorus are Wilamowitz (259), Marzullo (197ff) and Burnett

<sup>51</sup> B. Snell, *Griechische Metrik*<sup>3</sup> (Göttingen 1962) 47; cf. also *infra* n.107. Snell's point is that, contrary to the practice of Pindar and Bacchylides, who usually favor one metrical type in writing a poem, Alcman and Ibycus anticipate the freer metrical flow of dramatic odes by using different metrical species side by side in one and the same strophe.

<sup>52</sup> But see now A. F. Garvie in *CQ* 15 (1965) 185-7, who makes Phoebe, daughter of Leucippus, a plausible candidate for the position of the goddess in the poem.

<sup>53</sup> Bowra 1961.56-8: "His song indicates . . . some kind of contest, which is suggested by such words as μάχονται at 63, ἀμύναι at 65, πόνων at 88, and ἰρήνας ἐρατᾶς at 91 . . ." "There is then something to be said for the view that Alcman's choir competes against another choir called 'The Doves' and that the competition consists of appearance, singing, and running."

<sup>54</sup> Kukula 216. He points out that Pindar and Bacchylides use μάχη and νίκη of contests.

<sup>55</sup> A. E. Harvey, in his review of Garzya in *Gnomon* 28 (1956) 91.

(31). The issue has been reopened with the publication of the new papyrus, *Partheneion II*, which contains the word ἀγών. Marzullo contends that the term need not refer to a contest but may mean an assembly place, as it does in Homer. Peek (167) also decides in favor of the meaning 'place of assembly' and cites Pindar, *Paean* 6.60, in evidence. However, even though the spatial sense of ἀγών is attested earlier than the abstract sense of 'contest', it usually, even in Homer, refers to a place of contention rather than mere assembly.<sup>56</sup> Hence Barrett<sup>57</sup> is probably right in suggesting that the reference in *Partheneion II* is to a contest of some kind: "The surviving lines remind us strongly of the Louvre partheneion . . . It seems from fr.1 that there will be others singing besides our chorus, in what was perhaps a contest of some kind . . ." On balance, then, what with the supportive evidence of *Partheneion II* and the agonistic language of *Partheneion I* itself, the assumption of a rival chorus is not implausible, and causes fewer difficulties than the opposite hypothesis.<sup>58</sup>

The issue of 'amoebean' structure, specifically of the operation of half-choruses, or διχοροία, has also been raised anew by the publication of *Partheneion II*. According to Peek (169ff) the new poem presents alternating half-choruses, although he admits that this interpretation is largely speculative. In actual fact, it seems to me, Peek does not exploit the evidence as fully as he might. His view that three successive strophes concern themselves with Astymeloisa makes him overlook the possibility that in one or the other of them the singers turn

<sup>56</sup> H. J. Mette, in B. Snell/H. Erbse, *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (Göttingen 1955) coll. 134–6, on ἀγών: "Der ἀγών ist ursprünglich das Ergebnis eines ἄγειν, so der ἀγών θεῶν das Ergebnis eines 'Zuges', der die Götterbilder auf die Akropolis usw. geleitet, der ἀγών νεῶν das Ergebnis eines 'Heereszuges'." In Homer and Hesiod the noun ἀγών occurs only in the singular. Mette cites from schol. B<sup>3</sup> Il. 18.376 to the effect that ἀγών has five different meanings: ἀγών δὲ σημαίνει πέντε· τὸν τόπον ὡς τὸ <θ 260>, τὸ ἄθροισμα <Υ 33>, τὸ πλῆθος ὡς τὸ <Ω 1>, τὸ ἄθλον . . . τὸν ναὸν ὡς ἐνταῦθα καὶ <H 298>. Similar and derived statements are to be found in *Et.Gen.*, Apollon. *Lex.* and Hesychius. But in spite of Mette's etymology and the variety of interpretations suggested by the scholiast, the passages from Homer assembled by Mette show clearly that in the majority of the cases ἀγών signifies an 'area-for-contention' or a 'body-in-contention'. Even some passages which Mette puts under the heading 'Ensemble, Versammlung' should be crossfiled under the heading 'body-in-contention': e.g., when the golden automata of Hephaestus are said to move on their own from their house to the θεῖος ἀγών and back, the expression may be due to the fact that when the gods assemble, there is always a stir and a contest of wills, at least in Homer. As for the ἀγών νεῶν (Mette's B 1 b), one is reminded of the racing ships that started out for the Sicilian campaign, Thuc. 6.32.2. ἀγών, then, is a body swarming with activity and tension, or the activity itself.

<sup>57</sup> W. S. Barrett, in his review of POxy. XXIV in *Gnomon* 33 (1961) 683.

<sup>58</sup> Compare the same conclusion of Page 1951.57.

against Astymeloisa. If, e.g., in fr.3 PMG col. ii v.65 we read ἀ δὲ τὸ]ν πυλεῶν' ἔχοισα and imagine Astymeloisa's co-leader as the subject, we may set up the following amoebean situation. Vv.64ff: Astymeloisa does not answer me, but she with the πυλεῶν, like a star, steps out with slim legs, and her hair is beautiful. Vv.73ff: Astymeloisa is the darling of the people; if she were to take my hand, I would be her worshipper. Or again, the sequence might be the other way round; ἀ]λέγω v.76 (cf. *Partheneion* 1.2) may be negative: though Astymeloisa is the darling of the people, I do not care for her, and turn to X. A number of interpretations along these lines could plausibly be suggested; certainty is obviously impossible. In any case there is no compelling reason to assume that Astymeloisa is the only girl praised in the parts of the poem that we have; and Peek's assumption that *Partheneion II* employs half-choruses is more easily defended if we are ready to assume the contrary.

If we now turn to *Partheneion I* we find that there has been violent disagreement over the comparative status of Hagesichora and Agido. Page (1951.45–6) is of the opinion that “Agido is a kind of Chief Assistant to Hagesichora, a Second-in-Command.” The terms, with their evocation of law and order in colonial Africa, are witty enough; but one wonders what the parallels for such a position might be, either in choral poetry or in ritual practice. Page's conclusion is based on a purely quantitative procedure, the counting of occurrences of names, which for want of other criteria must remain an unsatisfactory method of inquiring into dramatic subtleties. Furthermore, Page seems to me to be taking too much for granted in the last three strophes. If, for instance, he says that “the girl ‘with the lovely yellow hair’ in v.101 is surely the same person as the girl with the ‘hair like purest gold’ in vv.51ff,” this means that in Page's opinion either there was only one eligible blonde in Sparta, or, if we must assume rivalry between two choral leaders, the contest is between a blonde and a brunette. In actual fact, all girls, in archaic poetry, are blondes.

Other critics who uphold the superiority of one girl over the other encounter similar difficulties. Davison (446), though recognizing that Agido is just slightly more beautiful than Hagesichora (she “wins only ‘by a short head’”), says that since the κέλης at 50 is Hagesichora, αὐτά at 45 must be she too, since in both cases the talk is of a horse. Van Groningen (348–9), while conceding that the fourth strophe is in praise of Agido and the fifth in praise of Hagesichora, nevertheless

concludes that there is only one full chorus, of which Hagesichora is the (non-singing) leader, while Agido (also non-singing), though the superior of Hagesichora, is given very short shrift in the poem itself. Schwenn (306) similarly suggests that Agido is the priestess, Hagesichora the choral leader. Bowra (1961.62–3) concedes to Page that Hagesichora is more important than Agido, “but of course it does not stop the choir from continuing to praise Agido.”<sup>59</sup>

In view of the contradictory opinions held on this score, the simplest solution, viz. that there are two half-choruses each with its non-singing leader, alternately praising the leaders, may have something to recommend it after all. A detailed demonstration of this from the text will be given below. Here we may anticipate by stating that apparently Alcman wrote at least two different kinds of songs for *παρθένοι*: (1) songs in which two half-choruses contend with one another (*Partheneion I* and perhaps *II*); and (2) songs in which he and the girls address one another. The conclusion that Alcman appeared in some of the *partheneia* in his own person is inescapable. In fr.26 PMG, consisting of four lyric hexameters, the poet sings to the girls that he is too old to dance at their pace, and wishes he were a *κηρύλος*, flying along with his *ἀλκύνες*.<sup>60</sup> In fr.38 the girls sing of themselves as commending the (male) *κιθαριστάς* who is, if not Alcman himself, a stand-in for the artist. In fr.39 and possibly also in fr.40 we seem to have a *σφραγίς*, which must mean that Alcman reserved solo passages for himself; cf. Pollux 4.66, where we learn about the rôle and the position of the *σφραγίς* in citharoedic poetry, especially in Terpander's *nomos*. Fragments 39 and 40 are too brief to furnish assurance that they come either from a choral poem or a monody. But the fact that the poet is referred to in the third person in fr.39 and the parallel of the bird comparisons in *Partheneion* 1.87 and 101 argue for the

<sup>59</sup> For a survey of scholarly opinion concerning the identity and rôle of Agido, see Garzya 35ff.

<sup>60</sup> For a song in which lyrical utterances by an individual alternate with singing by the chorus, cf. Bacch. *Dith.* 18 Snell. The first and third strophes are sung by the chorus, the second and fourth by Aegeus. There are no amoebian patterns of responson, however. Whether the avowal of feebleness in Alcman fr.26 PMG is to be regarded as applying to the chorus master in his own person or to a character acted out, we cannot say. The gossip reported in Athenaeus 13.600f, fr.59 PMG, appears to suggest that Alcman managed to express his personal feelings and desires in his choral poetry. Page's criticism of Antigonus, p.41 PMG, seems excessive. It is true that Alcman's bird flies along with, rather than with the support of, the halcyon birds. But Antigonus recognized correctly that the popular notion of the halcyons' supporting the *κηρύλος* with their wings lends a distinct color to Alcman's picture, in spite of the difference in detail. See, however, G. L. Huxley, “Studies in Early Greek Poets, II: Alcman's *Κολυμβῶσαι*,” *GRBS* 5 (1964) 26–8.

choral alternative. Ibycus fragments 286 and 287 PMG are, on the basis of their metrics, generally thought to come from choral odes; and they allow for the expression of the innermost feelings of individuals. It is difficult to imagine how this could have been managed in any other way than through exchanges between singers.<sup>61</sup>

#### IV

I may turn now to a selective commentary on *Partheneion I*, restricting myself to discussion of those lines whose readings have a bearing, positive or negative, on the suggestion that the poem exhibits *dichoria*.

#### COMMENTARY

**Lines 2 and 12:** οὐκ] . . . ἀλέγω, and παρήσομες. It is tempting to suppose that these expressions of disinterest, which occur in two successive strophes, are a function of amoebean responsion; cf. Theoc. 5.112–5. If so, it would be interesting if the heroes of the ancient war could be divided into two groups. Half-chorus A would then be expressing its lack of appreciation for the heroes acclaimed by half-chorus B, and *vice versa*. But our text is too fragmentary to be sure of anything. For the suggestion that the Deritids and the Hippo-coöntids were praised by two different groups, see Stoessl 95.

**Lines 40–3:** ὄρω γ' ἄτ' ἄλιον, ὄνπερ ἄμιν Ἀγιδῶ μαρτύρεται φαίνην. Page translates: "I see her (*sc.* Agido) like the sun, which Agido summons to shine, as our witness." Page is undoubtedly right in his view that φαίνην is intransitive. He is less convincing when he opposes the old view (Bergk, Diels, Jurenka; now also Treu<sup>62</sup>) that μαρτύρομαι here equals μαρτυρῶ, *i.e.* 'to testify in a court of law'. If, as Page himself assumes, the poem is performed in a night ceremony, what sense is there in saying that Agido summons the sun to shine? Further, if μαρτύρεται meant 'summons', we should expect the aorist of φαίνω; cf. Il. 9.240: ἀράται δὲ τάχιστα φανήμεναι Ἥῳ δῖαν. Rather, Agido is our evidence that there is a sun; in the absence of the heavenly body we need somebody like Agido to remind ourselves of the sun's existence. Translate: "I see Agido as the sun; she is our witness of the sun's shining." The phrase is analogous to a lyric comparison; cf. Sappho's ἐμπρέπεται . . . ὦς . . . μήνα, 96.7–9 LP. It is true that μαρτύρομαι in the sense of μαρτυρῶ is

<sup>61</sup> It is difficult to guess what kind of a song fr.16 comes from and whether the lines refer to Alcman himself.

<sup>62</sup> M. Treu, *Von Homer zur Lyrik* (Zetemata 12, München 1955) 263–4. Cf. now also P. Janni, "Agido ed Agesichora," *RFIC* 92 (1964) 59–65, who emphasizes the agonistic tenor of μαρτύρομαι.

attested only once, in Plato, but even weak attestation takes precedence over faulty sense, particularly in the case of a poet like Alcman whose vocabulary is known to us only very imperfectly.

**Line 44:** Page 50 n.1 comments: “*χοραγός* in v.44 cannot be Agido; for *νιν* would then have to refer to Agido, and *νιν* is never used thus reflexively.” Strictly speaking the use here is not reflexive but ‘anaphorical’. Chantraine<sup>63</sup> defines “l’anaphorique *μιν*” as the *μιν* in a subordinate clause which refers to the subject of the main clause and cites a number of such cases in Homer. Schwyzer (190–1) remarks: “Die anaphorischen Pronomina der 3. Person stehen statt des Reflexivs im allgemeinen nur in Infinitiv- and Partizipialkonstruktionen und Nebensätzen.” He cites cases from the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and Herodotus. He even makes some allowance for *μιν* in cases of reflexive reference. Thus there is no reason why *νιν* should not refer to Agido.<sup>64</sup> The sense is “Agido is like the sun; but our respected leader does not permit us to praise her or to find fault with her.” That is, her appearance is so self-evident that there is no need for us to enlarge on it, either approvingly or disapprovingly (the latter is interesting, but not surprising if the context is amoebean). Some critics wish to make a distinction between *χοροστάτις* and *χοραγός*. Since the former, as we shall see and as is generally agreed, refers to Hagesichora, the champions of Hagesichora’s sole eminence in the poem are compelled to argue either that *χοραγός* also refers to Hagesichora or that the meaning of *χοραγός* is not ‘choral leader’. Plut. *Aporphth.Lac.* 219E, is our best evidence that the two terms are interchangeable: *Δαμωνίδας ταχθείς ἔσχατος τοῦ χοροῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ τὸν χόρον ἰστώντος, εἶγε, εἶπεν, ὦ χοραγέ, ἐξέυρες πῶς καὶ αὐτῇ ἢ χώρα ἄτιμος οὔσα ἔντιμος γένηται.*

**Lines 45–9:** *αὐτά* is emphatic: by herself, without help from others in the form of a eulogy, Agido impresses everyone as outstanding. To compare the girl with a well-built horse is good Spartan language.<sup>65</sup> Even more important, however, especially for the use of the masculines, is the Homeric model, *Il.* 9.123–4.<sup>66</sup> As for *ὑποπετριδίων ὀνείρων*, it is at present impossible to say whether the meaning is ‘winged dreams’ or, as the scholiast suggests, ‘dreams that live under the Rock.’ Since the epithet seems to be largely ornamental, the point is not a crucial one.

Summing up: strophe 4 is in praise of Agido. It is surprising that this should ever have been doubted, seeing that there is no mention of Hagesichora whatever.

<sup>63</sup> P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* II (Paris 1953) §228 p.54.

<sup>64</sup> The view of d’Errico 26 that *νιν* refers to the sun need hardly be considered.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Diels 355.

<sup>66</sup> “Part of the inherited stock-in-trade of the professional poet’s vocabulary” (J. A. Davison, “Quotations and Allusions in Early Greek Literature,” *Eranos* 53 [1955] 139), or direct quotation? Because of the masculines and also for general reasons affecting the relationship between the Homeric poems and the archaic lyric, I would assume the latter.

**Lines 50–4:** ἦ οὐχ ὄρηις; ὁ μὲν κέλης Ἐνητικός· ἃ δὲ χάλια τὰς ἐμὰς ἀνειψιάς Ἀγῆσιχόρας ἐπανθεῖ χρυσὸς [ὡ]ς ἀκήρατος. “Do you not see? The horse is Enetic; but the hair of my cousin Hagesichora blooms like unalloyed gold.” Page, in spite of a touch of adversativeness in his translation,<sup>67</sup> thinks that these lines are all complimentary to Hagesichora. But ‘Enetic’ is not necessarily complimentary, in spite of Devereux’s recent argument<sup>68</sup> that Homer’s reference to Enetic range mules, *Il.* 2.851, implies a compliment to the mares that breed them. Our earliest direct evidence for Enetic horses being regarded as choice racing horses comes from the fifth century; schol. *Eur. Hipp.* 231, tells us that Leon of Sparta in 440 B.C. was the first to win an Olympic victory with an Enetic team. Now Eust. 361.10–40 in his comments on *Il.* 2.852 complains that Euripides took his cue from Leon’s victory to talk, anachronistically, about Enetic horses in the heroic past. The complaint is paralleled in the Euripides scholion, which also reports that the Eneti had originally lived in Paphlagonia before they settled on the Adriatic. Hence, Devereux argues, we must distinguish between two varieties of Eneti, those of Paphlagonia, who breed fine mares for the production of mules; and those of the north Adriatic. Since the horses of the latter, as we are told by several sources,<sup>69</sup> are harness horses rather than riding horses, and since they are more distinguished for their speed than for their looks, Alcman must (Devereux concludes) be thinking of the Paphlagonian Eneti. But in spite of Devereux’s careful sifting of the sources, his case for a well-known breed of Paphlagonian Enetic mares is circumstantial at best.<sup>70</sup> The case for Adriatic Enetic harness horses is much better attested. Once Devereux’s premise, that Alcman is paying a compliment, is challenged, the difficulties of interpretation disappear. What is wanted is a reference to a horse that is neither overly attractive nor primarily a riding horse. Thus the Adriatic species fits excellently; that there are no other pre-classical references to the breed is an argument from silence which this very passage should be allowed to demolish. In effect, the girls are saying “Don’t you have eyes to see? The noble steed (of whom you sing)<sup>71</sup> is—an Enetic pony. But our cousin Hagesichora . . .” The strophe, then, starts with a piece of chaffing: Agido, by comparison with Hagesichora, whom the chorus is

<sup>67</sup> Page 1951.22. Marzullo 195 n.3 apparently misunderstands Page’s meaning.

<sup>68</sup> G. Devereux, “The Enetian Horse of Alcman’s Partheneion,” *Hermes* 94 (1966) 129–34.

<sup>69</sup> See especially John K. Anderson, *Ancient Greek Horsemanship* (Berkeley 1961) 37, who cites Strabo 5.1.9. Strabo is not explicit in relating his tale of the wolf-brand horses to the Enetic breed, but Anderson is probably correct in making the connexion.

<sup>70</sup> W. S. Barrett, in his edition of *Eur. Hipp.* (Oxford 1964) 204, appears to favor the Adriatic over the Paphlagonian identification, though he does refer to Page’s doubts on this head, Page 1951.88: “It is easy to presume familiarity with Paphlagonia, difficult to find traces of acquaintance with the far northern Adriatic.”

<sup>71</sup> The warning of Jurenka 1896.14 that the article in v.50 is demonstrative is worth heeding. His further comment that κέλης is part of the predicate is not equally binding.

about to praise, is a Connemara pony, fast perhaps, but small, half-wild and not entirely attractive.<sup>72</sup>

**Lines 55–7:** τό τ' ἀργύριον πρόσωπον διαφάδαν τί τοι λέγω; Ἀγησιχόρα μὲν αὐτά. "Hagesichora's face is silver. But why talk about it explicitly? Here she is before you!" This sequence is the pendant to the praise of Agido at 40–5. Like Agido, Hagesichora does not need to be praised in detail since her beauty is openly in evidence. Further, Kukula (208) may well be right that ἀργύριον implies a reference to the moon, which would thus answer to the mention of the sun at 41. But even without this, the correspondence between the two eulogies is clear. Page's translation "So much for Hagesichora," is misleading; his own citations (1951.89) of *Pi. Ol.* 4.24 and *Dem.* 18.282 show that his understanding of αὐτά is not exactly what is indicated by his translation. The pronoun is in fact used to emphasize the presence of persons near the speaker; cf. the examples given by Kuehner-Gerth.<sup>73</sup>

**Lines 58–9:** ἃ δὲ δευτέρα πεδ' Ἀγιδῶ τὸ φεῖδος ἵππος Ἰβηνῶι Κολαξαῖος δραμῆται. Page continues to feel that Ἀγιδῶ must be accusative,<sup>74</sup> in spite of the apparent view of the scholiast B (*POxy.* 2389 fr.6 col. i lines 2–4) that it is nominative. The reading of the papyrus is such that it favors the scholiast's understanding of the passage.<sup>75</sup> "The second one after her (*viz.* after Hagesichora) in looks, Agido will run, a Colaxaeon horse with an Ibenian." The scholiast says that according to Aristarchus an Ibenian horse is better than a Colaxaeon.<sup>76</sup> There are here two possible points of comparison: (1) beauty, (2) speed. We are told that Agido is less beautiful than Hagesichora. There is to be a race;<sup>77</sup> will Agido also be slower than Hagesichora? The answer to this depends in part on the interpretation of πεδ' and of the dative Ἰβηνῶι. The suggestion of Garzya (52) that πεδ' derives from πεδδραμῆται does not strike me as plausible; he himself notes that μετατρέχω in the sense of 'run with' is not attested. The position of πεδ' would seem to indicate that it is to be taken adverbially with δευτέρα, and Page acknowledges that the scholiast so understands it: 'second after'. This leaves Ἰβηνῶι as a dative associated with δραμῆται. On the analogy of μάχεσθαι with the dative it has been suggested that the reference here is to a

<sup>72</sup> Alcman fr.172 PMG is too uncertain textually and in its ascription to be useful.

<sup>73</sup> R. Kühner/B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*<sup>4</sup> I (Leverkusen 1955) 645.

<sup>74</sup> D. L. Page, in his review of *POxy.* XXIV in *CR* 9 (1959) 18; cf. also PMG p. 7.

<sup>75</sup> See also Garzya 51 and Marzullo 196–7.

<sup>76</sup> G. Devereux, "The Kolaxaian Horse of Alcman's *Partheneion*," *CQ* 15 (1965) 176 n.4, suggests that Alcman derives the Kolaxaian horse—and also the dream horse of lines 46–9—from Aristaeas' *Arimaspea*. Cf. J. D. P. Bolton, *Aristaeas of Proconnesus* (Oxford 1962) 40f.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. the references to racing contests given above, pp. 333f. Davison 446 asks whether the two girls are really thought of as running in a race, or whether the idea of the horse simile makes for this further image. He decides for the latter. But it is worth remembering that at many Greek festivals the musical agon is followed by a gymnastic and an equestrian agon; for the Great Panathenaea the evidence was collected admirably by Davison himself in *JHS* 78 (1958) 25ff.

contest between two girls compared to horses. But there is no other instance of *δραμεῖν* or its derivatives with the dative. Hence we are on our own. The interpretation will be affected by the understanding of the subsequent vv.60–3 about the Peleïades. For my own purposes it does not make much difference whether Agido is thought of as running *with* Hagesichora or *against* her (though my discussion of 60–3 will show that I favor the former).<sup>78</sup> We must, however, insist that the passage is concerned entirely with these two girls and no others. The notion that *δευτέρα* may refer to a third girl (Bergk, Kukula, Scheidweiler [244–5], Page [1951.89–90], Barrett<sup>79</sup>) is not warranted by anything in the text and is unlikely *ex hypothesi*. It is in fact an idea that was prompted only by an uncertainty about the rôles of Hagesichora and Agido.

**Lines 60–3:** *ταὶ Πεληάδες γὰρ ἄμυν ὀρθρία φάρος φεροίσας νύκτα δι' ἀμβροσίαν ἄτε σήριον ἄστρον ἀφηρομέναι μαχόνται.* Page<sup>80</sup> examines the various possibilities of interpreting *Πεληάδες*:

(1) Hagesichora and Agido (Wilamowitz, Schwenn; *cf.* also Farina [39] and Garzya [52–5]). This seems to be the opinion expressed in scholion XII and perhaps also in scholion B (*POxy.* 2389 fr.6 col. ii lines 16ff), although the scholia are too fragmentary to be very helpful. Garzya's position is interesting. For *ἀφηρομέναι* he cites *Il.* 6.289ff and translates: "And in fact these two doves struggle (with the rival chorus) in the ambrosial night, lifting up for us, who offer it to Orthria, the cloak (shining) like the star Sirius." Garzya is, I believe, alone in withholding the term *Πεληάδες* from the rival chorus without at the same time giving up the notion that there was a rival chorus. Further, he argues that *ἀφηρομέναι* cannot be intransitive and hence cannot refer to the rising of a constellation or star; and that Sirius is compared to the cloak rather than to the *Πεληάδες*. His interpretation is vulnerable on two points: (a) his interdiction of the intransitive use of *ἀείρομαι* is excessive, especially in the light of Herodotus' frequent use of *ἀείρομαι* in the sense of 'depart'; (b) Garzya fails to note that in the poetic tradition Sirius usually has ominous or uncomplimentary connotations;<sup>81</sup> hence the image is less likely in connexion with the gift to the goddess than as a characterization of a rival chorus.

(2) The constellation (Weir Smyth, van Groningen [250–1], Davison [449]; *cf.* d'Errico [26–7] and Burnett *passim*). Davison argues that there is no evidence

<sup>78</sup> *Cf.* now also G. Devereux (*supra* n.76) 177: "The Ibenian and the Kolaxaian horses are not racing *against* each other, but are running jointly . . ."

<sup>79</sup> W. S. Barrett in *Gnomon* 33 (1961) 686. Barrett is very hesitant about this solution.

<sup>80</sup> Page 1951.52ff. For the Pleiades generally consult Gundel's article in *RE* 21.2 (1952) 2486–2523.

<sup>81</sup> Hesiod connects the star with deadly drought. Homer does not refer to Sirius by name, but his *σῆλιος ἀστήρ* (*Il.* 11.62) seems to have been identified as Sirius, if we can trust the instincts of Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* 957–9. For a recent survey of the evidence, see K. Gantar, "Kaiser Justinian 'jenem Herbststern gleich': Bemerkung zu Prokop *Aed.* I 2, 10," *MH* 19 (1962) 194–6, who in turn refers to Gundel in *RE* zw.R. 3A.1 (1927) coll. 314ff.

of a rival chorus and that μάχεσθαι can be used only of competitions which involve actual fighting, such as boxing and other contact sports. Neither point is very strong. Though there is no explicit evidence for the rival chorus in the poem, there are hints of its existence; and as Page has said (1951.57), "If 'direct evidence' must be nothing less than the explicit statement that a Rival Choir exists, it is neither possible to find it nor rational to look for it." Davison's point about μάχεσθαι is too rigorous and has convinced few. But the main objection to (2) is that it would be absurd to compare the constellation Pleiades to Sirius. The point of a comparison is that it connects members of different classes.<sup>82</sup> Hence varying assessments of the brightness of Sirius will not suffice to vindicate (2); nor will the theory, derived from Proclus on Hes. *Erga* 417, that Σείριος could be used as a name for the sun.

(3) The rival chorus (Bowra, Page, Scheidweiler and others). Schol. Theoc. 13.25 p.262 Wendel (*cf.* Call. fr.693 Pf.) reports that the 'Peleiades' were the daughters of the queen of the Amazons and that these were the first, as girls, to establish dancing and a παννυχίς: *πρώτων δ' αὐται χορείαν καὶ παννυχίδα συνεστήσαντο παρθενεύουσαι*. The scholion goes on to connect the rising of the Pleiades with the quickening of spring, which is further proof of the impossibility of associating Sirius poetically with the constellation. Finally, the scholion names the seven Pleiades; the reminder that the Pleiades constitute a sizable group is further proof that the two leaders are not likely to be so designated.

On balance, then, identification (3) remains the most plausible. The reference is to a group of dancers who are engaged in a contest with the girls who sing this hymn. They rise like Sirius: an uncomplimentary remark which confirms the agonistic setting. Whether Agido and Hagesichora will do their racing together or in competition with one another is something else again. If their racing is at the same time an offering of the φάρος, which is by no means more certain here than in the description of the Heraea by Paus. 5.16.2–5, they will have to be imagined as running together. And in fact γάρ v.60 suggests a united effort on the part of the two leaders. I am not sure how to explain the change of tense between δραμήται at 59 and μαχόνται at 63. Perhaps it would be proper to say that δραμήται refers to a specific action which will take place directly, while μαχόνται refers to the general reality of the conflict between the two rival choruses; for the latter, *cf.* Il. 5.875.<sup>83</sup> Thus vv.58–63 will have the following meaning: "When Agido runs

<sup>82</sup> I do not understand why Page 1951.53–4 finds this argument of little weight. For the rest, Page's discussion of the identity of the Peleiades, pp.52–7, is magisterial. *Cf.* also his reference to Paus. 5.16.2–5 for a group of sixteen women racing one another in honor of Hera. They also offer a robe to the goddess and split into two (half?) choruses.

<sup>83</sup> At the Panathenaea, as at other such festivals (*e.g.* the Theseia) the agonistic order was: (1) music, (2) athletics, (3) horse-racing. The evidence comes from Pollux 8.93, Arist. *AthPol* ch. 60, and several inscriptions. J. A. Davison (*supra* n.77) pp.26ff gives the details; he seems inclined to believe that many of the contests formed part of the annual Panathenaea from very early times.

with Hagesichora, as she will later today, she will be second to her in beauty, as a Colaxaeon is to an Ibenian horse. (They will run) for the Peleides are contending with us, rising like Sirius (or: like a searing star) through the ambrosial night, as we take the *φάρος* to Orthria.”

Summing up: strophe 5 is in praise of Hagesichora, with some allowance for cooperation between Hagesichora and Agido in the face of a rival chorus.

**Lines 64–76:** οὔτε γάρ τι πορφύρας τόσσοι κόρος ὥστ’ ἀμύναι, οὔτε ποικίλος δράκων παγχρύσιος, οὐδὲ μίτρα Λυδία . . . οὐδὲ ται Ναννώσ κόμαι, ἀλλ’ οὐ[δ’] Ἀρέτα θειιδής . . . Bowra’s characterization (1961.63) is typical of the usual interpretation: “The choir proclaims its deficiencies . . . They have no purple, golden armlets, or Lydian coifs, nor can they summon to their help girls renowned for their beauty.” But it is strange that a chorus of girls, instructed by Alcman, should complain of not having enough in the way of ornaments or good looks to compete with their rivals. Kukula<sup>84</sup> protested against this notion, but his own suggestion, viz. “there is nowhere enough purple, etc. to be a match for us,” is hardly more convincing. Before the passage can be understood, we have to deal with three specific problems: (a) the meaning of *κόρος*; (b) the meaning of *ἀμύναι*; and (c) the function of *ὥστε*.

(a) Page comments (1951.90): “*κόρος*: rather ‘abundance’ than (as usual) ‘over-abundance’; cf. Hes. *Th.* 593; Heraclitus fr.111 D.” Page does not consider a third possibility, viz. ‘satisfaction’, i.e., the pleasurable gratification of a physical desire. But this is in fact the common meaning of *κόρος* and *κορέννυμαι* in Homer. Usually the source of *κόρος* is food (*Il.* 19.167; *Od.* 14.28), but there are many possible grounds of satisfaction, and the three uses of the noun (as distinguished from the verb, which is more common) are associated with grief (*Od.* 4.103), fighting (*Il.* 19.221), and with sleep, love, singing, and dancing (*Il.* 13.636): πάντων μὲν κόρος ἐστί, καὶ ὕπνου καὶ φιλότῆτος | μολπῆς τε γλυκερῆς καὶ ἀμύμονος ὀρχηθμοῖο. It is true that in later lyric poetry *κόρος* comes to have a meaning close to *ὑβρις*; cf. *αἰανῆς κόρος*, a persistent or obsessive state of being puffed up, at *Pi. Ol.* 2.95 and *I.* 3.2. But the Hippocratics continue the use of the term in the sense of pleasurable satisfaction of the moment: most foodstuffs are compounded and unhealthy, *ἔξω τῶν πρὸς ἡδονῆν τε καὶ κόρον ἠρτυμένων τε καὶ ἐσκευασμένων* (*De vet. med.* ch. 14 line 50 Jones). Here *κόρος* goes closely with *ἡδονή*, and designates ‘pleasure in and beyond satisfaction’.<sup>85</sup> The most plausible interpretation of 64–5, therefore, is: “I do not take as much pleasure in (or: get as much satisfaction from)

<sup>84</sup> Kukula 211. Marzullo’s explanation of the passage, pp.202–3, is colored by his thesis of an erotic connexion between Agido and Hagesichora. Cf. also Diels.

<sup>85</sup> The sense is anticipated in Hes. *Theog.* 592–3: he says of women that they πῆμα μέγα θνητοῖσι μετ’ ἀνδράσι ναιετάουσιν οὐλομένης πενίης οὐ σύμφοροι, ἀλλὰ κόροιο. they are a help, not in poverty, but in pleasure. The comment is bitterly ironical, since sexual pleasure is not one of the commodities which Hesiod counts among the things that

crimson . . ." On this interpretation, crimson material turns out to be not a desired stage prop but an imagined source of pleasure, comparable to other sources of delight such as pins, hats, and—girls.

(b) ἀμύναι. Page 1951.52 n.1 refers to schol. Lips. Hom. *Il.* 5.266 (=Eust. *Il.* 546.29): φησὶ γὰρ ὁ γραμματικὸς Ἀριστοφάνης (cf. Nauck *Ixi* p.213) τὸ ἀμύνεσθαι οὐ μόνον σημαίνειν τὸ κακῶς παθόντα ἀντιδιατιθέναι, ἀλλὰ τιθεῖσθαι καὶ ἀντὶ ψιλοῦ τοῦ ἀμείψασθαι ὅτιοῦν. Aristophanes cites as examples of this meaning the present passage from Alcman (reading ἀμύνασθαι rather than ἀμύναι) and Thuc. 1.42.1. Page professes not to understand Aristophanes' comments. The Thucydidean passage, however, seems to supply a possible cue: νεώτερός τις . . . ἀξιούτω τοῖς ὁμοίοις ἡμῶς ἀμύνεσθαι: "let the young men consider it proper to treat us as we have treated you." The force of ἀμύνεσθαι here is 'to respond', to react to a stimulus. So when Aristophanes compares ἀμύνεσθαι to ἀμείβεσθαι, he appears to think of the simple Homeric usage 'to answer', or 'to take one's turn'.<sup>86</sup> Hence the deprecatory ψιλοῦ and the generalizing ὅτιοῦν. It is true that Alcman has the active rather than the middle; but both occur in Homer, and I see no difficulty in applying what Aristophanes says about ἀμύνεσθαι to ἀμύναι. In Homer, the response is always a military response, i.e., a defense. But it may well be that in its origin ἀμύνω is not restricted to the field of battle. The variety of constructions (with acc., with dat., or with a preposition) indicates that ἀμύνω is not, in essence, a verb that requires an object.<sup>87</sup> Availing myself of Aristophanes' views, I propose to translate ἀμύναι as 'answer or 'respond'. The chorus talks of itself not as defending itself against the rival chorus but responding to the sentiments expressed in the previous strophe, hence responding to the other half-chorus. The use of ἀμύναι, then, is not agonistic

---

benefit society. I prefer this interpretation to Page's translation of κόρος by 'plenty'. Heraclitus fr.65 D. presents an interesting problem: καλεῖ δὲ αὐτὸ χρησιμοσύνην καὶ κόρον. χρησιμοσύνη δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ διακόσμησις κατ' αὐτόν, ἡ δὲ ἐκπύρωσις κόρος. In frgg. 67 and 11 κόρος is contrasted with λιμός. Both λιμός and χρησιμοσύνη signify 'hunger' or 'need'. G. S. Kirk, *Heraclitus, the Cosmic Fragments* (Cambridge [Eng.] 1954) 357–61, seems to imply that κόρος was used variously by Heraclitus to mean (1) fulness and (2) overfulness (his own translation 'satiety' does not really fit the situation as he describes it). But he admits that anything we might say on this score is speculative. In view of its contrast with λιμός, however, I consider it more likely that Heraclitus thought of κόρος as denoting a physiological or psychological experience rather than a condition or a state. To demonstrate this, a detailed analysis of Heraclitus' series of opposites would be required.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. also Simonides' use of ἀμύνεσθαι, fr.611 PMG, which the Suda 1.148 Adler glosses: ἀντὶ τοῦ χάριτας ἀποδίδοναι, 'to return favors'. See also the entries in Hesych. 1.3856 and 3860, p.134 Latte (gloss. Cyrill.), according to which ἀμύνειν and ἀμύνεσθαι equal ἀποδίδοναι or ἀνταποδίδοναι.

<sup>87</sup> The old view that ἀμύνω and ἀμείβω are etymologically related, i.e., that both of them derive from IE \*meu (cf. Latin *movere*), has now been abandoned. For references, see H. Erbse, in *LexfrgrEpos* (*supra* n.56) coll. 619 and 650.

but amoebian. But what is the connexion between *τόσσοι κόροι* and *ἀμύναι*? This depends on the translation of *ὥστε*.

(c) *ὥστε*. It is important to realize that *ὥστε* cannot be the consequent of *τόσσοι*, because of what follows. If for the moment we dismiss *ὥστε ἀμύναι* from consideration, the rest reduces to a simple though grammatically harsh *praeteritio*: “We do not get as much satisfaction from scarlet material . . . nor does a golden dragon pin (please us as much), or a Lydian toque . . . or Nanno’s hair, or the divine Areta, or . . .” It is true that beginning with *ποικίλος δράκων* we have nominatives rather than genitives, so that the initial construction based on *κόροι* is side-tracked. But it is generally agreed that the sequence is a *praeteritio* and that its items parallel one another. Beginning with v.73 Alcman relaxes the pattern of the sequence even further by introducing the house of Ainesimbrotia, with its charming inmates: *οὐδ’ ἐς Αἰνησιμβρο[ό]-τας ἐνθοῖσα φασεῖς· Ἀσταφίς [τ]έ μοι γένοιτο καὶ ποτιγλέποι Φίλυλλα . . .* Thus, instead of continuing the catalogue of ladies who do not measure up by comparison with someone else not yet mentioned, Alcman introduces a touch of concreteness and refracts the line: “Nor will you go to the house of Ainesimbrotia and say: Let Astaphis be mine, and let Philylla look at me . . .”<sup>88</sup> In spite of these resolutions, the underlying thought remains the same; everything in the extended *praeteritio* points to the final acclamation to which all such series move. The initial *τόσσοι* points toward an ultimate *ὄσον* (‘we do not get as much satisfaction from Y as from X’); the subsequent independent statement points toward an adversative statement (‘you will not say Y should look at you, but you will hope for a glance from the beautiful X’). It goes without saying that the girls mentioned in vv.70–6 are all beautiful. They are the acknowledged beauties of the Spartan *jeunesse dorée*, analogous to the various handsome youths eulogized in some of Socrates’ introductory gambits. They are mentioned because along with crimson garments and gold brooches they share the quality of desirability.<sup>89</sup> At the same time, like the wardrobe and the jewelry, they are supposed to pale into insignificance by comparison with the X toward whom the *praeteritio* is pointed. It does not much matter precisely what kind of a house Ainesimbrotia ran; Page (1951.65) may well be right that she was the keeper of a training school for chorus girls, though there is no evidence for this whatever. But we can be sure that the girls mentioned are not in the chorus; it would be awkward in the extreme if the members of the chorus (or half-chorus) were to refer to themselves for the mixture of praise and deprecation required in

<sup>88</sup> The second person *φασεῖς* has generalizing force; cf. Schwyzer p. 244 (B iv 3 a β). Throughout the lines preceding 73 the singers avoid the first person, as if the *praeteritio* were headed for expressing a universal rather than a personal value.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. also Plato, *Hp.Ma.* 287<sup>eff</sup>. Hippias instances young girls and gold as prime examples of beauty.

a *praeteritio*. Granted that this is the drift of the passage, that is to say, that *τόσσοι* anticipates a *ῥοσον* (which, to be sure, is never realized), then *ὥστ' ἀμύναι* can be nothing more than a parenthetical phrase, analogous to such expressions as *ὡς εἰπεῖν*, and meaning 'to respond'. True, *ὥστε* introducing an absolute or limitative infinitive is not paralleled, but there is some suggestion that the limitative infinitive is in its origins consecutive.<sup>90</sup> This is shaky ground. My argument requires *either* that *ὥστε* was at one time equivalent to *ὡς* with the limitative infinitive, *or* that a *τ* was added in the text of Alcman when it was felt that *τόσσοι* needed a consequent. An additional difficulty is that limitative infinitives are more common in prose than in poetry and that the first examples occur considerably later than Alcman. But it is probably fair to assume that at a time prior to the writing of literary prose, poetry was less self-conscious about excluding the patterns of living speech. What is more, this would not be the only colloquialism in Alcman's verse; *cf.* the parenthetical *φείπομι κ'* in v.85. In any case, the interpretation here suggested seems to me less awkward than the various uncertainties which result from the notion of a defense and a victory being read into the thought of the passage.

**Line 77:** *ἀλλ' Ἀγησιχόρα με τείρει*. Ever since Lobel warned Page that the papyrus reads not *τήρει* but *τείρει* scholars have been in a quandary about the sense of the line. Page (1951.91) simply confesses that he does not understand; his reference to Hes. fr.105 Rz. does not help since in Hesiod the subject of the verb is not a person but *ἔρως*. d'Errico (31) proposes the translation, "We are worried about Hagesichora." He understands the whole strophe as follows: "You, the girls of Hagesichora, will have a difficult stand against us, since you do not have a Nanno, or an Areta . . .; only Hagesichora, your leader, has us worried." But like the interpretation of Kukula (*supra* n.84), d'Errico's does not convince; the strophe is not about running, but about pleasure and beauty. Harvey<sup>91</sup> decides that emendation is the only recourse and proposes *μ' ἐθείρει*. Garzya (1954.62) ventures to disregard Page's warning and to read *τήρει* after all. The only scholar who accepts and translates *τείρει* without blinking is Bowra:<sup>92</sup> "The word means 'wears out' . . ." But then, because of his initial assumption that the strophe is in praise of Hagesichora, he concludes that the phrase means: "We are worn out with praising her; there obviously is nothing more to say." I suggest that we should take *τείρει* quite literally. In Homer, *τείρω* can be predicated of a wound (*Il.* 16.510) or a pain (*Il.* 16.61) or old age (*Il.* 4.315) or sweat or hunger or bad smells; or even of a

<sup>90</sup> *Cf.* Schwyzer 379; also Gottfried Herman, *Opuscula* I (Leipzig 1827) 227, cited by A. Roseth, "Die Entstehung des absoluten Infinitivs," *AJP* 43 (1922) 220–7. Roseth himself has a different view of the matter; he holds that the absolute infinitive comes about by ellipsis, when an auxiliary verb of possibility drops out.

<sup>91</sup> A. E. Harvey, in his review of Garzya in *Gnomon* 28 (1956) 89–90.

<sup>92</sup> Bowra 1961.61. But *cf.* also M. Treu, in *Gnomon* 26 (1954) 170.

depressing song (*Od.* 1.342), *i.e.*, of anything that does not please and positively displeases or even disgusts. *τείρομαι*, then, is in some respects the opposite of *κορέννυμαι*. Homer does not give us a person as the subject of *τείρω*, and in fact Alcman's usage may be the only one of its kind. But it is clear that the word was available to express the notion of violent displeasure. *Ar. Lys.* 960 has the word in a comic context; the chorus of old men sympathize with Cinesias after Myrrhina has disappointed his expectations: *ἐν δεινώι γ' ὦ δύστηνε κακῶι τείρει ψυχὴν ἔξαπατηθεῖς*. I suggest that Alcman uses the word, extravagant and usually impersonal as it is, in order to emphasize what turns out to be an egregious anticlimax. "But Hagesichora grates on me" comes to be substituted for the eulogy of X toward which the *praeteritio* has ostensibly been moving. Hence the eulogy would have been "Agido is the loveliest." Hence, the strophe is sung by the half-chorus of Agido. The substitution of a taunt of Y for the praise of X is an amoebean technique. Such *ἀπροσδόκητα* are not uncommon in comedy and the pastoral.<sup>93</sup> It makes particularly good sense in an atmosphere of intimate banter, in which insults are not taken amiss and in which the allegiances of the participants are evident without the need for the kind of information which modern theater audiences must have. The girls led by Agido can depend on their commitment to Agido being understood by all; taunting Hagesichora is immediately recognized as a direct outcropping of this commitment.

Summing up: strophe 6 is, by indirection, in praise of Agido. This contention is further strengthened by the opening of Strophe 7, which is unambiguously and argumentatively in praise of Hagesichora.

**Lines 78–81:** *οὐ γὰρ ἀ κ[α]λλίσφυρος Ἀγησιχ[ό]ρ[α] πάρ' αὐτεῖ, Ἀγιδοῖ . . . θωστήρ[ι]ά τ' ἄμ' ἐπαινεῖ;* The *γάρ* makes it likely that this rhetorical question is a rejoinder to the implications of the preceding lines. The sense is: "What you say is nonsense; does not Hagesichora, she of the fine ankles, stand

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Theoc. *Id.* 7.125; "May Molon choke himself with this tussle" has some of the same force, Molon being introduced in order, by negative implication, to wish Aratus a better fate. *Partheneion* 1.77 is unusual in that it combines two related forms of humor: (1) the *ἀπροσδόκητον*, and (2) the terminal punchline, which often operates with the element of surprise and equally often introduces a note of vulgarity. In pastoral poetry, the punchline terminates either an individual song or the whole poem. It is usually the winner in the contest or the dominant character who achieves this break-through. See Theoc. *Id.* 1.151–2; 4.58, 63; 5.149–50; 7.126–7; 9.35–6; 10.67–70, and the comments of E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957) 60–1. For surprise endings in modern pastoral poetry, cf. Ronsard's *Adonis* (Venus forgets Adonis and takes up with Anchises), and Robert Frost's *New Hampshire*: "At present I am living in Vermont." As for (1), the *Tractatus Coisl.* mentions the *ἐκ τοῦ παρὰ προσδοκίαν* as one of the sources of laughter. Lane Cooper, *An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy* (New York 1922) 249–50 gives examples and refers to Arist. *Rhet.* 3.11.1412a19ff. See also W. J. M. Starkie, *The Acharnians of Aristophanes* (London 1909) lxvii f, who criticizes Aristotle for defining the technique as pertaining to *γέλως ἀπὸ τῶν πραγμάτων*, which explains why Aristotle does not analyze the stylistic phenomenon involved. Starkie gives a list of examples from Aristophanes. The book on the rhetoric of humor in Aristophanes remains to be written.

right here to disprove your position?" What follows is fragmentary, but it is generally conjectured that there is some talk about Hagesichora standing next to Agido and commending the *θωστήρια*. As I have indicated above, there is no need to assume that the two leaders are acting as priestesses in a religious service. The emphasis on the close association of the two leaders is probably to be seen as a parallel to the joint (or competitive) running projected in vv.58–9. Here, as there, their very closeness will make the superiority of Hagesichora even more obvious. In the sequel, vv.82–4, there is some allowance for joint action, very much as in vv.60–3; whatever the differences between the two leaders, their stand vis-à-vis the gods is united, as is that of the whole chorus.

**Lines 84–91:** [χο]ροστάτις, φείποιμί κ', [ἐ]γὼν μὲν αὐτὰ παρθένος μάταν ἀπὸ θράνω λέλακα γλαύξ· ἐγὼ[ν] δὲ τᾷ μὲν Ἀώτι μάλιστα φανδάνην ἐρῶ· πόνων γὰρ ἄμιν ἰάτωρ ἔγεντο· ἐξ Ἀγησιχόρ[ας] δὲ νεάνιδες [ἱρ]ήνας ἐρατ[ᾶ]ς ἐπέβαν. For *χοροστάτις*, see above on v.44. In what follows, the girls, speaking in the choral singular, compare their own singing to the hooting of an owl from the rafter. The emphasis is on *αὐτὰ*, here in the sense of 'I alone', without the choral leader who is addressed. That this leader is Hagesichora is clear from 90. For a fuller understanding of the image of the owl we must wait for an examination of vv.100–1 below. The praise of Hagesichora is interrupted by a further mention of the goddess who is the object of devotion, Aotis, who has in the past been a saviour divinity.<sup>94</sup> We do not know whether the *πόνοι* of v.88 are connected with the *εἰρήνη* of v.90, whether, that is, the divine salvation from troubles and the peace upon which Hagesichora has launched the girls are one and the same. For a discussion of the difficulties and of past attempts to cure them, see the comments of Page (1951.93–5). Page himself declares for a contrast between the (general) peace owed to the goddess and the (particular) victory owed to Hagesichora. Garzya (66–9) prefers to think that Hagesichora is thought of as an instrument of the goddess and that both *πόνοι* and *εἰρήνη* are without reference to a specific past incident but designate effort and achievement in agonistic endeavour. Certainty in this is impossible; at any rate the singers ascribe some function in achieving peace to Hagesichora, and I consider it likely that the reference is to a past victory in a festival such as the one in which they are now engaged.<sup>95</sup>

Summing up: strophe 7 is in praise of Hagesichora, with some allowance for joint action between Hagesichora and Agido. The pious remarks about

<sup>94</sup> Garzya 67 is probably right when he protests against the notion of Bowra 1936.58 (tacitly corrected in Bowra 1961) and others that the troubles referred to are the second Messenian War. But Garzya's own proposal (68) to interpret both *ἔγεντο* v.89 and *ἐπέβαν* v.91 as gnomic aorists breaks down for want of parallels.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Davison 453. Garzya 68 rightly compares *Pi. Ol. 1.98: μελιτόσσααν εὐδῖαν*. I wonder whether *Ar. Eq. 579* is not at least ambiguous, that is, whether the reference is not as much to the dramatic competition as to any military promises. Cf. also *Thesm.* 1147.

the gods and Aotis carry us back to the respectable sentiments that had, from all we can gather, served as the keynote of strophes 1–3 and the beginning of 4. Whether this is connected with the fact that the poem is drawing to its close must remain a matter for speculation. If the papyrus did not show the coronis against the fourth line of col. iv, it would hardly have occurred to anyone that the poem should terminate so abruptly. For, as I will try to show next, the last strophe is no less amoeban in spirit and execution than the preceding ones.

**Lines 92–8:** It is generally agreed that the very defective text contains references to a trace-horse, to a helmsman on a ship and to someone whose singing is compared to that of the Sirens. Both Page and Garzya have their difficulties because they are unwilling to grant that more than one leader may be involved. Page (1951.97ff) argues that ἀ δέ 96 must refer to the chorus, since ἀ δέ 101 surely refers to Hagesichora. In support of this he elaborates a difference between 96 (the whole chorus) and 85 (each girl in the chorus) which is not borne out by the text. Garzya (70) with some considerable hesitation proposes to retain Hagesichora as subject in 96. It is evident that ἀ δέ 96 is the climax of a priamel which Otterlo<sup>96</sup> has clarified as follows:

The other horses follow the trace-horse. (92–3)

The sailors follow the helmsman. (94–5)

We are effective only because of the ability of our leader.  
(96–101).

The details of the priamel are not completely verifiable, but the broad outlines are clear. Since the representative of authority appears to be mentioned in the first colon of each element of the priamel, ἀ δέ 96 must refer to the leader. Her ability is, temporarily and parenthetically, compared with that of the Sirens, to the advantage of the latter.<sup>97</sup> But it looks as if the leader's prowess comes to be underlined once more in what follows, vv.98ff. The mention of the Sirens, therefore, is an interruption of a larger sequence in praise of the leader. It thus answers to the mention of Aotis in the previous strophe, vv.87–9. Just as the praise of Hagesichora was then tempered by the manoeuver of listing her side by side with the goddess and thus getting her in the goddess's shade, so the leader presently extolled is said to be inferior to the Sirens, and yet a virtuoso in her own right.

**Lines 98–9:** ἀντ[ι δ' ἐνδεκα] παίδων δεκ . . . . . εἰ. Scholiast XIX bases his

<sup>96</sup> W. A. A. van Otterlo, "Beitrag zur Kenntnis der griechischen Priamel," *Mnemosyne* 8 (1940) 148–53.

<sup>97</sup> Bowra 1964.26 cites Pindar fr.94b, 13–20 Snell, from a partheneion, and adds: "Here Pindar no more thinks of the danger lurking in the Sirens' song than does Alcman when he uses it as a type for the most beautiful song . . ." The Pindaric passage shows that the Sirens were regarded as spirits that calm the sea and rough winds. Is Alcman familiar with this notion? If so, the sentiment would connect with the εἰρήνη of line 91. But cf. Georg Weicker, *Der Seelenvogel in der alten Literatur und Kunst* (Leipzig 1902) 42.

explanation of 'ten in the place of eleven' on Pausanias' discussion (5.16.2) of the team groupings at the Heraea, with its organization by three age levels. Page (1951.99) is inclined to accept the comparison; others who associate δέκα (or δεκάς) with the chorus are Bowra, van Groningen, Wilamowitz and Jurenka. But it is hard to see what team divisions by age have to do with this song, which is sung before the racing starts. Also Pausanias' remark that the sixteen women formed two choruses (rather than three, as might have been expected) indicates that for singing purposes age was not the chief criterion. Hence παιδων in our text should not be pressed to mean 'very young girls' in contrast with older girls. In any case, since ἄ δέ 96 refers to the leader, it is natural to assume that this same leader is the subject of the verb whose ending is preserved at the end of 99. This is actually the explanation given in the second half of the scholion: φησὶν οὖν τὴν χορηγὸν . . . ἀντὶ ἑνδεκά ἄδειν δέκα, which may be translated: "he says that the choral leader . . . sings as ten in the place of eleven." Page<sup>98</sup> rightly warns that ἀντί cannot mean 'against'; 'against', in an agonistic or amoebean context, is πρὸς or ποτί, as is clearly shown in Theocritus. Precisely what the sense of 'as ten in the place of eleven' is I cannot say; perhaps Stoessl (101) is right in suspecting that a proverbial expression lurks behind it. But I take it that the expression is complimentary. For the use of ἀντί to designate worth, cf. *Il.* 9.116.

**Lines 100–1:** φθέγγεται δ . . . ω . . . . Ἐάνθω ῥοαῖσι κύκνος· ἄ δ' ἐπιμέρωι ξανθᾶι κομίσκαι [ . . . The compliment is continued with the passage about the swan. Since φθέγγεται, once more, is most plausibly assigned to the subject of the priamel, i.e., the choral leader, the passage apparently is a simile: "she sings as sweetly as the swan . . ." There is no reason to assume that the δέ which connects the new sentence with the previous statement is adversative. The simile of the swan is thus in direct response to the image of the owl in the same position in the preceding strophe. But whereas then the half-chorus had, for the sake of extolling the virtue of Hagesichora, referred to themselves as hooting like an owl, the supporters of the leader in the present stanza sing not about themselves but about their leader and top their opponents by praising the voice of their leader in terms of a bird simile, which in effect turns the technique of their opponents against them. It is clear from the compliments that the leaders are regarded as exceptionally fine singers. They do not participate in the singing of this song. One assumes that *Partheneion I* was part of a program which included other selections, in which the leaders could demonstrate their qualities as singers.<sup>99</sup> What follows, again connected by a continuative δέ, is a reference to the attractive blond hair of the leader.

<sup>98</sup> Page 1951.98 n.2. Cf. the flouting of this warning in d'Errico 34–5.

<sup>99</sup> Each half-chorus has praised its leader on three counts: (1) her beauty, (2) her ability as a racer on foot or on horseback, (3) her quality as a singer or dancer or both. Employing

Summing up: what remains of this strophe can be analyzed as referring to one, and only one, unnamed leader. She could be either Hagesichora or Agido; there is nothing in the words themselves to sway us in one direction or the other. But especially the responsion between vv.85–7 in honor of Hagesichora and vv.100–1 seems to me to make for the conclusion that the eighth and final strophe is in support of Agido.

## V

I hope that the foregoing analysis has put sufficient flesh on the skeletal notions offered in sections I–III and that the case for an amoebian structure of *Partheneion I* is now at least as strong as the case for monochoral delivery. More than probability is impossible in a field as open to hypothesis and reconstruction as the early choral lyric and Alcman in particular. It has not been my intention to say anything about the possible relationships between Alcman and later poetry or to contribute another chapter to the study of the origins of the pastoral. My citations from other choral writers and from Theocritus are to be regarded as heuristic only. I felt that these pointers might help to widen the range of speculation and provide thereby some new insights into the scope of the choral lyric. Happily this generation no longer subscribes to the principle that the simple precedes the more complex and that in reconstructing a song of Alcman we therefore must look for something rudimentary. At the

---

the traditional praise by comparison, particularly the simile, for (1) and (2) the poet has made use of the archetypal epic horse: cf. *Il.* 6.506–11, combining the attributes of speed, elegance, beauty and vitality. But for (3), especially for the leader as singer, there is little epic precedent. Surely one may assume the bird simile as an ancient formula. Alcman must take his cue from folk patterns when he says, as he appears to do in fr.39 PMG, that he learned his music from *κακκαβίδες*, which according to Athenaeus is a species of partridge: cf. also fr.40 PMG and *Ath.* 9.374d. In vv.85–7 and 96–101 the singing is compared once to the hooting of an owl (see the protest of Page 1951.93 against the imputation by some commentators that the owl's cry is ill-omened), and again to the song of a swan. The bizarre matching of swan and owl is found in Vergil, *Ecl.* 8.55: *certent et cycnis ululae*. In place of the owl, Theocritus introduces hoopoes (5.137), wasps (5.29) and frogs (7.41). The idea of a singing contest between ill-matched rivals is a fixed motif of the pastoral tradition (see Ernest Dutoit, *Le thème de l'adynaton dans la poésie antique* [Paris 1936] 33), often as part of an *ἄδύνατον*, as in the Vergil passage; cf. also *Ecl.* 9.29: *sed argutos inter strepere anser olores*. Alcman's is thus the first of many passages which later come to characterize singing contests, particularly the pastoral amoebian. No other examples have reached us from the time of Alcman or over three centuries thereafter, for Pindar's image of crows vs. the bird of Zeus (*Ol.* 2.86ff) is meant in a different sense. I suspect, however, that there were other instances in archaic choral lyric, and that this was one of the features which led Theocritus and his successors to look to early Dorian lyric for part of their inspiration. Cf. now also the remarks of G. Devereux in *CQ* 15 (1965) 176 n.4.

same time we expect, in our reconstructions of fragmentary material, to find patterns which are paralleled elsewhere in the history of Greek literature. If the present analysis of *Partheneion I* is plausible, the poem should please us on several scores. In its details it is often close to Homer; its mood alternates between lyricism, gnomic seriousness and mischievous banter; and in structure it exhibits a surprising amount of respension, conceptual as well as formal, between the strophes. The respension is never obvious or monotonous; like Theocritus, Alcman knows how to deflect answering patterns and to achieve subtle asymmetries. All this, and more, makes the poem hard to classify, but easy to enjoy.

## APPENDIX

### *Dichoria in Attic Drama*

According to schol. Ar. *Equites* 589, comic half-choruses, if consisting of dissimilar groups—men and women, women and children, young and old—tended to be numerically unequal, thirteen as against eleven.<sup>100</sup> This has been brought into connexion with scholion XIX, opposite *Partheneion I* v.99, which reads in part: . . . διὰ τὸν χορὸν ὅτε μὲν εἰ[ξ] ἰὰ παρθ[ε]νων ὅτε δὲ ἐκ ἰ· φη(σὶν) οὖν τὴν χορηγόν. . . . ἀντὶ ἰὰ αἰδεῖν ἰ. Cf. pp.351–2 above. Page (1951.99 n.4) rightly comments that there is nothing to connect the two scholia. ἀντί, in the Alcman scholion, does *not* mean ‘against’ any more than in the poem itself; and partheneia are not likely to pit young against old, or men against women. It may be useful, nonetheless, to present a brief synopsis of what is known as strophic διχορία in drama.<sup>101</sup> If, as I have argued,

<sup>100</sup> ἔστι δ' ὅτε καὶ ἡμιχόρια ἴσαντο ἤτοι ἐξ ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν . . . ἐν δὲ τοιούτοις χόροις, εἰ μὲν ἐξ ἀνδρῶν εἴη καὶ γυναικῶν ὁ χορὸς, ἐπλεονέκτει τὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν μέρος καὶ ἦσαν ιγ', αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες ἔνδεκα, εἰ δὲ παίδων εἴη καὶ γυναικῶν, αἱ μὲν γυναῖκες ιγ' ἦσαν, οἱ δὲ παῖδες ια'. εἰ δὲ πρεσβύτων καὶ νέων, τοὺς πρεσβύτας πλεονεκτεῖν δεῖν φασιν.

<sup>101</sup> Evidence from vase painting is not likely to be helpful. Women's choruses apparently were extremely rare in Spartan vase decoration; cf. E. A. Lane, "Laconian Vase Painting," *BSA* 34 (1933/4) 99–189. Cf. also the warning of R. M. Cook, *Greek Painted Pottery* (Chicago 1960) 279: "Mythical and divine occasions provided the favourite themes of Greek painting. Most are orthodox, and of the rest some deviate through negligence. Scholars of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were much concerned with the interpretation of rare myths and cults, often to fit the religious theories then fashionable; their spirit is kept alive by the zealots who look for illustrations of Greek drama." The closest we come to a partheneion is in such a painting as Villa Giulia 909 (J. D. Beazley, *ARV*<sup>3</sup> [Oxford 1963]

*Partheneion I* is to be sung by two half-choruses in competition with one or more groups (each consisting of half-choruses or not), the conditions of Attic drama would seem to be relevant.<sup>102</sup> We are here mainly concerned with those passages in which each half-chorus is assigned a whole strophe or antistrophe or its equivalent. Other kinds of choral distribution are common enough.

Attic comedy is the most obvious candidate for inspection. According to an old tradition, transmitted via the annotations in mss R and V, the Aristophanic chorus consists essentially of two half-choruses which operate independently in strophe and antistrophe of epirrhematic odes, especially in the parabasis. Unfortunately the tradition cannot be verified, though it is by no means implausible. However, even if demonstrable, this type of dichoria is not exactly relevant to our issue, because the epirrhematic structure with its interposition of sustained non-lyrical passages stands in the way of any amoebean immediacy. Hence I shall disregard the passages often cited in the handbooks (e.g., A. E. Haigh, *The Attic Theatre* [Oxford 1889] 282 n.1) and pass on to non-epirrhematic examples or to passages in which only a few lines of dialogue interrupt the pericope.

Ar. *Ranae* 324ff ~ 340ff. According to the scholiast, Aristarchus said that the chorus first sings as a unit and then divides into two groups. That is to say, vv.316–7 are sung by the whole chorus, 324ff by the chorus of women and 340ff by the chorus of men. There is little in the text itself to compel such a conclusion; but some kind of distribution between the women, who leave the stage at 447, and the men who remain, appears plausible enough. It is probably better, however, in this instance to talk of an initial double chorus rather than of half-

---

618, 1662) by a follower of Douris. The picture (Furtwängler-Reichhold plates 17 and 18) is that of a line of eleven girls, consisting of a flute player followed by ten singers, all of them moving towards the right, some in Ionic, some in Doric, some in mixed costume, with varying hair styles. There is no element of dichoria.

<sup>102</sup> W. Kranz, "Die Urform der attischen Tragödie und Komödie," *Njbb* 44 (1919) 145f, argues that the pre-Aeschylean *σατυρικόν* contained much dichoria, especially in epirrhematic form, and that it was Thespis who substituted an *ἐξάρχων* for one of the choral groups. Cf. however Aurelio Peretti, *Epirrema e Tragedia* (Firenze 1939) 91ff and *passim*. In a discussion of dramatic dichoria, Pollux 4.107 tells us that Tyrtaeus set up a *τριχορία*, a counter-singing of boys, men and old men. Unless we reject Pollux's note out of hand, it must be regarded as evidence that in Alcman's own time, or roughly his time, choral division was not unknown. The reference must be to an amoebean rather than an agonistic division, since competition between different age groups is unheard of.

choruses. We may compare the *προπομποί* of *Eumenides* 1032 or the slave women, if indeed they are the singers, at Aeschylus, *Supplices* 1034.

Conradt<sup>103</sup> discusses the case of *Acharnenses* 557ff. The passage is short, and the iambic trimeters are spoken by the two coryphaei. The question is whether the dochmiacs starting with 566ff are sung by one of the half-choruses or by one of the coryphaei. The question cannot be resolved with the evidence available to us; in any case the passage is too brief and too specialized to be significant. The same is true of *Equites* 242f and *Aves* 353, where the chorus divides into two action groups, that is, where a danced dichoria takes place.<sup>104</sup>

This leaves, as our most important evidence for dichoria in Attic comedy, the *Lysistrata*, though here also it would be more correct to speak of a double chorus rather than the division of one. But the exchanges between the chorus of old men and the chorus of old women (614–35 ~ 636–57; 659–81 ~ 683–705; 781–804 ~ 805–28) exhibit many of the verbal and conceptual symmetries and near-symmetries which we associate with amoebean. Wilamowitz<sup>105</sup> points out that the whole section is in place of a parabasis, which may help to explain the correspondences. But all dichoria, I venture to suggest, presses for amoebean patterns.

The transmission of the exodus of the *Lysistrata* is too faulty to allow us to assign lines with any degree of certainty.<sup>106</sup> But most modern editors follow Wilamowitz in assigning 1247ff to the Spartan, 1279ff to the chorus of the Athenians, and 1296 once more to the

<sup>103</sup> K. Conradt, s.v. 'Ημχόριον, *RE* 8 (1912) 236ff. Conradt's distinction (col. 235) between two types of division, (1) the confrontation of two groups by way of contrast, and (2) dichoria proper, the halving of a chorus for the sake of alternating in the singing of strophe and antistrophe, seems to me hazardous. All choral division tends towards the amoebean; it is of course true that the elements of response and feedback, such as ἀναδίπλωσις, capping and the like, are more prominent in some cases than in others. Cf. also n.14 *supra*.

<sup>104</sup> Cf. W. Schmid/O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* IV (München 1946) 50 n.: "Die stärkere Besetzung des Komödienchors gegenüber dem der Tragödie erklärt sich wohl daraus, dass streitende Doppelchöre in der ältesten attischen Komödie üblich waren (unter den vollständig erhaltenen hat solche nur noch Ar. Lys.)."

<sup>105</sup> U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristophanes Lysistrata* (Berlin 1927) 159: "Aber die Teilung des Chores verbot das παραβαίνειν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον. Da hilft sich der Dichter so, dass er die Form der Parabase einhält, eine ὠιδή mit ἐπίρρημα von zehn Versen. Strophe und Antistrophe verteilen sich auf die zwei Chöre. Dabei würde jeder einzelne zu kurz kommen, also folgt noch ein solches System."

<sup>106</sup> For a recent attempt to downgrade the rôle of the prytanis and to reserve a leading function to *Lysistrata*, see P. Händel, *Formen und Darstellungen in der aristoph. Komödie* (Heidelberg 1963) 164–7. He suggests that the ἄστροφον 1279ff is sung by *Lysistrata*.

Spartan. Wilamowitz<sup>107</sup> repeatedly refers to the likelihood that the combination of trochees and dactyls which characterizes both the first song of the Spartan and the song of the Athenians, reminded the audience of Alcman. With regard to the second solo performance of the Spartan, Wilamowitz is more inclined to think that it is the "eingelegte Glieder," the units interrupting the largely iambic sequence, which establish the Alcmanic ring. The Spartan's songs are astroptic; if we are to believe Wilamowitz, the song of the Athenians was matched by an antistrophe which is now lost. The dramaturgy as such, therefore, has no trace of dichoria. But I find it suggestive that it is in this play, full of dramatic confrontations and with a developed dichoria marking its half-way point, that we have songs strongly reminiscent of Alcman. It is as if choral amoebian went naturally together with the mention of girls and horses (1308) and Tyndarids gambolling along the banks of the Eurotas (1301-2).

Dichoria in drama is not restricted to comedy. The *Hyporchema* (?) of Pratinas (fr.1 D) appears to feature a chorus of satyrs in violent altercation with a rival chorus. Most scholars believe that there were two half-choruses.<sup>108</sup> W. Schmid thinks<sup>109</sup> that the double title of Pratinas' tragedy *Καρναίδες ἢ Δύσμαϊναι* must refer to a double chorus, since the two terms designate two different geographically separated entities. Other double titles might well be tested for the same implication. Further cases of dichoria in tragedy have been collected by Lammers<sup>110</sup> and others. The passages he cites are mostly restricted to parodi and exodi. The only one which features not conversation but parallel structuring, not strophes broken up into smaller

<sup>107</sup> Wilamowitz (*supra* n.105) 195-7; also his *Textgeschichte der griech. Lyriker* (Berlin 1900) 88ff. See also the earlier reflections of R. Westphal in his *Allgemeine griechische Metrik* (Leipzig 1865)=A. Rossbach/R. Westphal, *Metrik der griech. Dramatiker und Lyriker* II.2 p.224.

<sup>108</sup> But cf. A. M. Dale, as reported in A. Lesky, *Geschichte der griech. Literatur*<sup>3</sup> (Bern 1963) 259 n.3.

<sup>109</sup> W. Schmid (*supra* n.104) II (1934) 178-9. Schmid's thesis cannot be more than a guess, since we know nothing about the plot of the play.

<sup>110</sup> Joseph Lammers, *Die Doppel- und Halbchöre in der antiken Tragödie* (Paderborn 1931) 143ff. He examines Aesch. *Sept.* 874ff; Soph. *Eurypylos* fr.91, *Ajax* 866ff, *Ichn.* 94ff; Eur. *Alc.* 77ff, *Suppl.* 42 and 598, *Tro.* 153ff, *Ion* 184ff, *Rh.* 527ff. T. Zielinski, *Die Gliederung der altattischen Komödie* (Leipzig 1885) 277ff, rebuffs those who attempt to divide tragic choruses into half-choruses. Zielinski's conclusion, supported in principle by most scholars today, is that in tragedy, as against comedy, dichoria is very rare. Cf. also V. de Falco, *Studi sul teatro greco*<sup>2</sup> (Napoli 1958) 72ff, who lists some of the past champions of dichoria in tragedy, such as Muff, Hense and von Christ. They were influenced by R. Westphal, who was much inclined to make hasty inferences from the occurrence of certain formal elements commonly found in amoebian passages. And yet there is much in the analyses of Westphal, especially of tragic laments, which may still be usefully pondered by modern critics

segments but apparently strophe and antistrophe sung by alternate groups, is *Septem* 875ff. The paragraphi of the transmission, as well as the *λέγεις* of v.895, leave little doubt that the chorus divides, in response to the presence of the two biers on the stage.<sup>111</sup>

Two extant plays, then, are our principal evidence for strophic dichoria in Attic drama. But this is sufficient to support the notion that dichoria may have existed also in other types of dramatic performance. The usual argument is that if Alcman innovated by introducing dichoria, it is surprising that (1) Pindar and Bacchylides exhibit no trace of it, and (2) the ancient critics and grammarians do not comment on it more fully than they do; see, e.g., Farina 57. The answer to (2) is that dichoria may, at least in the classical age, always have been fairly rare; but that, conversely, there *are* traces in the scholia of remarks which point in the direction of dichoria in Alcman. As for (1), we should remember that except for the *Epinicia* of Pindar and the slim remains of Bacchylides, what we have of archaic choral poetry is not adequate to serve as the basis for the formulation of general rules. For all we know, partheneia favored dichoria. The two

---

interested in formal symmetries and reciprocal patterns in tragic lyric. One should, of course, endeavour to distinguish between the hieratic responses of a dirge, on the one hand, and the witty games of jockeying for position which we associate with amoebian contests. One and the same figure, anaphora, e.g., may be used to achieve different effects.

<sup>111</sup> *Sept.* 875ff, down to the end, 1009, contains many amoebian features. On the assumption that Aeschylus meant all the singing to be done by the chorus or by sections of it, we may discover dichoria in plenty. Unfortunately it is more difficult to know which sections are sung by whom. Ideally, 875–80 are sung by half-chorus A and 881–7 by half-chorus B; again, 888–99 by A, 900–10 by B, etc., etc. But with the introduction of Antigone and Ismene the situation became muddled. Murray notes in his apparatus that the paragraphi in the mss are “confuse appicti.” Still, in some cases the wording and syntax of the antistrophe are closely modelled on the strophe, for example 892–4~904–6. Beginning at 961 the two choral groups may be said to engage in a *stretta*, along the lines of division between Antigone and Ismene as proposed by the editors. The refrains at 975–7 and 986–8 would be sung by the complete chorus. *Il.* 24.718ff, our earliest reference to an amoebian lament (in this case an alternation between soloists and chorus), shows the typical patterns of threnodic symmetry, even though the choral statements are perforce omitted. Whether the common designation of the Muses as *ἀμειβόμεναι ὀπι καλῆι* (*Il.* 1.604, *Od.* 24.60, etc.; cf also Vergil, *Ecl.* 359: *amant alterna Camenae*, though the relation has been questioned) is an allusion to amoebian technique or not, must be left open. Cf. also Plato, *Lg.* 12.947b. In any case I should repeat that we expect to find a difference between the formal means of threnodic dichoria on the one hand and *γεφυρισμός* and allied types on the other. Eric T. Owen, *The Harmony of Aeschylus* (Toronto 1952) 17, reverts to the older view that in *Suppl.* 1018–51 the chorus divides. This may well be a more dramatic as well as a more economical solution than Kirchhoff's attribution of 1034–51 to the servants. However, whatever dichoria there may be is between *περικοπαί* and not between strophe and antistrophe, and that puts the passage out of contention for our purposes; it means that the symmetries are between statements of the same group rather than *between* groups.

Pindaric partheneia happen to be monochoral in the extant sections; but that tells us little about partheneia in general or Alcman's in particular. It is quite conceivable and indeed likely that if Alcman's partheneia, or some of them, involved dichoria, he did not innovate but followed previously existing models. It is instructive to recall that among Sappho's poems, amoebian patterns are usually felt to document her dependence on certain forms of folk poetry, for example fragments 140a, 114, 115 LP.

In sum, we cannot interpret *Partheneion I* on the basis of preconceived notions concerning the presence or absence of dichoria in early choral lyric. It is precisely because dichoria is so rare in extant drama that we must be prepared for the chance that there were some few examples of dichoria at a much earlier time.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

August, 1966