

The Rhetoric of Cohesion: Allusions to Homeric Heroes in Tyrtaeus' Poetry

by

Jessica Romney
B.A., The Pennsylvania State University, 2008

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Greek and Roman Studies

© Jessica Romney, 2011
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.

Supervisory Committee

The Rhetoric of Cohesion: Allusions to Homeric Heroes in Tyrtaeus' Poetry

by

Jessica Romney
B.A., The Pennsylvania State University, 2008

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Ingrid E. Holmberg, (Department of Greek and Roman Studies)
Supervisor

Dr. J. Geoffrey Kron, (Department of Greek and Roman Studies)
Departmental Member

Dr. Laurel M. Bowman, (Department of Greek and Roman Studies)
Departmental Member

Abstract

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Ingrid E. Holmberg, (Department of Greek and Roman Studies)

Supervisor

Dr. J. Geoffrey Kron, (Department of Greek and Roman Studies)

Departmental Member

Dr. Laurel M. Bowman, (Department of Greek and Roman Studies)

Departmental Member

Tyrtaeus, a Spartan poet of the early Archaic period, composed his martial exhortations in order to address growing tensions between elites and non-elites of pre-classical, and thus pre-militaristic, Sparta during the Second Messenian War. His poetry is filled with allusions to Homeric heroes and heroic concepts that interact with archaic institutions and thought. This thesis seeks to examine those interactions and to discern how Tyrtaeus uses the heroes Hector, Odysseus, and Achilles in his exhortations to encourage men to stand and fight and not to retreat from battle. This study also uses modern theories of cohesion in order to provide a framework for Tyrtaeus' appeals to social ties among the soldiers and for his models of reciprocal relations between the πόλις and the soldiers, both of which he uses to overcome the tension between the elites and non-elites and create a single, cohesive group.

Table of Contents

Supervisory Committee	ii
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Note on Editions and Translations	v
Acknowledgments	vi
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Historical Background and Theory	6
Chapter 2: Hector, the Hero of the Community	29
Chapter 3: Odysseus, the Hero of Endurance	59
Chapter 4: Achilles and the Aristocratic Ethos	93
Conclusion	118
Bibliography	124

Note on Editions and Translations

All translations of Greek and Latin in this thesis are my own. When quoting Greek texts, the following editions have been used unless otherwise noted:

- Munro, David B. and Thomas W. Allen, eds. *Homeri Opera: Iliadis*, vols. I and II, 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1920.
- Page, D.L., ed. *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Stanford, W.B., ed. *Homer: Odyssey*, vols. I and II. 1947-8. Reprint, London: Bristol Classical Press, 1996.
- West, M.L., ed. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci: Ante Alexandrum Cantati*, vol. I. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- -----, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci: Ante Alexandrum Cantati*, vol. II. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Acknowledgments

First I must thank Dr. Ingrid Holmberg for all of her help in this process. Without her insightful comments and sharp eye, this thesis would not be what it is, and I am extremely grateful for all of the time and expertise she gave. I would like to thank also Dr. Geof Kron and Dr. Laurel Bowman for being my secondary readers and for contributing their time and expertise as well. Thanks also to Dr. Iain Higgins from the English Department for agreeing to be my external reader and for contributing his time and expertise.

I am very fortunate to have pursued my MA studies in such a welcoming and considerate department, and I want to thank the Department of Greek and Roman Studies as a whole for their support and all that they have taught me in these past two years. Thanks must also go to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and the Social Studies and Humanities Research Council who have provided me with funding to complete this degree.

To my fellow graduate students and friends, especially Carly, Katie, Kristen, and Lindsey, thank you for your support and laughter this year and for keeping me from worrying myself into an ulcer. And to Eva as well, who kept us all well-fed with cookies and other sweets. Finally, I must thank my family, whose support has never wavered and has only increased as I progress along the academic *cursus*. Thank you for making sure I remembered to laugh and enjoy myself, and thank you, Mom and Dad, for never failing to tell me that when I grew up, I could be whatever I wanted to be.

Introduction

*post hos insignis Homerus
Tyrtaeusque mares animos in Martia bella
versibus exacuit*

After these poets [Orpheus and Amphion], Homer became eminent and Tyrtaeus trained manly spirits in the wars of Mars with his verses (Hor. *A.P.* 401-3)

In the second half of the seventh century, the Spartans were in the midst of a war in which, according to tradition, they fared very poorly. According to one version, the city sent messengers to Delphi, and they were told to seek aid from the Athenians if they wanted not only to survive but to win. Athens, loathe to aid the hegemon of the Peloponnese, sent a lame schoolmaster- Tyrtaeus- in order to accede to the god's oracle. To everyone's surprise, this lame schoolmaster urged the Spartans to victory with his poetry, inspiring them to defeat the Messenians and to conquer their land and become a powerhouse in Greek warfare and politics for centuries to come (Plato, *Leges* 629a-b; Paus. IV.xv.6).

While a nice story, this version of the Second Messenian War reflects Laconian and Attic relations in the fifth century more than in the seventh as well as a desire to remove all cultural accomplishments from the dour, militaristic state that stood in opposition to glittering, democratic Athens. Despite this, the parable illustrates Tyrtaeus' importance to Spartan culture and history as a poet who inspired his countrymen to victory in battle. Tyrtaeus was not an Athenian, much less a lame schoolmaster, but a Spartan, and while anything in addition to this concerning his origin is conjecture, several

fragments exhorting men to battle have been preserved for us, lending weight to his integral place in Spartan history.

This thesis is a study of Tyrtaeus' poetry and his allusions to the Homeric heroes Hector, Odysseus, and Achilles. In the early Archaic period, there was tension between the elites and non-elites who composed Sparta's hoplite phalanx, and Tyrtaeus' poetry seeks to address this antipathy and to create a cohesive group out of two disparate social elements and then root this unified group on the battlefield. Tyrtaeus aims to create a group committed to its own survival and that of its citizen community, and he creates an ideological space for this cohesion by intertwining the fate of the two in his poetry so that the community cannot survive without its soldiers and so that the soldiers cannot exist socially without the community nor receive the rewards for fighting.

In the process of examining Tyrtaeus' poetry, three main themes will become apparent in his allusions to the Homeric heroes. These are the denigration of flight from battle, the lauding of fighting in place, and the presentation of rewards for the soldier who fights. This final theme also includes competition, which Tyrtaeus uses both to allude to potential rewards his soldiers can win and also to create a field on which elites and non-elites can compete as social equals. The theme concerning flight from battle occurs the most in the poems. Tyrtaeus maligns flight more often and more strenuously than the other two themes because in the world of the hoplite and the phalanx, nothing is more detrimental than when one or more men flee from their positions in the tightly arraigned battle formation. The phalanx collapses in on itself as more men join in flight and the formation is lost, swept up by the opposing phalanx. After this, Tyrtaeus emphasizes the theme of "stand and fight" the most. Finally, he details what a man can expect for

fighting, places it within the hands of the community, thus creating a model of social obligations between the community and the soldiers, and then continues his exhortations. He does not dwell on the rewards as much as he does the other themes for he cannot guarantee them.

Tyrtaeus' allusions refer to the Homeric texts, and they draw on the general themes of the texts and on the heroes specifically. I have looked at both the specific allusions, such as those to Hector's stance in *Iliad* 12, and the more general allusions, such as references to Odysseus' wanderings throughout the *Odyssey*. My interest lies in how Tyrtaeus uses these allusions to further his purpose and in how he aligns with, and differs from, the Homeric context from which he derives them. In examining these similarities and differences in context and meaning, I hope to illustrate how Tyrtaeus uses these individual champions to create a cohesive force which strengthens the Spartan phalanx by both compelling the men who compose it to resist their desire to flee and by creating social bonds among the various members of the phalanx as well as reasserting those between the soldiers and the πόλις.

The first chapter of this thesis is a background chapter that details the historical and social context in which Tyrtaeus and his poetry occur. This section is predominately narrative, and I try to present the historical situation as honestly as possible, without transposing later Spartan values and institutions to this early period. Sparta in the seventh century did not differ from the other πόλεις of ancient Greece, and this needs to be recognized when studying early Sparta and her poet. This chapter also contains a discussion of modern cohesion theory and how it will inform my examination of Tyrtaeus' attempts to create cohesion. Though sociologists and social psychologists

normally divide cohesion into two groups- social and task- I will be examining cohesion mostly comprehensively, though with more weight given to the social aspect of cohesion than task.

The second chapter begins my analysis of the allusions to the Homeric heroes and focuses on Hector. The main allusions to Hector occur in fragment 10, and one appears in fragment 12 as well. Through Hector, Tyrtaeus imposes a sense of shame on the desire to flee, exhorts the soldiers to stand fast in battle, and presents the rewards for the soldiers who die fighting. Hector is a hero to whom it is easy for Tyrtaeus to allude, though he still has to tread carefully as Hector is ultimately unsuccessful in his attempts to save his city. The allusions to him, however, provide the majority of material on which Tyrtaeus bases his model of reciprocal relations between the community and its soldiers.

The third chapter examines Odysseus' place in the corpus, and Tyrtaeus' allusions to him use adjectives from his noun-epithet combinations and his status as both a warrior and a wanderer. Odysseus is an interesting hero. He is a beneficial hero for Tyrtaeus in his exhortations to fight, for Odysseus fights alone in *Iliad* 11, and Tyrtaeus alludes to him as an exemplar of a soldier who stands and fights. Odysseus, however, flees battle and is named a coward by Diomedes in *Iliad* 8, and Tyrtaeus thus also uses Odysseus as a negative example of a soldier who flees battle. These allusions are general, however, as Tyrtaeus prefers to let his audience draw on their own memory of Odysseus' sufferings as he details the terrible life of a wanderer in order to forestall men from running before battle is joined.

The fourth and final chapter examines Tyrtaeus' allusion to Achilles and his subordination of aristocratic ἀρεταί such as running and royal bloodlines to the ἀπερή of

martial courage. The subordination of these ἀρεταί occurs alongside the framing of martial prowess as a competition which takes place during battle. The allusion to Achilles follows this subordination, and with it Tyrtaeus alludes to the rewards young men can hope for should they fight on behalf of their city and their fellow citizens. The framing of martial prowess as a competition and the allusion to Achilles' immortal glory serve to create a single social group among the soldiers in the army by giving them a common form of competition.

In her recent book on Solon's poetry and rhetoric, Irwin comments on the tendency to view Tyrtaeus' poetry through a series of teleological narratives, whether they be narratives of war and conquest or of poetic and political 'evolution.'¹ She argues persuasively for removing the poetry completely from the narrative and then examining it on its own and from its own merits. I have done so as much as possible, framing my examination in the historical setting that has been passed down to us, the Second Messenian War. I believe this is necessary in order to understand as completely as possible Tyrtaeus' verses. Poetry does not exist in a vacuum, but it instead interacts with and influences and is influenced by the society in which it occurs. Tyrtaeus composed his poetry during a period of class tension and of social change, when the old ways were no longer set, and his poetry addresses men marshalled in a new and, for some, unfamiliar battle formation. These factors need to be taken into account when studying his work, just as his debt to the epic tradition does. This study seeks to examine how these forces are integrated in Tyrtaeus' poetry and how he uses them to further his rhetoric of cohesion.

¹ *Solon and Early Greek Poetry: The Politics of Exhortation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 17-22.

Chapter 1

Historical Background and Theory

Spartan history and culture changed direction after the Second Messenian War, and Tyrtaeus' poetry, which encouraged the Spartans to hold their ground and fight for the land their grandfathers had won, played a pivotal role in accomplishing the conquest of Messenia according to later tradition. This conquest enabled Sparta to create the *kleroi* system, through which each citizen had a plot of land with helots to work it and to provide food for him and his family, and this system allowed the city to have the only standing citizen army in Greece.¹ For Tyrtaeus' contributions to Spartan culture, the Spartans then enshrined his poetry, placing it at the center of their educational and military systems. Young men learned the poems during their schooling and joined in singing them after dinner in their mess at home and while marching on campaign (Ath. 14.630f). The constant repetition of his verses caused the ideals of courage and steadfastness in war to become an integral part of Spartan mentality.

The early archaic period, during which Tyrtaeus composed his poetry, was a time of great upheaval in Greece when the *πόλις* became an identifiable phenomenon, and the governments of the *πόλεις* opened to more citizens as the political structure became more permeable. Sparta did not stand outside of this change. Like the other Greek cities, she too experienced social problems and constitutional changes during this period, despite all

¹ See Hodkinson 1997, 88 and 2000, 65-112 for a discussion of the land distribution that led to the *kleroi* system and land ownership. It is important to separate this early distribution of land to Spartan citizens from the later distributions under Agis IV and Cleomenes III, when the myth of Spartan "equality" was promoted in order to further the two kings' reforms and attempts to regain Spartan military superiority.

later protestations to the contrary.² The conflict between Sparta's farmers and traditional aristocracy, who were the major land-owners, warriors, and statesmen, rose to a head around or during the Second Messenian War according to Aristotle (*Pol.* 1306b36-1307a1), and Tyrtaeus' poetry aims to address the civil strife and join the two classes.³ This chapter will provide a historical sketch examining Sparta's conflicts with Messenia and Argos and the evolution and adoption of the phalanx, a mass formation composed of heavy-armed soldiers, followed by a discussion of contemporary social changes, cohesion theory, and of Homer as a source of persuasion.⁴

I. Historical Sketch, the eighth and seventh centuries

Our evidence for this early period is scant due to lack of records and to a general lack of interest on the part of historians until after Epameinondas' liberation of Messenia in 369.⁵ Tyrtaeus and Alcman, Sparta's extant poets, present us with a picture of seventh century Sparta, but it is an incomplete one. Herodotus (I. 65-66) and Thucydides (I.xiii.1), the first historians to examine a topic that includes all of Greece, merely comment on Lycurgus or the longevity of Sparta's constitution and then focus on the later Archaic and Classical periods, when Sparta's history becomes applicable to their treatment of the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars respectively. Xenophon, the Athenian

² Thucydides states that Sparta's constitution had been the same for 400 years before the Peloponnesian War, since c. 831 BCE (I.xviii.1); Xenophon is just as adamant that Sparta's constitution was very old. He dates the Spartan lawgiver, Lycurgus, to the time of the Heraclids and the laws to that same period (*Lac. Pol.* X.8).

³ Aristotle only says that the unrest occurred during the 'Messenian War,' which has led to some confusion over which Messenian War he means. He does, however, cite Tyrtaeus' poem *Eunomia* (fr. 4 West) as evidence of this, which leads me to believe that he is discussing the Second Messenian War.

⁴ For recent Spartan scholarship, see the volumes edited by Hodkinson (2009), Hodkinson and Powell (1999), and Powell and Hodkinson (2002), where the interest has focused on distinguishing the various periods of Spartan history and their social differences from one another. See especially Flower 2002, where he applies the "invention of tradition" to Sparta and how she presented herself to the remainder of the Greek world. For a new general history of Sparta that separates conjectures from later periods onto the earlier periods, see Kennell 2010. See also Kennell 1995 for a thorough examination of the history of the Spartan *agoge* and its impact on Spartan society. For the Spartan economy, see Hodkinson 1997 and 2000.

⁵ All dates, unless otherwise stated, will be in BCE.

philolaconian who actually lived at Sparta for some time, discusses the Spartan constitution and way of life in detail, especially that of the army, in order to explain Sparta's success in Greek politics from the sixth century to 371. He lived, however, in the fourth century and looks back to a 'golden age,' before the Spartans deviated from their constitution. Aristotle's work on Sparta's constitution has been lost, leaving us with his shorter discussions of Sparta in the *Politics*. Pausanias and Plutarch write of this early period, but how much we can trust and how much we can dismiss as folklore is hard to discern. While these two later authors did have access to more sources than we do, we should view their works on the early period of Spartan history critically. The 'Spartan mirage' strongly colours the interpretations of Spartan history, both then and now.⁶

Despite the lack of material, we can determine a basic outline of events that becomes more detailed as the fifth century approaches. This section will discuss the First Messenian War, the battle of Hysiae, the development of the phalanx, and the Second Messenian War. First, however, I will discuss Tyrtaeus and the career later authors ascribe to him.

i. Dates and Tyrtaeus' Career

According to Tyrtaeus (fr. 5, 19) and Pausanias (III.3.2, 3.5; IV.3.3, 4.4), Sparta

⁶ The term *le mirage Spartiate* was coined by Ollier (1933) in his seminal work examining how Sparta was viewed and conceived by other Greeks. This 'mirage' has caused a number of problems for scholars looking at Spartan history, and in particular early Spartan history. One of the main issues is that the Spartans liked to present themselves as maintainers of a constitution that originated with the Heraclid state, and from this comes the tendency to view Spartan values from the classical period- militaristic, anti-individual, and austere values- to the beginning of the archaic Spartan community. There is also the issue that with the exception of Tyrtaeus and Alcman, who give us very little about day-to-day affairs, all the authors writing about Sparta are not Spartan. Most are Athenian and are pro-Laconian, so in their writings they tend to aggrandize Sparta in opposition to Athens, Xenophon and Plato especially. The two cities also tend to be presented as exact opposites (for example, the Corinthian speech in Thucydides book I), and this furthers clouds our view of Sparta.

fought two wars against the Messenians.⁷ The first dates to c. 735-715, and the second to c. 640-620.⁸ The First Messenian War is dated both by Sparta's increased participation in Hellenic and Mediterranean affairs and by the disappearance of Messenians from the Olympic victor list around the end of the eighth century.⁹ The second war then is dated on the basis of a two generation gap between the wars (Tyr. fr. 5), with an average of thirty years per generation hazarded. Pausanias gives a date of c. 685 for the Second Messenian War's beginning, but this date has been lowered to correspond with the dating of Tyrtaeus' poetry.

The *Suda*, the Byzantine era lexicon, dates Tyrtaeus' work to the 35th Olympiad, c. 640-637 (iv.610.5 Adler), and Jerome dates the poet to c. 633.¹⁰ Modern authors tend to follow these dates, attributing Tyrtaeus' work to around the middle of the seventh century.¹¹ Tyrtaeus' work mentions battles against the Messenians, both in the past (fr. 5) and the present (fr. 19, 20, 23), strengthening his connection with the Second Messenian War. Later authors place him in important positions within the Spartan army: Strabo (8.362) and Plutarch (*apophth. Lac.* 230d) call him a στρατηγός (general), and Athenaeus discusses his στρατηγία, though he does not actually call him a στρατηγός (14.630f). The Athenians, who claimed Tyrtaeus for their own, also name him as a

⁷ Tyrtaeus and Pausanias are the only two to mention two wars against the Messenians.

⁸ V.J. Parker disputes these dates, especially those for the First Messenian War, and instead dates the two wars to c. 690-670 and c. 620-600 (1991, 26).

⁹ Paul Cartledge, *Sparta and Laconia: A Regional History 1300-192 B.C.* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979), 114; David A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry* (London: Bristol Classical Press, 1982), 169.

¹⁰ Douglas E. Gerber, ed., *Greek Elegiac Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Century B.C.* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999), 24 n.2.

¹¹ Campbell dates the Second Messenian War and Tyrtaeus' work from the 660's to the 630's (1982, 169), and Cartledge places Tyrtaeus in the second or third quarter of the seventh century (1979, 127). Luraghi places him at the middle of the seventh century (2005, 70). These dates not only follow the ancient authors, but they also follow the dating scheme laid out by Macan (1897), which most scholars now follow instead of Verrall's dating scheme, which places Tyrtaeus during the helot revolt of 464 (1896).

general in the war (Lycurg. *Leocr.* 106).¹² Modern authors continue to place Tyrtaeus in a place of some import during the Second Messenian War, though not necessarily as a general.¹³ That a poet would be a soldier and even a general was not unusual.

Archilochus quipped:

εἰμι δ' ἐγὼ θεράπων μὲν Ἐνυαλίου ἄνακτος
καὶ Μουσέων ἐρατὸν δῶρον ἐπιστάμενος

I am a servant of Lord Enyalios [Ares], knowing also the lovely gift of the Muses (fr. 1)

Callinus, a contemporary of Tyrtaeus', also urged on his countrymen with his verses (fr. 1). Athens even had a poet-politician: Solon, her great lawgiver, promoted his political reforms and positions through his poetry. The idea of a poet-warrior did not die out after the sixth century, but rather it continued, as every able citizen served in the army.

Aeschylus and Sophocles fought in the Athenian phalanx, and Socrates distinguished himself during the Peloponnesian War (Pl. *Ap.* 28e, *Symp.* 219e-221c).

Tyrtaeus was, according to the *Suda*, a prolific writer, having composed several books of war songs and a work on 'good order,' *Eunomia* (fr. 4), which Diodorus and Plutarch preserve for us. He employs mostly Homeric language, as do several early archaic poets, along with some words common to Hesiod's works and the Homeric Hymns.¹⁴ The poetry is written in Ionic with the occasional Doric element, which likely helped to promulgate the alternate versions of his origin.¹⁵ His extant work mostly contains general exhortations to fight and not to run away. There is, however, one poem

¹² This Attic origin, along with the lame schoolmaster story, now is generally discredited and attributed to a reluctance to acknowledge that Sparta could produce a poet (see Campbell 1982, 170 for a more in-depth discussion).

¹³ Bowra calls Tyrtaeus a "superior officer at headquarters who had a gift for encouraging the troops" (1960, 70), whereas Lattimore calls him a poet operating in a semi-official capacity (1960, 14).

¹⁴ See Campbell 1982, 170 for a more thorough discussion of Tyrtaeus' language.

¹⁵ Some Doric examples would be the accusative plural in -ᾶς for the first declension (eg, fr. 20.14, χαίτᾶς), and the future ἀλοισηεῦ[μεν] (19.12), which is corrected to ἀλοισηέο[μεν] in West's edition.

that refers specifically to previous fighting against the Messenians under the Spartan king Theopompus (fr. 5) and several fragmentary poems which refer to fighting in his own day (fr. 19, 20, 23).

ii. The First Messenian War

By the middle of the eighth century, Laconia had been consolidated under Spartan rule, forming the state of Lacedaemonia. The Spartans then turned to Messenia, which lay just over the Taygetos Mountains. Relative overpopulation may have pushed the Spartans to expand their holdings, especially if a small aristocracy held the majority of the land, as was likely.¹⁶ Greece as a whole experienced a population growth at this time, and it is likely that the heartland of Laconia, the Eurotas valley, had become overpopulated. A πόλις with ready access to the sea could alleviate its overpopulation by sending out colonies, following the lead of Corinth and Euboea, the two early colonizers. The city of Sparta itself, however, lay further from the sea than Corinth or Euboea and was a land-bound state through most of its history, beginning with this early period.¹⁷ Sparta's solution consisted of conquering Messenian land and incorporating it into the Lacedaemonian state. According to Tyrtaeus, the two sides fought for twenty years before the Messenians finally fled (fr. 5). Pausanias gives us a far more in-depth account of the First Messenian War in books three and four of his *Guide to Greece*, but it borders on fiction. His description of this early war reflects the refashioning of tradition that had begun in Messenia since 369, when Epameinondas refounded the city of Messene and the

¹⁶ Cartledge, *Sparta and Laconia*, 114.

¹⁷ Sparta did dabble with a navy during and after the Peloponnesian War, but it never really worked out. Sparta's lack of participation in the colonizing movement can be compared with Thebes, another land based state, which did not send out a single colony.

state of Messenia.¹⁸ Regardless of how the war progressed, however, the Spartans defeated the Messenians and conquered the region around Stenyklaros and possibly the western half of the Makaria.¹⁹ The conquered land likely was distributed, though probably not on an equal basis.²⁰ This land distribution, however, caused more problems than it solved. Not long after the war ended, a group of Spartans called the Partheniai revolted, and when the Spartans put down the revolt, the Partheniai were expelled to Taras in Italy, Sparta's only official colony. The revolt seems to have been a result of the unequal land distribution, as the Partheniai were promised that, if the colony did not succeed, they could return to the Peloponnese and receive land in Messenia.²¹ Land distribution and ownership would become a problem again before the Second Messenian War, but with the completion of the later war, the problem was solved as all who fought in the army, not just the elites, received land conquered during the second war.

The conquest of Messenia made Sparta one of the richest πόλεις in Greece. Arts flourished in the city, and Sparta began to look outside of her own borders.²² She was not, however, the only Peloponnesian state on the rise at this time. Argos, Sparta's

¹⁸ When Messenia became an independent polity in 369, the πόλις needed its own history, which historians appear to have canonized by the 330's. The division of allies during the First and Second Messenian Wars illustrates this invention of tradition quite well; though the Thebans do not feature on either side, the other allies mirror fourth century politics after the Battle of Leuctra. The Argives, Aracadians, Sicyonians, and Pisatans side with Messenia, and Corinth and eventually Orchomenos with Sparta. The Samians, who should have played a part in this account- according to Herodotus they helped the Spartans against the Messenians (III.47)- do not, because they did not participate in fourth century Peloponnesian politics (Luraghi 2008, 79).

¹⁹ W.G. Forrest, *A History of Sparta, 950-192 B.C.* (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1968), 37; Cartledge, *Sparta and Laconia*, 119.

²⁰ Forrest envisions the land distribution as a "disorganized scramble" on the part of the elites (1968, 38).

²¹ Forrest, *A History of Sparta*, 61.

²² Sparta had an active ivory carving school, which appears to have been heavily influenced by the North Syrian ivory school. The ivory carving industry required not only trade with the Levant, but also a certain level of wealth. Laconian pottery also spread across Greece and some ivories even made their way to Africa (Cartledge 1979, 136).

northern neighbour, was enjoying a period of military power and influence during this period under her tyrant-king Pheidon.²³

iii. The Battle of Hysiae and the introduction of the phalanx

In 669, Sparta and Argos fought at Hysiae, and Argos walked away the victor. Pausanias is our only source for the battle, which he mentions in passing when describing the roads that lead out of Argos (II.xxiv.7). Hysiae then lay in the Argolid, causing Cartledge to link this battle with Spartan expansion into the Thyreatis region, which Argos and Sparta would continue to fight over after the battle of Hysiae.²⁴

The battle of Hysiae is notable not only for stopping Spartan expansion until the Second Messenian War, but also for the use of the phalanx on the side of Argos. Though Pausanias does not tell us anything about the battle itself, tradition places the phalanx's origins with Argos and her king Pheidon, who ruled c. 675 at the height of Argos' power in the Archaic period.²⁵ He led his army across the Peloponnese to Elis where, undefeated, he took control of Olympia and celebrated the Olympic games under his stewardship. Hysiae is generally included in this string of victories across the Peloponnese.

Though Cartledge passes over Pheidon in his discussion of the origins of the

²³ Though Pheidon was a king, Aristotle calls him a tyrant due to his seizure of more power than had been allotted to the king (*Pol.* 1310b28-30).

²⁴ *Sparta and Laconia*, 126; Lazenby also places the battle of Hysiae within Spartan-Argive conflict over the Thyreatis (1985, 75). P.-J. Shaw, however, argues that Pausanias' date is incorrect and that the battle should be moved to the early fifth century and the reign of Cleomenes, who fought against Argos several times in an attempt to increase Sparta's borders (1999, 277-288).

²⁵ This tradition comes mostly from later sources which attribute the hoplite shield to Argos (Dion. Hal. *Rom. Ant.* IV.16.2, Paus. VIII.5.1), and from Aristotle's account of Pheidon's extraordinary power (*Pol.* 1310b28-30). There is an alternate date of c. 750 for his rule (Salmon 1977, 92).

phalanx, Salmon places him in the forefront.²⁶ Salmon's main evidence for Pheidon's use of the phalanx is the speed and breadth of his conquests, which indicate, he argues, an Argive advantage over its opponents, and the later attribution of the double-gripped hoplite shield to Argos by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Rom. Ant.* IV.16.2) and Pausanias (VIII.5.1). This last piece of evidence suggests that, whether or not the Argives actually invented the hoplite shield, they enjoyed early successes with the phalanx.²⁷ According to Salmon, the Argive phalanx appeared at the battle of Hysiae in 669, at the latest, not long before the Corinthian vase painters would begin to depict phalanxes on their Proto-Corinthian ware (c. 650).²⁸

The phalanx crystallized during the first half of the seventh century and evolved from the mass formation tactics that replaced the Dark Age manner of fighting in the eighth century, which was more individualistic and suited for raids.²⁹ Attic Late Geometric pottery from the eighth century depicts armed men in carts and chariots along with lines of infantry who have spears over their shoulders, and scenes of mixed warfare include both archers and infantrymen.³⁰ The warriors on the vases carry both swords and spears, and the sword appears to be the preferred weapon.³¹ Two late eighth century Argive graves also bear witness to the use of heavy armour in this period, and though armour deposits begin to disappear from private burials, state and Panhellenic sanctuaries

²⁶ Cartledge holds that, due to the ambiguity of Pheidon's career, he is "best left out of the reckoning" (1977, 21). Salmon, however, argues extensively for Pheidon's role in the Panhellenic adoption of the phalanx (1977, 92-93)

²⁷ J. Salmon, "Political Hoplites?" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 97 (1977): 92-93.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 93

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 92; W. Connor, "Early Greek Land Warfare as a Symbolic Expression," *Past and Present* 119 (1988): 6; Anthony Snodgrass, "The Hoplite Reform and History," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 85 (1965): 111.

³⁰ Robin Osborne, *Greece in the Making: 1200-479 B.C.* (London: Routledge, 1996), 171-2.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 172

begin to receive dedications of armour around this time.³² The heavy armour does indicate that mobility becomes less important during this period and that there is some fighting in massed ranks, but this does not necessarily mean that the phalanx has appeared.³³ Both the ‘Dipylon’ shield, shaped like an hourglass, and a round shield with a single hand grip and a shoulder strap were used.³⁴ These could be slung onto the back, affording protection from the rear if retreat became necessary.

Our evidence for the adoption of hoplite gear begins with an Argive grave dating to c. 725 which contains a set of heavy armour. This set of heavy armour is followed by the hoplite shield, which Cartledge calls the “cardinal item of hoplite equipment,” and which appeared by c. 700.³⁵ The key feature to the new shield was the double grip system consisting of the πόρπαξ and ἀντιλαβή. The πόρπαξ was a detachable central armband which the left arm went through in order to grasp the ἀντιλαβή, the hand grip, which was usually a leather thong, on the far right edge of the shield.³⁶ These enabled a warrior to hold a bigger shield for longer periods of time, which suited the mass formation tactics well enough that the decrease in manoeuvrability did not affect the

³² Ibid, 173-4. The deposit of costly armour in graves demonstrated a family’s wealth, and these sorts of displays were becoming increasingly unpopular as the non-elites entered politics. Dedicating armour at a sanctuary served the same purpose, but could not be criticized due to the religious aspect of the dedication. It could also serve to demonstrate manliness, as dedicated armour was often taken from the enemy.

³³ A point which Osborne stresses (1996, 174).

³⁴ J.F. Lazenby, *The Spartan Army* (Warminster, England: Aris and Phillips Ltd., 1985), 70.

³⁵ “Hoplites and Heroes: Sparta’s Contribution to the Technique of Ancient Warfare,” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 97 (1977): 13. Similarly, Schwartz calls the shield “the piece of equipment which defined [the hoplite] above all” (2009, 27). See also Schwartz 2009, 27-45 for a thorough discussion of the shield’s materials and characteristics as well as how it was wielded in combat.

³⁶ Cartledge, “Hoplites and Heroes,” 13; Adam Schwartz, *Reinstating the Hoplite: Arms, Armour, and Phalanx Fighting in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2009), 32.

shield's popularity.³⁷

Archaeological finds and artistic depiction attest to the adoption of all the traditional elements of the hoplite panoply of a shield, spear, helmet, breastplate, and greaves by c. 650.³⁸ It is at this time that Proto-Corinthian vase painters begin to depict the phalanx, starting with the Macmillian painter and the Berlin aryballos, c. 655.³⁹ The Chigi vase, dating to c. 650 and also painted by the Macmillian painter, is the most successful of the early depictions with its lines of hoplites marching in the phalanx formation. These pots give us a *terminus ante quem* for the adoption of the phalanx of c. 650, at least in Corinth.⁴⁰ At this early period, the size of the phalanx varied, but it would be institutionalized later to columns of eight to twelve men deep. Cohesion along the line was essential, as each man protected the man to his left due to the overlap of shields.

The phalanx in the seventh century was not the 'pure' phalanx of the later Classical period, which was composed of only heavily armed foot soldiers armed with a thrusting spear and sword. Tyrtaeus urges his soldiers to grab either a sword or a spear, and the γυμνήτες, a group within the army usually identified as light armed troops but

³⁷ There are three main theories for the adoption of the phalanx and the hoplite panoply. There is the "sudden change" theory, advocated by both Cartledge (1977, 20) and Osborne (1996, 175), which argues that as the shield cannot be used outside of mass formations, mass formation tactics must have been in place before the shield was adopted. In this they oppose Snodgrass' "piecemeal" theory, in which the various pieces of the panoply were slowly adopted by the Greek warriors and that the mass tactics were only later added after the panoply had been adopted (1965, 113). Hanson (1991, 64) and Schwartz following him (2009, 104-5) have advocated what is basically a combination of the "sudden change" and "piecemeal" theories; with mass formation tactics already present, certain pieces of the panoply could be technological breakthroughs, like the double-gripped shield, but that not all of the pieces were adopted at one point in time. See also Schwartz 2009, 102-46 for a discussion of the scholarly debate concerning the phalanx's appearance and evolution alongside the archaeological and literary evidence.

³⁸ Cartledge, "Hoplites and Heroes", 19.

³⁹ Salmon, "Political Hoplates?" 87. Salmon also argues that the Perachora aryballos demonstrates the existence of hoplite formations and tactics. The vase shows Paris shooting Achilles with a flautist playing nearby. The flautist plays no part in the original myth, but does play a major role in a phalanx, where flautists played to keep time, and thus Salmon concludes that this indicates that the phalanx was known c. 675 (1977, 89-90).

⁴⁰ Ibid, 87.

who could have been simply hoplites who did not have a breastplate, are told to throw their spears (fr. 11.29-30, 37), indicating that both the heavy thrusting spear of the classical hoplite and the throwing javelin were used.⁴¹ Archaeological evidence also supports the use of two spears by hoplites in this early period.⁴² The shorter spear or javelin would have been thrown before the phalanxes met as it would be useless otherwise, and this practice then gradually fell out of favour, likely correlating with the rise of men fully armoured within the phalanx and the decrease in effectiveness.⁴³

iii. The Second Messenian War

By the time of the Second Messenian War (c.640-620) the phalanx had arrived at Sparta. This war, along with the increasing number of tyrannies in the Peloponnese, made “conformity ineluctable,” causing the Spartans to adopt the phalanx by the third quarter of the seventh century.⁴⁴ Archaeological finds confirm Sparta’s knowledge and use of hoplite gear; terra cottas and vases show warriors wearing rudimentary Corinthian helmets as early as c.675, and an ivory seal from the temple of Artemis Orthia dating to c. 650 shows three men in hoplite gear walking in a line. At around the same time, mass produced lead hoplite figurines begin to be dedicated at the temple, indicating a greater

⁴¹ V.D. Hanson, however, argues that the seventh and sixth centuries were the period of ‘pure’ hoplite warfare and that change did not come until the fifth century with the Persian Wars (2000, 36). This is highly unlikely, at least for the seventh century; the earliest we can definitively place ‘pure’ hoplite battle—that lacking cavalry, archers, and other light armed troops—is the Battle of Champions between Argos and Sparta, c. 545 (Hdt. I.82). Three hundred hoplites from each city met in battle with no light armed troops whatsoever, and this would become the ideal of hoplite warfare, just with larger armies.

⁴² The Berlin alabastron (c. 650) and a plaque from Perachora, dating to no earlier than c. 640, both depict a hoplite carrying a shorter spear for throwing and a longer thrusting spear (Salmon 1977, 90).

⁴³ Salmon, “Political Hoplitest?” 90-91; Schwartz, *Reinstating the Hoplite*, 121-2. Salmon also suggests that the chance that the enemy hoplites would throw the javelins or spears back as a cause, but this is unlikely. The phalanx’s effectiveness depends on its momentum and also cohesion; if some hoplites stopped to pick up javelins, that would interfere with both factors, even if the javelins were originally discharged before the phalanxes began to move towards one another.

⁴⁴ Cartledge, “Hoplites and Heroes,” 25.

familiarity with hoplite arms among the population.⁴⁵

The Second Messenian War began, according to tradition, when the Spartan king Teleklos was murdered in the Limnaian sanctuary in Messenia (Paus. IV.4.3). Tradition asserts that the war was long and hard, with Messenian resistance focused around northern Messenia and with the last stand at the fortress of Eira, south of the Neda Valley.⁴⁶ When the Spartans finally defeated the Messenians, they held the southern part of the Neda Valley and likely the area across to the western sea in addition to her earlier possession of the land around Stenyklaros. The Messenians who remained became helots and entered into a semi-free status; they could not be sold or alienated from the land they worked, which provided them more security than regular slaves, but they were required to give up half of their produce (Plut. *apophth Lac.* 239 E.41).

At this point, the militaristic nature characteristic of the later Archaic and Classical Sparta emerges. The distribution of Messenian land to all the citizens, both elites and non-elites, enabled Sparta to create a standing citizen army, a unique social feature that she flaunted proudly. Helots accompanied the land grants in order to work the farmland and provide food for their masters, freeing the Spartan hoplites from the cares of farming, which in turn permitted the Spartans to spend their time hunting and training for war. Tyrtaeus' war songs, traditionally instrumental in the war against Messenia, continued to be important in the new social order; they were sung in the *συσσιτία* and on campaign (Ath. 14.630f), adding to the militarized nature of Spartan society, as this repetition reinforced the ideals of bravery and solidarity presented in the poems.

⁴⁵ Snodgrass attributes these figurines to a unified hoplite class (1964, 116); Salmon, however, disagrees with him that at most they show a growing common identity among the hoplites (1977, 99).

⁴⁶ Forrest, *A History of Sparta*, 71.

II. Social Changes, the eighth and seventh centuries

It is only with the final conquest of Messenia that Sparta steps away from the other Greek πόλεις. During the eighth century, she, like the other πόλεις, enjoyed an increase in her wealth and population. The Corinthians and the Euboeans began the colonizing movement, and foreign trade from across the Mediterranean brought in new art styles and wealth. Correspondingly, the social and political changes that ended in the Classical πόλις are generally placed in this period.⁴⁷ As wealth began to trickle down into the general population, more farmers and traders began to question their position in society and demand political rights. This in turn led to tension between the elites and the newly rich. The question of who could hold political power became a heated one, allowing tyrants to rise in many πόλεις.⁴⁸ The requirements of hoplite battle compounded the tension. In order to be effective, a phalanx must have sufficient numbers to survive the clash and to push through the opponent's line. Furthermore, only the front ranks needed the full panoply, though as the formation became more uniform, all the hoplites became fully armed.⁴⁹ At this early period, however, the middle and rear ranks only needed a shield and a spear, though a sword also would have been helpful. These factors lowered the cost necessary to participate in the phalanx considerably and opened up the ranks to more men.

Sparta, unlike many other πόλεις, did not produce a tyrant despite discontent over the distribution of Messenian land after the First Messenian War. This was attributed to

⁴⁷ See Raflaub 1997, especially 55-57, however, where he argues that this process had been happening for quite some time.

⁴⁸ For example, Cypselus in Corinth and Orthagas in Sicily

⁴⁹ For a discussion on how only the shield was necessary, see Osborne 1996, 176 and Irwin 2005, 293-4. According to Osborne, the emphasis on "all or none have hoplite shields" is more understandable if not all of the hoplites have body armour (1996, 176); if the only defensive piece of equipment for a portion of the army is the shield, then it becomes more imperative that all have the same shield in order to better protect those who are less protected.

the ratification of the Great Rhetra, the Lycurgan constitution that made all Spartans into the *Homoioi* and established the Spartan way of life. This constitution, however, likely only entered into its final form around the end of the Second Messenian War, or even later, when the question of land distribution caused unrest between the elites and the rest of the population (Arist. *Pol.* 1306b36-1307a1).⁵⁰

The Second Messenian war forced the elites to come to terms with the non-elites. The war threatened Spartan holdings in Messenia, all of which were likely held by the elites. With this wedge, the commons demanded a distribution of newly conquered land and a redistribution of already conquered land with reasonable success. The conquered land was parceled out among the new hoplites and provided their required contributions to the *συσσιτία*, the communal messes that dominated Spartan public life (singular *συσσιτίον*).⁵¹ Each Spartan provided the same amount of food to his *συσσιτίον*, and this furnished the measure of citizenship.⁵² These new citizenship rules redefined Spartan social structure into the *Homoioi*- the Spartan citizens and hoplites, the *perioeci*- the traders and craftsmen of Laconia and Messenia, and the helots.⁵³ The *Homoioi*, as a single class, compose a new group which encompassed all Spartan citizens and required all of them to fight in the army.

⁵⁰ Lycurgus and his laws are the subject of numerous studies which argue both for and against his historicity. If Lycurgus was an actual person, he likely did not live as early as the Spartans said- Xenophon places him with the Heraclids' 'return' to the Peloponnese (*Lac. Pol.* 10.8)- but closer to Tyrtaeus' own time. The communal messes that form a major part of his laws, which were not written down, could not have been established until the distribution of land after the Second Messenian War which allowed all the Spartans to become hoplites.

⁵¹ Cartledge calls the land distribution a lure to persuade the commons to fight to recover land not their own (1979, 117). This distribution, despite the tradition that all the Spartans originally had the same sized allotments (Plut. *Lyc.* VIII), likely was not equal (Hodkinson 1997, 88).

⁵² The rich could provide more than was required, and the meals were also supplemented by hunting (Xen. *Lac. Pol.* V.3)

⁵³ Nikos Biraglias, "Helotage and Spartan Social Organization," in *Sparta: Beyond the Mirage*, eds. Anton Powell and Stephen Hodkinson (London: the Classical Press of Wales and Duckworth, 2002), 251.

The Second Messenian War thus enabled the non-elites of Sparta to see their demands fulfilled, though in an unusual way. In other Greek cities, the hoplites remained farmers, traders, and craftsmen, and the political power that had previously been held only by the aristocrats was shared among all the citizens. Sparta, however, elevated the farmers to the aristocratic class, thereby ensuring that political power remained with the aristocrats and the warriors. In Laconian society, the *Homoioi* stood above Spartans without citizen rights, the *perioeci*, and the helots. The aristocrats, who maintained their position overall, saw some of their power given to the new *Homoioi*, but not all. There were still differences amongst the *Homoioi*, whose name is better translated as ‘Peers’ than the traditional ‘Equals’ (literally, ‘Similar’), and the old aristocrats still stood at the top of the social order.⁵⁴ Participation in the *gerousia*, the Spartan probouletic council where positions were held for life, was the prerogative of the aristocrats, whereas the other *Homoioi* only served among the ephorate, which was a year long position, and the assembly. The two groups within the *Homoioi* class had not always stood together; their cohesion was a product of fighting alongside one another in the Second Messenian War and the joining of their interests after the war. The Spartan constitution made certain that this cohesion would remain in spite of its immaturity by integrating the two groups into the same general class and forcing them to attend a public mess, but it did not erase the differences.

III. Persuasion in Tyrtaeus’ Poetry

Despite the land distribution and the creation of the *Homoioi*, the hostility between the elites and the farmers still existed, and it is probable that neither group had

⁵⁴ I follow Cartledge (1979, 135) in translating *Homoioi* as ‘Peers’ rather than as ‘Equals.’

any particular love for the other. This enmity posed a problem for group cohesion because in order for the phalanx to succeed a group identity superseding the conflict between the two groups needed to be found which would bring the group together and make it more cohesive. Both groups were necessary for the phalanx to succeed. The non-elites provided the numbers needed to increase the mass of the phalanx, and the elites provided not only the armament needed for the first few ranks, but also their experience in battle. The elites had been fighting for generations, for it was on the battlefield that they won the glory and distinction essential to their esteemed position within their communities.⁵⁵ This experience, coupled with their ability to face the enemy, would give courage to the less experienced fighters in the ranks, which in turn increased the unit's ability overall to maintain its cohesion. While both groups were necessary, they did not regard the other as necessary, and both the elites and the non-elites had their own respective group identities which excluded the other. A new group identity needed to be found, one that encompassed both groups and created ties between them.

Tyrtaeus' model for group identity reaches back to the founding myth of the Doric Spartan state and highlights the aristocratic and warlike past of the Spartans. He places the Spartans within the Ἡρακλῆος ... ἀνικῆτου γένος (race of unconquered Heracles; fr. 11.1), reminding them of their ties to the Heraclids who conquered Laconia according to Greek myth. He also, in the process, raises the farmers in status; the Heraclids originally only consisted of the two royal families, the Agiads and the Eurypontids. Now, however, Tyrtaeus suggests that the entire Spartan army could appropriate this noble descent which, in a tidy manner, not only emboldens the farmers

⁵⁵ The best illustration of this is Sarpedon's speech to Glaukos, when he states that the two fight so that they are awarded with choice cuts of meat and prime seats at the feasts (*Il.* 12.310-321).

but also makes fighting alongside them more palatable to the elites.⁵⁶

i. Cohesion

The phalanx demands a comprehensive group identity, one to which all members can relate and commit, because the formation requires that no one leave his place in line, even to the point of forfeiting his life. If, when the phalanxes charge one another, men panic and break rank, the entire formation will be lost. There are two reasons for this; one, the phalanx is weakened by the loss of manpower and no longer has sufficient mass to break through or resist the other army, and two, the panic that caused some men to flee quickly infects the other men, and the army degenerates into a mob.⁵⁷ Normally the phalanx dissolves from the rear ranks, when men in the back turn and run, sensing some danger up front which they cannot see, and the remainder of the army then follows suit. It is to counter this desire to flee that Tyrtaeus devotes most of his energy and focuses on creating a cohesive social identity for the soldiers.

The phalanx formation is conducive to fear-induced flight because the men in the back cannot see what is ahead of the phalanx, and the helmets and general noise of the battle obstruct hearing and communication among the hoplites. S.L.A. Marshall, writing about the behaviour of soldiers during the Second World War, lists communication as one of the main deterrents to flight because when men do not know what is happening and see others retreating or running away, they tend to panic and flee as well, but in a

⁵⁶ Lazenby argues that in fr. 10.9-12, 12.24, 29-30, and 11.13, Tyrtaeus' words "confirm that the Spartans already thought of themselves as *homoioi*" (1985, 75-6). This may be so; it is, however, very easy to push back the traits of Classical Sparta to Tyrtaeus and even earlier under the influence of the Spartan mirage.

⁵⁷ Thus, Schwartz argues, "A phalanx above all relied on cohesion: it was all-important that its lines were kept as intact as at all possible. If gaps opened between the hoplites and the sections were pried from each other, there was a very serious risk that the whole phalanx might crumble and fall apart" (2009, 123).

disorderly fashion.⁵⁸ E. Canetti also stresses the group nature of flight, stating that when a group of people run, they run away together because that is the best way to flee.⁵⁹ The flight of a few men within the phalanx causes the breakdown of the entire unit because the other soldiers, perceiving the flight, also flee, for then at least there is safety in numbers. If there is any confusion as to why the retreat is underway, the level of panic and disorder rises.⁶⁰ Furthermore, hoplites would have been reluctant, especially at this early period, to remain and risk their lives when a few men had already left the formation and jeopardized its survival.⁶¹

Cohesion among armed forces has been a popular topic among sociologists and social psychologists since the Second World War, though they have not agreed on a universal definition. J.H. Johns' broad definition of cohesion as "the degree to which members of a group or organization are willing to subordinate their individual welfare to that of the group and to conform to the standards of behaviour, or norms, of the group" can serve as an example of a general definition of cohesion.⁶² Sociologists and social psychologists then divide this definition into two main groups, social cohesion and task cohesion. The theory of social cohesion, which Marshall first described and which many successive studies of military cohesion have taken up, focuses on the nature and quality of emotive bonds among group members; a socially cohesive group, then, comprises

⁵⁸ S.L.A. Marshall, *Men Against Fire: the Problem of Battle Command in Future War* (New York: William Morrow and Co., 1966), 154.

⁵⁹ *Crowds and Power* (New York: The Viking Press, 1963), 53.

⁶⁰ See Marshall 1966, 146-47 for an illustration of this.

⁶¹ Victor Davis Hanson, *The Western Way of War: Infantry Battle in Classical Greece* (1989; reprint, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 189.

⁶² *Cohesion in the U.S. Military: Defense Management Study Group on Military Cohesion* (Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1984), 1. See also Mudrack 1989, 39-45 for an overview and discussion of various definitions of cohesion.

members who like one another and feel emotionally close.⁶³ Task cohesion, on the other hand, does not require that group members like one another. Instead, it relies on the commitment of individual members to a common goal which requires the participation of all group members in order to complete it successfully.⁶⁴

The distinctions between social and task cohesion, while applicable to modern militaries, can be difficult to transpose back to ancient Greece and to this early, formative period of Greek warfare, though J.W.I. Lee has applied the distinctions of social and task cohesion successfully to the λόχοι and συσκήνια of the Ten Thousand who marched under Cyrus the Younger.⁶⁵ The Ten Thousand, however, hold a special place among ancient armies; they were a mercenary army, not a citizen army, and they lived and fought together for several years before some accepted the Spartan contract and the rest disbanded. Their situation, then, is far more akin to modern professional armies than the hoplite armies of the Archaic and Classical πόλεις which were composed of citizens who fought for a day and then returned to their fields.⁶⁶ Furthermore, we simply do not have the same amount of material for early archaic warfare as we do for the march and daily life of the Ten Thousand.

Due to these limitations, my concept of cohesion will draw more from Johns'

⁶³ R.J. MacCoun, "What is Known about Unit Cohesion and Military Performance," in *Sexual Orientation and U.S. Personnel Policy* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1993), 291. For studies arguing for cohesion as a force of social bonds, see Marshall 1966, Shils and Janowitz 1948, Stouffer et al. 1949, Little 1964, Janowitz and Little 1965, Moskos 1970 and 1975, Wong *et al.* 2003, and Siebold 2003.

⁶⁴ MacCoun, "Unit Cohesion," 291. For studies focusing on task cohesion, see Thibaut and Kelly 1959, Olson 1965, Kviz 1978, MacCoun *et al.* 2006, King 2006 and 2007, and Mullen and Copper 1994.

⁶⁵ *A Greek Army on the March: Soldiers and Survival in Xenophon's Anabasis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 104. A λόχος, a 'company,' was a unit of the Greek armies. The Ten Thousand's λόχοι seem to have been, on average, 120 men strong (*ibid.*, 84). Συσκήνια, the informal dinner groups, were far smaller, likely only five to ten men (*ibid.*, 100).

⁶⁶ King also comments on the historical dimension of cohesion; the lack of intensive drills during the mid-twentieth century and earlier caused army leaders to focus on social commonalities to create cohesion amongst the troops, whereas the professional, volunteer forces that succeeded the conscript armies have focused on repeated collective training to create cohesion (2007, 646 n.18)

broad definition given above than from a more precise definition focusing on social or task cohesion. Furthermore, it is easier for Tyrtaeus to emphasize aspects of social cohesion within his poetry than task cohesion. Social cohesion can be timeless; task cohesion is far more specific to individual tasks and goals, which change. Cohesion, therefore, will be the ability of the Spartan hoplites to hold their formation, despite their reluctance to fight in the new formation of the phalanx and despite their fear of the approaching engagement. Tyrtaeus also emphasizes the role of the community in rewarding the soldiers for their sacrifices, which in turn integrates the soldiers more closely with their community and makes them beholden to the community as a whole, just as the community is to them. He creates new social ties through the application of competitive excellences to the army, which creates a field for both elites and non-elites to compete on, something they did not previously have. The source for the allusions which Tyrtaeus uses to accomplish cohesion is the Homeric epics, works in the epic tradition that loomed large in Greek social memory.⁶⁷

ii. Homer as a source of persuasion

The importance of the Homeric poems in Sparta can be attested from c. 700, when the Spartans turned the Late Bronze Age palace outside the city into the Menelaion, a shrine to Menelaus and Helen.⁶⁸ The later tradition that Lycurgus brought the epics to Sparta after his travels in Asia Minor also attests to their popularity (Plut. *Lyc.* IV.4) for the Spartans connected only the best to Lycurgus. They also promoted the myth that Tyndareus, the father of Helen and her brothers and king of Sparta, bequeathed the kingdom to Heracles when Castor and Polydeuces died. Not only did this legitimize

⁶⁷ Schwartz on Tyrtaeus' focus on cohesion: "The principles on display above all in the poetry of Tyrtaeus are crucial to the cohesion and unity of a close-order phalanx" (2009, 123)

⁶⁸ Cartledge, *Sparta and Laconia*, 121.

Doric and Heraclid claims to Sparta, but it also connected them to the heroes of the Homeric world, which was a popular practice among the aristocrats from every πόλις.

Sparta's prominence within both poems- it is for Helen of Sparta that the Trojan War was fought, and it is to Sparta that Telemachus goes to learn of his father- would have appealed to the Spartan elites, especially after the First Messenian War, when Sparta became a larger player in Panhellenic politics and affairs. They found values to uphold and heroes to imitate; Achilles as an exemplar of aristocratic behaviour, motivated by κλέος and τιμή, gave aristocratic young men a legacy to emulate and a standard to uphold. The elites were not the only ones to find a hero within the poems though; Odysseus, who wanders as a beggar for a large portion of the *Odyssey*, appealed to the farmers and other non-elites. Not only did he live as a member of the lower classes, but he was a craftsman and, according to one tradition, able to farm his own land as well. Craftsmen, farmers, and traders could relate to him due to his breadth of skills and draw inspiration from his endurance. There was also Hector who, though he was a Trojan and thus a non-Greek, was Greek enough in Homer's depiction of him for the Greek audience to relate to him. Furthermore, Hector distinguished himself as the defender of Troy, as a man who would not give up on his city's defense, and thus is an ideal figure for Tyrtaeus to invoke as he presents his soldiers as defenders of home land. Tyrtaeus' work therefore relies on the appeal of these heroes to various parts of Spartan society as well as on Homeric language. The latter he uses not only to depict warfare, for which the *Iliad* is an excellent source, but also to allude to methods of persuasion used by the heroes.

Tyrtaeus' references to Hector and Odysseus pervade his poetry, framing the heroes in relation to the phalanx; Achilles figures in one major allusion in fragment 12

and then is absent from the remainder of the extant poetry. In the following chapter, I will discuss Tyrtaeus' allusions to Hector as a hero of his community and the exemplar of a civic defender. Tyrtaeus also uses Hector to impose a sense of shame upon the desire to flee, the first of many ways which he impugns the valid, yet detrimental, impulse to run away from battle.

Chapter 2

Hector, the Hero of the Community

Within his poetry, Tyrtaeus strives, as discussed previously, to create cohesion and to convince the soldiers to fight to the utmost of their abilities, even if it means they should die. Hector, who stands as an example of one heroic type among several within the Homeric poems, draws his main motivation from his sense of duty, and it is this sense of responsibility to his city that enables Tyrtaeus to employ him for the purpose of creating cohesion and an increased willingness to fight. Tyrtaeus then uses these allusions to strengthen the bonds within a heterogeneous and politically divided audience, the Spartan army.

Tyrtaeus' source for allusions to Hector, and to the other heroes Odysseus and Achilles, are the Homeric epic texts, a genre with significant differences from his own martial exhortations, which are a sub-group of archaic elegy. M.L. West defines elegy by the use of the elegiac meter- a couplet consisting of one line each of dactylic hexameter and pentameter- and the first person voice of the poet. The poet also addresses the audience directly, and his message occurs within a specific context, whether historical or social.¹ K.J. Dover has convincingly argued that exhortative elegy evolved from the hortatory speeches within epic poetry and the iambic tradition in which Archilochus composes.² Martial exhortative elegiacs appear in both Ionia and mainland Greece around the same time in the verses of Callinus of Ephesus and Tyrtaeus, but they likely

¹ *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1974), 2.

² "The Poetry of Archilochus," in *Achilouque: sept exposés et discussions* (Genève: Vandoeuvres, 1964), 193-4.

evolved in Ionia first, as Tyrtaeus composes in the Ionic dialect.³ Exhortation plays a key role in both elegy and epic, but Tyrtaeus delivers his address directly to his audience, whereas exhortation within the epic poems is internal and affects the characters of the epic narration directly and the audience indirectly.⁴ Epic poetry, in contrast to Tyrtaeus' direct advice, focuses on a third person narrative of past deeds and individual heroes who performed them.⁵ The purpose of the ἀοιδός or bard was to present the narrative as a narrative, not as advice pertaining to the audience's lives.⁶ The world of epic is entirely internal; it does not interact with the audience at all. The audience therefore views the epic from the outside, whereas Tyrtaeus' audience is the object of his performance, as he attempts to persuade them to agree with his message. Tyrtaeus' impact on his audience is thus more notionally immediate than the impact of the epic poet on his audience. Nevertheless, the epic *exempla* of Homer are so culturally powerful that Tyrtaeus appropriates them as his own *exempla*, embedding them not only generally but also specifically as allusions. Tyrtaeus relies on the cultural prevalence of epic *exempla* and his audience's knowledge of them in order to make successful allusions to the epic heroes. He also uses this knowledge to exploit heroic concepts such as the καλὸς θάνατος and the connection of a τύμβος with κλέος. These references need to be made carefully, however, as Tyrtaeus simply cannot provide his audience the rewards that epic implicitly claims for its subjects.

In order to successfully persuade his audience, Tyrtaeus must establish his

³ West, *Studies*, 10

⁴ For exhortation as a key feature of epic and elegy, see Irwin, *Solon*, 33.

⁵ Andrew Ford, "Epic as a Genre," in *A New Companion to Homer*, eds. Ian Morris and Barry Powell (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 398.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 411

authority as a poet. Homer was canonical. His authority began with his invocations of the Muses (*Il.* 1.1, 2.484-492; *Od.* 1.1-10) and was increased by the continual repetition of his works. Tyrtaeus, at the time of composition, had no such authority and thus needed to establish his own within the poems. He does this by presenting himself as an adviser and by claiming to control social memory. In fragments 10 and 11 and likely in fragment 2 as well, he gives advice on how to fight and why the men should fight, urging them on in the role of an adviser.⁷ He then begins fragment 12 with the statement οὔτ' ἄν μνησαίμην οὔτ' ἐν λόγῳ ἄνδρα τιθεῖν (I would not remember nor place a man in speech) which leads into a list of various ἀρεταί which are not sufficient to cause a man to be remembered by him (fr. 12.1-9).⁸ In stating that he would not remember men who have ἀρεταί of speed, strength, wealth, etc., Tyrtaeus refuses to recognize the κλέος that they gain from their abilities. He also refuses to grant it; the second half of this statement- οὔτ' ἐν λόγῳ ἄνδρα τιθεῖν- connects Tyrtaeus to the poetic tradition and its purpose of conferring κλέος upon its subjects.⁹ This statement thus associates him with the poetic tradition of praising and remembering the deeds of men, which in turn places him in a position of authority.

Tyrtaeus does not call on the Muses, though, to aid his memory or to pass the story on to him, and this is not necessarily a difference of genre between Homer and Tyrtaeus, as Solon invokes the Muses in fragment 13.1-2. By refusing to call on the

⁷ Fragment 2 is very fragmentary, but it does contain a command to obey someone (fr. 2.10). Gerber, following Browne *et al.* (1971, 3), has suggested “let us obey (the kings since they are?) nearer to the race (of the gods?)” as a translation for lines 10-11 (1999, 38-39), which would put this poem in the exhortative group of Tyrtaeus' works.

⁸ These ἀρεταί are ἀρεταί of foot, of παλαιμοσύνης, strength, speed, beauty, wealth, kingliness, and speaking ability (12.1-9).

⁹ T.A. Tarkow, “Tyrtaeus 9D: The Role of Poetry in New Sparta,” *L'Antiquité classique* 52 (1983): 63; Robert D. Lugenbill, “Tyrtaeus 12 West: Come Join the Spartan Army,” *Classical Quarterly* 52 (2002): 409.

Muses, however, Tyrtaeus distances himself from the epic tradition and sets himself up as the sole source of authority.¹⁰ Tyrtaeus' assertion that the only men worth remembering are those who possess θούριδος ἀλκῆς (raging courage; fr. 12.9) imposes restrictions upon his willingness to remember men, but it increases the emphasis on martial ἀρετή and its appeal as a prize to be won. Tyrtaeus' self-presentation as an authority figure thus enables him to present his stated opinions as certain and for them to be accepted more easily.

Tyrtaeus' extant fragments largely consist of advice given to the entire audience as a single unit. The only instance where he names an individual is in fragment 5, when he narrates the conquest of Messenia by King Theopompus.¹¹ Within his actual hortatory verses, however, he names no individual figure. The lack of individualism is one of the largest thematic differences between Tyrtaeus' work and the Homeric epics. Epic, which focuses on the actions of past heroes, depends on the individual figures performing those deeds and requires them to be recognized. Tyrtaeus appropriates qualities clearly associated with recognizable Homeric heroes rather than naming individual heroes because his advice is general and revolves around how the Spartans should and should not behave. Furthermore, the lack of individual names within his exhortations enables

¹⁰ The closest parallel to this is in Hesiod's *Works and Days*, where he begins with a prayer to the Muses but then states, ἐγὼ δέ κε Πέρση ἐτήτυμα μῆθησαίμην (And I would speak true words to you, Perses; *Op.* 10). This sets Hesiod's narrative and advice to Perses apart from the Muse's own narrative (Ford 1997, 409).

¹¹

ἡμετέρῳ βασιλῆϊ, θεοῖσι φίλῳ Θεοπόμπῳ,
ὄν διὰ Μεσσήνην εἴλομεν εὐρύχορον,
Μεσσήνην ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἀροῦν, ἀγαθὸν δὲ φυτεύειν·

To our king Theopompus, dear to the gods, through whom we captured Messene of the wide fields, Messene good to plough and good to plant (Tyr. fr. 5.1-3)

the advice to apply to all the audience members. Tyrtaeus' work thus does not alienate any particular group due to any preference shown to another group.¹²

Tyrtaeus' allusions to Hector are also inclusive. Though Hector is a prince, he is not Greek, and therefore is unconnected to the Greek aristocrats. This allows the non-elites in Tyrtaeus' audience to relate to him, even though he is a prince and heir to Priam's kingdom. Conversely, his appeal to the elites in the audience comes from his aristocratic status, which overrides his non-Greek heritage. His presence within Tyrtaeus' poems thus alienates no one. Beyond this, Hector stands as an exemplar of civic duty on account of his staunch defense of his city. Homer places the defense of Troy in Hector's hands when he states that the people of Troy call Hector's son Astyanax rather than his given name Skamandrios due to Hector's continual defense of the city (*Il.* 5.402-3).¹³ Due to this close connection with the city's defense, Hector is closely connected to the city's fate. While Hector lives, Troy stands; when he dies, it falls. Though all the Trojans fight and die for their city, it is Hector who is most closely connected with both actions.

Hector's sense of duty is important, for it allows Tyrtaeus to bypass objections to fighting and to insist that the Spartans should fight because it is their duty to fight for their city and families, just as Hector fought for Troy because it was his city and held his family. This heightened sense of duty has prompted Redfield to call Hector a "hero of responsibilities" and van Wees to hold that "shame and a sense of responsibility... cost

¹² Tyrtaeus does break this general trend in fragment 11. 35-38, though, when he addresses the γυμνήτες by name. The implications of this specific address will be discussed in the following chapter.

¹³ There may also be a connection between Hector's name and his role as his city's defender. Nagy has connected Hector's name with his role as the city's protector through the derivation of Ἔκτορ as an agent noun from the verb ἔχω in the sense of "protect" or "check" (1979, 146).

Hektor his life.”¹⁴ Aristocrat or farmer, the Spartans still live in the same city and on the same lands, and the city’s defense thus falls to all of them. Tyrtæus, by using Hector’s sense of responsibility as a prod to convince the Spartans to fight, asks each Spartan to consider himself as or to act as a “Hektor.” They are all asked to fight for their city out of a sense of duty, and this duty- the defense of the city- is traditionally aristocratic. The aristocrats can thus take pride in the continuing importance of their place as the city’s defenders. Only now the elites share this duty with the non-elites, who become a part of the elite “group” by participating in aristocratic duties. Their entrance into the group is also solidified by their emulation of Hector, who displays many traits in the *Iliad* which are familiar to the aristocrats.

I. Fragment 10

τεθνάμεναι γὰρ καλὸν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι πεσόντα
 ἄνδρ’ ἀγαθὸν περὶ ἧ πατρίδι μαρνάμενον
 τὴν δ’ αὐτοῦ προλιπόντα πόλιν καὶ πίονας ἀγροῦς
 πτωχεύειν πάντων ἔστ’ ἀνηρότατον,
 πλαζόμενον σὺν μητρὶ φίλῃ καὶ πατρὶ γέροντι (5)
 παισὶ τε σὺν μικροῖς κουριδίῃ τ’ ἀλόχοι.
 ἐχθρὸς μὲν γὰρ τοῖσι μετέσσειται οὓς κεν ἴκηται,
 χρησιμοσύνη τ’ εἰκῶν καὶ στυγερῇ πενήνῃ,
 αἰσχύνει τε γένος, κατὰ δ’ ἀγλαὸν εἶδος ἐλέγχει,
 πᾶσα δ’ ἀτιμῆ καὶ κακότης ἐπεταί. (10)
 εἶθ’ οὕτως ἀνδρὸς τοι ἀλωμένου οὐδεμί’ ὄρη
 γίνεται οὔτ’ αἰδῶς οὔτ’ ὀπίσω γένεος.
 θυμῶι γῆς πέρι τῆσδε μαχώμεθα καὶ περὶ παίδων
 θνήσκωμεν ψυχέων μηκέτι φειδόμενοι.
 ὦ νέοι, ἀλλὰ μάχεσθε παρ’ ἀλλήλοισι μένοντες, (15)
 μηδὲ φυγῆς αἰσχροῦς ἄρχετε μηδὲ φόβου,
 ἀλλὰ μέγαν ποιεῖτε καὶ ἄλκιμον ἐν φρεσὶ θυμὸν,
 μηδὲ φιλοχυχεῖτ’ ἀνδράσι μαρνάμενοι·
 τοὺς δὲ παλαιότερους, ὧν οὐκέτι γούνατ’ ἐλαφρά
 μὴ καταλείποντες φεύγετε, τοὺς γεραίους. (20)
 αἰσchrὸν γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο, μετὰ προμάχοισι πεσόντα

¹⁴ *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: the Tragedy of Hector* (1975; reprint, Durham: Duke University Press, 1994), 110; “Heroes, Knights, and Nutters: Warrior Mentality in Homer,” in *Battle in Antiquity*, ed. Alan B. Lloyd (Duckworth and the Classical Press of Wales, 1996), 25.

κείσθαι πρόσθε νέων ἄνδρα παλαιότερον,
 ἦδε λευκὸν ἔχοντα κάρη πολιόν τε γένειον,
 θυμὸν ἀποπνεῖοντ' ἄλκιμον ἐν κονίηι,
 αἵματόεντ' αἰδοῖα φίλαις ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντα — (25)
 αἰσχρὰ τὰ γ' ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νεμεσητὸν ἰδεῖν,
 καὶ χροὰ γυμνωθέντα· νέοισι δὲ πάντ' ἐπέοικεν,
 ὄφρ' ἐρατῆς ἥβης ἀγλαὸν ἄνθος ἔχηι,
 ἀνδράσι μὲν θηητὸς ἰδεῖν, ἐρατὸς δὲ γυναιξὶ
 ζωὸς ἐὼν, καλὸς δ' ἐν προμάχοισι πεσὼν (30)
 ἀλλὰ τις εὖ διαβάς μενέτω ποσὶν ἀμφοτέροισι
 στηριχθεὶς ἐπὶ γῆς, χεῖλος ὁδοῦσι δακῶν

It is noble to die, when a good man falls among the fore-fighters while fighting on behalf of his fatherland, and to beg is the most grievous, when a man abandons his city and rich fields and wanders with his dear mother and aged father, even with his little children and wedded wife. He is hated, being among those whom he reaches. He disgraces his form and line with both need and loathsome poverty, and he brings shame upon his splendid form, and every dishonour and misery follow him. Since thus there is neither regard nor respect for a man wandering, or his line afterwards, let us fight with spirit for this land, and let us die on behalf of our children, no longer sparing our lives. Young men, fight, remaining near one another, and do not begin shameful flight or fear, but rather make the spirit in your chest great and strong. Do not love life when you fight men. And do not flee, leaving behind the older men, whose knees are no longer nimble, the revered elders. For this is shameful, when an older man, already having white hair and a grey beard, lies in front of the young men, since he has fallen among the fore-fighters, and breathes out his valiant spirit into the dust as he holds his bloody genitals in his own hands- indeed these things are shameful to the eyes and cause indignation to behold, when also his body is naked. But for the young men everything is seemly, so long as he has the splendid flower of lovely youth. While he lives he is a wonder to men and desirable to women, and when he falls among the fore-fighters he is beautiful. Let each man now wait, standing with his feet well apart and firmly fixing both feet upon the ground, biting his lips with his teeth.

Fragment 10 is the anchor for this chapter, though fragments 11 and 12 will also be discussed alongside 10. Within this poem the main themes of Tyrtaeus' allusions to Hector appear, with one exception. These themes are shame (10.19-27), the beautiful corpse (καλὸς θάνατος, 10.27-30), an exhortation to stand firm (εὖ διαβάς, 10.31-2), and community loyalty (10.13-14). The final theme, which is hinted at in fragment 10 but is elaborated on in fragment 12, is the theme of communal mourning (12.27-34).

II. Shame

Though Hector is motivated by a strong sense of duty, it is not the only thing that motivates him; as van Wees notes, he is also forced by his sense of shame to stand his ground against Achilles.¹⁵ Tyrtaeus imposes a sense of shame upon his audience in fragment 10, where he spends twenty of the thirty-two lines presenting two situations designed to shame his listeners into fighting. Lines 3-12 detail the life of the coward, who is forced to wander around Greece with his entire family following him, and then after a brief exhortation to fight, Tyrtaeus launches into a detailed description of the fate of the older soldiers when the younger ones flee (21-30).¹⁶ This description bears a strong resemblance to Priam's plea to Hector in *Iliad* 22:

νέω δέ τε πάντ' ἐπέοικεν
 ἀρηϊκταμένω, δεδαϊγμένω ὄξει χαλκῷ,
 κεῖσθαι· πάντα δὲ καλὰ θανόντι περ, ὅτι φανήη·
 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ πολιόν τε κάρη τε γένειον
 αἰδῶ τ' αἰσχύνωσι κύνες κταμένοιο γέροντος,
 τοῦτο δὴ οἴκτιστον πέλεται δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν

Everything is seemly for a young man slain in battle as he lies dead, torn by sharp bronze; and though he is dead everything is beautiful to him, whatever shows around him; but when dogs disfigure the white hair and beard and the genitals of an old man who has been killed, this indeed is this most lamentable thing for wretched mortals (*Il.* 22.71-76)

Tyrtaeus alludes to this passage in fragment 10, but he reverses Priam's plea, both structurally and in meaning. Where Priam begins with the description of the young man and ends with the wretched fate of the old man (himself), Tyrtaeus begins with his detailed depiction of the old soldiers' deaths (fr. 10.21-27) and then finishes the poem with the description of the beautiful death of the young man (fr. 10.27-30). This allows

¹⁵ "Heroes," 25.

¹⁶ The shameful life of the wanderer/ coward will be discussed in the next chapter in relation to Tyrtaeus' allusions to Odysseus.

him to begin by shaming the young soldiers and then end by presenting them with a way to escape from that shame: by fighting, and possibly dying, at the front of battle. Priam's structure, conversely, allows him to focus on the shameful end he will meet if Hector fights Achilles and dies.¹⁷ In addition to this, where Priam employs the contrast between the old man's shameful death and the young man's death in an attempt to convince Hector to return to Troy and not fight Achilles, Tyrtaeus uses the contrast to encourage the young men to fight.

Priam calls the death of the old man οἴκτιστον, "most lamentable," and Tyrtaeus calls it αἰσχρόν, "shameful." They both use a neuter adjective to describe the situation in which the old man dies, and Tyrtaeus imposes a moral judgment on it.¹⁸ Both state that the old man is dead (κεῖσθαι, Tyr. 10.22; κταμένοιο, *Il.* 22.75), and they both emphasize the indignity of this death in relation to the old man's genitals. Priam's old man has his genitals disfigured by his dogs (αἰδῶ τ' αἰσχύνωσι κύνες κταμένοιο γέροντος; *Il.* 22.75), and Tyrtaeus' lies in the dirt, clutching his in his hands (αἰματόεντ' αἰδοῖα φίλαις ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντα; 10.25).¹⁹ Then, to increase the *pathos* of the old man's death, both comment on the white hair and beard of the old man (λευκὸν ἔχοντα κάρη πολλόν τε γένειον, Tyr. 10.23; πολλόν τε κάρη τε γένειον, *Il.* 22.74). The overall effect is a pitiable death, one which, Tyrtaeus and Priam argue, should not have happened. Priam argues that this happened because the young man, i.e. Hector, fought and died, abandoning his

¹⁷ See Vernant 1982, 60 for a discussion on how Priam inverts the domestic order in *Iliad* 22.54-76.

¹⁸ αἰσχρόν is used to condemn actions, just as its opposite, καλόν, is used to commend them (Adkins 1960, 180). Vernant also connects αἰσχρόν here with moral disapproval (il y a une nuance de réprobation « morale »), but argues that the contrast between the two deaths points to an aesthetic emphasis (1982, 61).

¹⁹ Prato asserts that Tyrtaeus' depiction of this scene is an exaggeration of a similar occurrence which would have been common on a battlefield (1968, 114). In this he follows Goldschmidt, who also sees this passage as a depiction of a common battlefield occurrence (1940, 157; see also for a discussion on different opinions on the scene). Barigazzi argues that this passage as a variation on *Il.* 22.71-76 (1951, 114), and Vernant also connects the two passages to argue that Tyr. 10.23 and *Il.* 22.73 allude to a body stripped of all masculinity (1982, 64).

father to his dismal fate. Tyrtaeus, on the other hand, argues that this happened because the young man did not fight, but instead fled the battlefield (10.19-20).

Unlike Priam's old man, the old men in Tyrtaeus' poetry fight, an action which is designed to imply that the Spartans are facing a major crisis. Γέρων as an age term refers to men who are sixty years or older, and who would not be involved in the fighting under normal circumstances. Even in the *Iliad* only exceptional old men, such as Nestor, fight, unless exceptional circumstances necessitate their participation. Nestor, even though he does fight, still spends most of the *Iliad* giving counsel and planning. Tyrtaeus' use of the term thus not only highlights the indignity of the old men's deaths, for by this point in their lives they should be able to die peacefully at home, but also the crisis, real or supposed, facing the Spartan army.

Both Tyrtaeus and Priam begin their depiction of the young man's death with the statement πάντ' ἐπέουκεν (Tyr. 10.27; *Il.* 22.71). This immediately contrasts the fate of the young man with that of the old, who must suffer a shameful or lamentable death. This statement governs the audiences' perception of the young man's death in battle (ἐν προμάχοισι πεσών, Tyr. 10.30; ἀρηϊκταμένω, δεδαιγμένω ὄξεϊ χαλκῷ, / κεῖσθαι, *Il.* 22.72-3). This battle death is not only fitting for the young man, it is also heroic. Both Priam and Tyrtaeus connect the young man's death to the καλὸς θάνατος, a form of death closely connected with the Homeric heroes (Tyr. 10.30; *Il.* 22.73). The young man's death, then, is the proper death for a hero and soldier. Priam, however, does not want his son to die in this manner, for then Troy's hope of survival and his own are gone. He thus presents the charmed death of the young man first and ends with the shameful death of the old man in order to emphasize the contrast between their two fates and hopefully

persuade his son to retreat and not fight Achilles. The young man in Priam's speech dies in battle, whereas the old man dies at home, where his dogs can reach him. For Tyrtaeus, however, both the young and the old man die in battle, in the front lines. The factor that separates nobility from shamefulness for him is that the young man should be in the front, and die there if need be, whereas the old man should not be. He ends with the young man's fate in order to fire up the young men after imposing a sense of shame upon their desire to flee battle.

Tyrtaeus needs to handle his appeal to fight through Hector carefully though. For even though Hector holds back the Achaeans until his death, he still dies and Troy burns; his son is thrown from the city walls; and his wife is led away as a slave. Tyrtaeus does not want the Spartans to dwell too heavily on this end, for otherwise their willingness to fight would weaken or disappear. Instead, he reassures them in fragment 11.2 by separating their situation from that of Hector: οὔπω Ζεὺς ἀνχένα λοξὸν ἔχει (Zeus does not yet hold his neck aslant).²⁰ Though both are fighting for their cities, Zeus removes his blessing from Hector (*Il.* 22.208-13), where he maintains it for the Spartans. Tyrtaeus thus emphasizes that the Spartans have nothing to fear and therefore no reason not to fight. Though some will die, a possibility he discusses openly in fragments 10, 11, and 12, their sacrifices will not presage the fall of Sparta but will rather contribute to its continued security.

III. Beautiful death

Tyrtaeus connects the deaths of the young soldiers with heroic death, a form of

²⁰ Though the precise meaning of this line is uncertain, it is likely indicates that, as argued above, Zeus still favours the Spartans (Gerber 1999, 57 n.2). See Theognis 857-60, where he grumbles that his friend "turns his neck aslant" when Theognis is in the midst of troubles, but is all smiles when Theognis is doing well.

death later Greeks would call καλὸς θάνατος, at the end of fragment 10: καλὸς δ' ἐν προμάχοισι πεσών (when he falls among the fore-fighters he is beautiful; 10.30). This specific statement on the beauty of the fallen soldier follows the poem's opening, where Tyrtaeus asserts the nobility of fighting on behalf of the πόλις: τεθνάμεναι γὰρ καλὸν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι πεσόντα / ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν περὶ ἧ πατρίδι μαρνάμενον (It is noble to die, when a good man falls among the fore-fighters while fighting on behalf of his fatherland; 10.1-2). The use of καλὸν to describe a man's death among the fore-fighters elevates the otherwise unpleasant act of dying. A.W.H. Adkins calls καλὸν the highest term of praise used to commend a man's actions which contains both an aesthetic and a moral element.²¹ The neuter form of the adjective καλός (beautiful, noble) does retain the aesthetic sense of beautiful, but it is the moral aspect of the adjective that is emphasized here.²² τεθνάμεναι γὰρ καλὸν contrasts the second moral judgment that Tyrtaeus makes; in lines 21-27 he identifies the opposite of noble death in the front lines: when the old soldiers die, abandoned by the younger soldiers. He calls this αἰσχρόν (shameful), using the neuter adjective to again speak to the moral aspect of the actions, and where καλὸν is the greatest praise, αἰσχρόν is the greatest condemnation.²³

The opinion that 'it is noble to die' when fighting in the front ranks is a general opinion that Tyrtaeus then applies to the men who die at the end of the poem when he switches to the masculine form of the adjective in καλὸς δ' ἐν προμάχοισι πεσών (he is beautiful, falling among the fore-fighters; 10.30). καλός here speaks to the fallen soldier's beauty, and it connects Tyrtaeus' poem to the heroic tradition of the καλὸς

²¹ *Merit and Responsibility: A Study in Greek Values* (Oxford: the Clarendon Press, 1960), 180.

²² See also Lugenbill 2002, 411 n.39, where he argues that καλὸν has moral force. See, though, Adkins 1960, 31 and 163, Snell 1969, 23, Verdenius 1969, 350, and Vernant 1982, 61 who all argue that καλὸν has more of an aesthetic aspect than moral in this passage.

²³ Adkins, *Merit*, 180.

θάνατος, which is a key feature of heroic death in the *Iliad*. When Patrokles and Hector die, their ψυχαί depart from the bodies, λιποῦσ' ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην (leaving behind manhood and youth; *Il.* 16.857; 22.363). Most of the heroes in the *Iliad* are short-lived; it is a mark of being a hero and what makes them worthy of being the subjects of an epic. The hero's willingness to die young and his choice to die in battle grant him κλέος that then makes him one of the main figures in bardic song, which in turn cements his immortality and his youth in the collective memory of society.²⁴

The beauty of the hero is a key aspect of the καλὸς θάνατος because of the impressiveness of the hero's acceptance of death and ability to make it his own and because of the physical beauty of the hero's corpse. Homer frequently remarks on the appearance of a hero's corpse, as he does when Hector falls to Achilles: οἱ καὶ θηήσαντο φῆν καὶ εἶδος ἀγῆτον / Ἔκτορος (They wondered at the form and wondrous appearance of Hector; *Il.* 22.370-1). Vernant connects this remarkable beauty of the dead hero to the transformation of his youth, which shows itself when he is alive through his exceptional strength.²⁵ The hero's beauty and youth are then fixed when he is immolated and buried, and the image of the youthful hero remains in the memory of the community.²⁶ The idea of the καλὸς θάνατος continued after Homer, though its purpose changed to serve the πόλις rather than the hero.²⁷ Tyrtaeus' use of the concept in fragment 10 puts a heroic veneer over the Spartans' enterprise, as does his later description of the beauty of the young man's corpse (fr. 10.27-30). Tyrtaeus also extends Homer's connection between

²⁴Jean-Pierre Vernant, "La belle mort et le cadavre outragé," in *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*, eds. Gherardo Gnoli and Jean-Pierre Vernant (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 54

²⁵Ibid, 58

²⁶Ibid, 66; Ian Morris, "Attitudes toward Death in Archaic Greece," *Classical Antiquity* 8 (1989): 304; Maurice Bloch, "Death, Women, and Power," in *Death and the Regeneration of Life*, ed. Maurice Bloch and Jonathon Parry (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 228.

²⁷Morris, "Attitudes," 306.

Hector's καλὸς θάνατος in defense of his city by making a general statement first to the nobility and to the beauty of dying in the front ranks while fighting on behalf of the πατρίς (fr. 10.1-2, 30).

IV. Stand Firm

Tyrtaeus' reference to the καλὸς θάνατος in fragment 10 is then followed by a couplet encouraging each soldier to stand fast in battle and wait for the enemy (10.31-2). This couplet is then repeated in fragment 11, where it introduces an extended description on how to behave before and during the battle:²⁸

ἀλλὰ τις εὖ διαβάς μενέτω ποσὶν ἀμφοτέροισι
στηριχθεὶς ἐπὶ γῆς, χεῖλος ὁδοῦσι δακῶν,
μηρούς τε κνήμας τε κάτω καὶ στέρνα καὶ ὄμους
ἀσπίδος εὐρείης γαστρὶ καλυψάμενος·
δεξιτερῆι δ' ἐν χειρὶ τινασσέτω ὄβριμον ἔγχος,
κινεῖτω δὲ λόφον δεινὸν ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς·
ἔρδων δ' ὄβριμα ἔργα διδασκέσθω πολεμίζειν,
μηδ' ἐκτὸς βελέων ἐστάτω ἀσπίδ' ἔχων,
ἀλλὰ τις ἐγγὺς ἰὼν αὐτοσχεδὸν ἔγχει μακρῶι
ἢ ξίφει οὐτάζων δῆϊον ἄνδρ' ἐλέτω,
καὶ πόδα παρ ποδὶ θεῖς καὶ ἐπ' ἀσπίδος ἀσπίδ' ἐρείσας,
ἐν δὲ λόφον τε λόφωι καὶ κυνέην κυνέηι
καὶ στέρνον στέρνωι πεπλημένος ἀνδρὶ μαχέσθω,
ἢ ξίφεος κώπην ἢ δόρυ μακρὸν ἔχων

Let each man wait, standing with his feet well apart and firmly fixing both feet upon the earth, biting his lips with his teeth and hiding his thighs and shins below and also his chest and shoulders with the belly of his round shield. Let him brandish a mighty spear in his right hand, and let him shake the terrible crest above his head. Let him learn how to wage war by doing mighty deeds, and let him not stand far from the missiles since he has a shield, but let each man, having gone close to the hand to hand fighting, kill an enemy by stabbing him with a long spear or sword, and let each man fight, placing foot beside foot and leaning shield on shield while also drawing crest near to crest, helmet to helmet, and chest to chest, holding either the hilt of his sword or his long spear (fr. 11.21-34)

²⁸ Due to the repetition of 10.31-2 in 11.21-2, the couplet in 10 has been suggested to be an interpolation. Verdenius (1969, 355) and Prato (1968, 101) argue against this. Faraone suggests that the couplet, which seems disjointed from the preceding lines, introduces another stanza of ten lines (2005, 323). See also Prato 1968, 100-101 for a more in depth discussion of the issue. Lorimer, on the other hand, suggests removing 11.21-28, arguing that these lines do not pertain to hoplite tactics (1947, 127).

Both occurrences of the command refer to a battle stance, and the description of Hector in this stance (εὖ διαβάς) is found in *Iliad* 12.458:

στῆ δὲ μάλ' ἐγγύς ἰὼν, καὶ ἐρυσάμενος βάλε μέσσας,
εὖ διαβάς, ἵνα μὴ οἱ ἀφανρότερον βέλος εἴη,
ῥῆξε δ' ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρους θαιρούς

Going very close Hector stood, and he threw the rock at the middle of the gates
once he steadied himself by standing with his feet well apart, so that the missile
would not be too feeble, and he broke off both hinges (*Il.* 12.458)

This reference to Hector comes from a single occurrence and, unlike the above references, lacks the taint of failure. Hector, standing with his legs spread, throws a rock at the Achaean gates and smashes them in, and the Trojans rush in to attack the Achaeans. Furthermore, he still has Zeus' help at this point (*Il.* 12.450). Zeus' support also plays a part in fragment 11: Tyrtaeus begins the poem by promising that Zeus still favours the Spartans (11.2). The pairing of Zeus' support and the stance within *Iliad* 12 contributes to the image of success with this stance which Tyrtaeus reinforces by repeating the pairing in fragment 11. Tyrtaeus' use of this phrase to describe the stance in which the Spartans should hold themselves implies that the battle stance itself is certain to be successful, which then gives confidence to those unfamiliar with warfare, and this in turn makes the Spartan line more secure.

The accepted translation for εὖ διαβάς is “standing with the feet well apart.”²⁹

B.D. MacQueen has challenged this translation, asserting that the phrase should rather be translated as “with a great forward stride or leap.”³⁰ MacQueen's argument has already been reviewed and answered convincingly by C. Brown.³¹ MacQueen's main contention

²⁹ Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 174 n.21

³⁰ “On the Correct Understanding of Eu Diabas,” *American Journal of Philology* 105 (1984): 453.

³¹ “On the 'Correct' Understanding of Eu Diabas: a Reply,” *American Journal of Philology* 105 (1985): 356-359.

is that the accepted translation does not take into account the degree of motion that, he argues, Hector's stance in *Iliad* 12.458 must imply.³² As Brown has shown, however, MacQueen's translation does not cohere with the remainder of the couplet in fragments 10 and 11, especially with the following participial phrase ποσὶν ἀμφοτέροισι στηριχθεὶς ἐπὶ γῆς (standing firmly with both feet on the earth; fr. 10.31-2, 11.21-2).³³

In addition to Brown's critiques of MacQueen's argument, there is the issue of what Tyrtaeus' advice means in relation to the army's formation. Both MacQueen and Brown assume that the Spartan army is arrayed as a phalanx, which then means that MacQueen's translation of εὖ διαβάς as "with a great forward stride or leap" is not feasible. At this early period, the men within the phalanx are not uniformly armed, and therefore they all will not be able to have the same "great forward stride."³⁴ Each individual man has a different sized "great forward stride," and this in turn leads to confusion and disorder among the ranks, which in turn leads to a rout. The regulated, ordered steps of the classical Spartan phalanx do not exist yet, and furthermore, even at the height of their military power the Spartans never rushed into battle, but rather calmly marched into it to better hold ranks.

Finally, the phrase itself is followed by the third person imperative of μένω, "let him wait" (fr. 10.31, 11.21). This, along with the appearance of διαβάς on its own in fr. 12.16 to describe the behaviour of a man possessing ἀρετή, argues against MacQueen's translation of "with a great forward leap or stride" for εὖ διαβάς. Tyrtaeus does not want the army to rush into battle; he repeats words for standing (ἰστάμενος, παρεστώς; fr.

³² MacQueen, "On the Correct Understanding," 455

³³ Brown "A Reply," 357

³⁴ See earlier discussion in Chapter One. Tyrtaeus also depicts varying levels of armament within the group as a whole in fragment 11.29-38.

12.12, 19) and waiting (μέονοτες, μενέτω, μένη, μένοντα; fr. 10.15, 31; 11.11, 21; 12.16, 33) several times, and εὔ διαβὰς forms part of his advice to convince the Spartans to stand in place and not rush into battle. This advice is not only based on a successful stance, albeit in the heroic world, but on a heroic stance. This pedigree then helps make the new style of fighting less new and suspicious, especially to the elites.

IV. Philopatria and Kleos

Iliad 15.494-99 contains Hector's major appeal to community loyalty, when he urges the Trojans to fight and even die for their country in order to save their wives, children, houses, and property. Hector denies that dying in such a manner is improper (οὐ ... ἀεικέες; 496), for though the man is dead, his family and possessions are still safe, provided that the Achaeans sail home. He needs to make this assertion to override the reluctance to fight without withdrawing. Homeric warfare, relatively speaking, was not very taxing. The heroes are depicted as retreating and attacking as they pleased, and though they might be chided for cowardice, they were not required to perform feats of bravery if they did not feel the need. Once wounded, heroes could and did retreat and, even if their side was hard pressed, did not have to return to the fray.³⁵

In addition to the lesser constraint to fight, death was dismal and dreary in the Homeric world. The heroes had no Valhalla and no Christian paradise; instead, all they could look forward to was wandering along with the mass of souls in Hades as νεκροὶ / ἀφραδέες ... βροτῶν εἶδωλα καμόντων (senseless dead men... phantoms of perished

³⁵ van Wees, "Heroes," 3, 6-7. For warriors retreating and leaving battle when injured, see *Iliad* 5.694-8, 794-8; 11.267-274, 355-60, 395-400; 14.409-39; 16;508-12. For deciding not to fight or to remain within the mass of fighters, see *Iliad* 11.163-4, 596-804; 13.234, 459-61; 14.1-15, 132;20.376. For retreats and declining to fight, see *Iliad* 11.354-60, 542; 12.574-9; 13.485-6; 14.488; 16.688-90; 17.102-3, 175-80, 530-5, 561-2; 20.100-1.

mortals; *Od.* 11.475-6).³⁶ Death normally meant that the hero had lost and yielded his κλέος to another (*Il.* 12.328) and had no chance to regain it. The great heroes, such as Achilles retained their κλέος through their place in bardic song, but for the average warrior this was not the case. Hector's statement that dying in defense of the city is οὐ ... ἀεικέες salvages some of the potential κλέος that could be lost and removes an objection to fighting to the death. κλέος, which is normally translated as "glory" but can also be translated more literally as "report" or "fame" through its relationship to the verb κλέω (tell of, make famous, celebrate), was a hero's reassurance that he would not be forgotten. Along with his children, it was the only form of immortality available to him, and the assertion that dying in defense of his city would not result in the loss of his memory would lessen the depicted resistance to fighting to the death.³⁷ Hector needs no reward beyond this; he lives and fights in the fictional world of the Homeric epics, and there is no reason to treat the issues of risk and reward concerning fighting to the death beyond an assurance that the men's κλέος and memory would not be lost. Furthermore, as the *Iliad* was continually recited and read, Hector's assurance of the longevity of the cultural memory of the Homeric heroes was fulfilled.

Within the epic world, the reward for fighting is κλέος, which the epic poem itself confers. Tyrtaeus, however, cannot accomplish this same feat; his νέοι and γέροντες are nameless and unable to receive κλέος. In order to bypass this, he states that the soldiers' reward is community standing, both in fr. 10.27-30 and again in 12.35-42. Fragment 12 emphasizes the benefits that an ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός can obtain through battle and seeks to

³⁶ Even Achilles wandered as a shadow (*Od.* 11.471). The tradition that he went to the Isles of the Blessed upon his death does not appear in Homer.

³⁷ Tyrtaeus' treatment of κλέος in fragment 12 will be discussed in chapter four alongside his allusions to Achilles.

persuade by presenting potential benefits accruing from bravery in war.³⁸ Tyrtaeus cannot promise them plunder nor the immortality of epic narrative, but he can promise standing in the community. Whether or not this standing will actualize is another matter, and Tyrtaeus, by promising a social reward, transfers the responsibility for fulfilling the promise to the community at large. This also strengthens soldiers' commitment to the community: since the community as a whole grants, or is indicated as granting, the prize, it is to the community that the soldiers must distinguish themselves and prove their commitment to the security of the group.

Tyrtaeus' direct statement on dying for one's πατρίς is an extension of Hector's statement, but the purpose is the same: to overcome men's fears and reluctance to fight to the death. He also centers his plea along similar lines as Hector, urging the Spartans to fight and die on behalf of their land and children: θυμῶι γῆς πέρι τῆσδε μαχώμεθα καὶ περὶ παιδῶν / θνήσκωμεν ψυχέων μηκέτι φειδόμενοι (Let us fight with spirit on behalf of our land and let us die on behalf of our children no longer sparing our lives; fr. 10.13-4). Furthermore, both Hector and Tyrtaeus present death in defense of the πατρίς as an alternative to complete failure. Hector's Trojans must repel the Achaeans if they are to save their city and their families (*Il.* 15.498-9), and Tyrtaeus' Spartans must fight to avoid abandoning the battlefield and city to foes (fr. 10.3-6).

Despite these parallels, Hector's "patriotism", or Homeric patriotism in general,

³⁸ Lugenbill argues that this focus on rewards and the individual ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός indicates that Tyrtaeus is here writing to persuade, whereas in fragments 10 and 11 his purpose is to encourage his audience to fight (2002, 409).

has been set against Tyrtaeus'.³⁹ I use the term “patriotism” here hesitantly, for the sentiment towards their cities and homelands that Hector and Tyrtaeus exploit in their appeals is not the same as the modern concept of patriotism. Hector’s and Tyrtaeus’ sentiment revolves more around the community, namely the individual οἴκοι and their lands, rather than around the political organization and sense of national identity. φιλοπατρία, the term with which I headed this section and which translates as literally “love of the πατρίς or fatherland,” is a more appropriate term for the sentiment to which Hector and Tyrtaeus appeal in *Iliad* 12.458 and fr. 10 respectively. I use the term “patriotism,” however, in the next few paragraphs because that is the term used by scholars when discussing this aspect of Hector’s and Tyrtaeus’ rhetoric. I do so in order not to misrepresent their arguments, and the term is only used here.

Most scholars argue that Tyrtaeus presents a new ideal concerning patriotism within his poetry. Starr contrasts Homeric patriotism with Tyrtaeus’ and Solon’s patriotism, asserting that for the Homeric heroes, such a sentiment revolves around “family, estates, and native hearths” whereas the poetry of the two later poets reveals “true patriotic love for one’s country.”⁴⁰ Likewise, Bowra and Lazenby both recognize patriotic sentiment within Tyrtaeus’ poetry, but not in the Homeric epics. Bowra considers Hector to be the exception that proves the rule, and for Lazenby, Hector is only a “possible exception” to the rule that the Homeric heroes fight for glory and Tyrtaeus’

³⁹ A similar dichotomy is drawn between Callinus and Hector, which again is a false dichotomy. Callinus states τιμῆν τε γὰρ ἔστι καὶ ἀγλαὸν ἀνδρὶ μάχεσθαι / γῆς περὶ καὶ παίδων κουριδίης τ’ ἀλόχου (For it is a splendid honour for a man to fight on behalf of his land and children and wedded wife; 1.7-8), and while this is an extension of Hector’s statement, it is framed in much the same terms.

⁴⁰ *The Origins of Greek Civilization: 1100-650 B.C.* (1961; reprint, New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1991), 308.

Spartans for the city, ignoring personal glory.⁴¹ Jaeger, stating that Tyrtaeus “recast the Homeric ideal of the single champion’s arete into the arete of the patriot,” acknowledges that Hector “comes closest to this ideal.”⁴² As for Tyrtaeus, Tigerstadt names him “the first poet of the Greek city-state” who praises ἀρετή as “the disciplined solidarity of the citizens, the unconditional sacrifice of self for one’s city.”⁴³

I would argue, however, with Greenhalgh and Irwin that such a contrast between Tyrtaeus’ and Hector’s patriotism is wrong. Greenhalgh correctly notes that Tyrtaeus’ concept of patriotism revolves around the same values as Hector’s, namely the family and its land.⁴⁴ Furthermore, the situation that Tyrtaeus’ Spartans and that Hector’s Trojans find themselves in is similar; both, he claims, are fighting in “vital struggles on home ground.”⁴⁵ Whether the Spartans are fighting on home ground or not, Tyrtaeus presents them as defenders. This then makes his appropriation of Hector within his poetry relevant to his rhetoric. Even though the Spartans had encroached into Messenian territory earlier and may have been the aggressors in the Second Messenian War, Tyrtaeus depicts them defending home territory, properly won by the Spartan ancestors and incorporated into the Spartan state. The allusions to Hector in his capacity as the defender of Troy then strengthen this image of the Spartans as defenders of Spartan land.

Tyrtaeus frames his appeal in similar terms as Hector by invoking the image of his audience’s land and family and extends Hector’s appeal by involving the entire πόλις. His allusions to Hector further the connection between family, its land, and the πόλις, as

⁴¹ C.M. Bowra, *Early Greek Elegists* (New York: Barnes and Noble Inc., 1960), 65-6; Lazenby, *The Spartan Army*, 76.

⁴² *Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture*, vol. I 2nd ed., trans. Gilbert Highet (New York: Oxford University Press, 1945), 90, 439 n.46.

⁴³ *The Legend of Sparta in Classical Antiquity*, vol. I (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1965), 50.

⁴⁴ P.A.L. Greenhalgh, “Patriotism in the Homeric World.” *Historia* 21 (1972): 535; Irwin, *Solon*, 27-8.

⁴⁵ “Patriotism,” 529.

Hector was so closely connected to Troy in the *Iliad*. Though he does highlight the importance of the πόλις in fragment 12, he does not present his appeal to community loyalty in opposition to Hector's. He cannot have it oppose Hector's own appeal to the πατρίς and the people within it, for to focus only on the πόλις would alienate the elites by excluding their traditional social circles which revolved around the οἶκοι. Thus by focusing on family lands and children, Tyrtaeus does not deviate from the traditional bonds of the οἶκος and retains the support of the elites. Furthermore, the οἶκος was a familiar economic and social unit to both elites and non-elites, and an exhortation formed around it could appeal to both groups.

Depending on when exactly the Spartans changed their army organization from the kin based tribal regiments to the non-kin based ἐνωμοτίαι (“sworn-bands”), there may have been another reason to focus on the family and its estates over the πόλις. If the army was still kin-based at this time, as Forrest argues, the emphasis on fighting for the community would have increased the social bonds between the soldiers, and from this there would have been an increased sense of cohesion within the army.⁴⁶

Tyrtaeus' appeal to the men's community loyalty is important. Within his poetry, the νέοι and γέροντες answer his call to fight on behalf of the πόλις, creating a reciprocal relationship, which the πόλις fulfills by granting status and a public funeral, as will be discussed next. This reciprocal relationship within the poem provides a model for the real world and is Tyrtaeus' way to bypass his inability to grant epic κλέος. The Homeric

⁴⁶ *A History of Sparta*, 30. Lazenby, however, argues that when the army was supplemented with men from outside the original four ὀβῆαι - each of Sparta's four original villages had an army regiment called an ὀβῆ- the army ceased to be organized on the basis of kinship as kin groups are “notoriously reluctant to admit outsiders” (1985, 69). There were by Herodotus' time five ὀβῆαι to reflect the fact that Amyklai had become a part of Sparta, but we do not know what military organization was used during Tyrtaeus' day. He does name the three original Doric tribes, the Pamyphloi, Hylleis, and Dymanes (fr. 19.8), but it is uncertain as to whether he is speaking of the current fighting with Messenian or the earlier fighting.

epics through the relative fixity of the oral tradition and their clear identification of the individual confer κλέος upon the individual heroes within them. Tyrtaeus though names no specific individual with the exception of King Theopompus (fr. 5.1). While this fits his purpose of creating cohesion, for no one can take offense that another individual or group has been highlighted more, it diminishes his ability to grant individual κλέος. All he can do is promise that the community will grant the soldiers κλέος and continue his appeal once he transfers responsibility for honouring the living and mourning the dead to the community as a whole.

III. Communal Mourning

Fragment 10 highlights the involvement of the community in honouring the living soldier, and in fragment 12 the community's involvement is extended to the soldier's funeral:

τὸν δ' ὀλοφύρονται μὲν ὁμῶς νέοι ἠδὲ γέροντες,
 ἀργαλέωι δὲ πόθωι πᾶσα κέκηδε πόλις,
 καὶ τύμβος καὶ παῖδες ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀρίσημοι
 καὶ παίδων παῖδες καὶ γένος ἐξοπίσω·
 οὐδέ ποτε κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀπόλλυται οὐδ' ὄνομ' αὐτοῦ,
 ἀλλ' ὑπὸ γῆς περ ἐὼν γίνεται ἀθάνατος,
 ὄντιν' ἀριστεύοντα μένοντά τε μαρνάμενόν τε
 γῆς πέρι καὶ παίδων θοῦρος Ἄρης ὀλέσῃ

The young men and elders mourn the brave man equally, the entire city is distressed by painful loss, and both his tomb and children are notable among men and even the children of his children and his line hereafter. Never does his noble fame perish nor his name, for even though he is under the ground he is immortal, whomever furious Ares kills while being the best by remaining and fighting on behalf of his land and children (fr. 12.27-34)

The entire community will mourn for the soldiers once they are buried in a conspicuous tomb, and their κλέος will continue though the men themselves are dead. The community's sorrow at the death of the soldier is emphasized by the use of the term

πόθωι (12.28), a strong word which connotes sorrow through deprivation or loss. It also has Homeric connections; Achilles, furious that the Achaeans did not support him against Agamemnon, swears that ἢ ποτ' Ἀχιλλῆος ποθή ἵκεται υἷας Ἀχαιῶν / σύμπαντας (on some day longing for Achilles will come to all the sons of the Achaeans; *Il.* 1.239-40). Achilles connects ποθή with the loss of and longing for a hero, and Tyrtaeus alludes to this loss and the sorrow felt by the Achaeans when he uses the term in 12.28. His emphasis on the πόλις continues as he places responsibility for honouring and mourning the soldier with the community, which includes the army. His assurance of communal mourning and burial thus reassures those going into battle and emphasizes the social bonds between the soldiers, as it will be their comrades who bear the responsibility for mourning those who die in battle. There is, according to Tyrtaeus, therefore no reason to fear dying forgotten and without being buried and mourned. This assurance of burial and mourning also continues the veneer of the heroic καλὸς θάνατος, as part of the κλέος which the καλὸς θάνατος provides derives from the mourning of the corpse and the proper burial rituals.⁴⁷

The participation of the entire community in mourning for the dead soldiers resembles the mourning for Hector at the end of the *Iliad*. Upon seeing Priam return with Hector's corpse, Cassandra calls out to the Trojans, and they all come to mourn Hector:

“ὄψεσθε, Τρῶες καὶ Τρωάδες, Ἐκτορ' ἰόντες,
εἶ ποτε καὶ ζῶοντι μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντι
χαίρετ', ἐπεὶ μέγα χάρμα πόλει τ' ἦν παντί τε δήμῳ.”
Ὡς ἔφατ', οὐδέ τις αὐτόθ' ἐνὶ πτόλει λίπετ' ἀνὴρ
οὐδὲ γυνή· πάντας γὰρ ἀάσχετον ἵκετο πένθος

“Come Trojan men and Trojan women, behold Hector, if ever you rejoiced at him living and returning home from battle, since he was a great joy to the city and to

⁴⁷ Vernant, “La belle mort,” 65

all the people.” Thus she spoke, and no one remained there in the citadel, neither man nor woman, for unchecked grief came to all (*Il.* 24.704-707).

They also continue to mourn; the speeches of Andromache, Hecuba, and Helen for Hector cause the women and entire populace of Troy to mourn (*Il.* 24.745, 776) and lead to γόον δ’ ἀλῖαστον, “unabating lamentation” (760).⁴⁸

Such a response to a soldier’s death is the best Tyrtaeus can promise. He makes certain to emphasize the extent of the community’s mourning for its soldiers: νέοι, γέροντες, and πόλις are all placed emphatically at the end of lines 27 and 28 in fragment 12. Tyrtaeus includes the entire citizen body in his promise of communal mourning, and because of this, the death of the individual soldiers will be known by more people within the community than normally. For most people, funerals were composed of kin and close friends.⁴⁹ The wealthy could afford to hire professional mourners and make the death of their family member known to a greater circle, but for most people this was not the case. Tyrtaeus’ indication that the entire community will mourn allows all citizens who die in battle to receive the recognition in death that previously only the wealthy could afford. The involvement of the entire community means that more people will know how and why the soldiers died, and this knowledge then provides κλέος for the soldiers as the community knows and possibly speaks of their deaths.

Tyrtaeus also states that there will be a recognizable τύμβος for those who die in battle (fr. 12.29-30). A tomb that can be recognized generations beyond its occupant’s death is another form of κλέος. It enables a man’s name to be remembered beyond his

⁴⁸ Some scholars hold that epic evolved from lamentations and praise given to kings at funerals. See, for example, Bowra 1952, 8-9, Ford 1997, 413, and Murnaghan 1999.

⁴⁹ So Solon in fragment 21 wishes to be mourned by his friends: μηδέ μοι ἄκλαυστος θάνατος μόλοι, ἀλλὰ φίλοισι / καλλείπομι θανῶν ἄλγεα καὶ στοναχὰς (let death not come to me unlamented, but when I die let me leave behind woes and groans for my friends).

own generation. In later Sparta, it became customary to inscribe only the graves of those who died in battle with their occupants' names (Plut. *Lyc.* 27.2, *Mor.* 238d; Paus. 3.14.1). Though we do not know how early this practice began, at some point the Spartan community accomplished the promise that Tyrtaeus made.⁵⁰ It was likely in practice at the time of the Persian Wars or shortly after; Pausanias records a plaque with the names of the Thermopylae dead inscribed on it (3.14.1).

Tyrtaeus uses the word *τύμβος* to refer to the warrior's grave mound; Homer uses both *σῆμα* and *τύμβος*. Sourvinou-Inwood argues that *σῆμα* is used to emphasize the function of the grave-mound as a memorial, whereas *τύμβος* emphasizes the physical appearance of the grave-mound. Both terms can also be used, she argues, to refer to both aspects of the grave-mound at the same time.⁵¹ Nagy also connects *σῆμα* to the functional purpose of the grave-mound of conferring *κλέος*.⁵² Both *σῆμα* and *τύμβος*, however, “represent ... the fulfillment of death ritual and a location which generates *κλέος*.”⁵³ The creation of a burial mound indicates that the corpse has been burned upon the funeral pyre and mourned, for the creation of a grave-mound completes the burial process in the Homeric epics, except for the following feast or funeral games.⁵⁴ It then serves as a “durable memorial that bridges the gap between immediate death ritual and

⁵⁰ Though, as Plutarch's attribution of the practice to Lycurgus shows, the practice was considered to be very old. The mourning period, however, was cut down to twelve days according to Plutarch. The mourning period for the kings was also short- ten days after the funeral- but required participation from every family in Laconia and their helots (Hdt. 6.58)

⁵¹ Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading' Greek Death to the End of the Classical Period* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 125-5, 134.

⁵² Gregory Nagy, *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990), 216.

⁵³ Katharine Derderian, *Leaving Words to Remember: Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 49.

⁵⁴ See, for example, the burials of Patrokles (*Il.* 23.161-257), Hector (*Il.* 24.783-803), and Elpenor (*Od.* 12.8-15).

cultural memory as well as between individual and collective relevance.⁵⁵ The σῆμα or τύμβος, then, fulfills much the same purpose as the epic poems do: it keeps the hero's memory within the cultural memory of the community.

In fragment 12, Tyrtaeus places the τύμβος after his description of the mourning πόλις. This then completes the burial process within the poem and this couplet (12.29-30) is followed by one which looks to the future. 12.31-2 states that the dead soldier's κλέος and ὄνομα will live on. The τύμβος here, then, stresses both the physical and functional purposes of the grave-mound as the completion of the burial rites and as the preservation of the soldier's κλέος. The connection between τύμβος and κλέος is also made several times in the *Odyssey*. Campbell connects fr. 12.27-32 to *Odyssey* 4.584, where Menelaus, when relating his story to Telemachus, says that he raised a τύμβος for Agamemnon so as to preserve his brother's κλέος.⁵⁶ The function of a τύμβος as a means of preserving κλέος is made three other times in the *Odyssey*: 1.239-40, 14.369-70, and 24.32-3. These three passages can also be tied to fr. 12.29-30, where Tyrtaeus names both the soldier's τύμβος and children ἀρίσμοι. Through their continued conspicuousness, the τύμβος and children preserve and promote the soldier's κλέος. Likewise, in the above three *Odyssey* passages, the speaker connects a τύμβος, a son, and κλέος.

τῷ κέν οἱ τύμβον μὲν ἐποίησαν Παναχαιοί,
ἠδέ κε καὶ ᾧ παιδὶ μέγα κλέος ἦρατ' ὀπίσσω

Then for him [Odysseus] all the Achaeans would have made a grave-mound, and then for both him and his son great fame would have been raised up thereafter (*Od.* 1.239-40; 14.369-70)

τῷ κέν τοι τύμβον μὲν ἐποίησαν Παναχαιοί,

⁵⁵ Derderian, *Leaving Words*, 52

⁵⁶ *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 182 n.29

ἦδέ κε καὶ σῶ παιδὶ μέγα κλέος ἦρα' ὀπίσσω

Then for you [Agamemnon] all the Achaeans would have made a grave-mound,
and then for both you and your son great fame would have been raised up
thereafter (*Od.* 24.32-33)

Tyrtaeus combines these connections between a τύμβος and κλέος in order to enhance his allusions to Hector's funeral and to Homeric epic's recognition of other heroes. The combination allows him to allude to personal and familial κλέος as well as to community standing and recognition, which also confers κλέος.

Tyrtaeus thus places his consolation and remembrance for those who die in battle securely within the community, just as he did for those who survive battle. The dead soldiers will be mourned by the community, and they will have conspicuous tombs that will be known to the community members. Their children and family line will also become distinguished within the community. Whether or not this promise will be accomplished for his original audience, the ramifications of the promise's fulfillment override any uncertainty. The prospective involvement of the entire community allows the elites to continue to distinguish themselves within the community at funerals, and it also allows the non-elites to take part in elite customs and also to become well known in the community upon their death.

V. Conclusion

Tyrtaeus presents Hector as an exemplar of the ideal city defender; he fights and dies for his πατρίς out of a sense of duty and shame, and in return he is mourned and remembered by his entire community. All of Troy recognizes Hector's sacrifice, and it is this recognition that Tyrtaeus presents as a certain outcome to the defenders of Sparta,

should they die in battle. Should they live, they will dwell in Sparta among their fellow citizens much as Hector did in Troy, honoured and a wonder to those around them.

Hector, however, is a difficult character to select as an *exemplum*. He fails, and Troy falls. Furthermore, while he is mourned by all of Troy, the period immediately after his death is not something to be desired. Achilles drags Hector around the Greek encampment, attached to his chariot by thongs through Hector's ankles. Even Hector's appeal to the Trojans' loyalty to their πατρίς does not lack tension and the taint of failure; in 12.243 he states that, εἶς οἰωνος ἄριστος ἀμύνεσθαι παρὶ πάτρης (one bird sign is best, to fight on behalf of the fatherland). Here, however, Athena has deceived Hector, and Polydamas' advice to retreat, which Hector angrily rejects, is actually the correct advice for the situation.

Tyrtaeus does not want his audience to dwell on these things. To overcome this, he demarcates the Spartans' situation from Hector's by emphasizing Zeus' continual favour for the Spartans (fr. 11.2) and by only using one phrase found in Homer which is tied to Hector (εὖ διαβάς), and which describes a successful stance and occurs in the *Iliad* during a period of success for the Trojans. In spite of the difficulties in alluding to Hector, Tyrtaeus does not entirely separate the Spartans from Hector. Tyrtaeus' appeal to the πατρίς revolves around the family and its land, as Hector's does, and like Hector he appeals to love of the πατρίς to encourage men to fight and to increase the social bonds among the audience members.

The next chapter will focus on Tyrtaeus' advice as to how the soldiers should behave before battle is joined and the dismal picture painted for those who would flee the battlefield. Tyrtaeus invokes the image of Odysseus to encourage the Spartans to be

steadfast and enduring, and to remain alongside one another as they wait for the enemy. He also relies on the audience's familiarity with Odysseus' wanderings and sufferings in order to present the coward who flees the battle as a wanderer, doomed to a miserable life along with this family. Tyrtaeus thus draws on Odysseus not as the cunning hero, but as the hero of endurance and the wretched wanderer.

Chapter 3

Odysseus, the Hero of Endurance

The Homeric figure of Odysseus, like Hector, provided powerful allusive material for Tyrtaeus. Unlike Hector, however, Odysseus has a variety of characteristics to which Tyrtaeus can allude, and he chooses to draw on Odysseus the warrior and the wanderer in his attempt to create military cohesion. As a warrior, Odysseus' endurance encourages a soldier to stand his ground and gain honour through fighting, which provides a positive model for those listening to Tyrtaeus' exhortations. Odysseus the wanderer, however, demonstrates the counter-example to this positive model through the wretchedness of the wanderer's life, which strengthens the opprobrium that Tyrtaeus then attaches to the wanderings of the coward in fragment 10.

Odysseus is a popular source of allusions for the archaic poets, mostly due to his endurance and his intelligence. Allusions to Odysseus can be found in Archilochus (fr. 128, 134), Solon (fr. 4), Theognis (for example, fr. 53-68, 631-2, and 1123-8), and Alcman (fr. 80), who is the first poet to name Odysseus after Homer and Hesiod.¹ Part of Odysseus' popularity can be attributed to his ability to endure life's miseries. Archaic pessimism held that the best thing was never to be born and the second best to die young; the majority of people, though, were not so fortunate.² Odysseus does not die young; he is a hero who endures life and lives into old age, serving as an example of "how one

¹ See Irwin 2005, 113-53 for a discussion on Solon's references to Odysseus. For Alcman, see Stanford 1954, 90.

² See the story of Cleobis and Biton (Hdt 1.31), Mimnermus 2 and 5, and Theognis 1.425-8 (among others) for examples of Archaic pessimism.

ought to live.”³ His ability to withstand life’s tribulations also broadened his appeal within society; he was not simply another king who demonstrated the heroic and elite ideal and died young in glory doing so. Odysseus is, however, still a king and therefore an aristocrat. He is an unusual aristocrat though, for not only does he spend the majority of the *Odyssey* as a beggar and wanderer, but he is a jack of all trades in addition to being a king. A scholiast on *Iliad* 8.93 lists sixteen arts which Odysseus knows, among which are farming, building, oratory, and wrestling.⁴ He is thus a non-divisive hero, like Hector, and can appeal to members of all social classes, which makes him useful for Tyrtaeus’ purpose of creating cohesion and a willingness to fight as a unit within his target audience. Furthermore, Odysseus uses his knowledge more than any other hero to help the Achaean expedition, the most notable example being the Trojan horse stratagem.⁵ He thus stands as an exemplar of team work and communal action.

When Tyrtaeus wishes to emphasize Odysseus’ role as a warrior, the majority of his allusions come from the *Iliad*. When he draws on the *Odyssey*, it is mainly to stigmatize the coward and emphasize the misery of living as a wanderer. The Iliadic allusions include use of Odysseus’ epithets, Agamemnon’s rebuke of Odysseus in *Iliad* 4.338, and Odysseus’ lone stand in *Iliad* 11.404-10. The *Odyssey* serves as a general example of what a wanderer’s life is; Odysseus’ role as a wanderer and his possible cowardice in *Iliad* 8.97-8 then enable Tyrtaeus to solidify the connection he makes between cowardice and wandering.

³ Margalit Finkleberg, “Odysseus and the Genus ‘Hero,’” *Greece and Rome* 42(1995): 4.

⁴ The other twelve are seafaring, shipbuilding, hunting, divining, cooking, medicine, music, boxing, discus-throwing, archery, javelin-throwing, and astrology (*Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera)*, 8.93a1; Cramer 1973, 27).

⁵ Cramer, “Odysseus in the *Iliad*,” (PhD diss., University of Texas, 1973), 28.

I. Odysseus' Epithets

Tyrtaeus' exhortations of endurance to the Spartan troops feature adjectives which are used in some of the most common noun-epithet combinations for Odysseus, thus strongly establishing an allusive context to Odysseus for these passages. Tyrtaeus avoids any reference to Odysseus' intelligence, the most common set of Odysseus' epithets, perhaps because it might prompt the soldiers listening in turn to consider more thoughtfully what Tyrtaeus actually says and asks them to do. As for "ornamental" epithets such as δῖος, they are used with other heroes as well and thus are not specific enough to cause the audience to recall Odysseus. His endurance in the face of adversity, however, is specific to him. Nestor is the only other hero to be called πολυτλήμων, "much-enduring," and this is due to his long life, not his life experiences and how he handled them, for which reason Odysseus receives this epithet.⁶ Within the set of noun-epithet combinations that refer to Odysseus' endurance, there are those that begin with πολυ- and those that do not (πολύτλας versus τλήμων), and Tyrtaeus draws from the latter group in choosing the phrase θυμὸν τλήμονα and the adjective ταλασίφρων to allude to Odysseus' endurance within battle.

a. Endurance: τλήμων and ταλασίφρων

When Sarpedon kills Tlepolemus in *Iliad* 5, Homer states νόησε δὲ δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς / τλήμονα θυμὸν ἔχων, μαίμησε δὲ οἱ φίλον ἦτορ (noble Odysseus perceived this, keeping his spirit enduring, and his dear heart was eager to fight; 5.669-70). θυμὸν τλήμονα occurs in Tyrtaeus 12 during Tyrtaeus' excursus on the man who possesses worthwhile ἀρετή, the ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός. A key characteristic of this ἀνὴρ

⁶ W.B. Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme: A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954), 74

ἀγαθός is his stationary position in battle:

ξυνὸν δ' ἔσθλὸν τοῦτο πόλῃ τε παντί τε δήμῳ,
 ὅστις ἀνὴρ διαβάς ἐν προμάχοισι μένη
 νωλεμέως, αἰσχρῆς δὲ φυγῆς ἐπὶ πάχῳ λάθηται,
 ψυχὴν καὶ θυμὸν τλήμονα παρθέμενος

This is a common good to both the city and to the entire people, a man who remains standing among the fore-fighters unceasingly, who forgets shameful flight entirely, risking both his life and his enduring spirit (fr. 12.15-18)

The key phrase here is ψυχὴν καὶ θυμὸν τλήμονα, which derives in part from *Iliad* 5.670.

This line completes Tlepolemus' death scene and introduces Odysseus' revenge for Tlepolemus' death at the hands of Sarpedon (5.655-669). Odysseus kills seven of Sarpedon's Lycians, and the poet claims he would have killed more had Hector not come to rescue them (5.674-80). The Homeric text combines Odysseus' stock trait of endurance here with the martial ability required by the *Iliad*'s plot, a combination to which Tyrtaeus alludes in fragment 12 with θυμὸν τλήμονα. This scene also allows Tyrtaeus to furnish proof that endurance is a feasible and even desirable quality to have in battle. θυμὸν τλήμονα does not appear again in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* as a phrase, so Tyrtaeus' use of it is specific, much like his use of the phrase εὖ διαβάς to allude to Hector.

Tyrtaeus elaborates on the stationary qualities of an ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός in fragment 12.10-42. ἀρετή is possessed by the man who fights in a defensive manner (12.12), and he becomes worthy of communal mourning when he dies fighting and holding his position in the ranks (12.27-34). The stationary behaviour emphasized and lauded here is required by hoplite warfare, and Tyrtaeus repeats words for 'standing' (ἰστάμενος, 12; διαβάς, 16; παρεστώς, 19) and 'remaining' (μένῃ, 16; μένοντα, 33) in order to overcome

the difficulties of holding ranks before and during battle.⁷ The allusion to Odysseus in this passage also parallels the allusions to Hector; the διαβάς (12.16) connects the Odyssean allusion in 12.20 to the allusions to Hector in 10.31-2 and 11.21-2, and all three passages exhort the listeners to stand their ground in the approaching battle. Tyrtaeus also emphasizes the stationary qualities which are essential to hoplite warfare through the use of the adverb *νωλεμέως* (unceasingly) to modify the verb *μένηι* (standing). *νωλεμέως* is used one other time in the extant corpus where it modifies the verb *ἐμάχοντ'*: *ἀμφ' αὐτήν δ' ἐμάχοντ' ἐννέα καὶ δέκ' ἔτη / νωλεμέως* (Around her [Messene] they fought unceasingly for nineteen years; fr. 5.4-5). Where, however, the Spartans were encouraged to risk (*παρθέμενος*) their *θυμὸν*, their forefathers held (*ἔχοντες*) their *θυμὸν* steadfast (*ταλασίφρονα*). Tyrtaeus stresses endurance here, as opposed to his stress on facing risk in fragment 12.⁸

νωλεμέως and the adjective *νωλεμές* also appear in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. In the *Iliad* they appear in mostly martial contexts (4.428; 9.317; 13.3, 780; 14.58; 17.148, 385, 413), and the majority of these occur in regard to close, phalanx type fighting where the emphasis is on pushing the other side back rather than heroic exploits.⁹ In the *Odyssey*, on the other hand, the context is generally one of suffering (9.435; 12.437; 16.191; 20.24). The final occurrence in the *Odyssey*, however, is during a battle: Athena scolds Odysseus during the fight with the suitors, reminding him that he fought “unceasingly” at Troy (*Τρώεσσιν ἐμάρναο νωλεμές αἰεὶ*; 22.228). In fragment 12, then,

⁷ On the risk of flight and disintegration of the phalanx before and during battle, see Hanson 2000, 96-7, 103, 189.

⁸ Fragment 12 is in many respects an anomaly in the extant corpus. It appears to be entirely geared towards young men who have not yet acknowledged their mortality and are susceptible to the heroic reward of glory. See chapter 4 for a more thorough discussion of 12 and its relationship to the corpus.

⁹ The exceptions to this are 4.428, where the mass of Danaans march into battle, 9.317, where Achilles complains that he has no reward for fighting, and 17.148, where Glaukos makes the same complaint on behalf of the Trojans.

Tyrtaeus combines the two Homeric contexts of *νωλεμέως* by having it modify a stationary verb and by placing both the adverb and the verb in the general context of battle.

The phrase *ψυχὴν καὶ θυμὸν τλήμονα παρθέμενος* also has resonances with *Odyssey* 3.73-4 and 9.254-5, where Nestor and Polyphemus ask Telemachus and Odysseus respectively if each is a traveller or a pirate:

ὦ ξεῖνοι, τίνες ἐστέ; πόθεν πλεῖθ' ὑγρά κέλευθα;
ἢ τι κατὰ πρῆξιν ἢ μασιδίως ἀλάλησθε
οἷα τε ληιστῆρες ὑπεῖρ ἄλλα, τοί τ' ἄλοωνται
ψυχὰς παρθέμενοι, κακὸν ἄλλοδαποῖσι φέροντες;

Strangers, who are you? From where did you sail the watery road? Is it on account on some business, or do you wander foolishly as pirates do upon the sea, who risk their lives, bearing evil to others? (*Od.* 3.71-4; 9.252-5)

In Tyrtaeus' poem, the allusion to Odysseus' *τλήμονα θυμὸν* is bracketed by the allusion to the two above passages with *ψυχὴν ... παρθέμενος*, which causes some difficulties in translating the line due to the double allusion. Gerber suggests "risking his life and displaying a steadfast spirit," which accounts for the allusions to *Il.* 5.670, *Od.* 3.73-4, and 9.24-5.¹⁰ Campbell, however, prefers to translate the line as "displaying a steadfast heart and soul" or as "making heart and soul steadfast" emphasizing the allusion in *θυμὸν τλήμονα* over that in *ψυχὴν ... παρθέμενος*.¹¹ Darcus also prefers to translate the *παρθέμενος* as "furnish" or "show forth."¹² Part of this issue lies with the fact that *παρθέμενος* does not normally connote "risk." In Homer, *παρατίθημι* is used only three

¹⁰ *Greek Elegiac Poetry*, 59.

¹¹ *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 181 n.18

¹² "A Person's Relation to *ψυχή* in Homer, Hesiod, and the Greek Lyric Poets," *Glotta* 57 (1979): 37-8. She does, however, later change her interpretation to favour *παρθέμενος* as "put forth" or "risk" (see Darcus Sullivan 1995, 91 and 145).

times to connote “risk” or “hazard”: *Odyssey* 2.237, 3.73-4, and 9.255.¹³ The first instance occurs when Mentor, addressing the Ithakan assembly, states that the suitors “risk their heads” (σφὰς γὰρ παρθέμενοι κεφαλὰς) by imposing themselves on Odysseus’ household, neatly foreshadowing Odysseus’ bloody slaughter of the suitors in *Odyssey* 22. The last two instances comprise the above question, which may have been a routine enquiry upon meeting a stranger within the epic world.¹⁴ The majority of the remaining instances of παρατίθημι in Homer occur when food is provided, as in the formulaic lines for setting out food:

σῆτον δ’ αἰδοίη ταμίη παρέθηκε φέρουσα,
εἶδατα πόλλ’ ἐπιθεῖτα, χαρίζομένη παρεόντων·
δαιτρὸς δὲ κρειῶν πίνακας παρέθηκεν ἀείρας
παντοίων, παρὰ δε σφι τίθει χρυσεῖα κύπελλα

And a modest housekeeper, bearing bread, set it before them [Telemachus and a disguised Athena], adding many food stuffs, being pleasing with the provisions; a carver, lifting platters of all kinds of meats placed them near, and he placed golden cups near to them (*Od.* 1.139-42)¹⁵

In contrast, when ψυχή occurs with παρατίθημι in Homer, and by extension παρατίθημι with κεφαλὰς, risk is implied. Dimock argues that the phrase “risking one’s life” is derived from ψυχὰς παρθέμενοι as “setting up one’s ghost as a price to be fought for.”¹⁶ Darcus Sullivan connects this argument with Tyrtaeus when she argues that “Tyrtaeus call for a generous expenditure of life” with this phrase.¹⁷ It is this implication of danger and of a contest that, I believe, is more appropriate for Tyrtaeus 12.18. In the

¹³ Heubeck *et al.* give “risk” or “hazard” for παρθέμενοι in *Odyssey* 2.237, 3.74, and 9.255 (1990, 146 n. 237).

¹⁴ See Heubeck *et al.* 1990, 164 n.71-4 for a discussion of whether or not Nestor and Polyphemus’ question is a routine enquiry upon meeting someone new.

¹⁵ The three exceptions to this comprise another formulaic line: Penelope “sets torches beside” (δαίδαας παραθεῖτο) her weaving at night so that she might tear it out and continue to deceive the suitors (2.105, 19.150, 24.140).

¹⁶ *The Unity of the Odyssey* (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1989), 10.

¹⁷ *Psychological and Ethical Ideas: What Early Greeks Say* (E.J. Brill: Leiden, 1995), 91. She also translates παρθέμενος as “risk” (145).

couplet previous to 12.18-19, Tyrtaeus asserts that the ideal soldier ignores flight (12.17), and four lines after 12.18-19, he discusses the possibility that this soldier will die (12.23-4). ψυχὴν καὶ θυμὸν τλήμονα παρθέμενος thus occurs in the middle of the section in fragment 12 that acknowledges the dangers of warfare and seeks to address them.¹⁸ This section is also followed by the potential rewards to be won from “risking” or “hazarding” one’s soul. Tyrtaeus thus combines here Odysseus’ ἔχων θυμὸν τλήμονα with the *Odyssey*’s ψυχᾶς παρθέμενοι to include θυμὸν τλήμονα in the dangers and rewards of hoplite warfare which increases the desirability of having a θυμὸν τλήμονα in war. The allusion to Odysseus in *Iliad* 5.669-70 then strengthens this connection between endurance and being victorious in warfare.

The above paragraphs have examined τλήμων when applied to the noun θυμός in both the *Iliad* and Tyrtaeus 12. Tyrtaeus only uses this adjective with θυμός in the extant corpus, but τλήμων does occur as an epithet for Odysseus in the *Iliad*. Odysseus is called τλήμων twice, and both times occur during *Iliad* 10 (231, 498), during the *Doloneia*.¹⁹ The first time is when he volunteers to accompany Diomedes on the night raid of the Trojan camp, and the second occurrence of the epithet comes when he steals Rhesus’ horses during the raid. O.C. Cramer argues that Odysseus’ participation in this unusual excursion and his lone stand in *Iliad* 11 emphasize his daring in warfare and bring him closer to the more traditional heroes of the *Iliad* such as Diomedes. Cramer also argues

¹⁸ Shey calls this the weak point of Tyrtaeus’ rhetoric due to a long standing societal opinion of death as κακόν (1976, 16).

¹⁹ *Iliad* 10 poses problems when examined alongside the remainder of the *Iliad*. It occurs at night, involves fantastic armour and other elements of folklore, and comprises a ‘cheap’ victory over sleeping men. It shares language with the *Odyssey*, which *Iliad* 24 does as well, and is in several respects more akin to the *Odyssey* than to the *Iliad* (Hainsworth 1993, 154). Beginning with the T Scholia, this book has been suggested to be an interpolation; the T Scholia posits its addition during the Peisistratids’ consolidation of the text (on 10.1; see also Hainsworth 1993, 153). Nagler calls the book a disaster stylistically, heroically, thematically, and structurally (1974, 136); Cramer, on the other hand, sees this book as “an excellent showpiece for Odysseus” that links the *Iliad* with the *Odyssey* (1973, 21).

that the alternative meaning of “dare” for τλη- root words is highlighted here in order to make Odysseus a more “traditional” hero.²⁰ The *Doloneia* is, however, an untraditional episode within the *Iliad* that seems to ignore “traditional” heroic behaviour as seen in the rest of the epic. Odysseus does play a pivotal role in this book, but that role appears to be more of a steadying influence on Diomedes than one of martial boldness.²¹ This episode is also one that does not lend itself to the hoplite ethic and is thus problematic for Tyrtaeus to allude to; it is more akin to the ambushes and raids that pre-hoplite warfare entailed than to stationary hoplite fighting. The allusion to *Iliad* 5 with θυμὸν τλήμονα is far less problematic, and the qualities displayed in the traditional battle scene are more useful for the hoplite ethic.

The other noun-epithet combination used by Tyrtaeus also serves to emphasize the stationary nature of hoplite fighting. In describing the conquest of Messene, he states νολεμέως αἰεὶ ταλασίφρονα θυμὸν ἔχοντες (always holding their spirits steadfast; fr. 5.5). ταλασίφρων occurs twice in the *Iliad* (4.421; 11.466), but it is far more prominent in the *Odyssey*, where it appears eleven times (1.87, 127; 3.84; 4.241, 270; 5.31; 17.34, 114, 292, 510; 18.311). In the *Iliad* it is used once in a generalization (4.421) and once for Odysseus (11.466). The generalization- δεινὸν δ’ ἔβραχε χαλκὸς ἐπὶ στήθεσσι βανακτος / ὀρνυμένου· ὑπὸ κεν ταλασίφρονα περ δέος εἶλεν (and the bronze on the chest of the king clashed terribly as he rushed into battle; fear would have seized even a steadfast man; *Il.* 4.420-1)- occurs when Diomedes, having been reproached by Agamemnon for not fighting, enters the battle that will result in his ἀριστεῖα in *Iliad* 5. It

²⁰ “Odysseus in the *Iliad*,” 72. Darcus Sullivan also prefers to emphasize the “dare” element in τλη- root words, but with Tyrtaeus 12.18, where she translates θυμὸν τλήμονα as “bold spirit” (1995, 91).

²¹ See Cook 2009, 157-8, where he argues that the character of Diomedes, that of a young warrior, needs a steadying influence which Nestor provides in *Iliad* 8. Odysseus also provides this steadying influence in *Iliad* 10.

establishes a *ταλασίφρων* ἀνὴρ as the epitome of a brave and stalwart soldier by stating ὑπὸ κεν *ταλασίφρονα* περ δέος εἶλεν. The second occurrence of *ταλασίφρων* is with Odysseus at *Iliad* 11.466, which is the conclusion of his small ἀριστεῖα. Hemmed in by the Trojans, he calls for help, and Menelaus calls him *ταλασίφρονα* as he asks Ajax to help him save Odysseus. This epithet, like *θυμὸν τλήμονα* at 5.669-70, arises in a scene of martial excellence for Odysseus. Here, however, he is on the defensive as, one by one, the major leaders are wounded and forced to retreat (*Il.* 11.273-594).²²

In the *Odyssey* Odysseus alone receives this epithet, and it generally occurs in contexts concerning his homecoming or absence from his house.²³ He is *ταλασίφρων* in the genitive, and the context in which this epithet arises is usually “the serving maids of steadfast Odysseus” (δμῳαὶ Ὀδυσσεύος *ταλασίφρονος*; *Od.* 17.34) or the like.²⁴ Helen’s and Menelaus’ use of this epithet for Odysseus, however, partially returns the epithet to the martial setting that it had in the *Iliad*. Helen relates to Telemachus how Odysseus broke into Troy, disguised as a beggar in order to gather information (*Od.* 4.235-64), and Menelaus how Odysseus restrained the Greeks in the Trojan Horse from answering Helen as she mimicked the voices of their wives’ (4.266-89). These stories both re-establish Odysseus’ heroic identity for his son, and they emphasize his ability to endure and be patient, even in high-stakes situations. Both instances also contributed to the Achaean victory, especially the Trojan Horse stratagem.

²² The retreat of leaders ends with Ajax who, after taking Odysseus’ place, is forced to retreat after Zeus thoroughly terrifies him (*Il.* 11.543-94).

²³ *ταλασίφρων* in homecoming contexts: *Od.* 1.87, 3.84, 4.241, 4.270 5.31, 17.114, 17.292, 17.510. *Od.* 4.241 and 270 use this epithet only in a general context of Odysseus’ homecoming, however; Menelaus and Helen both call Odysseus *ταλασίφρων* when relating stories of him at Troy to Telemachus, who has come to them for news of his father’s return home.

²⁴ See Cramer 1973, 66 table 4, 72 for when Odysseus receives *ταλασίφρων* as an epithet.

Tyrtaeus uses *ταλασίφρων* to describe the *θυμός* of the Spartan forefathers, the original conquerors of Messenia, which departs from Homer's use, who only uses the adjective to describe people. The application of this epithet to *θυμός* may be to create distance between the audience and Odysseus; *ταλασίφρων*, as noted above, occurs most often when Odysseus is wandering. Tyrtaeus' use of *τλήμων* and *ταλασίφρων* to describe *θυμός* can, though, be seen as part of his repeated exhortations to be courageous and steadfast. As in Homeric usage, *θυμός* in the lyric and elegiac poets is active within a person and can, at the same time, be controlled or affected by that person. It is the seat of emotions, including of courage and endurance.²⁵ Tyrtaeus is thus asking his audience to influence their *θυμός* to be enduring in the mode of Odysseus and their grandfathers who conquered Messenia.²⁶ Their model for influencing their *θυμός* in such a fashion is, once again, Odysseus: *τέτλαθι δῆ, κραδίη* (bear up, my heart; *Od.* 20.18).²⁷

Tyrtaeus' allusions to Odysseus' endurance strengthen those made to Hector. They pair naturally with the allusions to hold a secure battle stance (*εὖ διαβάς*), as well as with the stationary nature of the fighting emphasized when the allusion is made (fr. 10.31-2, 11.21-2). These allusions to endurance also offer an alternative to flight, to which Tyrtaeus attaches a heavy level of shame in fragments 10 and 11.²⁸ By not running from battle, the Spartan soldier not only saves himself the shame of flight, but he also is able to lay claim to the rewards for fighting: honours from his fellow citizens if he

²⁵ Darcus Sullivan, *Psychological and Ethical Ideas*, 60. See Felson Rubin 1981, 6 for a discussion of *θυμός* as the seat of emotions and courage in Archilochus 128.

²⁶ He could also be asking them to make their spirits daring, based on the alternate meaning of "daring" for *τλήμων*.

²⁷ Archilochus also alludes to this in fragment 128: *θυμέ, θύμ', ἀμηχάνοισι κήδεσιν κυκώμενε* (1).

²⁸ See chapter 2 for the discussion of shame in fragment 10. Shame in fragment 11 is discussed below, as well as the shameful life of the coward detailed in fragment 10.

lives, and a public funeral and conspicuous tomb if he dies. These allusions to Odysseus the warrior continue to present an alternative to fleeing battle, an option that Tyrtaeus does not want his audience to consider at all.

II. Odysseus as a Warrior

Within the *Iliad*, Odysseus proves himself as willing to fight as Ajax or Diomedes, and Tyrtaeus alludes to him as a warrior and not as a cunning strategist. The allusions to Odysseus the warrior are positive overall, in contrast to those alluding to his status as a wanderer, which will be discussed later in the chapter. The three main allusions to Odysseus' role as a warrior discussed here are Agamemnon's rebuke in *Iliad* 4, Odysseus' decision to fight in *Iliad* 11, and his ensuing rejection of flight. The final allusion does, however, present difficulties due to his earlier flight from battle in *Iliad* 8.

a. Rebuke

In this first allusion, Tyrtaeus appropriates for himself the image of Agamemnon from *Iliad* 4 as he dispenses advice and rebuke in what is portrayed as the process of gearing men for battle (fr. 11). While Agamemnon's status as a warrior and leader can be debated, he does hold a high degree of authority among the Achaeans, even though Achilles and Thersites question it in *Iliad* 1 and 2.²⁹ The assumption of this image from *Iliad* 4, where Agamemnon appears as a "leader of the host," enhances Tyrtaeus' own authority.³⁰ It also associates him with the aristocracy through his assumption of the role of the king who is *primus inter pares* at Troy, which then enhances his rebuke of the

²⁹ On Agamemnon as an insecure leader, see Donlan 1971, 112-3 and Greenberg 1993, 198; as a poor warrior, see Bassett 1934, 53 and Postlewaithe 1995, 98-9. On Agamemnon as a respected king, see Donlan 1971, especially 114; see Postlewaithe 1995, 102-3 for a counter argument.

³⁰ On Agamemnon as "leader of the host" in *Iliad* 4, see Donlan 1971, 112.

γυμνήτες in 11.35-8 as he separates them from the rest of the men addressed and addresses them:

ὕμεῖς δ', ὧ γυμνήτες, ὑπ' ἀσπίδος ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος
 πτώσσοντες μεγάλοις βάλλετε χερμαδίοις,
 δούρασί τε ξεστοῖσιν ἀκοντίζοντες ἐς αὐτούς,
 τοῖσι πανόπλοισιν πλησίον ἰστάμενοι

But, you naked men, throw your great boulders as you cower under your shield here and there, throwing also your polished spears while standing near to those with full armour (fr. 11.35-8)³¹

The key word in this address is πτώσσοντες, which corresponds to καταπτώσσοντες in Agamemnon's rebuke of Odysseus and the Athenian king Menesthes, who is with Odysseus when Agamemnon reviews the Achaeans.

ὦ υἱὲ Πετεῶο διοτρεφέος βασιλῆος,
 καὶ σύ, κακοῖσι δόλοισι κεκασμένη, κερδαλεόφρον,
 τίπτε καταπτώσσοντες ἀφέστατε, μίμνετε δ' ἄλλους;

Son of Peteos, the king nourished by Zeus, and you, you who excel in evil plots, a lover of profit, why do you stand apart, cowering, and wait for others? (4.338-40)

Both πτώσσοντες and its compound καταπτώσσοντες are pejorative words, especially when used of soldiers due to the implied lack of courage. Agamemnon's rebuke of Odysseus and Menesthes continues the implication of cowardice, as he accuses them of being willing to accept the benefits of being a hero- pride of place at feasts- but not the risks (4.341-8).

Adkins and Irwin both link Tyrtaeus' use of πτώσσοντες to a division within the Spartan army between the πανοπλίται (fully-armed men) and the γυμνήτες. Adkins argues that the γυμνήτες are light armed troops on the model of the classical ψῖλοι; Irwin,

³¹ I have translated γυμνήτες here as “naked men” as opposed to the usual “light armed men” in order to not confuse Tyrtaeus' γυμνήτες with later γυμνήτες, who were non-hoplite divisions of the army (slingers, bowmen, javelin throwers, etc.). This term does not imply that Tyrtaeus' γυμνήτες went into battle naked, but rather without the full complement of heavy armour.

on the other hand, argues that the γυμνήτες are new members of the hoplite class who have the all important hoplite shield, but no other part of panoply.³² I would argue, however, that the use of πρόσσοντες does not reflect class conflict, but rather an attempt to resolve or lessen it. The key to this argument is Agamemnon's rebuke of Odysseus. In *Iliad* 4, the Trojans and Greeks resume fighting after Pandarus shoots Menelaus after his duel with Paris. Agamemnon reviews the troops, praising some and rebuking others. Idomeneus, the Aiantes, and Nestor receive the king's praise (*Il.* 4.255-316), whereas Odysseus, Menesthes, Sthenelus, and Diomedes receive his censure (4.338-48, 371-400). While Agamemnon accuses Odysseus of cowardice, his rebuke of Diomedes is just as strong; he recalls the exploits of Tydeus, Diomedes' father, and suggests that the son is made of lesser stock than the father.

Odysseus responds heatedly to Agamemnon's censure, denying that he is a coward, and dares Agamemnon to remain and watch him fight (4.350-55); Diomedes, after reproaching Sthenelus who responds in a similar fashion to Odysseus, enters the fray (4.404-21). In both cases, Agamemnon accomplishes his purpose, namely to prepare the Achaeans for battle after they have left their ranks to watch the duel between Paris and Menelaus. Stanford and Haft, however, argue that this is another example of Agamemnon's "characteristic tactlessness" and "outright insensitivity."³³ Kirk, who agrees that the criticism is unfair of Agamemnon, places it nonetheless within the theme

³² *Poetic Craft in the Early Greek Elegists* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 86; *Solon*, 37-40, 294. The panoply, as discussed in chapter 1, consisted of the helmet, breastplate or linen cuirass, greaves, and the shield. The spear and sword comprised the offensive part of the hoplite's gear.

³³ *The Ulysses Theme*, 18; "Odysseus' Wrath and Grief in the 'Iliad': Agamemnon, the Ithakan King, and the Sack of Troy in Books 2, 4, and 14," *Classical Journal* 85 (89-90):103. Haft does note that Diomedes also receives Agamemnon's censure for not fighting, but argues that the situation is different, as he has not yet contributed to the Achaean cause in a significant way (1989-90, 104 n.26). This may, however, be part of the reason why Agamemnon's censure is so harsh; Odysseus, having shown himself to be one of the main leaders, thus has to maintain a higher standard of behaviour, one that would, in Agamemnon's eyes, place him marshalling his men in the front lines and not in the back with Menesthes.

of praise and rebuke, which is a major source of persuasion in the Homeric epics.³⁴

While the harshness of Agamemnon's insult may bolster this argument, the whole exchange seems to point at a different outcome when looked at together with Agamemnon's rebuke of Diomedes and the nameless Achaeans who are not fighting.

Within this episode Agamemnon delivers two sets of praise and rebuke: the first is for the nameless Achaean fighters, the second for the heroes, where four heroes are praised and four censured. Agamemnon first praises the Achaeans whom he sees marshalling for battle (*Il.* 4.232-39) and then rebukes those who are not: ἄργεῖοι ἰόμωροι, ἐλεγχέες, οὐκ ἔστιν ἄβησθε; (Argives, arrow-fighters, do you have no shame, you worthless men? *Il.* 4.242). He continues his censure by comparing them to young deer who have no courage and asks if they are simply going to wait for the Trojans to come (*Il.* 4.243-9). He then praises Nestor, the Aiantes, and Idomeneus and rebukes Odysseus and Menesthes as cowards and Diomedes and Sthenelus as less than their fathers.

G.M. Reyes, in his study of persuasion in the *Iliad*, places praise and rebuke as a major source of persuasion when used in regards to honour. Praise recognizes and honours status, blame conversely implies that the status is threatened or diminished.³⁵ Agamemnon's censure of Odysseus' and Diomedes' actions thus requires them to either accept that the blame is justified, that they are not fulfilling the requirements of their status as heroes, or to prove that the blame is unfounded and redeem their status as heroes. Agamemnon's choice of censure is tailored to the heroes; Diomedes' κλέος is closely tied to his father, Tydeus, and Agamemnon reproaches him by implying that the

³⁴ *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume I: books 1-4*, ed. G.S. Kirk (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1985), 365 n. 339. For persuasion in the *Iliad*, see Reyes 2002.

³⁵ "Sources of Persuasion in the *Iliad*," *Rhetoric Review* 22 (2002): 24. See also Finkelberg 1998, 19: "the stimulus behind the Homeric warrior's behaviour is first of all the drive to meet the expectations that flow from their status."

son is not worthy of the father.³⁶ Odysseus, however, is renowned for his intelligence and cunning, and it is on this issue that Agamemnon attacks. While this may, as Stanford and Haft argue, reveal Agamemnon's "secret prejudice" against Odysseus, the attack is not due to a failure to hide this prejudice, but rather to a desire to propel Odysseus to fight with his men alongside the other heroes.³⁷ In this endeavour, he is successful; Homer names Odysseus as the fourth Achaean to kill a Trojan in the ensuing battle, and he is the first to kill in revenge for a follower's death (*Il.* 4.489-503).³⁸ This is also our first view of Odysseus' martial prowess, before his participation in the night raid in *Iliad* 10 and his miniature ἀριστεῖα in *Iliad* 11.³⁹ Odysseus' revenge here from killing the Trojan Democoön does not only assuage his anger; it also benefits the Achaean attack as Democoön's death demoralizes the Trojans and causes a temporary retreat which forces the intervention of Apollo (*Il.* 4.505-13).

In like vein, Tyrtaeus' reproach of the γυμνήτες in fragment 11 may be indicative of tensions between the poet and the newer members of the phalanx, but it should be seen as such only second to the primary purpose of propelling men to fight.⁴⁰ The γυμνήτες, as discussed in chapter 1, were likely new members of the hoplite class who did not yet possess the full hoplite panoply and nor were they required to. They thus differ in this

³⁶ See Bernadette 2005, 37-8 for a similar discussion of Agamemnon's rebuke of Diomedes. Bernadette frames it, however, in terms of martial ability; without the patronymic, he argues, "Diomedes as an individual is weak, but as the son of his father he is irresistible."

³⁷ Kirk also asserts that the use of κακοῖσι δόλοισι κεκασμένε "is an equally malicious interpretation of Odysseus' reputation as πολύμητις [as the use of κερδαλέοφρον]" (1985, 365 n.339).

³⁸ See Haft 1989-90, 105-11 for an in-depth examination of this scene, especially concerning the connections to other arcs of the Trojan cycle.

³⁹ Haft calls Odysseus' victory over Democoön in *Iliad* 4 "an unambiguous victory," as opposed to his defeat of Socus in *Iliad* 11 because Socus almost killed Odysseus when seeking revenge for the latter's killing of his brother (1989-90, 106). I do not know, however, how much more 'ambiguous' Odysseus' victory over Socus would have been perceived as. Odysseus vaunted over Socus' death, which he did not do upon Democoön's death, and this boasting is a feature of heroic victory and would have overcome the fact that Socus almost defeated Odysseus.

⁴⁰ There is also the issue of assuming Tyrtaeus' personal views towards the γυμνήτες if we follow Adkins and Irwin in ascribing to πτώσσοντες class differences or prejudice.

respect from the γυμνήτες of later periods, especially of the Classical period, when the term refers to non-hoplite divisions of the army. Though normally translated as “light-armed troops” due to its use for slingers, archers, and other lightly armed divisions in later periods, γυμνήτες literally means “naked ones.”⁴¹ The γυμνήτες in the early archaic period carried their own shield to “cower” under, and they were marshalled within the phalanx, alongside those who did have full armour (οἱ πανοπλίται).⁴² This lack of bronze armour, however, meant that those inexperienced in battle would be at a higher risk, even with the extensive frontal protection of the hoplite shield, and this higher risk then increases the probability that they would run. Tyrtaeus thus reproaches their behaviour- “cowering” behind their shields and not holding a firm stance- and shames them to remedy their behaviour through the implication that they do not deserve to be among the ranks. The allusion to Odysseus emphasizes what the appropriate outcome is: they should fight and not flee and thus redeem their status as warriors.

This reproach thus functions in a similar manner to the inversion of Priam’s speech in fragment 10, where the contrast of the deaths of old and young men imposes a sense of shame on the desire to flee. Tyrtaeus, who ends with the glorious death of the young man, provides a solution for the young men listening; should they fight, they will avoid shame from fleeing. This then increases their willingness to fight, a result which opposes the desired result of Priam’s speech, where he aims to lessen Hector’s willingness to fight by presenting first the death of the young man and then that of the old

⁴¹ See, for example, Gerber’s translation of γυμνήτες as “you light armed men” (1999, 57).

⁴² It is highly unlikely that the γυμνήτες could be crouching under anyone’s shield but their own, as even the large hoplite shield could only not even fully cover its owner on account of the double gripped handhold which restricted the movement of the left arm. See Schwartz 2009, 121 for a discussion on this. He does, however, argue that Tyrtaeus’ γυμνήτες are light-armed troops and not hoplites without full armour. See van Wees 2000, 127 for an argument against the commonly held view that the hoplite shield restricted arm movement.

man. Tyrtaeus' reproach in fragment 11, however, aims to incite the audience to do better than the status quo. The reproach denigrates both the weak stance of the γομνήτες and the desire to flee through the use of πτώσσοντες, and it ends with an exhortation to act upon the alternative: to stand and fight.

b. Remain and win honour

The second martial allusion to Odysseus occurs in fragment 12 alongside the rewards, as intangible as they might be, for standing and fighting. This allusion parallels the allusions to Hector in εἶ διαβάς (fr. 10.31-2, 11.21-2), as all three allusions are intended to strengthen men's resolve to remain over fleeing. The allusion to Odysseus differs from the allusions to Hector, though, as it is clearly identified with the heroic code and is glamorized by Tyrtaeus due to its association with the rewards for fighting and immortal κλέος.⁴³

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

Never does his noble fame perish nor his name, for even though he is under the ground he is immortal, whomever furious Ares kills while being the best by remaining and fighting on behalf of his land and children (fr. 12.31-4)

The key to the reward of immortal κλέος and name is ἀριστεύοντα μένοντά τε μαρνάμενόν τε, “being the best by remaining and fighting.” Even if the second and third participles are not taken as causal, as I have done so here, the succession of the participles requires that they be taken together; all three actions are closely related.

The first participle recalls the heroic code in general, which Hippolochus expounds to his son Glaukos before he sets out for Troy: αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον

⁴³ The promise of immortal κλέος and name in fragment 12 will be examined in the next chapter as an allusion to Achilles and his two fates.

ἔμμεναι ἄλλων, / μηδὲ γένος πατέρων αἰσχυνόμεν (Always to be the best and to be pre-eminent among others, and never to shame the line of my fathers; *Il.* 6.208-9). The combination of the participles in Tyrtaeus' poem, however, alludes to Odysseus' dilemma in *Iliad* 11, when he debates whether he should flee or stand and fight alone:

ὄς δέ κ' ἀριστεύησι μάχῃ ἔνι, τὸν δὲ μάλα χρεῶ
ἑστάμεναι κρατερῶς, ἢ τ' ἔβλητ' ἢ τ' ἔβαλ' ἄλλον

The man who is best in battle, there is much need for him to stand strongly,
whether he is struck or strikes another (*Il.* 11.409-10)

Odysseus' ἑστάμεναι is the equivalent of Tyrtaeus' μένοντά, and his ἔβαλ' ἄλλον parallels Tyrtaeus' μαρνάμενόν. Both ἔβαλ' ἄλλον and μαρνάμενόν emphasize the belligerent situation, and ἑστάμεναι and μένοντά the stationary behaviour of the man fighting. The structural order is basically the same in the two quoted sections: be the best, stand/ remain, and fight. Tyrtaeus, however, shortens Odysseus' longer musing on the subject to three consecutive participles, which enhances the connections between the three actions and brings the message of stand and fight to his listeners more quickly.

Odysseus then acts upon his musings and kills six Trojans in a row before the mass of enemies forces him to call for help (11.420-62). This scene again highlights his martial abilities. Odysseus, after persuading Diomedes to not flee and fight, fights alone once Diomedes retreats since he has been wounded.⁴⁴ This is one of his more 'heroic' scenes, and Tyrtaeus uses this moment to emphasize the moral fiber that he wants his audience to have as he exhorts them to stand and fight.

c. Rejection of Flight

Odysseus' superior moral fiber in *Iliad* 11, for Tyrtaeus at least, derives in part

⁴⁴ This situation, where Odysseus fights after Diomedes retreats, is an inversion of the earlier one in *Iliad* 8, where Diomedes fights after Odysseus retreats.

from his rejection of his desire to flee, which for a Homeric hero is a valid feeling and one that generally receives no stigma from the other heroes.⁴⁵ Odysseus, however, does not choose to act on this feeling, but rather remains to fight.

ὦ μοι ἐγὼ, τί πάθω; μέγα μὲν κακὸν αἶ κε φέβωμαι
 πληθὺν ταρβήσας· τὸ δὲ ῥίγιον αἶ κεν ἀλώω
 μοῦνος· τοὺς δ' ἄλλους Δαναοὺς ἐφόβησε Κρονίων.
 ἀλλὰ τίη μοι ταῦτα φίλος διελέξατο θυμὸς;
 οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι κακοὶ μὲν ἀποίχονται πολέμοιο

Ah me, what do I suffer? It is a great evil if I flee, fearing the crowd, but it is chillier if I am caught alone; the son of Kronos frightened the other Danaans. But why does my dear spirit debate these things? I know that cowards run away from war (*Il.* 11.404-408)

For Tyrtaeus, whose focus is to maintain the integrity of the phalanx, these are noble sentiments indeed, even if Odysseus did withdraw after Ajax took his place in battle (485-89).⁴⁶ Odysseus' stand is unusual, and it leads into a small ἀριστεῖα.⁴⁷

Furthermore, the decision to stay appears to be linked not to any hope of material gain, but to “a moral argument: the ἄριστος *qua* ἄριστος has a duty to stand and fight.”⁴⁸ This argument that κακοὶ flee and their opposite, the ἀγαθοί and ἄριστοι, do not, correlates with Tyrtaeus' argument of “fight because it is your duty.” This argument also supports the need to affect cohesion within the hoplite ranks; an argument based on the dictum of ἀγαθοί/ ἄριστοι fight and κακοὶ flee increases the class of ἀγαθοί/ ἄριστοι when applied to hoplite tactics. Those who were previously not ἀγαθοί now are by virtue of fighting in the phalanx; they have been elevated to a new social class through

⁴⁵ See, for example, *Iliad* 11.542-56; 14.488; 17.94-108, 530-5

⁴⁶ Van Wees argues that in this scene, Odysseus “set an admirable but exceptionally high standard- and ultimately failed to live up to it” (1996, 10). While this may be the case, there is some redemption for Odysseus in the fact that he did not abandon his position in battle, but rather waited and fought until Ajax took his place.

⁴⁷ Bryan Hainsworth, *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume III: books 9-12*, ed. G.S. Kirk (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 271 n. 420-7. Cf. Odysseus' dilemma with Menelaus' at *Iliad* 17.91-114, where he retreats so as not to face Hector alone.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 270 n. 407-10.

their new place in battle.

Tyrtaeus actively exhorts his audience not to run: μηδὲ φυγῆς αἰσχροῆς ἄρχετε μηδὲ φόβου (do not begin shameful flight or fear; fr. 10.16). He then supplements this command by expounding upon the indignities that accompany fleeing battle in fragments 10 and 11. Fragment 10, as discussed in the previous chapter, highlights the shameful death of the older soldiers who fight in the front once the younger men have fled. This poem also, as will be discussed in the next section, focuses on the life of the coward, who is forced to wander without a home to which to return (fr. 10.3-10). Fragment 11 then presents the death of the coward as he lies in the dust, with a spear in his back (fr. 11.14-20). This image also fosters a connection with Odysseus, and it is an allusion to one of his more ambiguous scenes in the *Iliad*. In *Iliad* 8, after Zeus has caused the Achaeans to flee, Diomedes calls out to Odysseus to help him save Nestor, who is trapped beyond the quickly retreating Achaean battle line: πῆ φεύγεις μετὰ νῶτα βαλὼν κακὸς ὡς ἐν ὀμίλῳ; / μή τις τοι φεύγοντι μεταφρένω ἐν δόρυ πήξῃ (Why do you flee, turning your back in battle, like a coward? Lest someone fixes a spear in your back as you flee; *Il.* 8.94-5). Odysseus, however, continues on without halting, and this left him open to later accusations of cowardice.⁴⁹ Cowardice, flight, and death from a spear in the back are connected here, and Tyrtaeus draws on and makes this same connection. Only he elaborates on the image of a man killed from behind:

αἰσχροὸς δ' ἐστὶ νέκυς κατακείμενος ἐν κονίῃσι
νῶτον ὀπισθ' αἰχμῇ δουρὸς ἐληλάμενος

A corpse is ugly, when it lies down in the dirt, having been struck in the back from behind with the point of a spear (fr. 11.19-20)

Here is the opposite of the καλὸς θάνατος, emphasized by the use of αἰσχροὸς at the

⁴⁹ Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme*, 72.

beginning of the couplet.

While Odysseus' flight in *Iliad* 8 and Diomedes' reproach provide material to support Tyrtaeus' connection of shame with flight and death from behind, they also mar Odysseus' noble sentiments concerning standing and fighting in *Iliad* 11. After Diomedes' rebuke in *Iliad* 8, Odysseus does not stop, but continues on in his panic: οὐδ' ἐσάκουσε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς / ἀλλὰ παρήιμεν κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν (But much enduring, noble Odysseus did not give ear to him, but instead darted past to the hollow ships of the Achaeans; *Il.* 8.97-8). Diomedes, unaided, fights and rescues Nestor. None of Homer's heroes censure Odysseus for his behaviour here, but the verb ἐσάκουσε enabled later detractors to accuse Odysseus of ignoring his comrade's call for help.⁵⁰ His supporters asserted that he had simply not heard Diomedes.⁵¹ ἐσάκουσε, a *hapax legomenon* in Homer, has two possible meanings which facilitate the above debate: one meaning is "to hear," the other "to listen" or "to heed."⁵² Whether he heard Diomedes or not, this action still poses problems for Tyrtaeus when he alludes to Odysseus as an example of a hero who prefers to stand and fight rather than retreat. Tyrtaeus attempts to negate any positive light in which Odysseus' retreat might be seen by separating the paragon of ἀρετή in fragment 12 from Odysseus by asserting that his soldier takes the dictum of "never flee" to the extreme- he fights until death (fr. 12.34). The willingness to make this sacrifice, as discussed in the previous chapter, makes the soldier worthy of communal mourning and the honours that accrue from it. Tyrtaeus' second solution to

⁵⁰ Aristarchus was one of these detractors, and, according to Herodian, he was one among others holding the same opinion (*Aristonicus, De Signis Iliadis*; Herodian *Περὶ Ἰλιακῆς προσῳδίας* 4).

⁵¹ Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme*, 72. See also Leaf 1960, 339 n. 97 and Cook 2009, 145-6 for a discussion of the ambiguities of this verb.

⁵² This verb is used by Thucydides for situations in battle when an order or other vocalization was not heard properly (IV.xxxiv.3; Kirk 1993, 306 n. 97-8).

the issue of Odysseus' flight from battle is to continue to impose a sense of shame upon the desire to flee. As discussed above, he draws on Diomedes' threat of a death from behind to reproach Odysseus' actions and opposes it to the *καλὸς θάνατος*. This is not all, though; Tyrtaeus uses Odysseus and the *Odyssey* as general *exempla* of a wanderer and his life by establishing a correlation between the drifting life of a wanderer and fleeing the battlefield.

III. Odysseus the Wanderer

The beginning of fragment 10 contains Tyrtaeus' fate for those who flee battle:

τεθνάμεναι γὰρ καλὸν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι πεσόντα
 ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν περὶ ἧι πατρίδι μαρνάμενον
 τὴν δ' αὐτοῦ προλιπόντα πόλιν καὶ πίονας ἀγρούς
 πτωχεύειν πάντων ἔστ' ἀνηρότατον,
 πλαζόμενον σὺν μητρὶ φίλῃ καὶ πατρὶ γέροντι
 παισὶ τε σὺν μικροῖς κουριδίῃ τ' ἀλόχῳ.
 ἐχθρὸς μὲν γὰρ τοῖσι μετέσσειται οὐς κεν ἴκηται,
 χρησιμοσύνη τ' εἰκῶν καὶ στυγερῆι πενίῃ,
 αἰσχύνει τε γένος, κατὰ δ' ἀγλαὸν εἶδος ἐλέγχει,
 πᾶσα δ' ἀτιμὴ καὶ κακότης ἔπεται
 εἴθ' οὕτως ἀνδρός τοι ἀλωμένου οὐδεμί' ὄρη
 γίνεται οὔτ' αἰδῶς οὔτ' ὀπίσω γένεος
 θυμῷ γῆς πέρι τῆσδε μαχώμεθα καὶ περὶ παίδων
 θνήσκωμεν ψυχέων μηκέτι φειδόμενοι.

It is noble to die, when a good man falls among the fore-fighters while fighting on behalf of his fatherland, and to beg is the most grievous, when a man abandons his city and rich fields and wanders with his dear mother and aged father, even with his little children and wedded wife. He is hated, being among those to whom he comes. He disgraces his form and family line with both need and loathsome poverty, and he brings shame upon his splendid appearance, and every dishonour and misery follow him. Since thus there is neither regard nor respect for a man wandering, or his line afterwards, let us fight with spirit for this land, and let us die on behalf of our children, no longer sparing our lives (fr. 10.1-12)

This connection between fleeing battle and wandering is new; Homer does not make it.

Odysseus, the wanderer *par excellence*, does not wander because he fled battle; he wanders because he angered the god of the sea. Tyrtaeus' contemporary Callinus

likewise does not correlate cowardice with the fate of wandering forever; his hapless soldier flees battle only to return to his home, which is still secure and in place, and lives a long life among his fellow citizens, though unloved (1.14-7). Tyrtaeus, however, does make this connection, and he uses it to increase the stigma he has already attached to the desire to run away through his allusions to Priam's speech in *Iliad* 22 and Diomedes' reproach of Odysseus in *Iliad* 8. The stigmatization of flight by associating it with wandering is further helped by Homeric and archaic conceptions of wandering as a terrible state in which to be.⁵³

Lugnebill argues that the opening lines in fragment 10 are intended to shock the audience and capture their attention, so that Tyrtaeus may then hammer into them the terrible fate that fleeing battle entails.⁵⁴ The opening statement does serve well as a hook for the audience's attention and interest; an aesthetic opinion of individual, heroic death (καλὸς θάνατος) is transformed into a moral statement of death (τεθνάμεναι γὰρ καλόν). The opening lines present a conventional, if heroic, opinion, which the following lines then contrast almost completely.⁵⁵ The sudden contrast and change of focus places retreat in a negative light as Tyrtaeus attempts to persuade his audience that retreat is not acceptable under any circumstances. The emphasis in these lines is on the wanderer's life, and the onslaught of negative words (προλιπόντα, πτωχεύειν, ἀνηρότατον, πλαζόμενον, ἐχθρὸς, χρησιμοσύνη, στυγερῆι πενίη, αἰσχύνει, ἐλέγχει, πᾶσα ἀτιμὴ καὶ κακότης, 10.3-10) leaves no doubt that this life is the "most grievous" (ἀνηρότατον).

⁵³ On wandering and misery, see Montiglio 2005, 26.

⁵⁴ "Tyrtaeus 12 West: Come Join the Spartan Army," *Classical Quarterly* 52 (2002): 410.

⁵⁵ The complete contrast has to wait until the line 21, when the death of the old man is called αἰσχρόν. Lugnebill, however, argues that ἀνηρότατον (most grievous) answers the καλόν in line 1 (2002, 410). While the ἀνηρότατον does provide an immediate contrast to καλόν, it does not convey the moral disapproval that αἰσχρόν does.

In addition to this, Tyrtaeus' wanderer does not roam alone, in contrast to the Homeric wanderers who generally do wander alone, though the subject of companions can be blurred. Odysseus wanders with his men until they all die, Bellerophon drifts alone (6.200-2), and Tlepolemus wanders alone, but settles Rhodes with others (2.667-8). Tyrtaeus, on the other hand, makes it clear that the coward forces the terrible life of a wanderer upon his whole family: *πλαζόμενον σὺν μητρὶ φίλῃ καὶ πατρὶ γέροντι / παισὶ τε σὺν μικροῖς κουριδίῃσι τ' ἀλόχοισι* (he wanders with his dear mother and aged father, even with his little children and wedded wife; 10.5-6). The emphasis on the entire family's participation in a coward's itinerant life highlights the main difference between Tyrtaeus' wandering coward and Odysseus: the coward has no home to which he can return. He has abandoned (*προλιπόντα*) his *πόλις* to the enemy and thus no longer has a *πόλις* or *πατρίς*. He gives up more than just his *πόλις* when he flees battle though, for the loss of his *πόλις* results in the loss of an integral part of his identity. For the Greeks, identity and *πόλις* or *πατρίς* were closely linked.⁵⁶ The formulaic question *τίς πόθεν εἰς ἄνδρων;* (who whence are you among men?) illustrates this connection between the *πόλις* or *πατρίς* and self-identity; it is a combination of the questions "Who are you? Whence do you come?"⁵⁷ The abandonment of the battlefield thus becomes connected with the loss of homeland and identity and with aimless drifting, both for the fugitive soldier and his entire family.

Tyrtaeus does not use a specific word for 'coward' in fragment 10; the man who stands in contrast to the *ἄνδρ' ἀγαθόν* in the first two lines is only identified by the participles *προλιπόντα* (fr. 10.3) and *πλαζόμενον* (10.5) and the adjective *ἐχθρὸς* (10.7).

⁵⁶ See, for example, Solon 36.8-12.

⁵⁷ Sylvia Montiglio, *Wandering in Ancient Greek Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 35.

The *προλιπόντα*, however, is key to the contrast between the man who stands and dies and the man who flees and wanders. *προλείπω* (go forth and leave, abandon) and its fellow compound *καταλείπω* (leave behind, abandon) both connote abandonment due to the root verb *λείπω* (leave). *προλείπω* is used also of fugitive soldiers, and it can therefore be considered the equivalent of ‘coward’ here.⁵⁸ *προλείπω* and *καταλείπω* appear elsewhere in the corpus as participles describing abandonment as well: *κατα...λίποντες* (fr. 5.7), *καταλείποντες* (fr. 10.20), and a possible [*προλιπ*]όντες (fr. 2.14).⁵⁹ In fragment 5, it is the Messenians who abandon their *πίονα ἔργα* (rich fields) as they flee in the twentieth year of fighting, and the *κατὰ πίονα ἔργα λιπόντες* is repeated in fragment 10.3 with *τὴν δ’ αὐτοῦ προλιπόντα πόλιν καὶ πίονας ἀγρούς* (when a man abandons his city and rich fields).⁶⁰ The transfer of antecedent for *προλιπόντες/προλιπόντα* from the Messenians (fr. 5.7) to the Spartan soldier (fr. 10.3) may have coloured the reception of this line due to Tyrtaeus’ use of it with a group the Spartans had conquered. The Spartans are also the antecedent of *καταλείποντες* in 10.20, when they are urged not to abandon the older men, and of [*προλιπ*]όντες in 2.14. The [*προλιπ*]όντες is different from the other participles, as it does not depict the abandonment of other soldiers or of a city during war, but rather departure from Erineus, from where the Spartans said they travelled to the Peloponnese.⁶¹ There is still the implication, however, in this participle of leaving and never returning.

⁵⁸ On *προλείπω* and fugitive soldiers, see Montiglio 2005, 32.

⁵⁹ Fragment 2 is very fragmentary, and I follow West’s suggestion of [*προλιπ*]όντες here.

⁶⁰ In fragment 5, the antecedent of *κατὰ ... λιπόντες* is not stated in the extant poem. I take, however, the *οἱ μὲν* which precedes the participle and provides the article for it to denote a change of subject from the previous subject of *αἰχμηταὶ πατέρων ἡμετέρων πατέρες* (spearmen fathers of our fathers).

⁶¹ This move was also, according to Tyrtaeus, divinely sanctioned (fr. 2.12-15).

Tyrtaeus then connects the man abandoning his πόλις to wandering by using the participle πλαζόμενον as the next word to describe this man. πλαζόμενον is in the emphatic position at the beginning of the line here, and it emphasizes the continual state in which the coward now find himself. It also has strong connections to the *Odyssey*; the finite form of this verb appears in the proem as Homer invokes the Muse to tell the story of Odysseus (Ἄνδρα ποι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ / πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσε; Relate to me, Muse, the man of many-turns, who wandered very much, after he sacked the holy citadel of Troy, *Od.* 1.1-2). The conception of the coward as a wanderer is further enhanced by the use of ἀλώμενου fewer than ten lines later. ἀλάομαι, which is the other main verb for “to wander,” likewise has strong connections with Odysseus; he is the antecedent of the participle ἀλώμενος ten times in the *Odyssey* (5.336, 448; 6.206; 7.239; 8.28; 11.160; 15.205; 18.401; 19.170). Then, with the connection of προλιπόντα, πλαζόμενον, and ἀλώμενου, Tyrtaeus relies on Homeric connections with wandering and suffering to attach even more stigma to fleeing battle. He uses the *Odyssey* as a general example for evidence that wandering equals suffering.⁶² Odysseus and his men are buffeted about the Mediterranean, attacked by enemies, and stranded on a series of islands until only Odysseus is left, trapped on Calypso’s island until Zeus orders her to release him. His sufferings do not end either with his return home, but continue until he slaughters the suitors in *Odyssey* 22.

The *Iliad* then provides specific instances to add to the *Odyssey*’s general *exempla* through the audience’s own awareness of the Homeric texts: Tlepolemus (*Il.* 2.667-9) and Bellerophon (*Il.* 6.194-201) wandered and suffered until Tlepolemus arrived at Rhodes

⁶² Montiglio argues that in the *Odyssey*, wandering’s “association with suffering is almost formulaic” (2005, 25).

and until Bellerophon died (200-201). These three Homeric wanderers, furthermore, all wandered because they had incurred the enmity of the gods. Bellerophon roams, “hated by the gods” (*Il.* 6.200-201), and Eumaeus worries that Odysseus will never return to Ithaka, as he has been swept away by the winds because ὄ τ’ ἤχθετο πᾶσι θεοῖσι / πάγχυ μάλ’ (he was hated completely by all the gods; *Od.* 14.365-71).⁶³ Homer does not state outright that Tlepolemus was hated, but he says that Tlepolemus “suffered pains” (ἄλγεα πάσχων) and does not ascribe the gods’ blessing until after he settles Rhodes (*Il.* 2.667-70). On the basis of this, Montiglio argues that wandering means to become hateful to the gods.⁶⁴ Athena’s actions in relation to Odysseus’ return to Ithaka appear to support this argument; she argues for his release from Calypso’s island, but she does not actively intervene and help Odysseus except when he is on Phaeacia and Ithaka.⁶⁵ Telemachus, on the other hand, receives her aid from the beginning, but he is always either in a city or travelling directly to one. His travels have a specific purpose, whereas Odysseus’ have a general purpose of reaching home, but are otherwise undirected. Furthermore, Athena’s decision to help Odysseus does not come from anything that he did to win back her favour, but rather from her overall preference of him to others due to his personal characteristics.⁶⁶ If Athena had not decided to continue to favour Odysseus, the implication is that he would not have returned to Ithaka.

This uncertainty towards the gods’ favour for the wanderer only adds to the overall misery of his life, a state on which Odysseus himself comments: πλαγκτοσύνης δ’ οὐκ ἔστι κακώτερον ἄλλο βροτοῖσιν (there is nothing worse for mortals than wandering;

⁶³ Bernadette on the lack of divine patronage in most of the *Odyssey*: “Not man protected by the gods (man at war), but man without the gods, is the subject of the *Odyssey*” (2005, 15).

⁶⁴ *Wandering*, 25.

⁶⁵ Erwin Cook, “‘Active’ and ‘Passive’ Heroics in the ‘Odyssey,’” *Classical World* 93 (1999): 160.

⁶⁶ Montiglio, *Wandering*, 51.

Od. 15.343). The timing of this statement is impeccable. Odysseus has finally arrived on Ithaca after roaming the seas and after being trapped for years on Calypso's island, but he cannot reveal himself upon his arrival if he wishes to survive his homecoming, and he must hide as a beggar in his own home. This statement follows and explains to Eumaeus his desire, as the disguised beggar, to go into town and beg for food from the suitors despite Eumaeus' worry that he will be mistreated by them (15.307-345).

In Tyrtaeus 10, after the poem opens with a strong statement and an immediate contrast to that statement (10.1-6), Tyrtaeus explains why begging and wandering are the "most grievous" (10.7-10).⁶⁷ Not only does the coward/ wanderer disgrace his family line, which is in direct violation of the heroic code, but *πᾶσα δ' ἀτιμία καὶ κακότης* accompany him. Shame (*χρησιμοσύνη, αἰσχύνει, ἐλέγχει*) is compounded with disgrace (*ἀτιμία*) and misery (*κακότης*) to increase the hardship of the coward/wanderer's life.⁶⁸ Wandering, begging, and being hated are closely connected here, which follows the general pattern laid out in the *Odyssey*. The first part of the pattern is Odysseus' name, which Homer explains in *Odyssey* 19:

πολλοῖσιν γὰρ ἐγὼ γε ὀδυσσάμενος τόδ' ἰκάνω,

⁶⁷ This section is introduced with a *μὲν γὰρ* which indicates that it both provides an explanation for the previous claim (*γὰρ*) and that a contrast to this section will be coming. This contrast occurs in line 11 (*εἰθ'* or *εἰ δ'* if following Prato's edition of the text (fr. 6.11 Prato)), which ends Tyrtaeus' discussion of the wanderer and begins a long exhortation to fight and to not flee.

⁶⁸ Montiglio connects the *ἀτιμία* which follows the coward/ wanderer with the classical conception of *ἀτιμία* as the negation of citizenship rights: "the wanderer ... meets with dishonor in its most shameful form, as civic death (*ἀτιμία*)" (2005, 26). While the wanderer does experience a loss of citizenship rights after fleeing the battlefield, it is because, according to Tyrtaeus, there is no longer a *πόλις* to bestow those rights. The wanderer does not suffer *ἀτιμία* because of the Spartan community's belief that a soldier does not desert his position in the phalanx, a belief that other *πόλεις* also held. Likewise, when she comments on the reception of Tyrtaeus' stigmatization of the wanderer, she transposes Classical values to the early archaic period: "For the future hoplite, who will have to reside steadily, to eat in public, and to maintain his position in close, almost immobile battle formation (*μένειν*) with his fellow citizens, wandering alone all over the country is the ultimate aberration" (2005, 16). While this is valid for the hoplites of the Classical period, it is not for the period when Tyrtaeus composed his poems. We do not know when the public messes were instituted, or the *agoge* which facilitated the peculiar, militant way of life in Sparta, but it was likely after the Second Messenian War and therefore after the composition date of these poems.

ἀνδράσιν ἠδὲ γυναιξίν ἀνὰ χθόνα πουλυβότειραν·
τῷ δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ὄνομ' ἔστω ἐπώνυμον

As I came to this place, being hateful to many, to both men and women upon the much-nourishing earth, let his name be Odysseus, a fitting name (*Od.* 19.407-9)

As his name is derived from the middle verb ὀδύσασθαι (to have hostile feelings towards someone), Odysseus is the man who both gives and incurs pain.⁶⁹ He displays both sides during the course of the *Odyssey*, though at the beginning his active side brings nothing but problems, notably the hatred of Poseidon. Odysseus' passive status as a wanderer then corresponds to the passive side of his name, as the "receiver of pain." Odysseus as the disguised beggar is reviled and abused by the suitors, who do not care to respect the beggar as Eumaeus did, ignoring the belief that πρὸς γὰρ Διὸς εἰσὶν ἅπαντες / ξεῖνοί τε πτωχοὶ τε (all strangers and beggars are from Zeus; 6.207-8; 14.57-8). The other beggar in the *Odyssey*, Iros, does not receive the suitors' abuse, but he does receive Odysseus', along with a promise from the suitors not to help him should Odysseus gain the upper hand in their fight (18.14-109). These scenarios, though fictive, do not bode well for Tyrtaeus' coward/ wanderer who is forced to beg (πτωχεύειν) in his wanderings. Begging and abuse are thus closely linked, illustrating the uncertainty of a beggar's life, and the *Odyssey* also identifies wandering as the result of needing to beg: ἔνεκ' οὐλομένης γαστρὸς κακὰ κήδ' ἔχουσιν / ἀνέρες, ὃν τιν' ἴκηται ἄλλη καὶ πῆμα καὶ ἄλγος (on account of the accursed belly men have grievous woes, whomever wandering, suffering, and pain come upon; 15.344-5).⁷⁰ A man may be forced to wander simply to

⁶⁹ Jenny Strauss Clay, *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983), 59-60, 64. See also notes 12-14 on p. 60 for an overview of translation of the naming scene and of Odysseus' name.

⁷⁰ The connection between begging and abuse continues; Theognis 271-8 laments the loss of traditional morals, as sons refuse to help their father when he grows old and τὸν πατέρ' ἐχθαίρουσι, καταρῶνται δ' ἀπολέσθαι, / καὶ στυγέουσ' ὥσπερ πτωχὸν ἐσερχόμενον (they hate their father, and they call down curses for him to die, and they hate him as if he was a beggar coming to them; 277-8).

find food to eat. This is precisely the situation that Tyrtaeus promises to his audience; the coward/ wanderer has “abandoned his rich fields” and must therefore beg in order to eat. But unlike Odysseus, who connects wandering with begging, Tyrtaeus first connects begging with abandoning the city and fields and then follows this primary connection with Odysseus’ connection between begging and wandering.

Begging, then is the middle step in Tyrtaeus’ correlation of fleeing battle with wandering, which helps him cement the connection.⁷¹ The soldier who flees battle abandons his city and his land, which then necessitates that he beg in order to eat, and in order to beg he must wander from place to place. Tyrtaeus elaborates on the miseries that the wanderer will face in lines 8-10 in order to enhance the pre-established connection between wandering and suffering.⁷² He then expands the nexus of concepts surrounding wandering to include cowardice in order to further stigmatize flight from battle and uphold the alternative of fighting in place.

There is thus nothing positive nor glamorous attached to the state of wandering. A man who wanders cannot rely on social ties among other men or with the gods; such ties are based on a system of reciprocation, or the promise of it, and a wanderer with no home or belongings cannot partake in such a system. Though there is a reassurance for

⁷¹ Montiglio asserts that wandering in Greek conception is a continual state that involves movement away from the wanderer’s center, which is normally his home city. Due to this, both the wanderer and the exile/fugitive (both are called *φυγάς*) are held to move constantly, even though another *πόλις* may receive them. She then argues that Tyrtaeus conflates the coward who flees battle with the exile- in running away, the coward exiles himself- who is then conflated with the wanderer as both move away from the center *in perpetuum* (2005, 32-3). I do not think, however, that there needs to be so many steps in between the coward and the wanderer. Tyrtaeus does not use any terms that may pertain to an exile specifically; the closest he comes is using the imperative *φεύγετε* in line 20, but that is in the command of do not flee the battle (*μη καταλείποντες φεύγετε*). Instead, the coward’s flight from battle is followed by the participles *πλαζόμενον* (10.5) and *ἀλωμένον* (10.11) which are used to depict men wandering. There is also no need for Tyrtaeus to make the connection between exile and coward; exile, as opposed to wandering, was still socially acceptable. Two of Achilles’ closest companions, Phoenix and Patrocles, are exiles, and Telemachus takes in the exiled seer Theoklymenos on his return to Ithaka (*Od.* 15.222-81). Exile, therefore, does not have the necessary opprobrium for Tyrtaeus’ purpose; wandering does.

⁷² See, for example, *Il.* 9.648, 24.532-33, *Od.* 15.343-5, 20.377-79, and Archilochus fr. 130.

those forced to wander in the patronage of Zeus Xenios (Zeus the god of hospitality and strangers), the belief that beggars and strangers come from Zeus did not always end favourably. A wanderer may be taken in, as the Phaeacians and Eumaeus took in Odysseus (*Od.* 7.159-71; 14.45-51), but he may also be refused, as Aiolos did the second time Odysseus arrived on his island (10.72-76), or mistreated, as Odysseus was at the hands of the suitors. Tyrtaeus, in order to remove any chance that his wanderer may be seen as one of the fortunate ones who is received by a host, even states: ἐχθρὸς μὲν γὰρ τοῖσι μετέσσειται οὐδ' κεν ἴκηται (he is hated, being among those to whom he comes; fr. 10.7). His wanderer roams on the outskirts of society, separated from social interactions with other Greeks and, though this is not stated outright by the poet, with the gods.

IV. Conclusion

Tyrtaeus alludes to Odysseus in order to argue for fighting in place and to dissuade soldiers from retreating, thus using these allusions in a similar fashion as his allusions to Hector. The allusions to Odysseus are more specific, though, than the allusions to Hector, and this reflects the need to differentiate among Odysseus' many sides. Tyrtaeus does not want the soldiers listening to emulate the hero's intelligence, but rather his ability to endure during battle. Nor does he want them to reflect on how Odysseus endured the hardships of a wandering life until he accomplished his homecoming; he wants the audience instead to remember only the hardships and agree with Odysseus that nothing is worse for mortals than wandering.

Tyrtaeus' positive allusions to Odysseus mostly derive from the *Iliad*. There Odysseus stands as one warrior among many and as a warrior who benefits the common cause of the Achaeans the most. The first set of allusions discussed, the epithets, refer to

specific points when Odysseus is featured in a display of martial excellence, as are the allusions to his decision to stand and fight and his rejection of flight from battle. These instances demonstrate the applicability of endurance to warfare, a quality which is extremely important for hoplites to possess and which Tyrtaeus stresses and eulogizes repeatedly in his poetry. Finally, Tyrtaeus appropriates the image of Agamemnon and his tone of censure from his rebuke in *Iliad* 4 to single out and compel the γυμνήτες in fragment 11 to fight to the best of their ability and prove their worth to the group, much as Agamemnon does to Odysseus.

The negative allusions to Odysseus originate in the *Odyssey* for the most part. Tyrtaeus, even more so than promoting endurance and steadfastness in battle, needs to stigmatize retreat and flight due to its detrimental effect on the entire phalanx formation. The *Odyssey* provides the necessary material for this purpose through its illustration of the life of a wanderer, albeit one who journeys to fantastic lands. Tyrtaeus conflates the coward and the wanderer in fragment 10, and he prophesizes a doomed life for this man, one spent wandering Greece with his entire family, bereft of a πόλις to which they can return, as they are forced to beg and search out food to survive. In addition to this, Tyrtaeus draws on Odysseus' flight in *Iliad* 8 to present the form of death that opposes the καλὸς θάνατος: a death from behind that comes when fleeing the battlefield.

The next chapter will focus on the final hero of this study, Achilles. Achilles differs from Odysseus and Hector in that he is a potentially divisive hero due to his entirely aristocratic nature and in that he does not spend the majority of the *Iliad* on the battlefield. Tyrtaeus does not, however, use him as an example of what not to do, but

rather as a lure alongside Hector, as a promise of what may happen, should his audience fight on the battlefield and win glory for their πόλις and families.

Chapter 4

Achilles and the Aristocratic Ethos

Achilles in the *Iliad* embodies a certain aristocratic ethos; he is concerned with his status in relation to the other Greeks and his proper allotment of τιμή. He is the ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν (the best of the Achaeans; *Il.* 1.224, 412, 274), and he follows the heroic/aristocratic path of being a “speaker of words and a doer of deeds” (μύθων τε ῥητῆρ’ ... πρηκτῆρά τε ἔργων; *Il.* 9.443).¹ Achilles is thus a different hero than those to which Tyrtaeus alludes in his poetry, especially considering the Spartan poet’s preference for non-divisive heroes as displayed in his allusions to Odysseus and Hector. Furthermore, Achilles, despite his status as ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν, spends most of the *Iliad* away from the battlefield, and when he does return to it, his behaviour is marked by rage and excess. He excels in speed, but this is not a beneficial quality for a hoplite to have, and Tyrtaeus expends a great deal of his poetry diminishing any positive aspect of running. Despite this, Tyrtaeus 12 contains a blatant allusion to Achilles and draws on the aristocratic ethic of “always be the best” more than any other poem of Tyrtaeus.

Achilles and the aristocratic ethos of competition serve as a means to elevate the new members of the phalanx and, to some extent, equalize members of both classes. This is not to say that Tyrtaeus erases class differences and thus creates the “equal” class of *Homoioi* by applying aristocratic competitive values to the non-elites. Achilles and the aristocratic ethos are used instead to bring the non-elites to a level on which they can

¹ Nagy on Achilles’ status as ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν: “It is an overall Iliadic theme that Achilles is ‘best of the Achaeans’” (1979, 26). He is explicitly the ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν, versus Odysseus, who is implicitly the ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν because he brought about the fall of Troy (Nagy 1979, 41-2). See also Nagy 1979, 26-35 for an examination of the epithet ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν in the *Iliad*.

compete alongside the elites for glory and honour and thus participate in the elite culture of competition among equals. This then allows them to become a part of the elite group, even if they are not full equals of the traditional members of the group.

Furthermore, though Achilles does spend the majority of the *Iliad* distanced from the greater community of the Achaeans, our first view of him shows him as a leader concerned for the welfare of his men. He is the one who calls the Achaeans to assembly, not Agamemnon, when Apollo's plague threatens to kill the entire Achaean contingent (*Il.* 1.53-67). Previous to the quarrel with Agamemnon, Achilles is properly honoured by the Achaeans for his role as a war leader, Briseis being one of his prizes bestowed by the Achaeans, and during the quarrel with Agamemnon, the community's role as the distributor of prizes is repeatedly emphasized (*Iliad.* 1.123-9, 135-7, 162, 165-7). The Achaean community then preserves Achilles' κλέος by properly burying and mourning him, and the event, complete with funeral games, is detailed by Agamemnon in the second *Nekuia* (*Od.* 24. 43-94).²

This chapter will begin with a discussion of fragment 12 in relation to the rest of Tyrtaeus' work; it is unusual in relation to the other poems of the corpus, and on account of this, its authenticity has been questioned. The aristocratic ἀρεταί with which this poem begins and their place in Greek athletic competition will then be discussed along with how Tyrtaeus, in making martial ἀρετή the key to winning the best prize (ἄεθλον... ἄριστον), creates a level of competition in which both elites and non-elites can participate. This chapter will then finish with a discussion of Tyrtaeus' allusion to

² Achilles' funeral and its connection to the promulgation of κλέος follows similar connections made at *Odyssey* 1.239-40, 14.369-70, and 24.32-3, where the speakers connect the continuation of κλέος with a burial mound made by the Achaeans. See also *Iliad* 23 and 24 for Patrocles' and Hector's funerals respectively and the participation of the Achaean and Trojan communities in the mourning.

Achilles' immortal fame and the reward for fighting on behalf of the πόλις, which both serves as a lure to encourage young men to fight and stands alongside the allusion to Hector's funeral in order to provide a reciprocal model of relations between the πόλις and the warrior.

I. Fragment 12

οὔτ' ἄν μνησαίμην οὔτ' ἐν λόγῳ ἄνδρα τιθεῖν
οὔτε ποδῶν ἀρετῆς οὔτε παλαιμοσύνης,
οὐδ' εἰ Κυκλώπων μὲν ἔχοι μέγεθός τε βίην τε,
νικώϊη δὲ θεῶν Θρηίκιον Βορέην,
οὐδ' εἰ Τιθωνοῖο φυὴν χαριέστερος εἶη, (5)
πλουτοίη δὲ Μίδεω καὶ Κινύρεω μάλιον,
οὐδ' εἰ Τανταλίδεω Πέλοπος βασιλεύτερος εἶη,
γλῶσσαν δ' Ἀδρήστου μειλιχόγηρυν ἔχοι,
οὐδ' εἰ πᾶσαν ἔχοι δόξαν πλὴν θούριδος ἀλκῆς·
οὐ γὰρ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γίνεται ἐν πολέμῳ (10)
εἰ μὴ τετλαίη μὲν ὄρῳ φόνον αἱματόεντα,
καὶ δηίων ὀρέγοιτ' ἐγγύθεν ἰστάμενος.
ἦδ' ἀρετῆ, τόδ' ἄεθλον ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἄριστον
κάλλιστόν τε φέρειν γίνεται ἀνδρὶ νέῳ.
ξυνὸν δ' ἐσθλὸν τοῦτο πόλῃ τε παντί τε δήμῳ, (15)
ὅστις ἀνὴρ διαβάς ἐν προμάχοισι μένη
νωλεμέως, αἰσχροῦς δὲ φυγῆς ἐπὶ πάγχυ λάθηται,
ψυχὴν καὶ θυμὸν τλήμονα παρθέμενος,
θαρσύνη δ' ἔπεσιν τὸν πλησίον ἄνδρα παρεστώς·
οὗτος ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γίνεται ἐν πολέμῳ. (20)
αἴψα δὲ δυσαμενέων ἀνδρῶν ἔτρεψε φάλαγγας
τρηχειάς· σπουδῆ δ' ἔσχεθε κῦμα μάχης,
αὐτὸς δ' ἐν προμάχοισι πεσῶν φίλον ἄλεσε θυμὸν,
ἄστυ τε καὶ λαοὺς καὶ πατέρ' εὐκλείσας,
πολλὰ διὰ στέρνοιο καὶ ἀσπίδος ὀμφαλοέσσης (25)
καὶ διὰ θώρηκος πρόσθεν ἐληλάμενος.
τὸν δ' ὀλοφύρονται μὲν ὁμῶς νέοι ἠδὲ γέροντες,
ἀργαλέῳ δὲ πόθῳ πᾶσα κέκηδε πόλις,
καὶ τύμβος καὶ παῖδες ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀρίσημοι
καὶ παῖδων παῖδες καὶ γένος ἐξοπίσω· (30)
οὐδέ ποτε κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀπόλλυται οὐδ' ὄνομ' αὐτοῦ,
ἀλλ' ὑπο γῆς περ ἐὼν γίνεται ἀθάνατος,
ὄντιν' ἀριστεύοντα μένοντά τε μαρνάμενόν τε
γῆς πέρι καὶ παῖδων θοῦρος Ἴαρης ὀλέσῃ.
εἰ δὲ φύγη μὲν κῆρα τανηλεγέος θανάτοιο, (35)
νικήσας δ' αἰχμῆς ἀγλαὸν εὖχος ἔλη,

πάντες μιν τιμῶσιν, ὁμῶς νέοι ἠδὲ παλαιοί,
 πολλὰ δὲ τερπνὰ παθῶν ἔρχεται εἰς Αἴδην,
 γηράσκων δ' ἄστοῖσι μεταπρέπει, οὐδὲ τις αὐτὸν
 βλάπτειν οὔτ' αἰδοῦς οὔτε δίκης ἐθέλει, (40)
 πάντες δ' ἐν θόκοισιν ὁμῶς νέοι οἳ τε κατ' αὐτὸν
 εἴκουσ' ἐκ χώρης οἳ τε παλαιότεροι.
 ταύτης νῦν τις ἀνὴρ ἀρετῆς εἰς ἄκρον ἰκέσθαι
 πειράσθω θυμῶι μὴ μεθιεις πολέμου.

I would not recall a man nor place him in speech not for excellence of foot nor of wrestling, not even if he should have the stature and strength of the Cyclopes, and he could defeat Thracian Boreas in running, not even if he should be more charming in appearance than Tithonos, and more wealthy than Midas and Kinyras, not even if he should be more kingly than Tantalid Pelops, and he should have the soft-voiced tongue of Adrastus, not even if he should have every repute except raging courage; for a man is not good in war unless he can endure when he sees the bloody slaughter, and can attack while standing near to the enemy. This excellence, this prize is the best and most noble among men for a young man to bear. This is a common good to the city and to the entire people, when a man remains unceasingly while standing among the fore-fighters, and when he ignores shameful flight entirely, risking his life and enduring spirit, and speaks encouraging words when standing near to a man; this man is good in war. He turns the sharp phalanx of hostile men; he holds the wave of battle with zeal, and this man loses his dear life falling among the fore-fighters, honouring well his city and people and father, being struck many times through his chest and bossed shield and through the front of his breastplate. Young and old mourn him equally, and the entire city is struck by grievous sorrow, and his tomb and his children are notable among men, even his children's children and his family hereafter; never does his noble fame perish nor his name, but even though he is under the ground he is immortal, whomever furious Ares kills while being the best by remaining and fighting on behalf of his land and children. But if he flees the fate of death which lays men out, and by being victorious he takes a splendid boast with his spear, then all allot him honours, equally the young and the elders, and having experienced many joys he goes to Hades, and being old he is eminent among the townsmen, and no one wishes to deprive him of respect or just right, but all yield their place on the benches to him, the young men, the men of his own age, and the men older than him. Now, let every man attempt to arrive at the peak of this virtue with all his heart, not shirking in war.

Fragment 12 differs from the rest of Tyrtaeus' work in both theme and form. No other extant poem begins with a priamel nor spends as much time reflecting on a subject, and some scholars thus posit a fourth century date for this, arguing that it is too well

developed to have been written in the seventh century.³ This opinion, however, has been refuted by both Snell and Jaeger, and Lugenbill asserts that the “structural uniqueness merely serves to show that the approach used by Tyrtaeus in 12 is unlike that employed in his other poems.”⁴ Furthermore, the priamel and discussion of ἀρετή in 12 parallel priamels and discussions of ἀρετή in other archaic poetry and philosophy, some of it roughly contemporaneous with Tyrtaeus and some of it later (for example, Solon 13, Sappho 16, Xenophanes 2, Theognis 699-718, and Heraclitus of Ephesus fr. 49).

Thematically, several scholars note that this poem, which glorifies the individual and warfare, does not correspond with the remainder of the corpus, where the brutalities of war are openly acknowledged and where the tone is of endurance instead of youthful daring.⁵ It must be remembered, however, that of the total works attributed to Tyrtaeus by the *Suda*- a constitution, precepts in elegiac verse, and five books of war songs- we have very little today.⁶ Fragment 12 may not be unusual for Tyrtaeus, but without further material it is impossible to say. Furthermore, as Jaeger notes, the emphasis on martial courage, fighting and even dying in place, and rejection of flight are familiar themes in Tyrtaeus’ work.⁷ The meditation on the ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός, though long, is also not without

³ Hermann Fränkel, *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy: A History of Greek epic, lyric, and prose to the middle of the fifth century*, trans. Moses Hadas and James Willis, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975), 337-9. See, however, Bowra 1960, 62 for an early argument against this view: “The poem is the most literary, the most original, and the best constructed of the surviving works of Tyrtaeus.” On the amount of time spent reflecting, see Faraone 2008, 100. Faraone also ascribes the oddity of this long meditation to changes in performance contexts between the original composition date and the classical period (100-8).

⁴ *Tyrtaios und die Sprache des Epos* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1969), 27-36; “Tyrtaeus on True *Arete*,” in *Five Essays* trans. Adele M. Fiske (Montreal: Mario Casalini Ltd, 1966), 104-12; “Tyrtaeus 12 West,” 406. In addition to these arguments, there is also the almost verbatim repetition of 12.13-6 in Theognis 1003-6, which supports an earlier composition date for Tyrtaeus 12.

⁵ See Lugenbill 2002, 405-7 for a discussion of the scholarly debate on the poem’s authenticity and 412-3 for a comparison of the main themes in 12 to the rest of the corpus.

⁶ Gerber connects the “constitution” to fr. 4, *Eunomia* (1999, 25 n.3).

⁷ “Tyrtaeus,” 123. See also Fuqua 1981, 217, where he agrees with Jaeger on this point but notes that this poem “lacks the graphic immediacy of such poems as 10W, 11W, or the vivid fragments of the battlefield narrative of the Berlin papyrus (cf. 18-23W).

parallels in the corpus: Tyrtaeus reflects on the coward and his life in fragment 10.3-10, although in fewer lines.

The poem begins with a priamel which disregards a series of ἀρεταί until Tyrtaeus comes to martial valour, which he pronounces to be the best and most useful. Jaeger and Bowra both argue that this discussion of ἀρετή presents a new definition of ἀρετή, in which the previous ἀρετή of heroic excellence is transformed to benefit the πόλις alone.⁸ Other scholars, such as Campbell and Tarkow, argue for a restructuring of the relative values of these ἀρεταί, where martial ἀρετή becomes the most valuable.⁹ The key to this argument is that Tyrtaeus subordinates them to martial ἀρετή in the context of war; he does not disregard them out of hand, as Xenophanes later would, a point that Jaeger himself notes.¹⁰ After the issue of ἀρετή is the issue of Tyrtaeus' "patriotism," which has

⁸ Jaeger states that "when he [Tyrtaeus] cries out ἡδ' ἀρετή, he is transforming this value" and that "it is the first time in Greek history that this thought [the connection of ἀρετή with ξυνὸν δ' ἐσθλόν] appears" (1966, 120). Bowra states "This is the first time that this idea is to be found in Greece" (1960, 65). See also Shey 1976, 8, where he follows Jaeger's argument.

⁹ *Greek Lyric*, 177-8; "Tyrtaeus 9D," 52. Campbell argues that the emphasis should be "this ἀρετή" instead of "this is ἀρετή," and Tarkow "the hierarchical relationship of different forms of human activity is very much on the poet's mind." See also Fowler 1987, 32, who also agrees with Campbell, and Fuqua 1981, 218 n.10 for a discussion of the debate over whether Tyrtaeus redefines ἀρετή or revalues it in relation to other ἀρεταί.

¹⁰ "Tyrtaeus," 188. Xenophanes, after describing the honours that athletic victors receive from their πόλις states:

οὐκ ἔων ἄξιος ὥσπερ ἐγώ· ῥώμης γὰρ ἀμείνων
 ἀνδρῶν ἡδ' ἵππων ἡμετέρη σοφίη.
 ἀλλ' εἰκῆ μάλα τοῦτο νομίζεται, οὐδὲ δίκαιον
 προκρίνειν ῥώμην τῆς ἀγαθῆς σοφίης·
 οὔτε γὰρ εἰ πύκτης ἀγαθὸς λαοῖσι μετεῖη
 οὔτ' εἰ πενταθλεῖν οὔτε παλαιμοσύνην,
 οὐδὲ μὲν εἰ ταχυτῆτι ποδῶν, τόπερ ἐστὶ πρότιμον
 ῥώμης ὅσσ' ἀνδρῶν ἔργ' ἐν ἀγῶνι πέλει,
 τούνεκεν ἂν δὴ μᾶλλον ἐν εὐνομίῃ πόλις εἴη

The athlete is not worthy as I am; for my skill is better than the strength of men or horses. But this is held as custom heedlessly, for it is not more proper to prefer strength over good skill; for not even if there is a good boxer among the people, nor even if there is a man good at the pentathlon nor in wrestling, nor in the swiftness of his feet, that which is the most honoured of such deeds of men' strength that are in the contest, would the city be in better order on account of these (2.11-9).

For line 17, I follow Campbell's (1982) punctuation and omit the comma at the line end; West gives the line end comma.

already been discussed in chapter 2 in relation to Hector. In fragment 12, the loaded phrase is ξυνὸν ... ἐσθλόν (common good), which has led scholars to argue along with Tarkow that “in 9 [fragment 12 West], the state’s importance is afforded the highest priority.”¹¹ ξυνὸν ἐσθλόν, which both Jaeger and Lugenbill link with the later phrase κοινὸν ἀγαθόν (common good), makes Tyrtaeus’ conception of ἀρετή something that is a benefit to all; it is “common” or “public.”¹² Jaeger links this phrase to the rise of a new political consciousness in which the state is supreme over the individual, as do Snell, Tigerstadt, and Prato following him.¹³ Lugenbill, however, argues that ἀρετή was always considered to be a quality that benefited more than just the person possessing it and that therefore Tyrtaeus’ conception “falls short of the extraordinary in the context of Greek usage elsewhere.”¹⁴ I am inclined to agree with Lugenbill, that Tyrtaeus is not proposing a radically new idea, but I do believe that he makes the concept of ἀρετή more specific here. Tyrtaeus does not pronounce the superiority of the state over the individual, but rather he emphasizes the social responsibilities which the soldiers have. I would also argue that this phrase and its connection to ἀρετή and to the πόλις in the poem serve to temper the aristocratic nature of the poem rather than to display any “patriotism” on

¹¹ “Tyrtaeus 9D,” 54.

¹² “Tyrtaeus,” 120; “Tyrtaeus 12 West,” 408. Snell (1969, 21) and Prato (1968, 130), however, link this phrase not to κοινὸν ἀγαθόν but to ξυνὸν κακόν, a phrase which appears in the wasp simile in *Iliad* 16.259-265 (at 262), and Snell argues that just as an individual’s actions can cause harm to the community, conversely they can also be a benefit for the community (1969, 21). See also Snell 1969, 21-6 for his discussion of ξυνὸν ἐσθλόν and its Homeric connections.

¹³ “Tyrtaeus,” 120; *Tyrtaios*, 21; *The Legend of Sparta*, 50; *Tirteo* (Roma: Edizioni dell’Ateneo, 1968), 130. Jaeger argues that Tyrtaeus’ poetry “is the first time in Greek history that this thought appears... Here is the criterion which is the test of any true arete is announced: the value it has for the common welfare of the polis” (1966, 120). Likewise, Prato in his commentary states, “La sua apparizione segna un’evidente frattura... con le concezioni affermatesi nella oligarchia aristocratica della società omerica e propone per la prima volta alla coscienza del cittadino la preminenza assoluta dello Stato” (1968, 130).

¹⁴ “Tyrtaeus 12 West,” 408-9. In making this argument, Lugenbill follows the definition of ἀρετή given by Adkins: “Those [the men who possess ἀρετή] who are able effectively to defend the group, accordingly, must unite in themselves courage, strength, wealth, and high birth; and since these are the qualities of which society holds itself to be most in need, they are denoted and commended by *agathos*, *esthlos*, and *arete*” (1972, 13).

Tyrtaeus' part. The state is important in this poem, but it is not so as a political entity, but rather as a social collective of citizens who are able to allot honours to the soldiers who are a part of this community.

Lugenbill, arguing that the poem is not aimed at warriors in battle, suggests that the poem is a piece of political rhetoric aimed at persuading young men to join the army.¹⁵ This argument does account for 12's tone of glory and heroic exploits, though without knowing how the Spartans filled the ranks at this period, it is difficult to say whether this fragment is a recruitment piece, as Lugenbill argues, or not. In the later archaic period, it was a citizen's duty, both at Sparta and elsewhere, to serve in the army. The Homeric epics seem to depict a system where a βασιλεύς leads some, but not necessarily all, of his followers to war, but it is impossible to tell how much this pertains to the early archaic period. The requirement that citizens, at least those who had the proper armour, serve in the army likely came into play along with the phalanx due to the formation's need for numbers.¹⁶

II. Aristocratic ἀρεταί

The ἀρεταί which Tyrtaeus rejects at the beginning of fragment 12 are ἀρεταί of foot or running (ποδῶν, νικώη δὲ θέων), which he rejects twice, wrestling (παλαμοσύνης), stature and strength (μέγεθός τε βίην τε), beauty (φυὴν χαριέστερος), wealth (πλουτοίη), kingliness (βασιλεύτερος), and speaking (γλῶσσαν... μιλιχόγηρυν). These nine lines are, according to Shey, "hyperbolic and negative" as Tyrtaeus makes sure to cast all of these ἀρεταί in as negative a light as possible by selecting only mythic

¹⁵ "Tyrtaeus 12 West," 407, 409. Likewise, Fuqua states that "the poem is a bold, energetic work which makes a vigorous appeal for service to the state" (1981, 217).

¹⁶ See Raaflaub 1997, 52-3, where he links the rise of citizen armies, versus the aristocratic raiding bands, with increased population and widespread wealth and with the new organizational structures in the πόλις that this then required.

examples that ended poorly.¹⁷ His use of οὐδ' εἰ (not even if) in lines 3-9 increases the improbability of someone possessing these qualities impressing him and thus continues to subordinate them to martial courage, as does the rapid mention and rejection of ἀρεταί.¹⁸

Jaeger frames these lines in terms of an elaborate challenge of the status quo made in the time of extreme danger to the Spartan state.¹⁹ Tarkow links these ἀρεταί to the problems that the fourth century Spartan government would face: “the real problems with the Spartan system (problems over leadership, proneness to bribery, and so on...) may well justify Tyrtaeus’ rejection [of the ἀρεταί].”²⁰ Setting aside Tarkow’s retrojection of Spartan values and political problems from the fifth and fourth century to the seventh century, I do not think that Tyrtaeus rejects these ἀρεταί due to their place in the Spartan government, but rather for their place in the new Panhellenic games. In this, Tyrtaeus views the athletic games in a similar, though less extreme, fashion as Xenophanes, who rejects athletic ἀρεταί out of hand in fragment 2. The games were popular with the elite, and the ἀρεταί that Tyrtaeus disparages formed the core of aristocratic competition, especially wrestling and running, which was highly valued by the aristocrats due to its connection with Achilles.²¹ The Panhellenic games rose in popularity in the early archaic age; the Olympics were founded, according to tradition, in 776 and the other three major games- the Isthmian, Pythian, and Nemean games- all have a founding date roughly

¹⁷ “Tyrtaeus and the Art of Propaganda,” *Arethusa* 9 (1976): 13. See also pp. 5-13 for a discussion of how all the mythic *exempla* are figures who ultimately failed or ended badly.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 7; Tarkow, “Tyrtaeus 9D,” 65.

¹⁹ Jaeger on this rejection of elite values: “There are the illustrious gentlemen, the Olympian victors, the city’s pride. They are the beautiful, the rich, the bearers of royal dignity, together with the eloquent city senators, the *gerontes*; yet the speaker of our poem with his first line ... hurls his challenge into the very face of the elite, embodying all the supreme ἀρεταί of the ancient Greek aristocrat... He declares all their glory null and void” (1966, 117).

²⁰ “Tyrtaeus 9D,” 51.

²¹ Shey “Art of Propaganda,” 14; Jaeger “Tyrtaeus,” 129, 133.

contemporaneous with the adoption of the phalanx.²² They provided a venue for elites of the various πόλεις to interact and compete against one another. Though there was no rule against non-elites participating, the games nonetheless were aristocratic due to the cost of travel, stay, and training.²³

The popularity of athletic competition has been posited as a preparation for hoplite warfare, which required a higher level of fitness due to the weight of armour and the prolonged fighting.²⁴ M. Golden, however, has argued convincingly that the popularity of athletic competition was due to the elite community's reaction against the new form of warfare rather than from any desire to prepare for it.²⁵ With the inclusion of new fighters on the battlefield, the elites turned to the athletic competitions which required a greater amount of time and wealth than most could afford, even the new members of the hoplite class. The games thus became the new means for them to distance themselves from the remainder of the population and distinguish themselves within their own panhellenic community.

This distance then creates boundaries and differences between the hoplite classes; the ability to compete athletically becomes a marker of elite group status. Tyrtaeus must break down these boundaries that prevent the new members of the hoplite class from competing alongside the elites in order to integrate the various members of the phalanx. Competition in the Greek world was marked by the participation of social equals, and it revolved around the heroic code of "always be the best."²⁶ The ability of the elites to

²² Mark Golden, *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 25.

²³ *Ibid.*, 143-4

²⁴ Jean Delorme, *Gymnasion* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1960), 24-30; H.D. Evjen "Competitive athletics in ancient Greece: the search for origins and influences," *Opuscula Atheniensia* 16 (1986): 54-5.

²⁵ *Sport and Society*, 27-8.

²⁶ On the participation of social equals, see Finkelberg 1998, 1; on heroic ideology in the games, see Golden 1998, 27.

compete on a level that the non-elites could not would mean that there would be tensions within the members of the phalanx that could fragment the formation. There would be a fundamental difference between the two groups that would fracture the “equality” of the phalanx and of the soldiers. Tyrtaeus thus subordinates the ἀρεταί that form the core of aristocratic competition and of heroic excellence to martial courage, a standard which can be judged in the close packed formation of the phalanx, as J.E. Lendon has argued.²⁷

When the formation is as close and contains as many men as the phalanx does, those who do not measure up and desert cannot hide; they are noticed. Likewise, those who remain are also noticed, if only by those marshalled alongside them. This judging standard, and the fact that the soldiers’ comrades are their judges, makes martial ἀρετή a group competition on the model of modern team sports, where there is both competition against another team and competition within the team for distinctions such as “most valuable player” and “rookie of the year.”²⁸

More importantly, though, by making martial courage the form of competition, Tyrtaeus removes wealth and time requirements from the competition. The field on which the participants compete is the battlefield, and not some faraway sanctuary, and the competition consists of holding ranks and fighting; no special training is needed, because the phalanx is conducive to amateur soldiers, perhaps uniquely so. Everyone thus can

²⁷ “[T]he ethos that lay underneath this cooperation [of fighting in the phalanx] was only superficially cooperative, for those who fought in the seemingly unheroic phalanx conceived of what they were doing in Homeric terms...Performance in hoplite battle was conceived as a great competition between individuals, just as fighting was in epic” (2005, 45). For Lendon’s argument that the need to compete in warfare drove the Greeks to prefer the defensive fighting of the phalanx, see especially pp. 39-77. Lendon relies heavily on the competition nature of his argument, though he does note that the Greeks chose an unusual route if they based their form of warfare on the need to compete (“If the Greeks had wanted a more perfect competition between individuals, they could have surrounded one-on-one fighting with rules and taboos and become a nation of duelists, going down the road upon which feudal Europe and old Japan would travel a great distance,” 57). See Schwartz 2009, 16-7 for a discussion and critique of Lendon’s argument.

²⁸ Thus Tarkow states that martial ἀρετή “is realized only in the context of a group, for the presence of comrades similarly committed to the new definition of arete provides the framework for its very existence” (1983, 53).

compete, and as they are competing with one another- elite and non-elite- they become social equals, striving against one another for the prize of ἀρετή. They all compete for the ἄεθλον ... ἄριστον κάλλιστόν τε (the best and most noble prize), and “the aspiring warrior... takes the athlete’s place.”²⁹

The aristocratic ἀρεταί only compose the first part of the priamel, however. The remainder of the ἀρεταί are also aristocratic in nature, and their place in the priamel is to make certain that Tyrtaeus’ soldiers, unlike some of Homer’s heroes, do not value other aristocratic values over the ability to fight. Wealth, royal lineage, beauty, and speaking ability are all placed below martial ἀρετή, just as the athletic ἀρεταί were. Βασιλεύτερος even recalls the debate between Achilles and Agamemnon in *Iliad* 1, where the king of Mycenae maintains his right to lead the expedition through his bloodlines and by the superior number of men he leads. Tyrtaeus, by valuing martial ability over bloodline and by using Pelops, the grandfather of Agamemnon, as his mythic exemplar, throws his opinion behind Achilles, who bases his claim to leadership on his battlefield prowess. His rejection of beauty is aimed at the καλοὶ κ’ἀγαθοί, who may, as Achilles was, be beautiful, but without the hero’s fighting ability, are not as ‘good’ as an ugly man who can fight. Speaking ability and wealth can apply to both the old aristocracy and the newer members of the hoplite classes. The subordination of speaking ability to martial prowess continues Tyrtaeus’ rejection of Odysseus’ traits of speaking and cunning.³⁰ These ἀρεταί and their subordination thus continue to place martial courage above all other aristocratic values and practices, though it does not reject them out of hand.

Tyrtaeus also makes sure to include, even if it is only slightly, the new members of the

²⁹ Lugenbill “Tyrtaeus 12 West,” 411.

³⁰ Pittacus also rejects the ability to speak in favour of the ability to fight, though his motivation was likely more political than Tyrtaeus’ due to his participation in the civil war in Mytilene (in Bergk 1882).

hoplite classes; they may be rich and they may be able to speak well, but they still need to be able to fight well.

Tyrtaeus thus subordinates the traditional aristocratic ἀρεταί to martial courage and co-opts the traditional field of competition and transfers it to the battlefield, where both elites and non-elites can participate. This universal participation then creates a new social group, one composed of all the soldiers who vie with one another in displaying θούριδος ἀλκῆς in order to acquire the prize (ἄεθλον) of ἀρετή. Tyrtaeus provides a common prize that is desirable to all- ἀρετή- and their competition with one another equalizes them, not completely, but enough to increase cohesion within the ranks and to decrease tension among the soldiers. Having done so, Tyrtaeus then alludes to the exemplar of heroic behaviour and aristocratic values to provide a lure to fight, aimed at the would-be-heroes in his audience.

III. Achilles and Immortal Glory

As noted at the beginning of the chapter, Achilles is an unusual hero for Tyrtaeus to allude to in his poetry; Odysseus and Hector can not only appeal to both classes, but they are communal heroes who participate fully in their communities, or as fully as possible in the case of Odysseus. Achilles, though he does demonstrate concern for the Achaeans in *Iliad* 1, leaves the war when Agamemnon slights his honour. His concern for τιμή and his exemplification of the heroic code- he is the best of the Achaeans, the most beautiful, and the fastest- marks him as an aristocrat. Achilles is one type of hero among many, and his type is potentially destructive. When his honour is damaged, he retreats and even demands that the community suffer so that his honour may be redeemed. Once he decides to fight again, however, he does benefit the Achaean cause,

though his disregard for the social practices of eating and gift-giving needs to be overcome by Odysseus (*Il.* 19.140-281). Tyrtaeus' allusion to Achilles in fragment 12, following the subordination of athletic ἀρεταί, fits perfectly as the poet attempts to turn the minds of the younger men in his audience from athletic competition to warfare. The allusion to Achilles in fragment 12 stands out; the paragon of ἀρετή dies, winning himself undying glory and name (οὐδέ ποτε κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀπόλλυται οὐδ' ὄνομ' αὐτοῦ; never does his noble fame perish nor his name, 31). The phrase οὐδέ ποτε κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀπόλλυται combines the Homeric formula κλέος οὐποτ' ὀλεῖται (fame will never be destroyed) and the noun-epithet combination of κλέος ἐσθλὸν (noble fame).³¹ κλέος οὐποτ' ὀλεῖται occurs twice in the *Iliad*, where it is first used concerning the κλέος gained from conquering Troy (2.325) and then for Hector's κλέος which he will win by defeating the best Achaean champion in a duel (7.91). The phrase also appears once in the *Odyssey* when Agamemnon, upon hearing how Odysseus regained his home and standing in Ithaca, exclaims that for her role in it, Penelope's κλέος οὐποτ' ὀλεῖται (24.196). The prominence of the promise of undying glory in Tyrtaeus' poem then brings to mind the two possible fates which Achilles claims in his refusal of Agamemnon's gifts:

³¹ Lugenbill sees κλέος ἐσθλὸν as an archaism in this "modern" poem of Tyrtaeus' and states that "such stress on individuality seems all the more strange in the context of the Spartan *agoge* (or, for that matter, of the massed phalanx), renowned for suppressing the same" (2002, 412). He also concedes that such emphasis on individuality can cast doubt on the authenticity of this poem as "its focus upon the myth of individual glory runs counter not only to Tyrtaeus' other poems, but also to what we might expect to be issuing forth from Sparta at this time (especially in the midst of a long and bloody war that would have easily given the lie to this myth)" (413). This stress on individuality and the use of Homeric formula is not, though, enough to cast doubt on this poem, and though the individualism in fr. 12 is unlike that in the remainder of the corpus, it does not run counter to Spartan values promulgated through the *agoge*. This is chiefly because it is highly unlikely that the *agoge* has been instituted at this period, and if it had, we do not know what was taught in it (see Kennell 1995 for a thorough discussion of what we do know about the Spartan *agoge* and how this information, which is predominately 4th century on later, can be used to understand the earlier form of the *agoge*). Lugenbill has transposed the values of Classical Sparta onto this early period.

εἰ μὲν κ' αὔθι μένων Τρώων πόλιν ἀμφιμάχωμαι,
 ὤλετο μὲν μοι νόστος, ἀτὰρ κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται·
 εἰ δέ κεν οἴκαδ' ἵκωμαι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,
 ὤλετό μοι κλέος ἐσθλὸν, ἐπὶ δηρὸν δέ αἰὼν
 ἔσσεται, οὐδέ κέ μ' ὄκα τέλος θανάτοιο κιχεῖη

If, remaining here, I should fight around the Trojan city, then my homecoming will be destroyed, but there will be imperishable fame for me; but if I should arrive at home, in my dear fatherland, then my noble fame will be destroyed, but there will be a long life for me, and the end of death would not overtake me quickly (*Il.* 9.412-6)

Fame and homecoming are mutually exclusive here; Achilles cannot have both.³²

Though Homer's audience all knew that Achilles would fight, that he would choose eternal glory over a safe homecoming, Achilles at this moment favours the latter fate of growing old at home, for he feels that he has not been properly honoured for his participation in the war against Troy.

Though Tyrtaeus does not allude to *Iliad* 9 directly, Achilles' announcement and use of the phrase κλέος ἄφθιτον is striking enough to attach itself to the concept of eternal κλέος even if the above passage itself is not a part of the allusion. The Homeric passage to which Tyrtaeus does directly allude through the combination of name and "noble fame" is the second *Nekuia* in the *Odyssey*, when Agamemnon expounds on how much more preferable Achilles' death in battle is to his own:

ὥς σὺ μὲν οὐδὲ θανὼν ὄνομ' ὤλεσας, ἀλλὰ τοι αἰεὶ
 πάντα ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους κλέος ἔσσεται ἐσθλὸν, Ἀχιλλεῦ

So when you died, you did not destroy your name, but your noble fame will always be among all men, Achilles (*Od.* 24. 93-4)

³² It is highly likely that the homecoming option was never valid. Achilles, however, is angry and possibly fantasizing about returning home, a move which would harm Agamemnon and his expedition the most.

Tyrtaeus combines in fragment 12.31 the οὐδὲ... ὄνομ' ὄλεσας and κλέος ... ἐσθλὸν from the *Odyssey* as he comes to the end of the life of his ideal soldier.³³ The allusion to this passage in Tyrtaeus 12 provides an anchor for the general correspondence of 12.31 with *Iliad* 9.412-6. Both Homeric passages furnish support for Tyrtaeus' claim that a man who fights and dies on the model of his paragon of ἀρετή in fragment 12 will receive undying glory and thus obtain a form of immortality.

This passage thus continues Tyrtaeus' use of heroic concepts in relation to the phalanx and fighting in a group as a single unit and his restriction of the heroic rewards: the soldier who fights on behalf of his fatherland and children (τε μαρνάμενόν τε / γῆς πέρι καὶ παίδων; 33-4) is the only one worthy of undying κλέος.³⁴ Fuqua has taken these lines to illustrate a “sentiment... without parallel in epic tradition,” where the diction does not differ from epic, but the temper does.³⁵ Homer does not require that his heroes fight for a particular reason to sing of their exploits; they just need to fight. Tyrtaeus, on the other hand, does place a requirement upon his praise and upon receiving honours from the community. He thus makes the Homeric connection between fighting and glory more specific by requiring the would-be heroes to fight on behalf of the πατρίς or γῆ.

Though an allusion to Achilles allows Tyrtaeus to present the reward of eternal fame, this allusion and the Homeric connection between fighting and fame nonetheless provides a problem for Tyrtaeus: Achilles only wins immortal fame by dying. In the epics, the death of a hero is not necessarily bad; epic by its own nature continues and

³³ Theognis will later combine ὄνομ' ὄλεσας and κλέος ἄφθιτον in 245-6 in his extension of the role of poetry as a preservation of κλέος. In this he differs from Tyrtaeus, who maintains poetry's role in preserving κλέος, but makes sure that it is secondary to the community's role in maintaining the soldier's κλέος.

³⁴ Another example of this, discussed in chapter 2, is the reference to the καλὸς θάνατος.

³⁵ “Tyrtaeus and the Cult of Heroes,” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 22 (1981): 216. Fuqua draws on Jaeger's arguments concerning “political immortality” (1959, 138) here.

increases the κλέος of the hero whose story it relates. In the real world and in Tyrtaeus' exhortations, this is not always the case, even though Tyrtaeus attempts to bridge this difference between the "real world" and the poetic realm by presenting himself in the position of bard (οὔτ' ἄν μνησαίμην οὔτ' ἐν λόγῳ ἄνδρα τιθείην; I would not recall nor place a man in speech, 12.1). Thus, in order to overcome the implication that the only reward for fighting comes along with death, Tyrtaeus presents two "positive" outcomes for those listening to him, though one still does entail the soldier's death. The first is the undying glory and name of the soldier who dies fighting (οὐδέ ποτε κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀπόλλυται οὐδ' ὄνομ' αὐτοῦ, 31), and the second reward is the allotment of continual honours by the πόλις and the citizen body for the living soldier (πάντες μιν τιμῶσιν, ὁμῶς νέοι ἠδὲ παλαιοί, 37).³⁶ These positive rewards present a reason to fight; they are a lure, a supplement to Tyrtaeus' other arguments of "fight because retreat is shameful" and "fight because it is your duty."

Tyrtaeus continues along the Homeric path as he connects fame with martial ability, though he leaves it soon after, as he requires that martial strength and ability always be present in order for fame to be present. Homer in *Iliad* 23 uses the funeral games as a secondary means to display his heroes' merit. Of the major heroes who compete, all except the Aiantes and Menelaus win their events, and Telamonian Ajax ties with Odysseus and Diomedes in the wrestling and close combat events respectively (23.735-39, 820-5).³⁷ While the majority of the heroes participating appear elsewhere in

³⁶ This second reward for fighting, the continual allotment of honours and enjoyment of them, actually corresponds to what Floyd argues to be the traditional meaning of κλέος ἄφθιτον based on its context in the Indic texts (1980, 135-51).

³⁷ Diomedes wins the chariot race (23.499-513), and though he ties with Aias, Achilles still gives him the victory prize for the close combat (824-5). Odysseus wins the foot-race (773-79), and Agamemnon the spear-throwing, though by default (890-97). Meriones, though he 'loses' to Agamemnon in spear-

the epic, three appear only in *Iliad* 23: Eumelos, Epeios, and Leonteus. Eumelos would have won the chariot race if Athena had not smashed his chariot yoke so that Diomedes would win (291-400); still he is given the second place prize (536-38). Epeios is the only one of the three to win against a hero listed in the Catalogue of Ships and previously mentioned in the fighting; he defeats Eurylaos in the boxing event (689-99).³⁸ Leonteus competes in the stone throwing event, and he loses to Polypoites, who also appears in the Catalogue of Ships (2.740) and in *Iliad* 6 and 12. The funeral games are thus a secondary means for enhancing the prestige of the heroes, though for three of the competitors the games are a primary means to establish their merit. Though Epeios is the only one to win his match, the other two still distinguish themselves among the mass of Achaeans simply by competing.

Tyrtaeus, on the other hand, declares that he will have none of this; whether or not he actually cares about athletic contests is moot, for in fragment 12 he presents himself as concerned only with martial prowess. Athletic ability is incidental, as is the presence of beauty or the ability to speak well. His focus on fighting ability again continues the Homeric connections of fame through martial deeds, and those deeds make a man worthy of song and the rewards bestowed upon those who fight. Tyrtaeus makes sure to place these rewards in the hands of the citizen body and the πόλις, just as he did with the promised communal mourning for the dead soldiers (12.27-30). This provides a model for the relations between the community and the soldiers, one that implies that the

throwing, defeats Teukros at archery (870-83). Thus, for the most part, the relative hierarchies among the heroes are maintained in the funeral games.

³⁸ Eurylaos appears at *Iliad* 2.565, 6.20-8, and in 23.677-99.

disastrous outcome of Agamemnon's and Achilles' interaction will not plague the soldiers listening to Tyrtaeus and their community.³⁹

Tyrtaeus' first fate for those who fight, that of dying in battle, also alludes to cult honours paid to dead heroes: οὐδέ ποτε κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀπόλλυται οὐδ' ὄνομ' αὐτοῦ / ἀλλ' ὑπο γῆς περ ἐὼν γίνεται ἀθάνατος (never does his noble fame perish nor his name, but though he is under the earth he is immortal; 31-2). As Fuqua has noted, line 32 brings Tyrtaeus' ideal soldier into the realm of hero cults.⁴⁰ The hero cult, which existed alongside the separate cult of the gods, began around the eighth century.⁴¹ The cult was situated at a *heroön*, the hero's tomb, or if there was no recognized tomb, where his bones were supposed to lie.⁴² The hero's worship also comprised a cultic feast where the hero was honoured by and in the company of the living.⁴³ This worship was usually city specific and often formed an integral part of city politics and sometimes even interstate relations.⁴⁴ Tyrtaeus' allusion to this form of worship, then, not only connects the Spartan soldiers with the heroes of the past, but it also suggests that the Spartans themselves will be venerated in similar fashion to heroes who have a hero cult.⁴⁵

³⁹ Fuqua, following Jaeger (1959, 138), argues that Tyrtaeus makes securing immortality for those fighting "the role of the state" (1981, 217). I think, however, that it would be more fitting to say that he makes it the role of the *community*, of the citizens who make up the πόλις. The important difference is that by ascribing such responsibilities to the community to which the soldiers belong instead of to the state, we do not ascribe a democratizing agenda to Tyrtaeus without any hard evidence of such an agenda.

⁴⁰ Fuqua on 31-2: "the full force of the couplet cannot be recognized until it is considered in light of Greek attitudes towards heroes and their cults" (1981, 217).

⁴¹ Jan N. Bremmer, "The Rise of the Hero Cult and the New Simonides," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 158 (2006): 17. Though, see also Bremmer 2006, 18-19, where he argues for a muddled line between hero worship and Olympian worship was fully delineated.

⁴² Louise Bruit Zaidman and Pauline Schmitt Pantel, *Religion in the Ancient Greek City*, trans. Paul Cartledge (1992; reprint, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 179.

⁴³ Walter Burkert, *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, trans. John Raffan (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985), 203, 205.

⁴⁴ Thus every Attic deme had its eponymous hero in addition to others, and Cadmos was the hero of Thebes. Heracles, on the other hand, was a Panhellenic hero.

⁴⁵ Fuqua, "Cult of Heroes," 224.

Fuqua argues that “we cannot identify Tyrtaeus’ proposal with any specific cult.”⁴⁶ Line 32, however, seems to allude to a specific pair of heroes: the Dioscuri. This line, again, has Homeric antecedents, from when Odysseus first travels to the world of the dead: τοὺς ἄμφω ζῶοὺς κατέχει φυσίζοος αἴα· / οἱ καὶ νέρθεν γῆς τιμὴν πρὸς Ζηνὸς ἔχοντες (The life-giving earth covers them around, though they are alive; they hold honour from Zeus from below the earth; *Od.* 11.301-2).⁴⁷ Likewise, Alcman also places the Dioscuri under the ground, at Therapne (fr. 7). Both Castor and Polydeuces were important figures in Spartan cult, and they likely began as house spirits and as a part of domestic cult.⁴⁸ They came to be major figures in Spartan cult and politics, for they were both the model and the protectors of the dyarchy and the tutelary war-gods of the state, as Castor accompanied the king who led the army and Polydeuces remained at Sparta with the other king.⁴⁹ Thus I believe that the hero worship Tyrtaeus has in mind is that of the Dioscuri when he states that the dead hero, though buried, is still immortal (12.31-2). The reference to hero cult, regardless, presents a model in which the citizen body looks after its heroes, as it already does for the Dioscuri, and this then furnishes another set of reciprocal relations between the soldiers and their community. In doing so, the allusion to hero cults follows the allusion to Hector and his funeral, and both of these rewards for those who die fighting correspond in this fashion to the rewards for those who survive the battle, who are honoured by their fellow citizens.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ See also *Iliad* 3.243-5, where Homer comments that the τοὺς δ’ ἤδη κάτεχεν φυσίζοος αἴα / ἐν Λακεδαίμονι αὐτοῖ, φίλη ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ (already the life-giving earth lay over them [the Dioscuri] there in Lakedaimon, in their beloved fatherland).

⁴⁸ Cartledge, *Sparta and Lakonia*, 121; Noel Robertson, “ἥρωες ἐπιτέγιος,” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 127 (1999): 180.

⁴⁹ On the relationship between the Dioscuri and the Spartan dyarchy, see Cartledge 1979, 342 and Flower 2009, 202, who both follow Carlier 1977, 76 n.42. On the Dioscuri as war gods, see Moore 1983, 117.

The rewards that Tyrtaeus presents for those who fight, immortality through either communal memory or through cult honours and the allotment of honours by the community, are placed securely in the hands of the soldiers' fellow citizens. As discussed in chapter 2, this provides a model of reciprocal relations between the two groups. The soldier fights for the community, and thus the community rewards the soldiers, and because the community is the one dispensing the rewards, the soldiers are required to fight on its behalf and distinguish themselves to the community and not to the bard or to one another. In fragment 12, however, Tyrtaeus is even more emphatic that it is the entire community of citizens that dispenses the rewards, not him and not the aristocratic community.⁵⁰ He follows Sarpedon's reasoning that kings are honoured by their people because they fight (*Il.* 12.310-321), but he makes this applicable to more men, and he also makes it more specific by requiring that the men fight on behalf of their πόλις. Fragment 12 is the only exhortation to contain the word πόλις, and Tyrtaeus makes sure to offset the ideal soldier's heroic deeds by relating them back to the πόλις or the community at large.⁵¹ Thus a young man may win the ἄεθλον ... ἄριστον / κάλλιστόν τε (best and most noble prize; 12.13-4), but in doing so he wins a ξυνὸν δ' ἔσθλόν ... πόλῃ τε παντί τε δήμῳ (common good for the city and entire people; 15); he halts the enemy phalanx and dies heroically (21-3), but his glory goes to his city, people, and father (24). If he survives battle, he is honoured extensively by his fellow citizens, but this means that he must live and remain with them; if he leaves, he loses his allotted

⁵⁰ So Tarkow states that for Tyrtaeus "poetry's function is not to immortalize, for such responsibility belongs to the community" as he argues for the poet's role as a teacher (1983, 62). See also Jaeger (1959, 122) and Fuqua (1981, 220-1) for a discussion of the role of the πόλις in preserving the soldier's immortality through fame. Their arguments, however, are more applicable to the Classical period. For the early archaic age, I believe that when reading πόλις in fragment 12 the emphasis should be placed not on "city" but on "the citizens who make up the city."

⁵¹ πόλις also appears in fragment 4, but this poem is not an exhortative work. It is instead a discussion of the Spartan constitution.

honours. Tyrtaeus, then, not only provides a model of reciprocal relations for the soldiers and their community, but he also returns and integrates the soldiers into the community. This enhances the social interactions between the two groups as the poet who began fragment 12 by stating outright his requirements for poetic memorial removes himself from the equation so that only the community and the soldiers remain.

IV. Conclusion: The Individual, the Group, and Cohesion

Achilles is perhaps the best figure to end our discussion of Tyrtaeus' use of the Homeric heroes in his allusions because he is the most divisive hero alluded to by Tyrtaeus. He stands apart from his community, willingly, though he does display concern for it before his honour is slighted. Upon his return to the war, Achilles leads the Achaeans into battle, but the glory belongs to him alone. He is the maelstrom that destroys the Trojan ranks and the aloof chieftain who rules over the funeral games; he thus exemplifies the Dark Age chieftain who is concerned for his own personal honour, even if it should mean that his followers suffer for it. Hector is more akin to, though not the same as, the generals of the Archaic period, who fought on behalf of their cities, honouring themselves in the process but always as a secondary goal to honouring and preserving the πόλις.⁵² Odysseus, as always, stands somewhere in between, a liminal figure who is both welcomed as the ideal warrior and shunned as the hapless warrior.

Achilles, though he is a divisive figure, is still able to unite the disparate classes who compose the phalanx by providing a model of relationships between the soldiers and the community: the community provides κλέος in return for the soldiers' willingness to fight on its behalf. In the *Iliad*, the community is composed of the λαός; for Tyrtaeus, the

⁵² The exception to the idea that the general served his was πόλις, unsurprisingly, Alcibiades whose search for personal distinction and attempts to save his skin harmed Athens' chances for victory.

community is the πόλις and the citizens who live in it.⁵³ The allusions to Hector sit alongside those made to Achilles in this regard; Hector is properly honoured by his community, whose make-up is more similar to Tyrtaeus' community, and this example of how the reciprocal relationship between the two is enhanced by the negative example that Achilles provides. Tyrtaeus thus uses his allusion Achilles to enhance his other appeals to social ties and responsibilities.

In chapter 1 I introduced Johns' broad definition of cohesion as "the degree to which members of a group or organization are willing to subordinate their individual welfare to that of the group."⁵⁴ Tyrtaeus needs his listeners to feel this willingness to ignore their own personal welfare, for the phalanx will not survive otherwise. Most of the cohesive material in his poetry depends on social ties, which Tyrtaeus creates among the Spartan soldiers by using the material provided by Hector and Achilles for the his models of reciprocal relations between the community and its soldiers. The proper reward for fighting is honours allotted by the community or, barring that, immortal glory; Tyrtaeus acknowledges these claims and their validity, but he makes sure that the aristocrats are not to go to *him* for these rewards, but to the general community of their fellow citizens. In doing so, he bridges the gap between Hector and Achilles and returns the individual champion to the community that depends on him.

The ἀρεταί from the beginning of fragment 12 also play into this formation of cohesion, and the Spartans would continue to foster competition within the class of *Homoioi*, which, Xenophon claims, is to make sure that the soldiers are always in peak condition (*Lac. Pol.* IV.2-6). But it is just as likely to be a means to maintain the social

⁵³ See Nagy 1979, 82-3 for his examination of the λαός as a warrior community.

⁵⁴ *Cohesion in the US Military*, 1.

equality among men who are not equal in reality.⁵⁵ Odysseus also supports Tyrtaeus' new form of competition due to maintenance of the belief that it is only by standing and fighting that a man is the best (*Il.* 11.409-10). Competition among equals and the framing of competition on the battlefield thus sit alongside Tyrtaeus' models of social ties and obligations seen in the allusions to Hector and Achilles.

It is only recently that task cohesion has been emphasized as a force stronger than social cohesion, and King has suggested that this is due to the peculiar make up and nature of modern armies, which are volunteer based and are a full time profession.⁵⁶ For Tyrtaeus and his Spartans, warfare was a hobby for some and a new responsibility for others. A common task would likely have incurred contempt from the aristocrats, who had participated in warfare for centuries, towards the new members of the hoplite classes, many of whom were new to fighting in an army. Social ties were far safer to base an appeal to cohesion upon, and the susceptibility of the Greeks to bow to social opinion would have only enhanced these ties, for it enabled Tyrtaeus to emphasize how the elites and the non-elites should behave in relation to one another and how they should behave, as a single group, in relation to the community. This susceptibility to public opinion also enhances any rhetoric based on shame that Tyrtaeus might use, which he makes sure to exploit, especially in fragment 10. Thus, through creating new social ties and obligations and framing them in a familiar way- between the soldiers and the community- but by involving new members in the group of soldiers, Tyrtaeus is able to exploit the influence of shame upon his audience of soldiers and enhance his appeals to social ties and

⁵⁵ See Flower 2002 for a thorough discussion on how the concept of the Spartans as soldiers and only soldiers is from the Classical period, when Sparta suddenly felt the need to distinguish herself from Athens as Athens rose in power and prestige.

⁵⁶ "The Existence of Group Cohesion in the Armed Forces: A Response to Guy Siebold." *Armed Forces and Society* 33 (2007): 646 n.18.

obligations and create a greater sense of cohesion and willingness from the men to subordinate their own personal welfare to the good of the group. This willingness not only comes from a sense of community among the army but also from a sense of obligation on the part of the soldiers to the general community of citizens. The soldiers will fight, and they will fight for their community.

Conclusion

Λεωνίδαν μὲν γὰρ τὸν παλαιὸν ἐπερωτηθέντα, ποίος τις αὐτῷ φαίνεται ποιητῆς γεγονέναι Τυρταῖος, εἰπεῖν “ἀγαθὸς νέων ψυχὰς κακκανῆν.” ἐμπιπλάμενοι γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν ποιημάτων ἐνθουσιασμοῦ παρὰ τὰς μάχας ἠφείδουν ἑαυτῶν.

When Leonidas of old was asked what sort of poet Tyrtaeus seemed to be to him, he said, “a poet good at sharpening the spirits of young men.” For being filled with inspiration from his verses, they were unsparing of themselves in battle (Plut. *apophth Lac.* 235e)

Tyrtaeus’ poetry seeks to address issues of cohesion and military stability, and his goals are to root men on the battlefield and to have them fight in a concerted manner. In the new military order of the phalanx, there is no longer room for the single champion, even one who fights alongside the mass of common soldiers. Nor is there room for even the slightest chance that a man will drop his shield and run, abandoning his place in battle and his comrades and leaving a hole in the line. Tyrtaeus thus exhorts the soldiers listening to his verses to stand firm and to reject flight, to take courage and to fight in the defensive manner of the phalanx.

For every action and opinion, however, there is an equal reaction and contrary opinion. The phalanx required that the elites open up their ranks to include new members, new soldiers who could now lay claim to the benefits of fighting with equal validity as the old aristocrats. Even if, as Raafliab argues, the aristocrats supported and even furthered this progression from Dark Age fighting, which was characterized by raids

and individual fighters, to the hoplite phalanx, they would not have done so universally.¹ Furthermore, Aristotle records that during the “Messenian War” there was conflict between the classes (*Pol.* 1306b36-1307a1), a far more likely event than the 400 years of unbroken adherence to the Spartan constitution that Thucydides records (I.xviii.1). The elites, thus, stood against Tyrtaeus’ rhetoric of cohesion, preferring to safeguard their special privileges instead. This is not to say that they were the only ones who looked at the other group with distaste; the non-elites likely were not ecstatic to be marshalled alongside the elites either due to long standing class differences and tensions.

It is to reconcile these two groups that Tyrtaeus provides a reciprocal model of relations between the citizen community and the soldiers, as well as a common field of competition, the battlefield, where all strive for victory through displaying an ἀρετή that all can possess without special training: martial valour. These appeals to social ties, along with references to the shared mythic history and customs of the Spartans, then interact with and strengthen Tyrtaeus’ exhortations to stand firm and fight. The soldier, in order to win the prize for bravery, must display that bravery within the group of soldiers that compose the phalanx, both elite and non-elite, and he must do so in defense of his citizen community and πόλις.

This study began with the historical and social contexts in which Tyrtaeus composed his poetry. I began with this in order to provide as full of a picture as safely can be assumed for the situation that influenced Tyrtaeus’ poetry and brought about its creation. The next chapter examined Tyrtaeus’ allusions to Hector. Tyrtaeus uses Hector’s role in the *Iliad* to suggest that his soldiers not flee, because that is shameful,

¹ “Soldiers, Citizens, and the Development of the Early Greek Polis,” in *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, eds. Lynette G. Mitchell and P.J. Rhodes (London: Routledge, 1997), 55-7.

that they fight on behalf of their community, as Hector did, and that they will be rewarded with κλέος and τιμή. Hector is an ideal figure for Tyrtaeus' rhetoric. Not only is he the epitome of a city defender, but he is also a hero who requires the presence of his group to survive and to be effective. Chapter 3 then examined the role of Odysseus as both warrior and wanderer in Tyrtaeus' poetry. Odysseus the warrior is a mostly positive figure, and Tyrtaeus uses these allusions to urge the soldiers to fight. Odysseus the wanderer is a negative figure, and he is part of the general *exempla* that the *Odyssey* provides for Tyrtaeus to denigrate flight from battle and suggest that the soldier who does so lives a life not worth living. Finally, chapter 4 examines the place of Achilles and the aristocratic ἀρεταί from fragment 12. Though both are potentially divisive, Tyrtaeus uses them in a manner that enables him to create a group of social equals through providing a common field of competition and a common prize for all.

Tyrtaeus' rhetoric of cohesion focuses on creating and strengthening the social ties which bind the various members of the phalanx together. In addition to these, he emphasizes not only the obligations that the soldiers have to their πόλις but also the rewards that they can gain for behaving in the socially acceptable manner, or what he considers to be the socially acceptable manner. Even when exhorting the soldiers not to flee, Tyrtaeus frames these exhortations in relation to the πόλις (fr. 10.3-10) and other soldiers (10.15-27). His exhortations to stand firm are likewise placed within the setting of the group's welfare and survival (fr. 10.11-4, 11.11-3, 12.13-18, 21-4). More importantly, perhaps, he presents the community, both πόλις and citizens, as the one which bestows rewards on the soldiers (fr. 12.28-44). The soldiers, by fighting, oblige the community, who then fulfills this obligation by rewarding the soldiers. This transfer,

once completed, opens the way for more of the sort, and a pattern is thus established for the community's relations with its soldiers. Thus, not only are the soldiers now bound to one another through a series of new social ties and obligations, but they are also committed to the survival of the entire community due to the model in which the community is the one who bestows rewards upon those who fight.

I hope to have shown in this study the various ways in which Tyrtaeus alludes to the Homeric heroes and the epic tradition and then uses these allusions to create a social identity applicable to both the elites and non-elites and to create cohesion within the phalanx. He aims in his work to furnish social ties among the phalanx's soldiers, ties that were not always present before hand. Due to this, his poetry errs on being inclusive as opposed to being exclusive.² In relation to this goal, he alludes to Odysseus and Hector, heroes who both participated in their communities as much as was possible. Tyrtaeus counteracts the individualism of the major Homeric heroes (Hector, as soon as he leaves his community, standing outside the walls of Troy to face Achilles, dies; Odysseus manages to return to Ithaca, albeit after a ten year delay and without his comrades; Achilles ignores his men and the mass of Achaeans, preferring to nurse his wounded honour until Hector's defeat of Patrocles forces him to fight and to return to the battlefield) by emphasizing their attachment to their communities. Despite these varying levels of group attachment, however, Tyrtaeus alludes to all three in a manner that highlights their applicability to the group and emphasizes the new need for men to fight as a unit and not as individuals.

Tyrtaeus' poetry would continue to loom large in the Spartan mentality, and his verses spread to the rest of Greece as well, where they influenced later poets, politicians,

² On this issue I stand against the opinion of Adkins (1985, 86) and Irwin (2005, 37-40).

and philosophers. As the hoplite increasingly became the ideal of the Greek citizen, the verses that were seen to epitomize the hoplite mentality grew in popularity as well. Tyrtaeus, like his rough contemporaries Callinus and Solon, composed his poetry in a period of change, when the military and political structures changed into the forms familiar to us from the Archaic period. Unfortunately, we no longer have most of Callinus' poetry; one extended fragment and a few solitary lines are all that remain, but he is a martial elegist who makes similar appeals as Tyrtaeus and works in the same tradition of Ionic exhortations. Solon, though his elegies contain political rather than martial rhetoric, uses many of the themes and diction of martial exhortative poetry and makes appeals to social ties in his efforts to prevent civil war. Tyrtaeus' elegies, then, were produced in response to a situation that affected the Spartans personally, but they were composed in a panhellenic tradition of exhortations and elegies, and they interact with much of the thought current to the early Archaic period, such as, for example, the increasing importance of the πόλις, the priamel form, and the desire to define and rank various forms of ἀρετή. Furthermore, their very lack of specificity enabled them to be sung and used by various poets, including those not composing in the martial exhortative tradition.

The Spartans held Tyrtaeus up high, making his works integral in their educational and military systems. His place and role in Spartan history then joined the Great Rhetra and Lycurgus and became a part of the murky Spartan mirage, a haze that obscures our view of early Sparta and its impact on the city in later ages. Tyrtaeus, because of this mirage, should not be attributed with all of the Spartans' fascination with courage and dying at one's post, but neither should his influence be removed. His

exhortations to stand firm caught the imagination of the Spartans, and his appeals to social ties and reciprocal obligations continued to echo, strengthening the Spartan phalanx during his own time and later on as the Spartans continued to sing his verses.

Bibliography

- Adkins, A.W.H. *Merit and Responsibility: A Study in Greek Values*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.
- . *Moral Values and Political Behaviour in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the end of the Fifth Century*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1972.
- . *Poetic Craft in the Early Greek Elegists*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Adler, A. *Suda Lexicon*. Stuttgart: Teuber, 1967-1971.
- Barigazzi, A. "Contributo al vero Tirteo." *La parola d. passato* 6 (1951): 102-115.
- Bassett, Samuel E. "The ἀμαρτία of Achilles." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 65 (1934): 47-69.
- Bernadete, Seth. *Achilles and Hector: The Homeric Hero*. 1985. Reprint, South Bend, Indiana: St. Augustine's Press, 2005.
- Bergk, Theodorus, ed. *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*. vol. III. 4th edition. Lipsiae: B.G. Teubneri.
- Biraglias, Nikos. "Helotage and Spartan Social Organization." In *Sparta: Beyond the Mirage* edited by Anton Powell and Stephen Hodkinson, 249-266. London: The Classical Press of Wales and Duckworth, 2002.
- Bloch, Maurice. "Death, Women, and Power." In *Death and the Regeneration of Life*, edited by Maurice Bloch and Jonathon Parry, 211-230. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Bowra, C.M. *Heroic Poetry*. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1952.
- . *Early Greek Elegists*. New York: Barnes and Noble Inc., 1960.
- Bremmer, Jan N. "The Rise of the Hero Cult and the New Simonides." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 158 (2006): 15-26.
- Brown, Christopher. "On the 'Correct' Understanding of Eu Diabas: a Reply." *American Journal of Philology* 105 (1985): 356-359.
- Browne, Gerald M., J.D. Thomas, E.G. Turner, and Marcia E. Weinstein, eds. *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* vol. 38. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1971.

- Burkert, Walter. "Der hunderttorige Theban und die Datierung des Ilias." *Wiener Studien* 10 (1976): 5-21.
- . *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*. Translated by John Raffan. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985.
- Campbell, David A., ed. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric. Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry*. 2nd edition. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1982.
- Canetti, Elias. *Crowds and Power*. Translated by Carol Stewart. New York: The Viking Press, 1963.
- Cartledge, Paul. "Hoplites and Heroes: Sparta's Contribution to the Technique of Ancient Warfare." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 97 (1977): 11-27.
- . *Sparta and Lakonia: A Regional History 1300-362 BC*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Connor, W.R. "Early Greek Land Warfare as a Symbolic Expression." *Past and Present* 119 (1988): 3-29.
- Cook, Erwin F. "'Active' and 'Passive' Heroics in the 'Odyssey.'" *Classical World* 93 (1999): 149-67.
- . "On the 'Importance' of Iliad Book 8." *Classical Philology* 104 (2009): 133-161.
- Cramer, O.C. "Odysseus in the Iliad." PhD diss., University of Texas, 1973.
- Darcus, Shirely M. "A Person's Relation to ψυχή in Homer, Hesiod, and the Greek Lyric Poets." *Glotta* 57 (1979): 30-9.
- Darcus Sullivan, Shirely. *Psychological and Ethical Ideas: What Early Greeks Say*. E.J. Brill: Leiden, 1995.
- Delorme, Jean. *Gymnasion*. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1960.
- Derderian, Katharine. *Leaving Words to Remember: Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Dimock, George E. *The Unity of the Odyssey*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1989.
- Donlan, Walter. "Homer's Agamemnon." *Classical World* 65 (1971): 109-115.

- Dover, K.J. "The Poetry of Archilochus." In *Archiloque: sept exposés et discussions*, 181-212. Genève: Vandoeuvres, 1964.
- Evjen, H.D. "Competitive athletics in ancient Greece: the search for origins and influences." *Opuscula Atheniensia* 16 (1986): 51-6.
- Faraone, Christopher A. *The Stanzaic Architecture of Early Greek Elegy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Felson Rubin, Nancy. "Radical Semantic Shifts in Archilochus." *Classical Journal* 77 (1981): 1-8.
- Finkleberg, Margalit. "Odysseus and the Genus 'Hero.'" *Greece and Rome* 42 (1995): 1-14.
- "Timē and Aretē in Homer." *Classical Quarterly* 48 (1998): 14-28.
- Finley, M.I. *The World of Odysseus*, 2nd edition. 1954. Reprint, London: Penguin Books, 1979.
- Flower, Michael. "The Invention of Tradition in Classical Sparta." In *Sparta: Beyond Mirage* edited by Anton Powell and Stephen Hodkinson, 191-228. London: The Classical Press of Wales and Duckworth, 2002.
- "Spartan 'religion' and Greek 'religion.'" In *Sparta: Comparative Approaches*, edited by Stephen Hodkinson, 193-230. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2009.
- Floyd, Edwin D. "Kleos Aphthiton: An Indo-European Perspective on Early Greek Poetry." *Glotta* 58 (1980): 133-157.
- Ford, Andrew. "Epic as a Genre." In *A New Companion to Homer*, edited by Ian Morris and Barry Powell, 396-414. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Forrest, W.G. 1968. *A History of Sparta, 950-192 B.C.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Fowler, Robert L. *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.
- Fränkel, Hermann. *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy: a History of Greek Epic, Lyric, and Prose to the Middle of the Fifth century*. Translated by Moses Hadas and James Willis. Oxford: Blackwell, 1975.
- Fuqua, Charles. "Tyrtæus and the Cult of Heroes." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 22 (1981): 215-26.

- Gerber, Douglas E., ed. *Greek Elegiac Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Golden, Mark. *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Goldschmidt, R.C. "Tyrtaeus 10 B, 25. Αἱματόεντ' αἰδοῖα φίλαις ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντα." *Memnosyne* 9 (1940): 157.
- Greenberg, Nathan A. "The Attitude of Agamemnon." *Classical World* 86 (1993): 193-205.
- Greenhalgh, P.A.L. "Patriotism in the Homeric World." *Historia* 21 (1972): 528-37.
- Haft, Adele J. "Odysseus' Wrath and Grief in the 'Iliad': Agamemnon, the Ithakan King, and the Sack of Troy in Books 2, 4, and 14." *Classical Journal* 85 (1989-90): 97-114.
- Hainsworth, Bryan. *The Iliad: A Commentary: Volume 3, book 9-12*. Edited by G.S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Hanson, Victor Davis. "Hoplite Technology in Phalanx Battle." In *Hoplites: The Classical Greek Battle Experience*, edited by Victor Davis Hanson, 63-84. London: Routledge, 1991.
- . *The Western Way of War: Infantry Battle in Classical Greece*. 1989. Reprint, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Heubeck, Alfred, Stephanie West, and J.B. Hainsworth. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Volume 1: Introduction and Books i-viii*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Hodkinson, Stephen. "The Development of Spartan Society and Institutions in the Archaic Period." In *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, edited by Lynette G. Mitchell and P.J. Rhodes, 83-102. London: Routledge, 1997.
- . *Property and Wealth in Classical Sparta*. London: Duckworth and the Classical Press of Wales, 2000.
- Hodkinson, Stephen, ed. *Sparta: Comparative Approaches*. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2009.
- Hodkinson, Stephen and Anton Powell, eds. *Sparta: New Perspectives*. London: Duckworth and the Classical Press of Wales, 1999.

- Irwin, Elizabeth. *Solon and Early Greek Poetry: The Politics of Exhortation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Jaeger, Werner. *Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture*, vol. I, 2nd edition. Translated by Gilbert Highlet. New York: Oxford University Press, 1945.
- . "The Greek Ideas of Immortality." *Harvard Theological Review* 52 (1959): 135-47.
- . *Five Essays*. Translated by Adele M. Fiske. Montreal: Mario Casalini Ltd, 1966.
- Janowitz, M. and R.W. Little. *Sociology and the Military Establishment*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1965.
- Johns, J.H. *Cohesion in the US Military: Defense Management Study Group on Military Cohesion*. Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1984.
- Kennell, Nigel. *The Gymnasium of Virtue: Education and Culture in Ancient Sparta*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- . *Spartans: A New History. Ancient Cultures*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- King, Anthony. "The Word of Command: Communication and Cohesion in the Military." *Armed Forces and Society* 32 (2006): 493-512.
- . "The Existence of Group Cohesion in the Armed Forces: A Response to Guy Siebold." *Armed Forces and Society* 33 (2007): 638-45.
- Kirk, G.S. *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume 1: books 1-4*. Edited by G.S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Kviz, F.J. "Survival in Combat as a Collective Exchange Process." *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 6 (1978): 219-232.
- Lazenby, J.F. *The Spartan Army*. Warminster, England: Aris and Phillips Ltd., 1985.
- Leaf, Walter, ed. *The Iliad: Edited, with Apparatus Criticus, Prolegomena Notes, and Apendices*, vol. I, 2nd edition. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1960.
- Lee, J.W.I. *A Greek Army on the March: Soldiers and Survival in Xenophon's Anabasis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

- Lendon, J.E. *Soldiers and Ghosts: A History of Battle in Classical Antiquity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Little, R.W. "Buddy Relations and Combat Performance." In *The New Military: Changing Patterns of Organization*, edited by M. Janowitz, 195-223. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.
- Lorimer, H.L. "The Hoplite Phalanx with special reference to the poems of Archilochus and Tyrtaeus." *Annual of the British School at Athens* 42 (1947): 76-138.
- Lugentill, Robert D. "Tyrtaeus 12 West: Come Join the Spartan Army." *Classical Quarterly* 52 (2002): 405-414.
- Luraghi, Nino. *The Ancient Messenians: Constructions of Ethnicity and Memory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Macan, R.W. "A Note on the Date of Tyrtaeus, and the Messenian War." *Classical Review* 11 (1897): 10-12.
- MacCoun, R.J. "What is Known about Unit Cohesion and Military Performance." In *Sexual Orientation and U.S. Military Personnel Policy: Options and Assessment*, 283-331. Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1993.
- MacCoun, R.K., E. Krier, and A. Belkin. "Does Social Cohesion Determine Motivation in Combat?: An Old Question with an Old Answer." *Armed Forces and Society* (2006) 32: 646-654.
- MacQueen, Bruce D. "On the Correct Understanding of Eu Diabas." *American Journal of Philology* 105 (1984): 453-457.
- Marshall, S.L.A. *Men against Fire: the Problem of Battle Command in Future War*. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1966.
- Montiglio, Sylvia. *Wandering in Ancient Greek Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Moore, J.M. *Aristotle and Xenophon on Democracy and Oligarchy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Morris, Ian. "Attitudes toward Death in Archaic Greece." *Classical Antiquity* 8 (1989): 296-320.
- Moskos, C.G. *The American Enlisted Man*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970.
- , "The American Combat Soldier in Vietnam." *Journal of Social Issues* 31 (1975): 25-37.

- Mudrack, P.E. "Defining Group Cohesiveness: A Legacy of Confusion?" *Small Group Behaviour* 20 (1989): 37-49.
- Mullen, B. and C. Copper. "The Relation between Group Cohesiveness and Performance: An Integration." *Psychological Bulletin* 115 (1994): 210-27.
- Murnaghan, Sheila. "The Poetics of Loss in Greek Epic." In *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World: The Poetics of Community*, edited by Margaret Beissinger, Jane Tylus, and Susanne Wofford, 203-220. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Munro, David B. and Thomas W. Allen, eds. *Homeri Opera: Iliadis*, vols. I and II, 3rd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1920.
- Nagler, Michael N. *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.
- Nagy, Gregory. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.
- . *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- . *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Ollier, François. *Le Mirage Spartiate: étude sur l'idéalisation de Sparte dans l'antiquité grecque, de l'origine jusqu'aux cyniques et étude sur l'idéalisation de Sparte dans l'antiquité grecque du début de l'école cynique jusqu'à la fin de la cité*. 1933. Reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1973.
- Olson, M., Jr. *The Logic of Collective Action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Osborne, Robin. *Greece in the Making: 1200-479 BC*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Page, D.L., ed. *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Parker, V. J. "The Date of the Messenian Wars." *Chiron* 21 (1991): 25-47.
- Postlthwaite, N. "Agamemnon Best of Spearmen." *Phoenix* 49 (1995): 95-103.
- Powell, Anton and Stephen Hodkinson, eds. *Sparta: Beyond the Mirage*. London: The Classical Press of Wales and Duckworth, 2002.

- Prato, Carlo, ed. *Tirteo: Introduzione, testo critico, testimonianze e commento*. Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1968.
- Raaflaub, Kurt A. "Soldiers, Citizens, and the Development of the Early Greek Polis." In *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, edited by Lynette G. Mitchell and P.J. Rhodes, 49-59. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Redfield, James M. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: the Tragedy of Hector*. 1975. Reprint, Durham: Duke University Press, 1994.
- Reyes, G. Mitchell. "Sources of Persuasion in the Iliad." *Rhetoric Review* 21 (2002): 22-39.
- Salmon, J. "Political Hoplitēs?" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 97 (1977): 84-101.
- Schwartz, Adam. *Reinstating the Hoplite: Arms, Armour, and Phalanx Fighting in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2009.
- Shaw, P.-J. "Olympiad Chronology and 'Early' Spartan History." In *Sparta: New Perspectives*, edited by Anton Powell and Stephen Hodkinson, 273-310. London: Duckworth and the Classical Press of Wales, 1999.
- Shey, H. James. "Tyrtaeus and the Art of Propaganda." *Arethusa* 9 (1976): 5-28.
- Shils, E. and M. Janowitz. "Cohesion and Disintegration in the Wehrmacht in World War II." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 12 (1948): 280-315.
- Siebold, Guy. "Military Group Cohesion." In *Military Life: the Psychology of Serving in Peace and Combat*, vol. I, edited by T.W. Britt, C.A. Castro, and A.B Adler, 185-201. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Security International, 2006.
- Snell, Bruno. *Tyrtaios und die Sprache des Epos*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1969.
- Snodgrass, Anthony. "The Hoplite Reform and History." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 85 (1965): 110-122.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane. *'Reading' Greek Death to the End of the Classical Period*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Stanford, W.B. *The Ulysses Theme: A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954.
- Stanford, W.B., ed. *Homer: Odyssey*, vols. I and II. 1947-8. Reprint, London: Bristol Classical Press, 1996.

- Starr, C.G. *The Origins of Greek Civilization 1100-650 BC*. 1961. Reprint, New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1991.
- Stouffer, S.A., A.A. Lumsdaine, M.H. Lumsdaine, R.M. Williams Jr., M. Brewster Smith, I.L. Janis, S.A. Star, and L.S. Cottrell Jr. *The American Soldier: Combat and Its Aftermath*, Vol. II. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1949.
- Strauss Clay, Jenny. *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Talbert, R.J.A. "The Role of the Helots in the Class Struggle at Sparta." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 38 (1989): 22-40.
- Tarkow, T.A. "Tyrtaeus 9D: The Role of Poetry in New Sparta." *L'Antiquité classique* 52 (1983): 48-69.
- Tigerstadt, E.N. *The Legend of Sparta in Classical Antiquity*, vol. I. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1965.
- Thibaut, J. W. and H.H. Kelly. *The Social Psychology of Groups*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.
- van Wees, Hans. "Heroes, Knights and Nutters: Warrior Mentality in Homer." In *Battle in Antiquity*, edited by Alan B. Lloyd, 1-86. London: Duckworth and the Classical Press of Wales, 1996.
- "Tyrtaeus' *Eunomia*: nothing to do with the Great Rhetra." In *Sparta: Beyond the Mirage*, edited by Stephen Hodkinson and Anton Powell, 1-41. London: Duckworth and the Classical Press of Wales, 1999.
- "The development of the hoplite phalanx: iconography and reality in the seventh century." In *War and Violence in Ancient Greece*, edited by Hans van Wees, 125-66. London: Duckworth and the Classical Press of Wales, 2000.
- Verdenius, W.J. "Tyrtaeus 6-7D: A Commentary." *Memnosyne* 22 (1969): 337-355.
- Vernant, Jean-Pierre. "La belle mort et le cadavre outragé." In *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*, edited by Gherardo Gnoli and Jean-Pierre Vernant, 45-76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Verrall, A. "Tyrtaeus: A Graeco-Roman Tradition." *Classical Review* 10 (1896): 269-277.
- West, M.L. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1974.
- "The date of the *Iliad*." *Museum Helveticum* 52 (1995): 203-219.

West, M.L., ed. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci Ante Alexandrum Cantati*, vol. I. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.

----- *Iambi et Elegi Graeci Ante Alexandrum Cantati*, vol. II. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Wong, L, T.A. Kolditz, R.A. Millen, and T.M. Potter. *Why They Fight: Combat Motivation in the Iraq War*. Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2003.

Zaidman, Louise Bruit and Pauline Schmitt Pantel. *Religion in the Ancient Greek City*. Translated by Paul Cartledge. 1992. Reprint, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.