

CORINNA

The Boeotian archetype

In the controversy over the date of Corinna, the following points may be taken as agreed:

1. An edition was made in Boeotia about the end of the third or beginning of the second century B.C.
2. The texts of Corinna current in the late Hellenistic and Roman periods were all descended from that Boeotian edition.
3. Before its dissemination, Corinna was unknown in Greece at large. If she wrote at an earlier period, she must have been remembered only locally.¹

Since Lobel first suggested that the Boeotian archetype might be identical with Corinna's autograph,² it has been assumed that there are two clear alternatives. Either Corinna lived in the fifth century, as formerly supposed, and was metagrammatized some 250 years later, or there was no metagrammatism and she lived about 200 B.C. A reason for making this assumption, and for not considering the intermediate period, is offered by Page, p. 75:

The difference between Boeotian spelling of the fifth century and that of the fourth is very great: but the difference in this respect between the mid-fourth century and the late third or early second is comparatively slight. It is therefore tenable that whereas there would be a good reason for the re-spelling of fifth-century Boeotian into the later convention of any period, there would be no obvious or adequate reason for re-spelling Boeotian of the fourth century into the orthography of the third, or that of the third into that of the second. Even those features of fourth-century spelling which have ceased to preponderate are by no means unknown or even uncommon at the end of the third century. Certainly they are not enough to render texts of the fourth century at all difficult for readers of the third century to comprehend.

To get a clearer picture of the character of the archetype, we should note that it had a scholarly format, with titles,³ perhaps even accents⁴ and

¹ Wilamowitz, *Homerische Untersuchungen*, 321 f.; *Textgesch. d. gr. Lyriker*, 21-4; D. L. Page, *Corinna*, 65 ff.

² *Hermes* lxxv (1930), 356-65. Only P. Guillon has embraced the late dating with decision, *BCH* lxxvii (1958), 47-60, and *Annales Fac. des Lettres d'Aix*, xxxiii (1959), 155-68. It has been opposed by C. M. Bowra, *CR* xiv (1931), 4; K. Latte, *Eranos* liii (1955), 57-67 = *Kl. Schr.* 499-507; A. Lesky, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.*, 2nd edn., 205 (180 of the English version).

³ γ[? 654 ii 12 (references are to Page's *Poetae Melici Graeci*);]ε[*Ἀπεις* (?) 655 fr. 1 top; **Οπέσσας* 690;]α 692 fr. 2; *Θιομαχία*, Δευξίπ[α, 692 fr. 36; **Ερωίθρος*? 694 fr. 13. (These are only the titles attested in dialect form.) Dialect titles for dialect poems are not the norm; we do not find them in Stesi-

chorus (e.g. *Γηρυονής*, despite *Γαρύνας* frequently in the text) or the bucolic poets (Theoc. 28 *ἀλακάτα* codd. saec. xv, but]η[α[*P.Oxy.*). I can only cite the plays of Epicharmus and the mimes of Sophron—both, like Corinna, comparatively *recherché* authors (cf. Wilamowitz, *Textgesch. d. gr. Lyr.* 24-9).

⁴ An Alexandrian grammarian might be expected to treat Boeotian as Aeolic; cf. Wilamowitz in *Berliner Klassiker-Texte*, v (2), p. 42. What we find in the papyri is more like what we might ourselves expect for Boeotian: Doric accents (but not as much as in the papyri of Alcman, Stesichorus, and Ibycus), side by side with an occasional Aeolic barytonesis (692 fr. 8. 4 *σόφων*; possibly 654 i 29 *κάθεκτος*, but cf. Chandler, *Greek Accentuation*, 2nd edn., 150). There is

hypotheses.¹ We would hardly expect colometry so early, and its absence in the archetype may account for the relatively large number of papyrus fragments in which colometry is defective or undetectable. We cannot tell if there was book division.

Corinna is the most Boeotian of poets, even when allowance is made for metagrammatism.² If even she had to be rewritten for a Boeotian readership, one wonders what literature they could cope with at all. Homer, Hesiod, Pindar? Or was everything translated?—

μείνιν αἶδε θιά Πειλειάδιω Ἀχιλεῖος
ὠλομένειν, εἰ μούρι' Ἀχῆϋς ἄλγι' ἔθεικεν.

Certainly not. The point of the new Boeotian spelling was that it assumed the Attic values for the written vowels. Instead of writing *αι* and pronouncing it like Attic *η*, you wrote *η*. But if someone else pronounced it *αι*, you would write *αι* in recording him. Boeotians would read Homer in Ionic just as Athenians did. If Corinna was rewritten on the Boeotian system, it was because she was a Boeotian apparently writing in her own dialect, and not because she was obscure. If *παρθένοι κόραι* was transcribed as *παρθένυ κόρη*, it was because Corinna was assumed to have pronounced it *parthenū koré*; using the reformed spelling to represent it was no different from using it for inscriptions. Parallels of a more sporadic and less drastic kind can be adduced from the tradition of Alcman, where late Laconian spellings such as *σ* for *θ*, and *ἀνηρομένοι* for *ἀν-*, won acceptance at Alexandria and appear in our papyri.³

'Boeotica incerti auctoris'

The possibility that Corinna belongs somewhere between 450 and 225 B.C., therefore, deserves as much attention as the polar alternatives that have so far been canvassed, even if it does make a narrow dating harder. I shall argue for a date towards the end of this intermediate period, on various grounds. As some of them are linguistic, I must first say how much Corinna I think we have. There are about fifty small fragments of Boeotian verse whose ascription to her is doubted or denied by Lobel, but seems highly probable to me.⁴ His arguments are as follows:

a peculiarity about enclitic accentuation (654 i 16, iii 50). This all shows special knowledge: may it not go back to the archetype? In general, accents only began to be written in poetic texts in the second century B.C., but in these dialect poets the peculiar accents were written for a different purpose, for flavour rather than clarity.

¹ 655 fr. 4 is taken by Lobel and Page as Boeotian prose, but I do not see why it cannot be verse, whether or not the colometry is in order; it has accents in it. 655 fr. 1 is preceded by remains of prose which may be more than a title; there are grounds for thinking that this was the first poem of the first book (below, p. 283), and a hypothesis would not be the only possibility. If Apollonius Dyscolus and his son Herodian really used Boeotian datives in quoting titles (658 *Βοιωτοί*, 660 *Εὐωνυμῆς*; 'nicht glaublich', Maas, *RE* xi. 1396. 66), it may have been

a family pedantry, or modelled on some specimen of Boeotian philology preserved in conjunction with the text of the poems. In 659, Apollonius uses *Ἑπτά ἐπὶ Θήβαις* as the dative of *Ἑπτά ἐπὶ Θήβας*.

² Page, 65 exaggerates the non-vernacular element in her dialect (cf. Latte, 57–61 = 499–502), and unfairly quotes a sentence out of context to suggest that Wilamowitz was blind to it.

³ Aristophanes and Thucydides used *σ* for the Laconian *θ* at an earlier date, but I do not think it likely that it intruded into texts of Alcman in their time. Risch has shown how the Alexandrian text of Alcman was also influenced by acquaintance with the 'Doric' of Cyrene (*Mus. Helv.* xi [1954], 30–7).

⁴ *PSI* 1174, *P.Oxy.* 2371–4; Lobel on p. 60 of *P.Oxy.* xxiii. Page in his *Melici* calls them *Boeotica incerti auctoris*.

1. 'To judge by 2370, *BKT* v (ii) xiv, and the quotations, Corinna employs only two kinds of verse, glyconics and ionics (three, if we include the couple of hexameters quoted from her)', whereas these measures cannot be discerned in the disputed fragments. The situation is that the Berlin papyrus shows us two poems, one in ionics and one in glyconics;¹ *P.Oxy.* 2370 shows us another in glyconics, but not used on the same principle; brief quotations from the *Euonymiai* and *Kataplous* are compatible with glyconics, and one from the *Seven against Thebes* is compatible with ionics. Five further quotations are probably glyconics (664, 666, 675, 676b, 684), but we do not know that they came from different poems; 657 and 674 are hexameters; other quotations are metrically as obscure as the papyri in question (658 (*Boiotos*), 669, 678, 689). There is not enough evidence to justify the claim that in five books of poems Corinna used only two kinds of verse. We must bear in mind that the books may have been arranged by metre, and that a disproportionate number of the quotations may come from the first two.

2. 'Other slighter differences' in the group of dubious fragments are:

(a) the occurrence of genitives in *-vo* (= *-ουο*). There is only one clear example; another (*ἀμβρόστου* 690. 10) is conjectural and unnecessary. Its absence from our other fragments may be fortuitous.

(b) Hiatus within the line. Five apparent examples: one (690. 10) shows strong punctuation, and looks like a verse-end; in two others (691. 10, 692 fr. 1. 6) false colometry may again be involved; in a fourth (690. 6) the unelided vowel is unelidable, *π<ο>υρὶ ἔκλον*, and one might think of corrections such as *ποῦρ ἔκλον*, *πουρὶ κῆλον*, *πουρὶ φέ κῆλον*; in the fifth (692 fr. 3/4. 9), *ἐνθα* may have been written exceptionally with *scriptio plena* to avoid the suggestion of *ἐνθα*. We cannot object to hiatus at verse-end so long as we cannot identify the metre.

(c) A false digamma, 694 fr. 2. 4: Lobel himself finds an alternative interpretation on p. 86.

3. Three of the papyri in question (*PSI* 1174, *P.Oxy.* 2372 and 2374) are less consistent than the Berlin papyrus in writing *ov* for *υ* (but two of them show corrections to *ov*). As Lobel admits, this is an external feature of the manuscripts, and it cannot seriously be held to have any bearing on authorship.

My argument is this:

If the fragments are not Corinna, what are they? It is true that Plutarch apparently knew a poem of the blameworthy Murtis (*Melici* 716). But he was a Boeotian, with an interest in local antiquities and an exceptionally good library. The Alexandrians Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian, working at the same period, can only quote Corinna for Boeotian forms. That the burghers of Hermopolis and Oxyrhynchus in the second and third centuries had any Boeotian poetry to read other than Corinna seems to me highly unlikely.²

External evidence

In the Roman period Corinna was supposed to be an early author, contemporary with Pindar.³ We can see how such an opinion could have arisen

¹ Like Lobel and Hephaestion, I use 'glyconic' here to include the 'choriambic dimeter' or 'wilamowitzianus'.

² The statement in *P.Oxy.* 2438 ii that Pindar's father was called Scopelinus *κατὰ Κόρινναν καὶ ἐρέας ποιητρίας* is not of a form

to inspire confidence. In any case it is not said that this strangely unanimous host of poetesses wrote in Boeotian.

³ See Page, 71-3; Prop. 2. 3. 21 *antiqua Corinna*, vague as it is, may suggest the same.

from her reference to Murtis' vying with Pindar, especially if she elsewhere spoke of Murtis as a contemporary—provided that no one knew any better. I cannot think that this is a difficult proviso, but it is perhaps more easily satisfied if she lived somewhat before the archetype was made than if she made it herself.¹

Page rightly places no reliance on Tatian's reference to a statue by Silanion.² There is another piece of archaeological evidence that he might have mentioned. An extant statuette of the Roman period, clearly labelled as Corinna, is held on stylistic grounds to be modelled on a fourth-century original.³ Richter describes it as 'a slight work, and very generalized', and is accordingly disinclined to connect it with Silanion. Nevertheless, it would prove that Corinna was famous in the fourth century, if we knew that the original as well as the copy was intended as Corinna. But if she did not exist in the fourth century, and a demand for busts of her only arose in a period of imitation, what was to stop a Sappho being used as a model?

Genre

Corinna refers to herself as singing fair *φεροῖα* for girls of Tanagra who are wearing white dresses: 655 fr. 1. 2–3 *καλὰ φεροῖ' αἰσομέναν | Ταναγρίδεσσι λευκοπέπλυν*, cf. 11 *παρθ[έ]νυσσι κατά[ρχομη] (?)*. As *Φεροῖα* was adopted as the collective title of her poems, or at any rate of a sizeable section of them,⁴ we can take it that other poems appeared to be of the same nature. In 690. 11–12, in the exordium of the *Orestas*, we read *γέγα[θεν δὲ . . .] ὄν χορὸς ἂν ἐπτά-πουλων*: a chorus at Thebes.⁵ In the exordium of a poem whose title ended *].ια* (692 fr. 2), we see a mention of *παρθένυ κόρη*: they might be the Muses, but three lines later we see that certain people who can hardly be the Muses are going to sing beautifully, *λυ]γού δὲ μέλπον[θ.]* (sc. *-ονθι* or *-ονθη*). *κοῦφος* in line 3 suggests the dance.⁶ Terpsichore, the Muse named in 655 fr. 1. 1, is not chosen at random.

Corinna, then, writes for a Tanagraean girls' chorus. A chorus presupposes a festival. Not necessarily at Tanagra; the *Orestas* was written for performance at Thebes, and the Tanagraean girls may have competed in more than one place. When Corinna says *μέγα δ' ἐμῆς γέγαθε πόλιν | λειγουροκτύλιν ἐνοπής* (655 fr. 1. 4–5), she may be referring to Tanagra's pride in its strength against rivals.

Metres

First the structure of the single verse. Of the ionic I have nothing to say. In the glyconics, the predominant type is $\circ \circ - \times - \circ \circ -$. This already appears as an occasional variant in Sappho and Anacreon;⁷ in Corinna the relative frequencies are reversed. The resolved base $\circ \circ \circ - \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \times - \circ \circ - \\ \circ \circ - \circ - \end{array} \right.$, which

¹ Latte, 66 = 506, argues 'Kroisos und Chrysipp zusammenzubringen, versucht keine antike Anekdote'. No indeed, but the case is scarcely parallel.

² *Ad Graecos* 33, p. 34. 16 Schwartz; Page, 73 n. 6.

³ S. Reinach, *Rev. arch.* xxxii (1898), 161 ff. and pl. v, cf. xxxvi (1900), 169 ff.; G. Richter, *The Portraits of the Greeks*, i. 144.

⁴ 656 *Κόριννα Φεροίων α'*, cf. 657 *Κ. ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ*.

⁵ Cf. Pind. fr. 94b. 60; Page, 28. The time is spring. We know of a springtime festival at Thebes at which a girls' choir sang in praise of Apollo, the Daphnaphoria. We cannot tell what *δαφνι* is doing in 655 fr. 2. 3; but the *Orestas* might well have ended with glorification of Apollo.

⁶ Cf. Pind. *O.* 14. 17 (quoted by Lobel), *Ar. Th.* 954, *Melici* 936. 7.

⁷ Sappho 95. 9, 96. 7; Anacr. 349. 1, 357. 5.

occurs in five successive lines at the beginning of 655 fr. 1 and sporadically elsewhere, is foreign to archaic poetry, but common throughout the fifth century, and it can still be instanced in the late fourth (Aristonous, see below). Its occurrence in each of the first five lines of a poem prompts comparison with the openings of certain late Euripidean choruses.¹ A rarer resolution appears in line 22, ...]. τέκετο τυ[; cf. Eur. *IA* 580, 781, et al.

That poem has its glyconics *κατὰ στίχον*, with no sign of a strophe (pauses at verses 3, 5, 8, 11, 13). In 654 we have an ionic and a glyconic poem composed in stanzas of six and five verses respectively, marked by catalexis and sense-pause. The general principle can be illustrated from archaic lyric and from drama.² The pieces most reminiscent of Corinna, however, come from a later period. Maas drew attention to Aristonous' Paeon of 334 B.C.:³

*Πυθίαν ἱερόκτιτον
ναίων Δελφίδ' ἀμφὶ πέτραν
ἀεὶ θεσπιόμαντιν ἔδ-
ραν, ἣν ἱὲ Παιάν.*

Twelve stanzas like this, with glyconics of both forms alternating freely; there are twenty with medial and sixteen with final choriamb. Once we find ∪ ∪ ∪ - . . . (37); once × - ∪ - - ∪ ∪ - (29), as in Corinna 654 ii 32, 664b. 2, Eur. *Ph.* 236, etc.

The glyconic ephymnion of Limenius' Paeon of 128 B.C. (p. 149 Powell) is not in stanzas, but resembles Corinna in that the final choriamb predominates over the medial (seven to three in the verses complete enough to classify).

We may also compare the Epidaurian hymn to the Mother of the Gods,⁴ with its narrative in telesilleans, beginning with an appeal to the Muses, ending with a salutation to the Mother. The stonecutter of the third or fourth century A.D. had a defective hand-copy to follow, but we can see that the poem was composed in four-line stanzas like the last:⁵

*πόντω τε τρίτον μέρος,
χοῦτως ἀπελεύσομαι."
χαῖρ' ὦ μεγάλα ἄνασ-
σα Μᾶτερ' Ὀλύμπω.*

Attempts at dating range from the fifth century B.C. (Maas) to the second A.D. (Latte, *GGA* cxvii (1934), 409 ff. = *Kl. Schr.* 754 ff.). Maas's date is certainly too early, and Latte's too late. But his arguments bring it down to Hellenistic times: I have argued for a third-century date on pp. 212 ff. above.

It is hardly profitable to discuss other metres that Corinna may have used. 693 fr. 1. 1-16 seems to have had five-line strophes composed of three long lines and two short, but the metre is obscure.⁶ I do not enter into the problem of

¹ *Ph.* 202, *Or.* 807 (Euripides' most popular play), *IA* 164, 543. However, I am not impressed by the verbal parallels with *Ba.* 74 ff. (Page, 20 n. 5).

² Alc. 60?; Anacr. 347 = 417, 358-62; Aesch. *Pers.* 65 ff., *Suppl.* 1018 ff.; Ar. *Eq.* 973 ff., 1111 ff., *Eccl.* 289 ff.; Wilamowitz, *Gr. Verskunst*, 446.

³ Powell, *Coll. Alex.* 162. On the dating see G. Daux, *BCH* lxxvi-vii (1942/3), 137-40;

P. de La Coste-Messelière, *BCH* lxxiii (1949), 235-8.

⁴ *Melici* 935, but better in P. Maas, *Epidaurische Hymnen*, 134.

⁵ Maas, 135: 'aus 6 Vierzeilern, die teils durch Sinnespause, teils durch Katalexe (22), teils durch beides abgegrenzt werden'.

⁶ 2, 3, 7 look dactylic; 13 εἰροῦ πορ-φο[υρ-, 14]δ' ἐπ' Εὐρίππο look anything but.

654 i 1–6.¹ The tendency to treat syllables as short before mute and liquid, adduced by Lobel as an argument against an early date, perhaps has more to do with dialect than with epoch.²

Contents

Corinna's songs were narrative, dealing with local Boeotian legends.³ This was sufficiently clear from the fragments before her own description appeared, 655 fr. 1. 9 ff.

λόγια δ' †ἐπ πατέρω[ν
κοσμέισασα† ϖιδιο[
παρθ[έ]νυσι κατα[
πο]λλά μὲν Καφ[ισόν
]αγον κοσμ[]s,
πολλά δ' Ὠρί[ωνα] μέγαν
κῆ πεντείκοντ' οὐψιβίας
πῆδα[s ὥς νού]μφησι μυγ[ί]s⁴
· · · · ·

The criticism of Murtis may have come from the same manifesto:

μέμορμη δὲ κῆ λιγουράν
Μουρτιδ' ἰώνγ', ὅτι Πινδάρου
βανὰ φοῦσ' ἔβα πὸτ ἔριν⁵
· · · · ·
ἰώνει δ' εἰρώων ἀρετὰς
χεῖρωάδων – ∪ ∪ –

The song would begin with a conjuration of the Muse:

655 fr. 1. 1 ἐπί με Τερψιχόρα [καλὶ vel sim.⁶
692 fr. 36 (title)].[
(incipit) λιγουφ[ων- (or φ[θογγ-)
(title) Θιομαχία
(incipit) Μῶσα μ[υ (c.g.)
693 fr. 1. 17 ff.]πων Ὀλουμπ[
].ε
]ετε δεῦρ' ὁμε[ρίωση (?]

654 ii 13 Μω[σ

¹ See Page, 87 f.; A. E. Harvey, *CQ* n.s. v (1955), 176–9; Page again, *CQ* n.s. vii (1957), 109–12.

² Cf. Bowra, *CR* xlv (1931), 4 f.

³ 'Lyric nomes' (*Suda*) means no more than lyric narrative poems.

⁴ 9 ἐπ corrected from εν pap.: ἐς Lobel, cl. Alc. fr. 339: ἀπ Lloyd-Jones (*CR* 1958, 20), cf. Alc. fr. 371. In 10, Lloyd-Jones suggests κοσμέισασ' ἰδίο[ι λόγοι, but initial digamma is nowhere demonstrably neglected, and it seems rash to assume neglect when it is actually written. What scribe would know that ἰδιος should have a digamma? I cannot suggest an alternative supplement, except ἀφνδιδ[ω, with internal digamma written as

in ἀφύδιμος 694 fr. 5(a) 8; but I know no lyric example of epic diectasis except Stesichorus *P.Oxy.* 2735 fr. 16. 3. (Alexandrian poets use it under certain conditions [K. Meister, *Die hom. Kunstsprache*, 67 ff.]; Hermesianax 7. 13 has uncontracted ἀοιδιάει; Cercidas 4. 49 Powell has uncontracted φνοιάει in his racy brand of lyric.) The dot written over and to the left of the first iota looks like a trema abandoned half way through; perhaps Υ had been misread as ι.

⁵ I transpose Πινδάρου from after ἔβα, since βανὰ φοῦσ' must scan ∪ – –.

⁶ Cf. Pind. fr. 94c ὁ Μοισαγέτας με καλεῖ χορεῦσαι.

Alternatively, with a description of the circumstances of performance; so in the *Orestas* fragment, which I tentatively reconstruct as glyconics:

Ἀ]ς μὲν ὠκιανῶ λιπῶ-
 σα π[αγὰς] ἱαρὸν φάος
 σελάνας <σ>πάσα[τ' ὠραν]ῶ.
 Ὡρη δ' ἐς Διὸς ἄμβροτυ
 5 [νίονθ]ῇ φέαρὸς ἐν ἀνθεσι<ν>,
 γέγα[θεν δὲ πόνυς πο]δῶν
 χορὸς ἀν ἐπτάπουλον [πόλυν.

So too in 692 fr. 2 (cf. above), and perhaps in 654 ii 18-19]ἄέλιος, θ]ουσίας.

The narrative was simple and ballad-like,¹ and might continue to the end of the song with no epilogue (690. 1-7).

We have some notion of the kind of choral song performed at religious festivals in the time of Pindar, even in Boeotia, even by girls' choirs at Thebes: we have it from Pindaric fragments. In metre, style, and contents they are utterly unlike Corinna, and it is not easy to believe that she was in the same business. It will not do to say that Pindar was an eagle and that Corinna, who knew her limitations, deliberately chose simpler and humbler ways. We can see from Bacchylides what the jackdaws were like: simpler, certainly, but having much more in common with Pindar than with Corinna.

These were professionals with patrons in various parts of the Greek world. It might be wrong to emphasize the contrast between the Panhellenic nature of their myths and the parochial nature of Corinna's; she can be put beside Alcman. It may be significant, though, that when she does refer to a non-Boeotian story, the birth of Zeus (Cithaeron's song, 654 i 12-18), it appears in a form that is standard for the Alexandrian poets but unattested earlier than Euripides' *Bacchae*: the story that Zeus was hidden by the Kouretes.²

The poem beginning ἐπὶ μὲ Τερψιχόρα (655) may provide another indication of relatively late date. Certain things suggest that it stood at the beginning of the collection:³

1. The collection was known as *Φερούα*, a name which must have been taken from the text. The opening was particularly likely to provide a title,⁴ and there stands *φερούα* in the second line of this poem.
2. Hephaestion, seeking examples of glyconics with final choriamb, quotes verses 2-5 of this poem. It is well known that his habit was to take the first example he came to, and we can infer that this was at least the first glyconic poem in the collection.
3. It seems to be preceded in the papyrus by some prose.

Now when we read it, it is hard to avoid the impression that it is *designed* to be the introduction to a book.⁵ Corinna says she is going to sing *φερούα*. We do not

¹ Bowra, *Heroic Poetry*, 549.

² Eur. *Ba.* 120 ff.; Palaikastro hymn 17 ff. (Powell, 160; *JHS* lxxxv [1965], 149); Call. *Hymn.* 1. 52; Arat. 35; Ap. Rhod. 2. 1234. Wrongly Wilamowitz (*BKT*), 47, 'der hesiodischen Theogonie entsprechend'.

³ Cf. Maas, *RE* xi, 1394. 21 ff.

⁴ The crass example of [Xen.] *Ἀθηναίων*

πολιτεία comes to mind.

⁵ Lobel, *P.Oxy.* xxiii, p. 61. Maas, loc. cit., had divined that Hephaestion's quotation came from a 'Prooimion, in dem K. den altertümlichen und epichorischen Charakter ihrer Poesie kennzeichnete'; τὰ δὲ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται.

know what the word means, or whether the plural implies more than one poem, but it may. She says she tells tales of old, of Cephisus, of Orion and his sons, and more.¹

The practice of composing an introductory poem for a collection of one's poems is not attested before the first half of the third century. The clearest case seems to be Posidippus (H. Lloyd-Jones, *JHS* lxxxiii [1963], 96); and Theocritus' epigram 27 (*AP* 9. 434, ἄλλος ὁ Χῖος) looks authentic to me. No one can say it is impossible in 350; but it would be gravely improbable in 450. It will not be seriously proposed that the poem is an addition by a later editor. It is her own manifesto, not designed to be sung and accordingly not composed in stanzas. The blaming of Murtis, ὅτι Πινδάρου βανὰ φούσ' ἔβα πὸτ' ἔριν, again makes us think of the third rather than the fifth century. Guillon has made the obvious comparison with Theoc. 7. 47,

Μοισᾶν ὄρνιχες ὅσοι ποτὶ Χῖον ἀοιδὸν
ἀντία κοκκύζοντες ἐτώσια μοχθίζοντι.

Language

654 i 13, ζάθεος applied to persons is late, first in Philodamus Scarpheus 139 (Powell p. 169; 325 B.C.?). (Like Page p. 18 and Bolling, *AJP* lxxvii [1956], 283, I would have expected θαθί[οι . . .] ἄντροι, but the accent is against it.)

14 λαθράδαν and iii 20 κρουφάδαν are twin extensions from λάθρα or λάθρα and κρύφα. Latte thinks them early; even if they are, it would not follow that anyone who used them was early. Homer has κρυφήδον.

15 τάνικα for άνίκα by analogy with relative τάν, τόν, etc. Only here?

18 τὰδ' ἔμελψεν, cf. R. Führer, *Formproblem-Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik*, 40 f.: 'Ganz isoliert ist das redeabschliessende τὰδε bei Corinna . . . Vergleichbar ist nur Call. fr. 228, 52 τὰδ' ἔφα θεός und fr. 194, 44 ἡ μὲν τὰδ', οὐκέτ' ἄλλα sowie Batr. 56 πρὸς τὰδε μειδίσσας Φυσίγναθος ἀντίον ἦῦδα.'²

21 χροσσοφαῖς as it stands is a Boeotianized Atticism, indicative of lateness. See Page, p. 55 for alternative readings.

22 ὦρθεν is claimed by Latte as a mark of earliness, but Corinna may have got it from a predecessor. Cf. Page, p. 56.

29 λοῦπῃσι κά[θ]εκτος. Fifth-century verse uses ἀτοχος, e.g. Soph. *Tr.* 978. κάθεκτος first appears in Demosthenes and is common in late prose; in verse, Orph. Hymn. 10. 6 δινοκάθεκτε, i.e. δίνη κάθεκτε (*CQ* N.S. xviii [1968], 290; second to third century A.D.).

34 μου[ρε]άδεσσι as an adjective, if rightly read, is paralleled only in *Rhesus* 913 (fourth century, as I believe).

iii 15 δουῖν, sc. δυνεῖν, an Attic innovation of the late fourth century (caused by dissimilation as the pronunciation of οι approached closer to that of υ, cf. οἴκει for οἴκοι). Bechtel connected δυνεῖν with the nominative δύνε found in a few dialects; but it does not occur in those dialects. Boeotian had δυοῖν (*IG* 7. 1739. 7, c. 300 B.C.). Wilamowitz conjectured δουῖν, perhaps rightly.

¹ If Libya in 17 is the nymph from whom Cadmus was descended, we might supply τέκετο, κῆ] Λιβούαν κ[αλάν. In 19, the mysterious φίρίω might be interpreted as εἰρίου, a title of Nereus that I tentatively conjectured on other grounds at Hes. *Th.* 234.

² τοιάδε and ὡδε are also Hellenistic in this function, as Führer adds in a footnote, except for Tyrt. 4. 10 Bergk. On the date of the *Batrachomyomachia* cf., if in doubt, *Harv. Stud.* lxxiii (1968), 123 n. 35.

16 κρατούνι, Latte finds no parallels later than Tragedy. But cf. *Anacreontea* 59. 3; Orph. Hymn. 3. 11, 58. 8, 64. 8, 87. 1; Heitsch, *Gr. Dicht. d. röm. Kaiserzeit*, no. 59. 1. 6 (Leiden magical papyrus, iv A.D.).

19 πιθέταν, Latte claims that 'diese Form allein verbietet die Spätdatierung Korinnas', namely because the verbal dual died in Boeotian in the fifth century (ἀνεθέταν on two third-century inscriptions being a stereotyped survival from older dedications). But if Callimachus is capable of forming καθδραθέτην (fr. 260. 63), ἀναδραμέτην (fr. 284), ὀδεύετον (fr. 648), why should Corinna be incapable of πιθέταν?

24 κάσσονθῃ is not what we expect, whether Corinna is early or late; see Page, p. 58. *Scriptio plena* may have been used in Ptolemaic texts; κῆ may then have been vulgarized to καί, and the crasis incorrectly made.

25 ἀγείρω is wrong for the nominative plural, which should be ἀγείροι (< -ωι); and the heroes are not going to be unaging. ἀγείρω is genitive, agreeing with τρίποδος; compare Philodamus Scarpheus 119 ἀγήρων . . . ναὸν ἀνακτι Φοίβῳ.

μ[α]ντοσ[ο]οῦνω as an adjective: Latte can find no parallel later than Tragedy, but it seems an unavoidable restoration in Limenius 33.

43 ἀτ[ρ]έκ[ιαν] χρεῖ[σ]μολόγον looks a late type of expression, but I cannot illustrate it.

655 fr. 1. 5 λιγουροκωτίλως, an overweight adjective that smacks of the dithyramb. It is admittedly not as extravagant as Pratinas' λαλοβαρύοψ,¹ not to mention the γοεροστονοθηρνοαλήμων of a curious later poem.² The second element, though formally the simple adjective κωτίλος, is no doubt felt to have some verbal force, so that the compound represents λιγυρὰ κωτίλλων rather than a blatant portmanteau of λιγυρὸς καὶ κωτίλος. All the same, one would expect rather λιγυκωτίλος in a contemporary of Pindar. I should like to know where else, before Philox. Leuc. 836. 41 χλιεροθαλπές, an adjective with the formative suffix -ρο- is compounded with a verbal second element.

For κωτίλος in a complimentary sense cf. the Epidaurian hymn to Pan, *Melici* 936. 4.³ In Boeotia its associations may have been improved by the use of κωτίλας as a nickname for the swallow.

674 Θέσπια καλλιγένηθλε φιλόξενε μουσοφίλητε looks late in style. There may be a reference to the 'Hesiodic Muses' honoured at Thespieae, we do not know how early (cf. *IG* 7. 1785, 4240 b, c, Paus. 9. 27. 5).

693 fr. 1. 14 Εὐρίπνο. It is not likely that -νο is the result of levelling in the later tradition, for our texts consistently preserve οι derived from ωι. The archetype will therefore have had -νο. But it is difficult to believe that Corinna wrote the word in this form. For the masculine genitive singular she had the choice of vernacular -ω and epic/lyric -οιο.⁴ -νο just did not exist, unless we suppose that Boeotian rhapsodes were so inbred as to pronounce Homer in this way. The same may be said, *mutatis mutandis*, about γῆαν (654 iii 39, 655 fr. 1. 21). Dative plurals in -ῶσι are easier, as the product of

poetic	-οις	-οισι
vernacular	-υς	

¹ *Melici* 708. 12; to be dated to the late fifth century, see Lloyd-Jones, *Cuaderno de la Fundación Pastor*, xiii (1966), 15-18.

² Page, *Greek Lit. Pap.* 422, Heitsch, no. 6 fr. 1. 49.

³ Not pre-Hellenistic; perhaps as late as the second century A.D., as Latte argues, *GGA* cxvii (1934), 405 ff. = *Kl. Schr.* 750 ff.

⁴ For -οιο in non-scholastic Hellenistic lyric cf. *Paean. Delph.* 1. 8 and 25, Cerc. 5. 32.

But no similar parallelogram of forces leads to *-vo* or *γῆα*. The question 'what is to Boeotian *-ω* as epic *-οιο* to *-ου*?' is too difficult for a spontaneous answer.¹

I infer that Corinna wrote *-οιο* and *γαῖα*. This need not mean that she lived before the sound-changes, but it will mean that she was not contemporary with the archetype. We might fairly de-Boeotize her spelling, if we knew how far to go.

Conclusions

While more gifted than most of the local poets whose festival compositions were honoured by inscription on stone in the period 350–100 B.C., Corinna's stereotyped metrical cola and unoriginality of phrase class her with them rather than with Pindar and Bacchylides. Details of linguistic usage such as *δάθιον βρέφος*, *τάδ' ἔμελψεν*, *κάθεκτος*, *ἀγείρω τρίποδος*, *ἀτρέκια χρεισμολόγος*, *λιγουροκωτίλος*, and, if genuine, *χρουσοφαῖς* and *δουῖν*, greatly strengthen the case for a later dating. The use of a conspicuously Boeotian dialect, against classical precedent, suits the self-conscious regionalism of the later period. Guillon (p. 52) speaks of 'une volonté évidente, en contraste absolu avec l'œuvre de Pindare, de "faire du dialecte", qui ne se manifeste nulle part plus nettement que dans les inscriptions béotiennes du III^e s.' The same writer connects the tale about oracles in the Asopiades-poem with the reorganization of oracles by the Boeotian Confederacy in the second half of the third century, a suggestion which I am not competent to evaluate.

Considerations of literary history lead us in the same direction. There is an intrinsic implausibility in the hypothesis that Corinna's poetry survived underground for something over two centuries, finally to emerge and become a best-seller. On ordinary form it ought either to have got into the Panhellenic book trade in the fifth century, or vanished for good. When, furthermore, the collection appears all complete and shipshape with an introductory poem at the beginning—authentic, to all appearances—we may feel sure that we are not dealing with a writer of the fifth century, and highly doubtful whether we are dealing with one of the fourth.

It is hardly possible to be more precise. I have argued that Corinna is not quite as late as the archetype. That leaves the greater part of the third century open. Guillon's arguments would bring her down to the second half of it.

Marginalia

I finish untidily with some remarks on individual passages.

654 i 16 '*Πεία*' (*Πέα* before correction) should be '*Πία*', if we are using the archetype's spelling. *Frustra* Diehl, '*Πεία* voluit Cor., non '*Πία*, Homeri et Hesiodi memor'.

34 Page omits a bracket before *νν*. The whole word *εἴρισε* is preserved. But one might prefer *εἴριψε* or *εἴριξε*, if it were clearer what is happening.

ii 12, the heading, *F* [altered to *I*], might be *F* [*εροιῶν β'*] or the like. The new poem is in a different metre from the preceding one, and its contents suggest no name beginning with *γ* or *φ*.

20, an irregular hiatus, unless *φιλαές* is one word, 'liking to blow', of a breeze (cf. *ἄειτε* fr. 4. 6), or 'liking the dawn' (*ἄας* and *ἄές* are said to be Boeotian for

¹ There are linguists who might say that *-vo* could be re-formed on nom. pl. *-v* on the

model of *-οι* : *-οιο*. I would call that an abuse of the analogical principle.

'tomorrow', and assumed to be related to *ἀώς*). Cf. the opening of the *Orestes* as presented above.

The drift of the narrative in the rest of column ii seems to be: Asopus goes out to his watery haunts (26 Ἀσωπ[- υ υ] ἐν νομόν, with gloss ἐς); the gods come and remove his daughters (30 ἐς μελ]άθρων), causing him grief (32 ἐν πε[ιμονάν). The next two stanzas gave details of the distribution (38 δ' ἔσχε rather than Wilamowitz's κλέψε). Asopus is baffled (43 τ[οῖ δ' οὐ τις, cf. schol.; 45]σαφές), until (schol. 46 μέχρι)¹ [he meets the prophet of Apollo].

iii 25 f., e.g.

ἀγείρω τ' ἐς [μ]α[ντοσ]οῦνω
τρίποδος ὥτ[ε κλιενύ],

'and famous, as (far as you can take it) from the unaging oracle'. The oracle is dragged in by way of transition to the following account of its history:

τόδε γέρας κ[εκράτειχ' ἰὼ]ν κτλ.

(κ[ατέσχον Wilamowitz, but that is too short).

45 e.g. κῆ λού[πας ἀππαυε] φρένας, cf. iv 8 παύομ[η, i 29 λο]ύπησι.

iv 16 <f>εδν[. The digamma might be more easily omitted at the beginning of the line than elsewhere, but there may be an instance of omission even within the line at 655 fr. 2,]η <f>ερονσιμ[, if it was not]ηε ρουσι-. (The hyphen indicates a compound word; -μ[βροτ-?]

23 Wilamowitz's correction *ῥᾶδομη* deserves remembrance.

691. 10 Εὐω[νουμ-?

693 fr. 2. 1 δῶ]γνειτος is a possibility, besides Lobel's κατ[έ]γνειτος.

University College, Oxford

M. L. WEST

¹ There is punctuation at the end of 45, so that if I am right about the purport of the 'until', one would expect it to be the first word of 46. The beginning of 46 is read as θ[. There is a dialect word meaning 'until'

which begins with a theta and would justify a gloss: it is *θās*, found in Alcaeus fr. 70. 8 and 206. 6. The similar *ᾄς* is common to Sappho, Alcaeus, and Boeotian.