

MONODY, CHORAL LYRIC, AND THE TYRANNY OF THE HAND-BOOK*

Open any history or hand-book of Greek literature in general, or Greek lyric in particular, and you will very soon come across several references to monody and choral lyric as important divisions within the broader field of melic poetry. And the terms loom larger than the mere question of handy labels: they permeate and pervade the whole approach to archaic Greek poetry. Chapters or sub-headings in literary histories bear titles like 'Archaic choral lyric' or 'Monody'. Indeed it is possible to write a whole book and call it *Early Greek Monody*.¹ Diehl's *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* was structured around this distinction, which it adopted in preference to the chronological arrangement that is the obvious alternative. Indeed, it went so far as 'to invent Greek titles "μονωιδίαι" and "χορωιδίαι" (sic)'.² Most scholars would now agree that this is to go too far. But most would also continue to accept the validity and importance of the division, which a scholar³ has recently termed 'the most fundamental generic distinction within ancient lyric poetry'.

The Introduction to Bowra's *Greek Lyric Poetry*⁴ provides a helpfully clear example. The distinction is drawn, and the differences ranked under three main headings: (1) 'the stanzas of choral song were longer than those of monody... The difference may be due to the part taken by dance in [choral lyric]...because a set of complicated steps had to be performed, the stanza must coincide with them'; (2) 'the metres of choral songs are much more elaborate than those of monody'; (3) 'choral poets...are less intimate and personal than the writers of monody'. Not all scholars are so frank or explicit about their acceptance of this doctrine, but it can be shown to underlie any number of studies of Greek lyric poetry.

Two separate sets of reasons have started to cast doubt on the orthodoxy outlined above: our increased knowledge of the poetical output of the early lyrics, especially Stesichorus; and an increased sensitivity about the significance of the first person singular references in allegedly choral poets, especially Pindar.⁵ Let us proceed to examine the implications of this recent research.

* W. S. Barrett, Rudolf Kassel and Mary Lefkowitz helped me a great deal in the writing of this piece. Professor Lefkowitz's article 'Who sang Pindar's Victory Odes?', *AJP* 109 (1988), forthcoming, has enabled me to be relatively brief in my treatment of that topic.

¹ G. M. Kirkwood (Ithaca/London, 1974).

² To quote Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* 1.283, who rightly deplores 'the wrong impression' thus produced that these 'were terms of the ancient grammarians'.

³ G. W. Most ap. *Ancient Writers: Greece and Rome* (ed. T. J. Luce, 1982), p. 89. Compare W. Rösler, *Poetica (Zeitschrift für Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft)* 16 (1984), 192: 'Fraglich ist...inwieweit die antike Nomenklatur allein überhaupt eine tragfähige Grundlage für eine Gattungsabgrenzung bietet, findet sich doch, abgesehen vom Fehlen eines Oberbegriffs, auch der trotz bestehender Unschärfe keineswegs belanglose Unterschied zwischen Einzel- und Chorlied nicht erfasst' (my italics).

⁴ Second edition (Oxford, 1961), p. 6. Italics in the quotation are mine.

⁵ See especially M. Lefkowitz, *HSCP* 67 (1963), 177ff. and 84 (1980), 29ff. Meditation upon the complexities that underlie 'Ich' in early Greek lyric has led W. Rösler (sup. cit. [n. 3], p. 189) to entertain a degree of scepticism about the distinction we are examining: 'der Unterschied zwischen Einzel- und Chorgedicht insofern verschwimmen kann, als der Chor unter Umständen als blosses Medium des Autors fungiert. Doch auch da, wo der Text in dieser Hinsicht ambivalent oder gar auf die Individualität des Chores zugeschnitten ist, bleibt die Grenze hin zum Dramatischen unangetastet'. As will soon be seen, I think he could have carried this scepticism much further. For more general surveys of the problems posed by 'I' in early Greek lyric see Rösler, *Gnomon* 52 (1980), 609ff. and *QUCC* 19 (1985), 131ff.

I. THE ANCIENT EVIDENCE: INTERNAL

Ab Stesichoro incipiamus. Perhaps the most important consequence of our increased knowledge of this poet is the growing perception that in the light of his epic-style and immensely long narrative poems he is unlikely to have been a choral lyric.⁶ The perpetual association of him with Homer in antiquity⁷ points in the direction of monody. And yet his poetry was certainly composed in strophe, antistrophe and epode. Therefore, as Professor West saw, 'Triadic structure...can be understood as a purely musical principle of composition...the fact that Stesichorus' poetry is triadic is no evidence that it was choral'.⁸ The importance of this observation can hardly be exaggerated. And the repercussions of this revaluation of Stesichorus reach far beyond his personal significance.

The case of *Ibycus* is even more striking: no ancient authority denotes him as choral.⁹ He does not even have a name – like Stesichorus – suggesting this type of performance. It must, indeed, have been the frequent association of the two poets, in modern times as in antiquity,¹⁰ that has kept the younger lyric so regularly ranked among the choral composers. So long as Stesichorus was regarded as one of them the same might reasonably be inferred of Ibycus. The two have numerous features (including triadic structure)¹¹ in common: the mode of performance is likely to have been the same for both. But in the light of our newly gained knowledge of Stesichorus, our perceptions of the character of that mode should change.

The internal evidence of subject-matter and style tells a straightforward tale, and it is hard to believe that the first scholar to lend his ear to it was Richmond

⁶ I will deal at greater length with this question in my forthcoming commentary on the poet. Suffice it here to observe that Stesichorus' monodic character was largely perceived by Kleine in his edition of the poet (Berlin, 1828) and then rediscovered, after intervening obfuscation, by M. L. West, *CQ* 21 (1971), 312f. and M. W. Haslam, *QUCC* 17 (1974), p. 33 and n. 53. (Wilamowitz already saw most of the truth (e.g. *Sappho und Simonides* [Berlin, 1913], p. 239 where Stesichorus' titled poems are compared with the titled dithyrambs of Bacchylides: 'es sind also alles mythische Erzählungen gewesen, entsprechend dem was wir über die Dithyramben des Lokrers Xenokrates hören'.) On ancient references to τὰ τρία τῶν Cτηρίχου see my note in *JHS* 102 (1982), 206ff.

⁷ See *Testimonia* B 5ff. in my forthcoming edition of the lyric fragments (vol. 1).

⁸ Sup. cit. (n. 6).

⁹ He is reported to have been the inventor of the *σαμβύκη* [TB14], a type of lyre.

¹⁰ See, e.g., frs. 251, 258 and 262 (Stes.) = frs. 328, 335 and 317 (Ibyc.).

¹¹ Ibycus' employment of this was obviously the reason for Welcker's verdict (inevitably limited to the citational fragments): 'Der längere Anfang eines Liebesliedes von Ibykos in Chorstrophen und alle übrigen Bruchstücke berechtigen zu der Annahme, dass seine ganze Poesie für Chöre eingerichtet war' (from his review of Schneidewin's *Ibyci Rhagini carminum reliquiae*, reprinted in *Kl. Schr.* 1.230). So too Schmid, *Geschichte der gr. Literatur* I.1 p. 492: 'Wenn er in den Rhythmen sich nicht den Liedformen der östlichen Lyrik anschliesst, so muss er seine Lieder ebenso wie vorher seine Balladen für Chorvortrag bestimmt haben' etc. Similarly Bowra (sup. cit. [n. 4], p. 251) infers of the Polycrates Ode 'We have the best part of four triads, each composed in strophe, antistrophe and epode. This means that the poem was sung by a choir'. (The general inference is rightly questioned by Most (sup. cit. [n. 3]), p. 90.) 'The erotic hymns written by Ibycus at the court of Polycrates seem to have been choral' according to Jebb, *Bacchylides* (Cambridge, 1905), p. 42. For a recent instance of the inference that Ibycus is choral see Maehler's Introduction to his commentary on Bacchylides' *epinicia* (*Die Lieder des Bacchylides* 1. *Die Siegeslieder* I (*Mnemos. Suppl.* 62 [1982]), pp. 1 and 3). The crushing effect of traditional assumptions is illustrated by the way in which Schmid (sup. cit., p. 496) perceives Ibycus' 'Annäherung an Geist und Form der monodischen Lyrik' but feels obliged to argue it away (p. 492) partly by recourse to an inappropriate analogy with Pindar's *epinicia* ('einer Art subjektivster Epinikien'), partly by the conviction that only poetry which employs the metres of Anacreon and the Lesbian poets can be deemed monodic.

Lattimore¹² in 1960. According to his thumb-nail sketch of Ibycus' career, 'Like Stesichorus a Western Greek, he travelled widely and appears to have made a good living out of choral poetry. He also, I think, wrote lyric monody, of which [286 P] is probably an example'. D. A. Campbell in 1967¹³ asserted, I presume independently, that 'the two finest surviving poems of Ibycus (286 and 287) can hardly have been other than solo-song', an observation that might have been taken into account by G. M. Kirkwood in 1974 when he stated '[Lattimore] holds that the fragments of love poetry (286–7 P) are monody, and I know of no specific evidence to contradict this opinion'.¹⁴

It is surprising that none of these scholars took the next obvious step and assigned the rest of Ibycus' output to the class of monody. But Lattimore and Campbell abide by tradition in otherwise associating him with choral lyric.¹⁵ And yet the famous Polycrates Ode (282 P = S 151), for instance, is deliberately calculated to remind us of epic-style heroic narratives:¹⁶ nothing could be more natural or appropriate than for such subject-matter to be recited by the poet himself in the mode of the Homeric bard. And there is nothing about 288 P,¹⁷ S166 or S176, or any other of the less well preserved fragments of this author, that contradicts his right to the title of monodist. Yet the picture of him as a choral poet continues to prevail.

Alcman stands in a somewhat different position. He was famous for his *partheneia* in antiquity, and it so happens that the most extensive and interesting of his fragments fall within this class of poetry. But is that to say that all Alcman's compositions were intended to be sung and danced by a complete chorus with instrumental accompaniment? And does that in turn entail that all his poems were performed by choruses of young girls?¹⁸

So deep-rooted is that assumption in the minds of most scholars that any evidence (internal or external) seeming to contradict it has to be explained away by various stratagems. Some fragments contain a first-person reference¹⁹ most naturally to be interpreted as used not only *of* but *by* the poet himself: in particular fr. 59A: *Ἐρως με δῆυτε Κύπριδος φέκατι | γλυκὺς κατεῖβων καρδίαν λαίνει* where the motif 'falling

¹² *Greek Lyrics*² (Chicago, 1960), p. 37. But note that Wilamowitz (e.g. *Pindaros* [Berlin, 1922], p. 233) was already aware that 'die Knabenlieder des Ibykos sind formell von denen des Anakreon im Vortrage nicht verschieden gewesen'.

¹³ *Greek Lyric Poetry*, p. xxiv. Cf. the same scholar in *The Cambridge History of Greek Literature* (hereafter *CHGL*), p. 214.

¹⁴ Sup. cit. (n. 1), p. 212 n. 19. Cf. W. S. Barrett's brief summary of the tone of Ibycus, fr. 287 as 'sophisticated personal poetry' (*Euripides Hippolytos* [Oxford, 1964], p. 434).

¹⁵ E.g. Campbell (sup. cit. n. 13), p. xviii: 'the long papyrus fragment [282 P = S151] attributed to Ibycus or an imitator...provides an example of choral poetry', and in *CHGL*, p. 216: 'the choral poem written for Polycrates' (though *CHGL* ranks him, confusingly enough, under the heading 'Monody').

¹⁶ See especially J. P. Barron, *BICS* 16 (1969), 135f. and 31 (1984), 13ff. 'We know nothing about performance. We cannot even say for certain that any fragment must have been sung solo or...chorally' is the (excessively agnostic) verdict of T. B. L. Webster, *The Greek Chorus* (London, 1970), p. 79 on Ibycus' remains.

¹⁷ In spite of Bowra's picture (sup. cit. [n. 4], p. 258) of Ibycus spending upon Euryalus 'the rich resources of choral song'. Fr. 288 is associated with the intimate context of the symposium (cf. n. 24 *infra*) by W. Rösler, *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 9 (1983), 13.

¹⁸ Alcman 'wrote songs for men as well as songs for women' according to Webster, sup. cit. (n. 16), p. 61. Such open-mindedness is unusual.

¹⁹ That 'Alcman may speak in the first person singular as if he himself were singing' is allowed by M. Kaimio, *The Chorus of Greek Drama within the light of the Person and Number Used* (Helsinki, 1970), p. 31 in a brief analysis of the first person references found in his fragments. See further J. Herington, *Poetry into Drama* (London, 1985), pp. 22ff. and 229.

in love again' (as well as the context in which Athenaeus (600F) cites the lines) irresistibly reminds one of monody.²⁰ The tradition that Alcman was ἐρωτικός πάνυ (the Suda s.v.) *vel sim.* would seem to fit very well with such an interpretation. But instead we are told, for instance, that 'Evidently, the many expressions of homoerotic sentiments on the part of the choruses of maidens in his poems...were misconstrued as statements of personal involvement on the part of the poet himself'.²¹ Such a process is indeed conceivable; but where is the hard evidence that Alcman never ever practised monody which alone could justify the hypothesis? In spite of the anguish that will be caused to glib categorisers, it looks as if we must contemplate the likelihood that Alcman composed *both* monody *and* choral song. Furthermore, he may not have been alone in this versatility.

Error feeds on error: it is hardly surprising to find Ibycus' status as a choral poet defended by the comparison of his love-poems to *Pindar's* erotic *encomia*.²² But how do we know the latter were choral²³ (rather than as common sense,²⁴ among other things, would suggest monodic)? It is difficult to believe choral, for instance, those very personal compositions addressed to Theoxenus of Tenedos (fr. 123 Sn.) or to Thrasybulus of Acragas (fr. 124a–b Sn.). Indeed the scholar²⁵ who has devoted more time and energy to these poems than has anyone else goes one step further: 'Dans tout ce qui nous est rapporté au sujet des scolies²⁶ anonymes ou de ceux qui ont été composés par Alcée, Anacréon, Pythemos, Alcman, Hybrias, Callistratos, Mélétois, Aristote, d'autres encore, il n'y a pas le moindre indice d'une exécution chorale. Bien au contraire, ils présentent tous le même caractère d'une chanson de soliste. De plus

²⁰ E.g. Sappho 1.15ff., 22.11, 130; Anacreon 358.1, 376.1, 394B, 400.1 (to say nothing of Ibycus 287.1). Fr. 26.1f. P (οὐ μ' ἔτι, παρσενικαὶ μελιγάρνεις ἰαρόφωνοι, | γυνὴ φέρην δύναται) is an undeniable instance of a first-person allusion to Alcman himself, but constitutes a special case since, according to the orthodox interpretation, it 'may have been part of a prelude sung or recited by him before the performance of a partheneion' (Campbell sup. cit. [n. 13], p. 217 *et al.*). I have my doubts but I here suppress them. Fr 40: φοῖδα δ' ὀρνίχων νόμος | πάντων is also suggestive: ('the poet thus speaks through the performers' is the traditional explanation (so e.g. Kaimio sup. cit. [n. 19], p. 32); cf. W. Rösler, *Dichter und Gruppe* (Munich, 1980), p. 66 n. 87 etc.) as is fr. 106.

²¹ Most, *CQ* 37 (1987), p. 3 n. 16, following Calame, *Alcman* (Rome, 1983), p. xx. Compare my criticisms of Calame in *Gnomon* 58 (1986), 387. As for West's pretty picture (*CQ* 17 [1967], 15) of Alcman in fr. 5 col. ii 'before Thales, before Pythagoras, lightly limning a philosophical cosmogony for girls to sing at a public entertainment, and priding himself not at all as a thinker but as a poet and musician', it is not the least of the merits of the article by Most just cited that it reveals the implausibility of the first part of this scene (p. 6: 'whatever could have induced Alcman to place such a rebarbative doctrine in the tender mouths of the Dymainian maidens?') as well as of the second.

²² 'Nimmt man aber an, der Chor sei hier wie bei Pindaros nur Organ des Dichters zum Ausdruck von dessen eigenen Empfindungen, so sind diese Gedichte erotische Enkomien der Art wie sie auch Pindaros...gemacht hat': Schmid, sup. cit. (n. 11), p. 492 referring to Wilamowitz (sup. cit. n. 11), p. 511: 'Enkomia sind solche Gedichte alle, wenn auch gerade kein Komos dabei gewesen sein mag'.

²³ 'The skolia of Pindar seem to have differed from ordinary drinking songs in being choric, or at least accompanied by a choric dance': C. M. Fennell, *Pindar: the Nemean and Isthmian Odes* (Cambridge, 1899), p. 242 (= 1883 edn, p. 219); 'the skolia of Pindar were choral': Jebb, sup. cit. (n. 11); 'The σκόλιον...sung...by a company, like those of Ibycus, Pindar, and Bacchylides': Bowra, sup. cit. (n. 4), p. 6. And so on.

²⁴ Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), p. 39: 'as regards monody...it was again the banquet that furnished the richest opportunities'.

²⁵ B. A. van Groningen, *Pindare au Banquet: les fragments des scolies édités avec un commentaire critique et explicatif* (Leyden, 1960), pp. 15f. Cf. Lloyd-Jones, *PBA* 68 (1982), 143: 'performed, as Pindar's encomia must have been, by a single person' etc.

²⁶ For the relationship between the terms σκόλιον and ἐγκώμιον in ancient classifications of Greek lyric see Harvey, *CQ* 5 (1955), 162f.

les théories antiques concernant la nature du scolie et ses origines apportent une confirmation incontestable. Il est donc plus que probable que ceux de Pindare n'ont pas fait exception, et que le poète-compositeur les a chantés lui-même, l'instrument accompagnateur à la main'.

There is even stronger evidence for the placing of the *encomia* of *Bacchylides* in the class of monody: in fr. 20 B 1ff. the poet himself says ὦ βαρβιτε, μηκέτι πάσσαλον φυλάξε[ων]|ἐπτάτονον λι[γυράν κάππαυε γάρυν·|δεῦρ' ἐς ἐμὰς χέρας (cf. fr. 20C 1f.: μήπω λιγυαχ[έα - -]|βάρβιτον where Maas supplies κοῖμα *exempli gratia*). And since such language is irresistibly reminiscent of that used by Pindar in *Ol.* 1.17f. (Δωρίαν ἀπὸ φόρμιγγα πασσάλου|λάμβαν') we are drawn ineluctably on to the next stage of the argument.

For even the assumption that Pindar's *epinicia*, at least, may be safely assigned to the category of choral lyric can no longer be automatically made.²⁷ Here the sticking-point for several scholars²⁸ has proved to be *Pythian Four* which, with its massive length of nearly 300 lines²⁹ and preponderance of epic-style narrative,³⁰ looks intended for monodic performance.³¹ On internal evidence Wilamowitz deduced that the same was true of *Olympians One*³² and *Two*.³³ And Professor Mary Lefkowitz has recently reminded us³⁴ that 'Outside of the Pindar scholia' (and we know how reliable they can be) 'there is no direct evidence that every ode of Pindar was sung by a chorus'. Aristophanes' *Clouds* 1355f. is *prima facie* evidence for monodic performance of at least one of the *epinicia* of Simonides (πρώτον μὲν αὐτὸν τὴν λύραν λαβόντ' ἐγὼ 'κέλευα|ᾄσαι Ὀμηροῦ μέλος τὸν κριὸν ὡς ἐπέχθη: the reference is to

²⁷ See in particular Lefkowitz *ap. Pindare* (*Entretiens Hardt* 31 [1985]), pp. 46ff. and in *AJP* 109 (1988), forthcoming.

²⁸ Jurenka, *Sitzb. d. Wien. Akad. d. Wiss.* 1 (1986), 44, was so impressed by the length of *Pyth.* 4 that he concluded it could never have been intended for performance (cf. the counter-arguments of Imre Müller, *Quomodo Pindarus chori persona usus sit* [Diss. Freiburg, Darmstadt, 1914], pp. 27f.). Lloyd-Jones, *sup. cit.* (n. 25), Lefkowitz, *sup. cit.* (n. 27), p. 49 etc. deduce from the length that it was monodic.

²⁹ But to C. Segal *ap. CHGL*, p. 187 (cf. his *Pindar's Mythmaking* [Princeton, 1986], pp. 4f. and 10) *Pythian 4* is still 'our longest extant choral ode'.

³⁰ Identical, in other words, with two of the grounds for deeming Stesichorus monodic.

³¹ The assumption of choral performance is often written into the definition of the victory ode (e.g. Fraenkel, *sup. cit.* [n. 24], p. 40: 'ἐπινίκια, poems sung by a chorus to celebrate a victory', R. L. Fowler, *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric* [Toronto, 1987], p. 100, etc.). For a detailed survey of the evidence as to the performance of Pindaric *epinicia* see Herington (*sup. cit.* [n. 19]), pp. 28ff. and 181ff., Lefkowitz, *AJP* 109 (1988), forthcoming.

³² *Sup. cit.* (n. 11), p. 233 commenting on 1.7f. (ἀλλὰ Δωρίαν ἀπὸ φόρμιγγα πασσάλου|λάμβαν'): 'Ist das leere Redensart oder dürfen wir ihn beim Worte nehmen? Ist dies ein Chorlied, oder sang Pindar, die Phorminx auf den Knien, wie die bildende Kunst ihn dargestellt hat? Mich dünkt, man braucht es nur auszusprechen, dies Bild ist die Wahrheit'. Gerber's commentary *ad loc.* (Toronto, 1982) deplores any such attempt to extract factual information about performance from conventional expressions. On the evidence of art (for what it is worth) see Lefkowitz, *sup. cit.* (n. 27), p. 48 n. 45.

³³ *Sup. cit.* (n. 11), p. 240: 'Ol. 2 knüpft zwar auch an den Sieg an, ist aber gar kein Epinikion, sondern ein Gedicht an und auf Theron, ein Enkomion im späteren Sinne. Nichts deutet auf Vortrag durch einen Chor, die Phorminx wird eben so wie in Ol. 1 erwähnt, und so werden wir auch dies Gedicht von Pindar selbst vorgetragen glauben'.

³⁴ *Sup. cit.* (n. 27), p. 47. See too Herington (*sup. cit.* [n. 19]), pp. 27, 231 n. 68) etc.

³⁵ 'The circumstances, obviously, are not like those in which the epinician would originally have been performed; and yet it seems of some interest that by 423 B.C. a middle-aged Athenian can expect, apparently as a matter of routine, to hear the song performed by a soloist': Herington (*sup. cit.* [n. 19]), p. 28. Agreed, except for that jarring 'obviously' at the start. Pindar *Nem.* 4.13ff. seems to envisage, 'apparently as a matter of routine', monodic performance of a victory ode: see Lefkowitz, *AJP* 109 (1988), forthcoming.

fr. 507 P of this poet: *τοῦτο τὸ μέλος Σιμωνίδου ἐξ ἐπινίκου* comments one of the Aristophanic scholia *ad loc.*). Perhaps we should not infer too hastily that the poem is question was *originally* destined for monodic performance:³⁵ but the passage does at least show that no incongruity was perceived in the fifth century at the prospect of an *epinicion* monodically delivered.

The obvious implications of Pindar's *φόρμυγα... λάμβαν'* are regularly countered³⁶ by claims that such expressions are merely conventional, to be taken no more seriously than Horace's pretence that his odes were performed to the lyre. But does not such an argument beg the issue? If we take it for granted that the *epinicia* were all choral then of course we shall not be impressed by attempts to extract factual information from such statements. If we rid ourselves of that automatic assumption the picture may begin to seem different. Besides, the argument stressing convention is double-edged: why is it not the regularly vague references to the singer-dancers of the *epinicia* that are conventional and unreal?

II. THE ANCIENT EVIDENCE: EXTERNAL

This section could easily be shorter than the famous chapter *Concerning Snakes* (in *The Natural History of Iceland* from the Danish of Horrebow) which so tickled Dr Johnson: for in fact there is *no* ancient evidence of an external kind for the distinction we are studying. But so deep-rooted and far-spreading a belief in this distinction could not have survived so long without the imagined support of ancient testimony of some sort. The passage most frequently invoked for this purpose is Plato's *Laws* 764d–e:

ἀγωνιστικῆς μὲν οὖν ἀνθρώπων τε καὶ ἵππων τοὺς αὐτοὺς, μουσικῆς δὲ ἑτέρους μὲν τοὺς περὶ μονωιδίαν τε καὶ μιμητικὴν, οἷον ῥαψωιδῶν καὶ κιθαρωιδῶν καὶ αὐλητῶν καὶ πάντων τῶν τοιούτων ἀθλοθέτας ἑτέρους πρέπον ἂν εἶη γίνεσθαι, τῶν δὲ περὶ χορωιδίαν ἄλλους.

An accurate translation of this might run:

In the case of athletic competitions there should be the same umpires for men and horses; but in the case of musical contests there should be one set of umpires for (a) solo singing and (b) mimetic representation – I mean (a) performed by those who are rhapsodes and those who sing to the lyre and (b) those who play on the pipes and all such individuals – and another set of umpires for performers of choral song.

Now even the most enthusiastic supporters of the monodic/choral dichotomy are unable to do very much with this. Thus Bowra,³⁷ who refers to the passage as evidence that Plato 'distinguishes between monody and choral song', is at once obliged to admit 'He does not press the point or make much of it, and it plays almost no part in Greek poetical theory'. And Kirkwood³⁸ observes that although Plato 'is concerned with the judging of solo and choral performances in contests and groups several instrumental performances with monody, the passage has little bearing on the distinction of types of composition'. One can, in fact, give scepticism further rein in evaluating Plato's passage, with its pedantically fussy subdivisions. As E. B. England

³⁶ E.g. Gerber sup. cit. (n. 32). Since Pindaric references to singer-dancers are suspiciously and regularly vague ('There is no indication whatsoever of their number in any given ode': Herington sup. cit. [n. 19], pp. 29f.) it would be hard to argue that they occupy some privileged position of reality in contrast to the obviously conventional allusions to monodic performance.

³⁷ Sup. cit. (n. 4).

³⁸ Sup. cit. (n. 1) p. 212 n. 16. As Mr Barrett reminds me, this is an inaccurate summary of Plato's passage, since, with both *ῥαψωιδία* and *κιθαρωιδία* instances of *μονωιδία*, the only instrumental performance mentioned is of the *αὐλήτης*. Like the authors of several translations of the *Laws* into English, Kirkwood may be failing to distinguish between *κιθαριστής* ('lyre-player') and *κιθαρωιδός* (someone who *sings* to his lyre): cf. Fowler sup. cit. [n. 31] p. 96.

remarked in his commentary *ad loc.*,³⁹ 'The loose style of this classification, and its minuteness, are characteristic of the *Laws*. The author's first object is not to settle precisely the divisions of μουσική, but to give a general indication of the duties of the "Ministry of Education".' And a further ground⁴⁰ for extreme doubts about the value of this passage comes from Plato himself, who in a separate part of the *Laws* gives what is meant to be an historical survey of poetry before the time of the Persian Wars in which his later distinction⁴¹ between μονωιδία and χορωιδία plays no part at all (700a–b):

διηρημένη γὰρ δὴ τότε ἦν ἡμῖν ἡ μουσικὴ κατὰ εἶδη τε ἑαυτῆς ἅττα καὶ σχήματα, καὶ τι ἦν εἶδος ὠιδῆς εὐχαὶ πρὸς θεούς, ὄνομα δὲ ὕμνοι ἐπεκαλοῦντο· καὶ τούτῳ δὴ τὸ ἐναντίον ἦν ὠιδῆς ἕτερον εἶδος – θρήνου δέ τις ἂν αὐτοὺς μάλιστα ἐκάλεσεν – καὶ παιῶνες ἕτερον, καὶ ἄλλο, Διονύσου γένεσις οἶμαι, διθύραμβος λεγόμενος. νόμους τε αὐτὸ τοῦτο τοῦνομα ἐκάλουν, ὠιδὴν ὡς τινα ἐτέραν· ἐπέλεγον δὲ κιθαρῳδικούς. τούτων δὲ διατεταγμένων καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν, οὐκ ἐξήν ἄλλο εἰς ἄλλο καταχρῆσθαι μέλους εἶδος.

In the light of all this, H. Färber⁴² is perfectly right when he claims 'Es ist auffallend dass die Einteilung in Chor- und Sololyrik im Altertum in der Theorie gar keine Rolle spielt', as is Harvey,⁴³ who, going slightly further, states 'The modern division into "choral" and "monodic"...was unknown to antiquity or the Renaissance'.⁴⁴ But then it becomes all the more pressing to inquire: 'Who first hit on the distinction?'

III. THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND THE ORIGIN OF THE DISTINCTION

In the context of German scholarship the distinction appears as a self-evident truth in the influential writings of the brothers Schlegel. Thus in lectures⁴⁵ originally

³⁹ Manchester (1921), 1.583.

⁴⁰ As Pfeiffer observed, *sup. cit.* (n. 4), 'Plato was actually speaking of the training of solo-singers and chorus-singers in the course of a discussion of musical education. The two terms are not used either by him or by any other ancient writer for theoretical classification'. That 'Plato in the *Laws* 700b ignores this method of division' is observed by e.g. Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Melic Poets* (London, 1900), p. xx n. 2.

⁴¹ Apart from the Platonic passage 'χορωιδία does not occur elsewhere at all and μονωιδία is strictly applied to the song of a single actor in tragedy': Pfeiffer, *sup. cit.* (n. 3). μονωιδός occurs in Tzetzes *Vit. Hes.* (pp. 35, 62ff. Colonna) where μονωιδοί are contrasted with λυρικοί and defined as the authors of works delivered by one performer, like Lycophron's *Alexandra* (see the same author's commentary on the start of that work [1.4. Scheer]). Likewise, χορωιδέω is late and rare (Dio Cassius 61.19 of exhibitions in honour of Nero in A.D. 59). The earliest extant instances of the verb μονωιδέω are in Cratinus, fr. 270 K-A (*PCG* 4.258) from the *Ωραι* (whose date is not precisely ascertainable: see Kassel–Austin, *sup. cit.*) and Aristophanes' *Peace* 1012 (produced 421). 'The rather surprising fact' that χορός and χορεύται are not used by Pindar or Bacchylides of the performance of victory odes, 'although Pindar uses both words (and Bacchylides uses *choros*) often enough with reference to nonepinician performances' is remarked on by Herington (*sup. cit.* [n. 19]), p. 30.

⁴² *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike* (Munich, 1936), p. 16.

⁴³ *Sup. cit.* (n. 26), p. 159 n. 3. Cf. the remarks of Rösler cited in n. 3 *supra*. For Rösler the absence of the distinction from ancient writings constitutes another reason for being reluctant to take ancient nomenclature for Greek lyric seriously. But if one first examines the internal evidence of the poems themselves (as we have done), perhaps one will be prepared to be impressed, for once in a way, with this implicit verdict of ancient critics.

⁴⁴ See too Maehler, *sup. cit.* (n. 11), p. 1: 'die heute übliche Einteilung in Lieder, die von Einzelsängern, und solche, die von Chören vorgetragen wurden, [ist] nicht antik' etc.

⁴⁵ *Vorlesungen über schöne Literatur und Kunst* (ed. J. Minor, 2 (1984), p. 240). A similar distinction in the same writer's *Geschichte der klass. Lit.* (1802) (edited by Minor and also by

delivered in Berlin in 1802/3 we find August Wilhelm Schlegel stating 'es ist ausgemacht, dass das Chorische einen eignen Styl in der lyrischen Poesie der Alten ausmacht'.⁴⁶ This forms part of an elaborate subdivision of Greek lyric whereby choral poetry is assigned to the Dorians, 'melic' (here equivalent to monody) to the Aeolians, elegy and iambus to the Ionians, and dithyramb to Attic poets. Such oversimplifications are, of course, very helpful for the composition of lucid literary history, and even more useful for the delivery of (and note-taking at) lectures. The younger Friedrich Schlegel had already committed very much the same distinction to print⁴⁷ in writings that are still influential upon the general view of Greek literature held by beginners, writings whose brilliance evoked the admiration of so stern a judge as Wilamowitz.⁴⁸

As far as classical scholarship in its narrower sense is concerned, the distinction was incorporated into K. O. Müller's *History of the Literature of Ancient Greece*.⁴⁹ The first volume of this famous work was begun in England in 1836 and published, after its author's premature death in Greece, in 1840. Chapter XIII is entitled 'The Aeolic School of Lyric Poetry', its first section 'Difference between the Lyric Poetry of the Aeolians, and the Choral Lyric Poetry of the Dorians'. Here the familiar distinction appears fully-blown and in complete outline: the Lesbian school and the Doric 'differ essentially in every respect, as much in the subject, as in the form and style of their poems'. The alleged contrasts between the two types of composition are expressed in practically identical terms to those found in, for instance, Bowra's *Greek Lyric Poetry*: the greater length of stanza, the elaborateness of the metre, the triadic structure, the relatively public (rather than personal) tone and content which supposedly identify choral lyric and set it apart from monody: all receive their mention here as there. No-one who has read Bowra's brief summary of the purported facts and then turns to Müller's diffuser treatment will doubt for a moment that the latter's doctrine, however indirectly and whatever the intermediate stages of transmission, is the ultimate source for the former's. This is hardly surprising, since Müller's *History* was both successful⁵⁰ and respected. Wilamowitz,⁵¹ writing in the

E. Lohner in A. W. Schlegel, *Kritische Schriften und Briefe* 3 [1964], pp. 210ff.). It is interesting that Alcman and Ibycus are in the latter ranked with 'Melische Dichter' (here equivalent to monodic poets).

⁴⁶ Sup. cit. (n. 45), p. 242. For a useful summary (with bibliography) of the general contributions of nineteenth-century German culture and scholarship to our picture of Greek lyric poetry see Rösler sup. cit. (n. 3), p. 193 and n. 41.

⁴⁷ In *Über die Schulen der griech. Poesie* (1794) and *Geschichte der Poesie der Griechen und Römer* (1798). The early writings of Friedrich Schlegel (born 1772) are to be consulted in the first volume of the critical edition by Behler and Eichner (1979) under the heading 'Studien des klass. Altertums': see p. 560.

⁴⁸ 'Sehr viel tiefer' [i.e. in comparison with the superficialities of August Wilhelm] 'oft wirklich genial sind die ersten Arbeiten von Friedrich Schlegel... Von ihm stammt im wesentlichen die Vorstellung von einem organischen Leben, Wachsen und Welken der Literatur, für das die griechische das Hauptexempel ist, und demgemäss die allgemeine Beurteilung der Gattungen' [my italics] 'und Epochen' (*Die griechische Literatur des Altertums* [Die Kultur der Gegenwart 1.8]¹ 233 = ³316).

⁴⁹ This work first appeared in English, having been commissioned by the London Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge: for a brief résumé of the facts see Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* 2.187 and n. 3. I quote from the revised version of the translation from Müller's German MS. by Sir G. C. Lewis and J. W. Donaldson (London, 1858), 1.218ff. = *Griechische Literatur*⁴ (Stuttgart, 1882), 1.275ff.

⁵⁰ 'His most successful book' (Pfeiffer, sup. cit. [n. 49], p. 187).

⁵¹ *Geschichte der Philologie*, p. 57 ('die Literaturgeschichte... die nicht nur die lesbarste, sondern allein eine wirkliche Geschichte ist') = *History of Classical Scholarship*, p. 128.

year 1921, called it 'not only the most readable [history of Greek literature] in existence but the only one that is a genuine history'.⁵²

Müller was perfectly well aware that the distinctions he drew were not absolute:⁵³ he allows, for instance, that 'it is probable that the Aeolic poets sometimes composed poems for choral exhibition, for choruses were undoubtedly performed in Lesbos, as well as in other parts of Greece'. And we are now in a position to be highly sceptical as to the value of many of the above distinctions. Thus the point about greater length of stanzas in choral poetry is again thrown into doubt if Stesichorus' lengthy stanzas are the product of a monodist. Growing knowledge of other specimens of Greek lyric necessitated some new modifications in Müller's picture of the relationship between monody and choral lyric. For instance, 'Thoughts and feelings peculiar to an individual could not, with propriety, be sung by a numerous chorus...On the other hand, the Aeolic lyric poetry frequently expresses thoughts and feelings in which only *one* mind can sympathise...How would such impressions be destroyed by the singing of a chorus of many voices!' The publication of papyri fragments of various *partheneia* by Alcman and Pindar revealed the truth as more complex than this formulation allowed. In view of Alcman's *Louvre Partheneion*, a scholar⁵⁴ who still wishes to preserve the generalisation that choral poetry is distinguished by a 'caractère solennel et prétentieux' is obliged to admit that 'le ton de certains types de lyrique chorale, parthénées, chants symposiaques ou autres, est léger, badin, frivole'. Pindar's *epinicia* should have already given Müller pause. By the time of the revised edition of his *Greek Lyric Poetry* (preface dated 1960), Bowra had devised a more cautious generalisation: 'though the choral poets often speak in the first person and are by no means shy of voicing their own opinions, they are less intimate and personal than the writers of monody, who speak without reserve of their innermost feelings and do not attempt to identify themselves with their company, or to speak for anyone but themselves'. Indeed, the differences of emphasis that arose even over the relatively short space of time elapsing between the first and second editions of Bowra's book are rather revealing: in 1935 'The distinction between choral lyric and monody' was 'fundamental...If they interacted on each other their interactions were not of great importance'. In 1960 'The difference between choral song and monody is not absolute, and there is a certain overlap between them...None the less the distinction between choral song and monody is not valueless...it represents something which cannot be ignored, since it helped to foster a variety of form and temper in Greek lyric poetry'.⁵⁵ The more negative way of putting things here is striking: reality and preconceived schematicism here struggle, but the former still loses.

That the distinction under consideration should have been formulated by the brothers Schlegel and popularised by Müller is perfectly appropriate. The latter's was

⁵² Thanks to the various recent studies of individual lyric poets by F. G. Welcker, which for the first time tried to build up a significant and continuous picture of the contributions of Alcman, Stesichorus and Ibycus and their place in Greek literature.

⁵³ This concession is often made by scholars eager to preserve the general distinction. So Maehler, *sup. cit.* (n. 11), p. 1: '[die Einteilung] ist...nicht immer eindeutig, denn...kann derselbe Dichter sowohl für Chöre wie für den Einzenvortrag gedichtet haben, wie es z. B. Alkaios und Simonides getan haben'.

⁵⁴ Van Groningen, *La Composition Littéraire Archaique Grecque* (Amsterdam, 1958), p. 186.

⁵⁵ These questions are from Bowra *sup. cit.* (n. 4), p. 7, and pp. 6f. respectively, in the case of the 1960 edition, and p. 3 in that of the 1935 edition. See too van Groningen *sup. cit.* (n. 54): 'les limites entre la monodie et l'ode exécutée par un choeur ne peuvent être tracées avec une précision absolue' (the first sentence of a chapter entitled 'La lyrique chorale', preceded by a chapter called 'La Monodie').

the first History of Greek Literature in any meaningful sense, and the first work that was really in any position to present a coherent synthesis of the position of Greek lyric within Greek literature as a whole. A history of a nation's literature must impose significance, detect developments, trace patterns. It must also organise a vast amount of heterogeneous material. From all these points of view a distinction between monody and choral lyric is an invaluable aid in the arrangement of chapters and sections. As Pfeiffer observes,⁵⁶ 'the distinction...may well be used for the purpose of literary history'. But it can, as Pfeiffer was aware, have more disturbing consequences. The use of anachronistic labels in literary history is always problematic. More sinister and worrying still is the tendency to talk in terms of the *ethos* of Greek choral lyric. The metaphysical tone this produces was one which Hermann Fränkel,⁵⁷ for instance, found highly congenial: 'choral lyric had a high sense of its own dignity, and its production accordingly had certain closely-defined prerequisites...All these reasons conspired to make choral lyric also more representative of its age than any other literary form'. Maehler is no less portentous in his verdict:⁵⁸ 'Die lyrische Chordichtung des 6. und 5. Jhs. ist in ganz besonderem Masse eine öffentliche und repräsentative Kunst...das Chorlied [ist] für seine Auftraggeber in einem ähnlichen Sinne repräsentativ wie es die Weihgeschenke und Schatzhäuser sind' and so on. I fear there is a danger here of confusing the *ethos* of choral lyric with that of the epinician ode.

Another type of confusion is revealed in the following remark by Kirkwood:⁵⁹ 'there is more difference between a Pindaric ode and an Alcaic hymn than between a Pindaric hymn and a Pindaric epinician'. Thus far we can all agree. But when he proceeds: 'That is, the difference is greater between choral and monodic poetry, whatever the particular occasion, than between types of choral or of monodic poetry', there is room for the reply that the poet's personality has been ignored. One expects to find considerable similarities between two Pindaric compositions, in spite of differences due to the contrasting *ethos* required by sub-genres like *epinicion* or *partheneion*. To explain the 'difference between a Pindaric ode and an Alcaic hymn' purely in terms of this alleged distinction without reference to the poets themselves is surely a little perverse.

It is time to pull the different threads together. What have we learned as to the validity of the ubiquitous (but purely modern) distinction between choral and monodic lyric? The answer would seem to be that (who would deny it?) there *was* choral poetry and monodic poetry, but that it is dangerously misleading to talk of choral or monodic *poets*. Most lyric composers were versatile enough to practise both categories. And (a final paradox) though two poets, Stesichorus and Ibycus, were customarily supposed to have restricted themselves, with less versatility, to one subdivision of lyric, that subdivision, on all the evidence, is now revealed as monody not chorus. The importance of these findings should be obvious. But there is an even more crucial point at stake in rejecting the excessively schematic viewpoint imposed by that ambiguous tool the hand-book of Greek literature. As Albin Lesky observed

⁵⁶ Sup. cit. (n. 2).

⁵⁷ *Frühgr. Dichtung und Philosophie*, p. 484 = *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, p. 425.

⁵⁸ Sup. cit. (n. 11), p. 5. Maehler is talking primarily of epinicia, but also of paeon and dithyramb, as the context makes clear.

⁵⁹ Sup. cit. (n. 1), pp. 9f. It is a fashion with many modern scholars to conclude, on no grounds worth mentioning, that choral lyric was particularly 'communal': see Lefkowitz (*AJP* 109 (1988), forthcoming) for some bibliography.

in the Introduction to what is still the most sensitive history of the subject ever written,⁶⁰ 'The most difficult, and in a sense the most distasteful task, has been to divide the subject into epochs and to subdivide these, since as soon as we start doing so, living threads begin to be severed. Where Greek literature is concerned, the large divisions are at once obvious, but to divide them further is both difficult and dangerous'. Even Lesky, however, acquiesced, at least partially, in the conventional monody/choral distinction. In the cases of Alcman and Pindar, who straddle that distinction, the clumsy disjunction threatens numerous living threads, to no benefit except the continuance of a facile schematism devoid of any basis in the testimony of antiquity.

St John's College, Oxford

M. DAVIES

APPENDIX 1: THE SPIRIT OF COMPROMISE

Some scholars, impressed by some of the arguments adduced above, have nevertheless endeavoured to keep the best of both worlds by supposing that the poems in question represent a sort of amalgam of choral and monodic lyric. After all, there appears to be warrant of a kind for this in Homer's description of song at the court of the Phaeacians (*Od.* 8.261ff.):

κῆρυξ δ' ἐγγύθεν ἦλθε φέρων φόρμιγγα λήγεια
 Δημοδόκω· ὁ δ' ἔπειτα κί' ἐς μέσον ἄμφι δὲ κοῦροι
 πρωθῆβαι ἴσταντο, δαήμονες ὀρχηθμοῖο,
 πέπληγον δὲ χορὸν θεῖον ποσίν. αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς
 μαρμαρυγὰς θηεῖτο ποδῶν, θαύμαζε δὲ θυμῶι. 265
 αὐτὰρ ὁ φορμίζων ἀνεβάλλετο καλὸν αἶδειν
 ἄμφ' Ἀρεος φιλότῃτος εὖςτεφάνου τ' Ἀφροδίτης κτλ.

Wilamowitz⁶¹ thought this passage might explain why *Στησίχορος* was so named even if he did not compose for the chorus: he recited his works in the monodic manner, but to the background accompaniment of dancing. Fennell's picture⁶² of Pindaric *encomia* 'accompanied by a choric dance' is clearly similar in its attempt to achieve the very best of both worlds. A different sort of compromise bases itself upon another passage of Homer, the lament over Hector's corpse (*Il.* 24.720ff.):

παρὰ δ' εἶσαν αἰδοῦν
 θρήνων ἐξάρχους, οἳ τε στονοέσσαν αἰοιδῆν
 οἱ μὲν ἄρ' ἐθρήνεον, ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναικες.

Not altogether dissimilar to this is Jebb's hypothesis⁶³ that Bacchylides' fr. 18 'is the refrain of a love-song, given, probably in chorus, after a single voice had sung a strophe'. Maehler⁶⁴ is sympathetically disposed to the idea and believes we may have to do with 'gemischten Formen des Vortrags' so arranged 'dass Teile des Liedes vom Vorsänger oder Chorführer solo gesungen wurden, während dazwischen der Chor mit dem Refrain einfiel', and Herington⁶⁵ thinks it 'perhaps...worth considering the possibility that in this and some other cases the poem was delivered by a solo voice – or an alternation of solo voices – while the *corps de ballet* (or better, the *corps*

⁶⁰ *A History of Greek Literature*, pp. xivf. (≈ *Geschichte der gr. Literatur*³ p. ix).

⁶¹ Sup. cit. (n. 11), p. 238. On this and the following Homeric passage see in general Dale, *Collected Papers*, pp. 158ff.

⁶² Sup. cit. (n. 23).

⁶³ Sup. cit. (n. 11), p. 43.

⁶⁴ Sup. cit. (n. 11), p. 1 and n. 4.

⁶⁵ Sup. cit. (n. 19), p. 31.

de kōmos) danced in sympathy with the poetry'. Lefkowitz⁶⁶ has speculated that in Pind. *Ol.* 6 'the *κωμασταί* that Aeneas brought [might] be chanting something like *καλλίνικε* or hip-hip-hooray' or that the *δαροι* of boys mentioned in *Pyth.* 3.11f. 'could...be humming an accompaniment or providing a rhythmic background like the Delian girls' *κρεμβαλιαστύς* in *H. H. Ap.* 162'.

Speculations of this nature cannot be totally excluded. But in the light of the evidence adduced above they may not be necessary. We should certainly not feel obliged to accept this type of compromise out of any desire to save the face of any author, ancient or modern, who subscribes to the distinction under review.

APPENDIX 2: TOWARDS AN ALTERNATIVE CLASSIFICATION?

This article has been (designedly) negative and unconstructive, its aim to demolish a still widely accepted orthodoxy. But he who does such demolishing (it might be argued) should also explain what, if anything, he would put in place of the collapsed edifice. Furthermore, the attack was against excessive compartmentalisation (to change the metaphor). But are the compartments unreal, non-existent? Or are they merely wrongly labelled?

The poets in the alleged compartments were, it will be remembered:

(A) Sappho, Alcaeus, Anacreon. [One may also include here the Attic scolia and many of the compositions of Archilochus].⁶⁷

(B) Alcman, Stesichorus, Ibycus, Simonides, Pindar, Bacchylides.

Jettisoning the monody/choral distinction, can we differentiate those two groups in any other, more satisfactory, way? Two possibilities occur:

(i) *Metrical structure*

That of poets in the first group is simple: stichic, distichic or monostrophic. The stanzas are short (*c.* 30–40 syllables)⁶⁸ and/or narrowly homogeneous. The same stanza may be used for more than one poem (and even by more than one poet).

That of poets in the second group is by contrast complex and elaborate. Their poems are usually triadic (though they are sometimes monostrophic). The length of their stanzas varies widely (*c.* 40–200 syllables) and the metrical structure of every poem is peculiar to that poem.⁶⁹

(ii) *Language*

Here the position is more complicated, and various circumstances, not least the Alexandrian edition of the lyric poets, have produced distortions.

Nevertheless, of poets in the first group it can be said that they employ something closely approximating to their own vernacular, while those in the second group

⁶⁶ Sup. cit. (n. 27), p. 31.

⁶⁷ See, e.g., W. Rösler, *Rh. Mus.* 119 (1976), 302ff.

⁶⁸ Figures from Mr Barrett who observes that the longest would seem to be Pindar, *Paeon* 6 ($2 \times 196 + 177 = 565$) and Bacchylides 17 ($2 \times 196 + 172 = 564$). Pindar's *epinicia* (excluding the spurious *Ol.* 5) have stanzas of 60–169 (average 98), triads of 200–390 (average 290). Among the shortest are (strikingly enough, in contrast to *Paeon* 6) Pindar, *Paeon* 5 and the same poet's *παρθένεια*. Also the (monodic) *encomia* of Bacchylides and Pindar.

⁶⁹ An exception, as Mr Barrett points out, is Pindar, *Is.* 3/4. But this obviously constitutes a very special case: even if (as is likely) we have to do with two separate poems, the same victor and (at least in part) the same victory are involved.

display an artificial Doricised international poetic dialect with variations from poet to poet.⁷⁰

I do not think it will be denied that in the case of these two modes of differentiation we have to do with criteria far more objective, precise and tangible than any of the extremely vague (if not vacuous) generalisations about the *ethos* of monody and choral lyric considered above. The case for compartmentalisation of the two groups of poets is a strong one. What labels should we contemplate for them? One possibility that springs at once to mind is to call the first group 'eastern', the second 'western'.⁷¹ As we have seen above, the earliest exponents of the monody/choral dichotomy coupled it with a geographical distinction (choral: Dorian; monodic: Aeolian). The tripartite division into Aeolic, Ionian and Dorian traditions is still found useful by as rigorous and intelligent a hand-book as West's recent *Greek Metre*,⁷² from whose pages the choral/monodic differentiation is gratifyingly absent.⁷³

The east/west disjunction is not so portentous or impressive-looking as the monodic/choral dichotomy. But it looks to be more accurate.

⁷⁰ The case of Alcman is particularly difficult. As is well-known, several scholars are of the opinion that some of the laconisms now present in his text represent later additions due not to the poet but to his Alexandrian editors. See especially Risch, *Mus. Helv.* 11 (1954), 20ff. = *Kl. Schr.* pp. 314ff., J. T. Hooker, *The Language and Text of the Lesbian Poets* (Innsbruck, 1977), pp. 63ff.

⁷¹ This requires calling the two lyric poets from Ceos (Simonides and Bacchylides) after their genre rather than their actual birthplace. That the *Argive* poetess Telesilla should be ranked (from the metrical viewpoint at least) as an 'eastern' is no very great incongruity. Here, as throughout this article, I designedly exclude the Boeotian Corinna from discussion because of the total uncertainty as to her date.

⁷² Oxford, 1982. See too his remarks in *CQ* 23 (1973), 179ff.

⁷³ As it is from Paul Maas's determinedly scientific treatise on the same topic.